



W. N. S. Rajan

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

G.O. No. 839 M., dated 25th June 1920	1-6
D.O. No. 163-1 M./O., dated 25th June 1920	6
D.O. No. 4714-1 M., dated 10th July 1920	6
Brief Account of the Proceedings of the Conference	7
Opening Proceedings of the Conference	8-14

SUBJECT I.—PROVINCIAL CADRES FOR THE SERVICE OF LOCAL BODIES.

Secretariat Note	15-17
Report of Committee	17-21
Proceedings of the Conference	22-38
Resolutions of the Conference	38

SUBJECT II.—CO-ORDINATING THE ACTIVITIES OF LOCAL BOARDS AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS.

Secretariat Note	39
Report of Committee	40-43
Proceedings of the Conference	43-44
Resolutions of the Conference	44

SUBJECT III.—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO BE RENDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT IN CONNEXION WITH SCHEMES OF WATER-SUPPLY, DRAINAGE AND OTHER LARGE WORKS MAINTAINED BY LOCAL BODIES, WITH PARTI- CULAR REFERENCE TO THE WORKING OF FILTERS AND PUMPING STATIONS.

Secretariat Note	45
Report of Committee	46-47
Proceedings of the Conference	47-51
Resolutions of the Conference	51

SUBJECT IV.—THE STANDARDIZATION OF THE SALARIES OF MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL FUND EMPLOYEES.

Secretariat Note	52-54
Report of Committee	55-60
Proceedings of the Conference	60-65
Resolutions of the Conference	65-66

SUBJECT V.—THE STANDARDIZATION OF LICENCE FEES.

Secretariat Note	67-83
Report of Committee	84-85
Proceedings of the Conference	85
Resolution of the Conference	85

746

SUBJECT VI.—THE NEED FOR 'COSTINGS' ESTIMATES FOR THE SEVERAL SERVICES FOR WHICH LOCAL BODIES ARE RESPONSIBLE.

Secretariat Note	...	...	...	...	...	86—88
Report of Committee	...	...	...	...	...	88—97
Proceedings of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	97
Resolution of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	97

SUBJECT VII.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LOAN POLICY TO DEFRAY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE.

Secretariat Note	...	...	...	...	...	93
Report of Committee	...	...	...	...	...	99—101
Proceedings of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	101
Resolutions of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	101

SUBJECT VIII.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENTS AS SOURCES OF REVENUE.

Secretariat note	...	...	...	...	...	102—105
Report of Committee...	...	...	...	...	...	106—108
Proceedings of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	108
Resolution of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	108—110

SUBJECT IX.—CIVIC SURVEY.

Secretariat note	...	...	...	...	...	111—114
Report of Committee	...	...	...	...	...	115—116
Proceedings of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	117
Resolutions of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	117—118
Closing Proceedings of the Conference	...	...	...	...	...	118
G.O. No. 1046 M., dated 4th August 1920	...	...	...	...	...	118

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL (MUNICIPAL) DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 839 M., dated 25th June 1920.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has resolved to convene a Conference of officials and non-officials at Madras on the 17th July 1920 at 11 a.m. for the purpose of discussing certain matters connected with local fund and municipal administration and advising the Government in regard to them. His Excellency the Governor will open the Conference and the Hon'ble Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar will preside over it.

2. The gentlemen specified in Annexure A to this order are invited to attend the Conference.

3. A provisional list of the subjects proposed to be discussed is given in Annexure B to this order.

(True extract)

F. J. RICHARDS,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the gentlemen concerned.
Editors' Table.

ANNEXURE. A.

List of persons invited to attend the Conference.

Serial No.	Name.
1	The Hon'ble Mr. R. A. Graham, I.C.S., Chief Secretary to Government.
2	Mr. F. J. Richards, I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.
3	Mr. W. Hutton, Chief Engineer, Public Works Department (Buildings and Roads).
4	The Hon'ble Major-General G. G. Giffard, C.S.I., K.H.S., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.
5	Lieut.-Col. E. L. Perry, I.M.S., Sanitary Commissioner, Madras.
6	Mr. R. F. Stoney, Sanitary Engineer.
7	The Hon'ble Mr. R. Littlehales, Director of Public Instruction.
8	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. Vedachala Ayyar Avargal, Registrar of Co-operative Societies.

