

Educational (191³) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 320

DATED 18-4-1913 .

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council Recording papers connected with the question asked by the Hon'ble Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu at the meeting of the — held on the 2nd April 1913 regarding the grants to local bodies for ^{the construction of} elementary school buildings in 1910-11, 1911-12 and in 1912-13.

Educel no 977 *ML*
22-3-13

Legislative Department.

2

The Hon'ble Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu

Educational Department.

52. Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the distribution among the district boards and municipalities of the ~~xxxxxx~~ grant for the construction of buildings for elementary schools in 1910-11, 1911-12 and in 1912-13?

3

Educational Dept.

No grants were paid in 1910-11 either to district boards or municipalities for the construction of elementary school buildings. In the year 1911-12 a sum of Rs 1,25,000 was distributed among ~~the~~ district boards^{only}, but during the current year grants were made both to municipalities and district boards for the construction of buildings for elementary schools. The grants paid to municipalities during the current year amount to Rs 2,84,200 (a sum of Rs 80,500 was sanctioned in G.O. no. 608 Edl & 9-7-12 and a further sum of Rs 2,03,700 in G.O. no 165 Edl & 20th Feb 1913) the grants paid to district boards aggregate Rs 4,25,730 (a sum of Rs 2,54,500 was sanctioned in G.O. no. 660 Edl & 20-7-12 — vide Columns VI & VII of the statement on page 3 of the order — and Rs 1,71,230 in G.O. no. 165 Edl & 20-2-1913)

2. A statement showing the distributions of these grants among the district boards and municipalities during 1911-12 & 1912-13 is appended. If approved it may be printed and placed on the Council's table.

^{7/11}
27-3-13 All the ~~paid~~ ^{for} referred to above were placed on R.T.; but in the case of G.O. no 660. Edl & 20-7-12 only the order was so treated. The latter did not give the separate figures for buildings & maintenance of schools. There is therefore the necessity

G.O. no. 705 Edl M
6-10-11

I

L

H

L

(A)

for compiling the figures, without merely
refusing the Adm. members to the orders.
The following draft answer is for approval:-

No grants were distributed to local
bodies for the construction of elementary
school buildings in 1910-11. A sketch
showing the ^{grants distributed} ~~construction made~~ in
1911-12 & 1912-13 is placed on the table.

18
27.3.13 This answer will do. Verify figures
carefully. Send duplicate answer w.o. to
Lect. The file need not go to H.E. the
Secy, the answer being so simple.

D
28.3.13

Might be
combined with
57. 8

5
Draft Answer.

52. No grants were distributed for the construction of elementary school buildings in 1910-11. A statement is laid on the table showing the distribution of subsidies for this purpose in 1911-12 and 1912-13.

6

Statement showing the distribution among the district boards and municipalities of the grants paid for the construction of elementary school-buildings in 1911-12 & 1912-13, referred to in Annexure
Annexure No 52

	Name of District board	Year	Year	b
		1911-12	1912-13	
		Rs.	Rs.	
1.	Anantapur	6,000 x	24,300 ✓	
2.	Arcot, North.	5,800 x	10,000 ✓	
3.	Arcot, South	4,500 x	24,700 ✓	
4.	Bellary	6,000 x	21,000 ✓	
5.	Canara, South.	3,100 x	18,730 ✓	
6.	Chingleput	6,000 x	23,150 ✓	
7.	Chittoor.	3,600 x	18,500 ✓	
8.	Coimbatore	4,500 x	16,400 ✓	
9.	Cuddapah	6,000 x	16,450 ✓	
10.	Ganjam	6,000 x	20,000 ✓	
11.	Godavari	6,000 x	21,050 ✓	
12.	Guntur	6,000 x	20,550 ✓	
13.	Kistna	6,000 x	24,200 ✓	
14.	Koraput.	2,000 x	3,500 ✓	
15.	Kurnool	6,800 x	9,000 ✓	
16.	Madura	4,000 x	10,800 ✓	
17.	Malabar	6,000 x	9,700 ✓	
18.	Nellore	6,000 x	20,000 ✓	
19.	Nilgiris, The.		6,000 ✓	
20.	Ramnad	6,000 x	18,000 ✓	
21.	Salem	5,400 x	15,400 ✓	
22.	Tanjore	6,000 x	24,200 ✓	
23.	Tinnevely	3,000 x	6,000 ✓	
24.	Tiruchinopoly	6,300 x	24,100 ✓	
25.	Vizagapatam	4,000 x	20,000 ✓	
	Total Rs.	1,25,000	4,25,730	

