Public Works (1898) Department.

33/46

✓

G.O., No. 1701 W

DATED 6 July '98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Estimates for Public Works: Approving the recommendation of the Chief Engineer in regard to the Annual forecast, to be made by the Insp. Genl. of Prisons, of the requirements of the Jails under his charge, and cancelling the orders prohibiting the preparation, without the prior sanction of Govt., of estimates exceeding Rs 500.

340/20

2

[P. W. 26. 1,000—13-2-96.]

Indexed. Sio 7/7

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Government {1898} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*
Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 1701 W., 6th July 1898.

JULY.

Estimates for Public Works

Approving the recommendation of the Chief Engineer in regard to the annual forecast to be made by the Inspector-General of Prisons of the requirements of the jails under his charge, and cancelling the orders prohibiting the preparation, without the prior sanction of Government, of estimates exceeding Rs. 500.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following papers:—

- Endorsement, in the Judicial Department, No. 1856, dated 6th September 1897, on letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. 4478, dated 2nd September 1897.
- Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, Madras, No. 2977 B./A., dated 20th September 1897.
- Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. C./2497, dated 5th November 1897.
- Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, Madras, No. 111 B./A., dated 15th January 1898.
- Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. C./473, dated 6th February 1898.
- Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, Madras, No. 677 B./A., dated 2nd March 1898.
- Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. 1120, dated 30th March 1898.
- „ „ „ „ „ „ 1750, „ 25th April „

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

In his letters quoted above, the Inspector-General of Prisons asks for a reconsideration of the practice which "appears to be enforced by the Public Works Accounts Department of treating a jail as a single building." He adds: "*the reductio ad absurdum* of this practice is furnished by G.O., No. 2130 W., dated 4th August 1897, where an estimate for strengthening ventilators of sleeping blocks is, at the instance of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, treated as supplementary to an estimate for sinking a well."

2. The practice originated with G.O., No. 1954 W., dated 7th August 1895, and, on the initiation of the Examiner, who considered that "all sanctions during any one financial year connected with any one work or project should be looked upon as supplemental to one another." During the year 1894–95 the Consulting Architect sanctioned thirteen estimates of sorts in connection with the General Hospital, Madras. The first estimate sanctioned happened to be "providing designation boards." The result of the Examiner's suggestion would, the Consulting Architect pointed out, be that "the nomenclature in the accounts and returns of the whole thirteen estimates would be that of the first estimate," viz., "Providing designation boards." The Examiner proposed to get over this difficulty by arranging to sanction "one estimate for each building at the commencement of every official year." This arrangement would, he considered, "simplify accounting considerably," and this is undoubtedly the case. Moreover in Code Volume II, Chapter I, paragraph 99, it is distinctly laid down that a central jail is to be considered as one "work" and all its out-buildings as "sub-works."

3. The Inspector-General of Prisons, in the correspondence quoted above, considers the difficulties in the way of framing one estimate for each "work" per annum to be very great, if not insurmountable. He points out that, to enable him to estimate the requirements of each building, it would be necessary for him to tour all over the Presidency just before the commencement of each official year, so as to see each building for himself. If this be so, the arrangement must be admitted to be impracticable, but such a tour seems to be altogether unnecessary. The Chief Engineer does not inspect every building before submitting or sanctioning estimates for its repairs; that duty is delegated to the Executive Engineer in charge of the division, occasionally supervised by the Superintending Engineer. In the same manner the Superintendent of a jail can surely be trusted to estimate the requirements of his jail, with occasional supervision on the part of the Inspector-General.

4. There is no doubt that the Examiner is correct in his interpretation of the Code rules, although the latter are not very explicit on the subject, and it is submitted that the case will be met if the Inspector-General of Prisons is directed to have a forecast made annually in January of the requirements of each jail under his charge during the ensuing official year under the heads:—

(1) Minor new works. | (2) Repairs.

This forecast would be forwarded to the Executive Engineer in charge of the division, who, under the authority given to him by Code Volume I, Chapter IX, paragraphs 48 and 59 (see below), would prepare two estimates only, one headed Central Jail—Minor new works, 1898–99, and the other Central Jail—Repairs, 1898–99; the estimate for each separate building being included under one or the other, and the two estimates being sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, if within his powers, or, if not, submitted to Government for sanction. Any other works found absolutely necessary during the year would be considered as supplemental to one or other of the above estimates and sanctioned accordingly.

5. The Inspector-General of Prisons raises the further question as to whether the existing orders * prohibiting the preparation, without sanction of Government, of estimates exceeding Rs. 500 should not be relaxed. He points out that the rule is not in accordance with the Public Works Code or the recent policy of decentralization of work.

* G.O., No. 1787 W., dated 15th June 1892.
„ „ 2806 W., „ 7th Oct. „

6. In this connection it may be remarked that Code paragraph 59, Chapter IX, Volume I, vests the Executive Engineer with a discretionary power of refusing demands for works of the necessity for which he is not satisfied, which power can be supervised by the Superintending Engineer. I agree with the Inspector-General of Prisons that it is unnecessary to go beyond Code rules in this respect, they being sufficient to safeguard Government against the preparation of unnecessary estimates, and I recommend that the rulings on this head quoted above be cancelled.

(Signed) W. B. deWinton,
Chief Engineer.

16th May 1898.

From A. G. Cardew, Esq., M.A., Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 7th June 1898, No. 2858.

In reply to Mr. Russell's endorsement, No. 382/D., dated 1st June 1898, I have the honour to state, without referring to the technical difficulties surrounding the question, whether a jail should, for account purposes, be regarded as a single "building;" that, if the suggestion in paragraph 6 of the Chief Engineer's note is adopted, I am prepared to accept the proposals in paragraph 4, provided that the forecast should be forwarded to the Superintending Engineer rather than to the Executive Engineer.

Order—No. 1701 W., dated 6th July 1898.

His Excellency the Governor in Council approves of the recommendation made by the Chief Engineer in paragraph 4 of his note read above in regard to the annual forecast to be made by the Inspector-General of Prisons. The forecast will, however, be forwarded to the Superintending Engineer of the circle, who will communicate it to Executive Engineers concerned for the preparation of the requisite estimates.

2. The orders quoted in the margin prohibiting the preparation, without the prior sanction of Government, of estimates exceeding Rs. 500, are now cancelled. Executive Engineers will in future be guided by the provisions of the Public Works Code, *vide* paragraph 59, Chapter IX, Volume I.