District.	Serial No.	Name.
1. Anantapur.	9	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai Avargal, President, District Board, Anantapur.
	10	M.R.Ry. G. Rameswara Rao Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Anantapur.
	11	M.R.Ry. T. Sivasankaram Pillai Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Pennukonda.
2. Arcot, North.	12	Mr. H. M. Hood, I.C.S., President, District Board, North Arcot.
	13	M.R.Ry. K. M. Krishnaswami Nayudu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Vellore.
	14	The Hon'ble Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Walajapet.
3. Arcot, South.	15	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayalu Reddi Garu, President, District Board, South Arcot, and Chairman, Municipal Council, Cuddalore.
	16	M.R.Ry. S. Vadivelu Pillai Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Chidambaram.
	17	M.R.Ry. M. G. Parthasarathi Mudaliyar Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Vriddhachalam.
4. Bellary ...	18	M.R.Ry. H. Lakshmana Rao Avargal, President, District Board, Bellary.
	19	The Hon'ble Mr. P. Siva Rao Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Bellary.
	20	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur T. Kodandarama Nayudu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Hospet.
5. Chingleput.	21	M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur M. Venkataraghavulu Reddi Garu, President, District Board, Chingleput.

District.	Serial No.	Name.
5. Chingleput —cont.	22	M.R.Ry. P. B. Sambaunda Mudaliyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Conjeeveram.
	23	M.R.Ry. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Chingleput.
6. Chittoor ...	24	M.R.Ry. T. V. Ranga Achariyar Avargal, President, District Board, Chittoor.
	25	M.R.Ry. M. Narayanaswami Reddi Garu, President, Taluk Board, Chandragiri.
	26	M.R.Ry. K. Krishnama Achariyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Tirupati.
7. Coimbatore.	27	M.R.Ry. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar Avargal, President, District Board, and Chairman, Municipal Council, Coimbatore.
	28	M.R.Ry. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Coimbatore.
	29	M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib Vital Doss Anandji Sait Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Tiruppur.
	30	Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abd-ur Razzaq Sahib Bahadur, Chairman, Municipal Council, Udumalpet.
8. Cuddapah...	31	M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Achariyar Avargal, President, District Board, Cuddapah.
	32	M.R.Ry. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Cuddapah.
	33	M.R.Ry. A. Parasurama Rao Garu, President, Taluk Board, Rajampet.
9. Ganjam ...	34	M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur T. Venkatakrishnaayya Pantulu Garu, President, District Board, Ganjam.
	35	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Berhampur.
	36	M.R.Ry. M. Venkata Reddi Pantulu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Chicacole.
10. Gōdāvari ...	37	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur D. Seshagiri Rao Pantulu Garu, President, District Board, Gōdāvari.
	38	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayana-murti Nayudu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Cocanada.
	39	Mr. K. V. R. Swami, Chairman, Municipal Council, Rajahmundry.
11. Guntur ...	40	Mr. T. H. Hill, I.C.S., President, District Board, Guntur.
	41	M.R.Ry. P. C. N. Ethirajulu Nayudu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Guntur.
	42	M.R.Ry. L. Sangameswara Rao Pantulu Garu, President, Taluk Board, Tenali.

