

Local & Munl. (1898.) Department.

PRINTED.

G.O., No. 792P

DATED 12-8-98

DISPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Quarantine Regulations Communicated

to the Sanitary Commissioner the
President, Munl Commission Madras
and Chairmen of Maritime
Municipalities for Marine
Dept ordering with remarks
the publication of a Notifcation
Amending Regulation 17 of the
Madras —

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1898} of Madras. LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1898.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 792 P., 12th August 1898.

AUGUST.

Quarantine Regulations.

Communicating to the Sanitary Commissioner, the President, Municipal Commission, Madras, and Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities, Government Order, Marine Department, ordering, with remarks, the publication of a notification amending Regulation 17 of the Madras—.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

G.O., No. 668, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.

Read—the following paper :—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, dated Simla, 19th July 1898, No. 1764.

I am directed to refer to the Proceedings of the Government of Madras, Nos. 298-99, Political, dated the 2nd May 1898, regarding the rules for quarantine against plague issued by the Travancore Durbar.

2. These rules appear to be based on the quarantine rules issued by the Government of Madras with their G.O., No. 745, Marine, dated the 23rd August 1897. I am, however, to point out that rule 15 (5) of the Travancore Rules has not been corrected in accordance with the orders of the Government of Madras contained in their G.O., No. 823, Marine, dated the 21st September 1897, and I am to request that, with the permission of the Governor in Council, the Durbar may be invited to make the necessary correction.

3. I am, moreover, to observe that, in the opinion of the Government of India, rule 17 of the Travancore Rules, as well as rule 17 of the Madras Rules on which it is based, are open to objection and are not in accordance with the Venice Convention, inasmuch as they permit the Port Health Officer to place a *healthy* vessel in quarantine, if ten days have not elapsed since the date of her departure from the infected port last visited. In this connection I am to invite attention to the telegrams dated the 11th and 18th May 1898 from the Government of Madras, regarding the imposition of quarantine against Calcutta at the Madras ports, and to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, a copy of a letter from the Government of Bengal, dated the 19th May 1898, and the reply of the Government of India, dealing with the subject of the meaning of a healthy ship under the Venice Convention.

4. I am to request that His Excellency in Council may be moved to issue the necessary orders for amending the quarantine rules of the Government of Madras, so as to make it clear that a healthy vessel is not to be detained in quarantine and that the Travancore Durbar may be invited to make a similar amendment in their rules.

ENCLOSURES.

From H. H. RISLEY, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department (Medical), to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated Calcutta, 19th May 1898, No. 3167 Medl.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram, dated the 6th May 1898, intimating that the Colonial Government of Singapore have imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. A similar telegram was received from the Singapore Government direct.

2. This telegram and other communications which have been received on the subject of quarantine seem to raise the question, whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port. No such condition is expressly set out in the definition of a healthy ship, as given in clause 3 of section VIII which runs as follows :—

"Any ship, even though coming from an infected port, which has had no death or case of plague on board, either before departure, during the voyage, or on arrival, will be considered as *healthy*." Again, the third clause of the clauses relating to healthy ships, recommends that "the crew and passengers should be kept under medical supervision for ten days from the date on which the ship left an infected port." This provision would be meaningless if the definition of "healthy ship" implied ten days' absence from an infected port, for in that case the occasion for keeping the crew and passengers under supervision could never arise. The Bengal quarantine rules which have been adopted *mutatis mutandis* by the Government of Burma, are based on this interpretation of the Convention, which appears, moreover, to have been affirmed by the Government of India in their orders approving of those rules; in the paragraphs dealing with the three-fold classification of vessels and healthy vessels on pages 371 and 372 of Volume I of "The Plague in India, 1896-97;" and in paragraph 2 (ii) of their letter to the Government of Madras, No. 2091, dated the 8th September 1897.

3. On the other hand, in paragraph 7 of their letter No. 1625 of the 1st June 1897, circulating copies of the Venice Convention, the Government of India observe—"healthy vessels are those which have left an infected port for ten days or so, and have had no case of plague on board * * *;" and in the next paragraph but one, the application of the definition to "fast vessels sailing from Bombay" is illustrated in a manner which assumes that ten days' absence from an infected port is an essential part of the definition of a healthy vessel. I am further to invite attention to the definition of a healthy ship, given in chapter I, sub-division III, 2(a) under the heading "measures to be taken in the Red Sea," where it is laid down that a healthy ship will be allowed to proceed at once, but that she must have completed, or must complete, ten full days from the date of departure from the last infected port at which she has touched. It is added under (b) that ordinary healthy ships will be allowed to pass through the canal in quarantine, and will complete in the Mediterranean the ten days' period of observation.

