

(1) Number of pages 212

(2) Date of repair 11.7.39

(3) Initials of the Referencer R
13/1

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1571

Press
Mis.

Dated 14. 6 1886.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

J.P. DEPARTMENT.
DATED *14 June 86*
1871.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Lesson of the
French 1st
to Protestants &
the Jews —*

By Order of Government, dated
1886, No.

Enclosure

Count No.

Statement with ditto.

Order, &c. of Government—A.

PAPER KNIT CUT OF FILE FOR DISPATCH BY ORIGINATOR
(not page 1)

Number of copies
for each
Order of
Government
(not page 1)

N.B.—
A = Print
B = Not to
P = Print
Q = Print by

of {1886} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

Issue.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 14th June 1886, No. 1571.

JUNE.

12

18 of 1

14TH JUNE 1886, No. 1571, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 25th March 1885, No. 76.

With reference to paragraph 2 of the order noted in the margin and official memorandum No. 171, dated 26th January last, I have the honor to submit the proposition statement for the revision of the subordinate jail guard establishments in the remaining central and district jails in this presidency inclusive of the Penitentiary at Madras.

2. It will be observed that the statement exhibits an increase of Rs. 2,658-4-0 per mensem over the present cost. This increase is only nominal and cannot be fairly contrasted, as the present cost of the police guards, furnished by the Inspector-General of Police, is with reference to the actual number employed during the month of November last, and is framed with reference to the actual number of prisoners in the several jails during that month; whereas the proposed jail establishments and protective guards have been framed with reference to the actual accommodation of the jails and not with regard to their present strength.

3. The police have a reserve in each district from which men can be supplied for jail guard duty whenever necessary and reduced likewise, whereas the jail guard establishments must be fixed as there is no reserve to fall back on. The necessity of having a fixed establishment has been fully explained in paragraph 13 of Colonel Tennant's letter, No. 341, dated 30th November 1883.

4. The strength of the protective guards (police) has been fixed at all jails in consultation with the Inspector-General of Police who does not think it advisable to leave any guard with only one head constable. He also considers there should not be less than six constables on any guard; to this view I have assented; but I think, when the new system is fully established, that we may (certainly at all central jails where the men on the jail guards are mostly pensioned sepoys) be independent of protective guards and take the entire guarding ourselves. At district jails it may be desirable to retain protective guards, but these guards may, eventually, as we gain further experience, be considerably reduced.

5. I have asked the officers at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore, who have now had two months' experience of the new system of guarding, for their opinion regarding the retention or otherwise of the police protective guards. On receipt of their replies, I will forward them for the consideration of Government.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 31st March 1885, No. 90.

In continuation of my letter, No. 76, dated 25th instant, I have the honor to forward, for the information of the Government, the replies (return requested) of the Superintendents of the Jails at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore regarding the protective guard (police).

2. Mr. Johnston at Rajahmundry is of opinion the protective guard could very well be dispensed with, and that the warder guard is quite able to manage the entire annum for which we get little or no return, and that if our warder guard was increased by the same number of men as the police now furnish, the expense would be slightly less, and two great difficulties now encountered, viz., not having spare men for escort duty and to meet casualties, would be got rid of.

3. Colonel McLeod at Vellore is of opinion it is not desirable to reduce the protective guard unless the strength of the warder guard is raised by the same number; he considers this arrangement would be preferable to having a separate guard as at present, who have literally nothing to do, while the work of the warder guard is extremely onerous, thus making the latter discontented with their work. This proposed arrangement would be advantageous in lightening the work of the warder guard, and as the bulk of the men composing the warder guard are pensioned sepoys, the safety of the jail would be in no way impaired.

4. Colonel Pickance at Coimbatore considers it is not requisite to keep the protective guard at its present strength as there is a strong warder guard at the main gate both day and night, the protective guard might be reduced 25 per cent. or more, but if some additions were made to the warder guard, the protective guard might be done away with entirely. The men now enlisted are, more than half, pensioned sepoys; they are better suited for guard purposes than the police. The subordinate officers of the warder guard are all of them men who have served as subordinate officers in the native army, have been accustomed to responsible duties, and the enforcement of discipline; that there will be no difficulty, from the numbers now coming forward, in time to have the whole warder guard composed of pensioned sepoys.

5. From the opinions of these three officers it would appear desirable not to continue protective guards of police, but to raise our own establishments in proportion and to take the entire guarding of our jails—this I would certainly propose should be done at all central jails, but at district jails I think it would be desirable to retain protective guards of police until we have had more experience in the new system of guarding. At the same time I think the strength of the protective guards is more than is absolutely required, and that Government will be paying for the services of men who will literally be idle, whilst they might be better employed in their own department. There is another consideration to be thought of, viz., if we are to have protective police guards at central jails, we must incur expense in finding them guard rooms, and at some jails, viz., Vellore, Trichinopoly, Salem, and Cannanore, huts in addition.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cuddalore, 21st August 1885, No. 221.

Adverting to official memorandum, No. 1261, dated 10th ultimo, I have the honor to forward the enclosed statement, showing the average monthly strength and cost of police guards during the year 1884, and also the number of prisoners each jail will accommodate, called for in the reference under acknowledgment.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing the average monthly strength and cost of Police Guards during 1884, also the number of prisoners each jail will accommodate.

Names of the Jails.	Police Guards, 1884.		Number of prisoners each jail will accommodate.
	Average monthly strength.	Cost for the year 1884.	
1	2	3	4
		RS. A. P.	
Russellkonda Hill Jail	21	1,971 0 0	159
Berhampore District Jail	22	2,076 0 0	211
Vizagapatam do.	33	3,506 0 0	182
Párvatipur Hill Jail	20	1,912 0 0	105
Rajahmundry District Jail	19	1,911 0 0	106
Guntár do.	26	2,517 13 7	198
Nellore do.	27	2,522 0 0	273
Kurnool do.	20	2,029 0 0	132
Bellary do.	34	3,356 0 0	478
Cuddapah do.	27	2,917 0 0	197
Chittoor do.	24	2,382 0 0	320
Salem Central Jail	47	5,093 0 0	747
Cuddalore District Jail	27	2,909 4 2	364
Tanjore do.	37	3,988 8 0	216
Trichinopoly Central Jail	74	7,776 0 0	1,149
Do. District Jail	22	2,256 0 0	196
Madura do.	27	2,906 0 0	489
Tinnevely do.	27	3,056 0 0	335
Calicut do.	29	3,132 0 0	266
Cannanore Central Jail	49	5,406 0 0	925
Mangalore District Jail	16	1,539 8 0	291
Ootacamund do.	29	4,027 12 1	209
Her Majesty's Penitentiary	56	5,880 0 0	797

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 2nd October 1885, No. 271.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your official memorandum, dated 30th September 1885, No. 1713, and, in reply, I have the honor to state that the warder establishment, proposed to be substituted for the existing police guards in the jails referred to, will be sufficient to perform the escort duties which will, in future, fall upon the jail establishment without recourse to extra temporary hands.

2. With reference to the 2nd paragraph of your memorandum, the instructions therein contained shall be attended to in future.

3. Should the proposition now before Government, which was submitted with my letter, No. 76, dated 25th March 1885, be sanctioned, I request that the new system of guarding in the jails, therein referred to, may not be introduced until 1st January 1886, by which date all necessary arrangements, viz., enlisting the men, obtaining their arms, uniforms, &c., can be satisfactorily made.

No. 1863.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The undersigned is directed to return the proposition statement submitted by the Inspector-General of Jails with his letter, dated 25th March 1885, No. 76, and to point

out that the Inspector-General appears to have taken the capacity of each jail as the basis of calculation of the number of warders required to guard it. An inspection of the statement XV of the Administration report of the jail department for 1884 shows that the maximum population of many of the jails * was very considerably less than their capacity, and the average daily strength was, in most cases at least, 50 per cent. less than the maximum population on any one day. It is obvious therefore that the basis of calculation adopted by the Inspector-General cannot be accepted, and he will now recast his estimates in accordance with the actual requirements of each jail. It is presumed that the police guard, which has hitherto performed the duties of watch and ward, was always regulated by the actual convict population. If this is so, the average strength of the police guard for (say) the past three years will afford a satisfactory index of the number of men required to perform those duties, and the existing warder establishment should first be increased by the number of police constables whose services are dispensed with under the new system of guarding. This number will be obtained by subtracting the number of the protective guard from the average number of the police guard, obtained as suggested above. If this method is applied to the present proposals of the Inspector-General, it will be found that he has provided for a very considerable margin in the case of many jails†. The Government quite understand that a margin is necessary both for the performance of the duty of escorting prisoners, now to be taken over by the jail department, and to meet casualties. But this margin must be arrived at by some intelligible method which the calculation of the numbers required for escort duty can be based; these should be obtained, and the method of calculation clearly explained when Mr. Grimes next submits his proposals to Government.

	Capacity.	Maximum population.
* Nellore	273	113
Chittoor	320	167
Cuddalore	364	226
Madura	489	249
Mangalore	291	107

† Bellary	32
Madura	45
Cuddalore	25
Chittoor	24
Mangalore	30
Nellore	13

of calculation. The Inspector-General of Police will be able to furnish figures on which the calculation of the numbers required for escort duty can be based; these should be obtained, and the method of calculation clearly explained when Mr. Grimes next submits his proposals to Government.

2. The Government also quite understand that there may be cases in which peculiarities in the construction or situation of particular jails require some departure from the general principles of calculation indicated above, and they will be ready to sanction extra men in such cases, provided the necessity is clearly explained.

3. Turning now to the financial bearing of the scheme as at present proposed by the Inspector-General, the error of taking the figures of the police guard for one month only is at once apparent. The total cost of the jail establishment and of the police guards for the jails in question during the year 1884 was Rs. 2,01,419, while the cost of the proposed establishment, including the protective guard, is Rs. 1,77,120, showing a saving of Rs. 24,299. The Government are, however, not certain whether items have been included in the cost of establishment as given in the Administration report, which do not appear in the proposition statements submitted. It is also noticed that there is a discrepancy between the cost of police guards as given in the Administration report and the Inspector-General's letter, dated 21st August 1885, No. 221, respectively. Nor is it known whether the amounts given for this head of charge include the cost of clothing and arms or not.

4. The undersigned is directed to request the Inspector-General of Jails to explain all these points fully, and to furnish sufficient information to enable a comparison to be made between the cost of the present and proposed establishments.

30th October 1885.

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Acting Chief Secretary.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Accountant-General), dated Madras, 5th February 1886, No. 33.

With reference to official memorandum, No. 1863, dated 30th October last, I have the honor to submit a revised proposition statement for the full complement of the jail guard service inclusive of the protective police guard required for the district jails only.

2. In the statement originally submitted a protective police guard was shown for the central as well as the district jails, but after a year's experience of departmental guarding at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore, it has been found that the police protective guard is not necessary, and that we are paying for men who have little or nothing to do, whereas if our own guards were increased by a corresponding number of men, we should be fully able to meet all requirements for escort duty and casualties. Our warder guard, being principally composed of pensioned sepoys, is quite as effective as an armed body as the police reserve, and when the jails were guarded entirely by the police no protective guard was considered necessary, I fail to see any necessity for retaining it now. I have therefore, in the central jails only, taken the number of men allowed for the protective guard and added them to the number of the lowest grade warders. In the district jails I have retained the police protective guard as I do not consider it would be desirable in those jails to do without it, certainly not for the present.

3. In framing the statement now submitted, the average jail population for the last three years has been taken as a basis of calculation, and one warder has been allowed to every seven convicts, to which 10 per cent. has been added to meet requirements for the performance of escort duty and for casualties—this refers more especially to district jails. The revised establishment will therefore be found to be very much under that proposed in the original statement, and the cost has also been reduced by Rs. 24,888 per annum.

4. A sum of Rs. 28,020 has been provided in the budget estimate of this department for the year 1886-87 under Saderward and Contingencies to meet the cost of uniform to be supplied to the new jail guard.

5. In conclusion, I trust the Government will consider the revised proposition statement satisfactory and reasonable, and will be pleased to accord their sanction to it at an early date in order that men may be enlisted, drilled, and accoutred so as to enable me to take over the guarding from the police department at the commencement of the coming official year, the 1st April next.

6. The original statement, together with the revised one, is forwarded for comparison.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 1st June 1886, No. 158.

In reply to your official memorandum, dated 20th instant, No. 824-C, calling on me for more certain information regarding the cost of the proposed scheme of jail warders as compared with the existing system, I have the honor to state that the increase of Rs. 48-12-0 per mensem shown in the proposition statement was arrived at on comparing the existing sanctioned scale of the jail establishments, and the cost of the police guard with the proposed establishment inclusive of the protective police guard which it has been determined should be retained in all the district jails.

2. The principle adopted for arriving at the "Present scale" shown in the proposition statement was by taking the existing sanctioned jail establishments together with the number and cost of the police guard from a statement furnished by the Inspector-General of Police with reference to the number provided by that officer in his budget estimate for the year 1885-86. The material difference referred to between the present scale shown in the revised proposition statement and the average monthly strength of police guards for the year 1884, as shown in the statement submitted with

my letter, dated 21st August 1885, No. 221, is owing to the average not having been taken for the year 1884 in framing the revised proposition statement, because the information obtained from the Inspector-General of Police was of more recent date.

3. The revised proposition statement now submitted forms a complete one for all jails in the Presidency, differing from the one submitted with my letter, No. 76, dated 25th March 1885, which did not embody the central jails at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore; furthermore, it was framed with reference to the accommodation afforded by each jail. The actual difference between the original proposition statement and the revised one is Rs. 1,968 per mensem, or Rs. 23,616 per annum.

4. In regard to the relative cost of the two systems, the information is given in the revised proposition statement under the heads Present and Proposed scales.

5. The increase of Rs. 48-12-0 in the revised proposed scale is one of remote effect, as many of the jail subordinates will have to serve for some time before they become entitled to their maximum salaries, and if the proposed abolition of the district jails of Rajahmundry and Trichinopoly is sanctioned, there will be a monthly saving of Rs. 678-4-0, or Rs. 8,139 per annum, after deducting Rs. 48-12-0 net increase shown in the proposition statement, and Rs. 21 pay of three additional warders sanctioned for the Penitentiary.

6. I beg, under the circumstances explained, Government will be pleased to pass early orders, as there is constant reference made to this subject by Superintendents of Jails and the Police. Should the general scheme as now proposed not meet with approval, I would request that the guarding by warders may be sanctioned for all central jails, and that the police protective guards to the central jails of Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore be abolished, there will be a saving of Rs. 106-8-0 per mensem, or Rs. 1,278 per annum, in the cost of guarding the central jails, if this is done.

7. The revised proposition statement is herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE.

ABSTRACT of Proposition Statement.

