M.R.O. 1—77,005—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 238

(2) Date of repair 28-1-39

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 605-606 Press / ~~Mis.~~ Original

Dated 14 7 1898

105/105

Not to be folded or roughly handled

[F 22]

Financial (1898) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED

G.O., No. 605 - 606

DATED 14 - 7 98

INDEXED.

V.E

Please put
[illegible] post.

[illegible]
14/7/98

[illegible]

[Despatch Abstract.]

Conveyance Allowance

Passing orders on the claims of certain officers to ——— under Art 1093 of the C.S.R., and directing that the Govt of India be addressed on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon that Article.

[Letter Abstract].

Addressing on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon Art 1093 of the C.S.R.

[illegible]
14-7 98

Col D
263/97

Government {1898} of Madras.

FINANCIAL.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 605, 14th July 1898.

JULY.

Conveyance Allowance.

Passing orders on the claims of certain officers to — under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations, and directing that the Government of India be addressed on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon that article.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers:—

G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896.

Abstract.—Drawing the attention of the Board of Revenue, the Inspector-General of Police, and the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to the principles laid down by the Government of India as regards the application of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations; and directing the submission of an annual return of sanctions accorded by those authorities under that article.

G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 20th January 1897.

Abstract.—Recording, in continuation of G.O., No. 320 of 1896, the orders of the Government of India in regard to the claim of the Financial Commissioners to be reimbursed the cost of conveyance of camp equipment by rail from and to Lahore at the beginning and end of their tours in October–December 1895.

G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897.

Abstract.—Passing orders on papers from certain Superintending Engineers regarding the application of the rule in article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations as interpreted by the Government of India, and delegating to the Chief Engineer the power to sanction in special cases recoveries on account of transport of horses and camp equipment by rail or by steamer.

G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897.

Abstract.—Passing orders on the returns of sanctions under article 1093 of Civil Service Regulations for 1896; directing resubmission of them in a prescribed form through the Accountant-General; and laying down the procedure to be followed in future by heads of departments to whom the power of special sanction under the article has been delegated in furnishing particulars regarding such sanctions.

G.O., No. 40, Financial, dated 17th January 1898.

G.O., No. 244, Financial, dated 8th March 1898.

Read—also the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 5083, dated 19th November 1897.

Read—G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897.

Resolution—Mis. No. 5083, dated 19th November 1897.

The Board begs to resubmit, in the form prescribed by the Accountant-General, the return of sanctions accorded by it for the conveyance of horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt, Abkári and Customs department from the 1st January 1896 to the 30th June 1897.

2. In this department, an officer before taking his horses or tents by rail or steamer on public duty, applies through the proper channel to the Board for permission to do so explaining his reasons; and if the Board is satisfied that in the interests of the public service he should send them by the quickest means of conveyance, it permits him to do so by special order, a copy of which is communicated to the Accountant-General for information. In these circumstances, it is not possible either for the officer concerned to apply for permission, or for the Board to accord sanction, in the form prescribed by the Accountant-General as the particulars required for columns 4 and 10 to 17 thereof will not be available until after the officer proceeds on tour from the station to which he conveyed his horses or tents. The Board therefore requests that the present practice may be allowed to continue. It possesses the great advantage that an officer knows beforehand whether the expense of conveying his horses and tents will be paid by Government or not and can make his arrangements accordingly. Even with the best intentions, an officer's idea of what is essential to the interests of the public service may frequently differ from that held by the Board or Government and if, after sending his camp equipment by rail at what, to him, may be ruinous expense he finds that he will have to bear the cost himself—the result is discontent and hardship.

3. With reference to the form proposed by the Accountant-General and the remarks contained in paragraph 2 of his letter printed in the Government Order read above the Board would submit that the principle of assuming that because an officer after transfer does not at once start into camp he is not required in the interests of the public service to proceed to his new station ready equipped for duty is fundamentally wrong. To take the case entered as No. 2 on the return from the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), the Accountant-General points out that if Mr. Fowler's horses had been sent by road they would have arrived long before he started on tour. This is very true; but had an emergency occurred as it might at any moment, requiring Mr. Fowler's presence in an outlying corner of his division, he might have had to start into camp immediately after his arrival. It was impossible for either Mr. Fowler or the Board to foresee whether such a contingency would or would not arise. As a matter of fact all officers of this department, except Distillery officers, are required to be ready to start into camp at a moment's notice, and any policy which would result in their being deprived of the means of doing so, would, in the Board's opinion, be most detrimental to the interests of the public service. Again, as regards distant transfers, the Accountant-General draws attention to the cases of Acting Assistant Commissioners Messrs. Dalrymple-Hay and Kearns and Assistant Commissioner Mr. H. J. Simpson, who were transferred to places distant 878, 768 and 1,348 miles, respectively, from their previous stations and remarks that no information is forthcoming as to whether the interests of the public service would have suffered if they had sold and replaced their horses. The Accountant-General appears from this to suppose that horses can be bought and sold without difficulty in any part of the Presidency. As a matter of fact it is practically impossible to obtain them, except by accident, in places other than the Presidency town and Bangalore and perhaps in some other large centres, the result being that officers who from any cause lose their horses in the moffusil find the greatest difficulty in replacing them. If the Accountant-General's opinion were seriously accepted, the difficulty of enforcing the rules as to maintenance of horses would be enormously increased. Adding to this the fact that the officers of the department are for the most part but poorly paid and the fact that distant transfers are frequent and unavoidable, the Board considers that to enforce any such rule would cause so much hardship and discontent in general that no special reasons need be adduced in each case to show that the public interests must have suffered most materially had the officers concerned been required to sell and replace their horses.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. KRISTNASWAMI IYENGAR,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government.

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Camp, Aska, 10th February 1898, No. 519.

With reference to G.O., No. 40, Financial, dated 17th January 1898, regarding the allowances for the conveyance of horses by rail, I will in future interpret the orders as strictly as possible. I am afraid the result will be that officers will be led to tour to a great extent in hired conveyances, jutkas and country carts.

2. There are two points on which I venture to ask for distinct orders. The Government has remarked that charges admitted in several cases of transfer on the explanation that it was impossible to sell and replace animals, or that they were required shortly after arrival at the new station, should not have been allowed—one case for instance is that of Mr. Powell who was allowed charge for railing one horse from Mangalore to Nandyal on transfer. The march of that horse would have taken 31 days and would have been so risky in June (the month of transfer) that no officer could be expected to undertake it. Mr. Powell might certainly have sold his horse at Mangalore, though it would have been no doubt at great loss to himself. But he certainly could not have replaced the horse in Nandyal by any animal up to the standard required by the police rules. He therefore would have been without a horse at Nandyal and would either have had to buy one in Madras or elsewhere in a great hurry or got into trouble for not being in possession of a horse according to the rules. The other cases were similar. I have the honour to ask whether in future no officer is to be allowed to charge for the rail of his horse in cases of transfer such as these. An instance has recently occurred in which I intimated to Mr. Lane that on transfer from Nandyal to Tuticorin trainage for his horse would be allowed. If I was wrong I shall have to pay Mr. Lane from my own pocket as he railed his horse understanding from me that the charge would be allowed. Under the order above referred to, I did wrong and Mr. Lane should either have marched his horse or sold it at Nandyal and tried to get another at Tuticorin. I further submit with this letter an application from Mr. Mayne for Rs. 63-3-0 trainage charge for his horses from Chingleput to Madura. It could hardly be expected that Mr. Mayne would march his horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Ramnad and it was necessary for Mr. Mayne to have his horses with him when acting in Chingleput and he had to go out on tour. I request definite orders on the matter and venture to submit that if the ruling of the Government is to hold good in all cases, transfers, already a great burden on officers, will become severe pecuniary punishments.

3. The other point on which I should be glad of definite orders is as regards officers returning from tour. This is a matter which hardly affects district officers, but it is one which seriously affects inspecting officers who have several districts to look after. The Government rule that in the case of Mr. Young, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, he should not have been allowed to draw trainage for carrying his horse from Tuni to Waltair, his head-quarters (a distance of 81 miles) when returning from a tour in Rumpah. If so, similarly, I presume I shall not be allowed to draw the allowance for carrying my horses from Narsapatam to Madras next month when I end my tour at Narsapatam. This seems very hard on officers who have large areas to inspect, and as regards the Inspector-General and often the Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, they will be heavy losers, if they return from an inspecting tour from any point at all distant from their head-quarters. I have used my horses almost daily for a month and shall have to use them to inspect Chintapalli next month, from there I shall return to Madras. I venture to submit that it will be hard on me if I am required to pay the rail fare of my two horses from Narsapatam road to Madras. I must, however, do so under the ruling contained in the Government Order under reply. In G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897, it was ruled that as regards long marches where circumstances render it impossible to expect that horses should be marched by road the cost of railing horses might be recovered. But in the objection taken to Mr. Young's case above referred to, a march of 80 miles is apparently not considered to be a long march justifying the charge.

4. The case of Superintendents in this matter is of course different. They can generally without inconvenience march their horses from any point in their districts to head-quarters and I have told them that, in future, no trainage charges will be

allowed in such cases unless they can show that they had to leave their head-quarters on tour before the time elapsed necessary for their horses to reach head-quarters by road. Even here in those cases where a conveyance is necessary for going to and from office, it seems hard that a Superintendent should not be permitted to carry his horses with him by rail when returning to head-quarters.

5. I have the honour to request instructions on the above two points. First, is the head of a department always to refuse to allow the charge for horses by rail in cases where officers are transferred long distances? and secondly, are rail charges similarly to be always refused in the case of inspecting officers returning to head-quarters from long distances after having completed a tour of inspection?

From F. C. HARRISON, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 17th March 1898, No. 1077.

I have the honour to forward, for the orders of Government, the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), No. 5083 of 19th November 1897, re-submitting the return of sanctions accorded by them to the conveyance of horses and camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt and Customs Department for the period, 1st January 1896 to 30th June 1897.

The items marked A appear to be inadmissible under the Government of India resolution, No. 1603, Financial, dated 10th April 1896. As regards the item marked B the information given is not complete enough for me to form an opinion. I have, however, not thought it advisable to delay this report pending the information which I have asked the Board to furnish.

2. It is, however, my duty to point out that in this Presidency, article 1093, Civil Service Regulations, appear to be put into operation with undue frequency. The purpose of the rule is set forth in the Government of India resolution above quoted and in No. 5453 of 29th December 1896, whilst detailed instructions have also been laid down by this Government in its resolution No. 272, Financial, of 26th March 1897. In order to see whether, in other provinces, this article is resorted to in the same way, I enquired of Bombay and the North-West Provinces how many cases occurred there in a year. I find that 25 cases occurred in the former presidency and 20 in the latter, whilst here the number is about 316. It may be that, owing to more frequent transfer amongst Civilians due to the non-graded system or to distances travelled, the circumstances in this Presidency are peculiar. If so, perhaps Government may still desire to obtain some special modification of the rules. I notice in the Police department where Government supplies tents and officers can recover half the cost of moving them under article 1141, Civil Service Regulations, the number of cases is 108.

3, I invite particular attention to the line taken by the Board in its resolution now forwarded. That body towards the end of paragraph 3 speaks of the difficulty of "seriously" accepting my opinion. The opinion that I have expressed is what has been laid down by the Government of India as the correct view in very explicit terms, and the Government of Madras has communicated that view for guidance to the Board of Revenue in its Order, No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896. The Board maintain that all officers of the Separate Revenue Department except Distillery officers must be ready to start into camp at "a moment's notice," and that horses cannot be sold "except at Madras and Bangalore and possibly some other large centres." As regards the first point, the Government of India in their resolution, No. 1603, speak of this as a "more or less exceptional case." If the position were admitted in the case of Separate Revenue officials, it would be doubtless claimed in the Police and other departments. As regards the second point, I apprehend Madras is not different to other parts of India. Horses, if not saleable easily on the spot, may be sold in adjacent places and districts. In November last when I objected to passing to Mr. Wood the cost of taking a horse from Madura to Vellore, the Board did not uphold my objection and added that "it was not aware of the existence of any horse market at Madura and there is certainly no such market at Vellore." In the circumstances this answer to the objection, which I was bound to take, is, I submit, unnecessarily

From the Inspector-General of Police, Madras, dated 21st April 1898, No. 1476.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 1125, dated 26th April 1898.

Read—the following papers:—

Board's Proceedings, No. 239, dated 16th July 1897.

Collector's, Conservator's and Forest Settlement-officer's replies to the same.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1125, dated 26th April 1898.

With reference to paragraphs 2 and 5 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, the Board resolves to submit to Government, through the Accountant-General, the revised statement showing the cost of conveyance of tents and horses sanctioned under article 1093, Civil Service Regulations, from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897, the dates of receipt of G.Os., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896, and No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, respectively. The principles on which the claims under article 1093, Civil Service Regulations, have been scrutinized by the Board, and the necessity for the article being construed liberally so far as this Presidency is concerned, have been fully explained in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No 891, dated 29th March 1898.

2. With reference to paragraph 7 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, the Board submits that the rule in Board's Proceedings, No. 291, dated 30th July 1896, to the effect that an Assistant Collector, when deputed for training in survey, should not take a horse with him was prescribed on the ground that the officer undergoing training was not likely to require a horse. But in the cases of Messrs. A. Thompson and N. Macmichael who underwent training at Bellary (items 47 and 48 in the statement), the Deputy Superintendent in charge of the Survey school had requested them to take their horses with them. The claims of these officers were therefore allowed as special cases.

3. The Forest Settlement-officer, Trichinopoly, &c., districts, has not included in his return the charge of Rs. 13-5-0 sanctioned in Board's Proceedings, Forest No. 115, Routine, dated 10th February 1897, for the conveyance of two horses by rail from Cuddalore Old Town to Tiruvannámalai. The omission has been supplied in this office from the information furnished in the Forest Settlement-officer's weekly diaries.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) LIONEL DAVIDSON,
Ag. Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General, with two statements and
a copy of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 891, dated 29th March 1898.
Copy to Forest Section.

From T. HESKETH BIGGS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 13th May 1898, No. 1867.

In continuation of my letter No. 1077, dated the 17th of March 1898, I have the honour to forward herewith the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 1125, dated 26th April 1898, with two statements, and to state that the items marked A appear to be inadmissible.

From the *Accountant-General*, dated 8th June 1898, No. 2167.

Order—No. 605, Financial, dated 14th July 1898.

The Government of India will be addressed on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations.

2. As regards the revised returns forwarded by the Board of Revenue in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 5 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, it is not practicable to revoke at this distance of time the sanctions accorded by competent authority under article 1093 in 1896 and 1897 and the claims which have been admitted by the Board will be allowed to stand.

3. The claim of Mr. R. J. M. Mayne, referred to in paragraph 2 of the letter from the Inspector-General of Police No. 519, dated 10th February 1898, is admissible under the rules.

4. The action of the Inspector-General in having guaranteed payment of the trainage of a horse from Nandyal to Tuticorin to Mr. Lane, whose case is dealt with in the same paragraph, was not authorized by the rules. The charge will, however, be admitted.

5. The case of the Inspector-General of Police is provided for by article 1166-A of the Civil Service Regulations. The maximum number of servants and the maximum weight of baggage for which the officers specified in the margin may charge Government was laid down in G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890, which, however, omitted to specify any limit as regards horses. The limit prescribed for the purpose of article 1093 in G.O., No. 504, Financial, dated 19th June 1882 (viz., four horses), will in future be applied in the cases of all these officers for the purposes of article 1166-A.

	Number of servants.	Weight in maunds of baggage.
Members of the Revenue Board in their several capacities ..	4	15
Inspectors-General of Police, Prisons and Registration, Surgeon-General, Sanitary Commissioner and the Director of Public Instruction	4	10
Deputy Sanitary Commissioner ..	3	10

[Here enter letter No. 606, Financial, dated 14th July 1898.]

(True Extract.)

G. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
" Accountant-General.
" Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" " (Revenue Settlement).
" " (Separate Revenue).
" Educational Department.
" Judicial Department.
" Local and Municipal Department.
" Public Department.
" Public Works Department.
" Revenue Department.
" Superintendent, Madras Survey.

Exd. C. Parthasarathy.

13

Government {1898} of Madras.

FINANCIAL.

Recd.	} 1898.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

Letter, No. 606, 14th July 1898.

JULY.

Conveyance Allowance.

Addressing on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

The CHIEF SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA, Finance and Commerce Department.

Sir,

I am directed to address you regarding the interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations which runs as follows:—

"When the Local Government is satisfied that it is in the interests of the public service that an officer required to travel on public duty should send his horses, camels, or camp equipment by steamer or railway, it may, by special order in each case, permit him to recover, in addition to his authorized travelling allowance, the actual cost of their carriage, including, whether separately charged for or not, the cost of conveyance of one syce and one grass-cutter for each horse."

2. The history of the article in its present form is briefly as follows. The Finance Committee of 1886, in discussing the question of travelling allowance, came to the conclusion that whilst the travelling allowances then existing were quite sufficiently liberal for all cases of ordinary tours on duty, there could be no doubt that, as a general rule, the rates were altogether inadequate to meet the expenses attendant on a transfer from one station to another. It was notorious, the Committee remarked, that such transfers were almost invariably occasions of loss, unless accompanied by permanent promotion, and the fact that an ordinary and recurring incident in the official career of even the most meritorious officers practically amounted on every occasion to a heavy fine, was felt by all classes of public servants as an unmerited hardship. The Committee proceeded to point out that it had proposed material reductions in the rates of travelling allowances granted for journeys made on ordinary tours, many of which, it had little doubt, had from time to time been increased under the influence of a feeling that liberality in dealing with this part of the subject tended to mitigate the hardships occasioned by transfers; that these reductions would certainly be strongly objected to and would cause much discontent; and that this discontent could not, in its opinion, be held to be unreasonable, if the inevitable losses due to transfers still remained. The Committee urged that it could not be to the advantage of the State that its servants should have just grounds for discontent, and that there would not be grounds for discontent in the matter of travelling allowances if Government recognised, what appeared to be a fact beyond the possibility of dispute, that journeys upon transfer involve the complete break up of an officer's establishment and the conveyance of himself, of the members of his family, of many, if not all, of his servants, and of much baggage over distances which may extend to thousands of miles, with either the enforced sale, often at a ruinous loss, of furniture, horses and carriages, or their transit at a cost which produces the same result. Ordinary tours within an officer's circle of jurisdiction involve, the Committee

Report, Vol. II, Chap. XII, paragraph 27.

Paragraph 28 *ibid.*

Paragraph 29 *ibid.*

explained, none of these things. The circumstances being essentially different, their treatment should, the Committee considered, be different and a much more liberal provision made for travelling expenses in the case of transfer than in the case of ordinary tours. The Committee recommended therefore that the Travelling Allowance Code should be modified in this case, in consideration of, and as some compensation to officers for, the reductions which it had felt bound to propose in the rates of travelling allowance admissible on ordinary tours. The recognition of the exceptional circumstances involved by transfers would, the Committee observed, be a special boon to the junior and lower-paid classes of officers, as in some cases a transfer, or a succession of transfers, compelled such officers to get into debt and produced embarrassments lasting sometimes for years.

3. In paragraph 10 of Mr. Henry Stokes' letter, No. 1106, Financial, dated 27th October 1886, this Government expressed its cordial approval of the foregoing principle. It suggested that an officer should be permitted to draw for road or railway journeys in excess of 200 miles and for any journey by sea, the actual cost of transport of himself and of the member of his family residing with him, and also of baggage, servants, horses and carriages within a maximum scale to be laid down according to rank, and subject to declaration by the officers that the sum claimed had been actually paid.

4. Attention was again drawn to the matter in Mr. Price's letter, No. 337, Financial, dated 1st May 1890. The Governor in Council then stated that he still accepted as the fittest to meet the case the proposals made by the Madras Government in 1886, urging that the straggling conformation of the Madras Presidency renders transfers an exceptionally heavy charge on the officers in the services of Government in this Presidency; that the excessive fixed travelling allowances for ordinary journeys on duty which previously obtained had been reduced in the faith that the principles adopted by the Finance Committee would be accepted by the Government of India; and that it was a very real and substantial grievance that the cost of transfers ordered in the interests of the public service should not be reimbursed from public funds.

5. In Mr. Simkinson's reply, it was intimated that article 1205 of the Civil Service Regulations (which it is to be noted applies only to non-gazetted officers in receipt of salaries up to Rs. 400 *per mensem*) represented the final decision of the Government of India on the question; that this decision had been arrived at after very careful consideration; and that the Governor-General in Council regretted that he was unable to re-open the matter. Paragraph 3 of the same communication proceeded to state that the Governor-General in Council had, however, decided to modify the terms of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations so as to bring it into more exact accordance with the intention expressed in Finance and Commerce Department Resolution, No. 1517, dated 20th June 1884, viz., to leave to Local Governments a wide discretion in the application of the article. The Government of India expressed the hope that the article as revised would meet the special difficulty which had been previously felt by the Government of Madras in dealing equitably with the cases of its officers.

Finance and Commerce Department, No. 3115, dated 27th June 1890.

6. The article itself has since undergone no material alterations. Its application has, however, been restricted by subsequent rulings of the Government of India.

7. In Finance and Commerce Department Resolution, No. 1603-Ex., dated 10th April 1896, the Government of India pointed out that, in framing the rule contained in this article, it was not its intention that officers should, when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled in addition to drawing travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipment at Government expense, even when the nature of their duties required them to maintain horses or camp equipment. The rule, it was explained, was 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 was therefore obliged in the interests of the public service to convey them by rail or steamer. It is only therefore, the Government of India stated, when it is 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 transfer) 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. The Government of India at the same time suggested the advisability of all Local Governments issuing instructions similar to those obtaining in the Bombay Presidency where orders had from time to time been issued with a view to restrict the application of article 1093 to the cases which it is intended to meet, and where the authorities to whom powers under the article had been delegated were required to submit periodical returns of sanctions given, with brief notes explaining the circumstances of each case.

8. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter to the Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, No. 5453-Ex., dated 29th December 1896, copy of which was communicated to this Government, it was explained that the expression "interests of the public service" includes the economy of an officer's time; that there is no objection to the application of article 1093 to cases in which the Local Government thinks that the conveyance of camp equipment of horses by rail will serve the public interests by enabling an officer to do more work than he otherwise would in a given time; and that the only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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. This Government has interpreted the foregoing rulings to mean that officers should march their horses and send on their camp equipment by road in all *ordinary* cases as was the custom before railways were introduced; and that, in order to satisfy the requirements of article 1093, there should exist a knowledge on the part of the sanctioning authority that an officer granted the concessions of that article *will* (not may) be required to be ready for emergent duty on arrival at his destination; in short, that in order to justify the application of the article to any particular case the necessity for an officer requiring his camp equipment or horses immediately on arrival at a new station must, except in very special circumstances, be proved by the facts. It has further been presumed that the sentence quoted in the margin repeats the principle which has been held to govern all general claims under the travelling allowance rules, viz., that travelling allowances should be taken as a whole and that special consideration cannot be given to individual cases of loss.

The only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service.

[Paragraph 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter, No. 5453-Ex., dated 29th December 1896.]

10. In view to the article being applied as intended by the Government of India, the Governor in Council, on receipt of the resolution referred to in paragraph 7 *supra*, drew the attention of all sanctioning authorities in this Presidency to the principles enunciated by the Government of India and directed that a return of sanctions with brief notes explaining the circumstances of each case should be submitted to Government annually. These returns did not, however, afford sufficient information as to the necessity or urgency of taking horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer, and, on the suggestion of the Accountant-General, it was decided that officers in this Presidency claiming concessions under article 1093 should submit their applications in the *form printed on* page 4 of the *Proceedings of this* Government, No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897 (copy enclosed). This form, it will be observed, provides for the ascertainment of the facts, which, under the orders of the Government of India, are requisite for the application of the article. The annual return was at the same time abolished, and sanctioning authorities were directed to furnish the Accountant-General at the time of sanction with particulars in the form referred to above of each sanction accorded, the Accountant-General being instructed to submit for the orders of Government any case in which he considered the sanction of doubtful propriety.

G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896.

11. This strict application of the rules has met with various protests from controlling authorities and is causing much discontent in this Presidency. It may be that this Government has construed the intentions of the Government of India too literally, and, if so, I am to request instructions on the point and to ask that the orders already issued may be rendered free from all doubt.

12. If it is held that the orders of the Governor-General in Council have been correctly interpreted, I am to request that, in the application of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations, the special circumstances of this Presidency may be taken into consideration. These circumstances as well as the hardships involved in transfers —which were clearly recognized by the Finance Committee—have been alluded to in paragraphs 2 to 4 *supra*. I am, however, to invite attention to the views of the Finance Committee and of this Government as already intimated and urge that in this Presidency the exigencies of the public service and the numerical weakness of the staff necessitate frequent transfers of Revenue officers. With the opening of new railways the old traffic by road has ceased, and with the cessation of the demand it is no longer possible to obtain the carts and bullocks at convenient stages along the chief routes. It is, therefore, now impracticable except on a few routes to obtain carts to march a distance of even one hundred miles; cartmen will not undertake the duty in face of the long return journey, except at prohibitive rates. It is thus no longer possible, in the case of two distant stations connected by rail, to send baggage from one to the other by road, and the only result of denying officers the cost of conveyance of their camp equipment by rail is to compel them to pay for such carriage themselves.

13. In regard to the question of marching horses by road, I am to point out that, during a greater part of the year and in the majority of the districts in this Presidency, it is absolutely impossible to obtain forage *en route*. Servants who have been travelling all day cannot, moreover, be expected, even when it is available, to go and gather it. It was reasonable perhaps in the days before railways to require an officer to march his horses 200 or 300 miles, and he could do so with comparative safety since horses in a similar plight were constantly passing along the routes and resting places and forage were procurable; but the custom has passed away in this Presidency and it is not safe to send a horse alone on a long march. It is to be remembered in this connection that before the days of railways officers accompanied their baggage and rode their horses when travelling; while now they are required to travel themselves by rail where practicable.

14. As regards the sale and replacement of horses, I am to observe that in this Presidency, unlike Northern India, there is not one mufassal station where it is generally possible to procure any kind of horse, that the compulsory sale of an officer's horse is tantamount to the infliction of a heavy fine on him, as when an officer is under orders of transfer and has to break up his establishment at a few days' notice, it is impossible to find a purchaser at anything approaching the original price paid for an animal; that the purchase of a horse on the occasion of every transfer really entails another fine; and that is a distinct hardship on officers to expect that they should be continually put to the inconvenience of changing their horses which they have probably procured with great trouble and to which they have become accustomed.

15. The travelling allowance admissible by rail to an officer of the first class is twice the first-class fare. Deducting the railway fare of the officer himself, he is left with one anna a mile to defray the cost of moving his wife and family (if he has them), personal effects and camp equipment as well as all his servants and their following. This allowance is about half the ordinary rate of hire for one country cart. Moreover, an officer can under no circumstances draw any allowance for the charges incurred in sending his carriage or carriages by rail on transfer.

16. I am to point out also that the want of his horses and conveyance places an officer on arrival in a new station in considerable difficulties. In this Presidency he cannot dispense with a conveyance of some sort during the heat of the day, but there are no conveyances for hire in most up-country stations and superior officers are often forced to use the carriages of their subordinates or their friends.

17. The foregoing remarks apply in a great measure to journeys made on tour. As regards the latter, however, it is evident that the test applied by this Government —(paragraph 10 *supra*) and this appears to be the only proper test available to ensure that the existing orders of the Government of India are obeyed—is inappropriate, futile and inexpedient. The test consists in the ascertainment of the fact whether the transferred officer uses his horses and camp equipment immediately on arrival at his new station, *i.e.*, uses them for the purposes of touring. If he does not so use them, his claim to reimbursement of the cost of their carriage under article 1093 is not admitted. The test is inappropriate, because an officer joining a new appointment cannot possibly foresee whether or not any sudden emergency will necessitate the use of horses and tents and he should therefore join provided for all emergencies; it is futile as it tends to induce all transferred officers to proceed on tour immediately they take charge of a new appointment; and it is inexpedient since such officers might possibly, and, in the majority, of cases, would be better employed at head-quarters for some time after taking charge of a new office. The inexpediency of the test is apparent when it is considered that a touring officer—say, a Collector of a district—could recover the cost of transport of his camp equipment and horses by rail for all the journeys comprised in an extensive tour by carrying them with him on each stage of his journey and making various unnecessary halts, whilst another officer who, in precisely the same circumstances, travelled rapidly and sent his camp equipment and horses on to where they were actually required, would be pecuniarily a loser.

18. Finally, I am to point out that the orders of the Government of India to which reference is made above restrict the discretion of this Government considerably, in spite of the announcement made in 1890 (paragraph 6 *supra*), when this subject was last brought to the notice of the Governor-General in Council; for if those orders have been correctly interpreted it is impossible in any but very exceptional circumstances to grant the concessions allowed in article 1093. The reasons urged by this Government in 1890 apply if anything with greater force at the present time, and the Governor in Council trusts that the matter will be reconsidered by the Government of India.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Ootacamund,
14*th July* 1898.

G. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. A. F Eccleston.

19

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., NOS. 605–606, FINANCIAL, DATED 14TH JULY 1898.

Financial Department.

Charges for the conveyance of camp equipment and horses by rail under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations.

C.S.

The Inspector-General of Police refers to G.O., No. 40, Financial, dated 17th January 1898, regarding the allowances for the conveyance of horses and camp equipment by rail. In that order the Inspector-General's return of sanctions accorded under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations during 1896 and part of 1897, was reviewed by Government. A partial examination of the return showed that there had been laxity in the Police Department in passing the claims preferred by officers under the article in question. As, however, the sanctions comprised in the return had been accorded by competent authority, Government did not consider it feasible to recover the amounts incorrectly passed, but drew the Inspector-General's attention to the irregularities in view to his acting more strictly up to the instructions which have been issued on the subject.

