

Eedl (1916) Department.

His SERIES.

G.O. No. 268

DATED 13.3-16

[Despatch Abstract.]


Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatam
 Stating that the Court will not
 insist upon the recovery of the grant
 already paid to the ——— for the
 construction of a moulding &
 smelting shed & requesting the
 Director of Industries to follow the
 rules of the Grant in aid Code
 more strictly in future.

C^o 562 Eol

C.F.—29

DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered

14 2 1916

Subject.

Andhra Jatheeya Khalasala.

Submitting a petition received from the Correspondent,
-----, Masulipatam, re: Building Grant,
and the Director of Industries's remarks thereon.

ENCLOSURES

No.

7

Spare copies

No. B 16

Station Madras, Dated the 11th FEBRUARY, 1916

From (Name) K.T.B. Tressler, Esq.,

(Designation) Director of Industries,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
EDUCATIONAL Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith a petition from the Correspondent, of the Masulipatam School. The second paragraph is untrue as the correspondence in my file shows. The trouble with this school is that the former correspondent had certain views on education which did not accord with mine. As he himself says, he treats Mechanical Engineering as a part of a scheme of general education as well as an industrial career. It must be evident that if Mechanical Engineering is regarded in the former manner, ~~he~~ ^{it} must ~~suggest its occupation in a~~ ^{be regarded as an}

SK

general educational course and as such comes within the purview of the Director of Public Instruction. There has been a great deal of delay and trouble in dealing with this institution and this mainly for the reason that the applications for aid were mainly put forward with the intention of pushing the general education scheme rather than the industrial one.

2. Government is no doubt aware of the rule that no grant is payable for buildings commenced before the building grant is sanctioned. This rule is published in the Grant-in-Aid Code and it is the business of Correspondents to ascertain what the rules are before starting work. The work appears to have ^{been} started a considerable time before I was acquainted with the fact and when it was brought to my notice I asked for an explanation. I further asked that the work should be stopped and plans and estimates at once submitted. These were incorrectly prepared and had to be returned. They were only received in January ¹⁹¹⁵ and even then were found to be wrong. As I wished to help the school management as much as possible, I had them corrected in my office and submitted to Government. In my covering letter I also stated that the work had been begun without my knowledge.

3. Up to this point I had not been consulted about the work and knew nothing about it. After the despatch of my letter to Government, I wrote to the Correspondent permitting him to proceed with the work and instructed him to give notice to the Executive Engineer. So far as I can see, the argument put forward by the school is that the loss to the school authorities, if the building grant is withdrawn, is due to the Director of Industries. It will be observed that the bulk of the work was done before Government had a say in the matter and when the Executive Engineer was actually called in, a month after my


instructions to consult that officer had been received (with sanction to proceed with the work), the work was practically complete. It is also evident that even if the breach of rules in starting work before sanction is condoned, such a condonation does not imply approval of bad work.

4. I am therefore unable to see any reason to recommend to Government a reconsideration of their decision unless Government wish to consider ~~the~~ appeal ad miseri cordiam.


I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,



Director of Industries.



1335

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,
Masulipatam,

Dated 7th February 1915.

B16.

From

The Correspondent,

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,

MASULIPATAM.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department,

Government of Madras

Fort St. George.

Through

The Director of Industries,

MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No.74 Educational, Mis. dated 24-1-16 directing refund of Rs.1525/- to Government, communicated to ^{me} ~~the~~ by the Director of Industries in His. B.16, I beg to submit the following facts for your favourable consideration.

In 1913 the Director of Industries was approached by the Correspondent of this Institution for a building grant whereupon the Director promised to consider favourably such an application and the first application was made for a grant on behalf of the Institution in 1913. No notice was taken of it then.

The application was renewed on 14-5-14 and in reply the Director of Industries promised a grant in his communication No.853-I dated 28-8-14. By that time we had to take on hand, an iron shed ^{for} need for more accommodation, the construction of 17½ ft. by 12 ft. and smithy providing for a moulding space of communication No.128 of 18-9-14, for 6 forges and in our com-

2. 9/
The same request was re-iterated in our letter 156 of 29-9-14. Plans and estimates were invited for the shed by the Director in his communication 853 I/5262 dated 25-9-14 and the necessary plans and estimates for the shed already under construction were then submitted and the Director of Industries in his Memorandum No.E.16 B dated 11-2-15 informed us that our application was recommended for sanction and that the work might be proceeded with and notice given to the Executive Engineer.

