Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT

Recd. } 1911. *Enclosures*

Regd. } 1911. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 631, 8th September 1911.

Model High Schools.

Submitting the remarks of this Government on the protest made by the Missionary Council on Aided Education against the establishment of — 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.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT

Recd. } 1911. *Enclosures*

Regd. } 1911. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 631, 8th September 1911.

Model High Schools.

Submitting the remarks of this Government on the protest made by the Missionary Council on Aided Education against the establishment of — in this Presidency.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers:—

I

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. H. Sharp, Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Education (Education).
To—the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Educational Department.
Dated—Simla, the 14th June 1911.
No.—810.

I am directed to forward a copy of a letter, dated 11th March 1911, from the Rev. G. Pittendrigh, M.A., Honorary Secretary, Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras, to the address of the Hon'ble Mr. Butler, and, in requesting the favour of an expression of opinion thereon from His Excellency the Governor in Council, to place before you the following considerations which have occurred to the Government of India on this matter.

2. A reference has already been made to the Secretary of State upon the question of the establishment of model schools dealt with in the correspondence ending with your letter No. 735, dated the 12th December 1910. The Government of India cannot believe that the establishment of model schools is really likely unduly to interfere with the development of private enterprise. There are 24 districts in Madras, and it is under contemplation to provincialise only 15 institutions (paragraph 7 of your letter No. 87, dated 21st February 1910), which, with the four existing Government high schools, will raise the total number of model schools to 19—a moderate figure seeing that there are 172 boys' high schools in the Presidency. Moreover, it appears that four of the 19 schools are already Government institutions, ten are board or municipal schools and one (that at Nellore) appears to be a private school under Indian management. It would thus appear that only four of the model schools will compete on new terms with schools now under the management of Missionaries.

3. The Government of India are in full accord with the Government of Madras in considering that the importance of Government model schools constitutes a first duty. At the same time it is certainly desirable to dispel any opinion which may arise that the Government of India have receded from their policy as regards the encouragement of private enterprise in higher education. For this reason it appears desirable to fix a strict limit over the expansion of each Government school, whether existing or about to be established. If this is not done, Government schools are likely to grow to an unwieldy size, and heavy expenditure in the entertainment of staff and in the provision of pensions will have to be incurred. The great majority of our higher English schools are and must remain of the privately managed type; and it is important to re-assure managing committees of such schools that there is no intention of concentrating all our available resources upon Government institutions, that Government fully recognise the important part which private management plays in our educational system and that the curtailment or withdrawal of the assistance which the State has rendered to private institutions in the past is not a necessary or probable consequence of the establishment of model institutions by the State. Without such aid private institutions will in many instances lag so far behind that much of the benefit of the model school will be thrown away.

4. The Government of India observe that the average expenditure per scholar in all the high schools of the Madras Presidency is among the lowest of these averages for the provinces of India; and that to the average annual cost of educating a high school pupil the Government of that Presidency contributes only Rs. 2·85, while the average annual fee income per pupil is Rs. 18·12. This contribution by Government is lower than that made in any of the other large provinces of India; and on this subject I am to invite attention to the recommendations made in paragraph 13 of the record of the fourth day of the recent Educational Conference at Allahabad.

5. I am now to invite the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council upon the Rev. G. Pittendrigh's letter and likewise upon the considerations set forth in the preceding paragraphs. Further, I am to state that consideration is being given by the Government of India to proposals for the improvement of secondary education and that they would be glad to have information as to the amount of expenditure, recurring and non-recurring, which the Madras Government could, in the light of the preceding remarks, usefully devote to the improvement of aided secondary schools.

6. In conclusion I am to ask for the favour of an early reply.

Enclosure.

Letter—from the Rev. G. Pittendrigh, M.A., Honorary Secretary, Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. S. H. Butler, C.S.I., C.I.E., Member for Education in the Viceregal Council, Calcutta.
Dated—the 11th March 1911.

I have the honour to address you as Secretary of a council representing all the Protestant Missionary Societies engaged in educational work in the Presidency of Madras.

2. It has been brought to the notice of the council that the Government of Madras have now under consideration a scheme for the establishment of model secondary schools in a large number of the districts of this Presidency. This matter was discussed in the meeting of the Legislative Council of Madras held on 30th November 1910, and the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick, speaking on behalf of the Government of Madras, gave the assurance that no further effect would be given to this scheme until the newly appointed Minister of Education had had an opportunity of considering it in all its bearings and until the Government of India had again expressed their views upon it. Under these circumstances the Missionary Council on Aided Education beg to put before you the following considerations:—

(*a*) The carrying out of this scheme will mean a reversal of the declared policy of the Government of India with regard to private effort in education. It has been repeatedly stated that it is the policy of the Government of India to foster private effort. In harmony with that policy and in accordance with the recommendations of the Education Commission of 1883 the majority of Government secondary schools in the Madras Presidency were some years ago handed over to local boards or municipalities or to committees of private gentlemen. The Madras Education department also encouraged the establishment of secondary schools under private management. The announcement recently made that the Government of Madras have in view the establishment of these model schools has already created concern in the minds of those managers whose institutions are situated in the districts where it is believed that Government intend to open or take over schools, and if this proposal is actually carried into effect it must result in a serious discouragement to all private effort, not only in regard to schools of this class but also in regard to education in general.

(*b*) The members of the Missionary Council sympathize entirely with the desire of the Government to secure increased efficiency in secondary education, and were they assured that this proposal would effectively secure this they would hesitate to express their disapproval of the scheme even though they believed it to be a reversal of policy. But they feel confident that these model schools will not accomplish that end. If they are to be greatly superior to existing schools, Government must spend large sums of money upon their buildings and equipment and must appoint to each of them a staff much more costly than that now employed. Doubtless, with all the resources of the State at their command, it is possible to spend more money upon them than private managers could afford, but in so far as that is done so far would such schools become less and less models which other schools might copy.

(*c*) The members of the council, while recognising that the condition of secondary education in this Presidency is capable of much improvement, are not prepared to admit that it calls for such a drastic change of policy as the Madras Government proposes. Improvement will be effected on a much wider scale, will be much more real and will be less costly to the State—that is, to the tax-payer—by making all schools, whether under public or private management, the more intimate care of the department than has hitherto been the case. Efficiency will be best secured by an inspecting agency familiar with the highest ideals of education, by insisting on the employment of only qualified teachers and by suitable buildings and equipment. This we recognise will involve a larger expenditure upon grants-in-aid, but it will be an expenditure that will more certainly secure the efficiency aimed at than a lavish expenditure upon a few model schools.

