

1925

E. AFRICA

241

DATE

13th February 1925.

6978

REC^d
RE 13 FEB 25

OFFICE.

PAYMENT OF SPECIALIST'S FEES FOR COLONIAL OFFICIALS.

Minutes laying down decision as to circumstances in which fee should be paid (a) by C.O. (b) by officer concerned, and stating also as to payment of railway fares.

Previous Paper

See 10/11395/22 wa

MINUTES copied (for record)
From File 4976 Eastern,
(Dennett)

58126/25 (S.M. 11/3/25)

*In the case of Mr. A. Fishburn
of Uganda (file 13190/EA) &
Dennett wanted the opinion of
a nurse specialist & sent the
patient to such a specialist,
making himself responsible for
the fee (£3.40). You have directed
that we should look into the
question how far the M.A. was
justified in committing us to
the specialist's fee without
consulting us. As you have
poured*

Subsequent Paper

6.0.9.25

25 venance

pointed out on the file, it is a general matter.

The nearest previous cases that I can find are the following:-

Mr J Maxwell (2826/WA)

Mr W Proust was not satisfied with Mr Maxwell's urine and advised him for his own sake to have a laboratory examination, which cost 10gs. He understood that Mr Maxwell would pay, but the latter subsequently put in a claim, and after some discussion here was refunded 3gs.

Mr W A Willis (12944/WA)

To satisfy Dr Kerran Mr Willis underwent a cystoscopic examination costing 10gs. and an X-ray exam. costing 3gs. The minutes comment on Dr Kerran's action in incurring this expenditure without a claim, but in the end Dr Kerran was refunded the 3gs. in respect

of the X-ray exam., and Mr Willis was allowed 4gs. in respect of the rest.

I have looked at other cases, but the only one worth citing, I think, is that of Mr J W Sullivan (17442/E.A.), in which Mr Sullivan asked us beforehand if he might have the patient put under observation by a specialist, and incur a fee for the Specialist's report on the case to himself. We agreed.

The East African rule on the subject of the payment of specialists at A in typed minutes, fees is shown on this paper. I believe that the W.A. rule is the same.

If other Dept's would agree to accept the rule generally, I think that it would be a good plan to inform all the Medical

Advisors of the rule, saying that in cases where a fee ~~is~~ ^{should} be

under the rule full to be paid by
 the Govt they may take action on the
 assumption that the cost will be met,
 but that if the cost is in excess of
 \$50000 they shall refer to us for
 concurrence of their permits
 I think best to mention the
 C. G. 7-12

Mr. Friday Yes C. S. 10 225
 Mr. Hunt

If the proposed action is approved
 it would be well to include the
 ruling in the general notice of instructions
 to Mills (see M. 3, 488, 24) as well as
 informing the President
 and also copy from 3 of CO's Bulletin No. 10
 of October 1910

refer to the 30 Apr. 1911 Dept.

The West African Department was not
 officially concerned in the decision taken on Mr.
 Bennett's file in 1921, which was very carefully
 locked in the bosom of the East Afri-
 Tan. ganyika Departments, until someone
 minutes dug out, copied and registered. One
 cannot lay it down as a general ruling, until
 one knows what the other Departments think
 about

about it.

In the first instance, let Mr. Flood see on
 behalf of West Africa.

AT 25/1/10

~~Mr. Harding~~
~~Mr. Ellis~~
 I have got the SR to extract all - or most of - the noted
 cases, & attach a list. See also 4395/22 3 minutes
 thereon.

There are two things which are more or less
 distinct and yet not quite so

- viz A Specialist's fees for one examⁿ such
 as X-Ray, Wassermann, & so on
- B Fees for special medical or surgical
 treatment.

To take B first; when an officer has been
 injured on duty & has to have medical or surgical
 treatment it has been practice to pay fees
 for such treatment. Of cases numbered 4, 6, 9, 12,
 15, 17, 22. Sleeping sickness cases have always
 been 8 per cent special treatment expenses on part
 thereof paid. Of case No 20 there are many others.

Sometimes in specially cases Govt has
 made a grant as an act of grace. Of No 3, 8, 12
 (where the element of compassion came in) 13, 25, & minutes
 on 4395/22. In those minutes it is suggested that

is not to give a M.A. a general authority to send a Col to a specialist (on the assumption that the Col Govt. would pay the fee) when ~~the~~ the M.A. ~~should~~ thought examⁿ by a specialist desirable in order to enable him to report fully on the officer.

