GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

16th January 1882, No. 133 W.

General.
Account.

Read the following paper :—

No. 77. From JULAND DANVERS, Esq., Secretary, Public Works Department, India Office, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated London, 22nd December 1881, No. P.W. 1332.

With reference to your letter of the 17th ultimo, No. 2882 W., relative to the head of service to which the steamer *Undaunted* should be charged, I transmit herewith a copy of a report* thereon by the Accountant-General of this office, and I have to request that all indents and letters, calling for supplies of any description may, in future, clearly specify the head of service under which the cost should be charged.

* Dated 21st December 1881.

Copy report by the Accountant-General, India Office, dated 21st December 1881, No. P.W. 1332.

The adjustment necessary, in consequence of this letter from India, will appear in the statement of "payments made in England on account of stores and freight, Madras Harbour Works," for December 1881, which will be forwarded to Madras next month.

2. The matter having been referred to the Director-General of Stores in the following reference, viz. :—

"In accordance with the annexed letter it is proposed to transfer from Madras Harbour Works to Marine Stores the sum of £5,509-18-2, in respect of payments already made in this country on account of the steamer *Undaunted*.

Will the Director-General of Stores be so good as to state the total sum included in his estimate which should be similarly treated?

The Director-General of Stores after furnishing the particulars required in this department added :—

"If the head of service had been quoted in the original requisition from India this transference would not have been required. The papers spoke of a "steam tug required for the Madras Harbour," and in the absence of any information to the contrary it was assumed to be chargeable to "Madras Harbour Works."

With reference to that remark, it would be well if the attention of the Government of Madras were drawn to the request contained in paragraph 4 of the Financial Despatch to India, dated the 23rd January 1873, No. 13, viz. :—

"I request that, in future, all indents and letters calling for supplies of any description, may clearly specify the head of service under which the cost should be charged. I request that you will communicate this instruction to the Governments of Madras and Bombay."

No. 78. Order thereon, 16th January 1882, No. 133 W.

Communicated to the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, with reference to G.O., No. 2881 W., dated 17th November 1881; also to the Marine Department and the General Superintendent, Public Works Stores.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
" Marine Department.
" General Superintendent, Public Works Stores.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1882} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF MADRAS
HARBOUR WORKS,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated January, 16th.

Issued

Read. *Encl.*

G.O., 16th January 1882, No. 133 W.

JANUARY.

Nos. 77-78.

Steamer "Undaunted."—Letter from the Secretary, Public Works Department, India Office, regarding the adjustment of the cost of the — as a charge against the Marine Department, communicated to the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, Marine Department, and the General Superintendent, Public Works Stores.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

3rd February 1882, No. 46.

Madras Harbour.

Read the following paper :—

From A. ABERCROMBIE JOPP, Esq., Director-General of Stores, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated India Office, London, 12th January 1882 [*Current No.* 70].

With reference to the communications noted in the margin, relative to the purchase in this country of a second-hand steam-tug for the Madras Harbour, I have the honor to inform you that the steam-tug *Undaunted* has been purchased by the Secretary of State in Council.

Telegram from the Governor of Madras, dated 19th May 1881.
Madras Marine letter, No. 6, of 19th May 1881.
Telegram from the Governor of Madras, dated 26th July 1881.
Telegram to the Governor of Madras, dated 6th August 1881.
Telegram from the Governor of Madras, dated 25th August 1881.

2. The following are the principal dimensions of the vessel (full information regarding her, and the steps which led to her purchase, will shortly be communicated to the Government of Madras in a despatch from the Secretary of State in Council), built at Blackwall by T. A. Young in 1876 :—

Length	123 ft. 4 in.
Breadth	20 „ 8 „
Depth	11 „ 1 „
Gross tonnage	197
Nett „	57
Rig	Sloop.
Number of bulkheads	3
„ decks	1
Draft of water loaded about 7 feet.	
Engines—2 side lever disconnecting surface condensing.	
Boilers—2 Multitubular.	
Horse power, nominal	150
Diameter of cylinders	34 in.
Length of stroke	60 „
Working pressure	30 lbs.
Donkey engine	1
Consumption of fuel	Light.
Capacity of bunkers	99 tons.
„ hold for coal	55 „
Steam windlass.	
Holds a Board of Trade passenger certificate.	