G.O., No. 1787 W., dated 15th June 1892.
" " 2806 W., " 7th Oct. "

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To Superintending Engineers.
" the Consulting Architect.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse Division.
" the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" the Judicial Department.
" the Public "
" the Educational "
" the Ecclesiastical "
" the Financial "
" the Revenue "
" the Local and Municipal Department.
" the Marine Department.

Exd. Wm D'Moss.

From orders

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMEN

No. 1701 W 6.7.98

Read the following

Endorsement in the Judicial Department, No. 1856, dated 6th September 1897, on letter from the Inspe General of Prisons, Madras, No. 4478 dated 2nd September 1897.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras, No. 2977 B/A, dated 20th September 1897.

Letter from the Inspector General of Prisons, Madras, No. C. 2497, dated 5th November 1897.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras, No. 111 B/A, dated 15th January 1898.

Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. C. 473, dated 6th February 1898.

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras, No. 677 B/A, dated 2nd March 1898.

Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. 1120 dated 30th March 1898.

— do — do — No. 1750, dated 25th April 1898.

Note by the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department d/16 May 189

Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras, No. 2858 dated 7th June 1898.

Print infra 11

His Excellency the Governor in Council approves of the recommendation made by the Chief Engineer in para 4 of his note read above in regard to the annual forecast to be made

(To The Judicial Dept for favour of counterinitials)

I/B M

(40—4,000—14-3-95.)

made by the Inspector General of Prisons. The forecast will, however, be forwarded to the Superintending Engineer of the Circle, who will communicate it to Executive Engineers concerned for the preparation of the requisite estimates.

2. The orders* quoted in the margin prohibiting the preparation, without the prior sanction of Government of estimates exceeding Rs 500 are now cancelled. Executive Engineers will in future be guided by the provisions of the P.W. Code - *vide* para 59, Chapter IX, Volume I.

* G.O. 1787 W d/ 15th June 1893.
Flag N

" 2806 W d/ 7 October 1893
Flag C

R.S.

H 21/7/98.

22.6.98

recd by D.W.

Suptg: Engineers
The Consulting Architect
" Examiner P.W. Accounts
" Supt: of Works Lighthouse &c.
" Chief Engr: for Irrigation.
" Judicial Dept.
" Public "
" Educational "
" Ecclesiastical "
" Financial "
" Revenue "
" Local and Municipal
" Marine "

R 11/7/98

7

P Works.

~~Judicial~~ (1898) Department.

His Excellency the Governor
The Hon Sir Henry Bliss K.C.I.E.

CURRENT No. 5539

For orders.

Order

Submitted with reference to His Excellency's note d/ 20.5.98 on the previous note for orders, immediately below this paper. There is no objection to the forecast being forwarded to the Supdg Engr rather than to the Exec: Engr.-

R.S.

16.6.98

Then let it be so.

AGH 19.6.98

22/6/98

From

The Inspector-General of Prisons,
Ootacamund.

No. 2858.

Dated 7th June 1898.

Received } 10-6-98
Registered 4.7.98

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

States that he is prepared to accept the proposals in para 4 of Mr.Russell's Endorsement No.383/D, d/ 1st June 98 provided that the forecast should be forwarded to the Superintending Engineer rather than to the Executive Engineer.

H.M. 21.6.98 R 23.6.98
H.E. 17.6.98 26 R 21.6.98

382

mad
of O
will
to t
of th
mu
En
the
estr
2.
the
prep
san
of e
are
Eng
gen
the
59,
R.S.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
U.O.	382	dt	1-6-98
	1856 C	dt	5th Septr 97
	1204	Judl dt	20·8·97
	3825 C	dt	11·9·97
	2130 W	dt	4·8·97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	4240 D	dt	3·6·97
	290 D	dt	21·5·97
	1914 C	dt	3·4·97
	1369 C	dt	10·3·97
	3520 W	dt	8·12·96
	2062 W	dt	16·7·96

9

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 4814

C.F.

Order

From The Inspector General of Prisons Madras

No. 1750

C.E.W. Are the statements in para 1 correct — What is the true state of this case?

W.S.W.
28.4.98

Dated 25th April 1898

Received } 26th Do.
Registered }

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Jails. Stating that his letters in regard to certain suggestions as to treatment of works connected with — should not be suppressed because the Chief Engineer disagrees with their contents

W/

of/9

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPER

No.	Date.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS. 19 NOV. 1897 No.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS. 14 SEP. 1897 No.

P.W.

Judicial (189 7) Department.

9

CURRENT No. ~~3153~~ C. 2 ~~9105~~ ~~2250/97~~ 3992/98

Rd 7. 9. 97

From

The Inspector-General of Prisons,
Ootacamund.

~~Order~~

Endorsement No. 1856 d/ 6th Septr. 1897

Transferred to the Public Works Dept.

Ar. Under Secretary

No. 4478.

Dated 2nd September 1897.
Received 3 " 10-9-97
Registered 4 "
Enclosures - 1
Spare copies -

No. 3825 C. d/ 11th September 1897.

To C

For favour of remarks

8/9/97

SUBJECT.

Inviting the attention of the Govt: to the inconvenience of the practice, which appears to be enforced by the P.W.Accounts Department, of treating a Jail as a single building.

2130 C
11-8-97

To the Public Works Dept.

os
96

BACK PAP

G.O.	No.	Departmen	
	1204	Judl	20-8-97

FURTHER P

G.O.	No.	Departmen

CURRENT No. 3763

13

FORM No. 1-A—1,000—25-10-93.

Prisons,
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF ~~JAILS~~,

No. 4478 Dated 2nd September 1897.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 NOV. 1897
No

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
14 SEP. 1897
No

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A., I.C.S.,
Prisons,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF ~~JAILS~~,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.

SIR,

Enclosures.

I have the honour to invite the attention of Government to the inconvenience of the practice, which appears to be enforced by the Public Works Accounts Department, of treating a Jail as a single building.

G.O 1204 Judl / 20-8-97

2. The reductio ad absurdum of this practice is furnished by G.O.No.2150 W, dated 4th August 1897, where an estimate for strengthening ventilators of sleeping blocks is, at the instance of the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, treated as supplementary to an estimate for sinking a well!

3. To hold that a Jail is a single building is an inconvenient fiction which necessitates additional references, limits expenditure etc.

