

25-8-05
Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 860 *Mar*

DATED 12. December

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Harbour Improvements. Recording with reference
to certain orders of Govt letter from the Chairman,
H.T. Board on the subject of the Madras -
and Canal Entrance.*
==

*T.C.
14/12*

14/12

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	834	mar.	1. 12. 26.				
	814	mar.	24. 11. 96.				
	813	mar.	23. 11. 96.				
	47	ma.	9. 2. 95				
	529-30	N.	11. 2. 26.				
	119-20	mar.	26. 2. 26.				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
memo	50350	mar	21. 12. 96				
to	15-16	"	5. 1. 97				

Government {1896} of Madras. MARINE.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

1896.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 860, 12th December 1896.

DECEMBER.

Harbour Improvements

Recording, with reference to certain orders of Government, letter from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, on the subject of the Madras — and canal entrance.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From W. AUSTIN, Esq., I.C.S., Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 20th March 1896, No. 4894.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of G.O., No. 119, Marine, dated 26th February 1896, which has been carefully considered by the Board at its meetings of the 6th and 20th March.

2. The Board has been under the impression that in the appointment of the representative committee presided over by Colonel Pennycuik, Government recognised that the proposed harbour improvements were necessary in the interests of the development of the presidency at large and of the railways, which would benefit by Madras being made a cheap port; and in submitting the proposals forwarded with Mr. LeFanu's letter, above quoted, the Trustees were led to believe that Government would be pleased to make a liberal grant towards the total cost of the scheme or an annual contribution to Harbour Funds.

3. The Trustees, as explained in paragraph 8 of Mr. LeFanu's letter, No. 3258, dated 20th November 1895, are not in a position to recommend Government to sanction payment for any portion of the cost of the canal entrance from Harbour Funds. Should it appear to Government that a less expensive entrance is all that is required for the sanitation and drainage schemes, the simplest procedure would appear to be for Government to carry out such works as it may consider necessary, for the canal, subject to the plans being approved by the Harbour Trust.

4. Should Government decide that the deep quay wall alongside the canal entrance is not required as an integral part of the canal scheme, the Board must view the matter of dredging to provide extra berths in the light in which it is put in paragraph 3 of the Chief Engineer's note, dated 4th January 1896, viz., that the question is purely a financial one, as to whether the additional accommodation to be obtained is worth the Rs. 2,19,000 to be expended upon it, *plus* however Rs. 5,52,000, the balance chargeable to Harbour Works on account of the canal entrance; to which must also be added the extra cost of the proposed boat basin in the south-west corner, due to the proposal to give it also a deep water wharf, instead of a boat wharf only as proposed by the Improvements Committee. The difference in the estimated cost of the boat-basin with a deep water berth for a ship and Mr. Pogson's plan No. 1 submitted to the committee, which is practically identical in size and position, is Rs. 2,59,250. The total extra expense to be incurred therefore to give two extra berths alongside quay walls and three mooring berths would be Rs. 10,30,250, and the Board is inclined to think that it would not be justified in spending this large amount, as other satisfactory arrangements might probably be made, which would not involve so large an expenditure.

5. With regard to the proposed protective south groyne, the Board agrees with His Excellency the Governor in Council and with Colonel Pennycuik in his objections to it; and awaits the result of the reference to the Right Honourable the

Secretary of State. As observed by Colonel Pennycuik, if the proposed groyne were connected at its eastern end with the south wall of the harbour, it would form an excellent dock; but this proposal and the question of deep water docks has not been taken into consideration in the proposals lately made for harbour improvements.

6. If the Harbour Board is to depend entirely upon its own resources to carry out harbour improvements, it must confine itself strictly to the pressing requirements of the trade of the port, and be guided in a great measure by the limits of its financial resources.

7. This will necessitate the Trustees considering *de novo* what is now actually required to give the facilities needed by importers and exporters. If Government will, as suggested in paragraph 3 *supra*, make whatever proposals it may deem fit for a canal entrance, the Board will be prepared to enter into negotiations with the railways as to their requirements, in view to facilities being given to them, but not at the expense of Harbour Funds.

