

Notes up to 80
Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (EDUCATION)

P. 60
24.1.20
G.O. No. 1582, 20th December 1919

Plans and estimates

Prescribing the procedure to be followed in respect of the scrutiny by the officers of the Public Works Department of — relating to buildings for aided educational institutions.

INDEXED

Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (EDUCATION)

G.O. No. 1582, 20th December 1919**Plans and estimates**

Prescribing the procedure to be followed in respect of the scrutiny by the officers of the Public Works Department of — relating to buildings for aided educational institutions.

READ—the following papers :—

G.O. No. 597, Educational, dated 27th September 1904.

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

Order—No. 1582, Home (Education), dated 20th December 1919.

Under the existing procedure as laid down in paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 597, Educational, dated the 27th September 1904, and rules 50 and 54 of the Grant-in-Aid Code, plans and estimates connected with applications for grants-in-aid of educational buildings costing Rs. 5,000 and less are scrutinised by the Superintending Engineers and are finally disposed of by the Director of Public Instruction, while those costing more than Rs. 5,000 and recommended by the Director of Public Instruction are submitted by him to Government direct and are subjected to the scrutiny of the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department. In cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men, the Public Works Department scrutiny is confined only to pronouncing an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates, the responsibility for structural stability resting with the designer, while in cases of plans and estimates prepared by non-professional men, the scrutiny includes examination from the point of view of structural stability also. Owing to the increase in the number of applications for grants the practice of sending up all the estimates above Rs. 5,000 for the scrutiny of the Chief Engineer has thrown a heavy burden on the technical sections of his office; and with a view to lighten it, the Chief Engineer has suggested that the responsibility of scrutinising estimates for grant-in-aid works costing between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 50,000 may also be transferred to the Superintending Engineers in consideration of the fact that Superintending Engineers have since been given enhanced powers of technical sanction in respect of Government and Local Fund works up to Rs. 50,000 and that there is hardly any reason to differentiate grant-in-aid works from them so far as technical sanction to the estimates is concerned.

2. The Government accept the suggestion and direct that the following procedure may be followed in respect of grant-in-aid works :—

(i) In the case of works costing not more than Rs. 5,000 the existing procedure as to their scrutiny by the Superintending Engineers will continue.

(ii) In the case of works costing more than Rs. 5,000, but not more than Rs. 50,000, the Director of Public Instruction will forward the detailed plans, specifications and estimates received under rule 52 (ii) of the Grant-in-Aid Code to the Superintending Engineers concerned for opinion—

(a) if the plans and estimates have been prepared by professional men, as to the reasonableness of the estimate alone,

(b) and where they are not prepared by professional men, on the reasonableness of the estimate as well as the structural stability of the building.

The Director of Public Instruction will, after obtaining the Superintending Engineer's opinion, submit the plans and estimates to Government who will dispose of the application without reference to the Chief Engineer.

(iii) In the case of works estimated to cost more than Rs. 50,000, the Director of Public Instruction will submit with his recommendation the plans and estimates direct to Government who will refer them to the Chief Engineer for scrutiny and for an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates.

3. The Chief Engineer is, however, requested to see that the qualifications of persons whose plans may be accepted without detailed scrutiny are kept sufficiently high to preclude the possibility of an improperly trained or poorly qualified person being permitted to draw up plans. Superintending Engineers should bring to the notice of the Director of Public Instruction plans of proposed buildings which seem to them unnecessarily or extravagantly ornate so that the question whether a 'half grant' from public funds is justifiable in their case may be specially considered.

(True extract)

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

„ Accountant-General.
„ Public Works Department, with copy of notes.
„ Publicity Officer.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1582, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 20TH DECEMBER 1919

[SUBJECT.—Regarding scrutiny of grant-in-aid works.]

