

Financial (1896) Dep.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 40

Dated 17-1-98

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing order on
the period. Return of sanctions ac-
cording to the Police under art.
1093 of the C. S. Regulations during
1896 and the first half of 1897

Financial (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 3163



From

M. HAMMICK, ESQUIRE, I.C.S.,
Inspector-General of Police,
Madras.

(Through A.G.)
No. 3390.

Dated 18 September 1897.

Received 8-10-97

Registered 9-10-97

Enclosures one and enc 3163
sent ref.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting revised return of
sanctions accorded for charges for
conveyances by rail or camp equip-
ment and horses under Article 1095
C.S.R. in the form prescribed in G.
O. No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June
1897.

C.A.
11.10.97

Order
Memo only.

The Board of Rev., and the Supt. Madras
Survey are requested to expedite the return
of Sanctions under art. 1095 C.S.R. called for
in para. 2 of G.O. 435 dated 2-6-97.

To
The B. of Rev. (A.R.)
" (Rev. & Lt. Col. R. S. R.)
" (S.R.)
Supt. Madras Survey.

OK PAPERS.

Date. G.O. No.

FURTHER PAPER.

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

67/98

செப்பனிருபவர் பெயர்

செப்பனிருவதற்காக எடுத்த
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள்

செப்பனிரு முடிந்த நாள்

சுப்பிரகாசம்
கு.பா.பம்

ஆர்.யு.சி
உதவியாள்
கையொப்பம்

10/96

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date
<i>Print St.</i>	435	<i>72</i>	2-6-97
"	272	"	26-3-97
"	51	"	20-1-97
"	320	"	8-5-96
"	647	"	3-7-95
"	695	<i>72</i>	18-8-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

No. O-49.

DEPARTMENT.

No. 3390.

FROM

M. HAMMIG. 72.C.S., E

INSPECTOR-G

OF POLICE,

Madras,



CURRENT NO 3163

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

MADE

18 September 1897.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
The Accountant-General,
through

Fort St. George

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference

2nd June 1897 calling

Police officers sent

G. O. No. 435.

of road in 1896 I marched

fresh return

up in the form the may their tents and horses

have the honor

2.

who is bound

always have

Quarters.

General see

of a horse when the form laid down by the

than one day in to imply that an officer

be a mistake. Furen at head quarters

inapplicable to the camp. As

that an officer has rather

when on tour on arrival

ently objection is to

equipment by rail

long enough for his

But clearly he requires

cannot wait for it to

regards horses. An officer

may halt and often does halt.

financial, dated

cases in which

by rail instead

return drawn

With reference

G. O. No. 435.

fresh return

their tents and horses

the honor

described.

who is bound

always have

Quarters.

General see

of a horse when the form laid down by the

than one day in to imply that an officer

be a mistake. Furen at head quarters

inapplicable to the camp. As

that an officer has rather

when on tour on arrival

ently objection is to

equipment by rail

long enough for his

But clearly he requires

cannot wait for it to

regards horses. An officer

may halt and often does halt.

financial, dated

cases in which

by rail instead

return drawn

With reference

G. O. No. 435.

fresh return

their tents and horses

station for a week when our investigating into a crime. This investigation may take several miles every day away from his camp, and then he not proceed on tour again for a week, he is riding and must every day to get his work done properly. Police officers are compelled to keep horses and it seems only reasonable to allow them to carry their horses as often as possible with them.

Again, as regards transport from one head-quarter station to another, a police officer may not on arrival at his station go into camp for days during which time his balance demands perhaps a road from his former station to a new one, or of a serious crime or a disaster, at any moment, and then, if he is needed, he is useless. Even at head-quarters, the need of his animals, if he is with him, is not every morning, checking his reserve and many cases has been known to occur.

He should be allowed to march more than on his own men's lines, driving his horses better performed on his own lines and would be able to march 20 miles a day to a limit of thirty miles some time or even forty miles (a horse can do that limit) and has no need to ride down the limit of 50 to carry his horses when he halts for a short time. But on a bona fide tour of duty, the Police, that is, the Police, should be allowed most officers object as to the limit and would sooner march 50 miles than 30.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt. servant,

Yours

Charles Johnston

For Inspector-General of Police.

