

Home (1918) Department.
Education
Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 1596

DATED 13-12-18

N. P.

Printed

ORIGINAL.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Plans and estimates.

Passing orders on the question of the extent to which the Public Works Department will be held responsible for the scrutiny of ----- of buildings for aided educational institutions.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

N. P.

ORIGINAL

Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (EDUCATION)

G.O. No. 1596, 13th December 1918

Plans and Estimates.

Passing orders on the question of the extent to which the Public Works Department will be held responsible for the scrutiny of — of buildings for aided educational institutions.

Order—No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918.

Under the procedure now followed in dealing with applications for building grants from managers of educational institutions under private management, an outline of the plans is first forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction who scrutinizes the suitability of the proposals from an educational point of view; and after approval of the plans by him, detailed plans and estimates are prepared and submitted, which are subjected to scrutiny by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, whenever a grant exceeds Rs. 2,500. When a grant has been sanctioned, notice of commencement of the work is given to the Executive Engineer and provision is made for inspection of the work from time to time during its progress by the officers of the Public Works Department. Finally before the grant is paid, a certificate from the engineer is required to the effect that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and estimates.

In addition, special instructions have been drawn up for the preparation of plans and estimates which are supplied to correspondents of schools by Inspectors on application; and one of the instructions lays down that all plans and estimates should be prepared by a gazetted officer of the Public Works Department present or retired, a present or retired District Board Engineer, a member or associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers or a recognized professional architect.

2. Experience has shown that, though plans and estimates are now better prepared than before, they fall generally much short of the standard needed and the arrangement, as a whole, has not produced satisfactory results chiefly in fixing responsibility for the structural stability of buildings. In practice, considerable alterations of design are suggested, and not infrequently, badly drawn designs are returned for revision, thus entailing delay and trouble when estimates have to be scrutinized a second and a third time. The fact that the design and estimates underwent thorough scrutiny in the Public Works Department when the application for grants came up for consideration evidently operates in many cases against the designer feeling the full measure of responsibility for drawing correct and complete designs and estimates.

On the other hand, it is neither desirable nor possible for the Government to undertake the entire responsibility for structural stability in respect of the ever-increasing number of private buildings, which means, in several cases, re-designing and in all, watching every step of the construction of a building and interfering to condemn bad workmanship and bad materials.

3. The Government have given the matter their careful consideration and have decided to lay down the following procedure in respect of building grant applications. While the rule requiring that plans and estimates should be prepared by qualified professional architects should be strictly enforced, the responsibility for structural stability should be specifically fixed on the designers. As at present, the plan will be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction who will see that the design is suitable from an educational point of view. The subsequent examination of detailed

plans and estimates in the Public Works Department will in future be confined to pronouncing an opinion on the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates. The officers of the Public Works Department will not be required to inspect a building while under construction or to pass it on completion; where however private qualified professional advice is not available, the responsibilities of the Public Works Department will continue to be as at present.

The correspondent of the school in respect of which a grant is made will be required, in due course, to furnish a certificate that a building generally in accordance with the plans which were submitted to Government and on which the grant was sanctioned has been completed and that the full amount of the Government grant has been duly expended thereon.

4. The Director of Public Instruction is requested to submit a draft of the necessary amendments to be made in the Grant-in-Aid Code to give effect to the above decision.

(True extract)

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
" Accountant-General.
" Public Works Department, with notes.
" Local and Municipal (Medical) Department, with notes.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 13TH DECEMBER 1918

[SUBJECT.—*Grant-in-aid schemes—Plans and estimates—Extent of Chief Engineer's scrutiny.*]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Attention is invited to the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917 (No. 6518-C., dated 19th October 1917). With reference to paragraph 2 of Deputy Secretary's note, dated 4th September 1917, on page 4 thereof, the question as to the extent to which scrutiny should be applied to grant-in-aid building schemes has to be considered. The general orders on the subject are—

(1) Circular No. 116-C., dated 4th January 1913, modified by Memorandum No. 9789-C., dated 18th December 1913.

(2) G.O. No. 561, Educational, dated 14th June 1913.

It will be seen from the notes leading to Circular No. 116-C., dated 4th January 1913, that questions similar to the one now revived by the Consulting Architect were raised then with the Chief Engineer's (Mr. Pears') support. Educational agreed to rule that the plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works should be prepared by professional men of the qualifications stated in clause (1) of paragraph 2 of the circular, though they thought that it would often be difficult to get such qualified men. But they did not agree that detailed scrutiny by the Public Works Department especially with reference to structural stability, was not necessary even in the case of buildings in municipal areas. In this connexion please see Mr. Davidson's note, dated 3rd October 1912, on page 6 of the notes with the circular. The Educational Department's view was accepted in the Public Works Department—vide Mr. C. A. Smith's note, dated 12th November 1912, on page 7 of the notes with the circular.

2. Now Consulting Architect proposes that Government should absolve themselves from all responsibility for structural stability in cases where the designer is a recognized professional man. It is presumed that when the Chief Engineer does not make a detailed scrutiny and merely advises as to the amount of grant payable, he will not formally recommend the plans submitted by the applicant. Deputy Secretary has noted that, in such cases, the 'Public Works Department officers must not be called upon to inspect the building during construction or to give advice' (page 4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Educational, dated 15th September 1917). In this connexion, please see the Education Department note, dated 6th September 1917, on page 5 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917.

3. His Excellency's note, dated 10th September 1917, seems to apply only to the particular case of the Sourashtra school (page 6 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Educational, dated 15th September 1918). His reference to 'our usual system' seems to be based on a misunderstanding. The Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew agrees that the methods of examining plans and estimates before aid is given have in the past been rather too complex. It may be noted that G.O. No. 561, Educational, dated 14th June 1913, begins thus. 'In view of the fact that the Chief Engineer is responsible for the correctness of the plans scrutinised by him.' This apparently means correctness with reference to structural stability also.

For orders.

T.P.S.—9-11-17.

P.P.R.—10-11-17.

R.K.—12-11-17.

"Can no earlier orders be traced? The scrutiny of grant-in-aid works has been in force for years. What we want to get at are the original principles underlying the system."

D. MARSHALL—14-11-17.

The indexes have been examined. It will be seen from the marginally-noted Government Orders that the present practice of scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's Office, of grant-in-aid estimates for Educational buildings, is in substitution

of the earlier requiring the Executive Engineer or the Superintending Engineer to certify that the plans and estimates were suitable and that the rates were fair, before the application for grant was taken into consideration. To this was added the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office also. There was thus a double scrutiny. The present practice simplifies the system by dispensing with the scrutiny by the Executive Engineer or the Superintending Engineer. It thus appears that the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office is intended to be not only with reference to the reasonableness of the rates but also with reference to the suitability and satisfactory nature (i.e., presumably structural stability also)—vide the notes with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902, and also the notes with G.O. No. 3309 W., dated 14th November 1904.

T.P.S.—30-11-17.

Sir Murray Hammick thought that scrutiny as regards rates was necessary as "otherwise an unscrupulous applicant might get a grant and then save on the estimate enormously and so get much more than his fair share"—vide his note, dated 26th March 1902, with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902. This danger will doubtless be minimised if estimates are prepared by professional men of standing; but neither the manager of a school who gets a grant which depends on the amount of the estimate nor the professional man whose fee is presumably calculated on the same amount, appears to have any incentive for rigid economy in the matter of rates. Government interests would therefore seem to require that a scrutiny of the rates should continue to be applied by its officers.

A further object of the Public Works Department scrutiny is to avoid "the danger of buildings being badly constructed and eventually causing loss to Government"—vide Educational Department note, dated 26th March 1902, with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902. Government is interested in seeing that the contribution that it makes is not "wasted on unsatisfactory and unsafe erections"—vide Educational Department note, dated 6th September 1917, on page 5 of the notes with Memorandum No. 6518 C., dated 19th October 1917. The attainment of this object need not, it appears, necessarily involve scrutiny of all the estimates submitted

Superintending Engineers and Executive Engineers have more than they can do as it is.
D.M.—9-12-17.

is unwilling that this work should be done at all anywhere in its offices, a general circular will probably have to be sent in the Educational Department to all managers of schools that after a specified date, Government will not (take the trouble of) examine the structural stability of the designs submitted to it and that therefore they (the managers) should take care to have their designs and estimates prepared by competent professional men. In order to safeguard Government interests, a threat may also be included in the circular, if

considered necessary, that in case any building for which a grant-in-aid has been sanctioned by Government should, during or after construction, fail for any reason—structural or owing to defects of construction—the manager concerned will be liable at the discretion of Government to pay back the sum he received as grant-in-aid. This would be an effective step for forcing him to seek proper professional assistance before approaching Government. If this is approved, the present procedure of estimates being sent to the Chief Engineer may be continued, but the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office will be confined to the items specified in Consulting Architect's note, dated 1st September 1917 and also, if approved, to the reasonableness of the rates [pages 3-4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917].

D.M.—9-12-17.

I think we are bound to point defects if they are noticed. Further there is as much waste in an unsound building as in excessive rates.
D.M.—9-12-17.

September 1917 and also, if approved, to the reasonableness of the rates [pages 3-4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917].

R.K.—5-12-17.

The foregoing notes give the reasons why designs for grant-in-aid buildings are scrutinized in the Chief Engineer's office before grants are sanctioned. These reasons are to ensure that money is not wasted—

- (a) on excessive rates, or
- (b) on unsound structures, and
- (c) that the building is generally suitable architecturally and otherwise for the purpose for which it is required.

Mr. Nicholls in his note questions the necessity for (b), scrutiny in regard to structural stability, and it is with this point we are now concerned.

2. When the scrutiny has been completed the plans and estimates are returned to the Educational Department with a note by the Chief Engineer which points out defects that have to be rectified, and which recommends, subject to any alteration that may be required, the estimate for sanction; or if the defects are numerous and the building is badly designed the Chief Engineer's note points out the defects and recommends to the Educational Department that the design should be revised by the school authorities, and resubmitted.

3. A grant-in-aid building having been passed and the grant sanctioned, paragraphs 52 (iii) and 52 (i) of the Grant-in-Aid Code require that the building shall be inspected from time to time during construction by the local Public Works Department officers, and that before the grant is paid a certificate shall be granted by the Engineer (usually the local Executive Engineer) that the work has been completed

* This apparently applies to a building that has been purchased or one on which a grant is claimed after construction. in accordance with the approved plan and estimate (or that * the building is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed). Obviously these paragraphs presuppose that designs have been examined for structural stability and are approved, otherwise the final certificate would be worthless. I, therefore, submit that if scrutiny in regard to structural stability is not to be carried out paragraphs 52 (iii) and 53 (i) must be amended with a view to absolving the local Public Works Department officers from all responsibility in connexion with the building. My point is illustrated by paragraph 2 (b) of G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated the 15th September 1917, which runs thus "that the building will be inspected on completion and is certified by an officer deputed by Government to be worth at least one lakh of rupees". It will be observed that the order in its final form was not sent to Public Works Department for acceptance and if it had been, I think, we should have demurred at this paragraph if the officer referred to therein is to be a Public Works Department officer; because the designs have not been scrutinized, and in granting this certificate the officer who finally inspects the building must consider the question of its structural stability. For example he will have to go into the stability of the towers (about which the Public Works Department have already expressed doubts) because if they are not safe they will be a most serious danger, and the building will be worth nothing until they are strengthened or removed [see notes, pages 4-5 of the notes to G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917]. Further

at this late stage it will be a matter of very considerable difficulty to go into this particular question. The question as to whether the scrutiny in regard to stability of grant-in-aid buildings should continue or not is largely a matter for Financial and Educational to decide as it involves a question of money, and the safety of the pupils. As regards Mr. Nicholls' view of throwing the responsibility for structural stability on the designer in order to foster a responsible professional class and private enterprise, I submit, that Circular No. 116-C, dated the 4th January 1918, has since done a great deal of good and the designs that now come up are much better than they were formerly and are much less troublesome to scrutinize [page 4 of notes to G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917]. Further the fact that we, not infrequently, return badly prepared designs for revision has a salutary effect, inasmuch as the designer has to go over his work again and the delay caused thereby induces a school management to select a designer who is not likely to have this experience. We may, I think, hope for further improvement. Personally, I think, it would be imprudent to do away with the Chief Engineer's scrutiny in regard to stability of design, but as has already been pointed out the final say in the matter rests with Educational and Financial Departments. These notes may accordingly be circulated.