3. Since the purchase of the vessel she has been thoroughly overhauled.

4. I enclose, for your information and guidance, a list of the stores which were taken over with the vessel, and of those which have since been purchased for her.

5. The vessel carries three chronometers. One of these was originally provided for the India Government Steamer *Tenasserim;* but as there was not time to test it thoroughly before that vessel sailed, it was retained. It has since been rated, and on the arrival of the *Undaunted* should be forwarded to the Bengal Marine Department, where it will probably be found useful.

6. The other two chronometers were returned to this country from the Bengal Marine Department for repair, and should also be forwarded to that Department on the arrival of the *Undaunted.*

7. The vessel left Plymouth for Madras on the 11th instant, under the command of Mr. J. McPhail, who has agreed to navigate her to Madras for the sum of £990, one-half to be paid in this country before sailing, and one-half in Madras (at 1*s.* 8*d.* per rupee) after safe arrival.

8. A copy of the formal agreement with Mr. McPhail is enclosed.

ORDER THEREON, 3rd February 1882, No. 46.

Communicated to the Master Attendant.

2. The agreement referred to has not yet been received.

(True Extract.)

R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras, with enclosures in original.

Copy to the Public Works Department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of {1882} Madras.

MARINE.

To
THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
Madras,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated February, 3rd.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 3rd February 1882, *No.* 46.

B.N: 376 W d/ 10th Feby 1882
Communicated to the
Supdt. Madras Harbour
Works
sd/ Ross Thompson [illegible]
ag: Under Secy: to Govt P.W.D

FEBRUARY.

Supdt. M. H. Works

Madras Harbour.—Communicating letter from the Director-General of Stores, London, intimating that the steam-tug *Undaunted* has been purchased for the Madras Harbour.

10TH AUGUST 1882, No. 257, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From H. F. CLOGSTOUN, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 22nd June 1882, No. J.B.A.-100.

Book Department.

I have the honor to forward copy of letter from the Master Attendant, Madras, No. 5065, of 14th June 1882, respecting the department which is to bear the cost of the Steamer *Undaunted* recently purchased by the Home Government. In the Proceedings of Government, Public Works Department, No. 2881 W., dated 17th November 1881, the charge is stated to appertain to the Marine Department, no provision having been made to meet the cost in the estimate for the Harbour Works. As the Master Attendant is not prepared to accept the charge against Port Funds, and considers that it should be debited to the Harbour Works, I beg that I may be favored with the early orders of Government.

ENCLOSURE.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Officiating Accountant-General, dated Madras, 14th June 1882, No. 5065.

Administrative Department.

Referring to your letter, No. J.B.A.-41, dated 13th April 1882, forwarding the invoice of the Steam Tug *Undaunted*, amounting to £6,004-18-2, or Rs. 72,058-14-5, and inquiring whether the charges are debitable to Port Fund, I have the honor to state, in reply, that considering the steam tug like the moorings forms the plant necessary to complete the equipment of the harbour for the use of vessels, the cost of the same should be debited against the Harbour Account as in the case of the moorings. The whole will then form one capital account, and its future adjustment will not be attended with any confusion. I am, moreover, not prepared to recommend that the cost of the tug be met from the Madras Port Fund, as the erection of jetties and other beach improvements will form a heavy charge against it, possibly absorbing the balance standing to its credit. It would be remembered that Madras having lately been removed from the grouping of ports, now stands alone, and all that can be done is to devise the best ways and means to strengthen it in order to enable it to meet the interest on the harbour outlay and the large expenditure involved in its upkeep.

2. This department has received subsequent information that the whole cost of the tug is £9,165-6-8, while the amount anticipated was only about £5,000. In any circumstances the adjustment should be against Harbour Account.

No. 462.

Referred to the Public Works Department for remarks.

2. The cost might perhaps be debited in equal shares against "Port Funds" and "Harbour Works."

OOTACAMUND,
27*th June* 1882.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

Memorandum from Colonel R. H. SANKEY, C.B., R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 19th July 1882, No. 447-E.

Retransferred to the Marine Department with letter from the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, No. 21 W., dated 12th July 1882, and with remark that as the *Undaunted* was obtained for towing vessels in and out of the harbour and not for harbour construction purposes, it does not seem proper that any portion of her cost should be charged to the capital outlay on the works.

