

Revenue (1898) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3

Dated 4th January

[Despatch Abstract.]

Vaccination

At, Bombay, subject to certain modifications,
Dr. Bauner's scheme for the better working of —
in rural tracts.

[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Department	Date
CW	1479/01		
	In no 540R of 16-3-97		
CW	2794/01		

CURRENT No.

No. 2947 Inio.

Dated 7th August 1897

Received

Registered.

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Returning to Govt papers re: the scheme submitted by the Sanitary Comm^{ee} for the more efficient carrying out of vaccination in rural parts, with the remark that the Bd. has no objection to the scheme, that the Bd. agrees with Govt in considering that a permanent advance should be given to vaccinators to enable them to pay on the spot for vaccine calves, that the report as to the no. of successful cases required from Village Heads is apt to be misleading and that themselves might verify the totals of cases vaccinated but cannot be expected to decide whether the operations are successful or not.

12.14/6

BACK PAPERS.


G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Read by Mr. A. A. ...
" also C.N. 6955 4/15/77

2,000
28-1-97.



110

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 7th August

1897.

No. 2947

Miscellaneous.

READ G.O. Revenue Department N^o: 3722 mis dated 19th July 1907.

Resolution

The Board sees no objection to the scheme set forth in the papers herewith submitted. It concurs with the Govt in considering that a permanent advance should be given to vaccinators to enable them to pay on the spot for vaccine calves. The Board would also point out that the report as to the no. of successful cases required from village heads in Horumak, appended to Mr. Bauman's report, is apt to be misleading. As already observed by Govt in Encl. N^o: 869 dated 18-10-92 printed at p. 2 of G.O. N^o: 33 L. dated 14 January 1893, Messrs might verify the totals of cases vaccinated, but they cannot be expected to decide whether the operations are successful or not.

(True Extract)

Reclan
Secretary

To Secretary to Govt R.D. with 8 enclosures.

26/8

Read again S.C. No 3722 dated 18-7-37
" also C.No 2955 of 1897. 12/11

Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

128

Read again

Read again S.C. No 3722 dated 18-7-37

.. also C.No 2955 of 1897.

Order thereon His No 3 dated 4th January, 1898.

The papers read above refer to a scheme drawn up by Surgeon Major Fannerman, the Inspector of Vaccination and applied by the Sanitary Commissioner for the more efficient carrying on of vaccination in rural tracts. In his letter No 538/7 dated 23 April 1897, Dr Fannerman proposes that, the village munsif should go round with the vaccinator both when he first visits the village to vaccinate and also when he visits it a second time to inspect the results and that he should send in a statement in a prescribed form to the Deputy Inspector of Vaccination on each occasion of the vaccinator's visit. The requirement that the village headman should accompany the vaccinator is very necessary, as the object is to ensure that the vaccinator does go round, but the form marked C proposed by Dr. Fannerman ostensibly imposed on the Village Munsif the duty of deciding whether the cases inspected on the second visit have proved successful or not and the Board points out in its Proceedings read above that this is not a duty which should be imposed upon Village Munsifs. Generally speaking the success of a vaccination is a matter for the inspection of the village headman, it is believed, might certify in the proposed form to the total number of successful operations without much risk of error. Government however considers that it will be sufficient if the village headman certifies to the number of cases believed by him to be successful. Form C should be modified accordingly.

With regard to the question of the grant of permanent advance to vaccinators, His Excellency the Governor in Council

reconsideration does not think it desirable to issue instructions about the grant of such advances for the purposes of - buying calves. The way in which calves should be provided and payment made for them or for the hire of them should be left to District Boards

Subject to these modifications, Dr Fannerman's scheme for the better working of vaccination in rural tracts is approved

The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, will modify para 2 (new edition) in the sense of para 1 of this order.

(Ad) C. S. Foulds
Apr 20/97
to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue
Local and Municipal Department

140/3

The Hon. Mr. Grose C.P.
The Hon. Mr. Henry Bliss K.C.P.E.

19/1/97

For "should at" I shd say
"cannot". It wd be absurd
to assume that they are
capable. Deciding, & perhaps
the former words might lead the
outside world to think that the
point had been a matter of
words with the Govt. The repeated
modif. w? be safer?