Previous papers :

G.O. 1591 W.,	3rd June 1902	G.O. 561, Home (Education),	14th June 1913
„ 3309 W.,	14th Nov. 1904	„ 1188 „	15th Sep. 1917
„ 672, Educational,	21st Sep. 1908	„ 1596 „	13th Dec. 1918
„ 132 „	6th Mar. 1911	„ 397 W.,	25th Mar. 1919
„ 370 „	1st May 1912	„ 834, Home (Education),	4th July „
Memo. 16-C. W.,	4th Jan. 1913		

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Under the existing orders regarding scrutiny of plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works, plans and estimates for works costing Rs. 5,000 or less are scrutinized by the Superintending Engineers or the Executing Engineers concerned. All proposals costing more than Rs. 5,000 are sent to the Chief Engineer for scrutiny of the plans and estimates—vide paragraph 1 of G.O. No. 1596, dated 13th December 1918. In cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men, Public Works Department scrutiny is confined only to pronouncing an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates, the responsibility for structural stability resting with the designer. In cases, however, where the plans and estimates are not prepared by professional men, the Public Works Department scrutiny is to include the examination of structural stability also.

2. The Superintending Engineers have now powers to sanction technically estimates up to Rs. 50,000 for all classes of Government and local fund works including irrigation works—vide G.O. No. 397 W., dated 25th March 1919. So in all cases of works costing below Rs. 50,000 for which estimates are submitted to Government for administrative approval, no technical scrutiny is done in the Chief Engineer's office unless there is any special reason to suspect its necessity. The scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office is confined only to the general suitability of the proposals without a minute examination of the details as to the quantities, rates, etc. In view of the above, it is for consideration whether in the case of grant-in-aid works also, the whole responsibility may not be transferred to the Superintending Engineers even in the case of works costing between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 50,000.

3. There is at present very heavy work in the technical sections of the Chief Engineer's office and it seems unnecessary that a special procedure need be followed in the case of grant-in-aid works. As the Public Works Department scrutiny of plans and estimates for such works prepared by professional men is confined only to a pronouncement of the reasonableness of the estimated cost and as the local officer is the best judge in respect of rates, etc., it seems unnecessary that such cases should come up to the Chief Engineer. As already stated the Superintending Engineer deals finally (after administrative approval) with estimates for Government and local fund works up to Rs. 50,000 without any reference to the Chief Engineer.

4. It may therefore be suggested to the Home Department that the following procedure may be prescribed for being followed in future in regard to grant-in-aid works:—

(1) In the case of works costing below Rs. 50,000 the private body will submit detailed plans and estimates to the Director of Public Instruction. The Director of Public Instruction will then forward them to the Superintending Engineers

A | concerned for opinion only as to the reasonableness of the cost if they are prepared by professional men. In cases where the plans and estimates are not prepared by professional men the Superintending Engineer should give his opinion as regards structural stability also. The Director of Public Instruction after obtaining the Superintending Engineer's opinion should submit the plans and estimates to Government in the Home (Education) Department who will then dispose of the application for a grant *without any reference* to the Chief Engineer.

(2) When the works are estimated to cost more than Rs. 50,000, the Director of Public Instruction may submit the plans and estimates direct to Government who will refer the matter to Chief Engineer for scrutiny.

5. In this connexion attention is, however, invited to the notes on pages 2 and 3 of the notes connected with G.O. No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918. When these notes were written the practice has been for Public Works Department to scrutinize the plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works in respect of every detail and it was thought that the complete transfer of the work to the Superintending Engineers would throw too much work on the Superintending Engineers' offices (vide circular memorandum No. 116-C, dated 4th January 1913). But as it has been subsequently decided in the above Government Order that the Public Works Department scrutiny should be confined to a pronouncement of an opinion as to the reasonableness of the estimated cost in cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men and as there will be very few cases where they will be prepared by non-professional men it is not considered that by the new procedure suggested above, much additional work will be thrown on the Superintending Engineers' offices.

6. It is therefore submitted that the file may be sent to Home (Education) for issuing necessary orders prescribing the procedure suggested in paragraph 4 above. That department will doubtless circulate the file to Honourable Member (Education) who is also Honourable Member (Public Works Department).

V.K.K.—14-8-19.

P.RAO—14-8-19.