2. The vessel is to be used entirely under the control of the Port authorities who will, no doubt, levy dues for services performed. Such dues would undoubtedly be credited to Port Funds and not to the Harbour Works estimate.

3. The Marine Department can, if they think fit, bring the vessel down from Cocanada and hire her out to the Superintendent of the Harbour Works who would pay for the service in the same way as private traders.

From N. ST. B. BEARDMORE, Esq., C.E., Acting Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads, dated Madras, 12th July 1882, No. 21 W.

I have the honor to acknowledge your reference No. 1345-C of the 7th instant, in which a proposal is made by the Chief Secretary to Government on a letter from the Master Attendant, Madras, to divide in moieties between the Port Funds and the Madras Harbour Works Funds the cost, £9,165-6-8, of the Steam Tug *Undaunted* ordered out from England some months ago by the Marine Department.

2. I regret that I am unable to agree with the Master Attendant in "considering that the steam tug like the moorings" so much "forms the plant necessary to complete the equipment of the harbour" as that the cost of the same should be fairly debited to Harbour Works Funds. It is unusual, I think, to charge the cost of steam tugs to be employed in towing trading vessels in and out of a harbour to constructive works.

3. I think I am correct in stating that the harbour authorities were not consulted as to the purchase of this tug; if we had been and had anticipated that the cost would be debited to the Harbour Works, we might have proposed that she should be of such form and construction that she might be of use in the future for driving or withdrawing moorings and chains, but she is of a form, being a paddle boat, as to be useless for this work.

4. Had I known that the cost or any part of the cost would be proposed to be debited to these works, I might, during the past few months, have made great use of her in lifting wreckage from the bottom of the sea, while my own pontoon of boats lately purchased at Negapatam for that and other purposes was being got ready; but a fortnight or so after she arrived here, she was despatched to Cocanada and has not yet returned, while I have had a crew of divers doing little of their own legitimate work for the want of a good-sized boat with which to lift wreckage and chains.

5. If it is decided by Government to be fair that the cost of the *Undaunted* be equally divided between Harbour and Port Funds, I propose that, and should be glad if, she immediately returns to Madras and be placed at the entire use and control of the harbour authorities (except at the special request, as occasion may arise, of the Marine Department) until the reconstruction of the harbour is completed.

No. 637.

Retransferred to the Public Works Department for further information with reference to the Notes by Honorable Members.

OOTACAMUND,
28th July 1882.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

Memorandum from Colonel R. H. SANKEY, C.B., R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 2nd August 1882, No. 513 E.

Retransferred to the Marine Department with the observation that it may be proper to charge the vessel against the working expenses of the Port, but not against the capital cost of the *Works*. She may aid slightly in construction operations, and for such service the Harbour Works would pay a reasonable hire; but it is not considered fair to charge the capital cost of the Works with the value of plant obtained for other than construction purposes. Mr. Parkes never estimated for such plant, and he will have cause of complaint if the Government now swell his estimate by any such charge.

2. As, moreover, the Government of India are now practically supplying the funds for the work, it seems that, should it be desired to charge the amount to the capital outlay on the work, their acceptance of the charge would be necessary.

ORDER—dated 10th August 1882, No. 257, Marine.

The Government consider that the charge must fall against *Port Funds*. When the *Undaunted* is used in connection with the harbour construction, her hire should be met from the Harbour Works estimate and credited to Port Funds.

2. It is to be regretted that the Marine and Harbour authorities did not discuss this question last year before the vessel was brought out.

(True Extract.)

for *Chief Secretary.*

To the Master Attendant, Madras.
„ Public Works Department.
„ Accountant-General.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

No 2246 W dt 1st Sept/82

B

Communicated

to the Supt Roads

Harbour Works

28.8.82

Govt. of {1882} Madras.

MARINE.

Issued

Recd. 29 August/82 Encl.

G.O., 10th August 1882, No. 257.

No 2246 W dt 1st Sept/82

AUGUST.

Steamer "Undaunted."

Deciding that the cost of the — must be debited to Port Funds.

Supt Roads & Harbour Works

Exr P.W.D.