District.	Serial No.	Name.
12. South Kanara.	43	The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur N. Subba Rao Avargal, President, District Board, South Kanara.
	44	M.R.Ry. B. Mahabala Hegde Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Mangalore.
	45	The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Haji Abd-ul-lah Haji Qasim Sahib Bahadur, President, Taluk Board, Coondapoor.
13. Kistna ...	46	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu Garu, President, District Board, Kistna.
	47	The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu Garu, President, Taluk Board, Ellore.
	48	Mr. J. W. Maiden, Chairman, Municipal Council, Masulipatam.
	49	M.R.Ry. D. V. Hanumanta Rao Pantulu Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Bezwada.
14. Kurnool ...	50	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur S. Venkatanarasimha Rao Garu, Vice-President, District Board, Kurnool.
	51	M.R.Ry. N. Ramaswami Ayya Garu, Chairman, Municipal Council, Kurnool.
	52	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur C. Venkataranga Reddi Garu, Member, District Board, Kurnool.
15. Madura ...	53	M.R.Ry. V. Srinivasa Achariyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Madura.
	54	M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib J. A. Vedanayaga Tevar Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Usilampatti.
	55	M.R.Ry. K. Kuppuswami Ayyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul.
16. Malabar ...	56	The Hon'ble Mr. V. Madhava Raja, President, District Board, Malabar.
	57	M.R.Ry. R. Sekhara Menon Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Palghat.
	58	M.R.Ry. C. V. Narayana Menon Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Calicut.
	59	M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib P. Raman Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Tellicherry.
17. Nellore ...	60	Mr. A. Galletti, I.C.S., President, District Board, Nellore.
	61	M.R.Ry. M. Narasimha Achariyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Nellore.
	62	M.R.Ry. B. Perumal Nayudu Garu, President, Taluk Board, Kandukur.
18. The Nilgiris.	63	Mr. J. F. Bryant, I.C.S., President, District Board, The Nilgiris.
	64	Mr. E. F. Handcock, Chairman, Municipal Council, Ootacamund.

District.	Serial No.	Name.
19. Rāmnād ...	65	Mr. C. F. Brackenbury, I.C.S., President, District Board, Rāmnād.
	66	M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib K. Srinivasa Ayyangar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Srivilliputtur.
	67	M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib S. Tirumalai Ayyangar Avargal, Member of the Rāmnād District Board and Rāmnād Taluk Board.
20. Salem ...	68	Mr. P. Macqueen, I.C.S., President, District Board, Salem.
	69	M.R.Ry. R. M. Lokanatha Mudaliyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Salem.
	70	M.R.Ry. S. N. Prabalam Pillai Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Sankaridrug.
21. Tanjore ...	71	The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur V. K. Ramanuja Achariyar Avargal, President, District Board, Tanjore.
	72	Mr. A. T. Panuirselvam, Chairman, Municipal Council, Tanjore.
	73	The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur A. T. G. M. Ahmad Tambi Marakkayar Sahib Bahadur, President, Taluk Board, Negapatam.
	74	M.R.Ry. B. S. Nataraja Sastri Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Negapatam.
	75	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur K. G. Srinivasa Mudaliyar Avargal, President, Taluk Board, Mannargudi.
22. Tinnevely.	76	The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai Avargal, President, District Board, Tinnevely.
	77	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Palamcottah.
	78	M.R.Ry. Cruz Fernandez Avargal, Chairman, Municipal Council, Tuticorin.
	79	M.R.Ry. K. N. Kondalarayaswami Nayudu Garu, President, Taluk Board, Kovilpatti.
23. Trichinopoly.	80	The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar Avargal, President, District Board, Trichinopoly.
	81	Mr. E. W. Legh, I.C.S., Member, District Board, Trichinopoly.
	82	P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly.
24. Vizagapatam.	83	The Hon'ble Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju, President, District Board, Vizagapatam.
	84	The Hon'ble Mr. B. Venkatapati Raju, Chairman, Municipal Council, Vizagapatam.
	85	M.R.Ry. P. Appa Rao Chetti Garu, Member, District Board, Vizagapatam.

NOTE.—Mr. J. P. Kotilingam of Bellary was also subsequently invited for the Conference.

ANNEXURE B.

Provisional list of subjects to be discussed at the Conference.

- I. Provincial cadres for the service of local bodies.
- II. Co-ordinating the activities of local boards and municipal councils.
- III. Technical assistance to be rendered by the Government in connexion with schemes of water-supply, drainage and other large works maintained by local bodies, with particular reference to the working of filters and pumping stations.
- IV. The standardization of the salaries of municipal and local fund employees.
- V. The standardization of licence fees.
- VI. The need for 'costings' estimates for the several services for which local bodies are responsible.
- VII. The development of a loan policy to defray capital expenditure.
- VIII. The development of productive investments as sources of revenue.
- IX. Civic survey.