(*d*) It has been stated by way of defending the establishment of these model schools that it is the carrying out of a policy recommended in the report of the Decentralisation Commission of 1907. The Commission recommended that local bodies should be relieved of the cost of secondary education with the view that the funds so liberated should be applied to elementary education. But the Commission did not recommend that the management of such secondary schools as were then maintained by local boards should be taken out of their hands and assumed by Government. The Missionary council agree that the efforts of local bodies should be mainly directed to the spread of elementary education, but where secondary schools have been established and are well managed they deprecate the proposed action of Government. To transfer a number of schools from local bodies to the Education department at any time would weaken the spirit of self-reliance and self-help, but to do this at the present moment when in the political sphere increased responsibility is being placed upon the people of this country appears to us especially impolitic. We cannot think that the results of past management have been such as to warrant a change which is out of harmony with the spirit of modern developments.

(*e*) In Southern India wealthy private individuals, apart from a few conspicuous exceptions, have hitherto shown little inclination to come forward with endowments and bequests for educational institutions. We believe that the idea that such gifts are not necessary or would not be welcomed explains to a large extent this backwardness. We are aware that this assumption is not correct, but if Government take over the direct management of a number of schools it cannot but foster such an idea and be to that extent a hindrance to private individuals making large donations towards the maintenance of secondary schools. Moreover, the present moment is one in which there is an almost universal consensus of opinion that in some form or other religious and ethical training should form an essential part of the education of the youth of India. Pledged to neutrality in matters of religion as Government is—and we do not advocate any change in that neutrality—the more widespread the system of Government schools is the fewer will be the opportunities of giving that religious and moral training.

II

Endorsement No. 1439-1, Educational, dated 10th July 1911.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for *very early* remarks.

(By order.)

M. S. Mascarenhas,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

III

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. J. H. Stone, M.A., F.R.H.S., Acting Director of Public Instruction.
To—the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.
Dated—Madras, the 17th August 1911.
No.—Ref. on Cur. 4818/11.

With reference to Government Endorsement No. 1439-1, Educational, dated 10th July 1911, I have the honour to submit the following remarks :—

(i) *Effect on private enterprise of the establishment of model schools.*—The Government of India have themselves almost sufficiently answered the missionary arguments as to the effect on private enterprise of the establishment of model schools. Only four schools under private management are to be taken over, and only three of these are in places where there is a mission school. The provincialization of these *three* schools cannot, I submit, affect the progress of education or discourage private enterprise in the field of education. Private individuals have done very little towards the cause of secondary education, and past experience shows that such do not as a fact endow schools. I do not quite follow the last two sentences of paragraph 2 of the letter of the Government of India. There are only four schools not under public management to be taken over, but the Government of India seems to make five and to consider the Raja of Venkatagiri's High School, Nellore, a special case.

(ii) *Fixing of a strict limit to the expansion of each Government school.*—The scheme for the establishment of model schools certainly contemplates this, since the staff provided for all the schools is limited. Dr. Bourne foresaw the necessity of

moving teachers temporarily from school to school according to the exigencies of each, but what he seems to have had in view was rather variations in the courses of study than fluctuations in strength. It may be pointed out to the Government of India that our rules forbid a class being more than 40 strong; and that this, coupled with the limited staff to be sanctioned, would keep the numbers in the new schools within due limits. If it is thought necessary, I see no objection, however, to laying down a rule as to the extent that classes in these model schools may be duplicated. It would not, I think, be possible to forbid duplication altogether, both because that would involve great reduction in strength on taking over many of the schools and because duplication affords opportunities for improved teaching organization. These have hitherto been little used and an important function of the model schools will be to demonstrate their value.

(iii) *Possible expenditure towards the improvement of aided secondary schools.*—The actuals under recurring and non-recurring expenditure from Provincial funds for the past four years are given below in round numbers :—

Non-European schools.	1907-1908.	1908-1909.	1909-1910.	1910-1911.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Teaching grants to secondary schools	2,38,000	1,55,000	1,53,000	1,70,000
Building grants	25,000	23,000	61,000	38,000
Grants for furniture and other special objects	62,000	16,000	26,000	39,000
Total ..	3,25,000	1,94,000	2,39,000	2,47,000

The allotments under these heads for the past and current years are :—

	1910-1911.	1911-1912.
	Rs.	Rs.
Teaching grants to secondary schools	1,50,000	1,85,000
Building grants	60,000	72,000
Grants for furniture, etc.	25,000	1,20,000
Total ...	2,35,000	3,77,000

These increased allotments *exclude* the special additional lump grant of three lakhs for the current year. Steps are being taken to utilize these extra allotments and some portion will be given away as a free gift. But in the case of those grants the payment of which depends on the managers' contribution, it cannot be said definitely that the whole of the amounts will be actually paid before the close of the year.

2. In view of the stringent requirements of the Educational Rules and the introduction of the Secondary School Leaving Certificate Scheme, managers have been (and will continue to be) incurring additional expenditure on staff and contingencies, and the expenditure on teaching grants may therefore be expected to steadily increase. Similar increase of expenditure on buildings and equipment is also urgently necessary, but under the existing code and failing "gifts" by Government our power of increasing such expenditure is limited by that of managers of incurring it, and experience indicates that their power of finding lump sums for non-recurring expenditure is not susceptible of much expansion. The present code has for its object to make secondary education as nearly self-supporting as may be, and the figures quoted by the Government of India bear witness to its success. It would not be possible to modify the code without some departure from this policy. Such departure would be least objectionable if modifications were in the direction of increasing the proportion of non-recurring expenditure borne by the State. The proportion of grants for building and equipment might be made more liberal. Now that we safeguard our interest in school buildings by requiring the execution of mortgage deeds, I do not see why we should not give at least as much towards buildings as towards equipment or even more, and grants might be given in aid of endowments for the general purposes of schools, such endowments being properly constituted trust funds.

3. A method by which recurring State expenditure might be increased without seriously infringing the self-supporting principle would be to give special grants towards the salaries of headmasters of exceptional qualifications, *e.g.*, European graduates or graduates of European Universities appointed with the previous approval of the department. Nothing would conduce more to the improvement of the schools, and if the grants were calculated on the basis of the difference between the salary of an ordinary and exceptional headmaster as much could be given in this way as was available.

4. Another unobjectionable way of increasing recurring expenditure would be a provident fund.

5. I may mention in this connection that the raising of the standard rate of fees would, if we strictly followed the Grant-in-Aid Code in many cases, diminish the "code grant" for secondary schools, so that our expenditure this year on teaching grants would be actually less than last instead of, as budgetted for, more. I am taking steps to prevent this and to spend under the head up to the budget allotment in view of the promises made by the Honourable Member in the Legislative Council that there should be no falling off in grants. I am not able to form any estimate of the extent to which expenditure would be increased by the adoption of any one of the above suggestions. But I think that it is certain that they afford scope for the expenditure of any funds which Government could provide for the improvement of secondary education and that they would not infringe the principle of self-support in so far as this means that the burden of secondary education shall rest mainly on the parent.