Jails.	Increase per month.			Decrease per month.			Remarks.
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	
Trichinopoly Central	72	8	0				This will have to be reduced to Rs. 41 owing to 3 warders since sanctioned in G.O., dated 11th May 1886, Mis. No. 1214.
Rajahmundry do.				23	0	0	
Vellore do.				29	0	0	
Coimbatore do.				29	0	0	
Salem do.				27	0	0	
Cannanore do.				30	0	0	
Penitentiary				62	0	0	
Russellkondah Hill	24	8	0				
Berhampore District				0	8	0	
Vizagapatam do.				10	8	0	
Parvativur Hill	26	8	0				
Rajahmundry District	44	8	0				
Guntur do.	17	0	0				
Nellore do.	31	8	0				
Kurnool do.	13	0	0				
Bellary do.	15	0	0				
Cuddapah do.	9	12	0				
Chittoor do.	4	8	0				
Cuddalore do.	30	0	0				
Tanjore do.				20	8	0	

Abstract of Proposition Statement—continued.

Jails.	Increase per month.			Decrease per month.			Remarks.
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	
Trichinopoly District	16	0	0				
Madura do.	68	8	0				
Tinnevely do.				112	0	0	
Cochin do.							
Calicut do.	50	8	0				
Mangalore do.	6	0	0				
Coimbatore do.							
Ootacamund do.				37	8	0	
European Prison							
Debtors' do.							
Total	429	12	0	381	0	0	Difference Rs. 48-12-0.

Official memorandum from the Chief Secretary, dated 20th May 1886, No. 824-C.

ORDER—dated 14th June 1886, No. 1571, Judicial.

The foregoing papers contain the proposals of the Inspector-General of Jails, called for in paragraph 2 of G.O., 22nd April 1884, No. 989, for the revision of the subordinate establishments of the District and Central Jails. The Government observe that the great delay which has occurred in passing final orders on this question has been mainly due to the necessity for repeated references to the Inspector-General for further information.

2. The proposed scale of establishment has been arrived at by taking the average jail population of the last three years as a basis of calculation, and allowing one jail warder to every seven convicts with 10 per cent. additional establishment added to meet casualties and to provide for escort duty. The Inspector-General proposes in the central jails to do away with the police guard altogether, as he considers the jail warder force, which is principally composed of pensioned sepoys, is quite as effective as the police reserve. The Government accept this recommendation, but desire that the result of it should be watched, and especial care taken with the enlistment and training of the warder guard. In the district jails, the police protective guard will be retained; its strength has been fixed by the Inspector-General of Jails in consultation with the Inspector-General of Police. For the most part the proposed scale of establishment contained in the revised proposition statement, submitted with the Inspector-General's letter of the 5th February 1886, No. 33, appears to be satisfactory, and has the approval of Government with the modifications noted below.

3. The general financial effect of the scheme proposed is shown to be a monthly increase of Rs. 48-12-0. To this has to be added Rs. 21 per mensem for the extra warders sanctioned for the Penitentiary in G.O., 11th May 1886, No. 1214, Judicial. The total increase is therefore Rs. 69-12-0 per mensem, or Rs. 837 per annum; and the remaining excess would amount to Rs. 9-12-0 per mensem only. This question is, however, still unsettled, and in the mean time the Government are not prepared to sanction any expenditure. On the contrary, the scheme should involve, as anticipated, a reduction, that the largest increases occur in the central jail, Trichinopoly, and in the district jails of Madura, Rajahmundry, Nellore, and Cuddalore. The Government therefore, while approving of the scheme as a whole and

See paragraph 14, Colonel Tennant's letter, 30th November 1883, No. 341, in G.O., 11th January 1884, No. 60, Judicial.

14TH JUNE 1886, No. 1571, JUDICIAL.

sanctioning its introduction, direct the Inspector-General to consider in which jails a reduction of the proposed cost can be most conveniently effected, and to report, with reference to the jails above mentioned, whether the proposed increase of establishment is foregone, and a substantial reduction on the total cost of the scheme effected. In regard to the central jails, it is observed that great inequality exists, an average of 631 prisoners in the Penitentiary being guarded by 52 warders, while in the Trichinopoly central jail 652 prisoners require 106 warders. It should be considered whether the strength of the warder guard in Rajahmundry, Coimbatore, and Trichinopoly cannot be reduced to the standard adopted in Salem, Cannanore, and the Penitentiary.

4. The Government, while thus according their general sanction to the scheme, desire to impress on the Inspector-General the necessity of very careful supervision of its introduction. Much will depend on the material of which the new warder guard is composed. The gradual development of the scheme of convict warders in the direction followed in the North-West Provinces should not be lost sight of; further, the working of the scheme as a whole should be carefully watched, and special mention of it should be made in the annual report.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Jails,
" Accountant-General, with proposition statement.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

14TH MARCH 1886, No. , JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 25th March 1885, No. 76.

With reference to paragraph 2 of the order noted in the margin and official memorandum No. 171, dated 26th January last, I have the honor to submit the proposition statement for the revision of the subordinate jail guard establishments in the remaining central and district jails in this presidency inclusive of the Penitentiary at Madras.

2. It will be observed that the statement exhibits an increase of Rs. 2,658-4-0 per mensem over the present cost. This increase is only nominal and cannot be fairly contrasted, as the present cost of the police guards, furnished by the Inspector-General of Police, is with reference to the actual number employed during the month of November last, and is framed with reference to the actual number of prisoners in the several jails during that month; whereas the proposed jail establishments and protective guards have been framed with reference to the actual accommodation of the jails and not with regard to their present strength.

3. The police have a reserve in each district from which men can be supplied for jail guard duty whenever necessary and reduced likewise, whereas the jail guard establishments must be fixed as there is no reserve to fall back on. The necessity of having a fixed establishment has been fully explained in paragraph 13 of Colonel Tennant's letter, No. 341, dated 30th November 1883.

4. The strength of the protective guards (police) has been fixed at all jails in consultation with the Inspector-General of Police who does not think it advisable to leave any guard with only one head constable. He also considers there should not be less than six constables on any guard; to this view I have assented; but I think, when the new system is fully established, that we may (certainly at all central jails where the men on the jail guards are mostly pensioned sepoys) be independent of protective guards and take the entire guarding ourselves. At district jails it may be desirable to retain protective guards, but these guards may, eventually, as we gain further experience, be considerably reduced.

5. I have asked the officers at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore, who have now had two months' experience of the new system of guarding, for their opinion regarding the retention or otherwise of the police protective guards. On receipt of their replies, I will forward them for the consideration of Government.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 31st March 1885, No. 90.

In continuation of my letter, No. 76, dated 25th instant, I have the honor to forward, for the information of the Government, the replies (return requested) of the Superintendents of the Jails at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore regarding the protective guard (police).

2. Mr. Johnston at Rajahmundry is of opinion the protective guard could very well be dispensed with, and that the warder guard is quite able to manage the entire guarding of the jail. He states the cost of the protective guard is Rs. 2,352 per annum for which we get little or no return, and that if our warder guard was increased by the same number of men as the police now furnish, the expense would be slightly less, and two great difficulties now encountered, viz., not having spare men for escort duty and to meet casualties, would be got rid of.

3. Colonel McLeod at Vellore is of opinion it is not desirable to reduce the protective guard unless the strength of the warder guard is raised by the same number; he considers this arrangement would be preferable to having a separate guard as at present, who have literally nothing to do, while the work of the warder guard is extremely onerous, thus making the latter discontented with their work. This proposed arrangement would be advantageous in lightening the work of the warder guard, and as the bulk of the men composing the warder guard are pensioned sepoys, the safety of the jail would be in no way impaired.

4. Colonel Pickance at Coimbatore considers it is not requisite to keep the protective guard at its present strength as there is a strong warder guard at the main gate both day and night, the protective guard might be reduced 25 per cent. or more, but if some additions were made to the warder guard, the protective guard might be done away with entirely. The men now enlisted are, more than half, pensioned sepoys; they are better suited for guard purposes than the police. The subordinate officers of the warder guard are all of them men who have served as subordinate officers in the native army, have been accustomed to responsible duties, and the enforcement of discipline; that there will be no difficulty, from the numbers now coming forward, in time to have the whole warder guard composed of pensioned sepoys.

5. From the opinions of these three officers it would appear desirable not to continue protective guards of police, but to raise our own establishments in proportion and to take the entire guarding of our jails—this I would certainly propose should be done at all central jails, but at district jails I think it would be desirable to retain protective guards of police until we have had more experience in the new system of guarding. At the same time I think the strength of the protective guards is more than is absolutely required, and that Government will be paying for the services of men who will literally be idle, whilst they might be better employed in their own department. There is another consideration to be thought of, viz., if we are to have protective police guards at central jails, we must incur expense in finding them guard rooms, and at some jails, viz., Vellore, Trichinopoly, Salem, and Cannanore; huts in addition.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cuddalore, 21st August 1885, No. 221.

Adverting to official memorandum, No. 1261, dated 10th ultimo, I have the honor to forward the enclosed statement, showing the average monthly strength and cost of police guards during the year 1884, and also the number of prisoners each jail will accommodate, called for in the reference under acknowledgment.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing the average monthly strength and cost of Police Guards during 1884, also the number of prisoners each jail will accommodate.

Names of the Jails.	Police Guards, 1884.		Number of prisoners each jail will accommodate.	Number of men in warder guard proposed.	Proportion of columns 5 to 4.
	Average monthly strength.	Cost for the year 1884.			
1	2	3	4	5	6
Russellkonda Hill Jail	21	Rs. A. P. 1,971 0 0	159	23	1 to 7
Berhampore District Jail	22	2,076 0 0	211	31	1 to 7
Vizagapatam do.	33	3,506 0 0	182	29	1 to 6
Párvatipur Hill Jail	20	1,912 0 0	105	22	1 to 5
Rajahmundry District Jail	19	1,911 0 0	106	16	1 to 7
Guntúr do.	26	2,517 13 7	198	29	1 to 7
Nellore do.	27	2,522 0 0	273	40	1 to 7
Kurnool do.	20	2,029 0 0	132	20	1 to 7
Bellary do.	34	3,356 0 0	478	69	1 to 7
Cuddapah do.	27	2,917 0 0	197	30	1 to 6.5
Chittoor do.	24	2,382 0 0	320	47	1 to 7
Salem Central Jail	47	5,093 0 0	747	44	1 to 17
Cuddalore District Jail	27	2,909 4 2	364	53	1 to 7
Tanjore do.	37	3,988 8 0	216	62	1 to 4
Trichinopoly Central Jail	74	7,776 0 0	1,149	85	1 to 13.5
Do. District Jail	22	2,256 0 0	196	29	1 to 7
Madura do.	27	2,906 0 0	489	71	1 to 7
Tinnevelly do.	27	3,056 0 0	335	62	1 to 6.5
Calicut do.	29	3,132 0 0	266	38	1 to 7
Cannanore Central Jail	49	5,406 0 0	925	44	1 to 21
Mangalore District Jail	16	1,539 8 0	291	42	1 to 7
Ootacamund do.	29	4,027 12 1	209	15	1 to 14
Her Majesty's Penitentiary	56	5,880 0 0	797	35	1 to 23

NOTE.—The figures in column 5 do not include the Jailer, Deputy Jailer, or Clerk.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 2nd October 1885, No. 271.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your official memorandum, dated 30th September 1885, No. 1713, and, in reply, I have the honor to state that the warder establishment, proposed to be substituted for the existing police guards in the jails referred to, will be sufficient to perform the escort duties which will, in future, fall upon the jail establishment without recourse to extra temporary hands.

2. With reference to the 2nd paragraph of your memorandum, the instructions therein contained shall be attended to in future.

3. Should the proposition now before Government, which was submitted with my letter, No. 76, dated 25th March 1885, be sanctioned, I request that the new system of guarding in the jails, therein referred to, may not be introduced until 1st January 1886, by which date all necessary arrangements, viz., enlisting the men, obtaining their arms, uniforms, &c., can be satisfactorily made.

No. 1863.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The undersigned is directed to return the proposition statement submitted by the Inspector-General of Jails with his letter, dated 25th March 1885, No. 76, and to point

out that the Inspector-General appears to have taken the capacity of each jail as the basis of calculation of the number of warders required to guard it. An inspection of the statement XV of the Administration report of the jail department for 1884 shows that the maximum population of many of the jails * was very considerably less than their capacity, and the average daily strength was, in most cases at least, 50 per cent. less than the maximum population on any one day. It is obvious therefore that the basis of calculation adopted by the Inspector-General cannot be accepted, and he will now recast his estimates in accordance with the actual requirements of each jail. It is presumed that the police guard, which has hitherto performed the duties of watch and ward, was always regulated by the actual convict population. If this is so, the average strength of the police guard for (say) the past three years will afford a satisfactory index of the number of men required to perform those duties, and the existing warder establishment should first be increased by the number of police constables whose services are dispensed with under the new system of guarding. This number will be obtained by subtracting the number of the protective guard from the average number of the police guard, obtained as suggested above. If this method is applied to the present proposals of the Inspector-General, it will be found that he has provided for a very considerable margin in the case of many jails†. The Government quite understand that a margin is necessary both for the performance of the duty of escorting prisoners, now to be taken over by the jail department, and to meet casualties. But this margin must be arrived at by some intelligible method which the calculation of the numbers required for escort duty can be based; these should be obtained, and the method of calculation clearly explained when Mr. Grimes next submits his proposals to Government.

	Capacity.	Maximum population.
Nellore	273	113
Chittoor	320	167
Cuddalore	364	226
Madura	489	249
Mangalore	291	107

† Bellary	32
Madura	45
Cuddalore	23
Chittoor	24
Mangalore	30
Nellore	13

of calculation. The Inspector-General of Police will be able to furnish figures on which the calculation of the numbers required for escort duty can be based; these should be obtained, and the method of calculation clearly explained when Mr. Grimes next submits his proposals to Government.

2. The Government also quite understand that there may be cases in which peculiarities in the construction or situation of particular jails require some departure from the general principles of calculation indicated above, and they will be ready to sanction extra men in such cases, provided the necessity is clearly explained.

3. Turning now to the financial bearing of the scheme as at present proposed by the Inspector-General, the error of taking the figures of the police guard for one month only is at once apparent. The total cost of the jail establishment and of the police guards for the jails in question during the year 1884 was Rs. 2,01,419, while the cost of the proposed establishment, including the protective guard, is Rs. 1,77,120, showing a saving of Rs. 24,299. The Government are, however, not certain whether items have been included in the cost of establishment as given in the Administration report, which do not appear in the proposition statements submitted. It is also noticed that there is a discrepancy between the cost of police guards as given in the Administration report and the Inspector-General's letter, dated 21st August 1885, No. 221, respectively. Nor is it known whether the amounts given for this head of charge include the cost of clothing and arms or not.

