[B.]
500—12-2-94.
D

Educational (1905) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 31

DATED 20. 1. 05

N. P.

10

C

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Building grants.

Sanctions with remarks an additional grant of Rs 1116 towards the cost of the extensions to the Basel Mission Parsi High School Tellichery.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1905} of Madras.
EDUCATIONAL.

2

Recd. } 1905. *Enclosures*
Regd. } *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 31, 20th January 1905.

N. P.

JANUARY.

Building Grants.

Sanctioning, with remarks, an additional grant of Rs. 1,116 towards the cost of the extensions to the Basel Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following paper :—

G.O., No. 494, Educational, dated 10th August 1904.

Abstract.—Sanctioning, with remarks, a grant of Rs. 1,000 in aid of the extensions to the Basel German Mission Parsi High school, Tellicherry.

Read—also the following paper :—

From the Manager, Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry, to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, dated 10th October 1904, No. 39.

I have the honour to solicit that, in view of the circumstances explained below, you may be so good as to request Government to reconsider its Order No. 494, dated 10th August 1904, communicated to me in your Proceedings, Reference on C. No. 395/23, dated 18th August 1904.

2. The application for grant was made by me as early as 29th April 1903. According to the plan then submitted the extension was estimated to cost only Rupees 4,000 odd. The first communication that I received with reference to the application was dated the 25th July 1903 and was to the effect that the plan and estimate had been referred by you to the Public Works authorities for remarks.

3. I had stated in my application that accommodation in the school was already insufficient and the strength having risen considerably, it was imperative that the extension work should be taken in hand with the least possible delay. Since submitting the application, the strength had again increased so that I had to rent a building for the accommodation of two of my classes at Rs. 30 per mensem.

4. There was also the monsoon in Malabar to be taken to account. And if work was not commenced in November at the latest, it should have to be postponed for another full year. This meant unnecessary waste of money in the shape of rent and serious inconvenience, particularly because the landlord of the house which was taken on rent objected to our occupation of it running for a longer period, and it was hardly possible to obtain another suitable building in the neighbourhood.

5. These circumstances it was that compelled me to commence construction of the building without waiting for formal sanction of the grant for which I had applied. When the basement was finished the school was visited by the Divisional officer of Cannanore Public Works Department who gave me to understand that he was deputed by the Executive Engineer to inspect the work with a view to suggesting certain alterations which were proposed to be made in the plan submitted by me. The alterations were personally explained to me by the Divisional officer so that I might continue the work on those lines, and they were formally communicated to me by you in your Proceedings R.C. No. 3959, dated 14th November 1903. These alterations were practically all of them carried out by me with the result that there was an increase of Rs. 2,000 odd in the cost as originally estimated by me.

6. The building was, after completion, inspected again this time by the Executive Engineer himself and he expressed himself thoroughly satisfied with it.

7. It will thus be seen that I have been made to spend Rs. 2,000 odd on the building over and above the amount which I had intended for it. I beg to submit that it is very hard that I should in the end be offered only less than half this amount by way of aid.

8. I have also to submit that the whole cost was met from my personal income and not from the funds of our Home Committee who could not contribute anything towards the expenses. The order of Government reduces me therefore to serious difficulties.

9. In addition to the outlay on this extension, a further amount of Rs. 3,583 odd was spent in the current year on other improvements to the school building and on furniture for which no aid has been claimed.

10. The salary grant which the school gets from Provincial funds is but Rs. 584 per annum which is much less than what most High Schools of similar standing receive, while the only building grants which the school has ever received are Rupees 168 for a gymnastic hall in 1895 and Rs. 820 for the primary school building in 1902, not to say that the latter is a separate institution.

11. In these circumstances I request you will, in the strongest terms, support my request to Government that the grant sanctioned may be enhanced by at least another Rs. 1,000.

Ref. on C. No. 3959 of 1903, dated 26th October 1904.

Submitted to Government with reference to Order No. 494, Educational, dated 10th August 1904, and recommended for very special consideration.

2. The manager, who is very earnest in his work, acted as he thought for the best, and is deserving of every encouragement.

3. The grant of Rs. 2,116, as recommended in this office letter Ref. on C. No. 3959 of 1903, dated 20th May 1904, or at least Rs. 2,000 may, as a special case, be sanctioned.

A. G. BOURNE,
Director of Public Instruction.

Memorandum No. 609, Educational, dated 21st November 1904.

With reference to his letter R C. No. 3959 of 1903, dated 26th October 1904, the Director of Public Instruction is requested to forward for the perusal of Government all the records connected with the building grant applied for by the Manager of the Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry, including the original and revised plans and estimates.