D. MARSHALL—13-12-17.

I agree with Mr. Marshall's note. The position so far as the Public Works Department are concerned is perfectly clear. If the certificate referred to in paragraph 53 of the Grant-in-Aid Code is to be signed by an officer of the department, the plans and estimate for the building must be scrutinized and passed by the Chief Engineer before the work was started. If such scrutiny is to be waived, Public Works Department officers cannot sign the certificate. The whole matter depends upon the word 'approved' in the fifth line of the paragraph referred to above. If the approval is that of the Chief Engineer, a Public Works Department officer can be called upon to grant the certificate, or he can refuse to do so. If the plan and estimate are approved by some other authority a certificate from the Public Works Department should not be asked for.

S. B. MURRAY—17-12-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The above notes may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks in the first instance.

P.R.—21-12-17.

T.K.—22-12-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—24-12-17.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—27-12-17.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

I am quite against altering any detail of the present system and particularly against waiving the scrutiny of plans in relation to structural stability, and agree with Public Works Department notes on the point.

2. I am however constantly seeing evidences that the Consulting Architect and his office find a difficulty in dealing with educational plans and I therefore renew a suggestion I made some years ago that there should be an Architect in my office (presumably a Public Works Department officer) who should do the work, or most of it, now done by the Chief Engineer's office (page 5 of notes recorded in Memorandum No. 4835-C, dated 24th August 1911). If Government is now inclined to consider this suggestion I could go into the amount of work such an officer would have. Of course we should still want the Consulting Architect's help in designing important buildings.

J. H. STONE—4-1-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Director of Public Instruction's note on the previous page. Both the Director and the Public Works Department are of opinion that the existing procedure as to the scrutiny of plans of aided school buildings should not be altered. This department may also agree with that view.

2. As regards the Director's suggestion for the employment of an architect in his office, it is submitted that the same suggestion was made by him in 1911—please see page 5 of notes recorded in Memorandum No. 4835 C., dated the 24th August 1911. It was not then considered by the Government. The suggestion is now renewed apparently with a view to afford a certain amount of relief to the Consulting Architect and his office. No indication as to the nature of the Architect's duties when employed or as to the kind of relief to the Consulting Architect is given; nor is it clear how most of the work now done in the Chief Engineer's office can be satisfactorily done by the proposed Architect unless he is an officer of the superior grade. From the notes recorded in Memorandum No. 2663 C., dated the 24th March 1914, it is however observed that the Consulting Architect's complaint is not that he is overworked but that the plans and estimates are not drawn up in the first instance by a competent architect. Paragraph 2 (1) of Circular Memorandum No. 116 C., dated the 4th January 1913, is intended to remedy this defect. It is not known whether as matters now stand the Consulting Architect wants any relief and, if so, whether the employment of an architect in the Director of Public Instruction's office is the proper form in which that relief can be granted.

3. The question is one for consideration in the Public Works Department to whom it may be remitted. If that department views the idea with favour the details connected with the proposal will be called for from the Director of Public Instruction.

P.R.—17-1-18.

C.R.—18-1-18.

As observed by the Director of Public Instruction and the Public Works Department it is undesirable to vary the present procedure as regards scrutiny of plans and estimates of aided educational buildings. The examination of the rates is as much a necessity as the scrutiny from the point of view of structural stability. We have not yet got that class of professional experts to undertake private jobs like these, so as to dispense with Public Works Department scrutiny. We have lately seen that the plans and estimates prepared by no less a person than Mr. Pears were found by the Public Works Department to be not free from flaw even in the matter of structural stability.

The necessity for scrutiny being conceded, it is doubtful whether a separate agency in the Director of Public Instruction's office is advisable. It cannot replace the Chief Engineer's final examination altogether. In most cases it will cause duplication of work, and will also be expensive. The existing arrangement may probably continue.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—20-1-18.

I agree with the above note (Registrar's).

2. An additional reason against a separate officer would be that sometimes he may not have enough work to do and sometimes he may have too much.

3. Regarding examination by officers of the Government Public Works Department subordinate to the Chief Engineer, this is a matter for the Public Works Department to order, if at all, that plans of a certain type or of a certain amount may be scrutinized by the Superintending Engineer. All that Educational wants is a certificate with remarks from the Chief Engineer.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—21-1-18

1596, Home (Edn.)—2

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

It is proposed to make no alteration in the scrutiny now exercised by the Chief Engineer in the matter of educational buildings towards which Government contribute. Financial may agree.

L. E. KERSHAW—22-1-18.

L. DAVIDSON—23-1-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The Home (Education) and the Financial Departments have agreed that no alterations can be made in the scrutiny now exercised by the Chief Engineer in the matter of aided educational buildings and are opposed particularly to the waiving of scrutiny in regard to structural stability. Submitted that these notes may be sent to Consulting Architect for perusal with reference to his note, dated 1st September 1917, on pages 3-4 of the notes to G.O. No. 1183, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917, prior to circulation to Honourable Members.

T.P.S.—30-1-18.

D. MARSHALL—5-2-18.

Seen.

W. H. NICHOLLS—22-2-18.

With reference to paragraph 3 of Educational Secretary's note on page 5 ante,

H.F.W.G.—1-3-18.

it is presumed that it is not proposed to transfer any portion of the scrutiny in such cases to the Superintending Engineers—vide Deputy Secretary's marginal remarks on page 2 ante.

2. These notes may, it is submitted, be now circulated to Honourable Member (Public Works Department), Honourable Member (Financial) and His Excellency.

T.P.S.—27-2-18.

R.K.—27-2-18.

D.M.—28-2-18.

I agree.

H. F. W. GILMAN, —1-3-18.

I am afraid that in the course of the noting the outlines of this subject have become somewhat obscure. The question is one of policy and must be looked at from a wide standpoint. It is perhaps desirable to indicate briefly the history of the subject.

2. In Circular No. 116-C., dated the 4th of January 1913, the rule was laid down directing that every plan and estimate for a grant-in-aid work must be prepared by gazetted officers of the Public Works Department (retired or in service), a District Board Engineer or a recognized professional architect. The underlying principle of this order was evidently to secure proper and reliable plans prepared by competent professional men thereby tending both to relieve the Public Works Department of responsibility and to create a class of private professional architects capable of taking their place.

3. This circular has not been repealed and still holds good, but not long after its issue the late Mr. Thomas in his note, dated 10th September 1913, put forward a totally opposite theory (page 1 of the notes recorded in Memorandum No. 2663 C., dated 24th March 1914). He proposed that he as Consulting Architect should be responsible for and if necessary redesign all the more important designs for grant-in-aid buildings and while he admitted that this would add greatly to his work he was ready to undertake the task. Sir Harold Stuart decided against Mr. Thomas and the notes on the subject were recorded in No. 2663 C., dated the 21st March 1914, but the fact remains that Mr. Thomas's policy is the only logical and legitimate result if the responsibility for passing plans and estimates is to be placed upon

the Consulting Architect. There is in fact no half-way house between relieving the Public Works Department of all responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect of the plans and imposing upon them the liability to revise and even redraw these plans.

4. Mr. Nicholls in his note, dated the 1st of September 1917, has re-opened the question and has suggested that responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect should be thrown on the authors of plans (pages 3-4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1183, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917). He points out that if the Consulting Architect is to go into these questions and be responsible in these respects, he must do so thoroughly. He must in fact eventually be forced to take up the attitude which was definitely assumed by the late Mr. Thomas, that is, he must be ready to re-design any and every plan for an aided building. If he is not ready to take up that attitude, he must on the other hand be relieved from all responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect and the Government must rely upon the rule laid down in paragraph 2 (1) of the circular of the 4th of January 1913 which requires all plans and estimates to be prepared by a competent and trained officer or professional man.

5. It seems now therefore to me that we have got to choose between the two policies. Either we must undertake the task of doing all the designing for all aided buildings in the Presidency or we must give up the Grant-in-aid Code provisions which require the Public Works Department to examine plans and estimates and to certify to the building when finished. Is it then possible for the Government to adopt the first policy and to undertake to revise, and if necessary to redesign, every grant-in-aid building that comes up? I feel no doubt whatever that that policy is totally impracticable. It is impracticable for various reasons. In the first place, the growth of applications for buildings, whether they may be hospitals or whether they are educational works, for which Government assistance is needed, must tend to increase and it is not possible for the Government to go on increasing its architectural staff so as to deal with the whole architectural work of the Presidency. In the second place, the adoption of this policy would destroy any chance of the growth of an independent architectural profession. It would centralize all designing work in the hands of Government officials and would in that respect be fatal to architectural progress in Madras, because we must look forward to the gradual growth of independent professional architects who will design not merely grant-in-aid buildings but the numerous other buildings, banks, railway stations and the like for which plans are required. If the Government stifle private enterprise by insisting upon all aided buildings being designed by their own architects, then buildings which receive no aid from Government will suffer. In the third place, I have no doubt that the attempt to force all mission and other bodies who ask for aid for an educational or medical building to accept designs from the Consulting Architect to Government will end in a deadlock. Two or three years ago, the American Mission at Madura proposed to build a Women and Children's hospital and they obtained plans and estimates for it. When these came to Mr. Thomas he, with his usual enthusiasm, set to work and redesigned the whole building. The mission objected to the acceptance of his design on the ground that it involved more money than they could afford to spend. The Public Works Department declined to pass any plans except those approved by Mr. Thomas and the result was that for more than a year the progress of the work was entirely held up and the dispute was only eventually settled at a long conference when both sides had to give way in some respects (vide No. 3419 C., dated 13th May 1916). Experience in that case convinced me that it is utterly impossible for the Consulting Architect to undertake to design buildings for other people. After all the mission or other body which proposes to erect a building must be allowed to some extent to determine for itself the style of the building to be erected.

6. I am therefore convinced that it is essential to reject the theory put forward by the late Mr. Thomas and to accept Mr. Nicholls' view, namely, that responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect should be thrown upon the Architect who designed the building. It is true that the Government must be insured against excessive cost, but I understand that the Public Works Department can do that by a calculation based upon the plinth area of the building and can furnish a guarantee

that the total cost of the building is reasonable. Beyond that, I think the Public Works Department should not be asked to go and I advocate the amendment of the Grant-in-Aid Code, article 58.