4. The undersigned is directed to request the Inspector-General of Jails to explain all these points fully, and to furnish sufficient information to enable a comparison to be made between the cost of the present and proposed establishments.

30th October 1885.

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Acting Chief Secretary.

From H. R. GRIMES, Esq., Inspector-General of Jails, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government (through the Accountant-General), dated Madras, 5th February 1886, No. 33.

With reference to official memorandum, No. 1863, dated 30th October last, I have the honor to submit a revised proposition statement for the full complement of the jail guard service inclusive of the protective police guard required for the district jails only.

2. In the statement originally submitted a protective police guard was shown for the central as well as the district jails, but after a year's experience of departmental guarding at Rajahmundry, Vellore, and Coimbatore, it has been found that the police protective guard is not necessary, and that we are paying for men who have little or nothing to do, whereas if our own guards were increased by a corresponding number of men, we should be fully able to meet all requirements for escort duty and casualties. Our warder guard, being principally composed of pensioned sepoys, is quite as effective as an armed body as the police reserve, and when the jails were guarded entirely by the police no protective guard was considered necessary, I fail to see any necessity for retaining it now. I have therefore, in the central jails only, taken the number of men allowed for the protective guard and added them to the number of the lowest grade warders. In the district jails I have retained the police protective guard as I do not consider it would be desirable in those jails to do without it, certainly not for the present.

3. In framing the statement now submitted, the average jail population for the last three years has been taken as a basis of calculation, and one warder has been allowed to every seven convicts, to which 10 per cent. has been added to meet requirements for the performance of escort duty and for casualties—this refers more especially to district jails. The revised establishment will therefore be found to be very much under that proposed in the original statement, and the cost has also been reduced by Rs. 24,888 per annum.

4. A sum of Rs. 28,020 has been provided in the budget estimate of this department for the year 1886-87 under Saderward and Contingencies to meet the cost of uniform to be supplied to the new jail guard.

5. In conclusion, I trust the Government will consider the revised proposition statement satisfactory and reasonable, and will be pleased to accord their sanction to it at an early date in order that men may be enlisted, drilled, and accoutred so as to enable me to take over the guarding from the police department at the commencement of the coming official year, the 1st April next.

6. The original statement, together with the revised one, is forwarded for comparison.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

No 76

Calcutta 25th March 1885

From

H. P. Grice Esq.
Inspector Genl. of Jails

To The Honble E. J. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Sir

With reference to paragraph
2 of the order noted in the margin
and Official Memorandum No 171 dated
26th January last I have the honor
to submit the proposition statement
for the revision of the subordinate jail
guard establishments in the remaining
central and district jails in the
Presidency including of the Prisoners
at Madras.

It will be observed that the
statement

statement exhibits an increase of
Rs. 2658. 4. " per annum over
the present cost, this increase is only
nominal and cannot be fairly
contrasted, as the present cost of
the Police guards furnished by the
Inspector General of Police is with
reference to the actual number em-
ployed during the month of November
last and is framed with reference
to the actual number of prisoners
in the several jails during that month,
whereas the proposed Jail Establishments
and Protective Guards have been framed
with reference to the actual accommo-
dation of the jails and not with
regard to their present strength.

3 The Police have a reserve
in each district from which men can
be supplied for Jail guard duty
whenever necessary and reduced likewise,
whereas

52.
4. 11. 1883.
156

17
whereas the Jail guard establishments
must be fixed as there is no reserve
to fall back on. The necessity of having
a fixed Establishment has been fully
explained in paragraph 13 of Colonel
Simpson's letter No 341 dated 30th
November 1883

4 The strength of the Protective
Guards (Police) has been fixed at all
Jails in consultation with the
Inspector General of Police, who does
not think it advisable to leave any
Jail with only one Head Constable,
he also considers there should not
be less than 6 Constables on any
guard to this view I have assented,
but I think when the new system
is fully established that we may
(certainly at all central jails, where
the men and the Jail guards are
mostly pensioned sepoys) be independent
of

of Protection Guards and take the
entire guarding ourselves; at British
Sails it may be desirable to retain
Protection guards but these guards
may eventually, as we gain further
experience be considerably reduced.

I have asked the officers
at Rajahmundry, Vellore and Pambalore,
who have now had two months ex-
perience of the new system of guarding,
for their opinion regarding the
retention or otherwise of the Police
Protection Guards, on receipt of
their replies I will forward them
for the consideration of Government.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

Henry Pyrites.

Inspector General of Sails

1259 6. 22-4-86. 989 217.
 27-1 85. 2531
 70-12-86. 27340
 8-12-86. 13707
 15-10-86. 2642
 11-1 84. 60
 27-6-83. 1715
 16-2-85. 4464
 26-1-85. 2074
 18-2-86. 2329-90

CURRENT NO.

JUDICIAL.

Jail (1885) Department.

FROM
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO
THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

Fort St George

Dated 25th March 1885.
Received

No. 76

ENCLOSURE ONE

SUBJECT.

Submitting proposition
statement for the revision
of the subordinate jail
and establishments.



1752731 March 85
 Referred with the proposi-
 tion statement to the
 accountant general for
 verification & return.

By order.

H A Stuart.

By Asst. Secy.
85.

18
21

Portacammid 25th March 1885.

No 76

From,

H. R. Grimes Esq.
Inspector General of jails.

The Honble E. F. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St George.

Sir,

With reference to paragraph 2 of
the order noted in the margin and
official Memorandum No 171 dated 26th
January last, I have the honor to
submit the Proposition statement for
the revision of the subordinate jail
and establishments in the remaining
central and district jails in this
Presidency inclusive of the Penitentiary
at Madras.

2. It will be observed that
the statement exhibits an increase
of Rs 2658-4- per mensem over the
present cost. This increase is only nominal
and

and cannot be fairly contrasted, as the present cost of the Police guards furnished by the Inspector General of Police, is with reference to the actual number employed during the month of November last and is framed with reference to the actual number of prisoners in the several jails during that month; whereas the proposed jail establishments and protective guards have been framed with reference to the actual accommodation of the jails and not with regard to their present strength.

3. The Police have a reserve in each district from which men can be supplied for jail guard duty whenever necessary and reduced likewise, whereas the jail guard establishments must be fixed as there is no reserve to fall back on. The necessity of having a fixed establishment has been fully explained in paragraph 13 of Colonel Tennant's letter

no. 341

2 P
23
No. 341 dated 30th November 1883.

4. The strength of the Protective guards (Police) has been fixed at all jails in consultation with the Inspector General of Police who does not think it advisable to leave any guard with only one Head Constable. He also considers there should ^{not} be less than 6 constables on any guard; to this view I have assented, but I think, when the new system is fully established, that we may (certainly at all central jails where the men on the jail guards are mostly pensioned Sepoys) be independent of Protective guards and take the entire guarding ourselves. At district jails it may be desirable to retain Protective guards, but these guards may, eventually, as we gain further experience, be considerably reduced.

5. I have asked the officers at Rajahmundry, Vellore and Coimbatore

Combatants who have now had
two months experience of the new
system of guarding, for their opinion
regarding the retention or otherwise
of the Police Protective guards. On
receipt of their replies, I will for-
ward them for the consideration
of Government.

I have & &
Signed / Henry R. Grimes
Inspector General of jails.
(True copy)

Henry R. Grimes.
Inspector General of jails.

N. 122. Rajahmundry 21st March 1882

From The Superintendent, Central Jail
Rajahmundry.

To The Inspector General of Jails
Coast Command

Sir,

I have the honor
to acknowledge the receipt of your
telegram of the 19th inst requesting
my opinion as to whether the Protective
guard could not be reduced or even
abolished as a portion of the Jail
guard was composed of pensioned
sepoys. In reply I sent a
telegram recommending the abolition
of the Protective guard & the strength-
ening of the warder guard by 12
men

men & two Head wardens.

As far as this Jail is concerned I think the Protective guard could very well be dispensed with as the warden guard in my opinion is quite able to manage the entire guarding of the Jail since there are several pensioned Sepoys among them. The prisoners in this Jail are and have always been quiet & orderly & such a thing as a riot or break-out has never been known.

A Protective guard may be necessary where the inmates of a prison are drawn from an unruly or turbulent race of people but as no such people are to be found in the Northern Circars there is

is no need to take such precautions. 21

The cost of the present Protective guard is Rs 2352 per annum including clothing & contingencies - it is an expenditure for which we get no return whatever nor are we ever likely to. It was not so formerly when the Police guarded our prisoners as we did then get some thing for our money but now we get nothing. With this money we could place the warden guard on a better footing & by increasing its strength would be better able to get rid of two great difficulties which we now encounter in not having spare men for escort duty & meeting casualties.

In place of ~~the~~ Protective Guard
I would recommend our warder
guard be increased as follows:-

1	Headwarder. 1 st Grade	P. 15
1	Do 2 nd Grade	12
1	Do 3 rd Grade	10
6	Warders 2 nd class	48
12	Do 3 rd class	84
		169 per month
		12
1	Clothing	20 28
1	Contingencies	2 10
		10 5
		P. 23 43 per annum.

I think with this addition
to the force we ought to manage
all the guarding & escort duty
& also meet all casualties caused
by men going on leave & falling sick.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
Wm. Munro
Supt Central Jail

No 406

Vellore Centre 8 jail
25th March 1855

From
Him # 606 to S. Lee Leods
Sup # Centre 8 jail, Vellore.

To
The Deputy General of jail
Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt
of your letter No 1051 dated 19th instant,
I have the honor to state that it is
not in my opinion desirable to
reduce the strength of Police
Protective guard. Though 21 men
seems a large number to be on guard,
but 14 of this number are actually
always present in the guard Room,
a number I do not consider at all
sufficient for the safety of a large jail
such as this.

In case of any sudden insurrection
or attempt to break jail the protective
guard would have mainly to be
relied

13/4/55

From
The District
Magistrate
Vellore

To
The District
Magistrate
Vellore

Dated 21 March 1855

No 122

Regarding the
abolition of the
Protective guard

relied upon, the bulk of the warden
guards being fully employed in guarding
the gangs & the area around the
jail, leaving but 7 men actually
present in the jail guard room.
The strength of the warden guards
as proposed and subsequently
fixed for this jail was submitted
as a minimum scale, and it would
not in my opinion be at all desirable
at present to reduce the strength
of the protective guards. Were all
the convicts employed within the
jail walls a reduction might be
made as men of the warden guard
would then be available, but as
the bulk of these men are now
employed with gangs, and guarding
the garden &c. I would strongly
deprecate any reduction in the
strength of the protective guard here.

In reply to the 3rd query asked
by you I beg to say that I am of
³³ opinion the duties now performed
by the Police Protective guards could
be equally well performed by men
of the warden guard, provided
the strength of the warden guards
was raised by the same number (21)
as now compose the Protective guard.
In fact an arrangement of this
sort would in my opinion be preferable
to having a separate guard as at
present. Now the Protective guards
has literally nothing to do, except to
be present in case of necessity,
while the work of the warden guard
is extremely onerous & I think it
makes our men discontented seeing
the Police have nothing to do while
they have heavy work day & night.

re An arrangement as proposed would
 be in my opinion head and tail over
 as in lightening the work of the warder
 & guard generally, while the Permanent
 standing guard could be kept up to
 the same strength as that now main-
 tained by the Police, and from the
 bulk of the men composing the warder
 & guard being pensioned Sepoy the
 safety of the Jail would, in my opinion,
 be in no way impaired.

The whole of the Bills for the
 clothing have not yet been received
 from Head Quarters, but I expect them daily,
 & hope to submit to the information called
 for within this week.

I have the honor to be
 Sir
 Yours truly
 L. S. de Lencastre
 Supdt. Central Jail, Poona

Respecting the
 standing guard

of 25 men as

the number

of men

12/8/55

from

the South

Police

No 60

From

To

Sir

Central Jail office,
 Coimbatore 26th March 85

The Superintendent of Central Jail

Coimbatore

The Inspector General of Jails
 Pootalamund

In reply to your letter No 1052 dated
 19th March 1885 I have the honor to inform you, in reply to
 your 1st query, that it does not appear requisite to keep the
 Protective guard at its present strength.

2. The Protective guard at the Entana gate
 can turn out more men on an emergency than the old
 Police guard on the main gate could, and there is be-
 sides the warder guard on the main gate which at
 present numbers 12 men and 2 Petty Officers by day,
 31 men and 5 Petty Officers by night.

3. In reply to query No 2, the Protective
 guard might (if things remain as they are) be reduced
 25 per cent if not more.

4. In reply to query No 3, the present establish-
 ment having been calculated on the assumption that
 there would always be a standing guard of 3 Head Constables
 and 18 men, if some additions are made to the warder es-
 tablishment the Protective guard might be done away
 with entirely.

5. The material we are enlisting for the war-
 der establishment is in my opinion better suited for

guard purposes than the Police are. Our Petty Officers are all of them men who have served as Jemadars, Havildars, and Naikes, in the Native Army, and who have been accustomed to responsible duties and the enforcement of discipline: from the numbers still coming forward, and glad to take up inferior posts, there is no doubt that in time we can, if we like, have the whole guard composed of men who have served in the Army. At present more than half of our men are pensioners.

6. In reply to your last para the bills for the cost of materials supplied for warders' clothing not having all been received, I am unable to tell you what it has cost at present, but as the whole of the uniform has been made up in the jail, the only cost to Government, in addition to that of the raw material, will be for buttons, thread, and needles, a merely nominal sum.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

P. A. L. S. *Shol*
Superintendent of Central Jail

No 90

38
39

Orissamund 31st March 1885

From

H. R. Grimes Esq
Inspector General of Jails

To
The Honble C. F. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Sir

In continuation of my
letter No 76 dated 25th instant I
have the honor to forward for the
information of the Government the replies
of the superintendents of the jails at
Rayahmundry, Vellore and Coimbatore
regarding the Protective Guard (Police).

Mr Johnston at Rayahmundry
is of opinion the Protective Guard
could very well be dispensed with and
that the warder Guard is quite able
to manage the entire guarding of the

Recd 12/7/85

From

To

The Superintendent Central Jail
Coimbatore
The Inspector General of Jails
Orissamund

Dated 26th March 85

W. G.

Replying to Encl. Genl. letter No
1052 of 19th March regarding the
Protective Guard.

ind. It states the cost of the Protective Guard is Rs 2502 per annum for which we get little or no return and that if our warden guard was increased by the same number of men as the Police now furnish the expense would be slightly less, and two great difficulties now encountered viz: not having spare men for escort duty and to meet casualties, would be got rid of.

3. Colonel Medley at Vellore is of opinion it is not desirable to reduce the Protective Guard unless the strength of the Warden Guard is raised by the same number; he considers this arrangement would be preferable to having a separate guard as at present, who have literally nothing to do, while the work of the Warden Guard is extremely onerous, thus making the latter discontented with their work. This proposed arrangement

48

ment would be advantageous by lightening the work of the warden guard, and as the bulk of the men composing the warden guard are pensioned sepoy, the safety of the jail would be in no way impaired.

