

Marine (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 424 wa

DATED 16 May 1899

19/9/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Control over Coast ports. Stating that H.E.
the Govt in Council sees no reason to make any
change in existing arrangements with respect to
the ^{intermediate} authority exercising ~~the~~ — under the
Indian Ports Act.

100
4

18/9/99

Government {1899} of Madras.
MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 6th December 1898, No. 473/438 G.

With reference to G.O., No. 187, Marine, dated 14th March 1898, I have the honour to request that the attention of Government may be drawn to paragraph 3 of my letter, No. 473/346 G., dated 21st September 1897, and to enquire whether it is intended that action shall be taken on the proposal therein made.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 1528, dated 14th April 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1528, dated 14th April 1899.

In answer to Government's Official Memorandum, No. 32, dated 7th February 1899, the Board begs to report that it has as directed consulted the Collectors concerned on the proposal to make the Presidency Port Officer an "intermediate authority" under section 7 (4) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889) and now submits its views.

2. None of the Collectors concerned have any remarks to make on the proposal except the Collector of Ganjam who points out that the powers and duties of the intermediate authority are nowhere specified in the Act and that the term is nowhere mentioned except in section 7 (4). He proceeds to say that, if the Presidency Port Officer is to be appointed as an intermediate authority, his powers as such should be clearly specified and that if he is to share the Collector's responsibility and authority in matters of discipline and otherwise, friction is certain to ensue.

3. The Board concurs in the views of the Collector of Ganjam. The object of the proposed appointment is stated to be to prevent any misapprehension as to the control to be exercised by the Presidency Port Officer over coast ports. The Board was not aware that such misapprehension had existed or it would have taken steps to remove it; it will now take any steps that Government may think necessary departmentally to set matters on a proper footing on understanding what requires correction. But it would request Government to make no such appointment as is proposed if the effect of the same will be to create a divided authority in the matters of discipline and the like over officers now under its sole control.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

ORDER—No. 424, Marine, dated 16th May 1899.

His Excellency the Governor in Council sees no reason to make any change in existing arrangements.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. A. Rungasawmy Aiyangar.

Order

From

The Presidency Port Officer
Madras

No. 473/438 G

Dated 6th December 1898

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Enquiring whether Government intend taking any action on the proposal to appoint the Presidency Port Officer as "Intermediate Authority"

FURNISHED PAPERS.

No. 473
438

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 6th December 1898

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.N.,
Presidency Port Officer,
Madras.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
CHEPAK

Sir,

With reference to G.O. Marine n:
187, ⁺dated 14th March 1898 I have the
honour to request that the attention
of Government may be drawn
to paragraph 3 of my letter n:
dated 21st September 1897 and to
enquire whether it is intended that
action shall be taken on the
proposal therein made.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,
Your obed^t. serv^t.

✓ 46 theel

Commander, R. I. M.,

Presy: Port office

mmg

BACK PAPERS.

OLD PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

C. No. 1528

Marine Dept.

Note in the Marine Dept
for H.E. the Governor on For Order
Shut relative to the Interme-
diate Authority under the
Ports Act.

His Excellency's remarks
thereon.

Very well. The proposals
may go to the Board (Separate
Revenue), and to the Collectors
concerned, for their opinion
(Ed) A.E.H.

25-1-99

No. 61 E d/30-1-99

To

The Revenue Dept. U.O.

For favour of the
requisite action.

(Ed) W.B. de W.

Re

To

The Rev. Dept. with

Complete file - blue retch. ✓

21/1/99

BACK PAPERS

READERS.

44 R d/6th April 1889

Revenue Department

Order no. 32

To prevent any misapprehension as to the control to be exercised by the Presidency Port officer over Coast ports, it has been suggested that Govt. should

A proposal has been made to appoint that Presidency Port officer as "intermediate authority" under Section 7(4) of the Indian Ports Act (X of 1889). The Board of Revenue is requested to be good enough to submit its remarks on the proposal, after consulting the collectors concerned.

For: Secy
7th February 1889

To the Board (S.R.)

8/2/89
6.2.89

3/2/89
K.D.
3-2-89

4/1

BACK PAPERS.

BACK PAPERS.

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2582.

From

The Secretary to the Commissioner
of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue,
Madras.

Order

Mis. No. 1528

Dated 14th April 1899.

Received 17th do -

Registered 19th do -

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government the report call-
ed for regarding the proposal to appoint
the Presidency Port Officer ^{as} ~~as the~~ "inter-
mediate authority" under Section 7(4) of
the Indian Ports Act.

BACK

BACK PAPERS.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	0.111.	32	7.2.99
		* manifest	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Dated 14 April

1899.

Mis No. 1528

Resolution.

In answer to Government's Official Memorandum No.32, dated 7th February 1899, the Board begs to report that it has as directed consulted the Collectors concerned on the proposal to make the Presidency Port Officer an "intermediate authority" under Section 7(4) of the Indian Ports Act(X of 1889) and now ^{submits} ~~summits~~ its views.

2. None of the Collectors concerned have any remarks to make on the proposal except the Collector of Ganjam who points out that the powers and duties of the intermediate authority are nowhere specified in the Act and that the term is nowhere mentioned except in Section 7(4). He proceeds to say that, if the Presidency Port Officer is to be appointed as an intermediate authority, his powers as such should be clearly specified, and that, if he is to share the Collector's responsibility and authority in matters of discipline and otherwise, friction is certain to ensue.