8/2/97
The Secy & Mr. for favours
of Chamberlains

19/1/97

It has been a matter of
consideration. In the note
put up with GO 3/22. I only
objected what part of the
scheme w? said calves were
bought for 3 cheppes. I
thought Vaccin has no 1/97
have no part in it 20/1/97

Read again Note
" also C.N. 6955 of 19/1/97

Read again for 3/22
also C.N. 6955 of 9/1/97

The Govt. agrees
with the Board in consider-
ing that the duty of de-
ciding whether the cases
vaccinated have proved
successful or not, ^{can} ~~should~~
not be imposed on the
village munsiffs. Subject
to the grant of permanent advance to Vaccinators,
to this modification, Dr
Bannerman's scheme for
the better working of vac-
cination in rural tracts
is approved.

1/1/97

The L & M Dept.
" Board (Land Rev)

The question as
to the amount of permanent
advance to Vaccinators will be
considered in the L & M Dep

22.4.2-98

consideration does not think it desirable to issue instruc-

tions

in regard to reporting successful cases. I said: "It won't add much

work to the work of the Village Heads if they say how many cases have been successful. It is a mere matter for eye-inspection. No diagnosis is required." As, if a man were used to this effect, they will be in contravention of a previous order of Govt. the papers must go to another number. The Draft G.O. seems to have been drawn up carelessly

JG
4/9/97

The Hon. Secy H. Bliss

Due to a misapprehension of the H.M.'s meaning which is much regretted

8/9/97

The Hon. Secy H. Bliss K.C.S.E.
The Hon. Secy H. Bliss K.C.S.E.

The Hon. Secy H. Bliss K.C.S.E.

H.E. the Governor

Lager the the H?
the the 1893

10/7/97

Dr. Bannerman proposes, in his letter V. of the 26th April 1897 that for the purpose of checking the work of the Vaccinator should forward with the

Calculate accordingly
8/11/97

+ Village Headman should go round to him before when he first comes to the village to vaccinate, also when he comes a second time to the village to inspect the results of his vaccinations; and that the village headman should send in a copy

Note

Read again in "..."
" also C. 112 6955 of 1897

For orders

In his scheme for the better working of vaccination in rural tracts forwarded with the Sanitary Commissioner's support, Dr. Bannerman the Inspector of vaccination and the Dy. Sanitary Commissioner for Madras, has provided that village munsiffs are to intimate to the Dy. Inspector of vaccination of the circle concerned the number of successful operations on each occasion of a vaccinator's visit to the villages. The L. & M. Dept pointed out that under G.O. No. 33L dated 14th January 1893 village munsiffs are only required to verify the total number of operations in their villages. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose approved of the scheme subject to the grant of a small permanent advance to vaccinators to buy calves and desired that, before the scheme was introduced into all the districts, the Board should be asked whether it saw any objection to it. In regard to the imposing on village munsiffs the duty of deciding whether the operations have been successful or not, the Hon'ble Member observed "It won't add much work to the work of the village heads if they send how many cases have been successful. It is a mere matter of eye inspection. No diagnosis is required." Owing to a misapprehension of the Hon'ble Member's meaning, the purport of his

On

his observations regarding the responsibility of village munsiffs was not embodied in the G.O. referring the scheme for the Board's remarks. The Board is in favour of the scheme generally, but is opposed to making village munsiffs decide whether the operations are successful or not. As the adoption of the Hon. Member's views will be in contravention of the G.O. quoted above, and in accordance with the Hon. Mr. Grose's orders, the papers are circulated to the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss K.C.I.E.

8/9/97

Presented to the Village Headmen
The statement of the Village Headmen would, under this arrangement have the Vaccinator with him on the occasion of the second visit, it is not with the former, but with the latter, to decide whether or not the vaccination is successful. The object of the Hon. Village Headmen going round the second time with the Vaccinator is understood, mainly to see that the Vaccinator does his work. This object seems to me a reasonable one. I therefore agree with the Hon. Member's proposal, that the Village Headmen should go round the second time.

Perhaps if the last words of Form C were added "were believed the successful", - some of the Hon. Member's ground of objection would disappear.
A.H. 4.10.97

Draft and minutes to Sir H.B.
8/9/97

ax.
8/9/97

The

REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Letter Office Note No 23.

OFFICE NOTE No. 94.

Station Ooty. date 15th Oct. 1897.