With Order

Entd. in Receipt Regr

2nd April 1883, No. 180, Marine.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

Despatch from the Right Honorable the EARL OF KIMBERLEY, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated India Office, London, 28th February 1883, No. 17 (Military).

I have considered in Council your Marine letter, No. 15, dated 12th December 1882, forwarding a plan and specification of a steam launch for the port of Cocanada, which the Master Attendant at Madras recommends should be obtained from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., of Glasgow, in accordance with a specification which has been furnished by that firm.

2. I have sanctioned the provision of the launch, but I am unable to concur in the proposal that it should be ordered, without competition, from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., nor do I consider that the construction should be regulated by a specification drawn up by the constructors themselves, and not containing, as I am advised, the needful stipulations for ensuring good materials and workmanship.

3. I have accordingly directed that tenders for the supply of the launch should be invited from a few approved builders, on a specification prepared by a competent Engineer, who will also watch the construction of the vessel and test it on its completion.

4. As pointed out in my predecessor's Public Works Despatch to the Government of Madras, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, it is desirable, in cases such as this, where inquiries are needful relative to supplies required from England, that they should be made through this office, rather than by communications between officers in India and contractors.

5. In the 3rd paragraph of the letter under reply, you refer to a report by Lieutenant Taylor, the Master Attendant, dated 28th November 1882, suggesting certain alterations in the construction of the launch now demanded.

6. That report also contains strictures of some importance relative to the tug *Undaunted*, which was despatched from this country to Madras early last year, but these are not alluded to in your Excellency's covering letter.

7. I forward, for your information, a copy of a report by the Director-General of Stores of this office on the subject, from which it would appear that the *Undaunted* was not, as alleged, a new and untried vessel, and that she was specially adapted for working in a confined space.

8. I have to request that further inquiry be made as to the merits of this vessel and her suitability for the service for which she was demanded, and that the result be communicated to me.

9. From the general tenor of this report and of Lieutenant Taylor's previous report of the 14th October, it appears probable that the contents of Lord Hartington's Public Works Despatch to your Government, No. 3, of 30th March 1882, may not have been communicated to that officer. The 3rd paragraph of that despatch refers to the inconvenience likely to arise if the steps connected with the purchase of supplies in England be not left entirely for determination in this country.

ENCLOSURE.

Extract Report by Director-General of Stores, India Office, dated 23rd January 1883.

The *Undaunted* was not, as suggested, a new and untried vessel, but was built in 1876, expressly for towing, by one of the best London builders, and had had five years' service in this country before she was purchased. The *Undaunted* was considered by competent persons, including the Admiralty Officers, to be suitable for the service for which it was required by the Madras Government, and to possess the special qualifications referred to by the Master Attendant, viz., fair speed, and special adaptability to working in a confined space, like the Madras Harbour, as she was built expressly for working in the Thames as well as in the Channel.

The Madras Government was fully informed, in Public Works Despatch, No. 3 of 1882, dated 30th March 1882, of the steps taken for the provision of the vessel and of the description of tug that had been purchased.

The information which the Master Attendant states that he had obtained from the Chief Engineer of the *Undaunted* to the effect that the vessel had failed as a tug from various causes, and was in consequence relegated to passenger traffic, is incorrect. The tug was used for towing during the winter months, but was employed for passenger traffic in the summer, in consequence of her speed and accommodation, and also because that class of work was found more profitable than towing at that period of the year.

It is true that a considerable amount had to be expended on the vessel before it was fit for service at Madras, where it would be difficult and expensive to make repairs and alterations. Part of this expense was for preparing the vessel for the voyage out, and fitting it with a powerful pump, in order that the tug might be used as a salvage vessel. I may remark that any other second-hand vessel would have required some such expenditure in order to fit it for the service. A second-hand vessel was specially insisted on by the Government of Madras.

With regard to the statement that, "instead of being specially handy in working, it takes the whole crew to start the vessel, and when fairly under weigh it is equally difficult to reverse the engines, or suddenly go full speed astern," I have to state that when the vessel was tried in this country no such difficulties were experienced, and I am unable to understand how they can have arisen when the vessel was tried at Madras. The engines of the *Undaunted* were constructed similarly to the model of engines of tugs specially required to be easily and swiftly worked, in the starting, stopping, and reversing of the machinery, disconnecting paddles, &c. I therefore hope that when the officers in charge of the vessel are better acquainted with the machinery the above alleged defects will disappear.

