

Law (192 /) Department.
Education

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. ¹⁴⁵³~~7705~~

DATED 29th September 1921

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council-Resolution-Budget-Supervisors-Recorded.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Copy

V

Law (Rev) Sept

Mr. P. Siva Rao,

490. (3) That under the Detailed Account No. 31-E
(b)(ii) the provision of Rs. 1,40,160 for the supervisors
of elementary schools may be omitted (Budget page 139).

[This resolution
was not comm.
to this Dept. The
attention of the
Council Office has been
drawn to the matter
separately. The Council
has been kept enough
to point out the omission
in the ref. to the agenda.
CR

The main functions of Supervisors
of schools are to start and organise
elementary schools, to prepare statistics
of village schools, to advise teachers
in existing elementary schools in matters
connected with elementary education, to
report to Sub-Post Inspectors the
needs of such schools and to advise
local bodies generally in matters
connected with the development of
primary education.

2 Prior to 1909 the Supervisors
of Elementary schools were, with
a few exceptions, employed by
local Boards and municipal
Councils and paid from their

For the reasons for the
proposal, please
see H. 22 of notes
to Govt: 237
23-2-20

p. 2 of Govt

113
13-2-1908 (7)

para on p. 3 of

Govt 113
13-2-08 (7)

In 1907 the Govt of India sanctioned the proposal of this Govt that the charges on account of Supervisors should be transferred to the provincial budget and at the same time pointed out that the retention of Supervisors on the staff of the Inspectorate would not contribute to efficiency and that it was extremely doubtful whether men on salaries of Rs 30, 40 and 50 could be depended on to exercise the important functions assigned to them. They also remarked that the past work of the supervisors had been condemned and that experience in other provinces had shown that an inferior agency of inspection could not be trusted and that its maintenance was a waste of public funds. They accordingly suggested two alternative schemes for the consideration of this Govt:

(1) The entire abolition of the posts of Supervisors and the transfer of their duties to the existing Govt Inspectorate.

the number of Sub-Post Inspectors being increased or

para 7, p. 3 (ii) the retention of some of the most efficient supervisors for the inspection of schools of minor importance only with a partial addition to the staff of Sub-Post Inspectors.

(7) For the reasons explained in paras 5, 6 and 7 of their letter No 114 Resd. of 13.2.1908 the Madras Govt were unable to adopt either of the above suggestions. Thereupon the Govt of India recommended the Madras Govt's scheme of provincialising supervisors for the sanction of the Secretary of State which was received and given effect to from the 1st March 1909.

Govt No 744
5.11.08

(Q)

3 In his letter No. 5087/12 of 26.10.1914 Sir Henry Stoe, the then D.P.I. pointed out that the Conference of Inspectors of Schools held at Cochin was unanimously of the opinion that Supervisors were extremely of little value and that a better qualified

p. 9 of Govt
No 237
23.2.20 (Y)

^{a more} and highly paid official was absolutely necessary for the main purposes for which the Supervision existed. He therefore recommended the abolition of the agency of Supervision and a large increase in the number of Sub-Inspectors. In the scheme* for the reorganisation of the inspecting agency which was to have been submitted to the Govt of India, it was proposed to reduce the ^{existing} ~~four~~ grades of officers to two, viz Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors (or Deputy Inspectors). The abolition of the agency of Supervision was to be extended over a number of years.

p. 9 of (Y)

withheld - vide pages 69-71 of notes to the Govt (Y)

p. 12 of (Y)

4 The number of schools to be inspected is ~~growing~~ continually increasing and the existing staff of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors is quite inadequate to cope with the work ^{of inspection}. The Govt of India are about to be addressed for an increase in the ~~the~~ number of inspectors and when the scheme

File sent to M. & C.

of having one Inspector for each revenue district matters, all the posts of Asst Inspectors will be abolished. It will then be possible to have a correct estimate of the number of Deputy Inspectors that will be required to assist the Inspectors. The agency of Supervisors is to be replaced by a more costly agency.

5 The adoption of the A.C.'s suggestion will deprive local bodies of the assistance now rendered by Supervisors in the matter of elementary education besides throwing extra work on the ^{existing} staff of Sub Asst Inspectors which is already inadequate.

