

370/45
Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 688.

Dated 3rd Apr. 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

DELEGATION OF POWERS OF SANCTION.

Passing orders on proposals of the Inspector General of Police
regarding--

4/11/95

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

Issued.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 3rd April 1895, No. 688.

APRIL.

Delegation of Powers of Sanction.

Passing orders on proposals of the Inspector-General of Police regarding —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 8th July 1893, Mis. No. 1396, Judicial. A

ABSTRACT.—Informing the Inspector-General of Police that sanction should be sought for every block of huts the total cost of which exceeds Rs. 500, but that if he desires it the Government will be prepared to extend the limit to which he could sanction works for departmental construction up to Rs. 1,000.

G.O., dated 19th December 1894, No. 3135, Judicial. B

ABSTRACT.—Prescribing a revised statement in lieu of the "Programme of works of petty construction and repair by departmental agency" now submitted by the Inspector-General, stating that perhaps District Superintendents and Deputy Inspectors-General should possess certain powers of sanction in respect to such works, and enquiring whether G.O., dated 8th July 1893, No. 1396, should not be revised in favour of the old plan.

READ—also the following paper:—

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 28th February 1895, No. 1054.

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 19th December 1894, No. 3135, Judicial, I have the honour to report as follows:—

1. A statement will be submitted with future budgets showing—

(i) Separately proposed departmental works of—

(a) construction (whatever their cost) and

(b) repair costing more than Rs. 500 for each building, and

(ii) a lump sum for the rest.

2. Referring to the question of entrusting District Superintendents and Deputy Inspectors-General of Police with certain powers of sanction in regard to construction and repair of buildings, I do not think that Deputy Inspectors-General should be granted any power of sanctioning estimates. Deputy Inspectors-General have not the office establishment of a Deputy Commissioner of the Salt and Abkari Department and their duties are almost entirely those of inspection. They have no records and are purely peripatetic officers with only one clerk each. If they are given powers of sanction, they will certainly require an addition to their office establishments which is not now necessary. I think that Superintendents might, perhaps, have powers of sanction to the extent of Rs. 100. They must, of course, inform this office whenever they sanction a work, for entry in this office books. If Superintendents are given the above powers of sanction, the Deputy Inspectors-General will be specially instructed to examine and check the estimates in their offices when making inspections. I do not feel myself certain that it is a good plan to delegate any powers of sanction to Superintendents. The position of these officers is perfectly different from that of officers of the Salt and Abkari Department. They are most of them incapable themselves of checking estimates and their offices are not strong and are fully worked as matters stand. There is little delay in the present procedure under which all estimates are checked and sanctioned in my office. The limit of Rs. 100 may perhaps be allowed within which Superintendents may have powers of sanction.

3. As regards the question whether the decision arrived at in G.O., dated 8th July 1893, No. 1396, Judicial, should be revised in favour of the old plan of treating blocks of buildings as within the Inspector-General's power of sanction if each of the constituent buildings is within that power, I beg to reply that it will be advantageous to do so, for reasons given in Colonel Porteous' letter, No. 3480, dated 23rd June 1893, disposed of in the above-quoted Government order.

4. With reference to paragraph 6 of the Government order under reply, I beg to recommend that, as therein proposed, District Superintendents may be empowered to purchase on their own authority country-made articles costing less than Rs. 25 each and articles made elsewhere costing less than Rs. 5 each.

ORDER—dated 3rd April 1895, No. 688, Judicial.

In paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 19th December 1894, No. 3135, Judicial, the Inspector-General of Police was requested to advise as to the repairs for which details should be given in his annual statement of works of petty construction and repair. He suggests that repairs costing more than Rs. 500 should be shown separately. The Government accepts the limit suggested.

2. In the same paragraph the Government suggested that District Superintendents of Police and Deputy Inspectors-General should have power to sanction certain minor works of petty construction and repair. The Inspector-General gives reasons why such powers should not be conferred on Deputy Inspectors-General and expresses doubt whether District Superintendents should possess authority to sanction works. The Inspector-General does not, however, object to the grant to District Superintendents of power to sanction works of petty construction and repair up to a limit of Rs. 100 in each case, but he notes that they will have to report to his office every instance where such power is made use of. The Government is of opinion that District Superintendents should have authority to sanction petty works up to the limit suggested by the Inspector-General. They will then be able to carry out urgent repairs without the delay inseparable from a reference to head-quarters.

3. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Inspector-General's letter, the Government resolves to cancel paragraph 2 of G.O., dated 8th July 1893, No. 1396, Judicial, and to sanction a reversion to the old plan of treating blocks of buildings as within the Inspector-General's powers of sanction if each of the constituent buildings is within those powers.

4. With regard to paragraph 4 of the Inspector-General's letter, it is observed that the power to purchase country-made articles of furniture costing not more than Rs. 25 has been conferred upon District Superintendents of Police by paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 15th February 1895, No. 160, Financial.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
" Financial Department.
" Public Works Department.

Edw. A. Raitt.

Judicial (1895) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

M. Hammick Esq. B.C.S.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL

OF POLICE,

TO

14/9. 9/9. 1396. 9/9. 1639/95. CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE. - 1 MAR. 1895. GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS. No. 10571

Dated

Received

18th February 1895.

No.

SUBJECT.

Replying to G. O. No. 3135 dated 19th December 1894 J.D. on the delegation of Powers.

1857/95.

The Comr's letter read up. 20-6-84 No. 1556 N please. vide para 3 of G.O. 3135 19.12.94

11/5/95

For order

For order.

As to whether the D.G.'s recommendations may be accepted? He says he does not feel himself certain that it is a good plan to delegate any powers of sanction to sub.