No. 1857.

Transferred to the Marine Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
28*th March* 1883.

(Signed) E. L. HANKIN, Colonel,
Acting Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

ORDER—dated 2nd April 1883, No. 180, Marine.

Communicated to the Master Attendant for information and guidance with reference to G.O., 13th November 1882, No. 441, Marine.

2. The report called for in paragraph 8 of the despatch should be submitted at an early date.

3. Public Works Despatch, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, was communicated to the Master Attendant with G.O., 3rd May 1882, No. 103, Marine.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

Copy to the Public Works Department.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

B.No. 1096 dy 12th April/83

Recorded

(True Extracts)

aff C Bowen Majr R.E.
Under Secy to Govt

Govt. of {1883} Madras.

MARINE.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 2nd April 1883, No. 180.

APRIL.

B.No. 1096 dy 12th April/83

Steam Launch.

Communicating to the Master Attendant, for information and guidance, despatch from Secretary of State regarding the provision of a — for the port of Cocanada, and requesting early submission of the report called for as to the merits of the Steam Tug *Undaunted*, &c.

With Order

20/
The Supdt. M Works
for information

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

Despatch from the Right Honorable the EARL OF KIMBERLEY, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated India Office, London, 28th February 1883, No. 17 (Military).

I have considered in Council your Marine letter, No. 15, dated 12th December 1882, forwarding a plan and specification of a steam launch for the port of Cocanada, which the Master Attendant at Madras recommends should be obtained from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., of Glasgow, in accordance with a specification which has been furnished by that firm.

2. I have sanctioned the provision of the launch, but I am unable to concur in the proposal that it should be ordered, without competition, from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., nor do I consider that the construction should be regulated by a specification drawn up by the constructors themselves, and not containing, as I am advised, the needful stipulations for ensuring good materials and workmanship.

3. I have accordingly directed that tenders for the supply of the launch should be invited from a few approved builders, on a specification prepared by a competent Engineer, who will also watch the construction of the vessel and test it on its completion.

4. As pointed out in my predecessor's Public Works Despatch to the Government of Madras, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, it is desirable, in cases such as this, where inquiries are needful relative to supplies required from England, that they should be made through this office, rather than by communications between officers in India and contractors.

5. In the 3rd paragraph of the letter under reply, you refer to a report by Lieutenant Taylor, the Master Attendant, dated 28th November 1882, suggesting certain alterations in the construction of the launch now demanded.

6. That report also contains strictures of some importance relative to the tug *Undaunted*, which was despatched from this country to Madras early last year, but these are not alluded to in your Excellency's covering letter.

7. I forward, for your information, a copy of a report by the Director-General of Stores of this office on the subject, from which it would appear that the *Undaunted* was not, as alleged, a new and untried vessel, and that she was specially adapted for working in a confined space.

8. I have to request that further inquiry be made as to the merits of this vessel and her suitability for the service for which she was demanded, and that the result be communicated to me.

9. From the general tenor of this report and of Lieutenant Taylor's previous report of the 14th October, it appears probable that the contents of Lord Hartington's Public Works Despatch to your Government, No. 3, of 30th March 1882, may not have been communicated to that officer. The 3rd paragraph of that despatch refers to the inconvenience likely to arise if the steps connected with the purchase of supplies in England be not left entirely for determination in this country.

ENCLOSURE.

Extract Report by Director-General of Stores, India Office, dated 23rd January 1883.

The *Undaunted* was not, as suggested, a new and untried vessel, but was built in 1876, expressly for towing, by one of the best London builders, and had had five years' service in this country before she was purchased. The *Undaunted* was considered by competent persons, including the Admiralty Officers, to be suitable for the service for which it was required by the Madras Government, and to possess the special qualifications referred to by the Master Attendant, viz., fair speed, and special adaptability to working in a confined space, like the Madras Harbour, as she was built expressly for working in the Thames as well as in the Channel.

The Madras Government was fully informed, in Public Works Despatch, No. 3 of 1882, dated 30th March 1882, of the steps taken for the provision of the vessel and of the description of tug that had been purchased.