4. I, therefore, suggest that it may be ruled that a Jail is not a single building, but a collection of buildings.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

A G Cardew.
Prisons
Inspector-General of ~~Jails~~.

JUDICIAL.

JAIL (189) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF JAILS,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.

Dated
Despatched } 189 .
Received

No.

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

OW E.1
~~9405~~/97
~~9402~~
322/98

15

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 NOV. 1897

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9402

Order

From The Examiner
P. W. Accounts
Madras

No. 2977 B/A

Dated 20th September / 97
Received 22-9-97
Enclosures + 2
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Jail Buildings.
Anent the treatment of Supplemental Estimates in connection with —

o.l.5 508 R1/10

No.	Department.	Date.
3825 C	PW	11-9-97
2130 W	-	4-8-97
4240	.	3-6-97
2900	-	21-5-97
1914 C	-	3-4-97
1369 C	.	10-3-97
3520 W	-	8-12-96
2062 W	-	16-7-96

EXAMINER
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 NOV. 1897

E. No. 27.
500—26-2-97.

KEEP WITH CURRENT No. ...... GOVT. OF MADRAS } 1897. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated 189 .

Madras, 20th September 1897.

OFFICE NOTE No. 2977 B/A

To

W.

Your O.N.No.3825 C.dated IIth. September 1897.

It would perhaps help to a better conclusion in this matter if the Inspector General of Prisons would particularize in what respects the practice he refers to gives rise to "inconvenience";"necessitates additional references ; limits expenditure" etc.

W
20.9.97

C.

SPK
20/9/97

P. W. D.

No. 4036 C D/ 1-10-97

Memo.

With reference to letter from the Insp. General of Prisons, No. 4478 dated 2d Septr 1897, the undersigned has the honour to request that the Insp. Genl. will be good enough to particularise in what respects the practice of treating a jail as a single building for P. W. Accounts purposes causes inconvenience, necessitates additional references, limits expenditure &c.

29/9/97

W

To the Insp. Genl. of Prisons 2/10/97

7/10/97

21

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 NOV. 1897
No.

Public Works &

~~Judicial~~ (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~11100~~ S.-5 398/98

No. 4825C dated 18th November 1897

From

The Inspector General of Prisons.

~~Order~~ O. C.

To C

Forwarded with reference to your office note+ No 2977 B/A dated 20.9.97. for favour of any further remarks you may wish to offer.

10.11.97

W

CWBS
15/11.97

+ Reenclosed, with connected papers.

No. C. 2497

Dated 5th November 1897

Received
Registered } 8. 11. 97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting in what respects the practice of treating a jail as a single building for P.W. account purposes causes inconvenience, necessitates additional references, limits expenditure.

[H.O. Form No. 3—1,000—1-4-96.]

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 NOV: 1897
No.........................

No. C 2497

It is requested that the reply to this Letter may be addressed to Ootacamund.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

Dated Badagarai the 5th November 1897.

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A., I.C.S.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to Government,

Public Works Department.

SIR,

Enclosure.

I have the honour to submit the following reply to P.W. Memo. No. 4036 C. dated 1st October 1897.

Cw 3831 1198 W / 92

No. 296 Educational dated 5th April 1892.
1787 W. dated 15th June 1892.
2806 W dated 7th October 1892. ×

986 W 26.4.95

6376 / 93

Q not Communicated
× Flag A.

2. In the marginally noted G.Os of 1892, it was laid down that no estimate in excess of Rs 500 may be prepared by officers of the Public Works Department without previous sanction of Government being obtained. Under other orders not now available, I believe that no Officer of the Public Works Department is allowed to carry out an estimate which is less than Rs 500 without a special order of Government, and by the combined effect of

these orders it is impossible to get the assistance of the Public Works Department at all without first troubling Government. In 1895, I suggested a moderate relaxation of the former restriction but in G.O. No. 986 W dated 26th April 1895 this was not approved.

3. By a ruling conveyed in G.O. No. 435 W dated 13.2.97 the necessity for referring to Government every petty work of improvement was further extended by the decision that if two works are proposed to be carried out in the same building, and if their aggregate cost is in excess of Rs 500, sanction for the preparation of each estimate must be obtained from Government. Thus if two works one costing Rs 400 and the other Rs 101 are contemplated, sanction of Government must be obtained before either estimate may be prepared by an officer of the Public Works Department.

4. The finishing touch to this series of restrictions is supplied by the ruling of the Examiner of the Public Works accounts which I brought to notice in my letter No. 4478 dated 2nd September 1897. From the decision that the huge congeries of buildings known as a Central Jail is for Public Works accounts purposes a single building, it follows that only one estimate of Rs 500 can be prepared for each Jail by the Public Works Department without previous sanction of Government.

A reference will thus be necessary whenever any work or works aggregating Rs 501 and upwards have to be estimated for.

5. The object of increasing the number of references passing through an already congested and overworked Secretariat is not clear, and it would appear more in accordance with the recent policy of Government to reduce the necessity for such applications. The orders restricting the discretion of Public Works Officers in the matter of the preparation of Estimates are contrary to the terms of the Public Works Code, and are therefore presumably peculiar to the Madras Presidency. The adoption even of the proposal made in my letter No. 668 dated 2nd February 1895 (recorded in G.O. No. 986 W dated 26th April 1895) would be some advantage.

6. If a change in this direction were made it would be a matter of indifference whether the Examiner of Public Works accounts classed a Jail Latrine and a Drinking Water well as one and the same building or not, however unnatural such a classification might appear to the uninitiated. If, however, the rule prohibiting any estimate in excess of Rs 500 from being made without previous sanction of Government must be maintained, it will be seen that the Examiner's view of the meaning

of the term "building" both necessitates additional references and limits expenditure, and it will, therefore, I trust, be found possible to direct the Public Works Accounts Department to adopt an interpretation more in accordance with common language.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. G. Cardew.

Inspector General of Prisons.

PW 5-4
399/98

27

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 399

C/ No 430 cd 24.1.98

~~Order~~ Letter.

From

The Examiner P. W. Accounts
Madras

No. 111 B/A

Dated 15th January 1898

Received 17.1.98

Enclosures 6

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Jail Buildings - Expressing opinion in respect of the practice of treating a Jail as a single building for P. W. Accounts purposes &c

To the Inspr. Genl. of Prisons

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. C. 2497 dated 5th Novr. 1897, I have the honour ~~to~~ to forward copy of an office note from the Exr. P. W. Accts, No. 111 B/A dated 15th January 1898, giving reasons from an accounts point of view against a departure from the practice of treating each jail as a single work, and to inquire whether it would be practicable to give effect to the [illegible] suggestions in para 5 of his note. I see no reason why it should not be.

