

Home (1918) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 749.

DATED 10-6-1918

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]


Subsidy.

Declining to enhance the annual ---- now being paid towards the maintenance of the Municipal girls' school in the Periyakulam Municipality.

HOME (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered

1918

Subject.

Recommending an additional subsidy to the
Periyakulam Municipality on account of maintaining a girls' School.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

C. No. 1224/18

Station Madras

, Dated the 8th February 1918

From (Name) the Hon'ble Mr. J. E. Stone, M.A., F.R.H.S.,
C.I.E.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,
M A D R A S

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

HOME (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that the Chairman,
Municipal Council, Periyakulam, has applied, on account
of the cost of maintenance of the existing girls' School
which was opened in 1913-14 out of provincial subsidy,
for a contribution of Rs. 350 for the current year and of
Rs. 500 from the next year onwards, in addition to the
recurring subsidy of Rs. 650 sanctioned in G. O. No. 1104
Home (Education) dated 29th August 1917. In their order
No. 197 M dated 6th February 1917 on the budget estimate

2

of the Municipality for 1917-18 Government in the Local and Municipal Department directed that a separate application should be submitted by the chairman through the Director of Public Instruction for the additional grant required for the maintenance of the Girls' School. It is with reference to this order that the chairman has now applied for an additional contribution. I therefore recommend that a subsidy of Rs.350 may be sanctioned to the Council during the current year, to be met out of the savings in the allotment for 1917-18 under "22-E Education Government Schools - General - Payments in support of Board and Municipal Schools" and for next next year I request to be permitted to include a contribution of Rs.1,150 on behalf of this Municipality, besides the recurring grant of Rs.750 sanctioned in G. O. No.1585, Home, (Education) dated 15th December 1917, in the general distribution of subsidies to Local Bodies. In anticipation of the sanction of Government I have recommended increased credit being allowed under 'Receipts' in the budget estimate of this Municipality for 1918-19.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. Srinivas

for Director of Public Instruction

11/8.2.18

NOTES.

Home Education Dept.

CNo. 369 A from the D.P.I., no 1254 of 8.2.18
Subject - additional subsidy to the Kriyakulam municipality.

The following statement shows the total expenditure incurred on the school during the last three years :-

Year	Expenditure
1914-15	695
1915-16	629
1916-17	737 (against the provision of Rs 910 in the revised estimate).

p. 9 of fo. no 741 M of 28.4.17
para. 14 p. 4 of fo 1373 M of 14.8.17


The annual subsidy sanctioned in this account is Rs. 650. It is observed that the excess expenditure in 1916-17 over the amount of subsidy was only Rs 87. In the absence of details, it is not known how the additional subsidy of Rs. 350 ~~may~~ for the current year and Rs. 500 from next year onwards referred to in the Director's letter has been arrived at.

Submitted that he may be requested to furnish information on this point, if he has any.

2. Attention is in this connection solicited to fo. no 741 M. of 28.4.17 in which the Chairman has ^{already been} performed that the Govt. have not undertaken to bear the entire cost of the maintenance of the school from Provincial revenues.

he may first send the figures

[Faint handwritten notes in the left margin, mostly illegible.]



no. for remarks. They ~~has~~ will have the budget on hand & may be able to verify the need for the increased subsidy with reference to the expenditure on the school & the financial position of the Municipality.

CR
17.2.18

17/2/18

Lom (10)

Cones 369A-1
18.2.18

CVo. 15/6.71
20-2-18

Local and munl department

The council has been already informed that its request for a grant of Rs 500 towards the excess expenditure incurred by it on the school up to 1916-17 cannot be complied with - vide G.O. No 741 on dated 28th April 1917. The question of a subsidy to the Council in the current year and for the next year alone remains for consideration. This will have to be calculated solely with reference to the expenditure to be incurred by the Council in those years. In the current year, the expenditure on the school is estimated at Rs 1030.

Towards this expenditure, a ^{subsidy} grant of Rs 674 (550+24) ^{has been given} has been already ~~decided~~ ^{given} with reference to G.O. No 1104 dated 29.8.17 and No 1585 dated 15th December 1917. The Director of Public Instruction now recommends a further subsidy of Rs 350.

- ① already ~~decided~~ ^{given} with reference to G.O. No 1104 dated 29.8.17 and No 1585 dated 15th December 1917. The Director of Public Instruction now recommends a further subsidy of Rs 350.
- ②
- ③

④ according to the revised estimate for 1917-18

1-10-16

② 1916-17 -
1915-16 -

Rs
140

127

Rs 150
under this
head ought
to be
sufficient

114 of 1917
1372 m
14-9-17

VTK

apparently to cover the total expenditure on the school. This expenditure of Rs 1030 includes Rs 300 for contingencies which appears to be too high when compared with the actual expenditure under this head in the ^{two} previous years.