7. It is true that the Director of Public Instruction now objects to that course, but I do not think that Mr. Stone has correctly understood the position. It is for the Director of Public Instruction or the Surgeon-General, as the professional head of the administrative department, to see that the designs are correct and adequate from the administrative point of view. For instance, the Director of Public Instruction should see that in the case of a hostel the plans and estimates allow sufficient cubic capacity and ventilation or that there are sufficient and adequate class rooms. Similarly, the Surgeon-General should satisfy himself that the design of a hospital is in accordance with sound principles of hospital management. Neither of these points are matters which concern the Public Works Department and all that the Public Works Department has to see is the structural stability and the architectural effect (and cost). Those are points which do not affect the administrative point of view at all and for which we must trust to the Architect employed by the mission while we must rely upon the head of the administrative department to see that the administrative requirements are properly met.

8. I have dwelt at some length on this matter because it is one of great importance. The Consulting Architect to Government is already overburdened with work. A large building programme is before the Government and it will be increased by the taking over of headquarter district hospitals many of which require to be rebuilt. It is quite out of the question for one man to superintend all the work of designing the Government and aided buildings in the whole Presidency. Against this it is urged that the Government are spending large sums of money on these buildings and that it must be guaranteed that the work is properly done. In answer to this, I would reply, first, that the private owner, i.e., the mission or other body which builds the work, is at least as much interested as the Government in putting up a proper building. If it tumbles down, it will fall upon the mission to rebuild the whole structure and it certainly cannot expect that the Government will give a grant a second time. Moreover, the interest of a mission in a mission building, whether it be a school or a hospital, is a far more lively and vital interest than the interest of the Government which is limited to a mere grant-in-aid. The missionary in charge of a mission building, either as manager of a school or superintendent of a hospital, is usually keenly interested in his work and I think we may reasonably suppose that he will do his best to see that a proper design is obtained. In addition to that, we have the safeguard which is supplied by paragraph 2 (1) of the Public Works Circular, dated the 4th of January 1913, which requires plans and estimates to be prepared by responsible architects. In these circumstances, I think that the general policy should be pursued of relieving the Consulting Architect as far as possible from the responsibility for the structural design or architectural effect of aided buildings and I understand that the officers of the Public Works Department agree with this view provided that they are relieved from responsibility for passing the building after it has been built.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—20-3-18.

The Director of Public Instruction should, I think, see Sir Alexander Cardew's full and clear statement above, with which I am disposed to agree.

Could the precautions mentioned at A above 18 be taken before plans are drawn?

P[ENTLAND]—21-3-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The file may, in the first instance, be recirculated to the Honourable Member (Public Works Department).

P.RAO.—26-3-18.

R.K.—27-3-18.

D. MARSHALL—27-3-18.

S. B. MURRAY—28-3-18.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—3-4-18.

With reference to His Excellency's note above, the file may now be sent to Home (Education).

T.P.S.—4-4-18.

D. MARSHALL—5-4-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The file may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks with reference to His Excellency's note above.

P.R.—6-4-18.

T.K.—8-4-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—9-4-18.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—15-4-18.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

I must first remark that I am not conscious of having written anything suggesting the want of comprehension of the position attributed to me by the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew.

2. I do not know whether the limits of the scrutiny of plans by the Chief Engineer have ever been precisely laid down, but a perusal of sections V to XIV of Circular No. 116 of 4th January 1913 issued by Mr. C. A. Smith leads to the conclusion that the scrutiny he had in view was for structural stability and cost and I have never asked for more. I do not know how the Consulting Architect came to concern himself with architectural effect. It was not I believe because of any orders of Government. If people want to put up ugly buildings I would let them do so except that the Consulting Architect might point out to them where indulgence in ugliness means additional cost, and advise that such cost should not be admitted in fixing the grant. I have always been prepared to accept full responsibility for the practical suitability of proposed buildings to the purpose in view which involves such considerations as size and shape of rooms, their ventilation and lighting and their relative positions in the plan. I have sometimes even been inclined to resent the interference of the Public Works Department in these matters. It was in order that these things might be thoroughly attended to in my office before plans went to the Chief Engineer that the Grant-in-Aid Code, at my instance, lays it down that the first application for a grant must be accompanied by 'such outline plans as will enable the Director to judge of the suitability of the proposal from an educational point of view'.

3. Notwithstanding the arguments advanced in Sir Alexander Cardew's notes I am still of opinion that official scrutiny for structural stability and cost of plans for buildings for which a grant is asked and the correlative certification by the Public Works Department are necessary in the joint interests of aided school authorities and Government. In fact I do not see how Government without such evidence as is afforded by the latter that they have got their money's worth can pay building grants, and the latter is impossible without the former. There is the special instance of the Sourashtra High School, but hardly a plan passes through the Chief Engineer's Office that is not sent back with some alteration of detail with a view to stability. There has also been lately an instance of a professionally-designed building that was condemned as hopeless from every point of view by the Consulting Architect.

4. Aided school authorities no doubt try to get as good professional assistance as is available but in present conditions there seems no means of ensuring that they will not after all obtain unstable buildings except the check exercised by the Chief Engineer. What is wanted, I submit, is that he should understand that he has no responsibility for anything but cost and stability of structure.

5. I submit that this does not involve the acceptance of Mr. Thomas's position that the Consulting Architect must be ready to re-design unsuitable buildings. If a plan is so bad as to justify this the applicant for grant had better change his architect. This would rarely be necessary. Most of the plans submitted to him go

through his office with suggestions for alterations of detail only, and with the development of the profession of architecture even such suggestions will be decreasingly necessary.

6. I further submit that some other means of reducing the present and prospective congestion of work in the Consulting Architect's office may be considered than abolishing the present check on aided school building. It will be observed that I have answered His Excellency's question in the passage marked B on page 9 ante.

J. H. STONE—17-4-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders as to circulation to His Excellency and Honourable Members with reference to His Excellency the Governor's note on page 8 ante.

P.R.—18-4-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—19-4-18.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—20-4-18.

As Public Works Department is concerned Mr. Gillman should, I think, see now.

P[ENTLAND]—22-4-18

I agree, and meantime, as the Hon'ble Mr. Gillman is away, I suggest that the file might be sent to Mr. Nicholls and to Mr. Murray for any remarks they may have to offer.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—22-4-18.

Forwarded to Public Works Department.

R.R.—23-4-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

V.A.N.—25-4-18.

P. RAO.—25-4-18.

D. MARSHALL—25-4-18.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT.

Some of the views expressed in the foregoing notes arise, I think, from misunderstandings regarding what is involved by the proposal which I made in my note of 1st September 1917.

There was, I submit, no occasion to frighten Financial on the score of extravagance, or Education in respect of the safety of school children.

2. As I pointed out in my previous note the Chief Engineer's office would naturally draw attention to extravagance in any design submitted, even if full responsibility for structural stability were thrown upon the designer.

Extravagance is not detected solely or chiefly by examining the rates in estimates. The Chief Engineer's office does not check the accuracy of the quantities in estimates submitted from outside. Quantities can only be checked by measuring them again. It would be impossible to attempt any such remeasuring without an enormous increase of staff. This being the case, it would manifestly be absurd to base an opinion as to extravagance upon a check of rates applied to quantities which are not checked.

Although we do look at the rates, we detect extravagance chiefly by comparing the cost per square foot of superficial area and per cubic foot of the cubic contents of the design submitted with what we know from our practice and records to be a reasonable figure for these elements in any given locality.

I never suggested, nor do I recommend that these measures for detecting extravagance should be relaxed.

3. Then as regards the safety of pupils and possible collapse involving waste of the Government grant, I wish to say that there is no proposal to take any additional risk. It is only in the case of the qualified professional man by which I mean the man upon whom the Government know they can rely, not just any person who puts letters of 'Architect' after his name, that it is proposed to throw upon other shoulders the responsibility for structural stability. So far as I know the only reliable qualified man in this part of India at the present moment is Mr. Pears. It is unfair to the late respected head of the Public Works Department to suggest that he is not capable of making a building structurally sound (page 4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917). It is true, as I said in paragraph 3 of my previous note, that even he is hardly likely to maintain the necessary staff for this purpose or burden himself personally with all the labour involved if he knows that the Chief Engineer's office has got to do it for him.

The fact that Mr. Pears sent up a set of designs which we had to condemn emphasises the necessity for the measure which I proposed, one result of which would be that the trusted private practitioner would have to earn his fee or hang himself.

4. The Hon'ble Mr. Stone seems to think that my previous note was instigated by a desire to escape from certain duties (pages 3-4 of the note file with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917). I would gladly have less work, but as a matter of fact since it became recognized that an architect's business is to draw, the Consulting Architect has not been burdened with technical scrutiny. What actuates me in this matter is the consideration of what is best for the growth of the architectural profession in this Presidency.

5. It must not be supposed that, in wishing to give in greater degree a free hand to the trusted private practitioner, I am indifferent to architectural effect.

As the Honourable Member, Financial, has pointed out, the only means by which an architect can get a building right from his point of view is by designing it altogether *ab-initio*. Nobody can produce good work by tinkering with other people's designs or by mere verbal suggestions. Besides, if the architect who gives such advice does not know the site personally, and local conditions, his advice is quite likely to be worthless.

Apart from this, there is surely some limit to the extent to which it is desirable to allow any single architect to force his own idiosyncracies on buildings all over the Presidency. No real improvement can be expected until public taste feels the need of it. When, and only when public taste requires better, or let me say different buildings, development will take place automatically if it is not restricted by narrow guidance. It would, I am convinced, be antagonistic to such development to centralise the designing of all the more important buildings all over the Presidency in one office.

This was recognized at Delhi even in the case of Sir E. Lutyens, A.R.A. It is development in accordance with and illustrating public aspirations which is wanted in the interests of architecture in this or any other country. Development connotes a certain number of failures, but so long as a general improvement is going on failures ought not to be disconcerting.

I disagree emphatically with the policy advocated by the late Mr. Thomas in this respect, in the notes connected with Memorandum No. 2663-C of 24th March 1914.

W. H. NICHOLLS—1-5-18.

In submitting this case I venture to remark that as regards the scrutiny for structural stability our procedure at present is to see that rules regarding floor loads, pressures on masonry, etc. are observed and to point out errors connected therewith; but if these are numerous and the drawings are badly and incompletely prepared the scheme is returned for revision. We have not, I think, redesigned any scheme since Mr. Thomas was Consulting Architect. The point that has given rise to the present noting is the understanding that this scrutiny throws the whole responsibility for structural stability on the Public Works Department (vide also Mr. Smith's note dated 10th June 1913 on page 2 of the notes with G.O. No. 561, Educational, dated 14th June 1913). This principle was, I believe, enunciated by Mr. Wilson when

he was Chief Engineer, but I submit, though it may have been suitable and desirable some years ago it is no longer so. I therefore further submit that it should now be made clear and fully understood that although designs are passed through the Chief Engineer's office the designer who signs the plans is in no way relieved of responsibility. (The designer's signature on all plans must be insisted on. Omissions in this respect are occasionally noticed.) Our scrutiny if carried out on this understanding would still guard against failure while it would be no more harmful to the development of private enterprise than the London County Councils building regulations which apply to the London area. These are drawn up in great detail; for example the London County Councils' regulations relating to reinforced concrete; and no matter how highly qualified an architect or an engineer may be, he has to comply with these regulations and send in his plans to be passed by a representative of the London County Councils (the District Surveyor). The underlying principle being, I take it, that when knowledge and experience exist which will prevent failure, it is some one's business to see that they are applied.