4. Colonel Pickens at Coimbatore considers it is not requisite to keep the Protective Guard at its present strength as there is a strong Warden Guard at the main gate both day and night, the Protective Guard might be reduced 25% or more but if some additions were made to the warden guard the Protective Guard might be done away with entirely. The men now enlisted, are more than half pensioned sepoy, they are better suited for Guard purposes than the Police. The subordinate officers of the warden guard are all of them men who have served as subordinate officers in the native army, and have been accustomed

to responsible duties and the enforcement of discipline, that there will be no difficulty from the numbers now coming forward, in time to have the whole warden guard composed of pensioned Sepoys.

5 From the opinions of these three officers it would appear desirable not to continue Protective Guards of Police, but to raise our own establishments in proportion and to take the entire guarding of our jails. This I would certainly propose should be done at all Central jails, but at district jails, I think it would be desirable to retain Protective guards of Police until we have had more experience in the new system of guarding. At the same time I think the strength of the Protective Guards is more than is absolutely required, and that Government will be paying

50
43
for the services of men, who will
literally be idle, whilst they might
be better employed in their own depart-
ment. There is another consideration
to be thought of, viz: If we are to
have Protective Police Guards at Central
jails we must incur expense in finding
them Guard rooms and at some jails,
viz. Vellore, Trichinopoly, Salem and
Cannanore huts in addition.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant
Henry R. James.
Inspector General of Jails

Ms 446-167 2-25-
- 207-26 1-25-
- 9-6-1-25-
Feb 29 19-12-14.

CURRENT NO/278
JUDICIAL.

Jail (1885) Department.

FROM
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO
THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

John H. Gump

Dated *21st Jan 1885*
Received

No. *40*

3 ENCLOSURE

SUBJECT.

*Recommending jail
ward in lieu of Police
District Guard.*

W. M. Stewart

For orders.

M^r Grimes proposes to abolish
the existing Police Protective
guards at all Central Jails
and to replace them by adding
to the Warden Guard. Col. McLeod,
Col. Pickance and M^r Johnson are
all in favour of this proposal,
and there seems to be no argu-
ment against it and much in
its favour. The I. G. of Police
wd. probably welcome the
change.

HAS
22/10

Accountant General's Report.

No. *A.D.S.*
357

The entries in the Column of "Present Scale" have been compared with the
Registers of this Office, and are correct with the exception of the items ^{relating} ~~relating~~
~~relating~~ to Police Guards, for which no fixed scale is
recorded in the Audit Registers of this Office, as their strength
varies from time to time, with the number of prisoners in jail.
The delay in the submission of this report is partly due to
the statement having had to be returned to the Inspector-
General of Jails for correction.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Fort Saint George,
26 May 1885

Deputy Accountant General.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

No.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,

The 18

Secretary to the Government
of Fort St. George.

Statement of Proposition for vision of Establishment.

Statement of Proposition for																																
Order and numbering present Establishment.		Government of Department.		Office to which the proposition refers.		NATURE OF CHARGE.										PROPOSITION.										Grounds of Proposition.		Local Government's recommendation.		ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
						PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.		FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.								
						Pay.		No.		Designation.		Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.		Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.										
																Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.													
No.	Date.	No.	Designation.	Minimum.	Maximum.	No.	Designation.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Amount.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.					
376																																
28 February 1896																																
District of Lower (under) Office																																
1 Factor 150 250 1 Factor 150 250 20 35																																
1 Deputy Factor 75 75 1 Deputy Factor 75 75 35 40																																
1 Clerk 20 20 1 Clerk 20 20 40 50																																
1 Clerk 15 15 2 Clerk 50 50 40 60																																
1 Clerk 15 15 2 Clerk 40 40 60 60																																
2 Clerk 40 40 40 60																																
4 Clerk 60 60 40 60																																
4 Clerk 48 48 48 48																																
1 Clerk 60 60 60 60																																
12 Clerk 108 108 72 72																																
24 Clerk 142 142 210 210																																
30 Clerk 210 210 35 35																																
1 Clerk 35 35 45 45																																
1 Clerk 20 20 25 25																																
581 15																																
55 25 20 15 12 72 71 8 340 8 581 355 8 225 5																																
1 Constable 55 155 1 Constable 55 155 20 20																																
1 Constable 25 125 1 Constable 25 125 15 15																																
2 Constable 40 40 1 Constable 40 40 12 12																																
2 Constable 30 30 1 Constable 30 30 12 12																																
2 Constable 24 24 1 Constable 24 24 48 48																																
15 Constable 120 120 6 Constable 120 120 42 42																																
16 Constable 112 112 6 Constable 112 112 39 39																																
17 Constable 110 110 6 Constable 110 110 39 39																																
56 Total 516 8 516 8 71 Total 176 176																																
87 Grand Total 1073 8 1128 8 111 Grand Total 1299 1299 1364																																
1064 8 1129 8 1064 8 1129 8																																

obtained
25. Karb 1895

To
The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,
General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Wm. J. G. G. G.
Chief General of India.

49

Statement of Proposition for revision of Establishment.

Statement of Proposition for										PROPOSITION.										Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.															
NATURE OF CHARGE.										PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																				
PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.																		
No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Amount.	Amount.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.																						
No.	Date.																																				
																				RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.						
1 Sailor 106 8 - 112 8 - 1																				106			112														
1 Deputy sailor 50 - 50 - 1																				50			50														
1 Chiefwarden 25 - 25 - 1																				25			25			15											
1 Deputy Chiefwarden 12 - 12 - 1																				12			12			13											
1 Assistant Chiefwarden 20 - 20 - 1																				20			20			20											
1 Headwarden 15 - 15 - 1																				15			15			15											
2 do 2nd 24 - 24 - 2																				24			24			24											
3 do 3rd 30 - 30 - 3																				30			30			30											
3 Head wardens 27 - 27 - 3																				27			27			27											
7 Wardens 72 - 72 - 7																				72			72			72											
1 Matron 35 - 35 - 1																				35			35			35											
1 Head clerk 35 - 45 - 1																				35			45														
1 Second do 20 - 25 - 1																				20			25														
Total 386 - 457 - 49																				386			457			284			15								
1 General Constable 50 - 50 - 1																				50			50														
2 Head Constables 40 - 40 - 2																				40			40			20											
1 do 3rd 15 - 15 - 1																				15			15														
2 do 4th 24 - 24 - 2																				24			24			12											
11 Constables 88 - 88 - 11																				88			88			48											
11 do 2nd 77 - 77 - 11																				77			77			42											
18 do 3rd 117 - 117 - 18																				117			117			84 8											
Total 411 - 411 - 15																				411			411			255 8											
Grand total 797 - 874 8 - 64																				797			874 8			284			271 8								
Carried forward 1861 8 - 1991 8 -																				1861			1991			12 8											

Obtainment
25. March 1885.

To

ccr

ernment
Account

Department,

with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Chief Secretary to Government
Financial Department

69
209

53

To

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
and the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Officer's designation)

Curry, Thomas
 (relation) Chap. General of Mills.

69
80.9

55

(Officer's designation)

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

Statement of Proposition for revision of Establishment.

Statement of Proposition for																									
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.								DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.	
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.		Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.						
					Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.									
No.	Date.																								

1					3712																
1					75																
1					20																
1					4																
4					28																
1					40																
8					172																
1					20																
1					12																
5					37																
14					91																
21					160																
24					332																
					1254																

(Signature) *W. J. P. P. P.*
 (Officer's designation) *W. J. P. P. P.*

To
 The Secretary to Government
 Through the Accountant General,
 with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
 dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

Obtainments
 25th Nov 1878

57

209

59

To
The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,
General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

George Thompson
 (information) *Thompson* General of Mills.

69
209

61

376
21 February 1876
Nagayatsau District Jail

16

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Very Sincerely
Wm. G. Brewster

Statement of Proposition for revision of Establishment.

Statement of Proposition for																								
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.		REMARKS.		REMARKS.			ORDERS.		
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.				Period.	Amount.		Period.					Amount.	
No.	Date.																							

317.44	13th Feb 1883	Parvatipore Hill Jail	1	Jailor	50 95	54 20		1	Jailor	75	75		25								
				"	75	75		1	Sub Jailor	25	25		15								
				"				1	Headwarden	15	15		12								
				"				1	Headwarden	12	12		10								
				"				1	do 2 nd	10	10		8								
				1	Headwarden	2	0	3	Headwarden 1 st	27	27		48								
				6	wardens	42	42	10	do 2 nd	48	48		28								
				1	Club	35	40	1	do 3 rd	70	70										
								1	Club	35	40										
9				Total	161	165		25	Total	317	322		50								
				"				1	Constable 2 nd	20	20		20								
				2	Constables	30	30		"												
				1	"	12	12		1	do 1 st	12	12		22							
				5	Constables 1 st	37 8	37 8	2	Constables 1 st	15	15		5								
				12	do 2 nd	78	78	4	do 2 nd	26	26		26								
20				Total	157 8	157 8		8	Total	73	73		76								
29				Grand Total	318 8	323 8		33	Grand Total	390	395		76								
				Not submitted					Not submitted				71 8								
				Carried forward	543 8	543 8															

25th March 1883

To The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *Henry J. ...*
(Officer's designation) *Chief Secretary to Govt.*

209

66

(Officer's designation)

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

209

67

(Officer's designation)

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions for																								
Order sanc- tioning present Establish- ment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposi- tion refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recom- mendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPART- MENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.			Remarks.	Orders.	
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.							
No.	Date.																							

1	1st Tailor	75	100	1	1st Tailor	75	100
1	2nd Tailor	20	20	1	2nd Tailor	30	30
	"			1	Chamberlain	15	15
	"			1	Attendant	12	12
	"			3	do 2nd	30	30
1	Ad Warden	9	9	6	Warden	54	54
6	Chamberlain	48	48	6	do 2nd	72	72
4	Warden	20	20	20	do 3rd	140	140
1	Clerk	35	40	1	Clerk	35	40
14	Total	225	245	43	Total	453	453
1	1st Constable	20	20	1	1st Constable	20	20
1	do 4th	12	12	1	do 4th	12	12
6	Constable	45	45	3	Constable	24	24
3	do 2nd	60	60	3	do 2nd	24	24
7	do 3rd	45	45	3	do 3rd	19	19
24	Total	158	158	11	Total	76	76
38	Grand Total	403	403	54	Grand Total	559	559
	Not different				Not different		
	corrected	686	686				

25 March 1880

To The Secretary to Government Through the Accountant

Department, General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695, dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *Henry R. ...*
(Officer's designation) *Major General of ...*

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions for																								
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.			Remarks.	Orders.	
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.							
No.	Date.																							

15 Jailor	50	75	1 Jailor	52	75																
1404 Jailor	20	25	1 by Jailor	36	36																
			1 Singwarden	15	15																
			1 Headwarden	12	12																
1 Headwarden	9	9	1 do	10	10																
6 Headwarden	45	45	3 Headwarden	27	27																
			5 do	40	40																
1 Clerk	35	40	9 do	60	60																
1 do	25	25	1 Clerk	35	40																
11			Total	102	102	23															
1 Ad Constable	20	20	1 Ad Constable	20	20																
1 do	15	15	1 do	15	15																
2 do	24	24	1 do	12	12																
6 Constable	48	48	2 Constable	16	16																
145 do	98	98	4 do	28	28																
24			Total	205	205	8															
35			Total	381	417	21															
Net difference																					
can be for	6833	7283																			

25 March 1885

To

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Henry J. ...
Chief Secretary to Govt.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions for																					
Order sanctioning present Establishment.	Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.						PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
			PRESENT SCALE.			PROPOSED SCALE.			PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.			Decrease per month.			Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.
					Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.					

15 Jailor 6866 - 6866 -

15 Jailor 7405 4 - 7891 4 -

1 Jailor 75 - 150 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 Jailor 75 - 150 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 Jailor 75 - 150 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 Jailor 75 - 150 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 Jailor 75 - 150 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

1 3rd Jailor 20 - 20 -

376
28 February 1876
Lancashire District Jail

25 March 1876

To
The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant
General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *George Seligman*
(Officer's designation) *Chief Secretary to Government*

75

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanc- tioning present Establish- ment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposi- tion refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.												Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recom- mendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPART- MENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
No.	Date.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									</

Btford																				
Btford 7884 8 - 8399 8 -																				
1								1												
1								1												
1								1												
2								6												
8								11												
1								25												
1								1												
1								1												
15								57												
1								1												
1																				
1								1												
5								3												
9								3												
5								3												
22								11												
40								62												
Net difference																				
Carried forward 8283 - 8328 -																				

1812
376
20 February 1876
Btford District Jail

77

25 March 1885

To
The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant
General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *Curry*
(Officer's designation) *Curry*

Statement of Proposition for revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions for																								
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.		Remarks.	Remarks.			Orders.		
Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.			Period.	Amount.													
No.	Date.																							

13th Feb 8283 - 8288 -																					
1					75	5.10	1	Sailor	75	5.10											
1					20	5.10	1	1st Sailor	30	30											
								1	Head Warden	15	15										
								2	Head Warden / Clerk	24	24										
								3	do 2nd class	20	20										
1					3	1.6	1	Head Warden	60	60											
8					164	1.64	13	do 2nd class	124	124											
4					20	1.28	2	do 3rd class	180	180											
1					35	1.40	1	Clerk	35	40											
1					20	1.20															
17					257	206	50	Total	568	598											
1					32	22															
1					20	20	1	Head Constable 2nd	20	20											
2					30	30															
								1	do 4th	12	12										
2					16	16	3	Constable 1st class	24	24											
8					50	50	4	do 2nd	20	20											
11					71.8	71.8	44	do 3rd	26	26											
25					225.8	225.8	13	Total	110	110											
12					476.8	511.8	63	Grand Total	695	705											
Net difference																					
current 8759.8 - 9337.8 -																					

25th March 1895

To

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Chief Secretary to Government

79

209

41

336
25 February 1876
Singapore & back to Jail

To

Department,

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Curry, James
Buckingham of Ind.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.						PROPOSITION.												Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.		PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.			Decrease per month.		Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
					Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.		Period.	Amount.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
No.	Date.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					

Before 9197 8 - 9807 8 -																							
1							1	Sailor	75	100	10												
1							1	2nd Sailor	20	20	5												
							1	Chief Warden	15	15	12												
							1	Head Warden	12	12	20												
1							2	do 2nd	20	20	27												
7							14	Head Warden	36	36													
12							7	do 2nd	56	56	84												
1							14	do 3rd	98	98													
							1	Chief	38	40													
13								Total	239	239	32												
								Total	377	407													
1							1	Head Constable	12	12	8												
2							1	do 4th	12	12	7												
2							3	Constable 1st	24	24													
3							3	do 2nd	21	21													
							3	do 3rd	19	19													
9								Total	61	61	11												
21								Total	273	350	43												
								Total	648	1008													

28th February 1876
 Provisionary Estimate

25th March 1876

To
 The Secretary to Government
 Through the Accountant
 General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
 dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *George H. ...*
 (Officer's designation) *Major General of ...*

49
209

25

376
C. F. Brown 1876
O. H. Brown 1876

To

Department,

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Chap. General of Mills

49
209

47

To

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Very Obedient
Thos. J. Greenleaf, Clerk.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions																							
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
			PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.			Remarks.	Orders.	
					Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.							
No.	Date.																						

