No 1497 W dy 21-5-88
" 1828 C dy 9.5.88
" 1727 C dy 27.6.88

P.W.C. No. 3746

His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is willing that this sum should be retrenched from the current year's grant of Rs. 15,000.

D 241

H. E. No 1870 dy

Copy of the above forwarded to the Government of India P. W. Department for information.

D 2360 Jdl 14/6/88

B 11/20.

Rs 2616.

Rs 68. 6. Pm. 1416.

8 @ 2/5/6

12/

His Excellency the Governor in Council will offer no objection to any ruling that may be made by the Govt of India on the subject for future application but would point out the extreme inconvenience that would result from an ex post facto order charging sums to the contract allowance which is already inadequate to the purposes to which it is properly devoted.

217

No 1416 16/6 - R. 20. 6. 88

P. D. No. 1874 - 5 W. 23.8.88

No 2950.

Government of India.

Department of Finance and Commerce.

Simla, the 5th June 1888.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

In your endorsement to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Works Department No. 1127 W. dated 14th April 1888, the sanction of the Government of India is requested to the expenditure of Rs. 18,979/ incurred in 1887/88 on the following new works at Government House, Madras.

1. Improving Aide-de-Camp's quarters.
2. Constructing a Swimming Bath.
3. Constructing a Racquet Court.

In

B/ V/

(5.)

2. In reply I am directed to invite the attention of His Excellency the Governor in Council to the ruling conveyed in the letter from this Department No. 5762 dated 28th October 1887, in which it was decided — that the cost of reforming Tennis Courts attached to the Government House at — Ootacamund should not be charged against General revenues, and to add that the same ruling is applicable to items 2 and 3 referred to above, the cost of which is chargeable to the contract allowance of His Excellency the Governor. This being the case, the expenditure incurred last year will not be in excess of the annual limit of Rs. 15,000/ within which the Madras Government has powers of sanction.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

E. J. Tickner
Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of India

Ordered

P.W.D. 68/VI/88.

P. W. D. 1874-5 W 423 1874

8/ 3/ 3P (6 Vo)

Ordered, that copy, with copy of Madras Government No. 1127 W. dated 11th April 1808, be forwarded to the Public Works Department for information.

W

P.W.C. No. 6061

No 3557 C d/ 18. x. 87
" 320 D d/ 11. VIII. 87
" 3627 C d/ 21. X. 87
" 3244 W d/ 28. XI. 87
" 804 C d/ 24. ii. 88
" 1126-27 W d/ 14. IV. 88

" 1523 W d/ 7. VI. 87
" 4427 C d/ 2. XII. 87
" 1914 W d/ 16. 7. 87
" 108 C d/ 9. 1. 88
" 228 W d/ 20. 1. 88
" 28 D d/ 10. IV. 88
" 341 D d/ 17. VI. 88

Rg 23.6.88

No. 1873 / 1874 / 1875 } W. d/ 23rd June 1888

O.S. 68.6.

88/ Nos. connected with No. 1873 of 88

5/

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1 Sh

READ the following :—

Letter from Government of India No. 2958 d/ June 5 1888.

India will be again addressed. 'Reforming Tennis Courts' will naturally be held to apply to Lawn Tennis Courts* & the former ruling was intelligible. But its extension to these permanent structures is not intelligible.

RH
14 June

* I cannot make out whether it really related to the so called coach house or really to L.T. ground. but India probably understood the latter.

& ... are unlikely ever to spend this year as much than 15000 less the sum now asked for.

x ... is this a cement L.T. ground that we were urging for Chelsea? Can it be the ground objected to, under the G. of I objection? If what was this sum?

JW

The Excess was Rs 3979.
R.S
14. VI. 88

FOR ORDERS.

In their letter No. 5762 dated 28th October 1887, the Govt of India objected to a charge of Rs 475 for reforming the tennis courts attached to Govt House at Ootacamund being met from the P.W. grant. It was stated that "in the opinion of the Govt of India a charge of this nature should be met from His Excellency the Governor's contract allowance." The letter was received in the Financial dept and communicated direct to the Private Secretary to H.E. the Governor on the 12th Novr 1887. It was not till January 1888 that the P.W. Dept were made acquainted with the decision (Govt No. 228 W d/ 20th January 1888)

2. It was not then considered desirable to contest the ruling in view of the fact that a tennis court is not a permanent structure, and that on this ground it could not be claimed as a work properly devolving on the P.W. Dept.

3. The Govt of India now, however, object to the Swimming Bath and Racquet Court being charged to the P.W.D, and assign no reason beyond quoting the former ruling wherein it is said that a change of "this nature" should be met from the contract allowance.

4. Both the Swimming Bath and Racquet Court are permanent structures, and they are not of the same nature as the Tennis Court, and they are works ordinarily devolving on, and charged against, the P.W. Dept when

8/

8/

7

284

required for other services, such as for Barracks for European troops. The present ruling is thus not consistent with the practice approved in the case of Military Works. This might be pointed out to the Govt of India, and they might be asked to define for future guidance the principle on which their ruling is based. As matters now stand the P.W.D. can scarcely be expected to know what works are admissible and what are not as adjuncts to H.E. the Governor's residence.

Sdt
12/6/88

K.J.

2780 K
33341
6514

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

Letter from the Government of India N. E. No 2958 dy 5th June 1888. (a)

48

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India

Dept. of Finance & Commerce.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 2958 dy 5th June 1888 in which it is stated that the ruling conveyed in your letter No 5762 dy 28th October 1887 is applicable to the construction of a swimming bath and racquet court at Government House

PPH
14/7

Has attention is requested to the fact that the ruling has been communicated under my memo dated 14th inst. which is to be treated as non-precedent instruction, tho' I think it right

House Madras. The ruling in question is in these terms:" in the opinion of the Government of India as charge of this nature should be met from His Excellency the Governor's contract allowance, and should not come in the accounts of Government as a separate charge to general revenues."

2. His Excellency the Governor-in-Council raised no objection to the acceptance of the decision of the Government of India in regard to the Lawn-Tennis Courts, as it was understood that it did not apply to permanent structures such as those now objected to. It would, however, appear from your letter under acknowledgment that it is intended to have a wider application than was supposed, I am to request that the matter be reconsidered, and that definite instructions be issued as to the works which can, and those which cannot, be charged against the Annual Grant of Rs: 15,000 assigned by the P. W. Dept: for works in connection with His Excellency the Governor's residence.

3. I am to add that in the opinion of this Government, all works of a permanent nature such as are usually undertaken by the agency of the P. W. Dept. are properly chargeable to the P. W. grant, and that no objection should be raised to individual works of this character so long as the Annual grant is not exceeded.

4. During last official year there has been an excess expenditure of Rs: 3979, and

His

These works would on no account have been undertaken had it not been considered that they were undoubtedly chargable to the Public Works Grant.