[W. & L. 114]
1,000—20-1-11.

Educational (1911) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 377-78

DATED 16-6-11.

D

[Despatch Abstract.]

Missionary Council on aided Education.

Forwarding to the Secretary of State a Memorial by the ——— praying that he may withhold his sanction to the scheme for the establishment of first Model Secondary Schools in this Presidency.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[E. & L. 68]
2,400—15-3.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.

[P.T.O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. 0

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.)	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, etc., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.

Circulated
12.5.11

LEC No 1084
Res. 12. 5. 11

SECRETARIAT
10 MAY 1911
PASSED
SECRETARIAT
10 MAY 1911
RECEIVED

College House,
Esplanade,
MADRAS

_____ 1911

From

The Honorary Secretary,
Missionary Council on Aided Education,
Madras.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to send herewith the enclosed Memorial to the Right Honourable The Secretary of State for India, and to request that the Government may be graciously pleased to forward the same to his Lordship.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Honorary Secretary

2



To

The Right Honourable

The Secretary of State for India

The following Memorial from the Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras Presidency

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

1. That this Council was appointed in 1879 by a Conference of Missionaries to watch over the interests of Christian Aided education throughout the Presidency. That it consists of representatives of practically all the Protestant Missionary Societies engaged in education in South India, and that the most recent statistics show that, in round numbers, 200,000 pupils are receiving education in their schools and colleges.

2. That your Memorialists have entered upon the work of education relying upon the continuance of the policy of the Government of India declared in every State paper from 1854 to the present day. It is the belief that this policy of grants-in-aid so clearly stated and so emphatically re-affirmed would be consistently carried out that has encouraged private individuals and bodies to give much of their time to the establishment and management of schools and to contribute largely to their support. In the year 1908-1909, the number of educational institutions in the Presidency was 29,266, and of these 25,087 were under private management, and out of 1,099,615 pupils receiving instruction 841,787 were being educated in schools carried on by private Managers. In other words, 85 per cent. of the schools in the Madras Presidency are maintained either wholly or in part by private individuals and 76 per cent. of the whole number of scholars are studying in such schools. Towards the maintenance of these institutions Rs. 32,36,553 were contributed by the Managers. It will be seen, therefore, that the relation of the State to private effort is a matter that vitally affects the interests of four-fifths of the schools and scholars in the Presidency. Your Memorialists do not claim to represent all the bodies engaged in the maintenance of Aided institutions, but they do represent a large number of the most influential of them. Moreover, a large proportion of the Rs. 32,36,553 from private sources is contributed by those bodies to which your Memorialists belong.

3. That in spite of these facts and assurances the action of the Government of Madras in recent years seems to imply a change of policy of a wide and far-reaching

character. Evidence of this change may be found in connection with all grades of education,—elementary, secondary and collegiate,—as may be seen from the papers appended. (Enclosures A and B).

4. That more recently the Madras Government have declared their intention to take over from District and Municipal Boards the management of nineteen Secondary schools and to make them 'Model High Schools' under the direct control and management of the Education Department. This, it has been announced, is intended to be the beginning of a scheme which will be applied to every District of the Presidency. It has been stated officially that the scheme is now before your Lordship for orders.

5. Your Memorialists desire respectfully to submit the following objections to the scheme proposed :—

(1) It must result in the discouragement of private effort, which hitherto it has been the avowed object of the Government of India to foster, and it is moreover entirely contrary to the past declarations of that Government, which have laid down as a fixed principle the continuous devolution of the maintenance of secondary education on private effort.

(2) It has been adopted without any reference to the Managers of Aided institutions although one of the Recommendations of the Education Commission of 1882 reads as follows :—'We recommend that with a view to secure the co-operation of the Government and non-Government institutions the Managers of the latter be consulted on matters of general educational interest.'

(3) It will entail an enormously increased expenditure from public funds which will benefit a comparatively small proportion of the population of school-going age. In the Financial Statement of the Government of Madras 1911-12 (p. 44) an allotment of 1·20 lakhs has been made for the establishment of Government Model High Schools, while the scheme is estimated to involve an extra recurring cost of 4·43 lakhs per annum.

Your Memorialists would respectfully submit that the expenditure on Government and on Local Fund and Municipal institutions has been growing out of all proportion to the expenditure by Government on Aided institutions as the following statements show :—

(*a*) The amount expended by the Government of Madras (*i.e.*, from Provincial, Local and Municipal Funds) on Government, Local Fund and Municipal institutions, in round numbers, rose during the quinquennium, 1904-5 to 1908-9, from 17 lakhs to 25 lakhs, an increase of 8 lakhs, whereas the amount expended by Government on Aided institutions rose only from 13 to 15 lakhs, an increase of 2 lakhs. These figures give the expenditure on educational institutions alone and do not take into account general expenditure such as on inspection and on buildings.

(*b*) The amount contributed by Aided bodies in subscriptions, endowments, &c., amounted in 1904-5 to 12 lakhs, while in 1908-9 it rose to 20 lakhs, an increase of 8 lakhs. As the increased grants from Government amounted to only 2 lakhs, as seen above, it is manifest that the ever-increasing cost of education in Aided institutions is being borne mainly by the management.