2. The Inspector-General, while reporting that he will in future interpret the orders as strictly as possible, regrets that his doing so will lead officers to tour to a great extent in hired conveyances. He then proceeds to state *two* points on which he requests distinct orders—

(1) Is the head of a department always to refuse to allow the charge for horses by rail in cases where officers are *transferred long distances?* and (2) Are rail charges similarly to be always refused in the case of inspecting officers *returning to head-quarters from long distances after having completed tours of inspection?*

3. To illustrate (1) he takes the case of Mr. R. M. Powell, Assistant Superintendent of Police, Kurnool, whose explanation that his animal was required shortly after arrival at the new station, was pronounced inadmissible in paragraph 2 of the above Government Order. Mr. Powell was allowed by the Inspector-General to charge for railing one horse from

Ridiculous! Let them use hired conveyances while at head-quarters, or do without them. That is what we have all had to do when horses have been sent on.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

The Inspector-General has not returned the return disposed of by G.O., No. 40, dated 17th January 1898, but he gives full particulars of his illustrative cases.

(Intld.) C.M.S.

Mangalore to Nandyal. The Inspector-General states that to march the horse the whole distance would have taken 31 days and would have been highly risky in the month of June, the month of the transfer. If, on the other hand, the horse had been sold at Mangalore, the Inspector-General urges that it could not have been replaced at Nandyal by any animal up to the standard of Police requirements. Under such circumstances Mr. Powell would have had to purchase an animal in Madras or elsewhere in a great hurry or break the rules which require him to be in possession of a horse. A *second* case put forward by the Inspector-General to illustrate the same point is that of Mr. Lane who was recently transferred from Nandyal to Tuticorin, and to whom it seems the Inspector-General, presumably then in ignorance of the above-mentioned Government Order, intimated that trainage for his horse would be allowed. But according to the Government Order the charge will be inadmissible and so the Inspector-General submits that he will have to pay Mr. Lane out of his own pocket. A *third* illustration of the same point is the case of Mr. Mayne whose application for the cost of carriage by rail of two horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Madura the Inspector-General encloses. He submits that it was necessary for Mr. Mayne to have his horses with him when acting at Chingleput and that it could hardly be expected that he should march the horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Ramnad.

4. The second point, primarily affects inspecting officers. The Inspector-General first takes the case of Mr. Young, Deputy Inspector-General, whose charge for the carriage of a horse from Tuni to his head-quarters at Waltair (about 80 miles) was declared to be inadmissible by the above Government Order. The Inspector-General contends that under such a ruling he himself will not be entitled to the charge for carrying his horses from Narsapatnam to Madras, when his tour at the former station comes to an end. The Inspector-General submits that such a rule bears hard on officers who have large areas to inspect, if they return from an inspecting tour from any point at all distant from their head-quarters. He then refers to G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897, in paragraph 3 of which it is ruled that as regards long marches where circumstances render it impossible

The Inspector-General appears to have overlooked in this case the point that Mr. Mayne went on tour nine days after his arrival at Ramnad and seven days before his horses could have reached that station by road. The charge has been justified in this case.

(Intld.) C.M.S.

The Inspector-General is really too ridiculous. He ignores article 1166-A which completely meets the case he puts as regards himself and was intended to do so. I know, for I devised the rule myself when dealing with travelling allowances as a Member of the Finance Committee.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

I don't see why the Deputy Inspector-General should not march his horses 80 miles. How did he do four or five years ago before the railway existed?

(Intld.) H.W.B.

Officers seldom will look at this view of the matter, they expect to make a *profit* out of their touring, and one still hears of men who "live on their travelling allowance."

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Officers might be reminded of this aspect of the case and be referred to the first line of article 1087 and the first three words of the second line.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

Yes.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

to expect horses to be marched by road, the cost of railing them may be recovered, and applies it to the case of Mr. Young referred to above, and asks if a march of 80 miles is not considered long enough to justify the charge.

5. The Inspector-General submits that the case of Superintendents is different, as they can conveniently march their horses from any point in their districts to head-quarters, and reports that he has informed them that in future no trainage will be allowed unless they can show that they had to leave their head-quarters on tour, before the time necessary for their horses to reach them by road, has elapsed.

6. It is submitted that in making this representation the Inspector-General has overlooked the principle which has been laid down by India on more than one occasion, viz., that travelling allowance must be taken as a whole and that the real question for consideration in connection with claims under particular articles of the Civil Service Regulations, such as 1093, is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service. Individual and isolated cases of losses cannot, it is submitted, prove this.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
28-2-98.

H.M.

Most of the difficulties raised by the Inspector-General arise from a desire to escape from the ruling laid down by the Government of India and printed in G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896.

"In framing the rule contained in "article 1093 * * it was not the in-"tention of the Government of India that "officers should, when making ordinary "journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled, "in addition to drawing travelling allow-"ance, to convey their horses or camp "equipment, at Government expense * *.

"The rule was 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 another place * *."

Officers very naturally want to save time by railing their horses and also to avoid the risk of marching them by road when they can be carried by rail at Government expense.

No doubt.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

There is no more risk in marching horses now than there was before railways existed, but, less, as there are more roads more traffic and less poisoning, &c. The Inspector-General could hardly have chosen a worse illustration than that of Mr. Powell transferred from Mangalore to Nandyal in June. "The march," he says, "of that horse would have taken 31 days and would have been so risky in June that no officer could have been expected to undertake it." But the only really risky part of the journey was the march from Mangalore to the Mysore * frontier or to Calicut — whichever was the route chosen, and that was of necessity by road for there is no railway. If *that* part of the journey could be done by road *à fortiori* could the rest have been so done. I have myself had a pair of horses marched safely from Mysore to Mangalore, and back. The difficulty lies in the ruling of the Government of India—which is objected to—and not in the marching.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

* Three or four days.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

As the Inspector-General promised Mr. Lane the bill should be passed, but the Inspector-General should not have promised it unless he knew Mr. Lane would require his horse for tour purposes before it could have been marched down from Nandyal to Tuticorin.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

As to Mr. Mayne why should he not be expected to march his horse from St. Thomas' Mount to Ramnad? I have marched horses from North Arcot to South Arcot, Tanjore and Tinnevelly.

I remember once marching a horse from Madras to Tuticorin.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

No doubt the ruling of India bears hardly in cases, but the remedy for that is to get the ruling altered and not to ignore it.

The same argument applies to the Inspector-General and his Deputies and to Superintendents of Police returning from tour.

There is special provision for the Inspector-General in article 1166-A.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

The need of a horse to go to and from office at head-quarters *does not justify* training the horse at Government expense.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

1-3-98.

Government has never acknowledged any *responsibility for officers'* need of horses in head-quarters. If Police Superintendents are to be considered in this respect, why not District and Sessions Judges, or the Chief Secretary to Government?

(Intld.) H.W.B.

2-3-98.

C.A.

In the previous notes regarding the conveyance of horses and camp equipment by Police officers at Government expense, the Honourable Member pointed out that the provisions of article 1166-A could be applied in the case of the Inspector-General of Police. As this article does not appear to have been applied in practice hitherto, the Accountant-General was asked if he would admit the charges.

He telephones that there is no objection, but points out that no limit has been laid down as to the maximum number of horses that may be considered absolutely necessary.

The scales laid down by Government are as follows:—

	Article 1093, Civil Service Regulations—G.O., No. 504, Financial, dated 19th June 1882.		Article 1166-A—G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890.	
	Weight of tent equipment.	Number of horses	Number of servants.	Weight in maunds of baggage.
	MAUNDS.			
Members, Board of Revenue		..	4	15
Inspector-General of Police	55	4	4	10
Do. of Jail	55	4	4	10
Do. of Registration	55	4	4	10
Surgeon-General	55	4	4	10
Sanitary Commissioner	55	4	4	10
Director of Public Instruction	55	4	4	10
Collectors (except Madras)	55	4	..	..
Sub-Collectors	55	4	..	..
Director of Revenue Settlement	55	4	..	..
Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement	55	4	..	..
Commissioner of Salt Revenue	55	4	..	..
Deputy Commissioners of Salt Revenue	55	4	..	..
All officers whose extra tentage is not less than that of a Sub-Collector.	55	4	..	..
Head Assistant Collectors	35	3	..	..
Assistant Collectors (G.O., No. 2010, Judicial, dated 1st August 1883).	35	3	..	..
Deputy Inspectors-General of Police	55	4	..	..
Superintendents of Police	55	3	..	..
Assistant Superintendents of Police	55	3	..	..
	LB.			
Inspectors (G.O., No 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890) ..	700	1	..	..
Deputy Sanitary Commissioner	..	..	3	10
Assistant Director of Settlement, Inspector of Cattle Diseases ..	..	..	2	8

Mr. Hammick's claim is admissible.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

From the bills submitted it now appears that Mr. Hammick usually took two horses with him. Mr. Stuart *on joining his appointment* has taken four. Submitted that the same limit should apply in the case of both articles 1093 and 1166-A.

(Intld.) A.M.C.
18-3-98.

C.S.

It appears to be a question for consideration whether the number of horses for which charges are admissible under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations (*vide* column 3 of the foregoing statement) is not too high even for the purposes of that article. The Revenue and other departments concerned might perhaps report in regard to this point. In any case two horses would, it is submitted, be a liberal limit in the case of article 1166-A for all the heads of departments whose cases have been provided for in G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890 (*vide* columns 4 and 5 of the foregoing statement).

C. No. 824, Financial, is for orders. It refers to Mr. H. A. Stuart's claim for the conveyance of four horses on transfer from Ootacamund to Madras to join the appointment of Acting Inspector-General. It would, it is submitted, be somewhat hard to expect Mr. Stuart to have sold his horses and replaced them at Madras for a short acting appointment.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
20-3-98.

H.M.

The Inspector-General should, I think, be prepared for immediate tour on taking up his appointment and for this purpose two horses would be ample. He could not "ex-hypothesi" have marched them to Madras in time for his first move.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
21-3-98.

But how is Mr. Stuart's case distinguished from that of other officers who have not been allowed to rail their horses on transfer under India's orders ?

(Intld.) H.W.B.
22-3-98.

I don't see any need to go into this question which is not under discussion at present. The subject is quite thorny enough as it is.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Four horses seem a large order, but 15 maunds of baggage is absurd seeing that tents are included. When I applied under article 1166-A I weighed all my baggage and reported the weight. Please put up the papers.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

With reference to the Hon'ble Member's note marked A can Revenue Department supply any precedents ?

The Hon'ble Member apparently refers to his applications as Commissioner of Salt Revenue.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
26-3-98.

To Revenue Department—U.O.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
30-3-98.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

The Hon'ble Member perhaps refers to paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings on page 2 of G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890.

6-4-98. (Intld.) N.E.M.

To Financial Department—U.O.

C.S.

The Board in 1890 considered * that the Commissioner of Salt Revenue should be allowed 25 maunds of baggage, but Government cut this down to 15 maunds [G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890].

(Intld.) C.M.S.
16-4-90.

H.M.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
18-4-98.

Apparently I made a mistake when in my former note I spoke of 15 maunds including tents. I think the scale of servants and baggage too low for high officials, while that of horses is needlessly high. But as no complaint has been made the subject may be dropped.

(Intld.) H.W.B.
19-4-98.

* Paragraph 6 of its proceedings on page 2 of G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 29th January 1890.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Sanctions under article 1093, *Civil Service Regulations.*

C.S.

The Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue) submits, with reference to paragraphs 2 and 5 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, a revised return of sanctions accorded under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations to the conveyance of horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt, Abkári and Customs Department from 1st January 1896 to 30th June 1897. The items marked A in the return are objected to by the Accountant-General, who, however, is unable to express any opinion as regards those marked B in the absence of further information. It is not practicable to revoke at this distance of time the sanctions which have been accorded by competent authority—the Board in the present instance—but the Board's proceedings and the Accountant-General's letter raise several important points. In fact, the whole question of the interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations is raised and the real point for decision is whether the Board's interpretation or India's interpretation is to prevail. All the cases dealt with in the return have not been examined for the reasons given above and as the extraordinary position taken up by the Board requires, it is submitted, to be dealt with without delay.

Paragraph 1 of Accountant-General's letter.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

2. As regards the case of Mr. Fowler in which the horses, had they been marched by road, would have arrived seventeen days before the officer started on tour, the Board observes that it was not possible to foresee that a contingency would not arise in this case requiring the immediate use of the horses at the new station. The Board states that *all officers of the Salt* department except distillery officers are required to be ready to start into camp at a moment's notice. The Accountant-General rightly points out that if the interpretation of the Board is admitted, it will doubtless be adopted by other departments. He draws attention to paragraph 1 of India's resolution in G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896, where it is stated that article 1093 is intended to meet the more or less *exceptional* case of an officer requiring his camp equipment or horses in one place immediately or very shortly after having had to use them in

Paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings.

Paragraph 3 of Accountant-General's letter.

The orders of India require a knowledge that the officer *will* not *may* be required to be equipped ready for emergent duty on arrival at his destination.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

			Miles.
* Item No.	6	Mr. C. V. Dalrymple-Hay ..	878
,,	7	Mr. A. S. Kearns	768
,,	16	Mr. H. Simpson	1,348

Paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings.

Paragraph 3 of Accountant-General's letter.

As a matter of fact hardly any one would *sell* his horses, he would march them to the place of transfer.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings.

Precisely the Board has overlooked this.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

* Not in the correspondence before Government. The Accountant-General's complaint of flippancy was with reference to previous correspondence he had had with the Board.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

another place. It is submitted that the acceptation of the Board's arguments would render India's orders unworkable. By assuming that an officer may have to use his horses immediately on arrival at a new station and by overlooking the necessity for examining the *facts* of each case, the Board would over-ride India's interpretation of article 1093 altogether.

3. As regards the cases of transfer marginally * noted the Accountant-General, in paragraph 2 of his letter recorded on page 3 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, stated that there was nothing to show that the interests of the public service would have suffered if the officers had sold and replaced their horses. The Board argues that it is practically impossible to obtain horses, except by accident, in places other than the Presidency town and Bangalore, and perhaps in some other large centres. The Accountant-General contends that the conditions prevailing in this Presidency are not different from those in other parts of India and that horses if not saleable easily on the spot can be sold in adjacent places and districts. It is submitted that the Board's argument, if accepted, would support a practice under which an officer —not transferred—could charge Government for the conveyance (say) to Mangalore of a horse bought at (say) Madras.

4. The Board goes on to say that if the Accountant-General's opinion were seriously accepted, the difficulty of enforcing the rules as to maintenance of horses would be enormously increased, especially as the officers of the department, among whom distant transfers are frequent and unavoidable, are for the most part but poorly paid. It is submitted that what the Board calls the Accountant-General's opinion is in fact the ruling of the Government of India accepted by this Government and communicated to the Board in G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896. The Board's remarks are, it is submitted, flippant * as observed by the Accountant-General and evince anything but a desire to carry out the orders of the Supreme and the Local Governments. If the pay of the officers in the Salt department is too low or if these officers are put to loss by constant transfers there are other remedies open. These reasons, if they do exist, are not sufficient for disregarding the distinct orders of Government.

5. The Board now grants *previous* permission to an officer applying for the same, to carry his tents or horses at Government expense, on its being satisfied that the quickest means of conveyance should be used in the interests of the public service, and it communicates a copy of the order granting permission to the Accountant-General. The Board requests that this practice may be allowed to continue, so that an officer, whose idea of what is essential to the interests of the public service may frequently differ from that held by the Board or Government, may not, after sending his camp equipment or horses by rail at great expense, be called upon to bear the cost himself. The Board, however, adds that such previous sanction cannot be accorded in the form prescribed by the Accountant-General and adopted by Government (G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, paragraph 1) as the information required to be given therein is not available until after the officer proceeds from one station to another. In other words, the Board would keep the working of article 1093 in its own hands and would interpret it in accordance with its own ideas. It is clear from India's resolution in G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896, that sanctions under article 1093 are subject to the conditions laid down in that resolution and that it is absolutely necessary to ensure that these conditions are fulfilled in every case. The form to which the Board objects was drawn up with reference to the observations of the Government of India in paragraph 2 of the resolution referred to above.

Paragraph 2 of Board's Proceedings.

I don't understand this about tents; surely officers don't obtain the Board's previous permission to carry tents by rail if they are moving about on ordinary tours. But if they are moving on transit, they don't have to carry their tents at all, for the tents belong to the office or circle, not to the officer, and are not carried by him on transfer—at least they used not to be and should not be.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

6. The Accountant-General points out that the Board is not carrying out the orders of the Government of India though it is aware of the facts which led to the present rules in the Civil Service Regulations—*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 113, dated 25th February 1890, in G.O., No. 336, Financial, dated 1st May 1890, and G.O., No. 494, Financial, dated 22nd July 1890. The Accountant-General observes that if this Government considers that the circumstances in this Presidency are peculiar, owing to frequent transfers among civilians due to the non-graded system and to distances travelled, it is open to it to obtain a modification of the rules. He, however, points out that article 1093 is put into operation with undue frequency in this Presidency, as many as 316 cases having occurred in one year against 25 in Bombay and 20 in the North-Western

If the Board's practice is to continue it must be under the condition that it does not give sanction unless it *knows* that the officer will be required to go on tour before his horses, &c., could arrive by road. The sanction must not be given on mere supposition.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Paragraph 3 of Accountant-General's letter.

This is quite true. This should be pointed out and the Board informed that the orders of India must be obeyed.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Paragraph 2 of Accountant-General's letter.

It is open to the Board to address Government on the matter if it thinks proper.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

This should be pointed out to the Board.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

Provinces. In the Police department *alone* where Government supplies tents, and officers can recover half the cost of moving them under article 1141, the number of cases is 108. In these circumstances, it does not seem desirable to move the Government of India in the matter.

7. In the concluding portion of his letter the Accountant-General states that the instructions given in connection with tents and equipment in G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897, are not very clear. He apparently alludes to the remark in the last clause of paragraph 3 of that order "the transport of camp equipment by rail will frequently be justified under the rule that the cheaper route should be chosen." The Accountant-General is of opinion that the cost of conveyance of camp equipment |whether by *rail* or by *road* should be borne by the officer himself except in cases of urgency when the charges should be defrayed by Government in the interests of the public service. This view seems to be correct.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
13-4-98.

H.M.

It is "the interests of the public service" that have to be considered and not as the Board has taken it "the interests of the officer concerned."

(Intld.) A.T.A.
14-4-98.

I agree with the Chief Secretary all through. The Board seems to forget two things, (1) that the orders are India's and are positive; (2) that not so very long ago no one under any circumstances was allowed to charge for carriage of either horses or tents by rail. I remember having to carry three horses from Tiruppatúr to Vizagapatam at my own expense and for the matter of that I got no allowances at all on transfer, for the transfer was on promotion and in those days no travelling allowance was allowed in the case of such transfers. Moreover, when, after nine or ten months, I was turned out of my acting Sub-Collectorate and sent to Tuticorin as Head Assistant (pucka) I got no travelling allowance for that journey, for as my head-assistantship at Tiruppattúr had been acting I was held to have proceeded on promotion to join my pucka appointment at Tuticorin, though I lost nearly Rs. 300 a month by the transfer!

(Intld.) H.W.B.
15-4-98.

Send a copy of the Accountant-General's letter.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

Paragraph 4.

Yes. But it may be cheaper to Government to pay half carriage by rail than half carriage by cart.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 29th September 1897, C. No. 8796.

SECRETARY.

Mr. Davidson, who was transferred last April from the post of Under Secretary to Government in the Revenue Department to that of the Sub-Collector of Salem, claimed, under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations, the refund of a charge of Rs. 24 incurred by him in conveying his horse from Madras to Malur. The Board of Revenue in its Proceedings, dated 10th June 1897, Mis. No. 2100, disallowed the claim on the ground that, as Mr. Davidson was not required to maintain a horse as Under Secretary to Government, his claim was inadmissible under paragraph 1 of the Government of India Resolution under G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896. In his letter dated the 15th July 1897, which the Board now submits for the orders of Government, Mr. Davidson requests a reconsideration of his claim.

2. Mr. Davidson contends that under the terms of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations the sole criterion of the admissibility of such a charge is whether "it is in the interests of the public service that an officer required to travel on public duty should send his horses by railway." He also contends that in his case the above criterion is satisfied, inasmuch as at the time of his transfer to Hosur the Government had issued positive orders directing officers in the position of a Sub-Collector to maintain two horses from which he inferred that the interests of the public service required him to keep two riding animals at his disposal. He states that he arranged to purchase one horse from his predecessor Mr. Campbell; but that, a second animal not being available in the neighbourhood of the station to which he was transferred, he had to buy it at Madras where he was himself stationed. The leave of his predecessor in the Sub-Collectorship of Salem being decided upon suddenly, he urges that time did not permit him to send his horse by road to his new post of duty so as to be ready for use on his arrival there. He further states that if he had despatched his horse by road, it would not have reached Hosur until a fortnight after himself, and that for some time therefore after reaching his new station, he should have

had only one horse at his disposal, a state of equipment which in the light of G.O., No. 760, Public, dated 17th June 1897, he believed to be inconsistent with the interests of the public service. He contends that so far as the essential condition of the interests of the public service is concerned, his case is analogous to that of a Sub-Collector already possessing two horses who is transferred from Chingleput to Hosur with no longer warning than he has himself received.

3. The Board adheres to the view expressed in its Proceedings of June last referred to in the first paragraph of the note. The Accountant-General forwards the papers to Government with the remark that "no special circumstances have been suggested requiring the use of two horses immediately on arrival at his station except conforming to the rule about a Sub-Collector requiring to maintain two riding horses"; and that "mere conformity to such a rule does not bring a case within the spirit of the Government of India Resolution recorded in G.O., No. 320, dated 8th May 1896."

4. In a recent case the Board disallowed Mr. Stuart's claim to the conveyance of his horse from Madras to Bellary, on the ground that as Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor he was not required to keep riding horses. But it was subsequently found that as a fact Mr. Stuart was required to keep riding horses, and Government sanctioned his claim under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations on the ground that as he was transferred to a famine district, he had to go provided and ready to move into camp immediately on joining his new duties, and that he could not therefore be expected to sell and replace his horses. It is submitted that no special circumstances exist in Mr. Davidson's case which required the use of two horses *immediately* on his joining his new appointment. The minimum period during which Sub-Collectors are required to be on tour is $2\frac{1}{2}$ months for every half-year, and it does not appear that the public interests would have suffered if Mr. Davidson had for a fortnight or so after he reached Salem the use of only one horse. As the Accountant-General says, no special circumstances seem to have existed which required Mr. Davidson to use two horses immediately on arrival at his station.

5. In the event of the charge not being admitted under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations, Mr. Davidson

It is difficult to say what are special circumstances. It is certain that the need for his horses arises in the public interests as soon as a Divisional Magistrate takes charge of his appointment.

1-11-97. (Intld.) G.S.

An officer cannot foretell whether the public interests will suffer or not. He must act so that they may not.

1-11-97. (Intld.) G.S.

requests that in the special circumstances of his case and with special reference to the analogy referred to at the end of the second paragraph of this note, his claim may be sanctioned under article 278-A of the Civil Account Code. It is a question for consideration whether any case has been made out for the exemption of his claim from the operation of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations.

(Intld.) C.R.

29-10-97.

H.M.

I submit the rule is a very objectionable one and should be construed liberally. It was reasonable perhaps in the days before railways to require an officer to march his horses 300 or 400 miles and he could do so with comparative safety when horses in similar plight were constantly passing along the roads and it was possible without difficulty to get resting places and food for them; but now the habit has passed away and it is a serious risk to send a horse alone on a long march. Government does not march its own horses to Hosur. In all countries it is recognised that the employer must pay all travelling expenses of the employed incurred in the employment and horses are kept for duty. I submit that Government should give the allowance in t[illegible]nd similar cases. It is unreasonable to ask an officer to risk his horse's life and to lose its services for fifteen to twenty days, or to fine him Rs. 30.

1-11-97. (Intld.) G.S.

SECRETARY.

After Mr. Stokes had written the above, G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, was brought to his notice. It will be seen that the Officiating Accountant-General in his letter No. 1272, dated 22nd April 1897, proposed a curious test of the necessity for an officer's railing his horses. The test was to calculate the time it would take to send the horses by road at 15 miles per day and then to see whether the officer did actually leave his new head-quarters before the date on which his horses would by this calculation have taken to arrive at his new head-quarters. This plan involves two obvious fallacies—First, it is extremely probable that a horse sent by road from, say, Madras to Calicut (*vide* item 2 of the Accountant-General's list on page 4 of G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897) would never reach Calicut alive or would reach Calicut in a state unfit for use for weeks. Second, an officer cannot tell beforehand how many

Page 3 of G.O., No. 435 of 1897.

days it will be before he will have to go out into camp from his new head-quarters.

Mr. Stokes therefore wished to see whether these matters had been considered before G.O., No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897, was issued and the original was therefore sent for. Financial Department has not sent it yet. It appears that it is in circulation with some file.

As three other cases have arisen and as the officers concerned should not be kept waiting unnecessarily the papers are submitted for orders.

I. Mr. Davidson's case.—Mr. Davidson claims rail fare for one horse (he bought another at Salem, but could not get two there) from Madras to Malur.

The Board has disallowed the claim under paragraph 1 of the Government of India Resolution No. 1603-Ex., dated 10th April 1896. There is nothing, I submit, in this paragraph which would prohibit the grant of the allowance in Mr. Davidson's case. The last sentence of the paragraph obviously means that an officer is not to get rail charge for a horse from, say, Bombay when he can get one in Madras if Madras be nearer at hand.

The Government of India clearly expressed their intention in paragraph 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter No. 5453-Ex., dated 29th December 1896, to the Government of the Punjab in G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 20th January 1897, "the only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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."

Now Mr. Davidson was going as Sub-Collector to Hosur. It *might* have been necessary for him to go out into camp the day after he got there. If it had been necessary, he would have wanted two horses; one only was available at Hosur. He took one from Madras. Was this travelling not required by the interests of the public service? If it was not, why should Sub-Collectors be required to keep two horses? There can be no question that the allowances drawn by Mr. Davidson did not cover the expense of this travelling. They probably won't cover half these expenses even if Government decides to pay the cost of railing the horse from Madras.

I think this sentence means that when an officer is in his own district and requires another horse to complete his equipment and *sends* to Madras (say) to purchase one, the rail charges of bringing it to his station do not (ordinarily) come under aticle 1093. This is not quite Mr. Davidson's case. He had to join a station at which the use of the prescribed number of horses might be at once necessary. He takes one of the horses with him. I think he should be allowed the charge. If he had been going from one Sub-Collectorate to another it would have been open to Government to sanction the charge: and it may do so in this case. There is not *much*, but there is *some* logical difference between the case of an officer joining a distant appointment and taking his complement of horses with him so as to be able to act at once if necessary and the case of an officer already established in a district and completing his complement from the distant market, as he has more time to arrange and look about him and ordinarily can foresee his wants in time: but even in such case if an officer's horse died during an emergency and it was necessary that he should at once be re-equipped, Government should pay the rail charges of a horse sent up emergently from Madras.

I would pass Mr. Davidson's charge.

27-2-9[illegible]. (Intld.) G.S.F.

II. Mr. Parsons' case.—Mr. Parsons claims the cost of bringing his tents from Shikarpur in the Bombay Presidency to Chicacole *viâ* Bellary.

The Board recommends that the bill (with a few deductions of charges clearly inadmissible, such as cart and cooly hire) should be passed. Submitted that it may be passed, but if the construction which the Board places on the Government of India Resolution be correct, it would follow that Mr. Parsons should have sold his tents at Shikarpur and bought new ones at Vellore or Madras, or some place nearer to Chicacole. Indeed it is doubtful whether such an arrangement would not have kept expenditure to the most moderate scale forethought and arrangement could secure.

Yes.

(Intld.) G.S.F.

III. Mr. Butterworth's case.—Mr. Butterworth asks that Government should pay the rail fare for one of his horses from Dharwar to Coimbatore. As in Mr. Davidson's case, it is submitted, the use of the horse might have been necessary the moment Mr. Butterworth got to Coimbatore. But no doubt it was possible for Mr. Butterworth to get horses nearer to Coimbatore than Dharwar. He could possibly have got them in Madras without wasting many days there. If it is considered that he could have done so then I submit the cost of railing two horses from Madras should be paid to Mr. Butterworth. Mr. Butterworth took two horses from Dharwar although he asks trainage for one only apparently as an *Argumentum ad misericordiam.*

There is nothing to show that he could have sold his horses at Dharwar and replaced them without loss at Coimbatore. Moreover, is a man to sell a horse that suits him? The public interests would probably suffer.

(Intld.) G.S.F.

Mr. Butterworth should have the charges for railing both his horses.

(Intld.) G.S.F.

IV. The case of Mr. Platts, an Assistant Commissioner of Salt and Abkâri, who was transferred from Nellore to Cuttack.—He asks for rail fare for one horse. The Board declines to recommend the grant of the allowance. Mr. Platts contends that officers in Orissa are obliged to keep one horse that he could not have replaced the horse at Cuttack. The Board points out that Mr. Platts was transferred in the rainy season when no horse could be used in Cuttack. But if Mr. Platts was required to maintain one, it does not appear where he could have got one from nearer than Nellore.

This is the point of difference in Mr. Platts' case that though he is required to keep a horse it was not necessary that he should use them immediately or very shortly after arrival at Cuttack. At the same time the Government does not know this? Perhaps the Board might report whether there were any other duties for which Mr. Platts might reasonably assume that a horse might be required on arrival. Distance is an element to be considered and an officer who is bound to keep a horse can't be expected to march it from Nellore to Cuttack.

(Intld.) G.S F.

(Intld.) N.E.M.
19–2–98.

H.M.

I do not believe that the Government of India means the rules to be read harshly or with unreasonable illiberality. Common sense will generally solve any difficulty that may arise.