The work was accordingly completed in accordance with the plans and estimates that were before the Director of Industries at the time and notice given to the Executive Engineer on 9-3-15. The government grant of Rs.1525/- was paid to the Institution before the end of March 1915.

On the 11th June 1915 the Chief Engineer's note on the plans and estimates originally submitted was sent to the institution with instructions that they should be revised on lines indicated therein. In reply to this on 1-7-15 the Correspondent of the Institution submitted that the building had already been constructed, as permitted by the Director of Industries, in accordance with the original plans and estimates submitted to him and that the changes indicated in the Chief Engineer's note could not be carried out at that stage. Further information regarding site and soil, and plans required in the Chief Engineer's note was submitted.

An order directing refund now would work as a great hardship on an Institution almost wholly maintained by public donations and I pray that you may be pleased to direct that the G.O. be not enforced.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

K. P. S.

From

The Correspondent,

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,

M A S U L I P A T A M.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department,

Government of Madras

Fort St. George.

No. *25 725*

Despatched *16.10.14*

Received

Enclosures.

1. Copy of letter No.128 dated 12-9-1914

from the Correspondent, Anthra Jatheeya
kalasala, Masulipatam, to the Director of
Industries, Madras.

2. Copy of letter of Director of Industries

No.853 I/5262 dated 25-9-14 addressed to the
Correspondent, Anthra Jatheeya Kalasala, Ma-
sulipatam.

3. Copy of letter No.156 of 14-15 from the correspondent, Anthra Ja-
Kalasala, Masulipatam, to the Director of Industries.

4. Copy of memorandum No. 16 (b) dated 11-2-15 addresses to the govt to be
pondent by the Director of Industries.

5. Copy of letter of correspondent No.466 dated 9-3-15 to the Exec-
Engineer.

6. Copy of letter of correspondent dated 1-7-15 to the Director
tries, Madras.

Abstract

Requesting the refund of

1525 grant may be kindly can

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala

Masulipatam,

Dated. 12-9-1914.

From

The correspondent,

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,

Masulipatam.

To

K.T.B. Tressler, Esq.,

Director of Industries,

M A D R A S.

Sir,

In acknowledging receipt of your letter 853.I /28-8-14
I have the honour to communicate to you the grateful appreciation
of the Governing Body for your kind offer of a Government grant
for the better equipment of the Institution. In regard to
one of the items for which a grant is proposed I request that
favourable consideration may be accorded to the following points
and your decision thereon communicated to me at your convenience.

Our first application for a Government grant was made
in 1913 under the stress of a keen need for extension in work-
space. Ever since we have been making an effort to increase
working accommodation in our workshop and have laid out money
in the construction of an iron shed 105 ft. X 22 ft. to provide
for a moulding space of 47½ X 22 and Smithy room for 6 forges.
We are also adding 180 feet length of verandah to our main
building, which was, you may recall, the only structure in exist-
ence at the time of your visit. These additions are only now
nearing completion, part of the roof for the new shed and of a
masonry wall on one side and the iron sheet enclosure on the
remaining sides, still remaining to be built.

I will in the course of a few days send you plans of
the works as they would look when completed and also an account
of the money so far spent. The only difficulty as I under-

...chairs as we did not treat the building of the shed and the verandah as one entire and separate transaction separable from the ordinary purchase of raw material for the use in the workshop. But we can furnish leaves from a continuing account with firms in Madras and Masulipatam testifying to the purchase of the specific articles needed in their construction. I trust you would be pleased to accept the work done so far as representing the outlay from the side of the Institution.

As regards the other items mentioned in the communication we shall certainly provide one half of the whole expense incurred. May I request you to help us with approved plans for working tables in the fitting shop and in the carpentary shed.

Awaiting a favourable decision.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd) K. Hanumantha Row,

Correspondent.

K. Hanumantha Row
7-2-16
Correspondent.

True copy
K.H.R.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES.

Camp--Madras.

Dated 25-9-1914.

