A

Statement made by Nurse Mrs Ambrose on 6th March/85.

On being asked why she failed to send for the Matron Superintendent when Captain Hamilton was brought to Hospital, on the night of 3rd January 1885, she replied as follows:—

I fully understood from the Matron Superintendent that when the patient was brought into Hospital, that _I_ was to attend to him; and be responsible for all the nursing arrangements, as she was engaged in giving a dinner party that night. I am sure that this was the Matron Superintendent's intention and orders, because on other occasions when a gentleman is expected, in the officers Quarters, she directs the Nurses to come and inform her, as soon as they arrive, but, on this occasion, I received no such instructions, but was directed to do my best when the patient arrived.

2. Were you specially detailed to look after Captain Hamilton?

I was the ordinary duty nurse, for all Medical cases, on the night of the 3rd January last, and, as such, it was my duty to attend to all medical cases that were admitted upstairs.— My attendance on Captain Hamilton was part of my ordinary duty as night nurse for the fortnight.

3. What arrangements did you make for Captain Hamilton's reception?

I got a room ready in obedience to the Matron Superintendent's orders,— conveyed through nurse, Miss Leonard, a little before 7 P.M. Mrs Anderson came down to me and asked me if the room was ready. I told her "yes". She asked me if I knew what ailed the patient that was coming in.— I replied "No"— She then said she thought it was a case of Diarrhoea, from what she had heard and told me to be very particular as Dr. Furnell was likely to come with the

the

the patient.— Having worked under Dr Furnell before, I knew what he would be likely to call for.— So, I got a water-proof sheet put on the bed, placed a draw sheet over it, got a feeding cup and then I wrote a memorandum to the Steward's Department for a pint of milk. I then went to the Apothecary's room and asked him to make out a diet sheet for the expected patient. He marked on it Soda water and Ice. I procured these articles from the Steward's Department and placed them in the room. After doing all this, about 8 P.M. I called ward attendant Benjamin and told him a Gentleman was coming to the Officers' Quarters and asked him to come and let me know, as soon as the patient arrived. I then went up to the dining room, for my supper. On my way, I was met by the Matron Superintendent, who asked me if the patient had arrived. I answered "No". Again she cautioned me to be particular and to receive the patient and do every thing for him. The Matron Superintendent did not go with me into the room that

I

I had got ready. When I was at supper, ward attendant came and called me – I rushed down, at once passing by the Matron Superintendent's rooms – which were thrown open and where her friends were assembled. After attending to the patient for about half an hour, I was asked by Apothecary Jesudasen, if I knew that Dr Thomas was upstairs – I said "yes". He asked me to go up and ask Dr Thomas to come down at once. When I went up they were seated at dinner. So I told a servant, whom I met outside, to convey the message to Dr Thomas. Even then it never occurred to me to ask Mrs Anderson to come down, as I had been ordered to take charge of the case and do my best. I saw Mrs Anderson in the room where the patient was, sometime after Dr Thomas' arrival; but I do not know who asked her to come down. After all was over, I was not reprimanded for not calling Mrs Anderson. On the contrary I was asked to have a cup of coffee or tea or some whiskey and soda, but I declined all. After Mrs Anderson went up to her rooms, she sent me down some whiskey & soda, which I took.

sd/ A. Ambrose.

Saturday 14th March 1885

Present. – Mrs Anderson, Matron
Superintendent Genl Hospital
Mrs Ambrose 1st Grade Nurse
General Hospital

Nurse Mrs Ambrose's evidence (marked A of 6th March 1885) having been read to Mrs Anderson, she was invited to cross-examine the nurse.

Question by Matron Superintendent.
What should lead you to suppose that I did not intend you should let me know, on that night, as at all other times, that a serious case of illness was admitted

Answer by Nurse Ambrose.
Because in the first instance, you knew that this case was coming in about 8 p.m. and then when you came down and spoke to me, you told me to take charge of the case and see that everything was done for the patient.

The answer to the 2nd question in evidence A of 6th March is declared to be correct by the Matron Superintendent

Question by Matron Superintendent
Did I not go straight into the room, in

in the Officers' Quarters, that I had ordered you to get ready?

Answer by Nurse Ambrose

"Not that I am aware of"

(A.B) The Matron Superintendent declares the answer to be a manifest falsehood, seeing that she met the nurse in the verandah of the officers' quarters, just outside the room and asked her "Have you got the room ready" The nurse replied "Yes". The Matron Superintendent says she walked into the room, the nurse following her.

The Matron Superintendent then asked "Have you ascertained what the nature of the case is" The nurse replied "No" The Matron Superintendent then said "Neither do I know. I can only gather, that it must be a bad case from the fact of a dooly having been despatched for the patient. I would say that it would be an accident of some sort" I looked round the room and was so far satisfied by the preparation made by the nurse. I saw the mackintosh on the bed and said that it was right. If it is a broken head, you can draw it up, if a broken leg you can draw it down, or if it is not wanted at all, you can easily whip it off. As it would

would probably be a bad case you had better put a feeder here. The feeder was brought by the nurse. (Nurse ambrose denies that the above remarks were made and observes that they are not likely to have been made to a nurse who was in charge of medical cases. She also denies having followed the Matron Superintendent into the room that had been got ready).

The Matron Superintendent continues:-

"Dr Furnell's name was never mentioned by me neither did I suspect that it was a case of Diarrhoea. I gave no particular directions, because Mrs Ambrose was the oldest and most experienced nurse I felt quite comfortable, leaving her in charge, knowing that she would come to me, as usual, on the arrival of any serious case"

With regard to the Nurse's Statement in evidence A of 6th March that the Matron Superintendent did not go with me into the room that I had got ready, I again reiterate that it is utterly untrue.

With regard to the Nurse's Statement in the same document that "I was met by the Matron Supdt who asked me if the patient had arrived &c" the Matron Supdt. states that she saw (the nurse looking towards her as she passed the drawing room door and supposing that she had come up to announce the arrival of the patient she (the Matron Superintendent) left the room and came out on to the (x) landing and asked "has he come" Dr. Thomas who followed me out of the room asked her, if she had heard what the case was. She replied "No" Dr. Thomas used words to the following effect "then you will let us know." (xB) (The nurse denies having spoken to Dr. Thomas or having heard him say these words)

Nurse Miss Leonard States:-

I remember Dr. Furnell's coming to the Hospital on Saturday the 3d January about 6-30-pm, certainly before 7 pm. When I was coming up to the Nurses' quarters. Dr. Furnell called out to me and asked me if Mrs. Anderson(x) was at home. I said "Yes" He asked me if I knew that a room was ready for a patient who was coming in- I said "No" He next asked me "who was the Apothecary on duty", just then Mr. Jesudasen came up. Dr. Furnell told Mr. Jesudasen to tell the Serjeant to send a dooly over to the station and at the same time ordered some opium and Ice to be taken over. Dr. Furnell asked me to tell Mrs. ~~Ambrose~~ Anderson to have a room ready for a patient. I went upstairs and told Mrs. Anderson that Dr. Furnell had come and ordered a room to be got ready for a patient that was coming into the officers quarters. I went into Mrs. Anderson's bedroom where she was beginning to dress (Mrs. Anderson informed the Senior Medl. Officer that when the nurse entered she was beginning to dress) Mrs. Anderson told me to tell Mrs. Ambrose to get the room ready that was vacated by Mr. Ottley. I told Mrs. Anderson in reply to her question, "do you know if it is a Medical or surgical case" I said it may be a case of Dysentery as Tinct: Opium and some Ice are to be sent over to the station with the dooly. I came downstairs and conveyed the message to Mrs. Ambrose, the night nurse on duty (European Medical wards) who prepared the room indicated by the Matron Supdt.

(x) The Matron Supdt.

instead of the one that she had at first thought of. Mrs Andersen disputes the correctness of the answer made by Miss Leonard that "it may be a case of Dysentery" in reply to her question "do you know who it is, or what it is, whether medical or surgical".

The Matron Supdt. states "the Nurse Ambrose was interrupted in her supper that night and complained that she was very tired after the patients death I offered her a cup of tea or coffee which she declined but she said she would like something else as she felt faint Dr. Thomas, who was present, said "oh yes, do give her something - she has been working hard" I replied "I have no objection if you have not" he said "Certainly not". I then said Mrs Ambrose what will you take "a glass of wine or a little whiskey and Soda water" She said "a little whiskey and Soda water". I went upstairs and sent my butler down with it, at once. Mrs Ambrose took it. It was not unasked for

(Mrs Ambrose adheres to her statement already made on 6th March, see evidence A)

/ True Copy /

D. Elcum

Surgeon

Ag: Secy: Surgeon General.
with the Govt. of Madras.

See inside letter
marked X from
Dr Kees
26 June

X
2

Confidential

No. 446.

From. The Senior Medical Officer
General Hospital.

To, The Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras

Sir,- In reply to your letter No. 117 of the 23rd instant, I have the honor to state that Surgeon G. T. Thomas while filling the office of Resident Medical Officer General hospital, did not perform his duties with zeal.

2. He performed his duties in a perfunctory manner and just did enough to avoid getting into serious trouble. I had occasion once, to express dissatisfaction with his work in the out-patients Department, but, instead of taking reproof in a proper manner, he assumed a defiant and insubordinate attitude, for which I would have reported him, if I had felt that, under the late regime my complaint would have been fairly investigated and my authority upheld. I had much difficulty in conducting the work of the hospital with such a Resident Surgeon, as he was impatient of reproof inclined to be disrespectful and argumentative in his tone. He was abusive to Students and rude and inattentive to patients. — I objected, on these grounds, to his re-appointment as Resident Medical Officer, but Surgeon General Cornish disregarded the objections and recommended him a second time, for work,

which he was totally unsuited for, from want of temper, tact and zeal.

3. — Surgeon Thomas, during the period he worked at the General hospital left a very unfavorable impression on my mind. — Had he not been found out in the unfortunate case of the late Captn Hamilton, I would probably on Surgeon General Cornish's departure have applied for another Officer who possessed a fair temper, was attentive to the sick & whose conduct was marked by zeal in the discharge of his duties and respectful bearing to his superiors. — Surgeon Thomas was singularly deficient in these qualities

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servt
J. H. S. Keets
Brigade Surgeon
Senior Medl Officer
General Hospital.

Madras.
Genl Hospital
26th June,
1885.

To
The Secretary to the
Surgeon General
With the Govt of Madras

Sir,

With reference to Memo dated 15 instant, I have the honor to state, for the information of the Surgeon General, that I do not consider the explanation offered by Surgeon Thomas, the Resident Medical Officer of the General Hospital satisfactory.

2. Surgeon Thomas, on his hearing for the first time from the Matron Supt at 7.50 p.m. that a Dhooly with medicines &c had been sent, for a patient expected by train in a few minutes, should have lost no time in arranging for his reception into Hospital. It should have occurred to him that the case was a serious one, for were it not so, the Surgeon General would not have ordered medicines to accompany the Dhooly to the Railway station. He ought to have been present to receive the patient, and to give the requisite help without delay. In waiting to be called, after having had ample notice of the expected arrival of what should have appeared to him a case of very serious illness, he laid himself open to blame for neglect of duty.

No. 20.

To
The Secretary to the
Surgeon General
With the Govt of Madras

Sir,

With reference to Memo dated 15 instant, I have the honor to state, for the information of the Surgeon General, that I do not consider the explanation offered by Surgeon Thomas, the Resident Medical Officer of the General Hospital satisfactory.

2. Surgeon Thomas, on his hearing for the first time from the Matron Supt at 7.50 p.m., that a Dhooly with medicines, &c. had been sent, for a patient expected by train in a few minutes, should have lost no time in arranging for his reception into Hospital. It should have occurred to him that the case was a serious one, for were it not so, the Surgeon General would not have ordered medicines to accompany the Dhooly to the Railway station. He ought to have been present to receive the patient, and to give the requisite help without delay. In waiting to be called, after having had ample notice of the expected arrival of what should have appeared to him a case of very serious illness, he laid himself open to blame for neglect of duty.

3. The instructions given by the Surgeon General, that medicines, brandy ice &c should accompany the Dhooly to the station ought at once to have suggested to the Resident Medical Officer and Matron Superintendent, the necessity for having ready nourishment and other requisites sought for generally in serious cases of illness:

4. The present arrangements of the Stewards' department (which the Surgeon General evidently considers needs improvement) may be made to work more satisfactorily by detailing one of the three Stewards to be always present at night.

I have &c

Madras
General Hospital
17 January 1885

Sd/ J. Rees - Brigade Surgn
Senior Medical Officer General Hospl.

(True Copy)

M. C. Furnell.

Surgeon General with the Government

6

Office of Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras
Coonoor, 6th July 1885.

No. 2/149.

From M. C. Furnell Esqre MD, FRCS
Surgeon General with the
Government of Madras,

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government

Sir,
I have the honor to forward herewith a petition from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General, against the decision of His Excellency the Governor in Council in the late unfortunate case of Captain Hamilton R.E. The petition seems to me conceived in the most defiant and contumacious spirit, and not couched in the temperate and respectful language essential to all petitions.

2. The circumstances of the case are briefly stated in exhibit A of the appendix. The offence of Surgeon G. T. Thomas was in the first instance simply this, that although informed

Office of Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras
Coonoor, 6th July 1885.

No. 2/149.

From M. C. Furnell Esqre MD, FRCS
Surgeon General with the
Government of Madras,

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith *in duplicate a petition* from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General, against the decision of His Excellency the Governor in Council in the late unfortunate case of Captain Hamilton R.E. The petition seems to me conceived in the most defiant and contumacious spirit, and not couched in the temperate and respectful language essential to all petitions.

2. The circumstances of the case are briefly stated in exhibit A of the appendix. The offence of Surgeon G. T. Thomas was in the first instance simply this, that although informed

at 7.30 p.m. that the Surgeon General had ordered a Dhooly to be sent over to the Railway station with brandy, Chlorodyne, opium &c to meet a sick Officer coming by the train, and a room prepared for him in the sick Officers' quarters, Surgeon Thomas gave himself no concern about the matter, did not send for the Apothecary on duty to find out what orders or directions had been given, did not desire to be called, did not receive the patient on admission, but sat down to dinner.

3. His first defence was that the Apothecary did not "when he "saw a European patient was being "brought into Hospital accompanied "by Dr. Furnell, despatch an attendant "and fetch me from my house." The Apothecary was fully occupied attending to the sick Officer, and if he had despatched an attendant, it would have made matters no better, for Mr. Thomas was not in his house. Moreover the Apothecary had earlier in the evening ascertained that fact.

But all this was an after thought [illegible] till never occurred to Surgeon Thom[illegible] [illegible]ral many days after, when Surgeon G[illegible] that Furnell's memo came to Hospital, [illegible]t. anything had been wrong on his pa[illegible] And all this time that he complains he was not sent for to his house, Surgeon Thomas was in the Hospital quite close to the Officers' quarters, was perfectly aware that a European Officer was about to be brought into Hospital, but had himself taken no trouble to send for the Apothecary or tell an attendant to call him when the patient arrived; every thing was to be done by somebody else, but nothing by Mr. Thomas the House Surgeon.

4. His next defence was that "had "the telegram been handed to the Apothecary "we might have known something of "the nature of the case." The acting Surgeon General had no telegram, he was acting simply on the information of Colonel Smith R.E. that a telegram was somewhere about in search of him telling him that

[illegible] was in the train hading up very ill, and on the strength of that he naturally ordered over what would be most useful for a very sick man let the sickness be what it might. Had Surgeon Thomas shown the slightest professional zeal he could have come over to the Railway Station even after his arrival at Hospital, (it is only across the road, a stones throw), and ascertained all this personally, it would not have taken him 10 minutes.

5. Surgeon Thomas in his D.O. exhibit B para d says — "as nurse "Ambrose knew where I was, and I "had told her to call me". This nurse Ambrose distinctly denies — she denies most emphatically that Mr Thomas told her to call him. She is an admirable nurse, and has been in the Hospital now about ten years; is the oldest nurse on its establishment, and it is noticeable that in Mr Thomas's first defence exhibit B he does not say he asked to be called — "I saw nurse Ambrose by the stairs," he writes, "and asked her if the patient [illegible], she [illegible] was till "naturally then waited to be inform[illegible]ral "of the arrival of the patient". Nur[illegible] that Ambrose's impression — given in evidence [illegible]t. was, she was not to disturb either the matron or House Surgeon as it was a dinner party.

6. As regards Surgeon Thomas' last defence in his petition to the Viceroy, wherein he attempts to throw all the blame on Dr Purnell, and talks of his excitement &c, I must decline to say anything, except that having been a medical Officer over thirty years, I am not in the habit of being excited at sick beds.

7. The matter was naturally a very painful one to me, and I shrank for several days from taking any steps in the matter, feeling this sort of defence, viz "personal feeling" might be attributed to me; but it seemed to me, the more I reflected, so grave a scandal, that a sick Officer could be taken to the largest Hospital in Madras, where quarters are purposely

C No. 27904

at 7. did for Officers, and remain half more than half an hour whilst the Matron and Resident Medical Officer were within earshot enjoying themselves at a dinner party, that it was my bounden duty to report it.

8. Mr. Thomas desires to hint that the opinion formed of his conduct by Government is sustained by the professional opinion of Surgeon General Furnell only; as the constitutional adviser of Government it would be ample, but it will be seen from Dr. Reeso' letter herewith attached marked X that his immediate superior Officer most strongly condemned him; and moreover it will be seen by letter marked Z that this is not the case of a zealous Officer making an accidental error. Surgeon Thomas has evidently always performed his medical duties in an unsatisfactory manner.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
M. C. Furnell.

Surgeon General with the
Government of Madras.

will be sent to Madras

G.O. No. 1750 dated 27/7/71

Officers, and remain
more than half an hour whilst
Matron and Resident Medical Officer
within earshot enjoying themselves
at a dinner party, that it was my
bounden duty to report it.
8. Mr. Thomas desires to hint
that the opinion formed of his conduct
by Government is sustained by the
professional opinion of Surgeon General
Furnell only; as the constitutional
adviser of Government it would be
ample, but it will be seen from
Dr. Reeso' letter herewith attached marked
X that his immediate superior Officer
most strongly condemned him; and
moreover it will be seen by letter marked
Z that this is not the case of a zealous
Officer making an accidental error.
Surgeon Thomas has evidently always
performed his medical duties in an
unsatisfactory manner.
Surgeon General with the
Government of Madras

at 7.d
has
to
Ger

Public

CURRENT NO. 2790

from

the Surgeon General with the
Government of Madras.

DISPOSED OF
No. 1750 (Mis)
DATE 27-7-85
BY GOVT. ORDER.

Order 27 July/85 No. 1750 Mis

The memorial will be transmitted ~~through~~ to the Govt. of India and the memorialist informed accordingly.

W
27/vii

D16-7-85
R17-7-85

Surgeon G. T. Thomas - Memorial
of, to the Viceroy and Governor
General, against the decision
of the Governor in Council,
removing him from the Office
of Resident Medical Officer
General Hospital.

To Surgeon G. T. Thomas thro'
the Surg. Genl. with
the G. of Madras
Desp. 3/8

with order.

No. 1751 Mis of 27 July/

From

Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF INDIA,
HOME DEPARTMENT.

Dated 187 .

Public Department.

SIR,

I am directed to forward for the consideration and orders of H.E. the G. G. in Council, the accompanying memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas lately Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital Madras appealing against the orders of this Government removing him from his appt. to the unemployed list —

On the 20th Jany. last the then Ag. S. Genl. (Dr. Furnell) represented to the Government that between the hours of 6.30 & 8 P.M. on the 3d of Jany ~~[illegible]~~, he had called at the Genl. Hospital &, as the resident Surgeon (Surg. G. T. Thomas) was not

nt, had himself directed
Apothecary on
ty to have an officers
room prepared and
a dhooly with brandy
& medicines sent to
the Railway Station

That on his return
shortly after 8 P.M. with
Capt. Hamilton R.E.,
then in a collapsed
stage of Cholera, he could
find neither the sergeant,
nor the Steward, nor
any functionary of the
Hospital, to render
assistance: the House
Surgeon & the Matron
Supt. were also absent
& neither beef tea nor
broth were to be had:
~~But~~, after the patient
had been in bed for
15 or 20 minutes or
perhaps longer, Surgeon
Thomas, the resident
Medl. officer, ~~sauntered~~ ~~Came~~ Stet
into the room in
Evening Costume
and asked if he c

To Surgeon

the 3 of reasons

taking exception only to the
word sauntering

be of any assis
Surgeon Thoma
admits the corr
of the foregoing sta
ments, but attempts
to excuse his absence
from the ward when
the patient arrived
by blaming the
Apothecary for not
having sent a letter
to his quarters informing
him of Dr. Fennells
requisitions; had
this been done Dr. Sr.
Thomas says he shd
at once have made
inquiries about the
case — the Government
however were ~~[illegible]~~
~~prepared~~ unable to attach
any weight to such
a defence as this ~~&~~ seeing
that Dr. Thomas had also
admitted that the
Matron Supt. had informe

at 7.d
has
to
ber

Public

of Dr. Furnell's to the Hospital ... purpose of its ... 7.50 P.M. on the evening in question

6. and that, instead of at once satisfying himself that all arrangements necessary for the proper reception of a case of serious illness had been made, he went off to join the Matron Supdt's dinner party without, so far as can be gathered from his first explanation of 9th Jany., leaving directions that he should be summoned immediately the patient arrived at the hospital.

After an attentive consideration of the whole case the Govt. passed their order of 9th Feby 85 No. 333 in which the removal of Dr. Thomas

---

Home 187 . Dept.

[ ]

From Government of

Fort St. George.

Dated 187
R.

No.
Enclosures.
spare copies.

D. No.
L. No.

Progs. D.
No.

No.

From

Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT
of INDIA,
Home Department.

Dated 187

Department.

Sir,

2/

D/. 11.3.85
No. 141

from his appointment was directed. Shortly afterwards the Surgeon Genl. (Dr. Cornish) ~~4th~~ on his return to duty, addressed the Govt. on behalf of Dr. Thomas.

In para 17 of this paper the Cornish Surgeon Genl. expresses the opinion that Dr Surgn Thomas had committed "a serious error of judgement" in not proceeding to the ward on being apprised of the facts by the Matron Supdt. and seeing with his own eyes that everything was ready, and in not obtaining from the Apothecary on duty an account at first hand of the message

represent

by Dr. Furnell —

In view of the foregoing expression of opinion by the [illegible] of the Med Dept. the Govt. considered that no sufficient reason had been shewn for altering the orders already passed ~~[illegible]~~ but, when ~~[illegible]~~ confirming them, they intimated that as soon as they received from ~~Dr~~ Surgn Thomas an expression of his regret for the serious errors which had been brought home to him a convenient opportunity would be taken of re-employing him.

