

Public (1899) Department.

ORDINARY M.S.

G.O., No. 393

Dated 3 - 4 - 99

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders on the appeal submitted by the
Supt. Gun Carriage Factory, on behalf of Mr.
C. Bloxham, a conuanted overseer in the Factory,
against the amount of ~~dam stoppage~~ hospital stopp
g claimed on acct. of the Overseer's two children
who were inmates of the General Hospital, Madras,
and who were charged with rates prescribed for
patients drawing Rs 200 and upwards per mensem.

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

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cus 292,100 (2nd 7-2)	(85)			201	22-2	01	

CURRENT No.

From the supd, Gun Carriage
Factory,
Madras.

Encl.: No 245, d/25-1-99.

No. 8/5675

Referred to the Surgeon
General for remarks.

2 The authority under which the charges in question were laid should be stated. It is observed

lit G.D 434 Pub. 231/3/86,

which pays the rate of
hospital charges,
does as only with regard to
persons who are themselves
in receipt of a regular
income, and makes no
provision for payment
on account of the families

an account of the families
of such persons as Dr. 9/2/15

Dated 11
Received 11
Registered 12
Enclosures one

Enclosures one
Spare copies

SUBJECT,

SUBJECT.
Subd an appeal on behalf
of Mr J. Bloxham, the
Overseer of Carpenters in
the Queen Carriage Factory,
on the subject of a bill
for hospital charges payable
from the sick medical
officer, General Hospital,
in accordance with the
bill done in G.O. 15434 Public
Ord. 1873-96.

BACK PAPERS.

BACK PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1535	Pub	17.12.98
	482	"	30.3.26 and 1/2
	186	"	14.2.99
+ no. papers for			
Cco 674/99			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Extract from the articles of Agreement made the Tenth day of February 1890 between George Robert Latham of 5 Lifford Road Plumstead of the first part & the Secretary of State for India in Council of the second part.

18. That the Government will provide him & his wife & family with such medical attendance & medicine, in India as the Government shall consider necessary.

"True extract"

Сви

) Captain E.A.,

Superintendent Gun Carriage Factory.

m

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

No.

C/5675

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,

GUN CARRIAGE FACTORY,

MADRAS,

To

The Chief Secretary

Inclosure.

to the Government of Madras.

GUN CARRIAGE FACTORY OFFICE,

Madras, ~~11th~~ January 1899.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for favor of the special consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council an appeal on behalf of Mr. G. Fletham, the Overseer of Carpenters in this Factory, on the subject of a bill for hospital charges received from the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, in accordance with the scale laid down in G.O. No. 454 Public dated 21st March 1898 published in Port Saint George Gazette part II dated 10th June 1898 page 820.

2. Mr. Fletham's daughter, Miss Agnes Fletham, was an in-patient in the General Hospital from 15th November '98 to 20th November '98 & died.

3. Mr. Fletham is unfortunate enough to have a son who has now been in Hospital nearly three months, & is still detained as an in-patient.

4. At the rate of Rs 2 per diem a bill for Rs 50 was received by him on account of his daughter, & another for Rs 174 for his son. His pay is Rs 240 a month only.

5. Mr. Fletham is employed in this Factory under a Covenant entered into between himself & the Secretary of State for India in Council, & it will be seen from

entitled to free medical attendance & medicines for himself, wife, & family".

6. Reliance on this paragraph in his covenant, Mr. lexham allowed his children to be taken as in-patients to the Hospital, expecting that he might perhaps be charged the actual cost of the food supplied, but not realizing that the paragraph in question was to be looked on as null & void in the case of in-patients, and that he was liable to be charged at precisely the same rate as if he were not in Government service at all.

7. The relief now asked for will not prove a precedent, as I have informed all factory employees under covenant with the Secretary of State that they will have to pay the fees laid down if they, or any members of their families, are admitted to hospital as an in-patient.