From The Secretary to Govt. Rev. Dept.
To The Secy. to Govt. Local & Munl. Department.

In forwarding the accompanying file of papers relative to the introduction of a scheme for the more efficient carrying out of vaccination in rural tracts the undersigned has the honour to enquire whether the Local & Municipal Department has any remarks to offer with reference to the Hon.^{ble} Sir Henry Bliss' remarks dated the 13th instant.

K. Marjambur
19-10-97
For Secy. to Govt.
Please see the accompanying note
V. Rajaram
for Secy to Govt.
6-11-97

*I have
seen
the
note
but
have
not
sent
it
yet
as
the
note
is
not
in
the
file*



Note

The permanent advances proposed to be granted to Vaccinators have to be from Local Funds as the entire cost is payable to those for whom the vaccination is conducted. In some of the districts in which vaccination with fresh lymph is conducted, such advances have already been sanctioned by Government, as will be seen from the G.Os. noted in the margin; and as under clause (6) of para. 1 of G.O. No. dated 17th May 1894, district Boards are permitted to grant such advances without reference to Government, it is probable that these advances have been made in many more districts during recent years. As the advances will be adjusted from time to time by the submission of contingent bills accompanied by vouchers, and as the Local Fund account and Audit Departments will doubtless see that the total expenditure on vaccination does not exceed the budget allotment, there appears to be no need either to consult the district Boards or to get an estimate prepared of the amount required for the grant of such advances. From the G.Os. noted in the margin above, it will be seen that permanent advances have been, so far as is known, granted to Deputy Inspectors of vaccination and not to Vaccinators. The former have of course to make petty advances again to the latter, to enable them to procure calves for inoculation, but the district Board holds the Deputy Inspectors responsible for the proper expenditure of the money.

On

requiring in the Chingleput district, appears that calves for inoculation are purchased by the vaccinators, but village headmen are required to procure calves on hire at the rate of two Rs per diem, the care and feeding of the animals until they are returned to the owner being undertaken by the vaccinators themselves. are provided with a watchman on Rs.5 per mensem for the purpose. When the supply of lymph in a calf is exhausted, it is restored to the owner through the village headman, the hire due for the period during which the animal was retained being paid to the headman and a receipt being obtained from him in evidence of such payment. The system of purchasing calves and selling them when no longer required will, it is thought, be a costly one and is not in force in Chingleput and it is said that no difficulty has been experienced in procuring calves for hire. The hire system is probably in force in other districts also, and its adoption in the districts in which it is not, may be recommended as it is preferable to the purchase and subsequent sale of the calves - an arrangement which will be more costly and give scope for fraud.

The exclusive use of preserved lymph will of course be most convenient, especially as all local Boards have lately been authorized to obtain their supply of lymph from the Mysore Government Vaccine Institute at Bangalore. But it is for consideration whether the use of fresh lymph, which as will be seen from para.8 of G.O.No.1657 L, dated 30th August

1897

REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Letter Office No. 23.

OFFICE NOTE No. 94.

Station Ooty. date 15th Oct. 1897.

From The Secretary to Govt. Rev. Dept.
To The Secy. to Govt. Local & Munl. Department.

In forwarding the accompanying file of papers relative to the introduction of a scheme for the more efficient carrying out of vaccination in rural tracts the undersigned has the honour to enquire whether the Local and Municipal Department has any remarks to offer with reference to the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss' remarks dated the 13th instant.

Mr. Major J. B. B. B.

For Secy. to Govt.

Please see the accompanying note

V. Raghavaiah
for Secy to Govt.

6-11-97

The Hon: Sir Henry Bliss K.C.S.I.
The Secy.

Note

1897, obtains the highest percentage of success, may be practically prohibited.

*1897
31/1/97*

The above note states the facts.

(It seems a very anomalous arrangement which places the direct administration of vaccination under the L. & M. Dept. while at the same time the Rev. Dept. issues orders on the same subject. In reviewing the annual Vaccination Report lately I found that some G.O.s relating to vaccination of fundamental importance had never been communicated to this Dept. at all. It might be said I think be an advantage if the subject were dealt with in one dept, the other dept being of course consulted.)

G.O. No 3819 Res 24/9/96
No 3888 - 30/9/96
No 4261 - 2/10/96
(skipped with G.O. 1934 & 2671097 - Ray K)

How has it come about that these orders were not coming?