I would further point out in this connexion that technical control is similarly exercised in England in regard to engineering works of a public nature by the Local Government Board, the Board of Trade and similar bodies but this control does not relieve the designer of his initial responsibility. My point is that grant-in-aid buildings are public institutions and therefore it is only reasonable that Government should exercise the necessary amount of control to guard against unsafe designs and jerry built structures. The procedure laid down in the Grant-in-Aid Code provides for this.

The above view of the matter will perhaps satisfy both Mr. Nicholls and Mr. Stone.

D. MARSHALL—20-5-18.

Some of the noting above has gone beyond the point at issue. As I understand the position Government propose to decide what rules they will frame which will ensure that they get proper value for their money when they give a grant-in-aid for a building. These rules are not intended to cover the responsibility of Government for the structural stability of any building which is erected, as is shown by the fact that Government have no responsibility for a building which is built solely with private funds. It is clear therefore that any action which Government will take is not to safeguard their responsibility but to see that the grant-in-aid which they give is suitably expended. I am strongly opposed to such action being carried so far as to interfere with architectural design and structural stability. As regards the former I agree entirely with what Mr. Nicholls says in paragraph 6 of his note, and undertaking responsibility for structural stability would be just as vexatious for it would mean not only cutting about and challenging the designs of a professional man, but also interference on the part of Government at every stage of the construction of the building—please see paragraph 92 (iii) of the Grant-in-Aid Code. It is obvious that if responsibility for structural stability is to be undertaken it cannot stop at approving of, or altering, the design of a building. Every step of its construction must be watched, and the officer on whom the responsibility has been put must have the right to condemn bad workmanship, or bad materials. This is Government interference with a vengeance.

2. In my opinion when Government consider the gift of a grant-in-aid the first step is for the head of the department concerned to certify that the proposed building is generally suitable for the purpose for which it is intended. The next step will be for this department to certify that the estimated cost of the building is reasonable. (This is a simple matter which will not entail a detailed examination of the design and estimate.) On the receipt of the above certificate the Government may then decide what sum they will give as a grant-in-aid to those responsible for the construction of the building.

S. B. MURRAY—27-5-18.

As I understand Sir Alexander Cardew's proposals, they are—

(a) that every plan for a grant-in-aid work shall be designed by one of the persons named in paragraph 2 (1) of the Circular of 4th January 1913, and that the designer shall be responsible for the structural stability of the building;

(b) that the plan and estimate shall be forwarded to the head of the department concerned who shall be responsible that the design is suitable and adequate from the administrative point of view. (This seems to be the existing practice, and it is apparently impossible for the head of the department to offer his criticisms until the plan has been prepared);

(c) that the only function of the Public Works Department will be to advise Government as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimate, and that the Department of Public Works officers will not be required to inspect the building while under construction or to pass it on completion.

2. I am prepared to accept these proposals as I agree with my Honourable Colleague that there is no middle way between making the Public Works Department absolutely responsible for grant-in-aid works, or relieving them of responsibility altogether. I see little use in requiring them to pronounce on the structural soundness of a design if they are not to supervise the construction which is equally important.

H. F. W. GILLMAN—28-6-18.

A. G. CARDREW—29-6-18.

In theory, I agree: and there is a lack of non-official western professional advice, which it would be well to supply. But that will take time, especially under present circumstances.

And what is to happen when no such qualified professional advice, as is contemplated in paragraph 2 (1) of Circular No. 116 C., is available?

Have Mr. Thomas' criticisms really been met?

P[ENTLAND]—2-7-18.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT.

I have been requested by the Chief Engineer to note upon the points raised by His Excellency in his note, dated 2nd July 1918. First His Excellency asks what is to happen when qualified professional advice is not available. In such cases we must, I submit, go on as we are doing at present. As I understand the notes by Honourable Member (Financial), dated 20th March 1918, and Honourable Member (Public Works Department), dated 28th June 1918, neither contemplates that we should throw responsibility for structural stability upon persons incapable of assuming it.

With regard to His Excellency's second question, the answer must be, I think, in the negative. The late Mr. Thomas' criticisms in so far as they are constructive amount to this; that since modern architecture as practised by private bodies is bad, the Government architect should undertake the wholesale supply of designs: or, in other words, that the Government should set up an æsthetic standard for private persons to live up to. This has not been done, and I venture to urge that it is undesirable that it should be attempted.

I am afraid that in entering the field of æsthetics, where the expenditure of private funds is concerned, the Government would be treading upon a bottomless bog. I believe that only the public can set up its own æsthetic standard, and it does so by employing men whose work it likes or thinks it ought to like, and leaving others to starve. If the architecture of any particular period is bad, the remedy lies, I submit, not in giving the public something which it does not want or understand, but in educating it to want something better. It is only thus that architecture can develop on rational lines and keep itself above the sphere of scene painting. Sir Thomas Jackson has some forcible remarks upon this subject. He says: "It is for the general public and not for themselves that both Art and artists exist, and the Art of any time will be such as the public demand . . . a minority of sincere artists will never succeed by themselves in raising the general level of the architecture of their day so long as the public at large remains ignorant or indifferent . . . Art cannot lead a healthy life or make any vigorous growth if it is cultivated only as an exotic for the enjoyment of the cultured few . . . Till there is a public demand for good Art and a public recognition of it when it is offered, there will never be a fair field for the conscientious artist."

["Reason in Architecture."—Sir Thomas Jackson, Bart., R.A., Architect.]

W. H. NICHOLLS—22-8-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

I asked Mr. Nicholls to reply to the two points raised by His Excellency above. If no private qualified professional advice is available the only thing to do is for Government to help.

S. B. MURRAY—28-8-18.

P[ENTLAND]—5-9-18.

With reference to the remarks of the Honourable Member (Public Works Department) which have been agreed to by Honourable Member (Financial), and His Excellency, the case may now be forwarded to Home (Education) for modification of the rules in the Grant-in-Aid Code.

J.R.—14-9-18.

R.K.—17-9-18.

D. MARSHALL—20-9-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order is submitted for approval. If approved, it may be forwarded to Public Works Department and Financial for acceptance. The draft refers only to educational buildings. It is presumed that the necessary instructions extending the scope of the order to medical buildings should issue in Local and Municipal (Medical). It is proposed to communicate to that department a copy of the Government Order with notes.

P.R.—1-10-18.

N.K.—5-10-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—8-10-18.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—9-10-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The draft order may, it is submitted, be accepted and the file passed on to Financial.

J.R.—19-10-18.

Accepted.

D.M.—31-10-18.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Please see the notes of the Honourable Members (Financial) and (Public Works Department) on pages 6-8 ante and 13 ante on which the draft order is based.

2. Paragraph 3 of the draft.—In the case of grants from Government in aid of private educational buildings, it is proposed to lay down that the only function of the Public Works Department will in future be to advise Government as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimate, and that the officers of the Public Works Department will not be required to inspect the building while under construction or to pass it on completion.

According to the existing procedure in rule 53 of the Educational Grant-in-Aid Code, before the grant is paid in full, it shall be certified by a Public Works Department officer—

(a) that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plan and estimate, or

B | (b) that the building is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.

Such certificate shall be countersigned by the Director of Public Instruction.

3. It is respectfully submitted that it seems desirable that the Public Works Department should, in addition to their scrutiny of the reasonableness of the estimate (before the work is completed), be asked to give a certificate as at B above to the effect that the building after completion is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.

Orders are solicited.

V.G.K.—5-11-18.

Will Public Works Department please circulate to Honourable Member (Financial) again? I think we should have some sort of guarantee that our money has been spent.

C. G. TODHUNTER—6-11-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the Financial note above, attention is invited to paragraph 6 of the Honourable Member's (Financial) note on page 7 ante.

2. Submitted that the case may now be returned to Home (Education), who will no doubt recirculate the case to Honourable Member (Financial) as requested by the Chief Secretary.

J.R.—16-11-18.

T.P.S.—18-11-18.

D. MARSHALL—18-11-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders as to circulation to His Excellency and Honourable Member (Financial). [It will be observed that both the Director of Public Instruction and the Chief Secretary want to maintain the completion certificate which the Public Works Department are now giving, and which is to the effect that the building erected under a grant is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.] But please see Honourable Member's note on page 8 supra.

E.A.V.—21-11-18.

S.A.—21-11-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—22-11-18.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU—29-11-18.

His Excellency approves.

(By order)

T. E. MOIR—5-12-18.

If the Public Works officers are required to certify, as the Chief Secretary wishes, that the Government money has been spent, I am afraid that they will be driven into the same minute check of quality, quantity, etc., as of old, and the former position will recur. It is true that there may be, in rare cases, some risk of the Government money being spent without due value being obtained. Of course if the building is never built at all, or if the Government money is not even approximately laid out on the work for which it is given, the case will be one of fraud, and a prosecution under the Indian Penal Code will be necessary. To meet such cases I think that the person to whom the grant is made should be required, in due course, to furnish a certificate making himself personally liable that a building generally in accordance with the plans which were submitted to Government and on which the grant was sanctioned has been completed and that the full amount of the Government grant has been duly expended thereon. I would add this at end of paragraph 3 of the draft.

Further than that I doubt its being necessary to go. Even now I believe that cases occur where there is reason to doubt whether the Government money has been fully and fairly expended, and so long as the certificate above suggested is obtained, I think we must risk the chance of deliberate fraud.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—6-12-18.

A sub-paragraph has been added to the draft as required by Honourable Member. For orders as to circulation to His Excellency the Governor.

E.A.V.—9-12-18.

S.A.—9-12-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—10-12-18.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU—11-12-18.

P[ENTLAND]—12-12-18.

Issue.

L.D.S.—12-12-18.

[G.O. No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918.]

Plans and Estimators

will be held responsible for the security of ^{side of} ~~of~~ ~~admiralty~~ ~~build~~ ~~ing~~ ~~dated~~ ~~191~~

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1687/13 From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 191

" " " " , " 191

" " " " , , " 191

ORDER.
Press.

No. 1596 dated 13. 12. 191

Notes to be printed.

Rule 52 (1) of the Gujarat - in - Arch
code

Rule 52 (ii) ibide

Rule 52(iii) - ibid

Under the procedure now followed in dealing with applications for building grants from managers of educational institutions under private management, an outline of the plans is first forwarded to the D.P.I. who scrutinises the suitability of the proposals from an educational point of view; and after approval of the plans by him, detailed plans and estimates are prepared and submitted, which are subjected to scrutiny by the Chief Engineer, P.W.D., whenever a grant exceeds Rs.2,500. When a grant has been sanctioned, notice of commencement of the work is given to the Executive Engineer and provision is made for inspection of the work from time to time during its progress by

the officers of the P.W.D. Finally before the grant is paid, a certificate from the Engineer is required to the effect that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and estimates.

In addition, special instructions have been drawn up for the preparation of plans and estimates which are supplied to correspondents of schools by Inspectors on application; and one of the instructions lays down that all plans and estimates should be prepared by a gazetted officer of the P.W.D., present or retired, a present or retired District Board Engineer, a member or associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers or a recognised professional architect.