Until therefore it becomes possible to substitute another agency to take the place of Sub Asst Inspectors, the latter should remain. The file may be submitted to the Honble the Minister, the D.P.D.

CR
25/3/21

M
25/3/21

Resolution
was lost
Returned by the
Honble the
Minister
CR

J.M. (15)

25-52

Mr. P. SIVA RAO.—“Sir, the amendment that I propose to move is—

44. That under the Detailed Account No. 31-E (b) (ii). the provision of Rs. 1,40,160 for the supervisors of elementary schools may be omitted (Budget page 139).

“Now, Sir, the expenditure upon the head of inspection has grown enormously during the last five years and if I may be allowed to refer to the budget account of the several years, the expenditure under the head of ‘Inspection’ in 1916-17 was about Rs. 8,47,000, in 1917-1918 it was Rs. 8,71,000, in 1919, 9 lakhs, in 1920 Rs. 9,39,000 and in the revised estimate for the current year 1920-21 the expenditure allotted is about 11 lakhs and in the present budget, the budget for the coming year, the provision made comes to about Rs. 13,57,000. So, I may take it that during the last five years the expenditure under the head of ‘Inspection’ has grown up by about 60 per cent. Now, Sir, it may be stated on the other side by Government that if the expenditure under the head of ‘Inspection’ has grown by 60 per cent, the expenditure under the general head of ‘Education’ also has kept pace with the same and has grown also. I am quite alive to the fact, Sir, that under the head of ‘General Education’ from 83 lakhs in the year 1916-17 the total expenditure has grown to about 156 lakhs. If all these expenditure had gone towards the formation of new schools, that might be some

26TH MARCH 1921.]

(Mr. Siva Rao ; Mr. Grieve.)

excuse for the augmenting or strengthening the head of ‘Inspection’, but I am not at all sure that all this expenditure of 156 lakhs to which it has grown during the last five years has been entirely devoted towards the multiplication of schools in our Presidency. Leaving that apart, it may be stated that out of the total expenditure under the head of ‘Education’ provided in the next year, which is 156 lakhs, the amount provided under the head of ‘Inspection’ for the coming year is 13 lakhs which comes to about 8½ per cent.

“Now, Sir, the memorandum prepared by the Honourable the Finance Member explains the object which the Government have in view with regard to this inspection grant. It is stated at page 10 of that memorandum: ‘As regards controlling staff, the object which the Government have in view is the appointment of one inspector for each district except the Nilgiris with one sub-assistant inspector for each taluk. This means a total number of 25 officers in the first class excluding the inspector of European schools and of 226 in the second; it has been impossible, however, to make the full provision that was desired in this respect in the year 1921-22, and the total number provided for is 19 inspectors and 211 sub-assistant inspectors’. So I may take it, Sir, that the present policy has been to provide for one inspector of schools for each district and one sub-assistant inspector of schools for each taluk. I find ample provision made in the budget for the purpose. We have got provision made for 171 permanent sub-assistant inspectors and 35 temporary, in all 206, and if we may calculate it roughly, it comes to one sub-assistant inspector for every taluk; and we have got a number of inspectors of schools also, 13 permanent inspectors with 3 temporary added, three inspectresses of girls’ schools with three temporary added, that is the provision made for the inspectors and inspectresses of schools—and in all, Sir, we have got 206 sub-assistant inspectors of schools with temporary also included. In consideration of this, one wonders why, when there is ample provision made for the appointment of sub-assistant inspectors for each taluk, about 206 in number, this class of supervisors which has been in existence for a long time should continue to exist. I have been told several times in the Finance Committee that the Government was only waiting for the final sanction of the Secretary of State and that as soon as this sanction was obtained for the extra number of the sub-assistant inspectors we were told that this class of officers would cease altogether to exist. Now, I would ask when there is one sub-assistant inspector of schools for every taluk, is there any real necessity for the supervisors at all? The total number of supervisors that has been provided for in the coming budget comes to about 224 and now we shall see how many schools on an average a taluk has,—I mean schools under public management or aided. On an average, it will have about 100 to 120 or 125 schools and the question seriously arises for consideration whether the sub-assistant inspector of schools in each taluk cannot be trusted with the supervision of 125 schools in his taluk. In other words, Sir, it comes to this, whether in the course of a year a sub-assistant inspector in charge of a taluk cannot be expected to inspect and supervise the school work that is done in about 120 or 125 schools in his own taluk. After all, Sir, I would again ask, is there any use in going on multiplying this supervising staff when we have not got enough money for strengthening the schools. A full supervising staff presupposes a fully equipped school. Is there any use providing for supervisors, sub-assistant inspectors, assistant inspectors, and inspectors of schools when the schools themselves are in a highly deficient condition, when the schools are undermanned, when they are ill-equipped, and when the teachers themselves are grossly underpaid. Now, Sir, the time is come, I should say, that this class of supervisors at least should cease. They have become a costly redundancy, and I think the Government will see their way to put an end to these officers wholly; if I remember right, in the discussion that was going on in the Finance Committee, the policy enunciated was that, as soon as this class of sub-assistant inspectors of schools was formed, there will be no need for these supervisors. With these few words, I move for the deletion of the provision for 224 supervisors in the budget.

