Marine (1899) Department.

✓

G.O., No. 50 / 51 Marine

DATED 16th January 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Dr. H. Allison, Port Health Officer, Madras

Ordered that the memorial from ——, with the Surgeon General's letter submitting it to Govt, be forwarded to the Govt of India

Forwarded.

W

[M. 6 / 590—7-1-99.]

Indexed. 19/1/99

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
331	1 99 283	Ma.	25.3.99				

Marine DEPARTMENT.

2

READ the following :—

Letter from the Surgeon General With the Government of Madras, No. C/72 dated 21st November 1898.

Endorsement thereon in the Public Department, No. 2608, dated 23rd November 1898.

Lt. Col. Alison's appeal

Circulated to

His Excellency the Governor

No 50 Mar. 16 Jan 99

ORDER.

A.S.H. 4.1.99

Ordered that Lt. Col. Allison's Memorial, with the Surgeon General's letter submitting it to Government, be forwarded to the Government of India.

The Surgeon General
thro' the Public Dept.

[illegible]

(H. E. No. 51 Mar., d/ 16. 1. 1899

To

The Secretary to the
Government of India,
Home Department.

Sir,

A.S.H.

I am directed to forward for the Orders of the Government of India the accompanying Memorial dated 25th October 1898 from Lt. Col. Allison I.M.S., Health Officer at the Port of Madras, who appeals against the Orders of the Madras Government quoted in the margin censuring him ~~[illegible]~~ for the course taken by him when the recent Outbreak

G.O. No 479 Marine d/ 13 June '98

Hay W.

[P. W. 4 / 1,000—14-11-98.]

H.S. 2.1.99 / 5-1-99

outbreak of Plague at Calcutta was regarded as imminent.

2. I am also to forward a letter from the Surgeon General to Government No. C/72, dated 21st November 1898, submitting the Memorial.

3. The circumstances which led to the expression of disapproval of Lt. Col. Allison's conduct are narrated with sufficient accuracy in his Memorial, and an appeal to the Local Government was rejected in G.O. 734 Marine dated 31st August 1898.

& Flag T.

4. It will be observed from this order that Lt. Col. Allison was blamed on the following grounds:-

(1) For leaving Madras at all when the declaring of Calcutta as "infected" was imminent, and

(2) For not returning at once on becoming aware that quarantine against Calcutta had been ordered,

and there is no argument in the present Memorial which has not already been considered by Government as insufficient to exonerate that officer ~~Allison~~ from blame.

5. Para 7 of the present Memorial seems, however, to require special notice. The following statement is here made. " It would therefore seem that the Government of Madras was certain that Calcutta would be declared infected, and it therefore appears to your Memorialist that the Orders of the Madras Government on this subject might have been clearly -- defined and communicated in due -- time to your Memorialist, if they did not wish the rules regarding -- quarantine as laid down by the -- Venice Convention to be strictly -- adhered to". In regard to this -- statement, His Excellency the Governor in Council remarks that it is incorrect to say that the Madras -- Government was certain that Calcutta would be declared infected. There could have been no certainty in the matter. There was, however, great -- probability, and it was for ignoring this great probability and remaining away from his post that Lt. Col. Allison was blamed. It is true that as mentioned in para 1 of the Memorial, this Government upheld the -- action of Lt. Col. Allison's locum tenens in placing the vessels in -- quarantine, but it is considered that it would have been better if he had used the discretionary power vested in him under Regulation 17 of the Quarantine Regulations printed with G.O. No. 745 Marine dated 23rd August 1897, under which instead of placing "healthy" vessels in strict quarantine he could have allowed them to work

& Flag U

work cargo under suitable precautions. There is, it is considered, nothing in the Venice Sanitary Convention which prevents such an arrangement, and Lt. Col. Allison's concluding remark, therefore, in regard to departure from the Venice Reules is not intelligible.

6. I am to add that the request of the Surgeon General that his letter No. C/72 dated 21st November 1898 should be forwarded to the Government of India with Lt. Col. Allison's Memorial is complied with though considered irregular, in-as much as the Department over which he presides had also been censured by Government, as will be seen from G. O. 781 Public, d/ 21st June 1898, a copy of which is attached, and although the tenour of the letter might have been more becomingly expressed.