This is not the first time that the L. & M. Dept. has had cause to complain! Vaccination orders appearing to have been issued by the R.D. without communication with it.

157/1/97

The Hon: Sri Henry Bliss K.C.E.
The Hon: Mr. Rose C.J.E.

Note

flagged Z

I should say it most certainly the G.O.
I don't know whether it may approve
it, but I object for obvious reasons.
H.K.

I should be left, I think, at the R.D. to
to adopt within the hire or the purchase
system. My preference is for the hire system
as far as vaccination is concerned,
but the latter will necessitate larger
permanent advances & in my opinion offer
greater inducement to parents.
H.K.

In my view, in a case of this kind,
the R.D. should discuss it and
its own subordinates only & should
report the L. & H. Dept. to issue
orders to its subordinates. Thus we
shall have no confusion. But of course
the R.D. should not issue any orders at all
in 2nd instance without reference to
the L. & H. Dept. So far as I can make out
this is what it was actually intended to
do in this case!
H.K.

C. 13/11/97
R. 17/11/97

With reference to the
Hon: Sri Henry Bliss's remarks
below (flagged A), the accompanying
office note from the local and
Municipal sep.^{ts} is submitted.

2. It is presumed that with
reference to the remarks therein
the question of granting permanent
advances to vaccinators need
not be raised in the G.O. ob-
3. Orders are requested as to
whether a para may not be
added in the G.O. ^{suggesting to} recommending

the "hire system" Local Boards the
adopting of the "hire system".
4. With reference to the
remarks of the local and
Municipal Sep. orders are also
requested as to whether the
G.O. should not issue in
the local and Municipal
Dept. seeing that it deals
with all other questions in
regard to vaccination.

K.D.
12/11/97

The hire system can not be suggested

... seems to have been to ...
... in his book ...
... local board ...

in adoption by Local Boards because
the people in many districts e.g.
Salun want fine thin calves and
live for the purpose. It is not
cheaper than the system of buying
& selling again for their live &
calf will be about 312. whereas
the difference between the ~~system~~
buying and selling price is only
2 Rs or 2-8-0. Any of these
systems must be worked, and
for permanent advances to the
D. & L. Dept. from Local Funds.
There seems to be no objection to
advances relating to Vaccination
issuing in the L. & M. Dept. but
advances improving other duties on
the village establishments or
modifying in any way the Dept.
the issue of units for in the
Revenue Dept.

12/11/97

His for up with, I should say

The draft order talks of permit to
vaccinators - how the local boards
of their grant to the Dept. which is
relevant? For my part, I should
think it would be very risky to give
permit advances to vaccinators; and
in any case before order issued to
grant permit advances from Local Funds
to anyone, I think we should have
precise rules as to what is to be
done with them & how they are to be
accounted for.

15/11/97

Mr. The Draft G.O. says, "If
Bannerman's scheme is approved,
subject to the grant of perma-
nent advances to vaccinators
& modifications in one other
matter. This alludes to the order
in the Rev. Dept. in which it is stated
that Govt. considers that vacci-
nators may be allowed a perma-
nent advance to buy calves, & asks the
RD its opinion about this matter.
The RD agreed, but the
Hon. Sir H. B. does not. His last
office note suggests that the question

of granting permanent advances for
vaccination should not be done
in the R.O. The Hon. Sir H. B.
B. has the best of it, as he says
to it "for obvious reasons". I
think it will be best to leave
it in this way: "One recommendation
Govt. does not think it desirable
to issue instructions about per-
manent advances to vac-
cinators to buy calves. The
way in which calves are to be pro-
vided, & they or their hire
paid for will be left to District
Boards."

H. I agree. The additional
order which I have sug-
gested provides for this.

O. I don't think the Rev.
Dept. should be directed to issue
orders to its subordinates and
the L. & M. Dept. to its
subordinates. Subordinates
in the Rev. Dept. are of course
also subordinates in the L.
& M. Dept. A collector, for
instance, is President of
the District Bd of his district.
He may, however, be directed
that all orders relating to
subject which is managed by a
particular Dept. of Govt. should
issue in that Dept. Order
about Vaccination should issue
in the L. & M. Dept. The Hon.
Sir H. B. seems to have been
mistaken in his belief that local boards

27

C. No. 6985.

From

Dated

189

FOR ORDERS.

