

11. 2. 36
1,000-14-3 56

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

PRINTED.

G.O., No. 7530

DATED 19.5.98

Per
Please show proof
8/5

Desp. 19.5.98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Allowance to troops in plague duty

Informing the Lt Col Commanding the Force
Madras, that where a body of troops employed
on ~~the~~ plague duty performs ^{both} Sanitary and guard
duties i.e. Some of the party ~~are~~ ^{do} Sanitary duties
while others ~~are~~ employed on guard duty both
duties being interchangeable, all the troops so
employed should be paid plague allowance
and that no allowances should be granted
to ~~any~~ ^{any} troops when the duties assigned
them are exclusively of the nature of guard
duties.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government {1899} of Madras. LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

1899.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 753 P., 19th May 1899.

MAY.

Allowances to troops on plague duty.

Informing the Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces, Madras, that where a body of troops employed on plague duty performs both sanitary and guard duties, i.e., some of the party do sanitary duties, while others are employed on guard duty, both duties being interchangeable, all the troops so employed should be paid plague allowances; and that no allowances should be granted to troops when the duties assigned them are exclusively of the nature of guard duties.

No. 753 P., 19TH MAY 1899.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From the Deputy Adjutant-General, Madras Command, dated Ootacamund, 5th April 1899, No. A./N.T.-5439.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting for the favourable consideration of Government correspondence relating to a proposal to alter the existing ruling laid down in G.O., No. 173 P., dated 2nd February 1899, so as to allow all men whether engaged in the performance of sanitary duties or guard duties to draw the same plague allowances.

From L. E. BUCKLEY, Esq., I.C.S., Plague Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated Fort St. George, 29th April 1899, Ref. on C. No. 4371.

In returning the papers received with your endorsement No. 85 P., dated 18th April 1899, I have the honour to state that in this Presidency troops have been engaged for—

1. guard duty as at Jalarpet,
2. sanitary duty as at Vellore, Arcot, Kuppam, &c.

Many of those engaged for sanitary are from time to time employed on guard duty, in their own camp, and also to a limited extent in villages and plague camps. Their employment on guard duty in villages and plague camps should be discouraged. Where a detachment has been engaged for sanitary as opposed to guard duty, I consider that every member of the detachment on duty should receive the daily allowance whatever the duty he may be employed upon. The allowance should be withheld only when a man is struck off duty on account of sickness. Any other arrangement will only lead to discontent.

ORDER—No. 753 P., dated 19th May 1899.

The Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces will be informed that the Government understands that in most cases the troops employed on plague duty have been performing guard and sanitary duties in the same place together, that is to say, that some of the party have been employed on sanitary duties, while others have been doing guard duty, the duties being interchangeable. In such cases all the troops should be paid allowances. On the other hand where the duties assigned to any one body of troops have been exclusively of the nature of guard duties no allowances should be granted. Whenever there is any doubt in the matter, the case can be referred for the special orders of Government.

(True Extract.)

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Deputy Adjutant-General, Madras Command.
„ all Collectors (A, B, C, K, L).
„ the President, Municipal Commission, Madras.
„ General Officers Commanding Districts.
„ the Accountant-General.
„ the Financial Department.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Government (1899) of Madras. LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Spave 420
Sign - 30
4500

Recd.

Regd.

1899.

Enclosures

Spare copies

Recd for approval
25/5/89

G.O., No. 753 P., 19th May 1899.

Please check & return
25/5/89

MAY.

Allowances to troops on plague duty.

Informing the Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces, Madras, that where a body of troops employed on plague duty performs both sanitary and guard duties, i.e., some of the party do sanitary duties, while others are employed on guard duty, both duties being interchangeable, all the troops so employed should be paid plague allowances and that no allowances should be granted to troops when the duties assigned them are exclusively of the nature of guard duties.

No. 753 P., 19TH MAY 1899.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From the Deputy Adjutant-General, Madras Command, dated Ootacamund, 5th April 1899, No. A./N.T.-5439.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting for the favourable consideration of Government correspondence relating to a proposal to alter the existing ruling laid down in G.O., No. 173 P., dated 2nd February 1899, so as to allow all men whether engaged in the performance of sanitary duties or guard duties to draw the same plague allowances.

From L. E. BUCKLEY, Esq., I.C.S., Plague Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated Fort St. George, 29th April 1899, Ref. on C. No. 4371.

In returning the papers received with your endorsement No. 85 P., dated 18th April 1899, I have the honour to state that in this Presidency troops have been engaged for—

1. guard duty as at Jalarpet,
2. sanitary duty as at Vellore, Arcot, Kuppam, &c.

