Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2153 M.

DATED 2. 10. 97

INDEXED. CR

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Voters' list

Passing orders on the alleged irregularities in the publication of the list of the Mannargudi Munsif

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

A/S

CURRENT No. 2345 M

From The Collector of Tanjore.

Misc Order. No. 2153 M. mis. dt 2.10.97.

R. C. No. 1040. / Estt 97.

The Government does not consider that a case for its intervention under section 37 (1) of Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897, has been made out. The few vacancies that may occur in the course of the year must be determined on the existing list, which by operation of law, came into force on the expiry of the period mentioned in Rule 12 of the Election Rules issued in G.O. No. 1876 M, dated 8th December 1890.

2. The delay on the part of the Chairman, in bringing the council's action to the

Dated 16 & June 97.

Received DESPATCHED 23 JUN. 1897 24 JUN. 1897

Registered 24-6-1897

Enclosures 2.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting a further report on ~~reporting~~ the irregularity in publishing the voters list of the Mannargudi Municipality requesting orders in the matter.

1/7/97

collector's notice is most unsatisfactory.

(From orders)

R.R. 27/3/97

8/4/0/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To
The Collector of Tanjore
Chairman in-C. Mannargudi
Dupd. 8/10/97

P10

110

11/10/97

No. 109.

Municipal office
Mannargudi. Dated 26th Sep 1897

From
M. R. Ry. M. R. Srinivasa Row Avargal
Chairman, Municipal Council,
Mannargudi.

To
The Collector of
Tanjore.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith a Copy of the Resolution of the Council passed at a Meeting held on the 29th April last, and also the reports of the Sub committee Members Concerning it, I have the honour to Submit as follows:—

1. A list of voters qualified was published under Rule No 7. Any voter so included in the list and published Can only be removed by the decision of the Council at a Meeting held, Rule No 9. In this

Meeting

Encl 1
C/No 2345/96.

meeting the Council instead of passing a final decision on the objection of Mr. Venkataramaier, resolved that the qualifications of Voters objected by Mr. Venkataramaier be enquired into by a Sub committee within a fortnight and the result of such enquiry be placed before the Council and on the Council's approving of the qualifications, such persons be added to the list under the Sanction of the Collector. The Sub Committee so appointed has submitted two Separate reports one Signed by two of its members of whom one is the objector and the other by another member. In these reports out of the objected list of Voters 68 are reported as eligible by two members of whom one is the very objector Mr. Venkataramaier, and 85 by the other members.

The

The report of the Majority of the members was received at 6 P.M yesterday. I am at a loss to find a warrant for all these Proceedings in the Election Rules. All that the Council had to do in the matter was whether the objection of Mr. S. Venkataramaier was right or wrong. If it was right, the Council ought to have allowed the objection, if it was not, it should have rejected it. Instead of doing this, the Council have passed the resolution referred to above which in my humble opinion is not Sanctioned by the Election Rules and hence illegal. If the resolution of the Council above referred to is to be considered or treated as final. So far as it approves of the list, I have to Submit that injustice is done

to

to the voters who are really qualified and entitled to vote. To prove this, I need not bring in outsiders, for the very objector Mr. Venkataramaier has now reported that, out of his objected persons, 68 are eligible (Vide his report enclosed). If so to allow the resolution of the Council on this subject to stand, will be doing injustice to the parties which is patent.

2. Why I say that I find no warrant for the procedure adopted by the Council is, the Rule No 7 lays down that a list of voters should be published and rule No 8 says that any person desiring that his name shall be entered in the list may apply in writing to the Chairman within 3 weeks after the publication of the list and any person objecting to the entry of any name may lodge

RS

lodge an objection thereto in writing with the Chairman within the same period, and Rule No 9 provides for the decision of the Council within a certain time. Such claims and objections preferred under Rule No 8. In the present instance Mr. Venkataramaier preferred an objection under Rule No 8 and it ought to have been decided under Rule No 9 one way or the other, but the Council did not do this as pointed out in para 1.

3. If a large number of voters who are really qualified are removed by an erroneous decision of the Council, the election of persons to the Council as members, becomes nominal and places the Candidates at a great disadvantage.