8. Under those circumstances, & as Mr. lexham's mistake was a somewhat natural one, & as he has a family to support, I trust that His Excellency may be pleased to take a favorable view of Mr. lexham's case & to remit the charge, either wholly or in part.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most obedient servant,

C. B. M.
Captain R.A.,
Superintendent Gun Carriage Factory.

M.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

No. E/ 6092

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,

GUN CARRIAGE FACTORY,

To

The Chief Secretary,

to the Government of Madras,

Fort Saint George,
GUN CARRIAGE FACTORY OFFICE,

Madras, 4th February 1899.

Sir,

I have the honor to request the favor of information as to whether orders have yet been passed on this office No.E/5675 of 11th January 1899 on the subject of bills for Hospital charges received from the Senior Medical Officer, General Hospital, Madras, in the case of Mr. G. lexham, Overseer of Carpenters of this Factory.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most obedient servant,

C. B. M.
Captain R.A.,
Superintendent Gun Carriage Factory.

M.

B
Circ 12/99 146-
Ref 2/2/99.

To await the reply from
the Surgeon General.

11/2/99
12/2/99

Recd 4/2/99
Regd 6/2/99

Public Dept-

minis: $\frac{N. 426}{d/10-2-99}$

with reference to
letter from the Supt.
Gen Carriage Building Co
8/6092 dated 14 July
1899. The undersigned
has the honour to
state that the question
of the amount of
hospital stoppage
to be received from
L. Bloxham on account
of his children, is
still under inquiry -

Ct
7-2-99. H.
S. M.

10/10/99
11/12/99

To the Supt. Gen Carriage Building Co
Mandray } Dec 20/99
11/12/99

Public (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 674

Order

From Surgeon General
C. S. Libbey, M.D.
Surgeon General
with the Post of
the

No. 207.

Dated 2^d March 1899.

Received 3-3-99.

Registered 4-3-99.

Enclosures 2. Bureau 131 with encl.
ret.

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submitting his remarks
regarding the recovery of
hospital stoppages on account
of the families of persons
who are in receipt of a
regular income.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
GR Papers 79-3-89			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[1]

674

Office of Surgeon-General
 WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
 Madras, 2nd March 1899.
 From
 SURGEON-GENERAL J. SIBTHORPE, C.B., F.R.C.P.I.,
 SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
 To
 THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Public Department.

SIR,

B

A

In returning herewith the
 enclosure to your Memorandum of
 24th dated 26th January 1899, I have
 the honor to state that though G.O. 25
 434, Public, dated 31st March 1896 makes
 no express provision for payments on
 account of the families of persons in
 receipt of a regular income, yet the
 practice of charging this class of patients
 according to the income of the husband
 or father, as the case may be, has long
 been in existence. It was followed in the
 late Women and Children's Hospital, Egmore
 and has been continued in the General
 Hospital ever since the transfer thereto
 of that Institution. The Senior Medical
 officers suggest that the practice must
 be due to some old G.O. but no such
 authority can be traced either in the



Recd 1899

Papers

FKL

with the
 20th March 1899
 674

67

Here the hero

Sir,

Yours most obediently

C. Schürpf

Surgeon General.

[- 6 -]
002-15-12-98

CLB. 8.5
R17. 8.5

Public

DEPARTMENT

Subjekt

Hospital stoppages charged for Rs.
Bloster's two children

C. No. 131 From the Supt. Gen. Carriage, No. 2/5675, dated 11-14 1899.
Factory

” ” , ; , ... 189 .

” ” ” ” ” 189

..... 189 .

For orders

A. M.

The Supt. Gen. Carrier
Factory submits an appeal
on behalf of Mrs. E.
Blonham, a convicted
overseer in the Factory,
against the amount of
hospital stoppage charged
for Mrs. Blonham's two
children who were inmates
of the General Hospital
nurses.

2. Mr. B. Lockhart's daughter
was an in-patient of the
Hospital from 15th to 30th
Nov^r 1898 & died, while
the son, up to the date
of the current, had been
nearly three months in

hospital was still an in-patient.

3. Mr. Bloxham's pay is Rs. 240 per mensem. He was killed, at Rs. 2/- per diem, for the daughter Rs. 30/-, & for the son Rs. 174 with, apparently, further charges to follow. It will be seen that the monthly rate for the two children is at Rs. 120 per mensem, or just half the Overseer's pay.

