



WORKING PAPER

Working Paper No.100
State Competition with Private Enterpr
The Case of Manufacture in Jails in t
Madras Presidency

by
Padmini Swaminathan

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHI NAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No.100
State Competition with Private Enterprises
The Case of Manufacture in Jails in the
Madras Presidency

by
Padmini Swaminathan

Madras Institute of Development Studies
79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,
Adyar, Madras 600 020

January 1991

Acknowledgements

This is part of an ICSSR funded study on the Growth of the Corporate Sector in the Madras Presidency.

I am grateful to the Library, Research Officer and staff of the Tamil Nadu Archives for their cooperation during the collection of material from the Archives.

R.Sumathi who assisted me in the collection of data from the Archives,

S.Neelakantan, M S S Pandian and Nasir Tyabji for their comments on the paper,

C.Narasimhan who word processed the paper and V.Mohan for the cyclostyling.

State Competition with Private Enterprise: The Case of Manufacture in Jails in the Madras Presidency

An aspect of state intervention that aroused considerable opposition among the commercial community both in the Madras Presidency and elsewhere, related to the question of starting and expansion of industries in jails with the help of prison labour. The issue was seen as competition of the state with private enterprise, and, with the introduction of power machinery in some jails, the cry was raised that the "state was no longer competing with private enterprise with convict labour but with means of production which greatly enhance the output of the jails".

The whole issue of labour in jails has followed a long and torturous course beginning with the question of the aim of the administration in the selection of jail employment¹. The Committee of 1836-38 (with whose appointment can be traced the history of prison reform in India) favoured increased rigour in the treatment of prisoners. It rejected all such reforming influences as moral and religious teaching, education and/or any system of rewards for good conduct and advocated the building of central prisons where the convicts might be engaged not in manufactures which it condemned on somewhat theoretical and unsound grounds but

1. See, for example, the letter from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, dated 20 April 1910, - Judicial, Government Order (G.O.) No. 1097, 21 July 1910.

2. Chapter II and IX of the Report of the Indian Jails Committee, 1919-20, Volume I, Government of India, provide a good summary of the whole issue of jail employment.

"in some dull, monotonous, wearisome and uninteresting tasks in which there shall be wanting even the enjoyment of knowing that a quicker release can be got by working the harder for a time"³. Ever since, there had been an on-going debate on what principles ought to govern the selection of prison labour, how "hard" prison labour ought to be, what really constituted 'hard' labour - a term used in the Indian penal code and to which an offender sentenced to rigorous imprisonment was liable to.

One view held that inasmuch as the prisoner was an offender against the state, the state was justified (especially since the latter had to defray the cost of the prisoners support) in extracting the maximum profit from the labour of the prisoner regardless of considerations such as the effect of such treatment on the person of the prisoner. Over time it was realized that such a policy, apart from being short-sighted sacrificed any prospect of reforming the prisoner and of turning him into a useful member of society.

The acceptance of the principle that the main object of labour to be provided in prison should be to effect the reformation of the prisoner brought forth question such as the kind of labour to be provided, the differentiation that needs to be made between prisoners not only because of differences in their skill level but also due to the differing prison sentences being served. While it was agreed that short-term prisoners could be put into such

3. Ibid., p.30

forms of labour as did not require long training it was really in the case of those prisoners whose sentences were for longer terms that the object of both the reformation of the prisoner and economy in the running of jails could be pursued.

Differences persisted over the question of the most beneficial form of labour as far as the prisoners were concerned. Some authorities relying on the fact that "over 72 per cent of the population are engaged in agriculture and that 57 per cent of male convicts admitted to jails are returned as agriculturists insist that agriculture should be the staple jail industry".⁴ This suggestion was, however, abandoned as being impracticable and the Government of India in its resolutions laid down that the principal mode of employment for long term prisoners had to be intramural.⁵

This paper traces the controversy that arose in the Madras Presidency between the English mercantile community and the State Government over the issue of manufacturing in jails which the mercantile community dubbed as State competition with private enterprise.

We begin with a documentation of the principles and policies enunciated by the Government of India periodically modified to take into account,

4. *Ibid.*, p.119.

5. Government of India, Home Department Resolution No.10-605-18, dated 7 May 1886 - Judicial G.O. No.1493, 7 June 1886, Government of India, Home Department, Letter No.145-155, dated 29 April 1912 - Judicial G.O. No.981, 19 July 1912.

(i) governmental requirements in terms of making the jail pay for its own upkeep;

(ii) prisoners' requirements in terms of making them work not only for their own maintenance but also in the process equipping them with some industrial skill in the hope that this would help them in life after prison;

(iii) the need to keep interference with private enterprise to the minimum.

Our next section deals with the functioning of jails in the Madras Presidency; the specific policies enunciated based on the Government of India's guidelines, the Committees set up in the State to deal with this matter, the periodic reviews undertaken not only to streamline the functioning of the jails in the Presidency but also to expand the manufacturing activities given the Provincial Government's commitment to foster and strengthen jail industries.

In the third section we enter into the controversy proper between the Government and the mercantile community over the whole question of 'undue' interference by the State with private enterprises. The details surrounding the controversy document:

(a) the utter insensitivity of the commercial community (and therefore their selfishness) to the whole question of reformation of the prisoner as revealed in their insistence

on the point that "jail labour ought to be before all things penal"⁶ (emphasis added);

(b) the differing perception of the mercantile community and Government officials (both British) over the question of the role of the State, and the admissibility of the latter's intervention in areas that the English commercial community asserted belonged to the domain of the private sector.

The controversy spanned a period of almost four and a half to five decades. We begin our discussion with the Resolution of the Government of India on the issue in 1886 and end with the beginning of the Second World War by which time the intensity of the controversy had petered out. The period coincides with the rise of the Indian national movement which made it imperative for the colonial Government, especially after World War I, to make some concessions to the demands for economic development, particularly industrial development. This larger question of the slow, albeit late, development of industries under Indian entrepreneurship challenging British hegemony of the industrial field is outside the scope of this paper. But what is of immediate relevance to our concern here is that a substantial part of the rancour of the mercantile community against State promotion/initiation of industries in general⁷

6. Letter from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, dated 20 April 1910 - Judicial G.O. No.1097, 21 July 1910.

7. See in this context the author's paper on "State Intervention in Industrialisation: A Case Study of the Madras Presidency", (mimeo, 1990).

and in jails in particular arose from the fact that it took away from British business interests their monopoly of Government contracts. It needs to be mentioned here that private enterprise represented by the mercantile community did not deem it to be its responsibility to invest in order to expand domestic demand nor would it allow active State intervention in the development of industries. It is in this context of a "neither you nor me" attitude of the mercantile community that this article is anchored.