(By Order)

A. GALLETTI,
Assistant Secretary to Govt.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Ref. on C. No. 3959 of 1903, dated 14th December 1904.

Submitted to Government with reference to memorandum No. 609, Educational, dated 21st November 1904.

2. The original plan, which was returned to the Manager, is reported to be missing.

3. The revised estimate and plan and the original estimate are flagged A, B and C respectively.

4. The papers were sent to me while on tour but were not delivered and have only just been returned to Madras.

A. G. BOURNE,
Director of Public Instruction.

Order—No. 31, Educational, dated 20th January 1905.

The Governor in Council is pleased to sanction an additional grant of Rs. 1,116 towards the cost of the extensions to the Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry.

2. Every application for a building grant should be immediately acknowledged by the Director. Attention should be drawn prominently in the acknowledgment to rule 118 of the Grant-in-aid Code. The Director should also prescribe a period within which all applications should be dealt with in his office and see that this period is not exceeded in any case.

(True Extract.)

H. D. TAYLOR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
„ Accountant-General.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Educational Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 31, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 20th JANUARY 1905.

[Subject.—*Building Grant for the Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 3959, *dated 26th October* 1904.

In his letter No. 3959, dated 20th May 1904, the Director of Public Instruction recommended a grant of Rs. 2,116 towards the cost of extending the building occupied by the Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry; but, as the work had been commenced and completed before the grant was sanctioned, Government made a grant of Rs. 1,000 only in their Proceedings, No. 494, Educational, dated 10th August 1904.

2. The manager of the institution now applies for a reconsideration of this order. He states he was very hard-pressed for additional accommodation and, owing to the monsoon in Malabar, the work had to be commenced in November at the latest; otherwise the work would have to be postponed for one full year. He therefore commenced the work without waiting for formal sanction, but he carried out all the alterations suggested by the Public Works Department which increased the total cost of the work by Rs. 2,000. He met the cost from his own funds and the refusal of the Government to sanction the full grant reduces him, he says, to serious difficulties.

3. The Director says that the manager is very earnest in his work and acted as he thought for the best and that he is deserving of encouragement. He recommends that a grant of Rs. 2,116 or at least Rs. 2,000 may, as a special case, be sanctioned in lieu of the grant of Rs. 1,000 originally sanctioned.

Orders are solicited.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—9-11-04.

V. Krishnaswami—9-11-04. A. Galletti—11-11-04.

For orders.

2. The revised estimate, after carrying out the alterations suggested by the Divisional officer, Public Works Department, amounted to Rs. 6,350 as against Rs. 4,000 which the manager originally proposed to spend. From the Public Works Department note, it appears that some of the rates in the estimate were unduly high, but as the work was actually completed the estimate was not checked in detail by that Department.

Page 1 of notes in G.O., No. 494, Educational, dated 10th August 1904.

3. Please see paragraphs 7 and 8 of the manager's letter.

H. D. Taylor—13-11-04.

As a very special case, I would give him Rs. 500 more. The Parsis are a rich community and if they like to have palatial schools, that is no reason why the general ratepayer should have to meet the cost. (But surely this intervention of the Public Works Department so as to raise cost of school buildings as if such schools required palaces seems to be faulty. To what extent do they interfere and are we justified in requiring for native schools anything more than conformity to general conditions?

It is more important to spend money on education itself than in housing it in buildings beyond the necessities of the people and the country. Please note separately on the rules under which the Public Works Department exact revised plans, etc.)

Submitted that it is only a matter of practice not rule.

A. Galletti.

G. S. F[orbes]—15-11-04.

His Excellency the Governor.

H. D. Taylor—17-11-04.

Inattention to rules and orders, delays on one side and excessive haste on the other, confounds all proper working.

2. The man may justly plead that the Public Works Department really is responsible for the additional expenditure, but proper judgment on the point can be formed only after the whole of the papers are considered. The matter of grants has been very loosely gone about in the Director's office for long and I think the first reform to be done is to direct the Director to acknowledge applications promptly and to send applicants a slip showing all the rules governing grants and then to lose no time in deciding whether to call in the Public Works Department or not.

3. It is not advisable to be other than considerate to applications, for the State gets good value—ordinarily—from the share of cost that it accepts.

4. In the present matter I would call for the papers and learn the nature of the work originally planned and the propriety of the additional work required by the Public Works Department.

J. T[homson]—18-11-04.

The Director of Public Instruction may be asked by official memorandum to forward the records in connection with this matter.