I have etc.

C.S.

M. 22.12.98

recorded with memorial copy of G.O. with the extract 781 Public of 21/6/98 surgeon Genls letter C/72 21-11-98 17/11/98

Public DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

G. O. No. 479 Marine, dated 13th June 1898.

Order thereon No. 781 ~~Marine~~ Public, dated 21st June 1898.

In communicating to the Surgeon General the --- censure passed in the foregoing Proceedings upon Surgeon Lt. Col. Allison, His Excellency the Governor in Council observes with displeasure that the grave public inconvenience caused by the absence of the Port Health Officer from --- Madras reflects discredit on the Department.

(True Extract)
(s/d) G. Stokes.
Chief Secretary.

To
The Surgeon General.

C.S. 21-Dec-98

Confidential

Marine

~~Public~~ (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~3684~~ 1475

CHIEF SECRETARY 21. NOV. 1898 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

C.S.

From Surgeon General C. Sibthorpe, C.B., M.R.C.P.I.
Surgeon General with the Govt. of Madras

~~Order~~ Endt. No. 2608
Transferred to the Marine Dept.

A. D. Knapp.
Ag Under Secretary

Fort St George
23d November 1898

No. C/72

Dated 21st November 1898

Received }
Registered } 24 Nov. 1898

Enclosures — 2

Spare copies. Encl. in duplicate

SUBJECT.

Forwarding with remarks the memorial in duplicate, for transmission to the Govt. of India, from Lt. Col: H. Allison, I.M.S., Port and Marine Surgeon Madras, appealing against the censure passed on him in G.O. No. 479 Marine dated 13 June 1898.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
734	M,	31-8-98	
477	M,	13-6-98	
432	M	27-5-98 (Sec)	
768	E,	12-5-98	
260	E,	9-5-98	
367	M,	11-5-98 - S.C.	
359	M,	8-5-98	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
328A,	M,	2-5-98 S.C.	
327	M,	2-5-98	
745-46	M,	23-8-97 ..	
601	M,	6-7-97 ..	
I.O. 781	Public	dated 21-6-98	
		confidential	
1042	Public	16-8-98.	

1440 — 8 / 6

Madras,
25th October 1898.

To

His Excellency the Right Honourable VICTOR ALEXANDER BRUCE,
Earl of ELGIN and KINCARDINE, P.C.,G.M.S.I.,G.M.I.E.,
Viceroy and Governor-General of India.

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL
26 OCT. 1898
WITH [illegible] OF MADRAS

The Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel H.ALLISON, M.D., I.M.S., Port Health Officer of Madras.

Respectfully Sheweth,

Your Memorialist begs to state that during May 1898 he was Port-Health Officer for Madras and that in April he was granted ten days' casual leave by the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras and his substitute was Lieutenant-Colonel W.A.Lee. On May 2nd the Government of Madras issued a Notification x declaring quarantine against arrivals ~~fr~~ from Calcutta by sea. One steamer arrived from Calcutta on May 5th,one on May 7th and one on May 9th. These steamers were placed in quarantine. Some of the Agents of these steamers protested to Government against being quarantined,and on May 11th Government issued orders permitting healthy steamers from Calcutta to work in quarantine,but on the 6th an Order π had been issued upholding the action of the Port Health Officer, the concluding paragraph of the order being -

x G.O. 327 Mar dated 2-5-98
Flag - A

x G.O. 367 Mar dated 11-5-98
Flag - C

π G.O. 348 A Mar dated 6-5-98 - Flag G
printed on page 29.
G.O. 367 Mar dated 11-5-98

"The action of the Port Health Officer

H. Allison
Lt Col I.M.S.

"Officer in putting the vessels in "quarantine is thus in accordance with "the authorised Sanitary Regulations".

