

Government of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS AND LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(Irrigation)

G.O. No. 2371 I., 31st October 1933

Navigation—Inland Steam Vessels Act, 1917—Extension to Madras Presidency—Dropped.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O. No. 2509 I., dated 1st December 1927.

G.O. No. 2258 I., dated 31st October 1932.

II

Letter from Capt. B. GORDON, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Finance (Marine) Department, dated Madras, the 10th September 1932, No. 2366-GI.-1.

I have the honour to represent for the consideration of Government the inadequacy of the boat licensing rules to provide for the proper regulation of inland mechanically propelled vessels in Madras and in particular to the case of steam vessels, the boilers of which are liable to be a source of public danger as they do not come under the supervision of the officers appointed under the Indian Boilers Act.

2. Apart from the importance of exercising supervision over this class of steam boilers, it seems desirable to ensure that the more important of the passenger carrying vessels plying the ports and inland waters of the Presidency are placed in charge of persons competent to manage them.

3. Madras is the only Maritime province to which the Inland Steam Vessels Act has not been extended and I am strongly of the opinion that it seems desirable, instead of relying upon licensing rules, which are applicable only within port limits, to consider extending the Inland Steam Vessels Act to the Presidency.

4. With the appointment of Engineer and Ship Surveyor at Madras, there should be little or no difficulty in establishing an examination centre under the Inland Steam Vessels Act at Madras and in the event of the Act being extended to the Presidency, that officer would probably be able to undertake all important surveys under the Act, the expense thereof being covered by the fees recovered.

5. In view of the wide powers of exemption under the Act, vide sections 28 and 68, no practical difficulty seems likely to arise if the Act is applied to Madras so far as British territory is concerned, each special case could be considered on its merits and such exemption as regards survey or certificated personnel, as was considered justified, could be granted. I would suggest, in the first instance, that all vessels other than steam vessels carrying less than 12 passengers should be entirely exempted.

6. As regards non-British territory, difficulties may arise and the situation on the Malabar coast, where inland waters connect through British and Indian State territories will need careful examination. I incline to the view that it would be desirable to exempt from the operation of the Act, vessels plying in the Harbour of Cochin.

7. I therefore request that Government will be pleased to reconsider the question of introducing the Inland Steam Vessels Act to Madras in the light of the foregoing remarks.

III

Endorsement No. 374-D/33-1, P.W. & L., dated 2nd February 1933.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. *Reference.*—Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, dated 10th September 1932, No. 2366-GI.-1.]

Referred to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and the Board of Revenue for remarks.

N. GOPALASWAMI,
Secretary to Government.

for Irrigation } with copy of Presidency Port Officer's letter.
Revenue }

No. 2371 I., 31st OCTOBER 1933

IV

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement),
Miscellaneous No. 1308, dated 8th May 1933.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. B. COTTEREL, C.I.E., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

Read—the following paper:—

Endorsement from Government, Public Works and Labour Department,
No. 374-D/33-1, dated 2nd February 1933.

Resolution—Miscellaneous No. 1308, dated 8th May 1933.

The Board consulted select Collectors in the matter. It sees no objection to the extension of the Inland Steam Vessels Act to the Madras Presidency, the questions of details and exemptions being examined for the different localities.

2. The Board presumes that in the last sentence of paragraph 5 of his letter, the Presidency Port Officer means that vessels carrying less than 12 passengers, other than steam vessels should be exempted.

(True extract)

A. R. MACEWEN,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works and Labour Department.

V

Official Memorandum No. 374-D/33-2, P.W. & L., dated 17th May 1933.

[Acts—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency—B.P.
Mis. No. 1308, dated 8th May 1933.]

The Board of Revenue is requested to forward to Government copies of the reports on the subject submitted by the Collectors whom the Board consulted.

(By order)

A. VITTAL PAI,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement).

VI

Endorsement of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement),
No. E. 2482/33, dated 25th May 1933.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. B. COTTERELL, C.I.E., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

Read—the following:—

Memorandum from Government, Public Works and Labour Department,
No. 374-D/33-2, dated the 17th May 1933.

Endorsement—No. E. 2482/33, dated 25th May 1933.

The Board submits to Government the copies of the reports of the Collectors whom it consulted in connexion with the question of extending the Inland Steam Vessels Act to the Madras Presidency.

A. R. MACEWEN,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works and Labour Department (with copies of the Collectors' reports).

ENCLOSURES

(1)

Letter from C. H. MASTERMAN, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Nellore, dated the 3rd March 1933,
L. Dis. No. 829/33.

[Marine—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction into the Madras Presidency—Proposal—
Report. Reference.—Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

The Pulicat lake and the Buckingham canal are the only inland waterways in this district, but no steam vessel traffic is carried on in these inland waterways. There seems to be no objection to the introduction of steam vessels.