Many of those engaged for sanitary are from time to time employed on guard duty, in their own camp, and also to a limited extent in villages and plague camps. Their employment on guard duty in villages and plague camps should be discouraged. Where a detachment has been engaged for sanitary as opposed to guard duty, I consider that every member of the detachment on duty should receive the daily allowance whatever the duty he may be employed upon. The allowance should be withheld only when a man is struck off duty on account of sickness. Any other arrangement will only lead to discontent.

ORDER—No. 753 P., dated 19th May 1899.

The Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces will be informed that the Government understands that in most cases the troops employed on plague duty have been performing guard and sanitary duties in the same place together, that is to say, that some of the party have been employed on sanitary duties, while others have been doing guard duty, the duties being interchangeable. In such cases all the troops should be paid allowances. On the other hand where the duties assigned to any one body of troops have been exclusively of the nature of guard duties no allowances should be granted. Whenever there is any doubt in the matter, the case can be referred for the special orders of Government.

(True Extract.)

To the Deputy Adjutant-General, Madras Command. 5
 „ all Collectors (A, B, C, K, L). 304
 „ the President, Municipal Commission, Madras. 83
 „ General Officers Commanding Districts. 10
 „ the Accountant-General. 62
 „ the Financial Dept. 420
 „ Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

for Ag. Secretary to Government.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., No. dated 189 .

Again G.O., No. dated 189 .

Current No. 728 P. of 1899, dated 5.4.99, from Dy Adjutant-Genl, M.C.
 „ „ 899 P., 1899, „ 29.4.99, „ Plague Commr.
 „ „ „ 189, „ „ „

ORDER.

753 P. 18-5-99

understands that in most cases the troops employed on plague duty, have been doing guard and sanitary duties in the same place together, that is to say that some of the party have been employed on sanitary duties, while others have been doing guard duty, the duties being interchangeable. In such cases the troops

On the other hand where the duties assigned to any one body of troops have been exclusively of the nature of guard duties

Whenever there is any doubt in the matter, the case can

To The Dy Adjutant-Genl, M.C.
 All Collectors (A, B, C, K, L)
 President M.C. Madras
 General Officer Commanding D.S.
 W.S.

The Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces will be informed that the Government considers that, in all cases where troops are employed on both guard and sanitary duties at the same time, they

should be paid allowances, but that no allowances should be granted where the work given to them has been exclusively guard duty. Each

case might, however, be referred for the special orders of Govt. where there is a doubt.
 (From Orders)

24/5.99.

H. V. 99.

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 7287



From

The Dy. Assistant General
Incorporated Command
of the same.

Order

Cno 4371

Exdt. No 8577 18.4.97

Referred to the Plague
Commissioner for remarks.

No. A
NT-5429

Dated

Received

Registered

Enclosures 3

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Sub 9 for the favorable consideration
of local correspondence relating to
a proposal to alter the existing ruling
laid down in L.O. No. 1737 of 2.9.96
so as to allow all men whether
engaged in the performance of sanitary
duties or guard duties to draw
the same ^{scale} allowances.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

DISTRICT OFFICE,
STAFF RECEIVED
27 MAR 1899
A. BRANCH.
By No. 2421
slue. 3rd. M.B.D.

From: -

Lieutenant H.P. Ainslie 3rd M.L.I.

Special Plague Officer

To:-

The Adjutant

14th Madras Infantry

Kuppam

20th March 1899.

In acknowledging receipt of his No. A
691 dated 17.3.1899

In acknowledging receipt of the 691
I have the honor to request that you will inform the Officer
Commanding, that I am unable to forward a Roster (as per speci-
-men copy) as it has not been kept up, this being the first
intimation I have received with regard to it. I would also point
out that G.O. No. 173 P, while differentiating between Guard and
Sanitary duties, does not lay down that men when detailed for
Sanitary work should not receive allowances, for odd days on
which they may be called on to perform Guard duties or on which
there may not be any actual Sanitary work on hand also the G.O.
above quoted lays down that these allowances are granted be-
-cause the work is, among other things, dangerous; and in this
connection I would submit that the greater part of the Guard
duty which the men of your Regiment are called on to perform
here is dangerous, such as sentry duty in the plague camp and
in infected buildings, escorting contacts etc. The roster will
be kept up in future, but I would request that full pay may be
drawn for the whole party up to this date as they have been
engaged on Sanitary work & almost every day since their arrival
though ~~for~~ reasons stated above I am unable to sign the certifi-
-cate at the foot of the roster.

