Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 821 Mar

DATED 21 September 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Deck Accommodation in Ships: Govt of India letter stating that they have, pending the issue of formal orders on the subject, accepted the recommendation of the Govt of Bombay for the continuance of the practice of treating a vessel with three decks plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act as having two between decks and one upper deck. Comtd to the P.P. Officer

24.9.97

24/9/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	720	Mar.	1-8-99				

Government (1897) of Madras.

MARINE.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*
Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 821, 21st September 1897.

SEPTEMBER.

Deck Accommodation in Ships

Government of India letter stating that they have, pending the issue of formal orders on the subject, accepted the recommendation of the Government of Bombay for the continuance of the practice of treating a vessel with three decks plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act as having two between decks and one upper deck, communicated to the Presidency Port Officer.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

From J. E. O'CONOR, Esq., Assistant Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, dated Simla, 19th August 1897, No. 3650 S.R.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 644, Marine, dated the 21st September 1896, regarding the treatment of main deck accommodation for passengers in certain classes of vessels plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act, which are described in paragraph 2 of the letter from the Port officer, Madras, No. 460/223 G., dated the 25th April 1890.

The practice in Madras is to treat the main deck as an upper deck in calculating the number of passengers a vessel is permitted to carry, whereas in Bombay the main deck is treated as a between deck, and the Government of Madras request that an authoritative instruction may be issued for general guidance.

2. I am to enclose copy of a letter from the Government of Bombay and of its annexures, explaining the practice observed in that Presidency in determining the number of passengers to be carried by vessels of the class in question. It will be seen that the Local Government recommend that the practice obtaining in Bombay of treating a vessel with three decks as having two between decks and one upper deck should be allowed to continue until rules are issued under the new Merchant Shipping Bill in which the Native Passenger Ships Act will be embodied.

3. The Government of India have accepted the recommendation of the Government of Bombay as a provisional arrangement, pending the issue of formal rules on the subject based on the proposals made by the Commission appointed in 1890 to consider and report on the working of the Native Passenger Ships Act. The most important of the rules proposed by the Commission cannot be made until the Act is amended. An amended Act was embodied in the Merchant Shipping Bill, but as yet it has not been found possible to pass the Bill into law.

Enclosures.

From J. M. CAMPBELL, Esq., Collector of Customs and Opium, Bombay, to the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkári, dated 6th May 1897, No. C./8453.

With reference to your letter No. 1759, dated the 9th ultimo, I have the honour to report that the question raised in the letter No. 644, dated 21st September 1896, from the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, to the Secretary to the Government of India, seems to be based on a misconception of the rules under which the number of passengers to be carried by vessels having two between decks is fixed in Bombay.

2. The statement at page 4 of the accompanying compilation under head S.S. *Kataria* shows the largest totals under the head "main deck treated as between deck." This, as shown in Commander Street's letter to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, No. 460/289 G. of 4th September 1896, is believed in Madras to be the system under which the number of passengers on ships with two between decks is calculated in Bombay. This view is founded on the mistake that Bombay calculations are based on a 5-feet rule (see page 4 S.S *Kataria* as above). The 5-feet rule is peculiar to the Coromandel coast. This space is in no instance adopted in Bombay as the basis of calculation.

3. In fact, instead of increasing the number of passengers allowed between Madras and Rangoon in a vessel with two between decks, the Bombay practice would considerably reduce the allowance. The effect in S.S. *Kataria* would be for short voyages a reduction from the 1,214 in fair weather and the 906 in foul weather to 894 and 715, respectively. If this view is correct, I venture to think it follows that since this question has been raised in Madras, in order to prevent a risk of overcrowding which does not exist, no further action need be taken.

4. The class of two between deck vessels is small on the Bombay side of India; the correct method of calculating passengers is complicated and is detailed in the Superintendent's accompanying letter. As the Bombay system at present in use allows fewer than the Madras system and as the Bombay ship-owners have raised no objection, I would venture to suggest that the want of agreement between the practice in Madras and in Bombay which is not a matter of practical inconvenience, be allowed to continue till rules are passed under the new Merchants Shipping Bill in which the Native Passengers Ships Act is to be embodied.

