



practice of charging passengers for medical attention  
The G.P. & A.P. suggests in this case that the C.P.  
are taking advantage of their Contract with the  
S.P. but as the charges fall on all passengers  
S.P. or not I don't think we can complain.

As to the point raised in para 3 that a  
man who received a ticket before the new  
regulations were introduced had to pay,  
although the ticket provided for free  
attendance - this is really a question for  
the Office concerned to raise with the C.P.  
especially as the ticket appears to have been  
brought for his wife.

The Board raised the same complaint and  
the C.P. in response (H. 20.9.14) that the C.P.  
were prepared to meet him in the matter  
should be raise the question with them.

It may be argued that to cut free medical  
attendance out of the passenger ticket is  
equivalent to raising the price of the ticket.  
But I am not in the agreement  
preventing the G.P. & A.P. from raising their  
"drift rate" for the passengers they choose.

(para 2. S.P. passengers will be conveyed  
at half rate) In the case of cargo (para 3)  
there is a stipulation that "present tariff  
rates" shall remain in force for "ordinary cargo".

acknowledges and says that the G.P. does  
not consider that he would be justified  
under the terms of the agreement between G.P. & A.P. in  
the making representations to the G.P. & A.P. on  
this question, and with regard to the particular  
case of complaint mentioned suggest that it  
is a point which would most suitably  
be raised with the C.P. by the Office himself.

H. 20.9.2.14

(I think  
Klarock's  
complaint  
is  
of the  
same  
nature.)

It seems quite clear that the  
contract under the agreement is  
in such a position that the G.P. & A.P.  
cannot proceed to pay only  
they will not do it. They will  
not pay at all unless the G.P. & A.P.  
are ready to pay.

The Board raised the same complaint and  
the C.P. in response (H. 20.9.14) that the C.P.  
were prepared to meet him in the matter  
should be raise the question with them.

It may be argued that to cut free medical  
attendance out of the passenger ticket is  
equivalent to raising the price of the ticket.

But I am not in the agreement  
preventing the G.P. & A.P. from raising their  
"drift rate" for the passengers they choose.  
(para 2. S.P. passengers will be conveyed  
at half rate) In the case of cargo (para 3)  
there is a stipulation that "present tariff  
rates" shall remain in force for "ordinary cargo".

acknowledges and says that the G.P. does  
not consider that he would be justified  
under the terms of the agreement between G.P. & A.P. in  
the making representations to the G.P. & A.P. on  
this question, and with regard to the particular  
case of complaint mentioned suggest that it  
is a point which would most suitably  
be raised with the C.P. by the Office himself.

at once  
H. 20.9.2.14

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

January 6th 1914.

No. 12

Sir,

It has been brought to my notice that the proprietors of the Union Castle Steamship Company have recently instituted the practice of allowing medical practitioners attached to the Line to levy a fee for medical attendance on its passengers.

2. I am given to understand that the charge is fixed at the rate of five shillings for every visit to a first class passenger and two shillings and six pence for a second class passenger. The same rate is approved for prescriptions.

3. I am of opinion that this action of the Company, apparently decided upon without any reference to yourself, is deserving of condemnation. I have in mind an officer returning to this Protectorate with his wife, for whom he purchased a return ticket before the present regulation came into force. One of the conditions printed on the back of the ticket provided for free medical attendance for passengers, but this officer was nevertheless required to pay the fees.

4. I have ascertained that the Union Castle Steamship Company alone, of all the Lines whose steamers call at Mombasa, has inaugurated this practice

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

(2)

practice, and I regard it as but a further attempt to take advantage of the monopoly granted them by the terms of their contract with the Government. The effect will only be to make an unpopular line still more unpopular, and I have the honour to request that strong representations should be made to the Company and that they should be called upon to refund payments already made by officers of the Government Service.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,

H. G. G. G. G.

GOVERNOR.

3942/14 East.

322

*Minute*

*Draft for copy*

12. 2. 14

DRAFT.