(*c*) The percentage of the net cost of Aided institutions borne by the Government of Madras is the lowest in British India, being 43·1 per cent. of the net cost (the management contributing 56·9 per cent.), while in, *e.g.*, Bengal, the percentage contributed by Government is 55·7 per cent. (the management contributing 44·3 per cent.)

(4) The scheme will divert money not only from elementary education, the diffusion of which is one of the greatest needs of the country at present, but also from Aided institutions of all grades, the needs of which are already very inadequately provided for.

(5) It will not secure the desired increase of efficiency in Secondary schools generally, as Model schools established and maintained by Government will be so expensively managed that no Aided schools can possibly make them their model.

(6) The adoption of the policy proposed finds no justification in the condition of Secondary schools in the Madras Presidency, whatever may be the case elsewhere, while the knowledge and experience of your Memorialists lead them to believe that the proposed scheme is fraught with danger to the highest interests of education in South India. In a recent pamphlet entitled *Unrest and Education in India* (p. 15.) the Rev. Dr. William Miller, C.I.E., than whom no more competent witness can be cited, writes as follows :—"There (in Madras) every one who can in any sense be called a leader in public discussion has steadily set himself to the task of inducing students to keep themselves entirely apart from every form of political agitation. This is not because the educated community of the South is less interested than the same community elsewhere in all the current topics of the day. It is because those who for the last twenty or thirty years have been going out from College in the South have a comparatively high appreciation of the value of real education and of the means by which alone its principal ends can be attained. Few things can show more clearly than the stand thus made by the leaders of native opinion that the difference is wide indeed between the sentiments prevailing in Madras and in Bengal. Few things can show more clearly that the general effect of education has been more healthy in the former province than in the latter." Again (p. 65.) : "The difference in favour of the South is chiefly the result of such measure of encouragement as has been given to private effort in accordance with the policy of the Despatch of 1854. The beneficial result attained by the limited effect given to that policy in practice is undoubtedly less than it ought to be, and less than it might have been. Still, the good that has actually accrued is enough to show how much greater good might have been done if the right course of action had been consistently followed."

(7) The scheme, if it be given effect to, will, so long as the principle of religious neutrality is maintained, prevent the imparting of religious instruction to the pupils who may enter these schools. It will thus run counter to the widely expressed desire for religious instruction on the part of the most enlightened and influential members of every community and creed, and, as a policy, would seem to lead inevitably to disaster both political and social.

(8) The scheme proposed will, without fail, destroy the principle of local co-operation,—a principle which both as regards funds and management every effort should be made to conserve and develop. The principle finds expression in the following Recommendation of the Education Commission. (See Report, Chapter V, page 255):—

"That it be distinctly laid down that the relation of the State to secondary is different from its relation to primary education, in that the means of primary education may be provided without regard to the existence of local co-operation, while it is ordinarily expedient to provide the means of secondary education only where adequate local co-operation is forthcoming ; and that, therefore, in all ordinary cases, secondary schools for instruction in English be hereafter established by the State preferably on the footing of the system of grants-in-aid."

If it be found that the local bodies which at present manage the schools in question are no longer competent for the task, other local bodies with special powers could, in the opinion of your Memorialists, be constituted with advantage on the lines indicated in the Recommendations of the Education Commission, 1882. (See Report, Chapter XI, page 560).

In view of these considerations your Memorialists humbly pray your Lordship to withhold your sanction from the scheme now before you, and to devise such measures as in the opinion of your Lordship may be necessary to give continued effect to the policy originally formulated in the Despatch of 1854.

And your Memorialists will ever pray.

J. COOLING,
Chairman and General Superintendent,
Wesleyan Mission, Madras.

R. W. PEACHEY,
Ag. Secretary, Church Missionary Society and
Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.

G. HERBERT SMITH,
Secretary, Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

J. S. CHANDLER,
Secretary, American Madura Mission.

D. DOWNIE,
American Baptist Missionary Union.

J. J. KINGHAM,
Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

J. LAZARUS,
Danish Lutheran Missionary Society.

J. STEWART,
Secretary, United Free Church of Scotland Mission.

A. W. BROUGH,
Chairman, S. India District Committee, London Missionary Society.

W. M. ZUMBRO,
Secretary, South Indian Missionary Association.

K. PAMPERRIEN,
President, Leipzig Evangelical Lutheran Mission.

H. RISCH,
Basel German Evangelical Mission.

W. SKINNER,
Principal, Madras Christian College.

L. L. UHL,
American Evangelical Lutheran Mission.

L. B. CHAMBERLAIN,
Secretary, Arcot Mission of the Reformed Church of America.

H. E. STILLWELL,
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

G. PITTENDRIGH,
Secretary, Missionary Council on Aided Education.

MADRAS,
19th April 1911.

REGR. CHIEF SEC. 10 MAY 1911 MADRAS GOVT

ENCLOSURE A.

MADRAS,
11th April, 1907

To

HIS EXCELLENCY

The Governor of Fort St. George in Council

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

We, your Memorialists, are the members of a Council on Aided Education representative of eighteen Protestant Missionary Societies engaged in the work of Education in all parts of the Presidency of Madras. We have the honour now to address Your Excellency on the subject of changes recently made in the Grant-in-aid Code and in the Educational Rules.

