

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper :—

G.O., dated 29th May 1895, Nos. 428, 429, Public.

Read—the following papers :—

Petition from M.R.Ry. A. TEYUNNI MENON, M.B. & C.M., Medical Practitioner, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated Palghat, 21st February 1895.

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH—That Your Excellency's petitioner respectfully begs to bring to the notice of Your Excellency in Council one of the great disadvantages under which qualified private medical practitioners are placed in respect of granting medical certificates to Government officials. The Government Order bearing on the subject states "that such certificates should be accepted from Government medical officers alone." Your Excellency's petitioner begs to submit that this order of the Government is not only not calculated to encourage qualified medical men to set up in private practice, which it is the declared policy and intention of the Government to foster and which the successive Governors of Madras in their addresses to medical students had been supporting strongly, but operates as a death blow to their success in practice.

It is mostly the educated portion of the population that resort to English treatment and the majority of them are Government officials. However willing they may be to place themselves under the treatment of duly-qualified private practitioners, they find it impossible to do so as their superiors invariably require the production of medical certificate of sickness from a Government medical officer before they will be granted any leave, and in some cases they are obliged, much against their wish, to place themselves under the treatment of Government medical officers though they be extremely anxious to be under the treatment of some other or better private practitioner. Thus it will be seen that there is equal disadvantage to the practitioners and the people.

A certificate granted by a hospital assistant or an apothecary is accepted if he is a Government servant; but that granted by a graduate in medicine of the University is not accepted if he be only a private practitioner. It need hardly be said that a medical graduate of the University is far superior to a hospital assistant in medical attainments and status, and yet the latter enjoys greater privileges than the former.

Your Excellency's petitioner may here be allowed to cite one of the many instances of hardship which have occurred in the course of his practice. A Government servant was under your petitioner's treatment. He had to undergo a somewhat difficult surgical operation under chloroform. He had taken his privilege leave; but as his disease was of a more serious nature than he had anticipated, he was obliged to remain under treatment longer than his leave would allow him. Your Excellency's petitioner gave him a certificate, which was returned to him (the patient) by his superior on the ground that it was not given by a Government medical officer and as such could not be accepted. Your petitioner then gave the patient another certificate detailing the nature of his disease and the operation he had undergone, and asked him to get it forwarded to the District Medical Officer at Calicut for countersignature (C.S.R.A. 903). But that officer was then absent from Calicut and the Assistant Surgeon who was in charge refused to countersign it. Eventually the patient had to get a certificate from a hospital assistant; and this was accepted by his superior. When the Government itself is desirous that the people should not look up to it for

employment, but that they should take to private enterprise, your petitioner is at a loss to see how the Government could have put such a barrier in the way of private but duly-qualified medical practitioners.

In conclusion, your petitioner begs that Your Excellency will be pleased to consider his petition favourably and direct that the privilege of granting medical certificates (of health or illness to Government servants) be given to private medical practitioners who have taken medical degrees, and thus afford them sufficient encouragement rather than obstruct their way to progress.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 14th March 1895, No. 264.

With reference to the petition of Dr. A. Teyunni Menon forwarded with your endorsement, dated 27th February 1895, and herewith returned, it appears to me that paragraph 903 of the Civil Service Regulations is clear enough. The countersignature of a certificate by the medical attendant by a Government medical officer is most important and has to be done even in the case of Government medical officers: *vide* G.O., No. 299, dated 3rd May 1892.

2. I am not aware what Government order the petitioner refers to; it does not appear in the rules published in G.O., No. 339, Public, dated 15th April 1889, as corrected by No. 237, Public, dated 27th March 1890.

3. If Government considers it desirable, I will refer the petition to the Assistant Surgeon, Malabar, for his explanation regarding his refusal to countersign the certificate referred to in paragraph 4 of the petition, but before doing so it would be better to get the number and date or a copy of the refusal.

Reference—dated 10th May 1895, No. 995.

It seems desirable to move the Government of India to pass a general rule that certificates of private practitioners of a certain standing may be recognized under Article 903, Civil Service Regulations, in the absence of reason to the contrary in any particular case. The Surgeon-General is requested to state what standing he would recommend. It should be such as would be applicable to the whole of India. With regard to the M.B. & C.M. degree, there can be no doubt but it is possible that the L.M.S. degree may not exist elsewhere or that there may not be one equivalent to it. This point should be noticed in the Surgeon-General's reply.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 17th May 1895, No. 170—Tour.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 995, of the 10th May 1895, I am of opinion that such certificates might be accepted from medical men—

- (a) holding any qualification registrable in Great Britain and Ireland;
- (b) holding the M.B. & C.M. of Indian or other Universities registrable in Great Britain or Ireland of not less than two years' standing as private practitioners;
- (c) Licentiates of Medicine and Surgery of an Indian University of not less than two years' standing as private practitioners;
- (d) pensioned Assistant-Surgeons, Military or Civil, and pensioned Civil Apothecaries (in Madras).

