

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 27-293
No. 161.

INDEXED

First copy sent to Press. 27-293.

Returned for signature. 4-3

Despatched in print.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr. the Viceroy's mail
to India
Instructing the Accountant
the debit to ~~frank 25~~
Political of certain
charges incurred in
connection with —

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT NO.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER, NO. OF GOVERNMENT—A.

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DEVIATION IN ORIGINAL
(not paged.)

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—

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

27TH FEBRUARY 1893, No. 161, PUBLIC.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 19th October 1892, Mis. No. 724, Public.

Read—the following letter from Captain the Honorable R. T. LAWLEY, Military Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 17th October 1892, No. 564 :—

I have the honour to request that the sum of Rs. 5,000 may be placed at my disposal as an advance to meet expenses incurred in connection with His Excellency the Viceroy's visit to Madras, and that the sanction of Government may be obtained to an allotment being made to light-up the surf on Saturday evening, November the 26th, the probable cost of which will be about Rs. 600.

Order—dated 19th October 1892, Mis. No. 724, Public.

Sanctioned.

2. The Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor will be requested to submit an estimate of the charges, showing the nature of them, which it is desired should be public charges.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Military Secretary to H. E. the Governor.
" Accountant-General.
" Financial Department.

G.O., dated 21st November 1892, Mis. No. 802, Public.

Read—the following letter from Captain the Honorable R. T. LAWLEY, Military Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Guindy, 22nd October 1892 :—

In continuation of my letter applying for an advance to meet the expenses in connection with the visit of His Excellency the Viceroy of India, I have the honour to forward herewith an approximate estimate of the probable expenses to be met in connection with the approaching Viceregal visit to Madras.

2. The heads of expenditure were taken from the arrangements in connection with the visit of The Earl of Dufferin and Ava in 1886, and are only some of the charges actually incurred.

3. Estimate of probable expenses—

Printing	RS.
Cart-hire for tents	200
" of furniture	300
Hire of carriage for staff	500
" of furniture	300
Advertisements	900
Watering roads	100
Lighting-up surf	500
Postage and telegrams	800
Extra lighting	250
State Ball	1,250
Clothing	2,500
	500
Total	8,100

Order—dated 21st November 1892, Mis. No. 802, Public.

Of the sum sanctioned in G.O., dated 19th October 1892, No. 724, Rs. 2,000 will be debited against Political for charges incurred under the following heads, viz.—

Lighting-up surf.	Postage and telegrams.
Watering roads.	Advertisements and printing.

2. All other charges will be met from the contract allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Military Secretary to H. E. the Governor.
" Accountant-General.
Copy to Financial Department.

READ—also the following papers:—

From Captain the Honorable R. T. LAWLEY, Military Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 28th November 1892, No. 598.

With reference to G.Os., No. 724, of 19th October 1892, and No. 802, of 21st November 1892, there appears to be a misunderstanding in regard to the use of the word "advance" in my No. 564, of 17th October 1892, the Right Honorable the Governor and Honorable Members having taken it as meaning an advance from the contract allowance, whereas there was no mention in my letter of the contract allowance and it was never intended by me for one moment that it should be so interpreted.

2. I have, therefore, the honour to request that the procedure of debiting the expenses of Viceroy's visits to Madras to either Imperial or Provincial funds, which has invariably obtained hitherto, may be adhered to in the present instance, and that all expenses incurred in connection with His Excellency Lord Lansdowne's visit may be debited to Provincial funds.

3. It is only by the most rigid economy that the contract allowance can, in ordinary years, be made to meet the legitimate charges for which it was hypothecated. In 1891-92, when His Excellency the Governor took protracted tours far from the railway, there was a deficit, and again in 1892-93 there is no chance whatever of there being a balance to credit for the same reason.

4. I have the honour to urge that it was never contemplated that an extraordinary charge of this nature could be justifiably debited to the contract allowance; and in conclusion I would respectfully point out that, if the contract allowance were in a position to stand an unexpected call of six or seven thousand rupees, it argues considerable financial remissness that it has not been reduced by that amount all these years. As a matter of fact, however, it is not, and never has been, in such a position.

No. 205.

With reference to his letter, dated 28th November 1892, No. 598, the Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor is requested to furnish details of the charges for which a grant in excess of the usual contract allowance is desired and also the total extra amount required.

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

31st January 1893.

