

Government of Madras

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1084, 24th August 1917

Building grant

Raising the maximum amount of the grant sanctioned towards the cost of constructing a hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, from Rs. 36,045 to Rs. 39,765.

INDEXED

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Number of copies { Letter
Order

N. P.

ORIGINAL.

Government of Madras

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1084, 24th August 1917

Building grant

Raising the maximum amount of the grant sanctioned towards the cost of constructing a hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, from Rs. 36,045 to Rs. 39,765.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated 11th March 1915.

ABSTRACT.—Sanctioning, as a special case, a grant not exceeding Rs. 36,045 towards the cost of constructing a new hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.

II

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. J. H. STONE, M.A., F.R.H.S., C.I.E., Director of Public Instruction.

To—the Secretary to Government, Home (Education) Department.

Dated—the 19th April 1917.

No.—R.C. 2935/1912.

In G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated 11th March 1915, the Government sanctioned a grant of Rs. 36,045 towards the cost of constructing a hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, being five-sixths of the original estimated cost of Rs. 43,600. The Principal reported that, on account of the increased cost of labour and building materials, the work could not be carried out according to the sanctioned rates and accordingly requested permission to revise the rates—vide his letter No. 576-C/16, dated 17th August 1916 (copy enclosed) and the list of revised rates marked A. The Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division, whom I consulted on the matter, approved the revised rates with certain alterations—vide his letter No. 467, dated 3rd February 1917 (copy enclosed). The Principal has now submitted a revised estimate prepared in accordance with the rates approved by the Executive Engineer and requests sanction of additional grant. The excess cost involved according to the revised estimate is Rs. 4,464, and I have the honour to recommend that, as a special case, an additional grant equal to five-sixths of this excess cost, viz., Rs. 3,720, may be sanctioned.

2. The revised and the approved estimates are herewith submitted.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

Letter—from the Principal, S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.

To—the Director of Public Instruction.

Dated—the 17th August 1916.

No.—576-C/16.

I have the honour to forward a letter and enclosures received by me from W. N. Pogson, Esq., F.R.I., B.A., the architect and contractor of the new college hostel, for favour of your kind consideration.

2. The original estimate for construction of the hostel was Rs. 43,600 and towards its cost you kindly sanctioned a grant not exceeding five-sixths of the total (your Proceedings Reference C. No. 2935/12 of 24th March 1912) or Rs. 36,000 odd.

3. The contractor requests me to revise the rates allowed for the hostel on grounds specified in his letter and enclosures.

4. The total increase asked for would appear to be about Rs. 12,750. He states that the execution of the work at the contract rates is involving him in a considerable loss.

5. I regret that the college is unable so to revise the rates unless it can count also upon the indulgence of the Government in the matter.

6. I have the honour therefore to request you kindly, as an act of grace, to permit the revision of the rates suggested, if it be found reasonable and just, and to grant a proportionate increase of the grant already sanctioned, at the original rate of five-sixths of the total cost, which would amount to about another Rs. 10,000.

7. The difficulties experienced by the contractor prevented him from completing the building by July 1st as originally agreed and the loss which he is daily incurring is causing considerable delay in its execution.

(2)

Letter—from W. N. POGSON, Esq., F.R.I., B.A., Architect.

To—the Rev. A. F. GARDINER, M.A., Principal, S.P.G. College, Fort, Trichinopoly.

Dated—the 31st July 1916.

I have the honour to ask that the enclosed revised rates be allowed for the Montgomery hostel on the grounds that the estimate was really prepared with rates obtaining during the year 1913 and the final estimate and design prepared by me for submission to the Director of Public Instruction for the purposes of a grant is dated February 1914.

Since then the work has been delayed through various unpreventable causes and the rates have gone up, many especially owing to the increased cost of materials imported from "Home" such as cement, girders, zinc, etc., whilst the cost of labour and materials here has risen also some 25 to 30 per cent.

I hear on reliable sources that no Government contractor cares now to undertake any contract for longer than six months as the rates are continually rising and wages increasing.