985,25.4 000,25.1 1000

6
Multa
(No grants in 1911-12)

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

(Municipal)

Districts.	Serial number	Name of Municipality.	1912-13		
Anantapur ..	1	Anantapur ..	Rs 6,800	X	
	2	Gudiyattam ..	5,500	X	
	3	Tirupattur ..	..		
Arcot, North ..	3	Tiruvannamalai ..	2,000	X	
	4	Vaniyambadi ..	4,150	X	
	5	Vellore ..	5,500	X	
	6	Walajapet ..	7,000	X	
Arcot, South ..	7	Chidambaram ..	6,000	X	
	8	Cuddalore ..	2,500	X	
Bellary ..	10	Adoni ..	..		
	9	Bellary ..	5,000	X	
Canara, South ..	10	Mangalore ..	5,100	X	
Chingleput ..	11	Chingleput ..	2,500	X	
	12	Conjeveram ..	6,000	X	
Chittoor ..	13	Tirupati ..	4,000	X	
Coimbatore ..	14	Coimbatore ..	10,000	X	
	15	Erode ..	4,000	X	
Cuddapah ..	16	Cuddapah ..	3,000	X	
	17	Berhampur ..	4,000	X	
Ganjam ..	18	Chicacole ..	5,000	X	
	19	Parlakimedi ..	3,000	X	
Godavari ..	20	Cocanada ..	8,000	X	
	21	Rajahmundry ..	11,000	X	
	22	Guntur ..	5,000	X	
Guntur ..	23	Ongole ..	3,000	X	
	24	Tenali ..	7,250	X	
	25	Bezwada ..	8,000	X	
Kistna ..	26	Ellore ..	..		
	27	Masulipatam ..	2,000	X	
	28	..	3		

Districts.	Serial number.	Name of Municipality.	1912-13	
			Rs	
Madura	2982	Dindigul ..	5,200	X
	330	Kodaikānal ..	..	
	341	Madura ..	15,000	X
	342	Palni ..	4,200	X
	36	Periyakulam ..	..	
Malabar	343	Calicut ..	9,600	X
	344	Cannanore ..	2,000	X
	345	Cochin ..	6,000	X
	3640	Palghat ..	2,600	X
	3741	Tellicherry ..	2,000	X
Nellore	3842	Nellore ..	2,000	X
Nilgiris	42	Cannoor ..	"	
	44	Ootacamund ..	"	
Rámnád	3945	Srivilliputtūr ..	2,500	X
Salem ..	40	Salem ..	17,000	X
Tanjore	41	Kumbakonam ..	25,000	X
	42	Mannārgudi ..	2,000	X
	43	Māvavaram ..	2,000	X
	4450	Negapatam ..	6,000	X
	455	Tanjore ..	7,500	X
Tinnevely	4652	Palamecottah ..	3,300	X
	4753	Tinnevely ..	2,850	X
	4854	Tuticorin ..	2,000	X
	4955	Karūr ..	7,000	X
Trichinopoly	56	Srirangam ..	..	
	50	Trichinopoly ..	6,650	X
	51	Anakāpalle ..	2,000	X
Vizagapatam	52	Bimlipatam ..	3,500	X
	5357	Vizagapatam ..	..	
	5458	Vizianagram ..	4,000	X
Total			2,84,200	

7A
27-3-13 Ca

The question and answer as finally approved stand as follows:-

Question 51. Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the distribution among the district boards and municipalities of the grant for the construction of buildings for elementary schools in 1910-11, 1911-12 and in 1912-13?

grants to local bodies for elementary school buildings.

