

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4-8
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் _____
(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் _____

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

யோசு துறை

அரசாணை எண். <u>968</u> மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : <u>28-11-1889</u>	<u>1989</u>

மடிக்கலோ தண்டபடி கையாளலோ கூடாது.

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Public DEPARTMENT
G.O., dated 28. 11. 89
No. 968.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

Despatched Abstract.

Pallipatt Laxarettis.

Passing orders on ~~the~~ certain
proposals of ~~the~~ Collector of
Malabar regarding the ———.

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed

Many of the inmates who are not British subjects have been long in the Lazaretto, and were probably admitted by the Civil Surgeons of British Cochin without inquiry as to their nationality.

Latterly, I believe Dr. Evans (the late Civil Surgeon) has been refusing admittance to lepers, who are not British subjects, and in so doing, I think he was right.

I solicit the orders of Government as to whether lepers, who are subjects of Native States, should be admitted, and if so, whether the cost of their maintenance should not be contributed by the Native State to which they belong.

ORDER—dated 28th November 1889, No. 968, Public.

The Collector's proposal that he should be appointed an official visitor of the Palliport Lazaretto, and that all correspondence regarding the institution should pass through him, is approved.

2. The proposal that the Native States of Travancore and Cochin should be asked to contribute towards the Lazaretto will be considered when the general question of leper asylums comes under consideration. In the mean time preference should be given to those applicants for admission to the institution who are British subjects.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Malabar.

„ Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

„ Resident, Travancore and Cochin,
through the Political Department.

Palli

28TH NOVEMBER 1889, No. 968, PUBLIC.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From H. M. WINTERBOTHAM, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Calicut, 4th October 1889, No. 3204-P.

I have the honor to address the Government on the subject of the Lazaretto at Palliport, the history of which will be found in the following papers :—

1. Logan's collection of Treaties, Part I, page 131, and Part II, page 129.
2. Letter dated 30th November 1843, from the Collector of Malabar to the Chief Secretary to Government.
3. E.M.C., dated 29th March 1844, No. 105, Political.
4. Letter dated 24th July 1846, No. 20, from the Collector of Malabar to the Chief Secretary to Government.
5. E.M.C., dated 31st July 1846, No. 294, Political.
6. G.O., dated 20th " 1859, " 1103, Public.
7. " " 20th Jan. 1860, " 93 "
8. " " 27th March 1860, " 106 "
9. " " 14th April 1860, " 539 "
10. " " 11th March 1863, " 270, para. 8, Public.
11. " " 12th June 1863, " 658, Public.
12. " " 19th Oct. 1864, " 1176 "
13. " " 22nd April 1865, " 409 "
14. " " 26th July 1865, " 794 "
15. " " 22nd Nov. 1865, " 1203 "
16. " " 27th Feb. 1867, " 212 "
17. " " 8th March 1867, " 699 Public Works.
18. " " 16th Sept. 1867, " 2871 "
19. " " 15th Nov. 1867, " 3531 "
20. " " 8th March 1871, " 288, Public.

2. The annual budgets and reports of the Lazaretto do not pass through the Collector of Malabar, who is kept in complete ignorance of the resources and management of the institution.

3. The Lazaretto stands on the verge of the backwater, about 15 miles north of British Cochin, on a small plot of British ground surrounded by Cochin and Travancore territory.

I visited it last year, and from inquiries then instituted, I found that out of 34 resident lepers, no less than 22 were subjects of Travancore and Native Cochin, while the remaining 12 came from the British Cochin Municipality.

No Municipality or Native State contributes a rupee towards the cost of the institution.

4. I think it would be well that the Collector of Malabar should be appointed an official visitor of the Lazaretto, and that all correspondence regarding it should pass through him. In this opinion the Surgeon-General (Dr. Bidie) has expressed his concurrence.

5. I am not aware how Government provide funds for the institution, but it seems to me that its income, and thereby its sphere of usefulness as an asylum for incurable lepers, might be largely increased if the Native States contributed to the charges in proportion to the number of patients belonging to each.

It can hardly be right that the British Indian tax-payer should provide for the maintenance for life of the leper population of a Native State.

herewith also pass through
him way & approved
according to the returns sent in?
with the Surgeon's report for
1888 the expenditure on the
Lazaretto in that year was
Rs 3553; there were 24 beds in the
institution; the total number of
patients received was 41, the daily
average number 34.

12 Nov. 1889
14/11

The proposal to make the Collector
an official visitor should be approved
of course.
I think that it is not expedient
to make any change in regard to
the institution at present when the
general question of leper asylums
is under discussion; that in any
case the Govt expenditure on it
ought not to be curtailed and if
it is desirable, in consequence of
the decision arrived at on the general
question to extend the contributions
should be sought from Travancore
& Cochin only for that purpose.
Meanwhile it will suffice to direct
that applicants for admission who
are British subjects should have
preference.

14 Nov.

See. We may defer applying to
Travancore & Cochin for contribu-
tions till the general question
has been decided. But I don't
think there is any objection to
the Govt. not

H. S. M.

I agree with the Hon.
Secy for the Govt. but I
understand that it is
intended to ask the Hon.
Secy to the Govt.
when the general
question is settled
We shall get necessary
information from the
Govt. & will
of course want
C

C. 13/11
R. 15/11

C. 15/11

ers to be read in Proceedings:—

No

Again G.O., dated 188 , No.

