100—5-2-96.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2611

DATED 18th June

[Despatch Abstract.]

stating that the Govt regrets to be unable to accept the Board's recommendation in re the grant of double Travelling allowance to Mrs Dongla D.F.O. Nilgiri.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue

~~Financial~~ (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2299

Dr 15/6/98

From The Board of Revenue
Land Revenue

Order Minute No. 2611 of 18th June 98.

Inst No. 112 Defce

The Govt regrets to be unable to accept the Board's recommendation and Mr Douglas should ~~accordingly~~ be so informed ~~that his request is inadmissible~~

Dated 17-3-98

Received 21-

Registered 22-

Enclosures 3.

Spare copies

1111/17/6/98

SUBJECT.

Submitting his remarks to Govt's for favourable consideration correspondence regs the grant of double travelling allowance to Mr Douglas Dist, Nilgiris for the period he was engaged on the Survey and demarcation of the Nilgiri-Mysore boundary.

To

The Board of Rev L.R.
with 3 encls.

Encld 21/6/98

BYM 16.VI.98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Reference on For *Nos* 3457 *of* 1898.
641

In replying the above should be quoted.

(LAND REVENUE.)

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE. MADRAS.

Read Endorsement of the Conservator of Forests, S.C, dated 12th February 1898, No 3109 on Letter from the Collector of Nilgiris, dated 28th January 1898, Ref on C. No 135. B and the following reference thereon Dno 62, dated 17th February 1898.

Referred to the Accountant General for favour of remarks.

Read also Letter from the Accountant General, Madras, dated 14th March 1898, No 1019.

Reference No 112, dated 17th March 98.

Submitted to Government for favorable consideration.

2. The report on the demarcation of the boundary submitted to Government with B.P. No 758 dated 22.2.98 shows that the work was done quickly and well and the Board considers that Mr Douglas should not be allowed to remain a loser by reason of the extra expense to which he was put on this account. The Accountant General states that the work

Carried

cannot be classed as special duty because Mr. Douglas "was not detached from his regular duties". This fact in itself caused a saving to Government and the Board would accordingly recommend that a special concession may be obtained for the grant to Mr. Douglas of double travelling allowance during the period spent in the boundary demarcation.

Recd
Secretary

To: The Secretary to Government [illegible]
with the two Currents & the Conductor's Enclosure
which ought to be returned.

C 1/6/98
No 2/6/98

Travelling allowance to Mr. Douglas

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, L.R.
Forest No 112. Ref. d/ 17th March 1898 (C. No. 2299)

Note.

The Board of Revenue submits for orders an application received by it from Mr. C.G. Douglas, ~~Forest~~ District Forest ~~Settlement~~ Officer, Nilgiris, for the grant to him of double travelling allowance from the 12th November to the 12th December 1897, both days inclusive, ~~during~~ C.G. the period during which he was employed in surveying and demarcating the Nilgiri-Mysore boundary as settled by the Special Commission appointed for the purpose in 1897.

H G.O. 466 17-6-97

2. Mr. Douglas says that he was considerably out of pocket by work of this kind as will be evidenced by the fact that supplies had to be brought from Ootacamund, the transport costing 4, 6 or 8 annas a mile. He adds that in addition to the special duty he was engaged in, he had to attend to his own legitimate work of the district at a busy time of the year and had frequently to

C 2/5/98.
R.C. 2/5/98.
R.C. 4.6.98.
12/5/6/98.

to sit up till 11 or 12 o' clock at night in order to dispose of the current work after being out all day on the boundary. The Conservator of Forests supports Mr Douglas' application on the ground that "the "work was in excess of his ordi- "nary duties as a District Forest "Officer"

3. The Accountant General, to whom the Board of Revenue had referred the application for remarks states that as Mr. Douglas was not detached from his regular duties when employed on the demarcation work, he cannot be considered to have been on Special duty under Art. 94, C.S.R and no deputation allowance is admissible to him under Art. 98. He further adds that Mr Douglas has already drawn increased rate of travelling allowance at Rs 7-8-0 for journeys made in special tracts and the sanction of the Government of India will be required for the grant of travelling allowance in excess of that rate.

4. The Board of Revenue submits that

He is allowed Rs 7-8 for ordinary journeys on the Nilgiris, but this was special.
JG

that the report on the demarcation of the boundary sent to Government with B.P. No. 757 dated 22nd Feb. 98, shows that the work was done quickly and well and considers that Mr. Douglas should not be allowed to remain a loser by reason of the extra expense to which he was put on this account. The Accountant General's objection to grant a deputation allowance to Mr Douglas appears to be based, the Board states, on the fact that "he was not detached from his regular duties". But as this caused a saving to Government the Board of Revenue recommends that special sanction may be obtained for the grant to Mr Douglas of double travelling allowance for the period he worked on the boundary demarcation.

5. Similar concessions were made to Mr Douglas himself and to Messrs. Hayne, Sheffield, Peet and Porter on previous occasions when engaged in demarcating the boundaries between certain Native States and British India and the case of Mr Porter is exactly on all fours with

U G.O. 1599 24-4-99

W 2288 9-4-99

with the one now under consideration. It is submitted that the Board's recommendation may therefore be accepted and the Government of India addressed accordingly (in the Financial Department)

DMD 18/3.98

Secy

Submitted that India might be addressed Mr Douglas seems to have had a very hard time of it.

Wlli
2/4/98

Hon This was detained until orders had been passed on the report of the demarcation. The Govt has agreed with the B. that the work was done well & expeditiously.

There is the difficulty with regard to the present application that Mr Douglas already draws a rate of T.A. supposed to be specially fixed for journeys in the country through which the demarcation led him. Mr Douglas however

Yes
DJ
4/5/98

Ask S.O. if he can

2 days he was R300 out of pocket. If he can give us a bill of actual expenses during the period of the duty then Govt. I think he should be paid in lieu of T.A.

