EDUCATION (19) DEPARTMETN.

F D

MS SERIES.

[illegible]

G. O. No. 1043 Edn

DATED. 30/3/50.

(DESPATCH ABSTACT)

Colleges - Municipal College, Salem - Teaching staff - Revised scales of pay - Fixation of pay

58/Edu
3/3/49

By Registered Post. Ack. Due

G. 6.

From Sri S.R.Sellaraj B.A.,
Commissioner,
Salem Municipality, Salem

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education & Public Health Department
Fort St George, MADRAS.
Thro' The Director of Public Instruction
Madras.
THRO' The Chairman, Municipal Council,
Salem

C 214 26 AUG 1949 Public Instruction Madras

Roc No C3. 13586/46 dated 16/8/1949

Sir,

Sub:- Establishment - Salem College - Revised Scales of pay - Giving effedt to certain points - Clarification - requested.
Ref:- G.O. Ms No 581 Education dated 3/3/1949

In para 2 of G.O. No Ms 581 Education dated 3/3/49 revising scales of pay for the teaching staff of the Salem College, Government have sanctioned the posts of Professors and have also said that one of the Professors should be paid a duty allowance of Rs 50/- for doing the duties of the Principal. Prior to the introduction of the above new scales of pay there was a post of Principal in a separate scale of pay and he was drawing the maximum salary in that scale.

2 In para 3 of the Government order cited the Government have said that for purposes of weightage in the proposed scale for Professors the period of service of Lecturers as heads of departments in the subjects concerned shall also be taken into account. The Principal and three Lecturers were designated as Heads of Departments from 13-9-44. It is not clear from the above para of Government order that for purpose of granting weightage whether the services as Heads of Departments should alone be taken into consideration and the period of services rendered prior to that has also to be counted for payment of advance increments.

3 In the case of Sri A.Ramaswami Goundar, Principal, Salem College his entire service from the date of appointment as Principal, Salem College were taken into consideration and his pay was fixed at Rs 500/- granting him four advance increments. He was drawing Rs 300/- on 30-6-48 in the old scale of pay of Rs 200-20/2-300. He was appointed as Principal on 1-7-27 and his total service on 30-6-48 is 21 years. As per clause 2 (a) of G.O. No 2756 Education dated 27-12-47 his pay was fixed at Rs 340/- next stage above his pay in the revised scale and granting him four advance increments for his total service of 21 years his pay was fixed at Rs 500/- plus Rs 50/- duty allowance. I request the favour of orders of Government whether the fixation made is correct.

4 With reference to the above instruction only in the case of three other Lecturers who have been made as Heads of Departments from 13-9-44 and who have been designated as Professors their pay have been fixed at the minimum in the ~~old~~ scale of pay without allowing any weightage as per particulars noted below. Para 2 clause (e) of G.O. No Ms 2756 Education dated 27-11-47 however provides one year's service to be taken into account for purpose of weightage for those not eligible for any advance increments under clause (c). If this one year is added on to each of the Lecturers as Heads of Departments or in the alternative if their entire services in the College are taken into consideration they will be entitled to one advance increment on 1-7-48 or more and their pays have to be refixed at Rs 230/-. I request the favour of orders of Government on the above.

Name	Service Y. M. D	Service as Heads of Department Y. M. D	Old scale of pay Rs	Pay drawnon 30-6-48	New scale of pay Rs	Pay fixed now. Rs
1. Sri N.Srinivasan	15--5-26	3--9--0	100-10/2-180	Rs 180/-	200-30/2-260 -40/2-500	200
2. Sri P.Thangarajan	7-5-15	3--0-0	-do-	Rs 130/-	-do-	200
3. Sri V.Achuthan Nair	3-11-0	3--9-0	-do-	Rs 160/-	-do-	20

5) I presume the term 'increment' for purpose of weightage includes' 'Biennial increment'. I request the favour of orders of Government on this point also as it is very difficult to obtain and retain the services of qualified and experienced officers ~~in~~ like the present members of the staff, it is highly essential and necessary that favourable orders are passed on these points urgently.

Enclosures: 4. S.Rs.

------

km/17.8. 17/8/49

COMMISSIONER 17/8/49

Forwarded

N. Jagannathan
18/8/49
CHAIRMAN

G2

Office of the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.
Rc.No.2147 G3/49 dated 13th Sep. 1949.

Subject:- Municipal College, Salem -- Revision of scales of pay-grant of advance increments.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
17 SEP 1949
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

Read:- Letter from the Commissioner, Salem Municipality Roc.No.C3-13586/46 dated 16-8-49.

PP1-2 ante

Submitted.

72036

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
3 - DEC 1949
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

2. Government may be pleased to clarify the points raised by the Commissioner.

For Director of Public Instruction.

94626

To the Secretary to Government, Education and Public Health Department, Fort St. George, Madras.

SJ/14/9.

14/9 14/9

E&PH (G2)

Endt No 72036/92/49-1 (Edn)/- 24/9/49

Referred to the Examiner of Local Fund accounts for remarks at an early date

(By order)

24/9

V. Ramaswami
Assistant Secretary to Govt.
23.9.49

To
The Examiner of Local Fund accounts
(with encl- 4 service books to be returned).

EXAMINER OF LOCAL FUND ACCOUNTS
3254
27 SEP 1949
MADRAS

LF6603
1-12-49

Office of the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts, Mount Road, Madras--2.