I would not give our M.A.s such authority - they should refer to us. For one thing, we sometimes send to MA or give the option of going to the MA - an officer who is leaving the service just to give him the chance of getting ^{medical} advice from a doctor who knows something about tropical cases. We should not necessarily go to the ^{expense} of specialists

I mean with the permission of the M.A. when we send the matter to the Council

As regards the fee, it is limited, what is limited is the amount

the Col Govt will refund to the officer. This usually means that the officer gets examined by a specialist who charges him only 3 guineas. If the specialist charges more than 3 guineas, the officer has to bear the difference; just as a W.A.F.F. N.C.O. has to bear the difference (if any) between his dentist's bill and the maximum grant of £5.

Of course there are occasional cases of elaborate laboratory examinations which cost appreciably more than 3 guineas - these would be dealt with on their merits as special cases.

22/25
J.G. 5.5.45
AT 2/5/45
A/H 29/4/25
Then I think that a memo (quite short) should be drafted, circulated shall be advance of the next Gen. Council, which should be asked to agree to these proposals.

Mr. Flood.

Would you be good enough to let us have your observations as to West African practice with regard to payment of Specialists fees in the case of officers already in the Service. As I understand it, if examination by a Specialist is recommended by our Medical Adviser in this country, the Government pays whatever the rank of the officer - Cf. para. 3 of C.O. Bulletin of October 1920 herewith. According to this rule the decision on No. 18 was perfectly correct - consultation with an ophthalmic Surgeon was recommended by our Medical Adviser and therefore the Government paid. If, however, the Medical Adviser in Africa recommends examination by an oculist or other Specialist what is your practice? and do you discriminate between "1st Class" and "2nd Class" officers? In the present case you will see that consultation with an oculist was recommended by the Medical Adviser in Kenya and confirmed by Dr. Prout.

Before this file reached me I had been dealing with the case of another subordinate officer - H.M. Jones. (file 6080 E.A), and in this case I was going to send the officer to be examined by Dr Prout, who had promised to arrange for the examination and any work that might be necessary afterwards to be performed for a very moderate fee, by giving him a letter to a hospital or otherwise. But I am holding this up for the moment, as clearly we ought to deal with all cases on the same lines.

(Initialled) H. F. B.
23.5.21.

(I am not aware why this paper is sent to me rather than to one of the other 7 officers in the

two W. A. Departments).

In the past we have frequently paid oculists' fees of 23. 3. 0. when the Medical Adviser advises that a man should consult an oculist or rather when the oculist's report is essential to conson. of the case.

In this case as it is only a matter of getting his glasses altered I do not see why Government should pay anything. If the man is not able to see he is not fit for his job, and there is no reason why Government should pay any more than for dentist's fees or a bottle of medicine. It is not a case of getting a consulting diagnosis and if Mr. Dennett does not like to pay for his new glasses he can go blind and be retired on pension.

But the other side is that if Government pays the fee we can be sure that he is not dealt with by spectacle quacks.

A solution would be to pay any fee for visiting an oculist recommended by the Medical Adviser but nothing else, and I think that might be done in this case.

? Ask Colonel Prout to recommend an oculist and send Mr. Dennett to him paying a fee up to 3 guineas, and getting a report from the oculist.

Initialed) J.E.H.F.

23.5.21.

I think we can discriminate between
(a) cases where our Medical Adviser recommends examination by a Specialist for his own Assistance in order to enable him to report on the case
(b) other cases where a visit to a Specialist recommended in the interest of the officer.

In cases of (a) ? the Government should pay whatever the grade of the officer but for advice only

only and not treatment.]

In cases of (b) ? the officer himself should pay, but in cases of subordinate officers ? we should ask the Medical Adviser to arrange for the examination and (in the case of an oculist) any necessary work consequent upon it to be performed at as reasonable a fee as possible.

If the above ruling is approved we should explain to Mr. Dennett that we paid the oculist's fee in 1917 because the Medical Adviser recommended examination by an oculist in order to enable him to report whether he was fit to return to East Africa (I think we can truthfully say this); that we are unable to do so on the present occasion, but that if he will communicate with Colonel Prout, Colonel Prout will advise him as to consultation with an oculist at a moderate fee and promise 3rd class return railway fare to London.

Colonel Prout to whom I have spoken has promised to arrange all matters satisfactorily for Mr. Dennett for a small fee. Colonel Prout raised the question of his coming up to London and I said that I thought we could promise 3rd class railway fares - for precedent see case of Stewart (File 6533 E.A) Nos. 25 and 26, though in that case the fare was paid to Maidstone, not London. I think we can distinguish in this respect between a visit to an oculist and a visit to a dentist, because there is a dentist in every good town, whereas there isn't an oculist. Mr. Dennett could of course see oculist and optician in one day and no second journey should be necessary.

