M.R.O. 1—32,409—28-11-60.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 679 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 27.10.1859

B. No. 12 16 1860

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 12. From the Accountant General; to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated 28th September 1857, No. 175.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated the 11th Instant, communicating to me, for my observations, the letter from the Secretary to the Government of India to your address, dated the 21st Ultimo.

No. 568, *in the Financial Department.* No. 3440.

2. The Supreme Government justly observed that my letter of the 19th June last, did not appear to have been written after a consideration of the views stated in the letter of the Accountant General to the Government of India, dated 23rd April 1857. They also expressed their opinion that my letter of 19th June last, did not refute any of the grounds upon which their determination to introduce the Bengal system of Account at Madras was founded.

In para: 2.

3. The letter of the Accountant General to the Government of India with the resolution passed thereon, and the Extract from Minutes of Consultation of this Government, dated 12th June 1857, did not reach me until the 26th of that month, and consequently they were not before me when I wrote my letter to your address of the 19th June last. Had I, however, been in possession of it, I should not have been sure that it was expected of me to enter into further explanation; the order being peremptory, apparently, for carrying out the Bengal system. But it would now appear that I am invited to refute, if I am able, the positions laid down, and the arguments advanced, by the Accountant General to the Government of India in favor of the Bengal system.

No. 336.

No. 56.

4. The next point which requires explanation, is the observation of the Government of India, (in reference to the statement in the 4th para: of my letter to your address of the 19th June last,) that it is not clear how the pre-audit system can lead to any increase of work, and that they will be glad to be informed how this comes about.

In paras: 4 and 5 of their Secretary's letter under reply

5. A few of the Collectors stated (in reply to my reference to them, as to whether any, and what, reduction in their Establishments could be effected, consequent on the introduction of the Bengal system of Account) that the pre-audit system, in addition to other causes which they noticed, had increased the labour of their Account Establishments. In order to answer the enquiry adverted to in the preceding para: as to how the pre-audit system can lead to any increase of work, I shall at once give here the reasons assigned by three Collectors. The Acting Collector of Masulipatam states "the amount of relief that " can arise from the Duplicate copies of Journal " and Ledger being dispensed with is small, compared with the additional labour now entailed on the Account Department by the pre-audit " system recently introduced. Prior to its adoption it was only necessary to forward annually to " the Civil Auditor for audit a Statement of Charges together with certain Accounts Particular, " numbering in all less than 100 Statements and enclosures, but at present about 50 in number " are transmitted Monthly to that Officer." The Collector of North Arcot states that " the " system of pre-audit lately introduced into this " Presidency has increased the labor of the " Collector's Establishment, for Statements " that were formerly furnished once a year have now to be sent in Monthly. Yeomiahdars and " Pensioners are very numerous in this District, and the Monthly preparation of Abstracts of " Pensioners involves no inconsiderable amount of labor and time." The *Collector of* Cuddapah sets forth " as an instance, that, in " preparing the Statement of Pensions alone, " the business has increased nearly twelve-fold " to what it was formerly, and the Account Establishment is obliged at times to work from six " in the morning till dark, to enable it to despatch to the Presidency the required Accounts in " time." I think that the pre-audit system has tended to increase business, more are less heavily, in Districts where there are numerous Pensioners and Yeomiahdars.

Para: 3 of his letter, dated 20th March 1857.

In para: 5 of his letter, dated 18th May 1857.

Para: 5 of his letter of 4th March 1857.

6. The 3rd point to be noticed is the remark of the Government of India, that it is true that Annual Abstracts (or as they are called in Bengal, Annual Treasury Accounts) will have to be forwarded to the Honorable Court of Directors, but they add, that they think there is enough in the report to them of their Accountant General, dated the 23rd April last, to shew that the work in the Subordinate Offices here must be reduced under the Bengal system, and that such reduction is looked for.

In para: 7.

7. In reply to this remark I beg to state, that I have already reported* the result of my reference to the several Subordinate Officers under this Presidency on the point of probable reduction. I will, if it be considered necessary by Government, communicate to them again the observation and expectation of the Government

* *In letter, dated 19th June last.*

of India, and report thereon. It occurs to me, however, that this reference to Subordinate Officers had better be deferred until the Bengal system be practically introduced into their Offices, when we shall all be more competent to judge of the practicability, or impossibility, of a reduction of Establishment. On this subject I would beg to be favored with the Orders of the Government of India for my guidance.

8. The 4th and last point, requiring consideration, is the observation of the Government of India that, on the whole, it appears to them that the Bengal system of Account is imperfectly understood by the Officers at Madras, and that they propose to send down certain Officers from Bengal to Madras, in order that they may explain the Bengal Account and Audit system more accurately and practically, but before issuing any Orders on the subject, the Government of India request to be informed whether this Government would wish to have these Officers sent down as proposed.

In para : 8.

6. In reply to this enquiry, I would only beg to remark here, with due deference to higher Authorities, that if the system about to be changed were from Account Current to that of Book-keeping, by double Entry, the Officers at Madras might not, possibly, have declined the proffered aid; but the case being just the reverse, no such personal instructions or explanations whatever are needed. But even when the Account Current system was changed here, into that of Book-keeping by double Entry, throughout this Presidency, by Orders of the Honorable Court of Directors in 1832-33, the Subordinate Officers in the Provinces and at the Presidency were quite able to carry out the change accurately, under instructions and Forms furnished by the Office of Account. The Books thus prepared and furnished, *viz.*, the Monthly Journals and Annual Ledgers and Closing Entries of all the Collectors, Residents, and other Officers of Treasuries, and Accounts, have been, I presume, approved of by the Honorable Court of Directors, under whose explicit orders they were prepared in the improved form, since Duplicates thereof have been accepted by them year by year.

10. Under the present instructions of the Government of India,* I will at once prepare to introduce the Bengal system of Account in the Civil Branch throughout this Presidency: and, in doing so, if any Forms of Accounts or details kept in Bengal, or any information other than that given in the Printed Book received with the letter from the Financial Secretary to the Government of India to this Government, dated 4th February 1856, †be required by me, I shall have the honor of writing for them direct to the Accountant General to the Government of India. I can thus obtain the same from him at once, in the usual course, in view to save trouble and time by writing for them through this Government to the Government of India.

* *Vide Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 12th June & 11th September* 1857.

† *Vide Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 26th February* 1856, *No.* 81.

11. In continuation of my observation at the conclusion of para : 3 of this letter, and as it would appear, from the 2nd para : of the letter to your address from the Secretary to the Government of India, dated 21st August last, now under reply, that the Government of India have conceived that I have not refuted any of the grounds upon which the determination to introduce the Bengal system of Account was founded, I consider it behoves me to submit for the information of the Government, and the Government of India, my refutation of the grounds advanced by the Accountant General to the Government of India in his letter to that Authority, dated the 23rd April last. I do so in a separate, accompanying, Memorandum. On one side thereof is copied the letter of the Accountant General to the Government of India, and on the other, in juxtaposition, my observations are given. This will facilitate reference and permit comparison.

12. I will only add here, that I may not be understood as advocating the Madras system of Account, in preference to that of Bengal, *because* I am connected with this Presidency, that, had it so happened that the Journal system had been hitherto pursued in Bengal, and the Account Current System been in force at Madras, *then* I should have been delighted to find that the Bengal system was to be made universal.

(Signed) G. L. PRENDERGAST,
Accountant General.

Fort Saint George, Financial Consultation, 29th October 1857.

No. 13. Minute by the Right Honorable the President, and concurred in by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, dated 3rd October 1857, No. 512.

The only point on which the opinion of this Government is requested by the Government of India in Mr. C. H. Lushington's letter of the 21st August, No. 3440, is, whether "the Right Honorable the Governor of Fort St. George in Council would wish to have these Officers (that is certain Officers of the Bengal Accountant General's Office) sent down as proposed."

It is rather difficult to express any wish on a question of this nature, and this Government must be guided very much by the opinion of its Accountant General. Mr. Prendergast appears to think, that there will be no difficulty in adopting the Bengal system, and if his description of the nature of the accounts is correct, there certainly should be none, with persons conversant with book-keeping, as the Officers of his Department are supposed to be.

Had the proposition of the Supreme Government been of a slightly more comprehensive character, and had it contemplated by a deputation of Accountants to consider the respective merits of the two systems of accounts under discussion, I should have been anxious to accept their proposal, because I am fully imbued with the vast importance of a thoroughly correct system of accounts, and of the necessity there is for close investigation before the working and merits of distinct systems can be fully tested, and rightly appreciated.

The Accountants General are respectively impressed with the superiority each of his own system, and supposing them equally good, I think there can be no question that the lesser should yield to the greater, and that the Madras system should be superseded by that of Bengal.

But there appears to me to be a further question which might have been considered, but which has hardly come under discussion, and that is, whether these systems are based on the same or on different principles, if the same a similar conclusion to that abovementioned must be come to, and the Bengal system should be adopted; but if different, it should be a question as to the comparative correctness of the principles involved. Mr. Prendergast contends that the Madras accounts are kept on the Double Entry principle, and that those of Bengal are not, and he appears to look on the change, so far as this Presidency is concerned, as a retrograde move.

Now, if this assumption of Mr. Prendergast's be correct, I think, the change is to be regretted, not only because it will cause the introduction of an inferior system into this, and also as would appear from the Accountant General's remarks, into the Bombay Presidency, but also because it would entail the certainty of another change at no very long distance of time, as the policy of Government, as well as the force of public opinion are quite sure eventually to require that the most correct system of accountancy should be adopted in the public offices. I do not insist that Mr. Prendergast's assertion is well founded, but I think it would be advisable that the respective merits of the two systems should be thoroughly sifted, I would recommend, by professional Accountants, before so great a change is made, and an universal system for the Empire adopted.

It is not very clear from the communications received, whether the Bengal system assumes to be based on the Italian method or not, and hence in my estimation, would be the advantage of some investigation to decide on the merits of the respective methods.

For I imagine, that it will be allowed now without hesitation, that the Italian or double entry method contains the only correct principle, by which accuracy of account and a sure check on expenditure can be maintained.

It has been adopted in France and in England with entire success, and has been found as well suited to national as to mercantile accounts.

Moreover, according to the testimony of that able financier, Sir Henry Parnell, its introduction is attended by a saving of expense. In his observations on Army accounts, he states, "experience has fully proved, that in all instances where the double entry system has been substituted for any other system of accounts, it has always been attended with a large reduction in the expense of account keeping. This has been the case in my office. The quantity of Clerk's work has been very much diminished and the establishment considerably reduced. The attention I have bestowed on the difference of expense in keeping accounts between the old office systems, and the double entry system leads me to think, that with proper management of the change from one system to another, a saving could be made of at least one-fourth of the expense now incurred in keeping the whole of the public accounts."

From this high authority it may then be gathered, that not only is an improved method obtained, but that an actual saving in establishments may be gained.

To me it is a matter of indifference, whether the Bengal or the Madras plans are adopted but it is in my opinion, most important if there be one universally acknowledged correct principle on which all systems of accounts should be based, that that principle should be adopted for the accounts of this vast Empire, at the expense of abolishing both the systems above alluded to, as they have no correct foundation.

(Signed) HARRIS.

I concur.

(Signed) PATRICK GRANT.

No. 14. Minute by the Honorable WALTER ELLIOT, Esq., dated 8th October 1857, No. 513.

The subject, upon which the Government of India desire to know the wishes of this Government, being the re-introduction of certain forms of account, which were in universal use in the Presidency some years ago, and the Accountant General having stated that a return to the old system can be effected without the slightest difficulty, this Government has only to reply that the proffered assistance is considered to be unnecessary.

I will venture however to express a hope that the change contemplated in the letter of the Financial Secretary to the Government of India may not be carried out, until the objections so strongly urged by the Accountant General of this Presidency have been fully considered.

As far as I can gather from the letter of the Accountant General to the Government of India, dated 23rd April 1857, that Officer unreservedly admits the superiority of the Italian method of Book keeping by Double Entry which has been universally adopted in all Offices of Account, whether public or private at home, but he considers that a simpler form of account would suffice for the transactions of all subordinate departments in Madras, that Collectors and other local Officers should only be required to submit their transactions according to this form.

It does not appear whether the same form should be made applicable to the Accountant General's Office also. But I conclude not.

