

①
Edm. (1950) Deptt

closed
wm

Ms. Series.

G. O. Ms. No. 2204 Edm.

Dated -

5-8-50

⑦

Despatch Abstract.

Grant - Building - Navajivana High School, Perdala -
Construction of buildings - Enhancement - Sanctioned.

Back papers.

G.O. No. 3258 Edn. d/25-10-49.

G.O. No. 1376 Edn. d/28-4-50.

Madras.
3rd March 1950.

From

Dr. P.S. Shastri,
Correspondent,
Navajivana High School,
Perdola P.O., South Kanara.

To

The Hon'ble Minister for Education,
Government of Madras,
Madras.

Submission of a memorandum

Sir,

I beg to represent ~~xxx~~ that in the G.O. (MS) No. 3258 Education dated 25-10-49, announcing the grant admissible to our High School (Navajivana High School, Perdola, S.K.), there has been a lesser sanction. In our reply Ref.C.No. 151/49 dated 30-6-49 with reference to the Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction, Madras (R.O.No.200 D2/49 dated 22-6-49), we had stated clearly that our total estimated cost (including the present outlay of Rs.43,300/-) was Rs.75,000. The total estimated cost is put down in the G.O. referred to above as Rs.50,875. As the building work was proceeded with at three different stages, I am afraid, the cost of the work relating to the second stage has been left out. Therefore I request you to be good enough to rectify this and kindly sanction the maximum grant admissible for the total estimate of Rs.75,000, as originally stated by us.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

P. S. Shastri

Correspondent

Endt. No. 752 B/50-1 Edn dated 8-3-50. Edn. (B)

Referred to the D.P.G. for very early remarks.

8/3/50

To The D.P.G.
with copy of C.F.
7/3/50
1482
73.50

RI 174
RI 29/5
P.D. 15/6/50
8/3/50

7/3/50
1482
73.50

[Faint, mostly illegible text from the reverse side of the paper, appearing as bleed-through. Some words like "Education", "Director", and "MADRAS" are visible.]

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

2 APR 1950
8742
Sir,

From
The Director of Public Instruction,
M A D R A S.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education Department, MADRAS.

R.C.No.664-D2/48 dated 20th April 1950.

Sub:- Grant - Building - Navajivana High School,
Perdale - Construction before inclusion of the
scheme. *Enalt*
Ref:- Government Memo.No.752-B/50-1 Education dated
8-3-1950.

Particulars have been called for from the Inspecting
Officers. I shall submit my remarks on receipt of details.

Yours faithfully,

J. O. Pantanali

For Director of Public Instruction.

KVS/21/4.

The Director's remarks may be awaited till 20.5.50 *Edni(B)*

21/4

26/4/50

27/4/50

Re.664-D2/48.



Office of the Director of
Public Instruction, Madras.
Dated 12--7-50.

From The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

To The Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
Madras.

Sir,

Sub: GRANT - Building - Navajivana High School,
Perdala - Construction before inclusion -
Condonation - Enhanced grant.

Ref: 1. My letter C.699-D2/48, dated 17-1-49.
2. G.O. Ms. No. 3258-Education, dated 25-10-49.
3. Government Endorsement No. 752-B/50-1-Education,
dated 8-3-50.

The management of Navajivana High School, Perdala started the construction of the building in 1946 in anticipation of approval of plan. The plan was subsequently approved. At that time there was no application for grant, presumably because the management thought that no building grant would be sanctioned for a newly started school. After having constructed portion of the building, an application for building grant was submitted in January, 48 by which time a sum of Rs. 21,365/- had already been spent on the work. In the abstract estimate sent with the application for grant, the amount required to complete the construction of the building was shown as Rs. 29,510/-. Thus the cost of the building was taken as Rs. 50,875/- for purposes of grant (i.e. Rs. 21,365 plus 29,510/-). This did not include a sum of Rs. 21935/- being the cost of construction of three rooms completed before the the application for grant was submitted.

2. With reference to my letter C.699-D2/48, dated 17-1-49, Government in their order No. Ms. 3258-Education, dated 25-10-49, sanctioned the inclusion in the list of approved works, as a special case, of the scheme for the construction of a building for this School at an estimated cost of Rs. 50,875/- rendering the institution eligible for a grant upto one half of the cost of construction i.e. Rs. 25438/-. As the work was started before the approval of the Scheme, Government have stated that the irregularity would be condoned and the grant based upon the valuation of the buildings by the local Public Works Department.