No. 2371 I., 31st OCTOBER 1933

(2)

Letter from E. M. GAWNE, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, dated the 4th March 1933, L. Dis. No. 972/33.

[Acts—Indian Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency. Reference.—
Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

I do not see any objection for the extension of the Act to the Madras Presidency.

(3)

Letter from M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur R. SUBBAYYA NAYUDU Garu, B.A., Collector,
West Godavari, dated the 17th March 1933, L. Dis. No. 1067/33.

[Acts—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency—Report—Submitted.
Reference.—Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

I see no objection to the extension of the Inland Steam Vessels Act of 1917 to the Presidency of Madras in view of the wide powers of exemption granted to Local Government under sections 28 and 68 of the Act. I take it that the suggestion of the Port Officer made in the last sentence of paragraph 5 of his reference, would mean that steam vessels carrying less than 12 passengers may be exempted.

(4)

Letter from E. R. WOOD, Esq., M.C., I.C.S., Collector and District Magistrate, Kistna,
dated the 23rd March 1933, L. Dis. No. 1581/33.

[Acts—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency—Report—Submission.
Reference.—Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

So far as this district is concerned, the need for the extension of the Act has not been felt, as no launches are plying on the inland waters in this district. One or two steamers occasionally ply on the Kistna but they do so very irregularly. I see, however, no objection to the proposal of the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.

(5)

Letter from T. B. RUSSELL, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Malabar, dated the 6th April 1933,
D. Dis. No. 2101/33.

[Acts—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. Reference.—
Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated 14th February 1933.]

I agree that the Act should be introduced. If this is decided, the questions of detailed application and of exemptions can be examined in the light of particular local conditions.

(6)

Letter from A. R. C. WESTLAKE, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Ganjam, dated the 13th
April 1933, L. Dis. No. 1636/33.

[Act—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency. Reference.—
Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

It is not necessary to extend the Inland Steam Vessels Act to the Ganjam district.

(7)

Letter from E. BENNETT, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of East Godavari, dated the 23rd April
1933, L. Dis. No. 964/33.

[Acts—Inland Steam Vessels Act—Extension to Madras Presidency. Reference.—
Board's Reference No. E. 827/33-1, dated the 14th February 1933.]

So far as this district is concerned it seems unnecessary to extend the Act.

Rule 5-A and rule 36-B of the rules published in the notifications issued under the Canals and Public Ferries Act and appended to G.O. No. 2258 I., dated the 31st October 1932, appear to provide for all classes of vessels substantially the same measure of control which the proposed extension of the Inland Steam Vessels Act will afford in the very restricted classes of vessels driven by steam.

So far as the Godavari river is concerned there is also the difficulty referred to in paragraph 6 of the Presidency Port Officer's letter communicated with the reference under reply as the river running through Bhadrachalam and Nugur taluks adjoins the Hyderabad State.

VII

Letter from M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur N. SWAMINATHA AYYAR Avargal, B.A., B.E., Chief
Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works and Labour
Department, dated Madras, the 10th June 1933, No. 238/33-A.E.P.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. Reference.—Public Works and
Labour Department, Endorsement No. 374-D/33-1, dated the 2nd February 1933.]

With reference to Public Works and Labour Department endorsement quoted above,
I have consulted the Superintending Engineers of Circles and the Chief Inspector of
Boilers on the matter. The general opinion is that there is no necessity for extending the
provisions of the Inland Steam Vessels Acts to this Presidency. The Chief Inspector of
Boilers of the Port department are being consulted.

No. 2371 I., 31ST OCTOBER 1933

inspected by the Inspectors of Boilers as per sanction given in G.O. No. 638-M., dated 26th April 1911, at the instance of Presidency Port Officer, Madras. The Superintending Engineer, Bezwada Circle, while agreeing with the Presidency Port Officer that motor vessels carrying less than 12 passengers may be exempted from the operation of Inland Steam Vessels Act, recommends that rules, similar to those framed under the Canals and Public Ferries Act and approved in G.O. No. 2258 I., dated 31st October 1932, regarding steamers and motor vessels in the Godavari, may be adopted for the examination and certification of motor vessels plying in the Kistna and the Upputeru within the limits of the Bezwada Circle.

2. The Canals and Public Ferries Act (Madras Act II of 1890) which has been applied wherever necessary and the rules framed thereunder serve all requirements and provide for whatever control and safeguards are required. There is, therefore, no necessity at all to introduce the Inland Steam Vessels Act of 1917, which is, I think, too complicated and difficult to be applied to the small craft plying in the canals and rivers in this Presidency. The enforcement of the Act will also be found difficult and troublesome.

3. In this connexion, I invite the attention of the Government to Mr. Greg's letter No. 3808/27-A-10, dated 29th September 1928, in which it was recommended that the proposal to introduce the Inland Steam Vessels Act in this Presidency might be dropped.