In his letter to the Surgn Genl. d/28th March 85 Surgn Thomas ~~has~~ distinctly declined to admit that he had committed serious [illegible] in connection with the case of Capt. [illegible] No 333 in which no removal of Dr Thomas

G.O. 24.3.85 No 719.

Letter d/31.3.85

Matters were in this stage when Surgn Thomas addressed the Govt. with the view of ~~a~~ his own exculpation with regard to certain transactions which had taken place when before coming to the Genl. Hospital, he had been employed as Civil Surgeon in the Tinnevelly District and with regard to which he complained of scandalous charges and insinuations against him emanating from an officer employed in the district. Having received this memorial the Govt. have carefully examined the case as represented by Surgn Thomas

The material facts of the case, which has been most carefully looked into by the Govt., are as follows:—

as showing the opinion entertained of the officer by his immediate superior the Senior Med. Officer Genl Hospital I am to invite special attention to the letter noted in the margin in which Dr Kees describes Mr Thomas as being

From Brigade Surgeon Kess Senior Med Officer Genl. Hospital d/26th June 1885.

Hamilton & he ac[illegible] remains on the unem[illegible] list — In this connect[illegible] I am directed to invi[illegible] the attention of the Gov[illegible] of India to the letter from the Senior Med. Officer Genl. Hospital to the Surgeon Genl. in which Surgn Thomas is stated to be totally unfit for the post of Resident surgeon from want of temper, tact and zeal. Dr Kess ~~Brigade Surgeon~~ ~~Kess~~ adds that he found much difficulty in conducting the work of the hospital with such a resident surgeon as he was impatient of reproof, inclined to be disrespectful, argumentative in his tone, abusive to students, and rude and inattentive to patients" —

Before concluding this letter I am to lay before the Govt. of India representi[illegible]

brief account
ceedingly improper
duct on the part
of Surgn Thomas when
District Surgeon of
Tinnevelly, ~~during~~ in connection with
an enquiry into the
"cause of death" of a
Hindu Priest in
that District. The
material facts are the
following:- The jir
or Priest of a Matt in
Nanguneri, a village
in the Tinnevelly Dt,
died suddenly on the
24th Decr 1883 in
circumstances which
led to so strong a sus-
picion of foul play
that the local apothecary
refused to certify as to
the cause of death, the
police raised difficulties
about the burial of
the ~~body~~ corpse, & the Sub.
Magte reported the
case for the orders of
the Magte of the Dt Mr
Brecks Atkinson
since dismissed the
public service by order of the S of State for gross misconduct)

No 333 in
removal of Dr Thomas
surgeon

Home 187 . Dept.

[ ]

From Government of
Fort St. George.

Dated 187
R.

No.
Enclosures.
spare copies.

D. No.
L. No.

Progs. D.
No.

No.

To
The Secretary to the Government
of India,
DEPARTMENT.

~~Sir,~~

Who, as well as Mr Thomas, was then at District Hd Quarters, distant about 18 miles from Nanguneri. Upon receipt of this information it was the duty of Mr B. A., ~~the Magte of the District~~, to direct the Dt Surgeon (Mr Thomas) to proceed forthwith to Nanguneri and certify as to the cause of the jir's death. This however he failed to do & contented himself with despatching a note to Mr Thomas asking if that officer considered the case a suspicious one and adding "the people say they are willing to pay all expenses if you go".

Mr Thomas relies on this note as authorizing him to bargain with the Brahmans

represent

bee
ceeding should pay
400 Rupees for his
the in going to
Nanguneri; but this
explains that Mr Brooks
Inst.? failure to perform his duty ~~misconduct in this~~
~~respect~~ cannot be
accepted as a ~~justification~~
of ~~Mr~~ "justifying or
excusing ~~Mr Thomas's~~ the conduct of Mr Thomas
– an officer of ten years
experience – in entering
into an arrangement
which the Govt., agreeing
in the opinion expressed
by Surgn Genl. Furnell,
consider "as unbecoming
a Commissioned Medl
officer of Govt."–

Mr Thomas proceeded
to Nanguneri and, after
making a very cursory
examination of the corpse,
and without holding
a post mortem examin:
pronounced his opinion
that the cause of death
was apoplexy due to
fatty degeneration of
cerebral arteries and
that the heart was fatty

Para 7. letter d/15.6.85 No. 0/95

d/15.6.85 No. 0/95

– The corpse was
accordingly burned
but no certificate as to
the cause of death was
asked for, a gentleman
Surgeon Genl. Furnell
has informed the Govt.
that the Mr Thomas's
opinion as to the cause
of the death of the girl
is professionally worth
nothing and that for
all that appears to the
contrary the girl might
have been poisoned
"or done to death in
"three or four different
ways"–

The foregoing instances
of misconduct on the
part of Mr Thomas in
the discharge of his public
duties, coupled with the
exceedingly bad opinion
of his temper and general
character which finds
expression in Dr. Rees's
letter of the 26th ultimo
have forced H.E. in C
to the conclusion that

removal of Dr Thomas
Surgeon

Thomas is not a fit
at ... and proper person to
be retained any longer
in Civil employ and H
E in C has accordingly
resolved to ~~delegate~~ ~~him~~ retransfer him
~~officer~~ to the Military Dept
and to furnish copies
of this letter and its
accompaniments to H
E the C in Chief for
consideration
E.F.W.

which will be considered
where it
~~in view to the ? whether it is possible~~
~~any longer~~ whether it is possible
to make use, in any way, of the
services of a person whose
character has been so gravely
compromised by his
conduct while in Civil
employ.
J.F.W.

DEPARTMENT.

To
The Secretary to the
Government of
Department.
Dated 187

Passed in
Council
22/7/85

clean draft
being forwarded
for signature
66
23/7

Fair copy signed
66
27/7

removal of Dr. Thomas
Surgeon

Public Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

P.S.

~~Read the following~~

Letter — No. 1751 dated 27 July/85

To
The Secretary to the
Govt. of India, Home Dept.

Despd with Memorial in duplicate & copies of papers as per list — 29/7/85

Sir,

I am directed to forward for the consideration and orders of H. E. the Governor General in Council, the accompanying memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas lately Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital, Madras appealing against the order of this Government removing him from his appointment to the unemployed list —

2. On the 20th January last the then Acting Surgeon General (Dr. Furnell)

represented to the Government that, between the hours of 6 & 8 P.M. on the 3rd of January, he had called at the General Hospital and, as the resident Surgeon (Surgeon Thomas) was not present, had himself directed the Apothecary on duty to have an officer's room prepared and a Dhooly with brandy and medicines sent to the Railway station, that on his return shortly after 8 P.M. with Captain Hamilton R.E, then in a collapsed stage of Cholera, he could find neither the Sergeant, nor the Steward, nor any functionary of the Hospital, to render assistance: The House Surgeon and the Matron Superintendent

were

were also absent and neither beef-tea nor broth were to be had. But, after the patient had been in bed for 15 or 20 minutes or perhaps longer, Surgeon Thomas, the resident medical officer, sauntered into the room in evening-costume and asked if he could be of any assistance. Surgeon Thomas admits the correctness of the foregoing statements taking exception only to the word "sauntering", but attempts to excuse his absence from the ward when the patient arrived by blaming the Apothecary for not having sent a letter to his quarters informing him of Dr. Furnell's requisitions; had this been done Surgeon Thomas says, he

should

removal of Dr. Thomas
surgeon

should at once have made inquiries about the case - The Government however were unable to attach any weight to such a defence as this, seeing that Surgeon Thomas had also admitted that the Matron Superintendent had informed him of Dr. Furnell's visit to the hospital and the purpose of it at 7.50 P.M. on the evening in question and that, instead of at once satisfying himself that all arrangements necessary for the proper reception of a case of serious illness had been made, he went off to join the Matron Superintendents' dinner party without, so far as can be gathered from

---

~~Department.~~

~~PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.~~

~~Read the following~~

from his first explanation dated 9th January, leaving directions that he should be summoned immediately the patient arrived at the hospital.

3 After an attentive consideration of the whole case the Government passed their order dated 9th February 1885, No. 333 in which the removal of Surgeon Thomas from his appointment was directed. Shortly afterwards the Surgeon General (Mr. Cornish) on his return to duty, addressed the Government on behalf of Surgeon Thomas.

O/11-3-85, No. 141.

4 In para 17 of the

paper Surgeon General Cornish expresses the opinion that Surgeon Thomas had committed "a serious error of judgment" in not proceeding to the ward on being apprised of the facts by the Matron Superintendent and seeing with his own eyes that everything was ready, and in not obtaining from the Apothecary on duty an account at first hand of the message left by Dr. Furnell. In view of the foregoing strongly expressed opinion of the Head of the Medical Department the Government considered that no sufficient reason had been shown for altering the orders already passed, but, ~~when~~ confirming them, they intimated that as soon as they received from Surgeon

GO 24 March 1885, No 719

10

Surgeon Thomas an expression of his regret for the serious errors which had been brought home to him, a convenient opportunity would be taken of re-employing him.

5 In his letter to the Surgeon General dated 28th March 1885, Surgeon Thomas distinctly declined to admit that he had committed serious errors in connection with the case of Captain Hamilton, and he accordingly remains on the unemployed list. In this connection, as showing the opinion entertained of this officer by his immediate superior the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, I am to invite special

attention to the letter noted in the margin in which Dr. Keess describes Mr. Thomas as being totally unfit for the post of Resident Surgeon from want of temper, tact and zeal. Dr. Keess adds that he found much difficulty in conducting the work of the hospital with such a resident surgeon "as he was impatient of reproof, inclined to be disrespectful, argumentative in his tone, abusive to students, and rude and inattentive to patients."

From Brigade Surgeon Keess, Senior Medical officer, General Hospital, dated 26th June 1885.

Matters were in this stage when Surgeon Thomas addressed* the Government with a view to his own exculpation with regard to

*Letter dated 31/3/85.

~~Department.~~

~~PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.~~

~~Read the following~~

to certain transactions which had taken place when, before coming to the General Hospital, he had been employed as Civil Surgeon in the Tinnevelly District and with regard to which he complained of scandalous charges and insinuations against him emanating from an officer employed in the district. Having received this memorial the Government then carefully examined the case as requested by Surgeon Thomas. The material fac[ts] are the following:— The jir or Priest of a Matt i[n] Nanguneri, a village the Tinnevelly District, died suddenly on the 24th December 1883 in circumstances which led to so strong a suspicion of foul play that the local apothecary refused to certify as to the cause of death, the police raised difficulties about the burial of the corpse, and the Sub Magistrate reported the case for the orders of the Magistrate of the District, Mr. Breeks Atkinson (since dismissed the public service by order of the Secretary of State for gross misconduct) who, as well as Mr. Thomas, was then at District Head Quarters, distant about 18 miles from Nanguneri — Upon receipt of this

this information it was the duty of Mr. Breeks Atkinson, to direct the District Surg (Mr. Thomas) to proceed forthwith to Nanguneri and certify as to the cause of the jir's death. This, however, he failed to do and contented himself with despatching a note to Mr. Thomas asking if that officer considered the case a suspicious one and adding "the people say they are willing to pay all expenses if you go".

7. Mr. Thomas relies on this note as authorizin him to bargain with the Brahmans that they shoul pay him Rupees 400 for hi trouble in going to Nangu neri; but it is plain th

Mr. Breeks Atkinson's failure to perform his duty cannot be accepted as justifying or excusing the conduct of Mr. Thomas — an officer of ten years experience — in entering into an arrangement which the Government, agreeing in the opinion expressed by Surgeon General Furnell, consider "as unbecoming a commissioned medical officer of Government".

Para 7. letter d/15.6.85 No. 0/95.

8 Mr. Thomas proceeded to Nanguneri and, after making a very cursory examination of the corpse, and without holding a post mortem examination, pronounced his opinion that the cause of death was apoplexy due to fatty degeneratio

~~PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.~~

~~Read the following.~~

of Cerebral arteries and th the heart was fatty. The corpse was accordingly burie but no certificate as to the cause of death was aske for, or given. Surgeon General Furnell has informed the Government that Mr. Thomas's opinion as to the cause of the death of the gir is professionally worth nothing and that for all that appears to the contrary the girl might have been poisoned "or done to death in three or four different ways".

dated 15-6-85. No. 0/95.

9 The foregoing instanc misconduct on the part Mr. Thomas in the discha

of his public duties, comp d
with the exceedingly bad
opinion of his temper and
general character which
finds expression in Dr.
Kees's letter of the 26th
ultimo, have forced
H. E. in Council to the
conclusion that ~~Dr.~~ Surgeon
Thomas is not a fit and
proper person to be retained
any longer in Civil employ,
and H. E. has accordingly
resolved to retransfer
him to the Military
Department where it
will be considered whether
it is possible to make use,
in any way, of the services
of a person whose character
has been so gravely
compromised by his
conduct while in Civil S 4. 1.

JW

~~Note. This is to be done.
Surgeon Thomas has also
to be informed of the trans-
mission of his [illegible]~~

Br.

due to family depreciatio

I 3019

Surgeon Thomas

Fair draft

P.S.

DISPOSED OF
No. 1751
DATE 27/7/85
BY GOVT. ORDER

1751

For Fair Copy for signature
JW 24/7

3/ Letter to G of I [illegible]

No.

FROM

A. MACKENZIE, Esq., C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of India,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Home Department.
Medical.

SIR,

Simla, the October 1885.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1751 (Miscellaneous), dated 27th July last, forwarding, for the consideration of the Government of India, a memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, late Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital, Madras, in which he appeals against the orders of the Madras Government removing him from his appointment to the Unemployed List.

2. The following are the facts of the case, as recorded in the correspondence. Dr. Furnell, the Acting Surgeon-General, visited the General Hospital about 6-40 P.M. on the 3rd January last, and told the apothecary on duty that a European patient was expected to arrive by the train due at the Madras Central Railway Station at 7-45 P.M., instructing him to send a dooly with medicines to the Station, and to have a room prepared for the patient in the officers' quarters. These instructions were duly carried out, but were not communicated to the Resident Medical Officer till 7-50 P.M., when he, for the first time, was informed of Dr. Furnell's visit by the Matron Superintendent with whom he was engaged to dine. Mr. Thomas then enquired of one of the nurses if the patient had arrived, and, being informed that he had not, instructed the nurse to summon him on the patient's arrival. The patient reached the hospital in due course accompanied by the Acting Surgeon-General, who (finding no medical officer present to receive the patient) sent for the Senior Surgeon, Brigade Surgeon Keess. Surgeon Thomas was informed of the patient's arrival at 8-15 P.M., and immediately went to the room which had been prepared and found Dr. Furnell and attendants engaged in treating Captain Hamilton, who was in the collapse stage of cholera.

3. The reasons assigned for the removal of Mr. Thomas from civil employment are that, having had timely notice of the Acting Surgeon-General's visit, and the object of it, and being perfectly aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital under his immediate control,—

(1) he failed to give any instructions to his subordinates;

(2) he was not present, as it was his duty to have been, to receive the patient on arrival at the hospital.

all cases of accident brought to hospital, and to report them if necessary, seek the assistance of, the Resident Medical Officer. S le, in the absence of any other bearing a contrary sense, may reasonab eld to apply also to cases of serious illness. Moreover, the matron wo m to be the person properly responsible for the preparation of the r, rooms, and the medical officer should scarcely be expected person inspect them previous to the admission of each patient.

8. For the reasons above explained, the Governor General in Co is compelled to dissent from the opinion of the Madras Government t Mr. Thomas's conduct in this case is such as to justify the infliction of t serious penalty of removal to the Unemployed List. It appears to the Gov ernment of India that, on the facts stated, the requirements of the case called for no serious notice on the part of Government.

9. It is observed that your letter under reply contains a reference to two other instances in which Mr. Thomas is said to have been guilty of misconduct during his tenure in 1883 of the appointment of Civil Surgeon of the Tinnevelly District. As regards these cases, the Governor General in Council would remark that, although Mr. Thomas's action in receiving a fee in the case of the Jir or Priest of Nanguneri was without doubt injudicious, and even censurable, the circumstances do not seem to warrant the extreme view expressed by Dr. Furnell and endorsed by the Madras Government. Again, in the case of the Etiapuram Zamindar, there does not appear to the Government of India to be any reason for supposing that Mr. Thomas acted otherwise than in good faith, or that he was actuated by any dishonest intention. His Excellency in Council however considers it unnecessary to discuss these cases in detail, as the orders passed directing Mr. Thomas's removal to the Unemployed List are based entirely on his conduct as Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital in connection with the case of Captain Hamilton, and contain no reference to other instances in which his proceedings were deemed to have been deserving of censure. The probability that Mr. Thomas was guilty of any serious misconduct in these latter cases appears moreover to the Governor General in Council to be much lessened by the fact that he voluntarily invited full enquiry regarding them. Such enquiry, if made at all, should apparently have been instituted long ago; and it does not appear to His Excellency in Council to be fair to Mr. Thomas to adduce these charges now to support a course of action which was avowedly based upon an entirely distinct and more recent set of circumstances.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

A. MACKENZIE,

Secretary to the Government of India.

COPY of the correspondence forwarded to the military Department for information.

By order,

F. C. DAUKES,

Under Secy. to the Government of India.

G. C. B. Press, Simla.—No. 716 H. D.—1-10-85.—98.

No.

FROM

A. MACKENZIE, ESQ., C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of India,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Home Department.
Medical.

Simla, the October 1885.

SIR,

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1751 (Miscellaneous), dated 27th July last, forwarding, for the consideration of the Government of India, a memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, late Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital, Madras, in which he appeals against the orders of the Madras Government removing him from his appointment to the Unemployed List.

2. The following are the facts of the case, as recorded in the correspondence. Dr. Furnell, the Acting Surgeon-General, visited the General Hospital about 6-40 P.M. on the 3rd January last, and told the apothecary on duty that a European patient was expected to arrive by the train due at the Madras Central Railway Station at 7-45 P.M., instructing him to send a dooly with medicines to the Station, and to have a room prepared for the patient in the officers' quarters. These instructions were duly carried out, but were not communicated to the Resident Medical Officer till 7-50 P.M., when he, for the first time, was informed of Dr. Furnell's visit by the Matron Superintendent with whom he was engaged to dine. Mr. Thomas then enquired of one of the nurses if the patient had arrived, and, being informed that he had not, instructed the nurse to summon him on the patient's arrival. The patient reached the hospital in due course accompanied by the Acting Surgeon-General, who (finding no medical officer present to receive the patient) sent for the Senior Surgeon, Brigade Surgeon Keess. Surgeon Thomas was informed of the patient's arrival at 8-15 P.M., and immediately went to the room which had been prepared and found Dr. Furnell and attendants engaged in treating Captain Hamilton, who was in the collapse stage of cholera.

3. The reasons assigned for the removal of Mr. Thomas from civil employment are that, having had timely notice of the Acting Surgeon-General's visit, and the object of it, and being perfectly aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital under his immediate control,—

(1) he failed to give any instructions to his subordinates;

(2) he was not present, as it was his duty to have been, to receive the patient on arrival at the hospital.

4. After perusal of the correspondence and careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the Governor General in Council is constrained to differ from the conclusion at which the Madras Government has arrived with reference to Surgeon Thomas's conduct. His Excellency in Council considers that the explanation of the facts given by Mr. Thomas in his memorial to the Government of India and the remarks of Surgeon-General Cornish in his memorandum of the 11th March last, constitute what is on the whole a satisfactory defence to the gravamen of the charge brought against Mr. Thomas by Acting Surgeon-General Furnell. The facts show that Dr. Furnell visited the hospital about 6-40 P.M., while the train by which the patient was expected to arrive was due at 7-45 P.M. The first intimation received by Mr. Thomas of Dr. Furnell's visit was given to him at 7-50 P.M. when the patient might be momentarily expected, and can scarcely therefore be said to have been "*timely*." In the next place Dr. Furnell's requisitions appear to have been for a dooly and for a room. It is not denied that the room was properly prepared for the patient's reception, and it is admitted that the dooly was sent to the station. Again, as Dr. Furnell omitted to state the nature of the disease from which the expected patient was suffering, the Resident Surgeon could not reasonably be expected to have in readiness medical comforts which might turn out to be entirely unnecessary or inappropriate. The state of non-preparedness, of which Dr. Furnell complains, must apparently have consisted in the absence of broth, hot sand, &c.; but it is not in accordance with ordinary hospital practice that these articles should be always kept in readiness, and no blame can therefore be attached to Mr. Thomas on this account in the absence of any special warning that they would be required. It is presumed that Dr. Furnell himself was not aware of the nature of the case to be treated, as he neither stated it, nor gave definite instructions as to the requirements on his first visit to the hospital. It is not equitable to blame Mr. Thomas for the failure of the apothecary in charge to communicate to him at an earlier hour the fact of Dr. Furnell's visit and the instructions given by that officer.

5. As regards the alleged failure of Mr. Thomas to give instructions to his subordinates in connection with the case of the expected patient, it is observed that according to Mr. Thomas's statement, the correctness of which is not questioned, when he arrived at the hospital at 7-50 P.M., the matron informed him of Dr. Furnell's visit and the object of it, and at the same time intimated that the instructions of the Surgeon-General had been carried out. Mr. Thomas asked if the patient had arrived, and, receiving a reply in the negative, instructed the nurse to summon him in due course. There is nothing, so far as the Government of India can see, to show that any further instructions from Mr. Thomas were necessary or possible, inasmuch as Dr. Furnell had not stated the nature of the case.

6. With reference to the allegation that Mr. Thomas was not present to receive the patient on admission to the hospital, it is acknowledged on all sides that Mr. Thomas was actually in the hospital when the patient arrived, and was even within earshot of the room into which he was received. If the reference made to Mr. Thomas's failure to receive the patient means that it is considered to be part of the duties of a Resident Surgeon to wait for an indefinite period in the entrance hall or porch of a hospital to receive a patient, the Governor

Council cannot accept this view, which is opposed to the practice General in force, and which is moreover scarcely reasonable. In every univers, Mr. Thomas appears to have been present to receive the patient; other fact that he did not actually do so was due to the failure of the nurse and thecary to summon him, in spite of the special instructions which he and en in the matter, and in opposition to the standing orders of the had al. The Governor General in Council would also observe that it would h been better if Dr. Furnell, instead of sending for Dr. Keess, an h er who is believed to be non-resident and whose arrival would necessarily volve some delay, had at once enquired as to the cause of Mr. Thomas's bsence and directed the nurse or some other attendant to call him in. Such an enquiry and order would doubtless have been followed by the immediate attendance of the Resident Surgeon, and it was additionally incumbent on Dr. Furnell to have taken this course, if he considered Mr. Thomas's absence irregular, as he was at the time officiating in the appointment of Surgeon-General. The truth, however, appears to be that Dr. Furnell's urgent requisition of the services of the attendants prevented them from giving immediate notice to Mr. Thomas. No blame can be imputed to Dr. Furnell for thus acting, but it is equally clear that Mr. Thomas was not responsible for the delay which intervened between the arrival of the patient and his personal attendance on the case.

