

Marine (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 882 } Marine  
883 }

DATED 21-9-1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Theft of cargo - Ordered that the  
Govts of Bombay & Burma be  
requested to furnish information  
as to the precautions taken at their  
ports to protect cargo from theft  
when conveyed in boats between  
ship & shore.

The Govts of Bombay & Burma  
addressed.

M.-8.  
[500-11-9-99.]

Indexed.

25/9/99

23-2-99

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No.  | Department. | Date.   | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|------|-------------|---------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
| 22   | 4262 | mar.        | 15-8-99 |      |     |             |       |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date.   | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|---------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
| 20   | 45  | mar.        | 23-1-00 |      |     |             |       |

Marine DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:—

From the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 646 G., dated 4<sup>th</sup> 299

September 1899.

Circulated to

ORDER. No. 882 Mar of 21-9-99

Ordered that the Governments of Bombay and Burma be addressed.

(H.E. No. 883 Mar of 21-9-1899)

- to
- (1) The Secretary to the Government of Bombay Marine Department
  - (2) The Secretary to the Government of Burma Marine and Commerce Department

Sir,

I am directed to request that, with the permission of  
 (1) His Excellency the Governor in Council  
 (2) His Honour the Lieutenant Governor  
 you will be so good as to furnish me for the use of the Madras Government with information as to the precautions, if any, that

3/

it are taken at ports of  
 (1) the Bombay Presidency  
 (2) <sup>Burma</sup> protect cargo from theft when  
 shipped in boats between ship  
 and shore. In the Madras  
 Presidency the precaution of sending  
 a policeman in charge of each  
 boat has been tried, but has  
 been abandoned principally  
 on account of expense. As,  
 however, thefts continue to be of  
 frequent occurrence at some of the  
 ports here, it is necessary that some  
 other means should be tried, and  
 as the Government of <sup>Burma</sup> ~~Bombay~~  
 may possibly have dealt effectively  
 with cases of the kind, I am directed  
 to apply to you for any information  
 which you may be in a position  
 to afford.

I have &c,

W. J.

*[Signature]*  
 1881. 9. 21  
 M.

3

5/ 41 - 1 8681

16.

It will be seen from the  
 P.P.O's lists that Madras  
 Act I of 1881 was brought  
 into effect at various ports  
 of this Presidency, including  
 Cocanada, but was  
 subsequently withdrawn  
 as it was found to be  
 expensive, and some-  
 what ineffective, and  
 was not appreciated by  
 the merchants in whose  
 interests it was passed.

The Act did not appear  
 in the published volume  
 of "Local Rules & Orders".  
 It was thereupon assumed,  
 erroneously as now  
 appears, that it was  
 never brought into force.  
 The reason for its omission  
 is now seen to be that  
 it had been withdrawn  
 from all ports of the  
 Presidency. The correspon-  
 dence on the subject  
 had never come under  
 my notice before. I  
 therefore knew nothing  
 of it.

As regards the port of

are taken at ports  
 (1) to Bombay Presidency  
 (2) to <sup>Burma</sup> protect cargo from theft w  
 eysd in boats between sh  
 and shore. In the Madras  
 Presidency the precaution of se  
 policeman in charge of ca  
 at has been tried, but ha  
 en abandoned principally  
 the score of expense. A  
 wever, thefts continue to  
 frequent occurrence at some o  
 ports here, it is necessary that  
 other means should be tried, c  
 the Government of <sup>Burma</sup> Boon  
 may possibly have dealt effec  
 with cases of the kind, I am d  
 to apply to you for any info  
 which you may be in a posi  
 to afford.

I have re

used

Madras. there is a  
 Marine P.O., half the  
 cost of which is debited  
 to Port Funds - Indi f. 0.  
 427 Marine. d. 22 Sep 84.  
 Flagd. The legality of  
 this charge is open to  
 doubt. The charge can  
 not, apparently, be brought  
 under the provisions of  
 Section 36(5) of the Indian  
 Ports Act.

The question remains  
 as to what action is to  
 be taken under f. 0. 231.  
 Marine. d. 29 March 98.  
 The P.O. says that he is  
 in communication with the  
 local authorities at Cocanada  
 in regard to the re-introduc  
 tion of Act I of 1881, but  
 judging from the correspon  
 dence printed under f. 0. 485  
 Marine d. 3 October 1883  
 nothing is likely to come  
 of this proposal. The result  
 might, however, be  
 awaited.

14 Sep 99

\* I don't think see why not  
 \* I agree. Ask Port  
 & Harb. what he can do  
 they like to prevent such thefts  
 14 Sep 99

Marine (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1223.

From The Presidency Port  
 officer

No.  $\frac{646}{279}$  - 9

Dated 1. 9. 99

Received } 7. 2. 99

Registered }

Enclosures { Plans " } Total. -

Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Marine Act I of 1881.  
 (Port Police Act) :-

Regarding the introduction  
 of the \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
 Port of Cocanada.

| G.O. | No.       | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| 4262 | of 11-8-8 |             |       |
| 231  | may 28    |             | 3-8   |
|      | 4 file    |             |       |

No. 646 4  
299

The Secretary to Government  
Marine Department  
(Unofficially)

Your N<sup>o</sup> 426, E, dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 1899

Reference has been made  
in accordance with your  
para (2), and on receipt of  
the views of the Port Office  
Collector and Conservancy  
Board I shall submit  
my own as to whether the  
prevention of theft of cargo  
between shore and shipping  
at Canada can be met  
by enforcing Madras Act  
I of 1881 at that port.

