

Financial (1897) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 215

DATED 11-2-89

INDEXED.

217

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Engagement of an officer employed solely on plague duty
in Vizagapatnam that the officer should be
treated as a direct plague charge, whether
another officer is appointed to perform his
ordinary duties or not.*

218

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1899} of Madras. FINANCIAL.

Recd. } *Enclosures*
Regd. } 1899. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 215, 11th February 1899.

FEBRUARY.

Emoluments of an officer employed solely on plague duty.

Informing the Collector of Vizagapatnam that the — should be treated as a direct plague charge, whether another officer is appointed to perform his ordinary duties or not.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From W. O. HORNE, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Chief Secretary
to Government, dated 19th January 1899, Dis. No. 187.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Government Order, I am to state that the Sanitary Inspector therein referred to is a municipal servant paid from the Municipal funds. His appointment was neither created exclusively for plague duty nor made with the object of strengthening the existing establishment for plague purposes (*vide* paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 698, Financial, dated 15th August 1898). He was deputed temporarily to perform plague duties under Regulation XVII (I) and (II) (b). But his name is shown in the monthly lists of plague establishment of this district as he has been employed *exclusively* on plague duty (*vide* Proceedings of the Plague Commissioner, No. 382, dated 25th October 1898), and omitted in the monthly plague estimates as his salary does not fall either under "direct" or "indirect" charges (*vide* G.O., No. 899, Financial, dated 19th October 1898).

ORDER—No. 215, Financial, dated 11th February 1899.

With reference to paragraph 2 of his letter read above, the Collector of Vizagapatam will be informed that the emoluments of an officer, who is employed solely on plague duty, should be treated as a direct plague charge, whether another officer is appointed to perform his ordinary duties or not.

(True Extract.)

G. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Vizagapatam.
 „ all other Collectors.
 „ the Plague Commissioner.
 „ the Surgeon-General.
 „ the Accountant-General.

Copy to the Local and Municipal Department.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

FINANCIAL

~~Public~~

~~Public~~ (189⁹) Department.

CURRENT No. 351

From

The Collector
Nizagapattam

No. 187

Recorded

2. The explanation called for from Dated 19 January 1893

the Superintendent of Police, Vizagapatam, is awaited.

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reporting that no actuals under
"20 Police" have been shown in any of
the plague estimates of this District,
and that the Sanitary Inspector has
been omitted in the plague estimates
as his salary does not fall under
direct or indirect charges.

CS
Order
R

30-1-88

9A
The second part of
the letter regarding
the 9x10" cut
31.1.84

70. The eru of vijayapatnam (250)

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CURRENT NO. 357

Re C
Dis. No. 187

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 19 January 1899.

FROM

W. O. HORNE, ESQ.,

Ag. Collector.

Vizagapatam District.

TO

The SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Financial DEPARTMENT,

Madras.

SIR,

A

Referring to para 2 of G.O. no. 69 dated 10th instant, I have the honour to report that the actuals of Rs 240 under "20 Police" therein referred to have never been shown in any of the plague estimates submitted by me to the Plague Commissioner or the Surgeon-General. Nor is it understood under what item and for what purposes the expenditure has been incurred in this District. The Superintendent of Police Vizagapatam had already been requested, before the receipt of the G.O. under reply, to explain the actuals of Rs 240 shown in G.O. no. 1122 Financial dated 28th November 1898. His report will be submitted on receipt.

B

awaited

A

2.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the G.O.,

I am to state that the Sanitary Inspector therein referred to is a Municipal servant paid from the Municipal funds. His appointment was neither created exclusively for plague duty nor made with the object of strengthening the existing establishment for plague purposes: (Vide paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 698 Financial dated 15th August 1898) He was deputed temporarily to perform plague duties under Regulation XVII (I) and (II). But his name is shown in the monthly lists of plague establishment of this District as he has been employed exclusively on plague duty (vide proceedings of the Plague Commissioner No. 382 dated 25th October 1898), and omitted in the monthly plague estimates as his salary does not fall either under "direct" or "indirect" charges (Vide G.O. No. 899 Financial dated 19th October 1898.)

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

R. Provindar Rao

For Collector

G.

Financial Department

Note

Current No 351.

From para 2 of the Collector's letter it is observed that the appointment of the Sanitary Inspector was neither created exclusively for plague duty nor made with the object of strengthening the existing establishment for plague purposes. It is therefore neither a direct nor an indirect charge debitable to "Plague". The name of that officer should not be shown in the monthly establishment list as the same is intended to contain the names of the officers whose salaries are debitable to plague - either direct or indirect.

The Plague Commissioner's proceedings No 382, dated 25th October, quoted by Mr. Mulia lays down that the list should show all establishments employed on plague duty whether their cost is debitable to "Plague" or to the ordinary service head - i.e. - direct or indirect. It does not seem to lay down that ~~the~~ officers ~~are~~ ^{are} to be shown in the list.

deputed for plague duty should
be shown in the establishment list.

~~It~~ The collector may be informed that
~~the~~ the name of the Sanitary
Inspector need not be shown in the
establishment list.

~~To the CS~~
31-1-29 But if an officer is deputed
entirely on Plague duty his appt.
should, it is thought, be treated as
a Plague charge whether it is
~~for or against~~
another officer is apptd. to perform
his ordinary duties or not.

Curd
31/1/29

Mr. H. is Direct:
H. L.

Draft accord
Curd
Draft pp. of

CL

Financial department

Current No 351 (para 2-A)

Order no 215 of 11-2-29

With reference to para
2 of ^{his} letter read above the
Collector of Vizagapatam will
be informed that the emoluments
of an Officer who is ^{employed} deputed
^{Solely} ~~entirely~~ on plague duty should
be treated as a ^{charge} direct plague
^{expenditure}, whether another
officer is appointed to perform
his ordinary duties or not.

omit
[]
vide erratum

Curd
11-2-29

H. L.

To The Collector Vizagapatam
All other (Mrs)
Plague Commr.
L. S.
Copy to L. M. Dept.

Depd
18-2-29

Singam Sone

Enalim

G.O. N^o 215 Int. 7. 11. 2. 99.

Omit the word "direct" in
line 3.

Am.
1.3.99.

[Signature]

All (Mr.)

Plaza (Mr.)

S. H.

A. H.

Dom. Dept.

Desp

3.3.99

PA Copy to Plaza files & correct
all copies of this in the office

cont

P.A. in brackets
accordingly

[Signature]
3/3/99

Despatch
return

Dom

[Signature]
3/3/99

16

Printed

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Ministry of Education

1.3.42

*Mr. [unclear]
[unclear]
[unclear]
[unclear]
[unclear]*

*For copy to [unclear]
all copies to [unclear]*

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

4

Order complete. 230.
Letter only.
Order complete with letter.

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
139

DATED

CURRENT No.

Print as marked

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DATED.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.:-

- A = Print in full.
- B = Not to be printed.
- P = Print abstract only.
- Q = Print heading only.