4. The question now raised is of extreme importance to the vessels of the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Asiatic Steam Navigation Company in relation to the coast ports of British India, and to many other steamers besides these in relation to Singapore and Ceylon. I am accordingly to request that the Government of India may be moved to issue an authoritative ruling on the subject.

5. I am further to enquire whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II, regarding special rules for coasting vessels.

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary—Plague), to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department, dated Simla, 30th June 1898, No. 1590.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 3167 (Medical), dated the 19th May 1898, on the subject of the imposition of quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. The question is raised by the Government of Bengal whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port.

2. In reply I am to say that paragraphs 7 and 12 of the Home Department letter No. 1625, dated the 1st June 1897, to which you refer in your letter, were based on a misapprehension of the terms of the Venice Convention and require modification. I am to explain that the opinion was recently expressed by the British Foreign office that "the Government of India should not refuse pratique to any *healthy* vessel at Aden although they are at liberty, if they think fit, to impose restrictions, the maximum of such restrictions being those laid down by the Venice Convention of 1897." In accordance with this opinion the Governor-General in Council directed the cancellation in the rules in force at Aden of the provision which prohibited the grant of free pratique to vessels with less than a ten days' transit from an infected port, and the substitution for it of a requirement that all healthy vessels should be given free pratique at once.

3. This decision has been followed in other places recently. The question of the imposition of quarantine in Burma against healthy vessels from Calcutta was referred to the Government of India, and the opportunity was taken by the Governor-General in Council of explaining to the Government of Burma the position of His Excellency in Council with regard to the enforcement of quarantine generally. Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India have continuously opposed the enforcement of quarantine which, as abundant experience has shown, inflicts the maximum injury to trade and communication without affording real protection against the spread of epidemic disease. It is only in recent years that they have succeeded in some measure in bringing other European nations to adopt these views. The general objections of the Government of India against quarantine by land are set forth in the Home Department resolution, No. 227-240, dated the 3rd February 1898, and those objections are equally applicable to the imposition of quarantine by sea. When, as in the case of imposition of quarantine in Burma against Calcutta, the susceptibilities of other nations are not involved, the

Government of India are entirely opposed to any departure from the general principle that quarantine should not be imposed. The acceptance of this principle is of the first importance for British trade in general and Indian trade in particular, and the Government of India cannot consent to its infringement by one part of the Indian Empire against another. Such a course would probably be most prejudicial to the general interests of Indian trade and might lead to the re-opening of questions settled by the Venice Convention. The same question has had to be considered in respect of the treatment at Madras of vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of Madras have issued instructions to the Health officer of the port of Madras to admit into the harbour healthy vessels from Calcutta, and to allow them to work cargo and passenger traffic under proper precautions. This arrangement has also been extended to out-ports in the Madras Presidency where there is a health officer not below the rank of Apothecary.

4. The Government of Ceylon has, by the rules published in Part I of the *Ceylon Government Gazette* of June 3rd, 1898, modified the treatment of healthy vessels from an infected port, and such vessels which have not been absent ten days from an infected port will be permitted to land passengers, subject to the restrictions laid down in rules 4 and 12, and cargo under such conditions and restrictions as shall appear necessary to the proper authority. The Straits Settlements Government has, as noticed in paragraph 1 of your letter under acknowledgment, imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of India have no information as to whether they will follow the principles of the Venice Convention or not. The Government of India have separately referred to the Secretary of State the question of the adoption of the principles of the convention by Colonial Governments.

