

Law (Education) (1925) Department.

6rd. SERIES.

G.O. No. 514

DATED

8.4.25

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council Question
Municipal High School,
Trivannamalai

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Law Dept. III-8-4,000-1-12-24.

L. En 296B v
30/1/25

QUESTION.—No. 505

for the meeting of the Legislative

Council to be held on ~~the~~

3 - 2 - 1925.

SUBMITTED that two copies of this Question may be forwarded to the

Law (Education) Department.

The Question has been admitted.

29/1

U.O. No. , dated

25-1-25

To

The *Law (Education)* Department.

C.P.A.

QUESTION.

Clause (a) of the question.

Mr. V. Adinarayana Chettiyar.

Reference is solicited to the information given
by the Director of Public Instruction on page 5 of note, i

the link 505. Will the hon. the Minister for (a).

Clause Education be pleased to state-

Th (a) whether the Director of Public Instruction
1913 straction delayed the recognition of the

Clause IVth and Vth forms in the Municipal High

School, Tiruvannamalai, and whether the

Municipal Council appealed to Government

as to the building and equipment grants sanctioned

about it;

(b) whether the subsidy now paid to the

institution is not one fixed at a time

when the High School had only three forms;

(c) the amount of building and equipment

grants granted to school and the amount of

building and equipment grant to the Muni-

cipal High School;

(d) whether the Municipal Council has

constructed a building for the High School

at a cost of about Rs. 20,000;

(e) whether subsidies to local bodies

for maintaining schools are fixed with re-

ference to the net annual cost;

Clause (f)

(f) whether the subsidy to this Municip-

pal Council was not raised, when its net

sanctioned in 1913 when the same was

cost of maintaining the High School was

raised;

Clause (g)

(g) the strength of the High School

classes at the end of December 1924 (i) in

the Municipal High School and (ii) in the

Mission High School; and

(h) the average cost to Government per

pupil for education in the High School

to classes in both the above high schools?

is calculated for the school (middle and high)

VLS.

separate figures for the high school classes. It

*the Mission High School at
the same place after it
was made a high*

Clause (a) of the question.

Reference is solicited to the information given by the Director of Public Instruction on page 5 of *note, in the linked file* ~~the~~ linked file ~~III~~ III in regard to clause (a).

Clause (b).

The subsidy of Rs. 492 a year was sanctioned ^{for the first time} in 1913 when the institution was a middle school.

Clause (c).

It is not known when exactly the Mission ~~1920~~ School was recognised as a high school. Information as to the building and equipment grants sanctioned since that date may be called for from the D.P.I. *A draft memo is submitted below.* As regards grants to the Municipal High School, attention may be drawn to the answer given to clause (e) of question in linked file III.

Clause (d).

The Chairman reported in September, 1924 that the total outlay on the building constructed for the school amounted to Rs. 18,028.

Clause (e).

Subsidies to local bodies towards the cost of maintenance of secondary schools under their management are based on the net cost of the schools in some cases.

Clause (f).

The subsidy now paid is a fixed one which was sanctioned in 1913 when the school was a middle school.

Clause (g).

The information is not available.

Clause (h).

The M.L.C. refers to the cost of educating a pupil in the high school classes i.e., in forms IV to VI. Teaching grant to the Mission high school is calculated for the school (middle and high) as a whole; it is not, therefore, possible to give separate figures for the high school classes. It

linked file No. III.

See
~~1885/18-7-24~~
(P. in 1885 file not put up)

P of G.O. 1596 S.D.
16.10.24

The Mission High School is the same place after it has become a high school

may perhaps suffice if the M.L.C. is informed that the figures asked for by him are not available.

2. The draft answer below is for approval.

COA
4.2.25
8/1
4.2.25

CA
4.2.25
S
VTK
5/2

M2

Reps to C

if it is a Municipal High School
the grants are not funded
by the grant-in-aid code.
a Subsidy is usually given.
We need not call for any
particulars from D.D. of the
Municipal School.

The answer may be worded
as indicated above

5/2.25



Answer to clause (c) has been
altered in red ink. It is for
approval. The draft answer
in the linked file is also for
the approval of the Hon'ble the Minister.