2. We would respectfully remind Your Excellency that Aided Education plays a very large part in the educational system of this Presidency and we would point out that Managers have embarked on this enterprise on the faith of the declared policy of Government, which was originally set forth in the Educational Despatch of 1854 and which has been re-affirmed from time to time since. We would specially draw attention to paragraphs 51 and 52 of that Despatch, where the Directors of the East India Company say :—

"The consideration of the impossibility of the Government alone doing all that must be done in order to provide adequate means for the education of the natives of India, and of the ready assistance which may be derived from efforts which have hitherto received but little encouragement from the State, has led us to the natural conclusion that the most effectual method of providing for the wants of India in this respect will be to combine with the agency of the Government the aid which may be derived from the exertions and liberality of the educated and wealthy natives of India, and of other benevolent persons. We have, therefore resolved to adopt in India the system of grants-in-aid which has been carried out in this country (England) with very great success ; and we confidently anticipate, by thus drawing support from local resources, in addition to contributions from the State, a far more rapid progress of education than would follow a mere increase of expenditure by the Government : while it possesses the additional advantage of fostering a spirit of reliance upon local exertions and combination for local purposes, which is of itself of no mean importance to the well-being of a nation."

The policy here set forth was emphasised by the Education Commission of 1882, which in paragraph 475 of its Report recommended "that while existing State institutions of the higher order should be maintained in complete efficiency wherever they are necessary, the improvement and extension of privately managed institutions be the principal care of the Department. . . . The rules should therefore be such as to make it clear that to evoke, guide and strengthen private effort is the object to which the main attention of the Department should always be given." In paragraph 497 of the Report, the Commissioners further say :—"In all our recommendations we have therefore kept the principle in view that the main attention of the Department should be given to

evoking and strengthening private effort, and that its success must be largely judged by the increase in the number and efficiency of aided or self-supporting institutions under private management that has resulted from its care."

The Government of India accepted these recommendations as embodying its educational policy. Again, in its order of 28th October, 1899, reviewing the Quinquennial Report on Education, it re-affirmed its adherence to that policy, whilst more recently still in 1904 in its Resolution on *Indian Education Policy*, the Government of India accepted the policy of the progressive devolution of Primary, Secondary and Collegiate education upon private enterprise. This policy in its application to primary instruction was referred to by the Government of Madras in its Order, dated 22nd December, 1902, in the following terms :—"It is however to private efforts that the Director must continue to look principally, and it is therefore on the importance of increasing the payments of grants-in-aid that the Government would chiefly insist."

3. It is the belief that this policy so clearly stated and so emphatically re-affirmed would be consistently carried out that has encouraged private individuals and bodies to give much of their time to the establishment and management of schools and to contribute largely to their support. In the year 1904-1905, the number of Educational Institutions in the Presidency was 27,648, and of these 24,545 were under private management, and out of 971,242 pupils receiving instruction 791,800 were being educated in schools carried on by private managers. In other words 88 per cent. of the schools in the Madras Presidency are either maintained wholly or in part by private individuals and 82 per cent. of the whole number of scholars are studying in such schools. Towards the maintenance of these institutions Rs. 21,71,801 were contributed by the Managers. It will be seen therefore that the relations of the State to private effort is a matter that vitally affects the interests of more than four-fifths of the schools and scholars in the Presidency. Your Memorialists do not claim to represent all the bodies engaged in the maintenance of Aided institutions, but they do represent a large number of the most influential of them. Moreover a large proportion of the Rs. 21,71,801 from private sources is contributed by those bodies to which your Memorialists belong.

4. The actual relation of Government to private institutions is set forth in the Grant-in-aid Code and the Educational Rules. The Rules lay down the conditions upon which Government will recognise an institution and the Code states the conditions on which a school so recognised may receive financial aid and regulates the amount of such aid. On May 23rd, 1906, a new Grant-in-aid Code was issued and some months later a revised set of Educational Rules. In these two documents there are changes not simply of detail, but of so wide and far-reaching a character as in the opinion of your Memorialists to imply a change of policy on the part of the Madras Government. It is that this point may be definitely settled that we now address Your Excellency in Council.

5. *Elementary Schools.*—One of the main features of the new Grant-in-aid Code and of the revised Educational Rules is the distinction which they make between Elementary and Secondary education. Your Memorialists approve of this distinction being clearly maintained, provided that no injury is done to the spread of education.

According to the Code, Elementary schools are to receive aid on the principle that the amount of grant shall vary according to the number and qualifications of the masters and according to the number of scholars in attendance. This principle is well adapted to the conditions of Elementary schools, but your Memorialists would point out the following grave objections to the way in which practical effect has been given to it :—

(*a*) The grant of Rs. 36 a year for each trained teacher or teacher of proved ability together with As. 8 for each pupil in average daily attendance is suited

to the needs of schools only of the very lowest grade, that is, schools in villages in which the highest class is the second or third standard. In schools in which the highest class is the fourth standard and in which there are therefore five classes, a better paid staff is required and for such schools the grant of Rs. 36 a year towards the salary of each teacher is inadequate. In schools with a fifth, sixth or seventh standard class, which Elementary schools in towns usually have, and for the teachers of which correspondingly higher salaries must be paid, this grant is wholly inadequate.

