Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 592

DATED 2nd Febry 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sanctg the sale of Cutter 'Surprize'

[illegible]

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 9426

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
19 DEC 96
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Order.

From The Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue

Mis. No. 5104.

Dated 4th December 1896

Received 19.12.96

Registered 22.12.96

Enclosures 14.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government a further report dealing with certain points in connection with the "Cutter" Surprize

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Copy of a letter from N. S. Brodie Esq. Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division No 4072, dated 26th August 1896.

"With reference to Board's Proceedings Mis No 2545 (SR), dated 19th June 1896, I have the honour to report as follows:—

2. Para 1 of the G. O. clause 1. No plans and specifications were submitted by Mr Hawkins other than the rough sketch etc forwarded to the Board by the Assistant Commissioner, Calicut in his letter No 3467, dated 4th August 1895. Mr Hawkins' reply on this point is as follows:- "To the best of my knowledge none of the plans or sections prepared by me were submitted to the Board as they were all required in Calicut for the construction of the boat. The only "plan" that I forwarded was a rough pen and ink-sketch executed in Camp to give some

Co
9426

idea

idea of the style proposed. I cannot now possibly state where the plans are; my personal effects are scattered between Coimbatore, Coonoor and Negapatam but I will endeavour to find them when opportunity offers. With regard to the Sections of the model, two sets were made, one from which I made my calculations and the other which was handed over to the Sub-Contractor and from which he prepared the templets. The former set I have not seen since leaving Calicut but I will endeavour to find it."

3. Clause ii para 1 of the G.C. The following is the method by which the centre of gravity and metacentre of the boat were arrived at by Mr Hawkins

" The following formulae were used in the process.

C. Centre of gravity of the boat when

W. Weight of the boat.

A. Area of Displacement

V. Angle of Careen.

M. Position of the metacentre.

a Area immersed or emerged by careening at V.

K. Horizontal distance apart of centres of gravity of sections immersed and emerged.

c. Centre of gravity of displaced fluid.

d. Horizontal distance of C from m.

g. Distance of c from m.

e. Distance of c from b.

f. Distance of b from b.

Taking the first formula $d = \frac{ak}{A}$.

The quantities a, A, k can be determined by calculation from plans or from measurements on the boat. d being found the position of the metacentre is at once determined as c is readily and accurately calculated. This can be checked by $g = \frac{d}{\sin v}$. The centre of gravity of

of the boat can be calculated from the sections and checked by $f = g + l$

The above equations can of course be transposed at will for purpose of cross checks and any trigonometrical formula applied to the triangles constructed on the points enumerated and described above."

4. Clause iii" of para 10 of the G.C. The Assistant Commissioner, who inspected the Cutter on the 28th and 29th July and checked the articles belonging to her found that the following articles are not included in the Specification

1. Detached pump.
1. Iron water tank 6'x3'x2¼'
1. Galvanized iron bath tub 3⅓'x2⅔'x1¼'
1. Enamelled basin
1. Do water jug.
1. Wooden stone (out of order)
1. Small lantern
2. Copper pots
1. Mariner's Compass

The brass binnacle mentioned in the Specification is not found in the boat.

5. Clause iii of para 1 of the G.C. from Andrew and Co's statement that the boat was frequently found in a neglected condition and that owing to this neglect it had deteriorated considerably by July 1895 is denied by the officers concerned. The Cutter was lying at anchor in the Calicut Roads from the time Mr Hawkins left the Sub Division in October 1894 up to January 1895, when she was sent to Beypore. The Serang and the 2 lascars who were in charge of her during this period state that all possible care was

was taken of her. Mr. Smithes in whose charge the boat remained since January 1895 also states that on not a single occassion he found her neglected by the Serang and Lascars and that he used constantly to inspect her vide copy of his letter to the Assistant Commissioner enclosed. In regard to the accident alluded to by the firm which is said to have occurred in the Beypore river, it may be remarked that the Assistant Commissioner reported on the 20th March 1898, immediately after its occurrence that it was not due to any carelessness, on the part of anybody and that the boat was immediately repaired at an expense of Rs 55 by Mr. Joseph the Assistant Conservator of Ports - vide copy of the Assistant Commissioner's endorsement No 1156 dated

20th

20th March 1895 enclosed.

6. An extract of paras 5 to 8 of the Calicut Assistant Commissioner's letter about the Sea worthiness and the present state of the Cutter is also enclosed for the Board's information."

(True Copy)

Emmanuel Millett
Assistant Secretary.