(Intld.) G.S.F.
27–2–98.

There seems to me to be nothing in the Resolution of India which warrants us in refusing the rail charge of Messrs. Davidson, Parsons, and Butterworth. It was necessary in the public interests that they should have two horses directly they assumed their duties.

The case of Mr. Platts is different. In his case the transfer was "distant." According to India it must be *shown* that he could not sell and replace. Mr. Platts points out that there were several great difficulties about selling and re-placing, but he does not *show* that he could not do so. I think he should get the rail charge, but I don't think it can be given without referring the case to India.

But has it not been ordered that all such points are to be disposed of in the Financial Department?

1–3–98. (Intld.) J.G.

Yes. But it was necessary to ascertain first whether the claims were upheld and justified by this department. The papers will now be transferred to Financial Department for final disposal.

2–3–98. (Intld.) G.S.F.

But any way Mr. Platts' case would not be for the Hon'ble Mr. Grose.

19–3–98. (Intld.) H.W.B.

To the Financial Department, U.O.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

C.S.

The Revenue Department forwards four cases involving claims under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations from—

(i) Mr. Davidson, Acting Sub-Collector, Salem.
(ii) Mr. A. Butterworth, Acting Collector, Coimbatore.
(iii) Mr. F. C. Parsons, Acting Principal Assistant, Ganjám.
(iv) Mr. Platts, Assistant Commissioner, Salt Revenue.

The Revenue Department notes set out the facts and the arguments. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose, C.I.E., has noted on the papers in the Revenue Department.

The principles which should govern the admission of claims under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations are set out in—

(1) India's resolution in G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896.
(2) Its letter on page 1 of G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 20th January 1897.

This Government has also explained these principles further in G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897.

These principles have been so frequently applied in the Financial Department of late that it is unnecessary to set them out here. It will be observed that the construction placed on these orders in the Revenue Department notes does not follow recent Financial Department decisions.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
17th March 1898.

H.M.

As these questions have to be disposed of in Financial, it would, I think, have been well if Revenue had sent its note for orders to Financial for remarks before circulation to Honourable Members or transferred it to Financial with request to circulate to Honourable Members. For want of this procedure the Hon'ble Mr. Grose has noted without knowing the principle on which Financial has been disposing of cases such as these. Financial has been acting on the principle laid down in paragraph 1 of the Government of India resolution in G.O., No. 320, dated 8th May 1896.

Yes.

(Intld.) H W.B.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

Yes. This is quite a special case.

(Intld.) H.W.B.
19th March 1898.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

(Intld.) H. W. B.
19th March 1898.

" . . It was not the intention of the " Government of India that officers should, " when making ordinary journeys on tour " or transfer, be entitled, in addition to " drawing travelling allowance, to convey " their horses or camp equipment, at Gov- " ernment expense, even when the nature " of their duties requires them to maintain horses or camp equipment." It has been understood in short that the Government of India intended officers to march their horses and send their camp equipment by road in all ordinary cases, as they used to do before railways were made. On this principle *Mr. Davidson's* claim to rail a horse from Madras to Hosur would certainly be disallowed.

Mr. Parsons' claim for railing his tents from Shirkarpur in the Bombay Presidency to Ganjám *viâ* Bellary would be similarly disallowed, unless it were thought that over so great a distance it was certain the tents could not be carted, or if carting were possible, that it was certain Mr. Parsons would have to go into camp before they arrived. The other possible alternative would be to sell the tents for what they would fetch at Shirkarpur and buy others for Ganjám. On the whole I think this case might be treated exceptionally as Mr. Parsons was returning from active famine duty in another Presidency and deserved special consideration.

Mr. Butterworth was Judge at Dharwar and not on active famine duty there. His claim for rail charge to Coimbatore should be disallowed on the principle above noted.

Mr. Platts' claim also is inadmissible for railing a horse from Nellore to Cuttack. It was not required for immediate use on his arrival.

There is so much difficulty in the working of these rules that it may become a matter for consideration whether trainage for horse or camp equipment should never be allowed unless permitted with the order directing an officer's transfer.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
18th March 1898.

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose, C.I.E.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
22nd March 1898.

On reconsideration I think the order of the Government of India makes it necessary to disallow the claims of Messrs. Davidson and Butterworth.

(Intld.) J.G.
28th March 1898.

SECRETARY.

The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss has, upon the Chief Secretary's note, dated 18th March, noted that the claims of Messrs. Davidson, Butterworth and Platts for the cost of carriage of their horses by rail should be disallowed. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose has, on reconsideration, agreed with this view. A draft order has accordingly been sent by the Financial Department for counterinitials.

In the Chief Secretary's note it is stated that the principle upon which Financial has been disposing of such cases is that "laid down in paragraph 1 of the Govern-"ment of India's resolution in G.O., No. "320, dated 8th May 1896': . . It "was not the intention of the Government "of India that officers should, when "making ordinary journeys on tour or "transfer, be entitled, in addition to "drawing travelling allowance, to convey "their horses or camp equipment at Gov-"ernment expense, even when the nature "of their duties requires them to maintain "horses or camp equipment.'"

Acting on this principle the Financial Department has disallowed similar claims made by Messrs. Bannerji and Lakshmana Rao—*vide* G.O., No. 244, Financial, dated 8th March 1898 (Revenue Current No. 1974 of 1898.)

Against this latter decision the Board has submitted a strong protest in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 891, dated 29th March 1898 (Revenue Current No. 2590 of 1898.)

The Board puts the case admirably, and it is respectfully submitted that the interpretation placed on the Government of India's resolution quoted above may be reconsidered.

Taking this resolution by itself it would doubtless mean that such charges should be invariably disallowed provided that it is held that the public interests will not suffer if Revenue officers generally arrive at new stations without the means of going on tour for some days (in cases, some weeks or even months).

But this resolution, No. 1603 Ex., dated 10th April 1896, was explained in Mr. Gamble's letter to the Government of the Punjab, No. 5453 Ex., dated 29th December 1896, read in G.O., No. 51, dated 20th January 1897. In paragraph 4 it is explained that the *only question*

"which should be considered in deciding such matter is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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."

If it is finally decided that the terms of these instructions of the Government of India exclude claims such as have been put forward and disallowed, and that they intend that officers should march their horses by road as of yore, it is submitted that a modification of the rule in this Presidency may be asked for. As the Board points out, horses cannot be marched any considerable distances in this Presidency nor can tents, etc., be sent across several districts now by road, though this might have been possible 25 or 30 years ago. The whole tenor of the Government of India's resolution seems to show, I submit, that they had in view the conditions of Northern India—small districts; many large stations close to each other; horses and tents plentiful and cheap (*vide* daily advertisements in the *Pioneer*—Rs. 300 seems to be the average for a useful district horse of about 13·3 to 14·2).

There are very few upcountry stations here, it is submitted, where one could rely on getting any kind of horse; and a horse worth riding can't be got for much under Rs. 600 or Rs. 700.

(Intld.) N.E.M.

16th April 1898.

H.M.

In the lower file there is a strong protest from the Board in the cases of Messrs. Bannerji and Lakshmana Rao. This was not before Government when the cases of Messrs. Butterworth, Davidson, Platts and Parsons were circulated.

If the Hon'ble Member thinks the principles on which these cases have been decided should be reconsidered, it is for orders whether the decision about Messrs. Butterworth, etc., should be held over pending such reconsideration, or whether the decision should issue leaving it to be subsequently modified should Government alter its view.

(Intld.) G.S.F.

19th April 1898.

6

This is the crux.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

4th June 1898.

The tents belong to Government, not to the officers as here.

(Intld.) G.S.F.

Is this always so? I did not know. If it is, no doubt the officers do not get fixed tentage as they do here.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

I think the matter must be reconsidered. The Financial Department orders are in accordance with resolution of Government of India, No. 1603 Ex., dated 10th April 1896, which laid it down, that article 1093 was intended to meet the case of officers requiring to use their camp equipment or horses in one place soon after using them in another. In a subsequent resolution, viz., No. 5453 Ex., dated 29th December 1896, the Government of India said, "the only question to be considered" in deciding claims under 1093 is whether the allowances admissible under the ordinary rules "cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service." This implies that the intention of 1093 was to prevent loss to the officer in such cases and seems to me to modify the first resolution. I am not sure that this has been fully considered in the Financial Department. The decision about Messrs. Butterworth, etc., should lie over till the Board's protest is disposed of.

25th April 1898. (Intld.) J.G.

The file is retransferred to Financial Department for reconsideration of the principle involved in these cases with reference to the notes above, the Hon'ble Members' note of 25th, and the Board's Proceedings, No. 891, dated 29th March 1898.

26th April 1898. (Intld.) G.S.F.

Financial Department U.O.

C.S.

The notes received from the Revenue Department relate to the draft order on the claims of Messrs. Davidson, Butterworth and Platts to be reimbursed the cost of carriage of their horses or tents under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations which was sent to that department for counterinitials. The papers regarding these claims are contained in file marked I.

File II contains the protest from the Board referred to in the Revenue Department notes.

Files III and IV contain the cases in the Police Department and in the Separate Revenue Department on which orders had already been drafted in accordance with Hon'ble Members' instructions. These draft orders have been withheld pending the decision on the present notes. The files have been kept as they originally stood, in order to avoid confusion as to flags, except that the book-file has been moved from File IV to this file.

2. It will be useful to set out here the article of the Civil Service Regulations itself and the principal rulings issued by India and by this Government.

Article 1093 runs as follows:—

> When a local Government is satisfied that it is *in the interests of the public service* that an officer required to travel on public duty should send his horses, camels, or camp equipment by steamer or railway, it may, by special order in each case, permit him to recover, in addition to his authorized travelling allowance, the actual cost of their carriage, including, whether separately charged for or not, the cost of conveyance of one syce and one grass-cutter for each horse.

G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896.

In Finance and Commerce Department resolution, No. 1603 Ex., dated 10th April 1896, the Government of India pointed out that in framing the rule contained in the foregoing article, it was not the intention that officers should, when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled, in addition to drawing travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipment at Government expense, even when the nature of their duties require them to maintain horses or camp equipment. The rule, it was explained, was 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 railway or steamer. It is only therefore, the Government of India stated, when it is 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.

In paragraph 3 of Finance and Commerce Department letter, No. 5453 Ex., dated 29th December 1896 (G.O., No. 51, Financial, dated 20th January 1897), it was explained that the expression *interests of the public service* includes the economy of an officer's time and that there is no objection to the application of article 1093 to cases in which the local Government thinks that the conveyance of camp equipment or horses by rail will serve the *public interests* by enabling an officer to do more work than he otherwise would in a given time. The Government of India further explained that the only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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.

In G.O., No. 272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897, this Government laid down the general conditions under which sanctions under article 1093 might be granted. It was recognised that where economy of an officer's time is involved, there can be no difficulty in deciding that transport by rail (or steamer) of horses and camp equipment is necessary *in the interests of the public service;* that where the cost to Government is less if horses and camp equipment are forwarded by rail than if they are sent by road, it is obviously *in the interests of the public service* that the cheaper route should be taken: and that in regard to long journeys, where circumstances render it impossible to expect that horses should be marched by road while the use of horses is essential to the proper execution of an officer's duty, it may reasonably be held that the *interests of the public service* require that the horses should be taken out and back by rail or steamer.

(Intld.) H.W.B.

Of course they will and the duration of the tour is not specified; so a couple of days might do. It is not "in the interests of the public service" that such evasion of a rule should be feasible.

(Intld.) A.T.A.

3. The Hon'ble Member has pointed out in the Revenue Department that paragraph 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter No. 5453 Ex., dated 29th December 1896 (G.O., No. 51, dated 20th January 1897)—in which it was stated that the only question which should be considered in deciding claims under article 1093, Civil Service Regulations, is whether the allowances admissible under the rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service—seems to modify the Government of India resolution, No. 1603 Ex., dated 10th April 1896 (G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896).

As regards this point, it is respectfully submitted that the question turns on what is required in the interests of the public service and this requirement seems to be defined by India in paragraph 1 of its resolution, No. 1603 Ex., dated 10th April 1896 (G.O., No. 320, Financial, dated 8th May 1896). India seems, moreover, in paragraph 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter of the 29th December 1896, to be repeating a principle which has been held to govern all general claims under the travelling allowance rules, viz., that travelling allowance should be taken as a whole and that special consideration cannot be given to individual cases of losses.

4. With reference to the Board's protest in File II, it is submitted that the Financial Department orders have followed the instructions of the Government of India and so long as the orders of the Government of India remain unchanged, it is impossible to treat claims under article 1093 except as they have been treated in this department. The Board has, however, placed the arguments against the present application of article 1093 in a very forcible manner and there can be no doubt that one of the results of the present test—which it may be noted is the only one that can be applied to show that India's interpretation of the article is strictly carried out—will be, as pointed out in paragraph 8 of the Board's proceedings in File II, to tend to induce officers to go out on tour immediately they take over charge of a new appointment.

5. As regards a reference to the Government of India, attention is solicited to G.O., No. 336, Financial, dated 1st May 1890, and the letter following on pages 123--135 of the book-file and to the Government of India reply on page 137 of the same book-file (G.O., No. 491, Financial, dated 26th July 1890). It will be seen that the strong representation then made

by the Madras Government resulted in what is at present article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations. India has since placed its interpretation on the article and this interpretation, like that of article 1159 (*b*), renders the article almost wholly inoperative.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
12th May 1898.

H.M.

I am unable to see that the interpretation put by the Financial Department upon article 1093, Civil Service Regulations, and on the letters of the Government of India, is anything but strictly accurate. The Government of India make "the interests of the public service" the pivot of the whole matter. The Board's contention makes the pecuniary interests of the individual officer the pivot.

But while affirming that the interpretation of the rule is correct, I fully admit that hardship is caused to individual officers thereby, inasmuch as they are pecuniary losers by its application, more especially in the case of transfers from one district to another.

The Board, in my opinion, entirely fails to show that the interpretation of the rule is wrong, but it does show very conclusively the hardship of the rule, and makes out a strong case for its modification. It is nearly two years since India gave its last commentary and interpretation, and I think this Government might well make a strong representation to the Government of India on the subject, laying especial stress on the hardship experienced by officers under transfer from district to district.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
4th June 1898.

I quite agree. I don't see how the Financial Department could have acted otherwise than it has done.

It is curious that it should have devolved on me to carry out India's orders in this matter, seeing that I wrote the Finance Committee's proposals at p. 9 of G.O., No. 336, Financial, dated 1st May 1890, and drafted the Board's Proceedings in that order.

The Board makes out a good case and the matter must be referred to India.

(Intld) H.W.B.
6th June 1898.

I concur.

(Intld.) A.E.H.
22nd June 1898.

45

Letter to India on the correct interpretation to be placed on article 1093 *of the Civil Service Regulations.*

H.M.

It seems plain as well from the history of this question as from the rule itself that the position originally laid down was that the actual cost of the carriage of his horses and camp equipment was to be paid to an officer under the sanction of the Local Government when the Local Government considered it was "in the interests of the public service" that the officer should take them with him. This position involved the consideration of each case and there is in fact, I think, no difficulty in determining from the circumstances of each case whether the charge is in the interests of the public service or not. For example, if the Acting Head Assistant Collector at Tiruppattúr is reverted as Assistant to Salem where he has his Collector to go to and since there is no difficulty in marching his horses through his own division almost the whole way, there is no difficulty in determining that it is not in the interests of the public service that he should rail his horses from Tiruppattúr to Salem, but there is equally no difficulty in determining that it is in the interests of the public service that he should rail his horses to Tuticorin if he is transferred there as Acting Sub-Collector; or as another instance, in ruling that it is not in the interests of the public service that a Police officer transferred from Kurnool to South Canara for three months should sell his horses and replace them on both moves.

2. But abandoning the position assigned them by rule, the Local Government has acquiesced in an automatic test or criterion being set up, and it is the application of this test without considering each case which has given, and is giving, rise to all the difficulty. It is held apparently concurring with India that, for example, unless an officer uses his horses and tents immediately on his arrival, it cannot have been in the interests of the public service that he should have railed his horses to his new station—a conclusion which seems to me, as the draft says, on its face futile, inappropriate and inexpedient.

3. This test is founded on a ruling of the Government of India, but it seems to me that relying on the history of the origin of the rule and of the responsibility imposed on it by the rule, this Government would be justified in ignoring this gloss of India, and, for example, in ruling in particular cases that it was not in the interests of

the public service that an officer should sell his horses and replace them when transferred to a distant station.

4. If Government hold with me that it can reject India's gloss on the rule, no reference to India is necessary since Government would only have to rule the allowances admissible in the particular cases. But since the Accountant-General would probably require a reference to India, the reference may (or may not) ultimately have to be made. If the reference is made as things now stand, we are open to the retort that our difficulties are on our own showing of our own making, but what it is necessary to show to India is that its gloss is an undesirable encroachment upon the powers of the Local Government.

5. I would urge that no reference be made to India.

(Intld.) G.S.
6th July 1898.

I think the reference to India had better go. If the article in the Civil Service Regulations stood alone, it would perhaps be unnecessary, though even then, sooner or later, the Accountant-General would draw comparisons (as Mr. Rawlins did) between the expenditure here and in other provinces and would, if he chose, take India's orders. But the article does not stand alone. We have to take it together with India's glosses and interpretations. Taking it thus, we can only work it as the Financial Department has been working it; that is, in the manner against which the Board of Revenue protests. If we are not to take it thus, we can only change our course with India's sanction.

(Intld.) H.W.B.
7th July 1898.

I quite agree that the reference to India should go. The "gloss" of the Government of India is practically an order which we ought not to ignore. If it is wrong they should be made to cancel it.

(Intld.) A.T.A.
9th July 1898.

C.S.

Please see notes. The drafts may issue.

(Intld.) C.M.S.
12th July 1898.

Yes.

(Intld) G.S.
12th July 1898.

Through the Accountant General, Madras
Financial

~~Revenue~~ (1897) Department. 47

CURRENT No.

From

The Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue, Madras

Mis No. 5083

Order

Dated 19th November 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting to Government in the form prescribed by the Accountant General the return of Sanctions accorded by the Board for the Conveyance of horses or Camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department from the 1st January 1896 to the 30th June 1897

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

49

Financial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 467

CHIEF SECRETARY
11 FEB 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From

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

Order

No. 519

Dated 10 February 1898.

Received 11-2-98

Registered

Enclosures Two

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reporting upon G.O.No.40, Financial, dated 17th January 1898, and requesting instructions upon two points in connection with the charges for the conveyance of camp equipment and horses by rail under article 1093 Civil Service Regulations.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
435	2-6	97	372 : 15-4-98
272	26-3	97	327 : 30-3-98
51	20-1	97	599 : 18-9-96
573	26-8	96 SC	420 : 13-7-96
320	8-5	96 SC	494 : 22-7-90
647	3-9	95	240 : 21-3-90
40	17-1	98	51 : 29-1-90
			1502 : 7-7-84
			7445 : 8-4-84
			1182 : 25-9-83
			2010 2nd : 1-8-83
1744 Rev.	22-8-79		560 2nd : 26-6-82
			574 " : 19-6-82
			2193 " : 17-6-82

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CURRENT No. 467 Fin'l 51

Camp. Aska, 31st January 1898.

DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

No. 519. MADRAS, 10th February 1898.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, I.C.S., Esq.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

Madras,

88

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,

Fort St. George.

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

E

With reference to G.O. No.40 Financial, dated 17th January 1898 regarding the allowances for the conveyance of horses by rail, I will in future interpret the orders as strictly as possible. I am afraid the result will be that officers will be led to tour to a great extent in hired conveyances, jutkas and country carts.

How? Remove appropriate that they [illegible] hired conveyance at Rs. 2-8 and tour their horses out on tour

2. There are two points on which I venture to ask for distinct orders. The Government has remarked that charges admitted in several cases of transfer on the explanation that it was impossible to sell and replace animals or that they were required shortly after arrival at the new station, should not have been allowed - one case for instance is that of Mr. Powell who was allowed charge for railing one horse from Mangalore to Nandyal on transfer. The march of that horse would have taken 31 days and would have been so risky in June (the month of transfer) that no officer could be expected to undertake it. Mr. Powell might certainly have sold his horse at Mangalore, though it would have been no doubt at great loss to himself. But he certainly could not have replaced the horse in Nandyal by any animal up to the standard required by the Police rules. He therefore would have been without a horse at Nandyal and

would either have had to buy one in Madras or elsewhere in a great hurry or got into trouble for not being in possession of a horse according to the rules. The other cases were similar. I have the honour to ask whether in future no officer is to be allowed to charge for the rail of his horse in cases of transfer such as these. An instance has recently occurred in which I intimated to Mr. Lane that on transfer from Nandyal to Tuticorin trainage for his horse would be allowed. If I was wrong I shall have to pay Mr. Lane from my own pocket as he railed his horse understanding from me that the charge would be allowed. Under the order above referred to I did wrong and Mr. Lane should either have marched his horse or sold it at Nandyal and tried to get another at Tuticorin. I further submit with this letter an application from Mr. Mayne for Rs. 63-3-0 trainage charge for his horses from Chingleput to Madura. It could hardly be expected that Mr. Mayne would march his horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Ramnad and it was necessary for Mr. Mayne to have his horses with him when acting in chingleput and he had to go out on tour. I request definite orders on the matter and venture to submit that if the ruling of the Government is to hold good in all cases, transfers, already a great burden on officers, will become severe pecuniary punishments.

3. The other point on which I should be glad of definite orders is as regards officers returning from tour. This is a matter which hardly affects district officers, but it is one which seriously affects inspecting officers who have several districts to look after. The Government rule that in the case of Mr. Young, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, he should not have been allowed to draw trainage for carrying his horse from Tuni to Waltair, his head quarters, (a distance of 81 miles) when returning from a tour in Rumpah. If so, similarly, I presume I shall not be allowed to draw the allowance for carrying my horses from Narasapatam to Madras next month when I end my tour at Narasapatam. This seems very hard on officers who have large areas to inspect, and as regards the Inspector-General and often the Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, they will be heavy losers, if they return from an inspecting tour from any point at all distant from their head quarters. I have used my horses almost daily for a month and shall have to use them to inspect Chintapalli next month from there I shall return to Madras. I venture to submit that it will be hard on me if I am required to pay the Rail fare of my two horses from Narasapatam road to Madras. I must however do so under the ruling contained in the G.O. under reply.

J In G.O.272, Financial, dated 26th March 1897 it was ruled that as regards long marches where circumstances render it impossible to expect that horses should be marched by road the cost of railing horses might be recovered. But in the objection taken to Mr. Young's case above referred to, a march of 80 miles is apparently not considered to be a long march justifying the charge.

4. The case of Superintendents in this matter is of course different. They can generally without inconvenience march their horses from any point in their districts to Head Quarters and I have told them that in future no trainage charges will be allowed in such cases unless they can show that they had to leave their head quarters on tour before the time elapsed necessary for their horses to reach head quarters by road. Even here in those cases where a conveyance is necessary for going to and from office it seems hard that a Superintendent should not be permitted to carry his horses with him by rail when returning to head quarters.

This would admit the claims of almost every officer in the service. Cecil

5. I have the honour to request instructions on the above two points. First, is the head of a department always to refuse to allow the charge for horses by rail in cases where officers are transferred long distances and secondly are rail charges similarly to be always refused in the case of inspecting officers returning to head quarters from long distances after having completed a tour of Inspection ?

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

To Inspector-General of Police.

Exd.

[G. / 118]

2,000—26-11-97.

Financial Department.

C. No. 467

55

TELEPHONE MESSAGE.

From The Chief Secretary

CHIEF SECRETARIAT.

To Accountant General

Dated March 1898.

Please let me know if the I.G. of Police could recover charges for the carriage of horses under article 1166 A of the Civil Service Regulations. Also whether you know of any orders fixing the number of servants and quantity of private baggage chargeable under that article. CWB 2.3.98 AA 3.3.98

3-3-98

57

Code Class.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly Number.

To (Office)

From (Office)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
	4	17	10	

To (Person) Chief Engr.

From (Person)

Papers enclosed 5/3/98

41

Your telephone of yesterday. There is no objection to Engineer in charge receiving the cost of conveyance of his boxes under Article 215 A.C.S.R. provided they were necessary to enable him to carry out the work. The scale of servants' and baggage is laid down in Rail Co's No. 51 dated 29th January 1870. But there is no mention of how the number should be limited to what shall consider should be charged for as part of the "necessary expenditure" in the sense of the term as used in article 116 A.C.S.R. The limit presented by Govt for the purpose of article 109 C.S.R. is four.

64 Word Form.

2

Recd. from LN.

At Hrs. Mts by

Sent to LN.

At Hrs. Mts by

Telegraph Master.

C G P—No. 533 T—7 2 97—400000.

+Put in Hy Cwb 5/3/98

How this telephone message should be dealt with Cwb 5/3/98

Mr. Bruce Hoge 3 98

Copy of telephonic message from the Accountant-General, Madras, dated 4th March 1898:-

59

A

Your telephone of yesterday. There is no objection to the Inspector-General receiving the cost of conveyance of his horses under article 1166 A, C.S.R., provided they were necessary to enable him to carry out his work. The scale of servants and baggage is laid down in G.O.No.51, Finl., dated 29th Jany. 1890 but there is no mention of horses in this order. The number should be limited to what Govt. consider should be charged for, as part of the "necessary expenditure" in the sense of the term as used in article 1166 A, C.S.R. The limit prescribed by Govt. for the purpose of article 1093 C.S.R. is four.

--

B C

Draft please

Cm.S.
8/3/98

Financial (189 8) Department.

61

CURRENT No. 904

E

[illegible]

CHIEF SECRETARY
19 MAR 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From The Accountant General
Madras

Order

No. 1077

Dated 17 March 1898.

Received } 19. 3. 98
Registered }

Enclosures 2.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding for the orders of Govt, the Proc: of the Bd of Revenue Sep: Rev: No. 5083 dtd 9 Nov 97 recommending the return of donations accorded by them to the conveyance of horses & camp equipments by rail or steam, in the Salt Customs dept.

R. O

Nm
19-3-98.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	435	finl	2-6-97
	499		22-7-90
	1502		7-7-84

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Return of Sanctions accorded for the conveyance of Lunatics per Coast Steamer by rail or Steamer in the Salt, Khasia and Cachar Districts from the 1st January 1896 to the 30th June 1897.