No. 853 I /5262

From

K. T. B. Tressler, Esq.,
Director of Industries,
M A D R A S.

To

The correspondent,
Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,
Masulipatam.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 128 dated 14-9-1914, I have to invite your attention to rules 51 and 52 of the Grant-in-aid code and to request you will be good enough to let me know the circumstances in which you started the construction of the shed without submitting the plans and estimates for my approval and before grant was promised. ^{you require} If grant ^{fill} on behalf ^{and send it on} of the shed in the enclosed form together with the plans and estimates. Please also state why you did not comply with rules 51 and 52 of the Grant-in-aid Code.

2. Grant cannot be sanctioned for the construction of the verandah as I was not consulted in the first instance.

3. The submission of the application for furniture grant for working tables, work benches and forges with tools may also be expedited.

A plan of the work bench is herewith forwarded.

Yours faithfully,

(sd)

Director of Industries.

* will follow

(True copy)

K. Hanumantha Row
7-2-16
Correspondent,

Jatheeya Kalasala.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter 853-1/5262 dated 25-9-14 and to state in reply that the construction of the shed was taken up under the stress of urgent need for more of moulding space and room for forges. I am free to confess that the work was undertaken at a time when Government was only a hope and not an assured certainty either as to the amount which would be offered or the purpose for which it would be available. The work is being done with the ordinarily available resources of the Institution and under the limitations of strict and ^{rigid} ~~strict~~ economy.

A verandah along two sides of the original main building was only recently thought of as the most economical method in securing adequate extension of working space for carpentry and fitter's work. This was recently commenced, the roofing alone just nearing completion, the environing walls with the necessary provision for lighting the interior being still to provide.

I may here be permitted to state that my letter was essentially a request that under the special conditions of the case and on the eve of a great reorganisation of schemes we might be exempted from the strict operation of the procedure under Rules 51 and 52 of the Grant-in-aid Code that the work already done may be inspected and approved of if proved satisfactory, and that the vouchers we shall be able to supply may be considered adequate for the payment of the promised grant in regard to the one particular item of iron shed.

Plans for the above together with those for working tables and forges would be posted in a few days as soon as the school should reopen.

K. Sitar and Rao
7-11-16
Correspondent, Andhra Jatheeya

Kalasala Masulipatam.

M E M O R A N D U M

No. E 16 b dated 11-2-15.

With reference to your application for building grants, I have the honour to inform you that it has been recommended to Government for sanction. The work may be proceeded and notice should be given to the Executive Engineer.

(Sd) -----

Director of Industries.

(True Copy)

R Sitaram Rao
Correspondent,
7-2-16

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala,
Masulipatam.

12
Enclosure ✓

Andhra Jatheeya Kalasa

Masulipatam,

9-3-1915.

No. 466 of 1914-1915

To

The Executive Engineer,

Kistna Delta,

B R Z W A D A.

Sir,

I have the honour to request that you may kindly arrange to inspect a shed recently added to the workshop of this Institution, for which Government, through the Director of Industrial Education, is giving a half grant. The shed would be ready for inspection in three days from this date. I request you to appoint an early date as the grant has to be drawn before the 25th March.

Awaiting an early reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd) K. Hanumantha Rao,

Correspondent.

(True copy)

K. Hanumantha Rao
Correspondent

I have the honour to acknowledge
of your memorandum E 16 dated 12-6-15 enclosing copies of
Chief Engineer's note for Moulding and Smithy Shed for the
Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatan. Herewith I submit
fresh information in regard ^{to the} details asked for.

1. A site plan is herewith submitted showing the position of the various buildings.
2. The nature of the soil and sub-soil to a depth of about six feet is sandy.
3. The posts described as 'Jungle Teak wood' are now unfi-able but in actual experience have stood for one year free from attack of white ants. They are good strong substantial posts.
4. The Cupola refe-red to is an old thing standing on the spot. It ~~is~~ ^{has} never been used for smelting purposes and will probably never be so used. The Cupola now in use is the one to the South of it.
5. The trusses used had been made in the Kalasala and were utilised for this purpose. I regret that the change proposed cannot be effected.

The size of the purlins is $2\frac{1}{2}" \times 2\frac{1}{2}" \times 3/8"$. The roof ^a corrugated iron sheet, in view of which the size suggests

NOTES.

through the ignorance of the circular.

The instructions given will be carried out as far as practicable at this stage. And the Governing Body of the Institution regret that as the work had been carried out and finished during last and the early part of this year some of the corrections cannot now be incorporated into the building. I trust everything else would be found in order.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

.(Sd) K. Hanumantha Row,

Correspondent.