H. D. Taylor—19-11-04.

A draft memorandum is placed below for approval.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—19-11-04.

V. Krishnaswami—19-11-04.

Issue.

A. Galletti—21-11-04.

[Memo. No. 609, dated 21st November 1904.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 3959, dated 14th December 1904.

The Director of Public Instruction submits the records connected with the building grant applied for by the manager of the Basel German Mission Parsi High School, Tellicherry, including the plan and estimates.

2. The original plan submitted by the manager is reported to be missing.

3. The revised plan is flagged B; the revised estimate A and the original estimate C.

4. A brief history of the case is given in the Director's letter, dated 27th July 1904, printed at page 3 of G.O., No 494, Educational, dated 10th August 1904. From this it will be seen that the manager's application for grant was received in the Director's office on the 15th May 1903; the Director referred the plan and estimate to the Superintending Engineer on the 13th July 1903 and the Superintending Engineer returned them on the 16th October 1903 stating that they required revision —*vide* Superintending Engineer's memorandum No. 695 M., dated 16th October 1903. The alterations suggested in the plan and estimate were the following :—

Two months.

J. T[homson].

Three months.

J. T[homson].

(1) All the main walls should be 1½ feet thick ;

(2) the four windows marked c c in the original plan should be replaced by two each in the centre of the end bay ;

(3) the tie beams should be 28′ 6″ long, and should be of teak ;

(4) the king posts should be of 1¼″ wrought iron rod ;

(5) the hip rafters should be 6″ × 3″ ;

(6) the bressummers should be 5″ × 4″ ;

(7) the tie beams should rest on granite bedstone 1½″ × 1½″ × 6″.

5. From the Executive Engineer's letter No. 116, dated 17th February 1904, it will be seen that all these alterations were carried out by the manager.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—23-12-04.

V. Krishnaswami—23-12-04.

Inspecting officers in their reports on the school had said the accommodation was insufficient. The Department had pressed the manager to build. The manager, meaning to build in November (?) and thinking five months' notice enough, applied on 27th April 1903. The application made its way through the Inspector to the Director of Public Instruction's office in a month, from his clerks to him in another month, from the Director of Public Instruction to the Superintending Engineer in another three weeks, to the Executive Engineer and back again in three months, from the Superintending Engineer to the Director of Public Instruction in a week. The Director of Public Instruction took another month to send on the Executive Engineer's recommendations, endorsed by the Superintending Engineer to the manager, and by that time it was November and the manager, wanting patience, had already finished his basement. When the basement was begun does not appear. The whole building was finished in February 1904.

29th April to 25th May 1903.

25th May to 20th June 1903.

20th June to 13th July 1903.

13th July to 9th October 1903.

9th October to 16th October 1903.

16th October to 14th November 1903.

2. Under Grant-in-Aid Code 118, the grant was not earned till Government had sanctioned. Government's sanction was treated as a formality by the manager, if he was aware it was required. He probably thought it sufficient to do what the local Public Works Department told him. The Director of Public Instruction seems not to have been aware on 18th February 1904 that the building had been finished. He had obtained revised estimates from the manager (who was building all the time and estimating for portions built as well as portions unbuilt), had sent them on to the Superintending Engineer, was waiting for the Superintending Engineer to answer, and on 18th February sent him a reminder. So the Director of Public Instruction was not to blame for the building having been finished before Government's sanction was got or asked for. Suppose the manager had waited. He would have had to wait till after 18th February 1904, probably for many months after 18th February 1904 ; and if Government took as long about their references to the central Public Works Department as the Director of Public Instruction about his references to the local, till another dry season had come and gone.

3. Honourable Member has perhaps not seen G.O. No. 597 of September last. This has abolished the Director of Public Instruction's references to the local Public Works Department, the chief cause of delay in dealing with building grants. The applications will now come as fast as the Inspectors and the Director's clerks will let them up to Government and if there are delays in the future, they will chiefly be Government's own. The central, not the local, Public Works Department will be responsible for suggesting enhanced expenditure on buildings. Government, Educational, will be responsible for endorsing Public Works Department's suggestions. I submit that G.O., No. 597, has already done what can be done in the matter, at least can be done by Educational, and that no more general orders are required unless it be an order to the Director to stock acknowledgment forms with rule 118 printed on them.

4. In this particular case the manager was hasty and treated rule 118 with contempt. Orders on the particular case are required. Rs. 1,000 has been sanctioned.* Rs. 2,116 is admissible. Director of Public Instruction wants the remaining Rs. 1,116 to be sanctioned. Hon'ble Mr. Forbes suggested Rs. 500.