It is observed from the revised scales of pay sanctioned for the teaching staff of the Salem Municipal College that while the revised time scales of pay for Lecturers, Language Lecturers, Tutor, Demonstrators and Physical

P8799 (A)

Physical Training Director provide for annual increments, the scale of pay for the Principal and Professors provides for biennial increments. Apparently the Professors (including the Principal) of the Salem Municipal College were considered to correspond to the Provincial Service under Government. At the time of the general revision of the scales of pay of Government servants in G.O.No.78, Finance, dated 6-2-1947 the scales of pay for some Provincial Services were revised; but the members thereof were declared eligible only to the increased minimum pay without any weightage for past service. The revision of the scales of pay of posts under local bodies being consequent on the general revision of scales of pay of Government servants in G.O.No. 78, Finance, dated 6-2-1947, on the analogy of the orders governing the Provincial Services the Professors (including the Principal) of the Salem Municipal College will not normally be entitled to any weightage for past service. It is presumed that the orders in paragraph 3 of G.O.Ms.No. 581, Education, dated 3-3-1949 were issued after a consideration of this aspect and that a concession not given to persons of similar status in Government service was allowed as a special case.

2) In paragraph 3 of G.O.Ms.No. 581, Education, dated 3-3-1949 the principles laid down in G.O.No. 2756, Education, dated 27-12-1947 were made applicable to the teaching staff of the Salem Municipal College in the matter of fixation of pay in the revised scales. According to the instructions in the said Government Order, the Principal will, for his service of over sixteen years in the existing scale be entitled to four advance increments and his pay has been fixed at Rs.500 as shown below:

Pay in the existing scale.	Rs. 300
Next stage in the revised scale.	Rs. 340
4 advance increments at Rs.40	Rs. 160
Initial Pay.	Rs. 500

The rate of the biennial increment has been taken into account for this purpose. If the revised time scale had allowed for annual increments, the amount of increment would have perhaps been less than the present one - i.e., about half the amount of the biennial increment, and the Principal would be entitled to Rs.400 as shown below:

Pay in the existing scale.	Rs.300
Next stage in the revised scale.	Rs.320
4 advance increments at Rs.20	Rs. 80
Initial Pay.	Rs.400

It is not known whether the facts that the increment in the revised scale of pay is biennial and that the orders will confer on these individuals double the advantage that would accrue to persons on an annual incremental scale were considered by Government before the issue of G.O.Ms.No. 581, Education, dated 3-3-1949. The fixation of pay as now made by the Commissioner is strictly in accordance with the expression in the Government order though it will not be justifiable if it was not the intention of Government to grant to the Principal a concession in excess of that allowed to other officials in the service of Government or local bodies. It is therefore for Government to decide whether the biennial increment should, for purposes of weightage, be allowed at the rate prescribed in clause (c) under paragraph 2 of G.O. No.Ms. 2576, Education, dated 27-12-1947 which was issued in respect of scales with only annual increments.

3)

---

to 1 ante

3) In respect of the other Professors whose service for purposes of weightage was less than four years and who were not therefore entitled to any advance increment, a period of one year has been added to their service and one increment is proposed to be allowed to them. The instructions in clause(e) of paragraph 2 of G.O.Ms.No. 2756, Education, dated 27-12-1947 does not appear to have been properly understood. It merely allows the service in the existing scale of pay to be counted for increments in the revised time scales up to a period of one year and it does not allow any period to be added to the service for purposes of advance increment. The intention appears to be that those who are not eligible to any advance increment may count their service from the date of last increment in the existing scale for increment in the revised scale - this period being limited to one year if the revised scale allowed annual increments. Accordingly, none of these Professors would be eligible for one increment in the revised scale as surmised by the Commissioner.

do

4) The Government Endorsement with enclosures is returned herewith.

(B.B.Shanker Rao)
Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
1-12.

ENCLOSURES:

4 Service books.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education & Public Health Department,
Madras.

6

Education (F)

Precedes

The matter is under consideration (orders)

[illegible] Assistant Secretary

To
The Commissioner
through the [illegible]

F 7

From
Sri S.R.Sellaraj, B.A.,
Commissioner,
Salem Municipality,
Salem.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
Fort St. George, Madras
Thro' The Chairman,
Municipal Council, Salem.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
28 MAR 1950
4865
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Roc.No.C3-13586-46 d/23--3--1950.

Sir,

Sub: Establishment - Salem College - revised scales of pay - giving effect to - certain points - clarification - requested.

Ref: This office letter No.C3-13586-46 dated 16-8-49.

I request the favour of early orders on the above reference.

D. Gopalakrishnamachari
25.3.50
COMMISSIONER. Delegate

SSM/24.3.p. 2573

FORWARDED

CHAIRMAN.
25/3/50

PTO

2

Education (F)

Endts

The matter is under consideration

(By order)

V. Ramaswami
Assistant Secretary to Govt

VS
29/3/50

29.3.50

(*) file sent to L.A. for with draft note

To
The Commissioner,
Through The Chairman, Municipal Council,
Salem.

Education (F).

COLLEGES - Municipal College, Salem -Teaching staff - Revised scales of pay - Fixation of pay.

C.No.72036/49.

READ:- G.O.No.581 Edn., dated 3-3-1949.

From the Commissioner, Salem Municipality, Roc.No. C.3.13586/46 dated 16.8.49.

From the D.P.I.Rc.No.2147 G3/49 dated 13.9.49.

From the Exr.of L.F.Accts, No.L.F.6603 dated 1.12.49

ORDER./MS.NO. 1043 EDN. DATED 30-3-50

The action of the Commr. Salem Municipality in ~~The Government sanction as a special case~~ having refixed the pay of Sri A. Ramaswami Goundar, Principal, Salem Municipal College ~~the grant of a pay of Rs.~~ at Rs.500/- in the scale of Rs.200-30/2-260-40/2-500 plus the ~~usual~~ duty allowance of Rs 50/- p.m., ~~to Sri A.Ramaswami Goundar, Principal, Salem College~~, ~~with~~ effect from 1.7.48 is approved.