To the Military Secretary to H. E. the Governor.

From Captain the Honorable R. T. LAWLEY, Military Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Guindy, 4th February 1893, No. 697.

With reference to memorandum, No. 205, dated 31st January 1893, Public Department, I have the honour to forward herewith a statement of extra expenses for Rs. 7,077-12-10 incurred on account of His Excellency the Viceroy's visit to Madras in November 1892.

ENCLOSURE.

EXPENSES incurred on account of H. E. the Viceroy's visit to Madras in November 1892.

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Amount spent for extra servants	514	7	3
(2) Cost of lighting	748	2	9
(3) Purchase and repair of furniture	1,549	0	2
(4) Hire of furniture	925	11	6
(5) Lighting-up surf	422	9	0
(6) Ball	2,426	4	2
(7) Cost of printing	211	8	9
(8) " postage and telegrams	192	2	9
(9) " advertisements	87	14	6
Total	7,077	12	10

Deduct—
Advance—vide G.O., 19th October 1892, No. 724, Public .. 2,000 0 0
Amount due to adjust .. 5,077 12 10

Minute by the Honorable Sir Henry Stokes, K.C.S.I., dated 23rd February 1893.

Minute by the Honorable Mr. Garstin, C.S.I., dated 24th February 1893.

ORDER—dated 27th February 1893, No. 161, Public.

The Accountant-General is instructed to debit to Grant 25, Political—Provincial Miscellaneous, the charges specified in the statement which is annexed to the Military Secretary's letter of the 4th February 1893, No. 697, amounting to Rs. 7,078 in all.

2. The advance of Rs. 2,000 sanctioned in G.O., 19th October 1892, No. 724, Public, is to be included in the adjustment.

(True Extract.)

C. A. GALTON,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

To the Military Secretary to H. E. the Governor.
" Financial Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Gobt. of {1893} Madras.
PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th Feb. 1893, No. 161.

FEBRUARY.

H. E. the Viceroy's Visit to Madras.

Instructing the Accountant-General regarding
the debit of certain charges incurred in connec-
tion with —.

Recd. at the office of
No. 598.

Government House
Madras
28th November 1892.
30

From

The Military Secretary to the
Right Honourable The Governor

To

Secretary
Government.

Sir,

October 1892
appears to
use of the
the Right
Members
from the Co
mention in
and it was
that it shou

to G.O. No. 724 of 19th
of 21st November 1892 there
standing in regard to the
in my No. 564 of 17th October 1892.
Governor and Honourable
as meaning an advance
whereas there was no
Contract Allowance
by me for one moment,
led.

2. I have the honour to request that
the procedure of the expenses of Viceroy's
visits to Madras Imperial or Provincial
Funds, which have been obtained hitherto, may
be adhered to in this instance, and that all
expenses incurred in connection with His Excellency
Lord Lansdowne be debited to Provincial
Funds.

It is only by the most rigid economy that the Contract Allowance can in ordinary years be made to meet the legitimate charges for which it was hypothecated. In 1891-92, when His Excellency the Governor took protracted tours far from the Railway there was a deficit, and again in 1892-93 there is no chance whatever of there being a balance to credit for the same reason.

I have the honour to urge that it was never contemplated that an extraordinary charge of this nature could be justifiably debited to the Contract Allowance, and in conclusion I would respectfully point out that if the Contract Allowance were in a position to stand an unexpected call of six or seven thousand rupees it argues considerable financial prudence that it has not been reduced by that amount all these years. As a matter of fact however it is not and never has been in such a position.

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

P. J. Lawley Captain,
Military Secretary

Financial
This cannot be done
The Public Secy to H.E.
the Governor.

Date 28th

Recd

No 598.

Re: the debiting of the
Expenses of H.E. the
Viceroy's visit to Provincial
Contract allow.