I have &c

2. copies of the paras of the Code referred to by the Examiner are attached

Despd 21/1/98

SR 20/1/98

W. L. E.

20/1/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	4825 C		18-11-97
	4036 C		1-10-97
	3825 C		11-9-97
	2130 W		4-8-97
	986 W		26-4-95
	435 W		13-2-97

FURTHER PAPE

G.O.	No.	Department.	
CN 1131/98			

29

E. No. 27.
1,000—6-9-97.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 189~~7~~8 { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated 189 .

Madras, 15th January 189~~7~~8.

OFFICE NOTE No. 111 B/A

To

W.

Your O.N.No.4825 C dated 18th November 1897.

This case was held over by my locum tenens for me to reply to on my return from leave: hence the delay in reply.

2. The immediate question for consideration is whether it is proper and right from an administrative and accounts point of view to regard a central jail as a single building or work instead of a series of buildings or works.

3. A "work" is defined in P.W.D.Code Volume II.I.99, and under this a central jail has always been treated by us as a single work, all the buildings it comprises being treated as "sub works"-It has followed that, when more than one estimate has been sanctioned in connection with the central jail while the work on the original estimate has been in progress, we have required such estimate or estimates to be treated as supplementary to the original one: and it is only by the observance of this procedure that a proper

~~watch~~

watch can be exercised by the Examiner that the provisions of P.W.D.Code I.IX. 58, to which I would invite particular attention, are not departed from.

4. Any departure from this view or procedure would practically mean the upsetting of existing orders as contained in sundry G.Os.and, while saving, perhaps, a few references to Government, would defeat the object of the rules under which proper control is secured.

5. It seems to me, however, that what the Inspector General of Prisons complains of might, for the most part if not entirely, be got over if all the work required to be done for the central jail during each year whether in the nature of additions or repairs were, at begining of each year, as far as possible, provided and sanctioned in a single estimate, only any thing over and above that being treated as a supplementary sanction.

W. 15.1.98

C.

15/1/98

---

(8) Department.

CURRENT No. 1131 5.2 1871/98

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS
21 FEB. 1898
No

No. 987 C D/18-2-98

From
The Inspector General of Prisons.

Order O. u.

No. C. 473

To C

For favour of any further remarks you may wish to offer, with reference to your office note No 111 B/A dated 15-1-98.

Dated 6th February 1898.

Received } 7-2-98
Registered }

Enclosures

Spare copies

D.W. 17.2.98

SUBJECT.

States with remarks that the rules requiring the Sanction of Government to the preparation of all Estimates over RS. 500 is peculiarly inconvenient in regard to the Jail Department and requests that it may be relaxed in the case of this Department only.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Memo	430C	P.W.D. 24-1-98	
〃	4825C	P.W.D.	18-11-97
	4036C	〃	1-10-97
	3825C	〃	11-9-97
A	2130W	〃	4-8-97
A	986W	〃	20-4-95
A	435W	〃	15-2-97

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
21 FEB. 1898
No

[H.O. Form No. 3—1,000—1-4-96.]

No. C.473

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,
Dated Madras the 6th February 1898.

It is requested that the reply to this Letter may be addressed to Ootacamund.

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer, Public Works Department,
Madras.

SIR,

Enclosure.

In reply to your Letter No 430C dated 24th January 1898, I have the honour to state that the Examiner's suggestion would not in my opinion be found in practice to meet the needs of the case. In the hope of securing your support, I beg to explain as shortly as possible the real position.

Flag A

2. In certain orders of 1892, rehearsed in G.O. No. 2806 W. dated 7th October 1892, it was laid down that no plan or Estimate for buildings may be prepared by any Public Works officer, without previous sanction of Government if the probable cost of the work would exceed Rs 500. The object of these orders was presumably to prevent the time of the P.W. Officers from being wasted in making Estimates, which are not really needed.

There is no doubt that if Civil officers were found to abuse the power they formerly possessed of asking for Estimates, such an abuse ought to be repressed. But the proper way to deal with an abuse of that power was, it seems to me, to enforce responsibility against the officers who abused it, and not to take away the power altogether. The result of the Orders passed in 1892 is that Government has to scrutinize many schemes for petty works which would otherwise never come before it at all, and in the case of larger works, it has to examine them twice over, first when originally projected and secondly when Estimates have been made. Such duplication of work appears to me to be wrong in principle.

3. Since the G.Os of 1892 were passed the Government has been at pains to declare its desire to decentralize work as much as possible. In G.O. No. 49 Revenue, dated 22nd January 1894, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council determined to examine the Standing Orders and Codes in force in the several Departments in order to ascertain what powers, thereby reserved to Government, could be delegated. In other orders it has since carried this principle of decentralization into effect in various directions. But the retention of a rule which precludes a P.W. Officer, even if the work is clearly necessary, from preparing an Estimate for it over Rs. 500 without sanction of Government seems to be markedly inconsistent with the principle of decentralization adopted by the Government.

4. The rule of 1892 above referred to is not a consequence of any clause in the P.W. Code or of any instruction from the Government of India. On the contrary the P.W. Code,

as framed

as framed by the Government of India expressly provides in para 76, Chapter iii, Volume i that a P.W. officer may prepare any Estimate on the requisition of the local authorities, provided that he is convinced of the necessity of the work. The rule laid down in 1892 thus appears to be directly contrary to the provisions of the P.W. Code of the Government of India, just as it is contrary to the principle of decentralization advocated by the local Government.

5. For these reasons I venture to submit that the rule is wrong in principle and should be abrogated, Superintending Engineers being required to report to you any case which comes under their notice in which Estimates are unnecessarily called for by Civil Officers. It will doubtless not be overlooked that the revision of the rule of 1892 was urged by me before, but the lapse of time will, I hope, be held to permit of the matter being again considered.