I

The question of jail industries and the various issues that arose in connection with it among which the use of power machinery was one, were discussed by the Government of India between the years 1882 and 1886 and the principles then adopted were embodied in a Resolution issued in May 1886. * The principles then laid down to regulate the policy of Government in the matter of the industrial employment of prisoners were the following:

"(1) Extramural labour cannot be the principal mode of employment of long-term prisoners, who must therefore be employed intramurally.

(2) In central jails there must be well-regulated forms of industrial employment on a large scale.

(3) Jail industries must not compete injuriously with private capitalists in the neighbourhood.

8.(i) Judicial G.O. No. 1643, 21 October 1882
(ii)" G.O.No.1493, 7 June 1886.

(4) Jails must not be converted into steam factories. The use of steam machinery is not prohibited, but all extensions of substantial magnitude must be submitted to the Government of India for sanction.

(5) Jail industries must be adapted as far as possible to the requirements of the public consuming departments and these departments must be compelled to take articles of jail manufacture as long as they can be supplied of the same quality and at the same price as in the open market.

(6) The price of jail made articles must follow as closely as possible the existing market rates for similar products made by private industry.

(7) Multifarious employments must be avoided.

(8) The penal element must be fully maintained".⁹

Twenty years later in 1906, the Government of India felt that the time was ripe for a reconsideration of the general position and for a full enquiry into the manner in which jail industries were being carried on.¹⁰ With regard to some of the principles enumerated above the Government of India did not feel the need to re-open the discussion. Starting with the assumption that "there must be in the central jails intramural industrial employments on a large scale", the Government of India laid down that these were to be adapted as far as possible to meet the requirements of

9. Judicial G.O. No. 1493, 7 June 1886.

10. Letter from the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Jails) to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated 10 August 1906 - Judicial G.O. No.1814, October 1907.

the public consuming departments. However the Government of India realised that acceptance of the principle that jails could legitimately supply the consuming departments of Government meant that competition to some extent with private enterprise became unavoidable. "If the jails did not manufacture articles required for the consuming departments these would be manufactured by private enterprise. To this extent the jail industries compete with private enterprise, and in the opinion of the Government of India, do so legitimately"¹¹ (emphasis added).

While it was realised and laid down that "jail industries must not compete injuriously with private capitalists", the issue of when competition became injurious was never really satisfactorily settled. Certain norms were no doubt laid down by the Government of India which acted as guidelines, the interpretation and operationalisation of which brought forth the differing perceptions of the jail authorities and the business community and consequently the generation of much heat over the whole issue of state competition with private enterprise through manufactures in jails. Among the safeguards laid down it was emphasized that the consuming departments of government were to take articles of jail manufacture as long as they could be supplied of the same quality and at the same price as in the open market. It was recognized that there would not be a total ban on the sale to the public of any article which was

11. Ibid

being manufactured in the jails; the question that then arose was how jails were to dispose off their surplus stocks and/or limit their outturn so as not to exceed the requirements of public departments.¹²

The kind of restrictions contemplated by the Government of India in such cases amounted to making it clear that "jails do not exist for the purpose of making a profit and that, ...a profitable return from industrial employment ought not to be made the test of prison efficiency".¹³ Furthermore the advertising of jail-made wares and the maintenance of catalogues or price lists were prohibited, surplus stock were not to be sold directly to the public but to wholesale dealers with public tenders being called for; depots for the sale of jail manufactures were to be prohibited. As regards the use of steam machinery, the Government of India felt that a jail was not to purposely handicap itself by the use of obsolete or inferior machinery. The caveat specified in proposals to install machinery for the first time in any jail was that the objects of the installation and the possibility of its interfering with private enterprise were to be very thoroughly examined and if the proposal stood, the sanction of the Government of India was to be obtained. "One important aspect of this question, however, is the necessity for preserving the penal element in jail industries, and no

12. Ibid

13. Ibid

doubt this necessity will always be borne in mind", opined the Government of India.¹⁴

Among the other bodies that went into the question of prison labour and manufactures were the Indian Industrial Commission (IIC) in its Report in 1916-18 and the Indian Jails Committee (IJC) in its Report in 1919-20.¹⁵ The latter was specially invited to deal with the remarks of the IIC on the subject of jail manufactures, their competition with the products of free labour and the use of power driven machinery in Indian jails. The IIC did not profess to offer final conclusions on these matters but recommended that the subject be considered by experts. It however did make certain suggestions. After admitting that jail industries were justifiable in order to recover as far as possible the cost of the upkeep of the jails, to keep the prisoners employed and to teach a trade that will be useful to the prisoners after their release, the Report of the IIC went on to lay down that only manual labour was to be allowed to be used in jails and that the extensive use of machinery was undesirable. The ambivalent and operationally contradictory nature of the suggestions made by the IIC can be discerned from its statement, that, while jails could supply the needs of government departments to a much greater extent than at present, it condemned the use of efficient and up-to-date

14. Ibid

15. (i) Report of the Indian Industrial Commission 1916-18, (Reprinted 1980), Agricole Publishing Academy, New Delhi, especially Chapter XV.

(ii) Report of the Indian Jails Committee 1919-20, Government of India Chapter IX (Volume I).

means of manufacture without which this result could not be achieved; at the same time the IIC also condemned the manual industries which existed in jails as likely to compete with free cottage industries.

The IJC went extensively into the whole question. Most of the recommendations of this Committee found favour with the local governments, based on whose replies the Government of India enumerated the following principles:-

"(a) that the main object of prison labour should be the reformation of the criminals;

(b) that non-productive labour should be avoided;

(c) that short-term prisoners must necessarily be employed mainly on unskilled labour;

(d) that the principal mode of employment for long term prisoners should be intramural;

(e) that greater benefit to the prisoner is conferred by giving him the best available instruction in up-to-date methods of labour and so fitting him for free living under modern conditions;

(f) that attention should be concentrated in each jail in one or two main industries;

(g) that jail industries should be adapted to meet the needs of the consuming departments of Government".¹⁶

On the important question of the utilisation of power-driven machinery in jails, the IJC stated emphatically that

16. Letter from Dy. Secretary to Government of India to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated 19 December 1922. Law (General), G.O. No. 217, 22 January 1923.