19.10.92 - 724 -
19.10.92 - 723 -
as far as my experience goes
the 1st of the last day of
visited had no more to say
C. 7/12
H.E. the Viceroy
the Public Secy to H.E.
the Governor.
For Orders
C. 7/12
By advance the Military Secretary
meant no doubt that the Rs 5000 asked
for was only a part of the expenditure
that would be incurred. But that does
not affect the question whether the
extra expenditure for the entertainment of
H.E. the Viceroy, who was I understand
the guest of H.E. the Governor, is to be
a public charge or not. I apprehend
that only such portion of the expenditure
as is not incurred in the entertainment
of H.E. the Viceroy should be so treated, and
in classifying the items in the statement
furnished by the Mil. Secy. I endeavoured
to follow this principle. The relevancy of
the remark about the contract allowance
consists in the fact, that that allowance
is given to meet certain household
(lighting, servants, &c.) I know not what
or at any rate does meet such charges,
and that for this purpose an unusual
strain was put upon it by the Viceroy's visit.
This is a valid reason for granting a sup-
plement to the allowance for the current year
if desired, such supplement being recovered
from the allowance for next year. But it
is not a reason for treating as public charge
expenditure which ought not to fall under that
category. I am not responsible for the prece-
dents. I can only say that if wrong
in principle, they ought not to be followed.
Para 4 of the letter does not require answer.
H.E.

Of course the charges incidental
entertainment of H. E. the Viceroy
party as guests of the Governor in
on him. But there are many
which are over and above these
shd. fall on Provincial funds,
the light of the remarks of my
colleagues, the m. Sec. show
out a list drawn out on the
sketched out by H. M. S. and
classified as shown by them.

W
16 Dec. 48
I send this list.
Wes
18 Dec.

Can that
h. Food & Lodging
is a very small
the cost of extra training
H. S.

C. No 3357

Order

The Government considers that
only such portions of the expenditure
as ^{are} ~~is~~ not incurred in the entertain-
ment of H. E. the Viceroy and his suite
should be treated as a public charge.
^{Public} Charges incurred in connection with
additional lighting, in strengthening
the domestic establishment, & on
furniture ^{and} railway fares, would
be inadmissible as public charges.
~~fall under that category.~~

or on any item ordinarily
provided for from the central
allowance

The hon. Mr. Justice noted on Dec. 14th
that from his personal experience as P. S.
on the occasion of Lord Mayo's visit
"extra lighting, servants and furniture"
were paid for as public charges.

2. If the Military Secretary will
draw out a list classifying each item
in accordance with the principles
stated above, the Government will be in
a position to pass orders.

I see no reason for treating them differently
on the occasion of Lord Lansdowne's visit.

(From Order) (see)
19 Dec

W
23 Dec.

To.

The M. Secy. to H. E. the Gov.

I think the Hon. Mr. Justice has
written ~~inadvisably~~ ^{by mistake}
for ~~advisably~~. The cost of
allowance is public money & 79/12
an increased expenditure
ordinarily debitable to that
allowance and arising from
a Viceroy's visit is properly
payable out of that allowance
and not H. E. the Gov. is
purs.

Att 16/11

Viceroy, Exp. 100

I did not make any mistake in writing 'inadmissible' in regard to extra lighting elements, & other items of a kind ordinarily provided for from the contract allowance.

It follows from the very nature of that allowance that when extra charges are incurred of the kind for which the allowance is intended no extra demand is to be made upon public funds. Servants & lighting are incidental charges ordinarily debited to the contract allowance. We have no knowledge how it is spent, nor how it, I believe, been laid down distinctly what it is for; but I think that up to a comparatively recent date it consisted of separate allowances of given amounts for fuel, so much; annual ball, so much; lighting, servant, & so on. I was so when I was Under Secy 20 years ago; & since then, the separate allowances have been amalgamated into a single one of Rs 9000 per annum. If I am right all charges of the kind for which separate allowances were formerly made must be met from the lump sum of Rs 9000; or if they can't be, they must be paid from the Governor's private purse. The essence of a contract allowance is that a lump sum is given for certain purposes & no questions asked as to its disposal; and here within, no demands are entertained for supplements to the grant. The Governor has to take the lean years with the fat ones. If by good management, or by good fortune, there is a saving on the lump sum, it goes into his pocket; if he is compelled to exceed it, he has to pay the excess himself. This is the arrangement & I consider that it should be adhered to; but as I have said, I do object to an advance (which however we believe, need Indian sanction) to cover the contract fund of next year. I understand the object of the draft order to be that the expenditure claimed in excess of the contract should be paid before Govt. so that the Govt. should be able to pay it.

The Hon. Secy to Govt. C. S. D. Government

The Hon. Mr. G. S. D. 31/12

Resubmitted to the Hon. Secy to Govt. C. S. D. 31/12

C.S. or not. As I said before, I don't think 17.1. precedents so far any thing in the matter. If the precedents are wrong, a new precedent should be created. The charges of the Governor's household are now provincial and we are bound to examine them with special care, in accordance with the intention of the provincialization.