375	28. February 1876	Police Station	1	Sailor	104 1/2	107	1	Sailor	20	20											
			1	Sailor	20	20															
			1	Sailor	20	20															
			1	Sailor	50	75	1	Sailor	50	75											
			1	Sailor	20	20	1	Sailor	30	30											
			1	Sailor			1	Sailor	15	15											
			1	Sailor			1	Sailor	12	12											
			1	Sailor			1	Sailor	20	20											
			1	Sailor	40	40	5	Sailor	45	45											
			1	Sailor	25	25	2	Sailor	72	72											
			1	Sailor	35	40	1	Sailor	140	140											
			1	Sailor	35	40	1	Sailor	35	40											
			1	Sailor	152	212	11	Sailor	464	464											
			1	Sailor	35	35															
			1	Sailor	20	20	1	Sailor	20	20											
			1	Sailor	12	12	1	Sailor	12	12											
			1	Sailor	56	56	3	Sailor	24	24											
			1	Sailor	49	49	3	Sailor	21	21											
			1	Sailor	45	45	3	Sailor	10	14											
			1	Sailor	217	217	11	Sailor	46	46											
			1	Sailor	399	429	52	Sailor	515	525											
			1	Sailor	1083	1156															

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

To

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

25. March

1876

48
209

91

276
L. S. - German 1096
Klausurarbeit 18. 1

To

Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

1853
Wm. H. H. H.
Genl. of the

47
209

73

73

To

Department,
General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Officer's designation)

Carry over
Dip. General of 1816

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			Remarks.			Remarks.	Orders.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.			Period.	Amount.			Period.	Amount.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
No.	Date.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	

Bkford 1153 - 1172 -																							
1	Police	65	65	1	Police	65	65																
1	Police	16	16	1	Police	25	25																
3	Police	30	30	1	Police	16	16																
5	Total	111	111	16	Total	216	216																
1	Police	25	25	1	Police	25	25																
3	Police	48	48	1	Police	16	16																
10	Police	110	110	3	Police	33	33																
4	Police	40	40	3	Police	30	30																
4	Police	38	38	3	Police	28	28																
22	Total	261	261	11	Total	132	132																
27	Total	372	372	27	Total	372	372																
Total difference 11525 - 12300 -																							

25. March 1885.

To The Secretary to Government Through the Accountant

Department, General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695, dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *[Signature]*
(Officer's designation) *[Designation]*

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositi																								
Order rank- tioning present Establish- ment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposi- tion refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recom- mendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.		
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPART- MENT.				FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.		
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.								
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Amount.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.			Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.
No.	Date.																							

69
10.9

9.

Carnesford 12096 - - 12097 - -

To

Department,

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Mary Higgins
 Elizabeth Arnold of Hills

49
100

101

Whangbehut District, N. B.

Current from 12497 8 - 13302 8 -

25. June 1885.

ary to Government
rough the Accountant

ence to G. O. No. 1695,
 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

George Wyman
 (nation) ¹⁸⁶¹ ~~1862~~ General of Mills.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.						PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
			PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.						DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.					Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.			Maximum.	Period.			Amount.	Period.			Amount.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
No.	Date.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				</

Before 12497 8 - 13302 8 -

1	Sailor	50	75
1	Clerk	35	40
1	Head Cook	9	9
4	Head Cook	32	32
1	Head	7	7
8		133	163

1	Head Constable	15	15
2	Constable	16	16
2	Head	14	14
3	Head	14	14
8		64	64

Grand Total 197 8 - 227 8 -

Grand Total 12695 - 13530 -

25. March 1887

To

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

Department,

General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Chief Secretary to Govt.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions for																			
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.						PROPOSITION.				Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.			
				PRESENT SCALE.			PROPOSED SCALE.			PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.		
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.				Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Remarks.
Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.			Amount.	Amount.			Period.	Amount.			Period.	Amount.				
No.	Date.																		

Handwritten list of charges and amounts:

- 1. ...
- 2. ...
- 3. ...
- 4. ...
- 5. ...
- 6. ...
- 7. ...
- 8. ...
- 9. ...
- 10. ...
- 11. ...
- 12. ...
- 13. ...
- 14. ...
- 15. ...
- 16. ...
- 17. ...
- 18. ...
- 19. ...
- 20. ...
- 21. ...
- 22. ...
- 23. ...
- 24. ...
- 25. ...
- 26. ...
- 27. ...
- 28. ...
- 29. ...
- 30. ...
- 31. ...
- 32. ...
- 33. ...
- 34. ...
- 35. ...
- 36. ...
- 37. ...
- 38. ...
- 39. ...
- 40. ...
- 41. ...
- 42. ...
- 43. ...
- 44. ...
- 45. ...
- 46. ...
- 47. ...
- 48. ...
- 49. ...
- 50. ...
- 51. ...
- 52. ...
- 53. ...
- 54. ...
- 55. ...
- 56. ...
- 57. ...
- 58. ...
- 59. ...
- 60. ...
- 61. ...
- 62. ...
- 63. ...
- 64. ...
- 65. ...
- 66. ...
- 67. ...
- 68. ...
- 69. ...
- 70. ...
- 71. ...
- 72. ...
- 73. ...
- 74. ...
- 75. ...
- 76. ...
- 77. ...
- 78. ...
- 79. ...
- 80. ...
- 81. ...
- 82. ...
- 83. ...
- 84. ...
- 85. ...
- 86. ...
- 87. ...
- 88. ...
- 89. ...
- 90. ...
- 91. ...
- 92. ...
- 93. ...
- 94. ...
- 95. ...
- 96. ...
- 97. ...
- 98. ...
- 99. ...
- 100. ...

1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6																		
7																		
8																		
9																		
10																		
11																		
12																		
13																		
14																		
15																		
16																		
17																		
18																		
19																		
20																		
21																		
22																		
23																		
24																		
25																		
26																		
27																		
28																		
29																		
30																		
31																		
32																		
33																		
34																		
35																		
36																		
37																		
38																		
39																		
40																		
41																		
42																		
43																		
44																		
45																		
46																		
47																		
48																		
49																		
50																		
51																		
52																		
53																		
54																		
55																		
56																		
57																		
58																		
59																		
60																		
61																		
62																		
63																		
64																		
65																		
66																		
67																		
68																		
69																		
70																		
71																		
72																		
73																		
74																		
75																		
76																		
77																		
78																		
79																		
80																		
81																		
82																		
83																		
84																		
85																		
86																		
87																		
88																		
89																		
90																		
91																		
92																		
93																		
94																		
95																		
96																		
97																		
98																		
99																		
100																		

25 March 1885

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature) *[Signature]*
(Officer's designation) *[Designation]*

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Statement of Propositions.																							
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.								PROPOSITION.								Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.	
				PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.				PERMANENT.		TEMPORARY.				DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.				
				No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.							
						Minimum.	Maximum.			Minimum.	Maximum.			Amount.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.				
No.	Date.																						

Proposed to be added
to the establishment
of the
Department of
Revenue
for the
year 1887-88
at the rate of
Rs. 100 per month
for the
period of
12 months
from the
1st of January
1887

102 8 -

102 8 -

104 -

Department,

The Secretary to Government, General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695, dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Chief Secretary to Government

25th March 1887

207

The Secretary to Government
Through the Accountant

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

George Rogers
(nation) Chief of the band

11/11/11

No.

From

The Acct. Gen^l no. A.D.T
357

of 26th May 1885.

The J. G. of Jails, of 30th ^{March} May/85
no. 90.

FOR ORDERS.

The J. G. of Jails with his letter marginally noted submitted a proposition statement for substituting warden for Police Guards in all the jails in the Presidency except the Central Jails of Coimbatore, Rajahmundry, and Vellore in which the system has already been introduced.

In working out the cost of the present and proposed establishments the J. G. has

RECEIVED NO.

From
The Acct-Genl
Madras.

V.O. A.D.T
357

Dated 26.

C.V.O. 1198 with
Encls: 1st.

Subject

Re: Forwarding the Proposition
Statement from Inspector
General of Jails to the

Recd. 6/5/85

taken two different bases of calculation. Instead of finding the average monthly cost of the Police Guards at the various jails, he has taken the cost of those guards as they actually existed in the month of November /84, while in calculating the warden guard required in lieu of the police he bases his calculations upon the numbers each jail will accommodate.

~~The result is that~~
the cost of the proposed establishment exceeds that of the police establishment existing in November /84 by something more than Rs 3000 monthly, and taking advantage of his imperfect method of calculation, the J. G. boldly says that the increase is nominal only.

apparently wishes to imply that the average cost of the police guard is not less than the proposed warden guard, but this can only be proved by calculation and if the J. G. has made that calculation he should submit his figures to Govt.

There are many items in the proposition statement calling for remarks, but before going into these it is thought that the J. G. should be directed to submit a statement showing the average ^{monthly} strength and cost of the present police guards at each jail, and the no. of prisoners each jail will accommodate.

A draft J. M. is put up.

HAS
19/6.

No. 1261



DEPARTMENT. 113

Official Memorandum.

Dated the 10th May 1885.

With reference to the letter of the J. G. of Jails of 25th March, 1885, no. 76, the undersigned is directed to request that officer to submit a statement showing the average ^{during 1884} monthly strength and cost of the police guard at each of the jails to which the letter quoted above relates, and also the number of prisoners which each of those jails will accommodate.

HAS
19/5

JW

FOR ORDERS.

Qua De

187120

187121

187122

note

Statement showing the average monthly strength and cost of Police Guards during 1884, also the number of prisoners each Jail will accommodate.

Police Guards 1884

Cost for the year 1884
Average monthly strength
Number of prisoners each Jail will accommodate

Names of the Jails.

Remarks.

Bewolcondah Hill Jail	21	1,971	159	
Berhampore District Jail	22	2,076	211	
Bizagapatam do	33	3,506	182	
Berwathpur Hill Jail	20	1,912	105	
Rajahmundry District Jail	19	1,911	156	
Guantanamo do	26	2,517	199	
Mellore do	27	2,522	273	
Rurnool do	20	2,029	182	
Bellary do	34	3,356	478	
Buddapah do	27	2,917	197	
Chittoor do	24	2,382	320	
Salam Central	47	5,093	747	
Buddalore District	27	2,909	364	
Tanjore do	37	3,988	216	
Trichinopoly Central	74	7,776	1,149	
do District	22	2,256	196	
Madurai do	27	2,906	489	
Trinnevelly do	27	3,056	335	
Katant do	29	3,132	266	
Kannanore Central	49	5,406	925	
Mangalore District	16	1,539	291	
Palaamundi do	29	4,027	209	
Her Majesty's Penitentiary	56	5,880	797	

Note. The figures in col. 5 do not include the tailor, dy. tailor, or clerks.

Buddalore

~~Bottom~~

21st August 1885

Murray Pyramet

Inspector General of Jails.

N 221

6P
123

Cuddalore 21st August 1885

From

A. R. Grimes Esq
Inspector General of Police

To The Honble C. F. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government
Madras

Sir

Encl 1

Referring to official
Memorandum No 126, dated 10th
Ultimo I have the honor to forward
the enclosed statements showing the
average monthly strength and cost
of Police guards during the year
1884 and also the number of
prisoners sent to jail with accommo-
dation called for in the referred
under acknowledgment.

A

125
I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Henry P. Jones.

Secretary General of bills

CURRENT NO. 31240

JUDICIAL.

Jail (1885) Department.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

to Government

Dated

21st August 1885.

Received

No. 221

/ ENCLOSURE

SUBJECT.

*Forwarding statement
showing the average monthly
strength and cost of Police
guards during the year
1884.*

*Papers are at
with Police
1885-30/10*

129

Accountant General's Report.

No. ^{ADS} 376a

The entries in the Column of "Present Scale" have been compared with the Registers of this Office, and are correct with the exception of the items altered in ~~relating to the Jail Police guards for which no~~ fixed scale is recorded in the Audit Registers as their strength varies from time to time according to number of prisoners in the Jail.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Fort Saint George,
9th September 1885

J. H. W. Hammett
Off. Deputy Accountant General.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

No.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,

The

18

Secretary to the Government
of Fort St. George.

135

131

To

The Secretary to Government General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
Through the Accountant dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

135

133

To

The Secretary to Government General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
Through the Accountant dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

comp. *Hyman*
dupl. of *fact*.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present Establishment.	Government of Department.	to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.						PROPOSITION.												Grounds of Proposition.	Local Government's recommendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
			PRESENT SCALE.			PROPOSED SCALE.			PERMANENT.			TEMPORARY.						DEPARTMENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
			No.	Designation.	Pay.	No.	Designation.	Pay.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Amount.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.					Remarks.	Remarks.			Orders.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
												Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
											RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.		RS.	A.	P.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		

Colacum
3rd September 1888

To

The Secretary to Government
 Through the Accountant General, with reference to G. O. No. 1695,
 Dated the 23rd September 1878, Financial Department.

(Signature)

(Officer's designation)

Wm. H. Smith
Officer in Charge

No. 229

Pottamunda 3rd September 1885.

From.

H. A. Grimes Esquire
Inspector General ofails.

To.

The Hon'ble E. F. Webster,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Pottamunda.

Sir,

The Accountant General
having raised an objection
to pass certain charges con-
nected with the revised
Establishment sanctioned for
the District Jail at Tanjore,
on the ground that the Establish-
ment as given in G. O. No. 2389
dated 18th September 1884. J. F.
not having been entered in
the proposition statement
(under)

1071. 24-6-85
2208-4-10-84
1046-30-4-84

QUERENT NO. 32

JUDICIAL.

Jail (1885) Department.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

Obamacare

Dated

3rd

Received

11th

September 1885.

No. 229

ENCLOSURE

SUBJECT.

*Submit revised
Proposition Statement
to be substituted for
the District Jails at
Lanjore and Lumbini.*

No.



Judicial

DEPARTMENT.

163

Official Memorandum.

Dated the

1885.

25th March 85. No 76.

21st Aug. 85. No 221.

3rd Sept. 85. No. 229.

