

Home (1918) Department.

Education

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 1407.

DATED 4-11-18.

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Building grant.

Raising from Rs 50,000 to Rs 62,500 the amount of the -----
sanctioned for the construction of a building for the Sowrashtta
High School, Madura.

B
HOME (EDUCATION)

2
DEPARTMENT.

C.F.-29.


SonB
CNO.342

Received

191

Registered

16-2-1918



Subject.

recommending a half grant on the revised estimate
for the construction of a school house for the Sourashtra
High School, Madura.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

R.G. No.1754/17

Station Madras, Dated the 13th February 1918

From (Name) the Hon'ble Mr. J.H. Stone, M.A., F.R.H.S.,
C.I.E.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,
M A D R A S.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

HOME (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir,

(H)
The authorities of the Sourashtra High School, Madura,
submitted a design for constructing a building for the
School at a cost of Rs.1,50,000 and applied for a half-grant.
The Government in their order No.1188 Home (Education) dated
15th September 1917 stated that the design was unnecessarily
ornamental and expensive and sanctioned a grant of Rs.50,000
only on the ground that a suitable design could be prepared
to cost not more than Rs.1,00,000. The School authorities
now submit the enclosed revised design which is estimated to

2

cost Rs.1,25,000 and state that a suitable school building cannot be constructed at a less cost, vide their letter dated 24th January 1918 (copy enclosed). They request that they may be given half grant on the original estimate of Rs.1,50,000 or at least half grant on the enclosed revised estimate of Rs.1,25,000. They also desire to construct according to the original estimate if a half grant is given on the revised estimate. I consider that the revised estimate effects all economy that is consistent with the provision of a satisfactory school house. If they prefer to go somewhat further, I do not think that Government need object to their doing so. I have the honour therefore to recommend that a half grant on the revised estimate may be sanctioned and that the authorities may also be permitted to adopt the original design.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

R. Narayana

For Director of Public Instruction

Y.V./12/2

2 | 125,000
62,500

3 | 125,000
41,666

3

Letter dated 24th January 1918 from the Correspondent
Sourashtra High School, Madura.

3

With reference to G. O. No.1188 Education, dated 15th September 1917 communicated to me with your Proceedings R. O. C. No.1754 dated 26th September 1917, I am directed by the Committee of this Institution to express their gratitude to Government for the grant of Rs.50,000 towards the cost of their proposed new High School building and to inform you that they have given long and careful consideration to the question of what course they should pursue in the matter in view of the fact that the grant of Rs.50,000 towards the Rs.1,50,000 at which the building is estimated on Mr. Pears's design leaves them no less than one lakh to provide from their own funds, a very much larger sum than they had anticipated.

2. In view of the opinion expressed in the Government order that a suitable building could be constructed for one lakh of rupees, they requested Mr. Pears to design for them a suitable building at the least possible cost. In reply he has sent us a plan and estimate which I beg to enclose for perusal. It will be seen that every economy that could reasonably be expected has been embodied in it. The ornamental front has been dispensed with and replaced by a front exactly similar to the front of the Vellore Mission College now under construction, for which Government gave a half grant. A middle tower has been dispensed with notwithstanding the great length of frontage. The basement has been reduced from 3' to 2'. The height of all the rooms (except the large hall) has been reduced from 16' to 14'. Only the three verandahs necessary for access to the class rooms have been retained, and their widths have been reduced to that of the front one from 12' to 10' (8' clear between pillar and wall) and the side verandahs to 8' (6' clear). All other verandahs have been dispensed with and replaced by sun-shades. The class rooms have been reduced from 22' x 22' to 22' x 20'.

4

yet with all these reductions the estimate still amounts to Rs.1,25,000. No doubt there are further reductions that could be made without actually destroying the utility of the building for teaching purposes. The height of the rooms may be reduced to 13' or even 12'; the basement might be reduced to 1' or dispensed with altogether; the verandahs might be reduced by a foot or so; teak might be replaced by jungle wood; a wooden stair-case might be substituted for the proposed stone one, and in other such ways it is possible that the total cost might be brought down to the one lakh mentioned by Government. But the Committee are firmly of the opinion that they would rather not build at all than build on such lines. And they consider that even the reduced plan and estimate enclosed herewith are so greatly inferior to the original plan and estimate dealt with in the Government order, that they are not at all disposed to adopt it, and would very much prefer to adopt the said original plan if it were not for the financial difficulty.

