[L. & M. / 2,000—4-5-97.]

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1981 M.

DATED 15-9-97

INDEXED. CR

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

West market slaughter house in the Madura Muly.

Agreeing with the Collector of Madura in considering that, in the circumstances stated, it would be hard to make the Dy. Collr., Madura Division pay for the repairs executed to the ——— in his capacity as Chairman; & stating that Govt trusts that the Munl. Council will see its way to re-consider its resolution refusing to sanction the expenditure incurred by him in this connection

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cw 747		dt 98	G.O. 421	L & Mu	21-2-98.		
Cwo 2388		m of 01					

O.W.

✓

SANITARY COM
Registered 23338
7 JUL 97

AKS

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 2291/M

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

From The Collector of
Madura

No 717 dated 3rd July 1897.

~~**Order**~~

Referred to the Sanitary Commissioner for remarks with reference to para. 5 of the Collector's letter.

Secretary to Govt.

V.R.
1/6/97

Roc **No.** 2277/Genl of 1897

Dated 16th June 1897

Received 18 JUN 1897

Registered 18-6-1897

Enclosures + file 8

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting with remarks letter from the Deputy Collector Madura Division requesting to move Government to cancel a Municipal Resolution refusing to pass a bill for Rs 338 and odd incurred in anticipation of sanction on account of the construction of a slaughter-house in Madura Town.

The Sanitary Commissioner.

24/6 at 10/7.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Go	1698	L	18-9-96
„	261	„	12-2-96
„	1802	„	26-11-94

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Vide page 1 of 90
GO, 1802 M) 26 Nov
1894 -

Copy of Communication No. Rol. 4474/Genl of 1896 dated 27th May 1897 from M.R.Ry. R. Ramachandra Rao avergal, Deputy Collector on General Duties Madura Division to the Collector of Madura.

Adverting to your dis. no. 1018 of 1897 returning to me a letter addressed to Government, I have the honor to state as follows for your kind consideration. You are already aware of all the facts and it is unnecessary for me to dwell on them at length.

2. In the early part of 1896 Mr. Fischer vacated the office of the Chairmanship of the Municipal Council of Madura and I was directed to undertake the duties in addition to my own. Owing to very heavy work of which you are the best judge, I was compelled to delegate my powers. I did so to Mr. G. Srinivasa Row, a leading citizen of Madura who had acted as Chairman in previous occasions.

3. One of the markets in Madura is known as the West market and a slaughter house is attached to it. The condition of the market and the premises is fully dwelt upon by Dr. King in his inspection notes of 1894 printed in Government Order dated 26th November 1894 No. 1802 M. Enclosure A. The then Chairman promised

promised to take precautions to remedy the State of things revealed, but the promise was not kept up, for at the next inspection 1895, the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner Condemned in no unmeasured terms the insanitary Conditions of the Surroundings of the West market slaughterhouse (Vide G.O. no. 261 M dated 12th February 1896. Enclosure B). As further inaction was culpable, the Chairman prepared an estimate, Enclosure C, and C_2, to remedy the defects pointed out. The estimate was sanctioned by the Council in Resolution No 47 dated 6th February 1896.

page 7 of G.O. no 261 dd/12th Feby 96 –

4. The estimate is grossly inadequate and carelessly prepared and a mere perusal thereof will clearly convince any one that the Council did not set about the required improvements in a hearty manner. The execution of the work devolved upon me, and it was then I became aware of the utter futility of the sanctioned estimate.

5. The question of improvements was beset with other difficulties. The most important thing to provide for was to induce the butchers to move into the stalls inside the market instead of exposing the meat for sale on the open road offensively to the public view (vide

Chairman's

Chairman's reply in Enclosure B). Secondly the butchers in the town were torn into two great factions and each class had to be provided with stalls exactly similar in all respects to the stalls provided for the other. After a good deal of Controversy and persuasion, the butchers were ultimately prevailed upon to move into the enclosure provided certain repairs were undertaken. Some of them were of an indefinite nature and could not be foreseen and estimated for. I authorised the P.W. Overseer to execute the repairs as soon as possible and to send a revised estimate. He sent the revised estimate Enclosures D, and D_2 on the 18th June 1896 and even then he was not in a position to specify all the details; he had to submit on the 15th July 1896 a supplemental estimate for Rupees 45 Enclosure E. Work has been turned out as per these estimates; it has been rigidly checkmeasured and paid.

6. At the earliest possible opportunity the revised estimates were placed before a meeting; the Council wished the Sanction of

the

5

the Sanitary Board to be applied for; this Board refused to give any opinion as the work had already been executed.

