

Home (1918) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 599.

DATED 7-5-1918

[Despatch Abstract.]

Allowance.

Sanctioning the grant of a personal allowance of Rs.50 per mensem to Mrs.M.A.Srinivasa and declining to grant any allowance to Miss T.Lazarus and Miss M.C.Chatterton.

Received 191 . Registered 13 3 191 .

Subject.

Recommending the grant of personal allowances to
certain female officers of the Educational Department.

ENCLOSURES	
No.	Current No. 1678/1918
Spare copies	Station Madras, Dated the 20 th FEBRUARY 1918.

From (Name) The Hon. Mr. J. H. Stone, M.A., C.I.E., F.R.H.S.,
(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
H O M E Department.
(EDUCATION)
Sir, (Through the Accountant - General).

I have the honour to address Government regarding
the grant of personal allowances to certain deserving female
officers of this department.

(1) The case of Miss C. M. Lynch, Inspector of
Girls' Schools, Central Circle, seems to me to deserve first con-
sideration. She entered service as Inspector in June 1905 and
as 1st Inspector is now drawing a pay of Rs. 520/- in a grade
of Rs. 500-20-600 and if she retires at her 55th year she will
then have been drawing Rs. 600/- for two years only. In 1916 she
submitted a memorial to His Excellency the Governor-in-Council,
pointing out the inadequacy of her pay and asking for a

allowance of Rs. 100/- per mensem. I considered that she was entitled to some addition to her pay and accordingly in my endorsement N.R.O. No. 2182 of 1916, dated 10th May 1916 I recommended the immediate grant to her of a special personal allowance of Rs. 50/- per mensem to be increased to Rs. 100/- per mensem on Mrs. Rhenius' retirement, pointing out at the same time that the charge could be met from the lump sum which the Government of India allowed this Government for payment of personal allowances to the male members of the Indian Educational Service, but this recommendation which had the support of the local Government was not accepted by the Government of India (vide G.O. No. 1254, Home (Education), dated 27th November 1916). As stated in my endorsement N.R.O. No. 2182 of 1916, dated 10th May 1916, the criterion of eligibility to receive personal allowance is incapacity to receive benefit under any improvement in the service to be made in consequence of the recommendations of the Public Services Commission and it is not proposed to consider immediately the recommendations of the above Commission so far as they relate to the female officers, I beg to request that the orders passed in Miss Lynch's case may be reconsidered and that she may be granted a personal allowance of Rs. 50/- per mensem as a special case. It may perhaps be said that the comparative shortness of her service is against the grant to her of a personal allowance, but this I think is balanced by the facts that she was 36 years old when she entered service and that it is admitted that the rates of pay for inspectresses are in modern conditions inadequate.

(2) I beg to submit herewith a memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor by Mrs. M.A. Shrinivasa asking for the grant to her of a personal allowance of Rs. 100/- per mensem. Mrs. Shrinivasa joined service in July 1902 and is now nearly 51 years old. As stated in her memorial she has acted on several occasions as inspectress in all the three circles, her last act of appointment in the northern circle in which she was drawing a

salary of Rs. 300/- per mensem having lasted continuously for a period of two years and 9 months. As First Assistant Inspectress, Madras Girls' Range, which post she permanently holds and to which she should revert in the ordinary course on the expiry of her present privilege leave she is entitled to a pay of Rs. 200/- per mensem and a carriage allowance of Rs. 30/- per mensem, while Misses McLeod and Prager who are her juniors in service are better paid, while Miss Corrie Gordon who entered service only on 16th March 1916 and has no academic qualification has just been confirmed on Rs. 250/- exclusive of a carriage allowance of Rs. 30/- per mensem and holds thus an equal status to that of Mrs. Shrinivasa. Further Mrs. Shrinivasa starting work as a Sub Assistant Inspectress on Rs. 120/- sixteen years ago has done hard service in various capacities and I think that her unblemished service, character and educational qualifications entitle her to a much higher pay than Rs. 250/-. Certainly the drop from a salary of Rs. 300/- to Rs. 200/- is rather sudden and as there is no prospect of any improvement in her position before she retires on attaining her 55th year about four years hence I strongly recommend that she be granted a personal allowance of at least Rs. 50/- per mensem.