2. On June 13th your Memorialist received the following Order No.x479, Marine, dated 13th June 1898:-

x Flag - W

"It appears that the Surgeon-"General granted the Madras Port "Health Officer, Dr. Allison, ten days' "casual leave in April. By the 30th of "the month, however, when Dr. Allison "availed himself of the leave, it was "obvious from the daily News-papers "that the declaring of Calcutta to be "infected with plague was, in all pro"bability, only a matter of days, if "not hours, and on the 2nd May quaran"tine against Calcutta was established "by the Madras Government. Under these "circumstances Dr. Allison showed him"self in the opinion of His Excellency "the Governor in Council wanting in a "proper sense of duty in (1) leaving "Madras at all under the critical con"ditions which ~~excited~~ existed on 30th April; "and (2) in not returning thereto at "once on becoming aware that quaran"tine against Calcutta had been order"ed, an order which he must have known "would throw much extra work and great "additional responsibility on the Port "Health Officer.

" 2. As to the inconvenience caused by "the absence of Dr. Allison there can "be no doubt. It is evidenced by a "mass of telegrams x and correspondence "from the mercantile community which

x printed with G.O. 367 Mar of 11-5-98 - Flag C

A Allison

reached

"reached the Government on the quarantine regulations being brought ---- "into force. It is stated that Dr.Lee "was placed in charge of Dr.Allison's "work during his absence but it would "appear that he carried out none of "the Executive duties thereof; that, "however, is a matter for which Dr. "Allison must be held responsible. If "an officer takes casual leave it is "for him to arrange for the due discharge of his duties during his -- "absence. His Excellency the Governor "in Council thus considers Dr.Allison "is deserving of censure for obvious "neglect of duty in a serious public "emergency. This expression of the "displeasure of Government will be "communicated to Dr.Allison, through "the Public Department."

5. On August 8th your Memorialist forwarded the following letter x for submission to the Government of Madras:-

x with G.O. 734 Mar d/31-8-98
Flag - Y

To

The Secretary to the Surgeon
General with the Government of Madras.

Sir,

"With reference to G.O.G.No.479, "Marine, dated 13th June 1898, received "with your No.C/28 of 28th June 1898, I "have the honour to submit the following for the information of the Govern"-ment of Madras, with a request for a "reconsideration of the Order.

" 2. In the order above quoted it is stated

H Allison
Lt Col I.M.S.

"stated. By the 30th of the month, how-
"ever, when Dr. Allison availed himself
"of the leave it was obvious from the
"daily Newspapers that the declaring
"of Calcutta to be infected with ---
"Plague was, in all probability, only a
"matter of days, if not hours." This
"declaration of plague depended on the
"opinion of Professor Haffkine. Against
"this expectation of plague being --
"declared we have the opinion also in
"the daily Newspapers telegraphed from
"Calcutta about 28th April". That in
"the opinion of the Medical authorities
"plague does not exist in Calcutta. Also
"against it is the season of the year,
"1st May, the hottest time of the year
"in Calcutta. The experience of every
"other place being that plague does not
"first appear during the hot season and
"if it has been present it decreases or
"disappears altogether at that season.
"This has been the experience in Bombay
"and North of India during the past two
"years. I do not, therefore, think there
"was such a certainty of plague being
"declared.

3. "As regards returning to duty the
"Notification issued by Government --
"declaring quarantine against Calcutta
"was very simple and no ~~Notification~~ modification or
"exceptions were attached to the order
"and I do not see that any other pro-
"ceedure could have been adopted then
"to place the vessels in quarantine.
"This action has been upheld by Govern-
"ment in G.O.G. 348, Marine, dated 6th
May

Flag - G

A Allison
Lt Col I.M.S.

May 1898.

G.O. 479 Mar
13-6-98
Flag - W

"4. "In paragraph 2 of above order --
"Government states that "inconvenience
"was experienced by the Mercantile Com-
"-munity and goes on to state that Dr.
"Lee who was placed in charge did not
"do any executive duty, I am therefore
"responsible". Lieutenant-Colonel Lee,
"I.M.S., promised to act for me during
"my absence and the attached copy of
"letter (Appendix-A) shows that he did
"do so and that he was present every
"day from 6th May to date of my return
"to duty on 11th May, taking full res-
"ponsibility for all that was done. In-
"convenience was no doubt experienced
"by the Steamers being placed in qua-
"rantine, but I do not see how quaran-
"tine, of any sort, is to be carried out
"without inconvenience. These were not
"the first steamers placed in quaran-
"tine, as during last November three
"steamers from Bombay were so dealt
"with to complete ten days from that
"port. In G.O.G. $\frac{548}{A}$, Marine, dated 6th
"May 1898 it is stated in the end of
"paragraph 2, the action of the Port
"Health Officer in putting the vessels
"in quarantine is thus in accordance
"with the authorised Sanitary Regula-
"tions.