The information which the Master Attendant states that he had obtained from the Chief Engineer of the *Undaunted* to the effect that the vessel had failed as a tug from various causes, and was in consequence relegated to passenger traffic, is incorrect. The tug was used for towing during the winter months, but was employed for passenger traffic in the summer, in consequence of her speed and accommodation, and also because that class of work was found more profitable than towing at that period of the year.

It is true that a considerable amount had to be expended on the vessel before it was fit for service at Madras, where it would be difficult and expensive to make repairs and alterations. Part of this expense was for preparing the vessel for the voyage out, and fitting it with a powerful pump, in order that the tug might be used as a salvage vessel. I may remark that any other second-hand vessel would have required some such expenditure in order to fit it for the service. A second-hand vessel was specially insisted on by the Government of Madras.

With regard to the statement that, "instead of being specially handy in working, it takes the whole crew to start the vessel, and when fairly under weigh it is equally difficult to reverse the engines, or suddenly go full speed astern," I have to state that when the vessel was tried in this country no such difficulties were experienced, and I am unable to understand how they can have arisen when the vessel was tried at Madras. The engines of the *Undaunted* were constructed similarly to the model of engines of tugs specially required to be easily and swiftly worked, in the starting, stopping, and reversing of the machinery, disconnecting paddles, &c. I therefore hope that when the officers in charge of the vessel are better acquainted with the machinery the above alleged defects will disappear.

No. 1857.

Transferred to the Marine Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
28*th March* 1883.

(Signed) E. L. HANKIN, Colonel,
Acting Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

ORDER—dated 2nd April 1883, No. 180, Marine.

Communicated to the Master Attendant for information and guidance with reference to G.O., 13th November 1882, No. 441, Marine.

2. The report called for in paragraph 8 of the despatch should be submitted at an early date.

3. Public Works Despatch, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, was communicated to the Master Attendant with G.O., 3rd May 1882, No. 103, Marine.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

Copy to the Public Works Department.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

B. No. 1096 Wd. 12th April/83

Recorded

(True Extract)

C Bowen Major
Under Secy to Govt Mo

Govt. of {1883} Madras.

MARINE.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 2nd April 1883, No. 180.

APRIL.

B. No. 1096 Wd. 12th April/83

Steam Launch.

Communicating to the Master Attendant, for information and guidance, despatch from Secretary of State regarding the provision of a — for the port of Cocanada, and requesting early submission of the report called for as to the merits of the Steam Tug *Undaunted*, &c.

With Order

Supdt M. H. Works for information

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

Despatch from the Right Honorable the EARL OF KIMBERLEY, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated India Office, London, 28th February 1883, No. 17 (Military).

I have considered in Council your Marine letter, No. 15, dated 12th December 1882, forwarding a plan and specification of a steam launch for the port of Cocanada, which the Master Attendant at Madras recommends should be obtained from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., of Glasgow, in accordance with a specification which has been furnished by that firm.

2. I have sanctioned the provision of the launch, but I am unable to concur in the proposal that it should be ordered, without competition, from Messrs. Walker, Henderson, and Co., nor do I consider that the construction should be regulated by a specification drawn up by the constructors themselves, and not containing, as I am advised, the needful stipulations for ensuring good materials and workmanship.

3. I have accordingly directed that tenders for the supply of the launch should be invited from a few approved builders, on a specification prepared by a competent Engineer, who will also watch the construction of the vessel and test it on its completion.

4. As pointed out in my predecessor's Public Works Despatch to the Government of Madras, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, it is desirable, in cases such as this, where inquiries are needful relative to supplies required from England, that they should be made through this office, rather than by communications between officers in India and contractors.

5. In the 3rd paragraph of the letter under reply, you refer to a report by Lieutenant Taylor, the Master Attendant, dated 28th November 1882, suggesting certain alterations in the construction of the launch now demanded.

6. That report also contains strictures of some importance relative to the tug *Undaunted*, which was despatched from this country to Madras early last year, but these are not alluded to in your Excellency's covering letter.

7. I forward, for your information, a copy of a report by the Director-General of Stores of this office on the subject, from which it would appear that the *Undaunted* was not, as alleged, a new and untried vessel, and that she was specially adapted for working in a confined space.