(3) The cases of Miss T. Lazarus, Sub Assistant Inspectress, South Arcot-Tanjore Girls' Range and Acting Assistant Inspectress of Schools, Madras Girls' Range and of Miss M.C. Chatterton, permanent Headmistress of the Training Section and sub pro tem Kindergarten Mistress of the Government Secondary and Training School for Mistresses, Triplicane, are also deserving of special consideration. The former has been in the department for the last 9 years and has to revert from the acting Assistant Inspectress's post on Rs. 200/- plus 30 carriage allowance to a Sub Assistant Inspectress's post on Rs. 175/- per mensem. Her juniors in the Presidency Training School, viz., Misses Bartlett and St. Lazarus and Parakuttl Ammal are all in receipt of a special salary of Rs.

less than Rs. 150/- per mensem though the first two hold their appointments temporarily. If the first class in the cadre of female Sub Assistants had carried the same pay (Rs. 200/-) as the corresponding class among male Sub Assistants she would have already been in receipt of a salary of Rs. 200/- per mensem. I beg therefore to recommend that she be given a personal allowance of Rs. 25/- per mensem.

(4) Miss Chatterton has put in nearly 20 years service and is permanently in a grade of Rs. 150-5-175 drawing Rs. 155/- and is sub pro tem on Rs. 150-10-200 as Kindergarten Mistress in the Triplicane School. She is a domiciled European with English qualifications possessing a Teacher's Diploma of the Cambridge University and deserves special treatment. Her work has been uniformly satisfactory and she is very much discontented owing to the inadequacy of her salary and there being no near prospect of her being made either as an Assistant Inspector or the Superintendent of a complete secondary school on a salary of Rs. 200/- per mensem. She has represented her case more than once to His Excellency the Governor who seems to have given a sympathetic consideration to it. I recommend therefore that until she is promoted to a post on Rs. 200/- either in the scholastic or in the inspection branch she may be allowed to draw the maximum salary of her sub pro tem post, viz., Rs. 200/-. I may further remark that it is in the public interest that she should remain in the Triplicane School.

2. In this connection I beg to point out that, while the members of the Indian Educational Service have been allotted five personal allowances of Rs. 100/- each per mensem and those of the Provincial Educational Service an allowance of Rs. 65/- each per mensem, no such temporary relief has been afforded hitherto to the female members of the Educational Service. I hardly think that this invidious distinction should be perpetuated.

3. The allowances if granted should be subject to the

7th February 1918.

4. I beg to request that sanction allowances as proposed above may have effect from 1st Jan. 1918 in the cases of Misses Lynch and Chatterton, from the 20th Jan. 1918, the date of her relief from the Northern Circle, in the case of Mrs. Shrinivasa and from the date of relief from the Madras Girls' Range in the case of Miss Lazarus.

5. The extra cost amounting to Rs. 170/- per mensem can be met from the lump provision made for additional staffs in Government Girls' Schools proposed in my letter G. No. 10281 of 1917 dated 16th December 1917.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

G. V. Srinivasa
For Director of Public Instruction

Port St. George, the 12th March 1918.

No. G.A. 29- 2176

F O R W A R D E D.

2. The sanction of the Government of India is required for the grant of the personal allowance proposed for Miss C.M. [illegible]. The grant of the personal allowances proposed for Mrs. A. Shrinivasa and Miss T. Lazarus is within the financial powers of the Local Government, but in this connection attention is respectfully invited to the principles laid down by the Government of India in para 2 of their Finance Department Circular No. 358 E.A. dated 31st August 1912 to be followed in the grant of these allowances. Under the principles therein associated, Mrs. Shrinivasa and Miss T. Lazarus would not seem to be eligible for a personal allowance, as they were promoted to their present appointments of First Assistant Inspectress and Assistant Inspectress (First Grade) in June 1917 and January 1918 respectively. There is no audit objection to the grant of these allowances in advance of the due date to Miss M.C. Chatterton.

pages 459 to 465
27/9/12

[Signature]
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL.

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Home (Education) Department.



7th February 1918.