2. The action of the Commissioner in having fixed the pay of the Professors at Rs.200/- in the above scale from 1.7.48 is correct.

VS
22/3/50

22.3.50

23/3/50

28.3.50

To
The Commissioner,
Salem Municipality,
Through the Chairman,
~~Salem Ml.Cl., Salem.~~
The D.P.I. (with encl. 4 spare sets)
The Exr.of L.F.Accts.
The Inspr.of Ml.Cls,& L. Bds.
~~Copy to L.A.Deptt.~~
4 spare copies.

10

E.& P.H.(G.2)

College - Salem Municipal College - Teaching staff
Revised scales of pay - Clarification.

C.No.~~9462~~ 72036/49. PP1-2 cf

Fromthe Commissioner,Salem Municipality, Roc.No.C.3.
13586/46 dated 16.8.1949.

P3 cf
From the D.P.I.,Rc.No.2147 G3/49 dated 13.9.1949.

PP3-5 cf
From the Exr. of L.F.Accounts,No.L.F.6603 dated 1.12.49

Please see the letter from the Commissioner, Salem Municipality, on p.p.1-2 c.f., the endorsement of the D.P.I. on p.3 c.f., and the remarks of the ~~ExR~~ Exr.of L.F.Accounts on p.p.3-5 c.f. The Commissioner has requested clarification from the Govt. on the following points:--

PP85-86 cf (A)

para 2 on p1 cf

(1) Whether for purposes of weightage in respect of the scale of pay of the Professors and the Principal of the Salem College,under G.O.No.581 Edn., dated 3-3-1949, their service as heads of the Departments alone should be taken into account as per orders issued in paragraph 3 of the above G.O. or whether their service prior to that has also to be taken into account.

para 3 on P1 cf

P1 of (R)

(2) The pay of Sri A.Ramaswami Goundar,Principal of the College has been fixed at Rs.500/- ~~on 1.7.48~~ plus the duty allowance of Rs.50/- as from 1.7.48, As per clause 2(a) of G.O.No.2756 Edn., dated 27.12.47, his pay on 1.7.48 in the revised scale (Rs.200-30/2-260-40/2-500) was fixed at Rs.340/- just above his substantive pay of Rs.300/- in the old scale on that date and he has been given four advance increments for his service of 21 years with reference to paragraph 2(c)(iv) of G.O.No.2756 Edn., dated 27.12.1947,thus fixing his pay at Rs.500/- and he has also been given the duty allowance of Rs.50/- per mensem sanctioned in G.O.No.581 Edn.,dated 3.3.1949. The Commissioner enquires whether the above fixation is correct.

P2 of (R)

PP85-86 of (A)

(3) In respect of 3 other ~~persons~~ members of the staff who have been

have been appointed as Professors on 1.7.48, their pay in the revised scale was fixed at Rs.200/- i.e. the minimum of the new scale, as they are not eligible for any ~~xxx~~ of the concessions mentioned in G.O.No.2756 Edn., 27-12-47. ~~Exxxxx~~ Please see in this connection the statement furnished by the Commissioner in respect of the fixation of their pay, on p.1 c.f. ~~Under~~ Para.2(e) of G.O.No.2756 Edn., dated 27-12-1947 provides that an employee not eligible for any advance increment shall be allowed to count service in the existing scale of pay for increments in the revised scales of pay up to a maximum of one year. The Commissioner wishes to know whether he can add ~~that~~ one year to the ~~xxxxx~~ service of these persons as heads of Departments ~~and~~ which is over 3 years and grant them one advance increment on 1.7.48.

from 4 on p.1 cf

PP1-2 of Ⓡ

P2 of Ⓡ

P1 cf

(4) He desires to know whether the term 'increment' ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ for purposes of weightage includes 'Biennial increment'.

P2 cf

2 The D.P.I. has forwarded the Commissioner's letter ~~for~~ for the orders of Govt. without his remarks. The Examiner of Local Fund Accounts ~~xxx~~ was consulted in the matter and his remarks are as ~~fxxxxxx~~ follows:--

P3 cf

PP3-5 cf

He points out that the rate of increment for the lecturers, teachers and demonstrators in the revised scale sanctioned in G.O.No.581 Edn., dated 3-3-1949, is annual, that the scale sanctioned for the Professors and the Principal is biennial and that the latter is presumably fixed with reference to the biennial scales sanctioned to a few Provincial Service men ~~under~~ in the recent revision of pay under G.O.No.78 ~~Edn~~ Fin., dated 6.2.1947. He brings to the notice of Govt. that no advance increment has been allowed in respect of gazetted servants and that it has been confined only to persons in the ~~xxxx~~ non-gazetted service under the Govt. in the recent revision, while such a concession ~~it~~ is given to the Professors and the Principal of the Salem College under the revision now sanctioned by Govt. for the staff of that College. He desires to know whether the intention of Govt.

PP85-86 of Ⓐ

pages 4-6 of Ⓤ

---

is to confer ~~an advantage to the Professors and the~~ on the Principal of the Salem Municipal College ~~an advantage~~ a concession which ~~is not enjoyed by~~ has not been allowed to ~~the gazetted staff in Govt. service in the Education Department~~ persons of similar status in Govt. Service.

P 4 cf

As regards the fixation of pay of the Principal, the Examiner argues that if the rate of increment for purposes of advance increment is treated as annual, the pay of the Principal should probably be fixed at Rs.400/- only on 1.7.48. He desires to know whether the fact that the Principal gets double advantage viz. an increment of Rs.160/- on account of the biennial rate of Rs.40/- and also the weightage for past service which is not given to Govt. servants of the gazetted rank. He raises the point whether for purposes of weightage the biennial increment ~~xxxxx~~ should be allowed to them.