6. If the Government for reasons unknown to me should conclude to retain the rule of 1892 requiring their sanction to the preparation of all Estimates over Rs. 500/-, I would then submit that this rule is peculiarly inconvenient in regard to the Jail Department and may be relaxed in the case of that Department only. A church, a school, a Civil Court, or even a Cutcherri is in each case a fairly compact and homogeneous building, and may reasonably be regarded as a single work. But a Jail is composed of such a large number of separate and dissimilar buildings (Mainwalls, Workshops, Sleeping wards, Cookhouses latrines, wells, mortuaries etc) that the application to it

of a rule primarily intended for a single sample building is specially inconvenient. If it were laid down that, in the case of the Jail Department, the rule requiring sanction of Government to the preparation of an Estimate over Rs. 500/- should only apply when the Estimate relates the same sub-work as defined in para 99 Chapter I Pw. Code Volume II, some relief would be obtained. In that case if an Estimate exceeding Rs. 500/- were required, say, for covering in a Jail well, and if another Estimate in the same Jail were required for building a Mortuary, the Executive Engineer could prepare the Estimates without previous sanction of Government. At present he cannot, because a Jail is technically a single "work", though the incongruity of declaring a Dead House and a Drinking water well to be the same work is obvious. If the Rule of 1892 is to be retained, I would, therefore, propose that in connection with Jail buildings, it should apply to the amount of the Estimate for individual "Subworks".

7. Failing the adoption either of the recommendation in paragraph 5 or of the suggestion in paragraph 6, the only feasible course appears to be to move the Government of India to amend para 99, Chapter i Volume II, so as to declare that the "separate works" making up a Jail shall for the purposes of para 58, Chapter IX, Volume i and other similar rules be regarded as works and not as Sub-works. The absurdity of the practice of calling a kitchen and a Well, or a Hospital and a workshop a single work or a single building needs no demonstration. If it also necessitates additional

references

references to Government and hinders practical work, a good case for altering the practice seems to be made out. But it would be much easier to make one of the other changes referred to above.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Most obdt. Servant,

A G Cardew
Inspr Genl of Prisons.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1971

Order

From The Examiner, P. W. Accts, Madras

No. 67703/A

Dated 2d March 1898

Received 3. 3. 98

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Preparation of Estimates over Rs 500 for jail buildings — Furnishing remarks in Connection with the —

987c		18-2-98
4825c		18-11-97
3825c		11-9-97
2130w		4-8-97
4036c		1-10-97
430c		24-1-98

41

E. No. 27.
1,000—6-9-97.

Keep-with　　Current No.

dated　　189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1897. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 2d March 1898.

Office Note No. 677B/A

To

W.

Your Office Note No. 987 C dated 18th. February 1898.

I have nothing more to add beyond that the accomplishment of any one of the three alternative proposals of the Inspector General of Prisons would, apparently, involve more time and writing than the adherence to the existing rules and procedure would in a series of years, and that it is for Government to now decide whether a case has been made out for action in the direction sought.

W 2.3.98

C.

APh 2/3/98

516 C D/24/3/98

43

P. W. Dept.

To the Insp.-Genl. of Prisons

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. C. 473 dated 6 February 1898, regarding the preparation of estimates for jail works, I have the honour to inquire whether you have considered the other side of the question.

2. Your object in desiring that each jail should be considered a collection of separate buildings is doubtless to enable you, without the previous sanction of Govt., to call for estimates for work in each such building, when each such estimate is not likely to exceed

R 24/3/98

S.A.W.

25/3/98

INDEXED

Rs 500 - Granting that Govt. concedes this point, then whenever any estimate for work required in a sub building is likely to exceed Rs 500, separate sanction of Govt. will be required for the preparation of the estimate - Thus if a work of improvement is required in each of five separate sub-~~bu~~buildings, & each work is likely to cost a few Rupees over 500, the preparation of each estimate will require the separate sanction of Govt, whereas, under the existing practice, all five works would be included in a single estimate, and accounted for as a single work, & only one sanction to the preparation of one

estimate would be needed -

3. If your proposals were given effect to, a number of works going on in a jail at the same time would have to be treated each as a separate work, and separate sets of accounts would have to be maintained for each - On the other hand, if the existing practice were maintained, and a forecast made at the beginning of the year of all works likely to be, in any jail, needed, during the ensuing twelve months, one estimate would, with the sanction of Govt, be prepared for all, & as above stated, they would be accounted for as a single work -

4 It is of course possible

that works not foreseen at the commencement of the year may become necessary during the twelve months, but such cases should not be numerous if the forecast at the beginning of the year were made after careful inspection & consideration, and if requirements arising during the year were postponed to the next year, when not absolutely urgent. It seems doubtful therefore, whether your proposal would result in any saving of correspondence, and it would certainly result in an increase of account keeping -

4. Another result of your proposal would be to enable you to get a series of works in any one Jail carried out during a year, each of which might be within the sanctioning powers of yourself or the Supdg. Engineer, but the aggregate cost of which might be far beyond such powers - This would be in direct contravention of para 58, Chapter IX. Vol. I P.W. Code -

5.- Have the honour to inquire whether after considering the above mentioned points, you still wish your proposals to be laid before Govt.

Have &c

E.W.

6. My own opinion is that it is much the best & simplest course to make a forecast of expenditure on all the buildings connected with a Jail for the ensuing year, & have a general estimate made. I notice that you say this would not meet the case, but you do not attempt to support your opinion by any definite reasons. I think it is improbable that Govt. will sanction any change in the rules & still less so that any exception will be made in favour of the Jail Dept.

Ex

Comd 18/3/28.

but I will submit the question for orders if you still desire it

22.3.90

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 3067

From The Inspector General of Prisons, Madras.

Order

No. 1120

Dated 30 March 1898
Received 4 April 1898
Registered 4 April 1898
Enclosures —
Spare copies —

SUBJECT.

~~Forwarding~~ his remarks in regard to the preparation and submission of a forecast of jail works at the beginning of each year

Works

No.	Date.
1816C	24-3-98
987C	18-2-98
4825C	18-11-97
3828C	11-9-97
2130W	4-8-97
986W	26-4-95
435W	13-2-97

---

rm No. 3—1,000—1-4-96.]

No. 1120.

is requested that the
this Letter may be
ed to Ootacamund.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

Dated Ootacamund *the* 30th March 1898.

From

A. G. CARDEW, ESQ., M.A., I.C.S.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

To

THE Ag:Chief Engineer,

Public Works Department,
Madras.

SIR,

Enclosure.

In my letter No.C.473,dated 6th February January'98,I pointed out the various conclusive and unanswerable arguments which render the longer maintenance of the Orders of 1892 contrary to the declared policy of Government,to the Public Works Code,and to sound principle.I observe,from your letter No.1816/C,dated 24th Instant,that you do not attempt to deal with these arguments,but merely state that you think it impossible that Government will sanction any change in the rules. I am unable to share your belief,and feel confident that, when the case is placed before Government,the weight & correctness of my remarks will produce their due result.