Demi-official—from F. J. RICHARDS, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.

No.—163-1 M/O.

Dated—Ootacamund, the 25th June 1920.

I am to enclose a copy of a Government Order of this date convening a Conference of officials and non-officials at Madras on the 17th July 1920 for discussing certain matters connected with local fund and municipal administration, and to request you to intimate to me at a very early date whether you will attend the Conference.

I am to inform you that, for your journey to and fro and for your detention in Madras in connexion with the Conference, you will be treated as a first-class officer under article 1004 of the Civil Service Regulations and will be granted the travelling and daily allowance admissible for officers of that class.

Brief notes on the subjects to be discussed at the Conference will be sent to you separately.

Demi-official—from F. J. RICHARDS, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.

No.—4714-1 M.

Dated—Fort St. George, the 10th July 1920.

In continuation of my demi-official No. 163-1 M/O., dated the 25th June 1920, I am to forward brief notes* on the subjects to be discussed at the Conference.

The Conference will meet at Senate Hall, Chepauk.

* These notes are printed in this pamphlet under the respective subjects. They were forwarded to the members with the following note.

NOTE.

The subjoined notes are intended to indicate to the members of the Conference some of the issues on which the Government particularly desire their opinion. The notes are by no means exhaustive, nor do they in any way represent the views of the Government or of any particular officers of the Government on any of the questions suggested for discussion.

F. J. RICHARDS—13-7-20.

Brief account of the Proceedings of the Conference.

The Conference met in the Senate Hall, Madras, at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 17th July 1920. His Excellency the Governor, Lord Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E., opened the Conference and explained its object. The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., proposed the appointment of committees of the Conference to consider and report on the several subjects placed before the Conference. The proposition was duly seconded and carried and a separate Committee was appointed for each of the several subjects. A full account of the proceedings of the Conference on the 17th July 1920 is given on pages 8 to 14. The meeting then dispersed. The Committee discussed the subjects referred to them and finished their labours between the 17th and 19th July 1920. The Conference met again in the Senate Hall at 11-10 a.m., on the 21st July 1920, discussed the reports of the Committees and passed resolutions. The report of each Committee and the discussion thereon and the resolutions passed finally by the Conference, are printed under the respective subjects.

OPENING PROCEEDINGS OF THE LOCAL AND
MUNICIPAL CONFERENCE HELD ON
17TH JULY 1920.

His Excellency in opening the Conference said :—

In welcoming you gentlemen to this meeting to-day, representing as you do local bodies in all parts of this Presidency, I wish to say at once that I do not propose to detain you with preliminary remarks for more than a few minutes, for I realize that the bill of fare that we have placed before you is one which will probably satisfy the most voracious appetite, and consume a considerable amount of time, but I think it well to place before you the chief reasons which impelled us to invite you to meet us here to-day, and to discuss the various points we have placed on the agenda, and any additional ones which you may see fit to bring forward, which have reference to questions connected with local and municipal administration at the present time.

The Madras Government are endeavouring with the assistance, and I gladly acknowledge it, of members of the Legislative Council, to pass a series of bills connected with local self-government, which have to do with all local bodies, from panchayats to district local boards and municipalities, in order that Ministers and Members of the Reformed Council may have a sound foundation of legislation on such matters to start with, from which they can advance in future years.

I take no credit for any of these measures myself, for they were most of them drafted and worked out during the period of administration of my predecessor, Lord Pentland, but I do wish to give my very grateful thanks to my Honourable colleague Sir Rajagopala Achariyar, to the Advocate-General and to the Secretary of the Department and all members of his staff for the untiring zeal and devotion with which they have applied themselves to the task of bringing all these measures up to date to meet present conditions, and to keep alongside the very rapid advance which we are witnessing of all questions connected with local self-government during the last few years.