A on p4 cf

3 As regards the Examiner's remarks, it may be mentioned that in respect of the Salem Municipal College the revision of scales of pay of the staff was overdue and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the Govt. have sanctioned enhanced scales of pay on the repeated requests of the staff and the authorities of the College and on the suggestion of the Madras University.⊗ The recurring grant payable to the College is Rs.5000/- ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx which~~ and this amount has not been increased on account of the recent revision. As the Salem College is ~~only instance of a~~ the only single Local Body College in this province, and as the Govt. are not put to additional expenditure on account of the recent revision of pay of the teachers, it is for orders whether the case of this college will be considered as a special case and the orders regarding increments etc. issued in G.O.No.581 Edn., dated 3-3-1949 would be allowed to stand or whether the question will be re-opened in the light of the remarks of the Exr. of L.F. Accounts.

pages 1-8, 45 and 81-83 cf of Ⓐ

⊗ pages 21-22, 33, 61 ibid

para 4 of the G.O. on p86 ibid

Please see the next page

25-1-50

PP85-86 cf of Ⓐ

As

. As regards the fixation of pay of the ~~other~~ Professors, ~~their service~~ under the orders issued in G.O,No.581 Edn.,dated 3.3.49 the period of ~~their~~ their service as heads of the Departments alone should be taken into account for purposes of advance increment and not their total service. The Commissioner may be informed that the ~~period~~ orders already issued in this matter require no revision.

paras pp 85-86 cf of (A)

h 25-1-50

4 The Exr. ~~states that~~ points out that it is not correct to add one year to the service of the Professors as heads of Departments and grant them, each, one advance increment on 1-7-48, as suggested by the ~~Commissioner~~ commissioner, for ~~the~~ G.O. No. 2756 Edn. of 27/12/47 authorises the counting of one year alone for purposes of increment. In the circumstances, ~~his~~ the Examiner's ~~remark that~~ ~~the pay of~~ none ~~of the three other Professors can be fixed~~ ~~remark that~~ view that none of the other 3 professors can be given one advance increment on 1.7.48 may be agreed to.

p 5 cf

(R)

The file may be sent to L.A. and Finance for remarks ~~prior~~ ~~to circulation~~ on the points specifically raised by the Examiner in his note on pages 3-4 cf -

RS 17/1/50

18/1/50

5/. In G.O. No. 581 Education, dated 3-3-49, the following scales were prescribed for the teaching staff of the Salem College, as from 1-7-48:-

pages 86-87 cf of (A)

(a) Principal (who is also the Professor of Mathematics) — Rs 200-30/2-260-40/2-500 + a duty allowance of Rs 50.
(b) Three Professors ~~[illegible]~~ (Economics, Physics and English) — do.
(c) Lecturers — 100-10-250
(d) Tutors & Demonstrators — 75-5-100
(e) Physical Director — 85-5-125-10-175.

It was also ordered in that G.O. that the principles laid down in G.O. No. 2756 Edn. of 27-12-47 in regard to the fixation of pay of teaching staff in secondary schools under local bodies, should be adhered to. It is now brought to ~~notice~~ notice as seen from the correspondence in the current file that the principles cannot be applied to categories (a) and (b) above for the reason that biennial scales have been prescribed for the four posts, while the principles in the G.O. of the 27th December 1947 apply to posts carrying annual increments.

(R)

(R)

[illegible] at (A)

P It was originally proposed to allow ~~advance~~ annual increments only for the incumbents of these posts, but on the suggestion of Finance that biennial increments might be prescribed as in the case of gazetted posts ~~under~~ Govt, the scale mentioned above was introduced. The Municipal Commissioner has fixed the pay of each of the three Professors (category (b) above) at the minimum of the time-scale, viz Rs 200 and has raised the question whether they should not be allowed one advance increment raising their pay from Rs 200 to Rs 230. The Examiner of L.F Accounts holds the view that no such increment is permissible. The Commissioner has fixed the pay of the Principal at Rs 500; the Examiner holds the view that the fixation of pay is correct in accordance with the Govt. orders, but that the fixation confers on the Principal an advantage which is not given to Govt. officers or local board employees.

para 4 on p. 1 cf and the Service books below

p 5 cf

para 3 on p. 1 cf and the Service book below

p 4 cf

6. As stated in para 3 on page 3 ante, the intention was to introduce revised scales of pay for the staff and to give ~~advance increments~~ weightage for past service as in the case of other employees. The scales of pay suggested for adoption by the M.C, the D.P.I and the University of Madras and that ordered in the G.O, are compared below:-

(a) Scale proposed - Rs 200-15-350-20-450-25-500 (17 years).
(b) Scale fixed - 200-30/2-260-40/2-500 (16 years)

pages 2-2(a) of the sectional notes at (A)

p 95 cf ibid

The scale at (a) above is the one prescribed by the University. It was proposed to adopt this scale, but for the reason at 'P' above, the scale at (b) was introduced. The minima and the maxima of both the scales are the same. By the adoption of the scale at (a), the Professors who are not gazetted officers as in Govt. service, will get annual increments and also one advance increment for past service as shown in para 4 of the Commissioner's letter. This Dept. may therefore suggest that this scale may be prescribed for the Professors in modification of the scale at (b).