" 5. Therefore as the action of my
"substitute was in strict accordance
"with the Sanitary Regulations and was
"exactly the same as would have been
"taken had I been present. I fail to
"see whe~~n~~re the~~re~~re has been any neglect of
public

Lt. Col., I.M.S.

public duty and I feel that a great hardship has been inflicted on me by the Order of censure, I therefore request the matter be referred to Government for favourable consideration".

4. Your Memorialist begs to state the above letter was forwarded with the following remarks, by the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras:-

"In continuation of my letter No.C/36, Confidential, dated 3rd August 1898, I have the honour to forward herewith a representation from Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel H. Allison which fully meets all the points raised by Government and trust that under the circumstances Government will be pleased to withdraw the censure passed on him as he has very clearly shown that he is not, in any way, to blame in the matter."

5. On this letter His Excellency the Governor in Council passed Order No.734, Marine, dated 31st August 1898:-

x 7lg- 9

"His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that there is nothing in the Surgeon-General's letter or accompaniment which affects the grounds on which Dr. Allison was blamed, viz.,

(1) For leaving Madras at all when the declaring of Calcutta as infected was imminent;

(2) For not returning at once on becoming aware that quarantine

H Allison
Lt. Col. I.M.S.

against

"against Calcutta had been ordered."

6. Your Memorialist begs to state that his leave was granted by competent authority and an officer of his own rank was performing his duties and as pointed out in his letter of August 8th the reasons against Calcutta being declared infected on 1st May were very strong, and also that there was no difficulty in carrying out the quarantine regulations as laid down in the rules published by the Government of Madras based on the Venice Convention.

x Flag - Y

Flag - W

7. In G.O.G. 479, Marine, of 13th June, it is stated that it was obvious from the daily Newspapers that the declaring of Calcutta to be infected with plague was a matter of days, if not hours, and again in G.O.G. No. 734, Marine, dated 31st August, it is stated that the declaring of Calcutta as infected was imminent. It would therefore seem that the Government of Madras was certain that Calcutta would be declared infected, and it therefore appears to your Memorialist that the Orders of the Madras Government on this subject might have been clearly defined and communicated in due time to your Memorialist, if they did not wish the rules regarding quarantine as laid down by the Venice Convention to be strictly adhered to.

8. Your Memorialist would also beg to point out that this (quarantine) was adopted on several previous occasions, and on one of which the question was asked if the

Lt Col I.M.S.

the Port Health Officer had power to lessen the period of quarantine?, and to this His Excellency the Governor in Council replied that it was a matter entirely for the Port Health Officer to decide.

x cannot be traced

9. For a considerable time past the Government of Madras has been using all its powers to prevent the importation of plague into this Presidency and your Memorialist is of opinion that if, from any relaxation of the rules by the Port Health Officer, Plague had been allowed to reach -- Madras he would have been severely blamed.

10. Your Memorialist therefore prays His Excellency the Viceroy will be pleased to cause the removal of the Order of censure passed on him, seeing that he was on leave granted by competent authority and it has not been shown that he or his substitute failed in any way in strictly carrying out the quarantine regulations.

11. Your Memorialist begs to attach (as Appendix-A) copy of letter from Lieutenant Colonel Lee, I.M.S., and endorsement on same by the Surgeon General with the Government of Madras.

And your Memorialist will, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY.

G. Allison
Lt. Colonel. I.M.S.
Port Health Officer
Madras

Original Encl 1 [illegible] 14/5/98

APPENDIX - A.

To

The Secretary to the Surgeon-General
with the Government of Madras.