3. They therefore venture to beg that you will be pleased to move Government to reconsider their order. The Committee fully understand that they cannot expect Government to pay for any excess of ornamentation or of dimensions beyond bare necessities except in so far as Government may consider such excess to have an educative, and perhaps a hygienic, value, direct or indirect; and they are ready to bow with all submission to the opinion of Government as to what educative and hygienic value such excess may contain. But with all deference they beg to submit that even assuming that a building of ^{bare} necessities may be fit up for one lakh, the health, the comfort, the elasticity, provided by the larger dimensions, and the beauty of an ornamental building as compared with a mere barrack, must have some value over and above the lakh, though opinions may differ as to how much that value may be. It is on this ground therefore, as well as on the further ground that,

5

with rates rising as they are at present, a building estimated now at one lakh is unlikely to be completed - say two years hence - for less than perhaps Rs.10,000 or 20,000 above that sum, that my Committee have desired me to ask you to be so good as to approach Government with a strong recommendation that they should grant half the cost of the original estimate or at least half of the enclosed estimate of Rs.1,25,000.

/YRUE COPY/


Native

for Director of Public Instruction

13.2.18

Y.V./12/2

Reb No. 435
1917



Sourashtra High School,
Madura, 9th March 1918

From,

M.R.Ry. J. Ramaiyer Avergal, B.A., B.L.,

CORRESPONDENT,
Sourashtra High School,

Madura.

5
C.No. 558
12.3.18

To,

The Secretary to the Government of Madras.

Home (Educational) Department,

MADRAS.

Sir,

In obedience to the requisition of the Director of
Public Instruction, Madras in R.C.No.1754 of 17 dated 6-3-18,
I beg to send herewith (in separate packet) the plans and
estimate relating to the original design as regards the
construction of the building for the Sourashtra High School,
Madura.

The packet contains two plans and one copy of the
estimate.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,


D. Ameyy
Correspondent.

HOME (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

C.F.—20

Received



Registered

26-8-1918

Subject.

Submitting copy of a letter No.R.O.C.435 of 1917 dated 18th August 1918 from the Correspondent, Sourashtra High School, Madura, requesting orders on their request for building grant.

ENCLOSURES

No.

N.R.C.

No.1754/1917

Spare copies

Station Madras

, Dated the

24th

August

1918

From (Name) the Hon'ble Mr.J.H.Stone, M.A., F.R.H.S.,
C.I.E.,
(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,
MADRAS.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

HOME (EDUCATION)

Department.

Sir,

Submitted to Government with the request that early orders may be passed on this office letter R. C. No.1754 of 1917 dated 13th February 1918.

R. Narain

for Director of Public Instruction.

P.T.O.

Regd. Ct.

24/8/18

Letter R.O.C. No.435/1917 dated 18th August 1918
from the Correspondent, Sourashtra High School, Madura.

I am directed by the Committee to ask the
favour of your kind attention to my letter to you of 24-1-18,
in which I requested your support to our application for an
increased grant for our new High School building. Though
seven months have elapsed since the date of the above letter
we have not yet abandoned hope that Government may be after all
pleased to give a favourable reply to our application, but the
special point to which I am now directed to draw your kind
attention is that since the date of G.O.1188 dated 15th September
(Home Department, Education) in which it was stated that a
suitable building might be built for one lakh of rupees, building
rates have risen very greatly, especially those of teak, steel
and cement.

My committee, as stated in my letter above
quoted were unable to believe that a suitable building could
be built for one lakh, even before the great rise of rates
took place, but they are now more than ever convinced of this,
and feel sure that even if the Government calculation of one
lakh was correct in September last it could not be less than
one and a quarter lakhs now. They therefore renew their request
with increased hopes and beg that you will be pleased to bring
this point at once to the special notice of Government.

/TRUE COPY/.

N. A. Arivu.

for Director of Public Instruction.

Y.V./24/8

Home (Education)

DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered 31.10.1918

Subject.