Resubmitted to the Hon. Secy to Govt. C. S. D. 20/Jan

20/Jan

19/12 C. S. D. R. 17/11 C. 18/11 R. 19/11

Viceroy, Exp. 100

Apparently, when my hon. Charge, Sir H. St. John, wrote that outlay in connection with adst. lighting, furniture & such other would be inadmissible as a public charge he meant that they should be paid out of my Provincial Income, but out of the contract allowance. I don't object to that principle, but I entirely object to the principle he means that if there is a saving in the lump sum it goes into the Govt's pocket & if he is compelled to exceed it he has to pay the excess himself. I don't entirely differ with him as to precedents, going for with the Government is right it is. In Lord Napier's report. In Lord Napier's time there was no contract allowance but (speaking for memory) the Budget allowance was about Rs 65000 N. a year. But in the year of H. H. the Duke of Edinburgh visited it in consequence of an accident in consequence of a fire at the House & the provision of expenditure for both Govt. House. The expenditure that year ran up to about Rs 96000 N. I think that all the charges for the repairs, furniture & extra lighting was defrayed from the Govt. front. Now that there is a contract allowance all charges

Yes. H.C.

* 77/70 70/79

Character ~~is~~ ^{is the} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~it~~ ^{it}
 but it ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~character~~ ^{character}
 of it is, and ~~an~~ ^{an} ~~extra~~ ^{extra} ~~grant~~ ^{grant}
 is required, it must come
 out of the following year
 grant - There was such a
 case in Bombay. But
 it is an entire mistake
 to suppose that a ~~plenty~~ ^{plenty}
 of savings (if there are
 any on any one year's
 grant) goes to the
 pocket - no it is
 right that he should be called
 on to defray out of his
 own purse any charges
 not attributable to the
 contract fund. If
 any year's expenditure
 exceeds it must be
~~made~~ ^{made} ~~good~~ ^{good} ~~out~~ ^{out}
 of the next year's grant.
 The extra grant ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~thing~~ ^{thing} ~~which~~ ^{which}
 is asked for ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~an~~ ^{an} ~~extra~~ ^{extra} ~~grant~~ ^{grant}
 but a ~~special~~ ^{special} ~~grant~~ ^{grant}.
 20/1/93 J.H.C.

Some mis-apprehension appears to exist
 as regards the question at issue. Mr. Mill
 Secy. asks that the extra charges incurred
 by the Viceroy's visit (except the house &
 table expenses) should be defrayed by a
 special grant outside the contract
 altogether. He makes this demand as
 these expenses are abnormal, and not
 covered by the contract - which is calculated
 to cover the normal charges for the year.
 This view has been adopted on former
 occasions, and a

15a P
 (18)
 I must say I cannot see how
 the view expressed by H.E. the Governor
 in his Minute of the 29th Jan. last can
 be controverted. All previous precedents
 & correspondence go to prove that the visits
 of Viceroys to the Madras Presidency have
 always been charged to "Political"; (and I
 know that in other Provinces, such as
 Burma for instance, the extra cost of
 visits of Royal Highness Viceroys have not
 been paid by the Chief Commr.). Thus the
 principle appears to have been established,
 and I cannot see why, because it has
 been decided that such extra charges are
 in future to be made against Provincial
 instead of Imperial funds, the Governor
 should virtually have to pay for such
 visits out of his ^{own} pocket, when the
 Contract fund cannot bear the charges.
 The amount of this fund seems to have
 been fixed to meet normal expenses
 only.

21.2.93

J.H.C.

19
 as H.E. the Comr. in Chief has taken
 the same view as I have - orders will
 go out accordingly.

W
 22 Feb.

grant to cover these special charges come
 on former occasions out of Imperial funds.
 Still it was recognized that they were charges
 of an extraordinary nature, and therefore
 met by a special grant. I fail to see
 because the charge is now a Provincial
 instead of an Imperial one, that its character
 has in any way altered, or why what has
 been considered in the past to be beyond the
 power of the Contract fund to bear, should
 now be held to be within it. The hon.
 Mr. Parson points out correctly that the
 Governor does not pocket any savings that
 may be effected in any year out of the
 Contract fund - The balance is carried over
 from year to year - and from Governor to
 Governor.
 I object in principle to any alteration being
 now made in the manner of meeting expenses
 incurred by a Viceroy's visit - and do not
 see any reason why they should not be
 treated as before - viz. by a special grant
 outside the contract allowance.