The accompanying papers relating to the scheme for improving the working of the Vaccination Department are resubmitted to the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss with reference to the remarks of the Hon'ble Mr. Grose on pages flagged B & C.

2. The scheme proposes that the work of the vaccinator should be checked by the village munsiff by requiring the latter to go round with the vaccinator when he first visits the village to vaccinate and also when he visits it a second time to inspect the results. This scheme has met with the approval of Government.

3. The first point on which there has been a difference of opinion is whether the village munsiff should decide whether the vaccinations are successful or not. On this point the Hon'ble Mr. Grose agrees; but the Board of Revenue stated that munsiffs might verify the totals of cases vaccinated but that they could not be expected

consideration under
the L. & M. Dept. The scheme
was forwarded to the Rev. Dept.
the L. & M. Dept. on 20th 660
11.6.97
The order was asked the B.D.'s
opinion about it was sent to
the L. & M. Sec. for counter signature
The first draft of the G.O.
now under consideration
was sent to the Sec. L. & M.
Dept. for counter signature
& to the Hon. Mr. L. B. for
consideration. The whole
file was again sent for
remarks of the Rev. Dept.
to the L. & M. Dept. on 19.10.97
P. As I have said, permanent
advances to Vaccination
or Dep. Insp. of Vaccination
should not be ordered in the G.O.
The Hon. Mr. L. B. has re-
commended, in this & other
places, that rules should be issued
as to the recovery of permanent
advances, & as to the feeding
& sale of calves. The cost of
calves is, however, not small, &
that of feeding very trifling.
It would be undesirable to lay
down cast iron rules for
the whole Presidency, & these
matters had better be left to
the B.Ds.

JG
17/11/97

P.C. 17/11/97.
R. 2/11/97

no. 1111/97
Ch. 1111/97

to decide whether the operations were successful or not. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss (flagged D) agreed with the board. When the papers went round to L.E. he pointed out that if the last words of Form C were worded "were believed to be successful" some of Sir Henry Bliss's grounds of objection would disappear. A draft order was accordingly prepared and circulated to the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss. He, however, does not appear to raise any objection to the proposed alteration as he says nothing on the subject. It may be presumed that the proposed alteration is approved?

The second point on which there is a difference of opinion is the question of "Permanent Advances" to vaccinators. Mr. Kannerman stated that in districts where some form of reserved vaccine was not in use it is necessary that means of payment for the calves should be introduced for this purpose he prepared certain ^{cheque} forms. He pointed out however, that it might be objected that many villagers are situated at a considerable distance from the treasury and that difficulty might be experienced in obtaining payment. The board of revenue also agreed that this was a difficulty and stated that permanent advances should be given to vaccinators

FOR ORDERS.

Flagged D on the back of the sheet

Flag A

Yes
8/7.

Flagged A

Flagged B

to enable them to pay on the spot for the vaccine calves. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss objected to the draft order as being imperfect on the ground that it said nothing about the vaccinators having permanent advances. He considered that the system of giving advances would lead to fraud and that before orders issued information should be obtained as to the districts in which permanent advances were needed and as to the amount of money required. The question was then referred to the L. & M. Dept. for information. That Dept. stated that in some districts permanent advances had already been sanctioned by Govt., that in others District Boards were permitted to grant such advances without reference to Govt., that such advances were adjusted from time to time by the submission of contingent bills, ^{and} the Audit Dept. would see that the total expenditure on vaccination did not exceed the budget allotment ^{and} that it was therefore unnecessary either to consult the District Boards or to get an estimate prepared of the amount required for the grant of such advances. The note in the L. & M. Dept. also brought to notice the system of hiring calves for inoculation. It was thought that the question of granting advances for purchasing calves or of hiring calves was one for settlement by the local board.

concerned and it was under this impression that it was proposed in the note flagged ^{in the draft order} that no reference need be made to the question of granting permanent advances to vaccinators. The Hon. Sir Henry Bliss observes that the question must most certainly be raised. The Hon. Mr. Grose proposes the following arrangement. He observes "I think it will be best ^{to} notice ^{it} in this way on reconsideration Government does not consider it desirable to issue instructions about granting permanent advances to vaccinators to buy calves. The way in which calves should be provided and they and their hire paid for will be left to District Boards." For orders as to whether the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss agrees to orders being issued in this sense.