4. I did not place this before the Council

becau

because there is no time to pass any order by you as you have to pass your orders within one month from the date of the meeting held under Rule No 9 which was on the 29th April last and further in my opinion the Council has no power to pass any resolution on the Subject after the lapse of 35 days as mentioned in Rule No 9.

I have &c.

(Signed) M. R. Srinivasa Row
Chairman.

(True Copy)

T. Shanmukam
For. ag. Collector

RS

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

In a letter

FROM

THE COLLECTOR OF

Tanjore

To

THE Secretary to Government
Local & Municipal Department
Madras.

Dated 16th June 1897.

R. C. No. 1040/Enfl 897.

Subject.

Letter from the Chairman
Municipal Council, Mannar-
gudi dated 26th May 1897.
No 109.

1/28 Enclosure 1897

No. 2064/Rev of 1896

Proceedings of the Collector of Tanjore
dated 10th July 1896.

Read

(1) petitions from the under mentioned rate-payers of the Mannargudi Municipality stating that the exclusion of their names from the list of Voters for 1896 was wrong and praying that their names may be ordered to be included therein.

(2) This office Endorsement Reference on Petition Register No. 1139/Rev dated 16th May 1896 forwarding these petitions to the Chairman for report.

(3) Municipal Chairman's letter No. 124 dated 25th May 1896 reporting on the petitions read above.

(4) Further reference to the Deputy Collector Mannargudi Division, remitting the papers for his remarks.

(5)

Encl 2/CNo. 2345 Aug 97

(5) Petition from Manikkam Pillai dated 28th May 1896 and endorsement thereon dated 4th June 1896 forwarding the same to the Deputy Collector in Continuation of the above.

(6) Deputy Collector's letter No $\frac{576}{Rev}$ dated 15th June 1896 reporting on the Subject.

In the revision of the list of voters for the year 1896, One of the Councillors M. R. Ry. S. Venkataramaier avergal addressed a letter to the Chairman proposing that the names of 155 persons included in the original list prepared by a Sub Committee under Rule 6 of the Election Rules should be removed therefrom for want of qualifications as per rule 4 of the Election Rules.

(Vide his letter Dated 1st April 1896)

The Chairman did not Consider this as an objection under Rule 8 of the election rules and passed an order thereon as if it were a Communication to him and required that a properly drawn-up objection under the rules should be lodged with him for disposal of the Council. This order of the Chairman was clearly wrong and illegal.

The Council at its meeting held on the 29th April, however, Considered the Subject of this letter on the motion of the objecting Councillor and resolved that the list of voters be approved, excluding the names of 155 persons, named in the objection petition, that a Sub Committee Consisting of M. R. Ry. Ponnusami Mudaliar, M. R. Ry Venkataramaier

and

and M. R. Ry. Arumugam Pillai be appointed to report on the eligibility of the above 155 individuals mentioned in Councillor Venkataramaier's letter and that on the Council approving the persons reported on, such eligible persons be added to the list under the Sanction of the Collector within one month from the 29th April. Against this resolution, 52 of the 155 persons whose names have been excluded from the list appealed to the Collector on the 13th, 14th and 15th May, and one appeal was made on the 19th May last. The first mentioned 57 petitions were very unnecessarily referred to the Chairman on the 16th May, and his report thereon was received on the 29th in Tanjore by the Deputy Collector, Tanjore and on the 30th in the Head Quarters office when the

RD

the Collector was in Camp at Tiruthuraip poondi. The 35 days period prescribed in rule 9 of the Election rules expired with the 28th May i.e on the date on which the Chairman's report was signed by him. The Collector's power to intervene and pass an order as prayed for by the appellants ceased from the 29th. The list of voters must therefore stand as revised by the Council at the meeting held on the 29th April 1896. till the next year's list is prepared.

It is further observed that as decided by the Council at its meeting, it does not appear that the Claims of the 155 persons were Subsequently tested by the Sub Committee and the results reported to the Collector within 30 days of the meeting as resolved

resolved on at the time.

(Signed) G. Stokes
Collector.

(True Copy)

F. Brettingham
For. ag. Collector

RV

Enclosure No. 2

In a letter

From

The Collector of

Tanjore

To

The Secretary to Government

Local & Municipal Department

Madras.

Dated 16th June 1897.

Ref. No. 1040/Engl 797.

Subject.

Collectrs Proceedings

Ito 2064/Rev 731 97 10th July 96.