(*b*) In former Codes, grants at specially favourable rates were given to Girls' Schools. There is no such provision in the present Code. As, according to the definition given in the Code, the majority of schools for girls are Elementary, its provisions will bear peculiarly hard upon them. In those Elementary Girls' Schools in which managers employ as the Headmistress a lady educated in Britain or America, the grant of Rs. 3 a month towards the salaries of such ladies is conspicuously inadequate.

(*c*) Further, the uniform grant of As. 8 for each pupil in average attendance, without reference to the class in which the pupil is reading, will certainly have the effect of accentuating the disparity that already exists between the numbers of pupils in the lowest classes compared with those in the higher. In Elementary schools, it is much easier to get children to enter the Infant Standard than to retain them in the third and fourth Standards.

Chapter VI of the new Educational Rules contains Additional Regulations for Elementary schools under public management. A consideration of these will, in the opinion of your Memorialists, clearly show the inadequacy of the grants for Elementary schools under private management and seems to justify the fear of your Memorialists that the Government of Madras have changed their policy. These regulations deal with the number of teachers to be employed, their salaries, the capitation allowances for attendance and the fees to be charged. Your Memorialists accept these regulations as indicating what should be the practice in all recognised institutions, not those alone under public management. The contrast between the grants permitted by the Code to be paid from public funds to Elementary schools under private management and the expenditure, which, according to the Educational Rules, is to be borne by public funds in similar schools under the management of the Department, is very marked. In a school under public management, *i.e.*, a Board or Municipal School, with only four standards, the fees may be appropriated by the Headmaster in addition to his salary. Supposing a similar arrangement with regard to the fees to be adopted in an Aided school with the same number of classes, then if four Masters are employed, under the Grant-in-aid Code, an Aided school would receive only [Rs. 36 × 4] Rs. 144 a year, whilst the cost to be borne by public funds in the case of the school managed by the Department will be Rs. 45 a month [Rs. 15 + Rs. 12 + Rs. 10 + Rs. 8], or Rs. 540 a year. If the school contained five, six, seven or eight classes, the disparity in treatment would be more marked still, for the Educational Rules contemplate salaries of Rs. 40, Rs. 30, Rs. 25 and Rs. 20 being paid to these higher masters in a Departmental school, whilst the Grant-in-aid Code allows only Rs. 3 a month to be given from public funds to masters in an Aided school who are paid at the same rates.

Again, with regard to the capitation allowances in a school under public management, if it is a Boys' School attended by non-backward classes, an allowance of one Rupee a year for every pupil in average daily attendance will be given to the teachers from public funds, whilst to the Manager of a similar Aided school, a grant of only As. 8 is made. If the school is one for backward classes, Rs. 2 per head is given to the teachers in the Board or Municipal school, whilst to the similar Aided school

only As. 10 is given. If the school is one for Girls, Rs. 2 from public funds is given to the teachers in the Board or Municipal school, whilst a grant of As. 8 is all that the Manager of a similar Aided school can expect. Moreover, in those places where now a Board school and an Aided school are found under similar conditions, the tendency must be for the Board school to draw all the pupils to itself ; at any rate, the teachers of the Board school have a strong inducement to use their influence to draw away the pupils of the Aided school. With such marked preference given to schools managed by the Department, it is unreasonable to expect private individuals either to come forward to establish schools or to continue to maintain the schools which they have already established

A further regulation which has already proved injurious to Elementary schools of the better class is the proviso in a footnote to the heading of Chapter IV. of the Code which requires that any pupil, who, having read in the fifth, sixth or seventh standard of an Elementary school, wishes to continue his education in a Secondary school, whatever his attainments may be, must be placed in the fourth class of the Secondary school. This proviso militates against the interest of *all* Elementary schools, whether under public or private management, and your Memorialists are aware that schools under public management have already suffered. The effect of it, however, in the case of Aided schools is more serious, for, while managers not only have their fifth, sixth and seventh standard classes depleted of scholars, they also have at the same time the prospect of a large reduction in their grants. A proviso such as this defeats the very object for which the distinction between Elementary and Secondary education has been made, as the effect of it is to induce parents to place their children in Secondary schools from the very beginning of their school career.

6. *Secondary Schools.*—The main feature of the Chapter of the Code dealing with Teaching Grants to Secondary schools is the principle laid down in Rule 33 that the grant allowed to an institution will ordinarily be equal in amount to the "income from private sources," expenditure by the management on scholarships and reductions of fees being left out of account. Your Memorialists believe that such a principle, whilst presumably just in certain cases, cannot be laid down as one applicable to all Secondary schools whether for Boys or Girls, or whether situated in advanced or backward Districts.