5. When these rules are introduced the result will be an allowance of passengers considerably in excess of the present Bombay allowance and somewhat less than the present Madras allowance.

The details are—

S.S. "Kataria"—Short voyage.

Season.	Under present rules.		Under new rules for all Ports.	Increase, Bombay.	Decrease, Madras.
	Madras.	Bombay.			
Fair	(*a*) 1214	(*b*) 894	1099	205	115
Foul	906	715	830	115	76

(*a*) Madras would treat the main deck as a 2nd upper deck.

(*b*) Bombay would treat the second between deck as an orlop deck and the first between deck as an ordinary between deck. See accompanying compilation, page 4.

6. The papers received with your letter under reference are herewith returned.

From J. deC. ATKINS, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Marine Department, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Finance and Commerce, Simla, dated 5th July 1897, No. 134.

With reference to your letter No. 5461 S.R., dated 31st December 1896, regarding the treatment of the main deck in certain classes of vessels plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act (X of 1887), I am directed to forward herewith copy of a memorandum from the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkári, No. 2448, dated 21st May 1897, and of its enclosures, in explanation of the practice followed in this Presidency in the matter, and to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council concurs in the recommendation of the Commissioner that the present practice should be allowed to continue till rules are issued under the new Merchant Shipping Bill in which the law relating to native passenger ships will be included.

Memorandum by the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkári, dated 21st May 1897, No. 2448.

No. C./5787, dated 29th March 1897.
" C./8453, " 6th May 1897, with accompaniment.

With reference to the above, the undersigned has the honour to submit copies of the marginally-noted reports from the Collector of Land Revenue, Customs and Opium, from which it will be seen that the practice in Bombay is in accordance with the orders of the Government of India as communicated in their letter, No. 312, dated 27th August 1879, embodied in Government Resolution No. 2537, dated 16th September following, and that the question raised in letter, No. 644, dated 21st September 1896, from the Secretary to Government of Madras to the Government of India, is apparently based on a misconception of the rules under which the number of passengers to be carried by vessels having two between decks is fixed in Bombay.

2. For the reasons explained in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Collector's report No. C./8153, dated 6th instant, the undersigned ventures to support the suggestion that the present practice be allowed to continue till rules are issued under the new Merchant Shipping Bill.

From the Collector of Customs and Opium, Bombay, to the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkári, dated 29th March 1897, No. C. 5787.

No. 673 of 17th March 1879 and No. 2537 of 16th September 1879.

With reference to your No. 259 of 21st January last, I have the honour to invite attention to the marginally-noted Government resolutions, and to state that the practice in Bombay is in accordance with the orders of the Government of India as communicated in the latter of the two resolutions. The fact that the decision of the Government of India was arrived at while Act VIII of 1876, and not Act X of 1887, was in force, does not appear to affect the case.

From J. WALSH, Esq., Superintendent, Preventive Service, Bombay, dated 17th March 1897, No. 714.

In the pressure of urgent matters connected with the epidemic in Bombay this report has unavoidably stood over, and the Superintendent hopes that he may be excused for delaying it so long. At the same time he would venture to point out that the issues on which he is called upon to report were raised at Madras seven years ago, for Captain Street's letter raising the questions is dated 17th July 1890, No. 460.

2. The question, what is a between deck within the meaning of the Native Passenger Ships Act, is fully treated in Government resolutions, Nos. 673 and 2537, dated respectively, 17th March and 16th September 1879, General Department. The Act was then VIII of 1876, whereas the one under which we are now working is of 1887, but the question of between decks is not affected by that fact. It is on the interpretation of the term "between deck" given in the Government of India's ruling that the Preventive Department in Bombay acts.