5. In the last paragraph of your letter, inquiry is made whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II of the Convention, regarding special rules for coasting vessels. I am to explain in the first place that the Government of India do not regard trade between Calcutta and Burma as coasting trade within the meaning of the clause in question. That clause seems to them to apply in India to trade between minor ports situate, it may be, in the jurisdiction of one local Government, or possibly of two or more local Governments, all on the same main land. The Governor-General in Council has, on a reference from the Government of Bombay, expressed the opinion that coasting trade should be dealt with on the same principle as railway traffic. This decision has already been communicated to the Government of Burma. The Governor-General in Council does not propose himself to issue rules regarding coasting trade in accordance with this principle. His Excellency in Council will leave it to the local Governments concerned to make such rules for places in which they are, in their opinion, needed.

Order—No. 668, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.

Orders will issue in the Political Department in regard to the proposed amendment of the Travancore Quarantine Regulations so as to accord with Regulation 15 (5) of the Madras Regulations.

2. Regulation 17 of the Madras Quarantine Regulations will also be amended in accordance with the Venice Convention, so as to make it clear that a "healthy" vessel is not to be detained in quarantine. The Travancore Durbar will be invited to make a similar amendment in their regulations.

G.O., No. 367, Marine, dated 11th May 1898. The restrictions imposed under the orders quoted in the margin on the landing of cargo, passengers and crew will continue to be strictly enforced.

3. Ordered that the following notification be published in the Fort St. George and all Maritime District Gazettes:—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers delegated to him by the Governor-General in Council under section 2, sub-section (3) of the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to substitute the following revised regulations for regulation 17 of the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 31st August 1897, part I:—

17. In the case of a vessel certified to be suspected, a clean bill of health shall be given, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with, and if ten days have elapsed since the vessel's departure from the infected port last visited. If ten days have not elapsed, the vessel may be detained in quarantine at the discretion of the Port Health officer for the time necessary to complete the period of ten days; the crew and passengers being placed during such period under observation or surveillance.

17-A. In the case of a healthy vessel, a clean bill of health shall be granted at once, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with. Such precautions shall, however, be taken in regard to the landing of cargo, passengers and crew as may be prescribed by Government or as may be considered by the Port Health officer to be necessary.

4. The Translators to Government will furnish the necessary translation of the notification to the Superintendent, Government Press, who will print the required number of copies in English and in the vernaculars and forward them to the Collectors concerned for publication in Maritime District Gazettes.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent, Government Press, with notification.

- " the Surgeon-General to Government.
- " the Presidency Port Officer.
- " Collectors of Maritime Districts.
- " the Local and Municipal Department.
- " the Revenue Department.
- " the Public "
- " the Political "
- " Translators to Government.
- " other Governments with C.L.

ORDER—No. 792 P., dated 12th August 1898.

Communicated to the Sanitary Commissioner, President, Municipal Commission, Madras, and Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities.

(True Extract.)

H. TREMENHEERE,
Secretary to Government.

To the Sanitary Commissioner.
" President, Municipal Commission, Madras.
" Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities.

Recd
20/8/98

Government (1898) of Madras.
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

S. A

Prof for approval

M/S
23/8/98

Recd.

} 1898.

Enclosures

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 792 P., 12th August 1898.

Recd

Please correct and
Strike off
24/8/98

AUGUST.

Quarantine Regulations.

Communicating to the Sanitary Commissioner, the President, Municipal Commission, Madras, and Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities, Government Order, Marine Department, ordering, with remarks, the publication of a notification amending Regulation 17 of the Madras—.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

G.O., No. 668, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.

Read—the following paper :—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, dated Simla, 19th July 1898, No. 1764.

I am directed to refer to the Proceedings of the Government of Madras, Nos. 298-99, Political, dated the 2nd May 1898, regarding the rules for quarantine against plague issued by the Travancore Durbar.

2. These rules appear to be based on the quarantine rules issued by the Government of Madras with their G.O., No. 745, Marine, dated the 23rd August 1897. I am, however, to point out that rule 15 (5) of the Travancore Rules has not been corrected in accordance with the orders of the Government of Madras contained in their G.O., No. 823, Marine, dated the 21st September 1897, and I am to request that, with the permission of the Governor in Council, the Durbar may be invited to make the necessary correction.