I do not see why grant-in-aid educational works alone should be technically scrutinized in Chief Engineer's office for offering advice or opinion as to cost and general arrangements or features in the design when Government and local works are scrutinized and sanctioned by Superintending Engineers. When a definite amount has been fixed as the limit of sanctioning powers for Superintending Engineers it is but reasonable that all consultations on works costing below that limit should generally be made with Superintending Engineers and not with Chief Engineer. Cases presenting any extraordinary or special features should of course be excepted.

The work in connexion with the scrutiny of building estimates has increased very much recently and is sure to increase still further in future. The Chief Engineer's office is in need of some relief.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—14-8-19.

As it seemed to me that the logical conclusion to draw from the fact that the sanctioning (technical) powers of Superintending Engineers had been raised to Rs. 50,000 was that Superintending Engineer should take technical responsibility for such works, I ordered that the matter should be examined on above lines with a view to relieve my office and myself from the scrutiny of estimates under Rs. 50,000.

I think the proposal might now be examined in Home (Education) and the Director of Public Instruction consulted.

W. HUTTON—21-8-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Prior to 1904 all plans and estimates relating to grant-in-aid buildings were scrutinized by the Executive Engineer or Superintending Engineer and certified to by him—vide Public Works Department office note on page 2 of notes to G.O. No. 1596, dated 13th December 1918. Those relating to grants within the sanctioning powers of the Director of Public Instruction stopped with that scrutiny, while

those which were submitted to Government for sanction underwent a further scrutiny in the office of the Chief Engineer—G.O. No. 597, Educational, dated 27th September 1904 in G.O. No. 3309 W., dated 14th November 1904. This practice was subsequently modified to the extent that in the case of plans and estimates submitted to Government, the scrutiny of the Executive Engineers or Superintending Engineers was done away with. The present practice is that all plans and estimates

amounting to Rs. 5,000* are finally disposed of by the Director of Public Instruction under article 50 of the Grant-in-aid Code on the scrutiny of the

Executive Engineer or Superintending Engineer, while those in excess of Rs. 5,000 are sent up to Government who dispose of them after scrutiny by Public Works Department. The proposal of the Public Works Department is that even in cases coming up to Government for sanction the scrutiny of the Superintending Engineer should be considered sufficient up to Rs. 50,000. The reasons for this proposal are detailed in paragraphs 2-3 of that department's note on page 1 ante. Prima facie there seems to be no objection to the proposal. So far as Educational is concerned, it is immaterial whether the scrutiny is done by the Chief Engineer or by the Superintending Engineer. If Public Works Department consider that the Superintending Engineer's scrutiny is enough we can apparently have no objection.

2. The remarks of the Director of Public Instruction may be obtained u.o. in the first instance on the above proposal.

P.R.—27-8-19.

T.K.—30-8-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—2-9-19.

Three classes of estimates are referred to in the notes above A, B, C.

Regarding A alone, I have some doubts (subject to any remarks of the Director of Public Instruction). We have not yet got sufficient professional men. And the estimates now sent do not appear to be perfect. I presume that the scrutiny in such cases does not take much time but I may be wrong. Superintending Engineers may not have enough establishment; and perhaps they may not frankly criticise cases sent by local men. May cases A alone continue to come up to the Chief Engineer?

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-9-19.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted. The Educational Secretary presumably wants the existing procedure to continue.

V.K.G.—4-9-19.

P.RAO—4-9-19.

The three classes referred to by the Secretary, Education, are—

- (a) Estimates below Rs. 50,000 prepared by professional men.
- (b) Estimates below Rs. 50,000 prepared by non-professionals.
- (c) Estimates above Rs. 50,000.

The proposal of Public Works Department is that A and B should go to Superintending Engineers for scrutiny instead of to Chief Engineer as at present. The Secretary, Education, wishes that A may continue to be scrutinized in Chief

Engineer's office. This will not give

much relief as under existing orders

almost all estimates must be prepared by professionals only, private if available and Government or quasi Government servants otherwise. The scrutiny of all estimates between 5,000 and 50,000 in Chief

Engineer's office does take up much work and time and in very many cases the Superintending Engineers can scrutinize them as easily in their offices.