7. In paragraph 4 of your letter under acknowledgment reference is made to the views expressed in the memorandum by Surgeon-General Cornish of 11th March 1885, as rendering it undesirable to modify the action taken in removing Mr. Thomas to the Unemployed List. On this point I am to observe that, although Dr. Cornish in paragraph 17 of the memorandum expressed his opinion that Mr. Thomas had been guilty of "a serious error of judgment" in not having personally satisfied himself on arrival at the hospital that the necessary arrangements had been made for the reception of the patient and in not having obtained from the apothecary directly an account of the instructions left by Dr. Furnell, he added that "an error of this kind can scarcely be construed as 'a gross neglect of duty,' and the punishment described in the Government Order, which virtually closes the door to professional advancement of a promising young officer, seems to me to be somewhat disproportioned to the offence." The error appears indeed to the Governor General in Council to have been a very venial one. Mr. Thomas had been informed by the Matron Superintendent of the facts so far as they were known, had ascertained that the room was ready for the expected patient, and given orders that he should be called as soon as the patient appeared. Under all ordinary circumstances he had done as much as could fairly have been expected of him. The whole tenor of Dr. Cornish's memorandum goes to show that, in the opinion of that officer, the degree of blame attributed to Mr. Thomas by Dr. Furnell was excessive, and that the extreme punishment of removal to the Unemployed List was uncalled for. In the opinion of the Governor General in Council, Dr. Cornish's memorandum can scarcely be cited as supporting the condemnation of Mr. Thomas. To the arguments set forth in that memorandum, it may moreover be added that, under ordinary circumstances, it would not appear to be part of the Resident Surgeon's duties to attend to all serious cases on first admission. The Hospital rules state it to be one of the duties of the assistant apothecary to attend to

all cases of accident brought to hospital, and to report them and, if necessary, seek the assistance of, the Resident Medical Officer. Su rule, in the absence of any other bearing a contrary sense, may reasonabl held to apply also to cases of serious illness. Moreover, the matron wou eem to be the person properly responsible for the preparation of the pats' rooms, and the medical officer should scarcely be expected persona to inspect them previous to the admission of each patient.

8. For the reasons above explained, the Governor General in Cou is compelled to dissent from the opinion of the Madras Government t Mr. Thomas's conduct in this case is such as to justify the infliction of th serious penalty of removal to the Unemployed List. It appears to the Government of India that, on the facts stated, the requirements of the case called for no serious notice on the part of Government.

9. It is observed that your letter under reply contains a reference to two other instances in which Mr. Thomas is said to have been guilty of misconduct during his tenure in 1883 of the appointment of Civil Surgeon of the Tinnevelly District. As regards these cases, the Governor General in Council would remark that, although Mr. Thomas's action in receiving a fee in the case of the Jir or Priest of Nanguneri was without doubt injudicious, and even censurable, the circumstances do not seem to warrant the extreme view expressed by Dr. Furnell and endorsed by the Madras Government. Again, in the case of the Etiapuram Zamindar, there does not appear to the Government of India to be any reason for supposing that Mr. Thomas acted otherwise than in good faith, or that he was actuated by any dishonest intention. His Excellency in Council however considers it unnecessary to discuss these cases in detail, as the orders passed directing Mr. Thomas's removal to the Unemployed List are based entirely on his conduct as Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital in connection with the case of Captain Hamilton, and contain no reference to other instances in which his proceedings were deemed to have been deserving of censure. The probability that Mr. Thomas was guilty of any serious misconduct in these latter cases appears moreover to the Governor General in Council to be much lessened by the fact that he voluntarily invited full enquiry regarding them. Such enquiry, if made at all, should apparently have been instituted long ago; and it does not appear to His Excellency in Council to be fair to Mr. Thomas to adduce these charges now to support a course of action which was avowedly based upon an entirely distinct and more recent set of circumstances.

FW

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

A. MACKENZIE,

Secretary to the Government of India.

COPY of the correspondence forwarded to the military Department for information.

By order,

F. C. DAUKES,

Under Secy. to the Government of India.

G. C. B. Press, Simla.—No. 716 H. D.—1-10-85.—98.

No.

FROM

A. MACKENZIE, ESQ., C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of India,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Home Department.
Medical.

Simla, the October 1885.

SIR,

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1751 (Miscellaneous), dated 27th July last, forwarding, for the consideration of the Government of India, a memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, late Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital, Madras, in which he appeals against the orders of the Madras Government removing him from his appointment to the Unemployed List.

2. The following are the facts of the case, as recorded in the correspondence. Dr. Furnell, the Acting Surgeon-General, visited the General Hospital about 6-40 P.M. on the 3rd January last, and told the apothecary on duty that a European patient was expected to arrive by the train due at the Madras Central Railway Station at 7-45 P.M., instructing him to send a dooly with medicines to the Station, and to have a room prepared for the patient in the officers' quarters. These instructions were duly carried out, but were not communicated to the Resident Medical Officer till 7-50 P.M., when he, for the first time, was informed of Dr. Furnell's visit by the Matron Superintendent with whom he was engaged to dine. Mr. Thomas then enquired of one of the nurses if the patient had arrived, and, being informed that he had not, instructed the nurse to summon him on the patient's arrival. The patient reached the hospital in due course accompanied by the Acting Surgeon-General, who (finding no medical officer present to receive the patient) sent for the Senior Surgeon, Brigade Surgeon Keess. Surgeon Thomas was informed of the patient's arrival at 8-15 P.M., and immediately went to the room which had been prepared and found Dr. Furnell and attendants engaged in treating Captain Hamilton, who was in the collapse stage of cholera.

3. The reasons assigned for the removal of Mr. Thomas from civil employment are that, having had timely notice of the Acting Surgeon-General's visit, and the object of it, and being perfectly aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital under his immediate control,—

(1) he failed to give any instructions to his subordinates;

(2) he was not present, as it was his duty to have been, to receive the patient on arrival at the hospital.

4. After perusal of the correspondence and careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the Governor General in Council is constrained to differ from the conclusion at which the Madras Government has arrived with reference to Surgeon Thomas's conduct. His Excellency in Council considers that the explanation of the facts given by Mr. Thomas in his memorial to the Government of India and the remarks of Surgeon-General Cornish in his memorandum of the 11th March last, constitute what is on the whole a satisfactory defence to the gravamen of the charge brought against Mr. Thomas by Acting Surgeon-General Furnell. The facts show that Dr. Furnell visited the hospital about 6-40 P.M., while the train by which the patient was expected to arrive was due at 7-45 P.M. The first intimation received by Mr. Thomas of Dr. Furnell's visit was given to him at 7-50 P.M., when the patient might be momentarily expected, and can scarcely therefore be said to have been "*timely*." In the next place Dr. Furnell's requisitions appear to have been for a dooly and for a room. It is not denied that the room was properly prepared for the patient's reception, and it is admitted that the dooly was sent to the station. Again, as Dr. Furnell omitted to state the nature of the disease from which the expected patient was suffering, the Resident Surgeon could not reasonably be expected to have in readiness medical comforts which might turn out to be entirely unnecessary or inappropriate. The state of non-preparedness, of which Dr. Furnell complains, must apparently have consisted in the absence of broth, hot sand, &c.; but it is not in accordance with ordinary hospital practice that these articles should be always kept in readiness, and no blame can therefore be attached to Mr. Thomas on this account in the absence of any special warning that they would be required. It is presumed that Dr. Furnell himself was not aware of the nature of the case to be treated, as he neither stated it, nor gave definite instructions as to the requirements on his first visit to the hospital. It is not equitable to blame Mr. Thomas for the failure of the apothecary in charge to communicate to him at an earlier hour the fact of Dr. Furnell's visit and the instructions given by that officer.

5. As regards the alleged failure of Mr. Thomas to give instructions to his subordinates in connection with the case of the expected patient, it is observed that according to Mr. Thomas's statement, the correctness of which is not questioned, when he arrived at the hospital at 7-50 P.M., the matron informed him of Dr. Furnell's visit and the object of it, and at the same time intimated that the instructions of the Surgeon-General had been carried out. Mr. Thomas asked if the patient had arrived, and, receiving a reply in the negative, instructed the nurse to summon him in due course. There is nothing, so far as the Government of India can see, to show that any further instructions from Mr. Thomas were necessary or possible, inasmuch as Dr. Furnell had not stated the nature of the case.

6. With reference to the allegation that Mr. Thomas was not present to receive the patient on admission to the hospital, it is acknowledged on all sides that Mr. Thomas was actually in the hospital when the patient arrived, and was even within earshot of the room into which he was received. If the reference made to Mr. Thomas's failure to receive the patient means that it is considered to be part of the duties of a Resident Surgeon to wait for an indefinite period in the entrance hall or porch of a hospital to receive a patient, the Governor General in Council cannot accept this view, which is opposed to the practice universally in force, and which is moreover scarcely reasonable. In every other sense, Mr. Thomas appears to have been present to receive the patient; and the fact that he did not actually do so was due to the failure of the nurse and apothecary to summon him, in spite of the special instructions which he had given in the matter, and in opposition to the standing orders of the hospital. The Governor General in Council would also observe that it would have been better if Dr. Furnell, instead of sending for Dr. Keess, an officer who is believed to be non-resident and whose arrival would necessarily involve some delay, had at once enquired as to the cause of Mr. Thomas's absence and directed the nurse or some other attendant to call him in. Such an enquiry and order would doubtless have been followed by the immediate attendance of the Resident Surgeon, and it was additionally incumbent on Dr. Furnell to have taken this course, if he considered Mr. Thomas's absence irregular, as he was at the time officiating in the appointment of Surgeon-General. The truth, however, appears to be that Dr. Furnell's urgent requisition of the services of the attendants prevented them from giving immediate notice to Mr. Thomas. No blame can be imputed to Dr. Furnell for thus acting, but it is equally clear that Mr. Thomas was not responsible for the delay which intervened between the arrival of the patient and his personal attendance on the case.

7. In paragraph 4 of your letter under acknowledgment reference is made to the views expressed in the memorandum by Surgeon-General Cornish of 11th March 1885, as rendering it undesirable to modify the action taken in removing Mr. Thomas to the Unemployed List. On this point I am to observe that, although Dr. Cornish in paragraph 17 of the memorandum expressed his opinion that Mr. Thomas had been guilty of "a serious error of judgment" in not having personally satisfied himself on arrival at the hospital that the necessary arrangements had been made for the reception of the patient and in not having obtained from the apothecary directly an account of the instructions left by Dr. Furnell, he added that "an error of this kind can scarcely be construed as 'a gross neglect of duty,' and the punishment described in the Government Order, which virtually closes the door to professional advancement of a promising young officer, seems to me to be somewhat disproportioned to the offence." The error appears indeed to the Governor General in Council to have been a very venial one. Mr. Thomas had been informed by the Matron Superintendent of the facts so far as they were known, had ascertained that the room was ready for the expected patient, and given orders that he should be called as soon as the patient appeared. Under all ordinary circumstances he had done as much as could fairly have been expected of him. The whole tenor of Dr. Cornish's memorandum goes to show that, in the opinion of that officer, the degree of blame attributed to Mr. Thomas by Dr. Furnell was excessive, and that the extreme punishment of removal to the Unemployed List was uncalled for. In the opinion of the Governor General in Council, Dr. Cornish's memorandum can scarcely be cited as supporting the condemnation of Mr. Thomas. To the arguments set forth in that memorandum, it may moreover be added that, under ordinary circumstances, it would not appear to be part of the Resident Surgeon's duties to attend to all serious cases on first admission. The Hospital rules state it to be one of the duties of the assistant apothecary to attend to

all cases of accident brought to hospital, and to report them to, and, if necessary, seek the assistance of, the Resident Medical Officer. Such a rule, in the absence of any other bearing a contrary sense, may reasonably be held to apply also to cases of serious illness. Moreover, the matron would seem to be the person properly responsible for the preparation of the patients' rooms, and the medical officer should scarcely be expected personally to inspect them previous to the admission of each patient.

8. For the reasons above explained, the Governor General in Council is compelled to dissent from the opinion of the Madras Government that Mr. Thomas's conduct in this case is such as to justify the infliction of the serious penalty of removal to the Unemployed List. It appears to the Government of India that, on the facts stated, the requirements of the case called for no serious notice on the part of Government.

9. It is observed that your letter under reply contains a reference to two other instances in which Mr. Thomas is said to have been guilty of misconduct during his tenure in 1883 of the appointment of Civil Surgeon of the Tinnevelly District. As regards these cases, the Governor General in Council would remark that, although Mr. Thomas's action in receiving a fee in the case of the Jir or Priest of Nanguneri was without doubt injudicious, and even censurable, the circumstances do not seem to warrant the extreme view expressed by Dr. Furnell and endorsed by the Madras Government. Again, in the case of the Etiapuram Zamindar, there does not appear to the Government of India to be any reason for supposing that Mr. Thomas acted otherwise than in good faith, or that he was actuated by any dishonest intention. His Excellency in Council however considers it unnecessary to discuss these cases in detail, as the orders passed directing Mr. Thomas's removal to the Unemployed List are based entirely on his conduct as Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital in connection with the case of Captain Hamilton, and contain no reference to other instances in which his proceedings were deemed to have been deserving of censure. The probability that Mr. Thomas was guilty of any serious misconduct in these latter cases appears moreover to the Governor General in Council to be much lessened by the fact that he voluntarily invited full enquiry regarding them. Such enquiry, if made at all, should apparently have been instituted long ago; and it does not appear to His Excellency in Council to be fair to Mr. Thomas to adduce these charges now to support a course of action which was avowedly based upon an entirely distinct and more recent set of circumstances.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

A. MACKENZIE,

Secretary to the Government of India.

COPY of the correspondence forwarded to the military Department for information.

By order,

F. C. DAUKES,

Under Secy. to the Government of India.

G. C. B. Press, Simla.—No. 716 H. D.—1-10-85.—98

Department.

~~PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMEN~~T.

~~READ the following~~

D.O.

28th October 1885

Dear Irvine,

The enclosed demi-official note from the Hon'ble Mr. Master will explain to you what the orders and wishes of the Govt. of India and Madras are regarding the re-employment of Dr. Thomas. He must be re-employed under the Resolution of the Govt. of India and as he is now at the disposal of the Military Dept must be employed therein till his services are applied for - it is not

inte

intended to apply for them – by the Civil Dept.

The confidential orders that I understand you to have had regarding the non-employment of Dr. Thomas were I presume of date anterior to the final order of India in his case. That of course supersedes all former orders whatever their nature.

Yours sincerely
EJ W. Wilson

Return the enclosure please.

Surgeon Genl Irvine. } Despd
with Enclo: } 28/10/85

No. 515.

FROM

A. MACKENZIE, Esq., C.S.,
Secretary to the Government of India,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
MADRAS.

Home Department.
Medical.

9

Simla, the 3 October 1885.

SIR,

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1751 (Miscellaneous), dated 27th July last, forwarding, for the consideration of the Government of India, a memorial from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, late Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital, Madras, in which he appeals against the orders of the Madras Government removing him from his appointment to the Unemployed List.

2. The following are the facts of the case, as recorded in the correspondence. Dr. Furnell, the Acting Surgeon-General, visited the General Hospital about 6-40 P.M. on the 3rd January last, and told the apothecary on duty that a European patient was expected to arrive by the train due at the Madras Central Railway Station at 7-45 P.M., instructing him to send a dooly with medicines to the Station, and to have a room prepared for the patient in the officers' quarters. These instructions were duly carried out, but were not communicated to the Resident Medical Officer till 7-50 P.M., when he, for the first time, was informed of Dr. Furnell's visit by the Matron Superintendent with whom he was engaged to dine. Mr. Thomas then enquired of one of the nurses if the patient had arrived, and, being informed that he had not, instructed the nurse to summon him on the patient's arrival. The patient reached the hospital in due course accompanied by the Acting Surgeon-General, who (finding no medical officer present to receive the patient) sent for the Senior Surgeon, Brigade Surgeon Keess. Surgeon Thomas was informed of the patient's arrival at 8-15 P.M., and immediately went to the room which had been prepared and found Dr. Furnell and attendants engaged in treating Captain Hamilton, who was in the collapse stage of cholera.

3. The reasons assigned for the removal of Mr. Thomas from civil employment are that, having had timely notice of the Acting Surgeon-General's visit, and the object of it, and being perfectly aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital under his immediate control,—

(1) he failed to give any instructions to his subordinates;

(2) he was not present, as it was his duty to have been, to receive the patient on arrival at the hospital.

4. After perusal of the correspondence and careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the Governor General in Council is constrained to differ from the conclusion at which the Madras Government has arrived with reference to Surgeon Thomas's conduct. His Excellency in Council considers that the explanation of the facts given by Mr. Thomas in his memorial to the Government of India and the remarks of Surgeon-General Cornish in his memorandum of the 11th March last, constitute what is on the whole a satisfactory defence to the gravamen of the charge brought against Mr. Thomas by Acting Surgeon-General Furnell. The facts show that Dr. Furnell visited the hospital about 6-40 P.M., while the train by which the patient was expected to arrive was due at 7-45 P.M. The first intimation received by Mr. Thomas of Dr. Furnell's visit was given to him at 7-50 P.M., when the patient might be momentarily expected, and can scarcely therefore be said to have been "*timely.*" In the next place Dr. Furnell's requisitions appear to have been for a dooly and for a room. It is not denied that the room was properly prepared for the patient's reception, and it is admitted that the dooly was sent to the station. Again, as Dr. Furnell omitted to state the nature of the disease from which the expected patient was suffering, the Resident Surgeon could not reasonably be expected to have in readiness medical comforts which might turn out to be entirely unnecessary or inappropriate. The state of non-preparedness, of which Dr. Furnell complains, must apparently have consisted in the absence of broth, hot sand, &c.; but it is not in accordance with ordinary hospital practice that these articles should be always kept in readiness, and no blame can therefore be attached to Mr. Thomas on this account in the absence of any special warning that they would be required. It is presumed that Dr. Furnell himself was not aware of the nature of the case to be treated, as he neither stated it, nor gave definite instructions as to the requirements on his first visit to the hospital. It is not equitable to blame Mr. Thomas for the failure of the apothecary in charge to communicate to him at an earlier hour the fact of Dr. Furnell's visit and the instructions given by that officer.

5. As regards the alleged failure of Mr. Thomas to give instructions to his subordinates in connection with the case of the expected patient, it is observed that according to Mr. Thomas's statement, the correctness of which is not questioned, when he arrived at the hospital at 7-50 P.M., the matron informed him of Dr. Furnell's visit and the object of it, and at the same time intimated that the instructions of the Surgeon-General had been carried out. Mr. Thomas asked if the patient had arrived, and, receiving a reply in the negative, instructed the nurse to summon him in due course. There is nothing, so far as the Government of India can see, to show that any further instructions from Mr. Thomas were necessary or possible, inasmuch as Dr. Furnell had not stated the nature of the case.

6. With reference to the allegation that Mr. Thomas was not present to receive the patient on admission to the hospital, it is acknowledged on all sides that Mr. Thomas was actually in the hospital when the patient arrived, and was even within earshot of the room into which he was received. If the reference made to Mr. Thomas's failure to receive the patient means that it is considered to be part of the duties of a Resident Surgeon to wait for an indefinite period in the entrance hall or porch of a hospital to receive a patient, the Governor General in Council cannot accept this view, which is opposed to the practice universally in force, and which is moreover scarcely reasonable. In every other sense, Mr. Thomas appears to have been present to receive the patient; and the fact that he did not actually do so was due to the failure of the nurse and apothecary to summon him, in spite of the special instructions which he had given in the matter, and in opposition to the standing orders of the hospital. The Governor General in Council would also observe that it would have been better if Dr. Furnell, instead of sending for Dr. Keess, an officer who is believed to be non-resident and whose arrival would necessarily involve some delay, had at once enquired as to the cause of Mr. Thomas's absence and directed the nurse or some other attendant to call him in. Such an enquiry and order would doubtless have been followed by the immediate attendance of the Resident Surgeon, and it was additionally incumbent on Dr. Furnell to have taken this course, if he considered Mr. Thomas's absence irregular, as he was at the time officiating in the appointment of Surgeon-General. The truth, however, appears to be that Dr. Furnell's urgent requisition of the services of the attendants prevented them from giving immediate notice to Mr. Thomas. No blame can be imputed to Dr. Furnell for thus acting, but it is equally clear that Mr. Thomas was not responsible for the delay which intervened between the arrival of the patient and his personal attendance on the case.

7. In paragraph 4 of your letter under acknowledgment reference is made to the views expressed in the memorandum by Surgeon-General Cornish of 11th March 1885, as rendering it undesirable to modify the action taken in removing Mr. Thomas to the Unemployed List. On this point I am to observe that, although Dr. Cornish in paragraph 17 of the memorandum expressed his opinion that Mr. Thomas had been guilty of "a serious error of judgment" in not having personally satisfied himself on arrival at the hospital that the necessary arrangements had been made for the reception of the patient and in not having obtained from the apothecary directly an account of the instructions left by Dr. Furnell, he added that "an error of this kind can scarcely be construed as 'a gross neglect of duty,' and the punishment described in the Government Order, which virtually closes the door to professional advancement of a promising young officer, seems to me to be somewhat disproportioned to the offence." The error appears indeed to the Governor General in Council to have been a very venial one. Mr. Thomas had been informed by the Matron Superintendent of the facts so far as they were known, had ascertained that the room was ready for the expected patient, and given orders that he should be called as soon as the patient appeared. Under all ordinary circumstances he had done as much as could fairly have been expected of him. The whole tenor of Dr. Cornish's memorandum goes to show that, in the opinion of that officer, the degree of blame attributed to Mr. Thomas by Dr. Furnell was excessive, and that the extreme punishment of removal to the Unemployed List was uncalled for. In the opinion of the Governor General in Council, Dr. Cornish's memorandum can scarcely be cited as supporting the condemnation of Mr. Thomas. To the arguments set forth in that memorandum, it may moreover be added that, under ordinary circumstances, it would not appear to be part of the Resident Surgeon's duties to attend to all serious cases on first admission. The Hospital rules state it to be one of the duties of the assistant apothecary to attend to

Public

CURRENT NO. 4

all cases of accident brought to hospital, and to report them to, and, if necessary, seek the assistance of, the Resident Medical Officer. Such a rule, in the absence of any other bearing a contrary sense, may reasonably be held to apply also to cases of serious illness. Moreover, the matron would seem to be the person properly responsible for the preparation of the patients' rooms, and the medical officer should scarcely be expected personally to inspect them previous to the admission of each patient.