Again G.O., dated 188 , No.

Current No. of 188 , dated from

Current No. of 188 , dated from

Order - 28/11/89, No. 968

The Hon. Secy proposed that he
should be appointed official visitor of the
Bellport Lazaretto, & that all
correspondence regarding the
institution should pass through him,
is approved

2 The Hon. Secy proposed that con-
sideration should be given to the
towards the Lazaretto will be
considered when the general
question of leper asylums comes
under consideration. In the mean-
time preference should be given to
those applicants for admission
who are British subjects
subjects (2 orders)

14 Nov. 26/11

The (order) of resolution 10/Sept/89.
1. With the Govt. of Travancore & Cochin
Res. Trav. Res. 10/Sept/89.
10/11/89.

made on a former occasion
X ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~made~~ ^{made}
and proved futile. A similar

though ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~the same~~ ^{the same} proposal
was made by the Asst Surgeon

1863
Darg in 1869, but the Govt. seems

not then to have thought it worth
while to make the application.

The Collector seems to think
that contributions can be
claimed from the Native States
as of right and that if they

did not choose to pay, the
benefits of the hospital shd
be withheld from the natives of
those States.

Submitted that it is not purely
from the unselfish motive of
affording solace to the

X Yes but only to Cochin.
I know one does not
seem to have been asked
to

See his report in G.O. 12-6-63
658

Travancore & Cochin may be
asked again if they will
contribute, if they will not
the Asst Surgeon at Cochin may be
directed to administer the

subject. But in that
case it w^d be
advisable to remove the
institution to some place
well within British territory

miseries of the wretched that a leper
hospital is established - the
very interested motive of snatching
healthy people from becoming
infected is a very strong one in
its institution. Hence the
Collector of Malabar cannot
exclude lepers of Native States
from the Lazaretto without
endangering the bodily
safety of British Indian
Subjects.

As for his the Collector being
^{appointed}
an Official Visitor, submitted
that he may be allowed to
do so.

If the institution is maintained
the Coll^r's proposal that he shd be
an Official Visitor and

and Dept

...saying, stating that the institution was cosmopolitan in its nature, and was not meant for ^{any} ~~some~~ particular sect or class, and that the

Cochin Govt: was maintaining at some cost an asylum of a similar character at Cochin itself.

On the appeal made to Govt: the Govt: remarked that the application of the ferry proceeds

for the purposes of the hospital was irregular, and directed its being credited thenceforward

to the Public Accounts and

question of the future referred the whole matter to ~~the whole matter to~~ ^{business of the hospital}

See Dewar's letters of 7-12-43 & 22-1-44 in the paper above quoted

* He did not say this - He speaks of an hospital ~~detached~~ ^{is} and ~~under~~ ^{was} ~~place~~ ^{place} apparently called a poor house &

E. M. C. 29 Jan 1844.

E. M. C. 20 Feb '44

E. M. C. 2 April 1844.

...maintained the ledger taking credit for the receipts from the ferry
In fo. 20-7-55 it was ordered that no person should be admitted into the ledger without a certificate from the As. Surg. at Cochin & that none but persons who had been admitted there should be admitted there
The ledger is under the supervision of the As. Surg. (fo. 2-7-57 no 1021)

fo. 27-2-67 no 212

DEPARTMENT.

...that a copy of the Govt: of India.

The Govt: of India directed its continuance on its former basis and placed the hospital under

the management of the Medical Officer at Cochin. Thus the

The history of the institution after that ^{may be} is disposed of in a

few words. It consisted of some reforms and improvements

in the matter of diet & clothing and a rebuilding of the hospital

on its original site after a long protracted correspondence

as to the best place where it should ~~may~~ be rebuilt.

Thus the application was proposed to be made to the

prooking.

The ferry funds continued thus to be applied to the support of the institution and supplies for its wants for some time. But the Revenue from this source diminished in process of time while the number of patients increased ~~and~~ ~~on a~~ ~~corresponding scale~~ In the year 1848

The amount derived from the ferry fell so much short of the demands of the hospital that the Collector then in charge was obliged to make an appeal to Govt.:

It is noteworthy that the Collector before making this

See letter above quoted

reference made an appeal to the Cochin State, exactly similar to the one which the Collector of Malabar now proposes. He wrote to the Resident pointing out that there were no of Cochin patients in the Palliput hospital and that it was but right that the Cochin State should contribute something towards the support of the hospital, where some of its subjects were being treated. The outcome of this application was that the Dewan denied that the Cochin Govt. was bound to

Note

Palliput Lazaretto.

Palliput was originally a Dutch Settlement, and during the time the Dutch held authority there they established an hospital for the relief and maintenance of all lepers without respecting nationality, and devoted the proceeds of a contiguous ferry for its upkeep. On the British occupation of Cochin the then Collector of Malabar made an order on his own responsibility without reference to Govt. for the maintenance

See Malabar Colln's letter
of 30 Nov 1843 in E.L.C. 20-2-44
2