“I may observe, lastly, that in addition to these inspecting officers, we have got the presidents of the taluk boards, the presidents of district boards, vice-presidents of taluk boards and vice-presidents of district boards, who are expected to supervise the work that goes on in these elementary schools, and now, Sir, that the Educational Councils are in view, it may be that the District Educational Councils will have to employ their own supervisors. In any view, there won’t be any necessity for perpetuating this class of numerous supervisors like 224 in the budget.”

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—“Mr. President, Mr. Siva Rao really himself in his last sentence has answered his own motion by saying that it was quite probable that the District Educational Councils might require a staff of supervisors. Apart from that, I quite agree that ultimately as an ideal we hope to work up to two classes of inspecting officers only, the Inspector of Schools or the Sub-Assistant or Deputy Inspector, whatever you like to call him; but you cannot abolish the supervisors immediately. We have to remember that education is continually expanding. The Honourable Member says that the average number of schools in a taluk is 120 or 125, and he imagines that a sub-assistant can very well look after that number. I should like to point out that there are many taluks in this Presidency where the number of schools is not 120 or so, but is about 300. The proposals that I submitted to the Government some time ago for the strengthening of the inspecting staff were to enable us to reach an average, not of about 120 or 125 as Mr. Siva Rao put it but of 150 schools. We hope to reach that standard. We recognise that we may have to go further eventually, but till you can get an adequate number of sub-assistant inspectors and give them sufficient salary and till you can make it possible for them to

(Mr. Grieve; Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar; Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar; the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson; the Hon'ble the President.) [26TH MARCH 1921.]

know their whole charge intimately, you cannot abolish the supervisors' agency as well. As I have said elsewhere these sub-assistant inspectors are a very heavily worked class of officers. They have a very hard life of constant travelling and with the best will in the world they cannot inspect their schools more than once or twice in the year. I submit that for elementary schools that is not adequate supervision and their work has to be supplemented by the class of supervisors. I submit, therefore, that you must keep this provision in for some years to come. Ultimately, we may be able to absorb these supervisors in other cadres, or they could be retired but at present it is not right to do so."