I am informed that Government has also increased local rates owing to these causes in justice to contractors.

The rates I have put down as revised have taken a long time to compile carefully from the actual work being done, and it was owing to this that I would not hastily ask for an increase in them until I could, from actual experience of work executed, arrive at a careful and just calculation.

I trust that these revised rates may be put before the Director of Public Instruction and revised by the Public Works Department and the same privileges allowed in this case as have been allowed in the construction of other buildings under their charge.

(3)

Letter—from M.R.Ry. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA AYYAR Avargal, Officer in charge of South Sub-division, Trichinopoly.

To—the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division.

Dated—the 28th January 1917.

No.—77-E.E.

With reference to your No. 7329, dated 28th November 1916, I have the honour to report that the revised rates for the following items, viz.—

Item No.		Rate now asked for.
		RS. A. P.
4	Brick in mortar	31 0 0
6	Cement concrete brackets	1 0 0
7	Cement concrete steps and templates	1 0 0
8	Terraced (Madras) roofing complete	40 0 0
10	Venetian teak doors and windows	2 0 0
11	Venetian teak doors and windows with iron bars	2 4 0
12	Venetian teak doors and windows with iron bars and gothic transome lights.	2 8 0
13	Teak gates	1 4 0
17 & 18	String courses and plinth courses	0 4 0
21	Segmental arch work	33 0 0

may be passed as they are within the rates paid by this department in the various buildings in the town.

2. As regards the other items, viz.—

Item No.	Description.	Rate asked.	Rate usually given in Public Works Department.
		RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
1	Excavation	10 0 0	7 0 0
2	Earth filling	10 0 0	5 0 0
3	Concrete in foundations	22 0 0	18 0 0
5	Reinforced concrete lintels or beams.	4 0 0	2 8 0
9	Flooring in cement and leveling course.	24 0 0	15 0 0
14 & 24	Painting doors and windows and joists and girders.	4 0 0	4 0 0 (the painting must be three coats).
15	Extra to panelling	0 12 0	The estimate is not clear.
16	Interior and exterior plastering.	4 0 0	3 8 0 (two coats only enough).
19	Rainwater pipes	1 0 0	1 0 0 (galvanized iron pipe 2" diameter to be used).
20	Drains	1 8 0	1 8 0 (drain section must be 1' x 1½').

The rates usually given in the town are noted against each item and they may be given in this case also.

3. As regards items 22 and 23, the cost varied with the time and hence the amount may be settled on production of company's bills. As regards items 25 and 26 payments are to be made on the actual quantity of work done.

Endorsement No. 467, dated 3rd February 1917.

Copy forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, for information with reference to his No. C. 2935 of 1916, dated 12th September 1916. The enclosures received therewith are herewith returned.

C. PEDDIE,

Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division.

III

Note by the Chief Engineer Public Works Department, No. 335-D., dated 18th July 1917.

A detailed estimate amounting to Rs. 43,600 for constructing a hostel with out-houses attached to the S.P.G. College at Puthur, Trichinopoly, was approved in G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated 11th March 1915.

II. The Director of Public Instruction now submits, for an additional grant-in-aid, a revised estimate exceeding the estimate originally approved by Rs. 4,464.

III. The revised estimate has been examined in the Chief Engineer's office and it is observed that the excess is due to the provision of increased rates which have been approved by the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division, on a reference made to him by the Director of Public Instruction. Such items in the original estimate as are unaffected by these increased rates are omitted in the revised estimate. These items have now been included by which the revised estimate amounts to Rs. 48,064.

IV. With these remarks, the revised estimate as altered in the Chief Engineer's office, amounting to Rs. 48,064, is recommended for approval in supersession of the estimate referred to in paragraph I above.

S. B. MURRAY,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Order—No. 1084, Home (Education), dated 24th August 1917.

In the circumstances stated by the Director of Public Instruction the maximum amount of the grant sanctioned in G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated the 11th March 1915, towards the cost of constructing a new hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, will be raised from Rs. 36,045 to Rs. 39,765.

