

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்

(3) ஆதாரக் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

## தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

தலை

அரசாணை எண்.

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்

11லலகை

நாள் :

28.5.1891

199

மடிக்கவேர் துன்புடி மையாளவேர் கூ.பாது.

ஆவண எண். 1-18,006-69-90.

16 APR 91  
PUBLIC ETR DEPT.

Secretary to the Government of India,

The Chief Secy: to the Govt: of  
Madras.

Simla, the 9 April 1891.

I AM directed to forward for *the* information of *His Excy.*  
*the Governor in Council*  
a copy of a letter\* from the Bombay Gov-  
ernment and its enclosure, in which it is  
\* No. 514, dated 6th February 1891.  
represented that much inconvenience is caused at Bombay in consequence of the  
Port Health Officer being compelled to pay two or more visits to an outward  
bound vessel for the purpose of granting a bill of health, on account of the  
absence of some of the crew or passengers, or owing to the circumstance that  
timely notice has not been given him of the deferred departure of the vessel.  
The Government of Bombay suggest the imposition of fees on the Agents of  
vessels for every visit after the first which the Health Officer of a Port is obliged  
to make for any reason for which the Agents are responsible. It is proposed that  
the fees should in the first instance be credited to Government which could then,  
if it thought fit, give some compensation to the Health Officer for the additional  
work thrown on him.

I am to request that the Government of India may be favoured with an expression of *the* opinion of *His Excy. in Council* whether it would be advisable to impose fees in the cases stated, and, if so, on what scale the fees should be charged.

Your most obedient servant,

Chynell

Secretary to the Government of India.

செய்தியைப்பற்றி உடனடி நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுமா என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

தயவுசெய்து பதிலளிப்பீராக.

தலைவர் அவர்களே,

தலைவர் அவர்களே,

Public Dept.  
419

India asks for opinion on a proposal that Ship Agents should pay a fee for the services of the Harbour Officer when he has to pay more than one ~~monetary~~ visit to a vessel ~~monetary~~. owing to absence of some of the crew or timely notice not having been given him of the deferred departure of the vessel. India also asks what scale of fees should be charged.

The Surgeon General suggests a fee of Rs. 20, & would fix the time for notice at 24 hours. He also raises the question whether a similar fee should not be charged for Sunday & holidays.

It is submitted that  
24 hours notice is too  
long - 12 or even less might  
be sufficient. As to the  
fee, if Govt. is to have  
half, 20% would be rea-  
sonable, but if the  
officer is to pocket all  
it submitted it is too  
high.

For orders

I think we need only dissent at  
present with the Port of Callao  
that we then report in favour  
of the Bombay Gov<sup>ty</sup> suggestion  
with 12 hours notice. I think  
the fee might also be raised  
on Sundays & on holidays.

21 June

note for the Hu

As far as we can "on what-  
ever" the fees should be  
"fixed", will the Hon: mem:  
kindly say what amount  
considered reasonable for  
"advs:-

1. If half is credited to Govt.
2. If it all goes to the Health officer.

13

5

[illegible]

x For the Health Off.  
at Allahabad

If Health Officers at all  
are to be allowed  
it would be necessary  
to draw up a scale in accordance  
with the importance  
of the post & the pay of the  
officer.

5/13

No. 514, dated Bombay Castle, the 6th February 1891.

From—G. W. VIDAL, Esq., c.s., Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay,  
To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary) Calcutta.

In May 1889 the Health Officer of the Port of Bombay brought to the notice of this Government the fact that although he gave due intimation to Captains or Agents of vessels of his intended visits for the purpose of granting them a bill of health, several ships and buggalows had to be visited by him more than once owing to the absence of some of the crew or postponement of the date of sailing, and that consequently in addition to making several trips to the docks in the heat of the day he had to incur considerable expense for carriage hire. He therefore suggested that Government should sanction the imposition of a fee of Rs. 20 on all vessels that had to be visited twice by him. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were consulted on the subject, did not however think it advisable at once to authorise the levying of a fee as proposed by the Port Health Officer, but stated that they would bring the matter to the notice of Agents of ships in Bombay, and that if that measure did not prove efficacious the question regarding the imposition of a fine might, if Government thought it desirable, be reconsidered. The suggestion made by the Port Trustees was approved by this Government.