4. Under the terms of his covenant with the Govt. of India, Mr. Bloxham is entitled for himself, wife & family, to "such medical attendance and medicines in India as the Govt. shall consider necessary". The medical authorities apparently read this clause to mean that Mr. Bloxham & his family are entitled to free medical attendance & medicines only if treated at home, & that if they

go to Hospital, they are liable to be charged the same rates as other in-patients. Mr. Bloxham did not realize this when he sent his children to hospital, but apparently the Supt. Gen. Conveyance Dept. accepts the interpretation, for he has warned all factory employees under Covenant that ^{they} will have to pay the fees laid down if they, or any members of their families, are admitted as in-patients into hospital.

5. In Mr. Bloxham's case, the Supt. requests that Govt. will remit ^{either} the charge, wholly or in part.

6. It is questionable whether the interpretation given to the clause of Mr. Bloxham's covenant is correct. It seems anomalous that he

should be charged for
medical attendance &
medicines in hospital
when he is entitled
to same, free of cost, at
his house. Under the
terms of his agreement,
he can apparently claim
the privilege whether
he goes to hospital or
not, & it must be
more convenient to the
medical dept. to ~~be~~
attend on patients
in the hospital, than
in the homes. The prescribed
scale of hospital charges
apparently covers medical
attendance, medicines
& diet. Mr. Blochman's
children apparently oc-
cupied general wards,
for he has been charged
^{for each child}
the rate, Rs. 2 a day, fixed
for those wards, for people
in receipt of Rs. 200 a
month & upwards. Under
the terms of his agreement,

he would apparently be
charged only the cost
of dieting his children,
& this is what he expects.
7. There is another point
which this correspondence
raises, viz. ~~the~~ the
rates which should be
charged for the ^{living or} children
of Govt. servants who
are admitted as in-
patients in Govt. hospitals.
The scale laid down
in G.O. No. 434 Public Date
31-3-96 is based on the
monthly salary of
officials. The practice
~~of persons to charge~~
~~the same rate~~ for the
~~wife or each child~~
of an official the full
rate ~~he~~ himself would
have to pay if admitted
to hospital. A man
with a large family
may have two or even
three children in
hospital at the same

time - His household ex-
penses would hardly be
affected at all, and
will ^{be} readily understood
that his hospital bill
will be simply ruinous.
It would seem equitable
to fix a sliding scale for
children according to
age, or half rates
when more than one
member of a family
are
in hospital at the
same time.

Q. (note continued)
2.1.97 Current No 674.

8 - In endorsement
No 245 dated 25.1.99, the
Surgeon General was asked to
report the authority under
which the charges on account
of Mrs. Bloomfield's family were
levied, and it was pointed
out that G.O. No 434 Public
dated 31.3.96, which fixes
the rates of hospital stoppage,
does so only with regard

to persons who are themselves
in receipt of a regular
income, & makes no provision
for payments on account of
the families of such persons.
9. The Surgeon General
now states, in reply, that
the practice of charging
for the families of persons
in receipt of a regular income
the rates fixed for the
income of the husband or
father, has long been in
existence; that it was
followed in the late Hospital
for Women & Children, &
that it has been continued
in the General Hospital ever
since the transfer thereof
of the former institution -
He adds that the Senior
Medical Officer suggests that
the practice should be based
on some old G.O., but
that no such authority
can be traced in his office -
There appears to be no definite
order among the Govt. records

which gives the rates for
hospital stoppage for the
families of persons in civil
employ - the Senior Medical
Officer points out that
Soldiers' wives are subject
to hospital stoppage & that
it could not leave behind the
intention of Govt. to exempt
families of officers of the
Civil Dept. from similar
provision. The Surgeon General
suggests that, as the dis-
continuance of the practice
would result in a loss
to Govt., the existing
practice be definitely
authorized. Reg. a G.O.

10. There seems no reason
why the families of persons
who have been taken to hospital
should be received into
Govt. Hospitals free of
all cost, but the question
is whether they should be
charged at the same rates
as the heads of the families
would be. As already

+ G.O. No. 142 2728. 6. 36
find the rate of hospital
stoppage for warrant officers
at 1 R. per day. & for their
wives at 5- as per day; for
soldiers at 3 as per day. &
for soldiers' wives at 1 anna
per day

observed, if more than
one member of a family
are in hospital
at the same time, the
hospital charges would
be ruinous - It would
be ~~fair~~ perhaps to charge
half the regulated rate
for one member of a family,
and one-fourth for others,
if more than one of the
same family are in hospital
at the same time.