6. The next point on which orders are required is the Dept. in which the proposed order should issue. The L. & M. Secretary stated that it was a very anomalous arrangement which placed the direct administration of vaccination under the L. & M. Dept. while at the same time the Rev. Dept. issued orders on the same subject. He suggested that it would be an advantage if the subject were dealt with in one Dept. the other Dept. being of course consulted. Orders ^{were} therefore requested as to whether the G.O. should not issue in the L. & M. Dept. as that Dept.

It is presumed the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss will accept this.
8/12

flagged &

Dept. dealt with all other question with regard to vaccination. The Hon. Sir Henry Bliss has not accepted the recommendation. He observes that the Revenue Dept. should issue its orders to its own subordinates only and should request the L. & M. Dept. to issue orders to its subordinates. The Hon. Mr. Grose does not accept this course, as subordinates in the Revenue Dept. are often also subordinates in the L. & M. Dept. for example, a Collector being also President of the District Board of his district. He is for issuing orders on vaccination in the L. & M. Dept. Orders are requested as to the course to be followed. If orders are to be issued in the Rev. Dept. it is presumed that it should be confined only

- (1) to requiring the Tahsildar to send intimation to the village Munsif of the visits of the vaccinators to the several villages,
 - (2) to requiring village heads to go round with the vaccinator, and
 - (3) to submit a report on the work of the vaccinator in the village.
- Orders about permanent advances, and the hiring system ^{if} ~~have to be~~ issued Govt. will be dealt with in the L. & M. Dept.

6. In the L. & M. note flagged & it was pointed out that some G.Os. relating to vaccination of fundamental importance.

importance ^{had} never been communicated
 that Dept. at all. The Hon. Sir Henry
 ss inquires how this has come about.
 the three orders referred to on the
 margin of the note, only concerns vacci-
 nation. (vide G.O. 3519 d/ 24-9-96). A
 copy of this should have gone to the
 Dept. The omission is regretted.
 second order 3899 d/ 24-10-96
 proposed to revise the village registers
 births and deaths ^{in the rural tracts} and did not con-
 sider vaccination. The third order 4281
 d/ 29-10-96 merely recorded a formal
 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.
 It was not a matter of any importance.
 Orders are requested on the
 several points raised in the above
 note before the draft order is revised.

Of course
 S/L

But it is analogous, as the
 L.H. D. be acquainted with
 all orders on vital statistics.
 Moreover the ^{of} entering date of vaccination
 the registers was raised.
 It is not the ^{of} whether it is
 of importance. It settled a point
 raised in the No. of 24-9-96.
 S/L

KO
 24/11/97

H.M.

Please see the revised
 draft (marked A) below. I
 have revised it so as
 to remove all controversial
 points & at the same time
 include the conclusions
 which all H.M.s have
 agreed.

The question of raised
 the Hon. Sir H. Ellis of the
 Departmental disposal of
 vaccination questions may be

H.M.

I approve of the
 revised draft.

S/L
 21/12/97

Print order
 on separate
 sheet. Please
 send only copy of
 the order to the
 Press.
 24/1/98

separately taken up. I
 have looked into it again
 in this Dept. but there
 are several points of
 difficulty. ~~Since~~ the
 draft is now revised,
 avoids the any dictation as
 permanent advances,
 & may issue without com-
 mitting the Govt. on the
 departmental question.

It is therefore submitted
 that the draft may issue
 as revised without further
 circulation.

S/L 15/12/97

Issue the draft as approved
 by the H.M.

S/L 3/1/98

Read again G.O. No. 3722 dated 19-
also C.No. 6955 of 1897.

N^o 3 of 4th Jan. 1898.
G.O.

The Hon. Sir Henry Bliss K.C.J.E.

This order won't do much
if any harm; but it seems
to be imperfect, just says
nothing about the vaccinators
having permits advanced. As the
R.D. has decided that they
are to have them, I suppose they
will find the money for them. I
have (in fact) & it seems
to me that we can't well require
of R.D. to provide money without
getting them getting some sort
of estimate prepared of the sum
required. Apparently the permits
as issued won't be required in all
districts. I should say, however, if
an order is issued, we ought to ascertain
in what districts & to what extent the
permits advanced will be needed.
Also, if the vaccinators are to buy
calves, some arrangements must
be made for feeding them while retained
& for selling them when no longer re-
quired. How is all this to be done?
I'm the Rev. Sec. thinks that we
might depend entirely on private
enterprise - I quite agree, for I think this
system of granting permits advanced
of buying calves will run into
a deal of money & will be a
futile incentive to fraud.