The Detachment here has not as yet received any Plague allowance whatever, and I believe that the Detachments of yours & other Regiments, detailed under precisely similar conditions, have received their allowances for every day irrespective of the actual work they may have been engaged on.

Finally I would request that you will inform the Officer commanding that living here is exceedingly dear, and the men have great difficulty in obtaining food, as the place is practically deserted and the few shpp keepers who remain are charging

charging very high prices. They are also urgently in need of an advance, as stated in my No. 133 of 17.3.1899.

(Signed) H.P. Ainslie Lieut

3rd Madras Light Infantry

Special Plague Officer.

(True Copy)

H.P. Ainslie Lieut.

Offg. Adjutant 14th Madras Infantry.

Heading Plague Duty. No. 744A

ORDERLY ROOM, XIV MADRAS INFANTRY.
St. Thomas' Mount 25th March 1899.

FROM:—

Lt. Col. A. G. BURN.

Commanding XIV. Madras Infantry.

TO:—

The Assistant Adjutant General

Madras District

Fort Saint George.

Reference Your Letter
My Minute
My Endorsement No. dated, 1899

Sir

With reference to Proceedings of the Plague commission Madras, No. 656 dated 7th March 1899. I have the honor to forward herewith a Memorandum received from the Native Officer in charge of the Detachment 14th M.I. at present on plague duty at Kuppam and also a true copy of a Memorandum from Lt. H.P. Ainslie Special Plague Officer at Kuppam. From these Memoranda it is evident that the guard duty is far from being what it is described, in the Proceedings referred to, as "ordinary Military duty which any body of troops may be called upon to carry out"—but appears to be a highly dangerous and disagreeable duty and moreover a most unusual work for troops to be employed on.

I respectfully request that the plague authorities may be, at a very early date, approached with a view to the present ruling being altered and a new ruling brought into force which will allow of all men who are in actual contact with plague infected patients or persons segregated in a plague infected camp being allowed to draw the allowance whether they are performing Sanitary duties or guard duty.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your Obedient Servant

A. G. Burn Lt. Col.
Commanding XIV. Madras Infantry.

MAR 27 1899

No. A II Madras, 30th March 1899

Deputy Adjutant General,
Madras Command

Forwarded for favorable consideration.

Diary No. a. 6381
Recd. 1 APR. 1899.
Branch. NT 108(c)

2. It will be seen from the attached correspondence that, the duties exacted from the men as Guard duty, are ^{almost} ~~practically~~ as disagreeable and dangerous as those coming under the head of sanitary duties. I would therefore strongly recommend that allowances similar to those granted for the performance of the latter, be also granted for the former, and that no distinction be recognized between the two forms of duty. The men probably all live together irrespective of whether they do guard or sanitary duty, and so the men employed in the former, run every possible risk in the matter of ^{infection} ~~mischance~~ from the latter.

E. Brooke Anderson
Brig^d General.

Special and Miscellaneous. Ootacamund,
No. A 5th April 1899.

N-T-5439-
From Cno. 9287
The DEPUTY ADJUTANT GENERAL, MADRAS COMMAND,



To
The Secretary to the Government of Madras.
Local and Municipal.

3. ENCLOSURES.

SIR,

With reference to G.O. No. 173. P dated 2nd February 1899, I have the honour, by desire of the Lieut. General Commanding the Forces, Madras, to submit for the favorable consideration of Government, the accompanying papers having reference to a proposal to alter the present ruling so as to allow of all men who are in actual contact with plague infected patients or persons segregated in a plague infected Camp, being allowed to draw the allowance whether they are performing Sanitary duties or guard duty.

2. The return of the papers when no longer required is requested.

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your obedient servant
C. Anderson
Br. General

Deputy Adjutant General.

Cal & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 899 P

From

The Hague Commission

Region No. 4371

Dated 29.4.99

Received 2. } May '99

Registered 3.

Enclosures 5

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting his remarks called for in the Encl no. 85 P dated 18th April on the subject of the distinction between guards and sanitary duties.

der

No. 17

MEMORANDUM.