11. It has to be decided
whether any, ~~if so~~, what
charge should be received
on account of the two
children of Mrs. Bloxham,
who is entitled to free
medical attendance &
medicines for ~~himself~~
himself & family. In
his case the charges might
be limited to the actual
cost of dressing the children
& a general rule to the same
effect might be laid
down for all Govt. Servants

who serve under a contract
which entitles them to free
medical attendance and
medicines -

Please see rule 320 (g)
Ch. 11.3.99 of the Civil Medical
Code. Dr. Bloxham
was apparently entitled
to gratuitous medical
attendance at his own
residence - and it seems
fairly unfair to charge
him for anything more
than the diet of his
children.

The S.G. does not touch
the real point at issue
viz whether a father is
sending his children to
hospital and he has
to pay ^{partly} ~~partly~~ the
share of his pay for them.
It is submitted that the
proposed in the rule that
in cases where officers are
not entitled to gratuitous
medical attendance for
their families they should

This is clearly the just
reasonable course to
take. The cost of
diet for an adult &
for children should be
ascertained. When
this is done Mr. Bloxham
will be debited with
the dieting charges
only. M.D.

I quite agree with
the principle but a
little more detail is
necessary. It does
not seem right to
make the same charge
for an infant or child
of say 3 years and
for one of 12 or 13.
This may be looked into further.
M.D. 17.3.99.

but too much detail is
of course undesirable.

pay for his wife and
and for their children
as part of the rule
is by best case to be
inserted. It is hardly
understandable to make the
hospital charges prohibitive
as they would have been in
Mr. Bloxham's case had he
known that he would be
charged.

M.D. 17.3.99
14/4/99

C. No. 151 From the Supdt. Gun Carriage Factory, No. 37/5000, dated 11-1-1890.

“4-2-” “----- dQ-----” “7/2/93” “4-2-” 1899

Surgeon-General, " 307, " 3-5-1899

..... 189

H. E. The ~~Editor~~ ^{Editor}

Order
is

no. 393 of 3-4-99

The Superintendent, Gun Carriage Factory submits an appeal on behalf of Mr. G. Elanham, a covenanted Overseer in the Factory, against the amount of hospital stoppages claimed on account of the Overseer's ^{two} children, who were inmates of the General Hospital, Madras, and who were charged Rs. 2 each per diem, the rate prescribed for patients in the general wards drawing Rs. 200 and upwards per mensem. The monthly rate for the two children was thus Rs. 40, or half the overseer's pay of Rs. 80 per mensem.

3. Under the terms of his covenant with the Secretary of State, Mr. McPham is entitled to free medical attendance and medicines for himself, wife and family, and while it is in the interest of the Medical Dept. to encourage Govt. servants serving under such a contract

The cost of the article sent
 to me yesterday is \$1.00
 The cost of the article sent
 to me yesterday is \$1.00
 The cost of the article sent
 to me yesterday is \$1.00

Ans: for CS.

The A. H. notes that the average cost of diets should be ascertained, & Mr. Bloham debited accordingly. The ~~average~~ It is, however, respectfully submitted that Dr. Bloham, & Min in his position, may fairly be called upon to pay the actual cost of ^{the} diet ^{supplied}, including any extras that may have been given. If extras are omitted from the calculation it will mean a loss to Gov't if they are included in arriving at the average cost the calculation will be a complicated one, the actual cost may be fixed by taking the average cost of ordinary diets & the actual cost of extras.

AK
23/3/99. vs. ...
H ...
24/2/99.

Cu
 22.3.99.
 (From order)
 23/3/99.

The Surgeon-General }
 ,, Supdt. Gun Carriage Factory } Q &
 ,, Accountant-General }

2449

When given for copying }
When copied } 5/4 } 1899
When examined }
When signed }

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
189 .

CUR ENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING HEART FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.