But besides this legislation, as I have already said, there are various matters connected with the principles and policy of administration in municipalities and local boards, and particularly with regard to the relations of Government, with local bodies, which will come up for discussion during your Conference, and with regard to which I sincerely trust you will arrive at definite and unanimous conclusions.

Now I have no intention to-day to take you seriatim through the long list of subjects on the agenda, and explain to you the reason for our wish to discuss each one. I merely want to make some very general observations with reference to a particular and, let me add, most important question, namely, how best we can secure the most efficient staff for the various branches of executive work which is under the control of local bodies, and to explain to you as clearly as I can the Government's position in the matter.

I can fully understand and entirely sympathize with the objections that might be raised by members of local bodies in these days to any scheme put before them by Government which appeared to increase centralized control over their executive actions, but I hope I may claim that my record in this country in regard to matters connected with local self-government should re-assure them on this point; if it does not, let me assure them that I have always felt and still feel that one of the most important things connected with our reforms is to increase the power and responsibility of local authorities over their affairs, for I think it is certain that the experience gained in local administration will in the future prove the most useful training ground for many of our citizens who will hold high office in future years in the administration of their country.

Yes, and I think I can claim too that my Honourable Colleague, Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar, has clearly shown in his administration of this department his desire to give more responsibility, more freedom, and a fairer representation to local bodies in all parts of the Presidency. Indeed I can truly say that there is hardly a week goes by that I don't receive a file from him showing me that he has taken a further step in one of these directions. So please disabuse your minds of any idea that we want to establish further control. Indeed, I feel that it would be hardly decent for me, who have in the past years been working to secure greater liberty for local governments from the central government, if I were to come to you now with any suggestion of further centralization to the local government by local bodies. But what we do want to be sure of is that you will be able to secure the best possible men for your executive services, and my Honourable Colleague will lay before you certain proposals for your consideration. I have laid considerable stress on this matter, because I believe that of all the various heads, this is probably the most important that will come up for your consideration and decision to-day,

and further because I wanted to clear away any possible misconceptions which any of you may have had as to the Government's position.

Let me thank you once more for your presence here to-day to assist us in this important task, and let me express the profound hope that your deliberations will further establish relations of trust and confidence between the Government and local bodies, and prove of lasting benefit to the administration of local self-government within our Presidency.

The Hon'ble Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar—

Your Excellency, we greatly appreciate Your Excellency's kindness in opening this Conference in spite of your recent illness. As we are now going into Committee to start the work of the day, may I venture to suggest that the representatives of newspapers here may be requested to be so good as to withdraw? They may come back at a later stage. Will Your Excellency kindly accept the proposal?

His Excellency—

I would ask the representatives of the press to withdraw.

The Hon'ble Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar—

I wish to say a few words in regard to this Conference. My friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, will no doubt recall to his mind a Conference similar to this, of a thoroughly non-official character, started by him about four years ago. It was a most interesting Conference, and, I think, Sir Sivaswami Ayyar opened it. Mr. Ramachandra Rao will bear me out when I say that during the last few years I have more than once asked him to consider the advisability of making the Conference an annual function. But for one reason or another this wish of mine has not been realized. To-day we all meet here under the auspices of the Government. A Conference like this of representatives of local bodies will probably carry more weight than the one we had about four years ago. I do hope that this will become an annual function, so that you, gentlemen who represent local bodies, may feel that in all important matters your views carry predominant weight. And I, for one, recognize that, in all changes regarding your administration, the general wish of you all should as far as possible prevail.