3. The Superintendent attaches the measurements of the British India Steam Navigation Company's steamer *Kapurthala*, which represents the type of vessel on which the question is raised, and it will be seen that in treating her strictly under Government orders, she gets fewer passengers here than she would get in Madras or Calcutta where she would be treated as a vessel with one between deck and two upper decks, whereas in Bombay we treat her as a vessel with two between decks (the lower being an orlop) and one upper. Treating the upper between deck as a main deck not requiring 4 feet of airing space for each passenger carried on, it makes the difference between Bombay and the other side of India. The different systems are given at page 4 of the extract from the Proceedings of the Government of Madras, No. 300. Bombay invariably acts under section 4 of Notification, dated 14th March 1889. When the main deck is secured with shutters and is a habitable between deck, though not a "between deck" in a nautical or builder's sense.

4. The points summarized for report are (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) in Captain Street's letter, No. 460, dated 17th July 1890. The experience gained in seven years should have pretty well settled the point. The Superintendent would venture to remark whether any great change was required.

(*a*) If vessels of the Commilla class had shutters that would satisfy him as to security, the Superintendent would treat the main deck as a between deck, and the deck below (the real between deck) as an orlop deck. The figures in Appendix A shows how this works out.

(*b*) The rule quoted is a special one for the Madras coast and was made, no doubt, in view of special circumstances not understood here, but the Superintendent would humbly venture his opinion that Captain Street is right in his contention that the 5-feet rule can only be used when the upper and between decks are wholly available for the reception of passengers. The departure from 6 feet per passenger from the Act is only allowed on that condition.

(*c*) If horses and cattle are carried on either the main or upper deck, the space so occupied is deducted. The Board of Trade rule is to deduct one passenger for every square yard of space measured for passengers, but occupied by animals or cargo.

(*d*) The baggage question is a very difficult one to deal with. The space allowed to passengers under the Act is very small, but that, notwithstanding, it is within the experience of the undersigned, that there is no curing native passengers of the habit of carrying excessive baggage and so cribbling freight. They would rather be uncomfortable the whole voyage than pay a small charge and have their baggage put away in the hold. When a vessel from Bombay is going on a long voyage, the Preventive Department compels the ship to keep a large hold space for heavy baggage, and before the vessel leaves, the Preventive officers go round and insist on heavy boxes and trunks being stowed in the hold, especially in bad weather. It would be unsafe to let a vessel go to sea with her decks hampered with loose heavy baggage. The baggage difficulty is so serious that when a ship has only half her complement, she looks overcrowded. The Superintendent would be glad to see a rule made that for every passenger on board 2 feet was to be deducted for baggage.

APPENDIX A.

S.S. Kapurthala.

Gross tonnage	... ...	1,122
Register tonnage	... ...	720·63
Between deck net area	... ...	4,552′·66″ treated as 2nd between deck.
Main do.	... ...	1,815′ 63″ treated as 1st between deck.
Upper do.	... ...	5,129′

—	1st between deck.	2nd between deck.	Upper deck.	Total.
Fair weather.				
Bombay	302	379	400	1,081
Calcutta / Madras	302	758	349	1,409
Foul weather.				
Bombay	201	303	346	850
Calcutta / Madras	201	505	345	1,051

If no passengers are carried in the 2nd between deck—

Fair weather.

Bombay ... ... 302 + 652 = 954
Calcutta ... ... 302 + 854 = 1,156

Foul weather.

Bombay ... ... 201 + 548 = 749
Calcutta ... ... 201 + 681 = 882

APPENDIX B.

Passengers that the S.S. *Kapurthala* will carry under Part VII, Chapter XXXII, section 301 of Merchant Shipping Bill.

Short Voyages.

—	Passengers.		Fair season.	Foul season.
Upper deck ...	$\frac{5,129}{9}$	...	569	0 *
Main deck ...	$\frac{1,816}{9}$	$\frac{18}{7}$	201	259
Between deck ...	$\frac{4,553}{9}$	$\frac{4553}{7}$	505	650
		Total ...	1,275	909

* Barred by proviso (*a*).