Answer 51--

No grants were distributed for the construction of elementary school buildings in 1910-11. A statement † is laid on the table showing the distribution of subsidies for this purpose in 1911-12 and 1912-13.

The papers may be recorded. The draft below is for approval.

72/12-4-13 CA 12-4-13

17-4-13

APPENDIX III.

[Vide Answer to Question No. 51 asked by the Hon'ble Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd April 1913, page 15 *supra*.]

Statement showing the distribution among the district boards and municipalities of the grants paid for the construction of elementary school buildings in 1911-12 and 1912-13.

Name of district board.	Year	
	1911-12.	1912-13.
	RS.	RS.
1. Anantapur	6,000	24,300
2. Arcot, North	5,800	10,000
3. Arcot, South	4,500	24,700
4. Bellary	6,000	21,000
5. Canara, South	3,100	18,730
6. Chingleput	6,000	23,150
7. Chittoor	3,600	18,500
8. Coimbatore	4,500	16,400
9. Cuddapah	6,000	16,450
10. Ganjam	6,000	20,000
11. Godavari	6,000	21,050
12. Guntur	6,000	20,550
13. Kistna	6,000	24,200
14. Koraput	2,000	3,500
15. Kurnool	6,500	9,000
16. Madura	4,000	10,800
17. Malabar	6,000	9,700
18. Nellore	6,000	20,000
19. Nilgiris, The	..	6,000
20. Ramnad	6,000	18,000
21. Salem	5,400	15,400
22. Tanjore	6,000	24,200
23. Tinnevely	3,000	6,000
24. Trichinopoly	6,300	24,100
25. Vizagapatam	4,000	20,000
Total ..	1,25,000	4,25,730

MUNICIPALITIES.

(No grants in 1911-12.)

Name of municipality.		1912-13.	Name of municipality.		1912-13.
		RS.			RS.
1.	Anantapur	6,800	30.	Kodaikānal	
2.	Gudiyattam	5,500	31.	Madura	15,000
3.	Tiruvannamalai	2,000	32.	Palni	4,200
4.	Vāniyambādi	4,150	33.	Calicut	9,600
5.	Vellore	5,500	34.	Cannanore	2,000
6.	Walajapet	7,000	35.	Cochin	6,000
7.	Chidambaram	6,000	36.	Palghat	2,600
8.	Cuddalore	2,500	37.	Tellicherry	2,000
9.	Bellary	5,000	38.	Nellore	2,000
10.	Mangalore	5,100	39.	Srivilliputtūr	2,500
11.	Chingleput	2,500	40.	Salem	17,000
12.	Conjeeveram	6,000	41.	Kumbakōnam	25,000
13.	Tirupati	4,000	42.	Mannārgudi	2,000
14.	Coimbatore	10,000	43.	Māyavaram	2,000
15.	Erode	4,000	44.	Negapatam	6,000
16.	Cuddapah	3,000	45.	Tanjore	7,500
17.	Berhampur	4,000	46.	Palamcottah	3,300
18.	Chicacole	5,000	47.	Tinnevelly	2,850
19.	Parlakimedi	3,000	48.	Tuticorin	2,000
20.	Cocanada	8,000	49.	Karur	7,000
21.	Rajahmundry	11,000	50.	Trichinopoly	6,650
22.	Guntūr	5,000	51.	Anakapalle	2,000
23.	Ongole	3,000	52.	Bimlipatam	3,500
24.	Tenali	7,250	53.	Vizagapatam	
25.	Bezwada	8,000	54.	Vizianagram	4,000
26.	Masulipatam	2,000			
27.	Kurnool	3,000			
28.	Nandyal	4,000			
29.	Dindigul	5,200			
				Total	2,84,200

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide Answer to Question No. 68 asked by the Hon'ble Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd April 1913, page 19 *supra*.]

Report of Nellore Collector on the Pambaleru anicut.