12-45 p.m.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to oppose this reduction and I will give only a few grounds for doing so. First of all, it is not advisable to reduce any sum, however small it may be, given for education. Our object should be to increase the votes that are to be made in favour of the departments in charge of the Minister and to see that no objection is taken next year to their asking for additional demands. So far as the elementary schools are concerned, our cry has always been that we want more sums and larger grants to promote elementary education throughout the country and it will, therefore, be a very bad policy to reduce any sum, however small it may be, provided for elementary education. So far as these schools are concerned, we heard the Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao saying that supervisors are necessary for them if they are well-equipped. My own impression is that there will be a time when all these supervisors may be abolished entirely if all the schools become well equipped; because there will then be no necessity for any supervision or advice being given by these supervisors. In fact what takes place now is that many of these schoolmasters, a large number of whom are not trained, and who get a small pittance either from the taluk board or the district board or the municipality, or from private patrons, are generally people who have recourse to other means of income and teaching in the school is only one of their professions. If there is no fear in the minds of these people that there will be recurring inspections by higher officers, these people are not likely to devote as much attention to these schools as it is absolutely necessary. On the average we have got only one sub-assistant inspector and one supervisor for each taluk. Granting that we have got about 150 and not 300 schools, only two days can be devoted by every officer for one inspection in a year. We cannot expect these travelling officers to devote more than two days to a school if the inspection is to be on a satisfactory basis. One inspection by the sub-assistant-inspector and another by the supervisor in a year over each of these mostly ill-equipped schools, where the teachers are not trained and where the villagers are craving for some small education, will be very useful. I know in several cases these officers are not only examining persons but they are also advising them. In schools where these teachers are not trained men, the supervisors teach them how to teach and how to manage the institutions. On these grounds, Sir, I am strongly against any reduction of any item under education and especially in the matter of supervision of elementary education."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I feel it my duty so far as this motion before the House is concerned to say that the supervisors are not doing the work for which they are primarily intended. The Inspection Code which I have in my hands, says that the supervisor's duties will be of a pioneering nature. He will form the connecting link between the department on the one hand and the villagers on the other and start and organise village schools."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I know, Sir, what edition of the Code the Honourable Member is referring to? There are several editions of it."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" This is the edition of 1912. May I know if it has been modified?"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I believe 1912 is the last complete edition. But I understand a large number of corrigenda have been issued to that edition."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I am not concerned with the number of editions. I only wish to know if the proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction of 1909 on which I rely have been modified or cancelled."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I must apologise for rising on my feet again. I understand that the information given by me is not quite accurate. The last edition is that of 1916."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I repeat that I am not concerned with the number of editions. I only want to know if the proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction of 1909 on which I rely have been modified or cancelled or revised. I take it that the proceedings on which I rely continue to have force."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The Honourable Member first began by reading from an obsolete edition of the Code."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I think the best thing will be to allow the Honourable Member to finish his speech and then for the Government to correct him if there is any mistake."

26TH MARCH 1921.] (Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar; Mr. Gopalakrishnayya; Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar; Mr. Palmer.)

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Then, Sir, I am obliged to say that the supervisors are not doing the work for which they are appointed. If we take the statistics issued by the department year after year we find that in the year 1917-18 there were elementary schools to the number of 3,902. In 1918-19 they fell down to 3,670. In 1920 there is a still further fall to 3,435 while in the strength of the supervisors there has been no fall. While in the number of schools there is a reduction of 25 per cent we do not find any such large variation in the strength of the supervisors. If the supervisor is a pioneer who has to organise schools, the fact will be found in the number of the private aided schools, newly started year after year. It is obvious that the supervisor has not been able to add to the list of private schools to any appreciable number but there has been a fall in the number of schools. So, there is something wrong with these officers. The system should either be mended or ended. I think that till it is mended it had better end at least, temporarily instead of money being wasted year after year."