8. For the reasons above explained, the Governor General in Council is compelled to dissent from the opinion of the Madras Government that Mr. Thomas's conduct in this case is such as to justify the infliction of the serious penalty of removal to the Unemployed List. It appears to the Government of India that, on the facts stated, the requirements of the case called for no serious notice on the part of Government.

9. It is observed that your letter under reply contains a reference to two other instances in which Mr. Thomas is said to have been guilty of misconduct during his tenure in 1883 of the appointment of Civil Surgeon of the Tinnevelly District. As regards these cases, the Governor General in Council would remark that, although Mr. Thomas's action in receiving a fee in the case of the Jir or Priest of Nanguneri was without doubt injudicious, and even censurable, the circumstances do not seem to warrant the extreme view expressed by Dr. Furnell and endorsed by the Madras Government. Again, in the case of the Etiapuram Zamindar, there does not appear to the Government of India to be any reason for supposing that Mr. Thomas acted otherwise than in good faith, or that he was actuated by any dishonest intention. His Excellency in Council however considers it unnecessary to discuss these cases in detail, as the orders passed directing Mr. Thomas's removal to the Unemployed List are based entirely on his conduct as Resident Surgeon of the General Hospital in connection with the case of Captain Hamilton, and contain no reference to other instances in which his proceedings were deemed to have been deserving of censure. The probability that Mr. Thomas was guilty of any serious misconduct in these latter cases appears moreover to the Governor General in Council to be much lessened by the fact that he voluntarily invited full enquiry regarding them. Such enquiry, if made at all, should apparently have been instituted long ago; and it does not appear to His Excellency in Council to be fair to Mr. Thomas to adduce these charges now to support a course of action which was avowedly based upon an entirely distinct and more recent set of circumstances.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

A Mackenzie

Secretary to the Government of India.

14 Octr 85 No 2428.

Order 12/10

Communicated to the Military Dept. with reference to G.O. 30th July 85 No 1795.

10/x

No 516. To The Military Department.

Is 10/10/85

Military Acctt Genl

Copy to Surgeon General & Dr. Thomas with extract para 8.

2. The Acct. General will pay to Surgeon Thomas such allowances as under [illegible] the difference between employed and unemployed pay from 31 July till the date on which [illegible] may be [illegible] to Dr Thomas [illegible]

H-Dec 10/10

30th July 1885, No. 1795, Public.

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers:—

G.O., 9th February 1885, Mis. No. 333, Public.

Read—the following paper:—

From M. C. FURNELL, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 20th January 1885, No. 37.

I have the honor to forward, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, and for such orders as he may be good enough to pass, the details of what seems to me a gross neglect of duty.

2. The circumstances are, I think, sufficiently set forth in my memorandum marked A and the opinion of the Senior Medical Officer in appendix marked B, to obviate the necessity of recapitulation in this letter.

3. I was somewhat loath, being personally concerned, to move in the matter; but consideration has every day more and more fully convinced me I should not be doing my duty either to the Government or the public, if I refrained from bringing the conduct of Surgeon Thomas and the Matron Superintendent to the notice of Government. A large public institution, such as the General Hospital, is expected, and should be prepared, to render promptly skilled medical attendance in urgent cases; here ample notice was given, but the Resident Medical Officer and Matron are dining upstairs with a company of friends, within earshot of the ward wherein a young officer, a valuable servant of Government, is struggling against advancing death, rendered more sure because no restoratives or food had been prepared to assist him in the struggle, and the skilled attendance provided by Government was conspicuous by its absence.

Enclosures.

A.

MEMORANDUM No. 42.

On the evening of Saturday, about 6 P.M., Acting Surgeon-General Furnell received a telegram saying Captain Hamilton, R.E., was very ill in the train coming from Vellore, and asking him to meet Captain Hamilton on arrival of train or send a medical officer.

2. Dr. Furnell, in company with Colonel C. J. Smith, R.E., drove down to General Hospital and saw Mr. Jesudasen, an Apothecary on duty; inquired for the Resident Medical Officer, and was informed he was gone out; asked to have a room in the officers' quarters got ready and a dhooly, with brandy, medicines, &c., sent over to railway station.

3. The dhooly was sent in charge of a senior medical student.

4. The train arrived at 8 P.M., and Captain Hamilton, who was in a collapsed stage of cholera, was immediately removed in a dhooly to the General Hospital, accompanied by Dr. Furnell.

5. On arrival at the General Hospital the dhooly was received by Jesudasen. There was no sergeant, no steward or any other functionary to render assistance. The bearers wanted to take the dhooly upstairs, which was, at a glance, an evident impossibility.

6. At Dr. Furnell's suggestion a stretcher was brought and the patient was removed in it to the room in officers' quarters.

7. There, no House Surgeon or Matron was present to render assistance. There was no broth or beef-tea ready. As an old hospital physician, Dr. Furnell gave orders to have hot sand, hot broth, and hot water got ready; after a little time, hot milk and some brandy was produced, and subsequently, owing mainly to nurse Ambrose's exertions, hot broth made its appearance.

8. In the mean time, under Dr. Furnell's and Jesudasen's supervision, the patient was undressed and rubbed, and, when obtainable, milk, brandy, and broth was administered; there was no indication for treatment by medicine. It was a case of sinking from collapse. There was no vomiting or purging. About 15 or 20 minutes after the patient had been put to bed (it might be more), Surgeon G. T. Thomas the Resident Medical Officer sauntered into the room, in evening costume, and addressing Dr. Furnell asked if he could be of any assistance.

9. Dr. Furnell expressed his astonishment that, after the notice he had given of a patient dangerously ill being about to be brought to the hospital, more attention had not been paid, and that the House Surgeon was not present to receive and treat him; to which Surgeon Thomas replied he was perfectly aware a patient was about to be brought, for the Matron had told him so, and a room had been prepared, and that, moreover, he was not absent but in the hospital at the time of his (Captain Hamilton's) arrival, *but upstairs dining with the matron Mrs. Anderson.*

10. Now it seems to the Surgeon-General that Surgeon Thomas showed a lamentable ignorance of his duties under such an occasion. It was clearly his duty to have at once attended on a sick officer being brought in. Supposing, for instance, Captain Hamilton had been brought in by Colonel C. J. Smith, R.E., knowing nothing of the duties of the hospital, who would have ordered hot sand, hot water, hot broth, &c., to be prepared?

11. Dr. Keess, for whom, in his emergency, Dr. Furnell sent, and who immediately responded to his call, will, no doubt, share Dr. Furnell's feelings of astonishment at the treatment received, and will call upon Surgeon Thomas for any explanation he may have to offer for the conduct described above, and forward it to the Surgeon-General.

12. Dr. Furnell would also like to be informed if there is not an assistant steward at the General Hospital, whose duty it is to be present when the steward is absent. Such an arrangement was in existence when he was Senior Medical Officer.

(By Order.)

(Signed) A. J. STURMER, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

To the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital.

Memorandum from Brigade-Surgeon J. KEESS, M.D., Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, to the Secretary, Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 10th January 1885, No. 142.

Has the honor to forward explanations called for by the Surgeon-General from the Resident Medical Officer, the Matron Superintendent, and the Steward.

From Surgeon G. T. THOMAS, Resident Medical Officer, to the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, Madras, dated 9th January 1885.

With reference to memorandum, No. 42 of 6th January 1885, from the Secretary, Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to your address, I have the honor to offer the following explanations:

2. At 7-50 P.M. on the 3rd instant, I went upstairs to dine with the Matron Superintendent; I was then first informed by her that Dr. Furnell had been to the hospital and had ordered a dhooly and medicines to be sent to the central railway station, and that she (Mrs. Anderson) had prepared a room in the officers' quarters for the patient expected. At this time I saw nurse Ambrose by the stairs, and I asked her if the patient had arrived; she said "No". I naturally then waited to be informed of the arrival of the patient, *being ignorant of the true nature of the case, as was every one else.*

3. At 8-15 P.M., shortly after sitting down to dinner, nurse Ambrose came to inform me that the patient had arrived; I immediately left the table and went to the ward, where I was surprised to find Dr. Furnell, and that the patient was Captain Hamilton, R.E., in the collapse stage of cholera.

4. Dr. Furnell being an old experienced hospital physician and a relative of Captain Hamilton, I naturally asked him what line of medical treatment he would suggest. I saw that the patient had several attendants rubbing his extremities, and that he was receiving stimulants and nourishment, as the Surgeon-General remarks there was no indication for treatment by medicine. Dr. Furnell asked me to prescribe a stimulant mixture; I wrote this out and administered the first dose in a very few minutes, and assisted in applying warmth and friction to the extremities. I changed my dress coat at the first opportunity, having sent to my quarters for another coat. I very much regretted that unavoidably I was obliged to appear at first on such a scene in evening dress. I subsequently administered a beef-tea and brandy enema, and gave two hypodermic injections of Æther, and assisted in applying warmth and friction to the extremities of the patient.

5. With regard to my dining upstairs with the Matron Superintendent, if this be regarded as an offence, I must state that previous to this occasion, I had never in 1883 or 1884 had a single meal in Mrs. Anderson's rooms. It was under exceptional circumstances that I was asked to dine there: the wife of a medical man, a lady whom Dr. Furnell himself has met at dinner, was staying a few days with Mrs. Anderson, and I had been asked to dine and witness on the terrace the fireworks in the People's Park, with two or three other friends of Mrs. Anderson.

6. To account now for the delay before I appeared in the ward, I have the honor to state simply that it was due to an extraordinary oversight or forgetfulness of the Apothecary on duty in not giving me any information of what was going on; first, had the Apothecary at 6-30 sent a letter to my quarters to say that a dhooly was ordered to the station for a serious case, on coming in I should have received the letter and made inquiries about the case; secondly, when he saw that a European patient was being brought into the hospital accompanied by Dr. Furnell, he should have despatched an attendant to fetch me from my house; this man would have been told where I was, and I submit that any of the military apothecaries serving here in 1883 would have done either of these at once, as is always the custom. I never, at any time, leave my house without saying where I am going, or at what time I expect to return.

7. Nurse Ambrose, moreover, although most praiseworthily engaged herself in procuring nourishment, &c., had seen both Mrs. Anderson and myself just before meeting the patient, yet she never thought of sending a messenger to summon me on the arrival of the patient in the ward.

8. Further, until I was about to enter the ward, I had no idea what the nature of the case was, who the patient was, nor did I expect to find Dr. Furnell there. The Apothecary even tells me that he did not fully understand that he was admitting a case of cholera into the officers' quarters. I simply understood from Mrs. Anderson that some patient in whom Dr. Furnell was interested was coming by the evening train, that a room was ready, also milk. I have the honor to submit that had the telegram been handed to the Apothecary, and had he informed me in any way as above stated of what was going on, we might have known something of the nature of the case, all delay would have been obviated, and hot broth and other requisites for the treatment of a case of cholera might have been kept ready. Serious cases of dysentery, abscess of liver, and diarrhœa do come in from up-country at times, but it is not usual to have hot broths, &c., always ready. In this case the broth of another patient was quickly requisitioned and a fresh supply ordered.

From Mrs. M. ANDERSON, Matron Superintendent, to the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, Madras, dated 9th January 1885.

With reference to the remark contained in the Surgeon-General's memorandum No. 42, dated 6th January 1885, "no Matron was present to render assistance," I have the honor to state that on the evening of the 3rd instant one of the nurses came to me saying that Dr. Furnell had told her to let me know that a room was required for a patient in the officers' quarters. I at once got the best available room ready for his reception, and left one of the oldest and most experienced nurses of the hospital in charge. I then returned to my own quarters, feeling that I had done all I could.

2. My nurses have standing orders to come to me at any hour of the night or day. I am at all times accessible to them, and I can only express my regret that nurse Mrs. Ambrose did not send to let me know the moment she saw the serious nature of the case. Directly I was told of the patient's arrival, I went to his room, remained until the sad end, and rendered every assistance in my power.

Statement of Civil Apothecary V. Jesudasen, relative to the Surgeon-General's visit on the 3rd instant, Saturday evening.

Dr. Furnell, the Surgeon-General, drove up to the General Hospital on Saturday evening, at about 6-40 P.M., and wanted to see the medical officer on duty. I introduced myself as the Apothecary on duty. I was asked whether any d.d. surgeon was present, and whether the

Resident Medical Officer was in hospital. My answer was in the negative. I was questioned whether the Matron Superintendent was present. I said "Yes". I was directed to send up some one to Mrs. Anderson with the compliments of the Surgeon-General to have a room ready in the officers' quarters, to receive a gentleman who was expected by the 7-30 P.M. train. The Surgeon-General said that he would be in waiting at the railway station, and would require a dhooly, brandy, tincture opii, chlorodyne, ice, &c. I conveyed the instructions of the Surgeon-General to the Matron Superintendent and also sent word that Dr. Furnell was at the station. I sent Mr. D'Mello, one of the senior students on duty, with the medicines, &c., minim measure, an ounce glass, and a dhooly. As no one was found in the Steward's Department, I took out the bottle of brandy from the operation room.

2. The student returned at 7 P.M. and told me that the Surgeon-General desired that Dr. Keess should be sent for immediately as Captain Hamilton was expected by the 7-45 P.M. train. I wrote a letter to Dr. Keess at 7-5 P.M., and sent it through a bearer with the direction that he should run post-haste and deliver the letter.

3. With a view to intimate to Dr. Thomas what had transpired since his evening visit, I
7-15 P.M. made inquiries from the hospital sergeant as
to the presence of the Resident Surgeon in his quarters. I was told he was not present. Meanwhile, I had the stretcher ready, looked to the room being prepared and filled in a diet sheet, before the patient came in, for milk, ice, and soda-water. The patient came in, I think, a little before 8 P.M. He was transferred to the stretcher from the dhooly by me, assisted by the student, and was taken up to the officers' quarters, as I supported his right hand that was hanging down. Before I took the patient up, I did think of writing to Dr. Thomas to learn once more whether he had returned; but I was not in a position to do this, lest the Surgeon-General should be displeased with me if I should leave the patient without a medical attendant. There was no one by me who could be spared to be sent up to Dr. Thomas. The patient was transferred to the cot by myself and the student. No sooner this was done than the Surgeon-General asked for broth. Mrs. Ambrose ran for it and fetched some from the European ward; in the mean time, I poured out a little milk in a feeding cup and handed it over to the Surgeon-General, who directed me to use friction to the extremities of the patient with turpentine. As I was busily engaged I asked Mrs. Ambrose to send for Dr. Thomas; she told me that Dr. Thomas was with Mrs. Anderson and left the room and turned up again in a few minutes. Sand bags were ordered for the patient, but this was not to be had at once, and therefore hot water bottles were substituted instead. The Surgeon-General required candles. It was more than half an hour before these could be had. Dr. Thomas came into the room about 20 minutes after the patient was in, and Mrs. Anderson a little later. All this time nearly an hour. I myself, Mrs. Ambrose and the students were actively employed in using friction to the patient, rubbing his hands with ice and obeying the directions of the Surgeon-General. To convince that I could not have left the room, I may here state that Dr. Thomas ordered me to make up a prescription. As I was leaving the room, the Surgeon-General asked Dr. Thomas to send some one else, as I was of use to the patient. Dr. Keess came in a little before 9 P.M. I left the room a little after 9-15 P.M. on duty. It was barely 5 minutes after the arrival of the patient in officers' quarters, Dr. Thomas was sent for.

Dr. Cockerill visited the hospital on the day at 6-30 P.M.

(Signed) V. JESUDASEN,
Civil Apothecary.

Mrs. Ambrose tells me that Dr. Thomas was at dinner when she went up for him, and that she sent a boy for him and returned—V. J.

Memorandum from M. C. FURNELL, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, dated Fort St. George, 15th January 1885, No. 182.

With reference to your No. 142, forwarding explanation of the Resident Medical Officer, the Acting Surgeon-General requests that the Senior Medical Officer will be good enough to express his opinion frankly as to whether he considers the explanation satisfactory; whether, under the circumstances, Surgeon Thomas should not himself have left explicit orders to be called when the patient arrived, instead of expecting somebody to go looking for him, first, at his own quarters, when the messenger was to be informed he was in the hospital, secondly, whether some suitable food, beef-tea, or broth might not, in anticipation, have been ordered. It is true the *exact nature* of the case was not known, but then it was a serious case might have been surmised by the fact that a dhooly, brandy, ice, &c., had been ordered over to the central station; thirdly, whether the present arrangements of the Steward's Department for emergent night-cases are satisfactory, and if not, what steps are proposed to make them moreso.

B.

From Brigade-Surgeon J. KEESS, M.D., Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 17th January 1885, No. 20.

With reference to memorandum No. 182, dated 15th instant, I have the honor to state, for the information of the Surgeon-General, that I do not consider the explanation, offered by Surgeon Thomas the Resident Medical Officer of the General Hospital, satisfactory.

2. Surgeon Thomas, on his hearing, for the first time, from the Matron Superintendent, at 7-50 P.M., that a dhooly with medicines, ice, &c., had been sent for a patient expected by train in a few minutes, should have lost no time in arranging for his reception into hospital. It should have occurred to him that the case was a serious one, for, were it not so, the Surgeon-General would not have ordered medicines to accompany the dhooly to the railway station. He ought to have been present to receive the patient and to give the requisite help without delay. In waiting to be called, after having had ample notice of the expected arrival of what should have appeared to him a case of very serious illness, he laid himself open to blame for neglect of duty.

3. The instructions given by the Surgeon-General that medicines, brandy, ice, &c., should accompany the dhooly to the station ought, at once, to have suggested to the Resident Medical Officer and Matron Superintendent the necessity for having ready nourishment and other requisites sought for generally in serious cases of illness.

4. The present arrangements of the Steward's Department (which the Surgeon-General evidently considers needs improvement) may be made to work more satisfactorily by detailing one of the three stewards to be always present at night.

Order—dated 9th February 1885, No. 333, Mis., Public.

It appears from the papers read above that, on the evening of Saturday the 3rd ultimo, the Acting Surgeon-General Dr. Furnell desired the Apothecary on duty at the General Hospital to prepare a room in the officers' quarters and to send a dhooly, with brandy and medicines, to the central railway station to await the 7-45 P.M. train in which a sick officer was expected to reach Madras.

On returning to the hospital about a couple of hours later with Captain Hamilton, R.E., then in a state of collapse from a severe attack of cholera, Dr. Furnell found neither the House Surgeon (Dr. Thomas) nor the Matron (Mrs. Anderson) nor any functionary of the institution in attendance, nor had sufficient preparations been completed in accordance with the requisition of the Acting Surgeon-General.

2. It appears that Dr. Thomas had received timely notice of Dr. Furnell's visit and the object of it. He was perfectly well aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital under his immediate control, yet this officer failed to give any instructions to his subordinates, and was not present, as it was his duty to have been, to receive the patient on arrival at the hospital.

Dr. Thomas's letter of explanation, dated 9th January, shows that he is very far, indeed, from regarding in its proper light his failure in the above respects, or understanding what is required of him as Resident Medical Officer in charge of the hospital; and His Excellency the Governor in Council is constrained to mark his strong disapproval of Dr. Thomas's behaviour by directing his removal from his present appointment to the unemployed list.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council also remarks that Mrs. Anderson appears to have a very imperfect perception of her duty as Matron Superintendent, and desires that she be severely reprimanded for having failed to satisfy herself by personal examination that the room required for the patient was provided with all necessary comforts and conveniences.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.
" the Accountant-General—Extract.

G.O., dated 24th March 1885, Mis. No. 719, Public.

Read—the following papers :—

From M. C. FURNELL, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S., Acting Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 20th February 1885, No. 94.

I have the honor to forward an appeal from Surgeon G. T. Thomas, Resident Medical Officer, General Hospital, against G.O. No. 333 of 9th instant.

The appeal in question seems to me to throw no new light on the question. Statements A and B in paragraph 2 suggest, as in Dr. Thomas's former letter, that the initiative in cases of emergency rests not with the Resident Medical Officer but people outside. It is correctly stated in Dr. Thomas's former letter, dated January 9th, "*no one* knew the nature of the case;" but in this letter Dr. Thomas takes it for granted that Dr. Furnell was in possession of a telegram stating that the case was one of "cholera". The real truth is that Dr. Furnell, when he called at the General Hospital, was in possession of no telegram, simply an oral communication from Colonel C. J. Smith that a telegram* was somewhere about the town in search of him stating that Captain Hamilton was very ill and coming up by train. On this information, a room was asked for and a dhooly, with the usual medicines for emergent cases, ordered over to the station. What is chiefly complained of in Dr. Thomas's case is that with the same information he made no corresponding preparation in the hospital. He admits having heard about the patient's probable arrival at 7-50, say 15 minutes before Captain Hamilton was admitted, and yet he never visited the room or made any inquiries or gave any orders for restoratives to be prepared; he wanted to be called. In this letter he says, "I instructed nurse Ambrose to inform me of the patient's arrival;" in his previous letter of January 9th, he writes, "I asked her if the patient had arrived, she said, 'No.' *I naturally then waited to be informed* of the arrival of the patient", which I believe truthfully represents the case. Nurse Ambrose was fully employed with the patient from the moment of his entry till his death.

* Copy attached—M.C.F.

There is one statement I find in my memorandum to General Hospital, which is not strictly correct; the opening paragraph states:

> "On the evening of Saturday, about 6 P.M., Acting Surgeon-General Furnell received a telegram, &c."

This, as stated above, is not strictly correct, and is a slip of the pen. I really found the telegram at my house on return about midnight, when all was over. I acted on Colonel C. J. Smith's information, but it does not, it seems to me, affect the question in the least, for the memorandum which contains that remark only reached the General Hospital three or four days after the occurrence had taken place; and yet Dr. Thomas bases his defence on the non-receipt of this telegram stating the patient was suffering from cholera. This point, I think, is fully disposed of in Dr. Keess's letter of January 17th, where it is stated:

> "Surgeon Thomas, on his hearing, for the first time, from the Matron Superintendent at 7-50 P.M., that a dhooly, with medicines, ice, &c., had been sent for a patient expected by train in a few minutes, should have lost no time in arranging for his reception into hospital. It should have occurred to him that the case was a serious one, for, were it not so, the Surgeon-General would not have ordered medicines to accompany the dhooly to the railway station. *He ought to have been present to receive the patient*, and to give the requisite help without delay. In waiting to be called, after having had ample notice of the expected arrival of what should have appeared to him a case of very serious illness, he laid himself open to blame for neglect of duty.
>
> "The instructions given by the Surgeon-General that medicines, brandy, ice, &c., should accompany the dhooly to the station ought at once to have suggested to the Resident Medical Officer and Matron Superintendent the necessity for having ready nourishment and other requisites sought for generally in serious cases of illness."