To

His Excellency

The Right Honorable John, Baron of Pentland of Lyth,

P.C.C.C.I.F.,

Governor of Madras:

The earnest and humble memorial of Mrs. H.A. Shree-nivassa, Assistant Inspectress of Schools, Madras Girls' Range, (on leave) hereby sheweth

That Your Memorialist has been in the Educational Department since July 1902, when she was appointed Sub-Assistant Inspectress, on Rs.125/- per mensem. In 1907 she was appointed acting Assistant Inspectress and confirmed the following year when there was a vacancy. In 1910 she acted as Inspectress, Southern Circle, for 4 months; in 1911 to 1912, as Inspectress, Northern Circle for 10 months; in 1915, as Inspectress, Central Circle, for about 7 months, and again as Inspectress, N.C., from April 1915 to January 1918. The total period during which she has acted as Inspectress in the three Circles of the Presidency is about 4 years. She is the only woman in the Department who has had a working knowledge as Inspectress of the three Circles and she is the only woman Graduate who has ever acted as Inspectress in this Presidency. She therefore cherished the hope that she would be confirmed as the first Indian Inspectress of Schools, or failing which that she would be permitted

1908

appointment in the Educational Department in 1902, Mr. to continue to act as Inspectress, till the date of her retirement which will take place within the next five years. But unfortunately for her an English woman has been appointed Inspectress of the Circle in which Your Memorialist had been acting for the past two years and nine months.

Your Memorialist begs to represent that nowhere as in this Circle is a knowledge of the vernacular so essential for the efficient conduct of the work of the Department, for out of a total of 566 Schools in the Circle, there are but two Secondary Schools; all the rest are only Elementary ones, for which a knowledge of two or more vernaculars, is indispensable.

Your Memorialist begs to be pardoned for stating at some length certain facts in her educational career, which she begs to bring forward to show to Your Excellency the difficulties she has undergone to gain the Degrees she has earned, and the low standing on which she finds herself at the end of 16 years' service:

At the time of her marriage Your Memorialist had completed the F.A. examination of the Madras University, and a year's course in the Junior B.A. class of the Madras Christian College. In 1890, after her marriage, she appeared for, and passed, the Language Branch of the B.A., and after the death of her husband, Mr. Balu Shreenivassa, Barrister-at-Law, in 1898, she joined the Presidency College, and completed the B.A. examination in 1901, joined the Saidapet Training College and took her L.T., in 1902, all at her own cost with the exception of a stipend in the latter college and attending at the same time to her very young child of 2 or 3. When she applied for an

appointment in the Educational Department in 1902, Mr. Stuart, the then Director of Public Instruction, who was acquainted with some of the members of her husband's family, was good enough to take into consideration the following facts, which his sympathetic interest drew from her :- That she was the wife of one who had spent about 7 years in England, and held an honoured position as the leading lawyer of the Tinnevely Bar, as well as Chairman of the Municipality, Palamcottah; that she had been in Society, had never been accustomed to going about as ordinary Indian Christian women do, that her monthly expenditure, at the time of application for an appointment, was at least twice as much as the starting pay of a Sub. Assistant Inspectress, etc. Considering all this, he was good enough to appoint her on a salary of Rs.125/- per mensem. This was the first occasion on which a non-European woman was ever appointed in the Educational Department, on a salary of Rs. 125/- others having started on Rs.75/- or less. Your Memorialist was the first Indian woman Graduate appointed to the Inspectorate as Sub.Assistant. In 1908 she was confirmed as Assistant Inspectress and in June last when Miss Patterson, an Anglo-Indian was confirmed as Third Inspectress, Your Memorialist was confirmed as Senior Assistant Inspectress, on Rs.250/-

That your Memorialist's mode of living is that of an Englishwoman. Her husband's father, a Brahman convert of the S.P.C., was Sub.Judge of Madura; her father, a Brahman convert, was a missionary of the London Missionary Society; her brother, an Edinburgh M.B.,C.M., and a graduate of the Madras University, is Civil Surgeon of Gaya, and commands a lucrative practice in that important

town; her sister is the wife of the lately retired Principal of the C.B.M. High School, Vizagapatam; while her husband's sister is the wife of a well known Barrister-at-Law, in Coimbatore. Your Memorialist has a 8 young daughter, who appears for the Intermediate examination of the Madras University next March. Her education is yet incomplete, and Your Memorialist is desirous to send her to England to go through a Medical or Arts course. If at the termination of Your Memorialist's privilege leave she has to revert to her permanent appointment, she will draw only Rs.250/-, which will be Rs.100/- less than what she had been drawing as acting Inspectress. On this sum it will be impossible for her to live in a costly place like Madras, with a high house-rent to pay.

