

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10-20
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் _____
(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் _____

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொது துறை

அரசாணை எண். <u>883</u> மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள்: <u>5-11-1889</u>	1989

மடிக்கலோ கண்டபடி கையாளலோ கூடாது.

ORDINARY PRINTED

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. DATED 5. 11. 89

No. 883.

Recd
8 I 6/11

20-7-11

28-4-11

19-6-430

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

15/11

Despatched in print.



[Despatched Abstract.]

Medical

Sanctioning payment of Rs 5
to Mr. Tires, Civil Apothecary attached
to the Periyar Project Works, for holding
a post-mortem examination on the
body of a Travancore subject at the
request of the magistrate ^{Peariyar} ~~officiating~~;
stating that the Public Dept Proceedings
quoted do not apply to a medical
subordinate in the position of Mr. Tires;
and cancelling the Financial Dept
Proceedings quoted.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.
PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 5th Nov. 1889, No. 883.

NOVEMBER.

Medical.

Sanctioning payment of Rs. 5 to Mr. Pires, Civil Apothecary attached to the Periyar Project Works, for holding a *post-mortem* examination on the body of a Travancore subject at the request of the Magistrate, Peermad; stating that the Public Department Proceedings quoted do not apply to a medical subordinate in the position of Mr. Pires; and cancelling the Financial Department Proceedings quoted.

Miss Pires, No.

of 1889

Financial Department, No.

of 1889

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, 1889

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From G. BIDIE, Esq., M.B., C.I.E., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 14th October 1889, No. 256.

I have the honor to forward the accompanying letter, with its enclosure, from the Acting District Surgeon, Madura, and to request instructions as to whether a medical subordinate in the position of Civil Apothecary Pires is entitled to a fee for the performance of a *post-mortem* examination for judicial purposes on the body of a person, the subject of a Native State, and at the request of a Magistrate of that State.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. FERNANDEZ, Esq., Acting District Surgeon and Sanitary Officer, Madura, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Madura, 1st October 1889, No. 1179.

I have the honor to submit the following case for your decision.

2. In last July the Civil Apothecary attached to the Periyar Project Works was called upon by the Magistrate of Peermad to hold a *post-mortem* examination on the corpse of a Travancore subject. The Apothecary, after holding an examination, submitted a bill for Rs. 16, basing his claim under G.O., No. 570, of 19th July 1882, Public Department. This bill was referred to me by the Executive Engineer, Periyar Project Works, with a view to ascertain whether the charges were in consonance with the rules of the Medical Department. In my letters, No. 1023, dated

* Quarterly sheet of 1882, page 70.

19th August 1889, and No. 1087, dated 12th September 1889, I replied that the Government order* quoted by the Apothecary was not applicable to medical subordinates, and submitted that the Apothecary's charges for such work should be Rs. 5 agreeably to G.O., No. 1447,†

† *Vide* Quarterly sheets for 1873, page 161.

dated 8th October 1873, Financial Department. The Apothecary now contends (*vide* copy of his letter No. 270, dated 22nd September 1889, received under endorsement of the Executive Engineer enclosed), that the Government order quoted by me is not applicable to him as he is not a Municipal or Local Fund employé.

3. There is no definite ruling as to what should be the charges of a British medical subordinate for performing *post-mortem* examinations at the request of a foreign Government. I therefore submit this question for your orders.

ORDER—dated 5th November 1889, No. 883, Public.

Government Order, dated 19th July 1882, No. 570, Public, does not apply to a medical subordinate in the position of Mr. Pires. Payment to him of a fee of Rs. 5 in the special circumstances of the present case is sanctioned.

2. Government Order, dated 8th October 1873, No. 1447, Financial, should have been included among the orders cancelled by G.O., dated 12th August 1889, No. 1382, Judicial. It is hereby abrogated.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.
„ the Local and Municipal Department.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ all District Magistrates.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. W. H. French.

Subd. 8832
5th November/89.

The Collectors of

~~The District Magistrates of~~

Sept 16/11/89.

Anantapur. 8
North Arcot, Chittoor. 8
South Arcot, Cuddalore. 8
Bellary. 8
South Canara, Mangalore. 8
Chingleput, Saidapet. 8
Coimbatore. 8
Cuddapah. 8
Ganjam, Chatrapur. 8
Godavari, Cocanada. 8
Kistna, Masulipatam. 8
Kurnool. 8
~~Madras (when necessary).~~
Madura. 8
Malabar, Calicut. 10
Nilgiris, Ootacamund. 8
Nellore. 8
Salem. 8
Tanjore. 9
Tinnevely. 8
Trichinopoly. 8
Vizagapatam. 8

FOR ORDERS.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

Fr. the S. G. with Govt., No. 256, dated 14 Oct 1889

Order 5th November 1889 No 883.