"as the reformation of the prisoner is the chief object to be kept in view, and as familiarity with power driven machinery is instructive and mind awakening, the provision of such machinery subserves the true functions of jail administration; while at the same time it increases production and tends to give increased relief to the tax payer. It is therefore from all these points of view justifiable, but it should be employed in well established and organised industries and care should be taken to avoid any interference with nascent or unorganised industrial enterprises. Subject to this safeguard, we recommend that the restriction on the development of jail manufactures by power driven machinery should be withdrawn, that consuming departments of the state should be directed to obtain their requirements from the jails and that it should be the recognized duty of the jail department to develop their industries so as to meet these requirements. ...In making these recommendations we are not blind to the fact that increased production in jails will imply increased competition with free enterprise and that such competition affects particular interests, especially those of the shareholders in industrial ventures, more than it does the great mass of the community. ...[that] when all is done that can be done, prison labour remains inefficient as compared with free labour, and [that] the total number of prisoners available for manufactures spread over all the Provinces of

India, is not sufficient to have any appreciable effect on the great mass of industrial employment in the country".¹⁷

The Government of India invited the attention of the Local Governments to the above recommendations of the IJC since it involved a departure from the policy of the Government as laid down in 1886 and in 1906, and, since it was also at variance with the recommendations contained in the report of the IIC. The replies received denoted concurrence with the views expressed by the IJC. Consequently, the Governor General in Council decided "with the approval of the Secretary of State for India to cancel the orders on the subject contained in the Home Department Resolution NO.10-605-18, dated the 7th May 1886, and in the Home Department letter NO.145-154 dated 29th April 1912, as he considers that the existing restrictions on the use of power driven machinery should be relaxed and that it may be employed in well established industries, care being taken to avoid interference with nascent or unorganised industrial enterprises though he is disposed to think that the apprehension of the possible competition of jails with established industries is more imaginary than real".¹⁸

II

It would be pertinent at this stage to get an idea of the functioning of the jails in this Presidency in terms of

17. Report of the Indian Jails Committee, Op.cit., p.125-126.

18. Resolution dated 19 December 1922, Home Department, Government of India - Law (General) G.O.No.217, 22 January 1923.

the kind of industries permitted and those actually carried on in the different jails, the departments to which the articles made in these jails were supplied - in short the principles that governed and the practice that obtained as far as manufacturing activities in jails were concerned. We start with the first exhaustive review that was done by the Provincial Government in 1907, covering the whole question of jail industries and the various issues that arose in connection with it, including the use of power machinery.¹⁹

The provincial government accepted and functioned on the principle that jails must have industries and also that prison labour was best employed in meeting the requirements of the large consuming departments of government. Further, the government also frankly affirmed that government contracts should go to jails as soon as it had been satisfactorily proved that jails were capable of undertaking the work. In the Madras Presidency manufacturing operations were chiefly carried on in eight central jails and four district jails. Table 1 gives an idea of the articles manufactured in these different jails and supplied to Government departments. The chief industries concentrated in the different jails were: -²⁰

Cotton weaving - Coimbatore, Trichinopoly and Cuddalore

Tent-making - Coimbatore

19. Letter from Acting Secretary, Government of Madras, (Judicial Department) to the Secretary to the Government of India, Dated 25 October 1907 - Judicial, G.O. No.1815, 25 October 1907.

20. Law (General) Letter No.504, 3 June 1921.

Pile carpet weaving and leather work - Vellore
 Woollen cumlies and blanket - Trichinopoly, Bellary and
 Rajahmundry
 Jute fibre and gunny pattah making - Vizagapatnam
 Coir fibre industry - Cannanore
 Carpentry - Cannanore and Madras Penitentiary
 Printing - Madras Penitentiary
 Iron and aluminium work - Salem
 Cotton tape and thread - Palamcottah

The only jail in the Presidency in which articles were made for private sale to any appreciable extent was the central jail at Coimbatore, where machinery obtained from England had been installed and the work carried on with steam power. The only two central jails in the Presidency in which steam machinery had been installed were the Penitentiary for printing and the central jail at Coimbatore for weaving. The Penitentiary press worked solely for government. Initially, the powerlooms in the Coimbatore jail were worked by a treadmill, and a small engine was used to provide steam for and work a sizing machine. The material turned out on these looms was confined to 'drill' for the Police department and for many years the outturn was supplemented by hand-woven cloth from other jails. The cloth was of inferior quality which brought forth constant complaints. About the year 1896 the treadmill broke down; by this time the looms which had been in use for twenty years were also found to be in bad shape. New looms were obtained

and put under steam power. The work turned out was so satisfactory, that not only all the cloth for the police, but the demands of other public consuming departments were also given over to this jail.²¹

Having admitted that jails could legitimately supply the consuming departments of government the question that then had to be considered was how such contracts could be entered into. In the Madras Presidency over the years, the civil departments that dealt with the jails had practically discontinued calling for tenders and year after year obtained their requirements from the jails at rates that had gradually become more or less permanent or rather the rate was rarely changed unless there was a change of sample. In the case of Military contracts however the jails were made to compete with private firms and unless the jail tender happened to be the lowest the contract was placed elsewhere.²² The Acting Inspector General of Prisons, Gadsden, was firmly of the view that, since it had been recognized that jails must have industries and since prison labour was best employed in meeting the requirements of the large consuming departments of government, "the Government of India should not hesitate to affirm frankly that government contracts shall go to jails as soon as it has been satisfactorily proved that the jails are capable of undertaking the work. The objections to this procedure will

21. Judicial G.O. No. 1815, 25 October 1907.

22. See letter from Acting Inspector-General of Prisons to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 23 September 1906 - Judicial G.O. No. 1814, 25 October 1907.

occur in whatever form the jails take up the contracts".²³
(emphasis as in original)

The Madras Government fully concurred with the Government of India and endeavoured to give full effect to the orders relating to the provision in central jails of well-regulated modes of industrial employment on a large scale, the necessity for avoiding multifarious employments and for standardizing jail industries as far as possible. The Provincial Governments were asked to give their comments on the various proposals put forth by the Indian Jails Committee in its Report in 1919-20. The Madras Government in its reply endorsed the main principles put forth by the IJC that were to govern prison manufactures, namely, (a) that the reform of the prisoner was the essential feature of prison management; (b) jails were to concentrate on one or two large industries and avoid multifarious activities; (c) industries were to be so selected that they could employ prisoners profitably and taught them a trade to follow after release.²⁴