2/2345 prof 1897

Tanjore Collectrs office

Ref. on. Cir. No. 1040/Eng of 1897 16th June 1897.

Enc

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT. 2345/M

From

W. B. Ayling Esquire.

Ag. Collector,

Tanjore.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Local and Municipal Department.

Madras.

Sir,

In Continuation of this office Reference on Petition Register No. 641/Rev dated 21st April 1897, I have the honour to report the following:—

G.O. 1427 dt 17-6-97

2. On May 13th I received petitions from 99 persons stating that their names had been wrongly omitted from the published list of Voters, and asking me to order their inclusion under Rule 11. It appeared to me that

that the rules provided an obvious remedy to persons in their position by a Claim under Rule 8; and that it was not expedient for the Collector to interfere except in the Case of a person who had preferred a Claim and had it dismissed. I therefore gave each petition the following endorsement: —

"It does not appear that petitioner has "availed himself of the natural remedy pro- "vided by the rules, and applied to the "Chairman under Rule 8 for enrolment "in the list of Voters. Unless he has "done so, the undersigned will not "interfere on his behalf."

3. As a matter of fact, these Petitioners had not put in Claims under Rule 8. Only two Claims and one objection petition were received under that rule.

The latter emanating from Councillor Venkataramaier and objecting to the inclusion of 135 names in the published list.

4. The meeting under Rule 9 was held on April 29th: and the Council, instead of hearing and deciding the different Cases included in Mr. R. Ry. Venkataramaier's objection, chose to refer the whole thing to a Committee again! Vide the following resolution: —

"1. To dispose of the objections with regard "to the Voters' and Councillors' list for "1897-98.

"Resolved unanimously that the "under mentioned proposal of Mr. Singara- "velu Odayar avargal seconded by Mr. "Ponnusami Mudaliar avergal be passed.

"I propose that the list prepared by Mr.

"Mr. Ponnusami Mudaliar be approved
"except the persons mentioned by Mr.
"Venkataramaier and that a Sub
"Committee Consisting of Messrs Ponnusami
"Mudaliar, Venkataramaier and Singara-
"velu Odayar be appointed to report about
"the eligibility of persons mentioned by
"Mr. Venkataramaier within a fortnight
"by Checking them with house, Land,
"Professional and income tax, and house
"rents and that on the Council approving
"such eligibility, such eligible persons
"be added to the list — under the Sanction
"of the Collector within one month from
"this date."

5. This Committee behaved just as one would expect. Two of the Councillors (Mr. K. Venkataramaier and Mr. K. Singaravelu Odayar) recommended the inclusion

RS

inclusion of 68 of the names objected to. The third Committee man recommended the inclusion of 85. These two reports were received by the Chairman on 25th May and 14th May respectively.

6. The first intimation of these proceedings was conveyed to me in a letter from the Chairman dated 26th May, herewith enclosed, which reached me on the following day, so the months' time allowed by Rule 9 expired on the 29th. This left no time to make enquiries and amend the list, and I deemed it better not to interfere at all than to make hasty alterations which could only partially set matters right.

7. At present therefore matters stand thus: the published list of voters is the one

Selected

selected by the Chairman and prepared by one Councillor only M. R. Ry. Ponnusami Mudaliar. An objection under Rule 8 to the inclusion of 135 names in this list has been lodged. but no orders have been passed on it. Therefore, if an election has to be held before another list is prepared. I presume it will have to be held on this list unaltered and Complete. The inexpediency of this is obvious. One elected seat has now to be filled up. and two others fall vacant in July and November.

No. the Council has followed the objn., all these names having been omitted from the published list, at its meeting of the 29th April.

8. I therefore Submit that the only way out of the difficulty is to direct the preparation of a fresh list altogether. It appears to me that there are Sufficient grounds for passing an order to this effect

effect under Section 37(1). The election rules have the force of law, and the Councillors have made default in the following particulars in Carrying out the duty imposed thereunder:

1. The persons appointed by the Council under Rule 6 have not delivered a list of persons entitled to be registered as Voters.
2. The list published by the Chairman was not a list Contemplated by Rule 6, but a list prepared by only one of the three persons appointed to draw it up.
3. The Council has failed to decide at the meeting the objection put forward under Rule 8 by M. R. Ry. Venkataramaier.

