

Treasury, we shall get a definite
statement out from the Comptroller
regarding that pier structure
which a ship ⁴⁵⁰ feet long & ³⁰ feet
wide to built for \$80,000.

(It is a little understood that in our
letter of 6 Sept to the Syndicate
on 11696 (which is in circulation) we
gave maintenance to their suggestion
that the pier should accommodate two
such ships - which Mr. Currier tells me
is closed) ^{10/5}

Sp. for comm.
at once
to J. R.
1/5

They might
well satisfy
ourselves
by the time
have built
R. 7, we are
ready to
a second
berth
H. J.

C. O.
15617
REC'D MAY 3 1906

Extension of Kibindui

H. W. Commissioner of the P. O. Protectorate submitted an estimate amounting to about £8,000 for the location of certain works at Kibindui with a view to giving further facilities for traffic at that port. As was explained, this scheme - known as scheme B - was at first a tentative measure forming part of the larger scheme C. The latter scheme was asked for merely because it was understood that funds for anything further would not be available although it was fully realised that nothing short of scheme C would be of any permanent value.

It was pointed out that the interest on the cost of scheme B would be more than covered by the saving in landing charges on Government stores only at Kibindui.

instead of Ward and as the existing
duals the same argument will hold
good if it does not do so already
as regards the interest on the cost of
change ^C.

If either of the two projected schemes
for exploiting the timber has been or
the Lake the nation lake goes
through it will be impossible to handle
the traffic with anything less than
scheme C, but putting these aside the
present traffic more than justifies
the provision of accommodation.

Scheme C which is estimated to cost
£30,000 does not provide for a ship
getting alongside. As regards this I
took the actual plan which gives
the necessary structure - to be done
Radel - who advises the construction of
the extension now simply in pencil.
This would enable us to come

alongside at a time.

The cost of this addition including all
the necessary facilities would be about
£50,000 so that the full scheme would
cost £80,000. This may be called
scheme D.

It would be uneconomical to sanction scheme
C now & scheme D later on because
this would entail the construction of the
pier retaining wall of scheme C which
will be useless when the further
addition was made.

The most economical way of doing the
work would be to draw the full
estimated cost of £80,000 & place it
deposit with the Crown Agents - as has
been done with the balance of the Capital
Fund of the Railway. The work could
then be started & carried out to completion
without the necessity of being tied to
certain expenditures each year. The
labour question is not a difficult one
in E. Africa that for a work of this

nature to attempt to work to a given
time is of itself impossible at any rate
that is understood

W. L. Reed

Dear Mr. Reed.

In the connection will you
please cancel the order sent to The
Commissioner C. C. to have a survey
made.

The ordered plan is sufficient for present
purposes and a further survey will of
take up the time of my superiors who
are already that burdened & rather overburdened
with work.

Perhaps you will feel inclined to cancel the
order by me

Yours sincerely

7/8

W. L. Reed

C
15614

C.A.P.

630

Passing

Ans'd 1944

2
Yndy

DRAFT

C Agents

12 May '06

Gentlemen
With refer to
your letter E
283/14

MINUTE.

- Mr. Ellis 10/5
- Mr. Read 11
- X Mr. Antrobus 14. J.S.
- Mr. Coe.
- Mr. Lucas.
- Mr. Graham.
- Sir M. Dumasney.
- Mr. Churchill.
- The Earl of Elgin.

for reason

of the 17th March I
am directed by the
Earl of Elgin to trans-
mit to you for consider-
ation to Messrs
Rendel & Robertson
the accompanying copy of
a memorandum drawn from
Mr. Currie on the
subject of the confinement
of landing facilities
at Kibir line.
It appears that

Mr. Currie to C.A. 2 May
 (transferring in right
 to the Earl of Elgin)
 Copy to Currie 2 May
 Copy to ... 2 May