VIII

Official Memorandum No. 374-D/33-2, P.W. & L., dated 23rd June 1933.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency—Chief Engineer's letter No. 238/33-A.E.P., dated 10th June 1933.]

The Chief Engineer is requested to forward to Government copies of the reports on the subject submitted by the Superintending Engineers and the Chief Inspector of Boilers.

(By order)

A. VITTAL PAI,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

IX

Letter from M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur N. SWAMINATHA AYYAR AVARGAL, B.A., B.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works and Labour Department, dated Madras, the 4th July 1933, No. 1334/33-A-1.

I forward herewith copies of reports on the subject submitted by the Superintending Engineers and the Chief Inspector of Boilers.

ENCLOSURES

1)

Letter from the Superintending Engineer, Tanjore Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated the 8th March 1933, No. 295-A.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Madras Presidency. Reference.—Irrigation Chief Engineer's Endorsement No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.]

I have no special remarks to offer as there are no such vessels to be so licensed, plying for hire within the jurisdiction of this circle.

2. I am also not aware in what respects the present boat licensing rules are inadequate.

(2)

Letter from the Superintending Engineer, Waltair Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated the 10th March 1933, No. 69/I.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. Reference.—No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.]

I have the honour to state that I have no remarks to offer. I agree to the proposals.

(3)

Letter from the Superintending Engineer, Coimbatore Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated the 20th March 1933, No. 118-I/86-Z-34.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. Reference.—Your Endorsement No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.]

The Inland Steam Vessels Act may be made applicable to this Presidency as well. But there are no steam vessels plying at present on the West Coast canals.

No. 2371 I., 31ST OCTOBER 1933

(4)

Letter from the Superintending Engineer, Madras Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated the 28th March 1933, No. 148-E.I./152-A.

[Reference.—Your Endorsement No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933, regarding Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency.]

The Executive Engineers, Chingleput and Kurnool divisions, who were consulted in this matter report as follows:—

1. The Executive Engineer, Chingleput division, states that there are no steam vessels plying in the Buckingham Canal, but there are two motor boats licensed for carrying 11 and 19 passengers, respectively. These two vessels are understood to be also not plying regularly. The Executive Engineer is of the opinion that so far as the Buckingham Canal is concerned, there is not an urgent need for introducing the Inland Steam Vessels Act, but he has no objection to doing so if the Act is to be introduced throughout the Presidency.
2. The Executive Engineer, Kurnool division, reports that there are no privately owned mechanically propelled vessels in his division and that there is no necessity for the introduction of the Act in the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal.

(5)

Letter from the Superintending Engineer, Bezwada Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated 28th March 1933, No. 166-I.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency—Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, dated 10th September 1932, No. 2366-Gl.-1. Reference.—Your Endorsement No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.]

The subject has been already dealt with in this office No. 685 I., dated 15th February 1928 (copy enclosed). Since this letter was written, the only additions to motor traffic in the Kistna river or the drains connected with the Delta system are one or two motor boats plying in the Kistna river above the anicut from Bezwada to Amaravati and motor boats occasionally plying in the Upputeru from opposite Megaltur lock up to Tadinada. There are no steam vessels other than those belonging to the Public Works Department plying in the Kistna river either above or below the anicut.

As recommended by the Presidency Port Officer, motor vessels carrying less than 12 passengers may be entirely exempted from the operation of the Act when it is brought into force on the inland waters of this Presidency.

For the examination of motor vessels plying in the Godavari river, rules have been framed recently by Government—vide rules published in pages 1799-1801 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 15th November 1932. Similar rules may be adopted for the examination and certification of motor vessels plying in the Kistna and the Upputeru within the limits of this circle.

Sub-Enclosure.

(i)

Letter from L. H. GREG, Esq., Superintending Engineer, Bezwada Circle, Bezwada, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated 15th February 1928, No. 685.

[Rivers—Application of the Inland Steam Vessels Act. Reference.—Your Memorandum No. 3808/27-A-3, dated 16th January 1928.]

With reference to your Endorsement No. 3808/27-A-1, dated 24th November 1927, I submit may replies as follows:—

- (a) The whole Act may be brought into force in this Presidency with the following modifications:—
 - (1) In section 2 (2) canals may be omitted from the definition of "Inland water." This is necessary as there is already the Madras Act II of 1890 and the navigation rules thereunder. Hence the introduction of an additional Act and rules relative to canal navigation will result in confusion.
 - (2) In this circle no steam or motor vessels except those belonging to the Public Works Department are allowed to make use of the canals as the navigation of steam or motor vessels other than those under the direct control and ownership of the Public Works Department is attended with the likelihood of danger and of damage to the canals. Act may therefore be restricted to the Kistna river where at present the only steam or motor vessels plying is between Puligedda and Penumudi and this is a motor vessel.
 - (3) All Government steam or motor vessels should be exempted.
 - (4) Under the Bengal Regulations, page 36 of the Port Officer is the "Examiner." Under rule 5 of the Navigation Rules (Madras) the Inspector of Steam Boilers should inspect the vessel and certify and under rule 42 of same Act motor vessels are to be inspected annually before issue of licences by the Canal officer. But as no navigation of steam or motor vessels is allowed on the canals of this circle there does not appear any necessity for the officers of the Public Works Department to intervene in the