RS
13/10/97

But the Board will be read
above & it is not that the duty
which the former (Rev. Sec.) proposed
by the Board of Vaccination, proposed a
to R.D. the duty of deciding whether
to issue or not - & as the R.D. points out in his read above that

The papers (read above refer
scheme ^{drawn up} ~~proposed~~ by the Sanitary Com-
missioner for the more efficient carrying
of vaccination in rural tracts. In his
letter No. 538/V dated 26th April 1897
forms an enclosure to the Sanitary Com-
missioner's letter Dr. Bannerman proposes
for the purpose of checking the work
of the vaccinators, the village munsiff should
go round with ^{the vaccinators} both when he first visits
the village to vaccinate and also when
visits it a second time to inspect the
results of his vaccination, and that he
should send in a statement in the pre-
scribed form ^{to the Dy. Vaccinator} on each
occasion of the vaccinator's visit.
The requirement that the village headman
should accompany the vaccinator is
very necessary, as the object
is to ensure that the vaccinator
does go round.

on the second visit
has been neglected, have
the R.D. points out in his read above that

speaking the success of a vaccine is a
for eye inspection, ~~and~~ ~~being~~

~~the success of a vaccine is a~~
~~for eye inspection, and being~~
~~the success of a vaccine is a~~
~~for eye inspection, and being~~
have been successful or not. They

therefore seem to be no objection to

and ~~it is believed, might~~
the village headmen, ~~certify~~ to the

number of successful operations, Govt.

~~consider that it will be sufficient~~
~~itself for the present, with requir-~~

~~if the~~
village headman ~~certifies~~ to the

number of cases believed by him to be suc-

cessful. Form C should be modified accord-

ingly. ~~Subject to the question of~~

the

nt of permanent advance to vaccinators,

Bannerman's scheme for the better work-

ing of vaccination in rural tracts is ap-

proved.

The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue,

will modify para 2 of S.O. No. 203 (new edition)

in the sense of para 1 of this order.

in the proposed form
without much risk of error.

N. Line
The Govt. on reconsideration
do not think it desirable to
issue instructions about the
grant of such advances for the
purpose of buying calves.
The way in which calves are
provided & payment made
for them or for the hire of
them will be left to dist.
Boards
Subject to these modifications

7/10/97

to the Board of Revenue, L.R.
and M. Dept.
5/3
E. H. 2/2/98

Revised draft submitted
for approval. Please see
my remarks on the notes

8/12/97

Government (1898) of Madras. REVENUE.

Recd.

Regd.

1898.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 3, 4th January 1898.

JANUARY.

Vaccination.

Approving, subject to certain modifications, Dr. Bannerman's scheme for the better
working of — in rural tracts.

FORM A.

Office of Deputy Inspector of Vaccination,
Circle.

From

The Deputy Inspector of Vaccination,

Circle,

To

The Tahsildar of

Taluk.

Sir,

I beg to report that the vaccinators as per margin will visit the villages opposite their names on the dates noted.

I enclose takids to the heads of the villages for favour of your signature and very early despatch.

(In districts where glycerine paste is not in use, the following paragraph may be added)

I request that you will kindly arrange so that calves may be kept in readiness in each of the villages particularized on the dates named.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Inspector of Vaccination,
Circle.*Form B in vernacular to accompany Form A.*

From

The Tahsildar of

taluk,

To

The village head of

Village.

The vaccinator of division will visit your village on After his departure you are directed to fill in the accompanying form and send it to the Deputy Inspector of Vaccination, Circle, through this office. On the arrival of the vaccinator, you will supply him with the unprotected list of children maintained by you in accordance, with Collector's Standing Order No. ; you will accompany the vaccinator during his stay in your village, and will do your best to persuade all persons to submit to the operation of vaccination. If you, by reason of urgent revenue work, are prevented from attending to the vaccinator on his arrival, you must submit a special report on the matter to my office.