Mr. K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Mr. President, Sir, probably my remarks may appear to be directed towards the depletion of this grant; but I am not prepared to support the motion of Mr. Siva Rao entirely which is for the depletion of expenditure under this head. My experience of these supervisors is not probably that of the Director of Public Instruction. But as president of a taluk board, I have had occasions to examine this question rather very considerably. While coming to the conclusion that the supervision that is required with regard to the elementary and aided schools will have to be continued, I have also to say that the manner in which this supervision is conducted is not very satisfactory. I know some supervisors personally who have been turning out very satisfactory work; but in a majority of cases, I am sorry to remark, their work is not efficient. On that ground alone I find it impossible to support this motion. It is impossible no doubt that we can do away with the whole staff at present; but I should like to know from the Government whether under the new circumstances under which these elementary schools are going to be conducted by the various district councils, Government are not going to adopt a new policy of gradually withdrawing these grants and applying them towards strengthening the hands of the various District Councils in the matter of supervision. As I found it impossible to effect a thorough supervision among the various board schools under my taluk board, I was put to the necessity of appointing some advisory village committees in order to assist me in the matter of supervision; I found in several cases the village schoolmasters dodging their work. In several cases, I may bring this fact to the notice of the Director of Public Instruction; these aided schoolmasters do not regularly keep the schools. Only at the time of inspection either by the supervisor, or the sub-assistant inspector or the inspector or the Director of Public Instruction for the matter of that, they keep the schools open in order to draw the grants. These facts are rather very painful to us. We must see that these matters are mended, but not ended as Mr. Siva Rao's motion appears to suggest. I wish to know from the Government whether, under the new circumstances, they are not going to change their policy with regard to the supervision through this agency. I am in favour of liberal grants being given through district agencies. On these grounds, I am not in favour of this motion."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to support the motion that is now before the House. It is true that these supervisors go and inspect the schools. But my own idea is that Government are not getting any return for the expenditure, that is being incurred on the salary of these supervisors of elementary schools. Now the provision made is Rs. 1,40,160, and we find at page 132 of the budget that the provision for building grants to primary schools is only Rs. 71,000 and the provision for contributions to local bodies for the construction of elementary school buildings is nil. I should like that this sum under consideration should be paid towards the cost of primary school buildings, for aided schools and towards the contribution to local bodies, or it may be utilized for the purpose of giving a solid grant for the education of depressed classes. These supervisors can very well be dispensed with, as I find there is too much of inspection. This reminds me of some of the chatrams endowed by the Raja of Tanjore and supervised by the district board; we find in each chatram a clerk, an amn, a servant and so on, and, after all, the people fed there are only two or three. We must first of all increase the number of institutions, no matter whether they are good or bad, and allow them for some time to be mended by local opinion. Especially in the face of the fact that district councils are going to come into force, which will take the trouble of setting right these institutions, it is better that we have not got too much of inspection and too much of destructive criticism without any constructive criticism. I, therefore, think that these supervisors of elementary schools should be abolished and their services utilized in being drafted into the regular Government service and the service of local bodies. I do not say that they should be disbanded and sent home all at once. They can very well be taken into the existing institutions rather than asking them to go about inspecting the schools. There is no virtue in these people saying that they have been inspecting so many schools. I suggest that the sub-assistant inspector should stay in each school or in each village for two or three days, speaking to the people on educational matters and devising means how best to improve the condition of education in that locality."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—" I had the fortune to stumble into some of the elementary schools in different periods of my life and I had a memorable experience. In one of the schools I remember the headmaster was absent and the teachers were chatting over a *pan supari* business and the boys were playing hide and seek. I thought it was a happy school, but it needed supervision. I believe the more supervisors we have the better for such schools."

(Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu ; Mr. Vandanam ; Mr. Krishna Rao ; [26TH MARCH 1921.
Mr. Grieve ; Mr. Ramachandra Rao.]

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I also oppose the motion. We are going to increase the number of elementary schools, and therefore supervisors also should be increased. There is no meaning in our saying that the District Committees are going to supervise the elementary schools. One may as well consent to the curtailment of the superior staff, but the subordinate staff is necessary, because the schools are scattered all over the country. I do not think the Taluk Board Presidents are careful to inspect these schools. There ought to be a staff of supervisors, and it will have to be increased as we increase the number of elementary schools."

