4-6-58 D6

ORIGINALS

OF

Department.

Sectt. II-53—2,500—21-3-38.

Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Marine DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 240-241
~~B.P. No.~~
Press.
Mis.

Dated 1st July ~~197~~ 1890.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1st July 1890, Nos. 240, 241, Marine.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

From W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Acting District Magistrate, Vizagapatam, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Vizagapatam, 26th March 1890, No. 980.

Under Rule 4 of the Quarantine Rules embodied in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, Marine, I have the honor to report, for the information of Government, that four passengers—two bound for Vizagapatan and two for Cocanada—who were suffering from small-pox on board the S.S. *Scindia* on her passage from Rangoon to this coast, were landed at Bimlipatam on the 23rd ultimo by the Port Surgeon of the place. Being bound for onward ports they should not have been landed at Bimlipatam except under the highest necessity, and I called on the Port Surgeon to give the reasons for his action. He explains that he found them in a very exposed and utterly helpless condition on board the steamer and considered himself justified in landing them, as their lives were endangered by the want of attendance and comfort, and the disease might spread among the other passengers in the ship. His report is enclosed.

2. I would draw attention to the neglect which the Captain of the steamer seems to have displayed in leaving persons suffering from a disease of such a nature exposed in the way described.

Enclosure.

From M.R.Ry. C. MANGAYA, Civil Apothecary in charge of Municipal Hospital, Bimlipatam, to the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, dated Bimlipatam, 3rd March 1890, No. 34.

With reference to your letter, No. 327, of the 3rd March 1890, I have the honor to explain the necessity of landing the four cases of small-pox, therein alluded to, from S.S. *Secundra* on the 23rd February 1890. Out of the four cases I found on board the steamer, one was a case of confluent small-pox, one semi-confluent, and the other two just recovering from confluent variety of the disease. They were all in a precarious condition, having had no suitable food for the previous three or four days. They had no provisions, nor had they any friends or relations on board to make adequate provision for them. They were ordered to remain in a corner of the vessel in the open air, and I found them lying down in the sun without any sort of shelter and they had nobody at all to attend to their wants. They had no bedding of any description except a small piece of cloth, and on that spread on hard planks they were lying down. As I considered the two patients who were actually suffering from the disease to be in a totally helpless condition, and as I was afraid that their lives would be endangered if allowed to remain in that forsaken condition any further, I advised them to be landed. With regard to the other two, they were also in a state of starvation, and the scabs had not altogether fallen off. As they were also in a condition favorable to the spread of contagion, I thought it advisable to separate them also from the crew.

District Magistrate's letter, No. 642, dated 1st March 1890.
G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879.

The marginally-noted enclosures are herewith returned.

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 6th May 1890, No. 985—248-G.

With respect to Marine Department reference on No. 333 of 1890, dated 28th April 1890, I have ~~the honor~~ to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that in a letter~~, dated~~ the 9th March 1890, the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, brought to my notice that four native passengers suffering from small-pox had been landed from the B.I.S.N. Company's steamer *Secundra* on the 23rd February 1890, but he made no mention of these persons "being without food or having been found lying in a corner of the vessel unattended and in the open air." I have now addressed him on the subject, and desired him to report whether he can substantiate the apothecary's statements.

2. With regard to the question as to whether it is necessary, in my opinion, to issue separate instructions to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, I beg to point out that these rules appear to be still in force, as the rules laid down in G.Os., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, have reference only to the *action to be taken by the Master of a vessel* when there is disease, &c., on board his vessel within the limits of the port.

3. The rules laid down in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, relate to the *medical inspection* of vessels, and were issued for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports under Act of 1870. It is desirable in my opinion that there should be rules for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers in connection with the medical inspection of vessels and the working of the quarantine regulations, and, should the Government still be of opinion that the rules issued with G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, has been set aside by the rules laid down in G.O., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, then I submit that fresh rules should be issued under Act I of 1870. At all events, the rules issued on 24th May 1879 might be amended so as to exclude all reference to the action of the Master of a vessel, as this point is provided for in the rules made under Act X of 1889.

From W. FARQUHAR, Esq., M.D., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 7th May 1890, No. 402.

With reference to your R. No. 89, dated the 28th April 1890, I have the honor to observe that, in my opinion, the rules published in G.O., No. 280, dated the 24th May 1879, though obsolete and superseded, should be published separately for the guidance of Health Officers.

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd May 1890, No. 996—274-G.

In continuation of my letter, No. [illegible]—248-G, dated 6th May 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of the Government, that Mr. Minto, the Port officer at Bimlipatam, has informed me, in reply to a reference sent to him by me on the subject of the statement made by the medical officer at Bimlipatam respecting the treatment on board of the S.S. *Secundra* of certain native passengers suffering from small-pox, that he is unable to supply me with any reliable information on that subject: see Mr. Minto's letter, which I forward herewith in original for perusal.

2. At this date, I think that it is impossible to procure any further information on the matter, but it seems pretty clear that no temporary hospital was erected on board of the *Secundra*, and that the master has rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed in clause 3 of Section III of Notification, No. 1354, dated 14th March 1889, page 4 of appendix containing general notification by the Government of India, relating to the Native Passenger Ships Act, and it is for the consideration of the Government whether any action in this direction should be taken.

3. I am much inclined to the opinion that the clause relating to the erection of a temporary hospital is in many cases unknown to the Masters of vessels carrying native passengers on short voyages, and that, even if known, the shortness of the voyage between Rangoon and Madras—the few cases of sickness of a serious nature

which have hitherto occurred during such voyages—the difficulty of finding the materials in a vessel crowded with passengers and of erecting a hospital—tends to cause the Master to look on the clause as one not worth the trouble of attending to.

4. In a vessel crowded with native passengers, the fact of a passenger or two suffering from any disease is apt to escape the notice of the ship's people unless a special report on the matter is made by the friends of the sick persons. The tendency of a sick native passenger on board of a vessel is to get out of sight, and he generally stows himself away in some out-of-the-way corner where he is not likely to be disturbed or interfered with by the ship's people. The only way to ensure sick passengers being properly looked after would be to cause each vessel taking native passengers under the Native Passenger Ships Act to carry a medical officer, whose particular duty should be to inspect the passengers daily and to cause all sick persons to be removed to some place to be set apart for their accommodation. It might also be advisable to cause vessels carrying passengers on a short voyage to be provided with a permanent hospital.