I

I therefore Submit that under Section 37(1) Government may order the Council within a fixed time to prepare a fresh list of electors in accordance with the rules.

9. I would invite special attention to the Conduct of the Chairman. He says he considered the Resolution of April 29th quite illegal; yet he failed to bring the matter to my notice until it was too late to interfere, the result being to render any alteration in the list selected by him impracticable.

10. Irregularities of a similar character occurred last year as will appear from the enclosed Copy of Collector's order dated 10th July 1896.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servant.

For. ag. Collector

20

of Voters' lists in the Mannargudi Municipality

Local and Municipal Department.

Current No. 2345 hi

FOR ORDERS.

M.R.Ry. Venkatarama Aiyar
,, Ponnuswami Mudaliyar
,, Srinivasa ,,

H

Under No.6 of the rules for the conduct of elections by the town as a whole, issued in G.O.No.1876 M. dated 8th December 1890, the Municipal Council of Mannargudi appointed the three marginally noted Municipal Councillors to draw up the list of voters and deliver the same to the Chairman by the 16th March 1897, the date sanctioned by Government in G.O.No.949 M. dated 24th July 1893. As these Councillors did not agree, two lists-one signed by Ven-katarama Aiyar and the other by Ponnu-swami Mudaliyar, were submitted to the Chairman, who published the latter list, ig-noring the one prepared by Venkatarama Aiyar. This Councillor thereupon petition-ed to the Collector complaining against the Chairman's action, which he represented to be illegal. The Chairman who was called upon by the Collector to report on the matter, stated that as there was no provi-sion in the election rules prescribing the procedure to be adopted by him when the persons appointed to draw up the lists failed to do so, he acted in the exercise of his discretion; but the Collector, while considering that the Chairman had exerci-sed his discretion badly, observed that the petitioner or any other persons aggrieved

I

remedy in an application under Rule 8 and that if they had not availed themselves of the same it was their own fault. The Government was also of opinion that the action of the Chairman was irregular and observed that as a list was duly published it was open to any objector to come in and point -out any error in it, - vide G.O.No.1427 M. dated 17th June 1897.

2. With reference to the list published by the Chairman as above referred to, two claims and an objection were received by the Chairman within the period specified in Rule 8, the latter emanating from M.R.Ry.Venkatarama Aiyar and taking exception to the inclusion of 135 names. A meeting of the Council under Rule 9 was held on the 29th April, at which it approved the list prepared by M.R.Ry. Ponnuswami Mudaliyar (and published by the Chairman unde Rule 7), except the persons mentioned by Venkatarama Aiyar" and appointed a sub-committee of three Councillors to report on the eligibility of these latter within a fortnight, observing that "on the council approving "such eligibility, such eligible persons "be added to the list under the sanction "of the Collector within one month from "this date." Two of the members of this Committtee recommended the insertion in the list of 68 of the persons objected to, while the other member was in favour of including 85 names. These two reports were received by the Chairman on the 25th and 14th May respectively, and he forwarded them to the Collector on the 26th idem. The Collector received these reports on the 27th May 1897 but as he found that the one month's time allowed by Rule 11 was to expire on the 29th, so that he had very little time to make enquiries and to amend the list, he deemed it better not to interfere "at all, than to make hasty alterations which could only partially set matters right."

He might perhaps have done what he did in the two days, but it was impossible to have dealt effectively with so many names in the time

3. In the meantime 99 persons applied to the Collector on the 13th May (ie) a fortnight after the date of the meeting of the Municipal Council held under Rule 9, stating that their names had been wrongly omitted from the published list of voters, and requesting him to order their inclusion under Rule 11. The Collector, however, was of opinion that the rules provided an obvious remedy to persons in their position by a claim under Rule 8 and that it was not expedient for him to interfere, except in the case of a person who had preferred a claim and had it dismissed, and he accordingly passed the following order on each of these petitions:-

"It does not appear that the petitioner has availed himself of the natural "remedy provided by the rules and applied "to the Chairman under rule 8 for enrolment in the list "of voters. Unless he has done so, the "undersigned will not interfere on his be-"half."