Having said that, let me proceed to say at once that the question of improving the executive services under local bodies has become an urgent one. The necessity for placing the important services in your employ—the health service, the engineering service and the teaching service—on a satisfactory

footing demands immediate attention. When I go round, I meet in addition to the members of local boards and municipal councils a number of the people employed by them. I have come to the conclusion that, unless you put these services on a suitable footing—well-paid and with a reasonable sense of security in their tenure of office—efficient administration cannot be secured, however good the chairman or the president of the local body may be. The need for improving the services of our local bodies is therefore really an urgent matter. And I want to emphasize the need for some action being taken at once to improve the existing state of affairs. The provincial cadre that has been proposed, is one means of doing it. His Excellency has indicated to you that it is far from our intention in any way to interfere with the discretion allowed to local bodies by law in regard to their establishments. And even if we want to do it, we cannot, as the powers of municipal councils will be regulated by the District Municipalities Act already passed and the powers of the local boards by the Local Boards Bill which will shortly become law. The Government cannot frame any rules inconsistent with the law or take away from local bodies the powers which the legislature has conferred on them. You may rest assured that our wish is only to frame some scheme, which, while leaving with you the fullest measure of control, would give, at any rate to the higher officers of the local bodies, better prospects and a greater security of tenure. Personally I think a substantial general increase of pay will be necessary, but even quite as important as the increase of pay is the need for creating in the minds of your officers a feeling that their tenure is not insecure. If we have a provincial service, the president or chairman could say “we do not want such a man, can you transfer him elsewhere”? But we are working in water-tight compartments. The district board engineer and his assistant engineers cannot leave the district, and the result is that, when a particular employee cannot get on with his employer, either there is continuous friction or the employer has to get rid of the man by magnifying trivial charges against him. The position of the Government is even more difficult, when these matters are brought to their notice. Even when the Government consider that the particular officer has been dealt with unduly harshly there is no use sending him back to the particular local body: after what had happened it is too much to expect that he and his local body would get on smoothly. Nor can we send him to the service of another local body because we have no powers to do so. This evil should be abated by some arrangement

by which a particular man may be transferred from the service of a particular local body, if at any time the local body thinks his stay is detrimental to the public interest. It may happen that the man the head of a local body and servant of that body may disagree even though both of them are good. Under such circumstances it should be of advantage to have some system by which the two men may be separated with mutual advantage. I want you particularly to understand that I do not wish to force my ideas on you or to restrict your powers. All I want is to avoid the friction and inconvenience that now undoubtedly exist. Of course there is another point for you to decide, how far you should go in the direction of provincializing any service? You cannot for instance provincialize a whole service beginning from the district board engineer and ending with the lascars. The lower down you go the greater the latitude for the local body in matters both of appointment and of punishment. An incremental scale of pay will solve many difficulties. The moment a man's work becomes bad, his increment can be stopped. If we find that a district board engineer cannot get on in three or four places, our hands are strengthened, and we would be in a position to dispense with his services.

In regard to co-ordinating the activities of local boards and municipal councils you are all aware what endless discussions we get at times about the division of the toll revenue. If a local board and a municipal council disagree and do not come to a satisfactory settlement as to the division of the proceeds of a common gate, another toll-gate will be opened some 8 miles off an existing one, with the result that the cartman has to pay two tolls because these two sets of gentlemen cannot agree! The Government have very little power to interfere in such matters. All we can do is to advise—and to advise vehemently if need be—but if a local body would not follow the advice, we can do nothing further.

Similarly about the expenditure on hospitals: some local boards contribute very reasonably to the maintenance of municipal hospitals while others decline to do so. This question also will have to be considered by you carefully. You have to devise some system by which such disputes could be quickly and finally settled.

Another question is about the technical assistance rendered by the Government. It is a difficult question. I hope my friend Mr. Hutton will bear me out when I say that technical assistance in regard to pumps, filters and similar things is rendered for the reason that our local bodies have no qualified men in charge of them but they not infrequently

come into collision with our technical officers. I want you to look into that question carefully and devise some system by which large works may be kept going efficiently.

The question of the standardization of the salaries of municipal fund and local fund employees is another matter that you have to deal with. The pay now offered to such employees is very low in a large number of places and I would earnestly advise you to look into the matter most closely. There is no use in saying that we are poor people and we cannot afford to pay adequate salaries. If you local bodies say you are poor, you must not forget that the other man—your employee—is also in the same position and he *must* be given a living wage. You need not standardize all services but the pay of the more important classes of officers like engineers may be standardized.