Requesting orders in connection with the building
grant to Sourashtra High School, Madura.

ENCLOSURES

No.

Spare copies

No. 1754/17

Station MADRAS, Dated the 30-10-1918

From (Name) The Honourable Mr. H.S. Duncan, M.A.,
(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Home (Education) Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to request the favour of
early orders on my letter R C No. 1754 of 1917 dated
13th February 1918 in connection with the construction
of a building for the Sourashtra High School, Madura.

Home (Education) Dept.

The file on the subject with a draft order
was sent to P.W.D. on 19-10-18. This
may be forwarded to that department
with the request that the return of the file
may be expedited.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. A. Arivu.

for Director of Public Instruction.

S V

Subject - Revised plans and
estimate for the Sonachtra
high school building, medium

[Cor. 342 B] From the D.P.G. Re No. 1754/17 of the 13.2.18.

The plans and estimates may be forwarded
to P.W.D. for scrutiny and remarks.

18.2.18
G.R.
19.2.18

GA
20.2.18
See [Signature]

I think that we have decided
that the P.W.D. scrutiny is to include
check of stability of structure; & so,
the plan estimate of the work to be
actually executed should be scrutinised.

2. The check of the enclosed estimate is of
no use; as it is not intended to
build accordingly.

3. What is required seems to be (1)
an estimate without ornamentation
properly accounted sufficient in the
opinion of the D.P.G. according to standard
requirements (2) professional scrutiny of
the work to be actually turned out costing
not less than item (1).

Note further 21/2/18

It is submitted that the number of students
for whom accommodation is provided is not specified
the total strength of the school on the 31st March 1918.

Vol. II grepost.

1917 was 1,225, that of the three highest forms being 105. From the number of classes provided in the plan it appears that the building is designed to accommodate only the three highest forms. Apparently the D.P.D. has satisfied himself that the plan conforms to the standard requirements. Assuming that accommodation is for 150 students the cost (Rs 1,25,000) works out to Rs 833 for a student. According to the scheme for raising the status of incomplete secondary schools the D.P.D. calculated the cost of ^{school} buildings for 60 x 27 students at

para 19 of this d.o. on page 2 of order to Govt. 1210 (1917)

para 3 on p. 1 - do - 19.9.17

para 8 on p. 2 - do -

Rs 3,00,000 at the outside or Rs 185 for a student and hostel accommodation at Rs 773 per student and remarked that schools cost per head to build a good deal less than hostels. The estimate for the Sourashtra high school exceeds both the figures given by the D.P.D.

2. As observed by the Secretary the scrutiny of the P.W.D. includes that of structural stability and unless the plans approved by the P.W.D. are adopted the provisions of art. 53 of the Grant-in-aid Code will not be satisfied and the Govt. will not be in a position to guarantee structural stability of the building. Nor does it appear safe to permit the authorities of the school to adopt a plan not approved by the Govt.

3. In the light of the above remarks the S.P.C. may be requested n-o. to state whether he will modify his ~~for~~ recommendation.

^{PM}
25.2.18
^{CR}
27.2.18

It seems plain that the School authorities do not propose to build according to the design now sent up to Govt. The present plan is apparently intended to enable foot. ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~grant~~ ^{grant}, which in this case has been fixed on a rough ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~conjecture~~ ^{conjecture} of the Consulting Architect - a procedure which is quite unusual. We cannot allow the School authorities to build as they please without reference to Govt. If they stick to the original proposal to build a tower we should satisfy ourselves that the foundations ~~re~~ ^{are} sufficiently safe & that the stability of the building is otherwise secured. For this purpose ^{to examine the} we do want ~~plans~~ ^{plans} of the structure as it is eventually to be built.

As our grant is in this case to be based on an unornamental standard, we should have an idea as to what a building which conforms to the minimum educational requirements would cost. The present

reference ~~to~~ is apparently intended to serve this purpose. The C.A. fixed it first ~~at~~ roughly at one lakh but the school authorities state that the cost will be 1.25 lakhs. The D.P.D. considers that the plan effects "all Economy that is consistent with a satisfactory school house." We may ~~therefore~~ take it that the school building will conform to the Ed. requirements + will not provide for any unnecessary luxuries. The opinion of the P.W. authorities whether such a building would cost 1.25 lakhs has to be taken.