Letter—from M.R.Ry. R. RAMACHANDRA RAO Avargal, Diwan Bahadur,
Collector of Nellore.

To—the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Dated—the 16th February 1913.

No.—Ref. 162-G.B./Cor.

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 294 B-13-1, dated 14th February 1913, received by me to-day I have the honour to enclose copy of a report, dated 11th November 1904, by the Executive Engineer, containing a history of the Pambaleru ancient irrigation. The irrigation channel from the ancient having become much higher than the bed of the stream, the erection of a pumping installation at the head of the channel was proposed. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his No. 4224, dated 12th December 1904, pronounced the proposal as "not a promising one." Thereupon the correspondence was recorded by the Board of Revenue in Proceedings No. 6974, Mis., dated 23rd December 1904 (Settlement).

2. Early in 1912, certain ryots of Gundur and Tippaguntapalam, an adjoining village, presented a petition praying that the old ancient may be restored. The irrigation tank in the latter village was being fed from the stream; and the ryots believe that if the channel is restored, the area under the tank will be about 300 acres. The matter was referred to the Executive Engineer who inspected the site and was convinced that "no workable scheme can be made out." A copy of his letter No. 1393 M., dated 2nd October 1912, is enclosed. Since then I had a talk with the Public Works Department sub-divisional officer, Gundur division, and he made me understand that some arrangements about this ancient were being proposed. His proposals however have to be scrutinized.

3. I beg to suggest the following answers to the questions of the Honourable Member :—

- (a) The answer is in the affirmative.
(b) The answer is in the affirmative.

(c) The area involved is 1,168 acres assessed at Rs. 4,973 converted to dry at Rs. 1,413. Of these 340 acres assessed at Rs. 1,420 and bearing a dry assessment of Rs. 409 remained unoccupied. These figures are based upon the original survey and settlement. The present assessment on the entire wet ayacut would be Rs. 5,905 (wet) and Rs. 1,590 (dry).

- (e) The Engineering Department has pronounced against the remunerative restoration of the works, but the matter is under the consideration of the Collector and the Executive Engineer.

ENCLOSURES.

(i)

Report on a pumping installation proposed to be erected at Gudur.

There are 1,172 acres of *padava* or low lands in Gundur which were cultivated wet more than 30 years ago by a channel taking off from the Pambaleru or Venkatagiri river above the bridge on the trunk road. This channel is known as the Pambaleru irrigation channel and is still borne on the Imperial list as No. 178. The channel besides supplying water to this extent supplies the Tippaguntapalem tank, Imperial No. 179, with an *ayak* of 212 acres.

2. The channel bed is higher than that of the river from which it takes, and it was usual for the ryots to put up a *korambu* every year to raise the water. More than 30 years ago, the stream began to scour out so much both above and below the off-take of the channel that the villagers found it difficult to maintain the *korambu*. The Public Works Department then stepped in to help the ryots. Small piers were constructed on the up-stream side of the trunk-road bridge across the Pambaluru river, and planks were provided to be put in the grooves of the piers to raise water to the channel. The shutters were to be put in after the floods subsided and removed after the irrigation season. But in fact the ryots began to put the shutters when there were slight freshes in the river and neglected to remove them when there were high floods. There were heavy floods when the shutters were in, but the bridge was fortunately saved by the river breaching the road by its side making a way for itself. The Local Fund Department then objected to shutters being put to the road bridge, and the piers were consequently demolished. The irrigation under the channel began to decline from that date, and at present

READ AGAIN G.O. No., dated 191 ..

” ” ” ” ” ” 191

C. No. 977, From the Leg. Repl., No., dated 22-3- 1913

95 99 9 99 99 9 99 9 99 191

191

ORDER

mis

No. 32084, dated 18 4. 1913

Recorded

$$\frac{7/9}{12 \cdot 4 \cdot 13} \quad \frac{\alpha}{13 \cdot 4 \cdot 17}$$

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

191

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 191

. DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DETO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

V.B.—

A Copy in full.