M.R.O. 1—32,000—16-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	915	Press Mss.
256 Dated	21-6-1920	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
21*st June* 1870.

No. 915.

No. 256.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

HOME DEPARTMENT.

Miscellaneous.

SIR,—In acknowledging the receipt of your letter, dated 13th May 1870, No. 2,349, I am directed to state that the term "Designation" was intended to signify the relationship in which each female stood to the head of the household, either as belonging to his family or in his service.

2. As, however, the term in question is open to mis-construction, I am to add that the words "position in family" will be substituted for it in the forms prepared for the next Census.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed) R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Home 1870 Department.

[ ]

From Government of

Fort St. George.

Dated 21st June. } *No. 915.*
R. } *Enclosures.*
6 spare copies.

D. No.
L. No.
Progs. { *D.* / *No.*

SUBMITTING explanation with reference to the term "Designation" used in the form for the enumeration of females in connection with the Census of 1871.

7 Pub Despts

21st June 1870.

Rev. Dept. (2)

No. 915

To

The Secretary to the Govt of India.

Home Dept.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter dated 13th May 1870, No. 2349, I am directed to state that the term "designation" was intended to signify the relationship in which each female stood to the head of the household either as belonging to his family or in his service.

2 Ofts.

The form is not put up - but this seems an equivocal term - Could we not substitute - "Relationship" "Position in family" or some better expression. N.

J. B. S.

2. As however the term in question is open to misconstruction I am to add that ~~in the occ~~ the words "position in family" will be substituted for it in the form prepared for the next census.

J. B.

E. C. Bayley

H. A.

25/5