Certificates from these classes should only be accepted for a period not exceeding three months.

2. All such certificates would require countersignature under Article 903, Civil Service Regulations, and G.O., No. 299, Public, dated 3rd May 1892.

3. Certificates from medical practitioners of lower qualifications than those mentioned above or from dismissed Apothecaries or Assistant Surgeons should not be accepted except when submitted to cover short periods of absence from duty not exceeding ten days or the amount of casual leave due during the year.

Order—dated 29th May 1895, No. 428, Public.

The Government of India will be addressed.

2. The Government is of opinion that certificates granted by medical practitioners who have been dismissed from the service of Government should not be in any case accepted.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General.

Letter—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated 29th May 1895, No. 429, Public.

READ—also the following paper:—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Medical), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, the 5th July 1895, No. 464.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 429, Public, dated the 29th May 1895, on the subject of the acceptance and recognition of medical certificates granted to Government servants by private medical practitioners.

2. In reply I am to state, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, that Article 903 of the Civil Service Regulations, which provides for the acceptance of such certificates from "the applicant's medical attendant" if countersigned by a Presidency Surgeon or the Chief Medical Officer of the district, is not superseded by the ruling contained in the marginally-noted letter referred to by you which provides that medical certificates should ordinarily be accepted only from "Government medical officers who are

under Government control and supervision."

3. In these circumstances I am to say that it does not appear necessary to pass orders on the suggestions contained in paragraph 4 of your letter under reply.

ORDER—dated 26th July 1895, No. 630, Public.

The letter from the Government of India will be communicated to the Surgeon-General, the Departments of the Secretariat and all Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretariat, for information and guidance.

2. The Surgeon-General will be requested to communicate with Mr. A. Teyunni Menon.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General.

" Revenue Department.

" Public Works Department.

" Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretariat.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.
PUBLIC.

No. 3049 W of 27-11-94
2307 W of 12-9-94
1288 C of 20-3-94
746 C of 19-2-94
1559 W of 23-5-92
392 W of 8-2-92
Issued 1395 W of 23-5-89

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 26th July 1895, No. 630.

JULY.

Medical Certificates.

Communicating to the Surgeon-General, the Departments of the Secretariat and all Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretariat, for information and guidance, letter from the Government of India stating that Article 903 of the Civil Service Regulations, which provides for the acceptance of — granted to Government servants by private medical practitioners if countersigned by a Presidency Surgeon or the Chief Medical Officer of the district, is not superseded by the ruling that they should ordinarily be accepted only from "Government medical officers who are under Government control or supervision."

405.C

Recd: 16.8.95

No. 2180 W of 30 Aug: 1895

Communicated
to officers of the
P.W. Dept.
P.W. Dept.

L 770

Ch. E. for J. with 15C

Ch. E. for J. with 15C
Ch. E. for J. with 15C
Supdy. Engrs with 30 per cent
C.A. to Govt with 15C
S. J. W. P. Project with 15C
Engrs P.W. accAs with 15C
Engrs Ry accAs with 15C

025.311026/8 2.7/9

The Executive Engineer, Bellary District
Superintending Engineer III Circle, Bellary

With reference to your endorsement, No. 1084, dated 10th July 1895 on Chief Engineer Memo No. 2173 C dated 2nd Idene, I have the honour to reply as follows.

Combined Office for the Suptg: and Executive Engineers at Bellary.

The work was executed by Contract and paid for at tendered rates. The tender rates for the following items were in excess of those sanctioned as shown below.

	Rates as per	
	Estimate	Tenders
	Rs	Rs
(a) Coarsed rubble in chunam 16618	21	21
(b) Cor: Arch Work	22 to 24	50
(c) Flat Arch Work	18 to 20	25

These tender rates were recommended by Mr. C. J. Peters and were sanctioned by Mr. J. W. Martin, the then Suptg: Engineer in his No. 869 dated 20th June 1892.

The Estimate provided for foundations