And he knows the local circumstances better as a rule.

W.H.—13-9-19.

The Superintending Engineer's present drawing staff is quite capable of scrutinizing such estimates and will be able to do the work as the number of estimates going to

There is no doubt they will do so perhaps more than enough.

W.H.—13-9-19.

each Superintending Engineer will not be large; I do not see why Superintending Engineers should not frankly speak out what they think about proposals sent to them. I know a muddled up case of a municipal school at Rajahmundry which when it had to be sent up to Superintending Engineer by the municipal council came in for quite an outspoken criticism from the Superintending Engineer. The Superintending Engineer has got a Personal Assistant or Sub-Engineer similar to the Sub-Engineer of the technical section of Chief Engineer's office, who is a Presidency man and not a local man.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—5-9-19.

I agree with Deputy Secretary's remarks. I do not follow Education Secretary's doubt as Superintending Engineers are competent to scrutinize estimates up to Rs. 50,000. Above that they would come to Chief Engineer.

W. HUTTON—13-9-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted. For orders whether the file may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

P.P.—17-9-19.

T.K.—17-9-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—19-9-19.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—20-9-19.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

[U.O. Camp No. 421/19, dated 23rd September 1919.]

This is, in the main, a matter of Public Works Department administration, and I accept their proposals. That department advises as to the technical qualifications required in the persons whose plans may be accepted, and they will no doubt retain the qualifications sufficiently high so as to preclude the possibility of an imperfectly trained or purely qualified man being permitted to draw up plans.

I presume that the Superintending Engineers will bring to notice any plan which is unnecessarily or extravagantly ornate, for I should not favour the award of a grant equal to half the cost of a building the plan of which had not been drawn up with an eye to economy.

R. LITTLEHAILES—21-9-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order is submitted. If approved it may be sent to Public Works Department for acceptance, before submission to Honourable Member.

P.R.—26-9-19.

It is however for consideration whether the draft in this case may also embody the decision on the file relating to the question of giving a technical adviser to the Director of Public Instruction, etc., which is separately under consideration.

T.K.—30-9-19.

C.R.—21-10-19.

This Government order may issue now.

R.R.—4-10-19.

Paragraph 3 amounts to a decision on one of the four points raised by the Director of Public Instruction in the other case. The draft order may, I think, be held over till orders are passed on that case.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—21-11-19.

The draft will be accepted.

W. HUTTON—2-12-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

For orders as to circulation.

P.R.—8-12-19.

T.K.—8-12-19.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—9-12-19.

Issue as slightly amended.

A. R. K[NAPP]—14-12-19.

Issue.

R.R.—19-12-19.

[G.O. No. 1582, Home (Education), dated 20th December 1919.]

Prescribing the procedure to be followed in respect of the scrutiny by the officers of the Public Works Department of ----- relating to building ^{for} aided educational institutions

1596 Home (Bd) 13 — 12 — 1918 (Y)

C. No. 1631D, From the, No., dated 191

No. 1582, dated 20.12. 1919

P. S.

Under the existing procedure as laid down in para 2 of G.O.No.597 Edl. dated the 27th September 1904 and ~~and~~ Rules 50 & 54 of the Grant-in-aid Code, plans and estimates connected with applications for grants-in-aid of educational ~~institutions~~ buildings are scrutinised costing Rs.5,000 and less by the Superintending Engineers and are finally disposed of by the Director of Public Instruction, while those costing more than Rs.5,000 and recommended by the D.P.I are submitted by him to Government direct, and are subjected to the scrutiny of the Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

In cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men, the P.W.D. scrutiny is confined only to pronouncing an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates, the responsibility for structural stability resting with the designer, while in cases

para 3 of Geo. No. 1596 Homestead
13. 12. 1918

④

Handwritten: 2
of plans and estimates prepared by non-professional men, the scrutiny includes ~~the~~ examination ~~of~~ structural stability ~~also~~. *Handwritten:* ~~It has recently been brought to the notice of Govt. that the practice~~ *Being to the increase in the number of applications for grants*

of sending up all the estimates above Rs.5,000 for the scrutiny of the C.E. has thrown a heavy burden on the technical sections of his office, and with a view to lighten it, the C.E. has suggested that the responsibility of scrutinising estimates for grant-in-aid works costing - Rsx between Rs.5,000 and Rs.50,000 may also be transferred to the Superintending - Engineers in consideration of the fact that Superintending Engineers have ^{since} been given enhanced powers of technical sanction in respect of Govt. and Local Fund works up to Rs.50,000 and that there is hardly any reason to differentiate ~~the~~ grant-in-aid works from them so far as technical sanction to the estimates is concerned. *Handwritten:* 2 The Govt. accept the suggestion and direct that the following procedure may be followed in respect of grant-in-aid works:-

- (i) In the case of works costing not more than Rs.5,000 the existing procedure as to their scrutiny by the S.E's will continue.
- (ii) In the case of works costing ~~more~~ more than Rs.5,000, but not more than Rs.50,000, the D.P.I will forward the - detailed plans, specifications and estimates received under Rule 52(ii) of the Grant-in-aid code to the Superintending Engineers concerned for opinion.

- (a) if the plans and estimates have been prepared by professional men, as to the reasonableness of the estimate alone, *and*
 - (b) ~~also~~ where they are not prepared by professional men, on the reasonableness of the estimate as well as the structural stability of the building.
- Handwritten:* will ~~also~~ The D.P.I ~~also~~, after obtaining the S.E's opinion submit the plans and estimates to Govt. who will dispose of the application without reference to the C.E.
- (iii) In the case of works estimated to cost more than Rs.50,000, the D.P.I will submit with his recommendation, the plans and estimates direct to Govt. who will refer them to the Chief Engineer for - scrutiny and for pronouncing an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates.

3. The Chief Engineer is, however, requested to see that the qualifications of persons whose plans may be accepted ~~without detailed scrutiny~~ are kept sufficiently high ~~so as to~~ - preclude the possibility of an improperly trained or poorly qualified person being permitted to draw up plans, and to instruct Superintending Engineers ^{should} to bring to the notice of the D.P.I plans ^{of proposed buildings} which ~~are~~ - unnecessarily or extravagantly ornate in as much as the Govt. do not consider it desirable to award a grant equal to half the cost of a building, the plan of which had not been drawn up with an eye to economy.

Handwritten: To think the question whether a "half grant" from public funds is justifiable in this case may be specially considered.
To The D.P.I.
The A.G.
P.W.D. with copy of notes.
The publicity officer

Handwritten: Seen to them
24/1/20
PR. 24/1/20

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1582, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 20TH DECEMBER 1919

[SUBJECT.—Regarding scrutiny of grant-in-aid works.]

Previous papers :

G.O. 1591 W.,	3rd June 1902	G.O. 561 Home (Education),	14th June 1913
" 3809 W.,	14th Nov. 1904	" 1188 "	15th Sep. 1917
" 672, Educational,	21st Sep. 1908	" 1596 "	13th Dec. 1918
" 132 "	6th Mar. 1911	" 397 W.,	25th Mar. 1919
" 370 "	1st May 1912	" 834 Home (Education),	4th July "
Memo. 16-C. W.,	4th Jan. 1913		

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Under the existing orders regarding scrutiny of plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works, plans and estimates for works costing Rs. 5,000 or less are scrutinized by the Superintending Engineers or the Executing Engineers concerned. All proposals costing more than Rs. 5,000 are sent to the Chief Engineer for scrutiny of the plans and estimates—vide paragraph 1 of G.O. No. 1596, dated 13th December 1918. In cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men, Public Works Department scrutiny is confined only to pronouncing an opinion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the estimates, the responsibility for structural stability resting with the designer. In cases, however, where the plans and estimates are not prepared by professional men, the Public Works Department scrutiny is to include the examination of structural stability also.