Your Memorialist begs to represent that the acting Superintendent of the Presidency Training School for Mistresses, Egmore, a trained Kindergarten Mistress, with about 10 years' service, but with no University qualifications, is drawing a salary of Rs.430/- per mensem, including a house rent of Rs.80/- per mensem. Miss Prager a trained graduate, with half the service of Your Memorialist, is drawing a salary of Rs.290/- per mensem, as Superintendent of the Secondary Training School for Mistresses, Triplicane. Your Memorialist is a University graduate and a trained teacher and just because she is an Indian, she has been shut out of the higher ranks of the Educational Department. Your Memorialist has had an un-sullied record of not in-efficient and unfaithful work done during the past 16 years in the Department which will be evident from the records of the Office of

the Director of Public Instruction.

In conclusion, Your Memorialist respectfully requests Your Excellency to kindly take all these facts into Your Excellency's gracious consideration, and grant her as a special favour, a personal allowance of Rs.100/- per mensem, to enable her to secure a suitable house in Madras, and to live in some measure of comfort.

For which gracious act Your Excellency's humble Memorialist tends her most grateful and heartfelt thanks, and begs to remain

Your Excellency's humble servant,

M. A. S. Srinivasa

C.No. 740A from the D.P.I. C.No. 678 of 20.2.18
Subject. allowances To certain female officers of
 the Educational Department.

The D.P.I. recommends the payment of
 personal allowances to the following officers:—

Name	Designation	Amount Rs.
1. Miss C. M. Lynch	Inspector of girls' schools	50 p.
2. Mrs. M. A. Shrinivasa	Assistant do	50 "
3. Miss T. Lazarus	Sub. assistant do	25 "
4. Miss Chatterton	Kindergarten teacher Mistress, Triplicane girls' school.	Maximum salary of Rs. 150 p.m.

2. Miss Lynch's case is being dealt with
 separately and the file is now with H.E. the Governor.
 No action seems necessary here.

3. Mrs. Shrinivasa's case is clearly set out
 in para. 1(2) on pages 2 & 3 of C.F. The A.G.
 points out that under the principles enunciated by
 the Govt. of India in regard to the ^{grant} ~~payment~~ of personal
 allowances ~~she~~ ^{she does not appear} ~~and not seem~~ to be eligible
 for an allowance as she was promoted to the
 present appointment of first assistant inspector in
 June 1917 and has not yet completed five years ^(service) on
 the same pay. In support of his ~~prop~~ recommendation
 the Director states that he gives Misses McLeod and
~~Misses Gordon~~ ^{Misses Gordon} are better paid and that Mrs.
 C. Gordon who was recently appointed gets the
 same pay as Mrs. Shrinivasa.

page 6, of

page 3, of ¹⁴ 7.2.18

Name	Service	Pay
Miss McLeod	9. 4	350-10-450
Miss Gordon	8. 3	250-10-300 (250)
Mrs. C. Gordon	2. "	250
Mrs. Shrinivasa	15. 3	250

page 6 of

As observed by the A.C. the rules do not allow of any personal allowance being granted to Mrs. Shrinivasa who has not completed 5 years on the same pay. The rules are ~~now~~ observed strictly in almost all cases. Recently the Govt. for this reason declined to sanction a personal allowance to Mr. P. K. Anantavara Ayyar, Assistant Professor, Presidency College - G.O. no. 209 of 19th February 1918.

(T)

As regards the arguments advanced by the D.D. it is observed that Mrs. Medford was specially appointed from home in 1908 on a salary of Rs. 250 on account of her special qualifications in kindergarten, while Mrs. Shrinivasa was then only the 3rd Assistant Inspector drawing Rs. 200. It is submitted that in view of this fact the latter cannot be said to possess ~~any~~ ^{such} claims to be treated as senior to the former. Moreover ^(it was) the D.P.D. ^(also) recommended Mrs. Medford for confirmation in the D.E.S. as Deputy Presidency Training School for mistresses. As regards the comparison between Mrs. Shrinivasa and Mrs. Prager, it is not clear under what circumstances the latter came to draw higher pay than the former. If it be due to the fact that they are ~~in~~ in different branches viz. inspection and teaching, the inequality cannot be helped as similar inequality exists in the case of ^{promotions} male officers to the P.E.S. from the inspection and collegiate branches of the S.E. If however, Mrs. Shrinivasa is also fit for the teaching

she might have been appointed to the post now occupied by Mrs. Prager. The comparison between these two officers does not therefore seem to strengthen Mrs. Shimwasa's case. Miss Gordon has special qualifications in kindergarten & the cost of her post has been fixed at Rs. 250. There does not seem to be much force in comparing her ~~case~~ with Mrs. Shimwasa. Thus ^{long} no case appears to have been made out in the case of the allowance proposed for Mrs. Shimwasa.