2. You observe that if a forecast of the works required in Jails were made at the beginning of the year after careful consideration & inspection,few cases of omission would arise.The Jails of this Presidency are 20 in number,excluding the 303 Subjails.They are scattered all over the Presidency and they cannot all be inspected at the beginning of the year. Inspections have to be distributed over the official year.Thus, if the forecast of works,which you and the Examiner of Public

Works Accounts propose, were sent in in February or March, works in Jails which had not yet been inspected would have to lie over till the next year's forecast were submitted. Experience of the Public Works Department has taught me that a delay of a year would seem but as a day in its sight, but to the Head of a Department, anxious to get some small progress made during the brief period of his control, a year is a considerable item. I am, therefore, strongly opposed to any proposal which shall limit, even by 3 months, the preparation of Estimates. The wheels of the Public Works chariot move slow enough already.

5. Para 4 of your letter says that my proposal would "enable me to get a series of works carried out" the aggregate cost of which would be beyond some P.W. limit of sanction. Seeing that the Superintending Engineer's power of sanction goes, I believe to ₨ 2,000, I do not understand what you mean. The tone, however, of your remark seems to imply that if I were enabled to get works carried out more rapidly and easily, I should be obtaining some personal benefit, or some unfair advantage. It is just this sort of idea which seems to be at the back of those restrictions on the preparation of estimates and on their execution against which my letter No. C.473 was directed. Civil officers are not interested individuals, whose requirements are to be hampered and restricted as much as possible, nor are they, in my experience, of such inexhaustible and sleepless energy as to make it necessary to invent special clogs and drags to prevent their accomplishing too much.

Rs 2500

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A G Cardew.

Insptr: Genl of Prisons.

JUDICIAL.

JAIL (1898) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS,

To

THE Ag: Chief Engineer,
P.W.D.;
Madras

Dated 30th
Despatched
Received
March 1898.

No. 1120

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

States that he cannot agree with his views expressed in his No. $\frac{1816C}{24-3-98}$ and that he feels confident that if the case if placed before Govt. will produce the due result.

P. W. Department

No. 59 D D 20 April 1898

To

The Inspector General
of Prisons,
Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 1120 dated 30th March 1898 I have the honour to state that the word "impossible" which you quote in para 1, if it occurs in my letter, is a misprint for "improbable" the word used in the draft. I regret the mistake.

2. With regard to the rest of your letter, it consists either of misapprehensions of my meaning or of offensive remarks about the P.W.D. As you cannot discuss the question courteously, I must decline to continue this correspondence and beg

that, if you wish any alteration made in the rules, you will address Government direct in your own department.

I have &ca.

E.W.

Dw
20/4

57

H. O. Form No. (1)—2,000—October 1897.

No. 1750.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

It is requested that any reply to this letter may be addressed to Ootacamund.

dated Ootacamund, the 25th April 1898.

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A., I.C.S.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer & Secretary to Government,

Public Works Department.

SIR,

Enclosures.

No 3825C
4.9.97
filed with
No 4036C
1.10.97
Flag G

Flag H

X Flag N

Replying to your No.59/D, dated 20th April 1898, I have the honour to point out that I have already addressed the Government in the Judicial Department in my letter No.4478, d/ 2nd September 1897. The correspondence which has since taken place relates to that letter, vide P.W.D. Memorandum No.4036/C, d/ 1st October 1897, signed "D McCampbell, Col R.E. Secretary to Government", and No.450/C, dated 24th January 1898, signed "S. Murray Ag. Under Secretary". My letters addressed to you were in reply to these References, and I would point out to you that you are not at liberty to suppress letters merely because you disagree with their contents.

2. I refrain from commenting on the terms of your communication under reply, which was apparently written in a moment of irritation. It is necessary, however, to add that if you dispute the correctness of my statements regarding the dilatoriness of the P.W.D., I shall be happy to produce, before the proper tribunal, sufficient evidence in support of the same.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A G Cardew.

Insptr: Genl of Prisons.

M.K.

JAIL (189^{8}) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS,

Madras,

To

THE Chief Engineer, & Secretary
to Govt. P. W. D.

Dated 25th
Despatched
Received
} April 189^{8}.

No. 1750.

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

States that he has already addressed the Govt: in the Judicial Department in his letter No. 4478, d/2nd September 1897 re: the inconvenience of the practice of treating a Jail as a single building.

$\frac{43}{09}$.]

1701 W

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

C. Nos. 9105, 9402, 11100 of 1897, 399, 1131, 1971
and 3067 of 1898, and letter from the
I. G. of Prisons, No. 1750, d/25th April '98.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.
THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.
~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

SUBJECT.

Estimates for Public Works

FOR ORDERS.

G.

1. In his letters quoted above, the Inspector General of Prisons asks for a reconsideration of the practice which "appears to be enforced by the P. W. Accounts Department of treating a Jail as a single building". He adds "the reductio ad absurdum of this practice is furnished by G. O. 2130 W, dated 4th August 1897 where an estimate for strengthening ventilators of sleeping blocks is at the instance of the Examiner, P. W. Accounts, treated as supplementary to an estimate for sinking a well".

2. The practice originated with G. O. 1954 W., dated 7th August 1895, and on the initiation of the Examiner, who considered that "all sanctions during any one financial year connected with any one work or project should be

Restore L.G. [illegible]

be looked upon as supplemental to one another". During the year 1894-95, the Consulting Architect sanctioned 13 estimates of sorts in connection with the General Hospital, Madras. The first estimate sanctioned happened to be "providing designation Boards". The result of the Examiner's suggestion would, the Consulting Architect pointed out, be that "the nomenclature in the accounts and returns of the whole 13 estimates would be that of the first estimate" viz, 'Providing designation boards'. The Examiner proposed to get over this difficulty by arranging to sanction "one estimate for each building at the commencement of every official year". This arrangement would he considered ~~to~~ "simplify accounting considerably", but ~~he took no~~ cognizance of the practical difficulties in the way of giving effect to it.

and this is undoubtedly the case: moreover in Code Vol II Chap. I Para 99 it is distinctly laid down that a Central Jail is to be considered as one 'work' and its sub-buildings as 'subworks'

