

Law (1925) Department.
Education

Order SERIES.

G.O. No. 829

DATED

16/5/25

[Despatch Abstract.]

Establishment - Office of the Director of Public Instruction -

M.R. Ry. V. K. Sivarama Ayyar - Retention for a further period of one year -

Declined.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.


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

CF 70-41,000-8-9-24.

LAW (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.

Received 192 . Registered 192 .



Requesting sanction of Government to raise the pay of one of the Junior Superintendents of the office of the Director of Public Instruction to Rs. 200-10-250 from Rs. 125-5-175.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Current

No.

448-9/25

Spare copies

Station Madras, Dated the 6th March 1925.

From (Name) R.G. Grieve Esquire, M.A.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir, *through the Accountant General, Madras*

I have the honour in the circumstances stated below to request that Government will be pleased to raise the pay of one of the Junior Superintendents sanctioned for my office in G.O. No. 1016, Law (Education), dated 23rd July 1923 from Rs. 125-5-175 to Rs. 200-10-250, as a temporary measure for a period of one year in the first instance with effect from 1st April 1925.

2. Prior to the reorganization of my office under which five clerks in the old Sub Assistant Inspector's cadre were replaced by five Junior Superintendents and the post of Manager was abolished (vide G.O. No. 1016, Law (Education), dated 23rd July 1923 and G.O. No. 1486, Law (Education), dated 22nd October 1923) the personnel and establishment section of the office had on it two senior persons, viz., the Manager and another senior

clerk in the old Sub Assistant Inspector's cadre, though the former had, in addition, other duties connected with the general administration of the office. This section has now been given only one senior clerk in the cadre of Junior Superintendents. The work of the reorganization of the different branches of the Subordinate Educational Service, affecting nearly 1,000 officers in the different cadres of the service, exclusive of clerical appointments, is not altogether complete. Although the initial pay of officers in the Subordinate Service has been fixed in the new time-scales and the statements of overpayments and underpayments, which were mentioned in my letter R.C. No. 2100 C/24, dated 13th September 1924, disposed of in G.O. No. 1502, Law (Education), dated 24th September 1924, have been forwarded to the Accountant-General, numerous references are still being received from him on the subject and the matter will be finally settled only after all the statements have been accepted by the Accountant-General. Apart from this, the reorganization of the higher services has shortly to be taken up after receipt of orders on the recommendations of the Lee Commission. It is therefore necessary that the establishment section of the office should have as its Superintendent an experienced and efficient clerk, and I accordingly propose to retain in the office as Superintendent of this section, on the revised pay proposed above, M.R.Ry. V.K. Sivarama Ayyar whose retention in the office up to 31st March 1925 has been sanctioned in G.O. No. 1502, Law (Education), dated 24th September 1924.

3. The two most important sections of my office are the budget section and the personnel section. The Superintendent of the former section is now on the scale of Rs. 200-10-250 and I have in connection with the scheme for the control of Provincial Expenditure recommended a higher scale of pay for that post. Without prejudice to Government's orders on that recommendation, I now propose that the Superintendent of the latter section be placed on the same scale of pay as that already sanctioned for the

budget superintendent, especially as he has now to carry on the work formerly done partly by the Manager and partly by a senior clerk in the Deputy Inspector's cadre -- both of them drawing higher salaries than that now sanctioned for a Junior Superintendent.

4. The above proposal will entail an average additional expenditure of (Rs. $237\frac{1}{2}$ - $158\frac{1}{3}$), i.e., Rs. 79/- per mensem nearly

Average cost of 125-5-175 = $125 + (\frac{3}{4} - \frac{5}{60}) 50 = 158\frac{1}{3}$	} under the
" 200-10-250 = $200 + (\frac{3}{4} \times 50) = 237\frac{1}{2}$	

head 31 E.