The reason given for the change is that a Collector's accounts are confined to the simple transactions of a treasury, embracing simply Receipts and Disbursements, and as such resembling more nearly the business of a banking establishment than any thing else. Such, however, can hardly be said to be a correct description of a Collector's transactions in matters of account under this Presidency. In Bengal, perhaps the case may be different, and I have always understood that Collectors there had little else to attend to than the management of their treasuries. But here, their account transactions are of a very varied and miscellaneous description, including running accounts with individuals for purchases, advances, &c., &c.

I have assumed, that although it is desired to revert to the Account Current in subordinate Offices, the books of the Accountant General's Office will continue to be kept, after the most approved mode, by the Journal and Ledger.

If this supposition be correct, it will be found, I should imagine, to facilitate the business of the principal Office if the duty of abstracting and amalgamating the district accounts be conducted from Returns prepared on a system common to both, rather than by reducing the latter from different forms.

Mr. Prendergast has shewn that the existing mode of keeping mofussil accounts has for many years been carried on with perfect ease, that no difficulty occurs in finding properly qualified Clerks and Accountants and that the local Officers generally profess a preference for it over the former system.

The objection therefore urged from the difficulty of finding instructed Agents to give effect to the plan has not been found to exist in practice.

The Accountant General has also stated that the accounts transmitted from this Presidency to the India House and Board of Control for the year ending 30th April 1855, were in advance of those rendered from any other part of India and that those for 1856 were in no respect behind.

It does not appear therefore that the practice prevaling here can be charged with causing delay.

Lastly the system has met with the approval of the Home Authorities for a series of years or rather has been introduced expressly at the instance of the Honorable the Court of Directors in supercession of that very mode of keeping accounts which it is now desired to restore, and the innovation so made has been found to work satisfactorily in every respect.

Surely then, the views of the Authority from which the change emanated should be ascertained before deciding on the adoption of a retrograde movement.

The letter of the Accountant General of India also touches on the mode of performing the duties of the Audit Office and prescribes conformity with the usage prevailing in Bengal.

On this I would only observe that the accuracy of charges is much more likely to be tested by a system of division of labor under which the items are checked by Officers familiar with the details of the department to which they belong, than if the whole of this duty was to be thrown on the Accountant General's Office, which as exercising the financial control of the ways and means of the whole Presidency should in my opinion be especially free from all business of detail.

(Signed) WALTER ELLIOT.

No. 15. ORDER THEREON, No. 679; dated 27th October 1857.

Resolved that copies of the above papers be forwarded to the Government of India with the following letter

No. 16. To C. HUGH LUSHINGTON, Esq., Secretary to the Government of India; dated 27th October 1854, No. 679.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 21st August last, No. 3440, declaring the wish of the Government of India that the Bengal system of Account should be introduced into this Presidency, and offering to send down, if necessary, some Officers to explain that Account and Audit system accurately and practically.

2. Explanation was also asked for regarding an observation made by the Accountant General at Madras that the Collectors and Paymasters had found the business of their Offices increased by the introduction of the Pre-audit system.

Letter from Mr. G. L. Prendergast, the Acct. Genl., 18th September.
Memorandum which accompanied above letter.
Minute by the Right Honorable Lord Harris, 3d October 1857.
Minute by the Hon. Mr. W. Elliot, 8th Oct. 1857.

3. The whole subject has undergone the careful consideration of this Government, and I am now directed to forward, for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor General in Council, the papers entered in the margin

4. From these papers it will be seen that no difficulty is anticipated in introducing the Bengal system of Account, should the measure be resolved upon, and that it will not be necessary to send Officers from Calcutta to give instruction in it. Doubt is however still felt as to the Bengal system having advantages over that which has been followed for many years past in this Presidency with the sanction of the Home Authorities, and it is for the Government of India to decide whether the change is to be made at once, or whether further enquiries are to be first made and the wishes of the Honorable the Court of Directors consulted, in consequence of the Accountants General at Calcutta and here expressing such different views. This Government attaches the greatest value to a well ordered system of Accounts, and its only desire is that that system, which is really the most correct and practical, should be adopted.

The required explanation regarding the Pre-audit system is given in paras: 4 and 5 of the Accountant General's letter now forwarded.

(Signed) E. MALTBY,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. A. Wilson.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
16th January 1866.

No. 225. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd December 1865, No. 8,297.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 21st November 1865, No. 250 :—

The Committee of the Ootacamund Dispensary have fixed on a site for their proposed new Dispensary building, below the new Jail for Europeans. The site chosen, about three-quarters of an acre in area, belongs to the Reverend Mr. Hodson, who is willing to let the Committee have it, provided they give him another piece of land in exchange. There is a piece of Government land adjoining the Taluk Cutcherry which Mr. Hodson is ready to take, and I request the Board's sanction to carry out the exchange. The two pieces of land are about the same area.

---

1. Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. No correspondence relative to the new Dispensary has reached them, but they understand that some has been held with Government.

No. 226. ORDER THEREON, 16th January 1866, No. 116.

Miscellaneous. Sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

MEMORANDUM

SHEWING—IN JUXTAPOSITION

THE OBSERVATIONS OF

THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

TO THE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

and the grounds advanced by him in his letter to

THE SUPREME GOVERNMENT

dated 23d April 1857,

In support of the introduction of the Bengal system of Account at the Madras Presidency, and the refutation of them by the Accountant General of Madras.

Memorandum shewing—in juxtaposition the—observations of the Accountant General to the Government of India, and the grounds advanced by him in his letter to the Supreme Government dated 23d April 1857, in support of the introduction of the Bengal system of Account at the Madras Presidency, and the refutation of them by the Accountant General of Madras.

1. I have the honor to return the papers relating to the different systems of Account and Audit obtaining in this Presidency and at Madras, forwarded to me for report, with your docket No. 326, of the 21th January last.	
2. These papers, emanating as they do from an Officer for so many years connected with the Department of Accounts as the present Accountant General of Madras, have received my most attentive consideration, and I will endeavour to explain as clearly and concisely as I can, for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor General in Council, the points wherein they appear to me to fail in supporting the conclusions which they are intended to maintain.	1. No remarks necessary.
3. The subject, as observed by the Accountant General, Madras, may be divided into three general heads, *first*, the system upon which the local District Accounts are kept; *secondly*, the form in which these Accounts are to be rendered to the Accountant	

General ; and *thirdly*, the system of Audit of Civil charges : and in considering these, the questions at issue, respecting the Bengal and Madras systems, appear to be, first, in which are the Checks the more efficient ; and, secondly, in which is the mode of preparing and submitting the Accounts most simple and expeditious.

4. The Accountant General at Madras claims for his system, that it is an improvement upon that of Bengal, recognized and adopted by the Honorable Court a quarter of a century ago, that the Accountants on the establishments of Collectors have now become conversant with double entry, which is the one clear and comprehensive method which has superseded every other ; and that one special advantage of the Monthly Journal & Annual Ledger is, that every account under every Officer is complete for the year, and kept complete from year to year.

5. In this view, however, as it seems to me, there are two great fallacies, which, indeed, more or less, pervade the report : One, that the accounts in Bengal are kept on the system of *single entry* : the other, that that our Monthly Treasury Accounts, which are admitted in

2. This is very accurately put by the Accountant General to the Government of India—It is my view.

3. I do not myself perceive the first of these fallacies certainly. The second I give up as *quite* immaterial. I think my view most accurate—and what I shall state hereafter will, I think, fully support it.

4. If the Bengal accounts are not kept by single entry : perhaps they may be, in the sense the Acct. Genl. to the Govt. of India regards them, " in accordance with double entry. " But still this is not " the

para. 10, to be Abstracts of the Daily Ledger, are (as assumed in para. 11) similar to the Monthly and Annual Accounts Current formerly in use at Madras, and which have been definitively condemned by the Honorable Court.

6. I am not in the least disposed to question " the intrinsic superiority of double entry" (para. 19.) but in discussing this subject, the Accountant General, Madras, appears to have adopted the not uncommon, but not the less erroneous conclusion, that the existence of a *Journal* is the grand and necessary characteristic of the system ; the simple and correct definition of which system is, however, as I understand it, that for every transaction there must be *two* distinct Entries in the *Ledger* equal in value, one deducting the article delivered *from* some account, and the other adding the article received *to* some account, in other words for every debit there must be a per Contra credit, and any method of Book-keeping which dispenses with one of these two Ledger Entries is Book-keeping by *single entry*.

system of double entry." He alludes elsewhere to the *Ledger* being on the principle of double entry. I will quote a passage from " Foster's Double Entry elucidated, London 1852," page 10, He says " A Ledger kept upon " the principles of double entry " is neither more nor less than an " Account Current." The Bengal system I therefore say is the Account Current system and not the system of " double entry"—indisputably it is not the Journal system of double entry—and I shall presently shew how liable the system—which drops the Journal,—is to error.

5. I certainly maintain,—and I do not believe the conclusion is erroneous—I will shew why presently—that the Journal is indispensable in the *correct* system of Double entry.

6. I have shewn in the 4th para. that what the Accountant General understands is the Account Current system. I will give the passage from Foster here in full " A Ledger upon the prin- " ples of double entry is neither " more nor less than an Account " Current exhibiting, as it does, " the state of the Accounts not " only individually but collective- " ly—the net Capital or defici- " ency, which is the balance in " favor or against the proprietor " being added to the deficient " credits or debits, makes both " equal."

7. Foster in publishing his Book, from which I have quoted, gives a list of 159 Authors and

7. It is not necessary in applying the system of double entry, rigidly to adhere to forms originally adopted to meet the peculiar and varied requirements of Commercial transactions; the practical value of a science is in the application of its principles in the most direct and simple form possible towards the attainment of the object in view, and accordingly one result of all the improvements of late years in Banking Book-keeping has been the substitution of the Day-book for the Mercantile Journal.

Compilers of works on Book-keeping, published in the English language since 1543, of which 156 were in his possession, so that *he* probably knew something of Accounts Current and Book-keeping by single and double entry.

8. I conclude from this remark that the Accountant General regards the Journal as the antiquated form and that to drop it is the most direct and simple method towards the attainment of the object in view. I will shew presently how he commits himself when he lays down this dictum.

9. My own idea has always been that a Journal was indispensable in the system of Book-keeping by Double entry. I have looked into many books on the subject, and found that view supported in all the books except in a *note* in a small volume entitled "an Introduction to British In-"dian Book-keeping by single "and double entry by Urquhart, "printed at Calcutta in 1853." In page 10, it is stated that "If "the Ledger be kept by single "Entry, the Cash Book—Bill "Book—Day Book—Warehouse "Book—and Ledger are sufficient "to exhibit a correct system of "Accounts. But if the Ledger "be kept by Double Entry then "the *Journal* is employed to "ensure accuracy by a more "scientific method." To which this note is added, "In Fulton's "work published in Calcutta in "1799, the *Journal* is represented "as the principal Book, while in "the volume lately printed by "Messrs. Chambers, it is alto-"gether dispensed with."

10. What the Accountant General to the Government of India represents as "one result "of all the improvements of late "years in Banking Book-keeping "has been the substitution of the "Day book for the Mercantile "Journal," is of very doubtful validity, as an *improvement* on the Journal system for Accounts such as ours. In a *Bank* it may be so regarded, because the Banker *must* be prepared to-morrow morning to meet the cheques of all his constituents, and therefore their Accounts say 500, or 1,000, or 2,000 *must* be balanced *daily*. He cannot therefore, without more trouble than it is worth, post from his Cash-book to the Journal, and again from the Journal to the Ledger every evening. But the Collector has not these 2,000 constituents whose cheques he must be prepared either to accept or protest on the morrow.

11. So far from its being an *improvement*, however, on the Journal system,—speaking of the system *as* a system framed to meet the complicated business not merely of a Merchant, but of a vast Empire divided into five Presidencies, each Presidency of great magnitude.—I must, with all due submission, maintain that it is a retrogression to the practice of olden times—when the inaccuracy of the no-Journal system was discovered, and the Journal was introduced! I have just now before me an old book on Book-keeping, but none the worse for being old, by John Mair, A. M.' 8th edition, Edinburgh 1765. He explains how the Waste-book and Ledger had, at one time, been

thought sufficient. "The Ledger," he says, "differs from the "waste book only in form, not "in matter. The Ledger is the "waste book taken to pieces and "put together in another order." "And in regard transporting im- "mediately from the waste book "to the Ledger is attended with "great hazard of mistake as "being a complex task—Mer- "chants therefore to render "the matter easy, and to prevent "as much as possible errors creep- "ing into the Ledger, and also "upon other considerations, have "found it convenient to keep a "third Book, wherein every case "of the waste book is again "briefly narrated and the proper "Debtors and Creditors ascer- "tained, which being done they "are with great ease transported "from it to the Ledger. This "Book is called the Journal."