* Not given, I imagine. The new rule about deeds has stopped the giving of 90 per cent. of the money sanctioned for the present as Honourable Member has no doubt heard.

A. GALLETTI.

5. For partial justification of the manager's contempt of the rule, please see Deputy Director's remarks in the file (long note in red ink). Mr. Sathianadhan—he had experience of the Director's office before as Personal Assistant (1888—90)—says: "I should like to say a word about the delay involved in the scrutiny of plans and "estimates by the Public Works Department. It is true our office has not been "altogether without blame in the matter, but the chief cause of delay has been with "the Public Works Department. There are cases where applications for building "grants have been pending for THREE AND FOUR YEARS TOGETHER." You say to a manager: Your accommodation is insufficient; your school isn't fit for recognition and won't be till you add to the buildings; we won't recognise you or help you if you don't build; and then you keep him waiting—with a school building which you yourself say is defective till the additions are made—three or four years while you are revising the estimates. Submitted that the extraordinary delays which according to the Deputy Director occurred in the past were calculated to bring contempt on rule 118 and to encourage managers to build in anticipation of the sanction of a grant.

Perhaps Honourable Member would wish to suggest the desirability of expedition in dealing with these applications to the Public Works Department Secretariat, now that the scrutiny of estimates has been transferred to them?

A. GALLETTI—5-1-05.

P.S.—With reference to Hon'ble Mr. Forbes' note of 15th November 1904, the school has no Parsi boys in it—*vide* page 14, Part II, Report on Public Instruction for 1902-1903. The boys are 20 Native Christians, 5 Muhammadans, 39 Brahmans, 298 caste Hindus. See also page 2 of G.O., No. 494, dated 10th August 1904. The Executive Engineer did not understand a telegram from Government about "Parsi school", and wired back "Do you mean Basel Mission High school?"

A. GALLETTI.

The additional Rs. 1,116 may be paid.

2. The Director will draw applicant's attention prominently in each case to rule 118 as proposed by the Assistant Secretary.

3. I don't know what you are doing about requiring deeds in case of aided building grants. If you are hanging up disbursements and creating indefinite liabilities I want to know all about it.

4. Tell the Director to prescribe a time limit to his office in handling applications of aid and to see that his subordinates observe it. There must be no more scandals of this sort.

J. T[HOMSON]—7-1-05.

Please draft accordingly.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of Honourable Member's note, please put up the orders relating to deeds of acceptance and formal mortgage deeds. To avoid delay in execution of the necessary documents after a grant has been made, it is desirable that the Director of Public Instruction should, before recommending the grant in any case, satisfy himself as to the title of the manager to execute the deeds.

3. Another point that requires to be carefully considered is the question of *actual* cost. Before a payment is made a certificate of *actual* as against *estimated* cost should be furnished by the manager who will probably work at a good deal less than Public Works Department rates. The sanctioned grant will then be a maximum.

4. It would be well to prescribe a period after which grants should lapse. The Director of Public Instruction may be asked to furnish a statement showing the number of items which have been *sanctioned* but not yet disbursed, and date of each such sanction.

H. D. TAYLOR—9-1-05.

A draft is placed below for approval.

2. The orders relating to deeds of acceptance and formal mortgage deeds are put up—*vide* G.O., No. 739, Educational, dated 15th December 1904, and G.O., No. 634, Educational, dated 20th October 1904.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—10-1-05.

Under article 293 of the Civil Account Code if grants sanctioned by Government are not drawn within a year of the sanction, the sanction will lapse. It is, however, well that a specific provision to this effect is made in the Grant-in-Aid Code. Even now rules 118, paragraph 3, and 127 permit of a date being fixed for the payment of grants but this, it is submitted, is not enough.

P. T. THARYAN—10-1-05.

Office have stuck Secretary's remarks on paragraph 3 of Honourable Member's note in the draft; but I understand Secretary to be dealing with matters that are for consideration, not for immediate orders. Should the Director be asked by official memorandum to report on the points in Secretary's paragraphs 2 and 3 and to furnish the list of Secretary's paragraph 4?

Yes. Paragraph 3 of Honourable Member's note and my remark thereon should have been extracted and separately dealt with.

H. D. TAYLOR—10-1-05

2. If the Director is now ordered not to recommend any grants till he has satisfied himself of the title, all applications or nearly all will be hung up in his office for the present. Submitted that the better plan for avoiding the accumulation of liabilities is to say in each order of Government sanctioning a grant: provided the building is finished by such and such a date, as well as Provided the deed is executed by that date; and we are authorized by Grant-in-Aid Code, 118, to say this.