L. O. Book 27.

FROM Temadar Parakkal
Commanding Detachment
14th M. I. Kishore

ORDERED BY
RECEIVED
24 MAR 1899
BY NO. 17
XIV MADRAS INFANTRY

Station Trichy
Date 23rd March 1899

TO Officiating Assistant
14th M. I.
ST Thomas Mount

I was sent for by Lieut. Hunter, Special Plague Officer, on the 20th inst. and informed that the men of my detachment cannot all expect to get plague allowance receipts and only those engaged in disinfecting work will get the same. All those engaged in guard duty, whether in the camp or at the plague duty allowance receipts. (2) Before we were asked to enter upon plague duty here, Police Constables were guarding the plague camp and as plague patients they shrank from that duty and for fear of plague. The Lt. Plague Officer sent Salt about informed me to deputise 6 men and 1 M.C.O. to guard the plague camp daily. We also had that such guards will be entitled to the allowance as other engaged in disinfecting work in as much as they are also exposing themselves to danger for as we see the camp is situated in the following circumstances:— It is the place where plague stricken patients live. Such patients should not be allowed to go out. Others are not being given proper care. One guard has to follow them to get water or other necessary. There is so much danger of catching the

Dated 29th April 1899

189

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
u	603	P. Plague	26/6/99
So	213	Plague	"/2/99
u	173	Plague	2/2/99
u	1564	Meas.	5-17/99

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

L. E. BUCKLEY, Esq., I.C.S.,

To

The Secretary to Government,

Local and Municipal Department.

SIR,

In returning the papers received with your
endorsement No. 85 P dated 18-4-99, I have the honour to
state that in this Presidency troops have been engaged for

1. guard duty as at Jalarpet

2. Sanitary duty as at Vellore, Arcot, Kuppam &c.,

many of those engaged for sanitary are from time to time employed on guard duty, in their own camp, and also to a limited extent in villages and plague camps. Their employment on guard duty in villages and plague camps should be discouraged. Where a detachment has been engaged for sanitary as opposed to guard duty, I consider that every member of the detachment on duty should receive the daily allowance whatever the duty he may be employed upon. The allowance should be withheld only when a man is struck off duty on account of sickness. Any other arrangement will only lead to discontent.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Plague Commissioner.

R. C.

NOTE FOR THE

Submitted to P.L.
for approving the
docket and the
instructions to Pres

MS
19/5/99
Seen
is it usual to send for to
A.S. with C.L. of with
other orders

MS
19/5
Seems to be unnecessary.
This not usual as far
as L.M.

MS

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Again G.O., No. 173 P., dated 2.2.1899.
Current No. 728 P. of 1899, dated 11.2.1899 from the Dy. Magistrate, M.C.
Current No. 899 P. of 1899, dated 29.4.1899 from the Plague Commr.

SUBJECT.

Allowances to troops
employed on "guard duty" in
connection with plague.

FOR ORDERS.

MS
19/5/99
A
In its letter printed in
G.O. No. 173 P. of 2.2.99, the
Government of India have
classified the duties performed
by troops in connection with
plague into

(1) Sanitary duty, such as
searching, disinfecting,
superintending, scavenging,
etc.

(2) Guard duty. While
making this classification
they consider that "guard
duty is an ordinary mili-
tary duty which anybody
of troops may be called upon
to carry out and that "no
allowances are admissible
for its performance. The

Sanitary duty, on the other hand, is considered an unusual one and also disagreeable and dangerous. It has accordingly been ruled by the Govt. of India that officers and men who are called upon to perform it should receive adequate remuneration.

2. The payment of allowances, at the rates prescribed in the Govt. of India referred to above, to officers and troops employed on plague duties (Sanitary) in this Presidency, has been sanctioned by the local Govt. in Fin. G.O. No. 213 of 11th Feb. 1899.

3. With the first current read above, the Dy Adjutant-General, Madras Command, submits for the favorable consideration of Government the correspondence relating to a proposal to alter the ruling of the Govt. of India referred to in paragraph 1 of this note, viz., that no allowances are admissible

[L & M.
500-4-3-99.]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTE FOR THE

for the performance of guard duty, "so as to allow of all men who are in actual contact with plague-infected patients, or persons segregated in a plague-infected camp, being allowed to draw the allowance, whether they are performing sanitary duties or guard duty." The Officer, Commanding XIV M.D., represented that "it is evident that the guard duty is far from being what it is described in the Pogo referred to, 'ordinary military duty which any body of troops may be called upon to carry out,' but appears to be a highly dangerous and disagreeable duty, and moreover a most unusual work for troops to be employed on." The Officer, Commanding Madras District, strongly recommended "that allowances similar to those

But if in actual contact they must be doing some thing more than mere "guard duty"

At Jollapet Camp, I imagine the work done by troops has been more guard duty, also where no doubt they have been doing sanitary duty as well

Disagreeable - but doubtless if it is highly dangerous.