My dear Philippa

Dear Philippa King

I enclose a copy of a despatch from Bedford

MINUTE

We have, so far as

- Mr.
- Mr.
- Sir G. Fildes. 11. 2. 14
- Sir H. Just.
- Sir J. Anderson.
- Lord Emmott.
- Mr. Harcourt.

I can see, however for taking up the matter with the Union Carriage Company

*copy of the minute to be sent to the Secretary*

But you may be glad to see how an objection of some kind to the matter strikes the eye, and it is a question whether the resulting unpopularity is worth the small loss which the new regulation will produce.

Yours faithfully  
G. V. F.

6. 1. 14

3, FENCHURCH STREET,  
E.C.

13th February, 1914.

Private.

My dear Fiddes,

I thank you for your private letter of 12th February, sending me copy of a letter Mr. Harcourt has received from the Governor of British East Africa on the subject of the charges made for medical attendance on the Union-Castle Company's steamers.

I may tell you that the decision to institute a small charge for medical attendance on all the Company's vessels (the practice is not confined to the East African Service) was come to after the most careful consideration of the matter in all its bearings. It was found on the one hand that the free services of the ship's Surgeon were being requisitioned for all sorts of trifling and imaginary ailments, and on the other that there was a very general desire on the part of passengers who had benefited by the care and attention of the Doctor during the voyage to recognise his services in a practical form but were embarrassed to know what to give in the absence of a fixed scale of charges.

The tariff of 5/- per visit for first class passengers, 2/6 for second class, with free attendance for thirds, is, I think you will agree, quite moderate, and since its inception some months ago our Commanders have almost invariably reported that passengers prefer it to the old system.

While on this subject, I cannot refrain from quoting you from a letter received by us this morning from the British Medical Association, who say:-

"The Association is informed that some Shipping Companies 'already sanction a fixed scale of charges with great 'advantage to their passengers, who now know exactly what 'they are expected to pay for any medical services rendered

to/

'to them, and with a distinct increase of comfort to the Ship Surgeon, who is thereby placed in a proper relationship with his patients. The Association has good reason to believe that the universal adoption of such a system would do much to raise the status of Ship Surgeons in the eyes both of the public and of the profession, and would obviate many exceedingly awkward situations which arise when the amount of the fee is left to the discretion of the patient and subject to the Commander's approval. The present system in fact places all parties - the patient, the Commander and the doctor - in a position which in the opinion of the Association is indefensible from either a business or a professional point of view."

In writing the Association had overlooked the fact that we have already made the desired change in our practice. The change is also being made by nearly all the important Passenger Lines which were still adhering to the old system, but a number of Companies - particularly in the trans-Atlantic trade - have had a fixed tariff of charges for medical attendance in operation for years.

With reference to paragraph 3 of His Excellency's letter as to the conditions printed on the back of the passage ticket with respect to free medical attendance, I may say that when the change was made the wording of the tickets was altered, but some tickets issued before the date of the change for vessels sailing after that date may have contained the old clause, and whenever such cases have been brought to the Company's notice the charge for medical attendance has never been pressed.

Would you like me to write an official letter to the Colonial Office on this subject, for transmission to His Excellency the Governor?

Yours sincerely,



Sir George Fildes, K.C.M.G., C.B.

COLONIAL OFFICE.

Gov 3942/1914  
E.A.P.

RECEIVED  
19

325

19 February 1914

Rec'd 16/2/14

DRAFT

The Secretary,  
Union-Frank Steamship Company.

MINUTE.

- Mr. Harper 17/2/14
- Mr. Bottomley 17/2/14
- Mr. G. Fiddes 17
- Sir H. Just.
- Sir J. Anderson.
- Lord Emmott.
- Mr. Harcourt.

and  
copy for Mr. G. Fiddes  
to Mr. Harcourt

Sir,

I am to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a despatch from the Gov. of the E.A.P. on the subject of the practice recently instituted of allowing the medical officers on steamers of the N.C. Coy. to charge fees for medical attendance on passengers.

2. Mr. Harcourt does not feel in a position to make

18-6-1914