W
 29 Jan 93

In Council
 29 Jan 93
 The hon. Secy.

(8)

(Pamts = 40.)

CR 3357

40
Pub. Dep.

Reference No 205-731-193

With reference to his letter dated 28 November 1892 no 598, the Indly. Secy. to H.E. the Governor is requested to furnish details of the charges for which a grant in excess of the usual Contract allowance is desired and also the total extra amount required.

31/1/93

Indly Secy to H.E. the Govr

Dated 1/2/93

Office

17
No. 697

385
GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Quindry 4 February 1893.

58

From

THE MILITARY SECRETARY TO THE

RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR,

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

(14)

With reference to Memorandum No. 205,
dated 31st January 1893, Public Department, I have
the honour to forward herewith a statement of
extra expenses for Rs. 7077-12-10, incurred on account
of H. E. the Viceroy's visit to Madras in November
1892.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

P. J. Lawley

Captain,

Military Secretary.

Expenses incurred on account of H.E. the Viceroy's visit
to Madras in November 1892.

68

		R.	A.	P.
1	Amount spent for extra servants	514	7	3
2	Cost of Lighting	748	2	9
3	Purchase and repair of Furniture	1549	.	2
4	Hire of furniture	925	11	6
5	Lighting up surf	422	9	.
6	Ball	2426	4	2
7	Cost of printing	211	8	9
8	" Postage and Telegrams	192	2	9
9	" Advertisements	87	14	6
	Total Rupees —	7077	12	10
	Deduct			
	Advance vide G.O. No 724 dated 19 th October 1892, Public Department	2000	"	"
	Amount due to adjust	5077	12	10

Government House
Quindly
4th February 1893.

P. J. Lawley Captain
Military Secretary

xxx.

cannot agree to any increase of the
contract grant. And I do not think
that the Provincial Govt is bound by
the imperial precedents. By the provin-
cialization of political changes
the control of the changes
was made over to the provincial Govt.
to be dealt with at their discretion,
& the object of these and reason of
the change was that the Prov. Govt
might, I think, best qualify to know
their growth. I think we are bound
to do so.

14

(17) 9 Feb.

H.E. the Govt in his letter of

Dec. 28th has said in substance
that the Govt in his letter of

Dec. 14th 1921. That I

will say that the expenditure
of Govt is visit to
paid for out of H.E. the
Govt's private purse - excepting
charges for extra lighting,
sewage, furniture & other
charges.

I think at any
time (or H.E. Govt) that there
items were paid for no putting
charges, nor did I have
anything to think - they
were paid for out of the
Budget - allotment for Govt
house.

In those days
the Prov. system did not exist.
Govt house was in its
Budget like any other Govt
house. I think it is as far as possible
within a certain limit & if
more money was wanted, it
was asked for & if granted

4 6 5 286 55A

14

This should come out of the
contract grant - one year's
even expenditure being
made for economy in
the future.

The saving is made on 6
months' expenditure in
the next year. But
for each year the work
along the grant for the
following year is not working
H.E. 3 years' process.
I have not drawn in one year
one coming forward to the
end of the contract allotment
of 1/2 year - the Govt
leave to Govt.

grant of next year of any amount
which H.E. the Governor may think
necessary.

I do not understand how any how
colleague Mr. Austin object to the princi-
ple that if H.E. the Govt is compelled
to exceed the contract grant for contract
purposes, the Govt must come out of his
own pocket. The essence of the contract
grant is that no more is to
be given, but the Govt cannot be kept
within it, I don't think where they are
to come from.

As to the answer, that if there is a
saving, it goes into H.E. pocket, my
statement may have been too absolute.
We have no knowledge how it goes;
all we know is that the whole sum
is drawn from the public treasury every
year. The contract charges may, however,
be in excess of the grant, whether they
are or not. I don't know; but if they
are, I don't think it is plain that a
saving is made.

The Govt must not be liable for the
Govt. either to the relief of other charges paid.
It is personally liable, or if carried on
from year to year, in relief of other charges,
for which Govt is the saving carried on,
H.E. would be liable. This is
what I meant, it seems to me in-
terpretable.