True Copy

K. Hanumantha Row
Correspondent. 72

Subject.

Recovery of the grant paid to the Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatam, for a moulding shed.

Please see G.O.No.74 Edl, dated the 24th January 1916, and the notes therewith.

2. From the papers forwarded by the Correspondent of the Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatam, and the Director's letter thereon, it appears that both the Director and the school authorities are to blame in the matter. As early as in September 1914, the Director drew the attention of the school authorities to the provisions of rules 51 and 52 of the Grant-in-aid Code under which the management should not have commenced work before plans and estimates had been approved by Government. The Director, however, condoned this irregularity and permitted the management to proceed with the work after he had seen the plan and estimates. When the Executive Engineer to whom notice was given by the management after a delay of a month went to inspect the work, it ^{has} ~~was~~ practically ^{been} ~~is~~ completed. The defects could not therefore be remedied at that stage. In these circumstances, it is for orders whether G.O. No.74 Edl, dated 24th January 1916, directing the school authorities to refund the grant may be enforced. The best course seems to be to deduct the amount of Rs.1,525 already given from the grant-in-aid promised for this institution in G.O. 1437 Edl, dated the 18th December 1915, for the construction of a carpentry shed.

(A)

c.f.

page 9 of cf.

page 11 of cf.

page 12 of cf.

(A)

(B)

Please see Secy. Mr. Jotham's note on page 1-1-5-2 of 4/2/16

Edl no 562-1
24/2/16

21/2/16

D. I. for copy remarks

Uo

24/2/16

I fail to grasp the argument. The School started building without my sanction & I stopped them. By that time they had finished the greater part of the work. I could have disallowed the front at this stage, but this seemed to mean extensive measures, so I left them to make their own choice with the P.P.S. But they do not in any sense imply approval of the work done. When the plans & estimates were submitted properly, the School pressed for permission to complete the work & as matters had got as far as they had I gave this permission subject to inspection by the E.E. As Superintendent of Industries Education it is not my business to scrutinise plans from the engineering point of view, but merely to ^{ensure} that the work is properly done under the satisfaction of the P.P.S. This I could not assume as regards work already done & regarding such work the School authorities had in any case to take their chance: all I could do here was to add no extra obligations. As regards work done after my ^{permission} ~~inspiration~~ I assumed its inspection by demanding an inspection by the local P.P. Officer.

As a matter of fact the report P.P. Complaints Section has to do with the design & the execution. As explained the design (perhaps regards adequacy of materials) has nothing to do with me officially: execution falls less. A copy of the Chief Engineer's remarks on the design is enclosed. The School's reply is given on p. 3. However the points brought to notice are not such as would condemn the structure by themselves.

25/2/1916



Copy of note by the Chief Engineer, P.W.D., No. 131 D.
dated 31st May 1915.

The Director of Industries submits through the Educational department a detailed estimate amounting to Rs. 3050/- and a plan for a grant-in-aid towards the construction of a moulding and smithy shed for Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala at Masulipatam, Kistna District.

II The plan and estimate which have been examined in the Chief Engineer's office contain defects a few of which are pointed out below:--

1. A site plan showing the relative positions of the existing buildings and the proposed one has not been submitted. This is necessary to see if the workshop building shown in front of the 'plan' is sufficiently aloof from the cupolas and forges and if it is not deprived of light and ventilation.
2. The nature of the soil and sub-soil has not been stated.
3. The posts (described as jungle teakwood in the estimate) supporting the trusses are 13 feet in height according to section on A B encased in brick in clay to a height of two feet above ground level. This method of fixing does not appear to be satisfactory; besides the posts are likely to be attacked by white ants.
4. The end of one of the trusses is made to rest upon an iron bracked fixed to the cupola as shown in figure (a) on the drawing. This arrangement is unsatisfactory as the heat from the cupola may distort the truss.
5. The angle iron struts $1\frac{1}{2}" \times 1\frac{1}{2}" \times 5/16"$ of the roof are not strong enough. The size should be increased to $2\frac{1}{2}" \times 2\frac{1}{2}" \times \frac{1}{4}"$.
6. The sizes of the purlins have not been given. They may consist of angle iron $5" \times 5" \times \frac{1}{2}"$.
7. Provision is made in the estimate for a uniform weight of 3.2 lbs. per running foot of irons irrespective of their sizes.