On 4.3.18

- I would just take the D.P.D.'s advice.
2. Govt will be prepared to accept his estimate of the total minimum cost of the building for the requirements.
3. But a plan of the structure as it is intended to be raised is necessary to enable the P.W.D. to certify.

Conno. 342 B-1

5.3.18

Wm. 2/6



D P I (no)

Wm 5/3/18

NOTES.

No. 103 & 6. 3. 18 (4)

Jo. 11 88 15. ix says that the plans are too expensive but is silent about structural imperfections. The managers of the school appear to have taken this to mean that from the letter point of view the plans were approved by the Chief Engineer and have begun work. I am instructing them to resubmit the plans direct to Government in the Home (A) Cell.



Submitted that the plans referred to at A above may be awaited.

CR 7.3.18
 CR 8.3.18
 CR 9.3.18

The original plans and estimate have since been received. They are separately tied & kept below. Submitted that they may be forwarded to P.W.D. for scrutiny and for determining the cost of the building with reference to para. 1 of Ho No. 1188 Home (Ex) dt the 15-9-17.

CR 18.3.18
 CR 19.3.18

P.W.D. (no.)

LWS

20.3.18

781
 DATE 21.3.1918

Home 342 B-2
 20.3.18 (4)

MB
 24/3

Madura Sourashtra High School.

In arriving at his figure Rs.1,25,000 Mr. Pears includes

	Rs.
Compound walls (roughly)	5,500
Unforeseen works	6,000
Architects fees	6,600

	18,100

I did not allow for these when I quoted one lakh as the probable cost of a suitable building.

Mr. Pears' estimate also includes about Rs.11,000/- for cut stone work. If I had to design a suitable building for one lakh, it would not have much ornamental cutstone work in it. I still maintain that my figure one lakh was a reasonable one.

2. The D.P.I. submitted the original design without criticising its accommodation. In approving the design (his letter dated 29th June 1917 Ref.on C.1754) he said it was prepared in accordance with his suggestions. Consequently it has been assumed that all the room provided is required. We do not know the number of students to be accommodated in the various rooms and Laboratories.

3. The Hall 80'-6" x 40'-6" contains approximately 3200 Sft. which would seat nearly 600 persons in comfort. (The English Church Commissioners allow 20 x 34 inches for each sitting. For free sittings 20 x 27 inches. As a guide for accommodation in Churches, Hurst gives for every person, from 5 to 7 super feet, and this provides for all passages, communion table etc.). In deciding whether a

suitable

781 WHP

NOTES.

14 Page 2

suitable building could be built for one lakh these figures may help towards visualising what Mr. Pears has drawn.

4 As regards scrutiny for stability, it is obviously futile to apply this to a design which only serves an academic purpose and which nobody proposes to build. If it is ^{to be} applied to the original design, building of which has actually commenced (D.P.I.'s note dated 6-3-18) we must call for half inch details (plans sections and elevations) of towers, verandahs, domes, projecting balconies and staircases, and roof drainage should also be illustrated. Thickness of walls everywhere must be shown on Drawings. It is not reasonable to say they can be found out from the estimate. Portions of the masonry which are to be built of brick or stone or in cement must be clearly shown. Proposed scantlings for floors and roofs must be figured..

5 As to the claim in para 3 of the Correspondent's letter dated 24th January 1918 that "the beauty of an ornamental building as compared with a mere barrack must have some value x x x x" I will only remark that ornament attracts attention to the ugliness of man's handiwork quite as often as it embellishes it.

W.H.N.

10-4-18

we may agree entirely with
Mr. Nicholl

Kler
11.4.18W
16/4
OKS NOTW
11/4/18



P.W.D. NO. 781
17-4-18

With

Eight blue prints
two files of estimates

I agree entirely with Mr. Nicholls note - as the school authorities have started work on a design which has not been checked and scrutinised & must repudiate all responsibility for the result. The only thing I have done now is to leave the responsibility with them and for Government to give them a lump sum grant in aid.

From
16.4.18

Home (Educational) Secy.

Home (Edu) Department.