11/5/95

305: 12.2.95
So. # 235: 25.2.95 R.
73: 18.2.95 R
49: 17.1.95 R
So. 3135: 19 Dec 94
So. 1396: 8.7.93
1639/93 E.C.

DEPARTMENT.

No. 1054

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

Madras,

18 February 1895.

FROM

M. Hammick Esq. K.S.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government

Fort St. George.

SIR,

Enclosures.

With reference to para 3 of G.O. dated 19 December 1894, No 3135, J.D., I have the honor to report as follows:-

1. A statement will be submitted with future budgets shewing

(i) separately proposed departmental works of

(a) construction (whatever their cost), and (b) repair costing more than Rs 500 for each building, and

(ii) a lump sum for the rest.

2. Referring to the question of entrusting District Superintendents and as Deputy Inspectors General of Police with certain powers of sanction in regard to construction and repair of buildings, I do not think that Deputy

Inspectors General should be granted any power of sanctioning estimates. Deputy Inspectors General have not the office establishment of a Deputy Commissioner of the Salt and Abkari Department and their duties are almost entirely those of inspection. They have no records and are purely peripatetic officers with only one clerk each. If they are given powers of sanction, they will certainly require an addition to their office establishments which is not now necessary. I think that Superintendents might perhaps have powers of sanction to the extent of Rs 100. They must of course inform this office, whenever they sanction a work, for entry in this office books. If Superintendents are given the above powers of sanction, the Deputy Inspectors General will be specially instructed to examine and check the estimates in their offices, when making inspections. I do not feel myself certain that it is a good plan to delegate any powers of sanction to Superintendents. The position of these officers is perfectly different from that of officers of the Salt and Abkari

Abkari Department. They are most of them incapable themselves of checking estimates and their offices are not strong and are fully worked as matters stand. There is little delay in the present procedure under which all estimates are checked and sanctioned in my office. The limit of Rs 100 may perhaps be allowed within which Superintendents may have powers of sanction.

3. As regards the question whether the decision arrived at in G.O., dated 8th July 1893, No 1396, J.D., should be revised in favor of the old plan of treating blocks of buildings as within the Inspector General's power of sanction if each of the constituent buildings is within that power, I beg to reply that it will be advantageous to do so, for reasons given in Colonel Porteous' letter, No 3480 dated 23rd June 1893, disposed of in the above quoted G.O.

4. With reference to para 6 of the G.O. under reply, I beg to recommend that, as therein proposed, District Superintendents may be empowered to purchase on their own authority country-made articles costing less than Rs 25 each and articles made elsewhere

In 8078 July 93
No 1396 J.D.

elsewhere costing less than Rs 5 each.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedt. Servt.,

M. C. S.

Asst. Superintend of Police.
for Inspector General of Police.

Ludl DEPARTMENT.

[5]
48-21-12-88.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

P { Again G.O., dated 8 July
Again G.O., dated 19 Dec.

1893, No. 1396, hnd.
1894, No. 3135, hnd.

Current No. of 18 , dated from

A. Current No. 1010 of 1895, dated 25 Feb from Sd. Police
Order 3rd April 1895, No. 688.
P.S.

In para. 2 of G.O. of 19 Dec. 1894,
No. 3135, hnd., the S.G. of
Police was requested to
advise as to the repairs
for which details should
be given in his annual
statement of works of
petty construction &
repair. He suggests that
repairs costing more than
Rs. 500 should be shown
separately. The Govt. accepts
the limit suggested.

2. In the same paragraph
the Govt. suggested that District
Supts. of Police & Deputy
Inspector-General should have
power to sanction certain
minor works of petty con-
struction & repair. The
S.G. gives reasons why
such powers should be
be conferred on Deputy
Inspector-General & ex-
presses doubt whether Dt. Supt
should possess author-
ty to sanction works. The
Govt. does not, however, on
to the grant to Dt. Supt

27/3/95

power to sanction works of petty construction & repair up to a limit of Rs. 100 in each case, but he notes that they will have to report to his office every instance where such power is made use of. The Govt. ~~is desirous~~ ^{is anxious} to ~~attain~~ ^{ascertain} that Dt. Supts. should have authority to sanction petty works up to the limit suggested by the I.G. They will then be able to carry out urgent repairs without the delay inseparable from a reference to headquarters.

3. With reference to para. 3 of the I.G.'s letter, the Govt. resolves to cancel para. 2 of G.O. of 5 July 1893, No. 1396, B.D., & to sanction a revision to the old plan of treating blocks of buildings as within the I.G.'s powers of sanction if each of the constituent buildings is within those powers.

4. With regard to para. 4 of the I.G.'s letter, it is observed that the power to purchase country-made articles of ^{fermentation} ~~not more~~ ^{not more} than Rs. 25 ~~per annum~~ ^{per annum} ~~is conferred upon~~ ^{is conferred upon} Dt. Supts. of Police by para. 4 of G.O. of 15 Feb 1895, No. 11.

of Police 15/3/95
25/3/95
12/4/95

Cus
9/3/95

First copy sent to Press.
Returned for signature.
Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 139

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

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

10th July 4/1 8 July 1893 No. 1396.

Abstract informing the I.G. Police that sanction was to be sought for every block of buildings the total cost of which exceeds Rs. 500, but that if he desires it the Govt. will be prepared to extend the limit to which he could sanction works for departmental construction up to Rs. 1000.

10th July 19 Dec 1894 No. 3135.
Abstract prescribing a ^{revised} statement in lieu of the "Programme of works of petty construction & repair by departmental agency" now sent by the I.G., stating that perhaps Dt. Supts. & Sub-
200

Order complete. 45
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.