A

p 1 cf

7. The scale of pay prescribed by the University for the Principal of a college under private management, is either Rs 300-15-450-20-550-25-600, or the Professor's scale mentioned in item (a) in the ~~[illegible]~~ previous para, plus a duty allowance of Rs 100. The Salem M.C resolved to adopt the scale mentioned above and to give a starting pay of Rs 405 to the Principal. In G.O.No 581 Edn dated 3-3-49, the Professor's scale of Rs 200-500 was allowed to the Principal in addition to a duty allowance of Rs 50 as in the case of Govt. I grade colleges. As stated in para 5 ~~already~~ the pay of the Principal on 1-7-48 has been correctly fixed at Rs 500 by the Municipal Commissioner and the duty allowance of Rs 50 has also been allowed. If the suggestion in the previous para is accepted, the pay of the Principal on 1-7-48 should be refixed at Rs 370 and the difference should be recovered. This Dept. may however hold that no recovery need be made on account of the ~~following reasons in~~ fact that the ~~[illegible]~~ fixation is held to be correct in accordance with the existing orders, by the Examiner of L.F Accounts.

p 14 5 7 (A)

p 47 of ibid

p 85 of ibid

p 5 ante

p 14 cf

The Principal (Sri Ramaswami Gounder) may perhaps be allowed to draw Rs 500, the maximum of the Professor's scale in addition to the duty allowance for the following reasons:-

(i) From 26-11-1932 to 30-6-1948, he drew the same pay, viz Rs 300.

Vide the service book below

(ii) The status of the college was raised to I grade in 1944, but there was no increase of pay for the Principal.

(iii) The maximum pay of the Principal of a I grade college under Govt (other than the Presidency College) is Rs 700 + duty allowance of Rs 50. When compared to this, the pay of the Salem College Principal is not excessive.

(iv) The Principal is due to retire in March 1952.

p 1 of the Service book

It has already been ordered that no increased grant would be given to the Salem M.C on account of the revision of the scales of pay of the staff. L.A & Fin may see.

p 84 (A)

25-1-50

S/28/1 / L.A/Fin

E Dpt (92)
Lc. no. 72036/49
28/1/50

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
4468
31 JAN 1950
SECRETARIAT, MADRAS

(A)/85 86 9

(A)/pages 1-3 of Secy's notes

In G.O.No. 581 Edn dated 3-3-49 ~~two~~ biennial scales of pay were fixed for the posts of principal and professors of the Salem Ml. College while the scales of pay proposed by the M.C. and recommended by the University were annual scales. The biennial scale was adopted on the suggestion of Fin on the analogy of the scales of pay allowed for gazetted officers in Govt service. The amount of biennial increment is double or very nearly double that of annual increment. [Advance increment is not admissible to ~~In the case of~~ gazetted officers ~~advance increment has not been sanctioned~~ under ~~in~~ G.O.Ms. 78 Fin dated 6-2-47. The advance increment has been sanctioned in that G.O. only ~~in the case of~~ to subordinate services. Biennial increment and advance increment do not go together in the revision of scales of pay introduced by Govt in the case of Govt servants. Applying the same principle to the principal and professors of the Salem Ml. college, it has to be pointed out that the advance increment allowed in paragraph 3 of G.O. No 581 Edn dated 3-3-49 is not in conformity with the principles followed in Govt service. The G.O. needs modification to the effect that the principles laid down in G.O.Ms. 2756, Edn dated 27-12-47 (referred to in paragraph 3 of G.O. No 581 Edn dated 3-3-49) relating to advance advance increments will not apply to the principal and professors of the Salem Ml. college. Their pay in the revised scale should be fixed in accordance with the ordinary provisions of F.R. Any recovery from the principal and professors of the amounts already paid in excess of what was due to them according to the modified procedure for their fixation of pay suggested above, may be waived.

(U)/3

(U)/3 (para 9)

(A)/86 cf

2. As regards the proposal at "A" on page 5 and

E III

Prof-A

It is submitted that the future incumbents of the posts of Principal and Professors ~~will not get are~~ will not be entitled to advance increments even according to the existing orders. The need for revision on that score does not exist.

As the ~~two~~ biennial scale has been introduced after mature discussion, there seems to be no case for ~~revision of the policy~~ revising the scale as proposed by E&P.H.

3 The case may be passed on to Fin.

9.2.50.

1/ Prior to the introduction of the revised scale of pay, the Principal of the Ml.College was getting Rs.300, in the scale of Rs.200-20-300. On the revision of the scale to Rs.200-30/2-260-40/2-500 plus a duty allce of Rs.50, his pay has been fixed at Rs.500 plus 50, by granting him weightage for past service. In the case of certain provincial service officers whose pay was revised in G.O. No.78 Fin dated 6-2-47, weightage for past service has not been allowed as in the case of subordinate service officers. This point was probably overlooked when the orders in para 3 of 581 Edn. dated 3-3-47 were drafted. Officers in ml.service ~~can~~ are not ~~be~~ given an advantage which is not available to Govt. servants of corresponding grades or posts. As the pay the Principal was getting at the time of the introduction of the revised scale of pay represented a definite stage in the revised scale, ~~hexwsmid~~ his pay should have been fixed only at Rs.300 under F.R.22. He may get besides, the duty allce. of Rs.50. This Deptt. may advise that the pay of the Principal be fixed at Rs.300 plus duty allce of Rs.50, with effect from 1-7-48. The excess pay already drawn need not however be recovered. A

(U)

p.87 (A)

2/ As for the professors, the posts were newly created in the scale of Rs.200-30/2-260-40/2-500 for the first time/and the Asst.Lecturers already in service were appointed Professors and started at the minimum of the new scale. Their pay before they were appointed Professors was only Rs.180 in the scale of Rs.100-180. For the reason stated in the previous para, these Professors too are not eligible for any weightage for the service in their previous posts. As their pay has been fixed only at Rs.200, no question of recovery arises in their case. B

11.2.50

14.2.50

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
W 11083
17 FEB 1950
21
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Finance (E III)

The notes of L.A. deptt on pp 7-8 above which sets out the case briefly may be perused. Finance may agree with their views at 'A' + 'B' on p 8 above.