ORDER—No. 821, Marine, dated 21st September 1897.

Communicated to the Presidency Port Officer, with reference to the undermentioned orders:—

G.O., No. 300, Marine, dated 12th August 1890.
" " 643, Marine, " 21st September 1896.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Collectors of Maritime Districts.

Ent. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Marine (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1162

A Print with Enclosures

18 8P

Order 821 marine d/21st September 1897

Communicated to
the Presidency Port officer with
reference to the undermentioned
orders.

G.O. 300 Marine d/12 August 1890
" 643, Marine " 21 Sep: 1896

21/9/97

The P.P.O
Collectors of Maritime Districts
C.S. 9/10/97

From
The Government of India,
Finance + Commerce Dept.

No. 3650. S.R

Dated 19-8-97
Received 25-8-97
Enclosures 6
Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Main deck accommodation

Forwarding copy of a letter from the Government of Bombay explaining the practice observed in that presidency in determining the number of passengers to be carried by vessels with three decks and the practice obtaining there of treating such a vessel as to the capacity of the + stating that the Govt of India has ~~the Govt~~ accepted the recommendation of the Bombay Govt on the subject

authenticated

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
ack × of 1887			
643-4- of 21-7-86			
300-1 of 12-8-90			
368 of 17-7-89			
390 of 18-7-79			
377 of 16-7-79			
268 of 17-5-79			
128 A of 1-3-79			
456 [illegible] of 16-12-90			
400 [illegible] of [illegible]-90			
399-400 of 17-11-90			
336 of 16-9-90			
300-1 of 12-8-90			
149 of 17-4-90			
98 of 8-3-90			
318 of 17-7-89			
283 of 22-6-89			
89 & 90 of 22-3-88			
390 of 18-7-79			
377 of 16-7-79			
268 of 17-7-77			
128A of 1-3-77			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Marine CNo. 1162.

A&C

Please see papers now put up.

The Govt. Res. Nos 673 & 2537 of 1879 are resolutions of the Govt. of Bombay and the General Record (Int.) Dept. have not been able to trace the orders of the Govt. of India referred to as being quoted in the latter of the two Resolutions.

F. J.
7.9.97.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
ack X	of	1887	
643-4	of	21-7-86	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
318	of	17-7-89	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-5-79	
128 A	of	1-3-79	
456 [illegible]	of	16-12-90	
400 [illegible]	of	[illegible]-11-90	
399-400	of	17-11-90	
336	of	16-9-90	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
149	of	17-4-90	
93	of	8-3-90	
318	of	17-7-89	
283	of	22-6-89	
89 & 90	of	22-3-88	
380	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-7-77	
128A	of	1-3-77	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 1162

Please send up the following & connected papers if any

G.O. No. 55 Marine of 13-2-90 ✓

G.O. No. 93 Mar 8-3-90 ✓

G.O. No. 149 Mar 17-4-90 ✓

Soon please

25-8-97

...ference ... his letter as regards inadvisability of — that Govt. is not prepared to go [illegible] beyond the Govt. order quoted & that the rules of the G.O.I. notification specified will minimize the danger of such accidents as are alluded to

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
ack	X of	(89)	
643·4·	of	21-7-86	
300·1	of	12-8-90	
318	of	17·7·89	
390	of	18·7·79	
377	of	16·7·79	
268	of	17·5·79	
128 A	of	1-3-79	
456	[illegible] of	16-12-90	
400	[illegible] of	2[illegible]-11-90	
399-400	of	17-11-90	20
336	of	16-9-90	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
149	of	17-4-90	
93	of	9-3-90	
318	of	17-7-89	
283	of	22-6-89	
89 & 90	of	22-3-88	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-7-77	
128 A	of	1-3-77	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O. no 89·90 Mar 22 3/88

Cattle. Agreeing in opinion with the Port officer respecting the carrying of — in the tween & upper decks of British India Steam navigation Companys Steamers