ORDER—No. 860, Marine, dated 12th December 1896.

Recorded with reference to the undermentioned orders :—

G.O., No. 813, Marine, dated 23rd November 1896.

" " 814 " " 24th " "

" " 834 " " 1st December " "

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board.

Inamie

~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ DEPARTMENT.

N^o 860 Mas of 12.12.96

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, No. 4894,
dated 20th March 1896. *3 P*

Recorded with reference
to the undermentioned orders:-

G. O. 813 Inamie of 23rd Nov. 1896
" 814 - do - 24th " "
" 834 - do - 1st Decr " "

RS

11/12/96

*The Chairman, Harbour
Trust Board.*

Marine C. No. 357

Rk

860 am

The H. I. B. have recently
sent up fresh ^(a) proposals
providing for a boat basin
outside the harbour
on the S. W. of the S. Arm.
This, and the dredging
suggested by Sir H. Rendell
with lie all that the
Board will take up for
the present. +813 Mar 23 11 96

when orders ^{Press-} are
issued on the letter referred
to above. C. No. 1217 Mar:
the present paper can
be brought forward for
disposal.

A copy of the recent
R.O. on Mr. Hughes' pro-
posal for a canal from
the South of the harbour
should be added to the
file.

Rk

25 Nov 96

+ G.O. 80. 814 Mar, 24 11 96.

C. a. w

Submitted for disposal
as orders have been passed
on the letters referred to
above

Rk

11

11-12-96

(a) I don't find this in the
file? R. I. O.

Dr. A.W.

Copy of G.O. 80834-441

8/1-12-96 now put up
the original and big file
will be put up - if wanted -
U.R. Co. sent in the paper
without first showing
it to me - D.P., and

8/1-12-96
with the old one
of 11-12-96
the first one

the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96
the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96

the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96
the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96

the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96
the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96

the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96
the first one
is the best
one - 12/1-12-96

Read the following:—

From the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, No. 4894, dated 20th March 1896.

FOR ORDERS.

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation has already been directed to prepare a complete estimate for the proposed ~~Water~~ Canal including the harbour entrance. He might now be directed to draw up the design for the Canal Entrance in communication with the Harbour Trust Board who have a claim to be consulted in regard to any works inside harbour limits, but there seems no reason why the cost of harbour improvements, which falls against the Trust, should be mixed up with the cost of the Canal or its entrance, which is chargeable to Provincial funds.

2. Why the Board should assume, as they do in their present letter, that the Government intended to make a liberal, or any, grant towards the completion of the harbour is not clear. There is no warrant for such an assumption in any of the Proceedings

of

I understood that a different scheme is about to be submitted. The chief feature of which is to obtain the water for flushing the Canal and the Coon River, from the River back water, instead of from the Harbour. We had better await this scheme before passing further orders.

*H. H.
20. 4. 96*

*Note:
The revised scheme has since been submitted by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and will be in circulation shortly.
H. H.
21. 4. 96*

of Government. On the other hand, there is no reason why the Government should expect the Board to pay for "any portion of the cost of the Canal Entrance from Harbour Funds", and they might be told that the Government have no such intention.

3. If these conclusions necessitate the scheme of Harbour improvements being taken up de novo, the Board can come up with fresh proposals. It is to their interest to provide proper facilities not only for the berthing of ships but also for the loading and unloading of cargo; and it is submitted that they have not as yet made out any case for Provincial or other funds raised from general taxation, being applied to the Madras Harbour which is ~~practically~~ financially independent of Government.

W.
26/3/96

W.
Marine.

*Madras Harbour
Improvements &
Canal Entrance*

FOR ORDERS.

*See over forwarding
decision of the question
of the Canal Entrance -*
21/4/96
W.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE CHAIRMAN,

HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,

MADRAS.

TO

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Marine Department.

DATED

20th March 1896.

DESPATCHED

234

RECEIVED

ENCLOSURE

No. 4894.

SUBJECT.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Replying to G. O., Marine, No. 119, dated 26th
February 1896

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE CHAIRMAN,

HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,

MADRAS.

TO

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Marine Department.

DATED

20th March 1896.