3. The Correspondent has now requested that the estimated cost of the building scheme may be taken as Rs. 72,800/- (Rs. 50875 plus 21935 = 72810 or Rs. 72800) instead of Rs. 50875/-, thus including the cost of three rooms inadvertently left out by him in furnishing the cost of the work already done. The This request is reasonable and the rooms are necessary for the School. I, therefore, recommend that the estimated cost of the building scheme and the admissible grant may be revised as Rs. 72800/- and Rs. 35,000/- respectively, the grant being based upon the valuation of the buildings by the local Public Works Department after completion thereof.

4. I may add that this is not a case for execution of unapproved items of work, but a case of an omission on the part of the management to state correctly the expenditure already

/ P.T.O

incurred by them at the time of submission of the application for grant. In the circumstances explained above, the omission may be overlooked and the limit of grant raised to Rs.35,000/- as recommended in para 3 above.

Yours faithfully,

K. S. Hanumanth

For Director of Public Instruction

Ref: I.M. Letter No. 1376 Edu dated 28.4.50.

S.O. No. 3252 Education dated 12.1.50.

S.O. No. 3252 Education dated 12.1.50.

The management of Navagivana High School, Perdala started the construction of the building in 1946 in anticipation of approval of plan. The plan was subsequently approved. At that time there was no application for grant, but the management thought that no building grant would be sanctioned for a newly started school. After having constructed portion of the building, an application for building grant was submitted in January, 1948 by which a sum of Rs. 25,432 was sanctioned on the work. In the interim, the management had spent Rs. 25,432 on the building and had already completed the construction of three rooms. The amount required to complete the construction of the building was Rs. 25,432. The management had already spent Rs. 25,432 on the building and had already completed the construction of three rooms. The amount required to complete the construction of the building was Rs. 25,432. The management had already spent Rs. 25,432 on the building and had already completed the construction of three rooms. The amount required to complete the construction of the building was Rs. 25,432.

3. With reference to my letter No. 1376 Edu dated 28.4.50, Government in their order No. 1376 Edu dated 28.4.50, sanctioned the construction of the building for the school. In the special case, of the scheme for the construction of a building for this school an estimated cost of Rs. 25,432 was sanctioned. The management had already spent Rs. 25,432 on the building and had already completed the construction of three rooms. The amount required to complete the construction of the building was Rs. 25,432. The management had already spent Rs. 25,432 on the building and had already completed the construction of three rooms. The amount required to complete the construction of the building was Rs. 25,432.

4. The management has now requested that the estimated cost of the building be revised to Rs. 72,800. The management has now requested that the estimated cost of the building be revised to Rs. 72,800. The management has now requested that the estimated cost of the building be revised to Rs. 72,800. The management has now requested that the estimated cost of the building be revised to Rs. 72,800. The management has now requested that the estimated cost of the building be revised to Rs. 72,800.

5. I may add that this is not a case of execution of sanctioned items of work, but a case of an omission on the part of the management to state correctly the expenditure already

Edu Deptt
B

Grant - Building - Navagivana High School, Perdala -
Construction of buildings - Enhancement - Sanctioned

Read

Go no 1376 Edu d 28.4.50

From the Correspondent, Navagivana High School
Perdala dated 3.3.50

From the D.P.D. RC 664-D2/48 d 12.7.50.

Order no 2204 Education dated 5/8/50

In go no 1376 Edu dated 28.4.50, sanction was accorded to the payment of a grant not exceeding Rs 25432 towards one half of the cost of construction of buildings for the Navagivana High School Perdala which was then estimated at Rs 50875. It is now represented that unfortunately the cost of the building scheme, a sum of Rs 21935 being the cost of three rooms already constructed was inadvertently left out and that the estimated cost of the scheme should be revised as Rs 72,800. As the three rooms are necessary for the school, the estimated cost of the scheme will be revised to Rs 72,800 and the maximum grant payable towards the cost of construction of the buildings to Rs 35,000. The grant will be based upon the valuation of the buildings by the local Public Works Department after completion.

To
The D.P.D.
7/8
A.C. through Fin
8 copies 2

1876
2/8/50

1876
3/8/50

Edn (B)

Grant - Building - Navajivana High School, Perdala -
Construction of buildings - Enhancement of grant.

p18

From the Correspondent of the Navajivana High School,
Perdala d/3-3-50

H-3-48

From the D.P.G. Rc No. 664. D2/48 d/12-7-50.