These are the [illegible] carrying cattle [illegible] 27 Aug 91

G.O. no. 283 of 22-6-89

Carrying Cattle and Passengers in the same vessel. Intimating to the P.P.O. with reference to his letter as regards inadvisability of — that Govt is not prepared to go [illegible] beyond the Govt order quoted & that the rules of the G.O.I. notification specified will minimize the danger of such accidents as are apprehended

deck, and the Gov

ment that an

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Act	X of	1887	
643-4	of	21-7-86	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
368	of	17-7-89	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-5-79	
128 A	of	1-3-79	
456	of	16-12-90	
400	qd of	28-11-90	
399-400	of	17-11-90	
336	of	16-9-90	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
149	of	17-4-90	
93	of	8-3-90	
318	of	17-7-87	
283	of	22-6-89	
89 & 90	of	22-3-88	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-7-77	
128 A	of	1-3-77	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

P

G.O. No. 55 Marine 13/2/90

Native Passengers Ships Act 1887. Communicating to the P.P.O copy of letter from the Bengal Govt. to the Port Officer Calcutta, containing certain instructions for the guidance of that officer in granting certificates under the —

G.O. No. 93 Mar of 8 Mar 1890

Native Passengers Ships Act Forwarding to the Govt. of ~~India~~ Bengal letter from the P.P.O pointing out that the space allotted to passenger steamers during fair weather is disproportionately larger

G.O. 149 Mar of 17 April 90

Passenger space. Commu to the P.P.O letter from

---

deck, and the Gover

quest that an

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
ack	X of	1887	
643-4-	of	21-7-86	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
318	of	17-7-89	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-5-79	
128	A of	1-3-79	
451	w of	16-12-90	
409	A of	24-11-90	
399-	400 of	17-11-90	
336	of	16-9-90	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
149	of	17-4-90	
98	of	8-3-90	
318	of	17-7-89	
283	of	22-6-89	
89 & 90	of	22-3-88	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-7-77	
128A	of	1-3-77	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G. O. No. 409 A. of 24-Nov-90

Native Passengers Ships Commission, Recording letter from Capt. Street about proceeding to Calcutta to join the— and wiring to the President that officer's address and date of sailing

G. O. No. 451 of 16-12-90

Native Passenger Ships Act of 1887 Recording letter from the Govt. of India regarding the Constitution of the Commission to inquire into certain questions connected with the working of the —

Note

The above are B orders for orders whether they may be called for from [illegible]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
ack X	of	1887	
643-4-	of	21-7-86	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
368	of	17-7-89	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-5-79	
128 A	of	1-3-79	
456 &	of	16-12-90	
400 [illegible]	of	28-11-90	
399-400	of	17-11-90	
336	of	16-9-90	
300-1	of	12-8-90	
149	of	17-4-90	
98	of	8-3-90	
318	of	17-7-87	
283	of	22-6-89	
89 & 90	of	22-3-88	
390	of	18-7-79	
377	of	16-7-79	
268	of	17-7-77	
128 A	of	1-3-77	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

C.O. 1162

C.O. 11-9-97

The papers referred to in C.O. 1162 have not yet been traced. For orders whether I may keep this file till Tuesday next to see whether the required papers may be found in the Records here.

11-9-97.

---

bay the main deck

deck, and the Gover

that an

1.

1P

No. 3650-S.R.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Simla, the 19th August 1897.

To,

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Marine Department.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 644 marine, dated the 21st September 1896, regarding the treatment of main deck accommodation for passengers in certain classes of vessels plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act, which are described in paragraph 2 of the letter from the Port Officer, Madras, No. 460-223G, dated the 25th April 1890.

G.O. 3001 Marine
12.8.90

The practice in Madras is to treat the main deck as an upper deck in calculating the number of passengers a vessel is permitted to carry, whereas in Bombay the main deck is treated as a between deck, and the Government of Madras request that an

authoritative

authoritative instruction may be issued for general guidance.