2. With respect to your para (4) I would point out as follows:—

(a) On the passing of Madras Act 1 of 1881, it was brought into effect at Madras from 1<sup>st</sup> June 1881 and collectors of

Maritime Districts were asked to report to what ports on the coast it was desirable the Act should be extended (G.O. n: 199, Marine, dated 25<sup>th</sup> April 1881)

(b) The replies of the collectors are embodied in G.O. n: 207, Marine, dated 8<sup>th</sup> July 1882 and by Notification (see same G.O.) the Act was extended to Bimlipatam, Viragapatam, Cocanada and Negapatam.

(c) By G.O. n: 287, Marine, dated 16<sup>th</sup> August 1882 the Port Officers of these 4 ports were appointed to carry out the provisions of sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Act.

(d) The payment of

of a fee of 3 annas each trip to cover the cost of the Police, and the carrying of a constable in each boat, were made compulsory as under:-

For Madras by Notification printed in G.O. 485, Marine, dated 15<sup>th</sup> October 1881

For Bimlipatam and Viragapatam - See G.O. n: 337, Marine, dated 8<sup>th</sup> September 1882.

For Negapatam and Cocanada - See G.O. n: 377, Marine, dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 1882.

(e) In 1883 the Collector of Viragapatam reported that the arrangements made under the Act were not appreciated and entailed a loss to

to Government. The Act<sup>10</sup>  
was therefore withdrawn  
(G.O. N: 447, Marine, dated  
6<sup>th</sup> September 1883).

(F) From Cochinada  
the Act was withdrawn  
in 1883. Reasons will  
be found in G.O. N:  
485, Marine, dated  
13<sup>th</sup> October 1883.

(G) From Negapatam  
the Act was withdrawn  
also in 1883. For reasons  
see G.O. N: 631, dated  
24<sup>th</sup> December 1883.

(H) Finally by  
Notification printed  
in G.O. N: 287 Marine  
dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1884 the  
Act was withdrawn  
from Madras and  
by G.O. N: 427, Marine,  
dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September  
1884 the Beach Police  
at Madras is still  
maintained

maintained, the cost  
being met equally from  
Port and Provincial  
funds.

3. The following  
orders of Government  
will afford you ad-  
ditional information  
on the subject:-

|                     |                                 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| G.O. N: 387, Marine | 8 <sup>th</sup> Novr. 1875      |
| " 461,              | " 18 <sup>th</sup> Novr. 1882   |
| " 499,              | " 9 <sup>th</sup> Decr. 1882    |
| " 24,               | " 12 <sup>th</sup> Jan'y. 1883  |
| " 40,               | " 18 <sup>th</sup> Jan'y. 1883  |
| " 105,              | " 16 <sup>th</sup> Febr'y. 1883 |
| " 152,              | " 10 <sup>th</sup> March 1883   |
| " 12,               | " 9 <sup>th</sup> Jan'y. 1884   |
| " 55,               | " 7 <sup>th</sup> Febr'y. 1884  |

4. It will thus be seen  
that Madras Act 1 of 1881  
has not been in abeyance,  
but was given a fair trial  
and withdrawn under  
circumstances detailed  
in the several G.Os quoted  
above.

J. B. R. J. J.

Secy. Port Office,  
Madras, } Commander, R. S. M.,  
4<sup>th</sup> September 1899 } Secy. Port Office.

The Act did not  
appear in the published  
list of local rules and  
orders. It was therefore  
assumed that it was never  
brought into force. It now  
appears that the reason  
for the omission is that  
it had been withdrawn from  
all ports. J.S.

to Government. The Act<sup>10</sup>  
was therefore withdrawn  
(G.O. N: 447, Marine, dated  
6<sup>th</sup> September 1883).

(F) From Cochinada  
the Act was withdrawn  
in 1883. Reasons will  
be found in G.O. N:  
485, Marine, dated  
13<sup>th</sup> October 1883.

(G) From Negapatam  
the Act was withdrawn  
also in 1883. For reasons  
see G.O. N: 631, dated  
24<sup>th</sup> December 1883.

(H) Finally by  
Notification printed  
in G.O. N: 287 Marine  
dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1884 the  
Act was withdrawn  
from Madras and  
by G.O. N: 427, Marine,  
dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September  
1884 the Beach Police  
at Madras is still  
maintained

The Act did not  
appear in the published  
list of local rules and  
orders. It was therefore  
assumed that it was never  
brought into force. It now  
appears that the reason  
for the omission is that  
it had been withdrawn from  
all ports. J.S.

maintained, the cost  
being met equally from  
Port and Provincial  
Funds.

3. The following  
orders of Government  
will afford you ad-  
ditional information  
on the subject:-

|                     |                              |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| G.O. N: 387, Marine | 8 <sup>th</sup> Novr. 1875   |
| " 461, "            | 18 <sup>th</sup> Novr. 1882  |
| " 499, "            | 9 <sup>th</sup> Decr. 1882   |
| " 24, "             | 12 <sup>th</sup> Janry. 1883 |
| " 40, "             | 18 <sup>th</sup> Janry. 1883 |
| " 105, "            | 16 <sup>th</sup> Febr. 1883  |
| " 152, "            | 10 <sup>th</sup> March 1883  |
| " 12, "             | 9 <sup>th</sup> Janry. 1884  |
| " 55, "             | 7 <sup>th</sup> Febr. 1884   |

4. It will thus be seen  
that Madras Act 1 of 1881  
has not been in abeyance,  
but was given a fair trial  
and withdrawn under  
circumstances detailed  
in the several G.O.s quoted  
above.

J. W. R. J. J. J.

Secy. Fort Office, } Commander, R.M.  
Madras, }  
4<sup>th</sup> September 1884 } Secy. Fort Office.