4. The Collector now points out that as a matter of fact none of these petitioners had put in claims under Rule 8, and states that as the published list of voters is the one selected by the Chairman and prepared by a single Councillor and as the Council has not passed any

orders against an objection lodged under Rule 8, to the inclusion therein of 155 names, it would be inexpedient to hold any elections on this incomplete list. He therefore suggests that the Government should interfere under section 37 of Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897, and order the Council to prepare, within a fixed time, a fresh list of electors in accordance with the rules, seeing that the Councillors have made default in the following particulars in carrying out the duty imposed on them by the Election Rules which have the force of law:—

"(1) The persons appointed by the Council under Rule 6 have not delivered a list of persons entitled to be registered as voters.

"(2) The list published by the Chairman was not a list contemplated by Rule 6, but a list prepared by only one of the three persons appointed to draw it up and

"(3) The Council has failed to decide at the meeting, the objection put forward under Rule 8 by M.R.Ry. Venkatarama Aiyar".

5. The question for consideration in this case is whether the circumstances above referred to are such as to justify the interference of Government in the manner suggested by the Collector. Subsection (1) of section 37 of the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897 lays down that "if at any time it appears to the "Governor in Council that a Municipal Council "or a Chairman has made default in performing any duty imposed by or under this "or any other Act, the Governor in Council may, "may by order in writing, fix a period for "the performance of such duty". The rules for the conduct of elections having been framed under subsection (1) of section 250 of Act IV of 1884, they have the force of law under subsection (3) of that section and the duties imposed by them may be considered to be "imposed by or under this act", within the meaning of subsection (1) of section 37. But do the irregularities noticed by the Collector constitute a default of any duty imposed upon the Council or the Chairman by or under the Election Rules?

6. Rule 6 of these rules lays down that "the Municipal Council shall appoint "persons to draw up the list of persons "entitled to vote. On or before such date "as shall be determined by the Municipal "Council, with the sanction of the Governor "in Council, such persons shall deliver to "the Chairman of the Council a list of all persons entitled to be registered as voters". and rule 7 says that "the Chairman shall cause a "copy of the list of electors to be fixed up "in conspicuous positions in the town, and "a copy shall be affixed outside the Municipal office, within 10 days of the date "determined in accordance with Rule 6 and shall "continue so affixed for two months". Rule 8 requires that "any person desiring that "his name shall be entered in the list of "persons entitled to vote may apply in "writing to the Chairman of the Council "within three weeks after the lists have "been affixed under the rule last preceding "(Rule 7), and any person objecting to the "entry of any name in the list may lodge "an objection thereto in writing with the

Chairman

"Chairman within the same period". Rule 9 laysdown that "such claims and objections, "if any, shall be decided at a meeting of "the Council to be held after the expiry "of the period mentioned in Rule 8 and "within 35 days of the date on which the "list is affixed to the Municipal office as directed in "Rule No.7", while Rule 11 authorizes the Collector to "direct the Chairman of the Municipal "Council at any time within one month after the meeting held under rule No.9 for reasons which he shall record in writing to insert in, or remove from, the list of electors the name of any person.

7. It will be seen that rule 6 imposes on the Council two duties viz. (1) determining with the sanction of Government a date for the delivery of the list of voters and (2) appointing persons to draw up the list, while under rule 7 the duty of publishing the list delivered to him devolves on the Chairman. The Council had already fixed the 16th of March as the date for the delivery of the list of voters - vide G.O.No. 949M, dated 24th July 1893, I and in 1897 appointed three persons to draw up the list for the year and to deliver it to the Chairman by the prescribed date. These persons delivered to the Chairman two lists instead of "a list" as required by Rule 6. The election rules not providing for a contingency like this, the Chairman selected one of these lists; and although as remarked by the Collector in his letter in G.O.No.1427 M. dated 17th June 1897, the Chairman did not exercise his discretion properly in making the selection, yet he did not fail in his duty to publish the list selected by him as required by Rule 7. Neither the Council nor the Chairman has thus made any default in performing the duties imposed by rules 6 & 7 in regard to the preparation and publication of the list and it does not therefore appear that the first two points mentioned by the Collector can warrant any interference on the part of Government under section 37. As regards the third point, viz., that the Council failed to decide the objection petition putforward by Venkatarama Aiyar, it is observed that at its meeting held on the 29th April 1897 under Rule 9, the Council had for disposal two claims and an objection petition, the latter of which was put in by Venkatarama Aiyar objecting to the inclusion in the list of 135 names. The Council resolved that the list prepared by Ponnuswami Mudaliyar (and already published by the Chairman under Rule 7), be approved "except the persons mentioned by "Venkatarama Aiyar". This resolution is tantamount to disallowing the two claims above referred to and admitting the objection of Venkatarama Aiyar. The Council also appointed a sub-committee to enquire and report on the eligibility of the persons thus excluded from the list within a fortnight from that date, in order that the Collector may be moved under Rule 11 to insert in the list, the names of such of them as are found to be eligible on the report of the sub-committee. Now the Council cannot be said to have failed to decide the objection of Venkatarama Aiyar On the other hand it allowed the objection and apparently in view of the fact that it did

