

EAST BR. ROT

VOL

Individual

Assembly

1908

July

House Paper

1908

1908

1908

1908

*Appropriation*

*Annual Report*

*Copy sent  
w. to*

RECORDS

35421

Hydrographic Department

Admiral

Washington, D.C.

... of the ...  
 ... the ...  
 ...  
 ... would be ... to inform ...  
 ... of their being ... at ...

*Handwritten mark*

Official Seal

Secretary of State,

Executive Building,  
Washington, D.C.

July 14 1912

U.S.

it can be proved...

your interest...

probably for a long...

when he necessary...

be discharge...

side. Further...

charge which...

railway...

in...

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

lighters would be necessarily used on the other side of the ship as well. The lighter owner would therefore be still master of the situation. It is not possible to say whether a floating pier or fixed pier, the latter at least, may be in our opinion, is the better system, and the Pontack Pier, from the shore at some distance, would be a parallel to the shore. A ship drawing say 24 ft. would be allowed along each side of it. On this subject we refer to our Report to Sir F. E. [unclear] of the 20th. [unclear] 1901. Which of the two systems would be the cheaper we of course cannot say for want of information, but taking first cost, maintenance, working, and general convenience into account we believe the fixed pier would be found the better, not the cheapest, and probably not, and neither in our opinion enable the lighter to be dispensed

It seems therefore to us in our opinion that the floating pier is not a better system than the fixed pier, and at least of the lighter is not a better system than the fixed pier. It is not possible to say whether a floating pier or fixed pier, the latter at least, may be in our opinion, is the better system, and the Pontack Pier, from the shore at some distance, would be a parallel to the shore. A ship drawing say 24 ft. would be allowed along each side of it. On this subject we refer to our Report to Sir F. E. [unclear] of the 20th. [unclear] 1901. Which of the two systems would be the cheaper we of course cannot say for want of information, but taking first cost, maintenance, working, and general convenience into account we believe the fixed pier would be found the better, not the cheapest, and probably not, and neither in our opinion enable the lighter to be dispensed

...the complaints of the  
mentioned in the papers... and the  
the demand for... would be postponed  
for a considerable time.

(4) ...facilitate the consideration of the  
subject... a fixed Pier in Mombasa if we say here that the  
fixed structure we are thinking of would be a deck of the  
ordinary kind carried on steel and concrete piles, the  
lower end of which might be... if the depth  
did not exceed say 7 fathoms... 20  
feet deep if it did.

Yours

Messrs Rendel & Robertson to Green Agents

Great George Street, E.C.

London E.C. 2, 223/14  
Illinois Street.

to be raised by ...  
from it. What ...

have no ...  
are ...

very ...  
May ...

the ...  
the ...

1910



... will see that most of the  
 ... deep water piers, quays or docks  
 ... most similar conditions to this

... did enter into engineering or  
 financial details of the information we have been  
 able to get.  
 ... deep water pier  
 ... discharge on  
 ... side could be used for discharging a  
 ... port a  
 ... moored in  
 ... permit two steam-  
 ... side which may serve the same  
 ... arrangements could be  
 ... could discharge  
 ... including a  
 ... distribution of  
 ... about 200 feet  
 ... sent up to the lake and

DISBURSEMENTS

scarcely, and the fall of the tide there is only about 1/2 foot. Various schemes were designed with the intention of deepening the entrance and large sums of money have been expended with that object. The scheme of throwing dredgers North and South of the Harbour, and including dredgers were eventually abandoned. In about 20 years it had become impossible to enter the port at all times, originally wither discharged, they got over (the) they discharged in the Harbour, but of late years very few constructed inside the Harbour and inside can go alongside these wharves for vessels to discharge the cargo at the wharf, but there are plenty of also and for the purposes of discharge that steamers will discharge alongside same time overboard into barges. The rates the days when vessels had to discharge outside the Harbour varied from 4s/- to 3/6 per ton, but now the vessels can discharge alongside the wharves at prices varying from 2/3 to 3/- per ton, when vessels discharged entirely at the outside there were no Harbour dues, but in these days vessels the port has to pay Harbour dues according to the schedule, and in consequence it is necessary that the port should be improved in the ways are necessary.



SHIP COMPANY

from the Board of Directors of the Company  
at Quay No. 1, Harbour, London  
on the 10th of October 1914  
to Consignees of on the Board  
of the Board of Directors  
to compete with

Proceed as proposed  
Feb 6

The [unclear] →  
I have [unclear] this with [unclear]  
[unclear] & [unclear]

This company is not the  
company contemplated in 1897  
of the improvement of the [unclear] 1907  
(42720/07) It is a company  
whose object is [unclear] to take  
over the [unclear] with its  
assets [unclear] but  
to acquire a [unclear] interest in  
that & other companies.

That being so I do not think  
that the [unclear] called [unclear]  
[unclear] or disadvantages of [unclear]  
prospective at all to the [unclear]  
but this point to the [unclear] at the  
same time making [unclear] [unclear]  
[unclear] [unclear] for the  
[unclear] of the obligations under  
what steps are being

consider the [unclear]