The Inspector General of Jails is requested with reference to the marginally noted letters to state whether the ~~proposed~~ ^{proposed} warder establishment ^{is} to be substituted for the existing Police guards in the jails referred to, ~~the same~~ will be sufficient to perform the escort duties which will in future fall upon the

Note

This S.O. must be answered before the reforms proposed can be sanctioned. The practice of mixing up two or three subjects in one letter is not infrequently resorted to and will not be allowed. In G.O. 8th December 84. No 3207. Jud par. 1. it was directed that the jail guard establishment should be wholly discontinued in future to be performed by the jail guard establishment. It was also stated that the jail guard establishment should be wholly discontinued in future to be performed by the jail guard establishment. But it is not clear whether the course has been followed.

*Point out the mistake in the
it comes and 11/11/85*

2. This stated that in para 4
of the letter d. 25 March 85. 1876
the T.C. refers to the question of
the Protective guards, a subject not
dealt with in the early portion of
the letter, nor in the accompanying
Proposition statement. The
T.C. should take ^{such} care in future
that only one subject is dealt
with in each letter. Any variation
from the practice causes great
confusion.

[Signature]

The necessities of official
correspondence demand
that separate matters should
be dealt with in separate
triple communications
and the Inspector General
is requested to draw
this rule in future
W. J. [Signature]

Q17: 699 722

At 8.00. 20/1/13
B. G. P. S.

F. C. S.

86

From,

Henry. R. Grimes Esq.
Inspector General of Sails.

40

The Chief Secretary to Government
P Ootacamund

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Official Memorandum dated 30 September 1885 No 1713 and in reply I have the honor to state that the Warder Establishment proposed to be substituted for the existing Police Guards in the Sails referred to will be sufficient to perform the escort duties which will in future fall upon the Sail Establishment without recourse to extra temporary hands.

2. With reference to the 2nd paragraph of your Memorandum the instructions therein contained shall be attended to in future.

3. Should the proposition now before Government, which was submitted with my letter No 76 dated 25th March 1886 be sanctioned, I request that the new system of guarding in the Sails therein referred to may not be introduced until 1st January 1886 by which date all necessary arrangements, viz enlisting the men obtaining their arms, uniforms &c. &c. can be satisfactorily made.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most Obedt. Servant

Mary P. Pinner.

Inspector General of Sails.

1404-21-581-

Proceed

CURRENT NO. 2667

JUDICIAL.

Jail (1885) Department.

FROM
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO
THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

Costacumund

Dated 2nd } October 1885
Received 3rd }

No. 271

ENCLOSURE

SUBJECT.

States that the Warden
Establishment will be
sufficient to perform
escort duties and re-
quests that the new sys-
tem of guarding in the
Jails may not be intro-
duced until 1st January
1886.

*Order the
Governor.*

1492

*After 14th. 4 p.m. put
by field with it.
Send int. - - -
by
3/11/85*

*Received
14th 1885
for 14th 1885
for 14th 1885
for 14th 1885
for 14th 1885*

5/11/85

14th

No. 151
 From I.C. Jails Just. Com. No. 1979 (~~1979~~)
 " " " 3667

FOR ORDERS.

The I.C. of Jails submits a proposition statement for the substitution of warden guards for police guards. The total cost of the present and proposed schemes establishments is per annum:-

Rs. 2,01,419	(present)	and
Rs. 1,77,120	(proposed)	
<u>Rs. 24,299</u>	<u>Difference</u>	

The establishment proposed would therefore be considerably cheaper than that at present existing, but the figures given above do not quite accurately represent the difference, as the amount shown as the cost of the proposed establishment does not include the cost of arms & clothing. The cost of the present establishment is taken from the Adm^t Report (Jails) for 1884, ~~and is somewhat in excess of~~ The cost of the Police Guards as there given exceeds the amount given by the I.C. of Jails

in his letter of 21st August, 1885
no. 221. Part. Cur. no. 3040.

Possibly the discrepancy may
be due to the J.G. having ex-
cluded the cost of clothing &
arms. If that is so, the cost
of the present establishment ^{exclusive}
of Police uniforms &
arms is Rs 1,98,789, and the
saving which would be effected
by the change proposed is
Rs 21,669.

Financially, therefore,
the proposal is commendable,
and might have been passed
last June if the J.G. had shown
the average monthly cost of the
present police guard instead of
taking the cost for one month
only.

2. It is submitted, however,
that the J.G. has framed his
estimate of the number of guards
required for many of the jails
too high. I have added two
columns to ~~the~~ statement for-
warded with his letter of 21st
August, 1885, no 221, for the
purpose of showing the pro-
portion the proposed warden
guards will bear to the total

He might be asked as to this.
HLS
22/10

number of prisoners that
each jail will accommodate.

Statement no. XV appended
to the jail admⁿ Rpt^t gives
the average daily n^o ^{of convicts} and the
maximum population on any one
day. It is submitted that the
no. of guards required could be
~~but~~ ^{reduced} at by fixing them ~~at~~
so that there shall be one
warden guard to every 6 of the
maximum population. Thus
the guard required for Nellore
(Capacity 273: max. popⁿ 113) wd.
be 19 instead of 40 men as
proposed by the J.G. Similarly
the guard for Chittoor would
be 28 instead of 47, for
Cuddalore 38 instead of 53, for
Madura 41 ——— 71, for
Mangalore 18 ——— 42 and
so on. The number of
guards required if this sys-
tem of calculation is adopt-
ed would be considerably
less than the number pro-
posed by M^r Guines, who has
neglected actuals altogether

The J. G. proposes to divide the rank and file of the warden guard into three classes giving them Rs 9, Rs 8, and Rs 7 per man per mensem. The pay of the corresponding ranks in the Police is Rs 8, Rs 7 and Rs 6.8, but perhaps the more monotonous duty of the warden requires better pay than that of the constable.

It should however be remembered that the cost of guarding prisoners is higher in Madras than in any other province.

Submitted that J. G. be requested to frame his estimates on the basis of calculation suggested above and re-submit them to Govt.

HAS
22/10

Warden Guard

H.M.

FOR ORDERS.

	Guards & Establishment per head of average no.
* Madras ..	Rs. 39. 5. 9
Bombay.	Rs 36. 9. 0
Bengal.	Rs 30. 7. 7
N. W. P.	Rs. 20. 11. 3
~~Assam~~ ..	~~Rs~~

No. 1863



DEPARTMENT.

90
155

Official Memorandum.

Dated the

188

The undersigned is directed to return the proposition statement submitted by the J. G. of jails with his letter d/25th March, 1885, No. 76, and to point out that the J. G. appears to have taken the capacity of each jail as the basis of calculation of the number of wardens required to guard it. An inspection of the Statement XV of the Admⁿ

* Bellore:	Capacity 273	Max. pop ⁿ 113	Report of the Jail Dept. for 1884 shows that the ^{max.} ~~cap~~ population of many of the jails* was very considerably less than their capacity, and the average daily strength was in most cases at
Chittoor:	" 320	" 167	
Cuddalore:	" 364	" 226	
Madura:	" 489	" 249	
Mangalore:	" 291	" 107	

least 50 per cent less than the maximum population on any one day. It is obvious, therefore that the basis of calculation adopted by the J.G. cannot be accepted, and he will ~~not~~ now re-cast his estimates in accordance with the actual requirements of each jail. It is presumed that the Police Guard which has hitherto performed the duties of watch and ward was always regulated by the actual convict population. If this is so the average strength of the Police Guard for (say) the past three years will afford a satisfactory index of the number of men required to perform those duties, and the existing ~~establishment~~ ^{first} should ~~at once~~ be increased by the number

Bellary	32	*
Madura	45	
Cuddalore	25	
Chittoor	24	
Mangalore	30	
Kellore	13	

10 J.
of police constables whose services are dispensed with under the new system of guardings. This number will be obtained by subtracting the no. of the Protective Guard from the average no. of the Police Guard, obtained as suggested above. If this method is applied to the present proposals of the J.G. it will be found that he has provided for a very considerable margin in the case of many jails*. The Govt. quite understand that a margin is necessary both for the performance of the duty of escorting prisoners, now to be taken over by the Jail Dept., and to meet casualties. But this margin must be

arrived at by some intelligible method of calculation. The I.C. of Police will be able to furnish figures on which the calculation of the numbers required for escort duty can be based; and these should be obtained and the method of calculation clearly explained when Mr. Grimes next submits his proposals to Govt.

The Govt. also understand that cases ~~may arise~~ in which the peculiarities in construction or situation of particular jails require some ~~more~~ departure from the general principles of calculation indicated above, and they will be quite ready to sanction extra men in such cases provided the necessity is clearly explained.

Turning now to the financial bearing of the scheme, as at present proposed by the I.C., the error of taking the figures of the police guard for one month only is at once apparent

118
The total cost of the Jail Establishment and of the Police Guards for the jails in question during the year 1884 was Rs. 2,01,419 while the cost of the proposed establishment, including the Protective ^{Guard}, is Rs 1,77,120 showing a saving of Rs 24,299. The Govt. are however not certain whether items have been included in the cost of establishment as given in the Admⁿ Report which do not appear in the proposition statements submitted.

It is also noticed that there is a slight discrepancy between the cost of Police Guards as given in the Admin. Report and the I.C.'s letter of 21st August, 1885, No. 221 respectively. Nor is it known whether the amounts given for this head of charge include the cost of clothing and arms or not.

The undersigned is directed
to request the D. C. of jails
to explain all these points
fully and to furnish sufficient
information to ^{enable} ~~permit~~ a com-
parison to be made between
^{the cost of} the present and proposed es-
tablishments. -

HAS

24/10

W
24-10-85

603/86. 203/86

Wm. J. J.

No 33

126
15-3

Madras 5th February 1886

From

A. B. Grimes Esq

Inspector General of Jails

To

The Chief Secretary

to Government

Fort St George

Sir

With reference to official Memorandum No 1863 dated 30th October last, I have the honor to submit a revised Proposition statement for the full complement of the Jail guard service inclusive of the Protective Police guard required for the District Jails only.

2. In the statement originally submitted a Protective Police Guard was shown for the Central as well as the District Jails but after a years experience of departmental guarding at Rajahmundry, Vellore and Coimbatore, it has been found that the Police Protective

Guard is not necessary and that we are paying for men who have little or nothing to do, whereas if our own guards were increased by a corresponding number of men we should be fully able to meet all requirements for escort duty and casualties. Our Warden Guards being principally composed of pensioned Sepoys, is quite as effective as an armed body, as the Police Reserve and when the jails were guarded entirely by the Police. No protective guard was considered necessary I fail to see any necessity for retaining it now. I have therefore in the Central jails only taken the number of men allowed for the protective guard and added them to the number of the lowest grade wardens. In the District jails I have retained the Police protective guard as I do not consider it would be desirable in these jails to do without it, certainly not for the present.

3 In framing the statement now

138 135
submitted the average jail population for the last three years has been taken as a basis of calculation and one warder has been allowed to every 7 Convicts to which 10% has been added to meet requirements for the performance of escort duty and for casualties, this refers more especially to District jails - the revised establishment will therefore be found to be very much under that proposed in the original statement and the cost has also been reduced by Rupees 24,888 per annum.

4 A sum of Rupees 28,020 has been provided in the Budget estimate of this Department for the year 1886/87 under Saderward and contingencies to meet the cost of uniforms to be supplied to the new jail guard.

5 In conclusion I trust the Government will consider the revised Proposition statement satisfactory

and reasonable and will be pleased
to accord their sanction to it at an
early date in order that men may
be enlisted, drilled and accoutred
so as to enable me to take over the
guarding from the Police Department
at the commencement of the coming
official year, the 1st April next.

b. The original statement
together with the revised one is
forwarded for comparison.


I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant
Henry Pyman.
Inspector General of Fairs

my

Thro' the Accountant General
Fort St. George



132

167

July 30-10-87: 1863

1653-

JUDICIAL.

Jail (1886,) Department.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

Fort St. George

Dated 5
Received

} February 1886.

No. 33

ENCLOSURE.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding revised
proposition statement
to Jail guard.

No. 42

167

Salem 21st February 1886.

From.

Henry R. Grimes Esquire.
Inspector General of Jails.

To.

The Chief Secretary
to Government.
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

With reference to your official
Memorandum No. 330^c dated 19th
Instant. I have the honor to
forward a copy of this office
letter therein called for.

* No 76 dated
25th March 1885

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Henry R. Grimes.
Inspector General of Jails.

RECEIVED
JUDICIAL.
CURRENT NO. 725

Jail (1886) Department.

FROM
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,
Salem

TO
THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.
Fort Saint George

Dated 20th February 1886.
Received

No. 42


ENCLOSURE /

SUBJECT.

Forwarding copy of
this office letter No. 76
dated 25th March 1886

Enc. 752
... with the ...
... to ...
... for ...
...

No. 824C



6 heading only
Jail. DEPARTMENT.
173

Official Memorandum.

10/10/86
Dated the 10th May 1886.
The S.G. of Jails is informed, with reference to his letter dated the 5th Feb^r 86. no. 33, that the Government are unable to pass orders thereon in the absence of more certain information regarding the cost of the proposed scale (as compared with the existing system) of jail wardens. It is observed that the revised proposition statement, rec^d with the letter above mentioned, shows a net monthly increase of Rs. 48-12-03 but it is uncertain by what date this figure is arrived at. The S.G. has not stated on what principle he has arrived at the ~~present~~ "present scale". Shown in the proposition, and in the absence of certain information on this point - the comparison betwⁿ the present & proposed scales ^{can} not be relied on. It is observed that the "present

13/5

13/5

scale" shown in the revised proposition Statement differs materially from the average monthly strength of Police Guard for the year 1884 shown in the Statement submitted with the Dy. S. letter of 21 Aug 85 no. 221. The Dy. will state on what data the present scale is based.

2. In para. 2 of his letter dated 25 March 85 no. 26, the Dy. stated that the annual increase involved in the new scheme was (Rs 2658-4-0 x 12) Rs. 31899. In his letter of the 5 Feb. 86 no. 33, it is mentioned that the scheme ~~was~~ has been reduced by Rs 24888 per annum below that proposed in the original Statement. The annual increase involved in the revised scheme would appear therefore to amount to Rs 7011 per annum, whereas according to the revised proposition Statement an increase of Rs 648 per annum only is shown. The Dy. will explain these apparent discrepancies.

