

Law (Edn) (1925) Department.

Ord. SERIES.

G.O. No. 734

DATED 8. 5. 25

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council Question  
Municipal High School,  
Tiruvannamalai - Note, Records



# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.


| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

QUESTION.—No. 461 for the meeting of the Legislative  
Council to be held on the 3-2-1925

*1. du 293.B*  
*19/1/25*

SUBMITTED that two copies of this Question may be forwarded to the  
*Law (204) Department.*

The Question has been admitted.



U.O. No. , dated

To

The *Law (204)* Department.

*18.1.25*



Question

Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar:-

THE LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

461. Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state

(a) whether it is a fact that permission to open the VI form in the Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai was granted by the Director of Public Instruction in July 1923 and the application for recognition was received in time within six months of the date;

(b) whether the school has not been recognised yet and if so, the reason for the delay;

(c) whether it is a fact that every municipal council is <sup>re</sup>commended to maintain a High School;

(d) whether it is a fact that Rs. 4200/- was given as subsidy for the High School building in 1917;

(e) whether it is a fact that the Council applied for additional subsidy for extending the building and whether the same was refused;

(f) whether it is a fact that in spite of the fact that the finances of the Council do not justify incurring larger outlay on this head, yet to satisfy the conditions for recognition, extensions to the building had to be made by the Council to the <sup>cost</sup> ~~extent~~ of Rs. 18,000;

(g)



151



Clause (a) of the question.

Attention is solicited to paragraph 1 of the Director's note on page 5 of notes in the linked file III. Permission to open the VI form in the school was accorded by the Director of Public Instruction on 27th July 1923. It will also be seen from the note that the Council's application for recognition did not reach the Director of Public Instruction in time, nor did it reach him up to the 1st November 1924.

Clause (b).

On 1st November 1924 the Director stated that no application for the recognition of the sixth form had reached him. It is not known whether the D.P.I. received any application after that date and accorded recognition. The reply may be that the Government have no information but will enquire.

Clause (c).

There is no such recommendation by the Govt. The Financial Relations Committee suggested that there should be a secondary school in each municipality, but this does not mean that a school should be opened by a Municipal Council even if there be another school in the area.

Clause (d).

The Government sanctioned the payment of a subsidy of Rs. 4,200, being the difference between the estimated cost of the building and the amount available with the Municipal Council, towards the construction of a building for the Municipal Secondary School.

Clause (e).

In September, 1924 the Municipal Council applied for an additional subsidy of Rs. 4,814, being the difference between the subsidy already sanctioned and one-half of the actual cost of the building.

The

linked file III

\*The date on which  
the D.P.I. wrote the note

linked file III

not received

p 254 report put  
up

G.O. No. 761 29/11-6-17

linked file I

G.O. 15962.E 16.10.24

linked file I



5  
The Government declined to give any additional subsidy -  
G.O. No. 1596 Law (Edn.), dated 16-10-1924.  
Clause (f).

The Chairman reported in September last that the  
total outlay on the building amounted to Rs. 18,028.

Clauses (g) & (h).

The answers to these clauses are in the negative.

2. The following <sup>draft</sup> answer <sup>below</sup> is ~~suggested~~ for con-  
sideration.

CRA  
4.2.25  
8/2  
4.2.25

V.K.  
5.2

m2

9/2/25

(D) in linked file I

(D) ibid.

Cofed 2/2 m 7/2

Please send answer  
to Council office

CRA  
6/2

DESPATCHED

7 FEB 1925

Law Edn. no 293 B/25.1  
7.2.25

6  
LAW (EDUCATION) DEPT.

L.C.O. No. 461.

ANSWER.

(a) The answer to the first part  
of the clause is in the affirmative  
and to the second part in the negative.

(b) The Government have no  
information, but will enquire.

(c) There is ~~no~~ such recommenda-  
tion <sup>has been</sup> made by the Government.

(d) & (e). Yes.

(f) In September 1924 the Chair-  
man of the Municipal Council reported  
that the total outlay on the building  
amounted to Rs. 18,028.

(g) & (h). No.

CRA  
4.2.25  
8/2  
4.2.25

CRA  
4.2.25  
V.K.  
5/2



Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai.

\* 432 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that permission to open the VI form in the Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai, was granted by the Director of Public Instruction in July 1923 and the application for recognition was received in time within six months of the date;

(b) whether the school has not been recognized yet and, if so, the reason for the delay;

(c) whether it is a fact that every municipal council is recommended to maintain a High School;

(d) whether it is a fact that Rs. 4,200 was given as subsidy for the High School building in 1917;

(e) whether it is a fact that the Council applied for additional subsidy for extending the building and whether the same was refused;

(f) whether it is a fact that in spite of the fact that the finances of the Council do not justify incurring larger outlay on this head, yet to satisfy the conditions for recognition, extensions to the building had to be made by the Council to the cost of Rs. 18,000;

(g) whether Government are taking any steps to ascertain what would be the reasonable subsidy which the financial condition of the Council can bear; and

(h) whether Government are taking steps to ascertain what would be the reasonable additional subsidy for the building also?

A.—(a) The answer to the first part of the clause is in the affirmative and to the second part in the negative.

(b) The Government have no information.

(c) No such recommendation has been made by the Government.

(d) & (e) Yes.

(f) In September 1924 the Chairman of the Municipal Council reported that the total outlay on the building amounted to Rs. 18,028.

(g) & (h) No.

The final form of the question and answer was as above.

The note may be

Order. 734 d/8-5-25  
this Recorded.

Legislative Council—  
Question—Municipal  
High School, Tiruvanna-  
malai—Notes—Recorded.

CDL  
7-5-25

A  
7-5-25



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 DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH  
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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