(a) Education

General - Direction - Pay of Establishments. It will be possible to meet the extra expenditure during 1925-1926 from the provision for establishment of my office made in the Budget Estimates already submitted. Against this additional expenditure under 'Direction'

Average cost of 75-5-100-10-150 = $75 + (2/3 - 5/90) \times 75 = 121$	} there will
" 150-10-250 = $150 + (2/3 - 5/90) \times 100 = 211$	

be a saving of Rs. 90/-

per mensem in the cost of the cadre of Deputy Inspectors under 31 E. b. Education, General - Inspection - Pay of Establishment, so long as Mr. V.K. Sivarama Ayyar continues in this office, since the officer who officiates for him as Deputy Inspector is one in the ordinary grade on Rs. 75-5-100-10-150, ^{through} while Mr. V.K. Sivarama Ayyar holds a post in the selection grade, officiating promotion to the selection grade from the ordinary grade not being admissible. Financially therefore the proposal is one resulting in a saving to Government.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,


R. G. Ayyar
6/3/25.
Director of Public Instruction.

No. Edn.P.A.1-539

OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS.

St. George, 24th March 1925,

Enclosures.



1154 A
d-ca 10136
27/3/25

F O R W A R D E D.

There is no audit objection to the proposal being sanctioned by Government.

The per contra savings pointed out in Director of Public Instructions letter is only temporary i.e. so long as Mr. Sivaram Iyer continues in an officiating capacity elsewhere.

Dy. Accountant-General.
MR

To

The Secretary to Government,

Law (Education) Department.

(Law/Education) Dept

[No-1154A] from the D.P.I., No-4484/25

26-3-1925

Subject - Establishment - office of
the D.P.I. - Revision of the pay of
one of the Junior Superintendents.

The D.P.I. proposes that the pay of one of the Junior Superintendents sanctioned for his office may be raised from Rs 125-5-175 to Rs 200-10-250, as a temporary measure, for a period of one year ^{from 1-11-25} to enable him to retain the services of Mr. V. K. Swarame ayyar.

para 3-page 24 of

2. The proposal of the D.P.I. for the revision of the pay of the Pondicherry Superintendent has not been accepted. It does not appear desirable to alter the scale of pay of the establishment for the benefit of a particular individual. At the same time, it ^{may be pointed out} that Mr. Swarame ayyar is kept on in a costly place ^{like} Madras, not at his own request but in the interests of ^{the} public service.

If Mr. Swarame ayyar is appointed as ^{ordinary} Deputy Inspector of Schools in the Madras city, he will be eligible for a presidency

b

allowance of Rs 25 in addition to his ^{as a Deputy Inspector (Rs 170)} ~~presumptive pay~~. It therefore seems reasonable that he should be paid ^{from 1-4-25} at least Rs 170 + 25 or Rs 195. As he ^{it is submitted that} ~~is~~ eligible for a pay of Rs 180 p.m. from 1.8.25, ^{in the office of the D.D.} this pay may be fixed at Rs 200 p.m. for one year with effect from 1.4.25. One of the posts of Junior Superintendents ^{may} be kept in abeyance, and a post on Rs 200 may be created instead temporarily for a period of one year. If the ^{proposal} ~~above~~ is approved, ^{the} ~~a~~ draft order ^{is} ~~sanctioning~~ is submitted for approval. It may be sent to Finance for acceptance. The additional expenditure can be met out of the ¹⁻⁴⁻²⁵ ~~existing~~ provision under the head '31.2.(a) Education - General - Direction - Pay of establishment' - (vide paragraph 4 of the D.P.I.'s letter on p. 3 (cf.))


Sris
14.4M
21/4/25A
3.4.25V.K.
4.4

Finance (no)

Law En no 1154 A-1

13279 ET

6.4.25



A m p 2 aut.

D

B m p 1 aut.

page 64 of 80 1016 EM 23-7-23 E

H 25-26 of flap S

p 1780 1502 EM 24-9-24 B

The proposal of Law (Education) Department is that one of the posts of junior Superintendents on Rs 125-5-175 in the D.P.I.'s office be held temporarily in abeyance for a period of one year from 1-4-25 and that in its place a temporary post of Superintendent on Rs 200 p.m. be created for the same period. The creation of a temporary post for the performance of specific duties for which a permanent post already exists is irregular - vide Accountant General's endorsement at p. 5 of G.O. 2129, Development, dated 15-12-24. Finance cannot, therefore, agree to the proposal.