This is the opinion of Government, and I think so too; instead of this, he sat down to dinner.

M. C. FURNELL.

Enclosures.

Telegram from MARY HAMILTON, Arkonam, to Dr. M. C. FURNELL, Madras, dated 3rd January 1885.

Bob very ill sun, come or send a doctor to train.

From Surgeon G. T. THOMAS, Resident Medical Officer, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Madras, 16th February 1885.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of G.O. No. 333 of 9th instant, placing me on the unemployed list for reasons which appear to me to be based upon a misapprehension of the true state of the case; I beg therefore to submit a further explanation.

2. I am reluctantly compelled to draw pointed attention to certain omissions made by Dr. Furnell, as the state of things described in the Government Order was due to these omissions and not any neglect on my part.

(*a*) The telegram announcing the coming of the patient and the nature of his disease should have been handed to the Apothecary, with orders to send for me;

(*β*) In the absence of the House Surgeon, Dr. Furnell himself as a physician might have suggested to the Apothecary that the special requirements and comforts used in the treatment of a case of cholera should be prepared; he did not do so; he did not tell any one that a case of cholera was expected, and no special requisitions were made by him, as one would infer from the Government Order.

3. The conclusions arrived at in the Government Order are—

(*a*) that Dr. Furnell gave two hours' notice of the expected arrival of a sick officer;

(*b*) that, notwithstanding that I had "timely notice," and was therefore well aware that a case of dangerous illness was about to be brought to the hospital, I was not present to receive the patient on arrival;

(*c*) that I had failed to complete efficient preparations in accordance with the requirements of the Acting Surgeon-General;

(*d*) that my explanation of the 9th January shows that I am far, indeed, from regarding in its proper light my failure in the above respects, and that I did not understand what was required of a Resident Medical Officer in charge of a hospital. Had my conduct been of this nature, I should confess myself at fault. The gravamen of the charges, as formulated against me by Government, lies in conclusion (*c*). This conclusion rests on the erroneous but natural assumption that Dr. Furnell had not omitted to make a requisition for the special preparations such a case would demand, and that I was apprised of such requisition but neglected to comply with it.

4. My defence to the charges in detail is, (*a*) the notice was admittedly given to the Apothecary in my absence. Hearing that I was out, Dr. Furnell should have directed that a messenger be sent for me, or have left a note to be taken to me informing me of Captain Hamilton's expected arrival and condition. He did neither; had he done either, I should have been in readiness to receive the patient, for I never go out of my house without leaving word where I may be found if required. Had I received either message or note on my return to my house, I should have personally seen that all necessary preparations were made for a case of cholera, and I should have gone to the railway station myself.

5. The only notice I received was at 7-50 P.M. that a European patient was expected by the train, that Dr. Furnell had ordered a room, and that a dhooly and brandy had gone to the station; this notice was from Mrs. Anderson, who also told me that she had personally seen that the room was ready as rooms usually are for expected arrivals.

6. No one knew the nature of the case, although it is invariably the custom for persons seeking admission to inform us of the nature of the disease or accident. I instructed nurse Ambrose to inform me of the patient's arrival. I respectfully ask what more could have been expected of me under the circumstances.

7. From the wording of the Government Order, it would appear that Government are under the belief that Dr. Furnell told the Apothecary of the nature of the case, and that he also made all the necessary or special requisitions.

Dr. Furnell informed no one of the nature of the case; he made no special requisitions beyond those already stated by me above. What special preparations then would he have me make?

8. It would also appear from the Government Order that having had timely notice of a dangerous case of cholera, I neglected all preparations, and that therefore I am unfit to hold the position I was in at the General Hospital.

This conclusion can be disproved by the simple facts that—

(*1st*) I practically received no notice at all;

(*2nd*) That the instant I received information of the patient's arrival, I hastened to attend upon him;

(*3rd*) That arrived at the patient's bedside, I did all in my power to render assistance.

9. I beg that it will be understood that I now confine myself to a defence of my own conduct.

From personal interest in the patient Dr. Furnell was naturally anxious and excited, and this has led him to characterise my appearing in evening dress as he has done.

The fact that I did not even wait to change my dress-coat shows that I hastened to the patient without a moment's delay.

10. In conclusion, I have the honor to request that Government will be pleased to reconsider my explanation of the 9th January by the light of this letter, and that the G.O. No. 333 of 9th instant be cancelled, or, if not, that my case may be investigated by a Court of Inquiry, and that, pending such reconsideration or reference to a Court of Inquiry, my removal to the unemployed list shall not be gazetted.

From Surgeon G. T. THOMAS, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 16th February 1885.

I beg to hand you, herewith, copy of a letter I have just addressed to the Secretary, Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, with reference to G.O. No. 333 of 9th February 1885.

2. I will mention one or two points to which I have not particularly referred in my defence—

(*a*) Had the patient been taken straight to the contagious ward for Europeans, the difficulty of getting a dhooly upstairs,—one of Dr. Furnell's complaints,—would not have occurred.

(*b*) The Apothecary on duty, between 6 and 8 P.M., did not, as he was bound to do by the rules of the hospital, try to inform me in any way of what was going on. Even after the patient's arrival, he did not send to call me, because, as he says, his time was so taken up in attending to Dr. Furnell's numerous directions.

(*c*) When I was casually informed that a patient (whose name and malady were unknown) was expected, Mrs. Anderson had personally visited the ward and seen that all was ready in the usual way.

(*d*) As nurse Ambrose knew where I was, and I had told her to call me, I began my dinner, knowing that I was available at a moment's notice, and that everything usually got readyhad been got ready.

(*e*) Patients for whom we receive notice to prepare do not always arrive, for instance, so recently as the 3rd instant, Dr. Shaw sent for a dhooly at 7-30 P.M., describing, as is almost invariably done, the nature of the accident a friend of his had sustained; everything was, of course, prepared, but the dhooly returned at 10-45 empty. Is it expected that I should wait about the hospital the whole of that time, or that I should tell the Apothecary to inform me immediately of the patient's arrival?

(*f*) According to hospital Rule 3, chapter III, page 15, one of the duties of an Assistant Apothecary is, "to attend to all cases of accident brought to the hospital, reporting the same to, and seeking, if necessary, the assistance of, the Resident Medical Officer;" and other rules show that a considerable amount of confidence is placed on the Apothecaries. I cannot always be on the spot.

The simple truth is that Dr. Furnell being naturally very anxious about the patient was excited, he omitted to give necessary information, he was irritated at my costume and at my dining with Mrs. Anderson, and he has magnified the unfortunate incident. As a fact, within half an hour of the train's arrival, the patient was removed from the train to the hospital, put to bed, and hot milk, hot water bottles and hot sand procured; this does not show a state of unpreparedness, although no notice had been given of such requirements.

I feel convinced that I should be honorably acquitted of the charges of negligence and ignorance of my duties by any Court of Inquiry. I have not thought it necessary to burden my defence by the foregoing and many other arguments.

Those I have adduced read in conjunction with my defence and previous explanation will, I trust, serve to avert the grave scandal that would be occasioned by gazetting my punishment for the baseless reasons alleged for placing me on the unemployed list.

MEMORANDUM.

The papers in connection with the charge made by Acting Surgeon-General M. C. Furnell against Surgeon G. T. Thomas, Resident Medical Officer of the General Hospital, "of gross neglect of duty," have come under my notice, since my return to duty, and I have solicited the sanction of Government to be permitted to offer a few remarks on the subject before Dr. Thomas's case is finally disposed of, on the grounds (1) that the disciplinary arrangements of an important public institution are involved; and (2) that the charge has arisen out of the fact of the Acting Surgeon-General requiring hospital aid for an immediate relative.

2. Surgeon Thomas, in his letters of 9th January and 16th February 1885, has distinctly denied the imputation of "gross neglect of duty," and, in the latter communication, has requested that the order passed by Government on his case (as he believes under misapprehension of the facts) be cancelled, or that the charge preferred against him by the head of his own department may be investigated by a military tribunal.

3. The order of Government disposing of the case directs Dr. Thomas's removal from his appointment and transfer to the unemployed list.

In my opinion, before carrying this order into effect, it would be well to comply with Dr. Thomas's request, if the Government are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence before them to support the charge advanced by Dr. Furnell "of gross neglect of duty". The charge is one cognisable by military courts to which Dr. Thomas is amenable, and it would seem to be unadvisable for Government to take so serious a charge as proved, without giving the officer concerned the opportunity of justifying himself before a military tribunal. If he is guilty, a military court can award a fitting punishment; if not guilty, the finding of the court to that effect will be the most satisfactory way of clearing the officer's character from imputations which must always operate to his disadvantage in his professional career.

4. So far as I can gather from the facts stated in the papers submitted to Government, I would record my opinion that no "gross neglect" of duty or even "culpable neglect" has been proved against Surgeon Thomas, while some important extenuating circumstances in connection with his conduct have not been represented, as they should have been.

5. The facts seem to be briefly these: On the evening of 3rd January, about 6-40 P.M., Acting Surgeon-General M. C. Furnell drove to the General Hospital and saw the Apothecary on duty, informing him that he wanted a room made ready for a gentleman expected to arrive by the 7-30 train, and that a dhooly, with medicines and stimulants, was required to be sent to the station to meet the train. Dr. Furnell stated his intention of remaining at the station to meet the train. The Apothecary sent Dr. Furnell's message to the Matron Superintendent by one of the nurses, and the Matron at once had a room made ready for the reception of the patient.

6. But the Apothecary on duty, instead of writing urgently to the Resident Surgeon Dr. Thomas to inform him of the Surgeon-General's visit and request, took no steps whatever to acquaint Dr. Thomas with what had happened. Even when, at 7-5 P.M., he received a special message from Dr. Furnell to summon Dr. Keess the Senior Physician, it never seems to have occurred to him to send a similar message to the Resident Medical Officer, who, from first to last, never received any communication from the Apothecary regarding the unfortunate case of the late Captain Hamilton.

7. The rules of the hospital are explicit enough on the subject of subordinates on duty summoning the Resident Medical Officer in cases of emergency. Civil Apothecary Jesudasen who was merely doing duty, and had no permanent connection with the hospital, probably was ignorant of the General Hospital rules; hence his neglect to send for Dr. Thomas immediately on Dr. Furnell's order being communicated to him. He excuses himself by saying he had no time, but the summons should have been sent to Dr. Thomas's house immediately on receipt of Surgeon-General Furnell's orders. If subordinate officials are permitted to take upon themselves the responsibility of withholding important information from their immediate superiors, there must be an end to all discipline.

8. In the year 1882 a case occurred in which an unfortunate gentleman in a high fever was kept waiting in the General Hospital for nearly an hour without receiving any help, because the Apothecary on duty declined to admit him without payment of hospital charges for ten days in advance. On that occasion, I had to impress on the hospital authorities the duty of immediate and prompt attention to the admission of patients; and if any of the proper hospital staff had been on duty, as they should have been, I feel certain that Dr. Thomas would have received an immediate notice of Surgeon-General Furnell's visit and its purport.

9. By a mere chance Dr. Thomas came to the General Hospital on the night of the 3rd of January, arriving a few minutes before 8 o'clock, being engaged to dine with the Matron Superintendent. On arrival he heard, for the first time, from Mrs. Anderson that Dr. Furnell had requested a room to be made ready for a patient expected by the evening train, and, while talking with Mrs. Anderson, he saw nurse Ambrose who was in charge of the room so prepared, and inquired of her if the patient had arrived. Being informed that he had not, Dr. Thomas, by his own account, directed the nurse to inform him when the patient came and sat down to dinner.

10. There is some discrepancy in the evidence as to the time intervening before Dr. Thomas was summoned to see the patient. Probably from 15 to 20 minutes elapsed when nurse Ambrose bethought herself of the instructions given by Dr. Thomas to call him. This delay on the part of the nurse is entirely inexcusable, for both the Resident Medical Officer and Matron might and should have been summoned to so serious a case within half a minute of time, for, as Dr. Furnell states, they were dining "within earshot" of the room to which Captain Hamilton had been brought.

11. When Dr. Thomas received the message from nurse Ambrose, it is not disputed that he immediately left the dinner table and repaired to the patient for whom he had been sent.

12. Dr. Thomas seems to think that his appearance in evening dress was annoying to Surgeon-General Furnell, but this, of course, is absurd. Being summoned from a dinner table, he very properly attended promptly without regard to costume. Nor was there, in my view, any impropriety in his dining with Mrs. Anderson. At all the civil hospitals with which I was acquainted as a student, the Matron Superintendent habitually dined with the Resident Medical Staff. The present Matron Superintendent, as well as former ones, have been guests at my own table. Surgeon Thomas urges that this was the first and only occasion in which he had been a guest of Mrs. Anderson, and that he had been invited to have a good view of the fire-works in the People's Park from the hospital roof. I attach myself no importance to the circumstance, and should not have alluded to it here, had not Dr. Furnell's notice of the fact in his memorandum been underlined in a manner to imply an unusual or improper proceeding on Dr. Thomas's part.

13. One of Dr. Furnell's complaints is, that there was no broth or food ready. It is much to be regretted that it did not occur to Dr. Furnell to make requisition for anything of this nature, when he ordered a dhooly and medicines to be sent to the station. It is not the practice to keep food of this sort ready made in any hospital for people who may never come in, but if any warning had been given, the Steward's Department would have doubtless had everything in readiness. The unfortunate circumstance in this case is, that no one had any idea of the nature of the case expected to arrive. If Dr. Furnell had known his relative to be suffering from cholera, he would, of course, have given the necessary orders, and proper arrangements would have been made for the reception of the case in the infectious ward instead of in a room in the main building where it is never the custom to treat cholera cases.

14. It should be clearly understood that the ordering of food is not in the department of the Matron Superintendent, who seems to have been blamed for having nothing ready. Dr. Furnell, who had more knowledge of the supposed nature of the case than any of the hospital staff could have had, made no requisition for the preparation of broth or beef-tea, and this would seem to indicate that he did not at the time attach much importance to these things being ready in the ward.

15. Nevertheless, there should have been no delay in complying with immediate requisitions for nourishment, either by day or night. The General Hospital is provided with a steward and two assistants. The steward is a *resident* officer, occupying the room almost next door to that in which the patient was treated, and is responsible for all the internal economy of the hospital. Some years ago when a new steward was appointed, I insisted on his residing in the hospital, so that there might be no difficulty, by day or night, in the immediate provision of necessities for the use of the sick.

When Dr. Furnell was Senior Medical Officer, the steward was *non-resident*, and a practice grew up of making the third steward reside at night in the hospital, which arrangement appears to have been discontinued during Dr. Furnell's tenure of office. At that time, the steward's arrangements as regards night duties were certainly not on a proper footing, but since the steward has been a resident officer, I do not recollect any complaints of inefficiency of night service on the part of stewards. On the 3rd of January, the steward was absent from hospital at 6-40 P.M., when the Acting Surgeon-General arrived. He ought not to have left without placing one of his assistants in charge, or leaving word where he might be found; and it was clearly the duty of the Apothecary on duty to have summoned the steward as well as the Matron and Resident Medical Officer, the moment he received intimation from Surgeon-General Furnell that a serious case of illness in a European officer would be admitted on arrival of the evening train. The steward states that he left a man in charge of the stores; but this seems to be doubtful, as the Apothecary states he took brandy from the operating room where a supply is always kept.

16. Acting Surgeon-General Furnell, in his memorandum No. 182 of 15th January, inquired of the Senior Medical Officer whether "the present arrangements of the Steward's Department for emergent night cases are satisfactory."

Dr. Keess's reply to this question is given below, letter No. 20, 17th January:

> "The present arrangements of the Steward's Department (which the Surgeon-General evidently considers needs improvement) may be made to work more satisfactorily by detailing one of the three stewards to be always present at night."

I have to ask the special attention of Government to the misleading character of this reply. Dr. Keess conceals from the Surgeon-General the fact that since Dr. Furnell was Medical Officer of the hospital, the chief steward had been made a *resident officer*, and that he always slept in the hospital for the express purpose of attending to emergent cases occurring in the night. Under this arrangement, it was clearly the duty of the steward to have arranged for his duties being conducted by a member of the staff during his absence in the evening in question, or at other times when he was the sole officer of the department available for duty. The break down in this case occurred not for want of prevision for the necessities of the hospital, but from imperfect discipline in the Steward's Department, whereby the hospital was left for some hours without any one in authority to prepare and supply the food and drink required in emergent cases. The steward is a well-paid officer, and although he is entitled to his periods of absence for exercise and recreation, he is properly held responsible for the duties of his department being performed during such periods of absence. He has two assistants provided for him, and, under present arrangements, they are not required to sleep in the hospital; but one should certainly be present during the absence of the steward, who ordinarily takes the night duty.

In justice to the Steward's Department, it should be stated that the ordinary work of the day and provision for the night had been completed; and that no notice was given by the Apothecary on duty, as should have been done, of the probable arrival of a serious case of illness.

17. In regard to the conduct of Dr. Thomas, I am clearly of opinion that he should have proceeded to the ward made ready for the patient on being apprised of the facts by Mrs. Anderson, and have seen, with his own eyes, that everything was ready, and have obtained from the Apothecary on duty an account, at first hand, of the message left by Dr. Furnell, reproving him, at the same time, for his negligence in omitting to transmit Dr. Furnell's message to himself. It was a serious error of judgment on Surgeon Thomas's part that he did not do so, considering that he was in the hospital building, and could have ascertained all the facts within two minutes; but an error of this kind can scarcely be construed as "a gross neglect of duty," and the punishment described in the Government Order, which virtually closes the door to professional advancement of a promising young officer, seems to me to be somewhat disproportioned to the offence. If it could be shown that Surgeon Thomas had neglected to attend to an emergent summons, or had delayed in attending after receiving due notice, I should have formed a very different opinion; but, as a matter of fact, he received no notice whatever from the person who was bound to send it, and only learnt the fact in casual conversation with the Matron Superintendent, and immediately he received a summons from the nurse, whom he ordered to call him on arrival of the patient, he promptly proceeded to see the patient. On the evidence as it stands, I doubt if any military tribunal could find a verdict of "guilty" on the charge. If Surgeon Thomas had been dining out at a distance, as might readily have happened, it is clear that he would have received no intimation of what was going on, and that he could not, in that case, be held responsible for the neglect of the Apothecary to convey to him Surgeon-General Furnell's message.

18. Surgeon Thomas was chosen by me to fill the office of Resident Medical Officer, on the distinct ground of his ability as a medical officer and his complete mastery of native languages which enabled him to converse, at first hand, with the numerous native in and out-patients attending that institution. Very few officers of any department have taken such honorary distinctions in linguistic tests as Surgeon Thomas (*vide* Army List). I have had no complaints made to me of any neglect of duty on his part, and I believed he was excellently well suited for the office to which he was appointed.

19. Regarding the question of Dr. Thomas's removal from his appointment, I offer no opinion; but if that removal is carried out, I think it should be done in such a way as to leave no stigma on his characters, such as transfer to the unemployed list would involve. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has recently refused to receive for military duty medical officers who may be removed from civil employment for incapacity or neglect, and it is only fair, therefore, to officers who may be charged with such offences that they should have an opportunity of clearing themselves before the military courts to which they are amenable.

20. The conduct of the Apothecary shows great negligence and ignorance of discipline. The man himself was sent to do duty at the hospital, because he had been found unfitted for independent employment under local authorities, in the hope that, under discipline and direction, he might improve and become a competent officer. It was an error of judgment on the part of the Senior Medical Officer, in detailing "doing duty" subordinates of this description to take the place of the regular members of the hospital staff. Civil Apothecary Jesudasen is not a military subordinate, or I should have directed him to be placed in arrest, and tried for want of attention to hospital rules, in neglecting to inform his immediate superior of the arrival of an emergent case of illness. His conduct seems to me to require some notice from Government. I observe that Dr. Furnell, in his complaint, takes no notice of the indiscipline of the man, or of the nurse Mrs. Ambrose, the latter of whom had a distinct order to call the Resident Surgeon on arrival of the patient, and failed to obey it, until much valuable time had past. She appears also to have neglected to apprise the Matron Superintendent of the patient's arrival. The only excuse for these two persons in their neglect of rules and orders is that they may have lost their heads in the presence of the head of the Medical Department with a patient under such distressing circumstances. Dr. Furnell shows that they were active and busy in doing such things as the circumstances of the patient needed, and that their errors arose from want of thought rather than want of heart. In hospitals, as in battle fields, coolness and calm judgment are essential to those who have responsible duties, and in these respects both the Apothecary and nurse fell lamentably short of what might have been expected of them.

(Signed) W. R. CORNISH, Surgeon-General,
Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

No. 141.

Forwarded to the Chief Secretary to Government, with reference to his demi-official of the 6th March 1885.

(Signed) W. R. CORNISH, Surgeon-General,
Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

Fort St. George,
11th March 1885.

Order—dated 24th March 1885, No. 719, Mis., Public.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has given his most careful attention to the papers read above, and regrets that he can find in them no sufficient reason for altering, in any respect, the orders which have already been passed in this case.

2. It is, in the opinion of His Excellency in Council, altogether unnecessary to discuss the point raised by Surgeon-General Cornish, whether the behaviour of Surgeon Thomas would be more accurately described by the words "a serious error of judgment" than by the expression "a gross neglect of duty;" but it may be remarked in passing that the latter phrase does not find a place in the order of Government of the 9th February last, No. 333. Putting this point on one side as being quite immaterial, the Government observe that the Surgeon-General has himself recorded the opinion that Dr. Thomas committed serious errors in not proceeding to the ward made ready for the patient, in omitting to see, with his own eyes, that everything was ready, and in neglecting to obtain from the Apothecary on duty an account, at first hand, of the message left by Dr. Furnell. The Surgeon-General thus admits that, in part at least, through the neglect of Dr. Thomas, a young officer of great merit did not receive all that care which he should have received at the General Hospital. It is the plain duty of the Government to give notice to all concerned that such errors must not take place, and it would be in vain to hope that any salutary result could be produced if an officer in Dr. Thomas's position is allowed to escape without a most serious warning.

3. The orders already passed removing Surgeon Thomas from the post of Resident Medical Officer to the unemployed list will accordingly remain in force; but, as soon as the Government receive an expression of Surgeon Thomas's sense of the serious errors and omissions which have been brought home to him, and of his deep regret for the same, a convenient opportunity will be taken of employing

him in some up-country station, where, it is to be hoped, he will so conduct his public duties as to regain the ground he has lost.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

G.O., dated 10th April 1885, Mis. No. 873, Public.