The Report of the Indian Education Commission of 1882 has been referred to as if it approved this principle. The paragraph alluded to is number 476, and we venture to quote it *in extenso* :—

"It is an important element in the grant-in-aid system that part of the expense of the Aided institution should be provided by its managers from private resources of their own. As to the share of the total expense that should thus be provided from private resources, no absolute rule can be laid down, nor is it possible to say what proportion of the total expenditure the State will find it necessary to afford if the institution is to be maintained. Everything depends on the ability and disposition of the managers, and on their zeal in the cause of education. Some managers will persevere in their efforts, although nearly all the expense that is not met by fees be thrown on them. Others will be discouraged and will retire if the larger proportion of the deficiency left, after reckoning the fees, is not awarded to them from public funds. In a rough and general way it may be perhaps laid down, though certainly not as a rule to be universally applied, that the sum necessary to supplement the amount of self-support attained by the institution may be equally divided between the managers and the State. This can only be taken as an approximate average of what the rate ought to be. In wealthy Districts where education is appreciated, it might justly be considerably less. In backward Districts, it might with equal justice be considerably more. Thus in the case supposed, if a Departmental institution, being self-supporting to the extent of 40 per cent. of its entire cost, needs 60 per cent. of that cost to be furnished by the

State, it may be held that, since an Aided institution providing instruction of the same grade will also require 60 per cent. of its entire cost to be supplied from without, half of this, or 30 per cent. may be reasonably expected from the State. In some cases, no doubt, a grant of less than half the deficiency, after fees have been deducted, will enable an institution to do the work it aims at, especially if it has any endowments to fall back on ; but in other cases, a grant of less than half the deficiency might result in the loss of the institution to the general system of education. The only real security that the amount of aid necessary in each case will be given depends on an earnest desire on the part of the Head of the Department to encourage private effort to the full. Still, for the purposes of this section of the present Chapter, the principle of the deficiency being equally shared between the managers and the State may be taken as a practically satisfactory guide. It may be observed that this principle would enable the State, in cases where private effort can be elicited, to secure the provision of the means of Collegiate and Secondary education at less than one-fourth of the expense at which such education is at present provided by direct departmental agency. We have already seen that Aided Colleges and Secondary schools cost on the average only half as much as similar departmental institutions. According to the general principle explained above, the proportionate rate of aid to be afforded by the State to an Aided institution would be half the ratio of the State expenditure to the whole expenditure on a departmental institution of the same class. Hence the whole cost of the Aided institution being one-half, and the proportionate rate of aid being also one-half, the outlay of the State on the Aided institution would be one-fourth of its outlay on the departmental institution. This, however, refers only to strictly educational funds. In the case of the Aided institution the State would further save whatever expenses are incurred on account of pensions to the teachers employed in the departmental institution, and also a large part of the expenses incurred for buildings.

"As the result of these considerations, it may be held that the aid afforded is fairly sufficient, or at least not manifestly insufficient, when it bears to the entire cost of the Aided institution half the ratio which the expenditure from public funds bears to the entire cost of a similar and similarly situated institution managed by the Department directly."

It will be seen that the principle embodied in the Code as regulating aid to Secondary schools is here spoken of as one "certainly not to be universally applied" in fixing the amount of aid, but as a "practically satisfactory guide" to determine the economic advantage to the State of providing Collegiate and Secondary education by means of Aided institutions rather than by Departmental ones. That the Commission had no intention of making this a hard and fast rule is established by the fact that while they recommend in paragraph 552, 13 (*b*), (page 476), that the amount of State aid (exclusive of Scholarships from public funds) do not exceed *one-half of the entire expenditure* on an institution, there is no recommendation that the amount of aid from public funds shall not exceed the "income from private sources." The principle laid down in the closing words of the quotation is the only statement in the Report as to the adequacy of a grant and it is a wholly different one from that laid down in the Code.

Your Memorialists, therefore, deprecate the introduction of the principle of Regulation No. 33 as one of rigid application. In the most advanced Districts and under favourable conditions the proportion of aid promised may be sufficient to call forth private effort and to enable private managers to maintain Secondary institutions in efficiency, but in backward Districts, and especially in the case of Girls' schools, the principle, if rigidly adhered to, will lead to the closing of many schools under private management. The progress of Secondary education will thus meanwhile be seriously retarded and ultimately Government will have to place a heavier burden on public funds by opening schools of their own.

In regard to Secondary schools, the requirements of the Department are in some particulars most exacting. In Rule 28, dealing with the proportion of teachers to pupils, it is laid down that in all Secondary schools with classes above the fourth there shall be

not only a teacher for every class, but a Headmaster in addition and also the necessary pandits, drawing-masters, and other instructors of special subjects. In Girls' High Schools, in which, according to the returns of the Department, in the fourth, fifth and sixth forms there is an average of only 21 pupils in each school, it is necessary, according to this Rule, to employ four teachers, who must either be trained graduates or satisfy the Inspectress of their qualifications, in addition to the pandit and other special instructors. A rule that thus throws such unnecessary expense upon the Manager, unless relaxed, must prohibit the development of the higher education of girls. In regard to the maximum number of pupils in any class, the rule is stricter in Aided than in Departmental schools. Rule 29 says: "No additional pupil shall be admitted to a class when there are already 40 pupils upon the rolls in that class"; whilst the corresponding rule for Departmental schools reads: "Without the sanction of the Director the strength of a class shall not continuously exceed 40."