Sir,

My arrangement with Surgeon-Lieut: Colonel Allison was that during the period I was to act for him, Assistant Surgeon Weston would perform the -- routine duties and would communicate with me whenever my services were specially required.

2. Accordingly I went to the Office on the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th May and disposed of the correspondence in connection with the enforcement of quarantine rules, copies of which I have asked Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Allison to record with this Minute.

3. I also received reports from Assistant Surgeon Weston regarding his inspection of all the steamers three in number, viz., ~~Superber~~ Jupiter on May 5th, Nawab on 7th and ~~[illegible]~~ Pongolo on 9th idem, and issued verbal instructions to him in respect to the application of the rules.

4. I may add that I did not see my way to yield to pressure by authorising any relaxation of the quarantine rules, without the sanction of superior authority, because I felt that had any untoward result followed such a step on my part, the consequences would have been visited on me alone.

In forwarding above the Surgeon General

A Allison
Lt Col I.M.S.

General with the Government of Madras writes No.C/36, dated 3rd August:-

With reference to G.O.No.781, Public, dated 21st June, communicating G.O.No.479, dated 13th June 1898, I have the honour to forward for the information of Government copy of a communication from Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Lee, explaining the arrangements Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Allison had made with him, regarding the performance of his (Dr. Allison's) duties during his absence on casual leave.

The arrangements seem to me to be all that could have been made by a careful Medical Officer. I particularly wish to draw attention of Government to paragraph 4 of Dr. Lee's letter. Dr. Allison says that if he had been in Madras at the time he would have been in exactly the same position and would have acted in the same manner as it was according to the regulations then in force. I have myself had the appointment of Marine Surgeon for some years and would, under the circumstances, have acted exactly as Dr. Lee has done.

3. Under these circumstances I trust that Government will be pleased to withdraw the censure passed on him which he does not seem to merit.

-÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷oXo÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷-

A Allison
Lt Col. I.M.S.

Enc: 2 Ind
1475/98
Gis

Copy of letter from the Surgeon General with the Government of Madras, No. C/72 dated 21st November 1898, to the Hon'ble Chief Secretary to Govt. Public Department.

With reference to G.O No. 734 Marine dated 31st August 1898, Communicated with G.O No. 1143 Public of the 7th September following, I have the honour to forward for transmission to the Government of India the accompanying Memorial in duplicate from Lieut-Colonel H. Allison, I.M.S, Port and Marine, Surgeon, Madras, appealing against the censure passed on him in G.O No. 479 Marine dated 13th June 1898.

2. The Memorial sets out in a clear and concise way the whole facts of the case so as to show that the censure passed by the Madras Government was wholly unmerited.

3. I may be permitted to remark that G.O No. 479 Marine dated 13th June 1898 appears to me to have been passed without sufficient regard to the following facts:- viz (a) that Lieut-Colonel Allison was on casual leave granted by competent authority, (b) that another

Commissioned

commissioned medical officer of equal rank and experience was acting for him during his absence, and (c) that it was impossible under the Notification issued by Government declaring quarantine against Calcutta, to adopt any other procedure than what Dr. Lee had done.

4. In my letter No. C/36 Confidential, dated 3rd August 1898, I represented to Government that Lieut. Col. Allison had made all the ~~average~~ arrangements that could have been made by a careful medical officer, and recommended the withdrawal of the censure, but Government saw no reason to reconsider its order. With all deference to the decision of Government. I am still of opinion that there was no neglect of duty or want of discretion on the part of Dr. Allison and he is consequently not deserving in my opinion of the censure passed on him, after 25 years unimpeachable and approved service.

5. I beg that in transmitting his Memorial to the Government of India a copy of this letter may also be forwarded with it.

HIS E.

The

THE H

The Hon

THE H

With the

put up

notes

The G.O.

contain

Note for the Hon

The papers were

the record of the

Secretary's office

now been obtained

resubmitted: note

covers marked A

Was there not an appeal by the S. G. against the censure passed on him. If so please, put up that file also. It is not in A.

9.12.98

It was disposed of in Public I think. Put it up.