Name and designation of officer	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment Carried.	Charges incurred on account of Carriage of Camp Equipment.	Number of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of Carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was transferred	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road	Date on which the officer left the Station in Column 7.	Date on which the officer arrived at the Station in Column 8	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left a Station in Column 8 on tour	Number of days the officer remained at the Station in Column 8 before proceeding on tour	Total of Columns 12 & 14	Time admissible if horses or camp equipments were carried by road (at 15 miles a day between the Stations in Column 7 & 8)	Number of days' delay that would have occurred if horses had been carried by road (at 15 miles a day between Stations in Column 7 & 8)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
		lbs	Rs. as. p.		Rs. as. p.			miles			Days		Days	Days	Days	Days	
Mr. W. Wardle D. C. Southern Division Trichy	Inspection Duty	38-15	34-13-10	1 horse and grass cutter 1 horse	28-7--	Srirangam	Tuticorin	195	17-1-96	18-1-96	2	19-1-96	0	2	13	+11	were required for inspection duty
					13-10--	Madura	Trichinopoly	94	27-1-96	28-1-96	2	29-1-96	-	2	7	+5	
		-	21-10-8			Koilpatti	Tuticorin	42	11-2-96	11-2-96	1	12-2-96	.	1	3	+2	
						Kadamboor	Tuticorin	28	12-2-96	12-2-96	1	13-2-96	.	1	2	+1	
		31-17	32-10--			Trichinopoly	Coimbatore	178	21-4-96	21-4-96	1	27-4-96	5	6	12	+6	
		25--	11-9--	1	11----	Erode	Trichinopoly	87	31-5-96	31-5-96	1	1-6-96	-	1	6	+5	
2. Mr W. A. Fowler D. C. C. Do	Transfer	-	-	2	46-11--	Madras	Trichinopoly	248	11-9-96	12-9-96	2	15-10-96	32	34	17	-17	on transfer
		-	-	2	77-10--	Calicut	Madras	413	29-8-96	31-8-96	3	11-9-96	40	43	27	-16	Do.
	Inspection	-		Do	51-12--	Madras	Guntakal	332	In May 97 he started on tour by boat in the Nellore and the Krishna and while at Kurnool in July 97 he was directed by the Board to report on the location of the chowkies and the establishment required for the collection of import duty on toddy in the Kurnool and Bellary frontier Guntakal to Kurnool Kurnool to Bellary							
	-	32-6--		Do	57-9--	Bellary	Madras	362	22-8-96	25-8-96	3	28-8-96	2	5	25	-20	had to rail his horses from Madras to Kurnool & from Kurnool to Bellary
	Inspection			Do	51-12--	Trichy	Palghat	161	27-1-97	28-1-97	2	31-1-97	2	4	11	-7	
						mangalore	Calicut	149	21-3-97	23-3-97	3	24-3-97	-	3	10	-7	
		24-7--	71-5--			Calicut	Trichy	257	24-3-97	3-4-97	11	12-4-97	8	19	18	-1	
3 Mr C. G. Todhunter	Inspection		34-2--	2	59-13--	Madras	Kurnool via Guntakal and Gooty	324	30 14-9-96	10-10-96	11 27	7-10-96	8	35	22	-13	Inspection of chowkies in the Kurnool Hyderabad Frontier.
				2	48-6--	Gooty	Madras	257	3-11-96	4-11-96	2	10-11-96	5	7	18	-11	
		22-19--	41-15--	-	-	Kurnool	..	324	30-10-96	4-11-96	6	10-11-96	5	11	22	-11	on tour along the Bellary Hyderabad Frontier
	-			3	83-8--	Madras	Tungabadra	357	22-12-96	23-12-96	2	23-12-96	-	2	24	-22	
	..			2	101-8--	Bellary	Hindupur	142	8-2-97	8-2-97	1	10-2-97	1	2	10	-8	
		22-12	41-5--			Dharwar	Madras	338	19-2-97	20-2-97	2	5-3-97	12	14	23	-9	
4 Mr. Bryce McMaster Ag. Deputy Comm. Northern Divn	Transfer			2	41-10--	Bezwada	Waltair	222	30-3-96	31-3-96	2	9-4-96	8	10	15	-5	Inspection duty
	Inspection			Do	73-5--	Waltair	Humma	195	3-5-96	8-5-96	6	13-5-96	4	10	13	-3	
				Do	46-11--	Waltair	Humma Waltair Surla	157	3-11-96	14-11-96	12	16-11-96	1	13	11	-2	
						Surla	Waltair	157	8-11-96	27-11-96	12	10-12-96	12	24	11	-13	
	.	22-8.	8-9--	Do	9-14--	Trichy	Negapatam	79	15-4-97	15-4-97	1	26-4-97	10	11	6	-5	Do
						Negapatam	Trichy	79	13-4-97	13-4-97	1	15-4-97	1	2	6	-4	
	.			Do	46-11--	Waltair	Rajamundry	124	10-12-96	12-12-96	3	15-12-96	2	5	9	-4	To meet the Commissioner
	.			Do	61-14--	Vizianagram	Ichapur										
	.					Ichapur	Humma	260	9-1-97	18-1-97	10	18-1-97	.	10	18	-8	Inspection duty
	.					Berhampur	Surla Kimedi road										
	.					Parlakimedi Road	Waltair	93	18-1-97	21-1-97	4	23-1-97	1	5	7	-2	
	.			Do	37-14--	Waltair	Ramtha	202	4-2-97	5-2-97	2	7-2-97	1	3	14	-11	
	.			2	46-11-- 35-5--	Cuttack road	Berhampur	272	14-3-97	16-3-97	3	11-3-97	.	3	19	-16	
						Berhampur	Vizianagram										
	A	Transfer		1	35-5--	Vizagapatam	Madras	848	5-4-97	10-4-97	6	12-4-97	1	7	57	-50	
						madras	Trichy										
5 Mr W. C. H. Leggatt	A Inspection			1	10-2--	chicacole road	Waltair	81	22-1-96	22-1-96	1	3-2-96	11	12	6	-6	To meet the Commissioner under request order
	Do			1	13-12--	Waltair	Nanpada	110	12-12-96	12-12-96	1	14-12-96	1	2	8	-6	
	Do			1	23-4--	Waltair	Parlakimedi road and back	186	17-1-97	20-1-97	4	24-1-97	3	7	13	-6	
	Do			1	11-2--	Nanpada	Vizianagram	110	19-3-97	21-3-97	3	22-3-97	-	3	8	-5	
6 Mr C. V. Dalrymple Hay Ag. A.C. Chicacole Sub Division	A Transfer			1	104-10--	Salem	Waltair	878	29-3-96	2-4-96	6	12-4-96	8	14	59	-45	
	Inspection			1	9----	Vizianagram	Nanpada	110	6-6-96	6-6-96	1	10-6-96	3	4	8	-4	Assigned to him under Bench Order
Inspector	A Transfer			1	117-12--	Waltair	Trichy	942	18-12-96	4-1-97	18	11-1-97	6	24	63	-39	
7. Mr A. S. Kearns. Ag. A. C. Masulipatam Sub Division	A Transfer			1	95-14--	Negapatam	Bezwada	768	23-3-96	10-4-96	19	11-4-96	-	19	52	-33	

59

8 Mr. J. G. L. Platts A.C.	Inspection	42--	19-10--				Kurnool	Madras	127	5-1-96	5-1-96	1	11-1-96	5	6	9	-3		
Bellary Sub Division	..			1 horse hyena & grass cutter	29-6--		Bellary	Markapur	200	6-1-96	8-1-96	3	11-1-96	2	5	14	-9		* Horse had to be hailed as the road across the Nallamalai has been abandoned
	..			1 horse hyena & grass cutter	3-14-6		Giddalore	Gazulapalle	* 33	26-1-96	30-1-96	5	30-1-96	.	5	3	-2		
	..		2-10--	1	8-10--		Panyam	Kurnool road	38	27-2-96	27-2-96	1	28-2-96	-	1	3	-2		
	.			2	32-15--		Bellary	Hindupur	142	3-4-96	3-4-96	1	11-4-96	7	8	10	-2		
	.		11-14--				Cuddapah	Bellary	148	12-8-96	14-8-96	2	25-8-96	10	12	10	-2		To hand over charge to Mr. Brown
	Transfer			2	31-12--		Cuddapah	Nellore	108	26-8-96	31-8-96	6	11-9-96	10	16	8	-8		
9 Mr. G. W. Brown. A.C.	Transfer			2	74-12--		Nellore	Bellary	254	21-8-96	22-8-96	2	1-9-96	9	11	17	-6		
Bellary Sub Division																			
	Inspection		22-15--	2	36-4--		Bellary	Cuddapah	146	11-3-97	12-3-97	2	21-3-97	8	10	12	-2		
10 Mr. C. W. P. St. John. Agt.	.			2	33-12--		Arcot	Tirupattur Suramangalam	142	2-2-96	14-2-96	13	19-2-96	4	17	10	-7		
A.C. Arcot Sub Division	.						Suramangalam	Arcot	142	19-2-96	20-2-96	2	21-2-96	.	2	10	-8		
11 Mr. A. W. Thomas. A.C.	Inspn	22-31	16-12--	2	28-2--		Vellore	Sankari Drug	150	17-8-96	25-8-96	9	1-9-96	6	15	10	-5		
Arcot Sub Division	-	23-6	12-9--	2	14-4--		Arkonam	Tirukkoyilur	110	20-3-96	26-3-96	7	28-3-96	1	8	8	-		
	..	..	7-6--	.			Katpadi	galarpet	105	2-4-97	2-4-97	1	4-4-97	1	2	7	-5		
12 Mr. E. R. H. Mainwaring	-			2	14-4--		Negapatam	Villupuram	113	10-4-96	10-4-96	1	14-4-96	3	4	8	-4		
A.C. Negapatam Sub Division	.	16.35	8-15--	.	.		Negapatam	Nellikkuppam	93	8-10-96	8-10-96	1	8-10-96	-	1	7	-6		
13 Mr. B. Hawkins	Transfer			2	43-2--		Coimbatore	Negapatam	229	15-6-96	16-6-96	2	21-6-96	4	6	16	-10		
Ag. A.C. Negapatam Sub Div	Inspn			2	15-15--		Negapatam	Cuddalore	141	21-6-96	22-6-96	2	1-7-96	8	10	10	-		
Ag. A.C. Trichinopoly Sub Div	Transfer			1	14-13--		Negapatam	Trichy	79	20-10-96	21-10-96	2	25-10-96	3	5	6	-1		

14. Mr. C. M. Sherman	Inspn			2			Tuticorin	Tinnevelly	37	23-11-96									* Horse could not be marched owing to floods
Ag. A.C. Tinnevelly Sub Div	..			2	18-9--		Madura	Tuticorin	99	22-6-96	22-6-96	1	8-7-96	15	16	6	-10		
				Do	5		Tuticorin	Tinnevelly	37	3-12-96	3-12-96	1	5-12-96	1	2	3	-1		
Ag. A.C. Calicut Sub Div				1 and grass cutter	61-11--		Tuticorin	Calicut	452	17-3-97	20-3-97	4	24-3-97	3	7	31	-24		
15 Mr. R. W. Kite A.C. Tinnevelly Sub Division	Inspn			1	12-6--		Madura	Tuticorin	99	30-6-97	5-7-97	6	19-7-97	13	19	7	-12		
16 Mr. H. J. Simpson	Transfer			2	179-1--		Khandala road	Calicut	1348	4-4-96	10-4-96	7	12-4-96	1	8	90	-82		
A.C. Calicut Sub Division	Inspn	2-7-6		1	11-9--		Calicut	Palghat	85	particulars not available									
A.C. Nellore Sub Division	Transfer			1	60----		Calicut	Nellore	480										
17 Mr. K. V. Panchapa Kesadyer Asst. Inspector in charge of the Tinnevelly circle	Transfer			1	55-8--		Madras	Tinnevelly	443	24-6-96	3-7-96	10	5-7-96	1	11	30	-19		
18 Mr. C. E. Rhenius Inspector Cumbum Circle (A)				1 grass cutter & 1 grass cutter Coorg	3-14-6		Giddalore Gazulapalle	Gazulapalle Cumbum	* 87	31-1-96	2-2-96	3	3-2-96	-	3	6	-3		* The roads over the Nallamalais have been abandoned
					24-1-6		Cumbum and	Gazulapalle Kadle	108	3-2-96	16-2-96	13	16-2-96	-	13	8	-5		
19. Mr. H. W. M. Brown A Assistant Inspector in charge of the Erode circle	Transfer			1	21-6--		Calicut	Erode	171	9-6-96	17-6-96	9	24-6-96	6	15	12	-3		
20 Mr. A. C. Woodhouse Inspector Villupuram circle B	Transfer			1	12-8--		Tiruvallur	Villupuram	100	26-3-96	29-3-96	4	Particulars not known as the Officer draws fixed Travelling allowance.						

21. Mr. J. warner Inspector A	Transfer		X	1	12-10-..	Mettupet	Cuddalore	101	19-2-96	2-3-96	13	14-3-96	11	24	7	-17
Ponnani circle A	Transfer			1	..	Cuddalore	Feroke	374	23-3-97	1-4-97	10	6-4-97	4	14	25	-11
22 M.R.Ry R. Srinivasa Iyengar A	Transfer		X	1	9-12-..	Negapatam	Cuddalore old Town	98	19-4-96	26-4-96	8	1-5-96	4	12	7	-5
23 Mr. C.J.R. Blake A A	Transfer		X	1	.	Waltair	Nanpada	110	26-5-96	1-6-96	7	13-6-96	11	18	8	-10
Inspector B B	Do			1	37-6-..	Nanpada	Nellore	295	12-11-96	19-2-97						
24 Mr. R.P. Millard Assistant Inspector in charge Karassa circle	Do		?	1	..	Nellore	Vizagapatam	769	18-5-96	25-5-96	8	2-6-96	7	15	52	-37
25. M.R.Ry P. Lakshmiah Naydu Assistant Inspector in charge the Anakapalle circle B B	Do		?	1	87-14-..	Chittoor	Anakapalle	725	18-4-96	24-4-96	7	4-5-96	9	16	49	-33
	Do			1	25-10-..	Anakapalle	Bezwada	201	25-4-97	3-5-97	9					
26 Mr. A. J. Mitchell Assistant Inspector A	Do		X	1	33-.-..	Vizagapatam	Khunda road	204	8-6-96	23-6-96	16	11-7-96	17	33	14	-19
27. Mr. E. A. James Assistant Inspector in charge B	Do			1	32-8-..	Bezwada	Vizianagaram	260	3-6-96	10-6-96	8					
28 M. R. Ry M. Gopalarow (Inspector)	Do			1	51-10-..	Tirukkoyilur	Nandyal	275	1-9-96	10-9-96	10	14-9-96	3	13	19	-6
29 Mr. W. H. Taylor Assistant Inspector in charge	Do		?	1	87-8-..	Jubilee	Khunda road	1616	14-9-96	7-10-96	24	10-10-96	2	26	108	-82
30 M.R.Ry A.R. Ananta-Rama Iyar Asst. Inspector	Do			1	31-12-..	Negapatam	Madanapalle	323	4-9-96	8-9-96	5	11-9-96	2	7	22	-15
31 Mr. G. E. Johnstone Assistant Inspector in charge of the Krishnagiri circle A	Do		X	1		Madras	Dindigul	139	17-10-96	27-10-96	11	1-11-96	4	15	10	-5
Do - Rajahmundry circle B	Do		2	1	81-10-..	Madras	Rajahmundry	650	9-1-97	15-1-97	7	23-1-97	7	14	44	-30
Do Kamparti circle C A	Do		X	1		Rajahmundry	Kamparti	210	29-3-97	8-4-97	11	20-4-97	11	22	14	-8
32 Mr. D. Holman Inspector	Do			1	20-14-..	Negapatam	Erode	167	17-10-96	23-10-96	7	24-10-96	.	7	12	-5
	Do			1	38-12-..	Erode	Nellore	310	23-1-97	. no particulars are given as his transfer to the Atmakur circle was cancelled on his arrival at Nellore						
33 Mr. H. C. Sherman Inspector B	Do			1	.	Madras	Tuticorin	443	8-10-96	26-10-96	19					
34 M.R.Ry A. Seshagiri Row Assistant Inspector	Do			1	~~Vizagapatam~~	Vizagapatam	Ellore	185	7-11-96	13-11-96	8	18-11-96	4	12	13	-1
35 Mr. Viviani	Do			1	.	Palghat	Cuddalore	800	14-5-97	22-5-97	9	31-5-97	8	17	20	-3
36. M.R.Ry V. Krishna Row B	Do			1	34-6-..	Nellore	Cuddalore	275	Particulars are not known							
37 Mr. C. A. Luxa Inspector Adirampatnam circle	Do		X	1	27-14-..	Vellore	Adiram patnam	223	12-4-97	17-4-97	6	14-6-97	57	63	15	-48
38 M.R.Ry C. Saraoma Mudali South Trichi-nopoly circle B	Do			1	31-2-..	Madras	Trichy	249	30-4-97	5-5-97	6	Particulars are not known				

39 M. R. Ry M. Vasudeva Nayudu	Transfr		1		Cellore	Nandyal	235	7-2-97	16-2-97	10	18-2-97	1	11	16	-5	
40. Mr. Jeremiah Manjinapudi circle B	Do		1	27--	Madras	Masulipatam	245	Particulars are not available.								
41- M R Ry R Venkataramaiyar Asst Inspector Manjinapudi circle B	Do		1	66-14-	Madras	Guntur	534	5-6-97	15-6-97	11			Do			
42. Mr. H. B. Rendle Coimbatore circle	Do		1	49-4--	Nellore	Mettupalayam	394	29-4-97	5-5-97	7	18-5-97	12	19	27	-8	
43 Mr. R J Taylor B	Do		1	56-10--	Tinnevelly	Calicut	453	23-6-97	6-7-97	11	Particulars are not available					
44 Mr E. M. Smither Tuticorin Circle	Do		1	55-6--	Feroke	Tuticorin	446	17-3-97	20-3-97	4	26-4-97	36	40	30	-10	
46 M G Ry N. Gopalarao Assistant Inspector B	Do		1	36-4-	Mutupet	Tuticorin	283	27-4-97	6-5-97	10	Particulars are not available					
46 M. K. Ry C. S. Srinivasa Acharlar Asst. Inspector Kayalpatnam Circle B	Do		1	56-10--	Calicut	Tinnevelly	453	12-6-97	23-6-97	12			Do			
47 Mr J. J. F. Mc Murray Assistant Inspector Krishnapatnam	Do		1	27-12--	Vizagapatam	Krishnapatnam	324	28-8-96	16-9-96	14	17-9-96	6	20	22	-2	

A Ramanarayana Iyengar
Ag. Assistant Secretary

(1.10.97)

[G. / 74]
1,000—3-9-97.

73

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

Three cases submitted

C. No. 467 - Reference to Rev. appears to be necessary.

C. No. 782. The draft may issue?

C. No. 824 The rules bearing on this ~~case~~ case have been receipted on the docket to admit of its separate disposal. ~~with correspondents~~ With ref: to this last query, it is submitted that the facts mentioned in the C.S's note of 21.3.98 differentiate the case of the Dy. of Police from those of Officers of lower grades. ~~that~~ that it was in the interests of the public service that he should join his appt. ready equipped ~~for~~ for all emergencies.

Cmds.
26/3/98

Draft yes
JRA
29.3.98.

Are alterations that are made.
JRA.

1898
Finl Dept.
Enclos. No 1
To
C. N. 904

Revenue (189 8) Department.

75

CURRENT No. 2570.

From

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue,
Madras

Order Addl

Transferred to the Financial Department

No. 891 Mis.

Dated 29th March 1898.
Received 31
Registered 31
Enclosures
Spare copies

Ordered accordingly
April 1898

To
The Financial Dept

SUBJECT.

Comng. to the Collectors of South Arcot and Malabar G.O. disallowing the charges of Rs. 40-10-0 and 58-15-0 respectively incurred by Mr. A.R. Banerji and Dewan Bahadur K.V. Lakshmana Rao avergal for conveying their tents and horses by rail; and requesting Govt. for reasons stated to reconsider its orders on the interpretation of article 1093 Civil Service Regulations.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Sanctions under article 1093, C.S.R.

C.S.

The ~~Hon'ble Sir~~ Henry Bliss, K.C.I.E.

Rev for c.i with ref: to first part of para 4 of Draft

L.

77

Financial Dept:

Read again G.O.No.435 Finl., d/2nd June 1897 --------P
" G.O. ..... (A)
" also C.No.904 (A)

ORDER

P.S.

With its proceedings No.1077, d/17th March 1898, the Board of Revenue submits, with reference to paragraphs 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. to the conveyance of horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt, Abkari and Customs Dept. from 1st January 1896 to 30th June 1897. The Acct. Genl. considers that certain claims ~~marked A~~ should not have been admitted but is unable to express any opinion as regards the remainder ~~those marked B~~ in the absence of further information. It is not practicable to revoke at this distance of time the sanctions which have been accorded by competent authority - the Board of Revenue in the present instance - but the Acct. Genl's letter, with the opinions in which the Govt. concurs ~~agrees~~, will be communicated to the Board for information and future guidance.

2. In dealing with the present matter the Board has apparently overlooked the fact that the orders which the Acct. Genl. has endeavoured to enforce do not express his own individual ~~ideas~~

opinions

ideas, but are the ~~positive~~ orders of the Govt. of India, and as such they must be followed. The Board also loses sight of the fact that the privilege of charging for the carriage of either horses or camp equipment by rail is of recent creation, and that before the existence of railways it was usual for officers to march horses very long distances without obtaining any compensation from Govt. for doing so. ~~The Board has further overlooked the fact that~~ in dealing with claims under art: 1093 of the C.S.R., ~~it is~~ "the interests of the public service", ~~that have to be considered and not as the Board has understood the matter~~ "the interests of the officer concerned".

3. The attention of the Board of Revenue will be drawn to the remarks in G.O.No. d/ on the subject of the application of art: 1093 of the C.S.R., from which it will observe that the orders of the Govt. of India require prior to the admission of a claim under that article, a knowledge that the officer will ~~not may~~ be required to be equipped ready for emergent duty at his destination. The Govt. has no objection to the continuance of the practice described in paragraph 2 of the Board's proceedings on the condition that the Board does not accord sanction in any case unless it knows that the officer concerned will be required to proceed

79

proceed on tour before his horses etc. can arrive by road and ~~on condition~~ that the sanction is not given on mere supposition . In cases of all such sanctions, the Board will in due course furnish the Acct. Genl. with the particulars required by paragraph 3 of G.O.No. 435, d/2nd June 1897 and that officer will bring to the notice of Govt. any cases in which he considers that sanction has been incorrectly accorded.

4. The allusion in the Board's proceedings to the carriage of tents is not ~~quite~~ clear. In the Salt, Abkari and Customs Dept. the tents supplied to officers do not belong to them but to the circle or office and are not apparently carried on transfer. The Govt. ~~cannot agree~~ observes that the low pay of the officers in the Salt Dept: and the constant transfer of these officers - if ~~these~~ such reasons ~~do~~ exist - ~~appear to suffice~~ do not justify a ~~grant~~ concession for disregarding the distinct orders of the Govt of India which have been passed in regard to the application of art: 1093 of the C.S.R.

5. Whilst agreeing with the principle enunciated by the Acct. Genl. in paragraph 4 of his letter, it is to be observed that it may be cheaper in some cases for Govt. to pay half the carriage of tents by rail with reference to art: 114(2) of the C.S.R. than the half carriage by cart.

I from orders

27.4.98.

NOTE

NOTE

With reference to H.M's query on page 4 of the note for orders, it is submitted that what the Board means as regards officers carrying tents when on ~~ed~~ ordinary tours is that permission is obtained when officers wish to be reimbursed the entire carriage of the tents. - please see article 1141 of the C. S. R. especially clause ~~(2)~~ (c) Cmdt

Adl 27.4.98

(26)

81

Financial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1213

Ltr This to be kept with Ltr
The other folio 9 sent to
H. § 605. C S R
Cmdt
24.4.98

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 APR. 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From H. A. Stuart Esqr. I.C.S.
Offg Inspr General of Police,
Madras.

Order

No. 1476

Lodged with reference to 80 W. 404 Fin. dated 26th April '98.

Dated 21st April 1898.
Received 22. "
Registered 23. "
Enclosures —
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Enquiring whether he may expect the early orders of the Government on Mr Hammick's letter No: 519 dy 10th Feby 1898.

PACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department	Date

Current No. 1213. 83

No. O-48.

DEPARTMENT.

No. 1476.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
MADRAS 21st April 1898.

FROM W. S. Stuart Esqre I.C.S.,
M. ~~HAMMICK~~, ~~I.C.S.~~, ~~Esq.~~,
Ag. INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

To

THE *Chief Secretary to Government,*
Ootacamund.

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

I have the honour to inquire whether I may expect the early orders of the Government upon Mr. Hammick's letter No. 519, dated 10 February 1898. There are several cases pending in my office, the decision upon which depends upon the orders of Government on that letter.

Gen 467 98
804048 26/4/98

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedt Servant,
Dougl. Robertson
for Ag. Insp. Genl of Police.

(189) DEPARTMENT

FROM

M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

Madras,

To

THE

Dated
Despatched } 189 .
Received

No.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

[G/24]
1,000-22-11-97.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:- 85

Again GO., No 435 Jud, dated 2 - 6 - 1897. (P)

Again G.O., No. 40 " , dated 17 - 1 - 1898. (P) Not suitable for abstract

Current No. 467 of 1898, dated , from the I.G. of Police (A)

" " " 189 , " , "

" " " 189 , " , "

Letter only not enclosures

C.S.

Letter issued

ORDER. R.O. 4041 of 26th April 98

With reference to the letter from the Inspector-General of Police read above, his attention will be drawn to the fact that "in framing "the rule contained in article 1095 "of the C.S.R. x x x it was "not the intention of the Govt. of "India that officers should, when "making ordinary journeys on tour or "transfer, be entitled in addition "to drawing travelling allowance, to "convey their horses or camps equip- "ment at Government expense x x x. "The rule was 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 short- "ly after having had to use them in the "public service in another place." [Govt. of India, Finance and Com. Dept resolution No. 1603 Ex., d/ the 10th April 1896, recorded in G.O. No. 330

Even when the nature of their duties requires them to maintain horses or camp equipment.

K

DC

Check expenses at both ends

Chd 25/4/98

Financial, dated 8th May 1896.] He will also be reminded that it is a "fundamental principle" that travelling allowance "is not to be a source of profit" [article 1087 of the C.S.R.], and that "the only question" to be considered in deciding claims under article 1095 of the C.S.R. is "whether the allowances "admissible under rule do or do not "reasonably cover the expenditure neces- "sary to meet such travelling as is "required in the interests of the public "service." [Govt. of India, Fin. & Com. Dept. letter No. 5453 Ex., dated 29th December 1896 recorded in G.O.No. 51, Financial, dated 20th January 1897], independently of isolated instances of losses, which cannot possibly be provided against.

2. As regards the illustration given by the Inspector-General of the case of Mr. Powell, transferred from Mangalore to Nandyal in June 1897, it is to be observed that ~~at least~~ it was necessary to march the horse ~~at least~~ part of the journey, ~~was the only~~ ~~marc~~ from Mangalore to the Mysore frontier or to Calicut, ~~which would have occupied three or four days only, and which was unavoidable~~ in the absence of railway communication. If that portion of the journey could be performed by road, ~~a fortiori could~~ the remainder could also have been so performed ~~with equal facility~~.

3. The Govt. does not regard the march of horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Ramnad in the case of Mr. Mayne as in any way extraordinary; considerably greater distances were traversed by road before railway lines came into ~~in~~ existence. The same remarks apply in the case of Mr. Young.

4. The action of the Inspector-General in having guaranteed payment of the trainage of Mr. Lane's horse from Nandyal to Tuticorin, before it was clear that the horse would be required for tour purposes immediately on the arrival of that officer at Tuticorin, was irregular. The charge will, however, be admitted on the present occasion.

5. The Government cannot ~~undertake~~ ~~to~~ recognize any claims in connection with the cost of locomotion at head quarters.

6 As regards the case of the Inspector-General himself, that officer appears to have overlooked the provisions of article 1166 A of the C.S.R. G.O.No. 51, Finl., dated 29th January 1890 laid down the maximum number of servants and the maximum weight of baggage for which the officers specified in the margin may charge Govt. but omitted to specify any limit as regards horses.

7. The limit prescribed for the purpose of article 1095 in G.O.No. 504, Financial, dated 19th June 1882 (viz. 4 horses) will in future be applied in the cases of all these officers for the purposes of article

	No. of servants.	Weight in Mds. of baggage.
Members of the Rev.Bd. in their several capacities.	4	15
I.G. of Police, Jails & Regn, Surgeon-Genl. with Govt., Sanitary Comr., D.P.I.	4	10
Dy. Sanitary Commissioner.	3	10
~~Asst. Director of Settl.,~~ Inspector of Cattle Diseases.	2	8

1166 A.

1166 A. J

(from orders)

Cmb 22.4.98 MA 23.4.98

To

The I.G.of Police (with bills)
,, Accountant-General.
,, P. W. D.
,, Board of Rev. (L.R.)
,, ,, (Rev.Settl.,Land Records & Agri.)
,, ,, (Sep. Rev.)
,, Supt., Madras Survey.
,, Educl. Dept.
,, Rev. Dept.

Ref S. C. & T. A. file. Camage Hires &c

89

Revenue (1898.) Department.

Thro the accountant General

CURRENT No.

From

The Board of Revenue
Land Revenue
Madras.

No. 1125 Misc.

Order

Dated 26th April 1898.
Received
Registered
Enclosures
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt with remarks through the Accountant General revised return showing the Cost of Conveyance of tents and horses Sanctioned by the Board under Article 1093 C.S.R from 22-5-96 to 28-6-97.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

91

Financial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1415

CHIEF SECRETARY* 14 MAY 1898 *GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From The Accountant General Madras

Order

No. 1867

Dated 13th May 1898.

Received 14. " "

Registered 16. " "

Enclosures 4

Spare copies —

SUBJECT.

Forwarding the Proceedings of the Bd of Revenue (Land Revenue) No. 1125 thus dated 26 April 98 with 2 statements stating that the Items marked A appear to be inadmissible

93

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cul.	904/98		
435	2.6.97		
272	26.3.97		
51	20.1.97		
320	8.5.96		
647	3.9.95		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Return of Sanctions accorded under article 1093 C.S.R. from 22.5.96 to 28.6.97.

Land Revenue Dept.