"One great design of the "Journal is to prevent errors "in the Ledger, a thing of the "worst consequence in Book- "keeping, which yet, without the "help of this book would be "almost inevitable. After the "Ledger is filled in, the Journal "facilitates the work required in "revising and correcting it, for "first the waste book and Jour- "nal are compared and then the "Journal and Ledger: In case "of difference betwixt a Mer- "chant and his dealers, the Jour- "nal is the book commonly called "for, and inspected by a Civil "Judge."

8. The Bengal system of Account then, instead of being the defective one of single Entry, accords strictly with the most approved system of the Banks in which the *Day Book* takes the place of Commercial *Journal*. The transactions of a Treasury, like those of a Bank, being all in Cash, the Treasury Officer is regarded simply as a Cashier of Government, the Cash Books and Waste-books contain the original Entries, the Ledger Account, or Day book, is made up each night, and a trial balance made, and in the Monthly Treasury Account, which is the counterpart of the Day book, the whole of the transactions are exhibited in the Ledger form, as a personal Account Current with Government, and balanced "By Cash," the balancing of the real Accounts (such as Profit and Loss, &c.) *inter se*, being left to the Government Accountant, or (as "Land Revenue") shewn in separate Statements, or (as "Stamps") in plus and minus Memoranda at foot of the Accounts, and subjected to separate and independent check.

12. In this para. the Accountant General to the Government of India explains that in the Monthly Treasury Account "which *is* "the counterpart of the Day book, "the whole of the transactions are "exhibited in the Ledger form as "a personal Account Current "with Government and balanced "by Cash." If this be so—inasmuch as the Entries are Entries of receipt on the Dr. or left hand side of the account, and of disbursement on the Cr. or right hand side of the account; the Account Current will *not* be the Account Current of the Collector or Treasury Officer with Government, but it *will* be the Account Current of Government against the Treasury Officer. To make the Account Current correctly what the Accountant General states it is, the sides of the account must be changed—*As the Account Current stands* it makes out that the Government owe the Collector the balance of Cash—not that the Collector is accountable to Government for the said balance! So much for the accuracy of this part of the Bengal system.

13. But it must be remarked here, that if the Account Current is meant to be the Treasury Account of the Government (and not a personal account with Government) kept by their Officer for them, which in fact it is, then the present Form of the Account Current is right in its Dr. and Cr. sides.

14. Again, in the same para he refers to the balancing of the real

Accounts "or (as 'Stamps') in plus and minus Memoranda at foot of the Accounts." On this I will only note that it is the first time I have ever heard of accounts being balanced by plus and minus Memoranda, and I impugn the accuracy of the proceeding. An Accountant can no more go out of the four corners of his account to balance the account than a Judge can go out of the four corners of a 'Will,' to construe the 'Will.'

9. The Accountant General, Madras, has apparently (para. 5) accepted as correct, in principle at least, the system upon which the District accounts are now kept in Bengal; but it must be obvious that, if that system is unobjectionable, then the simplest form of submitting these Accounts must also be the best, and what can be more simple than the Monthly transmission of a *copy of the daily Ledger*. So far then from being defective, our system is, critically speaking, considerably in advance of that of Madras; for, dispensing with the technical formality of a Journal, we obtain from Subordinate Officers the Ledger or Day book itself, exhibiting every transaction in the detail sought for by the Honorable Court, and constituting in the Accountant's Office *a complete record duly vouched*, of every monetary transaction in the Empire.

15. I must have given a defective explanation for the Accountant General to understand that I "accepted as correct, in "principle at least, the system "upon which the District Ac- "counts are now kept in Bengal." The only part that I approve is the complete check maintained over the Cash-keeper by the Accountant in a Collector's Office by two sets of daily Cash Accounts being kept, one by the Treasurer in brief, and the other by the Accountant in detail, the latter serving as a check against the former. He says "what can be "more simple than the Monthly "transmission of a copy of the "daily Ledger." I say, why not put the materials into shipshape, make a Journal of them—Cash Dr. to Sundry Accounts for the receipts and Sundry Accounts Dr. to Cash for the disbursements—and add the Transfer Entries—and a business-like proper account, viz. a Journal is rendered. It would not cost more trouble when instituted. The Annual Ledger and the Closing Entries would follow at the end of the year. I have proved by reference to published

works, the superiority of the Journal form. I think I have shewn that, so far from the Bengal system being "criti- "cally speaking, considerably in "advance of that of Madras," it is dangerously liable to error, and far behind. I stated before, a quarter of a century.—may I not now say a century behind? It belongs to the days when Journals had not yet been introduced.

16. The advantages described, at the close of para. 9, by the Accountant General to the Government of India as appertaining to the Bengal system are not only preserved in adopting the Journal, but the arrangement is better.

10. The Accountant General, Madras, again, appears to think that his system has the support of the Honorable Court of Directors, because the Account Current form of furnishing subsidiary Accounts to the Court was, so to speak, abolished by the Court, (para. 24), and the present form of Journal and Ledger has continued under the Court's annual inspection from the year 1832–33, up to the present time (paras 16 and 18); but I see little resemblance between the Abstract Account Current of the Madras Presidency, which was condemned by the Honorable Court, and the Treasury

17. Surely the annual acceptance for 20 years and more, of our accounts in the Journal and Ledger form by the Honorable Court without their having raised any objection, is a sufficient ground for advancing that the Madras accounts have their approbation. I did not say this as comparing them with either Bengal or Bombay, but as a fact which indicates that had there been any thing objectionable in the form, or system, the Honorable Court would not have failed to upset them.

accounts of this Presidency; and the general argument founded upon the non-interference of the Court is obviously as much in favor of the Bengal or Bombay system as that of Madras. The fact seems to be, that the Honorable Court, in addition to the General Books of the different Presidencies, wished to be furnished with the detailed Subsidiary Accounts from which those Books were prepared; this was at once complied with in Bengal, by transmitting the Monthly and Annual Treasury Accounts; but the Court being unable to attain their object in the case of Madras were constrained to prescribe a form, and none would probably so readily occur to them, as free from liability to misconception, and calculated to ensure what their previous orders had failed to elicit, as the well known form of Journal and Ledger.

18. I do not see this. If the Hon. Court had thought the Bengal form and system *better* than the Journal and Ledger why should they not *then*, in 1834, have desired Madras to adopt the Bengal? As I have always understood the change, theCourt wished all the Presidencies to adopt the Journal and Ledger form—but did not desire it to be introduced if additional expense were to be incurred thereby. Madras and Bombay accordingly took the Journal form, with this difference, the Journal here is Monthly, in Bombay, annually. Bengal went on as before.

11. It appears hardly correct then to assume, from these orders, that the Honorable Court intended to introduce the complicated machinery of a complete set of Books into each Collector's Office, when a simpler form of Account was sufficient for every purpose, or that, in prescribing a form in which certain Accounts should be rendered to them, they had it in contemplation to prescribe a General system of Account for the Presidency, which should relieve the Accountant General's Office (the central one of account) of its chief duties, and constitute each Collector his own Accountant.

19. The difference of opinion in respect to the Hon. Court's intentions can be easily settled by an immediate reference by the Supreme Government, if it be their pleasure, to the Honorable Court of Directors, who first ordered the Journal system, and whose orders on the present reference can be received at all events 2 months previous to the expiration of the Current Official year i. e. 30th April 1858. The orders of the Supreme Government being to commence the Account Current system from May 1858, every preparation will be made and all necessary instructions issued by me to Collectors and

other Officers in the Civil Branch, so that no delay will occur in adopting the Account Current system from the commencement of 1858-59, if the Honorable Court of Directors should decide in favor of that system. I have taken the liberty of submitting the above proposal more especially as the Accountant General of Bombay who has been long *

* *About* 16 *years.*

employed in the Finance and Account Department, expressed his opinion in corroboration of mine, in his letter to the Accountant to the Government of Bengal dated 4th October 1855, in the 19th para of which, he proceeds to state that "Requiring Officers in charge of "Treasuries and important De- "partments to keep Books, is, in "my opinion an excellent ar- "rangement. The items are thus "dealt with at once according to "the most approved system of "account—the labour is divided "—and the Officers are annually "apprized of the Profit or Loss "in their respective Departments; "which course it may reasonably "be supposed, is likely to cause "a greater interest to be taken "in the accounts, and to promote "zeal: for, upon active super- "intendence over the Receipts "and Charges will, in most cases, "depend the Financial result of "the year."

20. "The arrangement is also "advisable I consider, as regards "the Head Offices of Account. "In Books, the accounts are "presented complete and classi- "fied, and should, therefore, I

"imagine be more convenient for "reference Adjustment, and In- "corporation in the General "Books, than when rendered in "Monthly Cash Accounts."

21. "The above remarks may "be viewed as likewise applicable "to the other General Returns, "mentioned in my 2d paragraph "as furnished to my Department "by Collectors and others. Those "Officers, I should imagine, can "alone frame approximate Esti- "mates of Receipts and Charges "and explain why the Actual "amounts exceeded or fell short "of the Estimate."

22. "I view the Bombay sys- "tem of account as very com- "plete and efficient. It is some- "what defective in details—an "imperfection which I am at- "tempting to remedy. I have "for sometime past, been en- "gaged in framing a revised List "of Headings of Account and "new forms of Cash Account, "Journal and Ledger, Financial "Statement, and am sanguine "that when these Forms have been "issued and the Departments "have had time to comprehend "them, there will be little to "complain of in regard to the "Accounts of this Presidency."

23. The above paras.* contain the opinion of Mr. Elliot the Accountant General of Bombay in favor of the Journal system.

*19 to 22.

12. To view the whole question, however, in its proper aspect, it must be considered not only as related merely to the forms in which Local Officers should keep and render their accounts, and whether this should be done in the form of Account Current or of Journal and Ledger, but as involving considerations affecting the entire system of account, the principles of audit and responsibilities of check as observed in the two Presidencies.

13. As already observed, no objection appears to be taken to the first step in the Bengal system, and the peculiarity noticed by the Accountant General, Madras, (para. 6) in respect of Talook Treasuries, has already been experienced and provided for in the Oude, Nagpore, and Hydrabad Provinces. The accounts submitted to the Accountant's Office have also been explained to be the counterparts of the District Ledgers, of which the disbursements are supported by Vouchers audited by the Civil Auditor, whose duty is confined simply to passing Charges duly authorized. The Land Revenue accounts of Demand, Collections, and Balances (of which the amount of Col-

24. I do not perceive what the principles of *audit* have to do with the *form* and *system* of the Accounts kept in the Collector's Offices. Whatever may be the form of Accounts kept in the Collector's Offices, whether Journal or Account Current, the principle of audit need not be affected by it; because under the present pre-audit system the Civil Auditor is merely to pass the Bills of charges, and is not, as he contends, to see those charges entered in their Accounts under proper heads, which if the Accountant General is to see and check, he can as easily, (and perhaps with greater facility,) perform this work, in the Journal entries as in those in the Account Current form.

25. There is no connection whatever between the first step here noticed and the question now under discussion; vizt. the rendering of the Accounts of the Collectors &c. in the approved form of Journals and Ledger, which I still maintain is the best.

26. According to the Bengal system, the Civil Auditor never sees a charge at all as it stands in the Accounts. He is merely a passer of Bills.

lections only is credited in the Monthly Cash Accounts), are submitted in the form of Statements for the independent check and examination of the Revenue Authorities and the Accountant, and the whole of these accounts are then thrown, with the accounts of every other Department in the Presidency, into one general Journal and Ledger in the Accountant General's Office, which form the General Books of the Government.

14. In Madras, to which I may here remark that from want of information my report, dated 12th November 1855, had no reference, it would appear that a Monthly Journal, instead of an Account Current, is prepared by each Subordinate Officer; and, it is presumed, from the report of the Accountant General, Madras, as scientifically prepared as it would be in the Accountant General's own Office. These Journals contain the adjustments of demand of Revenue, and all Transfer and Closing Entries, which are needlessly multiplied by the number of Offices attached to the Presidency, and I question whether in this complete form they can possibly be checked with the same facility as an Account Current. But be that as it may, the adjusting Officer, who is also the disbursing Officer, cannot be left uncontrolled in the admission of charges in his own Journal, and the Civil Auditor is therefore

27. These arguments do not prove that the same process cannot be effected if the Accounts of the Subordinate Officers are rendered in the Book-keeping system. I maintain that the work can be done with as great or greater facility, expedition, and accuracy, than under the method explained in this para. by the Accountant General.

