

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

Plague.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 7980

DATED 28-5-99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Plague Office.

Sanctioning the retention of the Apothecary at Mangalore, & informing the Colls of South Canara that orders on the question of distribution of charges incurred on account of the Apothecary will be passed in the Financial Department.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

PLAGUE COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE.

(1899)

CURRENT No. 1352

Progs.
Letter
Ref.

G.O. 1352, 4285, 4605
For order in para 2.

A proposal of Rs 1200 for the purchase of
drugs, including Rhotenic acid,
for the Dept. of Public Health,
under Impl. Officer has been submitted.

From

The Agent of
South Canara

G.O. 798 P. 1115 825-5-25

Current No. 336
2-8-88

The retention of the apothecary
at Mangalore is sanctioned.

2. Orders in para 2 of the Collis
letter will be deferred until the
passed in the 2nd Dept.

Dated 27th January 1899

Received 1-2-1899

Registered 1-2-1899

Enclosures -

Spare copies -

To the Colls of S. Canara
In 2nd Dept in continuation of
S.C. Ref. in Cuo 1352
17-4-88 2-5-88

206 The note flagged W explain
the delay in the disposal of this Ref
paper. S.C. Ref in Cuo 1352
17-4-88
& Ref in Cuo 4605 are still pending
in the 2nd Dept & para 2 of the
present current may also be
dealt with at the same time as these
references. Dated 20/5/88.

SUBJECT.

Pointing out that the budget
estimate of plague expenditure for 1899-1900
passed by Government contains
no provision for the pay of the
Apothecary doing duty as Port
Health Officer at Mangalore
requesting instructions with
reference to remit orders whether
a moiety of the same should
be contributed by the District
Board in future.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

1000. 23-11-98.

Plague

Department.

SOUTH CANARA COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

Current No. 336 of 88.
En

Camp, Mangalore

27th January 1899.

FROM

A. F. Pinky Esq.,

Collector of SOUTH CANARA,

To

THE

Plague Commission,
Madras

SIR,

With reference to G.O. No 1259,
dated 28th December 1898, I have
the honor to point out that the
budget estimate of plague expenditure
from Municipal funds as passed by
Government contains no provision for
the pay of the Apothecary who has
been doing the duties of the Port
Health Officer at the Port of Mangalore
since last year, though in the
budget sent from this office a sum
of Rs 450 being moiety of his pay for
9 months had been provided from
Municipal funds the other moiety

being shown under Local Funds.
No reason is assigned for this omission in the G.O., but there is reason to think that it might be simply due to an oversight since the Apothecary's post appears in the numerical list of establishment printed at page 24 of the G.O. However this may be, it will I think be necessary to continue the Apothecary even after the close of the current financial year as there is recrudescence of plague in Bombay with which Alangalore has constant communication by sea chiefly by means of Shephard's Steamers which ply twice a week between the two ports. I therefore request that you will be so good as to sanction the continuance of the Apothecary during next year also so long as it may be actually necessary. There is however no necessity for any fresh allotment of Funds as the Apothecary's pay

and allowances can be met from the total amount already sanctioned.
2. I would take this opportunity to request your opinion as to whether the present distribution of charge equally between the Municipality and the District Board is to be maintained any longer.
G.O. No. 7 dated 3rd January 1899.
Financial says that "the Government intend it unnecessary to maintain the order of April 1897 as regards the distribution of local charges in each District between the District Boards and the Municipalities in that District and directs that each Municipality shall bear its own charges". But my Treasury Deputy who is also the Municipal Chairman thinks that this G.O. is inapplicable to these

case on the ground that the distribution of the charge between the two local bodies was sanctioned in a special G.O. viz: 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898. I am inclined to doubt the correctness of this view since it appears to me that the aforesaid G.O. 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898 must have been based on G.O. No. 900 M. dated 13th April 1897 and since the principle therein laid down is as long to be followed, it is a question whether G.O. 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898 should not also cease to operate.

I have the honor to be
 Sir,
 your most Obedt Servant

D. J. [Signature]
 for Collector

28.7.98

This was submitted
 to the G.O. 85 P. A

one in the present case the distribution of the charge between the two local bodies was sanctioned in a special G.O. viz: 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898. I am inclined to doubt the correctness of this view since it appears to me that the aforesaid G.O. 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898 must have been based on G.O. No. 900 M. dated 13th April 1897 and since the principle therein laid down is as long to be followed, it is a question whether G.O. 85 P. this dated 25th February 1898 should not also cease to operate.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. 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.