The Madras Government also agreed with the IJC's observation that jails were to employ modern power driven machines and up-to-date tools and methods of production wherever large scale production of standardised articles were required for consuming departments of Government. In

23. Ibid

24. Letter from Inspector-General of Prisons, to the Secretary to Government, Home (Judicial) Department, dated 2 March 1921 - Law (General), Letter No.504, 3 June 1921.

this context it categorically asserted that the use of power driven machinery in the jails of the Presidency had not been injurious to private enterprise as the output had been limited and largely consumed by government departments.²⁵

Another Committee that also examined the various aspects of manufacturing in jails was the Madras Retrenchment Committee in 1921. The latter then made suggestions with a view to make jails more efficient and self supporting. Among their recommendations were the following:

"(i) that up-to-date machinery should be installed wherever necessary and adequate provision made, where local conditions were suitable, for the introduction of such preliminary processes as spinning, the capital required for such expansion being found by loans; and that the Inspector General of Prisons should have an expert to assist him in supervising the jail industries and advise him on questions connected with them;

(ii) that the system now adopted for the purchase of raw materials should be examined with a view to decide whether the establishment of an agency for purchase would be more economical and efficient;

(iii) that in order to secure a steady market for the products of jail labour it should be made obligatory on all

25. Ibid

consuming departments of government to purchase articles of jail manufacture subject to safeguards as to quality and price; and

(iv) that the system of accounts maintained should be recast the possibility of introducing a commercial system of accounts being kept in view".²⁶

The Government of Madras considered that these proposals should be subjected to a careful examination by a Committee which should work out, in consultation with the expert technical officers of the Government, detailed schemes for improving the efficiency of the industries in jails and also advise on the other questions raised. Accordingly a Committee was constituted in 1924 ²⁷. The members of the committee visited most of the jails and discussed the improvements needed in particular industries with technical expert officers and their detailed recommendations were accompanied in every case by careful estimates of the expenditure involved. To sum up, their recommendations included,

(a) the installation of a power cotton spinning plant at Coimbatore, a wool spinning plant at Bellary on an experimental scale at first, while at Salem they contemplated some simple machinery actuated by man power in connection with the steel and aluminium manufactures, some

26. See Order No.2157, in Law (General) G.O. No.2157, dated 4 July 1925.

27. Law (General) G.O. No.1934, dated 30 June 1924.

comparatively inexpensive boot making plant, and at Cannanore they recommended the organisation of coir yarn and mat industries with improved plant and under skilled supervision. They also recommended a thorough overhaul and reorganisation of the more widespread carpentry industry;

(b) they advised that the services of the technical officers of the department of Industries should be made available to the jail department in preference to the suggestion that the department should have an expert adviser;

(c) they were against the introduction of commercial accounts though they considered that large scale industries involving the use of power should have an adequate costing system suited to the industry; they strongly recommended that the purchase of such jail articles as could be made economically and efficiently should be made obligatory on departments of government subject to certain safeguards detailed by them.²⁸

The Madras Government accepted almost all the recommendations of the Committee after very few modifications.

In 1932, in the Madras Government a review of the question whether government policy towards jail manufacture needed revision was again undertaken. The overwhelming

28. Law (General) G.O.No.2157, dated 4 July 1925.

opinion was that the observations and recommendations of the Jail Industries Committee of 1924 were still valid. "It will be observed", the government spokesperson stated, "that it is only after a careful examination of the recommendations of the various committees, the jail industries have been organised in the Presidency. Even now according to the recommendations of the Jail Industries Committee only such of the articles as can be made economically and efficiently are now required to be purchased compulsorily by the departments of Government"²⁹. (emphasis added)

Brushing aside suggestions to effect a change in policy, the government submitted that "the installation of power driven machinery and the employment of trained instructors in the several jails have placed these concerns more or less on a permanent basis. They have cost the government enormously and any direction to recede from the steps already taken regarding these industries will result in serious loss to government. The jails department have, on the advice of committees, undertaken only such manufactures as can be advantageously carried out by the department. In the circumstances stated above there does not seem to be any real necessity for a change in the policy of government adopted in the matter of jail industries. Jails cannot obviously compete successfully with private enterprise but is endeavouring to meet the reasonable requirements of the consuming departments of government in respect of their

29. Law (General) G.O. No.732, dated 24 February 1932.

orders. At the same time the Inspector General of Prisons should see that the jail industries are run on sound and efficient lines so that the consuming departments may not have any cause for complaint in regard to the quality of the articles supplied to them".³⁰

III

Manufacturing in jails under the aegis of the state had its critics who kept up a constant correspondence with the provincial and central governments condemning state sponsored manufacturing in general and the introduction of steam machinery in particular as being unfair and detrimental to private enterprise. The Coimbatore central jail, where weaving and making of cotton goods was carried on a fairly large scale, became the prime target of attack from the Chambers of Commerce in general and M/s Binny and Co in particular. In the beginning, for almost twenty years, that is, upto 1905, Binny and Co addressed their complaints directly to the Government of India requesting the latter to bring pressure on the Provincial Government to close down and/or at least minimize manufacturing activities in jails. It was only in 1905 that the Government of India in one of its replies to Binny and Co (through the Madras Government) informed the Company that "in future any representations which they wish to make must be submitted through the

30. Ibid

Government of Madras".²¹ The arguments and counter arguments in the case and the unresolvable nature of the debate, inadvertently, also reveal the differing perceptions of the mercantile community and the officials in the provincial government over the role of the state.

Mention has already been made of the installation of new machinery and expansion of weaving facilities in the Coimbatore jail towards the closing years of the 19th century. Complaining against this, Binny's quoted an extract from the proceedings of the Government of India, Home Department resolution of 1886 to show how the action of the jail authorities was a direct violation of the expressed views of the Governor-General in Council.

"With regard to intramural employments the Governor-General in Council admits that, in Provinces having a completely organized system of Central jails, there must be in such jails well regulated industrial employments on a large scale; but His Excellency in Council considers that Jails should not be converted into steam factories. The use of steam machinery in jails will not, however in future be absolutely prohibited, although care should be taken that limits are set to its employment in individual cases, where it is found to be incompatible with the penal character of convict labour, or where there is strong reason to believe

21. Letter from Under Secretary, Government of India, to the Chief Secretary, Government of Madras dated 6 June 1905.
- Judicial, G.O. No. 1080-81, dated 8 July 1905.

that it enables the jails to compete injuriously with private capitalists in the neighbourhood. If any jail industry is proved seriously to injure any local trade, it should be discontinued in favour of some other kind of employment".³²

The use of power looms in the Coimbatore jail, therefore, according to Binny's enabled the jail to compete injuriously with private capitalists in the neighbourhood and was, hence, a direct discouragement to the development of private enterprise.