28. Every item of receipts and charges is first exhibited in the Monthly Journal under the distinct head to which it appertains, and closed to the general head in the Closing Entries at the termination of the year. The importance of exhibiting receipts and charges under distinct heads in the first instance in the Subordinate Accounts, was considered so great; that when the forms of the Revenue Accounts were about to be revised under the order of Govt., I myself and Mr. Bourdillon the Revenue Secretary to Govt., we intended to have introduced certain heads in those forms, which are not now distinctly shewn in the Collector's Accounts, an arrangement considered essential to the Exhibition of the charges properly in their respective places, and as items in the Financial Returns. The correctness of the Entries above described and of their respective heads is examined and passes audit in the Office of Accounts. Nothing here advanced by the Accountant

called upon to perform a double duty (para. 35) and is required not only to audit the charges as in Bengal, but to see to what is called the completion of audit, or in other words, to satisfy himself that the audited vouchers are duly brought to account.

General in Bengal shews that any defect exists in the present system or that it is inferior to the principle of Account Current. In Madras we have had experience of both the systems i. e. Account Current and the Journal and I am satisfied that the latter is the best of the two in every respect, when a fair view can be obtained of the working of them both.

29. The Journals in the Provinces *are* prepared upon the same scientific principle as they would be in the Accountant General's Office.

30. From the Accountant General classing Transfer and Closing Entries together, I infer that he does not understand the Closing Entries are, not Monthly but, annual. They are used to condense and bring the heads of inferior importance under the principal heads of Account; and thence the general Books are framed.

31. Undoubtedly the Journal is as susceptible of easy check as the Account Current. What is the difference? none but in the principles in the form. The items are all equally supported by Vouchers or Authorities; and contain the necessary particulars. If the Collector adjusts charges, he adjusts them only under proper authority. It is not because the adjusting Officer cannot be left uncontrolled that the Civil Auditor audits the *charges*, but the Civil Auditor here audits the *charges* (the Accountant General does this in Bengal) because it is considered to be his proper duty. What is the *charge*? not the *Bill*, which the Civil Auditor has passed, but the *Entry of the Bill in*

15. Now this seems a very singular arrangement of duties and responsibilities. Every Collector in addition to his other Fiscal and Judicial duties, is required to be a Book-keeper and Accountant, and keep each for his own Office a complete set of Books.—The Civil Auditor must not only pass charges, but see that they are properly brought to account. Certainly no part of an Auditor's legitimate duties, whilst the Accountant General is called upon to do little more than compile one

the Accounts. If therefore the Civil Auditor be the Auditor of Accounts, i. e. of charges he *ought*, as he does in Madras, to pass i. e. audit *the charges*. In Bengal the Civil Auditor never sets his eyes at all on a *charge*, he is merely a passer of *Bills*. Having passed the Bill his duty ends. The Accountant in Bengal sees to the *charge* being correctly entered in the Accounts and, inasmuch as he does so, *I* think he does the duty of the Civil Auditor. The Military Auditor General audits the charges entered in the Paymasters Accounts. *His* duty does not end in passing Bills merely. I do not understand why one system is to be observed in this instance in one branch of the service, and another system in another branch. Although the charges entered in the Accounts are passed by the Auditor, still the Accountant General at Madras does invariably see that each item of those charges is brought under the proper head and orders correction thereof when necessary, after communication with the Auditors, if such be requisite.

32. To me it appears the most natural arrangement of the two.

33. Certainly, I think he should keep his District Accounts in the Journal and Ledger form. He has a Cash and an Account Department, and surely, if he can, with not more labour and at the same expense, keep them in a business-like form, it is better that he should do so—than that he should be merely a purveyor of accounts in the Account Current form for the Central Office.

set of Books for the Presidency out of those sent up to him by each Officer in charge of a Treasury.

34. I am of opinion that the passing of charges, not merely passing of *Bills, is* the Civil Auditor's legitimate duty. The Bengal Accountant General's Office seems to me to be very much what the Madras Accountant General's Office once was, 'alieni appetens.' The whole object *here* was at one time—in order to obtain a large native establishment—to get hold of every body else's duty. Thus also in Bengal it seems to me that the Accountant General's Office has taken to itself not a little of the subordinate Officers' duties, and not the least important of the Civil Auditor's business.

35. The difference as to the compiling of the General Books amounts to no more than this, the Accountant General in Bengal compiles them from the Monthly Ledgers.—The Accountant General in Madras from the Closing Entries of the different Officers who render Accounts to him.

36. I hope it is not meant by this remark to intimate that the Account of each Officer in charge of a Treasury, is not examined and checked in the Accountant General's Office at Madras, as is done in Bengal. These accounts *are* examined and passed here; and I should say with more efficiency, because the items appear in the subordinate Accounts under the minor, as well as the principal, heads. A Memorandum of remarks on the Journal of a Collector is sent to him whenever alteration of the heads or explanations of the Entries appear necessary.

16. At para. 22, the Accountant General, Madras, says " if " the principles of double entry " be adopted by the superior Office in Bengal, as admittedly the " best form, I do not understand " why it should be held that " the inferior accounts ought to " be kept in the Account Current form as the proper form." The question, however, is not between double entry & single entry, but as to the number of preliminary steps in the process to be required of the local Officers, and whether the Ledger, in which alone the double entries *actually* appear, shall be kept in each Collector's office, in addition to its preparation in the Accountant's office, for the sole purpose of carrying out a theoretical notion of completeness. The form of our Treasury accounts, as already stated, is perfectly consistent with the principles of double Entry; and the reason why that form is prescribed for the local Officers, and the Journal and Ledger form is observed in the superior Office in Bengal is, that the Treasury account form is best suited to exhibit the simple transactions of a Treasury, whilst the latter is better adapted for collecting together and exhibiting in a complete form the extended and complicated operations of the Government.

37. True—I think *that* is *the* question.

38. Here the Accountant General, instead of answering my question, takes new ground. I do not think he at all answers it by saying that such accurate and complete Accounts are unnecessary in the Provincial Offices. The one, the Account Current form, is an unbusiness-like, unfinished, way of keeping the Accounts. The Journal form is admittedly the *best* method. If therefore the accounts can be kept in that best method—sent in with due expedition—no complaint being made by the Officers rendering them, many of whom on the contrary advocate it—when there will be no appreciable economy in the change to the inferior form, I cannot understand why the Accountant General to the Government of India should insist upon our degrading, so to speak, to the lower form. True, it may be assimilation of practice, but I think that miserable advantage purchased at too high a price when a maimed, a manqué, system is to be substituted for a sound one.

39. The Accountant General writes, " and whether the Ledger in which alone the double entries *actually* appear."—This is either a great mistake or a great misapprehension for the double entries appear in the Journal also—not *alone in the Ledger*.

40. It is not a " theoretical notion," but a positive fact, practically, that the Accounts are not complete; safely complete—without the Journal.

41. They may be " consistent with," but certainly they are not the principles of the system of double entry without the Journal.

42. Again, why not go a step further and have them complete and safe as well as simple—when it will cost no more.

43. It is not shewn here *how* " the Treasury Account form is best suited to exhibit the simple transactions of a Treasury," nor what are the defects and difficulties in the Journal form—which he admits, and I maintain, is a better form. Again, as the Accountant General himself agrees that it is better adapted for collecting together, and exhibiting in a complete form the, extended and complicated operations of the Government—I beg to assume, on the same grounds and for the same reasons, that it is better adapted to exhibit in a clear and comprehensible manner the varied transactions of a Collector. I say varied, because his Receipts and Disbursements are not a *simple* Cash Account. They are not confined merely to Revenue collections and charges thereof; but to receipts and charges of various kinds, such as Judicial, Magisterial, Marine, Military charges, Advances repayable,—and Advances on account of the Service of Government,—Deposits of the Revenue Department,—items of Account with other Presidencies and Go-

vernments—Public Works—Public Instruction,—Railway Bills, Bills drawn by the Sub Treasurer to draw the surplus Balance into the Presidency Treasury—Bills of exchange drawn by Collectors on the Presidency or other Collectors, &c. for authorized purposes,—certificates and registers for payments to be made at other Presidencies, on Public Account—Pensions of several descriptions—Postal receipts and Disbursements,—Deposits and withdrawals on account of the Government Savings' Bank,—Payment of Interest on Government Promissory Notes—Subscriptions to Current open Loans and transfers of other Loan Paper into the Current Loan—Sales of Judicial Stamp paper and Cadjans—and of Postage Labels—If the Collector manages the Receipts and Disbursements on all the above transactions, I think it infinitely better that the Journal should be used, in which he can exhibit them in a clearer, and more distinct, form than the Account Current will permit.

17. It is possible to keep the simplest accounts in the most intricate and complicated form; but to do so would be to waste; and not economize time and labour-Revenue Officers have many and engrossing duties to attend to besides the care of their Accounts, and the great and essential object which it has always been thought material to keep in view, has been that of prescribing

44. The Journal and Ledger system is not so intricate and complicated a form but that many Accountants of ordinary intelligence learnt that system in a few months when it was first introduced in 1832-33. If this was the case about a quarter of a century ago, how easy must it be at this advanced period when education has widely spread for "Accountants of ordinary qualifications" to attain that know-

a system which any Officer or any Clerk of average intelligence, however, deficient in a knowledge of the art of Book-keeping, may understand and master in a few days, and which, from its simplicity and facility of check, may obviate as far as possible the risk of error.

ledge. This form has been observed in the several Districts and at the Presidency, and the entries scrutinized and checked by the Head Office of Account in its several Departments, so that the Clerks can as readily produce an account in that form, and with the same facility, as they can prepare an Account Current. The Collectors under this Presidency generally do not view the Journal system as intricate and complicated. The Collector of Masulipatam states that the "decrease of the labours of "the Copyist would be outweighed by the greater care "required in the Entries, as the "proposed System does not give "such facility for checking "items as are now afforded by "the Journal and Ledger system, and in some cases the "labour would be increased, for "should a transfer transaction "occur, the Entry must be shewn "with all particulars in both the "Dr. and Cr. sides of the Account "Current, whereas an item of this "nature is exhibited only by a "single entry in the Journal."

45. The Collector of Coimbatore also says that "the utility and "soundness of the present Journal system are so fully explained in your Report to Government, that I think it hardly necessary for me to discuss the "point beyond remarking that it "appears to me that whatever "new system may be introduced, "the labour and work of the Ac-

"countants and Clerks will be "nearly the same as at present, "inasmuch as the *whole* transac- "tions of the various items of "Receipts and Disbursements "will have to be exhibited in the "Accounts, under any form."

18. In para. 27, the Accountant General, Madras, contends for the completeness of the Accounts of every Officer for the year, and from year to year; and maintains that the Journal and Ledger form alone can ensure this completeness. "It is not enough," he says, "that the central Accounts should "be complete, the local Accounts "should also be complete in "themselves;" and again (para. "30.)" This is a vast Empire, and "to allow the local Accounts to be "left defective, and to have "them framed only for the pur- "pose of supplying information "to the Central Office, is a mis- "take: I am of opinion that the "Accounts in every Office of "Treasury and of Accounts "should be kept complete; and "this can be done only by the "Journal system, in which no "delay or defect is innate be- "yond the delay or defect innate "in the Account Current sys- "tem." It is possible that our views may have become corrupted by our practice; but we hold that completeness in the several subordinate Offices, in the sense intended, is quite unnecessary. Of course, accuracy is essential in details and and results: and completeness in so far as the re-

46. I am sorry I cannot concur in the view, here taken by the Accountant General to the Government of India, that in each Presidency in this vast Empire, the one Central Account need be the only one accurate Account—accurately kept—and that all the other subordinate Accounts ought to be

sponsibilities of a Treasury Officer extend; but completeness, as respects classification, and full adjustment of Demands, Transfers, and Closing Entries in the local Officers' Accounts, is quite unnecessary: for this we naturally look to the General Books, where all the transactions of the Presidency are collected together, and presented in one view. It certainly seems questionable, if to secure this subordinate completeness in the different Treasury Offices, it were worth while to establish the heavy machinery of a complete set of Books for each.