3. I am, moreover, to observe that, in the opinion of the Government of India, rule 17 of the Travancore Rules, as well as rule 17 of the Madras Rules on which it is based, are open to objection and are not in accordance with the Venice Convention, inasmuch as they permit the Port Health Officer to place a *healthy* vessel in quarantine, if ten days have not elapsed since the date of her departure from the infected port last visited. In this connection I am to invite attention to the telegrams dated the 11th and 18th May 1898 from the Government of Madras, regarding the imposition of quarantine against Calcutta at the Madras ports, and to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, a copy of a letter from the Government of Bengal, dated the 19th May 1898, and the reply of the Government of India, dealing with the subject of the meaning of a healthy ship under the Venice Convention.

4. I am to request that His Excellency in Council may be moved to issue the necessary orders for amending the quarantine rules of the Government of Madras, so as to make it clear that a healthy vessel is not to be detained in quarantine and that the Travancore Durbar may be invited to make a similar amendment in their rules.

ENCLOSURES.

From H. H. RISLEY, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department (Medical), to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated Calcutta, 19th May 1898, No. 3167 Medl.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram, dated the 6th May 1898, intimating that the Colonial Government of Singapore have imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. A similar telegram was received from the Singapore Government direct.

2. This telegram and other communications which have been received on the subject of quarantine seem to raise the question, whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port. No such condition is expressly set out in the definition of a healthy ship, as given in clause 3 of section VIII which runs as follows :—

"Any ship, even though coming from an infected port, which has had no death or case of plague on board, either before departure, during the voyage, or on arrival, will be considered as *healthy*." Again, the third clause of the clauses relating to healthy ships, recommends that "the crew and passengers should be kept under medical supervision for ten days from the date on which the ship left an infected port." This provision would be meaningless if the definition of "healthy ship" implied ten days' absence from an infected port, for in that case the occasion for keeping the crew and passengers under supervision could never arise. The Bengal quarantine rules which have been adopted *mutatis mutandis* by the Government of Burma, are based on this interpretation of the Convention, which appears, moreover, to have been affirmed by the Government of India in their orders approving of those rules; in the paragraphs dealing with the three-fold classification of vessels and healthy vessels on pages 371 and 372 of Volume I of "The Plague in India, 1896-97;" and in paragraph 2 (ii) of their letter to the Government of Madras, No. 2091, dated the 8th September 1897.

3. On the other hand, in paragraph 7 of their letter No. 1625 of the 1st June 1897, circulating copies of the Venice Convention, the Government of India observe—"healthy vessels are those which have left an infected port for ten days or so, and have had no case of plague on board * * *;" and in the next paragraph but one, the application of the definition to "fast vessels sailing from Bombay" is illustrated in a manner which assumes that ten days' absence from an infected port is an essential part of the definition of a healthy vessel. I am further to invite attention to the definition of a healthy ship, given in chapter I, sub-division III, 2(a) under the heading "measures to be taken in the Red Sea," where it is laid down that a healthy ship will be allowed to proceed at once, but that she must have completed, or must complete, ten full days from the date of departure from the last infected port at which she has touched. It is added under (b) that ordinary healthy ships will be allowed to pass through the canal in quarantine, and will complete in the Mediterranean the ten days' period of observation.

4. The question now raised is of extreme importance to the vessels of the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Asiatic Steam Navigation Company in relation to the coast ports of British India, and to many other steamers besides these in relation to Singapore and Ceylon. I am accordingly to request that the Government of India may be moved to issue an authoritative ruling on the subject.

5. I am further to enquire whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II, regarding special rules for coasting vessels.

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary—Plague), to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department, dated Simla, 30th June 1898, No. 1590.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 3167 (Medical), dated the 19th May 1898, on the subject of the imposition of quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. The question is raised by the Government of Bengal whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port.

2. In reply I am to say that paragraphs 7 and 12 of the Home Department letter No. 1625, dated the 1st June 1897, to which you refer in your letter, were based on a misapprehension of the terms of the Venice Convention and require modification. I am to explain that the opinion was recently expressed by the British Foreign office that "the Government of India should not refuse pratique to any *healthy* vessel at Aden although they are at liberty, if they think fit, to impose restrictions, the maximum of such restrictions being those laid down by the Venice Convention of 1897." In accordance with this opinion the Governor-General in Council directed the cancellation in the rules in force at Aden of the provision which prohibited the grant of free pratique to vessels with less than a ten days' transit from an infected port, and the substitution for it of a requirement that all healthy vessels should be given free pratique at once.