From R. MINTO, Esq., Port Officer, Bimlipatan [illegible] e Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated Bimlipatam, 16th [illegible] 0, No 23.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 9[illegible] 4-P, dated 7th May 1890, on copy of local apothecary's letter, No. 34, dated 3rd Marc[illegible] o this office, I have the honor, with much regret, to inform you that I am unable to [illegible] you with any reliable information on the subject therein referred to. The S.S. *Secundra* a[illegible] t this port from Rangoon direct, having flag R flying at the fore, on the 23rd February las[illegible] he Acting Port Surgeon proceeded on board at my request. Unfortunately I did not acco[illegible] him on board, and this, I confess, under existing circumstances, was an error on my part; th[illegible] ccurred prior to your Government Order having been issued requesting Port officers to boar[illegible] amine passenger vessels. The apothecary in question is a young and inexperienced offi[illegible] being his first official visit to a vessel of the sort, and he is perhaps unable to judge wit[illegible] gree of accuracy of the impossibility of commanders in charge of crowded passenger v[illegible] g able to pay such careful attention to patients as they would have bestowed upon them [illegible] well regulated hospital on shore. These vessels do not carry any medical officer, and if [illegible] given the matter a little consideration, he might have formed a very different opinion. I j[illegible] he apothecary on the beach the moment he had landed; a few words passed between us abo[illegible] disposal of the patients, but not one word of any complaint of any sort was ever mentioned [illegible] upon that occasion, and it was not until some time afterwards that the District Collector [illegible] upon me to obtain a report from the apothecary as to why the patients were landed at [illegible] ort at all, that any complaint was heard. This letter under acknowledgment is the result, [illegible] quite astonished me. The patients were not landed for some time after the vessel had a[illegible] "perhaps some two hours had passed," and it is just possible that the poor fellows may [illegible] ft their sick quarters and planted themselves almost anywhere to be in readiness for [illegible] g, the supervision of the officer being perhaps a little less rigorous for the moment, an[illegible] a well-known fact that all such persons suffering from small-pox on board of those steam[illegible] as a general rule, placed in some one of the boats so as to be as far distant as possible f[illegible] est of the native deck passengers. I very much doubt whether the apothecary obtained an[illegible] information on board the vessel. I am of opinion that the patients themselves were the [illegible] source from where his information was obtained, and not likely to be very reliable.

ORDER—dated 1st July 1890, No. 240, Mar[illegible]

G.O., Marine, No. 280, dated 24th [illegible]79, contains two entirely distinct sets of rules:—

(i) APPENDIX A—*Rules for the [illegible] inspection of vessels*, which are intended for every-day use, [illegible] should be regarded as executive orders of the Government; they [illegible] provide for quarantine.

(ii) APPENDIX B—*Quarantine [illegible] under Act I of* 1870, as amended by G.O., No. 583, Marine, da[illegible] October 1879, which are not to be brought into operation without the previous sanction of the Government of India in each case.

2. The incorporation of the latter rules in G.Os., Marine, No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, as rules under section 6 (*p*) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889), was therefore contrary to the intentions and

orders of the Governme t of India. art I of these rules, headed "Quarantine arrangements," will accordingly be cancelled, and the notification appended to these Proceedings will be published in the Fort St. George and District Gazettes.

3. The executive orders in Appendix A of G.O., Marine, No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, which conta instructions for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports, will continue in force side by side with the extracts therefrom issued under the Indian Ports Act for the guidance of Masters of vessels.

4. The Surgeon-General will furnish all Health Officers with copies of the rules in Appendix A for the medical inspection of vessels in G.O., No. 280, Marine, dated 24th May 1879.

5. In the particular case of the S.S. *Secundra* which gave rise to this correspondence, it is observed that the vessel arrived at Bimlipatam with flag R of the Commercial Code flying at the fore. The Master was therefore fully aware of the presence of the disease on boar he caused no temporary hospital to be erected as required by the rules, he wa liable to the penalty indicated in paragraph 2 of the Presidency Port Officer dated 23rd May 1890. The Government is, however, of opinion that no need be taken against him in the present instance, but directs that the r pted in paragraph 4 *supra*, which sufficiently provide for cases of this kind, sh trictly enforced in future.

Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Surgeon-General with the G t of Madras.
" Collectors of Maritime Distr
" Superintendent, Government

Endorsement—dated 1st July 241, Marine.

Copy to the Government of Department of Finance and Commerce.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

~~Gazette~~

3

ANNEXURE.

NOTIFICAT

His Excellency the Governor in Counc ased to cancel the following rules relating to quarantine arrangements issued u e provisions of section 6 (p) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889) and publish the *Fort St. George Gazette* :—

Page 727, Notification No. 97, dated 8th October 1889.
- R V for the port of Madras.
- P I, uarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*).

Page 55, Notification No. 4, dated 17th January 1890.
- I I (for district ports.)
- I I, uarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

Gaz: 15/7

Exd. A. Raitt.

orders of the Government of India. Part I of these rules, headed "Quarantine arrangements," will accordingly be cancelled, and the notification appended to these Proceedings will be published in the Fort St. George and District Gazettes.

3. The executive orders in Appendix A of G.O., Marine, No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, which contain instructions for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports, will continue in force side by side with the extracts therefrom issued under the Indian Ports Act for the guidance of Masters of vessels.

4. The Surgeon-General will furnish all Health Officers with copies of the rules in Appendix A for the medical inspection of vessels in G.O., No. 280, Marine, dated 24th May 1879.

5. In the particular case of the S.S. *Secundra* which gave rise to this correspondence, it is observed that the vessel arrived at Bimlipatam with flag R of the Commercial Code flying at the fore. The Master was therefore fully aware of the presence of the disease on board he caused no temporary hospital to be erected as required by the rules, he wa liable to the penalty indicated in paragraph 2 of the Presidency Port Officer dated 23rd May 1890. The Government is, however, of opinion that no need be taken against him in the present instance, but directs that the r oted in paragraph 4 *supra*, which sufficiently provide for cases of this kind, sl trictly enforced in future.

Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Surgeon-General with the G t of Madras.
" Collectors of Maritime Distr
" Superintendent, Government

Endorsement—dated 1st July 241, Marine.

Copy to the Government of Department of Finance and Commerce.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

~~Gazette~~

3

ANNEXURE.

NOTIFICAT

His Excellency the Governor in Counc ased to cancel the following rules relating to quarantine arrangements issued u he provisions of section 6 (*p*) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889) and publish the *Fort St. George Gazette* :—

Page 727, Notification No. 97, dated 8th October 1889. { R V for the port of Madras.
{ P I, uarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*).
Page 55, Notification No. 4, dated 17th January 1890. { P II (for district ports.)
{ I, uarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

Gaz: 15/7

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1890} Madras.

MARINE.

Issued

Recd, Encl.

G.O., &c., 1st July 1890,
Nos. 240, 241.

JULY.

Port Rules.

Passing orders regarding the publication in the Fort St. George and District Gazettes of notification cancelling certain rules relating to quarantine arrangements, and directing that the rules for the medical inspection of vessels be strictly enforced in future. Copy to the Government of India.

18

No 980

[illegible] 333

VIZAGAPATAM District Magistrates Office, 26th March 1890.

From

W. A. Willock Esq.
Ag. District Magistrate,
Vizagapatam District.

To

The Honorable J. Grose
Chief Secretary to Government,
Department,
Madras.

Sir,

Under rule 4 of the Quarantine Rules embodied in G.O. No. 280 dated 2nd May 1879, Marine, I have the honor to report for the information of Government that 4 passengers, two bound for Vizagapatam and two for Cocanada, who were suffering from Small-pox on board the S.S. Scindia on her passage from Rangoon to this Coast, were landed at Bimlipatam on the [illegible] ultimo by the Port Surgeon of the place. Being bound for onward ports should not have been landed at [illegible] except under the highest necessity, I called on the Port Surgeon to give the reasons for his action. He explains that he found them in a very exposed and utterly helpless condition on board the Steamer and considered himself justified in landing them, as their lives were endangered by the

the want of attendance and comfort and the disease might spread among the other passengers in the ship. His report is enclosed.