Read—the following letter from Surgeon G. T. THOMAS, Indian Medical Department, to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 28th March 1885 :—

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the Order of Government, dated 24th March 1885, No. 719, Public Department.

2. I observe that my request that my conduct in this case should be investigated by a Court of Inquiry has been ignored. I therefore desire to enter my most respectful protest against the decision arrived at by Government.

3. The conclusions arrived at in G.O., 9th February, No. 333, amount, as construed by the Surgeon-General, to a charge of "gross neglect of duty,"—an expression used by Dr. Furnell himself in a letter to Government, as well as those of "lamentable ignorance of his duty," and "failure of duty". The Government Order based on Dr. Furnell's representations records a "failure of duty" on my part.

4. The case being one of conflicting statements, the truth can only be ascertained by submitting the charges against me to the test of a judicial investigation.

5. Categorically I deny—

(*1stly*) That I had "timely notice".

(*2ndly*) That I was aware that a case of "*dangerous* illness" was about to be brought to the hospital. Dhoolies are frequently requisitioned for serious or emergent cases, and sometimes they are brought back empty; such instances have recently occurred.

(*3rdly*) I deny that it is my duty to be present in verandahs to receive patients. I was in the hospital at the time available at a moment's notice; and I had given instructions to the nurse that I was to be summoned directly the patient arrived.

(*4thly*) I deny that there was any failure on my part to give "instructions" to the Apothecary. I could have given him no instructions, as I was ignorant of the nature of the expected case, as was he.

(*5thly*) I deny that it was my duty to order hot broth, hot bottles, or hot sand. Patients are never dieted before they arrive.

6. On reflection, I feel it was an error of judgment on my part that I did not summon or see the Apothecary on being informed of the expected arrival of a European patient, and that I did not question him as to Dr. Furnell's orders on the subject; and, further, I should have reprimanded him for his neglect to inform me of the expected arrival. Still, had this occurred to me, and had I visited the ward (which is a most unusual proceeding), I should not have been in a position, nor should I have had any indication that it was my duty to order hot broth, hot bottles, and hot sand. Nevertheless, for this error of judgment on my part I beg to express my deep and sincere regret.

7. In conclusion, I cannot admit that Captain Hamilton, R.E., through any neglect on my part, did not receive all that care which he should have received.

8. I desire to express my grateful sense of the considerate offer made me by Government of a pardon on certain conditions. This I extremely regret I cannot unreservedly avail myself of. It is, I trust, needless for me to state that, if I felt myself in fault, I should frankly acknowledge my error, as it is obviously my interest to do. I have anxiously and conscientiously examined my conduct in this matter from first to last, with the sincere desire of arriving at the conclusion that I could consistently, with honor and self-respect, adopt the course left open to me by Government, without making a further effort to vindicate myself from unmerited censure. Under the above circumstances, I respectfully urge that the whole matter be referred by Government for investigation by a Court of Inquiry.

Endorsement on the above, dated 30th March 1885, No. 185.

Forwarded to the Chief Secretary, with reference to G.O. No. 719, dated the 24th instant (confidential).

(Signed) W. R. CORNISH, Surgeon-General,
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

Order—dated 10th April 1885, No. 873, Mis., Public.

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that Surgeon Thomas's letter above recorded shows how little he understands the gravity of his misconduct in relation to the case of the late Captain Hamilton.

2. Surgeon Thomas's request for a Court of Inquiry is quite inadmissible.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

G.O., dated 27th July 1885, Mis. No. 1750, Public.

Read—the following letter from M. C. FURNELL, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Coonoor, 6th July 1885, No. O-149.

I have the honor to forward, herewith, a petition (in duplicate) from Surgeon G. T. Thomas to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General against the decision of His Excellency the Governor in Council in the late unfortunate case of Captain Hamilton, R.E. The petition seems to me conceived in the most defiant and contumacious spirit, and not couched in the temperate and respectful language essential to all petitions.

2. The circumstances of the case are briefly stated in exhibit A of the appendix. The offence of Surgeon G. T. Thomas was, in the first instance, simply this: That although informed at 7-50 P.M. that the Surgeon-General had ordered a dhooly to be sent over to the railway station, with brandy, chlorodyne, opium, &c., to meet a sick officer coming by the train, and a room prepared for him in the sick officers' quarters, Surgeon Thomas gave himself no concern about the matter, did not send for the Apothecary on duty to find out what orders or directions had been given, did not desire to be called, did not receive the patient on admission, but sat down to dinner.

3. His first defence was that the Apothecary did not, "when he saw a European patient was being brought into hospital, accompanied by Dr. Furnell, despatch an attendant and fetch me from my house." The Apothecary was fully occupied attending to the sick officer, and if he had despatched an attendant, it would have made matters no better, for Mr. Thomas was not in his house. Moreover, the

Apothecary had earlier in the evening ascertained that fact. But all this was an after-thought. It never occurred to Surgeon Thomas till many days after, when Surgeon-General Furnell's memorandum came to hospital, that anything had been wrong on his part. And all this time that he complains he was not sent for to his house, Surgeon Thomas was in the hospital quite close to the officers' quarters, was perfectly aware that a European officer was about to be brought into hospital, but had himself taken no trouble to send for the Apothecary or tell an attendant to call him when the patient arrived; everything was to be done by somebody else, but nothing by Mr. Thomas the House Surgeon.

4. His next defence was that "had the telegram been handed to the Apothecary, we might have known something of the nature of the case". The Acting Surgeon-General had no telegram, he was acting simply on the information of Colonel Smith, R.E., that a telegram was somewhere about in search of him telling him that Captain Hamilton was in the train coming up very ill, and on the strength of that he naturally ordered over what would be most useful for a very sick man, let the sickness be what it might. Had Surgeon Thomas shown the slightest professional zeal, he could have come over to the railway station even after his arrival at hospital (it is only across the road, a stone's throw), and ascertained all this personally; it would not have taken him 10 minutes.

5. Surgeon Thomas in his demi-official, exhibit B, paragraph *d* says, "As nurse Ambrose knew where I was, and *I had told her to call me*." This nurse Ambrose distinctly denies; she denies most emphatically that Mr. Thomas told her to call him. She is an admirable nurse, and has been in the hospital now about ten years, is the oldest nurse on its establishment, and it is noticeable that in Mr. Thomas's first defence, exhibit B, he does not say he asked to be called. "I saw nurse Ambrose by the stairs," he writes, "and asked her if the patient had arrived; she said 'No'! I naturally then *waited* to be informed of the arrival of the patient." Nurse Ambrose's impression, given in evidence, was, she was not to disturb either the Matron or House Surgeon as it was a dinner party.

6. As regards Surgeon Thomas's last defence in his petition to the Viceroy, wherein he attempts to throw all the blame on Dr. Furnell, and talks of his excitement, &c., I must decline to say anything, except that having been a medical officer over thirty years, I am not in the habit of being excited at sick-beds.

7. The matter was naturally a very painful one to me, and I shrank for several days from taking any steps in the matter, feeling this sort of defence, viz., "personal feeling," might be attributed to me; but it seemed to me, the more I reflected, so grave a scandal, that a sick officer could be taken to the largest hospital in Madras, where quarters are purposely provided for officers, and remain there more than half an hour whilst the Matron and Resident Medical Officer were within ear-shot enjoying themselves at a dinner party, that it was my bounden duty to report it.

8. Mr. Thomas desires to hint that the opinion formed of his conduct by Government is sustained by the professional opinion of Surgeon-General Furnell only. As the constitutional adviser of Government, it would be ample, but it will be seen from Dr. Keess's letter, herewith attached marked X, that his immediate superior officer most strongly condemned him; and, moreover, it will be seen, by letter marked Z, that this is not the case of a zealous officer making an accidental error. Surgeon Thomas has evidently always performed his medical duties in an unsatisfactory manner.

Enclosures.

X.

From Brigade-Surgeon J. KEESS, M.D., Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Madras, 26th June 1885, No. 146.

In reply to your letter No. O-117, of the 23rd instant, I have the honor to state that Surgeon G. T. Thomas, while filling the office of Resident Medical Officer, General Hospital, did not perform his duties with zeal.

2. He performed his duties in a perfunctory manner, and just did enough to avoid getting into serious trouble. I had occasion once to express dissatisfaction with his work in the out-patient's department, but, instead of taking reproof in a proper manner, he assumed a defiant and insubordinate attitude, for which I would have reported him if I had felt that, under the late régime, my complaint would have been fairly investigated and my authority upheld. I had much difficulty in conducting the work of the hospital with such a Resident Surgeon, as he was impatient of reproof, inclined to be disrespectful and argumentative in his tone. He was abusive to students and rude and inattentive to patients. I objected, on these grounds, to his re-appointment as Resident Medical Officer; but Surgeon-General Cornish disregarded the objections, and recommended him a second time for work which he was totally unsuited for, from want of temper, tact and zeal.

3. Surgeon Thomas, during the period he worked at the General Hospital, left a very unfavorable impression on my mind. Had he not been found out in the unfortunate case of the late Captain Hamilton, I would probably, on Surgeon-General Cornish's departure, have applied for another officer who possessed a fair temper, was attentive to the sick, and whose conduct was marked by zeal in the discharge of his duties and respectful bearing to his superiors. Surgeon Thomas was singularly deficient in these qualities.

A.

Statement made by Nurse Mrs. Ambrose on 6th March 1885.

On being asked why she failed to send for the Matron Superintendent when Captain Hamilton was brought to hospital, on the night of 3rd January 1885, she replied as follows:

I fully understood from the Matron Superintendent that when the patient was brought into hospital, that *I* was to attend to him and be responsible for all the nursing arrangements, as she was engaged in giving a dinner party that night. I am sure that this was the Matron Superintendent's intention and orders, because, on other occasions, when a gentleman is expected, in the officers' quarters, she directs the nurses to come and inform her, as soon as they arrive; but, on this occasion, I received no such instructions, but was directed to do my best when the patient arrived.

2. Were you specially detailed to look after Captain Hamilton?

I was the ordinary duty nurse, for all medical cases, on the night of the 3rd January last, and, as such, it was my duty to attend to all medical cases that were admitted upstairs. My attendance on Captain Hamilton was part of my ordinary duty as night nurse for the fortnight.

3. What arrangements did you make for Captain Hamilton's reception?

I got a room ready in obedience to the Matron Superintendent's orders, conveyed through nurse Miss Leonard. A little before 7 P.M. Mrs. Anderson came down to me and asked me if the room was ready, I told her "Yes". She asked me if I knew what ailed the patient that was coming in, I replied "No". She then said she thought it was a case of diarrhœa from what she had heard, and told me to be very particular, as Dr. Furnell was likely to come with the patient. Having worked under Dr. Furnell before, I knew what he would be likely to call for. So, I got a waterproof sheet put on the bed, placed a drawn sheet over it, got a feeding cup, and then I wrote a memorandum to the Steward's Department for a pint of milk. I then went to the Apothecary's room and asked him to make out a diet sheet for the expected patient. He marked on it soda-water and ice. I procured these articles from the Steward's Department and placed them in the room. After doing all this, about 8 P.M. I called ward attendant Benjamin and told him a gentleman was coming to the officers' quarters, and asked him to come and let me know as soon as the patient arrived. I then went up to the dining room for my supper. On my way, I was met by the Matron Superintendent, who asked me if the patient had arrived, I answered "No"; again she cautioned me to be particular and to receive the patient and do everything for him. The Matron Superintendent did not go with me into the room that I had got ready. When I was at supper, ward attendant came and called me. I rushed down at once passing by the Matron Superintendent's rooms, which were thrown open and where her friends were assembled. After attending to the patient for about half an hour, I was asked by Apothecary Jesudasen if I knew that Dr. Thomas was upstairs, I said "Yes". He asked me to go up and ask Dr. Thomas to come down at once. When I went up they were seated at dinner. So I told a servant, whom I met outside, to convey the message to Dr. Thomas. Even then it never occurred to me to ask Mrs. Anderson to come down, as I had been ordered to take charge of the case and do my best. I saw Mrs. Anderson in the room where the patient was some time after Dr. Thomas's arrival; but I do not know who asked her to come down. After all was over, I was not reprimanded for not calling Mrs. Anderson; on the contrary, I was asked to have a cup of coffee or tea or some whiskey and soda, but I declined all. After Mrs. Anderson went up to her rooms, she sent me down some whiskey and soda, which I took.

(Signed) A. AMBROSE.

9

Madras
May 4th 1885

From Surgeon G. T. Thomas
Indian Medl Department

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

OFFICE OF SURGEON GENERAL
4 MAY 85
WITH GOVT: OF MADRAS.

Sir

I have the honour to request that my services may be gazetted at the disposal of His Excellency the Commander in Chief as in the absence of such an order the Military Account Department declines to recognise me as having been transferred to the Military Department. I am unable therefore to draw my pay from the 28th March

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant
G. T. Thomas
Surgeon. I.M.D.

may be sent to Dr Thomas.

No. 260

Forwarded to the Chief Secretary to Government, with a view to the services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas being formally replaced at the disposal of the Military department, and the same notified in the Fort St. George Gazette.

M. C. Furnell
Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras

Fort Saint George
6th May /85 3.

Order:

The services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas are replaced at the disposal of the Military Deptt.

12/5

Gazette.

11/5

PB

Public

CURRENT NO. 1935

From
the Surgeon Genl.
with Govt.
No. 260

Surgeon Thomas

Dd 6' May /85
Rd 9 May /85

Subject

Replacing of Services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas at the disposal of the Military Deptt.

With order

No. 226
Despatched with an Enclo:
21/5/85

Ootg.
19/5.
20/5/85

Dear Clogstoun!

With reference to the enclosed application from Dr. G. Thom
d. 4th May 85, the Govt. wish to
know whether he can remain i
the Civil Dept., out of employ
drawing the same pay as he
do, if transferred to the Mil
Dept. Please return the p
with your reply.

J.W.

19/5

[9] 10

D.O. No. 228

From H. F. Clogstoun Esqre

No.

Dated 29th May/85

Received 31st do. —

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Dr. Thomas' salary

Refer to A. Genl.
say it was the intention of Govt.
to punish Dr. T. by leaving him without
appt. till he shows to Govt. he recognizes
the gravity of his offence – is there any
technical objection to this & E he be allowed
any subsistence allowance ? W.

The services of Surgeon
G. T. Thomas are replaced at
the disposal of the Military
department. —

For

Chief Secretary

Mily Dept
with papers

Surg. G. T. Thomas

R.D.O. No. 226

21st May/85

Deputation 8/6/85

From orders from Council –

No. 1075 of 8th June/85

~~Adm~~

O.M.

The acct general ~~will be~~ F.W. is informed that it was the intention of Govt. to punish Dr Thomas, by leaving him without employ until he showed Govt that he recognized the gravity of his offence, and he is requested to report whether there is any objection to this course, and whether Dr Thomas can be granted any subsistence allowance.

MM FW
8/VI.

Put up O.M. from

Mily Depts with papers

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL
WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Coonoor ~~Fort St. George~~, 5th June 1885.

No. 0/58

From M. C. Furnell Esqr. M.D. F.R.C.S.
~~The~~ SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
~~FORT ST. GEORGE~~,

To
THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT,

× No. 260 of 6th May '85

× C. No 1935/85 sent to Acct General with D.O. No 226/85

SIR, With advertence to my endorsement noted in the margin I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to replace the services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas at the disposal of the Military Department with effect from date of relief at the General Hospital, to enable him to draw pay.

2- The Military Department will not disburse pay as it does not recognize Surgeon Thomas, until his services are placed at the disposal of that Department, nor will the Civil Treasury acknowledge his claim to pay, as he holds no appointment in the Civil Department.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obt. Servant
M. C. Furnell.
Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras.

B

Simla
3.10.85

My dear Webster

Our order in Surgeon Thomas' case designedly leaves it entirely to the Madras Govt. to determine the mode & place of that officer's further employment. The effect is simply to set aside the removal to the unemployed list - & if Mr. Thomas sets the difference

between unemployed
and employed pay up
to date he will have nothing
to grumble at & may be
sent anywhere with such
warnings as you may
think his previous general
conduct requires

Yrs sincly

(Signed) A Mackenzie

True copy
Em Woodhope

This to Mr Mangold
4
26-10-86

Wt of India & ourselves.
F.W.

Shewn to Mr Rees
The C.S. wants to
send with Council
tomorrow

Dear Master
The enclosed has just come without any covering letter – I suppose it has reference to Indias order re Dr Thomas memorial

p wr A.E.S.

10/7/0.

The Cedars
Oct: 11. 1885.

My dear Master

I enclose a letter from H.E. re Dr. Thomas who is a child of yours and it rests with you to put him in the corner either N.E. or S.W. as suggested by the Government – considering all things he has I think got off cheap – You will see that Mr Grant Duff wishes his letter enclosed & the d.o from Mackenzie on the subject to be shown confidentially to Farrell Mackenzie's D.O. was in circulation the other day & I presume you have seen it

Ever yrs

H. C.

Oct 3/85

My dear Sullivan.

All matters of any importance are going well here.

The Govt of India takes a more lenient view of the transgressions of Dr Moran (whose case you will remember) than we did & I found a ~~despatch~~ letter prepared in which the Govt of India express their opinion that removing him altogether from Civil employ was a severer measure than was needed

This is quite un-important & very likely they may be right but it would have been a serious matter if they had given a man who is evidently a very bad public servant a triumph over the head of the department This however is very far from being their wish & I enclose a copy of a letter on the subject. Pray show this & that letter to Fornell & let him settle to what point Dr Thomas should be sent. It should be some small station far

away from Madras &
where his conduct can
be watched by some steady
& sensible man. Mangalore
& Chatrapur have suggested
themselves to me; but any
place which would fulfil
the condition I have mentioned
& remove from the younger
men of his department

the bad influence
of which while he
remained in Madras
Furnell formally com
plained to me would
do as well as another

Believe me
yours very

M E Grant Duff

P.S. I learn that the Sudrasan has applied been abroad, and

Please show it or this
to Martin

ven of

Dear Wilson,

Will you deal
with these papers
as Sullivan pro
Roses

Yours very

G Masters

12/10/85

Note

D.O. from Mr Mackenzie to Mr
Webster and
D.O. from Mr Webster to Mr Wilson
removed from this file by the
C.S. 26/10/85

D.O. No 226 d/ 21/5/85—

C No 1935/85—

CURRE..T NO. 2350

[illegible] (1885) DEPARTMENT.

From

~~THE~~ SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
~~Fort St. George.~~

No. 0/68

Dated 5 } June 1885.
Recd. 6 }

No.

SUBJECT.

Requesting to replace the services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas at the disposal of the Mily Deptt from date of relief at the Genl Hospl —

To lie over, pending r/ly from the Acctt General

7/vi

Memo
No 1075
8th June/85

Gazetted Audit DEPARTMENT.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
10 June 1885.

No. 1446

From

H. F. Clogstoun Esqre
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Public Department.

SIR,

With reference to Official Memorandum No. 1075 dated the 8th June 1885, I have the honor to state that an Officer in the position of Dr. Thomas, removed from his appointment for misconduct is entitled to the allowances laid down in Article 301 B II of the India Army Regulations.-

2. I am not aware of any rules which debar Government in the Civil Department from retaining in its pay a Commissioned Medical Officer placed by way of punishment temporarily out of employ, and as it now appears to be the desire of Government so to retain Dr. Thomas, I have today disbursed to that Officer the allowances to which he is entitled under the India Army Regulations above quoted.-

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant
H Clogstoun
Accountt. General

VHS

CURRENT No. 2436

Public (188) Department.

From
The ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,
Madras,

To
The Chief Secy: to Govt.
Public Dept:

No. 1446

Dated 10th June 1885.
Received 12th

No.

Subject.

Stating that he is not aware of any rules which debar Govt: from retaining in its pay a Commissioned Medl: Officer placed out of employ by way of punishment, and as Govt. desire to retain Dr. Thomas, that he has disbursed to that Officer the allowances to which he is entitled under the India Army Regulations.

Hon: Mr. Master

Circulated FW

Ackd 7/6
ref 18/6

16/6

No. 4006.

Government of Madras.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT,

Ootacamund the 23d July 1885.

Read the following telegram from the Secretary to the Government of India, Mily Dept; dated, Simla, 22nd July 1885 No. 879 A.

"Yours 3774 of thirteenth. Term Local Government does not apply to Civil Madras Government which government can appoint its own Medical Officers to Civil and relegate them to Military without reference to Government of India."

Order: Communicated to the Public Department.

(True Extract)

A Kenney Herbert Lt. Col
Offg Secy: to Govt

To
The Public Department

× C Nº 2436

It appears from the Accountant General's letter of 10 June that he has disbursed pay to Dr Thomas, at the unemployed rate from 28 March to date _ say 2½ months _ i.e. according to the scale laid down in regulation for an Officer after 10 years service at Rs 410-9-5 per mensem.

As the grade pay of an Officer

of such service is not very much more (Rs 451-14-5) see 301 I.A. Regs I think it would be better to place the services of Dr Thomas at the disposal of the Military Dept so that he may be usefully employed instead of eating his bread in idleness. He would get very little additional pay but he would be doing something for it. His position at present is an anomalous one & the loss of his appointment× at the General Hospital may be taken as a sufficient punishment for his carelessness

ECM
18/6

×Value Rs 800 per mensem

I agree AS
19/6

I do not object but do nothing without H.E. the Commander in Chief MSD 20th June /85

If Dr Thomas is not required in the Civil department, I presume he must be transferred to the Military, but in order that they may know how to deal with him, I would ask that the reason for his services being dispensed with of the Civil, might be communicated to the A.G.

J.R.

25.6.851

C 18/6 H.S. thr C 22/6

W/ 22/6 - W/ 26-

22/6

The services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas are replaced at the disposal of the Military Dept.

The circumstances under which the Govt. consider that this Officer should no longer be employed in the Civil Dept., are set forth in the accompanying letter ~~which the Govt. addressed~~ which the Govt. addressed to the Govt. of India with regard to a memorial ~~[illegible]~~ from Dr. Thomas.

The papers regarding Dr. Thomas' conduct when Resident Medical Officer at the Hospital at Madras are forwarded as a special case ~~[illegible]~~ in original. It is requested that they may be carefully kept and returned when no longer required. The further papers regarding

---

Public. **CURRENT NO.** 3175

From

the Military Deptt.

No. 4006

D/ 23rd
R/ 23rd } July '85.

Subject.

Stating that term Local Govt. does not apply to Civil Madras Govt. with regard to appt. of Medical Officers.