3. ~~Miss~~ Miss Lazarus's presence and that she has resided from the acting appoint at Rs. 200 (with a carriage allowance of Rs. 30) to the permanent post on Rs. 175 & that her junior in the Veterinary Training School are in receipt of a special salary of not less than Rs. 150. As pointed out by the A.G., she is not entitled to a personal allowance under the rules. Moreover there is likely to be a vacancy in the post of Assistant Dispensary (at Rs. 200) owing to the probable retirement of Miss M. A. Jule who has already completed 56 years (on August 1917). ^{and Miss Lazarus's salary with the usual allowance} No allowance seems

therefore necessary in the case of Miss Lazarus. 4. Miss Chatterton's case appears to be. The A.G. also states that there is no valid objection. For orders whether she may be permitted to draw the maximum ^{pay} of her sub-postern post ~~allowance~~ until she is promoted to a post on Rs. 200.

2926
R 20 3 18
part (3) - page 3 of 4

* Name	Service	Pay
Pam Nathiammal	4 9	155
Miss S. K. Lazarus	2 8	150
Miss Barkley	2 9	150
Mrs. T. Lazarus	9 2	175

page 6 of

part (4) - p 4 of

5. Financial may also be consulted ¹³ ~~no~~.

by ^{AL}

$$\frac{25.8.18}{27.8.18}$$

 Int'l (no) ^{26.3.18}
 Leds

Financial Dept

For the H.S.



CURRENT

2926 do not

Ry. 20. 8. 18 ^{Home} ^{sub} ^{con} ²

K. 20

Submitted that no remarks are

called for in respect of Mrs. Chinnappa's case or in the case of Miss Lazarus.

The third proposal is to give ^{Miss Chatterton} the maximum pay of the subpostman post ~~but~~ she now holds until she is promoted to a post on Rs 200 p.m. The reasons advanced in support of the proposal will be found in para 1 (4) of the D.P.'s letter - p 4 ct. There is no anti objection to the proposal - para 6 ct. ~~For reasons which the proposal will be accepted in Financial. The substance~~ of giving increments in advance should be ¹⁴¹⁸ resorted to in very exceptional cases and this is not a very strong case to justify the measure in the case of Miss Chatterton.

7.4.18

Article 153 of the C. S. R says that an increment in a person of due date should not be allowed 'excepting under circumstances which would justify a personal allowance to an officer whose pay is fixed -

that is to say, seldom if ever.

Miss Chatterton is permitted
in the scale of Rs 150-5-175 and
is drawing only the first increment
in that grade. She has been pro-
moted sub-pro. ten to the grade of
150-10-200. In these circumstances
there is / submit no case for the
grant of a pension of allow: and
therefore none for the grant of
an increment in advance of
due date.

CS -

2.4.18

CS

The rules are clear against any
allowance: & for must advise
against it

LD

3.4.18

Final no 2926-1
3.4.18



Home Education Dept.

A draft order is submitted for approval

CS
4.4.18

CS
8/4/18

NK
5/4/18

15/3

[Faint handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

for no 166 (N)
11.2.18

(F)

for no 600 (S)
27.9.12



for no 166 (N)
11.2.18

(F)