IV

Telegram—from the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Education.
To—the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Educational Department.
Dated—Simla, the 4th September 1911.

Demi-official number 510 Education. Your demi-official number 2047 of 24th ultimo. Please send separate communication on representation of Missionary Council as proposed.

Order—No. 631, Educational, dated 8th September 1911.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

L. Davidson,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

No. 632.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. L. DAVIDSON, I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Educational Department.

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Department of Education.

Dated Ootacamund, the 8th September 1911.

Sir,

I am directed to reply to your letter No. 810, Education, dated 14th June 1911, forwarding for remarks a letter from the Rev. G. Pittendrigh, M.A., Honorary Secretary to the Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras, protesting against the establishment of model secondary schools in this Presidency, proposals in regard to which are now before the Secretary of State, on the grounds—

(i) that such a measure would discourage all private effort in regard to education ;

(ii) that it would not secure increased efficiency in secondary education since the standard set up would be incapable of being copied by aided schools ;

(iii) that it involves a drastic change from the educational policy hitherto pursued ; and

(iv) that it is at variance with the policy recommended by the Decentralization Commission in regard to secondary education.

2. The arguments of the Missionary Council as to the effect on private enterprise of the establishment of the model schools have been sufficiently answered in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply. I am, however, to point out that the scheme in no way contemplates the general creation of new schools under Government management which will compete with existing mission schools ; and that the number of the proposed model schools (19) is so small as compared with the total number of secondary schools in the Presidency (157) and their location has been so carefully selected that no serious discouragement of private effort need be apprehended. Four of the 19 proposed model schools are already Government schools, ten are managed by local boards or municipal councils and five are under private management. The net cost of most of the local board or municipal schools in issue being now met from Provincial funds, they may for

all practical purposes be regarded as Government institutions and their provincialization will merely remove them from dual control, and put an end to their subordination to local bodies, which, as past experience in this Presidency proves, are ill fitted to superintend the management of secondary schools. The provincialization of the remaining five schools under private management, four of which are situated in places where there is a mission school, cannot, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, seriously affect the progress of education or, having regard to the previous limited exhibition of private munificence in the matter of endowing secondary schools, discourage private enterprise in the field of education.

3. With regard to the fear expressed by the Missionary Council that the model secondary schools will set up standards which it would be impossible for private managers to copy, I am directed to state that, while maintaining their own institutions as models and as incentives to private managers to raise the level of their schools, the Government will be prepared gradually to increase the amount of aid given to the latter schools so as to enable them to approximate to the standards set up. As a first instalment of this programme of aid, an extra provision of Rs. 1,70,000 has been made in the current year for payment of special grants to this class of schools to enable them to improve their equipment.

4. As regards the argument put forward by the Missionary Council on the ground of supposed change of policy, I am directed to state that it is based on a misapprehension. As already stated, the scheme for the establishment of model schools does not involve any reduction in the grants to aided secondary schools. On the other hand, larger expenditure on such grants, both under the ordinary rules and in the shape of special subsidies, is contemplated as a simultaneous step towards the improvement of aided secondary education, and this Government have every intention of improving the existing arrangements for the inspection and supervision of aided schools, helping the latter in their outlay on buildings and equipment and providing a larger supply of qualified teachers.

5. The contention of the Missionary Council that the Decentralization Commission did not recommend that the management of secondary schools maintained by local boards should be taken out of their hands and assumed by Government is clearly untenable. It is directly opposed to the recommendation contained in paragraph 751 of their report "that high schools and all institutions in which teaching is given in "English should in all cases be a direct Government charge." The Madras Government have, moreover, had sufficient experience of the past management by local bodies of secondary schools to justify the policy of taking the charge of secondary education away from the local bodies and doing away with the present system of dual control.

6. Adverting to paragraph 3 of your letter under reply, I am to state that the Governor in Council agrees with the Government of India that it is desirable to fix a limit to the indefinite expansion of the Government high schools. The scheme for the establishment of model schools is based on this assumption and the staff provided for the proposed schools is limited with reference thereto. Rule 86 of the Madras Educational Rules restricts each class to forty students and will effectively keep the strength of model schools within due limits, though some expansion may in exceptional circumstances be permitted by the duplication of classes. Care will be taken to prevent such expansion from leading to competition with good private schools, but it is neither possible nor desirable to forbid duplication altogether. Such a course might, it is

apprehended, not only involve great reduction in the strength of some of the schools which it is proposed to convert into model institutions, but would also destroy the opportunities for improved teaching organization afforded by the duplication of classes, an advantage which has hitherto been but little utilized and the value of which it will be an important function of the model schools to demonstrate.

7. In paragraph 4 of your letter, reference is made to the comparatively low expenditure incurred by Government on secondary education in this Presidency. The main reason for this is that the policy of this Government in regard to secondary education has long been based on the principle that subject to certain limitations such education should normally be self-supporting. I am in this connection to invite attention to paragraph 7 of this Government's letter No. 217, Financial, dated 9th February 1882, in which it was stated that "it has in practice been found necessary "to guard against the tendency to provide superior education at the cost of the tax-"payers for the children of a very limited class, which is perfectly well able to pay "for it". As at present advised, His Excellency the Governor in Council sees no reason to recede from that position. Under the existing Grant-in-Aid Code secondary schools are aided with (i) teaching grants, (ii) building grants and (iii) grants for furniture and other special objects, and the following statement shows the assistance given under each of these heads in the past four years as compared with the provision made in the current year's budget:—

—	1907–1908.	1908–1909.	1909–1910.	1910–1911.	1911–1912 (Budget estimate).
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Teaching grants	2,38,000	1,55,000	1,62,000	1,70,000	1,85,000
Building grants	35,000	23,000	61,000	38,000	72,000
Grants for furniture and other special objects ..	52,000	16,000	26,000	39,000	1,20,000

8. In addition to the amount provided in the budget, a sum of Rs. 1,20,000 has been allotted for "grants for furniture and other special objects," out of the special assignment from the surplus opium revenues made by the Government of India in their letter No. 364, Education, dated 11th March 1911. If these special grants be taken into account, it will be seen that the aggregate Government contribution towards the cost of secondary education in this Presidency will rise substantially in the current year. It will increase still further when the proposed scheme of model schools has been brought into operation.