27/2/50

27/2/50

24.2.50

27/2/50

E&P.H

~~24.2.50~~

Fin. no
11083 E III
27/2/50

15386
24 FEB 1950
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

(U) (B)

Following the revision of the scales of pay for ~~the~~ Government servants in G.O. No. 78 Finance dated 6-2-1947, the scales of pay of Board and Municipal employees were revised in 1947. The question of revising the pay of the staff employed in the Salem Municipal College (the only College maintained by ~~the~~ a Local body in this Province) was also taken ~~into account~~ up and final orders were issued in G.O.No. 581 Education dated 3rd March 1949, giving retrospective effect from 1-7-1948. The following statement shows in one view the previous scales of pay, the scales proposed by the University of Madras, the Salem Municipal Council and the D.P.I. and the scales ~~h~~as finally approved by Government.

paras 85-86 of f.f (A)

Vide the sectional notes to the front (A)

Posts (1)	Previous scale. (2) Rs.	Pay proposed by the University of Madras the Salem Ml.& the D.P.I. (3) Rs.	Pay finally fixed by Government (4)Rs.
(i) Principal (who is also the Professor of Mathematics.)	200-20/2-300	300-15-450-20-550-25-600 or 200-15-350-20-450-25-500 plus a duty allowance of Rs.100.	200-30/2-260-40/2-500.plus a duty allowance of Rs.50
(ii)Three Professors(English, Economics and Physics) ~~(No posts)~~	No Posts.	200-15-350-20-450-25-500	200-30/2-260-40/2-500.
(iii)Lecturers.	100-10/2-180	100-10-250	100-10-250
(iv)Tutors and Demonstrators.	40-5/2-50	75-5-100	75--5-100
(v)Physical Director.	70-10/2-120	100-10-250	85-5-125-10-175.

1689

The biennial ~~Colleges~~ scale for the Professors and the Principal was fixed on the suggestion of Finance that Professors in Govt.Colleges are allowed time scale of pay carrying biennial increments.(M.E.S. Scale -- 230-700).It was also ordered in that G.O. that staff would be eligible for advance increments based on their previous service as in the case of teachers and Headmasters employed in Board and Municipal Secondary Schools.

pages 1 and 2 of [illegible] (A)
para 3 on p 86 of f. (A)
G.O. No 2756 Edn 27-12-47 (R)

2 The G.O. so far as it applies to the Principal and three Professors has given rise to certain doubts. The Commissioner of the Salem Municipality has fixed the pay of the Principal at Rs.500, the maximum of the revised scale plus duty allowance of Rs.50 from 1-7-1948, taking into account his previous service of 21 years as the Principal of the College prior to Ist July 1948. The Commissioner has allowed the minimum pay of Rs.200 to each of the three Professors in the revised scale, as their service on 1st July 1948 was less than 4 years, and asks whether they can be allowed an advance increment with reference to para 2(e) of G.O.No.2756 Education dated 27th Dec. 1947. The Examiner of Local Fund Accounts who was consulted in the matter, holds the view that the Professors are not eligible for any weightage for past service and that the fixation of their pay is correct. As regards the Principal's pay, the Examiner says that the fixation is correct according to G.O.No.581 Education dated 3rd March 1949; but he points out that this fixation has conferred on the Principal an advantage which is not given to officials in the service of Govt. or local bodies; i.e. advance increments have not been allowed to officers on biennial scales. L.A. say that as in the case of gazetted Govt.servants, the pay of the Principal should be fixed on Rs.300/-only on 1-7-48 which is a stage in the scale of Rs.200 -500 and that the excess pay already allowed, need not be recovered. As regards the Professors, they say that no recovery arises

para 3 on p 1 cf
para 4 on p 1 cf
p 2 of (R)
para 3 on p 5 cf
Q on p 4 cf
pages 85-86 of f. (A)
A
para 1 on p 8 ante
para 2 on p 8 ante

---

pages 4-5 and 20 of f.f. (A)
paras 6 and 7 on pages 5-[illegible]
p 2 of (B)

as the Professors have been given only the minimum.. The intention of this department had ~~all along~~ all along been not only to enhance the scales of pay of the teaching staff of the College but also to allow weightage for past service as in the case of teaching staffs in Board and Municipal secondary schools, and other local fund employees. This Department therefore suggested that in ~~view~~ lieu of the biennial scale fixed for the Professors and the Principal, ~~Salem College~~ annual increment scale might be adopted. This however has not been agreed to in the L.A. office note. -- para 2 on pp 7-8 ante. It may be mentioned in this connection that although Assistant Surgeons in Govt. ~~scales~~ service (Rs.200-25/2-400) are classified as gazetted Officers, the classification ~~adopted~~ adopted in respect of such employees in Board and Municipal service is only non-gazetted and in the recent revision, they have been allowed a scale of ~~Rs.150~~ Rs. 150-15-350. The Ml. ~~Council~~ and Dt.Board Women Medical Officers Grade I- who are non-gazetted officers in charge of Maternity and Child Welfare centres are allowed a scale of Rs.250-15-400. In the same way ~~the~~ Professors and the Principal of the Salem College may continue to be termed as non-gazetted officers. In fact the service books of these officers are maintained in the Ml. ~~Cty~~ office, are scrutinised by the Commissioner and their pay is drawn on establishment bills and not on gazetted officers salary bill. This deptt. may therefore reiterate the proposal for the introduction of the time scale of pay carrying annual increments ~~in~~ for the Professors and the Principal in ~~view~~ lieu of the biennial scale from 1-7-48 viz.,200-15-350-20-450-25-500 with a duty allowance of Rs.50 for the Principal . By modifying the scale as proposed, Professors will be eligible for an increment of Rs.15/- on 1-7-49 and for another increment of Rs.15/-on 1-7-1950. It may perhaps be ruled out that no arrears need be