Cardew, Inspector General of Prisons, in his letter to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, stated that the new machines installed in the Coimbatore jail were to replace the 25 year old machinery of the jail: "renewals are obviously essential and such renewals are evidently authorized by the para of the Home Department Resolution quoted in M/s Binny and Co.'s letter".³³ Cardew also pointed out that the Government of India had laid stress on the importance of developing jail manufactures particularly with a view to supplying the requirements of government departments. "But until the Government of India's views on the subject of manufactures undergo a change, it is impossible to allow jail manufactures to retrogress and if

32. See letter from Binny and Co. to the Chief Secretary, Government of Madras, dated 6 December 1898.

- Judicial G.O. No.1342, dated 22 August 1899.

33. Letter from Inspector-General of Prisons dated 3 January 1899 to the Chief Secretary, Madras - Judicial G.O. No.187, dated 1 February 1899.

retrogression is to be avoided, machinery must from time to time be renewed and replaced with renewed and more efficient types. The action taken at the Coimbatore central jail has not gone beyond this and is not reasonably open to the random remarks contained in M/s Binny and Co.'s communication."³⁴

The Government of India in its orders on the above complaint agreed with the Government of Madras that M/s Binny and Co.'s petition disclosed no reasonable ground of complaint. The Government of India's letter stressed the fact that while paragraph 6 of the Home Department Resolution of 1886 dealt with the general question of supplies to the public and forbid jail manufactures being carried on in such a manner as to compete injuriously with private enterprise in the same neighbourhood, paragraph 7 requested local governments and administrators to adopt their intramural industries to the needs of the public consuming departments. These departments were required to take articles of jail manufacture in preference to any other provided such articles were supplied by the jails of the same quality and at the same price as they could be obtained in the open market. Hence the Government of India letter emphasized that the "general orders in paragraph 6 of the Resolution of May 1886 are subject to the regulations

34. Ibid

regarding supplies to public departments prescribed in paragraph 7".³⁵

In 1900, Binny's forwarded, as an illustration of the extent of jail competition with private enterprise in the Madras Presidency an extract from the Madras Mail containing an advertisement of the Vellore Central Jail offering to the supply a number of miscellaneous articles to the public.³⁶ The Inspector General of Prisons tried to justify multifarious activities in the Vellore jail on the ground that it was not possible to utilize all available labour supply on the one principal industry which, in the Vellore Central jail was tent making. Consequently, certain minor industries that offered facilities for providing prisoners with a ready means of obtaining an honest livelihood on release from jail were chosen.³⁷ However orders were issued to the Vellore Central jail to reduce the multifarious industries carried on there. This jail was also asked to desist from advertising for sale in the local papers articles of jail manufacture.³⁸

In 1905 Binny's again addressed a memorandum to the Department of Industries and Commerce entitled 'Jail vs

35. Letter from Inspector General of Prisons to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 21.4.1900.

- Judicial G.O.No.187, dated 1 February 1899.

36. Ibid

37. Letter from Inspector General of Prisons to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 21.4.1900.

-Judicial G.O. No.757, dated 30 May 1900.

38. Orders of the Government, Judicial G.O. No.757, dated 30 May 1900.

Cotton Mills' in which they lamented: "we have at various times during the last twenty years addressed the Local Government on the subject of jail competition with private enterprise but without satisfactory results either in the decrease of such competition or of any hope that the competition would cease at some future time".³⁹ Their principal target was the cotton mill at the central jail at Coimbatore which had added considerably to its capacity and had taken over not only the supply of drills to the Police and Madras Army clothing departments but also material to the Supply and Transport departments. Besides, the jail had extended its efforts to cover Burmah also, the latter being supplied with sheets made at the Coimbatore jail.

Binny's accordingly requested the Government of India to ensure that:-

(a) sale in the open market of cloths manufactured in jails was prohibited when such goods competed with existing private manufactures;

(b) an enquiry was made by Government before ordering power machinery to supply cloth to Government departments to ascertain whether private enterprise had expended capital in importing special machinery to meet particular government requirements;

39. Letter from Binny and Co., to the Department of Industry & Commerce, Government of India dated 13 February 1905.
- Judicial G.O. No.460, dated 23 March 1905.

(c) the use of power machinery by jails was limited;

(d) private manufactures were given a fair and equal chance of competing with jails for government contracts and that when the tenders of jails were found unsatisfactory, the latter was not given a special favoured chance of reconsidering their tendered rates.⁴⁰

The Inspector General of Prisons, Madras, and the Chief Secretary, Madras Government, in their reply to the Government of India differed fundamentally from the views expressed by Binny's and refused to accede to the latter's demand. Commenting seriatim on the points raised by Binny's their contention was that:-

(a) requesting Government of India to prohibit the sale in the open market of cloths manufactured in jails when such goods competed with existing private manufactures was tantamount to asking that all weaving in jails be discontinued in as much as all cloth even that used for convict clothing could be obtained in the open market and therefore, if made in the jails must in a sense compete with private enterprise. While it was laid down that the intramural industries of the jails should be adapted as much as possible to the requirements of the public consuming departments, it was pointed out that it was not possible always for a jail to obtain contracts from public

40. (i) Judicial G.O. No. 831, dated 20 May 1905.

(ii) Judicial G.O. No.1080-81, dated 8 July 1905.

departments that would exactly keep all the looms occupied throughout the year. When government orders were not sufficient certain articles were manufactured for private sale. In the Coimbatore jail the articles thus manufactured were only such as had been made on handloom for the past thirty or forty years. Better machinery had merely enabled the jail to improve on these materials;

(b) expecting the government to make an 'enquiry' as to whether private enterprise had expended capital on importing special machinery to meet particular government requirements was considered unreasonable by the provincial government authorities. The latter referred the company to Government of India order of 1900 in which it was explained that the intention of the order was to enable the government "to avail itself of labour, for the maintenance of which it has to pay, in producing articles it has to purchase". It was also considered important that government was not to be solely dependent on private enterprise for its public wants especially when it had an institution to meet these wants;

(c) the introduction of power machinery had become necessary to meet the essential condition under which the public consuming departments were required to take articles of jail manufacture in preference to other, namely, that such articles as were supplied to by the jails were of the same quality as could be obtained in the open market;