9. With reference to paragraph 5 of your letter under reply, I am to express the regret of His Excellency in Council that it is not possible to furnish any reliable estimate of the amount of expenditure, recurring and non-recurring, which this Government are likely to incur on the improvement of secondary education in the next five or ten years. In the case of aided schools, increase in recurring expenditure normally takes place under the head of teaching grants. The conditions under which secondary schools are eligible for these grants are set out in articles 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code, and the principles underlying those articles are in the opinion of the Governor in Council eminently sound. If more funds were available, this Government would be prepared to *consider* whether the amount of teaching grants which under article 33 of the Code depend on the income guaranteed to be annually provided by the management might not be substantially increased, whether grants for buildings and equipment (articles 51 and 57) might not be made more liberal, whether a system

of salary grants might not be instituted for masters possessing special qualifications, *e.g.*, European graduates or graduates of European Universities, and whether provision might not be made for the assistance of provident funds started for the benefit of teachers in aided institutions. While there is thus considerable scope for increasing the Government contribution to secondary education by adopting some or all of the above measures, the actual increase in the expenditure will depend mainly on the ability of the managers to provide their share, and it is, therefore, not possible even approximately to say by how much the expenditure could be increased.

10. In conclusion, I am to assure the Government of India that the existing policy of this Government in regard to secondary education does not give any reasonable ground for dissatisfaction and that there is no real foundation for the alarm felt by missionary bodies lest the Government should be intending to destroy private effort and alter the policy which they have pursued for years.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

L. DAVIDSON,

Ag. Secretary to Government.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 631, 632, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 8TH SEPTEMBER 1911.

[SUBJECT.—*Memorial of the Missionary Council on Aided Education regarding Model Secondary schools.*]

Previous papers:

G.O., No.	1768,	*Financial,*	*dated 17th August*	1883.
,, ,,	711,	*Educational,*	,, *15th November*	1884.
,, ,,	250	,,	,, *18th April*	1885.
,, ,,	727	,,	,, *28th September*	1894.
,, ,,	765	,,	,, *18th November*	1899.
,, ,,	678	,,	,, *21st* ,,	1901.
,, ,,	358	,,	,, *25th May*	1905.
,, ,,	250	,,	,, *30th March*	1906.
,, ,,	140	,,	,, *25th February*	1908.
,, ,,	87	,,	,, *21st* ,,	1910.
,, ,,	501–2	,,	,, *25th August*	,,
,, ,,	59–60	,,	,, *2nd February*	1911.
,, ,,	209	,,	,, *11th April*	,,
,, ,,	378	,,	,, *16th June*	,,
,, ,,	551	,,	,, *8th August*	,,

From the Government of India, Department of Education, dated 14th June 1911, No. 810.

"Please ask Honourable Member to return the file now with him on this subject, "sending this for preliminary perusal at the same time."

L. DAVIDSON—19–6–11.

The Secretary apparently refers to the file relating to the memorial addressed to the Secretary of State by the Missionary Council on Aided Education regarding the establishment of model secondary schools. This file has already been disposed of and the memorial was forwarded to the Government of India with letter No. 378, Educational, dated 16th June 1911, which was despatched on the same date. This Government Order has been sent to Madras for tabling and indexing and has been telegraphed for.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—19–6–11.

M. S. MASCARENHAS—20–6–11.

L. DAVIDSON—20–6–11.

Government Order, Nos. 377–8, Educational, dated 16th June 1911, forwarding to the Government of India the memorial of the Missionary Council on Aided Education has been received from Madras and is submitted. For orders whether the present communication from the Government of India may be submitted to the Honourable Member for preliminary perusal before it is taken up for examination.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—26–6–11.

No; you may examine it at once.

L. DAVIDSON—28–6–11.

Paragraph 2 (*a*) of the Missionary Council's letter.

The first point raised by the Missionary Council on Aided Education is that the carrying out of the scheme for the establishment of Model Secondary schools will mean a reversal of the declared policy of the Government of India with regard to private effort in education, and that if the

proposal is actually carried into effect, it must result in serious discouragement to all private effort not only in regard to schools of this class, but also in regard to education in general. The policy of the Government of India in regard to secondary education is set out in detail in paragraphs 46 to 60 of the notes with G.O., Nos. 59–60, Educational, dated 2nd February 1911, dealing with the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Decentralization on the subject, and was fully discussed at the meeting of the Legislative Council on the 29th November 1910 in connection with the resolution on the subject of model schools, which was moved by the Hon'ble Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Aiyar. Attention is specially solicited to the remarks of the Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick on page 437 *et seq.* of the proceedings of the Council. It seems, therefore, to be sufficient here to refer briefly to the various pronouncements of policy made from time to time as to the course to be adopted in regard to secondary education.

Pages 24 to 30 of notes.

2. The first in time, as in importance, is the despatch of 1854, which was issued by the Court of Directors laying down the policy to be followed in this country in the matter of education. In paragraphs 51 and 52 of this despatch of 1854, the Directors said—

"The consideration of the impossibility of 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."

3. The policy laid down in the above despatch was emphasized by the Education Commission of 1882–83 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 should be the principal care of the department and that "private effort should be increasingly relied on for supplying the means of all general "education in its higher stages".

4. In pursuance of the above recommendations and also in accordance with the principles of local self-government then brought into operation, a considerable devolution of the management of Government schools upon municipalities and district boards was effected in 1885, with the result that all the high schools and most of the second-grade colleges maintained by Government were transferred to local bodies, the Government undertaking to bear the net cost of the high school departments of the high schools so transferred.

Vide G.Os., No. 1768, Financial, dated 17th August 1883, and No. 250, Educational, dated 18th April 1885.

5. Four years later, Sir Alfred Croft who was deputed to review the progress of education in India with special reference to the recommendations of the Commission, reported in 1887 that in the Madras Presidency secondary schools under Government management had been transferred to local bodies and as to the encouragement of purely private enterprise in secondary education "the policy and practice uniformly followed in Madras" left nothing to be desired.

Paragraphs 158 and 172 of the report, pages 163–4 and 188–9.

6. Twelve years after this, in Home Department Resolution No. 495–506, dated 28th October 1899, reviewing the report of Mr. J. S. Cotton on the progress of education during the quinquennium ending 1896–97, the Government of India said—

G.O., No. 765, Educational, dated 18th November 1899, paragraph 9.

"In respect to secondary education, the Government of India in paragraph 20 "*et seq.* of Home Department Resolution "of 23rd October 1884 laid down clearly "the following principle: 'That the "'function of State effort shall henceforth ordinarily be confined to extending secondary "'education in cases where there is a local demand for this and local co-operation'; "and in the Resolution of 7th September "1894, attention was drawn to the "principle which 'has been accepted by "'the Government that the Education Department should gradually withdraw from "'the direct management of secondary schools'. The second statement of the principle "is not the same as the first. The first only has been on the whole observed . . . "It cannot be said that the second statement of the principle under discussion has "been observed. There has been no real withdrawal of Government from the manage- "ment of secondary schools. There are strong arguments against complete withdrawal, "quoted by Mr. Cotton from the Directors of Education in Bombay and Bengal "(pages 139 and 141 of the review), based on the fact that the well-managed Govern- "ment schools serve to keep up the standard of discipline in aided schools. These "arguments in favour of maintaining existing institutions are worthy of the fullest "consideration; and the Government of India, while maintaining the position that "there should be no extension of the system, will not insist on the withdrawal from "management where that is considered inexpedient. It seems specially expedient in "most cases to have one such Government school in each district as a model."