The Consulting Architect still maintains that his estimate of one lakh for a suitable building is a reasonable one. The Chief Engineer agrees with him. There is therefore no reason for any additional grant.

2. As regards structural stability, the Chief Engineer considers that ^(the responsibility) should be left with the authorities of the School and ~~that~~ apparently he is not for calling for the details mentioned in para 4 of the C.A.'s note on page 7 and for the scrutiny of the design. Submitted that this view may be accepted.

3. A draft order is submitted for approval

18.4.18

T
204

With reference to the opening sentence of Mr. Nicholls' note - page 6 above - we generally

16
 Take into account for purposes of frame the expenditure on compound wall, and architect's fees. The latter if taken at $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent amounts to Rs 2500 on the approximate estimate of one lakh assumed in this case. This with the cost of compound wall amounts to Rs 800. A half grant of Rs 4000 on this may be allowed. We need not make any allowance for unforeseen works.

(With reference to para. 3 of Mr. Nichol's note it may be observed that the hall is ^{as usual principally} ~~intended~~ intended for examination purposes where students have their seats placed at a distance from each other. The usual standard of seating in churches & other public halls cannot be obviously be applied here in determining the number that will be accommodated.)

A
 24.4.88

I cannot usefully pass orders in this case at present

2. In the first place the question of what the PWD scrutiny is is under consideration. That case must

NOTES.

17 Page 10

be disposed of first.

3. afterwards, the C.A. note shows he sent to the D.P. for note if he approves of the lavishly large rooms.

4. Ultimately we shall have to decide

(1) if the accommodation is reasonable
— DPI to certify

(2) what the building will cost — without unreasonable ornamentation & unreasonably expensive materials (e.g. cut stone &c)

(3) if the building as actually built is stable.

4. The grant can then be revised.

5. Para 2 of the draft put up is obvious

18/4/18

pages 7+8 of C.F.

[C.F. 1813 B]. From the D.P.D. Rec. No. 1754/17 of the 24.8.18

1894 9/8
1894 9/8



me (80) uo.
18-342B-3
20-8/18

Please see the remainder from the D.P.D. on pages 7+8 C.F. asking for early orders on the case. It is not known what decision has been come to by the D.P.D. ~~in the~~ regarding the question of D.P.D. pending of the grant-in-aid buildings referred to in para 2 of the Secretary's note above. Submitted that that department may be requested, in the first instance is to state in what stage the matter now is.

18/4/18

18 P.W.

Please see the
Ed Dept. notes on the
previous page. The file
regarding the question of P.W.
Scrutiny of the grant-in-aid
referred to is being circulated
to H & the Governor today.
2 This file relates to the
increased grant for the
Saraswathi High School
and the H. of Sec'dary has
ordered that this file should
lie over till the general
question is settled.

10/9
4/9

4/9

The file may be referred
to with the above
remarks. I doubt if the
final action, on the case
referred to above will
be of much assistance
in connection with the
issue in this file.



1894/1
4.9.18

Edl. no. 4.9.18

NOTES.

19

Home (You) Depart.

Please see the PWD note on the previous page. In the circumstances stated therein it is for consideration whether the ~~consideration~~ question raised in this may be further examined. If so, the file may be forwarded to the S.P.D. u.o. for remarks with ref to paras 3 & 4 of the Secretary's note on page ante.

CA
6.9.18
5.9.18

I should be glad however to see the general orders before disposing of this file. To save time however the file may be sent to the S.P.D. u.o. now

WJ/S/W

S.P.D. u.o.

Home (ES) u.o.
No. 342 B-4
7.9.18
WJ/S/W

No. 214 Q/12.9.18

h of about 1100 pupils

I do not know how the idea arose that the building is intended for the higher /junior/. It is to accommodate the /middle school/ and the accommodation is not lavish. The hall is used as 5 class rooms and is divided by movable partitions. This is really an economy as they are teaching space as well as a fine hall for examinations and assemblies. The size of classrooms in the original plan is almost the minimum but

NOTES.

Page 13
20

has been added in the second plan to
below that given in the new rules.

I have nothing to say about the technical
point of examination of plans for
stability except that it is for P.W.D.

to decide whether they will accept Pearson's
regulation as a sufficient guarantee of this.

for it.¹⁸
12.