2. The Health Officer of the Port now reports that but little improvement has taken place in the matter and that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to by him, or failing that to compensate him for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels. The reasons assigned by the Health Officer in support of his proposals have been given in paragraphs 4—7 of his letter No. 291, dated 9th June last, a copy of which is appended hereto. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were requested to favour Government with their opinion on the subject, have stated that they are in favour of the levy of a fee

|                           |        |                                             |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------|
|                           | Rs.    | at the rates noted in the margin from       |
| For square rigged vessels | ... 20 | vessels to which more than one visit has    |
| For Native craft          | ... 8  | to be paid by the Health Officer in connec- |

tion with the issue of bills of health, and that such fees should be levied for every visit after the first.

3. The Governor in Council considers it desirable to levy a fee from vessels in case of repeated visits, but is of opinion that such fee ought to rest on an identical rule or at least on a uniform principle in all the Indian ports. I am accordingly directed to request that you will be so good as to move the Government of India to issue such orders on the subject as may be deemed expedient. I am to add that the fees should at first be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give the Health Officer of the Port an allowance for each extra visit or else a small addition to his regular salary.

No. 291, dated Bombay, the 9th June 1890.

From—SURGEON MAJOR F. F. MACCARTIE, M.B., Health Officer of the Port of Bombay,

To—The Sanitary Commissioner for the Government of Bombay.

I HAVE the honour to forward Government Resolution, General Department, No. 3300 of 15th August 1889, with a copy of Surgeon Crimmin's letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 with a request that the question of imposition of a fee for bills of health issued to vessels to which more than one visit has to be made may be reconsidered.

2. When I resumed charge of my duties as Health Officer of the Port in January 1890, Surgeon Crimmin directed my attention to the above mentioned Government Resolution, but I thought it right to see for myself whether the state of affairs referred to in his letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 still existed.

3. I regret to have to state that but little improvement has taken place, and I think that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to in Dr. Crimmin's letter, or failing that to compensate the Health Officer for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels.

4. I find from my returns that out of 555 outward vessels, inspected between the date of the above mentioned Government Resolution and 31st May of present year, 122 were inspected more than once, and that 272 visits were made to those 122 vessels. Only a portion of these vessels were cases of postponed departure, the extra visits in some cases being due to the absence of members of crew or passengers from inspection, or the remedying some sanitary defect, but the cases of postponed departure are very frequent, and matters will not, I submit, improve until it is made clear that a fee will be levied in the event of more than one visit having to be made to such vessels.

5. It is noticeable that when a ship's departure is postponed the Captain rarely takes the trouble to inform the Port Health Officer of the fact in sufficient time to save him the worry and expense of making a needless visit to the vessel, and it would seem to be a hardship that the inspecting officer should have to bear the very considerable expense in ghari-hire due to the extra labour incurred by recurring visits to vessels.

6. I would also point out another matter which Surgeon Crimmin's letter does not refer to, and which causes much worry and expense, viz., the fact that in many cases Ship-Captains or Agents do not give 24 hours' notice of a vessel's intended departure. In some instances I have had to visit outward vessels on an hour's notice, and so serious a matter is it delaying a vessel's sailing that I have almost invariably proceeded to inspect them. Such cases cause more worry and trouble than even cases of postponed departure, and, I respectfully submit, should be dealt with in the same manner as Surgeon Crimmin suggests in the cases of postponed departure, viz., by the imposition of a fee for the bill of health.