G.O., No. 711, Educational, dated 15th November 1884.

G.O., No. 727, Educational, dated 28th September 1894.

7. The inapplicability to the Madras Presidency of the Government of India's indictment against Local Governments for not withdrawing from the direct management of secondary schools was pointed out to that Government in letter No. 379, Educational, dated 22nd August 1900, with the result that in paragraph 20 of their letter No. 466, dated 6th November 1901, forwarding the resolutions of the Simla Educational Conference, they expressed the fear that the State had in the Madras Presidency receded too much from the maintenance of model secondary schools and called on the Madras Government to consider the matter carefully. The suggestion contained in paragraph 4 of Home Department letter No. 758, dated 10th October 1906, that there should be a Government high school in each district is only a repetition of the principle which had been previously laid down, and is not a departure from the established policy of Government in regard to secondary education.

In G.O., No. 678, Educational, dated 21st November 1901.

Page 2 of G.O., No. 250, Educational, dated 30th March 1906.

8. The objection of the Missionary Council that the maintenance of the proposed 19 Government schools would discourage private effort seems also to be untenable. It is not the intention of Government to establish new secondary schools side by side with existing board, mission or private schools. The proposal is to take over under the direct management of Government, high schools which are already managed either by local bodies or private agencies, and which, owing to lack of funds or other causes, they are unable to run efficiently. Altogether 15 schools are proposed to be so taken over, of which ten are now managed by local boards or municipal councils and the annual net cost of many of them is borne from Provincial funds. The remaining five are managed by private bodies or individuals. There are now 25 districts in this Presidency, and it is proposed to have model schools only in 18* districts, seven districts, namely, Vizagapatam, Kurnool, the Nilgiris, Madura, Tinnevelly, Rámnád and Vellore, in all of which except the Nilgiris there are efficient high schools under mission or non-mission management, which may

Vide paragraph 7 of letter No. 87, Educational, dated 21st February 1910.

* Of the 19 schools two are to be in Malabar.

be expected to come up to the level of Government high schools, being left without Government schools. The existing number of Government schools, namely, four for 25 districts, compares very unfavourably with the number in other provinces, except the United Provinces, Burma and the Central Provinces, the numbers on the 31st March 1907 being 20 for 25 districts in Bombay, 38 for 35 districts in Bengal, 29 for 29 districts in the Punjab and 25 for 27 districts in Eastern Bengal and Assam. The proposal to have 19 schools for 25 districts would still leave Madras behind the other provinces above mentioned and if the existence of a large number of Government schools in other provinces does not prejudicially affect private effort there, there is no reason to suppose that the proposed increase in the number of Government schools in this Presidency will have an undesirable effect on private enterprise.

Vide table 77 on page 99 of Volume II of the last quinquennial report by Mr. Orange.

9. The total number of complete secondary schools in this Presidency arranged according to management during a series of years is given below :—

—	Number managed by Government.	Number managed by local boards and municipal councils.	Aided schools.	Unaided schools.	Total.
On 31st March 1883	22	..	52	20	94
,, ,, 1886	10	..	..	..	..
,, ,, 1892	* 4	26	66	40	136
,, ,, 1897	* 4	23	84	22	133
,, ,, 1902	* 4	25	96	31	156
,, ,, 1907	* 4	24	103	39	170
,, ,, 1910	* 4	27	103	23	157

* Excludes the Brooks' Memorial school, Ootacamund.

On the 31st March 1911, there were 157 high schools, of which four were Government schools, 27 managed by local bodies, 103 were aided schools and 23 unaided schools. If the proposals of Government are carried out, the numbers will be 19 Government, 17 local bodies, 99 aided and 23 unaided, and it cannot be said that this scheme will produce any appreciable effect on private enterprise.

10. It has also to be observed that great care was taken in the selection of schools to be taken over for the purpose of the model schools, that no schools which had been established by private effort were interfered with. Attention is solicited in this connection to the notes on pages 11 to 14 of the notes to G.O., No. 250, Educational, dated 30th March 1908.

11. The next objection is that if these Government schools are to serve as model schools, the Government must spend on them large sums of money on buildings and equipment and on staff, which private managers cannot afford to do. There appears, at first sight, to be some force in the above argument, but it overlooks the fact that while the existence of a model school will be an incentive to private managers to raise the level of their schools to that of the model school, increased aid will be given by Government to these schools so as to enable them to do so. As a matter of fact a special grant of Rs. 40,000 was given to aided secondary schools in 1907–1908 towards the cost of equipment and an extra provision of Rs. 1,70,000 has already been made in the current year's budget for the same purpose.

Paragraph 2 (*b*) of the Missionary Council's letter.

G.O., No. 140, Educational, dated 25th February 1908.

Vide G.O., No. 209, Educational, dated 11th April 1911, and page 144 of Civil Budget Estimate.

12. The Government of India observe that it is desirable to fix a strict limit over the expansion of each Government school as otherwise Government schools will grow to an unwieldy size and entail heavy expenditure on staff and pensions, and it is important to re-assure managing committees of private schools that there is no intention of concentrating all our available resources upon Government institutions.

13. The scheme as now formulated is expected to involve a recurring net expenditure of Rs. 90,953, and it provides for only one master for each form or class. The intention of the Government of India apparently is that the model schools should not be allowed to expand in size, that is, should not take in more boys than could be taught with the establishment now provided; for if the admissions are not restricted it will be necessary to open two or more sections of the same class involving an increase in the staff. There seems to be no objection to provide such a limitation.

Paragraph 11 of letter No. 87, Educational, dated 21st February 1910.

L. Davidson.

14. With regard to the point raised in paragraph 2 (*c*) of the Rev. Mr. Pittendrigh's letter, the answer is that the establishment of model schools will not result in the withdrawal or reduction of grants to aided schools and that every effort will be made to increase their efficiency by giving increased grants where necessary.

15. The objection in paragraph 2 (*d*) of the letter seems to be based on a misapprehension of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Decentralization. Attention is solicited to paragraph 751 of the Commission's report and to paragraph 5 of Home Department letter No. 1, dated 3rd January 1910, from which it will be clear that the Commission recommended that high schools should not be maintained by local bodies but "should be a direct Government charge."

Paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 59, Educational, dated 2nd February 1911.