The D.P.D.'s note above may
be sent to the P.W.D. with reference
to their note on page 6 to 8 above.

PWD CA may
13-9-18 14/9/18

Public Works Department.

W

The figures of cost given in previous notes were
based on experience of cost of buildings in the past
but rates have recently risen and are still rising and
it is unlikely that the building estimated at 1.5 lakhs
will be completed for that sum. Government have sanc-
tioned a contribution of .5 lakh it would therefore
perhaps not be unreasonable to recommend that Govern-
ment contribution will be 1/3 the final cost provided
satisfactory reasons are given for any excess over



Home (884) W.O.
18. 342 P-5
14 9. 18



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
NO. 2038
17 9. 18

the original estimate of 1.5 lakhs.

It is essential that the school management and the D.P.I. should be informed that the Chief Engineer is taking no responsibility whatever for the stability of the building.

P.W.D. No. 2038/18-1
1.10.18

Home (Educational) no.

From
20/9/18

21.

Home (Education) Department

The position briefly is as follows:-

The correspondents original estimate was for Rs. 1,50,000

Rs. The Consulting Architect's estimate for an unornamental building providing for necessary educational requirements was for Rs. 1,00,000

Grant sanctioned in G.O. No. 1188, dated the 15th September 1917 — one half of Consulting Architect's estimate — — — — — Rs. 50,000

2. The correspondent of the school, now submits a revised estimate for Rs. 1,25,000 and applies for a half grant on that amount, viz., Rs. 62,500. It is at the same time stated that the building ~~is~~ has already ~~in~~ been commenced according to the original design, costing Rs. 1,50,000. The Director of Public Instruction recommends the increase of the grant from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 62,500 as prayed for by the correspondent. The Public Works Department do not recommend the acceptance of the Director of Public Instruction's proposal, but, having regard to the ^{rise in the} ~~high~~ prices of building materials, that a Department recommend a grant of one-third of the cost of the building as finally completed according to the original design, provided ~~satisfactory~~ satisfactory reasons are given for the excess over the original estimate of Rs. 1,50,000.

50.1188
15-9-17 (H)

(H)

3. It has since been decided by H. E. and H. W. that the responsibility for structural stability and architectural effects of all grant-in-aid buildings should be thrown on managers or designers of buildings and that arts. 52 & 53 of the Grant-in-aid Code should be amended accordingly. The draft order on the case is being separately submitted.

4. A draft order on this case is submitted below for approval.

MD
2.10.18
MK
Thurs

Q
10.10.18
L

If the grant is worded as in the draft there will be no inducement for economy & there may be subsequent acrimonious discussions as to what is essential & what is ornamental.

We are prepared to grant Rs 50,000. The present recommendation is to grant 25% extra. I think that this is a reasonable increase to sanction on account of increase in rates. I would prefer to sanction Rs 62,500. Draft & write further remarks of M.D.

11/10/18

After grant is worded as in the draft there will be no inducement for economy & there may be subsequent acrimonious discussions as to what is essential & what is ornamental. We are prepared to grant Rs 50,000. The present recommendation is to grant 25% extra. I think that this is a reasonable increase to sanction on account of increase in rates. I would prefer to sanction Rs 62,500. Draft & write further remarks of M.D.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes on the left page, possibly including the word "submitted" and "attention"]

23

for order submitted. If approved, it forwarded to Prov. for acceptance or

Remarks

[Signature]
11.10.18

[Signature]
18.10.18

[Signature]
8/10/18

[Signature]
15.10.18

[Signature]

23

P. W. O.

Home (Ed #) 1813-B-1
19.10.18



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
C. NO. 2354 W. K. B.
DATE 22.10.18

[Signature]
W.

Submitted.
Attention is invited to the
Dept. notes on 13-14 and

[Signature]
24/10

The draft may be accepted

24

24

”

C. No.

C.

99

"

4

Mis.

No.

the responsibility for structural stability
and architectural effect must rest entirely
with the Management.

11.10.18

15.10.18

CR 18.10.18

My 19/10/18

Revised
with encls
5.11.18

with encls. returned

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A