2. Experience has shown that, though plans and estimates are now better prepared than before, they fall generally much short of the standard needed and the arrangement as a whole has not produced satisfactory results chiefly in fixing responsibility for the structural stability of buildings. In practice, considerable alterations of design are suggested, and not infrequently badly drawn designs are returned for revision, thus entailing delay and trouble when estimates have to be scrutinized a second and a third time. The fact that the design and estimates underwent thorough scrutiny in the P.W.D., when the application for grants came up for consideration evidently operates in many cases against the designer feeling the full measure of responsibility for drawing

Rule 53 (iii) of the Grant-in-Aid Code.

Circular No. 116 c. 4.1.13

-p.6.

para 2 (i) clerk

pp 6 & 7, N.F.

paras 1 & 2, p. 5, N.F.

p. 7, N.F.

Para 3 of consulting architects

note on p. 30 of N.F.

drawing correct and complete designs and estimates.

On the other hand, it is neither desirable nor possible for the Government to undertake the entire responsibility for structural stability in respect of the ever-increasing number of private buildings, which means, in several cases, redesigning and in all, watching every step of the construction of a building and interfering to condemn bad workmanship and bad materials.

3. The Government have given the matter their careful consideration and have decided to lay down the following procedure in respect of building grant applications. While the rule requiring that plans and estimates should be prepared by qualified professional architects should be strictly enforced, the responsibility for structural stability should be specifically fixed on the designers. As at present, the plan will be forwarded to the D.P.I. who will see that the design is suitable from an educational point of view. The subsequent examination of detailed plans and estimates in the P.W.D., will in future be confined to pronouncing an opinion on the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates. The officers of the P.W.D., will not be required to inspect a building while under construction or to pass it on completion; where however private qualified professional advice is available, the responsibilities of the P.W.D. will continue to be as at present.

4. The D.P.I. is requested to submit a draft of the necessary amendments to be made

H.N.'s note on p. 21, N.F.

para 1. p. 35 of N.F.

Vide (a) on p. 36, N.F.

Vide (b) clerk

Vide (c) clerk

The correspondent of the school in respect of which a grant is made will be required, in due course, to furnish a certificate making himself personally liable that a building generally in accordance with the plans which were submitted to Govt. and on which the grant was sanctioned has been completed and that the full amount of the Govt. grant has been duly expended thereon.

L.D.

in the Grant-in-aid Code to give effect
to the above decision.

L.D.S.
29-11-18.

LWS
12-12-18

To

The D.P.

.. A.G.

.. P.W.D., with notes.

.. L & M (Medical) with notes.

Not for E.T.

*Notes copy to go to P.W.D.
done (m/s)*

Not copy.

Copy

15

20-1-18

CR

4-1-19

G.O. No. 1596, 13th December 1918

Plans and Estimates.

Passing orders on the question of the extent to which the Public Works Department will be held responsible for the scrutiny of -- of ~~aided educational~~ buildings -- *for aided educational*

Order--No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918.

Under the procedure now following in dealing with applications for building grants from managers of educational institutions under private management, an outline of the plans is first forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction who scrutinizes the suitability of the proposals from an educational point of view; and after approval of the plans by him, detailed plans and estimates are prepared and submitted, which are subjected to scrutiny by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, whenever a grant exceeds Rs. 2,500. When a grant has been sanctioned, notice of commencement of the work is given to the Executive Engineer and provision is made for inspection of the work from time to time during its progress by the officers of the Public Works Department. Finally before the grant is paid, a certificate from the engineer is required to the effect that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and estimates.

In addition, special instructions have been drawn up for the preparation of plans and estimates which are supplied to correspondents of schools by Inspectors on application; and one of the instructions lays down that all plans and estimates should be prepared by a gazetted officer of the Public Works Department present or retired, a present or retired District Board Engineer, a member or associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers or a recognized professional architect.

2. Experience has shown that, though plans and estimates are now better prepared than before, they fall generally much short of the standard needed and the arrangement as a whole has not produced satisfactory results chiefly in fixing responsibility for the structural stability of buildings. In practice, considerable alterations of design are suggested, and not infrequently badly drawn designs are returned for revision, thus entailing delay and trouble when estimates have to be scrutinized a second and a third time. The fact that the design and estimates underwent thorough scrutiny in the Public Works Department when the application for grants came up for consideration evidently operates in many cases against the designer feeling the full measure of responsibility for drawing correct and complete designs and estimates.

On the other hand, it is neither desirable nor possible for the Government to undertake the entire responsibility for structural stability in respect of the ever/increasing number of private buildings, which means, in several cases, redesigning and in all, watching every step of the construction of a building and interfering to condemn bad workmanship and bad materials.

3. The Government have given the matter their careful consideration and have decided to lay down the following procedure in respect of building grant applications.

While the rule requiring that plans and estimates should be prepared by qualified professional architects should be strictly enforced, the responsibility for structural stability should be specifically fixed on the designers. As at present, the plan will be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction who will see that the design is suitable from an educational point of view. The subsequent examination of detailed plans and estimates in the Public Works Department will in future be confined to pronouncing an opinion on the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates. The officers of the Public Works Department will not be required to inspect a building while under construction or to pass it on completion; where however private qualified professional advice is not available, the responsibilities of the Public Works Department will continue to be as at present.

The correspondent of the school in respect of which a grant is made will be required, in due course, to furnish a certificate that a building generally in accordance with the plans which were submitted to Government and on which the grant was sanctioned has been completed and that the full amount of the Government grant has been duly expended thereon.

4. The Director of Public Instruction is requested to submit a draft of the necessary amendments to be made in the Grant-in-Aid Code to give effect to the above decision.

(True extract)

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction,

Accountant-General

" Public Works Department, with notes.

" Local and Municipal (Medical) Department, with notes.

For orders.
T.P.S.—9-11-17.
P.P.R.—10-11-17.
R.K.—12-11-17.

2 NOTES TO G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1918

"Can no earlier orders be traced? The scrutiny of grant-in-aid works has been in force for years. What we want to get at are the original principles underlying the system."

D. MARSHALL—14-11-17.

The indexes have been examined. It will be seen from the * marginally-noted Government Orders that the present practice of scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's Office, of grant-in-aid estimates for Educational buildings, is in substitution

of the earlier requiring the Executive Engineer or the Superintending Engineer to certify that the plans and estimates were suitable and that the rates were fair, before the application for grant was taken into consideration. To this was added the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office also. There was thus a double scrutiny. The present practice simplifies the system by dispensing with the scrutiny by the Executive Engineer or the Superintending Engineer. It thus appears that the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office is intended to be not only with reference to the reasonableness of the rates but also with reference to the suitability and satisfactory nature (i.e., presumably structural stability also)—vide the notes with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902, and also the notes with G.O. No. 3309 W., dated 14th November 1904.

T.P.S.—30-11-17.

Sir Murray Hammick thought that scrutiny as regards rates was necessary as "otherwise an unscrupulous applicant might get a grant and then save on the estimate enormously and so get much more than his fair share"—vide his note, dated 26th March 1902, with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902. This danger will doubtless be minimised if estimates are prepared by professional men of standing; but neither the manager of a school who gets a grant which depends on the amount of the estimate nor the professional man whose fee is presumably calculated on the same amount, appears to have any incentive for rigid economy in the matter of rates. Government interests would therefore seem to require that a scrutiny of the rates should continue to be applied by its officers.

A further object of the Public Works Department scrutiny is to avoid "the danger of buildings being badly constructed and eventually causing loss to Government"—vide Educational Department note, dated 26th March 1902, with G.O. No. 1591 W., dated 3rd June 1902. Government is interested in seeing that the contribution that it makes is not "wasted on unsatisfactory and unsafe erections"—vide Educational Department note, dated 6th September 1917, on page 5 of the notes with Memorandum No. 6518 C., dated 19th October 1917. The attainment of this object need not, it appears, necessarily involve scrutiny of all the estimates submitted

Superintending Engineers and Executive Engineers have more than they can do as it is.
D.M.—9-12-17.

is unwilling that this work should be done at all anywhere in its offices, a general circular will probably have to be sent in the Educational Department to all managers of schools that after a specified date, Government will not (take the trouble of) examine the structural stability of the designs submitted to it and that therefore they (the managers) should take care to have their designs and estimates prepared by competent professional men. In order

to safeguard Government interests, a threat may also be included in the circular, if

considered necessary, that in case any building for which a grant-in-aid has been sanctioned by Government should, during or after construction, fail for any reason—

This would lead to waste and extravagance in order to avoid risk.

structural or owing to defects of construction—the manager concerned will be liable at the discretion of Government to pay back the sum he received as grant-

D.M.—9-12-17.

in-aid. This would be an effective step for forcing him to seek proper professional assistance before approaching Government. If this is approved, the present

I think we are bound to point defects if they are noticed. Further there is as much waste in an unsound building as in excessive rates.

procedure of estimates being sent to the Chief Engineer may be continued, but the scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office will be confined to the items specified in Consulting Architect's note, dated 1st

D.M.—9-12-17.

September 1917 and also, if approved, to the reasonableness of the rates [pages 3-4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917].

R.K.—5-12-17.

The foregoing notes give the reasons why designs for grant-in-aid buildings are scrutinized in the Chief Engineer's office before grants are sanctioned. These reasons are to ensure that money is not wasted—

- (a) on excessive rates, or
- (b) on unsound structures, and
- (c) that the building is generally suitable architecturally and otherwise for the purpose for which it is required.

Mr. Nicholls in his note questions the necessity for (b), scrutiny in regard to structural stability, and it is with this point we have now concerned.

2. When the scrutiny has been completed the plans and estimates are returned to the Educational Department with a Chief Engineer's note which points out defects that have to be rectified, and which recommends, subject to any alteration that may be required, the estimate for sanction; or if the defects are numerous and the building is badly designed the Chief Engineer's note points out the defects and recommends to the Educational Department that the design should be revised by the school authorities, and resubmitted.

3. A grant-in-aid building having been passed and the grant sanctioned, paragraphs 52 (iii) and 52 (i) of the Grant-in-Aid Code require that the building shall be inspected from time to time during construction by the local Public Works Department officers, and that before the grant is paid a certificate shall be granted by the Engineer (usually the local Executive Engineer) that the work has been completed

* This apparently applies to a building that has been purchased or one on which a grant is claimed after construction.

in accordance with the approved plan and estimate (or that * the building is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed). Obviously these paragraphs

presuppose that designs have been examined for structural stability and are approved, otherwise the final certificate would be worthless. I, therefore, submit that if scrutiny in regard to structural stability is not to be carried out paragraphs 52 (iii) and 53 (i) must be amended with a view to involving the local Public Works Department officers from all responsibility in connexion with the building. My point is illustrated by paragraph 2 (b) of G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated the 15th September 1917, which runs thus "that the building will be inspected on completion and is certified by an officer deputed by Government to be worth at least one lakh of rupees". It will be observed that the order in its final form was not sent to Public Works Department for acceptance and if it had been, I think, we should have demurred at this paragraph if the officer referred to therein is to be a Public Works Department officer; because the designs have not been scrutinized, and in granting this certificate the officer who finally inspects the building must consider the question of its structural stability. For example he will have to go into the stability of the towers (about which the Public Works Department have already expressed doubts)

a note by the Chief Engineer

are/ 9/

11

P.A. Thomas

because if they are not safe they will be a most serious danger, and the building will be worth nothing until they are strengthened or removed [see notes, pages 4-5 of the notes to G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917]. Further, at this late stage it will be a matter of very considerable difficulty to go into this particular question. The question as to whether the scrutiny in regard to stability of grant-in-aid buildings should continue or not is largely a matter for Financial and Educational to decide as it involves a question of money, and the safety of the pupils. As regards Mr. Nicholls' view of throwing the responsibility for structural stability on the designer in order to foster a responsible professional class and private enterprise, I submit, that Circular No. 116-C, dated the 4th January 1913, has since done a great deal of good and the designs that now come up are much better than they were formerly and are much less troublesome to scrutinize [page 4 of notes to G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917]. Further the fact that we, not infrequently, return badly prepared designs for revision has a salutary effect, inasmuch as the designer has to go over his work again and the delay caused thereby induces a school management to select a designer who is not likely to have this experience. We may, I think, hope for further improvement. Personally, I think, it would be imprudent to do away with the Chief Engineer's scrutiny in regard to stability of design, but as has already been pointed out the final say in the matter rests with Educational and Financial Departments. These notes may accordingly be circulated.