7. With reference to the two above mentioned classes of vessels, viz., those postponing or those anticipating time of departure, I may state that I have reason to suppose that Ship Agents would cheerfully pay a fee for the inspection, for when I have on occasions complained of the extra labour entailed by irregularity in sailing, surprise has been evinced that no fee was leviable.

Again G.O., dated 18, No.

Again G.O., dated 18, No.

Current No. 1113 of 1891, dated 9/4. from *Shelby. q. d.*

1212 A. — 23/4 — — P. P. Off.

Current No. 1418 of 1891, dated 14/5 from *Shelby. q. d.*

*Letter No. 419 of 28th May 91*

*To the Secy: to the G. of I.*

*Home Dept.*

*Sir, In reply to your letter of 122, d/ 9th April. 91, I am directed to inform you that this Govt. is in favour of the Bombay Govt's suggestion that a fee should be levied for every visit after the first made by a Port Health Officer to a vessel in consequence of the absence on the first occasion of some of the crew or passengers, or of timely notice not having been given of the deferred departure of the vessel.*

*2. The Govt. of Madras would propose twelve hours "timely notice"; and,*

case of the Health Officer at Madras, to suggest a fee of fifteen rupees - the whole to be retained by the officer - for every visit after the first on ordinary work - <sup>the Agents are responsible</sup> during days and for every visit on Sundays and close holidays.

I would order

27 May

1013.

No. 514, dated Bombay Castle, the 6th February 1891.

From—G. W. VIDAL, Esq., C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay,  
To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary) Calcutta.

In May 1889 the Health Officer of the Port of Bombay brought to the notice of this Government the fact that although he gave due intimation to Captains or Agents of vessels of his intended visits for the purpose of granting them a bill of health, several ships and buggalows had to be visited by him more than once owing to the absence of some of the crew or postponement of the date of sailing, and that consequently in addition to making several trips to the docks in the heat of the day he had to incur considerable expense for carriage hire. He therefore suggested that Government should sanction the imposition of a fee of Rs. 20 on all vessels that had to be visited twice by him. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were consulted on the subject, did not however think it advisable at once to authorise the levying of a fee as proposed by the Port Health Officer, but stated that they would bring the matter to the notice of Agents of ships in Bombay, and that if that measure did not prove efficacious the question regarding the imposition of a fine might, if Government thought it desirable, be reconsidered. The suggestion made by the Port Trustees was approved by this Government.

2. The Health Officer of the Port now reports that but little improvement has taken place in the matter and that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to by him, or failing that to compensate him for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels. The reasons assigned by the Health Officer in support of his proposals have been given in paragraphs 4—7 of his letter No. 291, dated 9th June last, a copy of which is appended hereto. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were requested to favour Government with their opinion on the subject, have stated that they are in favour of the levy of a fee

|                           |        |                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | Rs.    | at the rates noted in the margin from                                                                                                                  |
| For square rigged vessels | ... 20 | vessels to which more than one visit has                                                                                                               |
| For Native craft          | ... 8  | to be paid by the Health Officer in connection with the issue of bills of health, and that such fees should be levied for every visit after the first. |

3. The Governor in Council considers it desirable to levy a fee from vessels in case of repeated visits, but is of opinion that such fee ought to rest on an identical rule or at least on a uniform principle in all the Indian ports. I am accordingly directed to request that you will be so good as to move the Government of India to issue such orders on the subject as may be deemed expedient. I am to add that the fees should at first be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give the Health Officer of the Port an allowance for each extra visit or else a small addition to his regular salary.

No. 291, dated Bombay, the 9th June 1890.

From—SURGEON MAJOR F. F. MACCARTIE, M.B., Health Officer of the Port of Bombay,  
To—The Sanitary Commissioner for the Government of Bombay.

I HAVE the honour to forward Government Resolution, General Department, No. 3300 of 15th August 1889, with a copy of Surgeon Crimmin's letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 with a request that the question of imposition of a fee for bills of health issued to vessels to which more than one visit has to be made may be reconsidered.

