

Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 140 Mar

DATED 20 February 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Cranes. P. W. End to on letter from S. C. Smith stating that the delay in setting up the cranes at the Subic Bay pier is due to the inability of the port authorities to determine where the cranes should be located. That he has himself fixed the position for each crane & that he has no objection to the work being undertaken by Messrs. Dykes & Co., Con. to the P. P. Office.

///

7.2
22/2/97

[illegible]

FURTHER PAPERS.							
G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Walt
Plum are
cr- 149 in
ball. Co. 148 mm
22-2-97.

[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
7214	627		

6TH CIRCLE,

of us

Rob. O. V. Brady, R.E.

The Speringtending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to Ltr. 2
201 W dated 21 January 1897, have
the honor to inform you that the delay
in setting up the cranes is due to the
inability of the Port Authorities to de-
-termine where they want the cranes
-cated.

2. I have hereto, 11. gone into the question and fixed the position that each crane shall occupy and have ordered the Executive Engineer to proceed with the work.

I have no objection to offer to the work being undertaken by Messrs. Dymos & Co. The work is of a simple nature. In this connection I would point out that the commissions are 6 in number, 2 of them are 1st class.

The Gopalpur pier - the remaining
being supplied by the Presidency
& officers who obtained them from
Messrs. Massey & Co. These are not of
ton power, but only 15 cwt. I believe
that 1 ton cranes were intended to
be supplied. They are moreover of an
unsuitable type for the Tussock Pier,
having extended crane posts the ends of
which will be in the sea when set.

They seemed also to me to be of rather
flimsy manufacture, but this will be
evident when they are put together
and erected. I am unaware how
much they cost.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Yours most obed^t Servant.

J. V. No. 1111 Lt Col. R. E.
Superintendent, or Clerk

P. S.

Since the above was written
I have received G.O. No. 395W.

Under No. 52 Memo
19.2.97

dated 9th February 1897 -
do not consider that the de-
fecting of the crane can be
attributed to the P. & O. Dept.
It certainly seems true that
the location of the crane should
have rested with the Port
Commissioner - as it is I have
fixed the position myself.

C. F. W.
11.2
97

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE.

FROM
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6th CIRCLE.

TO
THE CHIEF ENGINEER,

NO.

Dated. }
Received. } 189 .

Enclosure.

Encls 1
Mar 22/57