CHIEF SECRETARY
14 MAY 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 1093. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of leave or duty	Weight of camp equipage carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was summoned.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was suspended.	Distance by road.	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8.	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8	No. of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols 9 & 14	Time admissible (last Hooghly Camp Regulations) whether in Col. 12	No. of days by which the period admitted (if the journey was performed in less than the time admissible) is exceeded.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	

97

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 109 3. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of leave or duty	Weight of camp equipage conveyed	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was transferred.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance between	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8 on tour	No. of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols. 12 & 14	Time allowed by Article 1 of Account Code, paragraph 1, Subdivision (a) and (b) for the journey between the stations mentioned in Cols. 7 & 8	Is the journey by Col. 17 allowed by the Article of the Code mentioned in Col. 16	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
		Mds. Seers	Rs a p.		Rs a p			Miles			days		days				
1. E.S. Lloyd Esqr. Actg. Head Apt. Collr Bellary	Transfer	14 — 12	16-1-0	1	38-12-0	Bezwada	Bellary	296	1-5-96	4-5-96	4	8-5-96	3	7	20	+13	✓
2 C. W. Mounsey Esqr. Acting Collector Salem	Do	44 — 1	48-1-0	3	65-4-0	Anantapur	Salem	234	21-5-96	29-5-96	9	25-7-96	56 3	65	16	-49	A
3 A.C. Dutt Esqr. Acting Sub-Collector, Chingleput	Do	10 — 34	6-9-0	2	24-15-0	Guntur	Chingleput	120	4-6-96	6-6-96	3	10-6-96	3	6	8	+2	✓
4 J. A. Robertson Esqr. Ag. Sub Collector, Tinnevelly	Do	Not known	38-3-2	1	82-0-0	Kandapur in S. Canara District	Tuticorin	465	Not known left Manja-lore on 28-4-96	5-5-96	8	18-5-96	12	20	31	+11	✓
5 In R.Rg. C. Adikesavulu Nayudu or Dy. Collector Nellore	Do	8 — 8	6-7-0	1	19-6-0	Cuddapah	Nellore	108	22-6-96	22-6-96	1	24-6-96	1	2	7	+5	✓
6. P. Rajagopala Chari Esqr. Acting Sub Collector, Coimbatore	Do	30 — 28	25-7-0	2	34-4-0	Madura	Erode	129	2-7-96	2-7-96	1	6-7-96	3	4	9	+5	The information furnished in Cols 10-17 against this item do not agree with those given by the A.G. in his statement appended to G.O. 435 Fin. 2-6-97. The figures in the present statement have been taken from the revised return submitted by the Collector.
7. H.F.W. Gillman Esqr. Ag Collector Kurnool	Do	28 — 8	22-4-0	1	27-2-0	Guntur	Kurnool	184	14-9-96	15-9-96	2	3-10-96	17	19	13	-6	A
8 R.F. Grimley Esqr. Acting Sub. Collector Madura	Do	25 — 7	34-10-0	2	60-9-0	Arcot	Dindigul	267	2-9-96	3-9-96	2	6-9-96	2	4	18	+14	✓
9 R.F. Austin Esqr. Acting Head Apst. Collector, Madura	Do	9 — 18	15-8-0	1	44-6-0	Calicut	Madura	230	8-9-96	10-9-96	3	12-9-96	1	4	16	+12	✓
10 A.J. Forbes Esqr. Acting Sub-Collector Cuddapah	Do	22 — 33	10-5-0	1	16-4-0	Penukonda	Madanapalle	146	10-4-96	11-4-96	2	19-4-96	7	9	10	+1	✓
11 J.H.A. Irenmonger Esqr. Ag. Collector Nilgiris	Do	45 — 0	84-10-0	3	122-8-0	Bellary	Ootacamund (Nethipalem)	320	11-8-96	15-8-96	5	24-9-96	39	44	22	-22	A
12 A.L. Vibert Esqr. Acting. Head Apst. Collector, Coimbatore	Do	31 — 19	48-12-0	"	"	Tinnevelly	Coimbatore	237	10-5-96	11-5-96	2	17-5-96	5	7	16	+9	* ✓
13 M. Ghose acting Head Apstt Collector, Kurnool	Do	21 — 9	30-9-0	"	"	Tirupathur	Nandyal	272	30-5-96	4-6-96	6	23-6-96	18	24	19	-5	A
14 J. Varada Row Esqr. Apstt Collr S. Arcot	Do	12 — 38	22-8-0	"	"	Calicut	Cuddalore	374	28-5-96	29-5-96	2	15-6-96	16	18	25	+7	✓
15 J.W. Hughes Esqr. Special Assistant Apst. Godavari	Do.	28 — 10	62-6-0	"	"	Ranipet	Rajahmundry	388	28-4-96	30-4-96	3	11-5-96	10	13	26	+13	✓

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 109 S. C. S. R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

	Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of camp equipage carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer proceeded or to which he was transferred.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance between	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8.	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8 on tour.	No. of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols. 12 & 14	Time allowed (as shown in Camp Establishment Tables) for journey between Cols. 7 & 8	Time allowed (as shown in Camp Establishment Tables) for journey between Cols. 8 & 13	Remarks.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
16	P. Rajagopala Chari Espr. Asst. Sub-Collector, Coimbatore	Transfer	35-10	29-3-0	"	"	Madura	Erode	129	5-9-96	5-9-96	1	8-9-96	2	3	9	+6	Vide remarks against item 6. (101)
17	P. Rajagopala Chari Espr. Head Asst. Collector, Madura	Do	32-36	27-5-0	"	"	Erode	Madura	129	Not known (10-8-96)	24-8-96	14	24-8-96	"	"	9	-5 information not available.	
18	V. Venugopala Chetti Espr. Asst. Sub-Collector, Salem	Do	8-10	7-14-0	"	"	Madras	Hosur	188	13-9-96	14-9-96	2	18-9-96	3	5	13	+8	
19	L. J. Harris Espr., acting Head Asst. Collector Nellore	Do	15-20	65-6-0	"	"	Russelkonda via. Berhampore	Cuddapah	607	20-10-96	31-10-96	12	11-11-96	10	22	41	+19	
20	S. R. Rowman Sahib Bahadur, Head Quarters Dy. Collector Salem	Do	18-23	44-4-0	"	"	Bezwada	Salem	493	29-2-96 (28-2-96)	7-5-96	2-8 (2-8)	16-5-96	8	2-16 (2-16)	33	+16 -44	Joined at Salem from privilege leave. The order of transfer was gazetted on 28-4-96
21	E. L. R. Thornton Espr. Head Asst. Collector, N. Arcot	Do	22-0	52-4-0	1	50-0-0	Waltair	Ranipet	514	2-4-96 (Halt made when leaving on special duty)	3-4-96	2	20-4-96	16	18	35	+17	
22	L. C. Miller Espr. Acting Collector S. Canara	Do	-	-	1	139-12-0	Vizagapatam	Mangalore	859	10-4-96	25-4-96	16	No town	72	108	58	-50	On 10-5-96 Mr. Miller visited Kudremukh for which he did not appear to have drawn any allowances.
23	In R. Ry. N. S. Somasundara Sastri Avl. Dy. Collector, Kistna	Do	-	-	1	12-12-0	Cocanada	Masulipatam	160 Via Peddapuram	17-2-96	23-2-96	4	Not known	29		11	Information not available	
24	E. Scott Espr. Acting Collector, Bellary	Do	-	-	1	41-0-0	Nellore	Bellary	266	16-6-96	16-6-96	1	26-6-96	9	10	18	+8	
25	E. L. R. Thornton Espr. Acting Sub-Collector Salem.	Do	-	-	1	15-14-0	Ranipet	Hosur	118	12-6-96	16-6-96	5	24-6-96	7	12	8	-4	
26	E. Scott Espr. Acting Collector Nellore	Do	-	-	1	38-8-0	Bellary	Nellore	266	3-7-96	4-7-96	2	18-8-96	44	46	18	-28	The Collector Explains that horses are wanted not only on tour, but also at head quarters.
27	R. A. Campbell Espr. Acting Collector. N. Arcot	Do	.	.	1 grass cutter 2	3-10-0 21-0-0	Hosur	Chittoor	146	16-6-96	20-6-96	5	26-6-96	5	10	10	0	
28	N. Mac Michael Espr. Acting Head Assistant Collector Guntur	Do	34-10	65-9-0	1	58-8-0	Madura	Penukonda	504	28-3-96	4-4-96	8	10-4-96	5	13	34	+21	
29	A. C. Dutt Espr. Acting Head Assistant Collector Nellore	Do	11-5	26-12-0	2	101-7-0	Tinnevelly	Guntur	467	21-3-96	24-3-96	4	12-4-96	18	22	31	+9	

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 109 3. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

	Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of leave or duty.	Weight of camp equipage duly carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was transferred.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road.	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8.	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8 on tour.	No. of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols 12 & 14	Time admitted as allowance for journey, i.e. according to the rules in force at the time	Time actually taken by the officer on the journey	Remarks.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
30.																		
30	S.W.G. MacIver Esqr. Acting Head Asst. Collector S. Arcot	Transfer	18-1	18-4-0	1	28-2-0	Gooty	Cuddalore	199	31-3-96	7-4-96	8	16-4-96	8	16	14	-2.	A
31.	J. Murphy Esqr. acting Sub-Collector, Malabar	Do			1	10-10-0	Palghat	Calicut	84	26-5-96	26-5-96	1	29-5-96	2	3	6	+3	
32.	A.F.W. Gillman Esqr. Acting Sub-Collector	Do.	26-10	20-10-0	1	21-4-0	Kurnool (Nandyal)	Guntur	184	27-10-96	5-11-96	10	29-11-96	23	33	13	-20.	Road journey over the Nallamalais was difficult and dangerous. He had also to proceed ready equipped owing to the state of season
33	C.G. Spencer Esqr. Acting Head Asstt Collector, Bellary	Do	19-25	30-0-0	1	44-12-0	Rajahmundry	Bellary	429	31-7-96 left Madras where he received telegram posting to Bellary	5-8-96	5	15-8-96	9	14	29	+15.	
	Do Acting Sub-Collector, Godavari	Do			1	55-6-0	Bellary	Rajahmundry	429		9-9-96	2½	22-9-96	12	14½	29	+14½	
34	G.K. Dance Esqr, Acting Collector, Malabar	Do	11-28	20-6-0	2	71-4-0	Cuddalore	Calicut	374	2-7-96	19-7-96	18	11-8-96	22	40	25	-15.	A
35	F.A. Coleridge, Asst. Collector Kistna	Do	35-0	103-7-3 including charge for horses and 2 Servants	2 horses 2 Servants		Bellary	Bezwada	296	19-8-96	28-8-96	10	27-10-96	59	69	20	-49.	Ordered by the Collector of Kistna by wire to join sharp, as he was wanted urgently for relief work in the floods. The ten hand horses had therefore to be taken by rail.
36	M.R.Ry. M. Ravivarma Rajah and. Dy. Collector Tinnevelly	Do	16-4-0	32-4-0	—	—	Mangalore	Shermadevi, in Tinnevelly Dt	427	14-4-96	3-5-96	20	9-5-96	5	25	29	+4	
37	M.R.Ry. J. Ramayya, Pandha., Asst. Head Quarter Dy. Collector, Bellary	Do			1	56-6-0	Vizagapatam	Bellary via Cocanada	439	29-6-96 × 29-6-96	12-5-96	18	17-5-96	18 17	32	33	Information not available	× Information not available
38	R.H. Campbell Esqr. acting Collector, Bellary	Do			3	63-4-0	Chittoor	Bellary	228	4-8-96	10-8-96	7	26-9-96	46	53	16	-37.	A
39	C.M. Mullaly Esqr. Collector of Kurnool	Duty	—	—	1	16-0-0		Markapur	113	8-4-96	8-4-96	1	14-4-96	5	6	8	+2	Journey occasioned by the urgent nature of the Jowabary work at Markapur
		Do.			1	13-14-0	Cumbum	Kurnool	130	19-4-96	19-4-96	1	2-6-96	43	44	9	-35.	
40	J.K. Batten Esqr. acting Sub-Collector, Madura	Special Duty	—	—	1 ✕	72-8-0	Dindigal Trichy	Dindigal	165	13-4-96	14-4-96	2	14-4-96	"	2	11	+9	Ordered to go to Malabar by telegram
									165	6-5-96	9-5-96	4	10-5-96	"	4	11	+7	on Special duty in connection with the Inopla outbreak.
41	J. Twigg Esqr., Collector, Madura	Duty			1	5-0-0	Madura	Dindigul	38	23-5-96	23-5-96	3 hrs.	Immediately	"	3 hrs.	3 days	d.h. 2-24	Anticipated a riot in the neighbourhood of Dindigul and hence started suddenly
42	W.B. Ayling Esqr. Asst. Sub-Collector, Tanjore	Duty			1	5-0-0	Kumbakonam	Kattalam	14	4-8-96	4-8-96	1 hr. nearly	at once	"	1 hr	1	+1	Had to start suddenly to prevent breaches in the Coleroon

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 109 3. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

	Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of leave or duty	Weight of camp equipage carried	Charge incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No of horses carried	Charge incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was recalled	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road.	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8 on tour	No of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols. 12 & 14	Time admissible (Journey allowance, Camp equipage, Horses and Relays) for the distance in Col. 9	No of days by which the time allowed in Col. 15 exceeded or fell short of the time taken by the officer	Remarks.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
43	P.S.P. Rice Esqr. Acting P.A. Collector Ganjam.	Transfer	—	—	1	11-8-—	Berhampore	Chicacole	98	29-6-96	29-6-96	1 day	5-7-96	5	6	7	+1	Had to proceed at once in the interests of public service.
44	C.A. Mounsey Esqr. Acting Collector Salem	Durbf.	—	—	1	14-—-—	Suramangalam	Samalpatti	55	14-11-96	14-11-96	1	14-11-96	—	1	4	+3.	Returned from a tour only on 12-11-96. He had to go to Samalpatti urgently to inspect the condition of the people and of the crops.
							Samalpatti	Suramangalam	Do	15-11-96	15-11-96		20-2-97		96	5	-91	
45	A.B. Willimott Esqr. Assistant Collector, South Arcot - (Since deceased)	on Survey training	11—11	4-9-—	—	—	Cuddalore	Periakulam via. Ammaia naikkanur	229	15-5-96	16-5-96	2	Joined Survey Camp on 16-5-96 No tour		2	16	+14	
		Do.	Do.	5-7-—	—	—	Kodaikanal.	Cuddalore	246	18-6-96	19-6-96	2				17	-6	
46	A.R. Banerji Esqr. Apptd Collector, Godavari	Do	19-25	9-4-—	—	—	Godavari	Kaltair	124	15-5-96	Information not received			7	10	9	-1	
47	A. Thompson Esqr. ~~Acting~~ Apptd Collector Nellore	Do	14-37	36-15-11	1	75-14-—	Nellore	Bellary	260	30-5-96	31-5-96	2	27-6-96	27	29	18	-11	† The tents and horses were apparently required for use immediately on arrival at Bellary.
		Do	Do		Do		Bellary	Nellore	260	27-6-96	28-6-96	2	26-7-96	27	29	18	-11	
48	N. Macmichael Esqr. Acting Head Assistant Collector, Anantapur	Do	—	—	1	11-12-—	Anantapur	Bellary	73	31-5-96	1-6-96	2	⊛ 30-6-96	27	29	5	-24	⊛ The date entered in Column 13 appears to be incorrect. The horse was taken for use immediately on arrival
							1897											
49	L.E. Buckley Esqr. Acting Sub-Collector, Chingleput	Transfer	—	—	2	33-3-—	Bangalore	Chingleput	183	3-12-96	9-12-96	7	8-1-97	29	36	13	-23	
50	A.C. Butt Esqr. Acting Sub-Collector Coimbatore	Do	11-29	13-7-—	2	37-11-—	Chingleput	Coimbatore	298	14-12-96	17-12-96	2	10-1-97	23	25 d	20	-5	
51	E. Scott Esqr. acting, Principal Assistant Collector Vizagapatam	Do	23-34	83-8-—	1	106-4-—	Nellore	Vizianagaram	406	4-12-96	8-12-96	5	30-12-96	21	26	28	+2	
52	E.L.R. Thornton Esqr. Acting Head Apptd Collector, Madura	Do	22-5	36-13-—	2	72-1-—	Madras	Madura	281	22-12-96	23-12-96	2	14-1-97	21	23	19	-4	

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 109 3. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

No.	Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey is taken on account of transfer or duty.	Weight of camp equipage carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage. Rs. A. P.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was expected.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance in miles.	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col. 8.	Time taken by the officer on tour.	Date on which the officer left the station in Col. 8 on tour.	No. of days the officer remained at the station in Col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total of Cols. 12 & 14	Time allowed (As Provided in Rule 3 of Appendix I to the Travelling Allowance Rules)	Deficit (if any) in the time allowed (Col. 15) as compared with the time actually taken (Col. 13)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		
53	J.J. Cotton Esqr. Apl. Coll. Chingleput	Transfer	18-30	42-0-0	1	49-0-0	Narasapatam	Saidapet	489	14-12-96	18-12-96	5	4-1-97	16	21	33	+12	107
54	C.G. Spencer Esqr. Acting Head Apl. Collector, Bellary	Do	—	—	1	50-6-0	Rajahmundry	Bellary	429	4-12-96	13-12-96	10	15-12-96	1	11	29	+18	
55	R.F. Austin Esqr. Acting Head apl. Collector, Malabar	Do	9-18	46-6-0 including charges for horses.	1	—	Madura	Palghat	Information not received									
56	In R.Rg. C. Somasundara Sastriar and Dy Collector, Trichinopoly	Do	Not known	13-3-0	—	—	Calicut	Trichinopoly	244	2-2-97	3-2-97	2	Madura tour	8	10	17	+7	† was directed to proceed to Godavari Dt as Manager of the Pittapur Estate on 11-2-97. The tents were taken by rail, to enable him to go into camp immediately on arrival at Trichinopoly, if necessary.
57	R.A. Campbell Esqr. Ag. Sub. Collr., Salem	Do	—	—	3	51-12-0	Bellary	Attur via Bangalore	210	10-2-97	11-2-97	2	21-2-97	9	11	14	+3	
58	A.J. Forbes Esqr, Acting Sub-Collector, Cuddapah	Do	Not known	17-6-0	—	—	Cuddapah	Narsapatte	~~178~~ 77	8-1-97	8-1-97	1	19-1-97	10	11	6	-5	Had to go on circuit for general inspection with refce to the state of season.
59	In. V. Venugopala Chetty Ag Head. apl. Coll. Nellore	Do	19-26	21-10-0	2	44-1-0	Inalur in Salem Dt.	Gudur.	243	16-2-97	20-2-97	5	8-3-97	15	20	17	-3.	
60	H.W.F. Gillman Esqr. Special Apl. Collector Bellary	Do	12-37	13-8-0	1	36-4-0	Guntur	Bellary	290	9-2-97	12-2-97	4	30-3-97	45	49	19	-30	In Gillman states that a transferred officer has very often no idea of the nature of work he will have to perform on his arrival at the new station and suggests that the proper rate to apply in such cases would be to allow actual expenses when the No of days in Col. 16 exceeds the period of joining time actually availed of. He points out that an officer under transfer always knows what joining time he has and can therefore decide whether he should send the horses by rail or road.
61	In R.Rg. N.S. Somasundara Sastriar and Dy. Collector Godavari	Do	14 mds	8-0-0	—	—	Srikakulam	Cocanada	160 via Parlakd.	10-3-97	12-3-97	3	20-3-97	7	10	10	-	The road was practically impassable owing to the flood damages of 1895.

Return of Sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) under Art. 1093. C.S.R. from 22nd May 1896 to 28th June 1897

No.	Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of leave or duty.	Weight of camp equipage carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of camp equipage.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses.	Station from which the officer started or was transferred.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road.	Date on which the officer left the station in col. 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in col. 8.	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the station in col. 8 on tour	No. of days the officer remained at the station in col. 8 before proceeding on tour.	Total No. of cols. 12 & 14	Time allowed by Code for the journey in col. 12	Time taken by the officer on the journey in col. 12	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
62	A.R. Cumming Esqr. Ag. Head Apt. Collector Kistna	Transfer	28 Trunks	39-4-9	—	—	Cuddalore	Bezwada by sea	468	15-7-96	23-7-96	9	1-8-96	8	17	31	+14	109
63	A.R. Banerji Esqr. Ag. Head Apt. Collr, Madura	Do	28 Trunks	45-2-6	—	—	Cocanada	Madura	686	16-4-97	26-4-97	11	4-5-97	7	18	46	+28	
64	J.J. Cotton Esqr. Actg Head Apt. Collr, Tanjore	Do	36-36	35-4-0	2	39-12-0	Madras	Negapatam	195	12-4-97	12-4-97	1	13-4-97	—	1	13	+12	
65	E.B. Elwin Esqr. Ag. Provl. Apt. Collector Vizagapatam	Do	4-0	6-0-0	1	7-8-0	Anakapalle	Vizianagram	55	23-4-97	23-4-97	1	25-4-97	1	2	4	+2	had to join ready equipped for famine duty.
66	P.S.P. Rice Esqr. Actg Sub-Collector, Tinnevelly	Do	10-37	13-0-6	1	63-0-0	Berhampore	Tuticorin	1010	12-4-97	30-4-97	19	13-5-97	12	31	68	+37	
67	V. Venugopala Chetty Esqr. Ag. Sub-Collr. N. Arcot	Do	18-33	11-0-0	1	16-7-0	Nellore	Vellore	147	2-5-97	3-5-97	2	11-5-97	7	9	10	+1	
68	E. Scott Esqr. acting Collector, Nellore	Do	22-20	75-1-0	1	100-14-0	Vizianagram	Nellore	405	28-4-97	1-5-97	4	9-5-97	7	12	27	+16	
69	E.A. Elwin acting Collector, Kurnool	Duty	—	—	2	10-5-0	Cuddapah	Pandikal	50	16-5-97	18-5-97	3	21-5-97	2	5	4	-1	*
70	A.A. Stuart Esqr. Ag. Collector, Bellary	Do	—	—	3	20-4-0	Kurnool	Bellary	80	27-2-97	28-2-97	2	5-3-97	4	6	6	0	
71	Do	Do	—	—	1	10-0-0	Bellary	Adoni	50	8-6-97	9-6-97	2	10-6-97	0	2	4	+2	
72	R.B. Wood Esqr. Apt. Collector, Salem	Survey training			1	92-2-0	Salem / Bellary	Bellary / Salem	305	29-5-96 / 30-6-96	31-5-96 / 1-7-96	2	30-6-96	29	31	21	-10	* the horse was taken under special instructions from the Superintendent of Survey. Vide para 2 of the Resn.
									305	30-6-96	1-7-96	1	5-8-96	36	37	21	-16	*

(True copy.)

Lindesay
Ag. Secretary.

CV
29/4

125

Forest

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY
14 MAY 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Encl: to G.O. 1 to Secl
G.O. 1141 dated 9/8/95

Return of sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue (Forest Branch) under Article 1093 C.S.R. from 22nd May '96 to 28th June '97.

Name and designation of Officer	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment carried	Charges incurred on account of Camp equipment.	No. of horses carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses	Station from which the Officer started on tour or transferred	Station at which the Officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance in miles	Date on which the Officer left Station on Col.	Date on which the Officer arrived at the Station named: 8.	Time taken by the Officer.	Date on which the Officer left the Station named: 8 on Col.	No. of days the Officer remained at the Station named: 8	Total days: 12 & 14.	Time admissible for journey (Leave rules 15 and 16 Chapter 2 Part I: the Station to which transferred being reckoned as the Station left)	No. of days absence from Head Quarters (Leave rules 15 and 16 Chapter 2 Part I: the Station left being reckoned as Head Quarters)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
					Rs As P			miles			Days		Days	Days	Days	Days	
Mr. A.W. Peet - Const. N.C.	on inspection duty.	"	"	2	102 - " - -	Waltair	Anantapur	574	9-10-96	12-10-96	4	18-10-96	5	9	37	+28	181
	Do	"	"	2	7 - 5 - "	Anantapur	Mukkajapalli	39	18-10-96	18-10-96	1	18-10-96	"	1	3	+2	
	Do	"	"	2	7 - 6 - "	Mukkajapalli	Anantapur	39	29-10-96	29-10-96	1	6-11-96	7	8	3	-5	
	Do	"	"	2	13 - 4 - "	Anantapur	Bellary	72½	11-11-96	11-11-96	1	16-11-96	4	5	5	"	
	Do	"	"	2	58 - 2 - "	Bellary	Bezwada	309¼	16-11-96	17-11-96	2	18-11-96	"	2	21	+19	
	Do	"	"	2	6 - 15 - "	Bezwada	Ellore	37	12-12-96	12-12-96	1	15-12-96	2	3	3	"	
	Do	"	"	2	34 - 12 - "	Ellore	Waltair	165	15-12-96	16-12-96	2	17-1-97	31	33	13	-20	
	Do	"	"	2	15 - 3 - "	Waltair	Chicacole Road Station	81	17-1-97	17-1-97	1	17-1-97	"	1	6	+5	
	Do	"	"	2	15 - 3 - "	Chicacole	Waltair	81	13-2-97	13-2-97	1	22-2-97	8	9	6	-3	
	Do	"	"	2	8 - 10 - "	Waltair	Narsapatam	46	22-2-97	22-2-97	1	24-2-97	1	2	4	+2	
	Do	"	"	2	11 - 4 - "	Zunni	Waltair	60	18-3-97	18-3-97	1	27-3-97	8	9	4	-5	
	Do	"	"	2	21 - 8 - "	Waltair	Bobbamspore	172	27-3-97	28-3-97	2	31-3-97	2	4	12	+8	
	Do	"	"	1	23 - 4 - "	Chatrapur	Waltair	186	14-3-97	15-3-97	2	18-5-97	63	65	13	-52	Return journey from Chatrapur for inspection duty.
Mr. R. McIntosh, D.F.O. Ganjam	Do	"	"	2	10 - 11 - "	Chatrapur	Kotabommali	57	2-5-96	2-5-96	3 hrs	3-5-96	1	1	4	+3	
	Do.	"	"	2	14 - 4 - "	Kotabommali	Chatrapur	76	7-5-96	7-5-96	5 hrs	22-5-96	15	15	5	-10	
Mr. J.L. Mac Carthy, Asst. Conr.	Transfer	"	"	2	73 - 14 - "	Berzada	Berhampur	394	11-1-96	13-1-96	2 Days	21-1-96	8	10	27	+17	The office was transferred in connection with the boundary demarcation of Malkangiri and had to proceed expeditiously.
Mr. S. Cox - D.F.O. Vizag	Duty	"	"	1	10 - 2 - "	Waltair	Chicacole road	81	17-1-97	17-1-97	"	17-1-97	"	"	6	+6	An inspection with the Conservator N.C.
	Do.	"	"	1	10 - 2 - "	Chicacole road	Waltair	81	13-2-97	13-2-97	"	22-2-97	8	8	6	-2	An ~~inspection~~ return from tour of - Do -
Mr. S. Cox - D.F.O. Godavari	Transfer	"	30-5-"	2	61 - 8 - "	Nandyal	Cocanada	328	2-4-96	2-4-96	1	19-4-96	17	18	22	+4	
	Duty	"	"	2	11 - 7 - "	Ellore	Rajahmundry	61	15-5-96	15-5-96	"	21-5-96	5	5	4	-1	
	Duty	"	4-4-"	"	-	Ellore	Cocanada	102	22-5-96	22-5-96	"	12-6-96	20	20	7	-13	
Mr. C.D. Thornton	Transfer	16m. 3 Boxes 2 Boy Servants	7-7-"	2	18 - 15 - "	Waltair	Cocanada	103	23-9-96	24-9-96	1	3-10-96	8	9	7	-2	
	Duty	"	"	1	6 - 14 - "	Rajahmundry	Kottapalli	64	11-4-97	11-4-97	"	12-4-97	1	1	4	+3	
	Duty	"	"	2	7 - 14 - "	Cocanada	Rajahmundry	41	21-5-97	21-5-97	"	21-5-97	"	"	3	+3	
G.V. Popert Esqr., Const. C.C.	Duty	"	"	1	20 - - -	Madras	Nellore	110	16-8-96	17-8-96	1	18-8-96	"	1	8	+7	
	Do	"	"	1	20 - - -	Nellore	Madras	110	21-8-96	21-8-96	1	11-9-96	20	21	8	-13	
	Do	"	"	2	15 - 3 - -	Madras	Kalpadi	83	11-9-96	11-9-96	"	11-9-96	"	"	6	6	
	Do	"	"	2	18 - 8 - -	Arcot	Amboor Pack	48	20-9-96	20-9-96	"	21-9-96	1	1	4	+3	The horses were used on the morning of the 24th & were therefore sent by rail.
								10	24-9-96	24-9-96	"	25-9-96	1	1	1	"	
	Do	"	"	1	10 - 8 - -	Arcot	Sholingur	84	4-10-96	4-10-96	"	5-10-96	1	1	6	5	
	Do	"	"	2	20 - 7 - -	Madras	Renigunta	109	18-10-96	18-10-96	1	30-10-96	11	12	8	-4	
	Do	"	"	2	46 - 11 - -	Kotur	Madras	250	25-11-96	26-11-96	2	29-11-96	2	4	17	13	
	Do	"	"	2	46 - 11 - -	Madras	Trichinopoly	250	14-12-96	15-12-96	2	15-1-97	30	32	17	-15	In addition to the Railway journey the horses were marched by road for 28 miles -
						Trichinopoly	Madras										

Return of sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue (Forest Branch) under Article 1093 C.S.R. from 22nd May '96 to 28th June '97.