2. The Superintending Engineers have now powers to sanction technically estimates up to Rs. 50,000 for all classes of Government and local fund works including irrigation works—vide G.O. No. 397 W., dated 25th March 1919. So in all cases of works costing below Rs. 50,000 for which estimates are submitted to Government for administrative approval, no technical scrutiny is done in the Chief Engineer's office unless there is any special reason to suspect its necessity. The scrutiny in the Chief Engineer's office is confined only to the general suitability of the proposals without a minute examination of the details as to the quantities, rates, etc. In view of the above, it is for consideration whether in the case of grant-in-aid works also, the whole responsibility may not be transferred to the Superintending Engineers even in the case of works costing between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 50,000.

3. There is at present very heavy work in the technical sections of the Chief Engineer's office and it seems unnecessary that a special procedure need be followed in the case of grant-in-aid works. As the Public Works Department scrutiny of plans and estimates for such works prepared by professional men is confined only to a pronouncement of the reasonableness of the estimated cost and as the local officer is the best judge in respect of rates, etc., it seems unnecessary that such cases should come up to the Chief Engineer. As already stated the Superintending Engineer deals finally (after administrative approval) with estimates for Government and local fund works up to Rs. 50,000 without any reference to the Chief Engineer.

4. It may therefore be suggested to the Home Department that the following procedure may be prescribed for being followed in future in regard to grant-in-aid works:—

(1) In the case works costing below Rs. 50,000 the private body will submit detailed plans and estimates to the Director of Public Instruction. The Director of Public Instruction will then forward them to the Superintending Engineers
 A | concerned for opinion only as to the reasonableness of the cost if they are prepared by professional men. In cases where the plans and estimates are
 B | not prepared by professional men the Superintending Engineer should give his opinion as regards structural stability also. The Director of Public Instruction after obtaining the Superintending Engineer's opinion should submit the plans and estimates to Government in the Home (Education) Department who will then dispose of the application for a grant *without any reference* to the Chief Engineer.

(2) When the works are estimated to cost more than Rs. 50,000, the
 C | Director of Public Instruction may submit the plans and estimates direct to Government who will refer the matter to Chief Engineer for scrutiny.

5. In this connexion attention is, however, invited to the notes ~~marked A~~ on pages 2 and 3 of the notes connected with G.O. No. 1596, Home (Education), dated 13th December 1918. When these notes were written the practice has been for Public Works Department to scrutinize the plans and estimates for grant-in-aid works in respect of every detail and it was thought that the complete transfer of the work to the Superintending Engineers would throw too much work on the Superintending Engineers' offices (vide circular memorandum No. 116-C, dated 4th January 1913). But as it has been subsequently decided in the above Government Order that the Public Works Department scrutiny should be confined to a pronouncement of an opinion as to the reasonableness of the estimated cost in cases where the plans and estimates are prepared by professional men and as there will be very few cases where they will be prepared by non-professional men it is not considered that by the new procedure suggested above, much additional work will be thrown on the Superintending Engineers' offices.

6. It is therefore submitted that the file may be sent to Home (Education) for issuing necessary orders prescribing the procedure suggested in paragraph 4 above. That department will doubtless circulate the file to Honourable Member (Education) who is also Honourable Member (Public Works Department).

V.K.K.—14-8-19.

P.R.A.—14-8-19.

I do not see why grant-in-aid educational works alone should be technically scrutinized in Chief Engineer's office for offering advice or opinion as to cost and general arrangements or features in the design when Government and local works are scrutinized and sanctioned by Superintending Engineers. When a definite amount has been fixed as the limit of sanctioning powers for Superintending Engineers it is but reasonable that all consultations on works costing below that limit should generally be made with Superintending Engineers and not with Chief Engineer. Cases presenting any extraordinary or special features should of course be excepted.

The work in connexion with the scrutiny of building estimates has increased very much recently and is sure to increase still further in future. The Chief Engineer's office is in need of some relief.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—14-8-19.

As it seems to me that the logical conclusion to draw from the fact that the sanctioning (technical) powers of Superintending Engineers had been raised to Rs. 50,000 was that Superintending Engineer should take technical responsibility for such works. I ordered that the matter should be examined on above lines with a view to relieve my office and myself from the scrutiny of estimates under Rs. 50,000.