DESPATCHED

25th „

RECEIVED

„

ENCLOSURE

No. 4894.

SUBJECT.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Replying to G. O., Marine, No. 119, dated 26th
February 1896.

10

Harbour Trust Office,

MADRAS, 20th March 1896.

No. 4894.

FROM

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

TO

THE HON'BLE COL. D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, R. E.,
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Marine Department.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of G. O., Marine, dated 26th February, No. 119, which has been carefully considered by the Board at its meetings of the 6th and 20th March.

2. The Board has been under the impression that in the appointment of the representative Committee presided over by Col. Pennycuik, Government recognised that the proposed Harbour improvements were necessary in the interests of the development of the Presidency at large, and of the railways, which would benefit by Madras being made a cheap port; and in submitting the proposals forwarded with Mr. LeFanu's letter, above quoted, the Trustees were led to believe that Government would be pleased to make a liberal grant towards the total cost of the scheme or an annual contribution to Harbour Funds.

3. The Trustees, as explained in para. 8 of Mr. LeFanu's letter, No. 3258, dated 20th November 1895, are not in a position to recommend Government to sanction payment for any portion of the cost of the canal entrance from Harbour Funds. Should it appear to Government that a less expensive entrance is all that is required for the sanitation and drainage schemes, the simplest procedure would appear to be, for Government to carry out such works as it may consider necessary, for the canal, subject to the plans being approved by the Harbour Trust.

4. Should Government decide that the deep quay wall alongside the canal entrance is not required as an integral part of the canal scheme, the Board must view the matter of dredging to provide extra berths, in the light in which it is put in para. 3 of the Chief Engineer's note, dated 4th January 1896, viz., that the question is purely a financial one, as to whether the additional accommodation to be obtained is worth the Rs. 2,19,000 to be expended upon it, plus however Rs. 5,52,000, the balance chargeable to Harbour Works, on account of the canal entrance; to which must also be added the extra cost of the proposed boat-basin in the south-west corner, due to the proposal to give it also a deep water wharf, instead of a boat wharf only as proposed by the Improvements Committee. The difference in the estimated cost of the boat-basin with a deep water berth for a ship and Mr. Pogson's plan No. 1 submitted to the Committee, which is practically identical in size and position is Rs. 2,59,250.

The total extra expense to be incurred therefore to give two extra berths alongside quay walls, and three mooring berths, would be Rs. 10,30,250, and the Board is inclined to think that it would not be justified in spending this large amount, as other satisfactory arrangements might probably be made, which would not involve so large an expenditure.

5. With regard to the proposed protective south groyne, the Board agrees with His Excellency the Governor in Council, and with Col. Pennycuik in his objections to it; and awaits the result of the reference to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State. As observed by Col. Pennycuik: if the proposed groyne were connected at its eastern end with the south wall of the Harbour, it would form an excellent dock; but this proposal, and the question of deep water docks has not been taken into consideration in the proposals lately made for Harbour Improvements.

6. If the Harbour Board is to depend entirely upon its own resources to carry out Harbour Improvements, it must confine itself strictly to the pressing requirements of the trade of the Port, and be guided in a great measure by the limits of its financial resources.

7. This will necessitate the Trustees considering *de novo* what is now actually required, to give the facilities needed by importers and exporters. If Government will, as suggested in para. 3 *supra*, make whatever proposals it may deem fit for a canal entrance; the Board will be prepared to enter into negotiations with the Railways as to their requirements, in view to facilities being given to them, but not at the expense of Harbour Funds.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant.

W. S. P. H.
Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

Engineer's Office No. 85

No. 47 49-2-95 Marine
" 190 " 1-7-95 "
" 529-300-11-2-96
" 119-20-26-2-96 Marine.

Dec 24 3 96

Government { 1896 } of Madras.
MARINE.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

} 1896.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 834, 1st December 1896.

DECEMBER.

Boat-Basin

Directing the Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal, with remarks, to prepare, in communication with the Harbour Works Engineer, the estimate for the construction of a — outside the south arm of the Madras harbour and within the sand which has accumulated to the south-west.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From WARE AUSTIN, Esq., I.C.S., Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras,
to the Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 6th November 1896,
No. 3284.