Name and designation of Officer	Whether by the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of Camp Equipment.	½ of three cents	Charges incurred on account of carriage of tents	Station from which the officer started on tour or journey	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road	Date on which the officer left the station on Col: 4 on Govt.	Date on which the officer left the station on Col: 8 on Govt.	Time taken by the officer.	Date on which the officer left the Station on Col: 8 on Govt.	No. of days the officer remained at the Station in Col: 8.	Total of Cols: 12 & 14.	Time admissible for the journey (Rule 8 of the Rules for Travelling allowance)	Time actually occupied by the journey (i.e. the difference between the dates in Cols: 13 & 10)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
E.V. Popert Esqr., Cond.r C.C.	Duty	"	"	2	Rs. As. P 30-6-"	Bradras	Cuddapah	162	15-1-97	15-1-97	1	19-1-97	3	4	11	7	did not halt at Trichinopoly-Horses marched in addition-12 miles.
	Do	"	"	2	6-7-"	Cuddapah	Trichinopoly	35	19-1-97	19-1-97	"	19-1-97	"	"	3	3	
	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Chinnatippa Samudram	Bradras	172	5-3-97	6-3-97	2	10-3-97	3	5	12	7	
	Do	"	"	2	22-11-"	Pattapalayam	Salem	121	24-6-97	25-6-97	1	28-6-97	2	3	9	6	The horses were taken to Coimbatore on duty thence sent to Salem.
E.D.M. Hooper Esqr., Cond.r, S.C.,	Do	"	"	1	8-2-"	Podanur	Pattambi	65	8-9-96	8-9-96	1	9-9-96	1	2	5	3	
	Do	"	"	1	14-8-"	Calicut	Coimbatore	115	1-12-96	1-12-96	1	15-12-96	13	14	8	-6	
	Do	"	"	1	18-4-"	Cannanore	Mangalore	By steamer distance not known	14-1-97	15-1-97	2	19-1-97	3	5	"	"	The journey was made by steamer.
	Do.	"	"	1	42-4-"	Bryore	Singanallur	338	30-1-97	31-1-97	2	5-2-97	4	6	23	17	
Lt. R.H.L. Luckington R.S.C. Gunjam dca	Duty	"	"	2	34-14-"	Chatrapur	Waltair	186	25-7-96	25-7-96	1	5-8-96	10	11	13	2	
Do	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Waltair	Beshampore	172	5-8-96	5-8-96	1	8-8-96	2	3	12	9	
	Transfer to Head Quarters	"	"	2	34-14-"	Chatrapur	Waltair	186	11-9-96	11-9-96	1	27-9-96	15	16	13	-3	
	Duty	"	"	2	32-4-"	Waltair	Beshampore	172	27-9-96	27-9-96	1	29-9-96	1	2	12	10	
	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Beshampore	Waltair	172	30-11-96	30-11-96	1	16-12-96	15	16	12	-4	
	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Beshampore	Waltair	185	9-1-97	10-1-97	2	13-1-97	2	4	13	9	
	Do	"	"	2	34-11-"	Waltair	Ellore	132	21-1-97	21-1-97	1	30-1-97	8	9	9	"	
	Do	"	"	2	24-6-"	Godavari Smith	Waltair	172	2-2-97	2-2-97	1	9-2-97	6	7	12	5	
	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Waltair	Beshampore	172	25-2-97	25-2-97	1	16-3-97	18	19	12	-7	
	Do	"	"	2	32-4-"	Beshampore	Waltair	411	16-3-97	17-3-97	2	20-3-97	2	4	28	24	
	Do	"	"	1	57-6-"	Waltair	Nandyal	458	12-4-97	13-4-97	2	26-4-97	12	14	31	17	
	Do.	"	"	1	57-4-"	Kurnool road	Waltair	130	16-5-96	19-5-96	4	22-5-96	3	7	9	2	
Lt. E.A. Smith - R.S.C. Ellore dca	Do	"	"	1	64-10-"	Ellore	Vinukonda	150	27-7-96	28-7-96	2	15-8-96	18	20	10	-10	
	Do	"	"	1	54-5-"	Giddalore	Ellore	130	22-9-96	23-9-96	2	27-9-96	3	5	9	4	
	Do	"	"	1	64-10-"	Ellore	Vinukonda	96	5-11-96	6-11-96	2	8-11-96	1	3	5	2	
	Do	"	"	1	9-8-" / 12-9-"	Vinukonda	Giddalore	90	21-11-96	22-11-96	2	22-11-96	"	2	6	4	
	Do	"	"	1	11-4-" / 15-"	Giddalore	Kurnool road	250	30-11-96	1-12-96	2	11-12-96	11	13	17	4	
	Do	"	"	1	38-14-" / 3-4-"	Kurnool road	Ellore	220	18-1-97	19-1-97	2	22-1-97	2	4	15	11	
	Do	"	"	1	36-9-6	Ellore	Anantapur	250	1-2-97	5-2-97	5	9-2-97	3	8	17	9	
	Do	"	"	1	34-"-3	Anantapur	Vinukonda	156	12-3-97	20-3-97	8	28-3-97	8	16	11	-5	
	Do	"	"	1	67-9-6	Sarpavaram-pet	Ellore	70	26-7-96	27-7-96	1	27-7-96	"	1	5	4	The tents were at Jammalamadugu when Mr. Ry. Ganapayya Garu was appointed to the R.S. duty. They were not taken from Vellore his head quarters, but were carried to Vayalpad where the R.S.O. proceeded on duty after taking over charge.
Mr. R. Ry. Ganapayya Garu, R.S.O. Anantapur dca	Do	"	"	1	12-8-"	Vellore	Vayalpad	75	4-7-96	27-7-96	23	27-7-96	"	23	5	-18	
	Do	12 md 33 seers	Rs. As. P 11-12-"	"	"	Nuddanur	Vayalpad	160	22-8-96	30-8-96	9	30-8-96	"	9	11	2	
	Do	"	"	1	19-8-"	Vellore	Cuddapah	85	13-12-96	14-12-96	1	17-12-96	3	4	6	2	
	Do	"	"	2	16-15-"	Kattpadi	Madras	60	11-1-97	11-1-97	"	12-1-97	1	1	4	3	
	Do	"	"	2	13-2-"	Tiruvallur	Gudiyattam	140	3-2-97	4-2-97.	1	13-2-97	8	9	10	1	The R.S.O. did not work at Salem (as the work was not ready for him there) but left for Rajampet on the 13th idem.
	Do.	"	"	2	23-13-"	Kattpadi	Salem										

Return of sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue (Forest Branch) under Article 109 C.S.R. from 22nd May '96 to 28th June '97.

Name and designation of Officer	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment carried	Class of conveyance of Camp equipment	No. of horses carried	Class and number of carriage of horses	Station from which the officer started on tour or transfer	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred	Distance in miles	Date on which the officer left the station on col: 7 on Govt.	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in col: 8.	Time taken by the officer.	Date on which the officer left the station on col: 8 on Govt.	No. of days the officer remained at the station in col: 8 before starting on tour.	Total days: 12 & 14.	Time admissible for journey (vide rule 18 of F.R. & S.R. Vol: I)	Time admissible for journey (vide rule 19 of F.R. & S.R. Vol: I)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
											Days		Days	Days	Days	Days	
Dr. R. Ry: Canapaya Gaun R.S.O. Nilgiris	Duty	"	"	2	Ro. As. P 47-4--	Salem	Rajapet	245	13-2-97	14-2-97	1	23-2-97	8	9	16	7	
Do	Do	"	"	2	9-15--	Kodur	Cuddapah	53	20-2-97	20-2-97	"	21-2-97	1	1	4	3	
Do	Do	"	"	2	15-3--	Kalpadi	Madras	85	13-6-97	14-6-97	1	17-6-97	3	4	6	2	
Dr. R. Ry. S. S. Sivaraveluvellai aul, R.S.O. Trichinopoly	Do	"	"	1	23-9--	Erichy Jn	Erukkambattu	143	3-10-96	7-10-96	5	7-10-96	"	5	10	5	
Dr. R. Ry. S. S. Sivaraveluvellai aul, R.S.O. Trichinopoly	Do	"	"	1	23-3--	Erukkattai	Erichy Jn	164	30-10-96	3-11-96	5	6-11-96	2	7	11	4	
Do	Do	"	"	1	26-- 6	Erichy Jn Coimbatore	Coimbatore Pattakali	129	6-11-96	9-11-96	4	16-11-96	6	10	9	-1	
								39	26-11-96	26-11-96	1	26-11-96	"	1	3	2	
								90	20-12-96	20-12-96	1	5-1-97	15	16 x	6	-10	x includes Xmas holidays.
	Do	"	"	1	11-15--	Erode	Erichy Jn	100	15-1-97	16-1-97	2	17-1-97	"	2	7	5	
	Do	"	"	1	13-5--	Erichy Jn	Chidambaram	71	28-1-97	29-1-97	1	2-2-97	3	4	5	1	
	Do	"	"	2	13-5--	Cuddalore	Dimmanamedu	43	24-2-97	24-2-97	1	28-2-97	3	4	5	1	The officer left a station 21 miles from Erukkattai on 24-2-97. The horses had to be marched that distance also
	Do	"	"	2	9-3--	Erukkattai	Cuddalore	121	28-2-97	28-2-97	1	3-3-97	2	3	9	6	
	Do	"	"	1	15-4--	Cuddalore	Erichy Jn	196	11-3-97	12-3-97	2	16-3-97	3	5	14	9	
	Do	"	"	1	24-6--	Erichy Jn	Timmelly	196	24-3-97	30-3-97	7	3-4-97	3	10	14	4	
	Do	"	"	1	24-6--	Timmelly	Erichy Jn	90	16-4-97	16-4-97	1	18-4-97	1	2	6	4	
	Do.	"	"	2	16-8--	Erichy Jn	Erode.	90	2-6-97	6-6-97	5	8-6-97	1	6	6	"	The R.S.O. had to go to Coimbatore en-route to Erode to consult the D.F.O. in which taluk the settlement should commence.
Dr. F. V. V. Sampathy, F.R.S.O. Erichy tea Dt.	Do	"	"	1	11-7-6	Do	Erode.										
Dr. H. S. Mullins, F.R.S.O. Malabar tea Dt.	Transfer	19 mds	Ro. As. P 97-3--	"	"	Coimbatore	Calicut	955	18-7-96	25-7-96	7	29-7-96	4	11	64	53	was directed to report himself at Madras on his way from Ceylon.
	Do	"	"	1	206-10--	Do	Do via Madras	60	18-2-97	19-2-97	1	not given 27-2-97	4	4	"	"	The journey was made by steamer
	Duty	not given	6-12--	"	"	Mangalore	Condapur	22	23-3-96	24-3-96	1	27-3-96	2	3	2	-1	the Sub-Divl. Officer was following the D.F.S.
Dr. F. A. Hearsay, Sub. Dl. Officer, Kurnool	Do.	"	"	1	7-14--	Betamcherla Kurnool Rd	Kurnool Rd Jaggalli	26	27-3-96	27-3-96	1	27-3-96	"	1	2	1	officers on Settlement work & the horse was reqd every day for marching to Reserves & back
								63	28-5-96	6-6-96	10	9-6-96	2	12	5	-7	The transport of the horse by rail was necessary in order to get it across the Pallamalais where it is very tricky to march horses.
	Do	"	"	1	8--	Sandyal	Cumbum	124	7-6-96	13-6-96	7	15-6-96	1	8	9	1	
Dr. Lodge, D. F. O. Kurnool	Do	"	"	1	26-6--	Kurnool Dupmanitta	Mankapur Kurnool Rd	76	13-7-96	13-7-96	1	22-7-96	9	10	5	-5	Do —— Do ——
								279	4-1-97	9-1-97	6	5-2-97	26	32	19	-13	The officer was transferred from Mangalipatnam and his horse had therefore to be marched by road from that station in addition to the Railway journey.
Dr. Fischer, Asstt. Conservator	Transfer	"	"	1	23-8--	Sirsamanpet	Kurnool Rd	107	16-1-97	16-1-97	1	25-1-97	8	9	8	-1	
Dr. W. W. Batchelor, D.F.O. Tellore	Do	23 mds	Ro. As. P 30 Seers 17-6--	"	"	Cuddapah	Nellore	362	2-5-96	4-5-96	2	9-5-96	4	6	24	18	
Dr. Sivaman, A/: D.F.O. Chingleput	Do.	21 mds	4 Seers 33-3--	2	61-8--	Pattupalam	Chingleput	226	12-5-96	13-5-96	1	19-5-96	5	6	15	9	
Dr. R. Ry. Alwar Chetty Gaun, Extra Asst. Conr. of Forests, Chingleput	Do.	"	"	1	28-1--	Salem	Saidapet	82	9-5-97	10-5-97	2	16-5-97	5	7	6	-1	The E.A. Conr. did not go to camp immediately on arrival at Salem as he intended, as his tents arrived late & reqr. mending.
Dr. Nares, E.A. Conr., Salem	Do.	9 mds	5 Seers 6-3--	"	"	Khalur	Salem	444	2-6-97	6-6-97	5	17-6-97	11	16	30	14	In addition to the Railway journey the horse was marched by road from Calicut to Kilambur a distance of 46 miles
Dr. Wood, A/: D.F.O., Madura	Do.	"	"	1	54-10--	Chinnattupatti Sundarampatti	Madura	372	23-1-97	26-1-97	3	27-1-97	1	4	25	21	In addition to the Ry: journey the Camp equipment was conveyed by road to Manantoddy a distance of 93 miles.
Dr. R. Ry. Gutmaska Pillai A/: D.F.O. Malabar	Do	"	"	1	56-10--	Timmelly	Calicut	418	20-6-96	1-7-96	11	6-7-96	5	16	34	18	
Dr. Sivaman, D.F.O. Nilgiri-Malabar Dn.	Do	not known	47--	"	"	Saidapet	Calicut										

(True copy)

Ag. Secretary.

N 2814

Return of Sanctions accorded by The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue (Forest Branch) under Article 1093 C.S.R. from 22nd May '96 to 28th June '97.

Name and designation of Officer	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment carried	Charge incurred on account of Camp Equipment.	No. of Horses carried	Charge incurred on account of carriage of horses	Station from which the Officer started on tour or transfer	Station at which the Officer arrived or to which he was transferred	Distance in miles	Date on which the Officer left the Station mentioned in col: 7 on Govt.	Date on which the Officer arrived at the Station in col: 8.	Time taken by the Officer.	Date on which the Officer left the Station mentioned in col: 8 on Govt.	No. of days the Officer remained at the Station mentioned in col: 8 before proceeding to that Station.	Total of cols: 12 & 14.	Time admissible for the journey as per rule 1093 C.S.R. Part I: the Station mentioned in col: 7 being considered the head quarters of the Officer and the Station mentioned in col: 8 the Out-station (vide col: 5 of Rule 1093 C.S.R.)	Difference between col: 15 & 16.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	

Return of sanctions accorded by the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue (Forest Branch) under Article 1093 C.S.R. from 22nd May '96 to 28th June '97.

Name and designation of Officer	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp Equipment carried	Charges incurred on account of Camp Equipment.	½ of three cartmiles	Charges incurred on account of carriage of horses	Station from which the officer started on transfer	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road	Date on which the officer left the station mentioned in Col: 7 on Govt.	Date on which the officer arrived at the station in Col: 8.	Time taken by the officer.	Date on which the officer left the station mentioned in Col: 8 on Govt.	No. of days the officer remained at the station mentioned in Col: 8 beyond the period allowed on Govt.	Total days: (12 to 14).	Time admissible (shown in cols: 11 to 12 less 3 days)	Time admissible (shown in cols: 11 to 12 less 3 days)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	

Encls: Fr.° 2 to
Sec C. R.° 11th S 98

Financial Current Fn 1898.

8 d
Rec'd 10/6/98
Reg'd 11/6/98

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
10 JUN 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

2167

Fort St. George,
Accountant General's Office,
8th June 1898.

Forwarded with reference to para 1 of this office
C 22/6/98 letter No. 1077 dated 17th March 1898.

Accountant General.

The Chief Secretary to Government
Financial Department.

Name and designation of officer.	Whether the journey was on account of transfer or duty	Weight of Camp equipment carried	Charges incurred on account of carriage of Camp equipment.	Number of loads carried	Cargo incurred on account of carriage of loads.	Station from which the officer started or was transferred.	Station at which the officer arrived or to which he was transferred.	Distance by road.	Date on which the officer left the Station in Col: 7	Date on which the officer arrived at the Station in Col: 8	Time taken by the officer	Date on which the officer left the Station in Col: 8 on tour	Number of days the officer remained at the Station in Col: 8 before proceeding on tour	Total of columns 12 and 14	Time admissible if loads or camp equipment were carried by road at 15 miles a day (absence in Col: 8 and 8:	Number of days delay that would have occurred if loads had been carried by road (i.e difference between Cols 15 and 16	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
20. Mr A.C. Woodhouse Inspector, Villipuram Circle	Transfer	"	"	1	12-8-0	Tiruvalur	Villipuram	100	26-3-96	28-3-96	3	29-3-96	1	4	7	3	
23. Mr C.J.M. Blake, Inspector Ellore circle	Do	"	"	1	37-6-0	Naupada	Ellore	295	12-2-97 *	20-2-97	8	5-3-97	14	22	20		
25. M.R.Ry P. Lakshmiah Garu, Assistant Inspector in charge of the Anakapalle Circle	Do	"	"	1	25-10-0	Anakapalle	Bezwada	201	25-4-97	3-5-97	9	12-5-97	8	17	14		
27. Mr E.A. Jones, Assistant Inspector in charge of the Bobbili Circle	Do	"	"	1	32-8-0	Bezwada	Vizianagram	260	3-6-96	10-6-96	8	18-6-96	7	15	18	3	
33. Mr H.C. Sherman Inspector Tuticorin circle	Do	"	"	1	55-6-0	Kendrapara Madras	Tuticorin	443	8-10-96	26-10-96	19	x			30		* Mr Sherman did not go on tour during his stay in the circle
36. M.R.Ry V. Krishna Row Assistant Inspector, Cuddalore Circle	Do	"	"	1	34-6-0	Nellore	Cuddalore	275	23-5-97 *	24-5-97	2	15-8-97	81	83	19		He was granted privilege leave from 14-1-97 and was transferred to the Vayalar circle during his leave.
38. C. Saravana Moodali Asst Inspr in charge South Trichinopoly Circle	Do	"	"	1	31-2-0	Madras	Trichy	249	30-4-97	5-5-97	6	7-5-97	2	8	17	9	
40. Mr Jeremiah, Assistant Inspector, Manginapudi Circle	Do	"	"	1	27-0-0	Madras	Masulipatam	279	25-5-97 *	2-6-97	9	12-7-97	41	50	19		
41. M.R.Ry R. Venkataramier Asst Inspector, Manginapudi circle	Do	"	"	1	66-4-0	Madras	Guntur	250	5-6-97	16-6-97	11	7-9-97	83	94	17		
43. Mr R.J. Taylor, Asst. Inspector, Calicut Circle	Do	"	"	1	56-10-0	Tinnevelly	Calicut	453	23-6-97	3-7-97	11	19-7-97	16	27	31	4	
45. M.R.Ry N. Gopala Row Assistant Inspector Tuticorin Circle	Do	"	"	1	36-4-0	Mettupet	Tuticorin	283	27-4-97	5-5-97	10	27-7-97	82	92	19		
46. M.R.Ry C.S. Sreenivasachari Assistant Inspector, Kayalpatnam circle	Do	"	"	1	56-10-0	Calicut	Tinnevelly	453	12-6-97	23-6-97	12	22-7-97	240	252	31		

* Messrs Blake and Jeremiah joined their new stations on the expiry of the three months' leave granted to them and M.R.Ry V. Krishna Row after two months' leave. The dates of the commencement of their joining time have, therefore, been entered in Col. 10

Rm Thurlley

Ag Assistant Secretary

23/5/98

2/3

[G. / 25]

1,000 -22-11-97.

Financial DEPARTMENT

153

C. No. 467

SUBJECT.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

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

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

Charges for the conveyance of Camp equipment and horses by rail under Article 1093 of the C. S. R.

FOR ORDERS.

E

The Inspector General of Police refers to G.O. No. 40, Fin., dated 17th January 1898, regarding the allowances for the conveyance of horses and camp equipment by rail. In that order the I. G's return of sanctions accorded under Article 1093 of the C. S. R. during 1896 and part of 1897, was reviewed by Govt., & a partial examination of the return showed that there had been laxity in the Police Dept. in passing the claims preferred by officers under the article in question. As, however, the sanctions

comprised in the return had been accorded by competent authority Govt. did consider ~~not consider~~ it feasible to recover the amounts incorrectly passed, but drew the I. G's attention to the ~~above irregularities~~ irregularities in view to his acting more strictly up to the instructions which have been issued on the subject.

2. The I. G. while reporting that he will in future interpret the orders as strictly as possible, regrets that his doing so will lead officers to tour to a great extent in hired conveyances. He then proceeds to state two points on which he requests district orders. (1) Is the head of a Dept. always to refuse to allow the charge for horses by rail in cases where officers are transferred long distances?

Ridiculous (Let them use hired conveyance which at Rs. 2½, or do without them. That is what he allowed to do when horses have been sent on. BS

The I.G. has not returned the return disposed of by S.O. 40 17.1.98 but he gives full particulars of his illustrative cases Curb

and

(2). are rail charges similarly to be always refused in the case of inspecting officers returning to head quarters from long distances after having completed tours of inspection?

3. To illustrate (1) he takes the case of Mr. R. M. Powell, (Asst. Supt. of Police, Kurnool), whose explanation that his animal was required shortly after arrival at the new station, was pronounced inadmissible in para 2 of the above G.O. Mr Powell was allowed by the I.G. to charge for railing one horse from Mangalore to Nundyal. The I. G. states that to march the horse the whole distance would have taken 31 days and would have been highly risky in the month of June, the month

of the transfer. If, on the other hand, the horse had been sold at Mangalore, the I. G. urges that it could not have been replaced at Nandyal by any animal up to the standard of police requirements. Under such circumstances ~~& procedure~~ Mr. Powell would have had to purchase an animal in Madras or elsewhere in a great hurry or break the rules which require him to be in possession of one a horse.

A second case put forward by the I. G. to illustrate the same point is that of Mr. Lane who was recently transferred from Nandyal to Tuticorin, and to whom it seems the I. G., presumably then in ignorance of the above-mentioned G.O., intimated that trainage for his horse would be

4

The I.G. appears to have overlooked in this case the point that Mr. Mayne went on tour nine days after his arrival at Rammad and ~~28~~ 10 days before his horses could have reached that station by road. The charge has been justified in this case.

CWB.

5

allowed. But according to the G.O. the charge will be inadmissible and so the I.G. submits that Mr. Lane he will have to pay ~~him~~ out of his own pocket.

A third illustration of the same point is the case of Mr. Mayne whose application for the cost of carriage by rail of two horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Madura the I.G. encloses. He submits that it was necessary for Mr. Mayne to have his horses with him when acting at Chingleput and that it could hardly be expected that ~~he~~ Mayne he should march the horses from St. Thomas' Mount to Rammad.

4. The second point, (2), primarily affects inspecting officers. The I.G. first takes the case of Mr. Young, Dy. I.G. whose charge for the carriage

G 1/3/98

of a horse from Tuni to his Head quarters at Waltair, (about 80 miles) was declared to be inadmissible by the above G.O. The I.G. contends that under such a ruling he himself will not be entitled to the charge for carrying his horses from Narsapatam to Madras, when his tour at the former station comes to an end. The I.G. submits that such a rule bears hard on officers who have large areas to inspect, if they return from an inspecting tour from any point at all distant from their head quarters. The item refers to G.O. No. 272, Fin., dated 26th March 1897, in para 3 of which it is ruled that as regards long marches where circumstances render it impossible to expect

The I.G. is really too ridiculous. He squares art 1166A which completely meets the case he puts & regards himself and was intended to do so. I know, for I devised the rule myself when dealing with T. Allen & a member of the Finance Comee

BS

I don't see why the D.? S. should not march his horses 80 miles. How did he do 405 yards before the Reprint?

BS

horses to be marched by road, the cost of railing them may be recovered, and applies it to the case of Mr Young referred to above, and asks if a march of 80 miles is not considered long enough to justify the charge.

5. The I.G. submits that the case of Superintendents is different, as they can conveniently march their horses from any point in their districts to Head quarters, and reports that he has informed them that in future no trainage will be allowed unless they can show that they had to leave their Head quarters on tour, before the time necessary for their horses to reach them by road, has elapsed.

6. It is submitted that in making this representation the I.G. has overlooked the

principle which has been laid down by India on more than one occasion - viz that T. A. must be taken as a whole and that the real question for consideration in connection with claims under particular particular articles of the C. S R. such as 1093 - is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service. Individual and isolated cases of loss can cannot if is submitted, prove this.

Officers might be reminded of this aspect of the case and be referred to the first line of Art 1007 or the first 3 words of the second line

HS

Officers seldom will adopt at this view of the matter, they expect to make a profit out of their touring, & one still hears of men who "live on their travelling allowance."

Cmdt
28/1/98

Most of the difficulties raised by the I.G. arise from a desire to escape from the rates laid down by the Govt of India. & printed in G.O. 320 Fin. of 8th May 1896.

Offrs Hors

Yes HS

K

"In framing the rule contained in Art. 1093 x x it was not the intention of the G. of I. that officers should, when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled, in addition to drawing travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipment at Govt Expense x x.

The rule was 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 another place xx."

Officers very naturally want to save time by railing their horses & also to avoid the risk of marching them by road when they can be carried by rail at Govt expense.

No doubt HS

There is no more risk in marching horses now that there was before railways existed, but less, as there are more roads & less poisoning &c. The I.G. could hardly have chosen a worse illustration than

8

9

that of Mr Powell transferred from Mangalore to Hendyal in June. The march – he says, "of that horse wd have taken 31 days & would have been so risky in June that no officer cd. have been expected to undertake it." But the only really risky part of the journey was the march from Mangalore to the ⊗ frontier ^ Mysore ^ or to Calicut – whichever was the route chosen, and that was of necessity by road for there is no railways. If that part of the journey could be done by road ~~must~~ à fortiori could the rest have been so done. I have myself ~~marched~~ had a pair of horses marched safely from Mysore to Mangalore, & back. The difficulty lies ~~is~~ in the ruling of the Govt of India – wh. is objected to, – and not in the marching.

⊗ 3 or 4 days
BS

BS

As the D.C. promised Mr Lane the bill should be passed but the D.C. should not have promised it unless he knew Mr Lane wd require his horse for town purposes before it could have been marched down from Hendyal to Tuticorin.

10

I remember one marching a horse from Madras to Tuticorin
BS

There is special provision p/c 25 in Art 1166 A
BS

Govt. has never acknowledged any responsibility for officers' need of horses in 4th 2nd. If their rights are to be examined in this respect, let not Dist. or Sess. Judges, or the Collectors of Govt?
BS
2/3/98

11

As to Mr Magne ~~A~~ why should he not be expected to march his horse from St Thomas's Mount to Ramnad? I have marched horses from N. Arcot to S. Arcot, Tanjore to Tinnevelly.
No doubt the ruling of India bears hardly in cases, but the remedy for that is to get the ruling altered & not to ignore it.
The same argument applies to the D.C. & his Deputies & to Supts of Police returning from tour.
The need of a horse to go to & from Office at head quarters does not justify training the horse at Govt Expense
AEA 7.3.98

C 22.3.98
R 23.3.98

[G. / 25 A]
500-8-12-97.

Financial DEPARTMENT. 165

C. Nos 467, 782 & 824
(4 linked files)

SUBJECT.

Carriage of Camp equipment & horses.

HW

FOR ORDERS.

B

C.S.R

In the notes on C.No.467 Finl., regarding the conveyance of horses and camp equipment by Police Officers at Govt. expense, the Honourable Member ~~has~~ pointed out that the provisions of article 1166 A ~~should~~ could be applied in the case of the Inspector-General of Police. As this article ~~has never~~ does not appear to have been applied in practice hitherto the Accountant-General was asked if he would admit the charges. He telephones that there is no objection but points out that no limit has been laid down as to the maximum number of horses that may be considered absolutely necessary.

The scales laid down by Govt. are as follows:-

P.T.O.

C

~~Article 1005 C.S.R.~~
~~G.O. No.304 Finl., d/19-6-~~

~~Article 1166 A C.S.R.~~
G.O.No.51 Finl. d/29-1-90

12

MM.

D

	Art.1093 C.S.R. G.O.504 Finl., d/19-6-82 (A) Weight of tent equipment Maunds	Number of horses	Art.1166 A G.O.51 Finl.,29-1-90 Number of servants	Weight of baggage in maunds
Members, Board of Revenue	,,	,,	4	15
Inspector-General of Police	55	4	4	10
,, ,, Jails	55	4	4	10
,, ,, Registration	55	4	4	10
Surgeon-General	55	4	4	10
Sanitary Commissioner	55	4	4	10
Director of Public Instruction	55	4	4	10
Collectors (except Madras)	55	4	-	-
Sub Collectors	55	4	-	-
Director of Revenue Settlement	55	4	-	-
Dy.Director of ,, ,,	55	4	-	-
Commissioner of Salt Revenue	55	4	-	-
Dy.Commissioners ,, ,,	55	4	-	-
All officers whose extra tentage is not less than that of a Sub Collector	55	4	-	-
Head Assistant Collectors	35	3	-	-
Assistant Collectors G.O. 2010 Jud. dt. 1-8-83	35	3	-	-
Dy.Inspectors General of Police	55	4	-	-
Superintendents of Police	55	3	-	-
Assistant Superintendents ,, ,,	55	3	-	-
A Inspectors ~~80~~ 55 Jud. dt. 29-1-90	700 lbs	1	-	-
Deputy Sany.Commissioner	,,	,,	3	10
Assistant Director of Settlement Inspector of Cattle Diseases	,,	,,	2	8

From the bills submitted it now appears that Mr.Hammick* usually took 2 horses with him. Mr.Stuart on joining his appointment has taken 4. Submitted that the same limit should apply in the case of both articles 1093 & 1166 A.

13/2/98 It appears to be a question for consideration whether the

(checked 13/2/98)

* (Vide Exhibit to C No 782 - linked file) Jud. G.O. 327 dt. 30-3-98

(⊗) (,, ,, ,, 824) Jud. G.O. 327 dt. 15-4-98 linked file

Mr. Hammick's claim is admissible - Vide draft order in file below

A.S. 13

I don't see any need to go into this question which is not under discussion at present. The subject is quite thorny enough as it is. H.A.

4 horses seem always order, but 15 md of baggage is absurd seeing that tents are included - When I applied under 1166 A I weighed all my baggage & reported the weight - Please enlarge the limits.

A M

BS

Separately disposed of

I should say

The D.G. should I think be prepared for immediate tour on taking up his appt. & for this purpose two horses would be ample. He could not "ex hypothesi"

14 CMS 20.3

167

number of horses for which charges are admissible under article 1093 of the C.S.R. (vide column 3 of the foregoing statement) is not too high even for the purposes of that article. The Revenue and other departments concerned might perhaps report in regard to this point. In any case two horses would, it is submitted, be a liberal limit in the case of articles 1166A for all the heads of depts whose cases have been provided for in G.O. 51 Finl. of 29.1.90 (vide columns 4 and 5 of the foregoing statement)

C. No. 824 Finl in the linked file is for orders. It refers to Mr. H. A. Stuart's claim for the conveyance of four horses on transfer from Ootacamund to Madras to join the appt. of Ag D.G. It would, it is submitted, be somewhat hard to expect Mr. Stuart to have sold his horses and replaced them at Madras for a short acting appt.

GS

have marched them to Madras in time for his first move — ~~&c~~

MA 21.3.98.

But how is Mr Stuart's case distinguished from that of other officers ~~those~~ who have not been allowed to sail their horses on transport under India's orders?

BS
22/3/98

15

Apparently I made a mistake when in my former note I spoke of 15 rupees including tents — I think the scale of servants & baggage too low for high officials, while that of horses is needlessly high — But as no complaints has been made the subject may be dropped

BS
19/4/98

16

HW

Financial Dept

C. No 467.

Endt. No. 845, dy 1-4-1898

To Revenue Department

With reference to the Hon'ble Member's note marked on the page flagged P, can Revenue Dept. supply any precedents? or as the Hon'ble Member apparently refers to his applications as Commissioner of Salt Revenue.

Cur. S. 29.3.98 MA 30.3.98

To

The Financial Department

The Hon: member ~~evidently~~ perhaps refers to para 4 of the B.P. on page 2 of G.O. No 51 Fin. dy 29th January 1890 (flagged X)

BS 3-4-98

WHM 6.4.98

In Fin Dept no.