19. In Bengal the Accountant General's Office, as the Central Office of account, is what it purports to be, and may be compared to the Book-keeper's Department in a Merchant's office. In such an office the Cash-keeper keeps his Cash accounts, the Bill Department has its registers of Bills payable and receivable, the Godown Department has its Account sales and Invoices, &c. and all are sent to the Book-keeper's Department to be Journalized, and thrown into one set of books. It would be quite possible for the Cash-keeper to keep a set of books for his Department, and the bill and Godown Department to send Journals of their transactions to the Book-keeper's branch; but they would be unnecessary doing the Book-keeper's duty, which is not legitimately their own, and needlessly multiplying subordinate sets of books; and this is the Ma-

left in statu quo as first entered in the primary Account, and never afterwards corrected—even though known to be inaccurate—particularly when there is no necessity for this slovenliness. It is not so in Madras—It has not been so for the last quarter of a century, and no fault has hitherto been found with our system during that long period.

47. Yes, the Office of Accountant General is to Government like that of the Book-keeper's Department in a Merchant's office—We must not forget then that the Account Department of a Collector is also to him like that of the Book-keeper's Department to a Merchant. The Cash-keeper, commonly called Treasurer, under a Collector, keeps the Collector's Cash Account of Receipts and Disbursements which is commonly known at this Presidency as "Daily Chittah." The Accountant abstracts the transactions under each head from that Chittah for each month and throws them into the Form of Journal, in which are also embraced all the necessary transfer transactions which are not shewn in the daily Cash Chittah of the Treasurer. The Journal is then checked in the Account Department, and, after being verified, the Balances of Cash at

dras system. According to our principal and practice, it would be as futile for a Treasury Officer to keep a complete set of books of his own Office, as it would be for the Cash-keeper of an Agency house to do so.

20. The Accountant General at Madras, in para 28, says, he cannot perceive why diversity of practice should be inherent in the Journal system, and not in the Account Current form. He seems to overlook the fact, that what he designates as the Account Current form, is a preliminary stage of the same process, and that in the Journal the entries assume the form of their final adjustment. Now, according to his own shewing, at Madras, questions of adjustment are decided by the Civil or Military Auditors or the Accountant General, or all these three in consultation; here are three Public Officers, among whom material differences of opinion may exist, and although their decisions may after consultation be uniform, yet they can but lay down general principles, and these may after all be understood in various senses. For instance, not long ago the commencement and termination of the month as exhibited therein being compared with those shewn in the Cash Chittah—it is sent up to the Accountant General's Office. Here it will be seen that the Cash-keeper of a Collector does not, keep Books—but the Accountant whom we may call Book-keeper frames the Accounts. The Collector cannot be designated a mere Treasury Officer, but he is also a Treasury Officer and Accountant in addition to the many and varied duties he has to perform. The Collector cannot, therefore, properly speaking, be compared with a Cash-keeper in a Mercantile Firm.

48. Here the Accountant General notes my enquiry why there should be, what I cannot perceive, diversity of practice in the Journal system and not in the Account Current form: but he does not answer it. He turns from the point and goes off to the audit question, which has nothing to do, *necessarily*, with the form of the Accounts. I have stated elsewhere why the Civil Auditor and the Military Auditor General as dealing *with Charges* are the co-equal assistants of the Accountant General. Whether they shall remain so, is a matter of minor importance. My opposition is mainly to dropping the Journal system, (which has worked well) the change being uncalled for by any complaint raised against it for a quarter of century—and the system being in my opinion the best system. The change is not desirable even in a financial point of view, because no appreciable reduction can be

donations by Government for the erection of Churches and other similar payments were debited by this Department to "Charges general," viewing them merely as donations; but considering the purpose for which these disbursements were made, the Financial Department took them under Public Works. Here was a difference of opinion between two high functionaries in a matter of final record at the last moment, involving an alteration which cost little more than the stroke of a pen. On the Madras system, if we are to carry out the principle of completeness in the local adjustments, it would have involved considerable correspondence and alteration of Entries in the Subordinate Offices. Many cases also may arise for which no positive rules exist, which each Collector might adjust according to his own particular views, and exhibit them in the Journal in such a manner as to defy or evade observation, and we might thus have as wide a diversity of practice as there are effected in the Establishment of Collectors by the introduction of the Account Current form.

49. But if this be changed to the Bengal system—*then* there is the difficulty, facing the change, that those Officers who are *supposed* to audit *the charges*, do no such thing: they merely *pass the Bills*, and never see the *charges* in the Accounts at all: they do not even *know* whether the charges are therein inserted, or whether arranged under proper heads of charge.

50. Yes, it is easy enough for the Accountant General's Office to alter the Accounts in Bengal, but this facility has its objections; as I have shewn elsewhere.

51. I should not say it would have involved *considerable* correspondence. Of course the entries would have to be reversed—2 perhaps 3 lines in each Journal—under instructions from this Office in the shape of remark: or, if it be too late for the Collector's monthly Journal, or his Closing Entries of the year, the reversal entry is made in the General Territorial Books.

52. I think this an extreme case, and I am not of opinion that any Entries could be made in a Journal in such a manner as to defy, or evade, observation, seeing that every Entry is scrutinized. Remarks being sent to the Collectors, &c. when any Entry is deficient in information or particulars,

numbers of separate adjusting Officers. In Bengal all these diversities of views and practice in local Officers, of which there are instances daily occurring, are brought in the Accountant General's Office under uniform tests, and disposed of according to uniform rules.

21. I am not sensible (para. 30 and 31) of having stated that the matter hinges on the question, whether or not each Department should know its own Profit and Loss, as inferred by the Accountant General, Madras, nor am I of opinion that perfect accuracy in matters of account is either useless or pernicious, because I advocate simplicity as tending to accuracy; nor, in pressing the importance of the early collection of materials in the Central Office did I overlook the ulterior object of the early issue of the accounts out of the Central Office. Perhaps it may weaken the reliance of the Accountant General, Madras, in the excellency of his own system, to learn that the Government of Bombay, with the concurrence, I presume, of the Accountant General there, are not averse to superseding their own by the Bengal system.

diversity of practice, such as that apprehended by the Accountant General, can hardly occur in Madras under its present system. There is one advantage in the Madras course. The whole of the transactions connected with the administration of each District are digested and exhibited in the Journals and Ledgers systematically and rendered in proper shape to the Central Office of Account where they are scrutinized, checked and contrasted, but under the Bengal system these duties are performed in the Office of Accounts, and consequently the transactions not susceptible of any such scrutiny or check.

53. I would here refer the Accountant General to para. 15 of his letter of 12th November 1855, to the Financial Secretary to the Government of India. The passages to which I alluded were these "nor do I see that it "can answer any good purpose "that the local Officers should be "thus apprised of the Profit or "Loss in their respective Depart- "ments." Again—"and to allow "each separate Officer to have a "complete set of Accounts and "balance his Books, according to "the Bombay system is not only "useless but pernicious."

54. I cannot admit that the simplicity of the Account Current system is a "simplicity tending to accuracy," for, undoubtedly it is quite the reverse. The Journal was introduced because the omission of such a book as the Journal did *not* tend to accuracy.

55. The Accountant General to the Government India here *presumes* that the Accountant General to the Bombay Government has given his concurrence to superseding the Journal and Ledger system by the Bengal system. This may be so: but I have no other information of it. There was nothing in his letter to the Accountant to the Government of Bengal of the 4th October 1855, to indicate any wavering of opinion. In para. 22 of that letter he said "I view the Bombay "system of Account as very com- "plete and efficient. It is some- "what defective in details an im- "perfection which I am attempt- "ing to remedy" and he closes the para. by saying when he had done what he wished to do, "there will be little to complain "of in regard to the Accounts of "this Presidency," see also paras. 19 to 22, extracted in my explanation opposite to para. 11 of this Memorandum. My reliance on the excellency of the Madras system is not because it is my own, i. e. the Madras system. I accept it as the one best system from my being long conversant with Accounts, and thus being able to judge whether it be good—just as a man well acquainted with horses, knows a good horse when he sees it. He knows what points to look for—If I could bring myself to believe that the Bengal system was the superior one, I would bow with all humility, and not pen a word against it. It is because, after an experience in the Accountant General's Office of 18 years, uninterrupted even by a month's absence on leave or from sickness, I am satisfied that

the system of double Entry by Journal and Ledger is unapproachably the superior for all Offices of account that I protest so vehemently against degradation to inferiority.

56. In a matter of this sort some regard should be had to the probabilities of the case. Which, most likely, will give the better judgment? the Officers in Bengal whose experience in the Financial line extends to no more than a very few years—one under five years (the Financial Secretary) the other (the Acct. General to the Government of India) under four years,—or the Officer in Madras whose experience is of more than 18 years. Again, the Officers in Bengal are conversant only with the Account Current system which does *not* include a knowledge of the Journal system—whilst the Officer in Madras has been dealing all this time with Accounts under the Journal system which includes the Account Current system.

57. Further, I still claim the Accountant General at Bombay as an advocate for the Journal system, seeing his opinion in favor of it, which I have just quoted, was very decided in 1855—and his experience is from January 1849—verging on nine years.

22. Adverting to para. 31, of the Report I have already shewn, that the comparison which it is sought to institute to the disadvantage of Bengal, by reference to the former and present form of Account in use at Madras, is altogether inapplicable, and I would beg the attention of Government to the annexed Memorandum A, shewing the Entry of a single transaction (taken from the Madras Journal) according to both the Madras and Bengal system, from which the relative simplicity and intelligibility of the two methods will be at once, I think, apparent, and which is equally manifest from comparison of the Madras tri-monthly, and the Bengal monthly forms of return of Cash balances, which are prescribed for precisely similar purposes.

23. The only other, but an important point which occurs to me in connection with the forms of Accounts submitted to the Accountant General's Office, is that of the comparative period necessary for their preparation. The Acct. General, Madras, states, that Journals can be furnished generally in about a fortnight, and he instances the Journal of the Sub Treasurer, whose accounts, he observes, are very voluminous. It is very difficult to institute any comparison in this respect between the two Presidencies, though I am not apprehensive that

58. I cannot myself see the superior simplicity and intelligibility of the Account Current entry over the transfer entry. To any one who understands the Journal system the transfer entry really expresses what is intended, whereas, the other pretends to do it, and vitiates the Account Current form in which there is no proper place for transfer entries. Of course transfer entries may be stuck in, but they are interpolations, the form not being open to them, whereas the Journal system has regular provision for transfer entries. The Bengal system, however, cuts the knot by omitting all correction by transfer entries, and thus leaves the subordinate Accounts inaccurate.

59. The remark I have to make on this para. is that I have no reason to shun the comparison. I do not believe, as I said before, para. 30, of my former Report of 29th November 1856, that there is any delay or defect innate in the Journal system beyond the delay or defect in the Account Current system.

the result would be other than favorable to our system. The transactions in the General Treasury (of which a Memorandum is given in the margins* for comparison with that entered at para. 26 of the report of the Accountant General, Madras,) are obtained *daily* in an Abstract form, and the Accounts are procured in original whenever required. The account of Civil charges, the only one regularly furnished by the Sub Treasurer, is usually received within one month, but if required earlier, which it is not, it could be rendered in a week. All other Treasury Accounts, including those of Oude, Hyderabad, and Nagpore, notwithstanding the many difficulties arising in

* 1854-55.

GENERAL TREASURY.	
Receipts in Cash per annum..... ...	9,96,24,916
Disbursements in Cash per annum.	12,37,42,093
Amount in Debits and Credits of Transfer entries..	4,19,24,332
Number of heads exhibited in his Account.....	80
Number of Cash Account pages for 1 year.....	1,200
Number of pages of the Cash Account of Civil charges	800
Number of Transfer Journal pages.	There is no separate Account of Transfers which are included in the same Account with Cash transactions.
Number of Journal folios.....	There is no separate Ledger.

60. I do not see what this is to the purpose—the purpose being to change the Accounts here, which are in the Journal system into the Account Current system, as an "*improvement.*" I deny the

new provinces from the inexperience of Officers and Clerks, may be stated generally to be *received* in in this Office within six weeks, (those of Indore arrive usually on the 25th of the month following that of the account,) and I question whether the Acct. General, Madras, could have attained similar results, and completed his adjustments and General Books within the usual time, if it had been necessary to provide for each of these new Treasuries' Officers and Clerks conversant with the mysteries of Book-keeping, and adepts at the intricacies of adjustments and complete sets of Books.