Referring to my letter No. 4894, dated 20th March 1896, and to your memorandum, dated 30th July, in which you remark with regard to the shoaling reported by Mr. Pogson of the Roadstead and at the entrance of the Harbour, that "the only satisfactory solution of the question from an engineering point of view is, I believe, the north-east entrance," I have the honour to inform you that the improvements from the altered stand-point which has gradually developed since the date of the Harbour Improvements Committee's report, and is of opinion that a north-east entrance would better suit the requirements of the trade of this port than any other form of entrance, provided that the cost of constructing it is not prohibitive.

2. It is observed that, in his evidence before the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for India in April 1887, Mr. Parkes stated, paragraphs 256-8, "The cost of making that north-east entrance, as designed by the Madras Committee, ship dock to the southward of the south pier to the area shown, it would be, in round numbers, say fourteen lakhs."

It would, therefore, appear that Mr. Parkes was of opinion that twenty-seven lakhs of rupees would provide a north-east entrance to the Harbour—which, it is presumed, included closing the then existing eastern entrance—and a ship dock in the sand to the south.

3. Very costly work has since been carried out to complete the eastern entrance, which has now been finished; and although the Trustees individually prefer a north-east or northerly entrance, it would only be in case of the present entrance shoaling works to keep it open being estimated at a very large sum, that they would be willing to seriously consider a change in the position of entrance; and the Board does not consider that the time has yet arrived to provide a ship dock in connection with the Harbour, but agree with Mr. Parkes that if ever this time does come, the sand which has accreted to the south of the Harbour is the best place for it; and, owing to its rapid accumulation, will afford more space and better facilities for the construction of a dock at an earlier date, than Mr. Parkes anticipated.

4. The Trustees will, therefore, await further information regarding the reported shoaling of the Roadstead, which at present does not threaten to close the entrance very rapidly, and must now consider what means should be adopted to improve Harbour facilities at a moderate cost.

5. The Harbour Improvements Committee recommended a boat-basin across the western side of the Harbour with a canal entrance; in the north-west corner, beyond which were provided quays and ample space for dealing with the large coal traffic of the Port, in a locality convenient for despatch by railway.

6. In considering these proposals, the Harbour Board adopted a modified form of basin confined to the south-west corner of the Harbour as being sufficient for general cargo, while coal was left to be dealt with in the north-west beyond the canal entrance as proposed by the Committee in and near the present block-making ground, but with the additional facility of a deep-water berth, alongside of which a steamer could lie to discharge coal and horses, or to embark troops or passengers.

7. In paragraph 3 of my letter referred to *supra*, it was pointed out that, as explained in paragraph 8 of Mr. LeFanu's letter, No. 3258, dated 20th November 1895, "the Trustees are not in a position to recommend to Government to sanction payment for any portion of the canal entrance from Harbour Funds," and in paragraph 4 I wrote, "should Government decide that the deep quay wall alongside the canal entrance is not required as an integral part of the canal scheme, the Board must view the matter of dredging to provide extra berths in the light in which it is put in paragraph 3 of the Chief Engineer's (Colonel Pennycuik) note, dated 4th January 1896, viz., that the question is purely a financial one, as to whether the additional accommodation to be obtained is worth the Rs. 2,19,000 to be expended upon it, plus, however, Rs. 5,52,000; the balance chargeable to Harbour Works on account of the canal entrance, to which must also be added the extra cost of the proposed boat-basin in the south-west corner, due to the proposal to give it also a deep water wharf, instead of a boat wharf only as proposed by the Improvements Committee."

8. It is now understood that Government has abandoned the idea of making a canal at the north-west corner; therefore, to provide the necessary accommodation for the coal traffic at that spot, the Board would have to incur the whole of the expense necessary to form the entrance without the advantages which may accrue to the Harbour by a canal connection. The canal section was estimated to cost Rupees 7,52,300, and the Board is of opinion that as the canal is not to be made from the north-west corner, it would not be justified in incurring this expense, to provide an entrance to a coal-basin only, which basin would be an additional expense not yet estimated for, it being intended when Mr. LeFanu submitted the Board's modifications of the Committee's recommendations to utilise a portion of the canal for landing and stacking coal (*vide* plan A 1 which accompanied the Committee's report, and the plan submitted with Mr. LeFanu's letter No. 3258).

