

207/222

Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 111 Mar

DATED 10. February 1897

Copy to
10/10/97
17/1/98

11/2/97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Fees, Considering that the prescribed — for a Port Officer's attendance on ^{the occasion of} a vessel entering or clearing out of office hours or on a close holiday should be levied whether the work is done by the Port Officer himself or by any other Govt. servant on his behalf.

10/2/97

10/2

10/2/97

Considering that the prescribed — for a Port officer's attendance on the occasion of a vessel entering or clearing out of office hours or on a close holiday, should be levied whether the work is done by the Port officer himself or by any other Government servant on his behalf.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 29th January 1897, No. 474/29 G.

I have the honour to request that the views of Government may be obtained as to whether, in the case of a Port officer being absent on duty from his port or prevented from other official causes from attending at his office on a vessel entering or clearing out of office hours or on a close holiday, and the certificate required by the ship is signed by the clerk of the Port office for the Port officer and on that officer's responsibility, the fee prescribed for the Port officer's attendance for the occasion should be levied.

2. As a case in point, I would mention that, recently a vessel "entered" Tellicherry on a close holiday when the local Port officer, who was then in charge of Mangalore port also, was away at the latter port on duty. The papers put in by the ship were examined by the Port office head clerk in behalf of the Port officer, and the certificates required to be signed by the Port officer were signed by the clerk for the Port officer.

3. It seems to me that as the Port officer, notwithstanding his absence from the office, is personally responsible for what is done in his behalf, the fee leviable on account of the Port officer should be charged, but I prefer to have a ruling of Government on this point.

4. In the particular case above cited, the fee has not been collected yet; and if it is held to be non-leviable, it will result in a loss to Government also, as such fees are divisible in the proportion of a moiety to be credited to Government and the other moiety to be retained by the Port officer (G.O., Marine, No. 439, dated 16th October 1889).

5. I must add also that if it should be decided that the Port officer's fee is not to be claimed under the circumstances detailed, it would be only fair that the Port officer should be relieved of all responsibility in connection with the papers to which his signature is requisite at present, but I do not advocate the Port officer being relieved of any responsibility connected with the duties appertaining to his office. The steamer agents naturally desire to pay as small a fee as possible for services rendered by the Port officer out of office hours, and, no doubt, would be content with the signature of a clerk; but a clerk is not a responsible officer, and, in my opinion, should not be made so in regard to the entering and clearing of vessels.

ORDER—No. 111, Marine, dated 10th February 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the prescribed fees should be levied whether the work is done by the Port officer himself, or by any other Government servant on his behalf.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Marine (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 133

From,

The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras

Order No. 111/10.2.97

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the prescribed fees should be levied whether the work is done by the Port officer himself or by any other Government servant on his behalf.

No. 474/29 G

Dated 29 January 1897

Received 1 Feb 97

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Requesting the views of Government regarding levying fees by Port officers while away from the Port on duty.

H. A. Street

R. S.

10/2/97

479
16.10.97

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
486 Mar	47-7-96 ✓
362 "	19-5-96 ✓
272 "	7-9-95 ✓
352 "	29-9-93 ✓
312-3 "	25-8-93 ✓
360 "	8-10-92 ✓
314 "	25-8-92 ✓
242 "	8-7-92 ✓
207 "	15-6-92 ✓
167-8 "	27-4-91 ✓
316-7 "	26-8-90 ✓
237-8 "	30-6-90 ✓
192-5 "	17-5-90 ✓
51-2 "	11-2-90 ✓
439 "	16-10-89 ✓
224 "	25-5-89 ✓

No.	Date.
Mar: 182	8-3-99

Mr. H. M. B. C. J. E.

Marine P.W. DEPARTMENT.
XX

Signature of Ship's papers.

Read the following:—

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 474/29 G, dated
29th January 1897.

Wm

FOR ORDERS.

It seems unquestionable that the fees should be levied whether the work is done by the Port Officer himself, or by any other Government servant on his behalf. The matter scarcely concerns the ship's agents. All that they require is valid documents. Having obtained these, they should pay the prescribed fees.

*AD
9/1/97*

1/2/97
M.

R.P.

c.a.w.

FOR ORDERS.

No. 474/29 *g*

10
Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 29th January, 1897.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer,
Madras,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,

Chepak.

Sir,

I have the honor to request that the views of Government may be obtained as to whether, in the case of a Port Officer being absent on duty from his port or prevented from other official causes from attending at his office on a vessel entering or clearing out of office hours or on a close holiday, and the certificate required by the ship is signed by the clerk of the port office for the Port Officer and on that officer's responsibility, the fee prescribed for the Port Officer's attendance for the occasion should be levied.

2. As a case in point, I would mention that, recently a vessel "entered" Tellicherry on a close holiday when the local Port Officer, who was then in charge of Mangalore Port also, was away at the latter port on duty. The papers put in by the ship were examined by the Port Office Head Clerk in behalf of the Port Officer and the certificates required to be signed by the Port Officer were signed by the Clerk for the Port Officer.

3. It seems to me that as the Port Officer, notwithstanding his absence from the office, is personally responsible for what is done in his behalf, the fee leviable on account of the Port Officer should be charged, but I prefer to have a ruling of Government on this point.

6/2/97 R 9/2/97.

4. In the particular case above cited, the fee has not been collected yet, and if it is held to be nonleviable it will result in a loss to Government also, as such fees are divisible in the proportion of a moiety to be credited to Government and the other moiety to be retained by the Port Officer. (G.O. Marine, No. 439, dated 16th October 1889.) *glas D.*

5. I must add also that if it should be decided that the Port Officer's fee is not to be claimed under the circumstances detailed, it would be only fair that the Port Officer should be relieved of all responsibility in connection with the papers to which his signature is requisite at present, but I do not advocate the Port Officer being relieved of any responsibility connected with the duties appertaining to his office. The Steamer Agents naturally desire to pay as small a fee as possible for services rendered by the Port Officer out of office hours, and, no doubt, would be content with the signature of a Clerk, but a Clerk is not a responsible officer, and, in my opinion, should not be made so in regard to the entering and clearing of vessels.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

H. A. Theet

Commander, R.I.M.,

Presidency Port Officer.

mmg