The same authority that conducts the examination for drivers of steam vessels and engines—I am not certain at the minute whether this is the Inspector of Steam Boilers or the Sanitary Engineer to Government—might conduct the examination for motor vessels drivers also. As regards syraings, etc., presumably this examination should be conducted by the Presidency Port Officer or by an officer deputed by him to do so.

The place of examination might be the same as for the steam engine drivers—I believe at Madras—and the survey will presumably have to be done at where the particular vessel or vessels happen to be plying at say Penumudi near Repalle for vessel plying in the lower reaches of the Kistna and at Bezwada for any vessel that may in the future ply above the Kistna anicut though such a likelihood is not probable.

(e) By ruling out "canals" as suggested under (a) (1) there does appear any necessity for any modification of the Canals and Public Ferries Act.

I have no further remarks to offer.

(6)

Letter from the Executive Engineer, Periyar division, Tallakulam, Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, Trichinopoly, dated 17th March 1933, No. 325-S-E.

[Inland Steam Vessels Act—Introduction in the Presidency. *Reference.*—
Your No. 182-P.R./C.-1640, dated 9th March 1933.]

The only craft in this division are (1) the Steam Launch "Lily" which is at present out of order and the Motor Boat "Blue Bell" 15 h.p. which were purchased to ply on the Periyar lake in Travancore territory.

2. The provisions of the Inland Steam Vessels Act of 1917 are, I consider, too complicated and exacting to be applicable to these craft especially as they ply in an isolated part of the district where it would be expensive and almost impossible to see that the Act is applied.

3. It is, however, essential that there should be an annual inspection of the engines, hulls, boilers, etc., in cases similar to the above by a Mechanical Engineer competent to make such an inspection and recommendations for rectifying defects since generally speaking the average Public Works Department officer or subordinate does not possess the mechanical knowledge to be able to deal with such questions. This could be arranged for without the application of the Act and would be less trouble to all concerned.

4. I agree that the drivers should possess adequate qualification for the management and repair of the particular engines which they are called upon to maintain, but it would be expensive to insist on such qualifications as those legislated for in the Act.

5. The copy of the Act sent with your letter under reference is returned herewith.

No. 501-C.E./C. 1640, dated 4th April 1933.

Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation with reference to his No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.

2. There are no other steamers or launches in this circle. There is, I consider, no necessity to apply the Inland Steam Vessels Act of 1917 in this circle.

M. O'BRIEN,
Superintending Engineer, Trichinopoly Circle.

(7)

Letter from S. D. SHROFF, Esq., Executive Engineer, Godavari Headworks division, Dowlaishweram, to the Collector of East Godavari, dated 30th March 1933, No. 53-R.

As a copy of the Inland Steam Vessels Act has not been supplied to this office, I do not know the exact requirements of this Act, but I believe the instructions published in G.O. No. 2258 I., dated 31st October 1932, provide for all that is necessary to ensure an efficient and safe working of all the mechanically propelled vessels plying in the river Godavari.

Copy submitted to the Superintending Engineer, Dowlaishweram Circle, with reference to his No. 1027-G.H., dated 6th March 1933.

No. 11-I, dated 10th April 1933.

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, with reference to his Endorsement No. 238/33-A-1, dated 27th February 1933.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Superintending Engineer, Dowlaishweram Circle.

(8)

Extract of report from Chief Inspector of Boilers, dated 13th March 1933, No. 5566.

The Indian Boilers Act, 1923, does not apply to boilers on vessels propelled by steam—vide section 3 of that Act. However, there does not appear to be any necessity for extending the Indian Steam Vessels Act to the Madras Presidency when the navigation rules and

G.O. No. 2258 I., dated 31st October 1932, provide adequate safeguards. It may be mentioned here that even boilers of sea-going vessels of the Port department are being inspected by the Inspectors of Boilers as per sanction given in G.O. No. 638-M., dated 26th April 1911, at the instance of the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.

J. L. THOMPSON,
Officiating Chief Inspector of Boilers.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation u.o.

Order—No. 2371 I., dated 31st October 1933.

The Government do not consider it necessary at present to extend the Inland Steam Vessels Act (India Act I of 1917) to this Presidency.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

N. GOPALASWAMI,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement).
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Finance (Marine) Department.
Copy to the Law (Drafting) Department.