At the D. District Sanitary Office

" granted for the performance
 " of the latter (sanitary duties)
 " be also granted for the
 " former (guard duty), and
 " that no distinction be
 " recognized between the
 " two forms of duty. He
 " adds also that " the men
 " probably all live together
 " irrespective of whether
 " they do guard or sanitary
 " duty, and so, the men em-
 " ployed in the former run
 " every possible risk in
 " the matter of infection from
 " the latter."

This is probably true
 W.

4. The Plague Commissioner
 to whom the Dy. Adjutant-
 General's letter was referred
 for remarks, states that
 " where a detachment has
 " been engaged for sanitary
 " as opposed to guard duty, I
 " consider that every member
 " of the detachment on duty
 " should receive the daily
 " allowance, whatever the
 " duty, he may be employed
 " upon. The allowance should

NOTE FOR THE

" withheld only when a man
 " is struck off duty on account
 " of sickness. Any other arrange-
 " ment will only lead to
 " discontent." The Plague
 Commissioner does not
 offer any remarks on the
 recommendation of the
 military authorities. He
 considers, however, that the
 employment of troops
 on guard duty in villages
 and plague camps should
 be discouraged.

5. Troops ^{have} ~~been~~ employed
~~solely~~ on guard duty only at Jalar-
 pet, although men employed
 on sanitary duty at Vellore,
 Arcot, Kuppam &c have
 been from time to time em-
 ployed on guard duty in
 their own camp and also to
 a limited extent in villages
 and plague camps. The
 employment of troops on guard
 as opposed to sanitary duty

The Kuppam men have
 probably had their batika
 under G.O. 603 P. 26. W. 97.

to FC.

having been ~~very~~ limited,
and their future employment
for that duty being dis-
courage by the Plague Com-
missioner, it is perhaps un-
necessary to take any action
on the recommendation of the
Military Authorities.

6. As regards the Plague
Commissioner's recommendation
referred to in para 4 supra
it would appear that it is
supported by the orders of
the Govt of India contained
in paragraph 2 of its
letter printed in G.O. No
173 P dt 2.2.1899.

The Government of India clearly
intended that local governments sh have
plenty of discretion in the matter. (See
para 2 of the letter. 7 Aug 98.)
As far as my experience went expts
at Jallashahi all the troops sent out were
doing "superintending" or disinfecting work
I must have at Chippagiri unless I
remember the Saffers were some of them
disinfecting, while a small guard was
of maintain and order to village - the
12.5.99. men on guard ^{needed} no doubt

did disinfecting duty on an =
= the day - and it will be sufficient
in advance of 1000 men today which
men were doing disinfecting & while
guard many fixed day =

I am sorry G.O. 603.P.

d 26. 4 - 99. I find without being

seen by the H.P. I intended it to

have you to the ~~see~~ the member. was
omitted to mark it so. Probably

on the G.O. the men have been
paid the batta due to them.

It would seem sufficient to
inform the d. Genl that in the opinion
of the Government in all cases where
men are employed both on guard duty
and disinfecting as to same case
the Govt considers that batta sh^d be
given. But that where the work given
to the Saffers has been exclusively
guard duty, no Plague allowance
sh^d be granted. Each case might
be referred for orders when there is
a doubt - It seems unnecessary

to refer to matters to the Govt of India

At the D. H. ^{referred} Sanitary Department

In future & in fact in the past,
 excepting that small guards are
 no doubt posted to watch the
 Camp etc. of the Sefoy, Sefoy
 are employed in this infelicitous work.
 J. K. K. C. C. in the way can
 where there will be a doubt & there
 if the orders have been followed
 viz: that the Sefoy were to do
 simple guard duty - [30 men
 I think it was more sent to guard
 that Camp after the Vancumbadi
 disturbance] no allowance
 sh^d be granted:

M. V. 99. *MT 26.5.99.*

In what places are
 troops now employed
 MT 15.9.99.

Note for the Secy

The information required
 by the H.M. is not available
 here. The question may be
 answered on obtaining
 the information from
 Madras.

17.5.98. *Yes yes*
the information
are not quite
Certain where there
are troops are

Ref. in copy

First copy sent to Press.
 returned for signature.
 dispatched in print.

AGAIN G.O. No.
 189

728 P — P
 899 P — A

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

DEPT OF GOVERNMENT

DEPT OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

FORMS NOT FILLED UP, BRING HEART FOR DISPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

A.S. —

A = Print in full.
 B = Not to be printed.
 P = Print abstract only.
 Q = Print heading only.

At the D. S. Sanitary Office, as the
 may be.