11/12/98

G.O. No. 1042 Pub / 16-8-98 put up and flagged K

12/12/98

12/12/98

12.12.98

Hay T

The censure passed on Lieut. Col. Allison was, in my opinion, deserved. That officer's Memorial should be forwarded to the Govt. of India with a covering letter setting forth the views of Govt. The Surg. Genl's letter, Confl, 21 November 1898, should also go. I am not sure that the tone and sense of that letter are becoming, or the Hon. Members should see the papers before a G.O. issues.

A. H.

3.12.98

P. W. 43.
500-24-3-98.

arine DEPARTMENT.

Novr. '98 from the
h the Govt. of Madras.
Dept. No. 2608, d/23rd

ECT.

ison's appeal to
ment of India

etter read above the submits a Memorial from ~~Dr.~~ Lieut. Col. H. Allison M.D. I.M.S. appealing the order of censure o. 479 Marine dated

2. ~~Dr.~~ Lieut. Col. Allison has already appealed to the Local Government and his appeal was rejected in G.O. No. 734 Marine dated 31st August 1898.

3. As stated in the last mentioned order ~~once Dr.~~ Lieut. Col. Allison was blamed on the following grounds:-

(1) For leaving Madras at all when the declaring of Calcutta as "infected" was imminent, and

(2) For not returning at once on becoming aware that quarantine against Calcutta had been ordered.

4. There seems no argument in the present Memorial which has not already been laid before the Government of Madras and rejected. Attention is

is however, invited to para 7 of the Memorial in which ~~Dr.~~ Lieut Col Allison[+] makes the following remarks:-

"It would therefore seem that the Government of Madras was certain that Calcutta would be declared infected, and it therefore appears to your Memorialist that the Orders of the Madras Government on this subject might have been clearly defined and communicated in due time to the Memorialist, if they did not wish the rules regarding --- quarantine as laid down by the Venice Convention to be strictly adhered to".

5. In regard to this it is submitted that it is incorrect to say that the Madras Government was certain that Calcutta would be declared infected. There could have been no certainty in the matter. There was, however, great probability, and it was for ignoring this great probability and remaining away from his post that Lieut Col ~~Dr.~~ Allison was blamed. ~~It was also considered that Dr. Allison's locum tenens had failed in his duty in not using the discretionary power~~ vested in him under Regulation 17 of the Quarantine Regulations printed with G.O. No. 745 Marine dated 23rd August 1897, under which instead of placing "healthy vessels in strict quarantine he could have allowed them to work cargo under suitable precautions. There is (this is conceded) ~~---~~ nothing in the Venice Sanitary Convention which prevents such an -- arrangement, and Lieut Col ~~Dr.~~ Allison's concluding remark, therefore, in regard to departure from the Venice rules is not intelligible.

M.

+Italics added.

I am disposed that the Allison-incident ~~was~~ made ~~too~~ much of & that a d.o. communication instead of a formal censure by G.O. w^d^ have sufficed.

The appeal must of course be sent on & the covering letter may note that the arguments used by Surg. Col. Allison were previously considered by the Gov^t^ of Madras which did not consider them to exculpate Col. A. The gist of para 5 of the note should also be added.

I agree that the S.G's letter should be forwarded, and it should, I think, be ~~with~~ ~~the comment~~ it is forwarded although ~~that~~ the S.G.'s request is irregular inasmuch as the Dept. over wh. he presides had also been censured (G.O. to be forwarded), and although the tenour of the letter might have been ~~couched in a more~~ ~~manner~~ more becomingly expressed.

M.A.
14.12.98.

It is true that, as mentioned in para 1 of the Memorial, the Govt upheld the action of Lieut Col ~~Dr.~~ Allison's locum tenens in placing the vessels in quarantine but it is considered that it would have been better if he had used the discretionary ~~[illegible]~~ power

H.W.
17-12-98

C.S.

29-12-98

Encd
Cnf

R. 17.12.98

H.S. 29.11.98 5.12.98 H.M. 6.12.98 H. M. 8/12/98 Hm. 2. 15.12.98

instead of

in

Hon. Mr. Arundel.

Note:

The papers asked for in the slip below are put up.

12/12/98.