NOTES TO G.O. No. 1582, HOME (EDUCATION), 20TH DECEMBER 1919 3
I think the proposal might now be examined in Home (Education) and the
Director of Public Instruction consulted.

W. HUTTON—21-8-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Prior to 1904 all plans and estimates relating to grant-in-aid buildings were
scrutinized by the Executive Engineer or Superintending Engineer and certified to
by him—vide Public Works Department office note on page 2 of notes to G.O.
No. 1596, dated 13th December 1918. Those relating to grants within the sanction-
ing powers of the Director of Public Instruction stopped with that scrutiny, while
those which were submitted to Government for sanction underwent a further scrutiny
in the office of the Chief Engineer—G.O. No. 597, Educational, dated 27th Septem-
ber 1904 in G.O. No. 3309 W., dated 14th November 1904. This practice was
subsequently modified to the extent that in the case of plans and estimates submitted
to Government, the scrutiny of the Executive Engineers or Superintending
Engineers was done away with. The present practice is that all plans and estimates

amounting to Rs. 5,000* are finally
disposed of by the Director of Public
Instruction under article 50 of the Grant-
in-aid Code on the scrutiny of the

Executive Engineer or Superintending Engineer, while those in excess of Rs. 5,000
are sent up to Government who dispose of them after scrutiny by Public Works
Department. The proposal of the Public Works Department is that even in cases
coming up to Government for sanction the scrutiny of the Superintending Engineer
should be considered sufficient up to Rs. 50,000. The reasons for this proposal are
detailed in paragraphs 2-3 of that department's note on pages 1-4 ante. Prima
facie there seems to be no objection to the proposal. So far as Educational is
concerned, it is immaterial whether the scrutiny is done by the Chief Engineer or by
the Superintending Engineer. If Public Works Department consider that the
Superintending Engineer's scrutiny is enough we can apparently have no objection.

2. The remarks of the Director of Public Instruction may be obtained u.o. in the
first instance on the above proposal.

P.R.—27-8-19.

T.K.—30-8-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—2-9-19.

Three classes of estimates are referred to in the notes above A, B, C.
Regarding A alone, I have some doubts (subject to any remarks of the Director
of Public Instruction). We have not yet got sufficient professional men. And the
estimates now sent do not appear to be perfect. I presume that the scrutiny in such
cases does not take much time but I may be wrong. Superintending Engineers may
not have enough establishment; and perhaps they may not frankly criticise cases sent
by local men. May cases A alone continue to come up to the Chief Engineer?
R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-9-19.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted. The Educational Secretary presumably wants the existing procedure
to continue.

V.K.G.—4-9-19.

P.S.R.—4-9-19.

The three classes referred to by the Secretary, Education, are—

- (a) Estimates below Rs. 50,000 prepared by professional men.
- (b) Estimates below Rs. 50,000 prepared by non-professionals.
- (c) Estimates above Rs. 50,000.

4 NOTES to G.O. No. 1582, HOME (EDUCATION), 20TH DECEMBER 1919

The proposal of Public Works Department is that A and B should go to Superintending Engineers for scrutiny instead of to Chief Engineer as at present. The Secretary, Education, wishes that A may continue to be scrutinized in Chief

None at all practically.

W.H.—13-9-19.

Engineer's office. This will not give much relief as under existing orders almost all estimates must be prepared

by professionals only, private if available and Government or quasi Government servants otherwise. The scrutiny of all estimates between 5,000 and 50,000 in Chief

And he knows the local circumstances better as a rule.

W.H.—13-9-19.

Engineer's office does take up much work and time and in very many cases the Superintending Engineers can scrutinize them as easily in their offices.

The Superintending Engineer's present drawing staff is quite capable of scrutinizing such estimates and will be able to do the work as the number of estimates going to

There is no doubt they will do so perhaps more than enough.