16. With regard to the argument that the establishment of Government model schools would act as a deterrent against private charity, it has to be noted that more than 25 years have now elapsed since Government publicly divested themselves of the management of high schools and transferred them to local bodies, and Government have not during this period done anything to create an impression in the minds of the public that private gifts would not be welcome; and yet very few individuals have come forward with donations or endowments towards the maintenance of secondary schools. There is no guarantee that if Government do not take over the proposed schools, indigenous effort will take their place and undertake the management of all or any of the schools under reference. As regards religious instruction it has to be pointed out that there is no objection whatever under the existing rules to religious or moral instruction being given in any school, if the management so desire. In the case of Government Muhammadan schools the Government have held that religious instruction may be given out of school-hours.

Vide paragraph 2 (*e*) of the Missionary Council's letter.

G.O., No. 358, Educational, dated 25th May 1905.

17. It now remains to consider the suggestion made by the Government of India in paragraph 4 of their letter in regard to the improvement of aided secondary schools. This subject was adverted to by the Government of India in paragraph 6 of Home Department letter No. 758, dated 10th October 1906, and was again raised in paragraph 5 of letter No. 597, dated 8th June 1910. The question is fully dealt with in paragraph 14 of Sir George Forbes' note on pages 35 and 36 of the notes with G.O., No. 250, Educational, dated 30th March 1908, paragraph 8 of Dr. Bourne's note on page 3 of the notes with G.O., No. 501, Educational, dated 25th August 1910, and paragraph 10 of letter to India, No. 502, Educational, dated 25th August 1910. The Government of India point out that the Government contribution towards the cost of educating a high school pupil in this Presidency is lower than it is in other provinces, being only Rs. 2·85 per annum against Rs. 18·12 contributed by fees; and they further draw attention to paragraph 13 of the record of the fourth day of the recent Educational Conference at Allahabad in which it is stated that it would not be right to rely upon increase of fees and private support alone for the improvement of our secondary schools and that secondary education requires liberal support from Government.

Page 3 of G.O., No. 250, Educational, dated 30th March 1908.

Page 3 of G.O., No. 501, Educational, dated 25th August 1910.

Page 23 of the volume.

18. With reference to the above observations it has to be noted that Government grants to secondary schools in this Presidency are regulated by the provisions of the Grant-in-Aid Code The provisions in regard to "teaching grants" are contained in articles 32 and 33. In addition to these grants, special grants for building, furniture and equipment are given to such of them as apply for them, in accordance with the provisions of articles 50 to 64. If, as pointed out by the Government of India, the Government support to secondary schools is very small in this Presidency as compared with the fee income, it is because the policy of Government in regard to secondary education has for nearly 30 years been that it should be self-supporting. Attention is solicited to paragraph 7 of letter to India No. 217, Financial, dated 9th February 1882, in which this Government stated that "it has in practice been found necessary to "guard against the tendency to provide superior education at the cost of the tax-"payers for the children of a very limited class, which is perfectly well able to pay for "it." It is not clear whether the Government of India desire that the above policy should now be modified and that the expenditure from State funds on aided secondary schools should be increased. If this is their intention, this can only be made by a modification of articles 32 * and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code so as to admit of a larger share of the net cost of the secondary schools being paid as teaching grants. With reference to paragraph 5 of India's letter, it is submitted that as already pointed out in paragraph 10 of letter No. 502, Educational, dated 25th August 1910, it will not be possible at present to furnish an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure, which will be required for the improvement of aided secondary schools. Perhaps the Director of Public Instruction may be consulted on this point.

* This question is separately under consideration.

I do not see how he can possibly frame an estimate of much value.

L. Davidson—5-7-11.

K. Rangaswami Aiyangar—4-7-11.

Will the Honourable Member kindly say if he would like to have any expression of the Director of Public Instruction's views on this reference.

2. India has already been told that no trustworthy estimate can be framed of the cost of bringing aided secondary schools up to the mark, and may now be assured that we have no objection to limiting the size of Government model schools.

3. The expansion of Government aid towards secondary education under private management depends on the decision whether or not articles 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code should be made more liberal and whether any action should be taken to encourage † endowments, and cognate question which, if my memory is not at fault, is raised in the same file (now with Honourable Member). The Government contribution towards the average cost of the education of high school pupils will rise substantially when the model schools come on and the recent special grants towards secondary education are taken into account. The statistics quoted relate to the past and are of little value so far as the future is concerned.

† Since disposed of in G.O., No. 551, Educational, dated 8th August 1911.

4. As to Mr. Pittendrigh's letter, the outlines of the reply will, I take it, be as follows:—

Paragraph 2, *clause* (*a*).—The number of model schools is so small and their location has been so selected that no serious discouragement of private effort need be apprehended.

A *Clause* (*b*).—The model schools will not set up standards which it is *impossible* to copy, and the gradual increase of State aid will facilitate imitation of the model.

Clause (*c*).—There has been no "drastic" change in policy, larger expenditure on grants-in-aid whether under the ordinary code or in the shape of special subsidies is contemplated as a simultaneous step towards the improvement of secondary education and the Government have every intention of (i) improving the existing arrangements for the inspection and supervision of aided schools and (ii) helping them in their outlay on buildings and equipment and by providing a larger supply of qualified teachers.

A *Clause* (*d*).—The letter entirely misapprehends the recommendation of the Decentralization Commission and we have had sufficient experience of past management by local bodies to justify the policy of taking the charge of secondary education gradually away from them and doing away with the system of dual control.

5. It is difficult to understand why India should have made any reference on this much discussed subject.

L. Davidson—5-7-11.

The letter must certainly go to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks before we reply to India. Please send it to him at once for early report. The letter will force me and other members of the Government to make up our minds as to the amendment of the rules for aid to secondary schools; a very difficult matter.

B Two points, I think, we must lay stress upon: (1) that we desire to adhere to our policy of doing everything we can to encourage managers to make secondary education self-supporting; and (2) we must point out how ill-adapted are our local municipalities for the management of secondary schools. We have evidence of that in the history of Palghat, Salem and Máyavaram and perhaps other schools.

But let us first hear what the Director of Public Instruction has to say. Tell him to report *soon*.

M. H[ammick]—8-7-11.

Reference to the Director of Public Instruction accordingly (official).

L. Davidson—10-7-11.

The draft is for approval.

T.K.—10-7-11.

M. S. Mascarenhas—10-7-11.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 17th August 1911, *No.* 4818.

Please see the remarks of the Secretary and the Honourable Member on pages 6 and 7 *ante* and the Director of Public Instruction's reply, dated 17th August 1911.

2. *Paragraph* 2 *of India's letter.*—The Director of Public Instruction points out that the Government of India have themselves sufficiently answered the missionary arguments as to the effect on private enterprise of the establishment of model secondary schools, that the provincialization of only *four* schools under private management, of which only *three* are in places where there are mission schools, cannot affect the progress of education or discourage private enterprise and that past experience shows that private individuals do not endow secondary schools.