3. The Inspector General of Prisons, in the correspondence ~~entered~~ quoted above, considers ~~these~~ the difficulties in the way of framing one estimate for each 'work' per annum to be very great, if not insurmountable. He points out that, to enable him to estimate the requirements of each building it would be necessary for him to tour all over the Presidency just before the commencement of each official year, so as to see each building for himself. If this be so, the arrangement must be admitted to be impracticable.

but such a tour seems to be altogether unnecessary - the Chief Engr. does not inspect every building before submitting or sanctioning estimates for its repair - that duty is delegated to the Ex. Engr. in charge of the Dn. occasionally supervised by the Supdg. Engr. - In the same manner the Supdt. of a Jail can surely be trusted to estimate the requirements of his Jail, with occasional supervision on the part of the Inspector General -

Further consideration of the Code Rules on which the Examiner bases his suggestions would seem to show that they do not bear him out in the lengths to which he has gone. He relies principally on para 31, Chapter VII, Volume I of the P. W. Code which reads as follows:-

"Any development of a project thought necessary while a work is in progress which is not fairly contingent on the proper execution of the works as first sanctioned must be covered by a supplementary estimate". It will be observed that the rule applies only to "works in progress," and not to completed works. Neither does it say that each subsequent "development" is to be supplemental to that which has gone before. The proper reading of the rule seems to be that each "development" is supplemental to the main project. Thus the ventilator of a latrine would not, as assumed in G.O. 2130 W., dated 4th August 1897, be supplemental to a well, but both would be supplemental to the Jail. The two works in this case, viz, the "ventilator" and the "well" are in fact "sub-works" of the main building, as defined in para 99, Chapter I, Vol. II of the P.W. Code.

There seems, moreover, nothing in the Code Rules to support the Examiner's contention that various isolated minor works connected with a completed building, the accounts of which have been closed, should be "grouped together" so as to form a single estimate. In actual practice this is not done if the financial year happens to have ~~closed~~ expired. The accounts of a previous year are not re-opened in order to add to a completed work the cost of additions subsequently found to be necessary.

The question thus arises whether under all the circumstances of the case, the ruling in G.O. 1954 W., dated 7th August 1895 should not be reconsidered.

4. There is no doubt that the Examiner is correct in his interpretation of the Code Rules, although the latter are not very explicit on the subject, & it is submitted that the case will be met if the I.G. of Prisons is directed to have a forecast made annually in January, of the requirements of each Jail under his charge during the ensuing official year, under the heads

(1) Minor New Works

(2) Repairs.

This forecast would be forwarded to the Ex. Engr. in charge of the Division, who under the authority given to him by Code Vol I Chap IX Paras 58 & 59 (see below) would prepare 2 estimates only, one headed

— Central Jail ____ - Minor New Works 1898-99.

& the other

— Central Jail ____ Repairs - 1898-99.

the estimates for each separate building being included under one or the other, & the two estimates being sanctioned by the I.G. if within his powers, or, if not, submitted to Govt. for sanction.

Any other works found absolutely necessary during the year would be considered as supplemental to one or other of the above estimates, & sanctioned accordingly -

Flag G.

Flag N.
G.O. 1787 W., dated 15th June 1892.
,, 2806 W., d/7th October 1892.
Flag O.

5 The Inspector General of Prisons raises the further question as to whether the existing orders prohibiting the preparation, without sanction of Government, of estimates exceeding Rs. 500 should not be relaxed. He points out that the rule is not in accordance with the P.W. Code, or the recent policy of decentralization of work.

6. In this connection it may be remarked that Code para 59, Chapter IX, Volume I vests the Executive Engineer with a discretionary power of refusing demands for works of the necessity for which he is not satisfied, ~~and I agree with~~, which power can be exercised by the Supt. Engr. - I agree with the I.G. of Prisons that it is unnecessary to [illegible] Code Rules in this respect, they being sufficient to safeguard Govt. against the preparation of unnecessary estimates, & recommend

R.S.

63

that the rulings on this head quoted above be cancelled.

13.8.88

Jail at Cannanore – vide G.O. 1.30 W dated 4 Aug 87. It is in reference to this contention that the I.G. uses the expression "reductio ad absurdum" in his first letter. There seems nothing in the Code rule which makes the one estimate supplemental to the other – they are both "sub works" of the main building, i.e. of the Jail itself.

It would perhaps be well to have C's further remarks on this point & call up papers from Madras. The matter came up, I recollect, some few years back, but the correspondence is in the Madras office.

There are other points in the correspondence which would have to be brought up when the papers are laid before Govt.

R.B.

28 Apr 88

I. G.'s letter No 17 of 25 April 98.

This correspondence commenced with the I. G.'s letter No: 4478 of 2 Sep 97 (Flag G). This letter is addressed to the Chief Secretary to Government and was "transferred to the P. W. D." by Jud. Dept. Endt No: 1856 of 6 Sep 97. Thereupon subsidiary correspondence arose between the Chief Engineer and the Inspector General. The question raised by the I. G. has still to be laid before Govt.

I have now read the papers for the first time and am inclined to think that the Examiner's rendering of para 99. Chapt. Vol II of the P. W. Code is open to question. He makes out that an estimate for ventilators in the cabins is supplementary to another estimate for a well in the Central

---

Cir. 3067

W

For orders.

In para 6 of this office letter No 1816C dated 24th March 1898, you stated your opinion that "it is improbable that Govt. will sanction any change in the rules" &c. —

In the fair copy, the word improbable appears to have been written as "impossible", and this word seems to have given umbrage to the I. G. of ~~Jails~~ Prisons.

The I. G. observes that this office letter No 1816C of 24. 3. 98 does not attempt to deal with the conclusive & unanswerable arguments contained in his No C. [illegible] 473 dated

Architect

6.2.98 – The arguments were not dealt with, because the I.G. was requested in the first instance to say whether he had considered the other side of the question, i.e. the points mentioned in paras 2 & 3 of this office letter No 1816C.

The I.G. does not answer these points at all, but merely objects to the proposal that a forecast of the works required should be made annually – He seems to assume that the inspection suggested by this office would be made by himself, but there is nothing to prevent such inspection being carried ~~on~~ out by local officers – The I.G.'s remarks about delays in the P.W. Dept. do not appear to be ~~a~~ called for at all –

With reference to para 3 of the I.G.'s letter, it is submitted that para 4 of this office letter merely showed that his proposals might result in an infringement of P.W. Code rules – He however places a construction on the para that was never intended.