9. The Trustees have, therefore, had to reconsider the whole question and decide whether other satisfactory arrangements could not be made which would not involve so large an expenditure, and this appears to be practicable.

10. As the canal section at a cost of Rs. 7,52,300, to provide an entrance to a coal-basin merely, is out of the question, the next step was to consider whether the proposed boat-basin in the south-west corner of the Harbour was sufficient to meet requirements, or, if not, what modifications were needed.

11. The nautical authorities have, throughout the discussion of the question of Harbour improvements, consistently and unanimously objected to any curtailment of the water area of the Harbour, but their objections and the disadvantages pointed out were overruled, as being of less importance than the advantages to be gained.

12. Without the canal section the boat-basin, as sanctioned in the south-west corner of the Harbour, is found to be totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the Port, and must, therefore, apart from nautical objections to it, be abandoned.

13. It was part of Mr. Parkes' original proposals to provide a boat-basin in the sand to the south of the Harbour, and the Board has, in reluctantly abandoning proposals previously approved, been compelled to seek a solution of the difficulty in this direction.

14. I submit for the information of Government the proceedings of a special meeting held on Friday, 30th October, together with a sketch of the proposals made by Mr. Pinsent to overcome the difficulties which have arisen, which proposals fully meet all nautical objections and traffic requirements, and are unanimously approved by the Trustees. The plan provides ample accommodation for coal, as well as for

general imports and exports, and leaves the space between the arms of the harbour free for railway communication through the present coal yard, and crane yard, where goods requiring cranes to handle them are now stored. The necessity of taking immediate action to provide better facilities for landing coal is daily increasing in importance. The trade has assumed large dimensions, and the Board can hardly expect to retain it under the present antiquated arrangements for landing. The facilities given by the proposed boat-basin will, it is hoped, lead to increased imports, as the suggested method of landing in large lighters, in bulk, instead of in bags by masula boats, will considerably cheapen the cost by reducing charges.

15. Owing to the absence of the Board's Engineer on leave, the Trustees are unable to submit with this sketch an estimate of the probable cost; but as Mr. Parkes stated that a ship dock could be constructed in the sand to the south of the harbour for Rs. 14,00,000, it is presumed that a shallow boat-basin should not be a very expensive undertaking. It is still uncertain when Mr. Pogson will return; and, as the Board would be glad to see harbour improvements commenced as early as possible, the Trustees would feel obliged if you would permit an estimate to be made in the Public Works Department, which, it is presumed, could be done without difficulty, as there are no features in the scheme requiring special knowledge of engineering problems connected with harbour construction. Should you be able to accede to this request, Mr. Pogson could, on his return, proceed to carry the work out as soon as Government has approved the proposals now submitted, instead of those previously recommended and approved, which, for the reasons given above, have become unsuited to present requirements.

16. The estimated cost of harbour improvements sanctioned in G.O., Marine, No. 119, dated 26th February 1896, was as follows:—

	RS.
Boat-basin	6,63,558
Addition to south pier	54,369
Deepening the harbour	2,19,069
	<u>9,36,996</u>

Two other works were estimated for: sanction to which was withheld, viz:—

	RS.
Canal entrance	7,52,300
Protective groyne	3,91,355
Total	<u>20,80,651</u>

To enable the Board to proceed with these works, it proposed to raise a debenture loan, sufficient to repay Government the outstanding balance of advances, and to provide funds to carry out all the above works; to do which the Board asked for sanction to issue debentures to the extent of Rs. 60,00,000—Rs. 50,00,000 to repay Government, and the balance Rs. 10,00,000, to proceed with the above first three items—that sum with cash and investments in hand being sufficient, with the exception of the protective groyne, regarding the utility of which the Board is not satisfied, and the matter has been referred to the Secretary of State.