D. MARSHALL—13-12-17.

I agree with Mr. Marshall's note. The position so far as the Public Works Department are concerned is perfectly clear. If the certificate referred to in paragraph 53 of the Grant-in-Aid Code is to be signed by an officer of the department, the plans and estimate for the building must be scrutinized and passed by the Chief Engineer before the work was started. If such scrutiny is to be waived, Public Works Department officers cannot sign the certificate. The whole matter depends upon the word 'approved' in the fifth line of the paragraph referred to above. If the approval is that of the Chief Engineer, a Public Works Department officer can be called upon to grant the certificate, or he can refuse to do so. If the plan and estimate are approved by some other authority a certificate from the Public Works Department should not be asked for.

S. B. MURRAY—17-12-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The above notes may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks in the first instance.

P.R.—21-12-17.

T.K.—22-12-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—24-12-17.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—27-12-17.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

I am quite against altering any detail of the present system and particularly against waiving the scrutiny of plans in relation to structural stability, and agree with Public Works Department notes on the point.

2. I am however constantly seeing evidences that the Consulting Architect and his office find a difficulty in dealing with educational plans and I therefore renew a suggestion I made some years ago that there should be an Architect in my office (presumably a Public Works Department officer) who should do the work, or most of it, now done by the Chief Engineer's office (page 5 of notes recorded in Memorandum No. 4835-C., dated 24th August 1911). If Government is now inclined to consider this suggestion I could go into the amount of work such an officer would have. Of course we should still want the Consulting Architect's help in designing important buildings.

J. H. STONE—4-1-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Director of Public Instruction's note on the previous page. Both the Director and the Public Works Department are of opinion that the existing procedure as to the scrutiny of plans of aided school buildings should not be altered. This department may also agree with that view.

2. As regards the Director's suggestion for the employment of an architect in his office, it is submitted that the same suggestion was made by him in 1911—please see page 5 of notes recorded in Memorandum No. 4835 C., dated the 24th August 1911. It was not then considered by the Government. The suggestion is now renewed apparently with a view to afford a certain amount of relief to the Consulting Architect and his office. No indication as to the nature of the Architect's duties when employed or as to the kind of relief of the Consulting Architect is given; nor is it clear how most of the work now done in the Chief Engineer's office can be satisfactorily done by the proposed Architect unless he is an officer of the superior grade. From the notes recorded in Memorandum No. 2663 C., dated the 24th March 1914, it is however observed that the Consulting Architect's complaint is not that he is overworked but that the plans and estimates are not drawn up in the first instance by a competent architect. Paragraph 2 (1) of Circular Memorandum No. 116 C., dated the 4th January 1913, is intended to remedy this defect. It is not known whether as matters now stand the Consulting Architect wants any relief and, if so, whether the employment of an architect in the Director of Public Instruction's office is the proper form in which that relief can be granted.

3. The question is one for consideration in the Public Works Department to whom it may be remitted. If that department views the idea with favour the details connected with the proposal will be called for from the Director of Public Instruction.

P.R.—17-1-18.

C.R.—18-1-18.

As observed by the Director of Public Instruction and the Public Works Department it is undesirable to vary the present procedure as regards scrutiny of plans and estimates of aided educational buildings. The examination of the rates is as much a necessity as the scrutiny from the point of view of structural stability. We have not yet got that class of professional experts to undertake private jobs like these, so as to dispense with Public Works Department scrutiny. We have lately seen that the plans and estimates prepared by no less a person than Mr. Pears were found by the Public Works Department to be not free from flaw even in the matter of structural stability.

The necessity for scrutiny being conceded, it is doubtful whether a separate agency in the Director of Public Instruction's office is advisable. It cannot replace the Chief Engineer's final examination altogether. In most cases it will cause duplication of work, and will also be expensive. The existing arrangement may probably continue.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—20-1-18.

I agree with the above note (Registrar's).

2. An additional reason against a separate officer would be that sometimes he may not have enough work to do and sometimes he may have too much.

3. Regarding examination by officers of the Government, Public Works Department subordinate to the Chief Engineer, this is a matter for the Public Works Department to order, if at all, that plans of a certain type or of a certain amount may be scrutinized by the Superintending Engineer. All that Educational wants is a certificate with remarks from the Chief Engineer.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—21-1-18.

6. NOTES to G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1913

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

It is proposed to make no alteration in the scrutiny now exercised by the Chief Engineer in the matter of educational buildings towards which Government contribute. Financial may agree.

L. E. KEESHAU—22-1-18.

L. DAVIDSON—23-1-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The Home (Education) and the Financial Departments have agreed that no alterations can be made in the scrutiny now exercised by the Chief Engineer in the matter of aided educational buildings and are opposed particularly to the waiving of scrutiny in regard to structural stability. Submitted that these notes may be sent to Consulting Architect for perusal with reference to his note, dated 1st September 1917, on pages 3-4 of the notes to G.O. No. 1183, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917, prior to circulation to Honourable Members.

T.P.S.—30-1-18.

D. MARSHALL—5-2-18.

Seen.

W. H. NICHOLLS—22-2-18.

With reference to paragraph 3 of Educational Secretary's note on page 5 ante,

H.F.W.G.—1-3-18.

it is presumed that it is not proposed to transfer any portion of the scrutiny in such cases to the Superintending Engi-

neers—vide Deputy Secretary's marginal remarks (on page 2 ante)

2. These notes may, it is submitted, be now circulated to Honourable Member (Public Works Department), Honourable Member (Financial) and His Excellency.

T.P.S.—27-2-18.

R.K.—27-2-18.

D.M.—28-2-18.

I agree.

H. F. W. G[ILMAN]—1-3-18.

I am afraid that in the course of the noting the outlines of this subject have become somewhat obscure. The question is one of policy and must be looked at from a wide standpoint. It is perhaps desirable to indicate briefly the history of the subject.

2. In Circular No. 116-C., dated the 4th of January 1913, the rule was laid down directing that every plan and estimate for a grant-in-aid work must be prepared by gazetted officers of the Public Works Department (retired or in service), a District Board Engineer or a recognized professional architect. The underlying principle of this order was evidently to secure proper and reliable plans prepared by competent professional men thereby tending both to relieve the Public Works Department of responsibility and to create a class of private professional architects capable of taking their place.

3. This circular has not been repealed and still holds good, but not long after its issue the late Mr. Thomas in his note, dated 10th September 1913, put forward a totally opposite theory (page 1 of the notes recorded in Memorandum No. 2663 C., dated 24th March 1914). He proposed that he as Consulting Architect should be responsible for and if necessary redesign all the more important designs for grant-in-aid buildings and while he admitted that this would add greatly to his work he was ready to undertake the task. Sir Harold Stuart decided against Mr. Thomas and the notes on the subject were recorded in No. 2663 C., dated the 24th March 1914, but the fact remains that Mr. Thomas's policy is the only logical and legitimate result if the responsibility for passing plans and estimates is to be placed upon

the Consulting Architect. There is in fact no half-way house between relieving the Public Works Department of all responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect of the plans and imposing upon them the liability to revise and even redraw these plans.

4. Mr. Nicholls in his note, dated the 1st of September 1917, has re-opened the question and has suggested that responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect should be thrown on the authors of plans (pages 3-4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Education, dated 15th September 1917). He points out that, if the Consulting Architect is to go into these questions and be responsible in these respects, he must do so thoroughly. He must in fact eventually be forced to take up the attitude which was definitely assumed by the late Mr. Thomas, that is he must be ready to re-design any and every plan for an aided building. If he is not ready to take up that attitude, he must on the other hand be relieved from all responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect and the Government must rely upon the rule laid down in paragraph 2 (1) of the circular of the 4th of January 1913 which requires all plans and estimates to be prepared by a competent and trained officer or professional man.

5. It seems now therefore to me that we have got to choose between the two policies. Either we must undertake the task of doing all the designing for all aided buildings in the Presidency or we must give up the Grant-in-aid Code provisions which require the Public Works Department to examine plans and estimates and to certify to the building when finished. Is it then possible for the Government to adopt the first policy and to undertake to revise, and if necessary to redesign, every grant-in-aid building that comes up? I feel no doubt whatever that that policy is totally impracticable. It is impracticable for various reasons. In the first place, the growth of applications for buildings, whether they may be hospitals or whether they are educational works, for which Government assistance is needed, must tend to increase and it is not possible for the Government to go on increasing its architectural staff so as to deal with the whole architectural work of the Presidency. In the second place, the adoption of this policy would destroy any chance of the growth of an independent architectural profession. It would centralize all designing work in the hands of Government officials and would in that respect be fatal to architectural progress in Madras, because we must look forward to the gradual growth of independent professional architects who will design not merely grant-in-aid buildings but the numerous other buildings, banks, railway stations and the like for which plans are required. If the Government stifle private enterprise by insisting upon all aided buildings being designed by their own architects, then buildings which receive no aid from Government will suffer. In the third place, I have no doubt that the attempt to force all mission and other bodies who ask for aid for an educational or medical building to accept designs from the Consulting Architect to Government will end in a deadlock. Two or three years ago, the American Mission at Madura proposed to build a Women and Children's hospital and they obtained plans and estimates for it. When these came to Mr. Thomas he, with his usual enthusiasm, set to work and redesigned the whole building. The mission objected to the acceptance of his design on the ground that it involved more money than they could afford to spend. The Public Works Department declined to pass any plans except those approved by Mr. Thomas and the result was that for more than a year the progress of the work was entirely held up and the dispute was only eventually settled at a long conference when both sides had to give way in some respects (vide No. 5419 C., dated 13th May 1916). Experience in that case convinced me that it is utterly impossible for the Consulting Architect to undertake to design buildings for other people. After all the mission or other body which proposes to erect a building must be allowed to some extent to determine for itself the style of the building to be erected.

6. I am therefore convinced that it is essential to reject the theory put forward by the late Mr. Thomas and to accept Mr. Nicholls' view, namely, that responsibility for structural stability and architectural effect should be thrown upon the Architect who designed the building. It is true that the Government must be insured against excessive cost, but I understand that the Public Works Department can do that by a calculation based upon the plinth area of the building and can furnish a guarantee that the total cost of the building is reasonable. Beyond that, I think the Public Works Department should not be asked to go and I advocate the amendment of the Grant-in-Aid Code, Article 53.