3. The Board concurs in the views of the Collector of Ganjam. The object of the proposed appointment is stated to be to prevent any misapprehension as to the control to be exercised by the Presidency Port Officer over Coast ports. The Board was not aware that such misapprehension had existed or it would have taken steps to remove it; it will now take any steps that Government may think necessary departmentally to set matters on a proper footing on understanding what

BACK PAPERS

BACK PAPERS

BACK PAPERS

requires correction. But it would request Government to make no such appointment as is proposed if the effect of the same will be to create a divided authority in the matters of discipline and the like over officers now under its sole control.

(True extract)



G. A. M. S.
Acting Secretary.
13-4-99.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

P. W.
13-4-99

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 473/438 G, dated 6th December 1898.

"Intermediate Authority" under the Ports Act.

Circulated to

His Excellency the Governor

FOR ORDERS.

The Presidency Port Officer inquires whether it is intended to take any action on the suggestion made in para 3 of his letter No. 473/346 G dated 21st September 1898 that he should, under Section 7(4) of the Indian Ports Act, be appointed "intermediate authority", so as to prevent any misapprehension as to his control over coast ports.

2. The question was, on the former occasion, considered with special reference to the port of Madras, and it was decided that no steps need be taken at this port, which is efficiently managed by the Harbour Trust Board. It, however, remains to be decided whether the control of the Presidency Port officer over other ports should not be formally recognised by gazetting him "intermediate authority" in respect to those ports.

BACK PAPER

BACK PAPER

3. There seems no objection to this being done. That it was not done long ago, is probably due to oversight.

The proposal is recommended for sanction. It means the legal sanction in the control exercised by the C.P.O.

W. H. C.
12.12.99

Before such an order issues, it would be well to know what the Conservancy Boards think of it. They should be consulted.

A.H.
13.1.99

Resubmitted to His Excellency the Governor with the opinion of the Board of Revenue, and a letter by the Hon. Mr. Arundel d/26.4.99 (below)

C.S.

W. H. C.
1/5/99

Please see my note dated 26.4.99.

A.H.
8.5.99

Intermediate Authority under the Ports Act

Very well. The proposal may go to the Board (Supervisory Revenue), and to the Collector concerned, for their opinion.

A.H.
25.1.99

No: 61E. d/30 Jan'y 99

To The Revenue Department (unofficially)

For favour of the requisite action.

W. H. C.
Secy. to Govt. Marine Dept.

C.S.
To The Rev. Dept. with complete file - to be returned -

To Secretary. Please see o.m. below.

K.O.
3-2-99

Marine Dept 8

Note for H.E. the Governor
With reference to His Excellency's note dated 13th January 1899 it is submitted that the only Conservancy Board in existence is that at Madras - the old Board at Coconada having become functus officio, and the new Board not having yet taken up its duties. His Excellency is probably thinking of Landing and Shipping Dues committees which exist at a few ports. These are not constituted, and exercise no powers under Act X of 1889.

The Port Conservators over whom the Presidency Port officer will exercise control as "intermediate authority" are the Port officers at the principal ports, and persons in the position of Sea Customs Superintendent at

at the minor Ponds.

Ponds.

L. H. H. / n. 18-1-98

Revenue Department

To Sleep.

from the Bd. of Rev. (S.R.)

Lib. No. 1528 of 14. 4. 99 (c. no. 2582)

To Secy.

May the above reply from
the Board to O. M. No. 32 of 7. 2. 99
be forwarded to the Marine Dept
(U. O.) ?

P.P.L.
19.4.99

air.
21.4.99

H. M. The Board of
Revenue seems to
take the right view

St. Louis

H.E.'s criticisms on the proposal to appoint the Presy. P. O. "intermediate authority" in Madras applies to a considerable extent to outposts. The legal power has not been conferred for the last ten years, & Capt. Street does not mention any evil results in consequence. If he only desires the power of on general grounds or for symmetry it wd be a mistake to give ^{it} ~~them~~ & upset an arrangement that has worked well for years.

If the power is conferred on him
he will be able to order prosecutions
by the P.O. under Sec 8 of the Act -
an undesirable power I think for him.
- & one better exercised by the P.O.
in communication with the Col.

In outports where the P.O. is also Supt. of Sea Customs the result of this proposed change would be that the local officer would have two masters, & friction wd. inevitably follow.

I think Capt^o Stet^o's query
should be answered in the
negative & that no change
should be made in the status quo.

To the Marine Dept. no. 1477/28-4-22
8/2 18/6/28

MA 26.4.99.

7 one of the same species. A.5 H 8.5-99

DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

READ the following:—
Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, 4th 1898, dated 6th December 1898.

December 1898.

December 1898.
Separate Revenue, No. 1525 9m's, dated
11th April 1899.

~~Circulated to~~

ORDER

His Excellency the Governor in Council sees no reason to make any change in existing arrangements.

R.A.

W. H. H. H.
13.5.50

To The Presy: Port Officer
" Revenue department.

P. W. 42-A.
1,000-2-3-99.

C. No 1528

H. E. letter of 13.1.99

There are no Conservancy
Boards, except that at
H. E. - the Cocomada
Board appointed under G.O.
255th March, of 4 April 98,
having refused to
accept office.

H. E. is apparently
under the impression that
the Landing & Shipping
Dues Committees at
some of the ports are
Conservancy Boards.
The exact position of these
Committees was
explained to you in
a letter of mine on
Saturday. (the Cocomada
Committee file).

Yes - say 10 - 16 for the
The Govt. Conservancy of the G.O.
person, who when the G.O.
is to select an authority, a
intermediate authority, a
he is, many case say
W. H. H. H. H.