Submitted. ~~Approved~~

P T.D

The Board in 1890 considered that the Comm: of Salt Revenue should be allowed 25 maunds of baggage but subs. cut this down to 15 maunds [G/O No. 51 Financial dt 29. 1. 90]

Para 6 of its proc. on page 2 of G.O. 51 29.1.90 Encl A

A

Cust 1674/98

18.4.98

17

[G. 25] 1,000 -22-11-97.

C 1574/98 Rev 4/98

1

Financial DEPARTMENT

171

C. No. 304

thro' the Accountant-General.

SUBJECT.

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

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

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

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

FOR ORDERS.

Page 191 of Book-file L

Para. 1 of A.G's. letter

The Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue) submits, with reference to paras. 3 and 5 of G.O.No.455,Finl., dated 2nd June 1897, a revised return of sanctions accorded under art. 1095 of the C.S.R. to the conveyance of horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer in the Salt, Abkari and Customs dept. from 1st January 1896 to 30th June 1897. The items marked A in the return are objected to by the Accountant-General who, however, is unable to express any opinion as regards those marked B in the absence of further information. It is not practicable to revoke at this distance of time the sanctions which have been accorded by competent authority - the Board in the present instance - but the Board's proceedings and the Accountant-General's letter raise several important points. In fact, the whole question of the interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the C.S.R. is

18

G 1/3/98

(2

is raised and the real point for decision is whether the Board's interpretation or India's interpretation is to prevail. All the cases dealt with in the return have not been examined for the reasons given above and as the extraordinary position taken up by the Board requires, it is submitted, to be dealt with without delay.

3. As regards the case of Mr. Fowler in which the horses, had they been marched by road, would have arrived seventeen days before the officer started on tour, the Board observes that it was not possible to foresee that a contingency would not arise in this case requiring the immediate use of the horses at the new station. The Board states that all officers of the Salt dept. except Distillery officers are required to be ready to start into camp at a moment's notice. The Accountant-General rightly points out that if the interpretation of the Board is admitted, it will doubtless be adopted by other departments. He draws attention to para. 1 of India's resolution in G.O.No.380, Finl., dated 8th May 1896 where it is stated that art. 1095 is intended to meet the more or less exceptional case of an officer requiring his camp equipment or horses in one place immediately or very shortly after having had to use them in another place. It is submitted that the acceptation of the Board's arguments would render India's orders unworkable. By assuming that an officer may

Item No.3

Para. 3 of Bd's.Pros.

Para. 3 of A.G's. letter

H Page 167 of the Book-file.

19

The rules of India require that a knowledge that the officer will, not may be required to be equipped ready for emergent duty on arrival at his destination. KH

		Miles
Item No. 6	(Mr.C.V.Dalrymple Hay)	878
,, 7	(Mr.A.S.Kearns) . . .	768
,, 16	(Mr.H.Simpson)	1348

Page 189 of Book-file. L

Para. 3 of Bd's. Pros.

Para.3 of A.G's.letter

As a matter of fact hardly any one would sell his horses, he would march them to the place of transfer. KH

Para. 3 of Board's Pros.

20

(3

173

may have to use his horses immediately on arrival at a new station and by overlooking the necessity for examining the facts of each case, the Board would over-ride India's interpretation of article 1093 altogether.

5. As regards the cases of transfer marginally noted the Accountant-General, in para. 3 of his letter recorded on page 3 of G.O.No.435,Finl., dated 2nd June 1897, stated that there was nothing to show that the interests of the public service would have suffered if the officers had sold and replaced their horses. The Board argues that it is practically impossible to obtain horses, except by accident, in places other than the Presidency town and Bangalore, and perhaps in some other large centres. The Accountant-General contends that the conditions prevailing in this Presidency are not different from those in other parts of India and that horses if not saleable easily on the spot can be sold in adjacent places and districts. It is submitted that the Board's argument, if accepted, would support a practice under which an officer - not transferred - could charge Govt. for the conveyance (say) to Bangalore of a horse bought at (say) Madras.

4. The Board goes on to say that if the Accountant-General's opinion were seriously accepted, the

difficulty

25

difficulty of enforcing the rules as to maintenance of horses would be enormously increased, especially as the officers of the dept, among whom distant transfers are frequent and unavoidable, are for the most part but poorly paid. It is submitted that what the Board calls the Accountant-General's opinion is in fact the ruling of the Govt. of India accepted by this Govt. and communicated to the Board in G.O.No.320,Finl.,dated 8th May 1896. The Board's remarks are, it is submitted, flippant and evince anything but a desire to carry out the orders of the supreme and the local Govts. If the pay of the officers in the Salt dept. is too low or if these officers are put to loss by constant transfers there are other remedies open. These reasons - if they do exist - are not sufficient for disregarding the distinct orders of Govt.

5. The Board now grants previous permission to an officer applying for the same, to carry his tents or horses at Govt. expense, on being satisfied that the quickest means of conveyance should be used in the interests of the public service, and it communicates a copy of the order granting permission to the Accountant-General. The Board requests that this practice may be allowed to continue, so that an officer, whose idea of what is

essential

Precisely – the Bd. has overlooked this
MR

H Pages 167 + 168 of Book-file

as pointed out by the Ag. ✓
not in the correspondence reports
Govt. The A.G.'s complaint of
flippancy was with ref. to previous
correspondence he had had with
the Bd. MR.

MR.

Para. 3 of Board's Pros.

I don't understand this about
tents; Local Officers don't obtain
the Bd's permission to carry tents by rail
if they are moving about on ordinary
tours – But if they are moving to distant
they don't like to carry their tents
at all, for the tents belong to the office
or C. not to the officer, save not
carried by rail on transfer – as last
they need not & should not be.
HS

21

essential to the interests of the public service may frequently differ from that held by the Board or Govt., may not, after sending his camp equipment or horses by rail at great expense, be called upon to bear the cost himself. The Board, however, adds that such previous sanction cannot be accorded in the form prescribed by the Accountant-General and adopted by Govt. (G.O. No.455,Finl.,dated 2nd June 1897, para.1) as the information required to be given therein will not be available until after the officer proceeds from one station to another In other words, the Board would keep the working of article 1093 in its own hands and would interpret it in accordance with its own ideas. It is clear from India's resolution in G.O.No. 320,Finl., dated 8th May 1896 that sanctions under article 1093 are subject to the conditions laid down in that resolution and that it is absolutely necessary to ensure that these conditions are fulfilled in every case. The form to which the Board objects was drawn up with reference to the observations of the Govt. of India in para. 3 of the resolution referred to above.

6. The Accountant-General points out that the Board is not carrying out the orders of the Govt. of India though it is aware of the facts which

Pages 190 & 191 of Book-file L

Page 167 of Book-file H

If the Bd's practice is to continue
it must be under the condition that
it does not give sanction unless
it knows that the officer will be
required to go on tours before his
horses &c. could arrive by road.
The sanction must not be
given on mere supposition. H
MR

22

Para. 3 of A.G's. letter

This is quite true. This
should be pointed out & the
Bd. informed that the orders of
India must be obeyed MR.

Finl. Fin. Dept. 2. Cir. 7/8/98
JG 1/3/98

25

which led to the present rules in the C.S.R. vide Board's Pros.No.113,dated 25th February 1890 in G.O.No. 336, Financial, dated 1st May 1890 and G.O. No. 404, Financial, dated 22nd July 1890 . The Accountant-General observes that if this Govt. considers that the circumstances in this Presidency are peculiar, owing to frequent transfers among Civilians due to the non-graded system and to distances travelled, it is open to it to obtain a modification of the rules. He, however, points out that article 1093 is put into operation with undue frequency in this Presidency, as many as 516 cases having occurred in one year against 25 in Bombay and 20 in the N.W.Provinces. In the Police dept. alone, where Govt. supplies tents, and officers can recover half the cost of moving them under article 1141, the number of cases is 108. In these circumstances, it does not seem desirable to move the Govt. of India in the matter.

N Pay 130 et seq Work file

U Page 137 ditto

Para. 2 of A.G's. letter

It is open to the Bd. to address Govt on the matter if it thinks proper. HS

This should be pointed out to the Bd. HS

I send a copy of the A.G's letter HS

7. In the concluding portion of his letter the Accountant-General states that in the instructions given in connection with tents and equipment in G.O.No.372,Finl., dated 26th March 1897 are not very clear. He apparently alludes to the remark in the last clause of para. 3 of that order "the transport of camp equipment by rail will frequently be justified under the rule that the cheaper route should be chosen".

Para. 4

M Page 184 of Bk's file

23

chosen". The Accountant-General is of opinion that the cost of conveyance of camp equipment whether by rail or by road should be borne by the officer himself except in cases of urgency when the charges should be defrayed by Govt. in the interests of the public service. This view seems to be correct.

Yes- But if it maybe cheaper to Govt. they help carriage by rail than help carriage by cart- HS

It is "the interests of the public service" that have to be considered & not as the Bd. has taken it "the interests of the officer concerned." HS 14.4.98

I agree with the C.S. all through. The Bd seems to forget 2 things, 1st, that the orders are India's & are positive; 2nd that not so very long ago no one under any circs was allowed to charge for carriage of either horses & tents by rail - I remember having to carry 3 horses from Tuticorin to Vizag at my own expense upon the matter of that I got no allce at all on transfer, for the transfer was on promotion & in those days no t.a. was allowed in the case of such transfers. Moreover, when, after 9 or 10 mths, I was turned out of my acting 2nd Collectorate sent to Tuticorin as Hd Asstt (under) I got no t.a. for that journey, for as my Head Asstship at Tuticorin had been acting I was held to have proceeded on promotion & join my substv appt at Tuticorin & though I lost nearly Rs 300 a month by the transfer! HS 15/4/98

24

35

the

D 1,000—8-4-97.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 8796 of 1897.

From the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue.

Dated 29th September 1897.

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. Davidson, who was transferred last April from the post of Under Secretary to Government in the Revenue Department to that of the Sub-Collector of Salem, claimed under Article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations the refund of a charge of Rs.24 incurred by him in conveying his horse from Madras to Salur. The Board of Revenue in its Proceedings dated 10th June 1897, No. 2100 Mis.(of which a copy is attached to the Current) disallowed the claim on the ground that, as Mr. Davidson was not required to maintain a horse as Under Secretary to Government, his claim was inadmissible under para 1 of the Government of India Resolution under G. O. No. 320 Financial dated 8th May 1896. In his letter dated

the

To Legal Dept.

Mr. Davidson was transferred from the post of Under Secretary to Govt. in the Rev. Dept. to that of the Sub-Collector of Salem, claimed under Article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations the refund of a charge of Rs.24 incurred by him in conveying his horse from Madras to Salur. The Board of Revenue in its Proceedings dated 10th June 1897, No. 2100 Mis. (of which a copy is attached to the Current) disallowed the claim on the ground that, as Mr. Davidson was not required to maintain a horse as Under Secretary to Government, his claim was inadmissible under para 1 of the Government of India Resolution under G. O. No. 320 Financial dated 8th May 1896. In his letter dated 25th Nov. 1896 Mr. Davidson requested that he might be allowed to draw his travelling allowance for the journey from Madras to Salur. The Board of Revenue will have no objection to the Legal Dept. allowing the claim if they consider that there is any ground for doing so.

Mr. Davidson's case

There seems to be nothing in the Rules of India Warrants as in regard to the rail charges of Mr. Davidson, Parsons & Buttercworths. It was necessary in the public interests that they should leave Madras & assume their duties.

The case of Mr. Pratt is different. In his case the transfer was "distinct". According to India it must be shown flagged A that he could not sell & replace. Mr. Pratt points out that there were several great difficulties about selling & replacing, but he does not show that he could not do so. I think he should get the rail charges, but I don't think it can be given without referring the case to India.

But has it not been ordered that all overly points are to be disposed of in the Financial Dept.? flagged B

Cir. 3/11/98.

Dy 1/3/98

Dy: Was it necessary to refer the claims were upheld by the Legal Dept. The Rly. will have no objection to Govt. allowing the claim if they consider that there is any ground for doing so.

FOR ORDERS.

the 15th July 1897, which the Board now submits for the orders of Government, Mr.Davidson requests a reconsideration of his claim.

2. Mr. Davidson contends that under the terms of ~~article of~~ article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations the sole criterion of the admissibility of such a charge is whether "it is in the interests of the public service that an officer required to travel on public duty should send his horses by railway".

He also contends that in his case the above criterion is satisfied, inasmuch as at the time of his transfer to Hosur the Government had issued positive orders directing officers in the position of a Sub-Collector to maintain two horses from which he inferred that the interests of the public service required him to keep two riding animals at his disposal. He states that he arranged to purchase one horse from his predecessor Mr.Campbell; but that, a second animal not being available in the neighbourhood of the station

station to which he was transferred, he had to buy it at Madras where he was himself stationed. The leave of his predecessor in the Sub-Collectorship of Salem being decided upon suddenly, he urges that time did not permit him to send his horse by road to his new post of duty so as to be ready for use on his arrival there. He further states that if he had despatched his horse by road, it would not have reached Hosur until a fortnight after himself, and that for sometime therefore after reaching his new station, he should have had only one horse at his disposal, a state of equipment which in the light of G.O. No.760 Public dated 17-6-97 he believed to be inconsistent with the interests of the public service. He contends that so far as the essential condition of the interests of the public service is concerned, his case is analogous to that of a Sub-Collector already possessing two horses who is transferred from Chingleput to Hosur with no longer warning than he has himself

himself received.

3. The Board adheres to the view expressed in its Proceedings of June last referred to in the 1st para of the note.

The Accountant-General forwards the papers to Government with the remark that "No special circumstances have been suggested requiring the use of 2 horses immediately on arrival at his station - except conforming to the rule about a Sub-Collector requiring to maintain 2 - riding horses"; and that "mere conformity to such a rule does not bring a case within the spirit of the Government of India Resolution recorded in G.O. No.320, dated 8th May 1896".

4. In a recent case the Board disallowed Mr.Stuart's claim to the conveyance of his horse from Madras to Bellary, on the ground that as Private Secretary to H.E. the Governor he was not required to keep riding horses. But it was subsequently found that as a fact Mr. Stuart was required to keep riding horses, and Government sanctioned his -

28

claim

B

Eo 2486/15-5-97 flagged F

It is difficult to say what are special circumstances. It is certain that the need for his services arises in the public interests as soon as a Dist.l Surgn. totters change of his appt.

11/5/97.

The office can not foretell whether the public interests will suffer or not: the must act so that they may not.

11/5/97.

29

183 5

claim under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations on the ground that as he was transferred to a famine district, he had to go provided and ready to move into camp immediately on joining his new duties, and that he could not therefore be expected to sell and replace his horses. It is submitted - that no special circumstances exist in Mr. Davidson's case which required the use of 2 horses immediately on his join -ing his new appointment. The minimum period during which Sub-Collectors are required to be on tour is 2½ months for every half-year, and it does not appear that the public interests would have suffered if Mr. Davidson had for a fort night or so after he reached Salem the use of only one horse. As the Account-ant-General says, no special circumstances seem to have existed which required Mr. Davidson to use 2 horses immediately on arrival at his station.

5. In the event of the charge not being admitted under article 1093 of -

the

the Civil Service Regulations, Mr. Davidson requests that in the special circumstances of his case and ~~his~~ with special reference to the analogy referred to at the end of the second para of this note, his claim may be sanctioned under article 278 A of the Civil Account Code. It is a question for consideration whether any case has been made out for the exemption of his claim from the operation of article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations.

para 4 of the letter

Sanctions under article 278-A of the Civil Account Code are dealt with finally in the Financial Dept. (Vide Go. 643 Fin d 29-9-96 Flag A/4

11/11/97.

There is note attached.

11/11/97

RR 29/10/97

30

185

I submit the rule is a very objectionable one and should be construed liberally. It was reasonable perhaps in the days before railways to require an officer to march his horses 300 or ~~400~~ 400 miles and he could do so with comparative safety when horses in similar plight were constantly passing along the roads and it was possible without difficulty to get resting places and food for them; but now the habit has passed away and it is a serious risk to send a horse alone on a long march. Govt. does not march its own horses to Hosur. In all countries it is recognised that the employer must pay all travelling expenses of the employed incurred in the employment and horses are kept for duty. I submit that Govt. should give the allowance in this and similar cases. It is unreasonable to ask an officer to risk his horse's life and to lose its services for 15 to 20 days, or to fine him 30 Rs.

11/11/97

See after Mr Slother had written the above, G.O. No 435 Fin d 2-12-97 was brought to notice

31 Flag H

It will be seen that the Accountant in that his letter No 1272 of 22 April 1897 proposed a curious test of the necessity for an Officer raising his horses. The test was to calculate the time it would take to send his horses by road at 15 miles per day & then to see whether the Officer did actually learn his new Hd Qrs before the date on which his horses had by this calculation been taken to arrive at his new Hd Qrs. This plan involves two obvious fallacies. First it is extremely probable that a horse sent by road from say Cuddalore to Calicut (vide item 29 the Accountant's letter on page 4 of G.O. 435 of 2 6 97) would never reach Calicut alive or would reach Calicut in a state unfit for use for weeks. Second the Officer cannot tell beforehand how many days

page 3 of G.O. 435/97 H

32

it will be before he will have to go onto Cannanore from his new head quarters.

The Store thereon wished to see the original of the Test G.O. whether there matter had been considered before G.O. 435 Fin of 2.6.97 was issued & the original was thereon sent for. Fin: has not sent it yet. It appears that it is in circulation with some file.

As the case has arisen & as the Officer concerned should not be kept waiting unnecessarily the papers are submitted for orders.

I. Cur No 8796/97 is Mr Davidsons case. Mr Davidson claims rail fare for the horse (he brought another at Salem but could not get two there) from Madras

x Refer Paul this up after 4 days Cmd 8/3/98 Paul up to blagger H dm 12-3-98

H

33

1879

to make.

The Bd has disallowed the claim under para 1 of the Govt of India Resolution No 1603-En d 10 April 1896. Flag B. I submit

There is nothing in this para which wd prohibit the grant of the allowance in Mr Davidsons case. The last sentence of the para: obviously means that an officer is not to get rail charge for a horse from say Bombay when he can get one in Madras if Madras be nearer at hand.

The Govt of India clearly expressed their intention in para 4 of Mr Gamble's letter No 5453-En d 29 Dec 96 to the Govt of the Punjab in G.O. Fin No 51 d 20 Jan 97 "the only question which should be considered in deciding beforehand how many days

I think this sentence means that when an officer is in his own district & requires another horse to complete his equipment & sends to Madras (say) to purchase one, the rail charges of bringing it to his station do not (ordinarily) become under Art 1093. This is not quite Mr Davidson's case. He had to join a station at which the use of the horses permitted no. of horses might be at once necessary. He takes one of the horses with him. I think he shd Flag L be allowed the charge. If he had been going from one Sub Divn to another & it had been open to him to sanction the charge: & it may

do so in this case. There is but there is some not much (topical difference between the case of an officer joining a distant appt & taking his horses complement of horses with him so as to be able to act at once if necessary & the case of an officer already established in a district & completing his complement from the distant market, as he has more time to arrange & look about him & ordinarily can foresee his wants in time: but even in such case if an officer's horse died during an emergency & it was necessary that he shd not be unequipped, for one he requipped, for wd shd pay the rail charges of a horse sent up emergently from Madras.

2nd para Mr Davidson's charge

If Government why shd S. Officers be required to keep 2 horses?

F.A. 27/4/98 35

such matter is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service, the assumption being that the expenditure both is kept on the most moderate scale that foresight and arrangement can secure.

Now Mr Davidson was going as Sub Collector to Salem. It might have been necessary for him to go out into camp the day after he got there. If it had been necessary, he would have wanted 2 horses. One might be available at Salem. He took one from Madras. Was this travelling not required by the interests of the public service? There can be no question that the allowance

drawn by Mr D did not
cover the expenses of
his travelling. Neg
probably wont cover
half their expenses even
if Govt decides to pay
the cost of sailing the horses
from Madras.

II. Cir No 9359 is
Mr Parsons case. Mr
Parsons claims the
cost of bringing his
cats from Shikarpur
in the Bombay Presidency
to Chicacole via Bellary
The Board recommend
that the bill (with a
few deductions of charges
clearly inadmissible,
such as cart hire) |
should be passed.
Submitted that it may
be passed but if | Yes
the construction which | JH
the Bd places on the
Govt of India Resolution
is correct it wd follow
that Mr Parsons should
have sold his cats at Shikar. 36

Reference how many days

pur and bought new ones
at Vellore or Madras or
some place nearer to
Chicacole. Indeed it is
doubtful whether such
an arrangement wd
not ~~really~~ have ~~been~~
~~to~~ kept expenditure
to the most moderate
scale for though no
arrangement could
secure.

III Cir No. 8822 of 97
is Mr Butterworths case.
Mr Butterworths asks
that Govt should pay
~~to~~ the railfare for
one of his horses from
Dharwar to Coimbatore.
As in Mr Davidsons
case it is submitted,
the loss of the horse
might have been necessary
the moment Mr Butler
works got to Coimbatore
But we don't it was
possible for Mr B. to get horses
nearer to Coimbatore

than Dharwar. He could possibly have got them in Madras without incurring many days there. If ~~Government~~ it is considered that he could have done so then I submit the cost of sailing 2 horses from Madras should be laid to Mr Butterworth. Mr Butterworth took 2 horses from Dharwar although he ~~claims~~ alleges damage to one only apparently as an argumentum ad misericordiam.

IV Cuttack No 10270 1897 is the case of Mr Platt, an Asst Commr of Salt & Abkari who was transferred from Pillour to ~~Balasore~~ Cuttack. He asks for railfare for one horse. The Bd decline to recommend the grant of the allce.

Mr Platt contends that Officers in Orissa are obliged beforehand how many days

38

~~[illegible]~~

There is nothing to show that he ever told this person at Dharwar that he required the horses at Cuttack. He could have replaced them without loss at Combatoor. Moreover it's a man to sell a ~~horse~~ horse that suits him? the public interests wd probably suffer.

Mr Butterworth shd have the charges for sailing both his horses

This is the point of difference in Mr Platt's case that tho' he is required to keep a horse it was not necessary that he shd use them immediately & very shortly after arrival at Cuttack. At the same time the Govt does not know this? Perhaps the Bd might report whether there were any other duties for wh. Mr P. might reasonably assume that a horse might be required. On arrival Distance is an element to be considered & an officer who is bound to keep a horse can't be expected to march it from Pillour to Cuttack

39

R.C. 18/1/98
R. 19/1/98

193

to keep one horse that he could have replaced the horse at Cuttack. The Bd points out that Mr. Platt was transferred in the rainy season when no horse could be had in Cuttack. But if Mr Platt was required to maintain one, it does not appear where he could have got one from nearer than Bellary.

HRH
19/1/98

Hon.

I do not believe that the Govt of India means the rules to be read harshly or with unreasonable illiberality. Common sense will generally solve any difficulty that may arise.

27/1/98

Financial Depts

C. 19.3.98.
R. 21.3.98.
C.R. 23.3.98.
29.3.98.

C. Nos 8796, 8822, 9359
and 10,270 Revenue.

Submitted to the Hon'ble
Mr. Frose C. S.R.

Cmb
22.3.98

MA 22.3.98.

The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss K.C.S.I.

—

For Orders

The Revenue Dept. forwards four cases involving claims under article 1093 of the C.S.R: from—

I. Mr. Davidson. Ag S.C. Salem
II Mr. A. Butterworth, Ag Coll.
Coimbatore
III Mr. J.C. Parsons, Ag. P.A.
Canjam
IV Mr. Platts, Asst. Comm.
Salt Revenue

Each current is tied separately in the file and the Revenue Dept notes flagged ~~A~~ B set out the facts and the arguments. The Hon'ble Mr. Frose C.S.R. has noted on the papers in the Revenue Dept.

The principles which should govern the admission of claims under article 1093 of the C.S.R are set out in

40

before hand how many days

(1) Indian resolution in F.O. No. 320 Fml: dy 8. May 1896

(2) Do letter on page 1 of F.O. No. 51 Fml. dy 20. Jany 1897

Govt. has also explained these principles further in F.O. No. 272 Fml dy 26th March 1897

All these papers will be found in File I. These principles have been so frequently applied in the Financial Dept. of late that it is unnecessary to set them out here. It will be observed that the ~~views of~~ proper construction placed on these orders in the Rev. Dept. which does not follow ~~the~~ recent Financial Dept decisions.

Clerk
13.3.98

As these questions have to be disposed of in Financial it would think have been well if Rev. had sent it to note for orders to Financial

Pp Bo 41

for remark before circ. to H.M. or transferred it to Financial with request to circ. to H.M. For want of this procedure The Hon. Mr. Grose has ~~has~~ noted without knowing the principle on wh. Fin. has been disposing of cases such as these. Fin. has been ~~dis~~ acting on the principle laid down in para of the Govt of India Resolu in G.O. No. 320 dy 8th may, 1896. ~~dy~~

flag B

"x x It was not the intention of the G. of I. that officers should when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer be entitled in addition to drawing travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipmt. at Govt expense, even when the nature of their duties requires them to maintain horses or camp equipmt. It has been understood in short that the Govt of I. intended officers to march their horses & send their camp equipmt.

42

by road in all ordinary cases, as they used to do before railways were made.
On this principle Mr. Davidson's claim to rail a horse from Madras to Hosur would certainly be disallowed.

Mr. Parsons's claim for railing his tents from Shirkarpur in the Bombay Pres.y to Ganjam via Bellary wd be similarly disallowed, unless it were thought that over so great a distance it was certain the tents could not be carted, or if carting were possible, that it was certain Mr Parsons wd have to go into camp before they arrived.
The other possible alternative wd be to sell the tents for what they wd fetch at Shirkarpur & buy others at for Ganjam.
On the whole I think this case might be treated exceptionally as Mr Parsons was returning from active famine duty in another Presidency & deserved special consideration.

Yes - this is quite a special case

19/3/98

43

Mr. Butterworth was Judge at Dharwar & not on active famine duty there. It was not required for Butterworth's services
for rail charge to Coimbatore
his claim should be disallowed on the principle above noted.

19/3/98

Mr. Platts' claim also is inadmissible for railing a horse for railing a horse from Nellore to Cuttack. It was not required for immediate use on his arrival.

There is so much difficulty in the working of these rules that it may become a matter for consideration whether carriage for horse or camp equipment should never be allowed unless permitted with the order directing an officer's transfer.

KH 8.3.98.

On reconsideration I think the order of the G of I makes it necessary to disallow the claims of Messrs Davidson & Butterworth.

44

29/3/98

Secy

In File I

The Hon Sir H Stuart has, upon the C.S.'s note flagged V noted that the claims of Messrs Davidson Butterworth & Platts for the cost of carriage of their horses by rail should be disallowed. The Hon'ble Mr Gross has, on reconsideration agreed with their view. A draft order has accordingly been sent by the Final Dept for countersignature.

In the C.S.'s note it is stated that the principle upon which Govt has been disposed of such cases is that laid down in para 17 of the Govt of India's Resolution in G.O. No 320 dd 8 May 96 (Flag B) — 'xx 'It was not the intention 'of the Govt of India that 'officers should when 'making ordinary journeys 'on tour or transfer, be 'entitled to addition to

File I

45

"drawing travelling
"allowance, to convey
"their horses or camp
"equipment at Govt
"expense, even when
"the nature of their duties
"requires them to maintain
"~~camp~~ horses or camp
"equipment" ~ x

Acting on this principle the Fmt Dept has disallowed similar claims made by messrs Banerji & Lakshmana Srinivasa Rao. (Vide G.O. Fmt No 264 dt 8 March Rev Cen No 1934/98 flagged W in file linked) File II

Against this latter decision the Board has submitted a strong protest in B.P 891 misc dt 29 Mar 98 (Rev Cen 2590/98 (in linked file) File III

The Board puts the case admirably & it is respectfully submitted that the interpretation placed on the Govt of India Resln quoted above may be reconsidered.

Taking this Resolution

46

by itself it would doubtless mean that such charges should be invariably disallowed provided that it is held that the public interests will not suffer if Revenue Offrs generally arrive at new stations without the means of going on tour for some days (in cases, some weeks or even months).

But this Resolution No 1603-Ea dt 10 April 1896 was explained in Mr Gamble's letter to the Govt of the Panjab No 5453-Ea dt 29th Dec 96 read in G.O. No 51 dt 20 Jany 97 In para 4 it is explained that the rule question

"which should be considered in deciding such matter is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessa

203

Flag Y

47

to meet such travelling 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 & arrangement can secure."

If it is finally decided that the terms of these instructions of the Govt of India exclude claims such as have been put forward & disallowed, and that they intend that Officers shall be able to march their horses by road as of yore, it is submitted that a modification of the rule in this Presidency may be asked for. As the Boards point out, horses cannot be marched any considerable distance in this Presidency nor can Centre Sts be sent across several Districts with any road, though this might have been possible 25 or 30 years ago.

48

This is the crux.
AH 4.6.98.

The tents belong to Govt. not to the officers ~~as here~~.

Is this always so? I did not know. If it is, no doubt the officers do not get pecuniary advantage as they do here.
BA

49

The whole tenor of the Govt of India's Resolution seems to show, I submit that they had in view the conditions of Northern India. Small districts; many large stations close to each other; horses & tents plentiful & cheap; bike daily advertisements in the Pioneer. Rs 300 seems to be the average for a useful district horse (about 13·3 to 14·2).

There are very few up country stations here, it is submitted, where one could rely on getting any kind of horse; and a horse worth riding can't be got for much under 600 Rs or 700 Rs.

WHL
16-4-98

PTO

File II

H.E.

