

Marine (1897) Department

G.O., No. 953 mar

DATED 22 Nov^r 67

24 / 11 / 97

Side Lights for Cargo boats. Observing that no power is vested in the Government to sanction the exemption of the boats at Locana and a port from carrying side lights as required by Articles 5 and 7 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

$$\frac{70}{2}$$

W
12/1/97

22/11/97

<i>Recd.</i>	} 1897.	<i>Enclosures</i>
<i>Regd.</i>		<i>Spare copies</i>

G.O., No. 953, 22nd November 1897.

NOVEMBER.

Side Lights for Cargo Boats

Observing that no power is vested in the Government to sanction the exemption of the boats at Cocanada port from carrying side lights as required by articles 5 and 7 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

Marine (1897) Department

2

No. 953, MARINE, 22ND NOVEMBER 1897.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 15th November 1897, No. 498/394 G.

I have lately received, through the Port officer, Cocanada, a protest from the boat-owners of that port to the enforcement of articles 5 and 7 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea as specified in page 9 of G.O., No. 120, Marine, of 12th February 1897. The boat-owners state that their tindals are too illiterate to understand the rules and lights, and they claim exemption under a special provision from carrying the side lights required by articles 5 and 7. It is not clear how the Cocanada boat-owners can be exempted, for article 30 of the Regulations for preventing collisions, &c. (see page 12 of Government order above quoted), applies only to "harbours, rivers and inland waters," whereas at Cocanada the cargo boats ply to vessels anchored in an open roadstead. I have desired the Port officer to inform the boat-owners to this effect, and to delay the enforcement of the regulations till the 1st January 1898. It is probable that the objection to the carrying of side lights is also caused by the expense connected with the obtaining of the same. I have ascertained from the Port officer at Bombay that the new regulations are in force at his port. The Port officer, Rangoon, states that they are to be enforced, and the Port officer, Karachi, informs me that it is proposed to extend article 7 (3) (4) to vessels from 20 to 60 tons. If the regulations can be enforced at Bombay, I see no reason why they should not be enforced at Cocanada.

ORDER—No. 953, Marine, dated 22nd November 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that no power is vested in the Government to sanction the exemption asked for by the boat-owners of Cocanada, their boats not coming under the reservation provided for by article 30 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

CURRENT No.

1466

For orders

The local port has no power to sanction the exemption asked for by the boat owners of Cocanada. Their boats not coming under the reservation provided for by Art 30.

From

Major The Presidency Port Officer Madras

No. 498/394 G

Dated 15th November 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Informing that the Boat owners of Cocanada protest against the carrying of side lights for cargo boats plying at that port.

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that no power is vested in the Govt. to sanction the exemption asked for by the boat owners of Cocanada; their boats not coming under the reservation provided for by article 30 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The P.O. 12/11/97

14.11.18-11-77 R20-11-97

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Date taken

No.	Date.
~~444~~	~~18-6-97~~
~~Head~~	
120	Mar 12-2-97 ✓
5	Feb " 2-1-95 ✓
400	Mar " 23-7-86 ✓
601	" " 7-12-80 ✓
450	" " 10-9-80 ✓
361	" " 21-7-80 ✓
190	" " 13-5-80 ✓
110	" " 22-3-80 ✓
60	" " 13-2-80 ✓
560	" " 30-10-78 ✓

No.	Date.
897	2-2-98

Heading.

No. 498
394

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 15 November 1897.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R. S. M.,
PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyvak.

SIR,

I have lately received through the Port Officer, Cocanada, a protest from the Boat-owners of that port to the enforcement of articles 5 and 7 of the Regulations for preventing collisions at sea as specified in page 9 of G. O. N. 120 Marine of 12 February 1897. The Boat owners state that their Jindals are too illiterate to understand the rules and lights, and they claim exemption under a special provision from carrying the side lights required by articles 5 and 7.

St

Date

2.

It is not clear how the Cocanada boatowners can be exempted, for Article 30, of the Regulations for preventing collisions &c. — See page 12 of G. O. above quoted — applies only to "harbours, rivers, and inland waters," whereas at Cocanada the cargo boats ply to vessels anchored in an open roadstead.

I have desired the Port-officer to inform the Boatowners to this effect, and to delay the enforcement of the regulations till the 1st January 1898. It is probable that the objection to the carrying of side lights is also caused by the expense connected with the obtaining of the same.

I have ascertained from the Port-officer at Bombay that the new Regulations are in force at his port. The Port-officer, Rangoon, states that they are to be enforced, and the Port-officer, Karachi, informs me ^{that} it is proposed to extend article 7 (3) (4) to vessels from 20 to 60 tons.

Yr

27

If the regulations can be enforced at Bombay, I see no reason why they should not be enforced at Cocanada.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your obedt. servant,

H. A. Street

Commander, R.N.M.

Bresy: Port-officer.