(True Extract)

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction (with estimates and copy of Chief Engineer's note).
" Accountant-General.
" Public Works Department.

**NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1084, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED THE 24TH AUGUST 1917.**

[SUBJECT.—Application for additional grant for the hostel for the Christian students of the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.]

*From the Director of Public Instruction, dated the 19th April 1917,
No. 2935/12.*

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The original estimate amounting to Rs. 43,600 for the construction of a hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, was approved by the Chief Engineer—vide his note on page 3 of G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated the 11th March 1915. The revised estimate now submitted may also be forwarded to the Public Works Department for remarks. The question of further grant if any may be considered separately on receipt of the file from the Public Works Department.

P.R.—28-4-17.

T.K.—30-4-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—2-5-17.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-5-17.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, No. 335-D., dated the 18th July 1917.

The estimate has been scrutinized by the Chief Engineer and his remarks are contained in his note read above.

2. The file may now be returned to Home (Education) for issue of orders.

J.R.—12-7-17.

T.P.S.—14-7-17.

D. MARSHALL—18-7-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The amount of the revised estimate as approved by the Chief Engineer is Rs. 48,064. Ordinarily the amount of the grant on this will be Rs. 24,032. Instead of this a grant of Rs. 36,045 has already been sanctioned by the Government in G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated the 11th March 1915. In the usual course, therefore, the management have no justification in asking for any additional grant. Even Page 3 of Notes to G.O. 274, Educational, while the original application was under consideration, the Chief Secretary (Mr. Butterworth) questioned the justification

of making a grant in excess of the one-half admissible under the rules, especially as the S.P.G. is not a poor mission. Finally, however, a grant in excess of one-half had to be sanctioned as the Director of Public Instruction had held out definite prospects of favourable terms to the managers—paragraph 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 272, dated the 11th March 1915.

2. There have been cases in which grants in excess of the one-half limit were sanctioned. There have, however, been no cases recently in which grants for hostels have been sanctioned over and above the maximum laid down in the Grant-in-Aid Code. Accordingly there appears to be no justification, as matters now stand, for granting more than one-half of the excess cost (Rs. 4,464), if any additional grant is to be sanctioned at all.

3. It is for consideration (1) whether any additional grant may be sanctioned, and, if so (2) whether a grant of $\frac{5}{6}$ of Rs. 4,464 or Rs. 3,720 is to be sanctioned as recommended by the Director of Public Instruction or (3) whether the grant may be limited to $\frac{1}{2}$ of Rs. 4,464, i.e., to Rs. 2,232.

P.R.—20-7-17.

T.K.—23-7-17.

We have not at present abundance of funds. The grant of Rs. 36,045 was fixed in 1915 with reference to the ability of the mission to contribute only the balance of the estimate. We have no information as to the present financial position of the mission to determine what portion of the excess can be borne by it. The Principal's letter in the current file only shows that the mission needs *some* assistance with regard to the revised rates and that it cannot meet the *whole* of the excess in cost from its own funds. The Director of Public Instruction may be asked u.o. to ascertain from the mission what is the *maximum* amount it can contribute from its funds towards the excess and to satisfy himself as to the correctness of that information with reference to the financial position of the mission. The grant will have to be passed by Financial if the usual half-rates are to be exceeded.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—25-7-17.

The excess is only small and we have liberally sanctioned five-sixths. Any further sanction will require Financial concurrence. Perhaps the mission can find the excess? After all we pay Rs. 36,045; and the mission only Rs. 12,019.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—26-7-17.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

If I ask the mission it is quite certain they will say that the extra grant is essential and I have no means of satisfying myself as to their financial position.

2. They were promised a five-sixths grant when Government had adopted a certain policy in regard to hostel grants which they have since abandoned. In all cases, I believe, certainly in a very great many, when owing to rise of prices the cost of a building has proved higher than the estimate Government have borne their share of the additional cost. This case only differs from others in that share being five-sixths instead of one-half. The grant was promised because the mission could only find one-sixth of the cost. There is no reason for expecting them to find more than one-sixth of a cost which has proved greater than was anticipated from circumstances outside their control.