In the lower file there is a strong protest from the Board in the cases of Messrs Banerji & Lakshmana Rao. This was not before Govt. when the decision in the cases of Messrs. Butterworth Davidson Platts & Parsons were circulated.

If the H.E. thinks the principles on which these cases have been decided should be reconsidered, it is for orders whether the decision about Messrs Butterworth &c shd. be held over pending such reconsidn., or whether the decision shd issue leaving it to be subsequently modified shd. Govt. alter to view.

S.R. 19/4/98

I think the matter must be reconsidered. The Fin. Dept. orders are in accordance with Res. 8 of 1603 Ex 10.4.96 as laid it down that Art 1093 was intended to meet the case of officers removing between their camp & quarters or homes in one place more often than once in another. In a subsequent Res viz 5453 Ex 29.12.96 8 of 9 I said "the only question which should be considered" in deciding claims under 1093 is whether the allowances are in excess of the ordinary rates of conveyance hire or travelling expenditure of such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service." This implies that the intention of 1093 was to prevent hardship to officers in such cases & cannot be held to modify the first Res. I am not sure that this has been fully considered in the Fin Dept. The decision about Messrs. Butterworth &c shd be one with the Board's protest is disposed of.

JG
25.4.98

The file is returned to Fin. Dept for reconsideration of the principle involved in these cases with reference to the notes above, the H.E's note of 25th inst., & the B.P. 891 d. 29/3/98 linked. S.R. 26/4/98

Fin Dept no

File II

50

Read in Fin. 27/4/98

C. 6/6/98
Rs 10/6/98

File Kept

C. 13.6.98
Rs. 23.6.98

207

[G. 25]
800—27-4-98.

Financial DEPARTMENT

C. No. 467, 904 & 1337

SUBJECT.

(3) HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.
(1) THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.
(2) ~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

Article 1093, C.S.R.

FOR ORDERS.

Z3

The notes below this received from the Revenue Department relate to the draft order on the claims of Messrs. Davidson, Butterworth and Platts to be reimbursed the cost of carriage of their horses or tents under article 1093 of the Civil Service Regulations which was sent to that department for counterinitials. The papers regarding these claims are contained in File marked I.

File II contains the protest from the Board referred to in the Rev: Dept. notes.

Files III and IV contain the cases in the Police Dept. and in the Separate Revenue Dept: on which orders had already been drafted in accordance with H. M's instructions. These draft orders have been withheld pending the decision on the present notes. The files have been kept as they originally stood in order to avoid confusion as

57

explained that the only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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.

In G.O.No.272 Finl., d/26th March 1897, this Govt. laid down the general conditions under which sanctions under article 1093 might be granted. It was recognized that where economy of an officer's time is involved, there can be no difficulty in deciding that transport by rail (or steamer) of horses and camp equipment is necessary in the interests of the public service; that where the cost to Govt. is less if horses and camp equipment are forwarded by rail than if they are sent by road, it is obviously in the interest of the public service that the cheaper route should be taken: and that in regard to long journeys, where circumstances render it impossible to expect that horses should be marched by road while the use of horses is essential to the proper execution of an officer's duty, it may reasonably be held that the interests of the public service require that the horses should be taken

page 184 of the book-file

page 180 of the book-file

out and back by rail or steamer.

3 The Hon'ble Member has pointed out in the Revenue Dept. that para. 4 of Mr.Gamble's letter No.5453 Ex., d/ 29th Decr. 1896 (G.O.No.51, d/20th Jan. 1897)— in which it was stated that the only question which should be considered in deciding claims under article 1093, C.S.R., is whether the allowances admissible under the rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service—seems to modify the Govt. of India resolution No.1603 Ex., d/10th April 1896 (G.O.No.320 Finl., d/8th May 1896 on page 167 of the book-file).

As regards this point, it is respectfully submitted that the question turns on what is required in the interests of the public service and this requirement seems to be defined by India in paragraph 1 of its resolution No.1603 Ex., d/10th April 1896 (G.O.No.320 Finl., d/8th May 1896 on page 167 of the book-file). India seems moreover in paragraph 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter of the 29th Decr. 1896 to be repeating a principle which has been held to govern all general claims under the travelling allowance rules, viz., that travelling allowance should be taken as a whole and that special consideration cannot be given to individual

6

File II

individual cases of losses.

4 With reference to the Board's protest in File II it is submitted that the Financial department orders have followed the instructions of the Govt. of India and so long as the orders of the Govt. of India remain unchanged, it is impossible to treat claims under article 1093 except as they have been treated in this Dept: The Board has however placed the arguments against the present application of article 1093 in a very forcible manner and there can be no doubt that ours of the result of the present test - which it may be noted is the only one that can be applied to show that India's interpretation of the article is strictly carried out- will be, as pointed out in paragraph 8 of the Board's proceedings in File II, to tend to induce officers to go out on tour immediately ϕ they take over charge of a new appointment.

5 As regards the reference to the Govt. of India, attention is solicited to G.O.No.336 Finl., d/1st May 1890 and the letter following on pages 123-135 of the Book-file and to the Govt. of India reply on page 137 of the same book-file (G.O.No.494 Finl., d/ 26th July 1890). It will be seen that the strong representation them made by the Madras Govt. resulted in what is at present article 1093 of the C.S.R. India has since placed its interpretation on the article

of course they will - and the duration of the tour is not specified, so a couple of days might do. It is not "in the interests of the public service" that such evasion of a rule should be feasible.

N.A.

56

7

4

article and this interpretation, like that of article 1159 (b), renders the article almost wholly imperative.

Cmdr. 12/5/98

I quite agree - I don't see how the F. D. C. have acted otherwise than it has done.

It is curious that it N. should have devolved on me to carry out India's orders in this matter, seeing that I wrote the Fin. Cmdr's proposals at p. 97 of F.P. 3367 / 1.5.90 & drafted the N.P. in that order.

The W. makes out a good case & the matter must be referred to India

HS
6/6/98

I concur.

A.M. 22.6.98

57

I am unable to see that the interpretation put by the Fin.l Dept upon art. 1093 C.S.R. & the letters of the Govt of India is anything but strictly accurate. The Govt of India make "the interests of the public service" the pivot of the whole matter. The Board's contention makes the pecuniary interests of the individual officer the pivot.

But while affirming that the interpretation of the rule is correct I fully admit that hardship is caused to individual officers thereby inasmuch as they are pecuniary losers by its application, more especially in the case of transfers from one district to another.

The Bd. in my opinion entirely fails to show that the interpretation of the rule is wrong but it does show very conclusively the hardship of the rule, & makes out a strong case for its modification. It is nearly two years since India gave its last commentary & interpretation, and I think this Govt might well make a strong representation to the Govt of India on the subject, laying especial stress on the hardship experienced by officers under transfer from district to district.

AA
4.6.98

58

Letter to India on the correct interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the C.S.R.

C. 7.7.98 C. 11.7.98
R 9.7.98 R 12.7.98 Instr.

215

Note in the C.S.

Please see notes.
The draft may issue?

Cmdr
12.7.98

Gen. 11/12/98.

N.B. Please see the linked files which have not yet been disposed of Cmdr

59

It seems plain as well from the history of this question as from the rule itself that the position originally laid down was that the actual cost of his horses & camp equipment of their carriage was to be paid to an officer under the sanction of the local Govt. When the local Govt. considered it was "in the interests of the public service" that the officer should take ~~them his horses and camp equipment~~ with him. This position involved the consideration of each case and there is in fact, I think, no difficulty in determining from the circumstances of each case whether the charge is in the interests of the public service or not. For example if the Ag: Head Asst. Collector at Tripatur is reverted as Asst. to Salem where he has his Collector to go to and since ~~when~~ there is no difficulty in marching his horses through his own division almost the whole way there is no difficulty in determining that it is not

not in the interests of the public service that he should rail his horses from Tripatur to Salem but there is equally no difficulty in determining that it is in the interests of the public service that he should rail his horses to Tuticorin if he is transferred there as Ag: Sub-Collector; as another instance or in ruling that it is not in the interests of the public service that a police officer transferred from Kurnool to S.Canara for three months should sell his horses and replace them on both moves.

2. But abandoning the position assigned them by rule, the local Govt. has acquiesced in an automatic test or criterion being set up, and it is the application of this test without considering each case which has given and is giving rise to all the difficulty. It is held apparently concurring with India that, for example, unless an officer uses his horses and tents immediately on his arrival, it cannot have been in the

interest-

interests of the public service that he should have railed his horses to his new station, a conclusion which seems to me, as the draft says, on its face futile, inappropriate and inexpedient.

3. This test is founded on a ruling of the Govt. of India (see flag H in book-file) but it seems to me that relying on the history of the origin of the rule and of the responsibility imposed on it by the rule, this Govt. would be justified in ignoring this gloss of India, and, for example, in ruling in particular cases that it was not in the interests of the public service that an officer should sell his horses and replace them when transferred to a distant station.

4. If Govt. hold with me that it can reject India's gloss on the rule, no reference to India is necessary since Govt. would only have to rule the allowances admissible in the particular cases. But since the Acct. Genl. would probably

probably require a reference to India, the reference may (or may not) ultimately have to be made. If the reference is made as things now stand we are open to the retort that our difficulties are on our own showing ~~~~ of our own making, but what is necessary to show to India is that its gloss is an undesirable encroachment upon the powers of the local Govt.

5. I would urge that no reference be made to India.

I think the ref. to India had better go — If the Act in the C.S.R. stood alone, it would perhaps be unnecessary, though even then sooner or later the A.G. would draw comparisons (as Mr. Rawlins did) between the expenditure here & in other provinces & would, if he chose, take India's orders. But the Article does not stand alone — we have to take it together with India's glosses & interpretations — Taking it thus, we cannot work it as the F.D. has been working it, that is, in the manner against which the Bd of Rev. protests. If we are not to take it thus, we cannot change our course with India's sanction.

RD
7/7/98

7/7/98

I quite agree that the ref. to India should go. The "gloss" of the Govt of India is practically an order wh. we ought not to ignore. If it is wrong they should be made to cancel it.

AH 9.7.98

62

Financial Dept: 219

Secret

Read again the follwong papers:

Letter to the Govt. of India on the correct interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the C.S.R.

P
- H: G.O.No.320 Finl., d/ 8th May 1896
- K: " " 51 " " " 20th Jan. 1897
- M: " " 272 " " " 26th March 1897
- L: " " 435 " " " 2nd June 1897

Q
- E: " " 40 " "17th Jan. 1898
- X: " " 244 " " " 8th March 1898

Procs. of the Board of Rev. (Sep: Rev) No.5083 Mis., d/19-11-97 ------ A
without enclos:

x
C.No.467 — From the I.G. of Police, No.519, d/10th Feb. 1898 --- A

C.No.904 — " " Acct. Genl. No.1077, d/17th March 1898 --- A

÷
C.No.2570 Rev. — Procs. of the Board of Rev. (L.R.), No 891 Mis., d/29th March 1898 --- A

z
C.No.1213 — From the I.G. of Police, No.1476, d/ 21st April 1898-Q

Procs. of the Board of Rev. (L.R.), No.1125 Mis., d/26th April 1898 -- A
without enclos.

x
C.No.1415 — From the Acct. Genl. No.1867, d/13th May 1898 ---- A

÷
C.No.1636 — " -do- No.2167, d/8th June 1898 -Q

Statements not to be printed

N.B. Tabular forms enclosed

188

ORDER P.S. No. 605, dt 14th July 1898

The Govt. of India will be addressed on the question of the correct interpretation to be placed upon art: 1093 of the C.S.R.

2. As regards the revised returns forwarded by the Board of Revenue in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 5 of G.O.No.435 Finl., d/2nd June 1897, it is not practicable to revoke at this distance

AH 7-7-98

AH 8.7.98 AH 14.7.98

distance of time the sanctions accorded by competent authority under art: 1093 in 1896 and 1897 and the claims which have been admitted by the Board will be allowed to stand.

x
3. The claim of Mr.R.J.M.Mayne, referred to in paragraph 2 of the letter from the I.G.of Police No.519, d/10th Feb. 1898, is admissible under the rules.

x
4. The action of the I.G. in having guaranteed payment of the train-age of a horse from Nandyal to Tuticorin to Mr. Lane, whose case is dealt with in the same paragraph, was not authorized by the rules. The charge will, however, be admitted.

x
5. The case of the I.G. of Police [redacted] is provided for by art:1166 A of the C.S.R. The maximum number of servants and the maximum weight of baggage for which the officers specified in the margin may charge Govt. was laid down in G.O.No.51 Finl., d/29th Jan. 1890, which, however, omitted to specify any limit as regards horses. The limit prescribed for the purpose of article 1093 in G.O.No.504 Finl., d/19th June 1882, (viz. 4 horses) will in future be applied in the cases of all these officers for the purposes of art:1166 A

x
Note. The last three paragraphs follow the original draft flagged

	No. of servants	Weight in Mds. of baggage
Members of the Rev. Bd. in their several capacities ------	4	15
Inspectors-Genl. of Police, Prisons and Regn., S.G., Sanv. Commr. & the D.P.I.	4	10
Dy. Sany. Commr.	3	10

page 118 of book-file

pages 11-14 of book-file

To
The I.G. of Police
" Board of Rev. (L.R.)
" -do- (Rev. Sett.)
" -do- (Sep. Rev.)
" Acct. Genl.
" Revenue Dept:
" L. & M. Dept:
" Judicial Dept:
" Educational Dept:
" P.W.D.
" Supt., Madras Survey.

Public

Pers Annexy depts alphabetically Circl

dispd 24-7-98

198 21

LETTER:- No. 606, dt 14th July '98.

TO

The Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Finance & Commerce Dept.
(with copy of G.O. 435 Fnl dt 2-6-97)

SIR,

I am directed to address you regarding the interpretation to be placed on article 1093 of the C.S.R. which runs as follows:-

"When the Local Govt. is satis-"fied that it is in the interests of "the public service that an officer re-"quired to travel on public duty should "send his horses, camels, or camp equip-"ment by steamer or railway, it may, by "special order in each case, permit him "to recover, in addition to his autho-"rized travelling allowance, the actual "cost of their carriage, including, "whether separately charged for or not, "the cost of conveyance of one syce and "one grass cutter for each horse."

2. The history of the article in its present form is briefly as follows. The Finance Committee of 1886, in discussing the question of travelling allowance, came to the conclusion that whilst the existing travelling allowances were quite sufficiently liberal for all cases of ordinary tours on duty, there could be no doubt that, as a general rule, the rates were altogether inadequate to meet the expenses attendant on a transfer from one station to another. It was notorious, the Committee remarked, that such transfers were almost invariably occasions of loss, unless accompanied by permanent promotion, and the fact that an ordinary and recurring incident in the

Report Vol.II, Chap.XII, para. 27

official

official career of even the most meritorious officers practically amounted on every occasion to a heavy fine, was felt by all classes of public servants as an unmeritted hardship. The Committee proceeded to point out that it had proposed material reductions in the rates of travelling allowances granted for journeys made on ordinary tours, many of which, it had little doubt, had from time to time been increased under the influence of a feeling that liberality in dealing with this part of the subject tended to mitigate the hardships occasioned by transfers; that these reductions would certainly be strongly objected to and would cause much discontent; and that this discontent could not, in its opinion, be held to be unreasonable, if the inevitable losses due to transfers still remained. The Committee urged that it could not be to the advatage of the State that its servants should have just grounds for discontent, and that there would not be grounds for discontent in the matter of travelling allowances if Government recognized, what appeared to be a fact beyond the possibility of dispute, that journeys upon transfer involve the complete break up of an officer's establishment and the conveyance of himself, of the members of his family, of many, if not all, of his servants, and of much baggage over distances which may extend to thousands of miles, with either the enforced sale, often at a ruinous loss, of furniture, horses and carriages, or their transit at a cost which produces the same result. Ordinary tours within an officer's circle of jurisdiction involve none of these things. The circumstances being essentially different, their

treatment

Para. 38 and

Para. 39 abid

The Committee recommended therefore that the T. A. Code should be modified in this case in consideration of, and as some compensation for to Officers for, the reductions which it had felt bound to propose in the rates of travelling allowance admissible on ordinary tours.

Note
Page 83 of the book-file.

Note
Page 135 of the book-file

treatment should, the Committee considered, be different and a much more liberal provision made for travelling expenses in the case of transfer than in the case of ordinary tours. The recognition of the exceptional circumstances involved by transfers would, the Committee observed, be a special boon to the junior and lower paid classes of officers, as in some cases a transfer, or a succession of transfers, compelled such officers to get into debt, and much embarrassment for years.

5. In para. 10 of Mr. Henry Stokes' letter No. 1106, Financial, dated 27th October 1886, this Govt. expressed its cordial approval of the foregoing principle. It suggested that an officer should be permitted to draw for road or railway journeys in excess of 200 miles and for any journey by sea, the actual cost of transport of himself and of the member of his family residing with him, and also of baggage, servants, horses, and carriages within a maximum scale to be laid down according to rank, and subject to declaration by the officers that the sum claimed had been actually paid. Attention was again drawn to the matter in Mr. Price's letter No. 537, Finl., dated 1st May 1890.

4. The Governor in Council then stated that he still accepted as the fittest to meet the case the proposals made by the Madras Govt in 1886, urging that the straggling conformation of the Madras Presidency renders transfers an exceptionally heavy charge on the officers in the services of Govt.

in

(4)

in this Presidency; that the excessive fixed travelling allowances for ordinary journeys on duty which previously obtained had been reduced in the faith that the principles already adopted by the Finance Committee would be accepted by the Govt. of India; and that it was a very real and substantial grievance that the cost of transfers ordered in the interests of the public service should not be reimbursed from public funds. (5) In Mr. Simkinson's reply it was intimated that art:1205 of the C.S.R. (which it is to be noted applies only to non-gazetted officers in receipt of salaries up to Rs. 400 per mensem) represented the final decision of the Govt. of India on the question; that this decision had been arrived at after very careful consideration; and that the Governor General in Council regretted that he was unable to reopen the matter. Paragraph 3 of the same communication proceeded to state that the Governor General in Council had, however, decided to modify the terms of article 1093 of the C.S.R. so as to bring it into more exact accordance with the intention expressed in Finance and Commerce Deptt. resolution No.1517, dated 20th June 1884, (243) to leave to Local Govts. a wide discretion in the application of the article ~~thereof~~. The Govt. of India expressed the hope that the article as revised would meet the special difficulty which had been previously felt by the Govt. of Madras in dealing equitably with the cases of its officers. (6) The article itself has since undergone no material alterations. Its application has however been restricted by subsequent rulings of the

Govt.

Note
Fin. & Com. No.3115, dated 27-6-90 on page 157 of the book-file

Note 57
~~Page 167~~ of the book-file.

Note
G.O.No.320, Finl., d/ 8-5-96, on page 167 of the book-file

(5)

Govt. of India. 225 n1 P

7. In Finance and Commerce Dept. Resolution No.1603-Ex., dated 10th April 1896, the Govt. of India pointed out that in framing the rule contained in this article, it was not its intention that officers should, when making ordinary journeys on tour or transfer, be entitled in addition to drawing travelling allowance, to convey their horses or camp equipment at Govt. expense, even when the nature of their duties required them to maintain horses or camp equipment. The rule, it was explained, was 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 was therefore obliged in the interests of the public service to convey them by rail or steamer. It is only therefore, the Govt. of India stated, when it is 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 transfer) 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. The Govt. of India at the same time suggested the advisability of all local Govts. issuing instructions

similar

similar to those obtaining in the Bombay Presidency where orders had from time to time been issued with a view to restrict the application of article 1093 to the cases which it is intended to meet, and where the authorities to whom powers under the article had been delegated ~~are~~ were required to submit periodical returns of sanctions given. with brief notes explaining the circumstances of each case.

8. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of Mr. Gamble's letter to the Secretary to the Govt. of the Punjab, No. 5453-Ex., dated 29th December 1896, copy of which was communicated to this Govt., it was explained that the expression "interests of the public service" includes the economy of an officer's time; that there is no objection to the application of article 1093 to cases in which the local Govt. thinks that the conveyance of camp equipment of horses by rail will serve the public interests by enabling an officer to do more work than he otherwise would in a given time; and that the only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling 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.

Note
G.O.No.81,Finl.,dated 20-1-97.

9. This Govt. has interpreted the foregoing rulings to mean that officers should march their horses and send on their camp equipment by road in all ordinary cases, as was the custom before railways were introduced; and that in order to satisfy the requirements of article 1093, there should exist a knowledge on the part of the sanctioning authority that an officer granted the concessions of that art. will (not may) be required to be ready for emergent duty on arrival at his destination; in short, that in order to justify the application of the article to any particular case the necessity for an officer requiring his camp equipment or horses immediately on arrival at a new station must, except in very special circumstances, be proved by the facts. It has further been presumed that the sentence quoted in the margin repeats the principle which has been held to govern all general claims under travelling allowance rules, viz. that travelling allowances should be taken as a whole and that special consideration cannot be given to individual cases of loss.

(x) The only question which should be considered in deciding such matters is whether the allowances admissible under rule do or do not reasonably cover the expenditure necessary to meet such travelling as is required in the interests of the public service.
[Para.4 of Mr.Gamble's letter No.5453 Ex., dated 29-12-96.]

10. In view to the article being applied as intended by the Govt. of India, the Governor in Council drew the attention of all sanctioning authorities in this Presidency to the principles enunciated by the Govt. of India and directed that a return of sanctions with brief notes explaining the circumstances of each case should be submitted to Govt. annually. These returns did not, however, afford sufficient information as to the necessity or urgency of taking horses or camp equipment by rail or steamer, and, on the suggestion of the

Accountant

80. 435 / 2.6.97 Finl I

Accountant-General, it was decided that officers in this Presidency claiming concessions under art.1093 should submit their applications in the form printed on page 4 of the proceedings of this Govt. No. 435, Financial, dated 2nd June 1897. (copy enclosed) This form, it will be observed, provides for the ascertainment of the facts, which, under the orders of the Govt. of India, are requisite for the application of art. 1093. The annual return was abolished and sanctioning authorities were directed to furnish the Accountant-General at the time of sanction with particulars in the form referred to above of each sanction accorded; the Accountant-Genl. being instructed to submit for the orders of Govt. any case in which he considered the sanction of doubtful propriety.

I. Page 190 of the Book file

11 This strict application of the rules has met with various protests from controlling authorities and is causing much discontent in this Presidency. It may be that this Govt. has construed the intentions of the Govt. of India too literally, and if so I am to request instructions on the point and to ask that the orders already issued may be rendered free from all doubt.

12 If it is held that the orders of the Governor-General in Council have been correctly interpreted, I am to request that in the application of art. 1093 of the C.S.R. the special circumstances of this Presidency may be taken into consideration. These circumstances as well as the hardships involved in transfers -

which

which were clearly recognized by the Finance Committee, have been alluded to in paras. 2 to 4 supra. I am, however, to urge that in this Presidency the exigencies of the public service and the numerical weakness of the staff necessitate frequent transfers of Revenue Officers, which the extension of railways has annihilated distances and facilitates transfers which were impracticable when the only means of travelling was by road. Article 106 of the C.S.R. compels officers on transfer to travel by rail, and under art. 195 they must accomplish 300 miles per diem. With the opening of new railways the old traffic by road has ceased, and with the cessation of the demand it is no longer possible to obtain the carts and bullocks which used to be posted at convenient stages along the chief routes. It is therefore impracticable except on a few routes to obtain carts to travel for one and the same pair of bullocks to drag a loaded cart at the rate of 15 miles a day for a distance of several hundred miles, in fact, (men will) undertake the duty on these conditions and in face of the long return journey, except at prohibitive rates. It is thus no longer possible, in the case of two distant stations connected by rail, to send baggage from one to the other by road, and the only result of denying officers the cost of conveyance of their camp equipment by rail is to compel them to pay for such carriage themselves.

initial attention to the views of the Finance Committee of this Govt. as already intimated and

I would say frequent not continual

Encl

will not

(10)

13. In regard to the question of marching horses by road, I am to point out that during a greater part of the year and in the majority of the districts in this Presidency it is absolutely impossible to obtain forage en route, and servants who have been travelling all day cannot be expected, moreover, even when it is available, to go and gather it. It was reasonable perhaps in the days before railways to require an officer to march his horses 200 or 300 miles, and he could do so with comparative safety since horses in a similar plight were constantly passing along the routs & and forage were procurable at resting places and [illegible]; but the custom has now passed away in this Presidency and it is not safe to send a horse alone on a long march.

14. As regards the sale and replacement of horses, I am to observe that in this Presidency there are very few municipal stations where it is generally possible to procure any kind of horse; that the compulsory sale of an officer's horse is tantamount to the infliction of a heavy fine on him, as when an officer is under orders of transfer and has to break up his establishment at a few days notice it is impossible to find a purchaser at anything approaching the original price paid for an animal; that the purchase of a horse on the occasion of every transfer really entails another distinct fine; and that is a hardship on officers to expect that they should be continually put to the inconvenience of changing their horses to which they

It is to be remembered in this connection that before the days of railways officers accompanied their horses and baggage and rode their horses when travelling; while now they are required to go themselves by rail (Court) where practicable

(11) NUP 231

have become accustomed and which they have probably procured with great trouble and to which they

15. The travelling allowance admissible by rail to an officer of the first class is twice the first class fare. Deducting the railway fare of the officer himself, he is left with one anna a mile to defray the cost of moving his wife and family (if he has them), personal effects and camp equipment, as well as all his servants and their following. This allowance is about half the ordinary rate of hire for one country cart. Moreover, an officer can under no circumstances draw any allowance for the charges incurred in sending his carriage or carriages by rail on transfer.

16. The majority of district officials in this Presidency are required by the orders of Government to maintain a certain number of horses and on the principle recognized in all countries that the employer pays all travelling expenses of the employee incurred in the duties for which he is engaged, it appears unreasonable that officers should be compelled to risk their horses lives and to lose their services for 15 or 30 days at a time.

17. The foregoing remarks apply in a great measure to journeys made on tour. As regards the latter, however, it is evident that the test applied by this Govt. (para. 10 supra) and this which appears to be the only proper test available to ensure that the existing

16
I am to point out also that the want of his horses and conveyance places an Offr on arrival in a new station in considerable difficulties. In this Presidency he cannot (during the heat of the day) dispense with a conveyance of some sort, but there are no conveyances for hire in most up country stations and Offrs are often forced to use the carriages of their subordinates or

Para 17. Note the word friends

This paragraph which is based on the Board's procs. may lead to the retort that the "futility" etc. is due to the erroneous view of this Govt. It is India's interpretation which merits these adjectives. Note

Cute

of obtaining of which advantage is endeavoured the latter afterwards

(12)

existing orders of the Govt. of India are obeyed is inappropriate futile and inexpedient. The test ~~is~~ consists in the ascertainment of the fact whether the transferred officer uses his horses and camp equipment immediately on arrival at his new station, i.e. uses them for the purpose of touring If he does not so use them his claim to reimbursement of the cost of the carriage under art. 1093 is not admitted. The test is inappropriate because an officer joining a new appointment cannot possibly foresee whether or not any sudden emergency will necessitate the use of horses and tents and he should therefore join provided for all emergencies; it is futile as it tends to induce all transferred officers to proceed on tour immediately they take charge of a new appointment, and it is inexpedient since such officers might possibly, and in the majority of cases would, be better employed at head quarters. The inexpediency of the ~~new~~ test is apparent when it is considered that a touring officer - say a Collector of a district - could recover the cost of transport of his camp equipment and horses by rail for all the journeys comprised in an extensive tour carried by him on each stage of his journey and making various unnecessary halts, whilst another officer who travelled more precisely the same circumstances and sent his camp equipment on to where they were actually required would be pecuniarily a loser.

6. Finally, I am to point out that the orders of the Govt. of India to which reference is made above restrict the discretion of this Govt. considerably, in spite of the announcement made in 1890 (para. 6 supra) when this subject was last brought to the notice of

(13) 258 233

~~His Excellency~~ the Governor General in Council, for ~~his~~ if those orders have been correctly interpreted it is impossible in any but very exceptional circumstances to grant the concessions allowed in art. 1093. The reasons urged by this Govt. in 1890 apply if anything with greater force at the present time and ~~his Excellency~~ the Governor in Council trusts that the matter will be reconsidered by the Govt. of India. ~~In the opinion of this Govt. the entire cancellation of art. 1093 of the C.S.R. would be preferable to the present state of affairs which can only lead to~~ hard as that would press in appeals, ~~further discontent~~

Cl. S.
2.7.98

4/7/98.

E 2754

MC

O. Issue the letter to India in this file in mss. sharp Then send the order to be printed at Madras and issued sharp. Ask Mr. D'Cruz to see the printing through. All the notes in this file are to be printed L&R. with please see to this and other instructions sent him the other day in the case of Pudukottai papers. As to arrangement &c. I should like to see a proof of the notes on yellow paper. The printing of the notes can go on independently of the issue of the order.

See the three Lucknow files below. Let K note each item in Annexure last (in the Lucknow file) as awaiting reference to India in Letter No. 606 of 14/7/98 & hand them over to Reference who must keep them intact & be responsible for them

Asst 12/7/98

Issued in mss. X

sent copies abd. p 129 14/7/98 to India.

H.B.

Please show this note to S. of S.

129 15/7/98

b/c 18/7

i.e. with the comments with Lr. already rd. & dated

Init. A.

Proof of notes on yellow paper submitted for approval. The original of the notes on string together separately for the present for ready reference.

11/8/98

Both are to be treated as V. I.

Posted 15/7/98.

3 files sent 15/7/98

First copy sent to Press. 18/7/95

Returned for signature.
Read from signature 27/9/95 at 6 P.M.

Despatched in print.

Number of copies required: Order complete. 237 100 / Letter only. 20 / Order complete with Letter. 15

Read again G.O., No. , dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government

Letter of Government

Statement with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch in original.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.

I
29/1/98

14/3/13

3.4-14,15

23.12.19