7. *Status of Private Managers.*—The Grant-in-aid Code and the new Educational Rules taken together have effected a significant change in the status of the private manager. In almost every detail he must follow the rules of the Department or act according to the instructions of the Inspector. He has little or no choice in regard to the building, the furniture and the apparatus of his school. The number of teachers he shall employ and their qualifications are prescribed. The Inspecting officer has power to declare a teacher unfit to teach a particular subject, even though such teacher may be qualified under the Rules; and if such teacher is employed after being declared unfit the same officer may withdraw recognition. The course of studies and the time-table mustbe drawn up in consultation with him. The number of days in a year on which the school shall meet, and the number of hours of school work each day are laid down. The Inspecting Officer has power to order the removal of a pupil from one class to another if he deems it desirable and no book other than books for religious instructions shall be even brought into the school by either teacher or pupil unless it has been approved by Government.

8. *Colleges.*—The University regulates the internal working of Colleges, but the financial aid is determined by the Grant-in-aid Code. The principle of making everything depend upon the officers of the Department is here carried to an extreme. Rule 40, Chapter V, says that the amount of grant given on behalf of a College will be determined by the Director after taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case. Again, Rule 41 says: "As a condition of the continuance of the grant or any portion thereof the Government reserve to themselves the right to prescribe any particular line of action to be taken by the management in regard to any matter affecting the College." In this connection your Memorialists desire to draw attention to the remarks of the Education Commission of 1882. In paragraph 491 they say that a condition essential to the success of private effort is that its freedom be not interfered with.

"There should be a clear understanding that a grant is not to be used as a means of coercing managers into adopting the views of the Department. It is no doubt conceivable, though in a high degree unlikely, that there may be so radical a difference between the views of the managers and those of the Department that the latter may judge a school to be positively injurious. In that case the grant should be frankly refused or withdrawn. To use the grant as a means of pressing the school into the mould of a Departmental school is opposed to the whole principle of relying upon private effort. The personal interest and zeal which it is the very idea of the system to appeal to is always strongest in those who have views on education to which they desire to give practical effect. If such men are to help the State they must have freedom. Any disadvantages that may be incidental to such freedom are a small price to pay for its many benefits. . . This must not however be understood to mean that managers are to be subject to no authority, or that their schools may be as inefficient as they please. Control is as necessary as freedom and control must rest with the Department."

Your Memorialists desire no larger measure of freedom than that contemplated by the Education Commission, but it is manifest that the Code places them and the institutions which they manage entirely in the hands of the Department and deprives them of every vestige of free action.

9. Your Memorialists are aware that it has been stated that a Conference of representative managers of Aided schools with officers of the Department was held before the new Grant-in-aid Code was adopted and that no objection was raised at that Conference to the proposed changes. Your Memorialists would point out (1) that many of the matters objected to are new provisions of the Educational Rules and that managers of Aided schools were not consulted in their revision; (2) that though a Conference of a few representative managers with officers of the Department was held on October 24th and 25th, 1905, the resolutions of that Conference have not as in the case of former Conferences been made public; and (3) that in the letter of the Director of Public Instruction to Government, dated 12th April, 1905, Cur. No. 3460 of 1905, which was laid before the Conference as containing the subjects for discussion, few, if any, of the points which your Memorialists take exception to are referred to, and that even these were not discussed.

10. While your Memorialists have not touched upon all the details they take exception to, they would in conclusion respectfully submit that in view of the facts they have cited they are justified in regarding the Educational Rules and the Grant-in-aid Code now in force as the initiation of a new policy on the part of the Government of Madras. They therefore approach Your Excellency in Council with the request that it may please Your Excellency to introduce with as little delay as possible such amendments in the rules of recognition and in the conditions on which grants-in-aid are given as will enable them to continue to participate in the great task of educating all classes of the people of this Presidency. Should adequate assurances be given them that it is still the policy of the Government of Madras to encourage private effort, Your Excellency may confidently rely on the continued co-operation of your Memoralists with Government both in raising the standard of education and in extending its benefits to those who do not now enjoy them.

And your Memoralists will ever pray.

JAMES COOLING,
Honorary Secretary,
Missionary Council on Aided Education,
Chairman and General Superintendent,
Wesleyan Mission, Madras.

G. HERBERT SMITH,
Principal of S. P. G. Theological College,
and Secretary, Madras Diocesan Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts.

J. M. RUSSELL,
Bursar and Manager, Madras Christian College.

E. SELL,
Secretary, Church Missionary Society,
and Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.

F. L. MARLER,
Secretary, South India District Committee, London Missionary Society.

J. H. WYCKOFF,
Secretary and Treasurer, Arcot Mission of the Reformed Church of America.

(AND TWENTY-TWO OTHERS).

To this Memorial the following reply was received :—

G. O. No. 190, *dated 16th March*, 1908.

From the Honorary Secretary, Missionary Council on Aided Education, dated 13th April, 1907.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 24th April, 1907.

Order :—

The members of the Missionary Council on Aided Education have submitted for the consideration of Government a memorial containing certain criticisms on the changes introduced in the Grant-in-aid Code and the Educational Rules issued in 1906.