J. H. STONE—2-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders whether the estimate may be approved and an additional grant not exceeding one-half of the excess cost may be sanctioned in view of the present financial situation, the mission being left to come up for any further grant with reasons for its inability to meet the remaining half-grant, or whether with reference to the Director of Public Instruction's remarks above, a grant of five-sixths of the excess cost may be sanctioned with the concurrence of Financial.

T.K.—6-8-17.

* According to rules.

We may first sanction a * *half*-grant on Rs. 4,464 the excess. If the mission wants additional grant it will have then to make out a case for its inability to find the other half. The Director of Public Instruction is *now* unable to get a satisfactory

account of the mission's finances and we have nothing before us to warrant an assumption of the mission's inability, except (1) the bare application for five-sixths grant which after all may be based only on precedent and (2) the statement that the mission cannot meet the *whole* of the excess.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—12-8-17.

There is no use haggling over the matter. Either we sanction five-sixths of the excess or we sanction nothing.

First to Financial for favour of note.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—13-8-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

[*New hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.*]

[G.O. 272, Educational, 11th March 1915, page 3, paragraph 6 of Chief Engineer's note.]	(a) Original estimate for the work ...	Rs. 43,600
	(b) Revised estimate now under consideration ...	48,064
	Excess ...	4,464
	(c) Grant from Government already promised ...	36,045

2. The grant of Rs. 36,045 already promised is about three-fourths of the total cost of Rs. 48,064 according to the revised estimate (the usual grant is only one-half).

Attention is solicited to page 3 of Notes to G.O. No. 274, Educational, dated 12th March 1915, and page 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated 11th March 1915.

It is submitted for orders whether it will not be preferable to inform the mission that it should find from its funds the sum of Rs. 12,019 representing the difference between the cost according to the revised estimate (Rs. 48,064) and the grant already promised (Rs. 36,045). If the mission is really unable to find the amount, it will doubtless apply to Government.

V.G.K.—17-8-17.

The Principal says the money cannot be found. I am afraid we must agree to perpetuate the five-sixths arrangement.

L. E. KERSHAW—18-8-17.

L. DAVIDSON—20-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

In view of the Financial Department's readiness to accept the Director of Public Instruction's recommendation to sanction a five-sixths grant in this case, it may, it is submitted, be sanctioned. A draft order is submitted for approval.

P.R.—22-8-17.

C.R.—23-8-17.

R.R.—24-8-17.

[G.O. No. 1084, Home (Education), dated the 24th August 1917.]

Auditing Grant.
Raising the maximum amount of the Grant sometime
towards the cost of constructing a hostel for the S. P. G. College,
Tiruchinopoly, from Rs 36,045 to Rs 39,765./-

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1070, From the , No. 2935/12 dated 15-19-4-1917

Note by the Ch. Engr 3352 " 18-7-1917
PND

" " , " " , ""

191

ORDER

No. 1084, dated 24 - 8 - 1917

PS

In the circumstances stated by the

499 The maximum amount of the Grant sanctioned in G.O. No. 272 Est of the 11-3-11 towards the cost of constructing a new hostel for the S. P. G. College, Tiruchinopolyam will be raised from Rs 26,048 to Rs 39,768

22-8-17

23 1877

24/8/11

Despd with
gas + funds
Mrs
11-9-17

To, the S.D. with estimates &
Copy of C.E. note.
.. A.G.
.. O.W.D.
Not for E.T.

(102) 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

1000 1000

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1084, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 24TH AUGUST 1917.

[SUBJECT.—Application for additional grant for the hostel for the Christian students
of the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated the 19th April 1917,
No. 2935/12.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The original estimate amounting to Rs. 43,600 for the construction of a hostel for
the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, was approved by the Chief Engineer—vide his note
on page 3 of G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated the 11th March 1915. The revised
estimate now submitted may also be forwarded to the Public Works Department for
remarks. The question of further grant if any may be considered separately on
receipt of the file from the Public Works Department.