2. When I resumed charge of my duties as Health Officer of the Port in January 1890, Surgeon Crimmin directed my attention to the above mentioned Government Resolution, but I thought it right to see for myself whether the state of affairs referred to in his letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 still existed.

3. I regret to have to state that but little improvement has taken place, and I think that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to in Dr. Crimmin's letter, or failing that to compensate the Health Officer for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels.

4. I find from my returns that out of 555 outward vessels, inspected between the date of the above mentioned Government Resolution and 31st May of present year, 122 were inspected more than once, and that 272 visits were made to those 122 vessels. Only a portion of these vessels were cases of postponed departure, the extra visits in some cases being due to the absence of members of crew or passengers from inspection, or the remedying some sanitary defect, but the cases of postponed departure are very frequent, and matters will not, I submit, improve until it is made clear that a fee will be levied in the event of more than one visit having to be made to such vessels.

5. It is noticeable that when a ship's departure is postponed the Captain rarely takes the trouble to inform the Port Health Officer of the fact in sufficient time to save him the worry and expense of making a needless visit to the vessel, and it would seem to be a hardship that the inspecting officer should have to bear the very considerable expense in ghari-hire due to the extra labour incurred by recurring visits to vessels.

6. I would also point out another matter which Surgeon Crimmin's letter does not refer to, and which causes much worry and expense, viz., the fact that in many cases Ship-Captains or Agents do not give 24 hours' notice of a vessel's intended departure. In some instances I have had to visit outward vessels on an hour's notice, and so serious a matter is it delaying a vessel's sailing that I have almost invariably proceeded to inspect them. Such cases cause more worry and trouble than even cases of postponed departure, and, I respectfully submit, should be dealt with in the same manner as Surgeon Crimmin suggests in the cases of postponed departure, viz., by the imposition of a fee for the bill of health.

7. With reference to the two above mentioned classes of vessels, viz., those postponing or those anticipating time of departure, I may state that I have reason to suppose that Ship Agents would cheerfully pay a fee for the inspection, for when I have on occasions complained of the extra labour entailed by irregularity in sailing, surprise has been evinced that no fee was leviable.

No. 514, dated Bombay Castle, the 6th February 1891.

From—G. W. VIDAL, Esq., C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay,  
To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary) Calcutta.

In May 1889 the Health Officer of the Port of Bombay brought to the notice of this Government the fact that although he gave due intimation to Captains or Agents of vessels of his intended visits for the purpose of granting them a bill of health, several ships and buggalows had to be visited by him more than once owing to the absence of some of the crew or postponement of the date of sailing, and that consequently in addition to making several trips to the docks in the heat of the day he had to incur considerable expense for carriage hire. He therefore suggested that Government should sanction the imposition of a fee of Rs. 20 on all vessels that had to be visited twice by him. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were consulted on the subject, did not however think it advisable at once to authorise the levying of a fee as proposed by the Port Health Officer, but stated that they would bring the matter to the notice of Agents of ships in Bombay, and that if that measure did not prove efficacious the question regarding the imposition of a fine might, if Government thought it desirable, be reconsidered. The suggestion made by the Port Trustees was approved by this Government.

2. The Health Officer of the Port now reports that but little improvement has taken place in the matter and that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to by him, or failing that to compensate him for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels. The reasons assigned by the Health Officer in support of his proposals have been given in paragraphs 4—7 of his letter No. 291, dated 9th June last, a copy of which is appended hereto. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were requested to favour Government with their opinion on the subject, have stated that they are in favour of the levy of a fee

|                           |        |                                                |
|---------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------|
|                           | Ra.    | at the rates noted in the margin from          |
| For square rigged vessels | ... 20 | vessels to which more than one visit has       |
| For Native craft          | ... 8  | to be paid by the Health Officer in connection |

with the issue of bills of health, and that such fees should be levied for every visit after the first.