did so without enquiry, appointed a sub-committee to fully investigate into the matter. The Council had no power under the rules to make any further alteration in the list and it therefore obviously thought that in case the investigation showed that any persons had been improperly excluded from the list it might have the defects remedied by an application to the Collector under Rule 11. The reports of the subcommittee were accordingly forwarded to the Collector by the Chairman, who did not place them before the Council, and they reached the Collector on the 27th May. As the period of one month within which the Collector can order any correction to be made in the list was to expire by the 29th May, the Collector says he had no time to make enquiries and so did not order any alterations to be made. The list of voters which was duly published under the rules has now become into operation under Rule 12 and its imperfection was not due to any default on the part of the Chairman or the Council to perform any duty imposed upon them by the rules. There is thus no ground for the interference of Government under section 37 of the Act. Even if the resolution of the Municipal Council dated the 29th April 1897 is not held to amount to a final disposal of the petition of Venkatarama Aiyar, thus resulting in the failure of the Council to perform the duty imposed on it by Rule 9, the Government can under section 37(1) of the Act order the performance of only that particular duty in respect of which default had been made viz: the disposal of the objection petition and cannot order the preparation of a fresh list as suggested by the Collector.

Nor does it appear that the Government can order the preparation of fresh lists under the Election Rules as no power has been reserved to Government to order the cancellation of a list once prepared even in cases in which there has been some irregularity in its preparation.

8. As observed by the Collector, it is undesirable that elections should be held on incomplete lists, such as the one now in force, and the only course which is open to Government is to order the Council to postpone the elections for the existing vacancies and for others that may occur in the meantime, until fresh lists are prepared (ie) until the end of May 1898.

9. The Collector invites the special attention of Government to the conduct of the Chairman, who although he knew the Council's resolution of the 29th April to be quite illegal, failed to bring the matter to his (Collector's) notice until it was too late to interfere. The Chairman's remissness in the matter is reprehensible and a similar delay was noticed in another connection in G.O. No.1608 M, dated 17th July 1897.

K

V.R
9/9/97 K.R.

I agree generally in the above. A case for Govt. intervention under Sec. 37(1) is not made out. Nor can we well postpone

Note Rule 15 of the election rules

Note

In the absence of any provision in the rules that a declaration that the preparation of the list will be stayed if the one put forward by the municipal Council must be held to have come into operation after the expiry of the period specified in Rule 12.

elections for vacancies until fresh lists are prepared next year. The few vacancies that may occur must be determined on the existing list, which by operation of law, came into force on the expiry of the period mentioned in Rule 12.

Voting lists will occasionally be incomplete.

As to the Chairman, who is appointed by election, ~~his~~ he has shown himself unfit for the post. If he goes on as he has been doing, it will become a question whether within the meaning of sec. 19(1)(iv) his continuance in office is not "likely to bring the municipal admn into contempt", & be a ground of his removal.

S.V.R. 16/9/17

I dont think Govt can interfere, but the moral is that fresh election rules should be provided so many hospitals should be prepared without further delay - I have over & over again pointed out that fresh rules were required & it was understood long ago that they should be prepared as soon as the amending Act was passed. They should be taken in hand as soon as possible.

HS

Note for the Secretary

A note on the subject is in the Press and will be put up in a couple of days.

NR 21/9/17

Apparently he is not a very wise man, but I dont quite see whether he has done what he should be so completely condemned.

HS
17/9/17

When given for copying
When copied 8/8 1940
When examined
When signed 7/10

189.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO								
PAPERS 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.