7. It is true that the Director of Public Instruction now objects to that course, but I do not think that Mr. Stone has correctly understood the position. It is for the Director of Public Instruction or the Surgeon-General, as the professional head of the administrative department, to see that the designs are correct and adequate from the administrative point of view. For instance, the Director of Public Instruction should see that in the case of a hostel the plans and estimates allow sufficient cubic capacity and ventilation or that there are sufficient and adequate class rooms. Similarly, the Surgeon-General should satisfy himself that the design of a hospital is in accordance with sound principles of hospital management. Neither of these points are matters which concern the Public Works Department and all that the Public Works Department has to see is the structural stability and the architectural effect (and cost). Those are points which do not affect the administrative point of view at all and for which we must trust to the Architect employed by the mission while we must rely upon the head of the administrative department to see that the administrative requirements are properly met.

8. I have dwelt at some length on this matter because it is one of great importance. The Consulting Architect to Government is already overburdened with work. A large building programme is before the Government and it will be increased by the taking over of headquarter district hospitals many of which require to be rebuilt. It is quite out of the question for one man to superintend all the work of designing the Government and aided buildings in the whole Presidency. Against this it is urged that the Government are spending large sums of money on these buildings and that it must be guaranteed that the work is properly done. In answer to this, I would reply, first, that the private owner, i.e., the mission or other body which builds the work, is at least as much interested as the Government in putting up a proper building. If it tumbles down, it will fall upon the mission to rebuild the whole structure and it certainly cannot expect that the Government will give a grant a second time. Moreover, the interest of a mission in a mission building, whether it be a school or a hospital, is a far more lively and vital interest than the interest of the Government which is limited to a mere grant-in-aid. The missionary in charge of a mission building, either as manager of a school or superintendent of a hospital, is usually keenly interested in his work and I think we may reasonably suppose that he will do his best to see that proper design is obtained. In addition to that, we have the safeguard which is supplied by paragraph 2 (1) of the Public Works Circular, dated the 4th of January 1913, which requires plans and estimates to be prepared by responsible architects. In these circumstances, I think that the general policy should be pursued of relieving the Consulting Architect as far as possible from the responsibility for the structural design or architectural effect of aided buildings and I understand that the officers of the Public Works Department agree with this view provided that they are relieved from responsibility for passing the building after it has been built.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—20-3-18.

The Director of Public Instruction should, I think, see Sir Alexander Cardew's full and clear statement above, with which I am disposed to agree.

P. Decker

NOTES TO G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1913 9
Could the precautions mentioned at A on page 18 be taken before plans are drawn?

P[ENTLAND]-21-3-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
The file may, in the first instance, be recirculated to the Honourable Member (Public Works Department).

P.Rao.-26-3-18.

R.K.-27-3-18.

D. MARSHALL-27-3-18.

S. B. MURRAY-28-3-18.

H. F. W. GILLMAN-3-4-18.

With reference to His Excellency's note above, the file may now be sent to Home (Education) ~~and~~.

T.P.S.-4-4-18.

D.M.-5-4-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.
The file may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction ~~and~~ for remarks with reference to His Excellency's note above.

P.R.-6-4-18.

T.K.-8-4-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR-9-4-18.
R. RAMACHANDRA RAO-15-4-18.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

I must first remark that I am not conscious of having written anything suggesting the want of comprehension of the position attributed to me by the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew.

2. I do not know whether the limits of the scrutiny of plans by the Chief Engineer have ever been precisely laid down, but a perusal of sections V to XIV of Circular No. 116 of 4th January 1913 issued by Mr. C. A. Smith leads to the conclusion that the scrutiny he had in view was for structural stability and cost and I have never asked for more. I do not know how the Consulting Architect came to concern himself with architectural effect. It was not I believe because of any orders of Government. If people want to put up ugly buildings I would let them do so except that the Consulting Architect might point out to them where indulgence in ugliness means additional cost, and advise that such cost should not be admitted in

fixing the grant. I have always been prepared to accept full responsibility for the practical suitability of proposed buildings to the purpose in view which involves such considerations as size and shape of rooms, their ventilation and lighting and their relative positions in the plan. I have sometimes even been inclined to resent the interference of the Public Works Department in these matters. It was in order that these things might be thoroughly attended to in my office before plans went to the Chief Engineer that the Grant-in-Aid Code, at my instance, lays it down that the first application for a grant must be accompanied by 'such outline plans as will enable the Director to judge of the suitability of the proposal from an educational point of view'.

3. Notwithstanding the arguments advanced in Sir Alexander Cardew's notes I am still of opinion that official scrutiny for structural stability and cost of plans for buildings for which a grant is asked and the correlative certification by the Public Works Department are necessary in the joint interests of aided school authorities and Government. In fact I do not see how Government without such evidence as is afforded by the latter that they have got their money's worth can pay building

P. Achu

10 NOTES TO G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1918

grants, and the latter is impossible without the former. There is the special instance of the Sourashtra High School, but hardly a plan passes through the Chief Engineer's Office that is not sent back with some alteration of detail with a view to stability. There has also been lately an instance of a professionally-designed building that was condemned as hopeless from every point of view by the Consulting Architect.

4. Aided school authorities no doubt try to get as good professional assistance as is available but in present conditions there seems no means of ensuring that they will not after all obtain unstable buildings except the check exercised by the Chief Engineer. What is wanted, I submit, is that he should understand that he has no responsibility for anything but cost and stability of structure.

5. I submit that this does not involve the acceptance of Mr. Thomas's position that the Consulting Architect must be ready to re-design unsuitable buildings. If a plan is so bad as to justify this the applicant for grant had better change his architect. This would rarely be necessary. Most of the plans submitted to him go through his office with suggestions for alterations of detail only, and with the development of the profession of architecture even such suggestions will be decreasingly necessary.

6. I further submit that some other means of reducing the present and prospective congestion of work in the Consulting Architect's office may be considered than abolishing the present check on aided school building. It will be observed that I have answered His Excellency's question in the passage marked B on page 9 ante.

J. H. STONE—17-4-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders as to circulation to His Excellency and Honourable Members with reference to His Excellency the Governor's note on page A ante.

P.R.—18-4-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—19-4-18.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—20-4-18.

As Public Works Department is concerned Mr. Gillman should, I think, see now.

P[ENTLAND]—22-4-18.

I agree, and meantime, as the Hon'ble Mr. Gillman is away, I suggest that the file might be sent to Mr. Nicholls and to Mr. Murray for any remarks they may have to offer.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—22-4-18.

Forwarded to Public Works Department.

R.R.—23-4-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

V.A.N.—25-4-18.

P. Rao.—25-4-18.

D. MARSHALL—25-4-18.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT.

Some of the views expressed in the foregoing notes arise, I think, from misunderstandings regarding what is involved by the proposal which I made in my note of 1st September 1917.

There was, I submit, no occasion to frighten Financial on the score of extravagance, or Education in respect of the safety of school children.

2. As I pointed out in my previous note the Chief Engineer's office would naturally draw attention to extravagance in any design submitted, even its full responsibility for structural stability were thrown upon the designer.

Extravagance is not detected solely or chiefly by examining the rates in estimates. The Chief Engineer's office does not check the accuracy of the quantities in estimates

submitted from outside. Quantities can only be checked by measuring them again. It would be impossible to attempt any such remeasuring without an enormous increase of staff. This being the case, it would manifestly be absurd to base an opinion as to extravagance upon a check of rates applied to quantities which are not checked.

Although we do look at the rates, we detect extravagance chiefly by comparing the cost per square foot of superficial area and per cubic foot of the cubic contents of the design submitted with what we know from our practice and records to be a reasonable figure for these elements in any given locality.

I never suggested, nor do I recommend that these measures for detecting extravagance should be relaxed.

3. Then as regards the safety of pupils and possible collapse involving waste of the Government grant, I wish to say that there is no proposal to take any additional risk. It is only in the case of the qualified professional man by which I mean the man upon whom the Government know they can rely, not just any person who puts letters of 'Architect' after his name, that it is proposed to throw upon other shoulders the responsibility for structural stability. So far as I know the only reliable qualified man in this part of India at the present moment is Mr. Pears. It is unfair to the late respected head of the Public Works Department to suggest that he is not capable of making a building structurally sound (page 4 of the notes with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education), dated 15th September 1917). It is true, as I said in paragraph 3 of my previous note, that even he is hardly likely to maintain the necessary staff for this purpose or burden himself personally with all the labour involved if he knows that the Chief Engineer's office has got to do it for him.

The fact that Mr. Pears sent up a set of designs which we had to condemn emphasises the necessity for the measure which I proposed, one result of which would be that the trusted private practitioner would have to earn his fee or hang himself.

4. The Hon'ble Mr. Stone seems to think that my previous note was instigated by a desire to escape from certain duties (pages 3-4 of the note file with G.O. No. 1188, Home (Education) dated 15th September 1917). I would gladly have less work, but as a matter of fact since it became recognized that an architect's business is to draw, the Consulting Architect has not been burdened with technical scrutiny.

What actuates me in this matter is the consideration of what is best for the growth of the architectural profession in this Presidency.

5. It must not be supposed that, in wishing to give in greater degree a free hand to the trusted private practitioner, I am indifferent to architectural effect.

As the Honourable Member Financial has pointed out, the only means by which an architect can get a building right from his point of view is by designing it altogether ab initio. Nobody can produce good work by tinkering with other people's designs or by mere verbal suggestions. Besides, if the architect who gives such advice does not know the site personally, and local conditions, his advice is quite likely to be worthless.

Apart from this, there is surely some limit to the extent to which it is desirable to allow any single architect to force his own idiosyncracies on buildings all over the Presidency. No real improvement can be expected until public taste feels the need of it. When, and only when public taste requires better, or let me say different buildings, development will take place automatically if it is not restricted by narrow guidance. It would, I am convinced, be antagonistic to such development to centralise the designing of all the more important buildings all over the Presidency in one office.

This was recognized at Delhi even in the case of Sir E. Lutyens, A.R.A. It is development in accordance with and illustrating public aspirations which is wanted in the interests of architecture in this or any other country. Development connotes a certain number of failures, but so long as a general improvement is going on failures ought not to be disconcerting.

12 NOTES to G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1918

I disagree emphatically with the policy advocated by the late Mr. Thomas in this respect, in the notes connected with Memorandum No. 2663-C of 24th March 1914.

W. H. NICHOLLS—1-5-18.

In submitting this case I venture to remark that as regards the scrutiny for structural stability our procedure at present is to see that rules regarding floor loads, pressures on masonry, etc. are observed and to point out errors connected therewith; but if these are numerous and the drawings are badly and incompletely prepared the scheme is returned for revision. We have not, I think, redesigned any scheme since Mr. Thomas was Consulting Architect. The point that has given rise to the present noting is the understanding that this scrutiny throws the whole responsibility for structural stability on the Public Works Department (vide also Mr. Smith's note dated 10th June 1913 on page 2 of the notes with G.O. No. 561, Educational, dated 14th June 1913). This principle was, I believe, enunciated by Mr. Wilson when he was Chief Engineer, but I submit, though it may have been so ~~was~~ suitable and desirable some years ago it is no longer so. I therefore further submit that it should now be made clear and fully understood that although designs are passed through the Chief Engineer's office the designer who signs the plans is in no way relieved of responsibility. (The designer's signature on all plans must be insisted on. Omissions in this respect are occasionally noticed.) Our scrutiny if carried out on this understanding would still guard against failure while it would be no more harmful to the development of private enterprise than the London County Councils building regulations which apply to the London area. These are drawn up in great detail; for example the London County Councils Regulations relating to reinforced concrete and no matter how highly qualified an architect or an engineer may be, he has to comply with these regulations and send in his plans to be passed by a representative of the London County Councils (the District Surveyor). The underlying principle being, I take it, that when knowledge and experience exist which will prevent failure, it is some one's business to see that they are applied.