3. The Director of Public Instruction is, however, wrong in saying that only "four" schools under private management are to be taken over by Government as model schools. From paragraph 7 of letter No 87, Educational, dated 21st February 1910, it will be seen that *five* schools under private management are to be taken over, namely—

(1) The Taylor High School, Narasapur;
(2) The Town High School, Guntúr;
(3) The Venkatagiri Raja's High School, Nellore;
(4) The Town High School, Cuddalore;
(5) The Coimbatore College.

4. It is not clear how the Director of Public Instruction makes out that only four schools under private management are to be taken over. Apparently he omits the Coimbatore College as it is not a "school". Nor is it clear why the Government of India have made a special case of the Venkatagiri Raja's High School, Nellore, which is not dissimilar in character to the other four schools. There is no mission school at Narasapur, but in the other four places there are mission schools with which the model schools will compete on new terms. The same argument would also probably apply to the case of the board and municipal schools to be taken over which are

L. Davidson.

situated in places where there are already mission schools. Four of the ten schools to be taken over are under this category, namely, those at Bellary, Salem, Palghat and Tellicherry; but it must be remembered that the existing board and municipal secondary schools are not now maintained in that state of efficiency in which they should be, and mission schools should not complain if they lose the advantage over these schools which they had hitherto enjoyed. On the other hand they must welcome the change as it will promote a spirit of emulation.

5. *Paragraph* 3 *of India's letter.*—Mr. Stone points out that the scheme for the establishment of model schools contemplates the fixing of a strict limit to the expansion of each Government school as the staff provided for the schools is limited, and he would tell the Government of India that the rules forbid a class containing more than forty students and that this restriction coupled with the limited staff to be sanctioned would keep the numbers in the model schools within due limits. He is, however, not in favour of prohibiting pdulication of classes.

Rule 86 of the Educational Rules.

6. *Paragraphs* 4 *and* 5 *of India's letter.*—The Director of Public Instruction suggests that the Government contribution to aided secondary schools might be increased in the following ways:—

(*a*) *Non-recurring grants*—

(i) by increasing the proportion of building grants to one-half of the total cost; and

(ii) by giving grants in aid of endowments for general purposes.

(*b*) *Recurring grants*—

(i) by giving special grants towards the salaries of headmasters having European or other special qualifications; and

(ii) by subsidizing a provident fund for teachers.

7. In paragraph 5 of their letter, the Government of India ask for information as to the *amount of expenditure*, recurring and non-recurring, which the Madras Government could usefully devote to the improvement of aided secondary schools, but the Director of Public Instruction is unable to form any estimate of the increased expenditure which the adoption of any of his suggestions above would entail. The Government of India first asked for an estimate of this cost in paragraph 6 of Home Department letter No. 758, dated 10th October 1906, and again in paragraph 5 of letter No. 597, dated 8th June 1910, and they now again ask for it saying that they have under consideration the question of improving secondary education. It would be a great pity if no estimate is given now, for we may lose the opportunity of getting some special assignment from the Government of India out of the surplus opium revenues probably. It must be possible for the Director of Public Instruction to frame some very rough estimate of the requirements of secondary schools under the head of non-recurring grants, and if this cannot be got we may ask for some big figure, say, 10 lakhs. As to recurring grants, the Director of Public Instruction has already been asked for an estimate of the probable cost of a provident fund scheme for teachers. The salary grant to headmasters suggested by the Director of Public Instruction is not likely to involve a heavy outlay for some years to come at any rate. As to teaching grants, the Director of Public Instruction thinks that the rate could not be increased without a departure from the policy which has hitherto been followed, namely, that secondary schools should be self-supporting or, in other words, that the cost of secondary education should be met by the section of the community which benefits by it and not by the general tax-payer. The Government of India themselves point out that the Government contribution to secondary education in this Presidency is much less than in the other provinces, meaning thereby that such contribution should be increased; and if they would place this Government in funds to meet the increased recurring expenditure which the adoption of a more liberal scale of grants might involve, this Government need not perhaps object to modifying articles 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code. This question has been raised in a separate file which has already been sent in circulation.

Page 2 of G.O., No. 250, Educational, dated 30th March 1908.

Pages 3 and 4 of G.O., No. 501, Educational, dated 25th August 1910.

Very difficult, I should say.
L. Davidson.

I have no doubt the Honourable Member would like to consult Dr. Bourne on this subject.
L. Davidson.

8. The Government of India have recently asked for an early reply to their letter of the 14th June 1911, and it is for consideration whether the memorial of the Missionary Council on Aided Education may not at once be returned to India with remarks on the lines of the Director of Public Instruction's letter and a further communication promised with reference to paragraphs 4 and 5 of their letter.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. Sharp separately submitted.

I think this course must be adopted, if delay is to be obviated.
L. Davidson.

K. Rangaswami Aiyangar—23-8-11.

I am afraid the Director of Public Instruction's letter does not carry us much further.

2. So far as the Missionary Council's letter is concerned, it is not difficult to send a reply on the lines indicated at **A** and **B** on pages 6 and 7 *supra*, which with what the Government of India have themselves said furnish a sufficient answer to the complaint.

3. *Paragraph* 3 *of India's letter.*—The limitation against the indefinite expansion of the model schools established may be accepted. As the Director of Public Instruction points out, this is already contemplated. Private institutions living side by side with model schools might also, I think, receive specially liberal treatment in the matter of grants-in-aid if their management is efficient; it is these schools which alone run risks from competition on unfavourable terms.

4. *Paragraph* 4 *of India's letter.*—The reason why the State expenditure on secondary schools is low in Madras is that stress has hitherto been laid on the principle that such institutions should in the main be self-supporting. Without material alteration of the Grant-in-Aid Code the outlay is not likely to need any large expansion.

5. *Paragraph* 5 *of India's letter.*—Only the roughest estimate can be framed of the funds required for the improvement of secondary education, recurring and non-recurring, and except for the chance that Madras might lose assistance from Imperial funds for want of asking I would not attempt to frame any forecast. It is hardly possible to do so until the future of the Grant-in-Aid Code is indicated. And so long as State assistance is proportioned to the private funds available all estimates are of necessity conjectural.

L. Davidson—24-8-11.

Please draft a reply to India on the lines proposed in the above note. The Director of Public Instruction's and the Secretary's replies to the missionary protest should be set out. I have no objection at all to assuring the Government of India that we shall strictly limit the expansion of the model schools. At present we shall only take in the number of pupils justified by the allotted establishment and we shall be very careful *not* to expand, if such expansion involves any competition with good private schools.

We may tell India that our Grant-in-Aid Code lays down strictly the conditions of aid and that at present Government does not see reason to modify the policy which has always been followed in the matter.

We should give the figures for the past five years of the Government aid granted.