8. It is not understood how the sloping roofs at the ends shown in elevation are supported.

9. The necessity of the arches at the ends of the front open space as shown in plan and section on A B is not apparent.

10. The dimensions of doors, windows, pilasters, and other details in the drawing have not been figured.

11. A general specification as required by Circular No. 116-C dated 4th January 1913 has not been submitted.

III The plan and estimate are returned for revision and in case they are resubmitted, they must be prepared in an intelligent shape by a competent person.

---ooo000ooo---

vide office note
on page 1 ante

(B)

in Jo. no. 1437 Edl. of the 18th Decr 1915.

1/3/16.

Page No. 19
4.3.16

His Excellency.

(A)

In G.O.No.74 Edl., dated the 24th January 1916, the correspondent of the Andhra Jatheeya Kala-sala, Masulipatam, was directed to refund a sum of Rs.1,525 on the ground that the moulding and smithy shed for the school, for the construction of which the amount was given as a grant, was not satisfactorily carried out. Against this decision of the Government the correspondent has memorialised pp.4 to 14 c.f.--the main ground of the memorial being that he (the correspondent) ~~was~~ acted under cover of permission granted ~~by~~ Mr. Tressler in constructing the

20

the building and ~~was~~^{can} not now make the changes indicated by the P.W.D. Mr. Tressler in submitting the memorial admits (p.2 C.F.) that he wrote to the correspondent permitting him to proceed with the work and that before the plans and estimates had been passed by the P.W.D. In his u.o. note (p.2 ante) Mr. Tressler admits that he could have disallowed the grant when he saw that the work was being done unauthorisedly, but that he did not do so as he thought that that - would be an extreme measure; and hence he gave permission to the correspondent to complete the work. At the same time Mr. Tressler contends that it was understood that everything was conditional on the approval of the plans and estimates by the P.W.D. and the correspondent is himself to blame for having got into this trouble.

I am unable to concur with Mr. Tressler in the view that his department is not to blame in the matter. On the other hand I feel that with a little more of discretion, the impasse could have been avoided. Admittedly the building was begun without any authorisation. In a case like

that

all 1012.420
Grant-in-Aid Case

① 1012.420
21.1.16

to 1011.420

to 1011.420

Mr. Tressler

H

Art. 51 of the
Grant-in-Aid Case.

page 1 of 10. No. 7425
24.1.16

page 11 of 11.

page 11 of 11.

21

that no grant was admissible. Mr. Tressler --
might have said this in unequivocal language.
But he condoned the irregularity, gave an informal
approval to the work as it was being done, and
recommended a grant; and the day after the ---
recommendation (and of course before he received
the orders of the Government) he told the cor-
respondent to proceed with and complete the work.
The grant was subsequently also disbursed under
the orders of Government passed at Mr. Tressler's
instance. And when the D.P.W. has condemned the
building and when we want a refund of the grant,
we find that the correspondent is covered by
Mr. Tressler's action. It is true that in ---
telling the correspondent to proceed with and --
complete the work, Mr. Tressler also told him to
give notice to the Executive Engineer. But the
correspondent did give the notice though he took
a month over it. ~~and~~ **We** could hardly on the --
strength of this delay transfer all responsibility
to the correspondent and absolve Mr. Tressler.
It would be a mistake to allow the head of the
Industries department to disown his own action
in

in dealing with the public and I would as a
matter of policy suggest that the order ----
directing the refund of the grant be not pressed.
Mr. Tressler may be told that ~~now~~ ^{in future} he should
not countenance ~~an~~ application ^s for grants in --
regard to ~~the~~ buildings the construction of which --
~~has~~ ^{is} begun prior to ~~an~~ application, secondly,
that he should not permit the continuance of any
work in anticipation of scrutiny of the plans and
estimates by the P.W.D., and thirdly, that ~~where~~ ⁱⁿ
no case should ^a grant be disbursed before the --
work is ~~is~~ ^{ified} by the P.W.D. to have been ---
~~satisfactorily~~ satisfactorily completed.