3. The Govt. wish to be furnished with clear & reliable information as to the cost of the proposed scheme as compared with the present system of Police Guards. ~~The Dy.~~ The Dy. will state clearly what the relative cost of the two systems is. The Govt. are not prepared to sanction any increase of expenditure at present.

sep
11/5

12/5

O. M. to Dy.
of Jails

No 824 B

20 Dec 1885

11/11

(Signature)

2.12/5
2.13/5

Abstract of Proposition Statement

5

Jails	Increase per month		Decrease per month		Remarks
	Rs.	as.	Rs.	as.	
Trichinopoly—Central	72	8	"	"	
Rajahmundry—do	"	"	23	"	
Vellore—do	"	"	29	"	
Coimbatore—do	"	"	29	"	
Salem—do	"	"	27	"	
Bannanore—do	"	"	30	"	
Penitentiary	"	"	62	"	{ This will have to be reduced to Rs. 41 owing to 3 warders since sanctioned in G.O. of 11 May 1886 No. 1245 Pres.
Russellcondah—Hill	24	8	"	"	
Berhampore—District	"	"	8	"	
Vizagapatam—do	"	"	10	8	
Parvatipur—Hill	26	8	"	"	
Rajahmundry—District	44	8	"	"	
Buntor—do	17	"	"	"	
Vellore—do	31	8	"	"	
Kurnool—do	13	"	"	"	
Bellary—do	15	"	"	"	
Cuddapah—do	9	12	"	"	
Chittoor—do	4	8	"	"	
Cuddalore—do	30	"	"	"	
Tanjore—do	"	"	20	8	
Trichinopoly—do	16	"	"	"	
Madura—do	68	8	"	"	
Tinnevely—do	"	"	112	"	
Cochin—do	"	"	"	"	
Calicut—do	50	8	"	"	
Mangalore—do	6	"	"	"	
Coimbatore—do	"	"	"	"	
Cotacamund—do	"	"	37	8	
European Prison	"	"	"	"	
Debtors Prison	"	"	"	"	
Total Prisons	429	12	381	"	Difference Rs. 48-12-"

Henry R. James
Inspector General of Jails

No 158

2P
Cotacamb
1st June 1886.
177

From,

Henry R. Grimes Esq
Inspector Genl of Sails.
To.

The Honble C. F. Webster
Chief Secretary to Government
Cotacamb

Sir,

Enclosure

In reply to your Official Memorandum, dated 20th Instant, No 824 C. Calling on me for more certain information regarding the cost of the proposed scheme of Sail Wardens as compared with the existing system. I have the honor to state that the increase of Rs 48-12-0 per annum shown in the Proposition Statement was arrived at on comparing the existing sanctioned scale of the Sails Establishments.

Just 2007
2/180

Establishments, and the cost of the Police Guard with the proposed Establishment inclusive of the Protective Police Guard which it has been determined, should be retained in all the District Sails.

2. The principle adopted for arriving at the "present scale" shown in the Proposition Statement was by taking the existing sanctioned Jail Establishments together with the number and cost of the Police Guard from a Statement furnished by the Inspector General of Police with reference to the number provided by that Officer in his Budget Estimate for the year 1885-86. The material difference referred to between the present scale shown in the revised Proposition

to the average
not having been
taken for the year 1884 in framing
the revised Proposition Statement,
because the information obtained from the Inspector General of Police was of more recent date.

30
Statement and the average monthly strength of Police Guards for the year 1884 as shown in the statement submitted with my letter dated 21st August 1885 N^o 221 is owing to the average not having been taken for the year 1884 in framing the revised Proposition Statement, because the information obtained from the Inspector General of Police was of more recent date.

3. The revised Proposition Statement now submitted forms a complete one for all Sails in the Presidency, differing from the one submitted with my letter N^o 76 dated 25th March 1885, which did not embody the Central Sails at Rajahmundry, Vellore and Coimbatore, furthermore it was framed

framed with reference to the accommodation afforded by each Jail. The actual difference between the original Proposition Statement and the revised one is Rupees 1968 per mensem, or Rupees 23,616 per annum.

4. In regard to the relative cost of the two systems, the information is given in the revised Proposition Statement under the heads present and proposed scales.

5. The increase of Rs 48-12-0 in the revised proposed scale is one of remote effect, as many of the Jail subordinates will have to serve for sometime, before they become entitled to their maximum salaries, and if the proposed abolition of the District Jails of Rajahmundry, and Trichinopoly

This has nothing to do with it -
The 17th of 1881
of the 17th of 1881
of the 17th of 1881

48 181
is sanctioned there will be a monthly saving of Rs 678-4-0 or Rs 8,139 per annum after deducting Rs 48-12-0 net increase shown in the Proposition Statement and Rs 21 pay of 3 additional Warders sanctioned for the Penitentiary.

6. I beg under the circumstances explained Government will be pleased to pass early orders, as there is constant reference made to this subject by Superintendents of Jails and the Police. Should the general scheme as now proposed not meet with approval, I would request that the guarding by Warders may be sanctioned for all Central Jails, and that the Police Protective Guards to the Central Jails of Rajahmundry, Vellore and Coimbatore be abolished.

there

187
there will be a saving of Rs
106-8 per annum or Rs 1,278
per annum in the cost of
guarding the Central Jails, if
this is done.

7. The revised Proposition
Statement is herewith re-
turned.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedt Servant,

Henry Pyramus.

Inspector General of Jails.

H.

CURRENT NO. 2007
JUDICIAL.
Jail (1886) Department.

FROM
THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF JAILS,

TO
THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT.

Estimate

Dated 1. } June 1886
Received 2. }

No. 158

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.

*Returning revised
Proposition Statement
with explanation.*

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

From

No.

Inspector Genl of Jails dated 25th March 85, 31st
March 85, 21st August 85, 2nd October 85, 5th
Feb. 86. Nos 76, 90, 221, 271/85- + 33/86.

FOR ORDERS.

The foregoing papers contain the proposals of
the I.G. of Jails for replacing the Police Guards in
the Jails of this Presidency by a Jail Warden
Guard.

G.O. 22nd April 84 - no. 989 J.G. sanctioned the
scheme of replacing police by jail warders in the
3 central Jails of Rajahmundry, Vellore and
Coimbatore, and directed the I.G. to submit proposals
for a similar scheme in all remaining central &
district Jails.

Accordingly, in his letter dated 25th March 85,
no. 76, the I.G. submitted a Proposition Statement
for the revision of ~~the~~ subordinate jail guard
establishments in the remaining central & district
jails of the Presidency. This Proposition Statement
was in several respects unsatisfactory. In the
first place the figures given in the columns headed
"present scale" were based on the strength of the
Police guards in the ^{single} month of November 1884, instead
of on the average strength for the year or several
years. In the second place, the figures given in the
columns headed "proposed scale" were based on
the actual average population of the Jail but upon
the total number which each jail could accommodate.
For the first mistake, no reason is apparent,
but with regard to the second, it must be stated
that Mr. Grimes, in fixing the guard on the basis
of the accommodating power of the jail instead of
on the ^{average} jail population, only followed the views of
Col. Tennant set forth in paras. 15 to 17 of his letter
dated 30th November 1883 - no. 341, which received
the approval of Govt.

G.O. 11th Jan. 84 - no. 60
G.O. 22nd April 84 - no. 954

Several references for further information were made to the Dy. and finally O. M. no. 1863. dated 30. October 1885, returned the Proposition Statement to the Dy., and directed him

- (1) to revise his proposed scale of establishments with reference to the actual requirements, i.e. to the average population of the jails.
- (2) to revise his present scale of establishments by basing his figures, not on a single month, but on the average of a year.

Finally he was requested to give full information on all points, sufficient to enable a comparison to be made between the cost of the present and proposed establishments.

With his letter, dated 3. Feb. 86. no. 33 (submitted thro' the Accountant-General) the Dy. resubmits his proposals, with a fresh Proposition statement: in this statement the following alterations appear:

- (1) ^{states that he} he has now based his proposed scale of establishments on the average jail population of the last 3 years - as directed by the above-mentioned O. M. - and has allowed one warder to every seven convicts - plus 10 per cent. extra to meet casualties & escort duty.
- (2) he has, presumably, based the estimate of present establishment on an average instead of on a single month, but he does not say so.
- (3) in all the central jails he has determined to do away altogether with any Police guard. Col. Tennant had proposed in all Jails to retain a Police Protective Guard. Mr. Grimes says that a year's experience in the 3 central jails - (Rajahmundry, Vellore & Coimbatore) - into which the system of warder guards has been already introduced, has shown that the police protective guard is not necessary & that the warder guard, being principally composed of prisoners,

Sepoys, is quite as effective an armed body as the Police reserve.

Orders have now to be passed on the Inspector General's revised proposals.

It is, in the first place, desirable to note ~~the~~ ^{large} the reduction in the proposed establishments effected in the revised Proposition Statement as compared with the first Proposition Statement ^{submitted} in consequence of the instructions given in O. M. 30. October 1885 no. 1863. This reduction amounts on the District Jails to Rs. 25788 p.a. the Central Jails show an increase of Rs. 1284 p.a. ^{thus there is} ~~showing~~ a net reduction of Rs. 24500.

The details of this calculation are shown in the Statement marked A, appended to this Note. From this, it is evident that the O. M. of 30. Oct. 85. ^{effecting} ~~has effected~~ a considerable saving.

II. It seems quite impossible to effect any satisfactory comparison between the ^{cost of} the proposed establishments and of existing establishments. Financial Statement - no. 8 at page 93 of the Jail Report for 1884, shows that in that year, the cost was as follows under the following heads:-

Fixed Establishments -	Rs. 1,96,058
Police Guard . . .	Rs. 1,11,576
or together . . .	Rs. 3,07,634

The Dy.'s revised Proposition Statement shows these results:

Present scale - Rs. 213,492 p.a.

Proposed scale - Rs. 214,140 p.a.

It is obvious that these figures do not correspond. The "Proposed scale" (Rs. 214,140) does indeed include all the police guard, but necessarily omits many

No.

From

FOR ORDERS.

agree, & column 2 differs. In his revised proposition statement, the I. J. compares the "proposed scale" with the above col. 2 to show relative cost: but we know, from col. 3 - that the average strength of the Police ^{guards} in 1884 - was in many cases very different from that assumed in col. 2 to be its "present scale". Therefore the I. J.'s comparison of "present" & "proposed" scales does - not appear to be strictly trustworthy.

In para. 2 of his letter of the 25th March 86 no. 76, the I. J. states that the establishments there proposed involve an increase of Rs. 2658 - 4 - 0 per mensem or Rs. 31899 per annum. In para. 3 of his letter of the 5th Feb^r 86 - no. 33, he states that the establishments now proposed have been reduced by Rs. 24883 per annum below the cost of his original proposals. If these figures were correct, ^{in fact the revised proposals, over present establishments} the increase would therefore be Rs. 7011 per annum, whereas his Proposition Statement shows an apparent increase of Rs. 648 per annum. This discrepancy is sufficient to ^{show how little reliance can be placed on} ~~be~~ the I. J.'s calculations.

III. Statement B. attached to this note, shows that, in District Jails, the I. J. has now worked out his establishments fairly accurately, on the basis proposed. Taking the average population of each jail for the last 3 years, and allowing one warder for every

FOR ORDERS.

items or heads of charge included in the Fixed Establishment (Rs. 196058) as shown in the Jails Administrative Report. Sweepers, scavengers & other menial establishments, are not included in the present Proposition Statement. It does not appear possible therefore to exhibit a comparison between the Jail Returns and the proposed scheme.

Nor is it very plain what ^{the actual relative} cost of the proposed scheme ^{as compared with} ~~these~~ ^{present} portions of expenditure shown as "Present Scale" in the Proposition Statement. The I. J. apparently means - that whereas the "present scale" costs Rs 213,492 p.a., the corresponding "proposed scale" costs Rs. 214140 or Rs. 648 per annum more. But it is by no means certain that the I. J.'s general figures of "present scale" are right. Comparing his first Proposition Statement with the revised Proposition Statement, and with the figures given in enclosure to his letter dated 21st Aug 85, no. 221, the following results appear:-

	Average Strength of Police		
	1 st Prop ⁿ Statement	2 nd Prop ⁿ Statement	Letter 21/8/85
Tinnevely	27	44	27
Calicut	24	29	29
Madurai	26	24	27
Tanjore Dt	29	29	37
Cuddalore	30	17	27
Pallari	34	46	34

These figures are enough to illustrate the discrepancies betw: the figures. The figures in the 1st column are the actuals of a single month (Nov. 84); the figures in the 3rd column are the average of a single year (1884); the figures in the 2nd column are ^{probably} the average of 3 years, but the I. J. does not say so. In some cases, columns 1 and 2 agree, & column 3 differs widely: in other cases columns 2 & 3 agree, & column 1 differs: in yet others columns 1 and

seven convicts of that population, plus 10 p.c. extra for casualties, the results would be as given in column 2 of the Statement B. The Jy. 's proposals are compared in column 3 - & the comparison is fairly satisfactory. These figures, of course, ^{apply} only to the warder guard, not to the Police protective guard, which has been retained in Dist. Jails. ^{Thus} As far as Dist. Jails are concerned, it is submitted that the Jy. 's proposals may be accepted.

IV. ^{The} Statement marked C. attached to this note. Shows the same figures for the Central Jails. Here the results are more open to question. In ~~the~~ ^{all the} Central Jails, the Jy. proposes to fix establishments very much below the ratio of one warder to 7 convicts, adopted in District Jails. Moreover the proposed establishments in the Central Jails include the Protective Guards, whereas in the District Jails, the Protective Guard exists over & above the Warder Establishment. Perhaps it is natural that the larger number of prisoners collected in a Central Jail should be guarded by a comparatively smaller number of guards than the smaller population of a Dist. Jail.

It is presumed that the Govt. will accept the proposal of the Jy. of Jails to do away entirely with all Police Guard in the Central Jails. Mr. Grimes, in making the proposal, has certainly assumed a considerable responsibility, but, as the head of the Dept., his opinion that a Police Protective Guard is unnecessary, must it is thought, prevail.

Altho' the establishments proposed for the Central Jails vary considerably in their relative strength, and are all considerably below the ratio of strength observed in Dist. Jails, it is sub-

mitted that they ~~may~~ ^{may} be accepted. The Jy. has asked rather for too few men than too many, and it may be presumed that he would not have taken the responsibility of doing this without sufficient cause.

It is submitted therefore, to sum up, that the scheme for the substitution of warder guards for police guards in all district & central jails of the Presidency may now be approved in the ^{revised} form in which the Jy. has submitted it, and the transfer to the Jail Dept. of the duties of jail-guarding ^{may be} ordered to be made from the 1st May or June. The unsatisfactory part of the scheme is that there is no clear statement of the cost of the ^{new} scheme: it may however be looked on as certain that any increase which may be involved, does not exceed Rs. 6000 a year, and the Jy. may perhaps be called ^{on} to furnish full & clear information on this point. In other respects the scheme appears to be fairly complete, but ~~the~~ introduction has been much delayed by the Jy. 's omission to adopt at the outset a rational basis for his calculations.