2. Some of the objections of the Memorialists have been met by alterations which have been made since the Code and Rules were published. The other points raised in the memorial have been under the consideration of Government, who, however, are not prepared at present to take any action with regard to them. The working of the new rules is being carefully watched and until the Government have had further experience of them they do not consider it advisable to bring the rules under general revision. The suggestions made by the Missionary Council on Aided Education will receive due consideration when the rules are next revised.

3. The Honorary Secretary of the Missionary Council on Aided Education will be informed accordingly.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. A. SOUTER,
for *Ag. Secretary to Garernment.*

The Council on Aided Education placed on record its dissatisfaction with the above reply, as the request for a declaration as to policy was ignored, and no prospect of any speedy amendment of the Code and Rules was held out.

ENCLOSURE B.

Extract of Minutes of Meeting of Missionary Council on Aided Education held on 29th October, 1910.

The Committee appointed in accordance with Minute No. 7 of 20th August, 1910, to prepare resolutions with regard to the new standard rate of fees to be levied in the Presidency College as compared with the new standard rate laid down for other Colleges, and also with regard to the suggested scheme of scholarships in the Presidency College, presented the following resolutions :—

1. The Council on Aided Education took into consideration the new Fee Regulations, published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of 24th May, 1910, so far as these applied to Colleges. It was noted

(1) that while the fees to be charged in the Presidency College were raised for the intermediate and B. A. courses by only 22·2 per cent. and 12·0 per cent. per annum respectively those to be charged for these courses in other Colleges had been raised by as much as 29·6 per cent. and 32·5 per cent. respectively, and :

(2) that this disproportion in the increase in the fees reduced the difference, in the rates charged, between the Presidency College and 'other Colleges' from 12·5 per cent. for the Intermediate course to 6·0 per cent. and for the B. A. course from 25 per cent. to 5·6 per cent. The Council noted further that while Managers of institutions under private management are required to 'levy reasonable fees' the rate of fees appointed for 'other Colleges' is presumably taken as the standard in the Financial Statement that is submitted annually to the Director of Public Instruction, for the purpose of calculating the amount of grant-in-aid for which Colleges may be eligible.

The Council on Aided Education therefore resolve respectfully to invite the attention of Government to these facts, and to submit that the increase in the rates for 'other Colleges' is excessive, when applied to Aided institutions under private management, and is so more particularly in comparison with the small amount of the increase in the rates for the Presidency College. The Council desire to support their contention by referring to Recommendation (10) Chap. VI of the Report of the Education Commission 1882, which reads ; 'That while it is desirable to affirm the principle that fees at the highest rate consistent with the undiminished spread of education should be levied in every College aided by the State, no Aided College should be required to levy fees at the same rate as that charged in a neighbouring Government College' : also by referring to the 'Summary' under section 311 of Chap. VI of the Report (p. 282), which reads, 'It appears from this review that the fee paid in Aided Colleges is less by about one-third than is paid in those maintained by Government. This seems about the ratio at which it is possible for both classes of institutions to thrive. It is also the ratio that is fixed in Madras by a formal regulation.' The 'formal regulation' here referred to seems to have fallen into abeyance many years ago and the principle embodied in it would appear to have been entirely lost sight of in the Madras Presidency. The principle, however, enunciated in the Recommendation and illustrated in the Summary implies that the ratio ought always to be such as to secure a substantial difference between the fees charged in the two classes of institutions respectively. This the revised Fee Regulations do not secure. This Council would therefore respectfully submit that, for the purpose of calculating the amount of grant for which Aided Colleges may be eligible, 15 per cent. less than the rate prescribed for 'other Colleges' maintained by Government, should be taken as the standard rate.

Int. act 17

Educational Dept

(Cuo 1084)

Endt No 1084 — 191. 6.11

Returned to the memorialist
for compliance with para VIII of
A. memorial Rules.

J.H.
31-5-11

1-6-11

31-5-11

To The memorialists with copy of para VIII of A. memorial Rules

Desp
1.6.11

B/8 Ed. Cn. 1323
Regd 9.6.11.

College House
Esplanade
Madras.
5th June 1911.

RECD. CHIEF SEC.
7 JUN 1911
MADRAS GOVT.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
9-JUN 1911
SECRETARIAT

From The Hon. Secretary
Miss. Council on Aids to Educn.

To The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras.

Sir, I have the honour to return
the inclosed memorial with a
signature on each sheet. The
memorial apparently requires
no addition as it already con-
cludes with a specific prayer.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obed. servt.
G. Pittendrigh
Hon. Sec.

U
T. R
9/6

[E. & L. 67]
806—15-3-03.

EDUCATIONAL / LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES.

Copy of letter from the Honorary Secretary, Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras;--

I have the honour to send herewith the enclosed memorial to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, and to request that the Government may be graciously pleased to forward the same to His Lordship.

Let H.M. have a spare copy in advance.

L.D.
12-5-11.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIES 16 MAY 1911

T.H.
Take this up at once

B.

Gp. 1838 Esl - C
29 3.11

The memorial forwarded by the Missionary Council on aided Education, is a protest against the proposals of this Government on the subject of establishing model secondary Schools - vide Gp. No. 8 Esl., dated 21st February 1910. The Scheme is now before the Secretary of State and in the present memorial which is addressed to the Secretary of State, the memorialists pray that the S. of S. may withhold his sanction to the Scheme.