G.O. 19 July 1882. No 570 Public does not apply to a med^l subordinate in the position of Mr. Pires. Payment ^{to him} of Rs. 5/ in the special civil of the present case is sanctioned.
2. G.O. 8 Oct 1873 No 1447 ^{Final} should have been included among the orders cancelled ^{Final} by G.O. 12 Aug 1889. No 1382. It is hereby abrogated.

From orders.

Alp 2 Nov.

Surgeon Genl. with the Govt. 6
Lt. Col. Capt. 6.
Sub. Capt. 1
All highest negotiators 11
Act General 8

Dec 1/18/89.

G.O. 883 Pub.
5. 11. 89

not a "Military Officer" within the definition of that term. Therefore G.O. 19 July 1882 No 570 Public does not apply.

From Dr. Balfour's Letter - 1st Oct 1873. No 371 in G.O. 8 Oct 1873. No 1447, it will be seen that med^l Subordinates are entitled to a fee of Rs. 5/ for making a post mortem exam. The apothecary in the present case w^{ld}; therefore, seem to be entitled to that fee, if the requisition had been made by a British Magt.

But it was not: it is, accordingly, submitted that no fee is payable fr. Govt. Funds. The applicⁿ emanates from a person who - so far as British India is concerned - is in the position of a private individual. Submitted that the apothecary should, therefore, be told to apply to the Travancore authorities for any fee to w^h he may be entitled under the rules.

Submitted that the order should issue in public.

Alp 24 Oct. 25 Oct.

G.O. 8 Oct 1873 ought to have been cancelled in G.O. 12 Aug 1889 No 1382. I have done so.

I would let the apoth^y draw the Rs 5 fee in this case, and say nothing about receiving it from Travancore.

U.S. 27 Oct.

I think the view of the M. Secy is strictly correct. but it is not worth while raising a question with Travancore about Rs 5.00 with the apothecary. I have told

No. 3805.

No. 6539

1889

Aug

Medical

DEPARTMENT.

From,

THE DISTRICT MEDICAL
AND SANITARY OFFICER,
MADURA.

To,

THE Secretary to the
Sargem-General mtd.
the Govt of Madras

No. 1179

Enclosure. (one)

Dated 14th } October 1889
Received }

Subject.

Forwarding copy of a letter
from Civil apothecary attached
to Perair Project works,
and submitting for order
the question regarding fees
for P. M. Examination to be
claimed by medl. officers for
such work at the request of a
foreign port.

It includes, and I intended it
to include, the certificate which
informs of the result.

Judl. DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 3805.

From

S. G. with Govt. No. 256.

Dated 14 Oct: 1889.

FOR ORDERS.

In Fm. Resolⁿ. 29 June 1882, No. 2018
the Govt of India declared that a medl.
officer, not being a Civil Surgeon or an
officer in medl. charge of a civil station,
shall be entitled to receive a fee of Rs. 16 for
conducting a postmortem or other examⁿ in
cases not falling within the ordinary dis-
charge of his duties.

In L.O. 12 Aug 1889, No. 1382 Judl. this Govt
has decided that medl. officers who are
public servants shall not receive any fee
from public revenues for giving certifi-
cates or evidence regarding any proce-
dure of public interest such as inquests or
enquiries into non-compoundable
offences.

The latter order does not seem to cover
post-mortem examⁿ, & if so, maybe put
on one side.

In the present case the Civil Apothecary
attached to the Perair Project works
claims a fee of Rs. 16, under the first L.O.
for making a post-mortem examⁿ of the
corpse of a Travancore subject at the
request of the Magt of Peermad.

It seems evident that a Civil apothecary
is not a medl. officer. For the definition
of warrant officer in art. 59 of the C.S.
Reg^s it will be seen that a senior apothecary
only ranks as a warrant officer, who is

not 3805 of 89

that the apothecary's charges for such work should be Rs 5, agreeably to G.O. No. 1447⁺ dated 8 October 1873 H. D. The apothecary now contends (vide copy of his letter No. 270 dated 22nd Sept. 89 received under endorsement of the Executive Engineer) that the G.O. quoted by me is not applicable to him as he is not a municipal or L. I. employee.