It is ^{to be} noted - that the scheme for the Penitentiary, which is included in these papers has been separately dealt with & sanctioned: (in G.O. 9-3-86, No. 612)

Rep
23/3.

FOR ORDERS.

A. Reductions in District Jails Establishments in the present as compared with the former Proposition Statement. 195

	^{increase} 1 st Prop ⁿ Statement	2 nd P.S.	Saving
Russelkonda.	Rs. 363	Rs. 317	= 46 p ^{er} m.
Berhampore - " "	Rs. 421	Rs. 320	= 101 p ^{er} m.
Vizagapatam - " "	Rs. 407	Rs. 41	= +4 p ^{er} m.
Parvatipur - " "	Rs. 322	Rs. 297	= 25 p ^{er} m.
Rajahmundry - " "	Rs. 281	Rs. 309	= +28 p ^{er} m.
Guntur - " "	Rs. 407	Rs. 341	= 66 p ^{er} m.
Nellore - " "	Rs. 493	Rs. 298	= 195 p ^{er} m.
Kurnool - " "	Rs. 312	Rs. 249	= 63 p ^{er} m.
Bellari - " "	Rs. 752	Rs. 597	= 155 p ^{er} m.
Cuddapah - " "	Rs. 414	Rs. 320	= 94 p ^{er} m.
Chittoor - " "	Rs. 548	Rs. 370	= 178 p ^{er} m.
Cuddalore - " "	Rs. 595	Rs. 422	= 173 p ^{er} m.
Tanjore - " "	Rs. 588	Rs. 370	= 218 p ^{er} m.
Tirichy - " "	Rs. 407	Rs. 298	= 109 p ^{er} m.
Madura - " "	Rs. 735	Rs. 450	= 285 p ^{er} m.
Tinnevely - " "	Rs. 588	Rs. 420	= 168 p ^{er} m.
Calicut - " "	Rs. 449	Rs. 357	= 92 p ^{er} m.
Mangalore - " "	Rs. 481	Rs. 264	= 217 p ^{er} m.
Ootacamund - " "	Rs. 246	Rs. 250	= +4 p ^{er} m.
European Prison - " "	Rs. 397	Rs. 397	= —

= this shows a total saving of Rs. 2149 per mensem or of Rs. 25,788 per annum on the J^{ails} alone; or in other words that the J^{ail}'s former proposals involved an outlay of Rs. 25788 p. a. too much!

deduct ^{an} increase in Central Jail Rs. 1284 = net reduction Rs. 24504

The J^{ail} himself - para 3. puts it at Rs. 24888 p. a.

No.

2. of Jails - dated 1st June - 10.158.

FOR ORDERS.

In the Note for orders, dated 23rd March 86, attached to O.M. 624 C. 20 May 86 - the correspondence on the Jail Warder scheme was noted in detail, and the features of the scheme fully examined. As the information on the financial bearing of the reorganization was incomplete, the above-mentioned O.M. was sent to the 2. of Jails, who has now replied.

The object of the scheme is, in central jails, to relieve the Police altogether of the duty of guarding prisoners, and to replace them by a special Jail Warder guard, enlisted in the Jail Dept., while in District Jails, the Police Protective Guard will be retained, but the actual guarding of the prisoners ^{individually} will be entrusted to the Jail Warders. The correspondence which led to the adoption of the scheme is noted in the margin. The 2. of Police complained that the Police Reserves were ruined by being unnecessarily indebted on to furnish men to fill vacancies in the Jail guard. The 2. of Jails said, that if the Police were going to charge more for their guards, his Dept. would do their own guarding. After enquiries

Q.O. 27th June 83 - 10.175

other Provinces Col. Tennant submitted a detailed scheme for the ~~formation~~ formation of a Jail warden Guard & proposed to try it experimentally in the 3 Central Jails of Rajahmundry, Vellore & Coimbatore. This was duly sanctioned, & the D.J. ordered to submit corresponding proposals for the revision of the subordinate jail establishments in the remaining districts - central jails.

G.O. 11th Jan 84. no 60.

G.O. 22nd April 84. no 989.

Mr. Primes submitted these with his letter of the 25th March 85. It is still undisposed of. But for the reasons related in the former note for orders - namely the inefficient & unsatisfactory data adopted, & information supplied; the scheme has been again and again referred back to the D.J.

It now comes up for final orders. The D.J. explains that the "present scale" in the ~~present~~ revised Proposition Statement has been obtained by taking the sanctioned strength of the Jail establishments and, adding to it, the ~~present~~ strength of the Police Guard as budgetted for in the Police Guard for 1885-86. In the O.M. no. 1563 dated 30th Dec 85. the D.J. was directed to take the average ~~present~~ strength of the Police Guards for 3 years; he has however taken only one year, because he says the figures were ^{at} latest date. The figures adopted - those of the budget 1885-86 - are probably sufficiently accurate. The "present scale" in the Proposition Statement (revised) is thus arrived at by adopting the ^{present} sanctioned Jail Establishment, so far as it exists in each case, & the strength of Police Guard ^{added} calculated to be required during 1885-86. With this present scale ^{there} is to be contrasted the "proposed scale". This is arrived at, as the D.J. states, ~~and~~ by allowing one convict warden to every 7 convicts plus 10 percent extra to meet cases

The D.J. should have stated this in his letter of the 5th Feb 86, & orders could then have been passed some months ago.

in the 1st Jail - Russell Kondah - the average population ~~of~~ last 3 years (82-83-84) has been 97: this would give an establishment of about 15 warders: the D.J. has allowed 17. In the statements marked B₂ appended to this Note, the establishments for each district & central jail are worked out on this calculation, & compared with the D.J.'s proposed scale.

If these statements are referred to, it will be seen that in the District Jails, the "proposed scale" of the D.J. corresponds with fair accuracy to the establishment worked out on the above principle. In the Central Jails, the D.J.'s proposed scale is considerably lower than that at which he arrived at on the above principle & the D.J. is not however ^{likely} to ask for too few men, & therefore the fact that the scale proposed is lower than that ~~arrived at~~ by the principle stated - need not be objected to.

Admitting the D.J.'s "present" & "proposed" scale, therefore, as generally satisfactory, it remains to be seen what is the net financial effect of the scheme. As will be observed from the Abstract of the revised Proposition Statement, the net result is an increase of Rs. 48-12 per annum or Rs. 585 per annum. To this has to be added, ^{an increase of} Rs. 21 p.m. or Rs. 252 p.a. for 3 additional warders sanctioned for the Penitentiary. This gives a total increase of Rs. 837/12 p.m. or Rs. 837 p.a.

G.O. 11th May 86 no 1214.

Against this the D.J. proposes to set off an anticipated saving to be made by abolishing the District Jails of Trichy & Rajahmundry. But, in the first place, this proposal, as is before the Finl. Dept., is not yet sanctioned. In the second place, the saving ought not to be all set off as if it was to be immediately expended on this scheme. The only set off ^{should} be allowed is the Rs. 16 per month ^{proposed by this scheme at Trichinopoly}

the Rs. 44.8. increase proposed by the scheme at the Rajahmundry. These 2 increases total Rs. 60/8 p.m. ^{if they were struck out of this list, the remaining increase would be Rs. 9/12}

The Jy. is proposed to set off the anticipated saving should, ^{however} it is submitted, be left out of account for the present the scheme should be taken as carrying with it an increase of Rs. 837 a year.

When the scheme was originally proposed, it was anticipated to yield a saving instead of an excess. Nor has any reason appeared why an excess in expenditure should be involved. The largest increases are found in the Trichinopoly Central, and the Madurai, Calicut & Rajahmundry Jails. It is therefore submitted that the Jy. may be told that the Govt. are not prepared to sanction these increases. If the Jy. can modify his proposals as regards these ~~three~~ jails, the introduction of the scheme might be sanctioned. A draft order on these lines is submitted.

29/10

8/6

Jail Warder's Guard

FOR ORDERS.

AM

With a draft
order

B

Statement comparing the Establishment proposed by the Jy. with those arrived at on the calculation which he adopts.

	Average pop ⁿ of last 3 years.	Establishment at 1 warder to 7 convicts + 10 per cent by Jy. scheme	Establishment by Jy. scheme
Russelkondah Hill Jail.	97	15 ~~17~~	17
Berhampore	110	17	18
Vizagapatam	208	31	31
Parvatipur	107	16	19
Rajahmundry	136	20	20
Guntur	133	21	21
Nellore	106	16	15
Kurnool	81	12	12
Bellari	349	49	50
Cuddapah	121	18	18
Chittoor	141	22	24
Chingleput	105	abolished	~~18~~
Cuddalore	173	27	28
Tanjore	132	20	25 +
Trichinopoly	99	15	15
Madurai	213	33	32
Tinnevely	105	30	32
Cochin	-	-	-
Calicut	186	28	26
Tellicherry	62	~~14~~	~~14~~
Mangalore	98	14	14
Coimbatore	137	-	-
Ootacamund	123	18	17
European Prison	22	3	5

a new jail with increasing population

District Jails only

Central Jails: Average Strength: ————— Cost of Establishment

Rajahmundry	1882 - 896 1883 - 746 1884 - 632	} average 758.	Rs. 1335
2. Vellore	1882 - 929 1883 - 967 1884 - 811	} average 902	1335
3. Trichinopoly	1882 - 880. 1883 - 562. 1884 - 516.	} average 652.	1335
4. Coimbatore	1882 - 886 1883 - 636 1884 - 641	} average 697	1576.
5. Cannanore	1882 - 603 1883 - 577 1884 - 490	} average 556	960.
6. Salem	1882 570 1883 463 1884 426	} average 466.	881.
7. Penitentiary	1882 688 1883 615 1884 591	} average 631.	1215.

	aver Rep.	Establishment as it sh ^d be:	Establishment as proposed
1. Rajahmundry	758	at 1 in 7 + 10 p.c. = 118	Strength shown 106
2. Vellore	902	at 1 in 7 + 10 p.c. = 140	" " 106
3. Trichinopoly	652	at 1 in 7 + 10 p.c. = 102	" " 106
4. Coimbatore (with 2nd Jail)	⁸³⁴ ~~697~~	" " = ¹³⁰ ~~108~~	" " 125
5. Cannanore	556	" " = 87	" " 76
6. Salem	466	" " = 72	" " 65
7. Penitentiary	631	" " = 99	" " 52

1881 - 1881
Tail Warden
Scheme

1881 - 1881
T

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881
H M

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881
D

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881
Plymouth

1881 - 1881
D

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

1881 - 1881

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From Inspector General of Jails - dated
25th March 85, 31st March 85, 21st August
1885, 2nd October 1885, 5th February
1886, 1st June 1886, Nos. 76, 90, 221
and 271 of 1885, 33 and 158 of 1886.

Tant Q. No. 834

Order, 14 June / 86

The foregoing papers
contain the proposals of the In-
spector General of Jails, called for
in para 2. of G.O. 22nd April 84. no.
989, for the revision of the subor-
dinate jail establishments of this
Presidency. The Govt. observe that
the great delay which has occurred
in passing final orders on this question
has been mainly due to the repeated
references to the Dy. for further infor-
mation, which should have been sub-
mitted in the first instance.

2. The proposed scale of establishments

Jail Under Scheme

For Ord.

411

With a draft

411
12/6

157!
Close by 21st 11/8
8 11/8

has been obtained by taking the average jail population of the last three years as a basis of calculation, and allowing one jail-warder to every 7 convicts of the average population, with ten per cent. additional establishment added to meet casualties, & to provide for cost duty. The Sd. proposes in the Central Jails to do away with the Police Guard altogether as he considers the Jail Warder force, which is principally composed of pensioned sepoys, is quite as effective as the police reserve. The Govt. accept the recommendation of the Sd. on this point - but the results should be carefully watched, & special care taken with the enlistment & training of the Warder Guards. In the District Jails, the Police Protective Guard will be retained; & its ^{strength} ~~force~~ has been fixed by the Sd. of Jails in consultation with the Sd. of Police. For the most part

the proposal scale of establishment contained in the revised proposition submitted with the Sd.'s letter of the 5th Feb^r 86, No. 33 appears to be satisfactory and has the approval of Govt. with the modifications noted below.

3. The general financial effect of the ~~scheme~~ ^{proposed} is shown to be a monthly increase of Rupees 48-12. To this has been added Rs. 21 per mensem for the extra warders sanctioned for the Penitentiary in G.O. 11 May 86 - No. 1214 Jwd. The total increase is therefore Rs. 69/12 per mensem. or Rs. 837 per annum. The Sd. points out that if the proposed abolition of the District Jails of Trichinopoly & Rajahmundry, which is now before Govt. is sanctioned, this increase would be reduced by the amount of the increase proposed in those Jails, & the remaining excess would amount to Rs 9-12 per mensem ^{only}. This question

Must be considered
a/2/86

is however still unsettled—and in the meantime, the Govt are not prepared to sanction any increase ^{however} of expenditure. On the contrary, the present scheme should involve ^{as was originally proposed} a reduction. It is observed that the largest ~~total~~ increases of outlay occur in the Central Jail Trichinopoly, and in the District Jails of Madurai, Calicut, Rajahmundry, Nellore and Cuddalore. The Government therefore while ~~approving of~~ ^{approving of} the scheme as a whole and sanctioning its introduction, direct the Dy. to consider in which jails a reduction of the proposed establishment can be most conveniently effected, and to report with reference to each of the jails above mentioned whether the proposed increase of establishments cannot be foregone, and a substantial reduction on the total cost of the scheme effected. With regard to the Central Jails, it is observed, that great inequality exists, ~~as~~ an average of 631 prisoners in the Penitentiary being guarded by 52 warders, while in the Trichinopoly Central Jail, 652 prisoners require 106 warders. It should be considered whether the strength of the warder guard in Rajahmundry, ^{Comptrolr} ~~Calicut~~ & Trichinopoly, cannot be reduced to the standard adopted in Salem, Cannanore & the Penitentiary.

See para. 14 Col. Tennant's letter
30 Nov. 83. No. 341 in G.O. 11th Jan.
84. No. 60 Tnd.

4. The Govt, while thus according their general sanction to the scheme, desire ^{to impress on} the Dy. the necessity of very careful supervision of its introduction. Much will depend on the material of w. the new warderguard is composed. The gradual development of the scheme of convict-warders in the direction followed in the N. W. Provinces should not be lost sight of, as it will enable the Dy. both to effect reductions & possibly to deal with temporary influxes of prisoners. Finally, the working of the scheme as a whole ^{the whole} will be carefully watched, and a notice thereof included in the administrative report of the Jail Dept.

Dep
8/6.

The J. S. 7. Jails 11/6 } Despatch
- 2. Acc. - 11/6 } sent in the 6/2/7
proper statement.

Shew to the
Govt.

Tail v. ...

Graft ...

...

10/1/11

Spice
10/1/11

c. 11/16
R. 11/16