3. The Governor in Council considers it desirable to levy a fee from vessels in case of repeated visits, but is of opinion that such fee ought to rest on an identical rule or at least on a uniform principle in all the Indian ports. I am accordingly directed to request that you will be so good as to move the Government of India to issue such orders on the subject as may be deemed expedient. I am to add that the fees should at first be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give the Health Officer of the Port an allowance for each extra visit or else a small addition to his regular salary.

No. 291, dated Bombay, the 9th June 1890.

From—SURGEON MAJOR F. F. MACCARTHY, M.B., Health Officer of the Port of Bombay,

To—The Sanitary Commissioner for the Government of Bombay.

I HAVE the honour to forward Government Resolution, General Department, No. 3300 of 15th August 1889, with a copy of Surgeon Crimmin's letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 with a request that the question of imposition of a fee for bills of health issued to vessels to which more than one visit has to be made may be reconsidered.

2. When I resumed charge of my duties as Health Officer of the Port in January 1890, Surgeon Crimmin directed my attention to the above mentioned Government Resolution, but I thought it right to see for myself whether the state of affairs referred to in his letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 still existed.

3. I regret to have to state that but little improvement has taken place, and I think that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to in Dr. Crimmin's letter, or failing that to compensate the Health Officer for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels.

4. I find from my returns that out of 555 outward vessels, inspected between the date of the above mentioned Government Resolution and 31st May of present year, 122 were inspected more than once, and that 272 visits were made to those 122 vessels. Only a portion of these vessels were cases of postponed departure, the extra visits in some cases being due to the absence of members of crew or passengers from inspection, or the remedying some sanitary defect, but the cases of postponed departure are very frequent, and matters will not, I submit, improve until it is made clear that a fee will be levied in the event of more than one visit having to be made to such vessels.

5. It is noticeable that when a ship's departure is postponed the Captain rarely takes the trouble to inform the Port Health Officer of the fact in sufficient time to save him the worry and expense of making a needless visit to the vessel, and it would seem to be a hardship that the inspecting officer should have to bear the very considerable expense in ghari-hire due to the extra labour incurred by recurring visits to vessels.

6. I would also point out another matter which Surgeon Crimmin's letter does not refer to, and which causes much worry and expense, viz., the fact that in many cases Ship-Captains or Agents do not give 24 hours' notice of a vessel's intended departure. In some instances I have had to visit outward vessels on an hour's notice, and so serious a matter is it delaying a vessel's sailing that I have almost invariably proceeded to inspect them. Such cases cause more worry and trouble than even cases of postponed departure, and, I respectfully submit, should be dealt with in the same manner as Surgeon Crimmin suggests in the cases of postponed departure, viz., by the imposition of a fee for the bill of health.

7. With reference to the two above mentioned classes of vessels, viz., those postponing or those anticipating time of departure, I may state that I have reason to suppose that Ship Agents would cheerfully pay a fee for the inspection, for when I have on occasions complained of the extra labour entailed by irregularity in sailing, surprise has been evinced that no fee was leviable.

No. 514, dated Bombay Castle, the 6th February 1891.

From—G. W. VIDAL, Esq., C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay,  
To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Sanitary) Calcutta.

In May 1889 the Health Officer of the Port of Bombay brought to the notice of this Government the fact that although he gave due intimation to Captains or Agents of vessels of his intended visits for the purpose of granting them a bill of health, several ships and buggalows had to be visited by him more than once owing to the absence of some of the crew or postponement of the date of sailing, and that consequently in addition to making several trips to the docks in the heat of the day he had to incur considerable expense for carriage hire. He therefore suggested that Government should sanction the imposition of a fee of Rs. 20 on all vessels that had to be visited twice by him. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were consulted on the subject, did not however think it advisable at once to authorise the levying of a fee as proposed by the Port Health Officer, but stated that they would bring the matter to the notice of Agents of ships in Bombay, and that if that measure did not prove efficacious the question regarding the imposition of a fine might, if Government thought it desirable, be reconsidered. The suggestion made by the Port Trustees was approved by this Government.