Another question is about the standardization of licence fees. My acquaintance with licence fees is very feeble and I do not propose to offer any advice, but it does occur to me—after a perusal of pages 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of the notes—that there exists a large amount of variation in the levy of licence fees. Is it not desirable that these variations should be minimised as much as is practicable?

In regard to a loan policy, it is a matter that I have been pressing upon the attention of every local body I have met. It is wrong in principle that a work like that of bridging a river—whose benefit to the public will last for 30 or 40 years—should be a burden on the tax-payers of two or three years only. My friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao should be of great help in connexion with this subject.

Then in regard to costings accounts, productive investments and civic survey, I shall not say anything now. The notes placed in your hands indicate what questions you have to consider in relation to them.

We propose that the Conference should now break up into a number of committees who will sit and deal with these questions. The distribution list of committees has been placed in the hands of all of you and I hope you will be so good as to accept the distribution. These committees will start work at once. After finishing their labours, they will present their reports. We shall again meet in full Conference on Wednesday and take the reports into consideration. It is open to any member then to discuss any subject. I would beg of you provisionally to accept this arrangement. It is intended to facilitate your task.

The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu in proposing a vote of thanks to His Excellency spoke highly

of the liberal measures adopted for the development of local self-government during His Excellency's regime.

The proposition was seconded by the Hon'ble Mr. A. T. G. M. Ahmad Tambi Marakkayar and supported by Mr. Kotilingam and the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar and carried.

The Mysore representatives M.R.Ry. H. Rangaswami Ayyangar, Avargal and Muhammad Oosman Khan Sahib Bahadur and the Hyderabad representative Ghulam S. Ahmad Khan Sahib Bahadur thanked His Excellency heartily for giving them an opportunity of watching the deliberations of this Conference and thereby enabling them to go back to their States with improved knowledge.

The Hon'ble Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar then proposed that the balance of work might be left in the hands of the Chief Secretary, the Hon'ble Mr. Graham: and added that Mr. Richards and Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar would give such help to the members as they wanted.

His Excellency said that in the early morning he doubted whether he would be able to be present at that function at all owing to his state of health and that he thanked the members of the Conference for the generous terms in which the members had referred to him. He then added that before his term of office in this Presidency expired a great deal more would be achieved in regard to giving responsibility and liberty to all local bodies and that he wanted the Conference to realize to the full that in matters relating to local self-government, he owed a deep debt of gratitude to his Honourable Colleague Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar, to whom the credit belonged for all the progress and success that had been achieved in that direction during His Excellency's administration.

In reply to what the Mysore and Hyderabad representatives had said His Excellency hoped that the policy of co-operation and help between this Government and the two States—of which their presence here was evidence—would always continue.

His Excellency then read a letter from Mr. Gray, Secretary to the Health and Welfare Association, inviting the members of the Conference to a tea party on the following day at Victoria Gardens.

A group photo was then taken.

Then the Hon'ble Mr. R. A. Graham, Chief Secretary to Government, presiding, continued the Conference and the time for the sitting of the various committees was decided upon.

SUBJECT I.

PROVINCIAL CADRES FOR THE SERVICE OF LOCAL BODIES.

(1)

Secretariat Note.

A. It is difficult to recruit health officers under present conditions. Only one municipality in the Presidency has a qualified man, though 15 posts have been sanctioned. The new District Municipalities Act contemplates the compulsory appointment of health officer to every municipality with an ordinary income of Rs. 1,00,000 or more. Of these in 1918-19 there were 20.

On the other hand, between 1914-20 only two students passed the degree which qualifies for a first-class health officer, and only ten passed the second-class health officers' test. Of the ten, six were from Bengal. No candidates have appeared for either test during the past ten years. What is the cause of this failure in men? Is employment under local bodies unpopular? If so, why?

What can be done to make the career of health officer attractive?

Is the pay sufficient? If not, what should it be?

Is the uncertainty of tenure a deterrent factor? If so, how can it be remedied? Should the English system be followed? (See extract from the Graham Committee's Report below.)

