

Home (1917) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 689

DATED 30-5-1919

[Despatch Abstract.]

Building Grant.

Declining to admit the claim of the authorities of the
Sowrashtta High School, Madura, for an additional grant on account
of the fees to the Architect who designed their building.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.


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

C.F.—29.

Home (Education)

DEPARTMENT.

Ed 8975



Received

191

Registered

5-5-1919

Subject.

Recommending that a grant under Rule 52 (ii) of the Grant-in-aid Code be sanctioned for the Sourashtra High School, Madura.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

R-C No. 1754/17

Station Madras

, Dated the

1-5-

1919

From (Name) The Honourable Mr. R. Littlehales, M.A.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Home (Education)

Department.

Sir,

In G.O. No. 1188 Home (Education) dated 15th September 1917 the Government sanctioned a grant of Rs.50,000 for the construction of a building for the Sourashtra High School, Madura. This grant was subsequently raised to Rs.62,500 in G.O. No. 1407 Home (Education) dated 4th November 1918 as the school authorities reported that a suitable building could not be constructed for less than Rs.1,25,000. The Correspondent now reports that he has paid Rs.3,270-5-4 for the preparation of plans and estimates, vide the two enclosed receipts and requests sanction of ^{a half grant on this} amount. A copy of his letter No.284 dated 26th March 1919 is also enclosed. I have the honour to recommend that a half grant on this amount, viz., Rs.1,635 may be sanctioned as grant is admissible for architect's and

bb445 m/19

draughtman's fees under rule 52 (ii) of the Grant-in-aid Code.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R. A. G. R. I. V. E.

for Director of Public Instruction.

ms
1-5

3
Letter from the Correspondent, Sourashtra High School,
Madura, No. 284 dated 26th March 1919

With reference to your R.O.C.No. 130M/17 dated 24th March 1919, I have the honour to state that a grant of Rs.50,000 was originally sanctioned in G.O.No. 1188/17 dated 15-9-17 on the basis of the actual cost of the building estimated by the Government as Rs.1,00,000 and that the revised estimate of Rs. 1,25,000 proceeded on the ground that the actual cost could not be less than Rs. 1,25,000 and so that the estimates as passed by the Government never included the cost of preparation of plans and estimates and request that you would be good enough to get sanction of Government a separate grant for the cost of plans and estimates actually incurred.

(True Copy)

R. A. G. R. I. V. E.

for Director of Public Instruction.

ms
1-5

Subject.

Building grant

Additional grant to
the Sourashtra High
School, Madurai.

¶ Para 2 of Sec (X)

pp 4 & 5, c. f.

Home (Ed. 2) Dept

Lo. 897/B, from the D.P.S. R. e. 1754/17, d/ 1.5.19

From Govt No. 1407 Ed. 2, d/ 4th

Nov. 1918 it will be seen that the design
adopted for the Sourashtra High School
has not been checked or sanctioned by
the P.W.D. Nevertheless the management
has produced two vouchers dated 8th & 5th
June 1917 which show that it has ~~been~~
incurred an expense of Rs 3,270 in getting up
the requisite plans and estimates and
under Art. 52 (ii) of the Grant-in-Aid Code
the expense in this regard is reckoned as a
legitimate charge for the purpose of
assessing the grant. It is therefore subd:
that the D.P.S.'s recommendation to sanction
a half-grant for the purpose may be
accepted. A draft order is subd:.. If appld:
it may perhaps go to the P.W.D. for perusal.

The ~~original~~ rough estimate,
on which the grant was fixed,
was suggested by P.W.D. &
is for that Deptt. to say what
that amount should be taken
to have included the designer's fee.

See page 6 n file 580 1407 9/1917

NOTES.

In fixing the grant at 62,500, the amount of fees was also taken into consideration.

I don't think that this bank is admissible in addition to 62,500. Examine

14/5/19

Submitted that the Consulting Architect's note says that the second estimate of 1.25 lakhs contained a provision of Rs 6,600 on account of Architect's fees. It is regretted that the point was not noticed in the note written in the first instance. It is however observed that the estimate did not receive the usual Public Works Department and did not exactly form the basis on which the grant was sanctioned: the order in No. 1407 Adm., D/4th Nov. 1918 mentions that the enhanced grant was on account of rise in the prices of building materials and the management evidently has taken this as their stand for putting in the present application for additional grant. If now the position is taken that the grant of Rs 62,500 ~~was~~ included

6,600
3,270
2,330
Rs 1,665

As we did not
for the amount of
frant with reference
to any final proportion
no and to any details,
we cannot now infer
this report of the m. m. com.
17.5.19
noticed that the
estimate was
exhausted out of
this probably one
of the items that
justified the remark.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
G. NO. 1420 W. A. S.
DATE 22-5-1919.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
20 MAY 1919
OOTACANDINO.

Edn. no. 8973-1
19.5.19.

Architect's fees, the management
stands liable to refund to Govt. 1/2
the difference between Rs 6,600 (the
provision in the estimate for Architect's
remuneration) and Rs 3,270, the amount
now reported as having been actually
paid to the Architect. It is presumed
that there is no intention to enforce
this refund. Subject to approval, a
revised draft order declining to
grant the additional amount now
asked for is subd. It is present to P.W.D. for
acceptance. 17.5.19

I take it in the present case that, subject
to certain inspections for some standard,
Govt has sanctioned a grant of Rs 62500
as half grant for the whole project
in closure of all expenses. It
is open to the management to spend
more in some directions than in
others as compared with the
revised estimate. For stipulations
see G.O. 1108 of 15 Sept 1917 (near 1 1/4 lacs
for 1 lac in the last line) 19/5/19

DW

7

Please see the notes on pp 1-3 ante.

The authorities of the Sourashtra High School, Madras ~~at~~ have applied for an additional grant on account of Architects fees. Their estimate of 1.25 lakhs, on which the grant sanctioned in Govt 1407 Home (con) of 4.11.18. is said to have been based, contained a provision of Rs 6,600 for Architects fees - vide para 1 of the Consulting Architects rule on p. of the rules to the Gov. It is therefore proposed to decline the request for an additional grant. The draft order may be accepted & the file returned to the Home (Edn) dept.

pp. 6+7.

(X)

fd

P.W. no. 1490 W.B.B./19-1



Home Educ. J.

27.5.19.
 W.B.B.
 27.5.19.

Magnisue

CA
 28.5.19
 S.

30/5/19

8637

~~quest~~ $\frac{a}{17.5.19}$ $\frac{a}{17.5.19}$ $\frac{a}{17.5.19}$

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

191

2/6

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURE TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

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

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

P = Copy abstract only.

Q = Copy heading only.