W.H.—13-9-19.

each Superintending Engineer will not be large. I do not see why Superintending Engineers should not frankly speak out what they think about proposals sent to

them. I know a muddled up case of a municipal school at Rajahmundry which when it had to be sent up to Superintending Engineer by the municipal council came in for quite an outspoken criticism from the Superintending Engineer. The Superintending Engineer has got a Personal Assistant or Sub-Engineer similar to the Sub-Engineer of the technical section of Chief Engineer's office, who is a Presidency man and not a local man.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—5-9-19.

I agree with Deputy Secretary's remarks. I do not follow Education Secretary's doubt as Superintending Engineers are competent to scrutinize estimates up to Rs. 50,000. Above that they would come to Chief Engineer.

W. HUTTON—13-9-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted. For orders whether the file may be forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction ~~and~~ for remarks.

P.P.—17-9-19.

T.K.—17-9-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—19-9-19.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—20-9-19.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

[U.O. Camp No. 421/19, dated 23rd September 1919.]

This is, in the main, a matter of Public Works Department administration, and I accept their proposals. That department advises as to the technical qualifications required in the persons whose plans may be accepted, and they will no doubt retain the qualifications sufficiently high so as to preclude the possibility of an imperfectly trained or purely qualified man being permitted to draw up plans.

I presume that the Superintending Engineers will bring to notice any plan which is unnecessarily or extravagantly ornate, for I should not favour the award of a grant equal to half the cost of a building the plan of which had not been drawn up with an eye to economy.

R. LITTLEHAILES—21-9-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order is submitted. If approved it may be sent to Public Works Department for acceptance, before submission to Honourable Member.

P.R.—26-9-19.

12 5
NOTES TO G.O. No. 1582, HOME (EDUCATION), 20TH DECEMBER 1919 5

It is however for consideration whether the draft in this case may also embody the decision on the file relating to the question of giving a technical adviser to the Director of Public Instruction, etc., which is separately under consideration.

T.K.—30-9-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—21-10-19.

This Government order may issue now.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—4-10-19.

Submitted that this may lie over till a proof of these notes becomes available.

T.P.S.—20-10-19.

S. BHASKARA AYYAR—21-10-19.

Paragraph 3 amounts to a decision on one of the four points raised by the Director of Public Instruction in the linked case. The draft order may, I think, be held over till orders are passed on that case.

S.B.—21-11-19.

The draft will be accepted.

W. HUTTON—2-12-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

For orders as to circulation.

P.R.—8-12-19.

T.K.—8-12-19.

R.R.—9-12-19.

Issue as slightly amended.

A. R. K[NAPP]—14-12-19.

Issue.

W.A.K.—19-12-19.

R.R.—19-12-19.

[G.O. No. 1582, Home (Education), dated 20th December 1919.]

ORDINARY.

PRESS SLIP.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT (a).

Scott. II-38-1-17.

Home DEPARTMENT.

Current No. dated 191

G.O. No. 1582 dated 20.12.1917.

Number of MS. pages sent (b) Correspondence 3 (Threes) (b) Notes 13 (Thirteen)

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	...	4	25	12.15
Ooty Records	...		6	1.7
For filing with original	...			
Total	...		31	13.22

FOR ISSUE.†

Letter only.	Complete G.O.	Special issue copies of G.O.		Notes.
		No.	Papers.	
Signature copies				
India Office				
Govt. of India	Dept.			
Revenue Department				
Public Works Department				
Local and Municipal Department				
Educational Department	Dept.			
Public Dept.				
Judicial Dept.				
Political				
Financial Dept.	Total			
Marine Dept.				
Ecclesiastical Dept.				
Spare copies				
The D.P. 9	6			
The	10			
The	90	1.4.26		
The P.W.D.	50	1.4.26		
The Reserve				
The				
The				
The				
The				
The				
The				
The				
The				
The				
Total	156			

Copies distributed on † (Press Clerk).

† Copies distributed on † (Press Despatcher).

† To be initialed and dated.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

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

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

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

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

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

TO PRESS, MADRAS QOTY.

A
Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.

B
Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.
Type may be released after usual interval at once.

C
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.

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.....	Dec. 22, 1912
First proof furnished on.....	
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	
Final copies supplied on.....	5/1/13

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 ...				