Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 18

(2) Date of repair 11.6.86.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No. 449

~~Press.~~
Mis.

Dated 1.2.1879 ~~197~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Mem

Famine

No. A. & V.
5728

Enclosure. 1 B with its Enclosure

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
7 January 187

From The ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
to the GOVERNMENT of MADRAS,

To

The Additional Under Secretary to Government
Revy Departt
With reference to his official memo
William H. Dobbs No. 21 dated 1st January 79

Offg Assistant ~~to the~~ Accountant General. [illegible]

Rec Mis d/1st July/79 No 1449

1802 B 2794 d 29-11-77
1585 A 8 / 17-7-78
1575 B 17-7-78
287 B 18-2-78
623 B 8-1-79
[illegible] 1865 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 15-1-79

Revenue 1879 Dept
No. 553

From
The Acct Genl

Dated 17
Recd. 20 } Jany

No. A.B.P. / 5728

Rev Mins of 1st Feby/79 No 449

E.S.

Submitting a Bill with reference to O.M. 13 Jany/79 No 21.

Lushington's Gardens
Sydapett
Dec. 22. 1878

rom H. A. D. Phillips
Bengal Civil Service.

The Additional Secretary
to Government
Famine Department.

herewith sent in original

Sir,
I have the honour to show cause against the Accountant-General's Objection Statement No. A 131 P / 5049 disallowing certain items of a Bill submitted by me for my actual expenses incurred by bringing two horses from Khorda in Orissa to Gooty in the

Bellary District

2. With regard to Rs. 9 Telegraph charges the Accountant-General states that they might have been passed, had they been sent as "State". I may mention that I applied to have the telegrams sent as "State"; but the Telegraph Master said they must be sent as "Private". I submit that a mistake made by another person ought not to act to my prejudice, especially as the matter was not under my control. If the Telegraph Master said the telegrams must go as "Private", I had no power to force him to do otherwise.

3. With regard to 12/- "fare for Gurudas Dawa in charge of horses" I have the honour to point out that this item is indisputable, as the government order to Famine Officers allows them to take two servants. Only one servant accompanied me, & he was charged for in a separate bill which I submitted in Madras after landing. Gurudas Dawa is the second servant, for whose expenses I could not at that time submit a bill, as he had not arrived, and I was therefore unaware what expenses he had incurred.

4. With regard to the item of Rs. 28/ "paid to induce men to bring horses" – it appears to me that, in using the word "induce", I was actuated by a foolish scrupulosity. Rs. 28/ was the amount I paid to syces for conveying the horses 100 miles. The amount is large: still

I could not get men for less and I was obliged to pay it. Ooriyas are very unwilling to leave their districts: and it was especially difficult to get anyone at that time, as a famine was threatening in the Pooree district, and there was a declared famine in Ganjam. At such a time it is very difficult to induce an Ooriya to leave his village. The amount I paid was therefore the market rate.

5. With regard to the other items, I have the honour to point out that, by sending the horses by road as far as Cocanada, I saved Government a considerable sum of money. Had I shipped the horses at False Point, it appears that the charges would not have been objected to, though I should have had to bill the Government for a far larger sum of money. If items of the kind charged are disallowed, then there is simply nothing else which I can charge; and the argument, if carried out, brings us to the following reductio ad absurdum — namely, that had I sent my horses all the way to Madras by road, a distance of over 600 miles, I should not have been entitled to draw a pice, notwithstanding the fact that the Bengal Government have assured me that I am not to lose a pice by taking horses, but that I am to get all actual expenses. It was on this assurance that I brought horses at great cost & considerable inconvenience. Had I had any idea that items of the

kind charged would have been objected to, I should never have been so foolish as to expose myself to such a loss.

6. I may add that Mr Oldham of the Bengal Civil Service, brought four horses to Madras in 1877 and he tells me that every pice of expenditure incurred by him in bringing them was charged for and passed.

7. I respectfully submit that it was not the intention of Government that officers taking horses should be losers thereby. On the contrary we were most distinctly assured that we might charge every pice of actual expenditure

incurred. If I send back my horses by rail to Calcutta, the expense will be very great – still it must be passed. But if I send by road, I not only save Government a considerable sum of money, but I am mulcted to the extent of what I actually expend. I trust the Government will be of opinion that my representation is reasonable and that my claim should be allowed. Should their opinion be adverse to me, I would claim the right to [illegible] as a Bengal Civil Servant serving in a different Presidency, and with all deference request that the matter may be referred for orders to the Government of India.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

H. A. Phillips

Recd Mis L/ 1st Feby/79 No 449

Co 1898 sep att
No 10657

From

H. A. D. Phillips Esqr
Bengal Civil Service

Rev Mins 4/1st Feby/79 No. 449

Dated 22 }
Recd 23 } December 1878

Enct

Showing cause against the Accountant General's objection statement disallowing certain items of a bill submitted by him for actual expenses incurred in bringing 2 horses from Khordie to Gooty

---

I have not time to go into the minute details. Mr Phillips case must be governed by special instructions & general regulations –

~~but do the scale [illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

HEJ

Memo:

Mr Oldham came under orders passed in 1877 under which the officers' actual expenses were to be paid.

Mr Phillips came under letter of the 19th July, &c 1875, the terms of which were telegraphed from Bengal to Mr Phillips when he was ordered off.

Mr Oldham's case, or that of his compeers, is, therefore, no precedent for Mr Phillips.

Taking the objection statement:-

Rs 28 were paid, Mr Phillips contends, for conveying the horses. If it was paid, it may be conjectured, as readily, as a gratuity to Mr Phillips' syce– whether it should be paid or not is open to question.

29-9-6 is clearly inadmissible.

12-0-0 is the charge for
4-9-0 Mrs Phillips' second
16-9-0 servant & is admissible.

25-0-0 is clearly inadmissible.

18-2-9 This consists of payments, it may be conjectured, of charges for ropes, stabling, water, grass, bed straw and items of a similar nature and should be rejected I think.

15-0-0 is on the same basis as Rs 28

9-0-0 is inadmissible in any other case

F.O.

To sum up:-

Admissible	Inadmissible	Doubtful
Rs 16-9-0	29-9-6	28-0-0
	25-0-0	18-2-9
	9-0-0	15-0-0
	63-9-6	61-2-9

It is submitted that if the Bengal Government were that paying the bill, Mrs Phillips might have a right to appeal further. Mr Phillips is young and seems somewhat puffed up. His head seems turned by Mr O'Brien's tall talk and lacking Mr O'Brien's ability he wishes to ape his style.

G.H.
25.1.99.

Recd Feby No 6514
Cert 553 -

Rev Misc No 449

Go

The charges of Rs 12. 0. 0 & 4. 9. 6 total 16. 9. 6 on account of the fare of Mr. Phillipps 2nd Servant are also admissible and may be passed.

G.J.
29.1.79.

1 Feby/79

Dept 1 Feby/79

H. A. D. Phillipps Esqr BCS
with an enclosure
Accountt General with 8
enclos note with refce to this
docket No. A.B.V/5728 of 17-1-79

C. 25/1/79 - R. 29/1/79