24. But it must be remembered also, that, when these Accounts have been rendered, the labors of the Subordinate Officers here have terminated, except as to occasional references for the explanation of errors and differences, and the work of final check and adjustment is *at once* commenced in the Accountant's Office. At Madras, on the other hand, besides the Monthly Journals and Returns to the Accountant General, each Officer must prepare for the Civil Auditor a Cash Account Current, supported by Vouchers, almost as extensive as the entire Treasury Accounts in Bengal; and it is, I apprehend, only after these have been checked by the Civil Auditor, and after the receipt of the Quarterly Returns, upon which the check in the Accountant General's Office of other Entries depends, that the final

improvement; and say that to make this change is merely to bring back a many years removed thing and *call* it an improvement. I am not asking the Accountant General to change his system. If he is satisfied with it, I am quite satisfied he should be so. All I am contending for is that he shall not induce a change here—a change, I think, *for the worse.*

61. True, they have terminated: too abruptly I think, for the Accounts are left inaccurate or as they stand in the first instance.

62. What used to be furnished to the Civil Auditor was a copy of the Journal in which the *charges* are entered: *now* the Journals received in this Office are sent to the Civil Auditor for audit of that portion which appertains to him. No separate Account at all is sent to him now.

63. The Entries in the General Books are taken from the Closing Entries of the Collectors, but when details are wanted for exhibition of distinct items under one head, then only such Abstracting becomes necessary: even then there is check, which there is not in the Account Current.

process can be commenced, and towards this again little appears to be gained from the submission of Monthly Journals beyond the form, since these must be again abstracted in the Accountant General's Office in order to the preparation of the General Journal. In addition then to the extra labor imposed upon Subordinate Officers, the Madras system must involve greater delay in the check and adjustment of the Accounts.

25. It is true, as stated by the Accountant General, (para. 25) that the Madras system has an apparent advantage in the earlier submission of the Financial Statements, of which a Comparative Memorandum is given in the margin, but this is only apparent, and is due not to a better system, but to the circumstance that the returns of the other Presidencies are despatched as soon as they can be framed from their regular Accounts, which are limited in number, while our Statements cannot be closed until after the receipts of theirs, upon which we depend for our State-

	Madras.	Bengal.
Sketch Estimate 1855-56.....	5th Sept. 1855	1st Oct. 1855.
Regular do.	2d Jan. 1856	1st Mar. 1856.
Receipts and Disbursements....	13th Dec. 1856	7th Feb. 1857.

64. What is gained, is more than mere form, accuracy is gained and freedom from liability to error.

65. This is what I do not admit. There *need* be no greater delay in the check and adjustment of the Accounts here than in Bengal, and, when I deny that there is greater delay, I point to the advantage Madras had over Bengal in the earlier transmission of the Actual Accounts for the year ending 30th April 1855, and which the Accountant General endeavours in vain to explain away in his next para.

66. I regret to find the Accountant General to the Government of India endeavouring to make it out that the "advantage" here alluded to is merely *apparent*. It is an undeniable palpable fact that the Madras Financial Statement for the year ending 30th April 1855, was before the House of Commons in the Session of 1856. I stated in para. 47, of my report, of 29th November 1856, that the other Presidencies' Actuals were not before the House. Only their Estimates had reached it. I closed that report by saying, that this fact shewed the system at Madras "is not at any rate defective as compared with the sytsems at the other Presidencies." The London *Times* noticed the fact and asked the pertinent question "Why should not Bombay and Bengal be just as forward with their Financial Statements as Madras."

ments of supplies, and our own Accounts, both in number and extent, and in the distance from which they are received, far exceed those of the other Presidencies.

67. The Accountant General will not admit that this precedence of Madras is due to a better system—But my averment that it was due to our better system cannot be over thrown by the fact here brought forward by the Accountant General—that the Bengal (it is not quite clear whether he means the Indian Government Accounts or the Bengal Accounts, I will assume the latter) statements *could not* be sent before the Accounts of the other Presidencies reached Calcutta.

68. The Indian Government Accounts could not, of course, be sent before the Accounts of the other Presidencies reached Calcutta since they comprise the results of the Accounts of the other Presidencies. What I adduced was the fact of the precedence of the Accounts of Madras over all the other Presidencies for that year.—Bengal not excepted: and this fact is not to be gainsaid. If the better system be not the cause of this precedence, I think it will be difficult for those who deny that cause to assign another, true, one. The Accountant General to the Government of India does not give the comparative dates (I suppose because the comparison would tell much more against Bengal) for the year ended 30th April 1855, which was the year I alluded to. But he brings forward the dates of the year ended 30th April 1856. Even that year however declares the Madras Financial Statement some 7 weeks in advance of Bengal—and, if the reason for Bengal being behindhand given by him—viz. that the

Bengal Statements cannot be closed until after the receipt of those of other Presidencies upon "which "we (Bengal) depend for our "statements of supplies"—be *the* reason, why, what does this admission go to prove, but the very fact, which I desire to bring prominently to notice, that the Bengal system *is* defective. It has, besides others, this one grand defect, as compared with that of Madras. *We* do not require to wait for the receipt of the supply Statements of other Presidencies. *We* have the materials at hand and work them up. Under the Madras system the Annual Statement can be closed without the help of such auxiliary statements from the other Presidencies—but not so under the Bengal system—see letter from the Accountant General to the Govt. of India noted below.* I entered into a full explanation of the method, adopted here, of preparing in this particular the Annual Statement at this Presidency in my Report to Government dated the 26th February, No. 386. In para. 8 thereof I recommended the adoption of the Madras system in preference to any other, in the event of a different practice obtaining elsewhere.

26. The third point is the system upon which Civil charges are audited: as already stated the essential difference in the Audit system in the two Presidencies is, that in Bengal the duties of the Civil Auditor are restricted to passing charges, in Madras they are extended to the work of check, i. e. to "satisfy

69. I would here beg reference to para. 35 of my Report of 29th November 1856. I have there shewn the rules passed in 1800, under which the Civil Auditor deals with *Charges*.

70. In *Bengal* the duties of the Civil Auditor are not, as here represented, to deal with *Charges*.

* Dated 8th February 1856, No. 2613, to the address of the Financial Secretary to the Government of India, received with that Functionary's letter to the Chief Secretary to Government at Madras of the 16th May 1856, No. 2341, communicated to me with Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 9th June 1856, No. 269.

himself that all charges are duly brought to Account and supported by audited vouchers," (para. 37.)

The Accountant General, Madras, goes on to say, that he would, not call this a double Audit, but a complete Audit, and in order

to maintain the correctness of his practice, he declares that the Military Auditor General, the Commissariat Auditor, Chief Engineer Public Works, do all not only pass charges, but also see that charges passed by them are brought to Account, and (in para. 40) he states it to be the duty of the Board of Revenue on the same principle "to see that all the demands of different sources of Revenue as settled annually are duly collected and brought to Account," and from all this he contends (para. 38)

that an exception should not be made in the case of the Audit of Civil charges by the Civil Auditor. But this argument does not lead to the conclusion that the Madras practice is correct or superior to that of Bengal; but

merely establishes the fact that whatever may be its worth, the practice is the practice of the Presidency. The question at

He only passes the *Bills*, as I have noticed elsewhere. The *Charges* are not "the Bills," but "the entries of the amounts of the Bills as charges" in the Accounts. If he be restricted to merely passing Bills he is altogether an Officer of lower degree, and less responsibility, having nothing to do with the Accounts.

71. Yes, I certainly do so consider it.

72. They pass the Bills and also see that the charges founded on those Bills are properly brought to Account. This shews that such is the system here in all branches. The Accountant General does not say how it is to Bengal, in respect to the Military and other Departments. I infer from his silence on this point that he cannot bring forward the practice in those Departments in support of his view.

73. Yes, why make the exception. If good for one Department, why not good for all.

74. I have this much of proof, that the Madras practice is correct. It has worked well for more than half a centry—a pretty sufficient proof of correctness I submit.

issue is whether, as in Bengal, the Civil Auditor and other responsible functionaries should be Auditors of charges, and the Accountant Auditor of Accounts, or whether, as in Madras, the latter duty should be divided between the Civil Auditor and other Officers, and the Accountant General; to my mind the

Bengal system is immeasurably the best, the Accountant General is, and I believe is intended to be, alone responsible for the adjustments upon the General Books, while the Civil Auditor

is confined to the work of passing bills under authority, and if he checks over charges in the various departments of the state, both establishments and contingencies, it would seem that he has quite

enough to do. The check to ascertain that charges entered in the Accounts have been duly audited, cannot be regarded as a completion of the process of audit, but is a distinct act to check the work of the Officer rendering the Account, and it seems not much more out of order, and opposed to the principles of check, for a disbursing Officer to audit his his own charges, than it is for

an Auditor do check the debits in account of the charges he has himself audited.

75. Unfortunately the "Auditor" in Bengal is merely a passer of *Bills* not auditor of *Charges*. The Accountant General—here calls the Accountant in Bengal Auditor of Accounts—exactly so—*he is* the Auditor—of the *Charges* in the Accounts—which in my opinion he ought *not* to be, in respect to those charges the Bills for which have been passed by the Civil Auditor and Military Auditor General.

76. Probably if he had as much experience in these matters as I have had, there would have been no difference of opinion between us.

77. So is the Accountant General at Madras, for all adjustments upon the General books.

78. But the Civil Auditor there does not see the *charges* at all as they stand in the Accounts.

79. The Auditor can also check the passed Bills with the entries of charge in Accounts with greater facility. This has been done for the last half century in Madras; with this difference, that he *passed* Bills *after* payment.

80. I cannot but think the Civil Auditor—if he is to be considered Auditor of Civil charges,—ought to audit the charges in the Journal, not merely perform the preliminary process of *passing* the *Bills*.

27. Two other points require a brief notice. The first is, the remark of the Accountant General, Madras, (para. 43) regarding the comparative quality of work done by his co-equal Assistants, or by subordinate Assistants in this Office. I do not quite understand the inference, intended to be drawn from the use of the terms co-equal and subordinate, my remark, which has perhaps been misunderstood, referred to Collectors at Bombay, who in matters of account are, I imagine as much subordinate to the Accountant General, as the Assistants in my Office are to me; and of the relative responsibility of different Officers is a matter of no moment to Government, there can be no reason why an Accountant General should receive a higher salary than his head Clerk. The co-equals, however, of the Accountant General at Madras can, it is obvious, no more "*do personally* all that they are by implication supposed to do," than can the Accountant General in Bengal, and consequently the subordinates of each stand in the same relation to him, as the subordinates of the Accountant General, Bengal, do

81. I must explain here that, by co-equal Assistants I meant the Military Auditor General.—The Civil Auditor.—The Commissariat Auditor—and others of equal standing: and I maintained that whatever (para. 43 and 44 of my Report of the 29th November 1855) assistance I derived from them was quite as valuable, to the State and to myself, and as reliable, as the assistance which the Accountant General in Bengal derived from the subordinate Officers in his own and other Offices of Account: and I remain of the same opinion.

to him : the question then arises, whether many circles of duty performed by subordinates acting under the authority of independent superintending powers, are so likely to work out uniform results, as if each circle sent in its crude materials to be elaborated under the direction of one controlling mind. Nor can any imputation possibly be made aganist the Accountant General, Bengal, in regard to *cooking accounts*. For, as he does not adjust his own disbursements, nor admit in account charges he has himself audited, as is done by Officers in Madras, his work is conducted with entire independence, and the only object he can have in view is accuracy of result.

82. The question is not unanswerable. Many circles of duty performed by subordinates possessing full local information acting under the authority of independent superintendents *will* work out better—uniformly better—results than if they were to be performed in one controlling Office. If the Accountant General be right, the settlements of the demand of Land Revenue now made by the Collectors in their respective Districts with the assistance of their subordinates, should not be made by them, but the crude materials of each circle should be sent to be elaborated under the direction of the Board of Revenue, the controlling authority in that respect.

83. The Accountant General seems to regard uniformity as *the* one thing to be sought. But it is possible to make things uniformly *worse* instead of uniformly *better*.

84. With regard to "imputation of cooking accounts"—what I mean is this. An Office where all the Accounts are condensed and brought into shape for publication—under a system where no Subordinate Account is left accurate to prove the Central Accounts correct—for the subordinate Accounts in Bengal are not corrected, the corrections being made only in the Central Office Accounts—I say, that such an Office, under such a system, is more liable to a charge of cooking Accounts i. e. making up the receipts and charges to suit each other, than the Madras Accountant General's Office ; where parts of the Accounts (the charges) are received, some from co-equal, and other parts from subordinate Officers. The Accounts of those Officers would shew, if referred to, whether the General, published, Accounts were or were not supported by the subordinate Accounts. In Bengal the subordinate, uncorrected, Accounts give no support whatever, of this nature, to the accounts of the superior Office.