2. I would draw attention to the neglect which the Captain of the Steamer seems to have displayed in leaving person suffering from a disease of such a nature exposed in the way described.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant,

Ag District Magistrate.

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY

Encls

No: 34.

Bimlipatam
3d March 1890

From
The Apothecary,
In Ch of Municipal Hospital,
Bimlipatam.

To
The Port officer,
Bimlipatam.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 327 of the 3d March 1890, I have the honor to Explain the necessity of landing the four cases of Smallpox, therein alluded to, from S.S. Secundra on the 23d February 1890. Out of the four cases I found on board the Steamer, one was a case of Confluent Small-pox, one Semi-confluent and the other two just recovering from Confluent variety of the disease. They were all in a precarious condition, having had no suitable food for the previous three or four days. They had no provision, nor had they any friends or relations on board to make adequate provision for them. They were ordered to remain in a corner of the vessel in the open air and I found them lying down in the Sun without any sort of shelter and they had nobody at all to attend to their wants. They had no bedding of any description except a small piece of cloth, and on Spread on hard planks they were lying down. So I considered the two patients who were actually suffering from the disease to be in a totally helpless condition and as

I

the want of attendance and comfort and the disease might spread among the other passengers in the ship. His report is inclosed.

2. I would draw attention to the neglect which the Captain of the Steamer seems to have displayed in leaving person suffering from a disease of such a nature exposed in the way described.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant,

Ag District Magistrate.

Enls
1

2 Sp

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY

3

No: 34.
Bimlipatam
3d. March 1890

From

The Apothecary,
In Chof. Municipal Hospital,
Bimlipatam.

To

The Port officer,
Bimlipatam.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 327 of the 3d. March 1890, I have the honor to Explain the necessity of landing the four cases of Smallpox, therein alluded to, from S.S. Secundra on the 23d. February 1890. Out of the four cases I found on board the Steamer, one was a case of Confluent Small-pox, one Semi-confluent and the other two just recovering from Confluent variety of the disease. They were all in a precarious condition, having had no suitable food for the previous three or four days. They had no provision, nor had they any friends or relations on board to make adequate provision for them. They were ordered to remain in a corner of the vessel in the open air and I found them lying down in the sun without any sort of shelter and they had nobody at all to attend to their wants. They had no bedding of any description except a small piece of cloth, and on spread on hard planks they were lying down so I considered the two patients who were actually suffering from the disease to be in a totally helpless condition and as

I

I was afraid that their lives would be endangered if allowed to remain in that forsaken condition any further, I advised them to be landed. With regard to the other two, they were also in a state of Starvation and the scabs had not altogether fallen off. As they were also in a condition favourable to the spread of contagion, I thought it advisable to separate them also from the Crew.

The marginally noted enclosures* are herewith returned

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
C. Maugay Jr
Civil Apothecary

* Dist: Magistrate's Letter no: 642 D/1st March 79
G.O. no: 280 D/ Int 6th May 1879

188

DEPARTMENT.

ENCLOSURE No.

In a letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam to
Chief
the Secretary to the ~~Commissioner of~~ Govt

dated 26th March 1890 No. 980

PURPORT.

Report of the Bimlipatam
Civil Apothecary regarding
Small pox on board Beunder

28 April 90 fol K1st 87

Forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer for enquiry and report. The action of the medical officer seems to have been quite justifiable. It is observed, however, that the quarantine rules issued with G.O. No. 280, d 24.5.79 have been superseded by those laid down in G.O. No. 426, d/8.2.89 and No. 9, d/17.1.90. ~~[illegible]~~ The revised rules contain no directions ~~for~~ regarding health officers because Act X of 1889 - under which the rules were framed - makes no provision for the issue of any such directions. The P.P.O. and the Surgeon General are therefore requested to state whether in their opinion it is necessary to issue separate instructions to health officers in place of the rules in G.O. No. 280, d 24.5.79, which are obsolete and superseded. (Form orders)

DESPATCHED

P. P. Off. MAY 90

Marine

333

DEPARTMENT

89 date 28-4-90

7 No 246/90

7 No 249/90

FROM

THE COLLECTOR & District Magte

VIZAGAPATAM.

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

FORT ST. GEORGE.

Dated 26th
Received 5th } March 1890
April

Regd 7 April

No. 980

ENCLOSURES. nil

SUBJECT

Bringing to notice the conduct of the Captain of a ship in leaving exposed a passenger suffering from small-pox

---

No. 946/248 G

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 6 May 1890.

Leading.

Quarantine Rules

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
MADRAS.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

13 MAY 90

SIR,

With respect to Marine Department Reference on No. 333 of 1890, dated 28th April 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you for the information of Government that, in a letter dated the 9th March 1890, the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, brought to my notice that four native passengers suffering from small pox had been landed from the B. I. S. N. Co's Steamer "Secundra" on the 23rd February 1890, but he made no mention of these persons "being without food or having been found lying in a corner of the vessel unattended but in the open air." I have now addressed him on the subject and desired him to report whether he can substantiate

substantiate the Apothecary's statements.

2 With regard to the question as to whether it is necessary in my opinion to issue separate instruction to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G. O. No 280 dated 24th May 1879, I beg to point out that these rules appear to be still in force as the rules laid down in G. O. No 426 dated 8th October 1889 and No 9. dated 17th January 90 have reference only to the action to be taken by the Master of a vessel when there is disease &c on board his vessel within the limits of the Port.

2 The rules laid down in G. Ord 280 dated 24th May 1879 relate to the medical inspection of vessels, and was issued for the guidance of Port Officers, Pilots and Medical Officers of Ports under Act I of 1870. It is desirable in my opinion that there should be rules for the guidance of Port Officers, Pilots and Medical Officers in connection with the medical inspection of vessels and the working of the quarantine Regulations, and should the Government still be of opinion that the rules issued with G. O. No 280 dated 24th May 1879 has been set aside by the rules laid down in G. O. No 426 dated 8th October 1889 and No 9 dated 17th January 1890, then I submit that fresh rules should be issued under Act I of 1870. At all events, the rules issued on 24th May 1879 might be amended so as to exclude all reference to the action of the Master of a vessel as this point is provided for in the rules made under Act X of 1889.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,

Captain H.M. I.M.
Presidency Port Officer.

p. 125 – 20 – 6 – E & R
p. 9 – 17 – 1 – 90.
L. 426 – 1 – 10 – 83

Marine (1890) Department.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 2961 / 248

Dated 6th } May 1890.
Received 8th }

No.

Subject.

Reporting about the manner in which certain Native passengers suffering from small-pox were landed at Bimlipatam, and suggesting that such rules be framed for the guidance of Port & Medical Officers as will lead to the better inspection of vessels & the enforcement of the Quarantine Regulations -

5

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL
WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George, 7th May 1890.

No. 402

From
W. Farquhar Esqr M.D.
Ag. THE SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
FORT ST. GEORGE,

To
THE Chief Secretary to Government
Marine Department

SIR,

With reference to your R. No 89 dated the 18th April 1890, I have the honor to observe that in my opinion the rules published in G. O. No 280, dated the 24th May 1879 though obsolete and superseded, should be published separately for the guidance of health officers.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
W. Farquhar M.D.
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

10

P. 89 – 28-6 – E & R

Marine (1890.) Departme

From W. Farquhar Esqr. M.D.
Ag. Surgeon-General with the
Government of Madras.
Fort St. George.