Fort Saint George, 740
Accountant General's Office
7 October 1897

N. 3100

1. Forwaded to Government.
2. The form in question was drawn up to include such particulars as would furnish some criterion in each case as to the necessity for the charge and thus enable this office to call attention to any charge of doubtful propriety. Government can then determine whether any special circumstances existed or were likely to arise and would justify the charge.

The Inspector General of Police takes exception to ^{certain} objections which he considers the Form implies. It is observed however that the objections apply equally in the case of officers of the Revenue Department. The Form is a general one applying to all Departments and does not seem to need any modification. The question of passing each charge is an administrative one and is decided by Government on its merits.

W. Manion

Offg Accountant General

To The Chief Secretary to Government
Financial Department.

[G.O.]
25
1,000 - 22-11-07.

~~HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.~~

~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.~~

~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

X
Encl. 1 to C.No.3163.

Encl. 1 to C.No.3163.

Financial DEPARTMENT

C. No. 3163
from Inspector General of Police
through the Accountant-General.

SUBJECT.

Sanctions under Art.1093, C.S.R.

FOR ORDERS.

The Inspector-General of Police submits, with reference to paragraphs 2 and 5 of G.O.No.435 Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, a revised return of cases in which Police officers ~~went~~ ^{received from Govt} tents and horses by rail ~~instead of by road~~ ^{under S 1093, C.S.R.} during 1896 and part of 1897. The G.O. is based on the Hon'ble Members' instructions contained in the note flagged

2. Of the 157 cases shown in the return, about 84 are those of officers whose camp equipment or horses, had they been sent by road from the old stations, would have arrived at the new stations to which the officers proceeded by rail, before they started on tour from the latter stations, the interval between the time required for sending camp equipment or horses by road and that actually taken by the officers who travelled by rail including halts, being from 1 to 5 days in the case of 52 officers, from 6 to 10 days in the case of 14 officers and in excess of 10 days in the case of

10
18 officers. These intervals are indicated by the minus sign placed before them in column 17 of the return. The reason assigned by most of the officers for not sending their camp equipment or horses by road is that they were required immediately before leaving the old and after arriving at the new stations.

3. Some officers merely state that their camp equipment or horses had to be kept in readiness to enable them to attend to emergent calls of duty at a moment's notice. The following are typical cases: No. 22 (Mr. N. E. Q. Mainwaring), 34 (Mr. T. W. Lushington), 44 (Mr. T. G. Young), 52 (Mr. A. P. Agar), 66 (Mr. C. G. W. Clogstoun), 67 (Mr. W. Macartney), 71 (Mr. P. P. Sweeting), 72 (Mr. L. G. Arbuthnot), 85 (Mr. A. P. Agar), 102 (Mr. R. M. Powell), 121 (Mr. A. Clark), 125 (Mr. E. S. P. Stevenson), 128 (Mr. P. P. Sweeting), 131 (Mr. T. G. Young), 143 (Mr. P. P. Sweeting), 144 (Mr. E. S. P. Stevenson), 147 (Mr. T. E. Thomas), 155 (Mr. G. F. Hunt) and 156 (Mr. P. S. Strinivasa Charlu).

4. The Inspector-General contends that the form prescribed by the Accountant-General and approved of by Government is inapplicable to Police officers; that a Police officer requires his camp equipment on arrival at a new station and cannot wait for it to come up to him by road; that horses are necessary at head-quarters for enabling the Police officers to check beats, inspect their men's lines, drill their reserve &c and that they cannot be dispensed with during tours, as they may be required at any moment in connection

x C.No.3163

G.O.435 Finl. dated
2nd June 1897
(para 1)

A B

11
with a serious crime or disturbance.

5. The Accountant-General states that the objections urged by the Inspector-General apply equally in the case of the Revenue Department; that the form prescribed by him does not require any modification, and that the question of passing each charge must be decided by Government on its merits.

6. The above is a brief summary of the contents of the return, and before proceeding further it will be useful to recount the principal rulings in regard to art: 1093 of the G.S.R. which have recently issued.