C.

13/4/98

Sir, In reply [illegible]

I – [illegible] to state that the words 'impossible' which purports in para 1, if it occurs in my letter, is a misprint for 'impracticable', the word used in the draft – I regret the mistake.

2. With regard to the
rest of the letter it
consists either of
misapprehensions of
my meaning or of
offensive remarks
about the O.W.D.

As you cannot dismiss
the question concerning
I must decline to
~~discuss the matter~~
continuing the correspondence
~~further with you~~, &
beg that if you wish
any alteration made
in the rules, you will
address Govt. direct
in your own Dept.

H.W.S.
16.5.98

[43/600]

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

C. Nos. 9105, 9402, 11100 of 1897, 399, 1131, 1971 and 3067 of 1898, and letter from the I.G. of Prisons, No. 1750, dated 25th April '98.

~~HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.~~

~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.~~

~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

SUBJECT.

Estimates for Public Works.

D

Note by the Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

~~FOR ORDERS~~.

Mr. de Winton's proposals should be sent to Mr. Cardew for comment.

A.SH
20.5.98

BS
26/5/98.

× Flag G

o Flag H

1. In his letters quoted above, the Inspector General of Prisons asks for a reconsideration of the practice which "appears to be enforced by the P.W. Accounts Department of treating a Jail as a single building". He adds "the reductio ad absurdum of this practice is furnished by G.O. $\overset{\times}{2130}$ W, dated 4th August 1897, where an estimate for strengthening ventilators of sleeping blocks is, at the instance of the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, treated as supplementary to an estimate for sinking a well".

2. The practice originated with G.O. $\overset{o}{1954}$ W, dated 7th August 1895, and on the initiation of the Examiner, who considered that "all sanctions during any one financial year connected with any one work or project should be looked upon as supplemental to one another". During the year 1894-95, the Consulting ---

Architect

HE. 16.5.98 R 21.5.98 H.M. 21/5/98 R 26/5/98

Architect sanctioned 13 estimates of sorts in connection with the -- General Hospital, Madras. The first estimate sanctioned happened to be "providing designation Boards". The result of the Examiner's suggestion would, the Consulting Architect -- pointed out, be that "the nomenclature in the accounts and returns of the whole 13 estimates would be that of the first estimate", viz, 'Providing designation boards'. The Examiner proposed to get over this difficulty by arranging to sanction "one estimate for each building at the commencement of every official year". This arrangement would, he considered, "simplify accounting considerably", and this is undoubtedly the case. Moreover in Code Vol. II Chapter I Para 99 it is distinctly laid down that a Central Jail is to be considered as one 'work' and all its outbuildings as 'Subworks'

3. The Inspector General of Prisons, in the correspondence quoted above, considers the difficulties in the way of framing one estimate for each 'work' per annum to be very great, if not insurmountable. He points out that, to enable him to estimate the requirements of each building it would be necessary for him to tour all over the Presidency just before the commencement of each official year, so as to see each building for himself. If this be so, the arrangement must be admitted to be impracticable; but such a tour seems to be altogether unnecessary. The Chief Engineer does not inspect every --- building before submitting or sanctioning estimates for its repair; that duty is delegated to the Executive Engineer in charge of the Division, occasionally supervised by the Superintending Engineer. In the same manner the Superintendent of a jail can surely be trusted to -- estimate the requirements of his -- jail, with occasional supervision on the part of the Inspector-General.

4. There is no doubt that the Examiner is correct in his interpretation of the Code rules, although the latter are not very explicit on the subject, and it is submitted that the case will be met if the Inspector-General of Prisons is directed to have a forecast made annually, in January, of the requirements of each jail under his charge during the -- ensuing official year, under the heads

(1) Minor New Works

(2) Repairs.

This forecast would be forwarded to

the Executive Engineer in charge of the Division, who, under the authority given to him by Code Vol. I Chapter IX Paras 48 & 59 (See below) would prepare 2 estimates only, one headed--Central Jail-Minor New works 1898-99, and the other---Central jail-Repairs 1898-99; the estimate for each separate building being included under one or the other, and the two estimates being sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, if within his powers, or, if not, submitted to Government for sanction. Any other works found absolutely necessary during the year would be considered as supplemental to one or other of the above estimates, and sanctioned accordingly.

5. The Inspector General of Prisons raises the further question as to whether the existing orders[M] prohibiting the preparation, without sanction of Government, of estimates exceeding Rs. 500 should not be relaxed. He points out that the rule is not in accordance with the P.W. Code, or the recent policy of decentralization of work.

6. In this connection it may be remarked that Code para 59, Chapter IX, Volume I vests the Executive Engineer with a discretionary power of refusing demands for works of the necessity for which he is not satisfied, which power can be supervised by the Superintending Engineer. I agree with the Inspector-General of Prisons that it is unnecessary to go beyond Code rules in this respect, they --- being sufficient to safeguard Government against the preparation of unnecessary estimates, and I recommend that the rulings on this head quoted above be cancelled.

[M] G.O. 1787 W, d/15th June 1892. ~~Flag~~ N
,, 2806 W, d/7th October 1892. ~~Flag~~ O

16.5.98
E.W.

D/ No. 3822 D., d/1st June 1898

Copy of the above, by order, forwarded to the Inspector General of Prisons for any remarks he may wish to offer.

W.S.E.W.

Copy of the above forwarded to the Inspector General of Prisons for any remarks he may wish to offer

The Inspector General of Prisons

The Inspector General of Prisons

Dt 1/6/98

No 382 D d/1 June 1898

---

(1)—2,000—October 1897.

It is requested that any reply to this letter may be addressed to Ootacamund.

No. 2858 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

dated Ootacamund , *the* 7th June 1898.

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS, MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to Government,

Public Works Department. Ooty

SIR,

Enclosures.

In reply to Mr. Russell's Endorsement No. 382/D, dated 1st June 1898, I have the honour to state, without referring to the technical difficulties surrounding the question whether a Jail should, for account purposes, be regarded as a single "building", that, if the suggestion in para 6 of the Chief Engineer's Note is adopted, I am prepared to accept the proposals in para 4, provided that the forecast should be forwarded to the Superintending Engineer rather than to the Executive Engineer.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A G Cardew

Insptr: Genl of Prisons.

JAIL (189) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS,
Madras,

To

THE

Dated
Despatched
Received
189 .

No.

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.