2. As regards next year, the Council has budgeted for an expenditure of Rs 1170 on the school taking credit for a subsidy of Rs 650 with reference to G.O. No 1104 E.D. dated 29th August 1917. Adding the further grant of Rs 144 sanctioned in G.O. No 1585 27th dated 15th December 1917 for this school, the total grant sanctioned for the school is Rs 794 or Rs 376 less than the expenditure. The Director of Public Instruction however recommends a further subsidy of Rs 500 or Rs 124 more than the anticipated expenditure. This expenditure of Rs 1170 also includes Rs 300 for contingencies ^{which is too high as observed in paragraph 1 supra}. Hence ^{further} the subsidy recommended by the Director would ^{admit of} ~~appear to be~~ a further reduction ^{permissible}. It is submitted that he may now be consulted u.o on this point and with reference to the subsidy recommended by him for the current year and noted on in the previous paragraph.

3. In connection with the budget however, the Director has recommended that the Council may be relieved of its expenditure under grants-in-aid of Rs 1400 the provincial contribution for 1918-19 being correspondingly reduced. This recommendation may, it is submitted, be approved with the concurrence of the Home (Education) Dept. If so, the Provincial subsidy for 1918-19 will have to be considerably reduced. It is submitted that the budget

114 of 1917-18
(for 1918-19)
114 of 1917-18
(for 1918-19)
114 of 1917-18
(for 1918-19)

114 of 1917-18
(for 1918-19)

114 of 1917-18
(for 1918-19)

VTK

of the municipality for 1918-19 now with Government is not one which has been passed at a duly convened meeting of the Council and hence the Chairman has been requested to place it before such a meeting and resubmit it at an early date - Vide memorandum No 901-1m dated 16.2.18.

PR
27.2.18

Home (Edn) U.O with reference to para 3 of the note above.

V.TK
28/2



Home (Edn) Dept

Submitted that the file may now be sent to the D.P.I. for remarks on the above

Se
13.18
Jd
23.18

CR
4.3.18
D.P.I. 1 (100)

mm
5/3/18

Lt m n. o
No. 1516-1 m
28.2.18

Convo. 369 A-2
5.3.18
Kc 2a 6.3.18

No. 1098/16.3.18

D.P.I.'s Office

It takes the smallest hour for - Rs 300 does not appear excessive for contingencies. It includes Rs 144 for house rent and sum for furniture books & maps & prizes which in the case of a free school which is increasing in popularity & usefulness do not seem to me too high.

NOTES.

Page 5

Rs. 300 recommended by the inspecting officer and (presumably) the sum paid for previous year expenditure.

2. In respect of the other points it may be observed that while the Secretariat note has taken into account the subsidy of Rs. 24 (being the salary of the additional teacher for two months of 17-18) and of Rs. 144 (being the salary of the additional teacher for 18-19) in arriving at the additional subsidy admissible for the Municipality on account of the maintenance of the school, it does not appear to have made a corresponding increase in the charges relating to it. According to the Budget estimate the expenditure on staff is Rs. 670 and if Rs. 144 were added to it, the expenditure under this head and the total expenditure will be Rs. 814 and Rs. 1314 respectively. It may be noted here that the Director's recommendation for enhanced subsidy was based on the rough estimates furnished by the chairman and that a larger subsidy would have been admissible if the proposal had been based on the figures appearing in the Budget estimate.

3. In the circumstances, no reduction in the amount already proposed is feasible.

J. H. S. (Signature)
1929
16.3.18.



1170 +
144
1314

1170
- 24
1146

⁹
Home Education Dept.

With reference to para. 1 of the Director's no. note in page 405 ~~opposed~~ ante it is observed that in the budget and revised estimates of the ^{the municipality} Penyakulam municipality for 1916-17 and 1917-18 the provision under contingencies was uniformly fixed at Rs 300 while the actual expenditure was only Rs. ~~140~~¹⁴⁰ and Rs. ~~127~~¹²⁷ respectively. ~~and~~ It does not therefore seem unlikely that the provision for contingencies made in the current year and for the ensuing year (Rs 300) is only a repetition of that in previous years and not intended for any specific purpose e.g. rent, books etc.

