

Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 1487 W

DATED 1st June 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Loss on Consignments. Pros: Marine Dept
Considering that the S.S. "Yorkshire" was in no way to
blame in the matter of shortage of weight occurring
in the consignment of iron shipped from England to
Cochin and addressing the Home Govt on the
general question of withholding a proportion of
freight in all cases to meet possible ~~loss~~
Cont^d to officers of the P.W.D.

O.L.S. 119 R22/5

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

From G. W. WICKS, Esq., Port Officer, Cocanada, to the Executive Engineer, Gódvári Eastern Division, dated 14th January 1897, No. 1441.

With reference to the remarks made on the packing account of Public Works stores shipped from England per S.S. *Yorkshire*, I have the honour to forward, for your information and remarks, copy of a letter received from Messrs. Hall, Wilson & Co., regarding the discrepancies and repudiating all responsibility in regard to weights.

2. They are quite correct in stating that the total number of packages (viz., 449) were delivered and also that the bars were marked with white paint at both ends. According to the Survey report there was one bundle of flat iron and one bar round iron short landed, but on the other hand, there were found to be two bars angle iron landed in excess and these bars were marked with white paint at both ends and also found to be of exactly the same size (viz., $3" \times 3" \times \frac{1}{4}"$) as the other angle irons in the consignment. This clearly points to a mistake having been made in England at the time of shipment, and I do not see how the ship can be held responsible for this discrepancy or for the other shortage in weight mentioned on the packing account.

3. Even if it is held that the ship is responsible for the shortage of weight, there is no balance of freight due to the ship and therefore no means of recovering the amount that I can see. I would therefore suggest that, in future (no matter how small the consignment may be), one-fifth of the freight should always be made payable in India subject to due delivery.

ENCLOSURE.

From Messrs. HALL, WILSON AND CO., Agents, British India Steam Navigation Company (Limited), Cocanada, to the Port officer, Cocanada, dated 9th January 1897, No. 17/51.

In terms of your guarantee letter, No. 1179, dated 24th October last, we gave you delivery order for 449 packages of iron addressed to the Executive Engineer, Gódvári Eastern division, landed ex S.S. *Chindwara* through cargo of the S.S. *Yorkshire*, and in due course duly delivered to you 449 packages. All these packages were marked with white paint at both ends and no question was raised as to their discrepancy before they were removed from the Custom House. We notice, however, that the Bill of Lading has been endorsed for a number of discrepancies resulting in a shortage of weight which we decline to accept, and return, herewith, the document in question. We have delivered to you the correct number of packages all bearing the same marks, and repudiate all responsibility in regard to weights.

Copy together with its enclosure is forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, with request that the sanction of the Government may be obtained to the Port officer's proposal that one-fifth of the freight on all shipments of stores (no matter how small the consignment may be) should always be made payable in India subject to due delivery.

(Signed) G. F. HANDCOCK,
Executive Engineer.

No. 2374 G.D.

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government to the proposal made by the Port officer in the foregoing letter.

7th February 1897.

(Signed) J. C. LARMINIE,
Suptg. Engineer, I Circle.

No. 1351 C., Public Works.

Transferred to the Marine Department, with reference to Rule 8 (Part II) in the appendix to G.O., No. 404, Marine, dated 23rd September 1889, which apparently contemplates the payment of freight in India on consignments from England.

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

9th March 1897.

No. 190 E., Marine.

Referred to the Presidency Port Officer for favour of remarks.

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

16th March 1897.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 30th March 1897, No. 458/117 G.

In reply to Marine Department endorsement, No. 190 E., dated 16th March 1897 (enclosure herewith returned), I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that one-fifth freight is always withheld when the freight is in excess of £50. Occasionally, however, this proportion has been withheld when the freight was below £50, and I think this should always be the case.

ORDER—No. 369, Marine, dated 23rd April 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the ship was in no way to blame in this case, and that the error must have occurred in shipping the iron in England.

2. The Home Government will be addressed on the general question of withholding a proportion of freight in all cases to meet possible loss on consignments.

[Here enter No. 4, Marine, dated 23rd April 1897.]

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer,
Public Works Department.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