They are not Govt. servants at all - either Gazetted or non-gazetted. They cannot be termed as non-Gazetted officers.
placed at the bottom of the file
20/3

There is no question of modifying the scale at all.
20/3.

paid to them on account of this modification. The Principal will ~~xxxxxxxxxxat~~ according to the revision proposed be eligible for a pay of Rs 370/ plus duty allowance of Rs.50/- from 1-7-1948 and an increment of Rs.20/- on 1-7-49 and another increment of Rs 20 on 1-7-50. The question whether his pay should thus be refixed or whether he should be allowed to continue to draw Rs.500, the pay which he has been drawing from 1-7-48 in addition to the duty allowance of Rs.50/- has been raised on page 6 ante and this point is for orders. If it is ordered that his pay also should undergo modification as proposed, L.A. deptt. have agreed to the waiver ~~after~~ of recovery of the difference between the pay admissible and that already ~~been~~ drawn.

A on p 8 ante

3 It may mentioned in this connection that on account of the revision of the scales of pay of the teaching staff of the Salem College, the Govt. have declined to increase the fixed subsidy of Rs.5000/- a year ~~granted~~ paid to the Ml.Cl. The extra cost is borne by the Ml.Cl.

para 4 on p 86 of f (A)

4 The file may be circulated to H.M.(Education) for orders.

9-3-50

A on p 10. CC

put up authority

I am inclined to agree with the Exam^r that what was intended in the relevant Govt. orders was that where the increments were biennial & therefore double the annual ones, the advance increments shd be calculated on the basis of the "annual" [illegible]. The only [illegible] to do is to refix the pay on this basis. Please look this out. There is no question at all of Govt. being put to any extra cost.

10/3

10/3/50

Re-submitted

Please see rule 8 on page 3 of G.O. No. 78 Fin dated 6-2-47 (U) and L.A. notes on pages 7 and 8 ante

Box

Dy. Secy. [illegible]

[illegible] & [illegible]

10/3

---

pages 85-86 of f (R)

Secretary's note on the previous page.

Orders are necessary as regards the scales of pay fixed for the Professors of the Salem Munl. College in G.O. No. 581, Edn., dated 3rd March 1949 and as regards the fixation of the pay of the Principal and Professors in those scales as from 1-7-1948. If the scales of pay with biennial increments (Rs. 200-30/2-260-40/2-500) already sanctioned for Professors are ordered to stand, and the principles governing the fixation of the pay of Munl. servants and the grant of advance increments to them in the revised scales are strictly applied as for annual incremental scales, as suggested, the pay of the Principal and the three Professors of the Munl. College will be as follows:-

(R) G.O. 2756 Edn. 27.12.47

Principal.

Pay in the revised scale after fixing it in the stage next above as in an annual incremental scale. Rs. 320 ~~(Rs.300 plus Rs. 20)~~.

Pay on 30-6-48 - Rs 300.
Next above stage - Half of Rs 40 = 20
320

Four advance increments as for annual increments, (the present biennial increment being halved for the purpose) for over 16 years of service in the old scale. Rs. 80

Pay to be fixed in the revised scale from 1-7-48. Rs. 400

M

As Rs. 400 is, however, not a definite stage in the new incremental scale for the Professors, the Principal's pay will have to be fixed as Rs. 380/- plus Rs. 20/- personal pay which will be absorbed in his next increment in the usual course on 1-7-1950 when his pay will be raised to Rs. 420/-. As the Principal's pay ~~appears to have~~ has been fixed by the Commissioner already at Rs. 500/-, it may be ordered that no recovery of the excess pay so far granted need be made in his case.

L.A. and Finance have agreed. (pages 8 and 9 ante)
13-3-50

Professors.

As regards the three Professors, the orders regarding advance increments will not benefit them as their service as heads of the departments is in every case less than four years. The Examiner's view is that the alternative concession allowed in clause (e) of paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 2756, Edn., dated 27-12-47 means only that the incumbents could count one year of their service for increment in the revised scale, if they are not eligible for advance increments. This view is correct and strictly speaking the Professors will not ~~be~~ ordinarily be eligible for one increment on this basis for one year's service, as the scale is a biennial one. We are however applying the orders

(R) para 2 (c) of G.O. 2756 Edn. 27.12.47 p 19

para 3 on p 59

R/2

regarding the fixation of pay as for annual scales, and on this basis, an additional pay of Rs. 15/- (half of Rs. 30/-)x may have to be allowed with reference to clause (e) of para 2 of the G.O. referred to already. In this view all the three Professors may be allowed a pay of Rs. 200 plus Rs. 15 personal pay from 1-7-48 which will be absorbed in the next increment of Rs 30 which will accrue to them on 1-7-1950 when their pay will be raised to Rs. 230/-.

x Initial increment for Professors

(R)2

N

2. It is for orders whether the fixation of pay for the Principal and Professor may be as at 'M' and 'N' above.

13.3.50

13-3-50

Previous notes need not be seen

This file (in which the note file has become much larger than the current file) relates to the fixing of the salaries of the Principal and certain Professors of the Salem Municipal College, consequent on the revision of the pay ordered in G.O.Ms. No.581, Education, dated 3-3-49. The Commissioner of Salem Municipality after having refixed the salaries of these people, has made a reference to Government requesting orders whether his decision in the matter is correct.

pages 85-86 cf of (A)

pages 1-2 cf

In 1947 the scales of pay of Government servants were revised and in accordance with the principles laid down in respect of that revision, the scales of pay of Dt. Board and Municipal employees were also revised by the Commissioner. The orders regarding the revision of the pay of the staff employed in the Salem Municipal College were however issued only as late as March 1949, but giving retrospective effect from 1-7-48; ~~and~~ In giving effect to the revision it was ordered that the principles laid down in G.O.2756, Education, dated 27-12-47 regarding the grant of advanced increments to teachers in secondary schools under local bodies will also apply to the teaching staff of the Salem Municipal College. The Government also said that no increased subsidy will be given by Government to the College because of the additional expenditure likely

G.O No 78 Fin / 6-2-47 (U)

(B) L. A Memo No 36715-46-9 spl / 8-12-49

pages 85-86 cf of (A)

(R)

para 4 on p86 of of (A)

to be involved in this revision.