2. I am to enclose copy of a letter from the Government of Bombay and of its annexures, explaining the practice observed in that Presidency in determining the number of passengers to be carried by vessels of the class in question. It will be seen that the local Government recommend that the practice obtaining in Bombay of treating a vessel with three decks as having two between decks and one upper deck should be allowed to continue until rules are issued under the new Merchant Shipping Bill in which the Native Passenger Ships Act will be embodied.

3. The Government of India have accepted the recommendation of the Government of Bombay as a provisional arrange-

28

Govt 398-400
17-11-90

G 0451
16-12-90

on the subject based on the proposals made by the Commission appointed in 1890 to consider and report on the working of the Native Passenger Ships Act. The most important of the rules proposed by the Commission cannot be made until the Act is amended. An amended Act was embodied in the Merchant Shipping Bill, but as yet it has not been found possible to pass the Bill into law.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant,
J. E. O'Conor
Assistant Secretary to the Govt. of India
uou

No. C/5787 of 1897.

To
The Commissioner of Customs,
Salt, Opium and Abkari,

Bombay Custom House,
29th March 1897.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 259 of 21st January last, I have the honour to invite attention to the marginally noted Government Resolutions, and to state that the practice in Bombay is in accordance with the orders of the Government of India as communicated in the latter of the two Resolutions. The fact that the decision of the Government of India was arrived at while Act VIII of 1876 and not Act X of 1887 was in force does not appear to effect the case.

No. 678 of 17th March 1879
and
No. 2537 of 16th September 1879

The Govt. Record Dept. might be asked whether the above have been commd. to Local Govt.

Note

The Govt. Record Dept. have not been able to trace the orders —

I have &c.

(Sd) J. Mc. Heile
for Collector of Customs & Opium.

Appendix A.

S/S. "Kapurthala".

Gross Tonnage 1122

Register —"— 720.63

Between deck, net area 4552'. 66" treated as 2nd 'tween deck

Main deck —"— 1815. 63 treated as 1st 'tween deck

Upper deck —"— 5129'—

Fair Weather

	1st Between deck	2nd Between deck	Upper deck	Total
Bombay	302	379	400	= 1081
Calcutta Madras.	302	758	349	= 1409.

Foul Weather.

	1st Between deck	2nd Between deck	Upper deck	Total
Bombay	201	303	346	= 850
Calcutta Madras	201	505	345	= 1051

B. C. House
Preventive Officer }

(Sd) J. Walsh. Supdt.

If no passengers are carried in the 2nd between deck

Fair weather

Bombay 302 + 652 = 954.
Calcutta 302 + 854 = 1156.

Foul weather.

Bombay 201 + 548 = 749.
Calcutta 201 + 681 = 882.

Excd
Mas 1162/97

Appendix B.

Passengers that the S.S. "Kapurthla" will carry under Part VII Chapter XXXII section 301 of Merchant Shipping Bill.

Short Voyages.

			Fair season	Foul season
Upper Deck	$\frac{5129}{9}$	passengers	569	0 *
Main Deck	$\frac{1816}{9}$	$\frac{1816}{7}$	201	259
Between Deck	$\frac{4553}{9}$	$\frac{4553}{7}$	505	650
		Total	1275	909

* Barred by proviso (a)

(Intd) J W.

(True Copy)

Hesseltine.
Registrar.
Finance and Commerce Department.

14C

Mar Gen 2 / 1162(57)

Below Collector's No C/1232 of 1897.

No 714 of 1897.

Preventive Department

17th / 20th March 1897.

In the pressure of urgent matters connected with the epidemic in Bombay this report has unavoidably stood over, and the Superintendent hopes that he may be excused for delaying it so long. At the sametime he would venture to point out that the issues on which he is called upon to report were raised at Madras seven years ago, for Captains Streets' letter raising the questions is dated ~~3rd~~ 17th July 1890 No 460.