~~4/3/16~~

~~6.3.15.~~

Let me have draft
for please ~~9.3.16~~

all p.w.d. and

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~4/3/16~~

~~6.3.15.~~

Let me have draft
for please ~~9.3.16~~

Extract from the notes to G. O. No. 74 Edl., dated the 24th January 1916, regarding the grant sanctioned for the construction of a moulding and smithy shed for the Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala Masulipatam:

x x x

Why did not the G.O. (283 Edl. Mis., dated the 12th March 1915) lay down that the buildings were not to be constructed until the plans had been approved? or would the money have lapsed?

P.
17-1-16.

x x x

2. With reference to H.E. the Governor's query it is submitted the grant was given from the provision in the last year's (1914-15) budget. It was given in advance so as to avoid the lapse of the provision. Under the Grant-in-aid code plans and estimates must be approved by the Director or the Government before work is commenced. In this case the work had already been begun as the buildings were urgently required and the D. I. stated that although this was against the rules, he was prepared to condone the breach and accordingly recommended that the plans and estimates might be generally approved and the grant applied for sanctioned. Mr. Tressler being also an Engineer (Executive Engineer in the P.W.D.) it was apparently thought that his scrutiny of the plans did not reveal any serious defects in them and that they might be provisionally accepted for an advance grant. But when the G.O. of the 12th March 1915 issued, the D. I. might have insisted upon the suspension of further

work

x Rs 1,525

P

So 283 Edl
12.3.15

work until the plans were finally approved by
Government.

V. S.
21-1-16.

x

x

x

Submitted to H. E. for perusal of the notes above
with reference to H.E's query at page 19. The necessary
orders have now issued and I venture to think that no
further action is necessary.

P. R.
27-1-16.

That no further action in this case is now
necessary I agree: but if the original G. O. had
expressed the intentions of the Government more
clearly, the mistake would not have arisen. Nor has
it been satisfactorily explained why prepayment was
necessary. The money if not paid in the last
financial year would it is true have lapsed from the
account point of view, but it would I suppose have
been available for reappropriation in the current
financial year. A procedure which renders cases such
as the present one possible requires examination and
I shall be glad if Secretary will consult Financial
on the point.

P.
11-2-16.

(noted at)
Hes A
I see that the G. O. has already issued in this
case. Please take extracts of notes and deal with
the general question raised by H. E. separately.

P. R.
14-2-16.

page 2 *infra*.

Act. 5-1, 5-2 + 5-3
of the grant. in-air case.

4. 11-11-14 25/14

1202
FINANCIAL

Reg. 25-2-16
Col no 690-1

24/2/16

ASSISTANT SE
GOVT. OF MA

With reference to H.E's note above, it is submitted that ordinarily building grants are sanctioned only after the plans and estimates have been scrutinized and that the amounts are disbursed only when work has been completed and a certificate in the prescribed form has been granted by the Engineer or other responsible officer deputed to examine the building that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and estimates or that the building is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed. Thus, the ordinary procedure in regard to building grants does not, it is submitted, admit of prepayment of grant.

2. In the present case, however, circumstances were somewhat special. The grant had already been promised and the plans and estimates which were received rather late in the year could not be scrutinised in time to admit of the payment within the financial year. If the payment had not been made, the allotment in the budget would ^{have} lapsed and it would not ^{have} be available for reallocation next year. The required amount should be found only by a reappropriation of the succeeding year's budget allotment, which may or may not be possible. Such reappropriation will dislocate the next year's budget programme and in order to avoid this, the prepayment in this case was made. But it is submitted that such instances are very rare and care may be taken to avoid them in future. It is therefore for consideration whether any change of procedure should be adopted to provide for such remote contingencies.

22/2/16
24/2/16
24/2/16

Financial dept.

Submitted that in the circumstances pointed out by the Educational dept. in their note on page 3 ^{into} no change in the existing procedure in regard to the disbursement of building grants seems necessary. The procedure adopted in Lgo. No. 283 Educl. dated 12-3-15 was an exception to the general rule in Rules 51 to 53 of the Grant-in-Aid Code.

2. With reference to the remark at I on page 1 ^{ante} that the payment (Rs. 1,525) was made in advance in order to avoid a lapse in the budget grant, attention is solicited to the ruling in Article 84 A. of the Civil Account Code which prohibits such a procedure. It is therefore submitted that, in future, care will have to be taken to see that the provisions in ~~Article 84 A.~~ Rules 51 to 53 of the Grant-in-Aid Code and in Article 84 A of the Civil Account Code are not in any way infringed.