(d) as regards the request that private manufactures be given a fair and equal chance of competing with jails for government contracts, it was pointed out that Binny's had misapprehended the conditions of the "favoured chance" referred to. The correct procedure that government departments were required to adopt was that before calling for tenders in the open market, the prevailing prices of such articles as the jails could supply was to be ascertained (by private local enquires) and the probable requirements with samples (if necessary) communicated to the Inspector General of Prisons with a view to it being considered whether the jails could undertake the supplies at those rates and according to the samples specified. It was only after the jails had declared their inability to do so that tenders were to be called for in the open market in which the jails were refrained from competing.⁴¹

In 1910 Binny's tried to pressurize Provincial Governments through the Chambers of Commerce in India. In a letter addressed to the Chamber of Commerce, Madras⁴², detailing what it termed "serious injury" being done to the private woollen mills of India, particularly the Bangalore Woollen, Cotton and Silk Mills, by the Bhagalpur Jail and to the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills by the Coimbatore Jail, Binny's urged the Chamber of Commerce in India to unite in

41. Ibid

42. Letter from Binny and Co. (Ltd) Madras, to the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, dated 7 March 1910
- Judicial G.O.No.1097, 21 July 1910.

pressing on the Government of India and if necessary, on the Secretary of State for India, the acceptance of the principle laid down by the Sydney Congress of Chambers of Commerce that "in no case should power machinery be employed in jails for the production of articles of trade"⁴³.

Binny began their tirade against the Provincial Government by stating that the "competition with private enterprise is [then] by Government machinery and not merely by Government's criminals"⁴⁴. The various issues raised by Binny's were as follows:⁴⁵

"(a) Government seems never to have understood that if a Government department takes the finished products of a jail, it does not supply the raw material... The Bhagalpur jail buys its wool in the open market in competition with the private manufacturers; correspondents of ours gravely complain of the impossibility of purchasing wool in the districts in which the jail is operating of the high prices

43. The resolution on jail manufactures as finally adopted by the Sydney Congress is worth reproducing.

"Whereas private enterprise has the right to be protected against the competition of articles of trade manufactured by convict labour at an artificially lowered cost of production; and whereas there are indications of a tendency in certain parts of the Empire to develop the commercial element of jail labour to the injury of private manufacturers, this Congress approves the principle that the products of jail labour should be used in Government services only but in no case should power machinery be employed in jails for the production of articles of trade"

- Appendix A to letter from Binny and Co., Madras to the Chamber of Commerce, Madras dated 7 March 1910.

Ibid.

44. Ibid

45. What follows has been taken from Binny's letter to the Chamber of Commerce, Ibid.

paid and of the consequent demoralization for a considerable time of the market. In any manufacturing industry the price paid for the raw material is plainly of as much importance as the sales value of the finished goods and the action of a government department which affects the one is as prejudicial as if it affected the other.

(b) The Coimbatore jail not only makes no secret of its desire to sell to the public, but pushes the business by commercial method... The jail sometime ago installed expensive check looms, government departments do not use checks, and there could be no clearer proof of a deliberate intention to cater for the public market than the purchase of special looms to manufacture such cloths. We have brought this fact to the notice of government without the slightest effect.

(c) The effect of the jail action has been that the woollen machinery at Bangalore is now only fully employed in exceptional years. In years of moderate demand much of it is stopped. During the last six months of 1909, only half the machinery of the mill was at work. The Army clothing contracts alone would have materially altered this condition of things.

(d) The Government of India requires "extensions of magnitude" in jail machinery to be submitted to it for sanction. Both Bhagalpur and Coimbatore appear to have made

such extensions but there does not seem to have been any such sanction obtained.

(e) ...We do most strongly object to a system which permits the money of the state to be continually expended in larger means of competition with the private manufacturer. Unless checked, this expenditure will go on and will become more and more a serious economic factor. The example of Bengal and Madras has already led the Punjab to contemplate steam machinery in the jails of the Province, and we may look for the same action in other parts of India. There is no security that such new jail factories will be limited to the industries already undertaken and once established they will grow by the natural process of 'replacements'.

(f) India is, we believe, the only country in the world which employs steam machinery in jails, or which justifies such employment for the supply of government requirements. A government controlled by public opinion would scarcely use such a pretext, and the fate of a British Ministry which turned on such grounds Parkhurst into a cotton mill or Dartmoor into a woollen factory would be sudden and memorable.

(g) Treated as a commercial undertaking the jail results are contemptible, whilst the system is a failure both as regards penal discipline and the reform of the criminal".

The Chamber of Commerce, Madras, forwarded the letter by Binny containing the above allegations to the Government of India (through the Madras Government) and strongly urged on the Government of India the necessity of imposing severe limitations on the employment of power machinery in jails until such time as its use could be altogether suppressed. "There is a tendency to lay too much stress on the commercial aspect of convict labour, in forgetfulness of the principle that jail labour ought to be before all things penal", the Chamber added.⁴⁶

The response from various official quarters to the above offensive launched by Binny through the Chamber of Commerce was equally scathing.

(1) The emphasis on the retention of the penal element in prison labour came in for a lot of flak, particularly from officials directly involved with jail administration.

Gadsden, Acting Inspector General of Prisons, remarked: "...the commercial community in general appears to hold the opinion that, as soon as an individual is placed in jail, his labour should be lost to the country and he is no longer entitled to earn his living. There is a large prison population for which some suitable labour must be found, and I consider that the ordinary tax payer may reasonably expect that the prison population should be to some extent self supporting, and this cannot be done without some

46. Letter from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, 20 April 1910.

- Judicial G.O. No.1097, 21 July 1910.

interference with private enterprise... A well organised industry where tasks can be carefully watched and exacted is perhaps the best method of maintaining the penal element, for though the work in such an industry would not be considered laborious especially where machinery is employed, it necessitates the constant attention of the prisoner throughout the working hours and also possesses an educational element which has not, I venture to say received the attention it deserves".⁴⁷

Col. Macnamara, Inspector-General of Prisons, Madras in a memorandum wrote: "such interest as the commercial interest takes in the subject is of a personal, if not of a more or less selfish character, and they are, to all interests and purposes neither actuated by a desire to benefit humanity at large, nor to take into consideration how matters stand from the point of view of criminal administration or reform ... They never think of how prisoners are to be employed if all the fields they wish to reserve to themselves, were closed against jail goods; they never think of how the general taxpayer may be affected so long as grist can be brought to their own mills, and most important of all, they never consider the question of the reform of the criminal, which is one, if not the principal point that should dominate the whole controversy. We must therefore choose between industry and interference on the one hand, and idleness and non-

47. Letter from E.H. Gadsden, Acting Inspector General of Prisons, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 23 September 1906.