No. 402

Dated 7 May 1890.
Recd.

Subject.

— Informs that the rules published in G.O. No. 280 of 24th May 1879 may be published separately for the guidance of Health officers.

8

Marine C. No. 333.

To R.M.

It is proposed to forward the papers to the P. O. Offr. for enquiry and report.

The quarantine Rules* quoted by Mr. Willock have been superseded by those in G.O. No. 9 d/ 17 January 1890, which contain no direct provision for the landing of passengers suffering from infectious diseases. As matters now stand there are no quarantine rules in existence at the ports of the Presidency other than those named in the margin of the Notification in G.O. [illegible] d/17.1.90 and the Port [illegible] Madras. Orders are requested whether the [illegible] Collectors at [illegible]

of

*In G.O. 280 d/24.5.79.

The action of the medical officer seems to have been quite justifiable even under the old rule.

The quarantine portions of the old rules of 1879 have been omitted from those issued under the Indian Ports Act, it is clearly that the latter being rules under sec 6(1)(p) for the guidance of masters of vessels only. (the heading referring to sec 6(2) is incorrect) it was not proper to include directions to health officers. The latter if issued at all should be in the shape of departmental orders separately. There appears to be no provision in the Ports Act under which they can be issued. Sec 17 gives health officers certain powers but I can find nothing about rules for their guidance.

I would refer the case to the P.O. Off's remarks & ask his opinion on this & of the Surgeon General [illegible] whether the departmental instructions to health officers [illegible] of the rules of 1879 which are obsolete & superseded are necessary.

Jes
19 Apr.

of [illegible] districts may be called to the fact that the rules in G.O. No. ~~200~~ of 24 May 1879 have been superseded

Although the existing Quarantine Rules do not state anything specific with regard to landing sick passengers the action of the health officer in this instance appears to have been properly justifiable & proper. The conduct of the Commander of the Scindia appears to have been ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] and [illegible]

J.D.B.
14.4.90

X
[illegible]

Quarantine Rules

Hon'ble Mr. Stokes

Ref
India Act X of 1889 the Ports Act — please
FDB.
20/4

m 17 4
Ob 1-4

Marine DEPARTMENT

No. 443 444

From

Dated 18

FOR ORDERS.

It seems to me that we have made rather a serious mistake in issuing the Appendix B. rules, which are only to come in force on special occasions with the previous sanction of the Govt. of India, as rules for ordinary every day guidance of masters of vessels under sec 6 of the Indian Ports Act in Not. 17 Jan 90 No 9. and that that notification must be cancelled so far as Part II rule XIII is concerned.

The Part II rules which contain extracts from App. A so far as the masters are concerned is all right & the remaining rules for the guidance of Health Officers may stand as proposed.

[illegible]
[illegible]

See note please
22/5/90

The rules in appendix A of G.O. Mar. 200 of 24 May 79 have not been formally rescinded. In para 17 of G.O. 322 Mar of 16-7-80 it was held that they could not be altered without the sanction of India. The authority to revise them conveyed in para 3 of India's letter in G.O. 426 of 78 [illegible] was perhaps only given [illegible] sect [illegible] of Act X of 89. So they provide instructions for Port Officers and Medical Officers [illegible] it [illegible] be simpler [illegible] a line [illegible] follow [illegible] therefore [illegible] submitted.

[illegible]

of road districts may be called to the fact that the rules in G.O. No. 200 of 24 May 1879 have been superseded

Although the existing Quarantine Rules do not state anything specific with regard to landing sick passengers the action of the health officer in this instance appears to have been properly justifiable & sufficient. The conduct of the Commander of the [illegible] ~~seems~~ seems to have been [illegible] and [illegible]

F.D.B.
14.4.90

X
[illegible]

Quarantine Rules

Hon. Mr. Stokes

Ref
India Act X of 1889
the Ports Act — please
F.D.B.
22/4

m/79
02-4

Marine DEPARTMENT

Nos. 443 & 444

From

Dated 18

FOR ORDERS.

The rules in appendix A of G.O. Mar. 200 of 24 May 79 have not been formally rescinded in para 1 of G.O. 322 Mar. of 16-7-80 it was held that they could not be altered without the sanction of India. The authorities [illegible] then [illegible] in para 3 of [illegible] letter in G.O. 426 78 [illegible] was perhaps only [illegible] sect [illegible] (b) [illegible] X of 89 as they provide instructions for Port officers and [illegible] of vessels [illegible] be [illegible] [illegible] here for [illegible]

It seems to me that we have made rather a serious mistake in issuing the Appendix B. rules, which were only to come in force on special occasions with the previous sanction of the Govt. of India, as rules for ordinary every day guidance of masters of vessels under sec 6 of the Indian Ports Act in G.O. 17 Jan 90 No 9. and that that notification must be cancelled so far as Part rule XIII is concerned.

The Part II rules which contain extracts from App. A so far as the masters are concerned is all right & the remaining rules for the guidance of Health Officers may stand as they are.

[illegible]

See note [illegible]

22/[illegible]/90

Order

G.O. Mas. No. 280 of 24-5-79 contains 2 entirely distinct sets of rules

(1) Appendix A – rules for the medical inspection of vessels.

These are intended for every day use, provide for no quarantine at all, and should be regarded as executive orders of Govt. not as rules under any legislation.

(2) Appendix B – Quarantine rules under Act 5 of 1870.

These are to be brought into operation only very occasionally for short periods and with the previous sanction of Govt. of India in each case — and that only when plague, yellow fever or some fatal epidemic not ordinarily prevalent among [illegible] population is concerned.

2. The latter rules have therefore nothing to do with the present question.

3. There is no objection to the Executive orders in App. A continuing in force side by side with the rules framed under the Indian Ports Act. Should the Presidency Port Officer however consider any amendments necessary he is at liberty to submit, through the Surgeon General, a revised draft for the approval of the Govt. of India —

To
P.P.O.
Surgeon Genl.

A.C.
10/5

14

For Orders

With reference to H. E.'s remarks regarding the cancellation of the quarantine rules in G. O. No. 9 of 17 January 1890 (and also in G. O. 426 dated 8th Oct. 1889) it is respectfully submitted that the instructions in the Govt. of India letter recorded in G. O. 280 of [illegible] May 1879 apply only to the [issue of these rules] (app. B) under Act I of 1870.

So far as Act X of 1889 is concerned India has given general sanction without specially mentioning app. A & app. B to adapt and modify these rules and [illegible] we please (paras. [illegible] of their letter in G. O. 426 of 8. 10. 89) page [illegible] 389 & 16 duly [illegible] referred to both the appendices.

It will [illegible] seldom [illegible] such special [illegible] subjects [illegible] in India will appear [illegible] necessary [illegible] issue of the rules in app. B of the G. O. of 1879 under Act I of 1870. The rules under Act X of 1889 [illegible] (i.e., per se of [illegible] [illegible])

but

[illegible] Quarantine Rules [illegible] the G. of I. [illegible] not to be confused [illegible] the quarantine rules but there appears to be no necessity to cancel the latter as the special sanction of [illegible] of India in each case is required only under Act I of 1870, and a general sanction has been given under Act X of 1889.