[illegible] 18/12

1,000
19-4-95

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE * MADRAS *

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue),

Dated 4th December, 1896.
No. 5104. Mds.

Read Proceedings of the Madras Government Order, Mis No 2269 dated 11th June, 1896.

Read also letter from the Deputy Commissioner Southern Division No. 4072 dated 26th August 1896 submitting the report called for in the Government Order embodied in Board's Proceedings Mis. No. 2545 (S.R) dated 19th June 1896 - in connection with the Construction and custody of the Cutter "Surprise"!

Read also letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division No 4342 dated 18th September 1896 submitting an extract from a letter of the Assistant Commissioner Caliout regarding the planks out of which the bottom of the Cutter "surprise" was built.

Resolution.

The Board begs to submit its reply to the question asked in the Government Order read above.

2. Question No(1). The Acting Commissioner has seen Mr. Hawkins on the subject and learns from him that he himself prepared a wooden model of the proposed vessel from which plans and sections were prepared for the builder to work from. These were left with the builder a Sub Contractor working under Messrs. Andrew and Company. The Board has endeavoured to obtain them but is informed that the man has left Belfast having got into difficulties and that his residence is not known. It sees no reason to suppose that the boat was not built in accordance with the model or that any carelessness was displayed in carrying the design out. From a conversation with Mr Hawkins on the subject the acting Commissioner is of the opinion that he exercised all reasonable care in putting the builder in possession of the lines

the lines on which the vessel was to be built. He may have a second set but is unable to lay his hands on them.

3. Question No (ii). Mr. Hawkins answer to this query will be found in para 3 of the Deputy Commissioner's letter No. 4072 dated 26th August 1876. His reply is not clear as he does not explain how he ascertained the data for his Calculations. His determination of the position of the Metacentre is obviously incorrect. As the vessel is said only to draw about 6 ft per meta centre obviously cannot be 6·3 about the Keelson.

4. Question (iii.) - It is difficult to give a satisfactory answer to the question as, though the vessel has provoked much hostile comment, the only person who has had any experience of her behaviour at sea is Mr. Hawkins himself and he asserts that it was thoroughly satisfactory

She has been hardly used at all and on one notorious occasion which has had much to do with her reputation, Mr Hawkins started on her for Lamanore and brought up at Ponnany instead. He states that this was due to bad weather suddenly coming on and leaving no alternative but to run for the best place of safety. Without a fair and impartial trial, it is impossible to say that Mr Hawkins is not correct and such a trial could now only be made at a cost not worth undertaking as even if the cutter was put in order, few if any of the Assistant Commissioners would know how to handle her or dare to use her (or any other vessel of her size however good) unless she was under the command of a responsible offier

The Acting Commissioner however is satisfied after the personal inspection that so far as workmanship and materials go she is very much superior to what the specification would lead one to expect and that there is little to find fault with except errors of design. The hull is very strongly built and the wood must have been well seasoned. That she was built with unseasoned wood was one of the faults found with her or rather suggested as probable, but the Board does not think this can have been the case. She has now been out of the water for many months and her seams have not opened at all which the Board regards as conclusive proof that the wood was well seasoned.

It has split off in flakes somewhat on a few planks which had to be bent considerably but this was due to the bending and not to want of seasoning. The Mast has been much damaged by insects and it is possible that it may not have been properly seasoned. The cordage is all very rough but substantial, and the sails are of good material and cost, it is believed, about Rs 350. There is also an excellent water tank capable of containing 350 gallons of water which must have cost a fair sum. There are several other articles, bathe tub basins, jigs &c but their total value is not great. They probably cost Rs 15 or Rs 20.

5. Though the Board does not think that any fault can be found with the way in which the Contractors constructed the vessel considering the price paid therefor it is not prepared to accept Mr Hawkins' statement that she was a success after all. The local account of her performances is very much what one would expect from his design. Mr Hawkins placed the long hollow sloping bow of a dhoni on to an English stern with a long counter and it could hardly be expected that the outcome of such a want of correspondence in parts would be successful. The result is that the cutter has an exceedingly short keel only the bad effects of which are accentuated by her small draught of water (6 ft) and the height of her fore boards forward. To secure greater comfort, the cabin

was made 7 feet high which unduly raised the weight of her deck, and her mast, appears to have been very heavy for a vessel of her size and probably helped to make her roll badly. As regards the other faults found with her by the Marine Department, the West Coast arrangement was a decidedly dangerous one but could easily have been remedied. The difficulty about ballast could, if necessary, have been met by raising the floor of the cabin or using iron and the fault connected with the Stern-post being cut short would only have been of consequence in case of the vessel being taken out in a weather which she was not intended for. The rudder is substantial and well-secured to the stern-post.