Sum is withdrawn from the Treasury in
any year can be granted in the following
year. But this of course is a different
matter altogether from the case of saving
out of sum drawn carried on in the
Military Dept's budget balances.

The items were under discussion
have to be clearly within the contract
which is intended to cover the
as well as normal charges. I think

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

14

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

Letter to Political changes. The
Govt. has to be kept in mind
at all times.

1893
Pub. Dept.
Encls. No. 1
To
C. No. 385

385
Pub. Dept.

8

C. No 385 + 314

Circulate

(15)

10P

From
The Military Secretary to the
Right Honourable the Governor.
The Military Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George.

Dated 4th } February 1893.
Received 4 }

No 697

Enclosure 7

Subject

Forwards a statement of extra
expenses for Rs. 7077-12-10, incurred
on account of H. E. the Viceroy's
visit to Madras in November
1892.

Submitted with reference
to the instructions in
Council on the 31st ultimo

C. In C. No 314 the Military
Secretary to H. E. the Governor
asks for an advance of
Rs. 10,000 from the contract
allotment for 1893-4 as
the funds for 1892-3 are
almost exhausted owing
to reasons recorded in para
3 of C. No. 3357.

Note +
this should
be separated
disposal
23-2-93

(16)

Col 8 Feb 11P

The file of papers sent up shows that
the contract allowance is intended
to meet charges for servants, lighting
furniture & bells, at Fort St. George.
And the allowance is in compensation
of all charges incurred under these
heads in previous years, ordinary &
extraordinary; the latter including
even royal visits. I cannot assent
to any grant over and above the contract
amount for any of these purposes.
I agree to an extension ^{under Article 10} of Rs. 914-3-0
in items 5, 7-9 in the Military list
list & I have no objection - subject
to the sanction of India w^{ch} I believe is
ready, but w^{ch} may be anticipated
to an advance out of the contract

16P

MINUTE.

I dissent from this order, because I consider that the contract allowance should
not in any case be added to on account of extra charges of the kind for which the
allowance was granted.

23rd February 1893.

(Signed) H. E. STOKES.

to be printed
178

MINUTE.

I, too, dissent, because I think that an advance from the contract allowances of future years is the proper way of meeting the abnormal expenditure now alluded to. By distributing 7,000 or 10,000 rupees, by 1,000 rupees a year, over 7 or 10 years, the grants in those years will not be sensibly diminished, while it is not unfair that advantages of a permanent character, such as the purchase of new furniture, should be paid for to some extent by succeeding Governors.

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN.

24th February 1893.

*Proof of his Minute
is submitted to the
Honorable Member for
favour of revision, if
necessary, and return.*

4th March 1893.

*see
L.A.*

18

10



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following papers:—

W
25 Feb.

dissent from this order, because I consider
that the contract allowance should not
any case be added to on account
of the charges of the kind for which
allowance was granted.

23 Feb. 93. H. H. Stokes

I do, dissent because I think
that an advance from the
contract allowances of future
years is the proper way of
meeting the abnormal expense.

It was now allowed to be
distributed 7000 or 10000 Rs.,
by 1000 Rs. each, over 7 or 10
years, the funds in the year
it will be evenly distributed,
while it is ~~unfair~~ ^{advantageous} that
advantage of a permanent
character, such as the fund.

The Military Secy. to H. H. }
The Genl. }
Financial Dept. }
12

C. Nos. 3357 & 385 Read again 21.11.92
1892 1893
Aide: 27 Feb 93 to 101
The Sect. Genl. is instructed
to debit to Grant 25 Militant
Provincial Miscellaneous—
The charges specified in
the statement which is
annexed to the Military
Secretary's letter of the
4th February, 1893, No. 697,
amounting to Rs. 7,078 in
all.

2. The advance of Rs. 2,000
sanctioned in G.O. 19 let. 1892
Public No. 724, is included
in the adjustment.

from orders

H. H. Stokes
23

23/2

25.2.93

6/3/93

Note

See 10 & 11 on page

Hon^{ble} Sir Henry Stoker,
E.C.S.I.

Hon^{ble} Mr Justice, C.S.I.

++ of her furniture sh^d be paid
for some extent by drawing
forwards. J. H. Gardiner
24/2/90

Resubmitted to H.E. the
Gen. in case they may desire
to record "Minute".

27/2 J.H.