P.R.—28-4-17.

T.K.—30-4-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—2-5-17.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-5-17.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, No. 335-D., dated the
18th July 1917.

The estimate has been scrutinized by the Chief Engineer and his remarks are
contained in his note read above.

2. The file may now be returned to Home (Education) for issue of orders.

J.R.—12-7-17.

T.P.S.—14-7-17.

D. MARSHALL—18-7-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The amount of the revised estimate as approved by the Chief Engineer is
Rs. 48,064. Ordinarily the amount of the grant on this will be Rs. 24,032. Instead
of this a grant of Rs. 36,045 has already been sanctioned by the Government in G.O.
No. 272, Educational, dated the 11th March 1915. In the usual course, therefore,
the management have no justification in asking for any additional grant. Even
Page 3 of Notes to G.O. 274, Educational, while the original application was under
12th March 1915. consideration, the Chief Secretary (Mr.
Butterworth) questioned the justification

of making a grant in excess of the one-half admissible under the rules, especially as the
S.P.G. is not a poor mission. Finally, however, a grant in excess of one-half had to
be sanctioned as the Director of Public Instruction had held out definite prospects of
favourable terms to the managers—paragraph 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 272, dated the
11th March 1915.



17/11/17

2 NOTES TO G.O. No. 1084, HOME (EDUCATION), 24TH AUGUST 1917

2. A list of cases in which grants in excess of the one-half limit were sanctioned will be found at slip B. There have, however, been no cases recently in which grants for hostels have been sanctioned over and above the maximum laid down in the Grant-in-Aid Code. Accordingly there appears to be no justification, as matters now stand, for granting more than one-half of the excess cost (Rs. 4,464), if any additional grant is to be sanctioned at all.

3. It is for consideration (1) whether any additional grant may be sanctioned, and, if so (2) whether a grant of $\frac{5}{6}$ of Rs. 4,464 or Rs. 3,720 is to be sanctioned as recommended by the Director of Public Instruction or (3) whether the grant may be limited to $\frac{1}{2}$ of Rs. 4,464, i.e., to Rs. 2,232.

P.R.—20-7-17.

T.K.—23-7-17.

We have not at present abundance of funds. The grant of Rs. 36,045 was fixed in 1915 with reference to the ability of the mission to contribute only the balance of the estimate. We have no information as to the present financial position of the mission to determine what portion of the excess can be borne by it. The Principal's letter in the current file only shows that the mission needs some assistance with regard to the revised rates and that it cannot meet the whole of the excess in cost from its own funds. The Director of Public Instruction may be asked u.o. to ascertain from the mission what is the maximum amount they can contribute from its funds towards the excess and to satisfy himself as to the correctness of that information with reference to the financial position of the mission. The grant will have to be passed by Financial if the usual half-rates are to be exceeded.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—25-7-17.

The excess is only small and we have liberally sanctioned five-sixths. Any further sanction will require Financial concurrence. Perhaps the mission can find the excess? After all we pay Rs. 36,045; and the remainder only Rs. 12,019.

R.R.—26-7-17.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

If I ask the mission it is quite certain they will say that the extra grant is essential and I have no means of satisfying myself as to their financial position.

2. They were promised a five-sixth grant when Government had adopted a certain policy in regard to hostel grants which they have since abandoned. In all cases, I believe, certainly in a very great many, when owing to rise of prices the cost of a building has proved higher than the estimate Government have borne their share of the additional cost. This case only differs from others in that share being five-sixth instead of one-half. The grant was promised because the mission could only find one-sixth of the cost. There is no reason for expecting them to find more than one-sixth of a cost which has proved greater than was anticipated from circumstances outside their control.

J. H. STONE—2-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders whether the estimate may be approved and an additional grant not exceeding one-half of the excess cost may be sanctioned in view of the present financial situation, the mission being left to come up for any further grant with reasons for its inability to meet the remaining half-grant, or whether with reference to the Director of Public Instruction's remarks above, a grant of five-sixth of the excess cost may be sanctioned with the concurrence of Financial.

