

Number of pages 22
Date of receipt 16-11-18
Initials of Reference

M.R.O. 1-82,400-22-11-20

PL

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	225	Press Mis.
Dated	18-2	18/7/

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department,
18th February 1871.*

No. 75. Read the following letter from the Collector of Kurnool, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Kurnool, 31st January 1871, No. 21:—

With reference to paragraph 8 of Government Order, dated 11th January 1871, No. 39, Public Department, calling my attention to the remarks of the Superintendent-General of Vaccination regarding the greatest and most determined opposition to vaccination in the Kurnool district, I have the honour to inform you that it is my opinion that the small number of cases in this District is due to the arbitrary and forcible manner in which the late Superintendent, named Meer Mazar Ally, attempted

to carry on his work, which made vaccination so unpopular. I reported* the Superintendent, and was the means of getting him removed to another district. No

* Copy of my report forwarded,
No. 237, dated 29th March 1870,
with one enclosure.

exertions on my part have been wanting to encourage vaccination to the utmost of my power throughout the district, and I trust, now that we have another Superintendent, and an amended way of carrying on the work of the Department, the returns for the current year will show more advantageously to the credit of this district.

No. 76. ORDER THEREON, 18th February 1871, No. 225.

Communicated to the Inspector-General, Indian Medical Department.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General, Indian Medical Department.

No 20

Peapally
Deputy Magistrate's Office
25th March 1870

From

The Deputy Magistrate

To

of Peapally

P. A. N. Chace Esquire

Magistrate of Tirunelveli

En

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 186 dated 5th instant together with enclosure (herewith returned) and in reply beg to report as follows

2 From a careful perusal of the records of the two cases referred to, in the letter of the Superintendent General of Vaccination and also in that of the Vaccine Superintendent, forwarded by Endorement, I find that on the evening in question, the Vaccine Superintendent, the Police Inspector, the School Master and others, were seated on a pial in one of the streets of Pattikonda, the Police Inspector seeing the Defendant Chenna

Bill of 1871

PUBLIC.

To
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL,
INDIAN MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Dated February, 1871.

Recd.

G.O. 186 February 1871, No. 225.

FEBRUARY.

NO. 75-78.

Communicating letter from the Collector of Madras, forwarding explanation on certain points connected with vaccination in that district.

2. send Rous' son aged about 8 years, passing by, desired another lad aged about 13 years (of the natives) to go and bring him. This was done, but as soon as the Defendant's son discovered that some of the Vaccinators were there, he became greatly alarmed and ran away crying to his house and stated to his father that Vaccinators had attempted to seize him forcibly.

3. In the meantime the Vaccine Superintendent, Police Inspector and others walked out in the direction of the Defendant's house. The Defendant suddenly provoked at seeing his son crying and believing that force had been used towards him, came out, just whilst they were passing, and in accordance with a common practice amongst natives, without naming any particular individual, he abused the person that had molested, and frightened his child. Hereon a squabble took place and angry words were exchanged between the Vaccine Superintendent, and his

party and Defendant, but it would appear, there was neither assault nor abusive language, though the Prosecutor states that the Defendant abused him directly during the said squabble, but this statement has been contradicted by other witnesses.

4. A complaint was made by the Prosecutor, a Vaccinator, and after due enquiry, the Defendant was fined a rupee by the (Theristador) Sub-Magistrate.

5. The Defendant appealed to me from the Sub-Magistrate's decision, but as I am of opinion that although the crying and report of his child had provoked the Defendant, yet it was hasty on his part to have had recourse to abuse without fully enquiring what had occurred, and as he used abusive language in the presence of the parties whom he believed to have frightened his son and which evidently insulted them.

6 I can find nothing in the record of the case, that would show this to have been any more than a private quarrel between two parties and wholly unconnected with Departmental business nor does it appear that the Defendant and other gunastahs had conspired against the Department as stated in the 4th para of the Vaccine Superintendent's letter, nor even that the Vaccine Superintendent had brought forward this circumstance during the enquiry into both cases.

7 From para 5 of the Vaccine Superintendent's letter, it is clear, that highly improper language in court while the Sub-Magistrate was seated in a stage judicial proceedings passed between the Vaccine Superintendent and Defendant.

The Defendant preferred a complaint against the Vaccine Superintendent Dicer Dierga illi for insulting him in

open court, which was dismissed by the same Sub-Magistrate, on the ground that the words used by the Vaccine Superintendent do not constitute an offence under section 504 of the Indian Penal Code. Hence Dicer Dierga illi has no cause for complaint. It is indeed to be regretted that the Sub-Magistrate did not take notice of the contempt of the Court betrayed by the language of both parties.

9 In my opinion the language used by the Vaccine Superintendent would have afforded a reasonable or probable cause for a complaint against him.

10 It appears from the record that Karasinga Rao Gunastah was taking down the deposition in the case and more in the way of advice, he said to the Vaccine Superintendent "Why did not you lay a complaint?"

without really meaning any harm. But
however this was objectionable on his part
and I have warned him regarding his
future conduct.