2. The objections to the Scheme put forward in the memorial are not new. They are the stock arguments advanced by all the opponents of the Scheme, and the remarks of the Hon. Sir. Murray Hammick at the meeting of the Legislative Council of the 29th November 1910 when a resolution on the subject of the model Secondary Schools was moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Aiyar furnishes an adequate reply to the various points urged by the memorialists.

3. The Scheme submitted by this Govt was formulated with reference to the instructions of the Govt of India conveyed

x Please see the notes connected with the Resolu
Slip F.

p. 2 of fo. 250 Estl. 30.3.08 D

p. 3 of fo. 59 Estl 2.2.11 E

G

H

J.

conveyed in Home Department Letter No 758. dated 10th October 1906 and are in accord with the policy enunciated by the Royal Commission on Decentralization vide para: 5 of Home Department letter No. 1 to 8 dated 3rd January 1910.

4. The figures & facts contained in the memorial have been verified. It is for consideration whether the memorial may be withheld under para XIII of the A. memorial rules or whether it may be forwarded to the Secretary of State under para IV of the same rules and whether in the latter case any recommendation should be made in favour of the memorialists.

5. The first enclosure to the memorial was disposed of in Go. No. 190 Estl. dated 16th March 1908 and the second in Go. No. 208 Estl. dy 11th April 1911.

29.5.11 Please see Rule VIII of the memorial rules — If no signed copy has been submitted, the memorial will have to be returned for compliance with this rule.

[illegible] 30/5/11

Submitted that no signed copy of the memorial has been received.

2. The draft below is for approval.

J.A.
31-5-11

N.D.
31-5-11

Secy

I wonder on the question of withholding memorial under Rule XIII. If it is to be forwarded to Secy of State, it may be returned for compliance with Rule VIII

from
31/5/11

The want of signature should have been pointed out weeks ago.

2. Rule XIII does not seem to me to apply. The case has been under the consideration of the Govt of India & under Rule IV (a) (iii), the memorial must go up through India.

3. I have passed the endorsement.

L.W.
1-6-11

31/5/11

[Memo no. 1084 dated 1-6-1911]
From the Hon Secy. Missionary Cl. on aided Education
Dt 5-6-11.

The memorial has been signed

by the Hon. Secy of the Missionary Council on aided Education and returned. It has also been authenticated by the signature of the Hon. Secy on each sheet. It may now be forwarded to the Secy of State thro' the Govt of I. The draft below is for approval.

J.R. 10-6-11

Secy

10/6/11

11. 6. 11

Cried in Box No 13.

Hm.

I presume no detailed Examns. will need be embodied in the letter: the policy to which exception is taken is the policy of the Govt of India & they can defend it without assistance from us.

L.D. 13. 6. 11

W 3796

I have passed to draft, as may [illegible].

15: VI: 11.

W 1696

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT 16 JUN 1911

[Jo 2103 377-2nd 16-6-11]

Educational Department.

Cur.No.1084, from the Hon.Secretary, Missionary Council on aided education, No. . dated ..

Cur.No.1323, ,, dated 5-6-1911.

ORDER:- Mis. № 377 dt 16. 6. 11.

With reference to rule IV(a)(iii) of the Memorial Rules, received from the Missionary Council on Aided Education, will be forwarded to the Secretary of State -- through the Government of India.

To The Secy. Mis. Cl. on aided Education. } 980

Letter. № 378 dt 16. 6. 11

To

The Secretary to the Govt., of India,

Department of Education.

Sir,

With reference to rule IV(a)(iii) of the ~~Memorial Rules~~ rules regarding submission of memorials, I am directed to forward ~~for transmission~~ to the Secretary of State a memorial addressed ~~to him~~ by the Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras, praying that he may withhold his sanction to the scheme for the establishment of ~~more~~ model Government secondary schools in this Presidency which was submitted to the Government of India with Mr.Wynch's letter No.87 Edcl., dated the 21st February 1910. ~~The scheme was~~ prepared ~~by him.~~ The proposals to which objection is taken are

A 25

19

prepared
~~accordingly~~ with reference to the wishes of the Government of India as expressed in Mr. ~~Risley's~~ letter No.758 Education, dated 10th October 1906, and as explained in paragraph 7 of Mr. Wynch's letter above referred to, the Governor in Council has, in formulating the ~~scheme~~ details, taken special care not to interfere in any way with successful private enterprise. The scheme has since been ~~carefully~~ considered by the Government of India and was ~~before they~~ forwarded to the Secretary of State on the 9th March 1911. In these circumstances, the Governor in Council sees no necessity to ~~say anything beyond expressing his conviction that there is absolutely~~ no ground for the apprehension ~~of the memorialists~~ that the scheme will result in the discouragement of private effort in the field of education.

P.2- 9 &o. 2585 Sl. 30.3.08 D

(Hon Sir Herbert) Risley B

Vrep. 183 Sl 29.3.11 — C

Examine & discuss the memorialists' arguments. It will suffice to say that in his opinion there is

J Hare Se

Hon 12/6/11 13.6.4

12.6.11

*When given for copying*_____
*When copied*_____
*When examined*_____ } 191
*When signed*_____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 191 . , DATED

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.