Moreover [illegible] of the latter Act authorises rules to be made for every kind of sickness or disease, whether usually prevalent in India or not. The quarantine rules in Appendix B of the G. O. of [illegible] were adopted by Captain Sheet only, as a matter of convenience. He could have adopted [illegible] quite sufficiently; and so long as no reference is made to Act I of 1870, the rules appear [illegible] within the competence of [illegible] to issue.

[illegible] states the arrangements for [illegible] [illegible]. It is however submitted that the arrangements on the [illegible] side are [illegible]

Quarantine & Port Rules

Circ

× [illegible] but Chimasant [illegible] have [illegible] it.

Ues
25 May

reach the Stranger and that the rules contained in G.O. No. 428 d/ 8 Octr 1889 (relating to the port of Madras) and those in G.O. No. 9 d/ 1st January 1890 (relating to certain [illegible]) should be amended by striking out the passages [illegible] Part I Quarantine Arrangements (a) (b) & (c).

2. It cannot [illegible] be said that the [illegible] has given sanction by implication to the issue of rules [illegible] published [illegible] of Act X of 1889 but really a reproduction of the [illegible] rules [illegible]

3. Some [illegible] habitually [illegible]

4. Such steps [illegible] the Government of India [illegible] the two sets of rules [illegible]

(App A) consisting of executive orders which might have been, but which were not published under Act I of 1870, and Appendix B. containing provisional rules sanctioned ~~of~~ under Act I of 1870 for adoption [illegible] the Government of India might order) [illegible] from one another (see § 4 of Rev. of 9th May 1879. No. 3-95-100, & of 24th idem).

5. Notwithstanding this Capt. Hore [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ quarantine with medical inspection rules in his letters of 13th February & 16 March 1888, where [illegible] the word quarantine is [illegible] employed in every instance where it is employed, except possibly [illegible] the last paragraph of the exhibits to [illegible] (No. 332 [illegible] 1888) [illegible] quarantine [illegible] rules [illegible] the [illegible] of 8th October 1887, No. 446 & in that of [illegible] 1888 [illegible]

the quarantine rules to be printed in the middle of the medical inspection rules.

6. The G. of I. has authorised the local Govt to revise "the rules" (§ 3 of the [illegible] 1887 [illegible]) but the rules [illegible] the medical inspection rules; & it would [illegible] to make the expression embrace the quarantine rules as well [illegible] purpose [illegible] to bring [illegible] the quarantine rules into force [illegible] the local Govt. could, [illegible] of 1885 [illegible] bring into force [illegible] rules identical with the quarantine [illegible]

7. [illegible] quarantine [illegible] rules [illegible] the hands [illegible] in protesting against had quarantine arrangements at places belonging to

"foreign powers" [p. 2 of G.O. 280 d/ 24 May 1879]. If these rules are permitted to remain in force, they are certain before long to be misunderstood & misapplied, & the Govt. of India will have good cause for complaint.

8 With reference to the use of the word "proposes" in the preamble of the Notifns published under Nos: d/ 8th Octr 1889 & 17th January 1890 Nos. 926 & 9, it may be argued that Govt. has not as yet made any ~~published~~ rules; it has only recited some rules & stated its purpose of ~~publish~~ making them.

If this [illegible] may be adopted all that has now to be done is to recall the orders of 8th Oct & 17 January and to say that as no objections have been raised, such & such rules (omitting Part I (a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f) in both cases) will be made [illegible] of 1885. & 23 Nov

Quarantine & [illegible] Rules

~~It is usual~~ in all right if the rules require a second publication before bringing them into force. But they have already come into force under the operation of the previous notification & therefore I think the portions objected to must be formally cancelled. This should be done.

H.S.
25 May

M 23-5
A 2[illegible]-5

No $\frac{996}{274}$ G.

17

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE, 78
Madras 20 May 1890.

14

Heading.
Native Passengers
[illegible]

From
THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
MADRAS,

To
THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. $\frac{996}{248}$ G, dated 6th May 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you for the information of the Government, that Mr. M[illegible] the Port Officer at Bimlipatam has informed me in reply to a reference sent to him by me on the subject of the statement made by the Medical Officer at Bimlipatam respecting the treatment on board of the S.S. "[illegible]" of certain native passengers suffering from small pox that he is unable to supply me with any reliable information on that subject (see Mr. [illegible]'s letter which I forward herewith in original for perusal.

2. At

×
Lr 440/90

2 At this date, I think that, it is impossible to procure any further information in the matter, but it seems pretty clear that no temporary hospital was erected on board of the "Secundra", and that the Master has rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed in clause 3 of section III of Notification, No 1374, dated 14th March 1889 — page 4 of appendix containing general Notification by the Government of India relating to the Native Passenger Ships Act, and it is for the consideration of the Government whether any action in this direction should be taken.

3 I am much inclined to the opinion that, the clause relating to the erection of a temporary hospital is, in many cases unknown to the Masters of vessels carrying native passengers on short voyages, and that

that even if known, the shortness of the voyage between Rangoon and Madras, the few cases of sickness of a serious nature which have hitherto occurred during such voyages, the difficulty of finding the materials in a vessel crowded with passengers and of erecting a hospital, tends to cause the Master to look on the clause as one not worth the trouble of attending to.

In a vessel crowded with native passengers the fact of a passenger or two suffering from any disease is apt to escape the notice of the ship's people unless a special report on the matter is made by the friends of the sick persons. The tendency of a sick native passenger on board of a vessel is to get out of sight, and he generally stows himself away in some out of the way corner where he is not likely to be disturbed or interfered with by the ship's people. The only way to ensure sick passengers being properly looked

looked after would be, to cause each vessel taking native passengers under the Native Passenger Ship Act to carry a Medical Officer whose particular duty should be to inspect the passengers daily, and to cause all sick persons to be removed to some place to be set apart for their accommodation. It might also be advisable to cause vessels carrying passengers on a short voyage to be provided with a permanent hospital.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,

H. Street
Captain H.M.'s I.M.
Presidency Port Officer

No 23

Port Office Bimlipatam 16th May 1890

From
The Port Officer
Bimlipatam

To
The Presidency Port Officer
Madras

Sir

With reference to your endorsement No. 916/764 P. dated May the 7th 1890 re copy of Local Apothecary's letter No. 34 dated 3rd March 1890 to this office. I have the honour with much regret to inform you that I am unable to supply you with any reliable information on the subject therein referred to. The S.S. "Secunda" arrived at this port from Rangoon direct having flag L flying at the fore on the 23rd February last. When the Acting Port Surgeon proceeded on board at my request, unfortunately I did not accompany him on board, and this I confess, under existing circumstances, was an error on my part, this case occurred prior to your G.O. having been issued requesting P.O. to board and examine passenger vessels. The Apothecary in question is a young and inexperienced Officer, this being his first official visit to a vessel of the sort, and he is perhaps unable to judge with any degree of accuracy of the impossibility of Commanders in charge of crowded passenger vessels being able to pay such careful attention to patients, as they would have bestowed upon them in a well regulated Hospital on shore, these vessels do not carry any Medical Officer and if he had given the matter a little consideration he might have formed a very different opinion. I joined the Apothecary on the beach the moment he had landed, a few words passed between us about the disposal of the patients but not one word of any complaint of any sort was ever mentioned to me upon that occasion, and it was not until some time afterwards that the District Collector called upon me to obtain a report from the Apothecary as to why the patients were landed at this port at all, that any complaint was heard. This letter under acknowledgement is the result, which quite astonished me