2. As regards the Law Department's contention that Mr. Sivarama Ayyar is kept on in a costly place like Madras and that he is losing the Presidency allowance which he would otherwise get, it is submitted that Mr. Sivarama Ayyar has been holding one of the five posts of clerk-Deputy Inspectors in the D.P.I.'s office. All these posts were converted into senior and junior Superintendents' posts and the D.P.I. was instructed in paragraph 4 (ii) of G.O. No. 1486, Law (Education), dated 22-10-23 to transfer the existing incumbents one by one to the executive line at suitable opportunities. All the incumbents except Mr. Sivarama Ayyar have been so transferred but Mr. Sivarama Ayyar has been retained in the office and has been allowed to draw the presumptive pay of his permanent post, that is, Rs 150-10-250 against the pay of a junior Superintendent (Rs 125-5-175). It is submitted that Mr. Sivarama Ayyar has not been put to any extra expense in his being continued in the office which he previously held. Moreover, the D.P.I. does not adduce this as a ground for increasing the pay of the post. It does not, therefore, seem that there is any case for any extra remuneration.


3. As the D.P.I. wants to retain Mr. Sivarama Ayyar in his office for sometime more, it seems sufficient if the arrangement sanctioned in G.O. No. 1502, Law (Education), dated 24-9-24 is extended for another year from 1-4-25. Finance may agree to this.

*Due
28.4.25*

I should agree to retention for 6 months only. It seems to me that the D.P.I. is taken in special pleading. He should be told finally that the officer must be provided for in the regular line as he ends the 6 months. Otherwise the orders already framed will never be brought into effect.

(B)

K.R



*A - Cu 1584A
5/5/25*

*Fin no 13279ET-1
5.5.25*

Law (Education) Department

Para 1 of the Finance Dept. note

It is submitted that it has been usual in this dept. to hold ^{temporarily} in abeyance permanent posts in the I.E.S cadre and to create tempy. posts in the M.E.S in their place. Finance has not objected to the arrangement in such cases. It will be seen from para 4 of the D.P.I's letter that the adoption of ~~these~~ ^{these} proposals will result in a saving to ~~the~~ Govt. of Rs.11 p.m. or Rs.132 per annum.

p. 3 and

p. 3 CF

2 Para 2 of the Finance Dept. note

There are two Dy. Insprs of schools stationed in Madras City. These officers were not in receipt of a Presidency allowance prior to 1-3-24. But they now draw a presidency allce. of Rs.25 p.m. each in pursuance of the orders in G.O.No.87 Fin., dated 29-1-24. Mr. Sivarama Ayyar also belongs to the cadre

(DD)

of Dy. Inspectors and, if he is employed in the regular line in Madras City, he will be in receipt of a presidency allce. There is no reason why he should suffer in emoluments, merely because his services are required in the Director's office. He has not voluntarily sought employment in that office.

3 Period of retention of Mr. Sivaramier's services in the Director's Office.

The Finance Department agrees to the retention of Mr. Sivaramier's services in the Director's office only for a further period of six months. The Director however desires to retain his services for a further period of one year in view of the impending re-organization of the higher educational services in the light of the recommendations of the Lee Commission. As the Director's proposal ~~involves~~ results in a saving to Govt., there is no reason why his recommendation should not be accepted.

p. 4 CF

p. 2 CF

4 The file may be circulated to M and C for orders.

*NK
6/5/25*

*6.5.25
S*

*V.T.
8.5*

M2

C4

I am not a little surprised at the proposal contained in this file. In G.O. 1486 "S" Government had that then Deputy Inspectors (H) be transferred to the Executive rank.

As a matter of fact they
were allowed to draw the pre-
sumptive pay & their Cadre.

It is anomalous & is urged to
fundamental rules as pointed out
in the Concluding part of the S.O.

2. The necessity for keeping in
Atheyance a Junior Sub's post
is not at all more ^{out} unless it be
that the D.P.O's Office has been
handed over the requirements -
It is a pity Mr Schmitt could
not complete his work in this
Office - I strongly deprecate
the suggestion of keeping a place
in Atheyance thereby depriving
Austin Subordinate of his right to
promotion in order to favour
this by Subordinate - Clerk

3. The Nassau Inlet is that requirements
of services will have to be made when
advice are framed on the Commission -
This is least Commission - till the
Reorganisation become responsible if
this Junior Sub's is transferred to the
original post? or if he is dismissed
I do not consider this is a serious
argument to proceed from that
Office -

4. I agree with the Finance note at pp 374
and concur with the opinion of the
Finance Secretary, this is a special
pleading to benefit this junior clerk
at the expense of others -

5. There is no reason why he should be retained
in the office. He does not belong to the
city, he was not posted to the city and
the analogy regarding city allowance is
not relevant -

6. The retention of Sivaswami Aiyar in the
D.P. D's office is opposed to the order of 1924
and to give him further allowance in
increase of pay in the office at the expense
of others is not justified.