Submit with draft now being copied. [illegible] 23.7.85

Circulated [illegible]

Hd. 7/6

1/6

64

Public Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

~~Read the following~~

P. [illegible]

dated 30th July 1885, No. 1795 ~~[illegible]~~

The services of Surgeon G. T. Thomas are replaced at the disposal of the Military Department.

2. The circumstances under which the Govt. consider that this officer should no longer be employed in the Civil Department, are set forth in the accompanying letter addressed to the Govt. of India with regard to a memorial from Dr. Thomas.

The

Public

65

3. The papers regarding Dr. Thomas' conduct when Resident Medical Officer at the Hospital at Madras are forwarded as a special case in original. It is requested that they may be carefully kept and returned when no longer required. The further papers regarding Dr. Thomas' conduct in Tinnevelly are in Madras: they will be forwarded as soon as received.

MA
30/vii

JW

For initials

To.

The Military Dept
(with enclosures)
Cop. letter to India No. 1751 [illegible]
& Ag. Pub. No. 333 [illegible] 8/9.2.85
Forwarded 3/7

3019

G.O. 30 July 85 – 1795

DISPOSED OF
No. 1795
30.7.85

Reference to Military

16/6

Confidential

Public Department

No. 1903 dy 12 August/85

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India

Home Department

Despatched
12/8/85
5 spare copies sent 15/8/85.

Sir,

I am directed with reference
to your letter dated 18th June 1885,
No. 25/1074, to state that H.E.
the Governor in Council approv
of the draft set of revised
Statutory rules ~~enclosed with~~ framed by
~~your letter~~ the Govt. of India and has directed
me to forward, for the
consideration of ~~the Govt of India~~ H.E. the G.G. in
the enclosed draft
set of Subsidiary Regulations
drawn up under Rule 3 of
the draft Statutory Rules.

2. It will be observed
that the Government desire
that

30/7

that twice in every three years they shall have the right to nominate a native of India who has either done good work in the uncovenanted Service, or who has attained eminence in one of the learned professions, and that once in every three years the selection shall be made by means of examination. With this modification the Government would wish to adhere to the general lines indicated in my letter dated 18th June 1884, No. 1332.

3. With reference to para 5 of your letter, I am directed to say that H.E. the Governor in Council considers that the scheme of examinations specified in the Subsidiary rules, now forwarded, is sufficient to secure a competent knowledge of English in the candidates.

4. I am directed, with reference to para 9 of your letter, to add ~~say~~ that the Govt. consider the most simple plan for securing the appointment of natives of India to a fair proportion of higher offices in the Service will be to allow promotion to follow its usual course. Though there will be no obligation to promote ~~the~~ officers holding appointments

under the Statutory rules, it will no doubt be found, in practice, that the refusal to promote will be the exception and not the rule.

20/7

2 copies sent to Secy of State 15/8/85.

c29/7

Confidential

Appt. of Natives to Civil Service

Draft letter to Govt. India

Print with + Secy & show
Secy ... please

i.e. the M. S. Rules 6/6 5/8

No. & date will be given on paper but all the same draft printed Secy's name paper can be [illegible]

Confidential

The blue pencil corrections are those suggested by the D. P. Instruction.

30/7

Mention in Council

Draft Regulations

1. Twice in every three years the Government will select and nominate to the Govt. of India a native of Madras who has done good work in the Uncovenanted Civil Service or who has attained eminence in the practice of one of the learned professions.

2. Once in every three years the Government will select candidates for nomination to the Government of India in the following manner.

3. A preliminary

examination, of which due notice will be given, will be held in Madras for the examination of natives of India and the Madras Presidency, for the purpose of selecting candidates qualified to appear at a second examination to be held as soon as possible after the preliminary examination.

At the second examination a certain number of candidates will be selected from among whom the final selection will be made by

by the Govt. for nomination to the Government of India.

4. All candidates for the preliminary examination must produce the following certificates

(a) A certificate showing the candidate to be a graduate in Arts of a recognised Indian University.

(b) A health certificate from a gazetted Govt. medical officer showing that the candidate is physically fit for Govt. service ~~work~~ and is free from any organic disease or constitutional affection

and has been vaccinated
had
or has suffered and
recovered from small pox.

(C) A certificate showing the candidate to be over 22 & under 25 years of age.

why over 22
I should say 21

4. The scheme of the Preliminary examination will be as follows:-

Branch I. English

	Hours	Marks (Paper)	Viva Voce
1. English Literature...	3	100	50
2. English Language...	3	100	40
3. Translation from the vernacular of the (or second language) candidate into English	2	40	...
4. Essay....	3	80	...
5. Reading aloud & conversation	—	40	

Branch II. (Second language).

Sanskrit, Arabic. Persian, Latin or a South Indian vernacular at the option of the candidate).

Marks
Hours Paper V V
& so throughout

	Hours	Marks (Paper)	Viva Voce
1. Grammar. Structure & idiom	3	100	30.
2. Translation from english into second language	3	70.	...
		200.	

Branch III. History

1. History of England	3.	100.	25
2. History of India	3.	100	25
		250.	

The questions will be of a general character, and calculated also to test a candidate's knowledge of the geography of the countries concerned.

Candidates failing to obt[illegible] ~~fourth~~ one third ~~marks in each Branch or one third on the whole~~ marks in each branch will be rejected.

~~F01 T20~~

C24/7

5. The candidates who qualify in the above examination will be required to appear at the final examination of which due notice will be given.

6. The scheme of the final examination will be as follows:-

Branch I.

	Hours.	Marks Paper.	Marks Viva Voce
English Literature	3.	100	25
English Language.	3	100	25
Essays - Two in number (2 Each)		100.	25
Reading & Conversation			25
			400.

Branch II.

History of England.	3½	125	25
Political & Physical Geography	3½	125	25

Branch III. Law.

	Hours.	Marks Paper.	Marks Viva Voce
Jurisprudence. - or	3½	125.	25
Indian History -	3½	125.	25

Branch IV

	Hours.	Marks Paper.	Marks Viva Voce
Geology. Bottany & agricultural chemistry for those candidates who wish to take up any one or two of those sciences	3½.	125.	25

	Paper.	V Voce
3½	125	25

NB. The 3 mentioned & agriculture are I think those which shd be most encouraged. Optics, Heat, Light Electricity, Magnetism & many other subjects however useful are not so important for our purposes. MW

7. The Director of Public Instruction under whose supervision the preliminary and final examinations will be held, will report to Government in alphabetical order the names of not more than twelve of the candidates at the final examination who shall have been awarded the

C24/7

the the highest number of marks. The Govt will finally select the candidates to be nominated to the Government of India from the list submitted by the Director of Public Instruction.

JN
14/1

[CONFIDENTIAL.]

No. 25/1074

FROM

A. MACKENZIE, ESQ., C.S.,
Secretary to the Government of India,

TO

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras.

Home Department.
Public.

Simla, the 18 *June* 1885.

SIR,

THE Secretary of State has called upon the Government of India to reconsider the mode in which the provisions of the Act 33 Vic., cap. 3, section 6, for regulating the appointments of Natives of India to offices reserved ordinarily for members of the Covenanted Civil Service, should be applied, and has directed that the regulations under which operation is given to those provisions should, as much as possible, be improved. I am directed to forward a draft set of revised Statutory Rules, and to request that the Governor General in Council may be favoured at a very early date with the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council upon these Rules, and also with a draft of the subsidiary Regulations (referred to in Rule 3) which His Excellency would propose to lay down for the Madras Presidency.

2. The Secretary of State, in a despatch of the 8th March 1883, desired that it should be made clear, on any revision of the Rules, that "Natives appointed under them are not members of the Covenanted Civil Service, though they may hold offices which under the Act 23 & 24 Vic., cap. 54, are reserved for Civil Servants." In view of these instructions, it becomes necessary to cancel the orders in the Home, Revenue and Agricultural Department Resolution No. 36-1322 to 1327 of the 25th August 1880, which directed that the names of Native gentlemen appointed under the Statutory Rules should be "shown in their proper order in the list of Covenanted Civil Servants and not in a separate list." The Secretary of State has pointed out that the Statute permits the appointment of Natives of India not to the general ranks of the Covenanted Civil Service, but to specific "offices, places, and employments" reserved for members of the said Civil Service. In the revised Rules this point is made perfectly clear in the preamble.

2

3. A definition of the term "Native of India," following the words of the Statute, is incorporated in Rule 1 to show that the widest possible application of the term is intended in practice.

4. Rule 2, prescribing the time of nomination, the numerical limits imposed upon admissions, and the procedure to be followed, is based upon the present practice and the existing orders of the Secretary of State.

5. Rule 3 permits each Local Government to select its nominees, in accordance with the provisions of subsidiary Regulations to be drawn up for each province with the approval of the Governor General in Council. As intimated above, His Excellency in Council desires to be furnished with a draft of the Regulations for the Madras Presidency as soon as possible. The Regulations must in all cases leave it open to the Local Government to nominate without preliminary examination or competition persons who are already in Government service or established in the practice of a profession. They must also in all cases provide for a high standard of educational qualifications on the part of untried candidates. The importance of securing a competent knowledge of English is a matter to which the attention of Local Governments should be specially directed. Subject, however, to these conditions, the Governor General in Council is willing to leave to Local Governments the widest discretion in framing their Provincial Regulations. The Home Department Resolution No. 59-2324—2330, dated the 24th December 1879, confining selection to young men of high family, is altogether withdrawn.

6. Rule 4 restricts the admission of untried men to the age of 25, but allows the Local Government to nominate, irrespective of age, persons already in Government service or established for a reasonable time in the practice of a profession.

7. Rule 5 makes it clear that the appointment is to be to a precise office, place or employment. Untried men admitted for the first time to service, and the younger men promoted from the Uncovenanted Service, would of course at starting be posted only to be Assistant Magistrates and Collectors or Assistant Commissioners of the lowest grade. Their further promotion to any higher grade would be a fresh appointment to a new office or place, for which under Rule 7 they are declared eligible without further reference to the Government of India, but to which no individual has any absolute claim. Promotion, that is change of appointment, will depend entirely upon individual merit and capacity, and be altogether at the discretion of the Local Government.

8. In the case of men of more senior standing or superior qualification it will be open to the Local Government to nominate them at once to higher offices, such as Joint Magistracies, District Judgeships, or other appointments which Natives of India may be considered qualified to fill. But the appointment will in each case be to the specific office, and will not confer a right to claim any other appointment. The Government of India will expect that Natives of India appointed under these Rules will receive from time to time that advancement for which they may show themselves qualified, but there will be no obligation laid upon any Local Government to promote a Statutory Civilian merely on grounds of seniority to any office for which he is unfit.

9. The Governor General in Council would be glad to know what steps the Local Government would propose to take in order to secure the appointment of Natives of India to a fair proportion of the higher offices with due regard to the maintenance of regular promotion in the Covenanted Civil Service.

10. Rule 6 places the existing practice of probation and confirmation on a clearer basis.

11. Rules 8 and 9 are reproductions of existing rules.

12. Rule 10 is added to obviate difficulties caused by technical errors in, or doubts regarding, points of procedure.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

A Mackenzie

Secretary to the Government of India.

Govt. C. B. Press, Simla.—No. 283 H. D.—16-6-85.—85.

C

[CONFIDENTIAL.]

Draft Rules.

IN exercise of the power conferred by the Statute 33 Vic., cap. 3, secti 6, the following rules for regulating the appointment of Natives of India not being members of the Covenanted Civil Service of Her Majesty in India, to offices, places, and employments reserved for members of the said Civil Service, have been prescribed by the Governor General in Council, and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council with the concurrence of a majority of members present.

1. The words "Native of India" in these Rules shall mean any person born and domiciled within the dominions of Her Majesty in India of parents habitually resident in India and not established there for temporary purposes only.

2. On the 1st September of each year, or as soon thereafter as the number of persons appointed for the year to the Covenanted Service of India by Her Majesty's Secretary of State under the provisions of the Statute 21 and 22 Vic., cap. 106, have been ascertained, the Governor General in Council shall call upon the various Local Governments and Administrations (or upon such of them as he may think fit) to nominate a certain number of Natives of India for appointment to offices ordinarily reserved for members of the said Covenanted Civil Service; provided that the total number of nominations so allotted to all the Local Governments and Administrations taken together shall not exceed one-fifth of the total number of Civil Servants appointed by Her Majesty's Secretary of State in that year.

3. Each Local Government or Administration shall select its nominees in accordance with the provisions of regulations to be drawn up for each province and published in the Local Gazette of the province after having received the sanction of the Governor General in Council.

4. A Native of India shall not be nominated by any Local Government or Administration under these rules after he has attained the age of 25 years, unless he is already in the service of Government or has been for not less than five years engaged in the practice of a learned profession.

5. The Local Government or Administration in making its nominations shall specify the precise nature of the office, place or employment to which it is proposed to appoint each of the nominees.

6. The Governor General in Council may accept the nomination of any Local Government or Administration either provisionally or absolutely. In the former case the nominee shall be appointed to be a probationer for service and shall not be confirmed in the office, place or employment to which he may be nominated until the Local Government has reported to the Governor General in Council that the nominee has acquitted himself satisfactorily during a period of not less than two years from the date of his appointment, and that he has, unless specially exempted by the Governor General in Council, passed such examination as may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government, subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council.

7. A Native of India admitted to any office, place or employment under these rules shall thereafter be eligible for appointment to any other office, place or employment for which the Local Government may consider him fit.

8. A Native of India appointed under these rules shall be eligible only for service in the province wherein he was first appointed, unless, under the orders of the Governor General in Council, he is formally transferred to an office, place or employment in some other province, in which case he will thereafter be eligible for appointment to any other office, place or employment in the latter province for which the Local Government may consider him fit.

9. A Native of India appointed under these rules shall not be dismissed or removed from the service of Government save under the orders of the Governor General in Council.

10. An appointment shall not be deemed void merely on the ground that it was not made in conformity with these rules; but nothing in this rule shall affect the power of the Governor General in Council to cancel any appointment not so made.

Govt. C. B. Press, Simla.—No. 263 H. D.—16-6-85.—85.

Public Cir. 2613

Circulated E. F. W
25/6/85

The opinions of the Members of the Govt. will be found recorded in G.O. 18th June 1884 No 1331–1332. E. F. W
25/6/85

Asking for opinion on draft rules for regulating the appt. of natives of India to the Civil Service.

Public Department.

No. 2613.

From

The Government of India. Home Department.

dated 18 June 1885, No. 25/1074.

I agree

From para 2. of Mr Macken=zie's letter I infer that the names of those natives who have hitherto been appointed under the Statute should be removed from the list of the Covenanted C.S. and should appear in a new ~~native~~ Local C.S. list.
H.S.

But wait till the new system is in practice & understood
MGD

FOR ORDERS.

We cannot, I think, do better than adhere to the general lines indicated in our letter d/18 June 1884 No 1332 Public.

As the service will be a "Local Civil Service" Natives of India who like to go to England and comp. ~~the~~ there wd. if successful enter the Covenanted Civil Service.

The "Regulations" wh. we are called upon to frame with reference to the 3rd of the Draft Rules shd., in my opinion, provide (1) twice in every three years for the selection and nomination of a Native of India and Madras who has done good work in the Uncovenanted Civil Service or attained eminence in any learned profession (2) Once in every three years for a competitive Examination of Natives of India & Madras — between 22 & 25 years of age — graduates of a University — certified to be physically+ fit — according to a test of the nature of that described in paragraph 5 G.O. 27 January 1885 No 214 Public — The names of the twelve of these candidates who may be considered by the Examiners to be

(1). This has my cordial approval

(2.) Don't let us bind ourselves down to Competitions and graduates — Let those who wish to compete go in and enter the Covenanted C.S. The alternative to selecting from the U. C. S. should in my opinion be the selection of a man of good family and position — a piece of patronage to be exercised for political purposes HS
2/7

And mine MD

I think we should bind ourselves to a competition once in three years — not often — & under the conditions specified by Mr Master MD

+ G.O. 14 Nov 82 No 1388 Public

Yes MD

Yes MD

Madras

Yes MD

the best qualified to be submitted in Alphabetical order to Government with whom will rest the ultimate selection for nomination to India.

Yes MD

The 'scheme' of Examination above referred to sufficiently meets the desire of India for a competent knowledge of English.

In regard to para 9 of Mr Mackenzie's letter the simplest plan will be to let promotion follow its usual course. Though there may be no obligation to promote it will be found in practice that the refusal to promote will be the exception and not the rule.

The Draft Rules appear to provide for ~~all~~ every that is necessary

29/6/85

These rules seem to me
just what were required,
and agree almost entirely
with the minute I recorded
on the 4th June 1883.

F.R.

5th July 1885.

Apptt of Natives of India
to the Civil Service

FOR ORDERS.

C2316 Retd 6/7/85

Madras
20 July 1885

From
The Ag. Director of Public Instru
tion,

To
The Honorable the Chief
Secretary to the Govt.
of Fort St. George

Sir

With regard to the Draft
Subsidiary Rules under Rule 3, I
have the honour to make the
following remarks.

2. I do not think the Prelimin
Examination can be dispense
with, in view of the large numbe
of candidates that may be ex-
pected to appear in future years
If the number should turn out
to be smaller than is anticipat
the examination could be done
away with at any time. Bu
I hardly think it would be saf
to dispense with it at the outs

3. Considering the wide definit

of the words "Natives of India" in Government of India Draft Rule 1, I think it will be necessary to make provision for Eurasians in the scheme of the Preliminary examination. In the present circumstances of that community, to insist on their passing at this stage in a Vernacular or Oriental language, would be, practically, to shut the door of this service upon them. A Eurasian if admitted to the service would, doubtless, in course of time, be required to pass in a vernacular language to qualify for promotion, just as European Covenanted Civilians have to do. But he should have the option of taking up Latin as his second language in the Preliminary examination. Accordingly, I would propose to insert under Branch I, 3, after the word "Vernacular" the words "or second language", & under Branch II, after the word "Persian", the word "Latin".

4. Since writing the above I find in the rough office draft of Mr. Grigg's proposals submitted to Government last year, that Latin did form a part of his original scheme. I do not know what were the reasons for its subsequent exclusion, but I still think it should be included.

5. I think the minimum, one-fourth in each branch, is too low. The University has always required a candidate to get one-third in English, though it has hitherto been content with one-fourth in each of the other branches. Under the new B. A. curriculum, however, the minimum has been raised to one-third in each branch. I would strongly recommend the same minimum to be adopted here; i.e. substitute for the words "one-fourth marks in each branch or one-third on the whole", the words "one-third marks in each branch". The only alternatives, in order to secure that this examination shall answer its purpose, would be either to make the question papers more severe or the marking less liberal than in the Degree Examination. Neither of these alternatives, however, would be easy to realize.

6. With regard to the final examination I would observe that subsidiary Rule 6 as it

stands does not make it clear whether those who do not take up Jurisprudence, must take up both Indian History and Political and Physical Geography, or only Indian History. Comparing Mr. Grigg's draft and the programme actually followed last December with para 2 of G.O. 5th Dec. 1884, No. 2607, it is clear that Indian History alone is the alternative subject to Jurisprudence. This being so I would suggest that Political and Physical Geography be brought under Branch II.

7. I would suggest that the provisions of the clause which permits candidates to offer themselves for examination in Geology, Botany or Chemistry be extended & made more definite. I gather from G.O. 5th Dec. 1884, No. 2607, para 2, that, if a Candidate professed to have a special knowledge of any of these sciences, it was the desire of Government to give him an opportunity of putting his profession to the proof. And I know of no better means of guaging a young man's intellectual and moral character than by thus taking him at his word when he professes to know ~~some~~ one science thoroughly and to be prepared to undergo a searching examination in it. This final examination being intended not so much to test the contents of a person's knowledge as his intellectual power, it is of comparatively small moment what branch of knowledge is selected. I would therefore suggest that a fourth branch be instituted for all candidates, to be specified in some such way as this — "Any one of the Sciences which the candidate professes to have specially studied for his Degree". These Sciences need not be ~~[illegible]~~ enumerated ~~them~~ in detail in the Rules; but for the information of Government it may be mentioned that they will be found in a condensed form on p. 433 of the University Calendar, where it will be seen that Botany, Chemistry, & Geology are of the number. As every candidate for a Degree has to bring up one or more sciences, the proposal I now make would put them all on the same level

at the final examination. The scheme would then stand thus:–

Branch I

	Hours	Marks Paper	Viva Voce
English Literature	3	100	25
English Language	3	100	25
Essays (two in number)	2 each	100	25
Reading & Conversation			25
		400	

Branch II

	Hours	Paper	Viva Voce
History of England	3½	125	25
Political & Physical Geography	3½	125	25
		300	

Branch III

	Hours	Paper	Viva Voce
Jurisprudence or	3½	125	25
History of India	3½	125	25
		150	

Branch IV

	Hours	Paper	Viva Voce
Any one of the Sciences which the Candidate professes to have specially studied for his Degree	3½	125	25
		750	

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
D Duncan
Ag. Director of Public Instruction

more
him at his word when he propo

Repd 14/7/85

Stonehouse
14. vii

Confidential

Dear Mr Duncan,

I am directed to forward you Confidentially the enclosed letter from the Govt. of India d. 18th June 85 No $\frac{25}{1074}$, regarding the mode in which Natives of India are in future to be appointed to the Statutory Service –

With regard to Rule 3. of the Draft rules, which accompany the letter, I enclose a rough draft of Subsidiary rules which has been drawn up in this Office, and I

Public (1885) Department

CURRENT NO. 3133.

From

D. Duncan Esq. M.A., D.Sc.

Ag Director of Public Instruction

D/20th
R/22d } July 1885.

Remarks on draft rules for regulating the appointment of Natives of India to the Civil Service &c.

Draft sent to
Madras to
[illegible]

578

12th August 1885, No. 1903, Public.

CONFIDENTIAL.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

The CHIEF SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of
FORT St. GEORGE,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Home Department.

Sir,

I am directed, with reference to your letter, dated 18th June 1885, No. 25-1074, to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council approves of the draft set of revised Statutory Rules framed by the Government of India, and has directed me to forward, for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, the enclosed draft set of subsidiary regulations drawn up under rule 3 of the draft Statutory Rules.

2. It will be observed that the Government desire that twice in every three years they shall have the right to nominate a Native of India who has either done good work in the Uncovenanted Service or who has attained eminence in one of the learned professions, and that once in every three years the selection shall be made by means of examination. With this modification, the Government would wish to adhere to the general lines indicated in my letter, dated 18th June 1884, No. 1332.

3. With reference to paragraph 5 of your letter, I am directed to say that His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that the scheme of examinations specified in the subsidiary rules now forwarded is sufficient to secure in the candidates a competent knowledge of English.