7. All paid bills are placed before a meeting; the bill for this work amounting to Rs 413-1-6 (voucher 429) was placed as usual, and one of the Councillors M.R.Ry P. R. Venkatasalu Naidu Garu remarked in the agenda paper as follows.

"Voucher 429: It does not appear that the work was sanctioned by the Council, tenders invited and necessary deed taken from the Contractor; nor does it appear that the Sanitary Board's permission was obtained before the work was commenced. All papers relating to the work must be put up and how the particular Contractor Lakshman Row happened to get the work is not known".

The real meaning of these dubious remarks was expressed by the Councillor himself during the subsequent discussion to be that the Chairman delegate perpetrated a job to favour the particular contractor. You know Madura and the people here so well it is unnecessary for me to refute this calumny, and the remarks are erroneous and false, for tenders were published and the lowest tenderer was selected. The subject was repeatedly adjourned from September to November and all the while the agenda paper with the above insinuations being circulated among

Please see page 8.

6

among the Councillors. At last on the 17th November the Council resolved as follows. No 362 "Resolved that the bill for Rs 413 and odd minus Rs 75 be not passed (1) as the excess amount did not receive the previous sanction of the Council (2) the requirements of the Act in giving the Contract were not complied with by the late Chairman (3) the previous sanction of the Sanitary Board was not obtained and (4) the Sanitary Board has condemned the work as unsuitable." The effect of this Resolution is that I have been compelled to refund to the Council from my private pocket Rs 338 and odd; this is very hard I submit and I beg you will be kindly pleased to consider the question and make a representation to Government on my behalf.

8. I shall first comment on the resolution.

Point 1: The work was executed in anticipation of sanction; the estimate was placed at the earliest opportunity before the Council and though the Council is fully authorised to reject unsanctioned works, I beg you to consider whether the circumstances of the case are such as to justify the exercise of this power, which is rarely resorted to.

Point 2. The point is not quite clear. Tenders were invited and the work was assigned to to the lowest tender. The nonexecution of the bond is not material.

Point 3. This I have already explained before; at the time of execution I had no knowledge that the amount of work would exceed Rs 200/- otherwise I should certainly have obtained the previous sanction of the Sanitary Board.

Point 4. This is based on a single sentence in Enclosure F (notes of inspection of the market after repair). I rely on the same authority to show that substantial improvements to the extent of Rs 400 have been executed, for, contrast its language with the language of Enclosures A and B (notes of Inspection before repair). I admit even after the repair the market is not ideally perfect, but could not be made so for Rs 400. If Dr. King states that any of the executed works must be dismantled or is opposed to hygienic requirements, I shall certainly take the risk; but this is not what he states; as I understand him he means to say that further requirements are still necessary.

9. I shall not dwell longer on the above, for, the real reasons which actuated the councillors to pass the above resolutions are other than those above expressed.

Mr

Mr. Venkatesalu Naidu laid great stress in the discussion on the following points:

(1) That tenders were not invited

(2) That the whole thing was a job of the Chairman delegate to favour the Contractor

(3) That work was not performed as billed for.

If this were a letter addressed to Government it would be necessary for me to refute at length the above calumnies; but it is hardly necessary for me to deny them even to you for you are fully aware of what is going on in Madura.

10. The resolution is the outcome of the existence of a factious feeling between two classes in the local Council. Madura Municipality has degenerated into a condition similar to that one reads of regarding cities in America; one councillor bosses the whole show, controls the elections and is backed by a strong majority in the Council which he leads by the nose. Of this also you are fully aware and I have reason to suppose the attention of Government itself has been attracted to this matter. In proof of this statement I may add that though the entire decision was

was conducted in English, some of the Councillors who voted against me were ignorant of that language. What further evidence is necessary of a packed majority.

11. Briefly put, the facts are as follows: As Chairman I execute a highly desirable work in anticipation of sanction amplifying on a meagre sanctioned estimate; the work so far as it goes is satisfactory and is highly spoken of though it falls short of the Sanitary Commissioner's ideal, and owing to malice and factious feeling I am made to pay for the work. I had no time to attend to details as I was immersed in Revenue work and the Chairman's office was thrust upon me in spite of my protests. I beg you will be pleased to recommend to Government that the resolution in question be cancelled and the Council be asked to return the money refunded by me.

16 Jne 97

For Collector

True copy

Enclosure no 1 to the letter from the Collector of Madura No Rol. 2277 of 1897 Dated 16th June 1897

Copy of the Communication from the Deputy Collector Madura Dn.

Enclosure A.

Extract from the Sanitary Commissioner's (Dr King's) notes of inspection in 1894 dated 3. August 1894 printed in G. O. dated 26 November 1894 No. 1802 M.