7. In paragraph 1 of Govt. of India Fin. & Com. dept. resolution No. 1603 Ex d/ 10th April 1896, it was pointed out that it was not the intention that officers should, when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled in addition to travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipment at Govt. expense, even when the nature of their duties requires them to maintain horses or camp equipment. The rule was, it was explained, intended to meet the more or less exceptional case of an officer requiring, for the discharge of his official duties, to make use of his horses or camp equipment in one place immediately or very shortly after having had to use them in the public service in another place, and who is therefore obliged in the interests of the public service to convey them by rail or

steamer. It is only therefore when it can be shown that public interests would suffer if an officer sent on his horses or camp equipment by road or country cart, or (in cases of distant transfers) if he sold and replaced them, instead of despatching them by the quickest means at his command, that the cost of their conveyance by rail or steamer should be sanctioned.

8. In para 3 of Fin. & Com. dept.

letter No. 5453 Ex., d/ 29th Decr. 1896,

it was explained that the expression

"interests of the public service" in-

cludes the economy of an officer's time;

that there ~~is~~ no objection to the ap-

plication of art:1093 of the C.S.R.

to cases in which the Local Govt. con-

siders that the conveyance of camp equip-

ment or horses by rail will serve the

public interests by enabling an offi-

cer to do more work than he otherwise

would in a given time; and that the

only question which should be consider-

ed in deciding such matters is whether

the allowances admissible under rule

do or do not reasonably cover the ex-

penditure necessary to meet such tra-

velling as is required in the interests

of the public service, the assumption

being that the expenditure will be

kept on the most moderate scale that

forethought and arrangement can secure.

9. In paragraph 3 of this

Govt's order No. 272, Finl., d/26th

March 1897, the general conditions re-

page 2 of G.O. No. 51 Finl., d/
20th Jany. 1897

para 4 of the resolⁿ

XXIV

required under art: 1093 were set forth and it was explained that where economy of an officer's time is involved, there can be no ~~doubt~~ difficulty in deciding that transport by rail (or ~~by~~ steamer) of horses and camp equipment is neces- sary in the interests of the public ser- vice; for example, ^{or} when an officer, while on tour, finds that his duty ~~requires~~ requires him to move to a new camp at such a distance that if he travels by road he must halt on the journey ~~on~~ the journey at places where he has no work, while to travel by rail himself, parting from his horses and camp equip- ment and sending them by road, would involve a waste of time at one or other of the camps, ⁽²⁾ or when the cost to Govt. would be less if horses and camp equipment were forwarded by rail ~~than~~ and if they were sent by road. In re- gard to the case of officers starting from and arriving at their headquarters, it was laid down that, except in special emergencies, the cost of the transport of horses by rail on a journey of less than 30 miles to or from head-quarters should not be admitted, while the transport of camp equipment under simi- lar circumstances at the public ex- pense should only be admitted where a saving to Govt. in the cost of the journey is effected.

10. At this length of time, and in view of the fact that the sanctions comprised

comprised in the present return have been accorded by competent authority, the Inspector-General in this instance, it is submitted that recoveries of amounts incorrectly drawn is not possible.

The following detailed examination of the first fifty items in the return is, however, submitted, ^{as} showing how the ~~rules have been~~ read by the Inspector-Genl.

Such of the items as are ticked off with a green chalk mark in column 18 appear in order. The doubtful ones are dealt with below seriatim and are marked with a green chalk cross in the column:—

No. 2 Mr. Hasted, Supt. of Police, Kistna. The doubtful items here are the first two, but they relate to carriage of camp equipment and Mr. Hasted was apparently on tour and the charge therefore appears to be admissible.

No. 4 Mr. H.G. Prendergast, Supt. of Police, Kurnool. The same remark applies here also and to the case of

No. 5 Mr. Mainwaring

No. 6 Mr. Macartney, Supt. of Police, Cuddapah. It is not clear here why the camp equipment ~~at all events~~, if not ^{the} horses, could not have been sent on a few days earlier.

No. 10 Mr. J.E. Sandell, 12 Mr. J.E. David, 18 Mr. F.A. Dene, 21 Mr. E.M. Owell, 23 Mr. C.B. Leggatt and 25 Mr. ^{are} are all cases of officers who were reimbursed the cost of carriage of horses

Quite so. But it is not so much a question as to the possibility or propriety of recovering the amounts as of the way in which the I.G. has made use of the power delegated to him. ~~the~~ The cases

therefor in which he ~~ought~~ to have exercised the power with laxity should be pointed out for his information & future guidance.