The patients were not landed for some time after the vessel had anchored, perhaps some two hours had passed - and it is just possible that the poor fellows may have left their sick quarters and planted themselves almost any where to be in readiness for landing - the supervision of the officer being perhaps a little less rigorous for the moment - and it is a well known fact that all such persons suffering from small-pox on board of these steamers are as a general rule placed in some one of the boats - so as to be as far distant as possible from the rest of the native deck passengers - I very much doubt whether the Apothecary obtained any such information on board the vessel - I am of opinion that the patients themselves were the only source from whence his information was obtained and not likely to be very reliable

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
Robt. Minto
Port Officer

The patients were not landed for some time after the vessel had anchored, perhaps some two hours had passed - and it is just possible that the poor fellows may have left their sick quarters and planted themselves almost anywhere to be in readiness for landing - the supervision of the officer being perhaps a little less rigorous for the moment - and it is a well known fact that all such persons suffering from small-pox on board of those Steam are as a general rule placed in some one of the boats - so as to be as far distant as possible from the rest of the native deck passengers - I very much doubt whether the Apothecary obtained any such information on board the vessel - I am of opinion that the patients themselves were the only source from whence his information was obtained and not likely to be very reliable

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Robt Minto
Port Officer

From

The Port Officer
Bimlipatam

To

The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras.

Dated 16th }
Received } May 1870

No 23

Explanation with reference to certain small pox patients landed from the S.S. Secundra in February last.

J. 518 - 17-7-85

30

Marine (18) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 996/274

Dated 23rd } May 1890
Received 26 }

No. CHIEF SECRETARY'S 26 MAY 90

Subject.

Reporting cases of small pox on board the S.S. "Secundra" and enquiring whether any action is necessary against the Master of the Vessel for not having an hospital erect=ed as required by Clause 3, Section III of Notification No. 1354 dated 14th March 1889.

Rep 2/6

18

TH JUNE 1890, No. , MARINE.

Please circulate and two [illegible] Rw 5/7

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

333

READ—the following papers :—

From W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Acting District Magistrate, Vizagapatam, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Vizagapatam, 26th March 1890, No. 980.

Under Rule 4 of the Quarantine Rules embodied in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, Marine, I have the honor to report, for the information of Government, that [illegible]—two bound for Vizagapatam and two for Cocanada—who were suffering from small-pox on board the S.S. *Scindia* on her passage from Rangoon to this coast, were landed at Bimlipatam on the 23rd ultimo by the Port Surgeon of the place. Being bound for onward ports they should not have been landed at Bimlipatam except under the highest necessity, and I called on the Port Surgeon to give the reasons for his action. He explains that he found them in a very exposed and utterly helpless condition on board the steamer and considered himself justified in landing them, as their lives were endangered by the want of attendance and comfort, and the disease might spread among the other passengers in the ship. His report is enclosed.

2. I would draw attention to the neglect which the Captain of the steamer seems to have displayed in leaving persons suffering from a disease of such a nature exposed in the way described.

ENCLOSURE.

From M.R.Ry. C. MANGAYA, Civil Apothecary in charge of Municipal Hospital, Bimlipatam, to the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, dated Bimlipatam, 3rd March 1890, No. 34.

With reference to your letter, No. 327, of the 3rd March 1890, I have the honor to explain the necessity of landing the four cases of small-pox, therein alluded to, from S.S. *Secundra* on the 23rd February 1890. Out of the four cases I found on board the steamer, one was a case of confluent small-pox, one semi-confluent, and the other two just recovering from confluent variety of the disease. They were all in a precarious condition, having had no suitable food for the previous three or four days. They had no provisions, nor had they any friends or relations on board to make adequate provision for them. They were ordered to remain in a corner of the vessel in the open air, and I found them lying down in the sun without any sort of shelter and they had nobody at all to attend to their wants. They had no bedding of any description except a small piece of cloth, and on that spread on hard planks they were lying down. As I considered the two patients who were actually suffering from the disease to be in a totally helpless condition, and as I was afraid that their lives would be endangered if allowed to remain in that forsaken condition any further, I advised them to be landed. With regard to the other two, they were also in a state of starvation, and the scabs had not altogether fallen off. As they were also in a condition favorable to the spread of contagion, I thought it advisable to separate them also from the crew.

District Magistrate's letter, No. 642, dated 1st March 1890.
G. O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879.

The marginally-noted enclosures are herewith returned.

Reference, dated 28th April 1890, R. No. 89.

This reference is all wrong

Forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, for enquiry and report. The action of the medical officer seems to have been quite justifiable. It is observed, however, that the quarantine rules issued with G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, have been superseded by those laid down in G.Os., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. [illegible], dated 17th January 1890. The revised rules contain no directions for the guidance of Health Officers because Act X of 1889, under which the rules were framed, makes no provision for the issue of any such directions. The Presidency Port Officer and the

Surgeon-General are therefore requested to state whether, in their opinion, it is necessary to issue separate instructions to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, which are obsolete and superseded.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras,
with spare copies of the Government Order.

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 6th May 1890, No. 996—248-G.

With respect to Marine Department reference on No. 333 of 1890, dated 28th April 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that in a letter, dated the 9th March 1890, the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, brought to my notice that four native passengers suffering from small-pox had been landed from the B.I.S.N. Company's steamer *Secundra* on the 23rd February 1890, but he made mention of these persons "being without food or having been found lying in a corner of the vessel unattended and in the open air." I have now addressed him on the subject, and desired him to report whether he can substantiate the apothecary's statements.

2. With regard to the question as to whether it is necessary, in my opinion, to issue separate instructions to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, I beg to point out that these rules appear to be still in force, as the rules laid down in G.Os., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, have reference only to the *action to be taken by the Master of a vessel* when there is disease, &c., on board his vessel within the limits of the port.

3. The rules laid down in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, relate to the *medical inspection* of vessels, and were issued for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports under Act I of 1870. It is desirable in my opinion that there should be rules for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers in connection with the medical inspection of vessels and the working of the quarantine regulations, and, should the Government still be of opinion that the rules issued with G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, has been set aside by the rules laid down in G.O., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, then I submit that fresh rules should be issued under Act I of 1870. At all events, the rules issued on 24th May 1879 might be amended so as to exclude all reference to the action of the Master of a vessel as this point is provided for in the rules made under Act X of 1889.

From W. FARQUHAR, Esq., M.D., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 7th May 1890, No. 402.

With reference to your R. No. 89, dated the 28th April 1890, I have the honor to observe that, in my opinion, the rules published in G.O., No. 280, dated the 24th May 1879, though obsolete and superseded, should be published separately for the guidance of Health Officers.

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd May 1890, No. 996—274-G.