(In districts not using glycerine paste the following may be added)

In accordance with Collector's Standing Order No. , you are directed to have in readiness before the arrival of the vaccinator on the day mentioned, a healthy male or female calf of less than two years of age. The vaccinator will pay for the calf and its feeding [by means of a cheque on the district board payable at].

Date.

Tahsildar of
Taluk.

Ullat head after visit of vaccinator and sent to
ough the Tahsildar.

Foil.

I do hereby certify that vaccinator visited this noon or
village on the noon of , and that he remained until the cases [of which
He performed cases. He inspected were successful.]

Signature Office.

Name of Village

Date

Form C in Vernacular to be filled in by village
head after visit of vaccinator and sent to
Deputy Inspector through the Tahsildar.

Counterfoil.

Taluk
Village
Name of vaccinator
Date of { Arrival
Departure
Number of operations performed
Number of cases inspected on (date)

[Number of successful cases.]

Signature.

Cheque Form.

N.B.—This cheque is not available for any sum exceeding Rs. [e.g., Rs. 3] (Rupees and will not be cashed unless it bears the signature of a vaccinator in the service of the District Board of

To

The Officer in charge of
the Treasury at

Please pay on account of charges incurred on behalf of the District Board the sum of Rs. (Rupees) as under:—

	RS.	A.	P.
To hire of one calf	2	8	0
Feeding charge	0	8	0
Total	3	0	0

(Rupees three only.)

(signed) [To be issued.]

First-class Vaccinator,

Division.

Date

Vice-President,

[or District Sanitary officer.]

Date

Endorsement No. 660, Local and Municipal.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of Dr. Bannerman's letter, it is observed that under G.O., No. 33 L., dated 14th January 1893, the village munsifs are to verify only the totals of cases vaccinated and are not expected to decide whether the operations are successful or not.

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

11th June 1897.

Order—Mis. No. 3722, Revenue, dated 19th July 1897.

Government considers that vaccinators may be allowed a permanent advance to buy calves, and that, with this alteration, the scheme submitted by the Sanitary Commissioner may be introduced into all districts; but, before this is done, the Board will be requested to state if it sees any objection to the adoption of the scheme.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue),
with the current in original (to be returned).

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 2947, dated 7th August 1897:—

Read—G.O., Mis. No. 3722, Revenue, dated 19th July 1897:—

Resolution—Mis. No. 2947, dated 7th August 1897.

The Board sees no objection to the scheme set forth in the papers herewith returned. It concurs with the Government in considering that a permanent advance should be given to vaccinators to enable them to pay on the spot for vaccine calves. The Board would also point out that the report as to the number of successful cases required from village heads in Form C, appended to Dr. Bannerman's report, is apt to be misleading. As already observed by Government in Endorsement, No. 869,

dated 18th October 1892, printed at page 2 of G.O., No. 33 L., dated 14th January 1893, munsifs might verify the totals of cases vaccinated, but they cannot be expected to decide whether the operations are successful or not.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with eight enclosures.

ORDER—No. 3, Revenue, dated 4th January 1898.

Miscellaneous.

sioner for the more efficient No. 538-V., dated 26th A should go round with the and also when he visits it in a statement in a present occasion of the vaccinator accompany the vaccinator nator does go round, but imposes on the village munsif the duty of deciding whether the cases inspected on the second visit have proved successful or not, and the Board points out in its Proceedings read above that munsifs. Generally speaking; and village headman total number of successful however, considers that number of cases believed accordingly.

With regard to His Excellency the Council on reconsideration does not think it desirable to issue instructions as to the grant of permanent advance to vaccinators, the way in which such advances for the purposes of buying calves. The way in which should be provided and payment made for them or for the hire of them should be left to district boards.

Subject to these modifications, Dr. Bannerman's scheme for the better working of vaccination in rural tracts is approved.

2. The Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), will modify paragraph 2 of S.O. No. 103 (new edition) in the sense of paragraph 1 of this order.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" the Local and Municipal Department.

Sik Karim.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

(Indicate page.)

Letter only.

Grouped copies with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
100

TYPE

to

URGENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DISC.

PAPER NOT FILLED UP, AND MEANT FOR REPAIRS
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A=Print in full.

b=Not to be printed.

P=Printed in full only.

Q=Print in full only.