The Principal of the College was getting a salary of Rs.300/- in the scale of Rs.200-20/2-300. He has been Principal of the College for 21 years and had reached the maximum of the previous scale. The Commissioner revised the Principal's pay to Rs.500 giving him 4 advanced increments in the new scale. But ~~somehow~~, feeling a doubt whether this was correct, the Commissioner has made this reference. The Commissioner's letter was forwarded to the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts for remarks and the Examiner has stated that the grant of 4 advanced increments in the new scale and fixing the pay at Rs.500/- is technically correct and is in accordance with Government order; but he raised the further question whether this was what the Government intended. He points out that so far as Government servants were concerned, no one who was getting the benefit of a biennial increments was allowed advanced increments in the pay revision; and he therefore requests Government to decide whether the biennial increment should for purposes of weightage be allowed. L.A. and Finance Departments whose remarks were called for argue that because in the case of Govt. officers of the Provincial service whose pay was revised in G.O.No.78, Finance, dated 6-2-47 weightage for past service had not been allowed, the same should apply in the case of the Principal also, and that his pay should be fixed in the revised scale at Rs.300/-, that is to say that he should have no immediate benefit at all from the revised scales.

para 3 on p1 cf

p3 cf

Q on p4 cf

para 2 on p4 cf

pages 7-9 ante

(U)

A. on p.8 ante

It is quite unnecessary to raise the question of revising or going back upon G.O.No.581, Education, dated 3-3-49 which specifically said that advance increments should be given, in carrying out the revision in the Salem Municipal College, in accordance with the principles laid down in G.O.No.2756, Education, dated 27-12-47 relating to the grant of advance increments to teachers in secondary schools under local bodies.① It is quite obvious that the revision was intended to benefit the staff, and so to

pages 85-86 cf of (A)

(R)

① There is therefore no need to compare the Salem College Staff to Govt. [illegible] Provincial Service interpret it in a way which gives no immediate advantage to them will be quite unfair. The Examiner of Local Fund Accounts seems to me to be right ~~that~~ when he doubts whether the intention of Government was to allow 4 advance increments (i.e. ~~or~~ allow one advance increment for every four years of service) when the increment are ~~at~~ a biennial scale and therefore double what an annual increment would have been. It is quite obvious that the intention of Government was not that anyone should get 4 advance increments for 16 years of service and more, each of the increments being Rs.40/- which is the biennial increment. It is quite proper (that the intention was and should have been that the four advance increments would be 4 times what the annual increment would have been, viz. Rs.20/-. Government can therefore now decide that what the Principal should now get is Rs.340 plus 4 advance increment of Rs.20 = Rs.400/- per mensem. He will of course also be entitled to a duty allowance. This may be ordered.

para (2) on p4 cf

So far as the Professors are concerned, there were no such posts previously and the posts were newly created for the first time and Assistant Lecturers already in service were appointed as Professors and started with the minimum of the scale. They had till then been getting only Rs.180/- and now their pay has been fixed at Rs.200/-, and so the fixation is correct. Everyone is agreed about this.

para 4 on p 1 cf

The Principal has been drawing Rs.500/- from 1-7-48 and he will have to draw Rs.400/- from 1-4-1950. The excess he has drawn so far, however, need not be recovered from him. L.A. and Finance have agreed to the waiver of any ~~recovery~~, ~~of this amount.~~ which may be necessary.

para 3 on p 1 cf

A on p 8 ante
on p 9 ante

~~It~~ There is no question of any extra cost to Government because the Government (have already said that they will not pay anything more to the Municipal College than the subsidy they have been given all these years.

para 4 on p 8 of

27.3.50.

H.M. (E. & L.)

(Box)

I am afraid the Principal

---

too old to get the advantage of the maximum of Rs 500/-. If we reduce the Commissioner's fixation to Rs 400/- Since the Mlty is meeting the entire cost I do not think we need disturb the Commr's fixation of his pay at Rs 500/- The Examiner says that it is technically correct. ~~So~~ ~~Please approve that~~ the case of the Principal & other Professors also as fixed now by the Commr.

KM.
22/3

Edn.(F)

Please see the orders in circulation above. A draft order is submitted for approval. LA & Fin. may see the orders in circn & the draft order below before issue.

KS
22/3/50.

22.3.50

23/3/50

23/3/50

23/3

B Edn (F)

U.O. No. 72036F/23.3

23/3/50

24 MAR 1950

12848

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DEPT.

L.A. / Fin.

L A Deptt.

[Previous note of L.A. on pp 7 & 8 ante].

The subsequent notes, the orders in circulation on this page and the draft order below may be perused and the file passed on to Fin. no.

24.3.50 Secy

LA no 12848/50 of 25/3/50

Fin.

F
25.3.50

Finance (E III)

(See finance note on p 9 above)

The further notes of Edn from

SECRETARY TO GOVT.
21968
27 MAR 1950
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

the middle of p 14 above, the minutes of [illegible] on pp 16-17 above, the rules following and the draft order below may be perused

Sm
27/3/50

27.3.50

Mj
28/3/50

Fin. [illegible]
29/3/50
29/3/50

Edn

Issue

30/3/50

[Issued as G.O. 1043 Edn dt- 30/3/50] Pg 9

5202