2. As regards para. 2 of the note, it is submitted that no additional provision need be made in the next year's budget on account of the new teacher ~~sanctioned~~ referred to. From ~~page 36 of the Statement~~ ^{the Statement} on page 36 of fs no 1585 of 15.12.17, it is observed that the new teacher referred to was in addition to the three teachers already employed in the school. The employment of this fourth teacher was sanctioned by the Lt M. Dept. in their order no. 1058 M. 8226/17 and the necessary provision therefor has ~~also~~ been included in the budget for 1918-19. No addition is thus necessary.

3. Moreover the Municipal Council has already been informed in no 7414-328.417 that the Govt. have not undertaken to bear the entire cost of maintenance and that Provincial grants are intended only to supplement municipal funds. The Municipal Council has not shown that it is unable to ~~find~~ find the extra cost if involved, from its own revenues. For orders whether in these circumstances the additional ~~recovery~~ subsidy recommended should be sanctioned.

La
18.3.18
Lm
21.3.18
Lm may perhaps be asked to state whether the above statements are correct. If they are, a further reference to the D.P. may be necessary. Cg
21.3.18

Lm u.o.

Lm
23.3.18


L + m Dep't

The statements in the Home (Lm) Dep't's note on pages 6 & 7 are correct. The file may be returned to Home (Lm) with the request that early orders may be passed on the question of grant as orders on the Council's budget have to be issued before the 31st Dec.

Lm
27.3.18


V.TK
27.3

Home (Lm) Lm



C/O 24439M

26.3.18



Hon'ble Education Dept.

Submitted that this file may be sent again
to the D.I. with reference to the Registrar's
note on page 7 ante.

2. ~~Boonago~~ ^{add. item} be noted Financial have
noted in another file that, today (27th) is
the last day for the payment of subsidy.
The payment of ^{add. item} subsidy to the Preriyakulam
municipality ~~provis~~ for the current year,
even if it is finally decided to sanction it
is therefore out of the question. The ~~provis~~ ^{plurket}
file dealing with the municipal budget
may ~~then~~ be referred to D.M. with the
request that the credit taken for the ^{add. item} ~~provis~~
subsidy may be omitted for the present.


Convo. 369A-4 ^{Se}
28.3.18 27.3.18 28.3.18
N.K. 28.3.18
LWS 28.3.18

No. 151 dated 10/4/18

9 - APR 1918

I must request the Secretary to be good
enough to compare the paragraph on 6
about the Rs 3000 contingencies with my
note which is misapprehension.

2 As to the subsidy, for 1917-18 as appears
from para 2 h. 6 of the notes on the
municipality; but as the sanction for the provision
was made in 1915 in the same
the sanction for 1918 the subsidy
allowed by me for 1917-18.



Home Education Dept.

Submitted that the amount of the subsidy recommended by the D.I. (Rs. 1,150) may be reduced by Rs. 144 the annual cost on account of the additional teacher referred to in para. 2 of the Director's note on page 8 ante and sanctioned with effect from the current official year, subject ^{thereafter} to re-adjustment with ~~effect from~~ ^(the year commencing) reference to the actual expenditure for the maintenance of the school. The L.M. Dept. may be requested to ^{once again} verify whether the ~~provision that for~~ ^{the additional teacher} ~~in respect of whom subsidy was sanctioned~~ ^{in respect of whom subsidy was sanctioned}

(5) info no. 1585 & 15.12.17. is the same as the one sanctioned in G.O. 1058 M & 22-6-17.
(J) 2. A draft order is placed below. It may be sent to L.M. and Financial for acceptance.

25/4/18
25/4/18
25/4/18
L.M. 1
Fin. 1

Accepted in L & M.


V.TK
26/4

Fin. 110

CURRENT NO.

3105

FINANCIAL



1150
144
1006

Home (ES) no.
18.369A-5
25-4-18

NOTES.

Page 10

Financial dept

It is proposed to increase the subsidy granted to the Municipal Council, Periyakulam, for the maintenance of the existing Girls' School, from Rs. 650 to Rs. 1,006 ^{per annum}. The additional subsidy is stated to be required to meet increased expenditure on the school. The papers showing how the maintenance charges have increased are not in the file.

2. Attention is solicited to G.O. No. 741 M.D. 28.4.17 in which the Periyakulam Municipal Council was informed that Provincial grants are intended only to supplement municipal funds and not to relieve Councils wholly of expenditure on Education. It is submitted that Govt. cannot go on increasing the grant every year with reference to the actual expenditure, as it would mean practically an agreement to meet the net cost of the school, which has ^{not} so far been accepted in respect of this institution. The D.P.D. does not also say that the Council is

(Draft order)

cf. para. 2 of
D.P.D. note on
page 5 ante

unable to meet the extra expenditure from its own funds. In the circumstances, it is for orders whether the increase should be sanctioned.