- Judicial G.O. No.1814, 25 October 1907.

interference on the other. The former means the reform of the prisoner and putting him in the way of earning his living, to the benefit of the public at large, while the latter means making him a worse member of society than when he entered the jail, and increased cost to the state, for the advantage of a few".⁴⁸

The Indian Jails Committee categorically put down in its Report that the main object of prison labour was reformation of the prisoner. Consequently all forms of labour that were purposeless and sterile were to be eschewed.⁴⁹

(b) Some of the accusations levelled by Binny's were not just debatable but factually incorrect.

Binny's had charged the Coimbatore Jail of installing expensive check looms when no Government department used such cloth. Gadsden exposed the falsity of this argument by pointing out, firstly, that there was one department of Government which did use check cloth, namely the Ordnance Department. For several years the Coimbatore Jail had been given the contract for check dusters for this department for which the four check looms had been obtained. Further, it was emphasized, that the outturn of miscellaneous cloth obtained from the looms during the time they were not

48. Memorandum on Prison Labour and the disposal of Jail made goods written by Lt.Col. R.J.Macnamara, Inspector-General of Prisons - Judicial G.O. No.1061, 3 August 1908. Also reproduced in the Report of the Indian Jails Committee 1919-20, Volume 2, Minutes of Evidence, p.425-434.

49. Report of the Indian Jails Committee 1919-20, Volume I, op.cit., p.118.

employed on work for government departments was so trifling that it could not be regarded as injuriously affecting Binny or any other private firm.⁵⁰ As regards Binny's accusation that 'extensions of magnitude' had been made in jail industrial machinery without Government sanction, Gadsden was furious that "a firm of Messrs. Binny and Co.'s standing should make statements without verifying the facts. Additions (to the Coimbatore Jail) were made from time to time but in every case with the sanction of Government".⁵¹

Another statement made by Binny, the veracity of which was contested by the Indian Jails Committee, was that India was the only country in the world that employed steam machinery in jails or that justified such employment for the use of government requirements. The Committee in its Report pointed out that both in the U.K. and the U.S.A., power-driven machinery of the most up-to-date character were freely employed in prisons often realising large profits and that, therefore, these jails had gone far beyond and ahead of what had been done in India.⁵²

Another accusation levelled, the content of which was discounted by Gadsden in the case of the Madras Presidency, was that, jail manufacturing activities had led to increase in raw material prices as well as a shortage. Gadsden countered this by pointing out that, on the contrary, in

50. Letter from Gadsden, Supdt, Central Jail Coimbatore to the Inspector General of Prisons, dated 6 May 1910.

- Judicial G.O. No.1097, 21 July 1910.

51. Ibid

52. Report of the Indian Jails Committee 1919-20, Volume I, op.cit., p.125.

taking up large government contracts, the government had benefited another company, namely, the Coimbatore Spinning and Weaving Mills who had no looms but confined their operations to spinning. The jail obtained nearly all its yarn from this local mill and had a monthly account with the mill averaging nearly Rs.8000-10000, benefiting therefore a private firm to a very considerable extent without causing any inconvenience or loss to anyone in the purchase of raw material.⁵³

(c) On the question of the use of power-driven machinery in jails and the consequent alleged competition of state with private enterprise, the Indian Jails Committee addressed all the local governments asking them to invite the special attention of the several Chambers of Commerce to the inquiry so that the latter might have a full opportunity of laying their views before the Committee. Each and everyone of the Chambers of Commerce throughout the country who sent in their replies to the IJC were categorical that power driven machinery ought not to be introduced in jails as such introduction would lead to increased production which in its train would bring competition with industrial concerns for disposal of the extra production.⁵⁴ Further most of them

53. (i) Letter from Gadsden to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 23 September 1906 - Judicial G.O. No.1814, 25 October 1907.

(ii) Letter from Gadsden to the Inspector-General of Prisons, dated 6 May 1910 - Judicial G.O. No.1097, 21 July 1910.

54. Report of the Indian Jails Committee 1919-20, op.cit., Volume I, Appendix V - Correspondence with Chambers of Commerce, p.415-423.

also stressed the fact that since attendance upon power driven machines did not involve arduous and toilsome work nor required such close attention as hand labour, "houses of correction should not introduce devices which would tend to minimize the rigours of labour".⁵⁵

However only one Chamber of Commerce in India, namely, the Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau, Bombay, thought it necessary to depute a representative to appear before the IJC. The evidence given by this person, as the IJC put it, "speaks for itself". He admitted that the competition of the existing jail power driven cotton and jute factories was so trifling as to be negligible, but nevertheless adhered to the objection to steam driven machinery "on principle". When asked whether the handloom in jail would not compete with the handloom weaver outside he could not deny that such competition would arise and would be infinitely more harmful to the handloom weaver than the existing power driven machinery was to the great organised industries. Finally, when invited to make constructive suggestions as to the proper employment of jail labour, all that he could suggest was stone breaking and road making or agriculture, the last two of them essentially extramural forms of labour and thus impossible of adoption for the general body of prisoners.⁵⁶

55. Ibid, specially letter from the Manager, Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company Ltd., Nagpur to the Under Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, Nagpur, dated 10 February 1920, p.417.
56. Report of the Indian Jails Committee, 1919-20, Volume I, Op.cit., p.124-125.

The IJC recognised that the task of finding employment for prisoners must be so conducted as to do the least possible injury to weak and unorganised trades and nascent industries. The IJC's conclusion was that the least injury to private enterprise would be caused by directing jail labour into those channels in which large organised and powerful industries were already in existence, such were, for instance, the great jute and cotton industries. Justifying this suggestion they pointed out that in the Presidency Jail of Calcutta there existed a power driven factory for the manufacture of jute goods with 50 looms. The data then available to the IJC showed that in 1916-17 there were in India no less than 74 jute mills with 39697 looms and 824315 spindles. "No one would, we think, be likely to affirm that the 50 looms in the Calcutta Presidency Jail or even ten times that number, could have any serious effect on the great, highly-developed and enormously prosperous jute industry of India"⁵⁷ Similarly, in the Coimbatore Jail, which had a power driven factory for the manufacture of cotton cloth, the number of looms in the factory was 110, while the numbers of looms employed in the 236 cotton mills of India in 1916-17 was 102,781 with 6253610 spindles. In such a situation, the IJC concluded, the effect of jail competition must always be infinitesimally small.⁵⁸

d) A lot of dust was raised by private capitalists to argue that "if the Government of India would have the