3. This decision has been followed in other places recently. The question of the imposition of quarantine in Burma against healthy vessels from Calcutta was referred to the Government of India, and the opportunity was taken by the Governor-General in Council of explaining to the Government of Burma the position of His Excellency in Council with regard to the enforcement of quarantine generally. Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India have continuously opposed the enforcement of quarantine which, as abundant experience has shown, inflicts the maximum injury to trade and communication without affording real protection against the spread of epidemic disease. It is only in recent years that they have succeeded in some measure in bringing other European nations to adopt these views. The general objections of the Government of India against quarantine by land are set forth in the Home Department resolution, No. 227-240, dated the 3rd February 1898, and those objections are equally applicable to the imposition of quarantine by sea. When, as in the case of imposition of quarantine in Burma against Calcutta, the susceptibilities of other nations are not involved, the

Government of India are entirely opposed to any departure from the general principle that quarantine should not be imposed. The acceptance of this principle is of the first importance for British trade in general and Indian trade in particular, and the Government of India cannot consent to its infringement by one part of the Indian Empire against another. Such a course would probably be most prejudicial to the general interests of Indian trade and might lead to the re-opening of questions settled by the Venice Convention. The same question has had to be considered in respect of the treatment at Madras of vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of Madras have issued instructions to the Health officer of the port of Madras to admit into the harbour healthy vessels from Calcutta, and to allow them to work cargo and passenger traffic under proper precautions. This arrangement has also been extended to out-ports in the Madras Presidency where there is a health officer not below the rank of Apothecary.

4. The Government of Ceylon has, by the rules published in Part I of the *Ceylon Government Gazette* of June 3rd, 1898, modified the treatment of healthy vessels from an infected port, and such vessels which have not been absent ten days from an infected port will be permitted to land passengers, subject to the restrictions laid down in rules 4 and 12, and cargo under such conditions and restrictions as shall appear necessary to the proper authority. The Straits Settlements Government has, as noticed in paragraph 1 of your letter under acknowledgment, imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of India have no information as to whether they will follow the principles of the Venice Convention or not. The Government of India have separately referred to the Secretary of State the question of the adoption of the principles of the convention by Colonial Governments.

5. In the last paragraph of your letter, inquiry is made whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II of the Convention, regarding special rules for coasting vessels. I am to explain in the first place that the Government of India do not regard trade between Calcutta and Burma as coasting trade within the meaning of the clause in question. That clause seems to them to apply in India to trade between minor ports situate, it may be, in the jurisdiction of one local Government, or possibly of two or more local Governments, all on the same main land. The Governor-General in Council has, on a reference from the Government of Bombay, expressed the opinion that coasting trade should be dealt with on the same principle as railway traffic. This decision has already been communicated to the Government of Burma. The Governor-General in Council does not propose himself to issue rules regarding coasting trade in accordance with this principle. His Excellency in Council will leave it to the local Governments concerned to make such rules for places in which they are, in their opinion, needed.

Order—No. 668, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.

Orders will issue in the Political Department in regard to the proposed amendment of the Travancore Quarantine Regulations so as to accord with Regulation 15 (5) of the Madras Regulations.

2. Regulation 17 of the Madras Quarantine Regulations will also be amended in accordance with the Venice Convention, so as to make it clear that a "healthy" vessel is not to be detained in quarantine. The Travancore Durbar will be invited to make a similar amendment in their regulations. The restrictions imposed under the orders quoted in the margin on the landing of cargo, passengers and crew will continue to be strictly enforced.

G.O., No. 367, Marine, dated 11th May 1898.
" " 382, " " 13th " "

3. Ordered that the following notification be published in the Fort St. George and all Maritime District Gazettes:—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers delegated to him by the Governor-General in Council under section 2, sub-section (3) of the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to substitute the following revised regulations for regulation 17 of the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 31st August 1897, part I:—

17. In the case of a vessel certified to be *suspected*, a clean bill of health shall be given, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with, and if ten days have elapsed since the vessel's departure from the infected port last visited. If ten days have not elapsed, the vessel may be detained in quarantine at the discretion of the Port Health officer for the time necessary to complete the period of ten days; the crew and passengers being placed during such period under observation or surveillance.