Go 3258 Edn
25-10-49

Item 2 on p2 of (C)

Memorandum 11941B/10-1 Edn
8-7-50 not put up

vide item 3 on p23 of (Y)

Memorandum 753B/50-1 Edn
28-4-50

put up in file bearing
C. No 11950B/50.

p18

para 1 on p2 of

The scheme for the construction of a ~~school~~ building for the Navajivana High School, Perdala was placed in the list of approved works at an estimated cost of Rs 50,875/-. The irregular action of the management in having commenced the construction without obtaining the prior approval ~~for~~ the plans and estimates was condoned and a grant towards one half of the cost not exceeding Rs 25,438/- ~~has been~~ ^{was} sanctioned in G.O. No. 1376 Edn d/28-4-50. A provision of Rs. 14,000 has been made in the current year's budget for the payment of ^{a portion of} the grant due to the scheme. But in view of the financial difficulties experienced by the management, the D.P.G. has been requested to authorise the disbursement of the balance of the grant also, in the current year itself if there are savings out of the provision made in the current year's budget in respect of other building schemes.

2. The management has since represented that the building work was completed in three stages out of which the ~~one~~ ^{one} stage ~~has been~~ ^{was} left out ~~when the~~ ^{when the} orders approving the scheme at an estimated cost of Rs. 50,875/- ~~were~~ ^{issued}. They have ~~stated~~ ^{requested} that the entire scheme may be included in the list of approved works at an estimated cost of Rs 75,000 and ~~that the entire scheme may be~~ admitted to aid.

3. The D.P.G. to whom the matter was referred has reported that the management started construction as early as in 1946 in anticipation of the approval of the plan and that when they submitted the plan for approval they did not apply for any grant presumably because it was

Subsequently they applied for grant towards the construction of the building stating that a sum of Rs 21,365/ had already been expended and that a sum of Rs 29,510/ would be required to complete the construction. While submitting the estimates the management failed to include the cost of construction of these rooms ^(already constructed) of Rs 21,935/. The D.P.G. has stated that the rooms already constructed are essential for the school and that the request of the management for the inclusion of this part of the scheme in the approved list is reasonable. He has therefore recommended that the estimated cost of the scheme may be ~~raised to~~ ^{raised to} Rs 72,800 and that ~~a half grant not exceeding Rs 35,000~~ the maximum grant payable may be enhanced to one half of the cost of the building as valued by the local P.W.D. subject to a maximum of Rs 35,000/-. In G.O. No. 1875 Edn d/ 27-6-50 the D.P.G. has been requested to issue instructions to managements of schools warning them not to apply for retrospective sanction for unapproved items of work and aid for them. However in the present case relates to an old scheme and the D.P.G. has stated that it is only a case of an omission on the part of the management to state correctly the expenditure ~~at the~~ incurred by them at the time of applying for the grant. In the circumstances stated it is for consideration whether the Director's recommendation may be accepted and the maximum grant payable towards the scheme ^{may be} raised to Rs 35,000/.

4. The remarks of Finance may be invited U.O. prior to circulation with reference to the minutes of H.M. (Edn) on p1 of.

21-7-50
22-7-50
Fin
Finance (Exp. A.)
Edn. U.O. No.

In G.O. No. 3258 Edn. dated 25-10-49, the Govt. sanctioned a half grant of Rs. 25,438 to the Navajivan

para 1 on p3 of
para 3 on p3 of
para 4 on p3-4 of
para 3 on p3 of
The Director's recommendation may be accepted & the maximum grant of Rs 35000 sanctioned to the management
21-7-50
24 JUL 1950
66733
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

cm 752 B/50
p.3 of
7/4/50
para 4 on p3-4 of
In no. 66733 Edn
31-7-50
21-7-50
SECRETARY
4 AUG 1950
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

High School, ^{Pardale} towards the construction of school buildings at an estimated cost of Rs. 50,875. It is now pointed out that the estimated cost of the building previously furnished did not include the cost of ~~the~~ three rooms due to omission and that the rooms are necessary for the school. The D.P.I. accordingly recommends that the estimated cost of the building and the admissible grant may be revised as Rs. 72,800 and Rs. 35,000 respectively. It is reported that this is not a case of execution of unapproved items of work but a case of an omission on the part of the management to state correctly the expenditure already incurred by them at the time of submission of the application for grant. The Education department recommend the proposal. Finance may agree. ~~subject to the remarks that the grant may be for Rs. 36,405.~~

29-7-50
31-7-50
21993
2 AUG 1950
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Edu Dept
Finance have agreed to the estimated cost of construction of buildings for the Navajivana High School Pardale and the admissible grant being raised to Rs 72,800 and Rs 35,000 respectively.
A draft order is submitted below for approval. HM (Edn & Co) may see with reference to his minutes on p1 of.
21-7-50
3-8-50
may issue
HM (272)
45/8