Chairman's remarks

× × × ×

(a) The East market building is formed of brick in mud with country tiled roofs. The stalls are low and badly ventilated. The meat stalls are paved with irregular stones; no drain is provided; blocks of wood and old boxes are provided for the

An estimate amounting to Rupees 28000 was prepared two years back for dismantling the market buildings and rebuilding the stalls on the approved designs but the work has not been commenced for want of funds. Steps will however be taken in the meanwhile to remedy the defects noticed by the Sanitary Commissioner.

A Enclosure

the meat when exposed for sale. The adjoining space is unpaved permitting of dust to be disturbed by every passer by. The drain round the market — itself situated in a very populous part — is evidently a favourite resort for defecation there being masses of fæces at the time of my visit and I am informed that this is the normal state of affairs. What with sewage, filth in the gutters and this unusual form of filth any approach to this market where human food is sold involves a duty that must be trying to any one but a long resident of Madura.

(b) West Market. The same style of building as above described is here found. The interval between the opposite rows of pandals is inconveniently limited by the use of cadjan pandals in the portion set aside for vegetables. In the fish and entrails bazaar irregular stone platforms are used. These are so covered with earth and old filth as to be unrecognisable without a careful examination. Fish is sold on boards that seem saturated with organic matter to

It is in contemplation to demolish the existing West market and reconstruct the same, estimates for which are under preparation.

was conducted in English, some of the Councillors

11

to an extent to suggest they must be family heirlooms of the fish sellers. This and the East market are too small; the places being crowded to an extent to be inconvenient and insanitary.

× × ×

If funds will not permit of new buildings being secured for vegetables, new portions should at least be made for the sale of meat and fish on cleanly principles

× × × ×

(c) A third slaughter house is provided within the West market; it consists of a rough unroofed platform of rubble. The only water available is from an unprotected well outside the market.

Every precaution is being taken to remove promptly the filth accumulating there and secure the Cleanliness of the surroundings

referred

12

referred to.

(True Extract)

V. Ramachandra Row
4 mar 97
Deputy Collector.

4/3

4/3/97

English some of the Councillors

Enclosure A

13

In a lesser from the ~~Deputy~~ Collector
of Madura ~~D~~

To

The Secretary to Govt.
Local, Municipal & Educational
Dept

Roc No 2277/~~1474~~ Genl of 97/16-6-97

~~Enclosure A~~

Extract from the Sanitary Commissioner's (Dr. King's) Notes of Inspection in 1894 of 3d August 1894 printed in G. O. of 26th November 1894 No 1802 M.

1/2291 M of 1897

Roc. No. 2277/Genl of 1897

14

Madura Collector's Office
(Camp) Uthamapalaiyam
16th June 1897

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 2291/M

From
J. Twigg Esquire,
Collector of Madura.

To
The Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for the orders of Government copy of a letter No. Roc. 4474/Genl of 96 dated 27-5-97 addressed to me by the Deputy Collector Madura Division in which he protests against the action of the Madura Municipal Council in making him pay for certain works carried out by him when in charge of the office of Chairman.

2 The estimate passed by the Council for Rs 75 for repairs to the slaughter house was obviously quite inadequate and the Deputy Collector had a revised estimate prepared for Rs 480/- which provided also for a compound wall and new stalls. He should, of course, have obtained the sanction of the Council and approval of the Sanitary Board. In excuse for his failure to do so, he can plead very heavy work.

3. The Sanitary Commissioner in his inspection notes of 1896 embodied in G.O. 87 M/25-1-97 said that the rough provision made for slaughtering was of an unsuitable character, but the estimate now in

Vide page 7

17

VR

A.S.

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 2565 M

From

The Sanitary Commissioner
for Madras.

Order

No. 1426/S

Dated 14th July 1897

Received 15 JUL. 1897

Registered 15-7-1897

Enclosures C. No 2291 M retd

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submitting remarks with reference to Endorsement of Govt No 717 dated 3. 7. 97 on letter from the Collector of Madura requesting to cancel a municipal resolution refusing to pass certain bill incurred on account of the construction of a Slaughter House in Madura Town.

19/7

a/10/5/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Go	87	M	25-1-97
"	1698	L	18-9-96
"	261	M	12-2-96
"	1802	M	26-11-96
"	436	ML	10-5-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2,250—1-4-97.

18

No. 1426/S

Office of Sanitary Commissioner,
Fort St. George, 14th July 1897

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT
CURRENT No. 2565 M

From
Surgeon-Lieut.-Col. W. G. King, M.B., C.M., D.P.H.,
Sanitary Commissioner for Madras,

To
The Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal department,
Fort Saint George

Enclosure.