SCA
5.2.25

CA
5.2.25
S

VTK
6.2 m2

5/2.25

ANSWER.

(a) Forms IV and V in the school
were opened in 1921 and 1922, respec-
tively, and Government approved the
action of the ~~Gadchod~~ Municipal
Council in G.O. No. 1934 L. & M.,
dated 14-10-1922. The Chairman there-
after applied for recognition of those
forms and the Inspector of Schools re-
commended it. The Inspector was in-
formed that no formal recognition was
necessary as the classes were opened
with the permission of Government.

(b) Yes.

(c) Particulars of grants sanc-
tioned for the Mission High School
are not available. Subsidies granted to the
have been called for. As regards
grants to the Municipal high school are not
the Hon'ble Member is referred to
governed by the rules in the grant-in-aid code.
the answer given to clause (c) of
question No. 1299 at the meeting of
the Legislative Council held on 3-12-24.

(d) The Chairman reported in
September, 1924 that the total outlay
on the building constructed for the
school amounted to Rs. 18,028.

(e) Subsidies to local bodies
towards the cost of maintenance of
secondary schools under their manage-
ment are based on the net cost of the
schools in some cases.

(f) No.

(g) & (h). The information is not
available.

Please see S.P. remarks
on clause (a) of the question
in linked file III.

(L)

Page 7 of notes in linked file III

(e) Not in all cases.

Please send answer
to Council office
CPA
6/2

Law Editor - 296 B/15.1
7.2.25

CPA
4.2.25
8/1
4.2.25

VTK
5/2

Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai.

* 387 Q.—MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Director of Public Instruction delayed the recognition of the IV and V Forms in the Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai, and whether the municipal council appealed to Government about it;

(b) whether the subsidy now paid to the institution is not one fixed at a time when the high school had only three forms;

(c) the amount of building and equipment grants granted to the Mission High School at the same place after it was made a high school and the amount of building and equipment grant to the Municipal High School;

(d) whether the municipal council has constructed a building for the high school at a cost of about Rs. 20,000;

(e) whether subsidies to local bodies for maintaining schools are fixed with reference to the net annual cost;

(f) whether the subsidy to this municipal council was not raised, when its net cost of maintaining the high school was raised;

(g) the strength of the high school classes at the end of December 1924, (i) in the Municipal High School and (ii) in the Mission High School; and

(h) the average cost to Government per pupil for education in the high school classes in each of the above high schools?

A.—(a) Forms IV and V in the school were opened in 1921 and 1922, respectively, and the Government approved the action of the Municipal Council in G.O. No. 1934, L. & M., dated 14th October 1922. The Chairman thereafter applied for recognition of those forms and the Inspector of Schools recommended it. The Inspector was informed by the Director of Public Instruction that no formal recognition was necessary as the classes were opened with the permission of the Government.

(b) Yes.

(c) Particulars of grants sanctioned for the Mission High School are not available. Subsidies granted to the Municipal High School are not governed by the rules in Grant-in-Aid Code.

(d) The Chairman reported in September 1924 that the total outlay on the building constructed for the school amounted to Rs. 18,028.

(e) Not in all cases.

(f) No.

(g) & (h) The information is not available.

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I ask the hon. Minister whether, if the strength of the classes is increased, Government will not also increase their grants?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"There seems to be no ground for such apprehension."

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"Tiruvannamalai is an important centre, a place of pilgrimage. It is a well-known fact that such municipal towns have heavy demands to meet. The municipality is afraid whether Government would contribute anything towards the increased expenditure of the school, if they increase the strength of the school. That is the object of this interpellation. There is also apprehension on the part of the people of Tiruvannamalai that the Mission High School is being more favoured than the Municipal High School."

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"It is not so."

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

192

READ AGAIN G.O. No.

192

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT ..

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DETAIL.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, 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.

The final form of the question and answer was as above. The papers may be 5/4 d/8-4-25

Order
is Recorded.

DESPATCHED

8 APR 1925 Ag

Leg. Council - Question

Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai

CPA
6-4-25

8/4
6/4/25

Cpy to the D.O.

with initial
for further action