In continuation of my letter, No. 996—248-G, dated 6th May 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of the Government, that Mr. Minto, the Port Officer at Bimlipatam, has informed me, in reply to a reference sent to him by me on the subject of the statement made by the medical officer at Bimlipatam respecting the treatment on board of the S.S. *Secundra* of certain native passengers suffering from small-pox, that he is unable to supply me with any reliable information on that subject: see Mr. Minto's letter, which I forward herewith in original for perusal.

2. At this date, I think that it is impossible to procure any further information on the matter, but it seems pretty clear that no temporary hospital was erected on board the *Secundra*, and that the master has rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed in clause 3 of Section III of Notification, No. 1354, dated 14th March 1889, page 4 of appendix containing general notification by the Government of India, relating to the Native Passenger Ships Act, and it is for the consideration of the Government whether any action in this direction should be taken.

3. I am much inclined to the opinion that the clause relating to the erection of a temporary hospital is in many cases unknown to the Masters of vessels carrying native passengers on short voyages, and that, even if known, the shortness of the voyage between Rangoon and Madras—the few cases of sickness of a serious nature which have hitherto occurred during such voyages—the difficulty of finding the materials in a vessel crowded with passengers and of erecting a hospital—tends to cause the Master to look on the clause as one not worth the trouble of attending to.

4. In a vessel crowded with native passengers, the fact of a passenger or two suffering from any disease is apt to escape the notice of the ship's people unless a special report on the matter is made by the friends of the sick persons. The tendency of a sick native passenger on board of a vessel is to get out of sight, and he generally stows himself away in some out-of-the-way corner where he is not likely to be disturbed or interfered with by the ship's people. The only way to ensure sick passengers being properly looked after would be to cause each vessel taking native passengers under the Native Passenger Ships Act to carry a medical officer, whose particular duty should be to inspect the passengers daily and to cause all sick persons to be removed to some place to be set apart for their accommodation. It might also be advisable to cause vessels carrying passengers on a short voyage to be provided with a permanent hospital.

From R. MINTO, Esq., Port Officer, Bimlipatam, to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated Bimlipatam, 16th May 1890, No. 23.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 996—754-P, dated 7th May 1890, on copy of local apothecary's letter, No. 31, dated 3rd March 1890, to this office, I have the honor, with much regret, to inform you that I am unable to supply you with any reliable information on the subject therein referred to. The S.S. *Secundra* arrived at this port from Rangoon direct, having flag R flying at the fore, on the 23rd February last, and the Acting Port Surgeon proceeded on board at my request. Unfortunately I did not accompany him on board, and this, I confess, under existing circumstances, was an error on my part; this case occurred prior to your Government Order having been issued requesting Port officers to board and examine passenger vessels. The apothecary in question is a young and inexperienced officer this being his first official visit to a vessel of the sort, and he is perhaps unable to judge with any degree of accuracy of the impossibility of commanders in charge of crowded passenger vessels being able to pay such careful attention to patients as they would have bestowed upon them in a well regulated hospital on shore. These vessels do not carry any medical officer, and if he had given the matter a little consideration, he might have formed a very different opinion. I joined the apothecary on the beach the moment he had landed; a few words passed between us about the disposal of the patients, but not one word of any complaint of any sort was ever mentioned to me upon that occasion, and it was not until some time afterwards that the District Collector called upon me to obtain a report from the apothecary as to why the patients were landed at this port at all, that any complaint was heard. This letter under acknowledgment is the result, which quite astonished me. The patients were not landed for some time after the vessel had anchored, "perhaps some two hours had passed," and it is just possible that the poor fellows may have left their sick quarters and planted themselves almost anywhere to be in readiness for landing, the supervision of the officer being perhaps a little less rigorous for the moment, and it is a well-known fact that all such persons suffering from small pox on board of those steamers are, as a general rule, placed in some one of the boats so as to be as far distant as possible from the rest of the native deck passengers. I very much doubt whether the apothecary obtained any such information on board the vessel, and I am of opinion that the patients themselves were the only source from whence this information was obtained, and not likely to be very reliable.

Surgeon-General are therefore requested to state whether, in their opinion, it is necessary to issue separate instructions to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, which are obsolete and superseded.

(Signed) J. [illegible] PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras,
with spare copies of the Government Order.

443

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 6th May 1890, No. 996—248-G.

With respect to Marine Department reference on No. 333 of 1890, dated 28th April 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that in a letter, dated the 9th March 1890, the Port Officer, Bimlipatam, brought to my notice that four native passengers suffering from small-pox had been landed from the B.I.S.N. Company's steamer *Secundra* on the 23rd February 1890, ~~but he made no~~ mention of these persons "being without food or having been found lying in a corner of the vessel unattended and in the open air." I have now addressed him on the subject, and desired him to report whether he can substantiate the apothecary's statements.

2. With regard to the question as to whether it is necessary, in my opinion, to issue separate instructions to Health Officers in lieu of the rules in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, I beg to point out that these rules appear to be still in force, as the rules laid down in G.Os., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, have reference only to the *action to be taken by the Master of a vessel* when there is disease, &c., on board his vessel within the limits of the port.

3. The rules laid down in G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, relate to the *medical inspection* of vessels, and were issued for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports under Act I of 1870. It is desirable in my opinion that there should be rules for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers in connection with the medical inspection of vessels and the working of the quarantine regulations, and, should the Government still be of opinion that the rules issued with G.O., No. 280, dated 24th May 1879, has been set aside by the rules laid down in G.O., No. 426, dated 8th October 1889, and No. 9, dated 17th January 1890, then I submit that fresh rules should be issued under Act I of 1870. At all events, the rules issued on 24th May 1879 might be amended so as to exclude all reference to the action of the Master of a vessel as this point is provided for in the rules made under Act X of 1889.

444

From W. FARQUHAR, Esq., M.D., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 7th May 1890, No. 402.

With reference to your R. No. 89, dated the 28th April 1890, I have the honor to observe that, in my opinion, the rules published in G.O., No. 280, dated the 24th May 1879, though obsolete and superseded, should be published separately for the guidance of Health Officers.

From Captain H. A. STREET, Her Majesty's Indian Marine, Presidency Port Officer, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd May 1890, No. 996—274-G.

In continuation of my letter, No. 996—248-G, dated 6th May 1890, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of the Government, that Mr. Minto, the Port Officer at Bimlipatam, has informed me, in reply to a reference sent to him by me on the subject of the statement made by the medical officer at Bimlipatam respecting the treatment on board of the S.S. *Secundra* of certain native passengers suffering from small-pox, that he is unable to supply me with any reliable information on that subject: see Mr. Minto's letter, which I forward herewith in original for perusal.

2. At this date, I think that it is impossible to procure any further information on the matter, but it seems pretty clear that no temporary hospital was erected on board the *Secundra*, and that the master has rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed in clause 3 of Section III of Notification, No. 1354, dated 14th March 1889, page 4 of appendix containing general notification by the Government of India, relating to the Native Passenger Ships Act, and it is for the consideration of the Government whether any action in this direction should be taken.

3. I am much inclined to the opinion that the clause relating to the erection of a temporary hospital is in many cases unknown to the Masters of vessels carrying native passengers on short voyages, and that, even if known, the shortness of the voyage between Rangoon and Madras—the few cases of sickness of a serious nature which have hitherto occurred during such voyages—the difficulty of finding the materials in a vessel crowded with passengers and of erecting a hospital—tends to cause the Master to look on the clause as one not worth the trouble of attending to.