28. The other question is, whether the Civil Auditor, or the Accountant General, should prepare Financial Statements and Returns ; under the Madras system, the Civil Auditor apparently has the means of preparing those returns, which he has not in Bengal. I find it difficult, however, to comprehend the precise working of a system, by which the transactions

85. Why lay such stress on the separation of the Cash Department from the Account Department? why require at the Presidency that one Office, the Accountant General's Office, shall give the order for payment, and another, the General Treasury, make the Cash payment—'but to prevent cookery of accounts and abstraction of cash.' I think it not unadvisable, on the same principle, that there *should* be the division of duty, which exists in Madras, i. e., that the Auditors should look to the charges, while the Accountant General settles, or looks to the settling of, advances, and all other multifarious transactions.

86. That it has worked well for upwards of half a century is very much in its favor at any rate.

of the same Treasury are subject to check and adjustment by two distinct Officers, i. e., Civil charges by the Civil Auditor, and Advances, Transfer, Supply, Deposit and Bill transactions by the Accountant General. It appears to me a work of sheer supererogation that charges once properly audited should be again submitted to the same Officer in the shape of a disbursement Statement; where indeed there is no pre-audit, or only occasional pre-audit, as in the Military or Commissariat Departments, the necessity for disbursement statements is obvious enough, but when pre-audits are the rule, that necessity has ceased to exist.

87. I beg reference to para. 41 to 46 of my Report of 29th November 1856, and also to my letter to Government dated 24th September 1856, No. 188, referred to in the 46 para. wherein I have clearly explained why the Financial Estimates furnished by the Auditors are preferable to those framed in the Accountant General's Office. The Auditors have ample and better means to frame them with nearest approximation to Actual results, because as Auditors, and controlling Authorities, of charges certain Registers and Memoranda are kept in their Offices for the purposes of their other duties which serve to assist them in compiling the Estimates and Comparative Statements and explanations of variations, usually furnished by them to the Accountant General's Office; and the furnishing of the Estimates to the Accountant Geneneral's Office in Madras from all Departments of the Service has been recognized under the distinct authority of the Honorable Court of Directors. * The question distinctly put forth in para. 45 of my letter of the 29th November 1856, as to whether the Estimates furnished to me by the *several* auditors and other heads of Departments thercin enumerated shall be continued to be furnished by them respectively, and shall the Accountant General's responsibility in these cases be admissible and

* *Vide para 74 of their Despatch dated 2d Novr. 1831, No. 9, communicated with letter from the Chief Secretary dated 22d May 1832.*

29. The proper sphere of a Civil Auditor's duties is the Check of Charges for Establishments and Contingencies, which are generally on a fixed scale and liable to little variation and for these, separate Estimate of probable expenditure are scarcely required by the Accountant; but, while the present system continues, it is probable that the Civil Auditor at Madras ought not to be relieved from the duty he has hitherto performed, without the full concurrence of the Accountant General.

fixed, has not been answered by the Accountant General to the Government of India; but from his stating in the following para. (29) that "while the present system continues, it is probable "that the Civil Auditor at Madras, ought not to be relieved "from the duty he has hitherto "performed without the full concurrence of the Accountant General," I conceive that he does not wish to direct his objections against the present practice in that respect.

88. Here it is admitted that the *proper sphere* of a Civil Auditor's "~~the~~ duties is the Check of *Charges* "for Establishments and Contin-"gencies." How can the *Check of Charges* be maintained if the Civil Auditor does not audit the *Charges* entered in Accounts? He may be styled then merely "passer of Bills." If the Charges under the cognizance of the Civil Auditor were generally on a fixed scale, and liable to little variation, as it is here represented they are, then scarcely could there be any necessity for the Civil Auditor passing the *Bills*. They could be checked in the Accountant General's Office at once, no excess beyond the *fixed scale* in total being allowed with reference to the amount in the previous years Accounts.

89. I give here a few instances of large variations and explanations afforded by the Civil Auditor in his Estimate for 1856-57, to shew how much more the matter appertains to the Civil Auditor than to the Accountant General.

Extract from the Civil Auditor's Estimate.

Heads of Charges.	Actual of 1855-56.	Regular Estimate of 1856-57.	Increase of Estimate.	Decrease of Estimate.	Remarks or explanation of the causes of variation.
SALARIES of the MEMBERS of COUNCIL.					
Two Councillors' Salaries.	1,17,201	1,28,000	10,799	....	The actual charges contain the full salary of the Honorable W. Elliot, only for 5 months and 24 days, and a moiety for 6 months and 6 days, the result of his leave of absence, and the arrears of salary paid in Bengal to the Honorable D. Elliott for May and the 1st and 2d June 1854, which were adjusted in 1855-56.
ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.					
Scotch Chaplains	22,099	11,760	....	10,339	The Actual charges contain the advance of the Revd. Mr. Macfarlane's absentee allowance for 2½ months of the year 1856-57—but do not contain this Gentleman's salary for December 1855, which cannot be traced in the Public Accounts up to May 1856. The Estimate contains the salary of the Senior Chaplain only as Mr. Macfarlane's absence will extend beyond the year of the Estimate.
Roman Catholic Clergymen	15,748	30,600	14,852	....	The Estimate is calculated on the revised and higher scale of Salary lately authorized by the Government of India.

Extract from the Civil Auditor's Estimate, *continued.*

Heads of Charges.	Actual of 1855-56.	Regular Estimate of 1856-57.	Increase of Estimate.	Decrease of Estimate.	Remarks or explanation of the causes of variation.
JUDICIAL.					
Salary of the Advocate General.....	26,250	3,881	....	22,369	The Estimate includes the full salary of the Office up to 24th May 1856, the date Mr. Smyth embarked for England—as the Goverment has ordered no acting arrangement to be made during Mr. Smyth's absence and his absentee allowance is paid in England, no payment will be made for the remaining portion of the year 1856-57.
Salaries of the Judges' of the Sudr Udalut.	1,43,638	85,033	....	58,605	The Actual charges contain the Absentee allowance of Mr. Morehead for one month and a few days, while the Estimate includes the full salary of Mr. Hooper, for the whole year, of Mr. Morehead for 4 months, and Mr. Strange's for 28 days, and the absentee allowances of the two latter Gentlemen for the remaining period, which are paid in India.
BOARD of REVENUE.					
Deputation allowance of the 1st Member as Commissioner of Northern Circars.	13,000	3,000	....	10,000	The Estimate contains the Deputation allowance only for three months, or up to the period of the revocation of the Commission appointed for the Northern Circars.

30. Generally speaking, however, the Accountant General having the complete Accounts from all Departments in his own hands, should possess the most comprehensive view of the whole of the transactions of the Presidency, and although he must necessarily be furnished with Subsidiary Statements from other Departments and Offices to aid him in his operations, he is, in my opinion, the Officer best qualified to prepare these returns in a satisfactory manner; and looking to his position, and the scale of remuneration attached to his Office, it is to him undoubtedly that the Government have a right to look for the most accurate Estimates of their financial operation.

90. Yes, this is the case. The Estimates and other Returns furnished by local and other Officers and Auditors in the several branches of the Service are examined and scrutinized in the Accountant General's Office, and any further information, or explanations required are called for and obtained from them, and errors rectified in communication with furnishers of Estimates. The Government and the higher Authorities look to the Accountant General for accurate Estimates, and he turns for assistance in this matter to the local Officers. He is answerable for accuracy, but there are cases which are beyond the reach of the Accountant General's Office in respect to accuracy and which appear to be lost sight of by the Accountant General to the Government of India. For instance; the Revenue collections in the Districts are estimated by Collectors on the best possible data before them, and so also are the receipts in the Commissariat Departments &c. the outlay for Public Works, advances for Railway operations, Electric Telegraph &c. by distinct Officers. Can the Accountant General revise their Estimates, and has he the means of so doing, or can he attempt to explain causes of variations between the Estimates and the Actual results thereof, without obtaining them from the framers of the respective Estimates? Is it not evident that the local or other Officers concerned are alone competent to frame Estimates in their respective branches and afford explanations of causes of variations with proper degree of precision? though I do not deny, as already observed, that the Acct. General checks and controls them before they are introduced or consolidated into one General Estimate or Return.

29

31. In conclusion, I would refer to the practical result of the two Systems in reference to the relative cost of Establishments. I am not quite sure if I correctly state the number of Treasuries in Madras at 24, exclusive of the General Treasury, but believing this to be so, and taking the Establishments as given the Books of the Civil Auditor's for 1855-56, I would solicit attention to the Memorandum given in the margin* of the expense of the Offices of Account and Audit in India, Bengal and Ma-

* 1855-56.	India.		Bengal.		Madras.	
	No.	Rs.	No.	Rs.	No.	Rs.
Accountant General...	1	3,500	1	3,000	1	3,877
1st Assistant...	0	0	0	0	1	850
2d Assistant...	1	1,000	0	0	1	700
Clerks 100 Rs. and upwards.....	6	2,520	16	3,010	17	2,605
Other Clerks including servants.....	161	4,604	173	4,674	161	4,136
Total....	169	11,624	190	10,684	180	12,168
Military Department Accountant's Office, Deputy Accountant General.....	0	0	0	0	1	2,429
1st Assistant.....	1	1,500	0	0	0	0
Clerks 100 Rs. and upwards...	8	1,968	0	0	3	330
Other Clerks and servants.....	96	2,722	0	0	46	1,595
Total.....	105	6,190	0	0	50	4,354
Civil Auditor excluding personal allowance in India and Bengal, of Rs. 500 Rs. per month.....	½	1,250	½	1,250	1	1,008
Clerks 100 Rs. and upwards.....	5½	977	5½	978	6	960
Other Clerks and servants.....	64	1,586	64	1,585	63	1,857
Total.....	70	3,813	70	3,813	70	3,825
Grand Total...	344	21,627	260	14,497	300	20,347
Collectorate Treasury Establishments....	43	8,002	53	6,615	22	5,941
Grand Total...	.....	29,629	.....	21,112	.....	26,288

CIVIL. * 1856-57.	Recipts Rupees.	Charges Rupees.
India exclusive of Interest.....	2,53,41,714	2,17,87,983
Bengal.....	10,78,12,110	3,64,98,748
Total.....	13,31,53,824	5,82,86,731
Madras.....	5,16,13,430	2,04,74,930

dras, including the Treasury Establishments of the local Offices, but excluding the Loan Department herewith, which Madras has little in common, and also the General Treasuries at Madras and Calcutta. The Audit Office here being undivided, has been entered in equal amount under India and Bengal.

MILITARY 1856-57.	Receipts. Rupees.	Charges Rupees.
India	13,70,200	5,41,99,008
Madras	2,92,800	3,10,70,900
TOTAL.		
India and Bengal	13,45,24,024	11,24,85,734
Madras	5,19,00,230	6,15,46,850

32. From the Statement here given it will be observed, that with an aggregate of receipts and charges amounting to Rupees 24,70,09,758, and with 96 subordinate Treasuries, the total cost of our Offices of Accounts and Audit, is Rupees 59,741: whereas in Madras, with an aggregate of Receipts and Charges of Rupees 11,30,91,077, and only 24 subordinate Treasuries, the cost is Rupees 26,288. The average cost of the local Treasury Establishments is given in the margin* this is exclusive of head Clerks and Accountants, whom I have omitted from a difficulty in ascertaining the correct amount under the Government of India, but in Bengal these cost Rupees 3,968 in 51 Collectorates, in Madras they cost Rupees 2,445, in 20 Collectorates, and if we apply the Madras average of Treasury Establishments, Rupees 270, to the 96 Treasuries under India and Bengal, the additional expense involved would be Rupees 11,470 per mensem, or 1,37,640 per annum, irrespective of the charge for a higher class of Accountants; while from the relative scale of charge it does not appear probable that any reduction could be effected in the Offices at head quarters, since with very much lighter duties the cost of the present Offices of Account and audit at Madras, is Rupees 20,347 per month, against Rupees 21,627, under the Government of India, and Rupees 14,497, under the Government of Bengal.