Mr. G. VANDANAM :—"The supervisors are expected not only to supervise these schools, but also to give model lessons. In my place the supervisors are doing very good work in going to schools and suggesting new methods of teaching and also giving model lessons. If we abolish such officers much of the needed service will be left undone. There are some schools where the teachers themselves are the managers of the schools and there are nobody to look after their work. If left to himself the teacher-manager does not go to the village where his school is, comes to the school just at the time of inspection to collect the boys and present them before the Inspector. There must be supervision to such schools."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO :—"I am glad that this motion has been brought before this Council as it has given an opportunity to discuss about the present system of inspection and as it has enabled us to find a means of working out a better system of inspection. There will not be anyone here who would say that there ought not to be a proper agency to supervise the various elementary and other kinds of schools. But the point for consideration is whether the present method is suitable. There is likely to be under the present system a certain amount of overlapping or duplicating of the work. Is that the right sort of thing to be continued. We find a provision made not merely for the maintenance of the existing supervisors of schools, but there is also provision made for additional inspectors and sub-assistant inspectors of schools. It will be noticed that there will be overlapping of functions both of the inspectors and the assistant inspectors and again of sub-assistant inspectors and supervisors to a great extent. It has been the policy of the Government for a long time and I don't find any justification for putting it off any longer that this duplication of work should be done away with. We might have one inspecting agency for high schools, i.e., the inspectors and another agency i.e., deputy inspectors for other schools. I don't find any justification for continuing this old complicated machinery in this department—inspectors, assistant-inspectors, sub-assistant inspectors, supervisors, etc. Those who have experience of the supervision of the elementary schools throughout the presidency will be satisfied that as between the supervisors and the sub-assistant inspectors, there has been unnecessary waste of trouble and time in one going over the same area as the other, they probably not being in a position to divide their work. Now that the question of supervisors has been raised, the Honourable the Director of Public Instruction has told us that in course of time the supervisors would be done away with. I urge that it is already late and the earlier they are done away with the better. The present system is very unsatisfactory. We must improve the system and provide for effective supervision. But I must admit that there is unnecessary duplicating of machinery which must be done away with as early as possible."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—"I just want to make one or two remarks with reference to what the Honourable Members have said on this motion. I am sorry I was not able to find what Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar referred to. By comparison of the various codes, however, I have found the extract relating to the functions of the supervisors. The point is emphasized in the paragraph quoted by the Honourable Member that the superior inspecting officers may transfer to the senior supervisor in the range a number of schools within the jurisdiction of the latter, and, in special cases where it is necessary, entrust the annual inspection of the school to supervisors. Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar said that he considered it proper for the sub-assistant inspector to spend in a school three or four days. I should like to point out if that ideal was reached we should require not 42 additional sub-assistant inspectors but perhaps a thousand more. As regards the remarks of Mr. Vandanam, I agree with him that one of the things that we have to watch is the working of the elementary schools when the inspecting authorities are not in the locality. I submit that if you reduce the number of inspecting officers you are making it easier for the teacher to be irregular. As regards the remarks of Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao about overlapping I do not admit their accuracy altogether. I repeat that ultimately we hope to have two classes of inspecting officers—the inspector and the deputy inspector. But that is an ideal for the future, and it will not be wise in the interest of elementary education to abolish the supervisors at present."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I have no hesitation in opposing this resolution. As a matter of fact, the inspection of elementary schools is very perfunctory at present. It is the common practice to suppose that the supervisor should inspect the schools twice a year and the sub-assistant inspector once. This is what the rules lay, and this is the state of things at present. If my Honourable friend's proposal is carried out and 224 supervisors are abolished, it seems to me that the inspection of the elementary schools must inevitably suffer. At one time, I was under the impression that there was a comprehensive scheme for the abolition of supervisors of elementary schools and for expanding the cadre of sub-assistant inspectors of schools so as to absorb the present number of inspecting officers. I do not know what became of that. It had been held over for want of funds. The idea is to replace these supervisors by deputy inspectors. If under the existing circumstances we are to be deprived

26TH MARCH 1921.] (Mr. Ramachandra Rao ; Rev. Mr. Macphail ; Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar ; Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar ; Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar.)

of the services of supervisors of schools, it will be a step in the wrong direction. We have also this additional fact that there is a point of view whether the inspecting agency should be brought under the District Educational Council or whether it is to continue under the department. This matter was discussed recently. But undoubtedly this is not the time to take up this step. For the present I do not think that we should be doing a right thing in abolishing the supervisors."

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"Mr. President, I oppose this motion as I consider the supervision of schools as of very great importance. I have intervened in the debate simply because I wish to say that I hope that Government, in view of the position they have taken up to-day and the importance they attach to the supervision of schools, will see their way to make suitable grants for supervision to the managers of aided schools. Of late, Government has been declining to give such grants, but I hope that after this debate they will, in view of the importance they attach to supervision, give grants for supervisors to aided schools."

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu moved for the closure of the debate. The closure motion was put and agreed to.

The motion was then put to vote and lost.

Legue Council —

Resu — Budget

— Supervisors —

Records

Order
Min

1453 J/29-9-21

Records

22-9-21
NK
26/9/21

27-9-21

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

192 .

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____ DATED _____
 192 .

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT. _____

STATEMENT WITH DITTO. _____

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

N.B.—

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