17-A. In the case of a *healthy* vessel, a clean bill of health shall be granted at once, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with. Such precautions shall, however, be taken in regard to the landing of cargo, passengers and crew as may be prescribed by Government or as may be considered by the Port Health officer to be necessary.

4. The Translators to Government will furnish the necessary translation of the notification to the Superintendent, Government Press, who will print the required number of copies in English and in the vernaculars and forward them to the Collectors concerned for publication in Maritime District Gazettes.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent, Government Press, with notification.

" the Surgeon-General to Government.
" the Presidency Port Officer.
" Collectors of Maritime Districts.
" the Local and Municipal Department.
" the Revenue Department.
" the Public "
" the Political "
" Translators to Government.
" other Governments with C.L.

ORDER—No. 792 P., dated 12th August 1898.

Communicated to the Sanitary Commissioner, President, Municipal Commission, Madras, and Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities.

(True Extract.)

for Secretary to Government.

To the Sanitary Commissioner.

" President, Municipal Commission, Madras.
" Chairmen of Maritime Municipalities.

Read again the following paper:-
C. No 1235-1
Government (1898) of Madras.
MARINE.

Recd. 10 AUG. 1898 }
Regd. 1898.

Enclosures

Spare copies 6

G.O., No. 668, 4th August 1898.

Order No 792 P. 12 3 98
Communicated to the Sanitary
Commr., President, Mch Madras, and
Chairman of Maritime Municipality

AUGUST.

Long
12/8/98

12 8 98

*W.H. prepare amendment for the Marine Regulations
and Rules.*

Submitted to
To His Sanitary Commr. 12/8/98
Ph. Mch. Madras
Chairman of Maritime Municipality
Done 30/8/98

Quarantine Regulations

Stating that orders will issue in the Political Department in regard to certain amendments, proposed by the Government of India, in the Travancore Quarantine Regulations; and ordering, with remark, the publication of a notification in the Fort St. George and Maritime District Gazettes, amending Regulation 17 of the Madras —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, dated Simla, 19th July 1898, No. 1764.

I am directed to refer to the Proceedings of the Government of Madras, Nos. 298-99, Political, dated the 2nd May 1898, regarding the rules for quarantine against plague issued by the Travancore Durbar.

2. These rules appear to be based on the quarantine rules issued by the Government of Madras with their G.O., No. 745, Marine, dated the 23rd August 1897. I am, however, to point out that rule 15 (5) of the Travancore Rules has not been corrected in accordance with the orders of the Government of Madras contained in their G.O., No. 823, Marine, dated the 21st September 1897, and I am to request that, with the permission of the Governor in Council, the Durbar may be invited to make the necessary correction.

3. I am, moreover, to observe that, in the opinion of the Government of India, rule 17 of the Travancore Rules, as well as rule 17 of the Madras Rules on which it is based, are open to objection and are not in accordance with the Venice Convention, inasmuch as they permit the Port Health Officer to place a *healthy* vessel in quarantine, if ten days have not elapsed since the date of her departure from the infected port last visited. In this connection I am to invite attention to the telegrams dated the 11th and 18th May 1898 from the Government of Madras, regarding the imposition of quarantine against Calcutta at the Madras ports, and to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, a copy of a letter from the Government of Bengal, dated the 19th May 1898, and the reply of the Government of India, dealing with the subject of the meaning of a healthy ship under the Venice Convention.

4. I am to request that His Excellency in Council may be moved to issue the necessary orders for amending the quarantine rules of the Government of Madras, so as to make it clear that a healthy vessel is not to be detained in quarantine and that the Travancore Durbar may be invited to make a similar amendment in their rules.

ENCLOSURES.

From H. H. RISLEY, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department (Medical), to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated Calcutta, 19th May 1898, No. 3167 Medl.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram, dated the 6th May 1898, intimating that the Colonial Government of Singapore have imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. A similar telegram was received from the Singapore Government direct.