*India... Rs. 186
Bengal. „ 125
Madras. „ 270

91. These figures are altogether so inaccurate that they can lead to no fair conclusion.

33. I have now completed my review of the questions submitted for my report, and however, imperfectly I may have treated a complicated and difficult subject, I trust that I have adduced enough to satisfy the Right Honorable the Governor General in Council, that the Bengal system of Account and audit is neither erroneous nor defective in its principles or practice, and that, while it is superior to those of the other Presidencies in simplicity of form and facility of check, in economy of labour and of cost, it is in no degree inferior in the despatch

92. I think I have shewn that the statement contained in this para., 33, is to be taken with qualification—that it is not indisputable. I have pointed out that the Bengal system, in which there is no *Journal*, is, therefore, if on no other account, peculiarly liable to error. I have indicated that in Bengal the Civil Auditor who is supposed to audit all the *charges* never sees one of the *charges*, for he only passes the Bills—whether those Bills come into the Accounts at all *he* never knows. I have been unable to discover any superiority whatever in the A. C. system—over the Journal system in facility of check or adjustment.

with which its operations are performed, or in any other requisite, which, if uniformity of system be desirable, would appear to recommend it for general adoption.

If the Bengal system is more simple, it is simply unsound, by reason of the omission of the Journal, *as a system*. It has no way the advantage of Madras in economy of labor, the distribution only of the labor being different, not better. As far as accurate figures have yet been given there is nothing to prove that the Bengal system is cheaper—(I fear much that the result of the change will be on the whole an increase, rather than diminution, of charge) —Madras, commercially speaking, certainly gets a better—a more finished—article for her money—all her Accounts in every Office being kept accurate from year to year, whereas, one only, Central, Account is so in Bengal. Hence, and because the charges as well as the receipts are in the Accountant General's hands *alone*, the Bengal system is undoubtedly open to the imputation, from evil disposed persons, of cookery of Accounts. And I have proved that the Madras Annual Statements—which are the Accounts, which the Honorable Court of Directors, and the House of Commons, particularly desire to have before them with early punctuality—have been more expeditiously prepared and dispatched from Madras than from Bengal, owing to a more perfect system.

J. R. Kindersley

Accountant General.

Fort St George
Acct Gen'l Office
28th Sept 1859

Printed by S. Casavooloo Naidoo, Supt. of the Accountant General's Office Press.

The Secretary to Govt. the Court of Directors desire to know the nature of the Taxes, being the introduction of certain Taxes of Account, wh. were in universal use in the Presidency some years ago, & the Accountant General drawing attention to the old system can be effected without the slightest inconvenience, the Court have only to observe that the four years appear to be sufficient for the purpose

Both are here known & explained

That the Changes contemplated in the Letter of the Financial Sec. to the Govt of India may be carried out, the objections to which are stated by the Accountant General of the Presidency have been fully considered.

As far as I can gather from the letter of the Accountant General to the Govt of India dated 23 April 1857, that officer expressedly admits the superiority of the Calcutta method of Bank keeping

double entry

double entry check has been universally
adopted in all offices of account whether
public or private alike, but he
considers that a simpler form of audit
could be used for the subordinate departments in India & that
follows that local officers should
be required to keep their accounts
according to this form.

It does not appear whether the
same form that he made applicable to
the Accountant Genl's office also. but
I conclude not.

The reason given for the change
is that the accounts are confused by the
simple transactions of Bazar, embracing
simply Rs. & ~~Pay~~ disbursements &
as such resembling the business of a Bank

Establishment than any thing else.
Each however can hardly be studied
a correct description of a collectors Business
tions in matters of account under
their Presidency. In Bengal perhaps the
case may be different & I have always
understood that collectors there had little
else to attend to than the management
of their Estates. But here their accounts
transactions are of a very varied & miscellaneous
description, including running accounts with
individuals for purchases, advances,
&c &c

I have assumed, that all the
~~receipts~~ the Account Current & subordinate
Officers, the Books of the Sub Treasury would
continue to be kept, after the mode approved
by the Journal & Ledger
of this Department be corrected &

with be found to facilitate the business of the
principal office in the duty of abstracting &
amalgamating the accts to be conducted from
returns prepared on a system common to each
than by inducing Bills to pass different forms.

Mr Pendergast has shown that the existing
mode of keeping Mopusil accounts has for many
years been carried on with perfect ease, that
no difficulty occurs in finding properly qualified
Clerks & accountants & that the local officers
Generally prefer a preference for the
former system.

The objection therefore urged from the difficulty
of finding substitute agents to give effect to the
plan has not been found to exist in practice

The Act Sol. has also stated that the accounts
of the Presidency to the Indian House & Board of Control
for the years ending 30 April 1859 were in arrear
of date received from any other part of India
that for 1856 were in no respect behind.

It does not appear therefore that the practice
prevailing here can be charged with causing

delay.

Until the system has met with the approval of the Home Authorities for a series of years or rather has been introduced expressly at the instance of the Court of Directors in a spirit of anxiety to have accounts rendered the most perfect the innovation so made desired & has been found to work satisfactorily in every respect

save from the results of the
accounts from which the change is
to be ascertained before deciding on
the adoption of a retrograde measure.

The Letter of the Govt of India also touches on the
work of Superintendence the duties of the
Auditor

Audit Office & presented Compliments
to the acting Secretary to Board.

In his Lordship's observe that
the accuracy of charges in much more
widely practised under the System of
Piece-work than under the Plan
are checked & their Examiners
of the Details of the Expenditure
they belong Plan of the whole
of this Department the Increase on the
Establishment in the Expenditure
the Financial control of the Audit
Means of the whole Practice of the
in my Opinion be advantageously pro

from all business of detail

6/10/7

Walter Niles

36

Financial Letter to England
1st December No 25 of 1857

Para 26.

Financial 1857 Despatch

Minute

by the Honorable Walter
Elliot Esquire

dated 8th October 1857.

Bo Nos 618 1859

No 613

Observations
on a letter from the
Accountant General
Relative to the extra Deduction in his offices of the
Bengal System of
Accounts.

14

37

time of the assumption of the
Government be examined.

I think the change in the
Regulation - not advisable
because it will cause
the introduction of an
inferior system into the
Land as we appear from
the Acct Genl's remarks
both the Bombay Madras
Acct also because it will

the greater long break
in the accountant Genl's

must before be made a change
is made - & an universal
legislation for the Empire
adopted.

The only point on which the opinion
of this Court is required by the Lords Justices
in their C. of. Authorities letter of
the 21 Sept. in 3440. is - whether "the
Act known" the Code of Fort St George in
Council should touch to have been
given (that is whether given by the Legislature
but Governor) but upon a perusal
it is plain different to suppose any
such to be a question of this nature.
This Code must be guided by reasons
by the opinion of the Government Council -

Mr Prendergast appears to think that there will be no difficulty in adopting the Bengal system - & if his description of the nature of the accounts is correct - there certainly should be none - with persons conversant with book-keeping - as the officers of his dept are supposed to be -

That the proposition of the Supreme Govt here is a slightly more comprehensive character - & that it was intended by a deputation to examine the merits of the two systems of accounts - under discussion - seems

from him manner he met that proposal. because I am fully imbued with the best confidence of a thoroughly correct system of accounts - & of the rapidity & ease of investigation upon the operation & merits of different systems can be fully tested - & rightly appreciated -

The Commissioners Journal are respectfully transferred to the Supervisory Board of this system - & subsequently their opinion thereon -

Fort William - 5th June 1833

that the Upper should fall to the ground
& that the Madras system should be
superseded by that of Bengal.

But there appears some other question
which might have been considered & which
has hardly come under discussion - & that
is - whether these systems are based on the
same or different principles - if the same
the similar conclusion must be come to -
& the Bengal system should be adopted
only if different - it would be a question
as to the comparative correctness of the principles involved

Mr Pinkerton suggests that the
Madras accounts are kept on the
double entry principle - & that those
of Bengal are not - & he appears to
think the change - to have one uni-
form Principle is wanted - as also to
provide room - & more space on the
foolscap note paper -

It is nothing clear from the com-
munications issued - whether the
Bengal system appears to be based
on the Madras method or not - &

have in my estimation would be always
of some investigation should in this main
of the inquiries made.

For I suppose that it will be allowed
here without hesitation that the standard
or double entry method contains the
only correct principle by which accounts
of accounts & a system which expenditure
can be maintained.

It has been adopted in France & in
England with entire success & has been
found as such entitled to national as to

commercial accounts.

Previous reading the testimony of
that able financier Sir Stafford Northcote as
introduction is attended by a doubt of ex-
pense - in his observations on Army
accounts. he states - "Expenditure has fully
trebled: that in all instances where de-
double entry system has been substituted
for any other system of accounts it has
always been attended with a large de-
duction in the expense of account keep-
ing - this has been the case in my office -

the quantity of clerk's work has been very much diminished & the establishment considerably reduced - the attention shd. be directed to the diffusion of Economy in keeping accounts between the old Office systems - & the double Entry system shd. be to think. that with proper management of the change from one system to another - a saving could be made of at least one fourth of the Expence now incurred in keeping the whole of the public accounts."

Upon this high authority - it may then be pronounced - that not only is an Economy obtained but that an actual saving of one fourth of establishments may be gained.

To me it is a matter of indifference whether the Bengal or Madras plans are adopted - but it is - in my opinion - most important - that - if there be one invariably acknowledged correct principle on which the systems of accounts shd. be based - that that principle should be adopted for the accounts of this vast Empire - at the expence of abandoning both the systems, about alluded to - if

Very Rare no count Saunders -

Stamps

Bk - 3/67

I owe ya

Lt. Gen

Dispd 27th by Secy England

Duplicate copy Dispd 29th

145

Fin: Dept.

No. 679.

C. H. Cushington Esqre
Secy to the Govt of India

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 21st Augt Cash No 3440, ~~on the subject of offering~~ declaring the Judge / that the Bengal system of Account should be introduced into the Presidency, & offering to send down if necessary, some Officers to explain that ~~Mayor~~ Account & Audit system accurately & practically -

2— Explanation was also asked for regarding an observation made by the Accountant General at Madras that the Collectors & Magistrates had found the burthen of their Work increased by the introduction of the Pre-Audit system -

3— The whole subject has undergone the careful consideration of this Govt & I am now directed to forward for the information of the Govr Genl in C the ~~Govt~~ Report noted in the margin -

Letter from Mr. G. L. Prendergast. the acct Genl & 28 Sept. Mem. on which accompanied above letter -
Minute of the Rt Hon Lord Harris 3 Oct 1857
Do of the Hon Mr. Elliot 5 Oct 1857
8 Oct 1857

Fin: Dept. Memorial 1857 Sept.

Minute

by the Rt Hon. the Governor in Council

Recorded in Sec. to Govt. Gen. Dept. Gen. Chief

dated 3rd October 1857

Pam 20

Examined & Letter to Govt. dated 21 Sept 1857

No. 678
Sec. 679

Secy Govt.

13

Copy of Minute on a Letter from Mr. Secretary Prendergast to the address of the Hon. Mr. Elliot

Bengal Secretariat

4- From these papers it will be seen that no difficulty is anticipated in introducing the Bengal System of Account, should the measure be resolved upon, and that it will not be necessary to send Officers from Calcutta to give instruction in it. Doubt is however still felt as to whether the Bengal System being advantageous than that which has been followed for many years past in the Proceedings with the Sanction of the Home Authorities, and it is for the Govt of India to decide whether the change is to be made at once, or whether further enquiries are to be first made & the wishes of the Hon'ble the Court of Directors consulted, in consequence of the Accountant General at Calcutta & here expressing such different views. - The Govt attaches the greatest value to a well ordered system of Accounts, & its only desire is that that System which is really the most correct & practical should be adopted -

5- The required explanation regarding the proposed System is given in Pts 4 & 5 of the Accountant General's letter now forwarded. -

In 18 Para of Desp

Financial Dept

No 678

46

Read a Min of Council dated 27 October 1857

Read the following papers

Read again Letter from Mr Larkin Sec to Govt of India dated 21 Augt 1857 -

Read also Do from Accountant General dated 28 Sept with Minute of the Rt Honble the President in Council dated 13th & the Hon'ble Mr W. Grant dated 8th Oct 1857

Resolved that copies of the above papers be forwarded to the Govt of India with the following Letter.

Sent

Dispd 2d Nov

Financial 1857 Depart^t

12 — 11

No 1757.

To
The Secy. & the Court of
Exhibitors
Dated October 1857

Finance — Letter to Complainants
1st December No 24 of 1857.

Pam 26.

12 — 16

In Ch. & Com. 24 vol.

Financial 1857 Dep^t

No 6758

Extract. Minutes of Court

Dated 27 October 1857