H. D. TAYLOR.

A. GALLETTI—12-1-05.

In the linked file the Secretary has suggested the addition of a clause to rule 118 about the submission of a certificate of actual cost.

G.O., No. 160, Educational, dated 16th March 1905.

P. T. THARYAN—12-1-05.

Send files together to Secretary.

A. GALLETTI—12-1-05.

The draft may issue and the present question may be taken up separately.

H. D. TAYLOR—18-1-05.

[G.O., No. 31, Educational, dated 20th January 1905.]

Stock Form No. 127
2,000—12-3-03.

+1

Educational (1904) Department.

7

CURRENT No. 1917

From

[*Name*] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[*Designation*] Director of Public Instruction,

[*Station*] Madras.

80 31/20-1-05

Res / Print with notes & show proof HB 1-12-04

2020

Ref. on C.No.3959 of 03,

No.

Dated 26th October 1904.

Received 190 .

Enclosures

Registered 1-11-1904.

SUBJECT.

Submitting copy of a letter from the Manager, B. G. M. P. High School, Tellicherry and recommending that the building grant applied for in this office letter R.O.C. No. 3959 of 03 dated 20th May 04 may be sanctioned as a special case.

BACK PAPERS.

494 Sdl & 10-8-04-SE ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

2

~~2~~

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

Stock Form No. 151
5,000—13-7-03.

(2

Educational
~~Local & Munl.~~ (1904) Department.

CURRENT No. 2183 8

From

[*Name*] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[*Designation*] Director of Public Instruction,

[*Station*] Madras.

Ref. on C. No. 3959 of 03,

Dated 14 December 1904.

Enclosures Papers in original.

Received 190 .

Registered 16 12 1904.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
15 DEC 1904
SECRETARIAT.

SUBJECT.

Submitting file of papers relating to the building grant on behalf of the B.G.M. Parsi High School, Tellicherry called for in Memo. No. 609 of 21st November 1904.

BACK PAPERS.

Memo 609/04 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS

T.R. 17-12

To

The Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department.

Sir,

Submitting file of papers relating to the building grant on behalf of the B.G.M. Parsi High School, Tellichery.

[E. 12]
1,000—24-9-04.

3

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

9

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 494, dated 10th Aug. 1904.
" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1917, From the D.P.I., No 3959, dated 26th Oct. 1904.
" " 2183, " " " , " " , " 14th Dec. 1904.
" " , " " , " " 190 .

4P

ORDER No. 31, dated 20. 1. 1905.

P. S.

Despicious & return file
PH 19/1/5

Done
TR 20/1/05

Every application for a building grant should be ~~promptly~~ immediately acknowledged by the Director. Attention should be drawn prominently in the acknowledgment to rule 118 of the Grant-in-Aid Code. The Director

The Governor in C. is pleased to sanction an addl. grant of Rs 1116 towards the cost of the extensions to the B.G.M. Parsi High School, Tellichery.

2. ~~In future the Director should acknowledge every application for building grant on its receipt and draw the attention of the applicant to rule 118 of the Grant-in-aid code. He~~ should also prescribe a period within which ~~see that~~ all ~~such~~ applications should be ~~are~~ dealt with in his office and ~~within a prescribed time~~ ~~carefully~~ see that this period

S. copies despd to D.P.I.

despd 20/1/5

To The D.P.I. (with original correspondence sets)
" A.G. para 1 only.

TR
10-4-

5 G 2 10

period is not exceeded in any case.

Wouldn't this cause delay?

12.1.15

10/1/15

~~To avoid delay in the execution of the necessary documents after a grant has been sanctioned, the Director should before recommending the grant in any case satisfy himself as to the title of the managers to execute the deeds.~~

3. The Govt. also consider that before paying a grant the Director should obtain from the manager a certificate of _actual_ as against _estimated_ cost. The latter will probably be able to arrange for the execution of the work at a good deal less than the P.W.D. rates. The sanctioned grant will then be a maximum. A period should also be prescribed after which grants should lapse. The Director is requested to submit a draft of the necessary alterations in the grant in aid Code in these respects, with a list of the grants sanctioned but not disbursed up to date. The date of sanction in each case should be entered in this list.

10/1/15

irst copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.
- Order complete. 50
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter.

Print with notes
& show proof

23-7-13

EAD AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
190 .

bP
Indu-1-13P

URRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

RDER OF GOVERNMENT

ETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

ATEMENT WITH

E NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.