2. This telegram and other communications which have been received on the subject of quarantine seem to raise the question, whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port. No such condition is expressly set out in the definition of a healthy ship, as given in clause 3 of section VIII which runs as follows :—

“Any ship, even though coming from an infected port, which has had no death or case of plague on board, either before departure, during the voyage, or on arrival, will be considered as *healthy*.” Again, the third clause of the clauses relating to healthy ships, recommends that “the crew and passengers should be kept under medical supervision for ten days from the date on

which the ship left an infected port.” This provision would be meaningless if the definition of “healthy ship” implied ten days' absence from an infected port, for in that case the occasion for keeping the crew and passengers under supervision could never arise. The Bengal quarantine rules which have been adopted *mutatis mutandis* by the Government of Burma, are based on this interpretation of the Convention, which appears, moreover, to have been affirmed by the Government of India in their orders approving of those rules; in the paragraphs dealing with the three-fold classification of vessels and healthy vessels on pages 371 and 372 of Volume I of “The Plague in India, 1896-97;” and in paragraph 2 (ii) of their letter to the Government of Madras, No. 2091, dated the 8th September 1897.

3. On the other hand, in paragraph 7 of their letter No. 1625 of the 1st June 1897, circulating copies of the Venice Convention, the Government of India observe—“healthy vessels are those which have left an infected port for ten days or so, and have had no case of plague on board * * * ;” and in the next paragraph but one, the application of the definition to “fast vessels sailing from Bombay” is illustrated in a manner which assumes that ten days' absence from an infected port is an essential part of the definition of a healthy vessel. I am further to invite attention to the definition of a healthy ship, given in chapter I, sub-division III, 2(a) under the heading “measures to be taken in the Red Sea,” where it is laid down that a healthy ship will be allowed to proceed at once, but that she must have completed, or must complete, ten full days from the date of departure from the last infected port at which she has touched. It is added under (b) that ordinary healthy ships will be allowed to pass through the canal in quarantine, and will complete in the Mediterranean the ten days' period of observation.

4. The question now raised is of extreme importance to the vessels of the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Asiatic Steam Navigation Company in relation to the coast ports of British India, and to many other steamers besides these in relation to Singapore and Ceylon. I am accordingly to request that the Government of India may be moved to issue an authoritative ruling on the subject.

5. I am further to enquire whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II, regarding special rules for coasting vessels.

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary—Plague), to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Municipal Department, dated Simla, 30th June 1898, No. 1590.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 3167 (Medical), dated the 19th May 1898, on the subject of the imposition of quarantine against vessels leaving the port of Calcutta. The question is raised by the Government of Bengal whether the definition of a *healthy* ship in chapter II, section VIII of the Venice Convention, includes as a necessary condition that the ship must have been ten days absent from an infected port.

2. In reply I am to say that paragraphs 7 and 12 of the Home Department letter No. 1625, dated the 1st June 1897, to which you refer in your letter, were based on a misapprehension of the terms of the Venice Convention and require modification. I am to explain that the opinion was recently expressed by the British Foreign Office that “the Government of India should not refuse pratique to any *healthy* vessel at Aden although they are at liberty, if they think fit, to impose restrictions, the maximum of such restrictions being those laid down by the Venice Convention of 1897.” In accordance with this opinion the Governor-General in Council directed the cancellation in the rules in force at Aden of the provision which prohibited the grant of free pratique to vessels with less than a ten days' transit from an infected port, and the substitution for it of a requirement that all healthy vessels should be given free pratique at once.

3. This decision has been followed in other places recently. The question of the imposition of quarantine in Burma against healthy vessels from Calcutta was referred to the Government of India, and the opportunity was taken by the Governor-General in Council of explaining to the Government of Burma the position of His Excellency in Council with regard to the enforcement of quarantine generally. Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India have continuously opposed the enforcement of quarantine which, as abundant experience has shown, inflicts the maximum injury to trade and communication without affording real protection against the spread of epidemic disease. It is only in recent years that they have succeeded in some measure in bringing other European nations to adopt these views. The general objections of the Government of India against quarantine by land are set forth in the Home Department resolution, No. 227-240, dated the 3rd February 1898, and those objections are equally applicable to the imposition of quarantine by sea. When, as in the case of imposition of quarantine in Burma against Calcutta, the susceptibilities of other nations are not involved, the Government of India are entirely opposed to any departure from the general principle that quarantine should not be imposed. The acceptance of this principle is of the first importance for British trade in general and Indian trade in particular, and the Government of India cannot consent to its infringement by one part of the Indian Empire against another. Such a course

would probably be most prejudicial to the general interests of Indian trade and might lead to the re-opening of questions settled by the Venice Convention. The same question has had to be considered in respect of the treatment at Madras of vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of Madras have issued instructions to the Health officer of the port of Madras to admit into the harbour healthy vessels from Calcutta, and to allow them to work cargo and passenger traffic under proper precautions. This arrangement has also been extended to out-ports in the Madras Presidency where there is a health officer not below the rank of Apothecary.