4. In a vessel crowded with native passengers, the fact of a passenger or two suffering from any disease is apt to escape the notice of the ship's people unless a special report on the matter is made by the friends of the sick persons. The tendency of a sick native passenger on board of a vessel is to get out of sight, and he generally stows himself away in some out-of-the-way corner where he is not likely to be disturbed or interfered with by the ship's people. The only way to ensure sick passengers being properly looked after would be to cause each vessel taking native passengers under the Native Passenger Ships Act to carry a medical officer, whose particular duty should be to inspect the passengers daily and to cause all sick persons to be removed to some place to be set apart for their accommodation. It might also be advisable to cause vessels carrying passengers on a short voyage to be provided with a permanent hospital.

From R. MINTO, Esq., Port Officer, Bimlipatam, to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated Bimlipatam, 16th May 1890, No. 23.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 996—754-P., dated 7th May 1890, on copy of local apothecary's letter, No. 31, dated 3rd March 1890, to this office, I have the honor, with much regret, to inform you that I am unable to supply you with any reliable information on the subject therein referred to. The S.S. *Secundra* arrived at this port from Rangoon direct, having flag H flying at the fore, on the 23rd February last, and the Acting Port Surgeon proceeded on board at my request. Unfortunately I did not accompany him on board, and this, I confess, under existing circumstances, was an error on my part; this case occurred prior to your Government Order having been issued requesting Port officers to board and examine passenger vessels. The apothecary in question is a young and inexperienced officer this being his first official visit to a vessel of the sort, and he is perhaps unable to judge with any degree of accuracy of the impossibility of commanders in charge of crowded passenger vessels being able to pay such careful attention to patients as they would have bestowed upon them in a well regulated hospital on shore. These vessels do not carry any medical officer, and if he had given the matter a little consideration, he might have formed a very different opinion. I joined the apothecary on the beach the moment he had landed; a few words passed between us about the disposal of the patients, but not one word of any complaint of any sort was ever mentioned to me upon this occasion, and it was not until some time afterwards that the District Collector called upon me to obtain a report from the apothecary as to why the patients were landed at this port at all, that any complaint was heard. This letter under acknowledgment is the result, which quite astonished me. The patients were not landed for some time after the vessel had anchored, perhaps some [illegible] had passed, and it is just possible that the poor fellows may have left the sick [illegible] and planted themselves almost anywhere to be in readiness for landing, the supervision of the officer being perhaps a little less rigorous for the moment, and it is a well-known fact that all such persons suffering from small pox on board of those steamers are, as a general rule, placed in some one of the boats so as to be as far distant as possible from the rest of the [illegible] passengers. I very much doubt whether the apothecary obtained any such information on board the vessel. I am of opinion that the patients themselves were the only source from whence his information was obtained, and not likely to be very reliable.

G.O. Mar 240/1
1-7-20

[illegible] which
incorporated rules [illegible]

Order - [illegible] [illegible] 1879 No. 240 [illegible]

G. O. Marine, No 280, dated 24
May 1879 contains two entirely distinct
sets of Rules:-

(i) Appendix A - Rules for the medical
inspection of [illegible], which are
intended for every day use &
should be regarded as executive
orders of the Govt. [illegible] [illegible]
provide for [illegible]

(ii) Appendix B - Quarantine [illegible]
under Act I of 1870, [illegible] by
G.O. No. 553 Marine dated 20th Oct.
1879, which [illegible] not [illegible] to come
into operation [illegible] is the province
[illegible] of the Govt. of India in
each case.

2 The incorporation of the latter
rules in G.O. Marine No. 224 dated
8th October 1889 & No. 9 dated 17 January
1891 as rules under Sect. 6 (f) of the
Indian Ports Act (X of 1889) was therefore
contrary to the intention of the order

of [illegible] of India. Part I of these Rules headed "Quarantine Arrangements" [illegible] [illegible] be cancelled & the notification [illegible] to these Progs. will be published in the Ft. St. George and Distt. Gazettes.

3. The executive orders in Appendix A of G.O. [illegible] No. 280, of 24th May 1879 which contain instructions for the guidance of Port officers, pilots and medical officers of ports, will continue in force [illegible] side [illegible] the extract therefrom issued under the Indian Ports Act for the guidance of Masters of Vessels.

4. The [illegible] General will furnish [illegible] officers with copies of the rules in Appendix A for the medical inspection of Vessels in G.O. 280 [illegible] 24th May 1879.

5. In the particular case of the S.S. "[illegible]" which gave rise to this correspondence it is observed that the Vessel arrived at Bimlipatam with flag R of the commercial Code flying at the fore. The Master was therefore fully aware of the presence of the disease on board, and if he caused no [illegible] to be [illegible] [illegible] by the rule, he was clearly [illegible] to the penalty indicated in para 7 of the Presidency Port Officer's letter of 23rd May 1890. The Govt. is however of opinion that no action need ~~not~~ be taken against him in the present instance, but directs that the rule quoted in para. 4 supra, ~~which~~ which sufficiently provides for cases of this kind, should be [illegible] enforced in future.

To
The Presidency Port Officer
The Surgeon Genl. with the Govt. [illegible]
Collector of [illegible] Distts/[illegible]
Supdt. Govt. Press

Copy
15/7

Desp 1/7

3rd Copy to the Govt. of India
Depmt. of Finance & Commerce

Keep [illegible] the
[illegible] original of
[illegible]

ANNEXURE.

NOTIFICATION.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to cancel the following rules relating to quarantine arrangements issued under the provisions of section 6 (*p*) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889) and published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*:—

Page 727, Notification No. 97, dated 8th October 1889.	Rule XIV for the port of Madras. Part I, Quarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*).
Page 55, Notification No. 4, dated 17th January 1890.	Rule XIII (for district ports.) Part I, Quarantine arrangements (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

AC
9/6

Exd. A. Raitt.

29

Dispatched
15-7-90

The Collectors of Maritime Dist
~~The District Magistrates of~~

~~Anantapur.~~
~~North Arcot, Chittoor.~~
South Arcot, Cuddalore. 8
~~Bellary.~~
South Canara, Mangalore. 8
Chingleput, Saidapet. 8
~~Coimbatore.~~
~~Cuddapah.~~
Ganjam, Chatrapur. 8
Godavari, Cocanada. 8
Kistna, Masulipatam. 8
~~Kurnool.~~
Madras (when necessary). 6
Madura. 8
Malabar, Calicut. 10
~~Nilgiris, Ootacamund.~~
Nellore. 8
~~Salem.~~
Tanjore. 9
Tinnevelly. 8
~~Trichinopoly.~~
Vizagapatam. 8

proof

Desure — a

200

Marine
5-7-90
8 240/1

9-3-06
12-5-[illegible]
11-12-07
15-3-11
1-[illegible]-1[illegible]
14-8-13. B.T.

14/7
15/7

/7

Port Rules

Passing orders re the public-
ation in the Fort St George and
District Gazettes of Notification
cancelling certain rules relat-
to Quarantine arrangements
and directing that the rules [illegible]
the medical inspection
vessels be strictly enforced
future. Copy to the Govt. of
India.