3 If it is considered that the grant for the Girls' School may be raised, it is submitted that the grant should be fixed once for all. Home (Edner) ^{deputy} ~~now~~ proposes to increase the grant to Rs. 1,006 with reference to the budget provision ^{in 1918-19}, subject to adjustment if the actual expenditure is less than the grant. This, it is submitted, has no appearance of the "net cost" arrangement and seems objectionable. The budget provision fixed by the Municipality has always been higher than the actuals. It is for orders whether the grant may not be fixed once for all at Rs. 900.

Thru MJ / agree with this intention
35.18.45.18 in the office note. We
have never pledged ourselves

page 9 ante.

draft order.

cf para. 1

on page bank

to meet the rest cost of the school, and there is not sufficient justification to finance the school on this principle. The Council was told in G.O. 197. Pt. of. 6. 217 that a separate application should be submitted for the additional grant required for the maintenance of this school, and it is said that the present application is the result of this G.O. The Chairman, who recently addressed the D.P.I. in pursuance of the G.O. in question seems to feel that this is a later G.O. —

¶ 41. In of. 28. 4. 17- the he was informed that Govt. had given ^{not} any undertaking to meet the entire cost of the school.

I wish to submit that financial should advise against any increase of the grant.

File no 3645-1
7.5.18.

LD
6.5.18

S

PK
5.5.18

570 Home (copy)



P.T.O.

NOTES.

16 Page 63

Home Education Dept.

Submitted for orders. If the amount of

La
7.5.18

the subsidy is not to be enhanced,
final orders may issue in L & M.

M
8/5/18

R
9.5.18

I would be obliged if Furl will
reconsider the matter

2. I never intended that the net cost
should be borne by Gov. On an examination
of the situation, Edel after consulting
the D.P.I. considers that in the
legitimate requirements of the school
the subsidy may be raised to Rs 1006.

3. But I noticed that the M.L. Council
did not exert itself properly to utilise
the subsidy. So the last sentence was
put in as a warning of retrenchment

4 No position is this

(20) Edel answers that the adol subsidy
is necessary in the interests of the
school.

(b) If notwithstanding this ^{the municipality} ~~the~~ Starves the
School (with debtment), Edel insists
on the unspeak subsidy being refused

(c) L & M considers that the Council has
not enough of its own to incur the expenditure

But, apparently that
is the effect of the
draft 90. L & M

(in the draft)



Home (Edn) LUG
N^o 369A-
11-5



CURRENT NO.

4092-4023

FINANCIAL

Regd 13-5-18-

Vide Draft order

page 45
flag ③

(d) There is not the slightest idea of paying net cost. In fact we have already declined requests of this nature

May 11/5/10

Full (w)

Financial dept

Are not the calculations in this file on the basis of net cost?

13.5.18

Submitted 'yes'.

Home (Edn) propose that the existing recurring Subsidy of Rs. 650 towards the maintenance of the Periyakulam Municipal Girls' school should be raised to Rs. 1,006 and that this should be in addition to the recurring Subsidy of Rs. 144 per annum sanctioned in G.O. 1585 Home (Edn) of 15.12.17 for strengthening existing schools. That is, it is proposed to raise the existing Subsidy of Rs. (650 + 144 or) 794 to Rs. (1,006 + 144 or) Rs. 1,150 per annum, which is almost the same as the total expenditure of

of the school as given by the municipality in its budget for 1918-19 - Rs. 1,170.

a. This sum of Rs. 1,170 is apparently the gross expenditure without deducting the fee income - (it is likely that the fee income in the Elementary Girls' school will be very small). Moreover, the budget figure is, when compared with the actuals of the last three years, overpitched - please see also portion P on page 3 ante.

b. It is respectfully submitted that, even assuming that it is decided in the present case to ^{fix} ~~submit~~ the subsidy from Govt. on the net-cost basis, the calculations will have to be made with reference to the figures relating to the actuals of the last preceding year, and not on the Budget figure which is always overpitched. It does not also appear that any special developments in the working of the school are contemplated, ^{to justify} an addition to existing subsidies.

Y. P. T. O.
17.5.18 17.5.18

Of sum 2 to 4 of Home Schemes
in H. 13-14 ante

1 minute is agree. The use of
C.S.'s are solicited.

File no 4092-1
18-5-18

18-5-18

72 Home (Grove) n/a



Home Education Dept

Submitted for orders.

2. Attention is solicited to the office note on p. 13a.
The file may be transferred to LHM dept.

The file may be transferred to L & M dept.