57. Ibid, p.124.

58. Ibid

accounts of these manufacturing concerns (in jails) subjected to a proper commercial audit, we are convinced that there would very soon be an end of steam machinery in jails."⁵⁹

The Jail Industries Committee set up by the Madras Government went into the question of the system of accounts maintained by the jails in the Presidency and came to the conclusion that they were not in favour of introducing a commercial system of accounts in jails. Their contention was that the object of introducing commercial accounts into a government concern was presumably to provide data for ascertaining whether a given manufacture was being conducted at a profit or not. While in free industrial enterprises labour contributed a very large proportion of the manufacturing cost, in jails, on the other hand, the labourer had to be fed whether he was producing or not.⁶⁰

"It comes to this, that a jail is not a commercial proposition and cannot be regarded or treated as one. Government wish to be satisfied that there is no avoidable waste in the maintenance of jails which are in effect a disagreeable necessity in all civilized communities, and that such industries as are possible are efficiently organized. The convicts must be employed on remunerative work if possible; if not, they cannot be turned away and set

59. Letter from Binny & Co. to the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, dated 7 March 1910, - Judicial G.O. No.1097, dated 21 July 1910.

60. Recommendations of the Jail Industries Committee - Law (General) G.O. No.2157, 4 July 1925.

free. All that seems to us to be required is a costing system for jail manufacturing to ensure that a jail does not go on making articles for sale at a cost exceeding the price that can be recovered. That price is determined by the price that similar articles fetch in the open market".⁶¹

IV

Concerted efforts at pressurizing the Government to revise its policy and lay down that "the state shall not in any way compete with private enterprise" were repeatedly made by the private capitalists. But the Provincial Governments in general and the Madras Government in particular held firmly to the view that manufacturing in jails would stay. The Government did not consider jail industries catering to Government departments (which had previously been supplied by the private sector) as being in any way 'injurious' to private enterprise; on the contrary they felt that the suggestion by the Associated Chambers of Commerce that prisoners should be employed in cottage industries⁶² as being really injurious to the interests of the badly organised artisan class.

On the whole, jail administrators were required to operationalise a difficult combination of objectives, namely, choosing industries in such a way that both reformation and remunerative labour went hand in hand together with ensuring that jails were run efficiently

61. Ibid

62. Letter from the Associated Chambers of Commerce to the Government of India - Law (General) G.O. No.693, dated 22 February 1932.

without loss to government. Under the circumstances the jails were keen on extending and improving their operations through the appointment of qualified and trained instructors including a technical adviser for raising the standard of business efficiency of jail officers, improving jail industries, disposing off jail products and procuring raw materials. In fact the authorities were even keen on introducing an "earning scheme" for prisoners - a small remuneration for work turned out in excess of the prescribed task already in force.⁶³

The Sixth All-India Conference of Inspectors-General of Prisons even passed the following resolution.

"In view of the necessity of providing good forms of industry for our jail prisoners and also of reducing the cost to the tax payer of the up-keep of jails, it is essential that good markets should be provided for jail industries, and the members of the Conference see no objection to the sale of Jail-made products to the outside public as well as to government and semi-government departments".⁶⁴

A more sharp and clear divergence of views between Government and private enterprise could not be asked for regarding what constituted the legitimate sphere of state activity. The controversy over the alleged competition of jail manufactures with private enterprise (even when

63. Letter from the Inspector-General of Prisons, to the Secretary Government of Madras, Home Department - Home Department G.O. No.588, dated 11 February 1942.

64. Ibid

demonstrated through figures that convict population engaged on manufactures was limited and incapable of expansion or contraction at the will of the employer to suit the exigencies of the market) starkly exposed the fact that the private manufacturers were not content with the lion's share of the market but needed to have a monopoly.

Equally, the determination and grit of the jail administrators of the Presidency showed in their resolve to pursue with manufacturing in jails. In the replies addressed to the Chamber of Commerce, their arguments centred mainly around the need, not only, "to keep the prisoners employed and try to effect some reform of character but also to diminish the expenditure of the department".⁶⁵ Consequently, the Inspector-General of Prisons, in his reply to the Secretary to the Madras Government, categorically stated:

" I submit that no sort of assurance need be given to the Chamber of Commerce in regard to the further development or retrogression of jail industries. If I may be permitted, I would like, in conclusion to suggest that the outlook of the deputation is wanting in feeling and entirely lacking in public spirit"⁶⁶

65. See letter dated 7 September 1932 from the Inspector-General of Prisons to the Secretary to the Government of Madras,

- Law (General) G.O. No.3827, 21 October 1932.

66. Ibid.

Table 1

Statement showing the articles manufactured in Madras jails and supplied to Government departments

1. <u>Military Department</u>	5. <u>Medical Department</u>
Corah matting	Gingelly oil
Tents	Sheets
Tape	Towels
Rope	Cloth
Coir	Quilts
Dhurries	Falliases
Money Bags	Corah mat
	Tape
	Carpets
2. <u>Public Works Department</u>	Coir mats
Sail Cloth	Furniture
Bamboo chicks	Binding work
Cloth	Bandage cloth
Belts	Belts
Ropes	
Coir	6. <u>Registration Department</u>
Furniture	Furniture
Bricks and tiles	Belts
Corah matting	Record planks
	Binding work
3. <u>Stationery Department</u>	7. <u>Forest Department</u>
Aloe and coir ropes and mats	Cumblies
Boots	Tents
Tape tags	Belts
Gingelly oil	
Sealing wax	8. <u>Judicial Department</u>
Wax cloth	Belts
Ink boxes	Duffer cloth
Cumblies	Sheets
Jute ropes	Towels
Tape	Cloth
Twisted thread	N.S.Cloth
	Furniture
4. <u>Police Department</u>	Binding work
Cumblies	
Ropes	9. <u>Revenue Department</u>
Tent carpets	Duffer cloth
Drill	Binding work
	N.S.Cloth
	Belts
	Rattan baskets
	Furniture

10. Treasury officers

Money bags
N.S.Cloth
Binding work
Canvas tape bags

11. Salt Department

Tents
Yellow cloth
Belt

12. Agricultural Department
Check dusters

13. Educational Department
Binding work

14. Miscellaneous Departments
Printing
Book binding
Tailoring
Laundry work

Source: Home (Judicial) G.O. No.1775, 6 August 1919.