17. In G.O., No. 119, Marine, Government sanctioned the works to the extent of Rs. 9,36,996 being carried out, provided the Board is able to raise the necessary funds; but sanction has been accorded by the Government of India to the issue of a debenture loan of Rs. 50,00,000 only, instead of Rs. 60,00,000 as asked for by the Board. The Trust would, therefore, not be able to proceed with those works until sanction had been accorded to the issue of debentures for the extra 10 lakhs asked for.

18. The present proposals, however, are, the Board believes, within its financial resources, and the issue of debentures other than to repay Government will not be required; at any rate for the present, if the proposals now made are approved and sanctioned.

19. The Board's accumulated funds may be briefly summarized as follows:—

	RS.
Estimated opening balance, 1897-98	7,38,000
Due by coast ports	2,00,000
Estimated recovery on sale of tools and plant	2,00,000
Total	<u>11,38,000</u>

The position at the end of the half-year closing on the 30th September is far more favourable than estimated, the opening balance of next official year should be more than noted above; and it would appear that the Rs. 11½ lakhs, which the Board will have to the good, should be ample to build and equip the proposed boat-basin, in supersession of the previously approved estimates and works, referred to in paragraph 16, all of which may be abandoned.

20. There are on hand ready for use, sufficient concrete blocks to construct the protecting arm shown to the east of the entrance to the boat-basin; a wall somewhat similar to that at the Buckingham canal-basin would be sufficient for traffic requirements, and it is presumed all that would be needed to retain the sand and secure the low level quays, required for working cargo between the lighters and the sheds for imports, and *vice versa* in respect of exports.

21. The sketch submitted herewith shows suggestions made by Mr. Pinsent for a north entrance, in connection with which he has also submitted again proposals for docks to the south of the harbour. The boat-basin does not interfere with these proposals being ultimately carried out; but, as stated in paragraph 3, the Board is not yet prepared to consider the question of a change of entrance, and does not think that the time has arrived to provide docks. The boat-basin, as now approved, would facilitate a canal connection with the Cooum for the transport of salt, coal, &c.

ENCLOSURE.

MINUTES of the Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Trustees of the Madras Harbour held at the Board's Office on Friday the 30th October 1896.

PRESENT:

Mr. Ware Austin, I.C.S., Chairman.	Mr. F. J. Wilson.
" W. S. Shaw.	" J. F. Davies.
" R. J. Black.	" Cowasjee Eduljee Panday.
" H. Scott.	" Mirza Mehdy Ispahani.
Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.	

The Trustees assembled at the Board's office at 4-30 p.m., and then proceeded to the south arm of the harbour, where they discussed the sketch of a boat-basin—prepared by the Secretary in accordance with instructions given at the last meeting—for providing accommodation for working general cargo, and coal discharged into lighters from vessels lying in the harbour.

It was decided that, having carefully discussed and considered the various proposals made from time to time for harbour improvements, and having now visited and inspected the site to the south of the harbour available for extensions and improvements, the Trustees approve of the suggestions made by Mr. Pinsent, for utilizing the sand accreted to the south of the harbour, for the construction of a boat-basin, to provide better facilities for working coal and general cargo, and for carrying out the views of the Harbour Improvements Committee, as regards the custody, storage and warehousing of general cargo, as the best means practicable under the altered circumstances of the case for meeting the requirements of the port, and the views expressed by that Committee.

The Chairman was requested to address Government, and to place a draft letter before the Board at its next regular meeting on Friday, 6th November, at 4-30 p.m., embodying the decision the Trustees have arrived at, and explaining their reasons for considering previously approved proposals now unsuited to the requirements of the trade of this port.

ORDER—No. 834, Marine, dated 1st December 1896.

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that the Harbour Trust Board now propose, in modification of all previous proposals, to limit their attention for the present to the construction of a boat-basin outside the south arm of the harbour and within the sand which has accumulated to the south-west. The proposed canal to the Cooum would be connected with this basin. The Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal division, who is, under separate orders, estimating for the Harbour canal, will also prepare the estimate for the boat-basin in communication with the Harbour Works Engineer.

2. The questions of dredging and of the north-east entrance are separately dealt with in Sir A. Rendel's report now under consideration of the Harbour Trust Board.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Presidency Port Officer.