

Marine

~~Public Works~~ (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 580. Mar

DATED 29. June 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Branch of Marine

Medical Inspection: Letter from the P.P. Office stating with reference to G.O. No 525 Marine of 11 June 1897, that the "Gloria" not having obtained her clearance could not proceed to sea and that the question which has caused this correspondence is that connected with the Complaint made by Messrs Binn & Co regarding the action of the Health Officer in not making his second inspection as soon as the passengers who were absent at his first inspection had embarked, recorded.

The Presidency Court Office
Madras

Order 580 Mar 9 29 June 1857

Recorded

No. $\frac{949}{228}$ 4

Dated 14 June 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

SUBJECT,
Informing that the complaint
of Messrs. Binny & Co is as to
the action of the Health Officer
in not making the second
inspection of the S.S. "Goroka"
as soon as the passengers,
not previously on board,
had embarked.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No. 949/ 2289

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 17 June, 1897.

From

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

To

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,
CHEPAK.

Sir,

With reference to G.O., No.525, Marine, dated 11th June 1897, I have the honor to beg that it may be pointed out to Government that the "Ghoorka" not having obtained her clearance could not proceed to sea. The question in connection with this vessel which has caused this correspondence is, that connected with the complaint made by Messrs. Binny & Co. regarding the action of the Health Officer in not making his second inspection as soon as the passengers who were absent at his first inspection had embarked.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

Commander, R.I.M.,

Presidency Port Officer.

Marine ~~P.W.~~ DEPARTMENT.

Breach of quarantine regulations

Read the following:—

From the Presy. Port Officer, Madras, No. 949/228 G. dated 17th June 1897.

The Hon. Sir Henry Philip C. J. E.

FOR ORDERS.

I don't see that there is anything to pass orders on. The Port Health Officer has other things to attend to than to have attendance on the Committee of ships who break the rules.

G.O. 344 Marine dated 8th April 1897.

There is no valid ground for complaint, that I cannot, at the delay which occurred.

RS
24/6/97

The original papers have gone to the Government Solicitor; but the matter came before Government in connection with a complaint from Messrs. Binny & Co. to the effect that the Port Health Officer did not, with the requisite promptitude, make a second medical inspection of a vessel to which he had already granted a Bill of health and whom he had attached to the quarantine rules; some passengers having subsequently been allowed to disembark. The master of the vessel was guilty of a breach of regulation 4, and the Government considered that he should, if a good case is made out, be prosecuted under regulation 7.

2. Why the Presidency Port Officer should lay stress on the fact that the complaint originated with Messrs Binny & Co. is not clear. A little delay in making a second inspection

after

FOR ORDERS.

after one had already been made, and a certificate granted by the Port Health Officer, seems excusable, but there is no excuse for the Master of the vessel allowing the law to be broken.

3. The additional fact now brought to notice, that "the "Ghoorka" not having obtained her clearance could not proceed to sea", is also beside the question. It was quite possible in this case for the Master of the vessel, having secured a certificate from the Port Health Officer, to obtain a ^{Port} clearance from the Customs authorities under regulation 5, and proceed to sea in contravention of the quarantine regulations.

~~4. The case is thus not one which the Presidency Port Officer, as Controlling Officer, should endeavour to palliate.~~

W.H.

For M.

R.S.