11 The records of both the cases are
herewith forwarded together with my
decision in appeal and from it I
trust you will be satisfied that the
case had been the result of a private
dispute between the parties wholly
unconnected with official duty and
that there was no obstruction to, or inter-
ference in, the working of the Vaccine
Department.

12 The Defendant is a low paid
common Gunastah in the Saluk Cutchery
and is not in a position to influence
the people in any respect.

I have seen

(Signed) S. Srinivasiah

Deputy Magistrate

(True Copy)

J. C. Chak

Collector

General Collector's Office
29th March 1890
#237
Sams.

J. A. S. Chavasse
Collector of Sams.

The Superintendent General
of Vaccinations
Madras Presidency

Sir, In reply to your dated
1st March 1890 I have the
honour to bring the following
facts to your notice

2. Regarding the specific
case which happened at
Pattanam and for which a
copy of the Samsam Magi-
strate's letter dated 26th March
1890 is enclosed from which it is
very clear that there was
a private quarrel between
the Superintendent and
the Samsam and that
nothing like a conspiracy
against operations of the
Theam Department can
be shown.

3. The fault of the present
establishment rests with
the Superintendent who
has not been

1871 P. 240

Enclosure is
a letter of 21st date
31st January 1891
from the Collector
of Samsam

Ms. 21st Feb 1891
En 13. 1895

En 186 No 232 of 1891

hardy temper and also with
their vacillating behavior in
a more arbitrary manner.

4. Many cases of forcible
vaccinations have been
brought to my notice but
not having been officially
reported I have not paid
much attention to them
hoping that the estab-
lishment would soon find
that kind of behavior
was a far surer means
of introducing vaccination
than harshness.

5. The Officers of the
Revenue Department from
largely downwards have
used all their influence
they can to encourage
vaccinations and to en-
courage every village
they go to the advantages
to be gained by it and
most the Vaccine Estab-
lishment to act in a
similar conciliatory
manner the number of
operations would greatly

138.
6. One case I know of for
certain and that was at
Vetmuckla in the Pandol
Taluk where the Vaccinator
seized a child and forcibly
vaccinated it and in
consequence some villagers
rose against them and
assaulted them.

7. The Tahildar of
Skilthimla has brought
to notice that the
Vaccine Establishment
gives a fee of one anna and
eight paise. This has
also done at Poth but the
villagers would not for a
small sum undertake
the trouble of making small
complaints on account
of the distances they would
have to travel besides the
length of time which
must necessarily be
wasted in any enquiry
of the kind.

8. The idea of the
Superintendent is always
to introduce vaccination
forcibly and this is clearly

shown by the fact of his
wishing always to have
a constable in attendance
to spread fear among the
people."

I consider the present
system objectionable and
am about to address the
Board of Revenue on the
subject and to recommend
that there should be a
Vaccinator permanently
located in each Taluk for
reference to consulting with
a strong body of vaccinators
to portions of the District

10. At all events I con-
sider from the behaviour
of the present Superintendent
Messrs. Muggaralli and his
hasty and hot temper
that he is totally unfit
to conduct any operations
which as vaccination
require to be inter-
posed with kindness.

patience

patience and forbearance.

Shancoo
J. S. S. S. S.
Collector
Patna

J. C. S.
Collector

M. S.

No. 21

Barnard Collector Office

31st January 1871

J. H. C. Chase Esq.

Collector of Barnard.

The Chief Secretary

to Government

Fort Saint George.

With reference to, para 8 of Govern-
ment Order dated 11th January, 1871 No. 39
Public Department, calling my attention
to the remarks of Superintendent General
of Vaccination regarding the greatest and
most determined opposition to Vaccination
in the Barnard District, I have the honor
to inform you, that it is my opinion that
the small number of cases in this
District is due to the arbitrary and forcible
manner in which the late Superintendent
named Meer Dazar Ali, attempted to
carry on his work, which made Vaccina-
tion so unpopular. I reported the

x Copy of my
report forwarded.

No. 237 dated 29th Superintendent and was the means
March, 1870. with one
enclosure.

of getting him removed to another District.
No exertions on my part have been wanting
to encourage Vaccination, to the utmost
of my power throughout the District, and
I trust now that we have another Super-
intendent, and an amended way of
carrying on the work of the Department,
the returns for the current year will show
more advantageously to the credit of this
District.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most Obedt. Servt.

J. Crank
Collector.

M.R.

Case 112 January 1871 No 251

Little 1871 Department

From

The Collector
of
The King's Bench
to
Governor
of
London

Date 21st January 1871
No 112

No 232

(Enclosure 2)

Alphabetic list of
names and addresses
of persons connected
with vaccination
in the District
District.

18 Feb 1871 No 225.

Communicated to the Inspector
General Indian Medical Department.
: sent. L.H.

To the Inspector General
Indian Medical Department

Case 112
25/1/71

L.H.
25-76

Not in order.

Dept. of Health, New York.

Public

To The Sup. Genl. L. H. S.

18 Feb 171

Recd.

C. D. 18 Feb 171. 1871, No. 220

Vol. 75-76

Communicating a
letter from the Coll. of
Surgeons, affording
explanation on certain
points connected with
vaccination in that
Dist.