

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

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

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

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

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

READ—also the following paper :—

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

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

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

(i) Separately proposed departmental works of—

(a) construction (whatever their cost) and

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

(ii) a lump sum for the rest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

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

Erd. A. Raitt.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

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

Erld. A. Raitt.

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.

JUDICIAL.

N^o 1005 W. d/30 April 1895

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

Communicated

Superintending Engineer
for information

(Sd) J. P.
W

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

APRIL.

Delegation of Powers of Sanction.

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

To Suptg. Engineer
to be sent to
Engr. P.W. acts.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

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

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

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

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

READ—also the following paper:—

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

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

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

(i) Separately proposed departmental works of—

(a) construction (whatever their cost) and

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

(ii) a lump sum for the rest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(True Extract.)

Lionel Davidson
for Chief Secretary.

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

P. W. CURRENT No. 3008

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

Applied for
Spanning
26/4

10 f.c

Recd: 17.4.95

N^o 1005 W. d/30 April 95

B

Communicated

to Suptg Engrs for
information

I am

Cross
22/5

one copy to B.
16/11/95

APRIL.

Delegation of Powers of Sanction.

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

DESPATCHED
1895
Suptg. Engineer
C. S. to Govt
C. S. to Govt
C. S. to Govt

Exas P.W.
22/4 22/5