4. I am directed, with reference to paragraph 9 of your letter, to add that the Government consider the most simple plan for securing the appointment of Natives of India to a fair proportion of higher offices in the service will be to allow promotion to follow its usual course. Though there will be no obligation to promote officers holding appointments under the Statutory Rules, it will no doubt be found, in practice, that the refusal to promote will be the exception, and not the rule.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

Ootacamund,
12th *August* 1885.

APPENDIX.

Draft Regulations.

Twice in every three years the Government will select and nominate to the Government of India a Native of Madras who has done good work in the Uncovenanted Civil Service or who has attained eminence in the practice of one of the learned professions.

2. Once in every three years the Government will select candidates for nomination to the Government of India in the following manner.

3. A preliminary examination, of which due notice will be given, will be held in Madras for the examination of Natives of India and the Madras Presidency for the purpose of selecting candidates qualified to appear at a second examination to be held as soon as possible after the preliminary examination.

At the second examination a certain number of candidates will be selected, from among whom the final selection will be made by the Government for nomination to the Government of India.

4. All candidates for the preliminary examination must produce the following certificates:—

(*a*) A certificate showing the candidate to be a Graduate in Arts of a recognised Indian University.

(*b*) A health certificate from a gazetted Government medical officer showing that the candidate is physically fit for Government service and is free from any organic disease or constitutional affection and has been vaccinated or has had small-pox.

(*c*) A certificate showing the candidate to be over twenty-two and under twenty-five years of age.

4. The scheme of the preliminary examination will be as follows:—

Branch I—English.

	Hours.	Marks.	
		Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
1. English Literature	3	100	50
2. English Language	3	100	40
3. Translation from the Second or Vernacular Language of the candidate into English	2	40	..
4. Essay	3	80	..
5. Reading aloud and Conversation	..	..	40

Branch II—Second Language.

(Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Latin, or a South Indian vernacular at the option of the candidate.)

	Hours.	Marks.	
		Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
1. Grammar—Structure and Idiom	3	100	30
2. Translation from English into Second Language ..	3	70	..
		200	

Branch III—History.

	Hours.	Marks.	
1. History of England	3	100	25
2. History of India	3	100	25
		250	

The questions will be of a general character and calculated also to test a candidate's knowledge of the geography of the countries concerned.

Candidates failing to obtain one-third marks in each branch will be rejected.

5. The candidates who qualify in the above examination will be required to appear at the final examination, of which due notice will be given.

6. The scheme of the final examination will be as follows :—

Branch I.

	Hours.	Marks.	
		Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
English Literature	3	100	25
English Language	3	100	25
Essays (two in number)	2 each.	100	25
Reading and Conversation	..	25	..
		400	

Branch II.

	Hours.	Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
History of England	3½	125	25
Political and Physical Geography	3½	125	25

Branch III—Law.

	Hours.	Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
Jurisprudence	3½	125	25
or			
Indian History	3½	125	25

Branch IV.

	Hours.	Paper.	*Vivâ voce.*
Geology, Botany, and Agricultural Chemistry for those candidates who wish to take up any one or two of those sciences	3½	125	25

7. The Director of Public Instruction, under whose supervision the preliminary and final examinations will be held, will report to Government, in alphabetical order, the names of not more than twelve of the candidates at the final examination who shall have been awarded the highest number of marks. The Government will finally select the candidates to be nominated to the Government of India from the list submitted by the Director of Public Instruction.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

Regr. No.

HOME 1885 DEPT.

[ ]

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, dated 12th August 1885,
No. 1903.

AUGUST.

Statutory Civil Service.

Intimating approval of the draft set of revised Statutory Rules framed by the Government of India, and forwarding, for consideration, a draft set of subsidiary regulations drawn up under rule 3 of the draft Statutory Rules.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Note—*To be filed with letter to the Government of India* No. 1903, *Public, dated* 12*th August* 1885.

From A. MACKENZIE, Esq., C.S., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 18th June 1885, No. 25-1074.

The Secretary of State has called upon the Government of India to reconsider the mode in which the provisions of the Act 33 Vic., cap. 3, section 6, for regulating the appointments of Natives of India to offices reserved ordinarily for members of the Covenanted Civil Service, should be applied, and has directed that the regulations under which operation is given to those provisions should, as much as possible, be improved. I am directed to forward a draft set of revised Statutory Rules, and to request that the Governor-General in Council may be favoured, at a very early date, with the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council upon these Rules, and also with a draft of the subsidiary Regulations (referred to in Rule 3) which His Excellency would propose to lay down for the Madras Presidency.

2. The Secretary of State, in a despatch of the 8th March 1883, desired that it should be made clear, on any revision of the Rules, that "Natives appointed under them are not members of the Covenanted Civil Service, though they may hold offices which, under the Act 23 & 24 Vic., cap. 54, are reserved for Civil Servants." In view of these instructions, it becomes necessary to cancel the orders in the Home, Revenue and Agricultural Department Resolution No. 36-1322 to 1327 of the 25th August 1880, which directed that the names of Native gentlemen appointed under the Statutory Rules should be "shown in their proper order in the list of Covenanted Civil Servants and not in a separate list." The Secretary of State has pointed out that the Statute permits the appointment of Natives of India not to the general ranks of the Covenanted Civil Service, but to specific "offices, places and employments" reserved for members of the said Civil Service. In the revised Rules this point is made perfectly clear in the preamble.

3. A definition of the term "Native of India," following the words of the Statute, is incorporated in Rule 1 to show that the widest possible application of the term is intended in practice.

4. Rule 2, prescribing the time of nomination, the numerical limits imposed upon admissions, and the procedure to be followed, is based upon the present practice and the existing orders of the Secretary of State.

5. Rule 3 permits each Local Government to select its nominees, in accordance with the provisions of subsidiary Regulations to be drawn up for each province with the approval of the Governor-General in Council. As intimated above, His Excellency in Council desires to be furnished with a draft of the Regulations for the Madras Presidency as soon as possible. The Regulations must, in all cases, leave it open to the Local Government to nominate, without preliminary examination or competition, persons who are already in Government service or established in the practice of a profession. They must also in all cases provide for a high standard of educational qualifications on the part of untried candidates. The importance of securing a competent knowledge of English is a matter to which the attention of Local Governments should be specially directed. Subject, however, to these conditions, the Governor-General in Council is willing to leave to Local Governments the widest discretion in framing their Provincial Regulations. The Home Department Resolution, No. 59-2324—2330, dated the 24th December 1879, confining selection to young men of high family, is altogether withdrawn.

6. Rule 4 restricts the admission of untried men to the age of 25, but allows the Local Government to nominate, irrespective of age, persons already in Government service or established for a reasonable time in the practice of a profession.

7. Rule 5 makes it clear that the appointment is to be to a precise office, place or employment. Untried men admitted for the first time to service, and the younger men promoted from the Uncovenanted Service, would, of course, at starting be posted only to be Assistant Magistrates and Collectors or Assistant Commissioners of the lowest grade. Their further promotion to any higher grade would be a fresh appointment to a new office or place, for which, under Rule 7, they are declared eligible without further reference to the Government of India, but to which no individual has any absolute claim. Promotion, that is change of appointment, will depend entirely upon individual merit and capacity, and be altogether at the discretion of the Local Government.

8. In the case of men of more senior standing or superior qualification, it will be open to the Local Government to nominate them at once to higher offices, such as Joint Magistracies, District Judgeships, or other appointments which Natives of India may be considered qualified to fill. But the appointment will in each case be to the specific office, and will not confer a right to claim any other appointment. The Government of India will expect that Natives of India appointed under these Rules will receive from time to time that advancement for which they may show themselves qualified, but there will be no obligation laid upon any Local Government to promote a Statutory Civilian merely on grounds of seniority to any office for which he is unfit.

9. The Governor-General in Council would be glad to know what steps the Local Government would propose to take in order to secure the appointment of Natives of India to a fair proportion of the higher offices with due regard to the maintenance of regular promotion in the Covenanted Civil Service.

10. Rule 6 places the existing practice of probation and confirmation on a clearer basis.

11. Rules 8 and 9 are reproductions of existing rules.

12. Rule 10 is added to obviate difficulties caused by technical errors in, or doubts regarding, points of procedure.

DRAFT RULES.

In exercise of the power conferred by the Statute 33 Vic., cap. 3, section 6, the following rules for regulating the appointment of Natives of India, not being members of the Covenanted Civil Service of Her Majesty in India, to offices, places and employments reserved for members of the said Civil Service, have been prescribed by the Governor-General in Council, and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council with the concurrence of a majority of members present.

1. The words "Native of India" in these Rules shall mean any person born and domiciled within the dominions of Her Majesty in India of parents habitually resident in India and not established there for temporary purposes only.

2. On the 1st September of each year, or as soon thereafter as the number of persons appointed for the year to the Covenanted Service of India by Her Majesty's Secretary of State under the provisions of the Statute 21 and 22 Vic., cap. 106, have been ascertained, the Governor-General in Council shall call upon the various Local Governments and Administrations (or upon such of them as he may think fit) to nominate a certain number of Natives of India for appointment to offices ordinarily reserved for members of the said Covenanted Civil Service: provided that the total number of nominations so allotted to all the Local Governments and Administrations taken together shall not exceed one-fifth of the total number of Civil Servants appointed by Her Majesty's Secretary of State in that year.

3. Each Local Government or Administration shall select its nominees in accordance with the provisions of regulations to be drawn up for each province and published in the Local Gazette of the province after having received the sanction of the Governor-General in Council.

4. A Native of India shall not be nominated by any Local Government or Administration under these rules after he has attained the age of 25 years, unless he is already in the service of Government, or has been for not less than five years engaged in the practice of a learned profession.

5. The Local Government or Administration, in making its nominations, shall specify the precise nature of the office, place or employment to which it is proposed to appoint each of the nominees.

6. The Governor-General in Council may accept the nomination of any Local Government or Administration either provisionally or absolutely. In the former case, the nominee shall be appointed to be a probationer for service, and shall not be confirmed in the office, place or employment to which he may be nominated until the Local Government has reported to the Governor-General in Council that the nominee has acquitted himself satisfactorily during a period of not less than two years from the date of his appointment, and that he has, unless specially exempted by the Governor-General in Council, passed such examination as may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government, subject to the approval of the Governor-General in Council.

7. A Native of India admitted to any office, place or employment under these rules shall thereafter be eligible for appointment to any other office, place or employment for which the Local Government may consider him fit.

8. A Native of India appointed under these rules shall be eligible only for service in the province wherein he was first appointed, unless, under the orders of the Governor-General in Council, he is formally transferred to an office, place or employment in some other province, in which case he will thereafter be eligible for appointment to any other office, place or employment in the latter province for which the Local Government may consider him fit.

9. A Native of India appointed under these rules shall not be dismissed or removed from the service of Government, save under the orders of the Governor-General in Council.

10. An appointment shall not be deemed void merely on the ground that it was not made in conformity with these rules; but nothing in this rule shall affect the power of the Governor-General in Council to cancel any appointment not so made.

No. 2613, Public.

From the Government of India, Home Department, dated 18*th Juhe* 1885, *No.* 25—1074.

We cannot, I think, do better than adhere to the general lines indicated in our letter, dated 18th June 1884, No. 1332, Public.

As the service will be a "Local Civil Service," Natives of India, who like to go to England and compete there, would, if successful, enter the *Covenanted Civil Service.*

The "Regulations" which we are called upon to frame with reference to the 3rd of the Draft Rules should, in my opinion, provide (1) *twice* in every *three* years for the selection and nomination of a Native of India and Madras, who has done good work in the Uncovenanted Civil Service or attained eminence in any learned profession; (2) *once* in every *three* years for a competitive examination of Natives of India and Madras, between 22 and 25 years of age, graduates of a University, certified to be physically fit*, according to a test of the nature of that described in paragraph 5, G.O., 27th January 1885, No. 214, Public. The names of the twelve of these candidates who may be considered by the examiners to be the best qualified to be submitted in alphabetical order to Government with whom will rest the ultimate selection for nomination to India.

I agree—M. E. G. D.

From paragraph 2 of Mr. Mackenzie's letter, I infer that the names of those Natives who have hitherto been appointed under the Statute should be removed from the list of the Covenanted Civil Servants, and should appear in a new local Civil Service List.—H. E. S.

But wait till the new system is in practice and understood.—M. E. G. D.

(¹) This has my cordial approval.—H. E. S.

And mine.—M. E. G. D.

(²) Don't let us bind ourselves down to competition and graduates; let those who wish to compete go home and enter the Covenanted Civil Service. The alternative to selecting from the Uncovenanted Civil Service should, in my opinion, be the selection of a man of good family and position,—a piece of patronage to be exercised for political purposes.—H. E. S.

I think we should bind ourselves to a competition once in three years—not oftener—and under the conditions specified by Mr. Master.

M. E. G. D.

* G.O., dated 14th November 1882, No. 1388, Public.

Yes.—M. E. G. D.

Yes.—M. E. G. D.

Yes.—M. E. G. D.

Yes.—M. E. G. D.

The "scheme" of examination above referred to sufficiently meets the desire of India for "a competent knowledge of English."

In regard to paragraph 9 of Mr. Mackenzie's letter, the simplest plan will be to let promotion follow its usual course. Though there may be no *obligation* to promote, it will be found, in practice, that the refusal to promote will be the exception and not the rule.

The Draft Rules appear to provide for everything that is necessary.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER.

29th June 1885.

The rules seem to me just what were required, and agree almost entirely with the Minute I recorded on the 4th June 1883.

5th July 1885. F. ROBERTS.

Demi-official letter from the Hon'ble. E. F. WEBSTER, Chief Secretary to Government, to the Acting Director of Public Instruction, dated Stonehouse, 14th July 1885.

I am directed to forward you *confidentially* the enclosed letter from the Government of India, dated 18th June 1885, No. 25-1074, regarding the mode in which Natives of India are in future to be appointed to the Statutory Service.

2. With regard to Rule 3 of the Draft Rules which accompany the letter, I enclose a rough draft of subsidiary Rules which has been drawn up in this office, and I am to ask you to give your opinion upon it. The Government desire that the method, which was followed in last year, as to the selection should be adhered to, but are doubtful whether in future two examinations,—a preliminary and final,—would be necessary. It is upon this point particularly that your opinion is desired. If two examinations are not really necessary, the preliminary may be omitted. But as the number of candidates in future years is likely to be large, perhaps a preliminary examination may be necessary. It prevents, of course, the examiners, at the final examination, from being overwhelmed by a number of inferior papers.

Please return the papers with your opinion as soon as possible.

From Dr. D. DUNCAN, Acting Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 20th July 1885.

With regard to the draft subsidiary Rules under Rule 3, I have the honor to make the following remarks.

2. I do not think the preliminary examination can be dispensed with, in view of the large number of candidates that may be expected to appear in future years. If the number should turn out to be smaller than is anticipated, the examination could be done away with at any time. But I hardly think it would be safe to dispense with it at the outset.

3. Considering the wide definition of the words "Natives of India" in Government of India draft Rule 1, I think it will be necessary to make provision for Eurasians in the scheme of the preliminary examination. In the present circumstances of that community, to insist on their passing at this stage in a

vernacular or oriental language would be, practically, to shut the door of this service upon them. A Eurasian, if admitted to the service, would, doubtless, in course of time, be required to pass in a vernacular language to qualify for promotion, just as European Covenanted Civilians have to do. But he should have the option of taking up Latin as his second language in the preliminary examination. Accordingly, I would propose to insert under Branch I, 3, after the word "Vernacular," the words "or second language," and under Branch II, after the word "Persian," the word "Latin".

4. Since writing the above, I find in the rough office draft of Mr. Grigg's proposals submitted to Government last year, that Latin did form a part of his original scheme. I do not know what were the reasons for its subsequent exclusion, but I still think it should be included.

5. I think the minimum, one-fourth in each branch, is too low. The University has always required a candidate to get one-third in English, though it has hitherto been content with one-fourth in each of the other branches. Under the new B.A. curriculum, however, the minimum has been raised to one-third in each branch. I would strongly recommend the same minimum to be adopted here, *i.e.*, substitute for the words "one-fourth marks in each branch, or one-third on the whole," the words "one-third marks in each branch". The only alternatives, in order to secure that this examination shall answer its purpose, would be either to make the question papers more severe or the marking less liberal than in the Degree Examination. Neither of these alternatives, however, would be easy to realise.

6. With regard to the final examination, I would observe that subsidiary Rule 6 as it stands does not make it clear whether those who do not take up Jurisprudence, must take up both Indian History and Political and Physical Geography, or only Indian History. Comparing Mr. Grigg's draft and the programme actually followed last December with paragraph 2 of G.O., 5th December 1884, No. 2607, it is clear that Indian History alone is the alternative subject to Jurisprudence. This being so, I would suggest that Political and Physical Geography be brought under Branch II.

7. I would suggest that the provisions of the clause which permits candidates to offer themselves for examination in Geology, Botany or Chemistry be extended and made more definite. I gather from G.O., 5th December 1884, No. 2607, paragraph 2, that, if a candidate professed to have a special knowledge of any of these sciences, it was the desire of Government to give him an opportunity of putting his profession to the proof. And I know of no better means of guaging a young man's intellectual and moral character than by thus taking him at his word when he professes to know some one science thoroughly and to be prepared to undergo a searching examination in it. This final examination being intended not so much to test the contents of a person's knowledge as his intellectual power, it is of comparatively small moment what branch of knowledge is selected. I would, therefore, suggest that a fourth branch be instituted for *all* candidates, to be specified in some such way as this: "Any one of the sciences which the candidate professes to have specially studied for his Degree." These sciences need not be enumerated in detail in the rules; but, for the information of Government, it may be mentioned that they will be found in a condensed form on page 433 of the University Calendar, where it will be seen that Botany, Chemistry, and Geology are of the number. As every candidate for a Degree has to bring up one or more sciences, the proposal I now make would put them all on the same level at the final examination. The scheme would then stand thus:

BRANCH I.

	Hours.	MARKS. Papers.	 *Vivâ voce.*
English Literature	3	100	25
English Language	3	100	25
Essays (two in number)	2 each	100	25
Reading and Conversation	0	..	25
		400	

BRANCH II.

	Hours.	Marks. Papers.	Marks. *Vivâ voce.*
History of England			
Political and Physical Geography	3½	125	25
	3½	125	25
		300	

BRANCH III.

	Hours.	Papers.	*Vivâ voce.*
Jurisprudence	3½	125	25
or			
History of India	3½	125	25
		150	

BRANCH IV.

	Hours.	Papers.	*Vivâ voce.*
Any one of the Sciences which the candidate professes to have specially studied for his Degree	3½	125	25
		150	

No. 1892.

From

T. C. Daukes Esquire,
Under Secy: to the Govt of India,

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras.
Dated Simla, the [illegible] October 1883.

Home Deptt.
Public

Sir,

I am directed to intimate for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council that the number of nominations of natives of India to offices ordinarily held by members of the Covenanted Civil service to be made in the current year, under the rules published in Notification No. 1534 of the 22d August 1879, will probably be 1 for Madras. The Governor General in Council will be glad to receive in due course the names of three selected candidates for the said appointment arranged in order of merit, if properly qualified persons to this number are forthcoming.

2. As regards the mode of selection to be adopted the full discretionary powers accorded to Local Governments by Home Department Circular letter No. $\frac{33}{1386-1390}$ dated

Attach → 5th September 1884, which related to the nominations of that year, may be exercised on the present occasion also. The Government of Madras may accordingly choose its candidates in any manner that may appear to it desirable, special regard being paid (in the case of candidates whose merits and abilities have not been already proved by employment in the public service) to educational attainments and proficiency. It will be open to His Excellency the Governor in Council to select suitable candidates from the Uncovenanted service or learned professions; to institute a test of limited competition among nominated candidates; or to follow any other mode of selection that may be thought suitable.

3. In submitting the names of the persons selected, full information should be given as to their qualifications and as to the mode of selection adopted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant

F C Daukes

Under Secy. to the Govt of India.

CB 29/10

[9] CURRENT NO. 4732

Public (1885) Department

From

The Government of Ind
Home Deptt.

No. 1892

Dated 29 October } 1885
Received 4 Nov. }
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Native Civil Servants for Madras.

For

Statutory Civilians

Appt. in 1885

I would suggest that where the method of a limited competition among nominated candidates is adopted the following should be the scheme

(1) No candidate to be admitted to examination ~~[illegible]~~ who is under 21* or over 25+ years of age.

(2) No candidate to be admitted who is not a native of the Province an

(3) No candidate to be admitted who has not taken at an Indian University one or other ~~one of the~~ of the following degrees

(1) M.A or M.L. in any class
2) B.A. in the 1st class
3) B.A. in the 2d class and at least a 2d class in Law.

(4) That applications from persons fulfilling the foregoing conditions be invited.

(5) That after scrutiny and examination by the Govt. in the first instance the list of such persons be further submitted to the Secretary and Commission

* the ~~English~~ standard of Majority
+ the ordinary age bar for employment in the Indian Service

by a Committee composed of

(1) A Judge of the High Court to be nominated by the Chief Justice

(2) ~~The~~ A member of the Board to be nominated by Govt.

(3) The Chief Secretary

(6) That the list as revised by them be submitted to Govt with full information regarding the candidates left in.

(7) That the candidates left in the list as finally settled by Govt be subjected to an examination which shall be arranged by a Board in consult. with the D.P.I.

(8) That the examination be strictly competitive* and that the candidates be placed in the order submitted to Govt in order of merit.

(9) That the names of the first three in the list in order of merit be submitted to the Govt of India with the recommendation of this Govt. as

* confidential

to the candidate it would prefer.

N.B. As the Govt by the previous process of elimination would have satisfied itself that none but eligible candidates were left to compete the recommendation would ~~probably~~ it is presumed generally be in accordance with merit as tested by the examination.

(10) Applications to be submitted each year not later than 1st Oct. ~~of each year~~ —

N.B. This to admit of the necessary enquiries being made regarding the applicants

(11) The examination each year to be held about 15th Dec. and the appt. to be made so as to be from 1st January following.

(12) The age limits to be determined by age on the 1st Dec. immediately preceding the examination.

Note This does not interfere with the method of selection from the learned professions or for approved public services within branches. W.

This system to be tried for a period of 5 years [illegible]

6-11-85

(15)

For Council 10-11-85

Statutory C.S.

Note

I have taken His Excellency's orders on the principle of selection to be adopted this year and shall in accordance with his instructions consult Hon'ble Member on the subject — I shall see W. Wilson personally.

6-11-85

seen CUC 7/11. The C.S. might bring the Rules & correspondence when he comes CUC

HCS 7/11

I incline to select only this year a tried man from the Native uncovenanted Service CUA

8.11

C 6/11

R 9-11

recommendation of His Ex.