The ~~quest for~~ conveyance from Bapatla to Eluru could have been done by road. Of course - He might have sent his things ~~in advance~~. ~~By~~

HA. ~~By~~

In 10 & 12 the officers did not know beforehand they would be wanted 10/2/18. 21, 23, 25 seem open to objection.

Most of these ~~HA~~ ~~whereas, of course - I don't remember~~

on transfer from one station to another, and in all cases it is stated in explanation that it was not found possible to sell and replace them ^{immediately} or that they ~~were~~ were required shortly after ~~the~~ arrival at the new station. It is not possible to say at this distance of time how far the contentions are correct, but the charges appear to be clearly inadmissible.

13 Mr. A. Clark Asst. Supt. of Police, Coimbatore, charged for the carriage of his camp equipment from Erode to Coimbatore when he went to attend the head-quarter office. He required the camp equipment for use immediately on arrival at the latter station. This seems to be straining the rules and the claim should not have been admitted.

17. Mr. C.D.J. Carmichael, Supt. of Police, Vizagapatam, rallied his horses at Govt. expense from Vizagapatam to Vizianagram and back from Vizianagram to Vizagapatam. There may have been some necessity in the case of the first journey, but considering ~~that~~ the horses were not required for inspection duty for 14 days after they would have reached Vizagapatam by road, the admission of the claim in this ~~second~~ case seems to have been incorrect.

19. Mr. G.T. Egan.
22. Mr. N.E.Q. Mainwaring
26. Mr. Paudry

clearly not. HA.

HA. ~~By~~

28. Mr. P.P.Sweeting ✓
29. Mr. L.G.Arbutnot ✓
34. Mr. H.W.Lushington ✓
41. Mr. P.P.Sweeting ✓
42. Mr. A.Clark ✓

and 44. Mr. H. G. Young ✓

are all cases in which carriage of camp equipment or of horses or of both ~~was~~ admitted for journeys on return to head-quarters. These appear to be clearly against the rule.

20. Mr. H. G. Prendergast ✓
32. Mr. W. J. A. Sullivan ✓
35. Mr. G. T. Egan ✓
36. Mr. H. G. Prendergast ✓
38. Mr. F. Armitage ✓
39. Mr. A. P. Agar ✓
40. Mr. G. E. Baudry ✓
43. Mr. F. Fawcett ✓
45. Mr. W. J. A. Sullivan ✓
48. Mr. F. A. Dene ✓
49 Mr. Prendergast ✓

and 50. Mr. Macartney

are cases in which, although camp equip-
ment or horses might have reached the
next halting station before the officer
~~continued his~~ proceeded on tour, the claims appear
to be admissible.

There is some force in the
Inspector-General's objection - vide para-
graph 2 of C.No.3163 - as regards the
barring of claims to carriage of camp
equipment by rail if an officer halts
at a station long enough for his camp
equipment to come by road, for when an
officer

Why? He strikes me but
sends it on - no

The last batch of cases dealt with in the preceding fall under this category

Besides a man can have
one horse with him. How
did people do before all
the railways were made?

Papers to be read in Proceedings:-

Again G.O., No.

, dated

189 .

Again G.O., No.

, dated

189 .

Current No. 3163

of 1897, dated 18th Sept. , from the Inspector-Genl. of Police.

" "

" 189 , "

" "

" "

" 189 , "

" "

OR I E R. W. 40717 Jan' 98
Mis

With the letter read above, the I.G. of Police submits through the Acct. Genl. with reference to paras 2 and 5 of G.O. No. 435 Finl., d/ 2nd June 1897, a revised return of sanctions accorded under Art. 1093 of the C.S.R. during 1896 and part of 1897.

2. Among An examination of the first fifty items included in the return ~~has brought~~ brought the following cases have been noted:-
facts to light:-

No. 2 Mr. J.E.H. Hasted, Supt. of Police, Kistna. The camp equipment ~~should~~ ^{might} have been conveyed from Bezvada to Guntur by road.

No. 6 Mr. W. Macartney, Supt. of Police, Cuddapah. It is not clear why the camp equipment, if not the horses, could not have been sent on in advance.

No. 10 Mr. J.R. Sandell 12 Mr. J.E. David (Probationer) 18 Mr. F.A

Dene

18

That is just what officers will not do. RA

This is to upset the whole arrangement. Yes.