~~X. No. 1447~~
Quoted by
Meets for 1873
page 161.

3. There is no definite ruling as to what should be the charges of a British Medical Subordinate for performing Post-mortem examinations at the request of a foreign government. I therefore submit this question for your orders.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servt

J. R. Mander
Acting Distt Surgeon

Judicial (1889) No. 3805.
DEPARTMENT.

From G. Bidie Esq M.B., C.I.C.
THE SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George.

No. 256

Dated 14th October 1889.
Recd. 14
Regd. 15

CHIEF SECRETARY
No. 1400
GOVERNMENT OF

SUBJECT.

Requests instructions
as to whether a medical sub-
ordinate is entitled to a fee
for the performance of a
post mortem examination
for judicial purposes.

Order

~~The request is a request for
a fee for a post mortem
examination for judicial
purposes.~~

Order

It has been ruled in G.O. 12 Aug 89
No. 1382 that Medl officers are not entitled
to fees for public revenues for giving certificates
opinions or evidence regarding any proceeding of
public interest. In the case submitted by the
Sd. the Deputy Magistrate, therefore, no claim any
fee for public revenues. But as has been
provided out in G.O. 16 Oct. 89. No. 1473. The Govt. above
quoting do not allow medl officers for fees
for medical services rendered to private
individuals, and the Govt. therefore, considers
that Civil apothecary fees should be allowed to
claim a fee for the Travancore authorities.

*
Enclosed Sheet
of 1882 page 70.

No. 1179

27
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT MEDICAL
AND
SANITARY OFFICER, MADURA.
1st October 1889.

From,
THE DISTRICT MEDICAL AND SANITARY OFFICER,
MADURA.

To,

The Secretary to the Surgeon-General,
With the Government of Madras,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit the following case
for your decision.

2. In last July the Civil apothecary
attached to the Periar Propet Works was
called upon by the Magistrate of Permarad,
to hold a Post mortem examination on the
corpse of a Travancore subject. The apothecary
after holding an examination, submitted
a bill for Rs 16, basing his claim under G.O.
No. 570 of 19th July 1882, Public Department.
This bill was referred to me by the Executive
Engineer Periar Propet Works, with a view to
ascertain, whether the charges were in
consonance with the rules of the Medical
Department. In my letters No. 1023
and 1087 of 12.9.89, I reported that the G.O. quoted
by the apothecary was not applicable to
medical subordinates and submitted

Sign Lincas.

24-9-89. (Sd) H. S. Taylor
Ex. Engineer
(See ret'd)

(True copy)

H. S. Taylor
to Dist Surgeon

CP-300

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL

WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Fort St. George 14 October 1889.

No 256

From G. Bidie
THE SURGEON-GENERAL

Esq. Mr. B. C. J. E.
GENERAL WITH THE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

THE Chief

Secretary to Government

Judicial Department

I have the honor to forward the letter with its enclosure from the Acting District Surgeon Madras and to request instructions as to whether a medical subordinate in the position of Civil Apothecary is entitled to a fee for the performance of a post mortem examination for judicial purposes on the body of a person, the subject of a Native State, and at the request of a Magistrate of that State.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

G. Bidie M. B. C. J. E.

Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

Not-
NOTE FOR THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY.

Submitted for removal as
this L.B. is to issue from
"Public" - please see ^{at} end of
Mr. Canby's note.

bb
spe.

Canby

been

ho 270.

To

The Civil Apothecary
Periar Propet

To,

The Executive Engineer
ho I Periar Dr.

Station - Periar.

Dated 22nd Sept. 1889.

Despatched 23rd do.

Encs. one.

Sir,

In reply to your endorsement
2248 of 18.9.89, I beg to state that the fee of Rs 5
for Post mortem examination is incorrect. If the fee
quoted by me is not applicable to my case, I
submit that the fee quoted by the District Surgeon
in support of Rs 5 fee is equally so. The latter
refers only to medical Officers in Local Government
and Municipal employ and paid wholly or
partly by such funds. As I am not an employee
of the Government Surgeon and not paid by the
latter, I beg that the question of fee may
be referred to the Surgeon General with the fee of
Madras for Settlement.

I beg to remain

Sir
Your most obedient servant

By P. A. Periar

Civil Apothecary

ho 175. m.

Forwarded to the District Surgeon
The case seems to be to have been mistaken
It is simply as to what fee should be charged
by a British Medical Subordinate,
performing a Post-mortem examination
at the request of a Magistrate of