* cf Mon
page 11 ante

The difficulty appears to have arisen from the fact that the procedure was not followed cf Reg D. Ful accepted this.

Page 400 of 400
N. 74. Ful A
24.116

Ful This was removed by Ednel when the file came to Ful
24.116

Yes, the practice adopted in the last in question was irregular cf Ful
(with the concurrence of Ful)

3. Portion N of the Educational
dept. note on page 3 ante :- As
pointed out by the Educational
dept. the allotment for the present
item made in the budget for 1914-15
would have lapsed. If it
was considered by the Govt. that
the expenditure should be incurred
in the succeeding year (1915-16) and
that the item was too urgent to
be postponed to 1916-17, funds
would, as usual, ^{have} been allotted by
the Financial dept. by reappropriation.

634.
43.16.

C.S.

2.3.16

The course adopted was wholly irregular.
The G. of J. & this Govt. are always insisting
against the hurrying of payments in order
to avoid lapse & in this case the
rules were deliberately infringed for
this sole purpose. H.C.'s strictures
are in consonance with financial principles.

3/3

Edwards

Educational dept.

Submitted for orders

5/3/16



Final n.o. 1202-1
24-3-16

2/3

To forest a recurrence
of this kind of trouble let
a clear pr. line to Wth
Directors. Let me have
draft that

32 A draft order is submitted for approval.

8A
9.3.16. ~~10/3/16~~ 2. It is however for consideration whether this separate order is necessary, in view of the special orders issuing on the linked file to the Director of Industries. A copy of these orders may go to the D.P. ^{available} for ~~his~~ information. If this course is deemed sufficient, the notes in this file may be merely "recorded".

(The two files have
since been made into one)
(vide pages 1-14 CF. and
pp 1-8 of Notes ante)

8
9/3/16

~~11.3.16~~

A Draft order is submitted for approval.

SK
9.3.16.
9/3/16

11.3.16.

Page 15 CF

Issued as per M. 26855
9.13.3.16.

After this let it be on the papers.

11.3.16.

CURRENT NO


1826

FINANCIAL

Regd: 17-3-16.

Voluo 562-1

17.3.16



Fin. no.

Financial dept.

May be perused and returned to Educational with thanks

Phk. bsh
203.16. 2416 Sent and returned with thanks.

[I beg to draw Educ Secy's attention to the remarks made by The Educ Supr. in the margin of ~~the~~ ^{Final} notes. This office is irregular as the office is not permitted to write in the margin and /

112 auli

Final no. 1826-1
22-3-16



ask Educ. Secretary kindly
to have them withdrawn.]

2 due date 22.3.16

Educational Dept.

Submitted to the Secretary for perusal.
2. With reference to the position ~~mentioned~~
in brackets in the Final note above, it is sub-
mitted that the marginal notes of this Dept. on
page 12 supra were only intended as
explanatory notes or references ^{(for the information of the Secy. (Est.))} and not
as remarks against the views of the Finb.
If they are considered objectionable, they will
be removed.

23/3/16

We are closing this
file; so there is nothing to
be done further. It will
not recur

23/3/16

Read again J.O. No. 74 Edl, of 24.1.16.

C.No. 562 From the D.I. No. B.16 dated the 11th February 1916.

CF

ORDER No. 268 S.C.M. of 13-3-16
Mis.

In the circumstances now brought to notice the Government will not insist upon the recovery of the grant already paid to the Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatam, for the construction of a moulding and smithy shed. The Director of Industries will be requested to see that in future no application is entertained for a building grant if the construction of the building has been begun prior to application, that no permission is accorded to the commencement or the continuance of any work in anticipation of scrutiny of the plans and estimates -- by the Public Works Department and that in no case a grant is disbursed before the work is certified by the P.W.D. to have been satisfactorily completed.

11-3-16

To the Director of Industries.

Copy to the D.P.I. P.O. (100)
" " " " (100)
" " " " (100)



Read again J.O. No. 74 Edl, of 24.1.16.

... ..

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

Handwritten notes at top of left page.

Handwritten 'Y' mark.

Handwritten signature or initials.

Handwritten notes at bottom of left page.

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

191

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.

27