On the whole there has been too much laxity in passing these ~~case~~ claims

RA 12.97

The cases referred to above may be taken merely as illustrations & not as exhaustive criticism at all.

The H. should be taken more strictly into the intentions of Indian
Cms 16.12.97
BS 3/1/98

cases in which they suffer a little loss but take the travelling allowances granted to them as a whole.

In the last paragraph of his letter in G.No. 3163, the Inspector General of Police suggests that the limit of 30 miles laid down in the last paragraph of G.O.No. 272, Finl., d/ 26th March 1897, should be extended to 40 miles, but outside that limit he is of opinion that a police officer should be allowed to carry his horses and camp equipment by train whenever going out on a bona fide tour or returning to head-quarters.

20
Dene (Asstt. Supt. of Police, Kistna),
21 Mr. E.M. Powell (Asstt Supt. of Police,
Kurnool) 23 Mr. C.B. Leggatt (Ag. Supt.
of Police, Anantapur) & 25 Mr. A.P. Agar
(Supt. of Police, Tanjore) are all
cases in which the cost of carriage
of horses on transfer from one
station to another was admitted on
the explanation that it was ~~not~~
~~found~~ possible to sell and replace
the animals or that they were required
shortly after arrival at the new station.
The charges were inadmissible.

13 Mr. A. Clark, Asstt: Supt of
Police, Coimbatore, charged for the
carriage of his camp equipment from
Erode to Coimbatore when he went to
attend the head-quarter office, as he
required the camp equipment for use
immediately on arrival at the latter
station. This claim should not have
been admitted.

17 Mr. C.D.J. Carmichael, Supt.
of Police, Vizagapatam, railed his horses
at Govt. expense from Vizagapatam to
Vizianagram and back from Vizianagram
to Vizagapatam. There may have been
some necessity in the case of the first
journey, but considering that the
horses were not required for inspec-
tion duty for 14 days after they
would have reached Vizagapatam by
road, the admission of the claim in
the second case was incorrect.

19 Mr. G.T. Egan (Supt. of Police,
Nellore) 22 Mr. N.E.O. Mainwaring
(Supt.

21
(Supt. of Police, Anantapur), 26 Mr. G.
E. Bandry (Supt. of Police, Madura)
28 Mr. P.P. Sweeting (Asstt. Supt.
of Police, Salem), 29 Mr. L.G. Arbuth-
nott (Supt. of Police, Coimbatore),
34 Mr. H.W. Lushington (Supt. of
Police, Godavari), 41 Mr. P.P. Sweet-
ing (Asstt: Supt. of Police, Salem),
42 Mr. A. Clark (Asstt. Supt. of
Police, Coimbatore) and 44 Mr. H.G.
Young (Dy. Insptr. Genl. of Police,
Northern Range) are all cases in
which ^{the} cost of carriage of camp
equipment or of horses or of both
was admitted for journeys on re-
turn to head-quarters. These sanc-
tions are clearly against the rules.

20 Mr. H.G. Prendergast (Supt.
of Police, Kurnool), 40 Mr. G.E. Bandry
(Supt. of Police, Madura), 43 Mr. F.
Fawcett (Supt. of Police, Malabar) are
cases in which the carriage of camp
equipment by rail was admitted for
distances ^{of} 10, 12 and 9 miles,
respectively. This ^{application} use of the rules
was irregular.

3. ^{This} ~~The above~~ partial examination
of the return shows clearly that
there has been ~~too great~~ laxity in
the Police Department in passing the
claims preferred by officers under
Article 1093 of the C.S.R. In view
of the fact that the sanctions com-
prised in the present return have
been accorded by competent authority.

the

22

Insptr. Genl. in this instance
it is not practicable at this length
of time to recover the amounts in-
correctly passed but the attention of
the Insptr. Genl. will be drawn to
these ~~above~~ ^{foregoing} remarks in view to his
acting more strictly up to the true-
tions which have been issued by Govt.
on the subject.

4. The Govt. is not prepared to
adopt the suggestions contained in
the I.G's letter.

Cms.
11.1.98

From 07/1/98

MA 15.7.98

ndi:
it wer

The I.G. of Police (Q. of his letter &
A of A.G's Endt.) with encl.
returned.

Acctt. Genl. (A of I.G's letter
& Q of his Endt)

Dec 25/1/98

11/1/97