6. As regards para 4, the Board begs to state that it does not think that the vessel has deteriorated more than might reasonably be expected under the circumstances. Some of the planking has been slightly worm-eaten. This is a thing which can only be avoided in the Bizpore river by the exercise of extreme care, especially with boats not actually in use. She should, of course, have been coppered. Her mast seems to have suffered most but whether this was due to its bad quality or to neglect or simply to its not being properly greased it is not possible to say now.

Her sails &c are in fair order.

7. The Board again recommends that she be sold as she stands for what she will fetch. It proposes to remove her sails anchors and the water-tank to Madras for use there. The two former will be of use in supplying the boats and budgerows of the Department and the latter will be handy for holding water for steam launches at Ennore.

(True Extract)

Cammanuttee
Assistant Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department
with Enclosures as per list.

D
4 1,000--11-6-96.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C No. 9426 of 1896

From the Board of Rev (S. R)

Dated 4-12- 1896.

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the office note under G.O dated 23-1-96 no 316. A cutter was constructed for the use of the Salt Officers on the West coast, and was paid for; but as the Officers of the Marine Dept. condemned it as unseaworthy, sanction was accorded for its sale by auction.

2. It was found that the initial mistake lay in the construction of the vessel without the plan and specification being referred to for professional examination. The Hon. Mr. Crole, who was in charge of the Dept at the time, was called upon for explanation, at which was recorded in G.O. No 997 dated 10-3-96.

3. Mr. Hawkins, the Asst. Commr. was stated to have paid the greater portion of the price before the cutter was passed and that he was also found fault with for not having it examined by a Marine Board to be assembled as directed. The Govt. considered that he "acted, as he thought, for the best and with the best intentions"

The Hon. Mr. Bliss C.I.E

The Asst proposals may be approval.
The truth evidently is that the case against this vessel has been made out to be much worse than it really is owing to the childish & ridiculous nature of the drawings sent up as the designs on which she was built

27/1/97

G.O. No 5/92 dt 2nd Febry 1897

The Board's proposals in para 7 of its Progs read above are approved.

[illegible]

To the Board (S. R) Dis. 8-2-97 with enclosures returned.

List. From orders

KD
29/1/97

C. 26/1/97
R. 28/1/97

4. The Govt. however, was of opinion that all the facts of the case had not been placed before it and called for a further report on four points (G.O. no 2269 dated 11-6-1896). The current read above contains the reply.

5. The first point is whether the drawings forwarded by the Board to Govt. were the plans and sections of the model of the boat designed by Mr. Hawkins. The reply is in the negative. The plans and sections were left with a sub-contractor, who has left Beypore and whose present residence is not known. They cannot therefore be procured for submission to Govt.

6. The Second point is how Mr. Hawkins ~~obt~~ obtained his figures as to the heights of the centre of gravity and metacentre of the Cutter. His reply is contained in para 3 of the Dy Comrs ~~to~~ report flagged E. The Board ~~considers~~ observes that this explanation is not clear, that it is not stated how the data for calculations were ascertained and that the determination of the metacentre is obviously incorrect.

7. The third point is ~~that~~ whether the cutter was ~~not~~ such a failure as the specification might imply and whether it was provided with several requisites not stipulated for. The Comr. inspected the vessel and found that, as far as workmanship and materials went, she was very much superior to what one would have

FOR ORDERS.

expected from the Specification and the only fault to be found was with errors of design. Particulars of the vessel as found on inspection are furnished in para 4 of the current. The Board is not prepared to accept Mr. Hawkins statement that the cutter was a success after all, and the reasons for this conclusion are stated in para 5.

8. The last point is whether the cutter was found frequently to be in a neglected condition and whether mainly owing to this cause it had deteriorated, and who was responsible for the same. The Board thinks that it has not deteriorated more than might reasonably be expected. Some of the planking has been slightly worm eaten; and the mast has suffered most. But it is difficult to state what this was due to - its bad quality, neglect or its not being properly greased.

9. Finally the Board recommends that the cutter be sold for what she will fetch, after removing her ~~sail~~ sails, anchors & the water tank. This, it is submitted, may be approved.

KD
24/1/97

[signature] 26/1/97

When given for copying ____
When copied ____
When examined ____
When signed ____
} 189.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.