He may be transferred immediately as by order
there are equally well qualified & more
experienced clerks in the office to take his
place equally well if not more so.

~~The proposal is not approved -
Order not of the D.P. D. but of the Finance Secretary
under Mr. Schacht who has been allowed
to overrule this office also.~~

2/5/25

I can quite understand D.P. D's
anxiety to retain an experienced
officer in whom he has confidence
at the present juncture, & am

not prepared to insist on moving to
him. Then that. But as the
proposal is turned down in the
Administration Dept. I am not
further concerned. I am afraid
however that we shall be forced
to take up the question of the
reorganization of the D.P. D's office
to meet changing conditions &
expansion before long.

2/5/25

Draft
V.T.K.
11.5

Draft submitted

13-5-25

V.T.K.
16.5



When received for Fair-copying.

When copied

When examined

When signed

When despatched

Date.	Initials
1903	
1904	
1905	
1906	
1907	
1908	
1909	
1910	
1911	
1912	
1913	
1914	
1915	
1916	
1917	
1918	
1919	
1920	
1921	
1922	
1923	
1924	
1925	
1926	
1927	
1928	
1929	
1930	
1931	
1932	
1933	
1934	
1935	
1936	
1937	
1938	
1939	
1940	
1941	
1942	
1943	
1944	
1945	
1946	
1947	
1948	
1949	
1950	
1951	
1952	
1953	
1954	
1955	
1956	
1957	
1958	
1959	
1960	
1961	
1962	
1963	
1964	
1965	
1966	
1967	
1968	
1969	
1970	
1971	
1972	
1973	
1974	
1975	
1976	
1977	
1978	
1979	
1980	
1981	
1982	
1983	
1984	
1985	
1986	
1987	
1988	
1989	
1990	
1991	
1992	
1993	
1994	
1995	
1996	
1997	
1998	
1999	
2000	
2001	
2002	
2003	
2004	
2005	
2006	
2007	
2008	
2009	
2010	
2011	
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
2024	
2025	
2026	
2027	
2028	
2029	
2030	
2031	
2032	
2033	
2034	
2035	
2036	
2037	
2038	
2039	
2040	
2041	
2042	
2043	
2044	
2045	
2046	
2047	
2048	
2049	
2050	
2051	
2052	
2053	
2054	
2055	
2056	
2057	
2058	
2059	
2060	
2061	
2062	
2063	
2064	
2065	
2066	
2067	
2068	
2069	
2070	
2071	
2072	
2073	
2074	
2075	
2076	
2077	
2078	
2079	
2080	
2081	
2082	
2083	
2084	
2085	
2086	
2087	

Establishment--Office of the D.P.I.--M.R.By

V.K. Sivarama Ayyar--retention for a

further period of one year--declined.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____, dated _____, 192 .

” ” ” ” ” 192 .

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 154 From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 192

” ” ” ” ” ” ” 192 .

" "....." " "....." "....." "....." 192 .

ORDER.

Misc.

No. 929, dated 10-5- 1925.

The Government are unable to entertain the proposals of the D.P.I to raise the pay of one of the Junior Superintendents in his office temporarily for a period of one year and to retain the services of M.R.Ry V.K.Sivarama Ayyar in his office for a further period.

2. M.R.Ry. V.K.Sivarama Ayyar
should be reverted to his permanent
appointment as a Deputy Inspector
of schools immediately on receipt of
these orders.

The D.P.I. (with ref. to his letter No. 448 dated 5-3-25)

Copy to the A.G.

DESPATCHED
16 MAY 1925

$$\frac{114}{13157.23}$$

13/5725

V.TK
16.5

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 192
When examined _____
When signed _____

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

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, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

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