It should be? No 460 of 25.4.90 disposed of by Go 300-1. Mar 12.8.90

2 The question what is a between deck within the meaning of the Native Passenger Ships Act is fully treated in Government Resolutions Nos 673 and 2537, dated respectively 17th March and 16th September 1879 General Department.

The Act was then VIII of 1876, where as

as

the one under which we are now working is of 1887. but the question of between decks is not affected by that fact. It is on the interpretation of the term "between deck" given in the Government of India's ruling that the Preventive Department in Bombay acts.

3 The Superintendent attaches the measurements of the B. I. S. N. Company's Steamer "Kapurthala" which represents the type of vessel on which the question is raised and it will be seen that in treating her strictly under Government orders, she gets fewer passengers here than she would get in Madras or Calcutta where she would be treated as a vessel with one between deck and two upper decks, whereas in Bombay we treat her as a vessel with two between decks (the lower being an orlop) and one upper. Treating the upper between deck as a main deck not requiring four feet of airing space for each passenger carried on it makes the difference between

between Bombay and the other side of India. The different systems are given at page 4 of the extract from the Proceedings of the Government of Madras No 300. — Bombay invariably acts under section 4 of Notification, dated 14th March 1889. When the main deck is secured with Shutters, and is a habitable between deck, though not a "between deck" in a nautical or builders sense.

G.O. No. 318 ✓
17-7-89

4. The points summarized for report are A. B C and D in Captain Street's letter No. 460, dated 17th July 1890. The experience gained in seven years should have pretty well settled the point, the Superintendent would venture to remark whether any great change was required.

G.O. No. 300-1
12-8-90
Hby G

A. If vessels of the Comilla class had shutters that would satisfy him as to security, the Superintendent would treat the main deck as a between deck, and the deck below (the real between

deck

deck) as an orlop deck. The figures in appendix A shows how this works out.

B. The rule quoted is a special one for the Madras coast and was made no doubt in view of special circumstances not understood here, but the Superintendent would humbly venture his opinion that Captain Street is right in his contention that the 5 feet rule can only be used when the upper and between decks are wholly available for the reception of passengers, the departure from 6 feet per passenger from the Act is only allowed on that condition.

C. If horses and cattle are carried on either the main or upper deck, the space so occupied is deducted. The Board of Trade rule is to deduct one passenger for every square yard of space measured for passengers, but occupied by animals or cargo.

D. The baggage question is a very difficult one to deal with The space allowed

to

to passengers under the Act is very small, but that notwithstanding, it is within the experience of the undersigned, that there is no curing native passengers of the habit of carrying excessive baggage and so cribbing freight. They would rather be uncomfortable the whole voyage than pay a small charge and have their baggage put away in the hold. When a vessel from Bombay is going on a long voyage, the Preventive Department compels the ship to keep a large hold space for heavy baggage, and before the vessel leaves, the Preventive officers go round and insist on heavy boxes and trunks being stowed in the hold, especially in bad weather. It would be unsafe to let a vessel go to sea with her decks hampered with loose heavy baggage. The baggage difficulty is so serious that when a ship has only half her complement, she looks overcrowded. The

Superintendent would be glad to see a rule made that for every passenger on board two feet was to be deducted for baggage.

Sd. J. Walsh
Superintendent, Preventive Service

Mem Genl 3 / 1162/9

No. C/8453 of 1897.

981

To
The Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkari,
Bombay Custom House
6th May 1897.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1759, dated the 9th ultimo, I have the honor to report that the question raised in the letter No. 644, dated 21st September 1896, from the Secretary to the Government of Madras, M. D. to the Secretary to the Government of India seems to be based on a misconception of the rules under which the number of passengers to be carried by vessels having two tween decks is fixed in Bombay.

2. The statement at page 4 of the accompanying compilation under head S.S. "Katoria" shews the largest totals under the head "Main Deck treated as 'tween Deck" this as shewn in Commander Street's letter to the Government of Madras, Marine Department, No. 460/289 G. of

Go 663 / 21-9-9

4th

4th September 1896, is believed in Madras to be the system under which the number of passengers on ships with two tween decks is calculated in Bombay. This view is founded on the mistake that Bombay calculations are based on a five feet rule (see page 4 S.S. Kataria as above). The five feet rule is peculiar to the Coromandel coast. This space is in no instance adopted in Bombay as the basis of calculation.