I would further point out in this connexion that technical control is similarly exercised in England in regard to engineering works of a public nature by the Local Government Board, the Board of Trade and similar bodies but this control does not relieve the designer of his initial responsibility. My point is that grant-in-aid buildings are public institutions and therefore it is only reasonable that Government should exercise the necessary amount of control to guard against unsafe designs and jerry built structures. The procedure laid down in the Grant-in-Aid Code provides for this.

The above view of the matter will perhaps satisfy both Mr. Nicholls and Mr. Stone.

D. MARSHALL—20-5-18.

Some of the noting above has gone beyond the point at issue. As I understand the position Government propose to decide what rules they will frame which will ensure that they get proper value for their money when they give a grant-in-aid for a building. These rules are not intended to cover the responsibility of Government for the structural stability of any building which is erected, as is shown by the fact that Government have no responsibility for a building which is built solely with private funds. It is clear therefore that any action which Government will take is not to safeguard their responsibility but to see that the grant-in-aid which they give is suitably expended. I am strongly opposed to such action being carried so far as to interfere with architectural design and structural stability. As regards the former I agree entirely with what Mr. Nicholls says in paragraph 6 of his note, and undertaking responsibility for structural stability would be just as vexatious for it would mean not only cutting about and challenging the designs of a professional man, but also interference on the part of Government at every stage of the construction of the building—please see paragraph 52 (iii) of the Grant-in-Aid Code. It is

obvious that if responsibility for structural stability is to be undertaken it cannot stop at approving of, or altering, the design of a building. Every step of its construction must be watched, and the officer on whom the responsibility has been put must have the right to condemn bad workmanship, or bad materials. This is Government interference with a vengeance.

2. In my opinion when Government consider the gift of a grant-in-aid the first step is for the head of the department concerned to certify that the proposed building is generally suitable for the purpose for which it is intended. The next step will be for this department to certify that the estimated cost of the building is reasonable. (This is a simple matter which will not entail a detailed examination of the design and estimate.) On the receipt of the above certificate the Government may then decide what sum they will give as a grant-in-aid to those responsible for the construction of the building.

S. B. MURRAY—27-5-18.

As I understand Sir Alexander Cardew's proposals, they are—

(a) that every plan for a grant-in-aid work shall be designed by one of the persons named in paragraph 2 (1) of the Circular of 4th January 1913, and that the designer shall be responsible for the structural stability of the building;

(b) that the plan and estimate shall be forwarded to the head of the department concerned who shall be responsible that the design is suitable and adequate from the administrative point of view. (This seems to be the existing practice, and it is apparently impossible for the head of the department to offer his criticisms until the plan has been prepared);

(c) that the only function of the Public Works Department will be to advise Government as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimate, and that the Department of Public Works officers will not be required to inspect the building while under construction or to pass it on completion.

2. I am prepared to accept these proposals as I agree with my Honourable Colleague that there is no middle way between making the Public Works Department absolutely responsible for grant-in-aid works, or relieving them of responsibility altogether. I see little use in requiring them to pronounce on the structural soundness of a design if they are not to supervise the construction which is equally important.

H. F. W. GILLMAN—28-6-18.

A. G. CARDREW—29-6-18.

In theory, I agree: and there is a lack of non-official western professional advice, which it would be well to supply. But that will take time, especially under present circumstances.

And what is to happen when no such qualified professional advice, as is contemplated in paragraph 2 (1) of Circular No. 116 C., is available?

Have Mr. Thomas' criticisms really been met?

P[ENTLAND]—2-7-18.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT.

I have been requested by the Chief Engineer to note upon the points raised by His Excellency in his note, dated 2nd July 1918. First His Excellency asks what is to happen when qualified professional advice is not available. In such cases we must, I submit, go on as we are doing at present. As I understand the notes by Honourable Member (Financial), dated 20th March 1918, and Honourable Member (Public Works Department), dated 28th June 1918, neither contemplates that we should throw responsibility for structural stability upon persons incapable of assuming it.

With regard to His Excellency's second question, the answer must be, I think, in the negative. The late Mr. Thomas' criticisms in so far as they are constructive amount to this; that since modern architecture as practised by private bodies is bad, the Government architect should undertake the wholesale supply of designs: or, in

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The draft order may, it is submitted, be accepted and the file passed on to Financial.

J.R.—19-10-18.

Accepted.

D. MARSHALL—31-10-18.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Please see the notes of the Honourable Members (Financial) and (Public Works Department) on pages 10-21 ante and 36 ante on which the draft order is based. 13

2. Paragraph 3 of the draft.—In the case of grants from Government in aid of private educational buildings, it is proposed to lay down that the only function of the Public Works Department will in future be to advise Government as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimate, and that the officers of the Public Works Department will not be required to inspect the building while under construction or to pass it on completion.

According to the existing procedure in rule 53 of the Educational Grant-in-Aid Code, before the grant is paid in full, it shall be certified by a Public Works Department officer—

(a) that the work has been completed in accordance with the approved plan and estimate, or

B | (b) that the building is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.

Such certificate shall be countersigned by the Director of Public Instruction.

3. It is respectfully submitted that it seems desirable that the Public Works Department should, in addition to their scrutiny of the reasonableness of the estimate (before the work is completed), be asked to give a certificate as at B above to the effect that the building after completion is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.

Orders are solicited.

V.G.K.—5-11-18.

Will Public Works Department please circulate to Honourable Member (Financial) again? I think we should have some sort of guarantee that our money has been spent. 11

C. G. TODHUNTER—6-11-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the Financial note above, attention is invited to paragraph 6 of the Honourable Member's (Financial) note on page 18 ante. 8

2. Submitted that the case may now be returned to Home (Education), who will no doubt recirculate the case to Honourable Member (Financial) as requested by the Chief Secretary.

J.R.—16-11-18.

T.P.S.—18-11-18.

D.M.—18-11-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders as to circulation to His Excellency and Honourable Member (Financial). [It will be observed that both the Director of Public Instruction and the Chief Secretary want to maintain the completion certificate which the Public Works Department are now giving, and which is to the effect the building erected under a grant is worth the amount on which the grant is claimed.] But please see Honourable Member's note on page 21 supra. 8

E.A.V.—21-11-18.

S.A.—21-11-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—22-11-18.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU—29-11-18.

16 NOTES TO G.O. No. 1596, HOME (EDUCATION), 13TH DECEMBER 1918

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.
His Excellency approves.

T. E. MOIR—5-12-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

If the Public Works officers are required to certify, as the Chief Secretary wishes, that the Government money has been spent, I am afraid that they will be driven into the same minute check of quality, quantity, etc., as of old, and the former position will recur. It is true that there may be, in rare cases, some risk of the Government money being spent without due value being obtained. Of course if the building is never built at all, or if the Government money is not even approximately laid out on the work for which it is given, the case will be one of fraud, and a prosecution under the Indian Penal Code will be necessary. To meet such cases I think that the person to whom the grant is made should be required, in due course, to furnish a certificate making himself personally liable that a building generally in accordance with the plans which were submitted to Government and on which the grant was sanctioned) has been completed and that the full amount of the Government grant has been duly expended thereon. I would add this at end of paragraph 3 of the draft. Further than that I doubt its being necessary to go. Even now I believe that cases occur where there is reason to doubt whether the Government money has been fully and fairly expended, and so long as the certificate above suggested is obtained, I think we must risk the chance of deliberate fraud.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—6-12-18.

A sub-paragraph has been added to the draft as required by Honourable Member above. For orders as to circulation to His Excellency the Governor.

E.A.V.—9-12-18.

S.A.—9-12-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—10-12-18.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU—11-12-18.

P[ENTLAND]—12-12-18.

Issue.

L.D.S.—12-12-18.

[G.O. No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918.]

other words, that the Government should set up an aesthetic standard for private persons to live up to. This has not been done, and I venture to urge that it is undesirable that it should be attempted.

I am afraid that in entering the field of esthetics, where the expenditure of private funds is concerned, the Government would be treading upon a bottomless bog. I believe that only the public can set up its own aesthetic standard, and it does so by employing men whose work it likes or thinks it ought to like, and leaving others to starve. If the architecture of any particular period is bad, the remedy lies, I submit, not in giving the public something which it does not want or understand, but in educating it to want something better. It is only thus that architecture can develop on rational lines and keep itself above the sphere of scene painting. Sir Thomas Jackson has some forcible remarks upon this subject. He says: "It is for the general public and not for themselves that both Art and artists exist, and the Art of any time will be such as the public demand . . . a minority of sincere artists will never succeed by themselves in raising the general level of the architecture of their day so long as the public at large remains ignorant or indifferent . . . Art cannot lead a healthy life or make any vigorous growth if it is cultivated only as an exotic for the enjoyment of the cultured few . . . Till there is a public demand for good art and a public recognition of it when it is offered, there will never be a fair field for the conscientious artist."

["Reason in Architecture."—Sir Thomas Jackson, Bart., R.A., Architect.]
W. H. NICHOLLS—22-8-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

I asked Mr. Nicholls to reply to the two points raised by His Excellency above. If no private qualified professional advice is available the only thing to do is for Government to help.

S. B. MURRAY—28-8-18.
P[ENTLAND]—5-9-18.

With reference to the remarks of the Honourable Member (Public Works Department) which have been agreed to by Honourable Member (Financial), and His Excellency, the case may now be forwarded to Home (Education) for modification of the rules in the Grant-in-Aid Code.

J.R.—14-9-18.
R.K.—17-9-18.

D. MARSHALL—20-9-18.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order is submitted for approval. If approved, it may be forwarded to Public Works Department and Financial for acceptance. The draft refers only to educational buildings. It is presumed that the necessary instructions extending the scope of the order to medical buildings should issue in Local and Municipal (Medical). It is proposed to communicate to that department a copy of the Government Order with notes.

P.R.—1-10-18.
N.K.—5-10-18.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—8-10-18.
R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—9-10-18.

ORDINARY.

PRESS SLIP.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT (a).

Sept. II-38-3-14.

Home DEPARTMENT.

Current No., dated 191

G.O. No. 1596 dated 23 DEC 1918. 1918.

Number of MS. pages sent

Notes 46 (7-20-21)

Brief subject

Vide draft sheet

Number of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press).

E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.

Complete correspondence and orders.

Notes

FOR RECORD.*

Madras Records

Ooty Records

For filing with original

Total

FOR ISSUE.†

Letter only.

Complete G.O.

Special issue copies of G.O.

No.

Papers.

Notes

Signature copies

India Office

Govt. of India..... Dept.

Revenue Department

Public Works Department

Local and Municipal Department

Educational Department

Public Dept..... Dept.

Judicial Dept

Political

Financial Dept

Marine Dept

Ecclesiastical Dept

Spare copies

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

The

Total

* Copies distributed on (Press Clerk).

† Copies distributed on (Press Despatcher).

To be initialed and dated.

P.T.O.

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 Referencee 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 after usual interval 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.....	13/12/18
First proof furnished on.....	
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	21/12
Final copies supplied on.....	21/12

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 ...				

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

19

When given for copying

19

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying

When given for copying