for no 600 (S)
27.9.12



[Handwritten notes:]
11/2
19/4/18

CURRENT NO.	8125
FINANCIAL	

3411

169d 20.4.18

[Handwritten:] Home 1857-110
No 740A-2
20.4.18

I venture to submit the case of Mrs. Shriniva for special consideration. She is a B.A., L.T. She was appointed as Sub-Assistant Inspectress in 1902 on a salary of Rs.125 per mensem. During the last 16 years she has only been able to rise permanently to the post of 1st Assistant Inspectress on Rs.250/-, a promotion hardly commensurate with her abilities and the length of her service. She has acted off and on as Inspectress of Schools for nearly 4 years since 1910, drawing a salary of Rs.350 per mensem and the Director bears testimony to her unblemished service and hard work in various capacities. At the meeting of February last, the Honourable Rao Bahadur V.K. Ramanuja Achariyar proposed to ask a question regarding the reversion of Mrs. Shrinivasa and the appointment of Miss Alice Sergeant in her place. This question was however disallowed by His Excellency the Governor. Numerous comments have also appeared in the newspapers recently about her reversion. She is now 51 years of age and there is no chance of any amelioration in her position as no Inspectress is likely to go on long leave. I agree that under the principles enunciated by the Government of India the personal allowance cannot be sanctioned. But there is a sudden drop in her emoluments and living in Madras is costly. I recommend a house rent allowance of Rs.50 per mensem be sanctioned. The D.P.I. has made the recommendation with excellent reasons. I do not agree with the office note and my predecessor and so remit the case to Financial again. I am sorry to give Financial this trouble.

2. Re. Miss Lazarus, in view of an early chance of promotion I do not press the D.P.I.'s recommendation.

[Handwritten signature:] Furl (uo)

[Handwritten:] 19/4/18

I'm afraid
 did not visit
 on the case. R
 of Mrs. Simonson.
 Quite so; I've not then
 backed by Home.
 I will

D. P. D's letter on pages 1 & 2
in which a personal allowance of
at least Rs 50 p.m. was recom-
mended to Mrs. Shrinivasa. The
Home Secy. holds that the D.
has made the recommendation
on excellent reasons. That he has
(That there is no case for a per-
allowance which has also been
accepted by the Home Secy.

2. The Home Dept now rec-
ommends a loans rent of Rs 5
p.m. The main consideration
is that there has been a sudden
drop in her emoluments and
living in Madras is costly. It
is noted that the fact that Mrs.
Shrinivasa has had to report from
~~her absence app't~~ ^{her absence app't} carrying a salary of
Rs 350 to ~~Rs 250~~ her permanent
place on Rs 250 is by itself of
no ground for increasing her emol-
as that for almost 3 years she
drawn Rs 350 must in itself
be considered to be a matter of
good fortune,

misplaced, and in fact is
perfectly blocked. Human nature
being what it is she harbours
a grivance and it might per-
haps be politic to placate her
with the grant of an allowance.
As regards the form of the allow-
ance I think on the whole it
may be given in the form of a
personal allowance, though the
conditions attaching to the
grant of such an allowance can
not be said to have been fulfilled.

The case has some peculiar features
and it cannot be gainsaid
that ~~it~~ ^{Govt} have dealt very
liberally with other cases of
lady teachers who have threatened
to seek their fortunes elsewhere
if Govt did not raise their
pay. In the circumstances C. S.
might, perhaps, be prepared to
treat the case of Mrs. Pinivas &
specially and to support the
~~the~~ recommendation of the D^r
for the grant of a personal

Final no 3441
26428

I agree that the case of ^{21.10.} Mr. H. H. B. is exceptional & I do not think final need offer the grant of a p. a. of Rs 50 p. a. But M.H./Final shd see.

Done (from no)

26-4-18



A draft order is submitted for approval

It does not appear necessary to sanction the allowance with retrospective effect from the 26th January last as recommended by the D.O. in para 4 of his letter (page 5 of CF).

MS 30/4/18

30/4/18

4/5/18

Commented that actual for receiving etc. in this by H. H. B.

H. H. B.

H. H. B.

6.5.18

7.5.18



7/5/18

AD AGAIN G.O. No. _____, dated _____

191

" " " " " "

191

READ ALSO:-

C. Co. HOA, From the ADJ, C. No. 1678, dated 20.2.1918.

" " Inst of the Ad, LA. 29.2.1926, " 12.3. 1918.

" " " " " " 191

ORDER.

Inst.

No. 599, dated 7.5- 1918.

The Govt. sanction as a special case the grant of a personal allowance of Rs. 50 p m to Mrs. M. Shrivasa. They are unable to approve the Director's recommendation in regard to the grant of similar allowance to Mrs. T. Lazarus and Mrs. M. C. Chatterton.

2. The case of Mrs. C. M. Lynch is separately under consideration

La
29.4.18

Ca
30.4.18

ms
30.4.18

my
4.7.18

To the ADJ (200)
ad.

Received
20.5.18

AGAIN G.O. No.
191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

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

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- F = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.