2. The Health Officer of the Port now reports that but little improvement has taken place in the matter and that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to by him, or failing that to compensate him for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels. The reasons assigned by the Health Officer in support of his proposals have been given in paragraphs 4—7 of his letter No. 291, dated 9th June last, a copy of which is appended hereto. The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, who were requested to favour Government with their opinion on the subject, have stated that they are in favour of the levy of a fee

|                           |        |                                                |
|---------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------|
|                           | Rs.    | at the rates noted in the margin from          |
| For square rigged vessels | ... 20 | vessels to which more than one visit has       |
| For Native craft          | ... 8  | to be paid by the Health Officer in connection |

with the issue of bills of health, and that such fees should be levied for every visit after the first.

3. The Governor in Council considers it desirable to levy a fee from vessels in case of repeated visits, but is of opinion that such fee ought to rest on an identical rule or at least on a uniform principle in all the Indian ports. I am accordingly directed to request that you will be so good as to move the Government of India to issue such orders on the subject as may be deemed expedient. I am to add that the fees should at first be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give the Health Officer of the Port an allowance for each extra visit or else a small addition to his regular salary.

No. 291, dated Bombay, the 9th June 1890.

From—SURGEON MAJOR F. F. MACCARTIE, M.B., Health Officer of the Port of Bombay,  
To—The Sanitary Commissioner for the Government of Bombay.

I HAVE the honour to forward Government Resolution, General Department, No. 3300 of 15th August 1889, with a copy of Surgeon Crimmin's letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 with a request that the question of imposition of a fee for bills of health issued to vessels to which more than one visit has to be made may be reconsidered.

2. When I resumed charge of my duties as Health Officer of the Port in January 1890, Surgeon Crimmin directed my attention to the above mentioned Government Resolution, but I thought it right to see for myself whether the state of affairs referred to in his letter No. 311 of 28th May 1889 still existed.

3. I regret to have to state that but little improvement has taken place, and I think that the time has come when steps should be taken to lessen the grievance referred to in Dr. Crimmin's letter, or failing that to compensate the Health Officer for the extra worry and expense he is put to in having to make recurring visits to outward bound vessels.

4. I find from my returns that out of 555 outward vessels, inspected between the date of the above mentioned Government Resolution and 31st May of present year, 122 were inspected more than once, and that 272 visits were made to those 122 vessels. Only a portion of these vessels were cases of postponed departure, the extra visits in some cases being due to the absence of members of crew or passengers from inspection, or the remedying some sanitary defect, but the cases of postponed departure are very frequent, and matters will not, I submit, improve until it is made clear that a fee will be levied in the event of more than one visit having to be made to such vessels.

5. It is noticeable that when a ship's departure is postponed the Captain rarely takes the trouble to inform the Port Health Officer of the fact in sufficient time to save him the worry and expense of making a needless visit to the vessel, and it would seem to be a hardship that the inspecting officer should have to bear the very considerable expense in ghari-hire due to the extra labour incurred by recurring visits to vessels.

6. I would also point out another matter which Surgeon Crimmin's letter does not refer to, and which causes much worry and expense, viz., the fact that in many cases Ship-Captains or Agents do not give 24 hours' notice of a vessel's intended departure. In some instances I have had to visit outward vessels on an hour's notice, and so serious a matter is it delaying a vessel's sailing that I have almost invariably proceeded to inspect them. Such cases cause more worry and trouble than even cases of postponed departure, and, I respectfully submit, should be dealt with in the same manner as Surgeon Crimmin suggests in the cases of postponed departure, viz., by the imposition of a fee for the bill of health.