Would the formation of a provincial cadre of health officers save the situation? If not, what alternative have local bodies to offer? How do they propose to induce men to qualify and to stimulate recruitment?

B. The sanitary inspectors are asking for the provincialization of their service. How should their demands be met? What can be done to allay the discontent which they express? What proposals have local bodies to put forward to render the career of a sanitary inspector attractive, and to induce men to qualify themselves for this responsible work?

C. What objections have local bodies to provincial cadres of medical officers? What complaints have they regarding the existing cadres of assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons? Can these objections be met by the Government; if so, how? What control should Government exercise

over the posting of such officers, and to what extent should control be delegated to local bodies? Is a provincial cadre of women medical officers needed? How can the paucity of lady doctors in public employ be made good?

D. Is recruitment of secondary schoolmasters satisfactory? Is their service capable of improvement? If so, in what direction? Can any guarantee of re-employment be given to those who are compelled to relinquish their posts under any particular local body?

E. Do the conditions of service of local fund engineers and local fund overseers require improvement? If so, in what direction? Is the service sufficiently attractive? Is the type of assistant engineer recruited competent to take district charge when vacancies arise? Is there any difficulty in recruiting qualified overseers? How is the request for a provincialized cadre to be met?

Extract from the Graham Committee Report—Paragraph 8.—Even in England it has been found that, in order that the best results may be obtained, some measures must be taken to protect the higher officials and to lessen their dependence on their councils, and to make them in a sense the agents of the central authority.

* * * *

“A county medical officer of health cannot be removed from office without the approval of the Local Government Board; nor can the medical officer or inspector of nuisances in the employ of any other local authority, if any part of his salary is paid out of money voted by Parliament; and the promotion of security of tenure is one of the objects with which, in all urban and rural districts and some boroughs, one-half of the salary of these offices is paid from funds supplied from the security of tenure for the surveyors employed by local authorities under the Ways and Communications Bill now before Parliament, and it may be said that the tendency is to secure the same privilege for all officers who have responsible duties to perform; and for the purpose of still further improving their position, the introduction of superannuation schemes towards which the State will contribute, is under discussion. It stands to reason that insecurity will tend to prevent the best men entering the employment of local bodies or giving them their best services; and we are of opinion that under the new conditions which will prevail in India any fresh legislation on local self-government should provide specifically for control over

the appointment, removal and salaries of the principal officials of the local bodies. If necessary, this control may be based on the payment by Government of a part of their salaries in view of the probability that many of them may be required to undertake work for Government.”

(2)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE No. I—PROVINCIAL CADRES FOR THE SERVICE OF LOCAL BODIES.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

1. The Hon'ble Mr. R. A. Graham (Chairman).
2. Mr. W. Hutton.
3. The Hon'ble Major-General G. G. Giffard.
4. Lt.-Col. E. L. Perry.
5. The Hon'ble Mr. R. Littlehales.
6. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai Avargal.
7. The Hon'ble Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
8. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur A. Subbararayalu Reddi Garu.
9. The Hon'ble Mr. P. Siva Rao.
10. M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur M. Venkataraghavalu Reddi Garu.
11. „ T. V. Ranga Achariyar Avargal.
12. „ T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar Avargal.
13. „ Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Achariyar Avargal.
14. „ Diwan Bahadur D. Seshagiri Rao Pantulu Garu.
15. „ B. Mahabala Hegde Avargal.
16. The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Haji Abd-ul-lah Haji Qasim Sahib Bahadur.
17. The Hon'ble Mr. V. Madhava Raja.
18. M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib S. Tirumalai Ayyangar Avargal.
19. „ M. G. Parthasarathi Mudaliyar Avargal.
20. Mr. H. M. Hood.
21. M.R.Ry. G. Kameswara Rao Avargal.
22. „ P. C. N. Ethirajulu Nayudu Garu.
23. „ N. Ramaswami Ayya Garu.
24. „ K. Kuppuswami Ayyar Avargal.
25. „ Rai Sahib K. Srinivasa Ayyangar Avargal.
26. „ H. Lakshmana Rao Avargal.