8. I have to request that further inquiry be made as to the merits of this vessel and her suitability for the service for which she was demanded, and that the result be communicated to me.

9. From the general tenor of this report and of Lieutenant Taylor's previous report of the 14th October, it appears probable that the contents of Lord Hartington's Public Works Despatch to your Government, No. 3, of 30th March 1882, may not have been communicated to that officer. The 3rd paragraph of that despatch refers to the inconvenience likely to arise if the steps connected with the purchase of supplies in England be not left entirely for determination in this country.

ENCLOSURE.

Extract Report by Director-General of Stores, India Office, dated 23rd January 1883.

The *Undaunted* was not, as suggested, a new and untried vessel, but was built in 1876, expressly for towing, by one of the best London builders, and had had five years' service in this country before she was purchased. The *Undaunted* was considered by competent persons, including the Admiralty Officers, to be suitable for the service for which it was required by the Madras Government, and to possess the special qualifications referred to by the Master Attendant, viz., fair speed, and special adaptability to working in a confined space, like the Madras Harbour, as she was built expressly for working in the Thames as well as in the Channel.

The Madras Government was fully informed, in Public Works Despatch, No. 3 of 1882, dated 30th March 1882, of the steps taken for the provision of the vessel and of the description of tug that had been purchased.

The information which the Master Attendant states that he had obtained from the Chief Engineer of the *Undaunted* to the effect that the vessel had failed as a tug from various causes, and was in consequence relegated to passenger traffic, is incorrect. The tug was used for towing during the winter months, but was employed for passenger traffic in the summer, in consequence of her speed and accommodation, and also because that class of work was found more profitable than towing at that period of the year.

It is true that a considerable amount had to be expended on the vessel before it was fit for service at Madras, where it would be difficult and expensive to make repairs and alterations. Part of this expense was for preparing the vessel for the voyage out, and fitting it with a powerful pump, in order that the tug might be used as a salvage vessel. I may remark that any other second-hand vessel would have required some such expenditure in order to fit it for the service. A second-hand vessel was specially insisted on by the Government of Madras.

With regard to the statement that, "instead of being specially handy in working, it takes the whole crew to start the vessel, and when fairly under weigh it is equally difficult to reverse the engines, or suddenly go full speed astern," I have to state that when the vessel was tried in this country no such difficulties were experienced, and I am unable to understand how they can have arisen when the vessel was tried at Madras. The engines of the *Undaunted* were constructed similarly to the model of engines of tugs specially required to be easily and swiftly worked, in the starting, stopping, and reversing of the machinery, disconnecting paddles, &c. I therefore hope that when the officers in charge of the vessel are better acquainted with the machinery the above alleged defects will disappear.

No. 1857.

Transferred to the Marine Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
28*th March* 1883.

(Signed) E. L. HANKIN, Colonel,
Acting Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

ORDER—dated 2nd April 1883, No. 180, Marine.

Communicated to the Master Attendant for information and guidance with reference to G.O., 13th November 1882, No. 441, Marine.

2. The report called for in paragraph 8 of the despatch should be submitted at an early date.

3. Public Works Despatch, No. 3, dated 30th March 1882, was communicated to the Master Attendant with G.O., 3rd May 1882, No. 103, Marine.

(True Extract.)

for *Chief Secretary.*

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

Copy to the Public Works Department.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

G.O. 133 W. d/ 16.1.82.
376 W. 10.2.82
2246 W. 1.9.82

B. No 1096 W. d/ 12th April/83.

B/

Recorded

Cu/

S bn

Supt. M. H. Works
for information
R. r. w.
13/4

S. W. Cho 23/4/9

Govt. of {1883} Madras.

MARINE.

No. 1096 W. d/ 12th April/83.

Issued

Recd. 6 Apl. '83

Encl. S. S. C.

G.O., 2nd April 1883, No. 180.

5. S.C.

APRIL.

2 Copies to Coly. of/ 20-5-83

Steam Launch.

Communicating to the Master Attendant, for information and guidance, despatch from Secretary of State regarding the provision of a — for the port of Cocanada, and requesting early submission of the report called for as to the merits of the Steam Tug *Undaunted*, &c.

With order

Entd. in Receipt Regr.