20.5.18

NK
2015718

21.528

The efficiency of the school, from a purely educational point of view, requires the additional expenditure.


20M will probably ask for this expenditure being met out of municipal funds. If the City does not do so, I shall be glad to be informed of the same so that the DP I may consider what.

Steps to take while the school remains inefficient.

2. As regards the Financial remarks above about my ideas of net cost, My point is that I consider in the interests of the efficiency of the school a certain expenditure necessary, that I am proposing to sanction this from Provincial funds as LTM consider that the M^y had no funds that I have no idea of ^{amount} Community Govt. to further expenditure on the school.

LTM (w)

Local & Municipal Department
The Director of Public Instruction requests the sanction of Home (Education) Department for enhanced subsidy to the school and a decision has now been arrived at that no further subsidy should be given to the Council to maintain the school. An order to this effect will be submitted, have to issue in Home (Edn) Department. ~~If Government are not prepared to give a grant, then the municipality is~~



CR^o 37381

29.5.18

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes on the left page, possibly related to school accounts or council matters.]

[Handwritten note:]
 Para 3 of
 529 44
 30-3-68

[Handwritten note:]
 Verified from
 the budget note

[Handwritten note:]
 Para 3 of
 529 44
 30-3-68



[Handwritten signature/initials:]
 J. L. F.

[Handwritten text:]
 L & M. 110 No. 3-138-111

[Handwritten text:]
 16-18

submit its school as ~~fast~~ as it can from its available
 resources. With these observations, it is submitted
 that the file may be returned to Home (Eo. n)
 Department for issue of final orders.
 Provision is made in the current
 year's budget of this Council for an
 expenditure of Rs 1310 on this school —
 Rs 810 for establishment and Rs 300 for
 Rs 200 for capitation allowance.
 Contingencies. On the receipt side, credit
 is taken for a grant of only Rs 790. The
 difference of Rs 520 will have to be
 met by the Council from its own funds,
 as Financial have refused to sanction any
 additional grant. The Council may be able
 to meet this, as the budget after providing
 for this expenditure closes with a balance
 of Rs 5230 under fund funds or 10.8 per
 cent of the estimated receipts. If the Council
 finds it difficult to provide for the
 needs of this institution without Govt. Aid,
 it will doubtless come up to Govt. again
 for a grant. The file may, it is submitted,
 be returned to Home (Eo. n) Department for
 the issue of orders on the D.P.I.'s letter.

[Handwritten signature/initials:]
 D. K.
 1-6-18

[Handwritten signature/initials:]
 V. T. K.
 4/6

[Handwritten text:]
 Home (Eo. n) uo

Home Education Dept

A draft order is submitted that following the precedent in no 741 M.S. 28.4.17^{also} received in the case of Panipatnam, the order declining to sanction any enhancement in the subsidy to the municipality may properly issue in L.H.

But there is no harm in so issuing it

6.6.18. 810 for establishment of Rs 300 in the 200 to 250 extra allowance.

is taken for a part of only Rs 520. The difference of Rs 520 will have to be met by the Council from its own funds.

as financial have refused to sanction.

Additional grant. The Council may be able to meet this, as the budget after providing for this expenditure closes with a balance of Rs 5230 under fund funds or 10.8 p. cent of the restricted receipts of the Council.

finds it difficult to provide for the needs of this institution with the grant.

it will doubtless come up to Govt. again for a grant. The 1st way, it is believed, has been to Home (S.N.) 28.4.17.

the issue of order in the 28.4.17.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

1.6.18.

Subsidy
Declining to enhance the annual — now being fixed towards the maintenance of the Municipal Pits' school in the Paripattanam municipality.

” ” ” ” ” 191 .

C. No. 369A, From the DFI C, No. 1254, dated 8.2.1918.

[illegible]

No. 749, dated 10-6 1918.

The Govt. see no sufficient reason to enhance the ^{annual} subsidy now being paid ~~annually~~ to the Municipal Council of Kariyakulam towards the maintenance of the municipal girls' school. The attention of the Council is also drawn to the orders in F.O. no 7414, D 28.4.17.

Received
Mrs.
13.6.19

7.6.18
MK
7/6/18

OK
9.6.28

To the D.I.I (Qtr)

To The C. m. c. Periyakulam

7 " " Collector of Madras

$$1 \quad u \quad 1 + m \quad \text{of } \frac{1}{2}$$

When given for copying 1917
 When copied 12 1918
 When examined 12
 When signed 12/16

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 DITO.

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

N.B.—
 A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only.