T.K.—6-8-17.

* According to rules.

We may first sanction a * half-grant on Rs. 4,464 the excess. If the mission wants additional grant it will have then to make out a case for its inability to find the other half. The Director of Public Instruction is now unable to get a satisfactory

NOTES TO G.O. No. 1084, HOME (EDUCATION), 24TH AUGUST 1917 3

account of the mission's finances and we have nothing before us to warrant an assumption of the mission's inability, except (1) the bare application for five-sixth grant which after all may be based only on precedent and (2) the statement that the mission cannot meet the whole of the excess.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—12-8-17.

There is no use haggling over the matter. Either we sanction five-sixths of the excess or we sanction nothing.

First to Financial (no) for favour of note.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—13-8-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

[New hostel for the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly.]

[G.O. 272, Educational, 11th March 1915, page 3, paragraph 6 of Chief Engineer's note.]

	RS.
(a) Original estimate for the work ...	43,600
(b) Revised estimate now under consideration ...	48,064
Excess ...	4,464
(c) Grant from Government already promised ...	36,045

2. The grant of Rs. 36,045 already promised is about three-fourths of the total cost of Rs. 48,064 according to the revised estimate (the usual grant is only one-half). Attention is solicited to page 3 of Notes to G.O. No. 274, Educational, dated 12th March 1915, and page 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 272, Educational, dated 11th March 1915.

It is submitted for orders whether it will not be preferable to inform the mission that it should find from its funds the sum of Rs. 12,019 representing the difference between the cost according to the revised estimate (Rs. 48,064) and the grant already promised (Rs. 36,045). If the mission is really unable to find the amount, it will doubtless apply to Government.

V.G.K.—17-8-17.

The Principal says the money cannot be found. I am afraid we must agree to perpetuate the five-sixths arrangement.

L. E. KERSHAW—18-8-17.

L. DAVIDSON—20-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

In view of the Financial Department's readiness to accept the Director of Public Instruction's recommendation to sanction a five-sixth grant in this case, it may, it is submitted, be sanctioned. A draft order is submitted for approval.

P.R.—22-8-17.

C.R.—23-8-17.

R.R.—24-8-17.

[G.O. No. 1084, Home (Education), dated 24th August 1917.]

J. Rao

ORDINARY.

PRESS SLIP.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT (a).

Sectt. 38-1-17.

Home (804)

DEPARTMENT.

25 AUG 1917

Current No. dated 191 ..

G.O. No. 10821, dated 24-8-1917.

(b)

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence.....
(b¹)
Notes.....

Brief subject.....

(c)	E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
Number of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press).			
FOR RECORD.*			
Madras Records ...	4	13	12
Ooty Records ...		2	4
For filing with original		1	1
Total ..		16	17

FOR ISSUE.†

Signature copies	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	(b)		Notes.
			No.	Papers.	
India Office.....		3			
Govt. of India.....Dept.					
Revenue Department.....					
Public Works Department.....					
Local and Municipal Department.....					
Educational Department.....					
.....Dept.					
Public Dept.....					
Judicial Dept.....					
Political.....					
Financial Dept.....					
Marine Dept.....					
Ecclesiastical Dept.....					
Total ..					
Spare copies					
The.....		10			
The.....		10			
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
Total ..		40			

Copies distributed on†(Press Clerk).

† Copies distributed on†(Press Despatcher).

† To be initialled and dated.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b¹) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the office Manual.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for one week, and larger papers for two weeks only. The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

TO PRESS, MADRAS OOTY.

A	B	C
Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.	Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.	As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (b) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.
	Type may be released <u>after usual interval</u> at once.	Type may be released after usual interval.
Referencer. Clerk.	Referencer. Clerk.	Referencer. Clerk.
Supdt.	Supdt.	Supdt.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	
First proof furnished on.....	
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	
Final copies supplied on.....	

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....				
" " " Issue.....				
" " " for Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.				4
For Volumes.....				
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.				
Total ...				