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No 717 dated 3rd July 1897, I have the honor to state that the following are the remarks made by me after inspecting the work mentioned which are embodied in G.O. No 87 M of the 25th January 1897:—

Page 7

"In two instances, rough provision for slaughtering has been made, but it is of an unsuitable character. The Sanitary Board should have been consulted before expenditure was incurred."

From the above it will be understood that my impression was that the work was of a rough and insufficient character, but the Deputy Collector is right in assuming that I would not wish to state that such arrangements as had been made by him did not represent an advance upon those formerly existing. In other words, whilst I would

from

19

from a sanitary point of view have preferred to have seen a structure more in accord with sanitary requirements, I do not think the Municipality has reason to consider it has not received a quid pro quo in the shape of sanitary improvement in return for the very modest sum spent on its behalf in at least aiding an urgently required reform. Accepting the Deputy Collector's statement that he was not in a position to understand that the estimate would exceed Rs 200, and that hence the design was not submitted for the scrutiny of the Sanitary Board, I think the Deputy Collector deserves credit for having at least made an effort in the right direction, whilst the Council had failed previously to do anything notwithstanding their promise of reform.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

W G King
Surg.n Lieut Col.
Sanitary Commissioner for Madras

20

Local and Municipal Department.

Expenditure incurred by the Revenue Divisional officer in repairing the [illegible] slaughter house be Madura.

Current No.s 2291 and 2565 M

For Orders.

The facts of the case are clearly stated in the Deputy Collector's letter of 27th May 1897. In forwarding this letter, the Collector supports the Deputy Collector and states that " it "would have been easy for him to allow "the work to be carried out according to "the inadequate estimate of Rs 75 passed "by the Municipal Council, but in the public interest he could not see this done. "He acted bona fide and the work was pro"-perly done according to the estimate. It "is hard that he should be made to pay "for the work of which the Council is en"joying the benefit". 2/On the suggestion of the Collector the papers were referred to the Sanitary Commissioner to ascertain whether he would condemn any part of the work done as waste, having regard to the fact that the Council had no intention of doing anything better and proposed to spend only Rs 75.

Para. 4 of the Collr's Endt.

3. In reply to this reference, the Sanitary Commissioner invites the attention of Government to the remarks made by him after inspecting the work and states as follows:-

" From the above it will be seen "that my impression was that the work was

of

21

"of a rough and insufficient character, but the Deputy Collector is right in assuming that I would not wish to state that such arrangements as had been made by him did not represent an advance upon those formerly existing. In other words, whilst I would, from a sanitary point of view, have preferred to have seen a structure more in accord with sanitary requirements, I do not think the municipality has reason to consider it has not received a quid pro quo in the shape of ~~the~~ sanitary improvement in return for the very modest sum spent on its behalf, in at least aiding an urgently required reform. Accepting the Deputy Collector's statement that he was not in a position to understand that the estimate would not exceed Rs 200 and that hence the design was not submitted for the scrutiny of the Sanitary Board, I think the Deputy Collector deserves credit for having at least made an effort in the right direction, whilst the Council had failed previously to do anything notwithstanding their promise of reform."

In these circumstances it is submitted that the Collector's suggestion in the concluding portion of his letter may be adopted, and the accompanying draft order is submitted for approval.

V.R.
3/9/97

H.M.

Yes. please see draft attached.

10/9/97

22

Local and Municipal Department.

C nos 2291 and 2565 M

HM

HM
14/9/97

Order No. 1981 M. mis. dt 15.9.97.

From the papers read above it is observed that the amount spent for repairing the west market slaughter house, ~~without obtaining the previous sanction of the Municipal Council has not been a waste, but has on the other hand improved the condition of the slaughter house,~~ which had been repeatedly condemned by the Sanitary Officers of Government ~~, has~~ provided the Mnty. with a building which is admittedly on an improved sanitary plan, though not perhaps altogether sanitarily perfect, & which the San. Commr. is prepared to accept as an advance on the existing building. The Deputy Collector also fully explains the special circumstances ~~under which he~~ irregularly tho' inadvertently failed to obtain the approval of the Council and the Sanitary Board to the works done. In these circumstances, the Government agrees with the Collector in considering that it ~~is~~ w'd be hard to make the Deputy Collector pay for the work of which the Council is enjoying the benefit, merely because he executed it in anticipation of sanction. Govt trusts that the Municipal Council will ~~therefore be requested~~ see its way to consider its resolution in the light of the above remarks.

V.R.
3/9/97

10/9/97

To
The Chairman, M.C., Madura
" Collector of Madura
with Encls 2 to 8 retd
L.210
Disp. 22/9/97

ven for copying
corded Ms 20/7/[illegible]
examined
signed 21/9
189 .

GAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 .

No.

OSURES TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

TER OF GOVERNMENT

ATEMENT WITH DITTO

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

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.