4. The Government of Ceylon has, by the rules published in Part I of the *Ceylon Government Gazette* of June 3rd, 1898, modified the treatment of healthy vessels from an infected port, and such vessels which have not been absent ten days from an infected port will be permitted to land passengers, subject to the restrictions laid down in rules 4 and 12, and cargo under such conditions and restrictions as shall appear necessary to the proper authority. The Straits Settlements Government has, as noticed in paragraph 1 of your letter under acknowledgment, imposed nine days' quarantine against vessels from Calcutta, and the Government of India have no information as to whether they will follow the principles of the Venice Convention or not. The Government of India have separately referred to the Secretary of State the question of the adoption of the principles of the convention by Colonial Governments.

5. In the last paragraph of your letter, inquiry is made whether any, and if so, what action is contemplated under the last clause of section VIII, chapter II of the Convention, regarding special rules for coasting vessels. I am to explain in the first place that the Government of India do not regard trade between Calcutta and Burma as coasting trade within the meaning of the clause in question. That clause seems to them to apply in India to trade between minor ports situate, it may be, in the jurisdiction of one local Government, or possibly of two or more local Governments, all on the same main land. The Governor-General in Council has, on a reference from the Government of Bombay, expressed the opinion that coasting trade should be dealt with on the same principle as railway traffic. This decision has already been communicated to the Government of Burma. The Governor-General in Council does not propose himself to issue rules regarding coasting trade in accordance with this principle. His Excellency in Council will leave it to the local Governments concerned to make such rules for places in which they are, in their opinion, needed.

ORDER—No. 668, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.

Orders will issue in the Political Department in regard to the proposed amendment of the Travancore Quarantine Regulations so as to accord with Regulation 15 (5) of the Madras Regulations.

2. Regulation 17 of the Madras Quarantine Regulations will also be amended in accordance with the Venice Convention, so as to make it clear that a "healthy" vessel is not to be detained in quarantine. The Travancore Durbar will be invited to make a similar amendment in their regulations. The restrictions imposed under the orders quoted in the margin on the landing of cargo, passengers and crew will continue to be strictly enforced.

3. Ordered that the following notification be published in the Fort St. George and all Maritime District Gazettes:—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers delegated to him by the Governor-General in Council under section 2, sub-section (3) of the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to substitute the following revised regulations for regulation 17 of the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 31st August 1897, part I:—

17. In the case of a vessel certified to be *suspected*, a clean bill of health shall be given, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with, and if ten days have elapsed since the vessel's departure from the infected port last visited. If ten days have not elapsed, the vessel may be detained in quarantine at the discretion of the Port Health officer for the time necessary to complete the period of ten days; the crew and passengers being placed during such period under *observation* or *surveillance*.

17-A. In the case of a *healthy* vessel, a clean bill of health shall be granted at once, provided the requirements of these regulations have been complied with. Such precautions shall, however, be taken in regard to the landing of cargo, passengers and crew as may be prescribed by Government or as may be considered by the Port Health officer to be necessary.

4. The Translators to Government will furnish the necessary translation of the notification to the Superintendent, Government Press, who will print the required number of copies in English and in the vernaculars and forward them to the Collectors concerned for publication in Maritime District Gazettes.

[Here enter No. 669, Marine, dated 4th August 1898.]

(True Extract.)

A. Russell

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent, Government Press, with notification.
 „ the Surgeon-General to Government.
 „ the Presidency Port Officer.
 „ Collectors of Maritime Districts.
 „ the Local and Municipal Department.
 „ the Revenue Department.
 „ the Public „
 „ the Political „
 „ Translators to Government.
 „ other Governments with C.L.

17-8-90
29-8-90

Copy sent to Press. 17-8-90
Returned for signature. 29-8-90
Despatched in print. 30-8-90

NUMBER OF COPIES
ORDERED.
Order complete. 90
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
180

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

A.B. -
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.