3. In fact instead of increasing the number of passengers allowed between Madras and Rangoon in a vessel with two tween decks, the Bombay practice would considerably reduce the allowance. The effect in S.S. Kataria would be for short voyages a reduction from the 1214 in fair weather and the 906 in foul weather to 894 and 715 respectively. If this view is correct, I venture to think it follows that since this question has been raised in Madras in order to prevent a risk of over crowding which does not exist, no further action need be taken.

4. The class of two tween deck vessels is small on the Bombay side of India, the correct method of calculating passengers is complicated and is detailed in the Superintendents accompanying letter. As the Bombay system at present in use allows fewer than the Madras system and as the Bombay Shipowners have raised no objection, I would venture to suggest that the want of agreement between the practice in Madras and in Bombay which is not a matter of practical inconvenience, be allowed to continue till rules are passed under the new Merchants Shipping Bill in which the Native Passengers Ships Act. is to be embodied.

5. When these rules are introduced the result will be an allowance of passengers considerably in excess of the present Bombay allowance and somewhat less than the present Madras allowance.

The details are:—

S. S. "Kataria"

Short voyage

Season	Under present rules		Under new rules for all Ports	Increase Bombay	Decrease Madras	
	Madras	Bombay				
	A	B				
Fair	1214	894	1099	205	115	
Foul	906	715	830	115	76	

A.

Marine No. 106

A. Madras would treat the Main Deck as a second Upper Deck.

B. Bombay would treat the second tween deck as an orlop deck and the first tween deck as an ordinary tween deck. See accompanying compilation page 4.

6. The papers received with your letter under reference are herewith returned.

I have etc.

Sd/. J. M. Campbell

Collector of Customs & opium.

Mar Genl 4 / 1162(6)

Memorandum by the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkari, No. 2448, dated 21st May 1897.

"With reference to the above the undersigned has the honour to submit copies of the marginally noted reports from the Collector of Land Revenue, Customs and Opium, from which it will be seen that the practice in Bombay is in accordance with the orders of the Government of India as communicated in their letter No. 312, dated 27th August 1879, embodied in Government Resolution No. 2537, dated 16th September following, and that the question raised in letter No. 644, dated 21st September 1896, from the Secretary to Government of Madras to the Government of India is apparently based on a misconception of the rules under which the number of passengers to be carried by vessels having two 'tween decks is fixed in Bombay.

No. C.-5787, dated 29th March 1897
" C.-8453 " 6th May "
with accompaniment

[illegible]

"2 For the reasons explained in paras. 3 and 4 of the Collector's report

Marine C No. 146

report No. C.– 8453, dated 6th instant, the undersigned ventures to support the suggestion that the present practice be allowed to continue till rules are issued under the New Merchant Shipping Bill.

Mar Cons
1462/97

No. 134 of 1897.

Marine Department.
Bombay Castle, 5th July 1897.

From
J. DeC Atkins. Esq. I.C.S.
Secretary to Govt.

To
The Secy. to the Govt. of India.
Dept. of Finance and Commerce.
Simla.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 5461 S.R., dated 31st December 1896, regarding the treatment of the main deck in certain classes of vessels plying under the Native Passenger Ships Act X of 1887, I am directed to forward herewith copy of a memorandum from the Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium and Abkari No. 2448, dated 21st May 1897, and of its enclosures, in explanation of the practice followed in this Presidency in the matter, and to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council concurs in the recommendation of the

Commissioner that the present practice should be allowed to continue till rules are issued under the new Merchant Shipping Bill in which the law relating to Native Passenger Ships will be included.

I have, &c.
(Sd) J. DeC. Atkins
Secy to Govt.