7. With reference to the two above mentioned classes of vessels, viz., those postponing or those anticipating time of departure, I may state that I have reason to suppose that Ship Agents would cheerfully pay a fee for the inspection, for when I have on occasions complained of the extra labour entailed by irregularity in sailing, surprise has been evinced that no fee was leviable.

\* \* \* \* \*

No.

FROM

C. J. LYALL, ESQ., C.I.E.,

Secretary to the Government of India,

TO

Home Department.  
Sanitary.

Simla, the April 1891.

SIR,

I AM directed to forward for information

a copy of a letter\* from the Bombay Government and its enclosure, in which it is represented that much inconvenience is caused at Bombay in consequence of the Port Health Officer being compelled to pay two or more visits to an outward bound vessel for the purpose of granting a bill of health, on account of the absence of some of the crew or passengers, or owing to the circumstance that timely notice has not been given him of the deferred departure of the vessel. The Government of Bombay suggest the imposition of fees on the Agents of vessels for every visit after the first which the Health Officer of a Port is obliged to make for any reason for which the Agents are responsible. It is proposed that the fees should in the first instance be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give some compensation to the Health Officer for the additional work thrown on him.

I am to request that the Government of India may be favoured with an expression of opinion whether it would be advisable to impose fees in the cases stated, and, if so, on what scale the fees should be charged.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. LYALL,

Secretary to the Government of India.

419

No.

FROM

C. J. LYALL, ESQ., C.I.E.,

*Secretary to the Government of India,*

To

Home Department.  
Sanitary.

Simla, the April 1891.

SIR,

I AM directed to forward for information

\* No. 314, dated 6th February 1891.

a copy of a letter\* from the Bombay Government and its enclosure, in which it is represented that much inconvenience is caused at Bombay in consequence of the Port Health Officer being compelled to pay two or more visits to an outward bound vessel for the purpose of granting a bill of health, on account of the absence of some of the crew or passengers, or owing to the circumstance that timely notice has not been given him of the deferred departure of the vessel. The Government of Bombay suggest the imposition of fees on the Agents of vessels for every visit after the first which the Health Officer of a Port is obliged to make for any reason for which the Agents are responsible. It is proposed that the fees should in the first instance be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give some compensation to the Health Officer for the additional work thrown on him.

I am to request that the Government of India may be favoured with an expression of opinion whether it would be advisable to impose fees in the cases stated, and, if so, on what scale the fees should be charged.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. LYALL,

*Secretary to the Government of India.*

419  
No.

FROM

C. J. LYALL, ESQ., C.I.E.,

*Secretary to the Government of India,*

TO

Home Department.  
Sanitary.

*Simla, the April 1891.*

SIR,

I AM directed to forward for information

\* No. 514, dated 6th February 1891.

a copy of a letter\* from the Bombay Government and its enclosure, in which it is represented that much inconvenience is caused at Bombay in consequence of the Port Health Officer being compelled to pay two or more visits to an outward bound vessel for the purpose of granting a bill of health, on account of the absence of some of the crew or passengers, or owing to the circumstance that timely notice has not been given him of the deferred departure of the vessel. The Government of Bombay suggest the imposition of fees on the Agents of vessels for every visit after the first which the Health Officer of a Port is obliged to make for any reason for which the Agents are responsible. It is proposed that the fees should in the first instance be credited to Government which could then, if it thought fit, give some compensation to the Health Officer for the additional work thrown on him.

I am to request that the Government of India may be favoured with an expression of opinion whether it would be advisable to impose fees in the cases stated, and, if so, on what scale the fees should be charged.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. J. LYALL,

*Secretary to the Government of India.*

FURTHER PAGE, No. *3422*

OF 18

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED  
18, No. MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURE

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

*Letter*  
ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A

PAPER NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH  
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

NOT TO BE  
FILED UP  
ONLY

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.  
G.O., DATED 20-5-91  
No. 419-

INDEXED.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Re the health  
officers for paying  
more than one visit  
to camps.