Whatever rulings are given on this paper should be noted by all members of the Department.

(Initialed) H.F.B.
25.5.21.

W.C.B.

precedent

(M.J. 26.5.21
Int.) P.C.
31.5.21
Int.) W.C.H.
31.5.
Int.) C.J.J.
31.5.
Int.) E.G.M.
30/6.

W.C.B.

Copy Original on Co/1395/22-W.A.

(I am sending on separately another similar case - that of H. M. Jones - file 6080 E.A - but in that case a further complication arises in as much as he lives at Cardiff).

Mr. Strachey.

If you agree to the general arrangements proposed by Mr. Batterbee please "at once".

(Initialled) W.C.B. 25.5.21.

(Initialled) C.S. 25.5.21 at once.

4567 W.A. Had to consult oculist. Minute was "we have paid specialist's fees before now but only where the examination was necessary for a decision as to an officer's fitness. Here it wasn't." Refused.

2415 W.A. Had to have an operation and applied for full instead of half pay on the extension of leave. Refused.

12821 W.A. A guard on Nigeria railway. Had a series of operations and Nigeria was invited to consider a grant and paid 2/3 of his surgical expenses (£17.15). Precedent cited of Whitworth.

1275 W.A. Injured on duty and had to have operation. Government paid half the surgeon's fee (£20). "as an act of grace."

2327 W.A. In hospital (Seamen's). Government declined to pay fees.

935 W.A. Injured on duty. Operation. Government paid fee (£14.18).

1102 W.A. Wassermann required by Medical Adviser. Fee for it (£2.2.0) paid.

14401 W.A. Got tuberculosis: treated in Bramshott (under Seamen's Hospital) Nigeria paid cost as an act of grace (£42.6)

4925 W.A. Lost arms in a gun accident while doing gun drill as a Volunteer. Expenses paid (£6 and £10 for a wood arm)

1079 W.A. Sent by Medical Adviser to an ophthalmic surgeon to decide as to the state of his eyes. Fee paid by Government (£2.2.)

Hall. 5191 W.A. Advised by Dr. Murray Bligh May 1916. (acting as Medical Adviser) to have X ray done in order to determine condition. Fee paid (£3.3)

Harvey. 4605 W.A. May 1919. Charged £157.10 by an Indian surgeon for operation. Had other expenses totalling over £300. £300 granted by Gold Coast as he had been insured on duty. A very doubtful case.

Hobbs. 14421 W.A. July 1924. Had an accident (shot on duty). Was in Seamen's Hospital but could not get as Government did (£19.4)

Smart. 27. 4. 21. July 1915. (X ray examination recommended by Sir W. Prout to determine whether renal calculus or not. Fee (£2.3.0) refused.)

Spencer. 1097 W.A. September 1917. Damaged hand on duty X ray fee (£1.1) paid by Government and no further grant made. He got treated at Greenwich and we were prepared to pay any expenses. He may have got them as he returned to the Colony and we left it to Government

Stocks. 5549 W.A. Came home for an operation March 1921. Applied for refund of expenses. Refused by Colonial Government.

Waddell. 3404 W.A. September 1912. Damaged leg on duty. Allowed doctor's fee and massage charges

Widdows. 1031 W.A. April 1918. Had a fibrous growth. Mr. Daniels recommended removal. Willing to apply for a refund of the operation (£5.0) as it was "a rather extraordinary complaint". Refused.

5329 W.A. Tapeworm. In-patient in Seamen's Hospital charged September 1918 £2.2. a week refund refused.

3095 W.A. A sleeping sickness case. Half of fees refunded. July 1924.

1236 W.A. Various Wassermann fees. Paid by Government. Test November 1916 recommended by Medical Adviser.

3584 W.A. Damaged ankle on duty. Fee for x ray examination paid April 1913

7121 W.A. £3.3. fee to ear specialist paid. December 1924.

3636 W.A. Wassermann and X ray fees paid. June 1916

4566 W.A. Got dysentery resulting in appendicitis. Was operated 1921 on while on leave and Nigeria made a grant of £75.

5372 W.A. Consultation fee paid but operation fee refused. March 1917.

2968 W.A. Had to come home for operation after murderous attack December 1912 by native cook. Fees refused.

15880 W.A. Operation (slight) Fee refused. February 1925.

- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
- 18.