We may represent the case very strongly to the Fin. Dept. with the request that they may find a way of recouping Mr Douglas, addressing the Govt of India if necessary.

S.J.F 20/4/98

Noted

Mr Douglas' reply to the O.O. enquiring whether he would be able to draw up a bill showing the actual expenses incurred by him while employed in demarcating the Hyderabad-Mysore boundary is submitted.

Mr Douglas says that he had no time to keep accounts and so is not in a position to draw up a bill of the sort required

required and that the excess expenditure of Rs 300 referred to in his application was only a rough estimate of the difference between the amount actually spent by him and that drawn in the shape of travelling allowance. He adds "I quite understand the "difficulties of the case and am "certain it would be idle to attempt "persuasion with the Govt of India. "I am disappointed, of course, for I am "not a rich Mahr but what must be must."

If Mr Douglas is to be granted extra travelling allowance the F.D. it is respectfully submitted can do nothing in the matter except address the Govt of India and the draft letter has in that case to be prepared in the Rev. Dept. There seems however a way of getting out of the difficulty. The boundary settled is inter-territorial and the charges are debited to Political - Miscellaneous. The work of demarcation can therefore hardly be considered to fall within the legitimate duties of a Forest Officer. If the Head of the Dept. could certify that

No. 5466 A
23.10.97

"that the work is special and
"outside the ordinary course of the
"officer's duties and that it does
"not interfere with the discharge of
"those duties" an honorarium of
Rs 200 (the charges in the present
case being Imperial) can apparently be granted
by the local Govt to Mr Douglas
under the provisions of arts 89
(a) & (b) of the C.S.R. For exceeding
that amount the sanction of
the Govt of India is necessary (or should
have been obtained prior to the
work being undertaken) Perhaps
the Acct General may be
consulted on the point.

Bmm
12.V.98

Yes
DG
21/5/98

Secy

The Board may
be asked o.m. whether
it is prepared to
give the above certi-
cate. If it is, there
seems no objection
to granting an
honorarium of Rs
200 if Political agree.
MMM
19.5.98

PTO

H2U.

... We have a good many of these boundary delimitations, & it wd be a bad precedent to treat such cases as justifying a honorarium under the article referred to.

I fear we must tell Mr Douglas' application for enhanced allowances as inadmissible

S.I. 20/5/98

To Fin. Dept &c.

S.R. 23/5/98

See Note attached

Travelling allowance to Mr. Douglas

Memo. Sir H. Bliss.

I don't see how Art 1086 + Art 15 C.S.R. can be got over. By the first T.A. is given to cover the actual travelling expenses in-currodity on officer; and by the second actual travel expenses do not include the carriage of stores, the greater portion of the claim on which Mr. Douglas bases his claim.

HS
1/6/98

Art 89 C.S.R. seems to me altogether inapplicable to such a case as this, and I do not think it should be suggested to the Board that they could certify that Mr Douglas's work on the boundary did not interfere with his ordinary duties - especially in the face of his own statement that he "frequently had to sit up till 11 or 12 o'clk at night & in order to dispose of his current work after being out all day on the boundary."
Mr. Douglas must surely include in his "Rs 300 out of pocket" expenses wh. travelling allowance is not intended to cover. His travelling allowance from 12th Nov. to 12 Dec was 81 x 7-8 = 232-8; and it is difficult to understand how his legitimate travelling expenses could have amounted to Rs 232-8 + Rs 300. As Mr. Douglas already draws travelling allowance 50 p.c. higher than the ordinary

rates, I doubt whether the Govt of India wd sanction anything more than another 50 p.c. to bring the rates up to double the ordinary. For double rates precedents can be quoted. The total amount for wh. sanction wd be needed is $31 \times 2\frac{1}{2} = Rs 77\text{-}8$. I see no objection to asking India to sanction this if it is thought worth while.

AA 27.5-98

To

Rev. Dept. u.o

Cust 12.6.98

AA 3.6.98

A. In reply to this letter & the C/s. I entirely concur in thinking it a very bad precedent to recognise this work as anything special.

4/6/98.

Mr Douglas must be told that his request is inadmissible.

AA 14.6.98

Note

. a draft G.O. on the docket of the current is submitted for approval. See ne

Revd 17.6.98

Typed 18.6.98

No. 43
Despatched
5/7/98

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Revenue Secretariat,
5.5. 1898.

Dear Mr Douglas,

With reference to your claim for double tash allce from 12 Nov to 12 Dec 97, the period you were employed in demarcating the Nilgiri-Mysore boundary, you mention in your report that you were some Rs 300

O
18 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (1898) Department.

D. O. CURRENT No. 71

To
and
From G. G. Douglas,
Collectorate.

Order

No.

Dated 7 May
Received 9 —
Registered 9 —
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Stating that he is unable to draw up a bill showing the actual expenses to which he was put while employed in demarcating the Nilgiri - Mysore Boundary.

H C
13-5-98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Nilgiri Collector's Office,
"FOREST BRANCH,"

7th May 1898.

D. O.

Dear Mr Forbes.

In answer to your D O of the 5th inst to 43. asking if I am able to draw up a bill showing the actual expenses I was put to while employed in demarcating the Nilgiri – Mysore Boundary, I regret to say I am not.

Either in my report or Application for a Special allowance, I am not sure which, I believed I said that kept two private ayes, there was really no time for that sort of thing, I was given no help and relieved of no duty, and now that 6 months have gone by since the work was finished, I could no more sit down and prepare a bill of my actual

* Para 4 of the letter in the current

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined —— } 189 .
When signed ——

READ AGAIN G.O., No. — DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.