I consider the principles of articles 32 and 33, Grant-in-Aid Code, sound enough and we should tell India this. We might of course give more than the amount fixed in article 33. We might give $1\frac{1}{2}$ the amount of the income guaranteed to be annually provided. But I should like to consult Dr. Bourne on this point.

We may also say that we will consider whether grants for buildings and equipment might not be on a more liberal scale, and we may give the special grants for masters with special qualification, and we may also provide for grants to provident funds. (The Hindu High school in Triplicane is starting one and I do not see why we should not aid it.)

But we must tell India clearly that we cannot possibly give any accurate estimate of what is likely to be spent in increased grants during the next five or ten years. But that if they are going to give grants we can certainly double our present expenditure on this head.

The letter of the Government of India is singularly foolish. It is quite impossible to make the estimates it calls for.

We can assure India that our present policy does not give grounds for dissatisfaction, and that the alarm raised is really the fear that Government is going to destroy private effort and alter the policy we have pursued for years, a policy which, I believe, has given satisfaction generally. We do not want to alter the policy laid down in our Grant-in-Aid Code which was carefully thought out years ago.

M. H[ammick]—28-8-11.

The draft letter submitted is for approval.

2. Owing to pressure of work in connection with the letter to India regarding the Elementary Education Bill and to my illness from Saturday afternoon, I regret I have not been able to submit this draft earlier.

K. Rangaswami Aiyangar—5-9-11.

The draft is for approval.

L. Davidson—6-9-11.

I approve of the draft. The Secretary of State apparently will not sanction our scheme for model schools until he has a reply to the missionaries, and the matter is therefore urgent. The letter will re-assure him and show the Government of India how matters now stand.

M. H[ammick]—7-9-11.

[G.O., Nos. 631, 632, Educational, dated 8th September 1911.]

Educational Department.

C.No.1439, from the Govt. of India, No.810, dated 14--6-1911.
C.No.2014, from the D.P.I. No.4818, dated 17--8-1911.

ORDER: No 631 8.9.11.
P.S.

The Government of India will be addres[illegible]

5-9-11

LETTER: No 632 8.9.11.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Department of Education.

Sir,

I am directed to reply to your letter No.810, Education, dated the 14th June 1911, forwarding for remarks a letter from the Reverend G. Pittendrigh, M.A., Honorary Secretary, to the Missionary Council on Aided Education, Madras, ~~in which he~~ protesting against the establishment of model secondary schools in this presidency, proposals in regard to which are now before the Secretary of State, on the grounds

(i) that such a measure would discourage all private effort in regard to education,

(ii) that it would not secure increased efficiency in secondary education since the standard set up would be incapable of being copied by aided

138
13

schools;

(i) that it ~~would be~~ involves a drastic change ~~of~~ from the present policy hitherto pursued ~~in regard to education~~; and

(ii) that it ~~does not carry out~~ is at variance with the policy recommended by the Decentralization Commission in regard to ~~xxxxx~~ secondary education.

2. The arguments of the Missionary Council as to the effect on private enterprise of the establishment of the model schools have been sufficiently answered ~~by the remarks contained~~ in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply. I am, however to point out that the ~~object of the scheme is not~~ scheme in no way contemplate the general creation of new schools under Government management which will compete ~~on unequal terms~~ with existing mission schools; and that the number of the proposed model schools (19) is so small as compared with the total number of secondary schools in the Presidency (157) and their location ~~xx~~ has been so carefully selected that no serious discouragement of private effort need be apprehended. Four of the 19 proposed model schools are already Government schools, ten are managed by local boards or municipal councils and five are under private management. The net cost of most of the local board or municipal schools ~~above~~ cases in

14P

14

~~above referred to~~ being now met from Provincial funds, they may for all practical purposes be regarded as Government institutions and their provincialization will ~~only~~ merely remove them from dual control, and put an end to ~~especially from~~ their subordination to ~~the~~ local bodies, ~~which~~ in this Presidency ~~have proved themselves ill adapted for~~ which, as past experience proves, are ill fitted to superintend the management of secondary schools. ~~The Governor in Council considers that~~ The provincialization of the remaining five schools under private management, four of which are situated in places where there is a mission school, cannot, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, seriously affect the progress of education or, having regard to the previous limited restriction ~~past experience~~ of private munificence in the matter of endowing secondary schools, discourage private enterprise in the field of education.

3. With regard to the fear expressed by the Missionary Council that the model secondary schools will set up standards which it would be impossible for private managers to copy, I am directed to state that while maintaining their own ~~schools~~ institutions as models and as incentives to private managers to raise the level of their schools, the Government will be prepared to increase gradually the amount of aid given to the latter ~~schools~~

15P

schools so as to enable them to ~~come up as nearly as possible~~ approximate to the standards set up ~~of the model schools~~. As a first ~~though modest~~ instalment of this programme ~~of increasing the amount of aid to secondary schools~~, an extra provision of ₹1,70,000 has been made in the current year's ~~budget~~ for payment of special grants to this class of schools to enable them to improve their equipment. ~~to which reference is made~~

4. As regards the argument put forward by the Missionary Council on the ground of change of policy, I am directed to state that it is based on a misapprehension. As already stated, the scheme for the establishment of model schools does not ~~contemplate or~~ involve any reduction in the grants to aided secondary schools. On the other hand, ~~as already pointed out~~, such larger expenditure on grants ~~in aid~~ both under the ordinary rules and in the shape of special subsidies is contemplated as a simultaneous step towards the improvement of aided secondary education, and the Government have every intention of improving the existing arrangements for the inspection and supervision of aided schools, ~~and~~ helping the latter in their outlay on buildings and equipment and providing a larger supply

of

of qualified teachers.

5. The contention of the Missionary Council that the Decentralization Commission did not recommend that the management of secondary schools ~~now~~ maintained by local boards should be taken out of their hands and assumed by Government is ~~likewise~~ clearly untenable. It is directly opposed to the recommendation contained in paragraph 751 of their report "that high schools and all "institutions in which teaching is "given in English should in all cases "be a direct Government charge." The Madras Government moreover have had sufficient experience of the past management by local bodies of secondary schools to justify the policy of taking the charge of secondary education away from the local bodies and doing away with the present system of dual control. ~~and the strongest opinion that the local bodies are extremely ill-adapted for the management of secondary education.~~

6. Adverting to paragraph 3 of your letter under reply, I am to state that the Governor in Council agrees with the Government of India that it is desirable to fix a limit to the indefinite expansion of the Government high schools. The scheme for the establishment of model schools ~~certainly~~

17P

is based on the assumption and ~~certainly contemplates this, since~~ the staff provided for ~~all~~ the proposed schools is limited. ~~Moreover~~ Rule 86 of the Madras Educational Rules ~~forbids a~~ restricts each class ~~containing more than~~ to forty students and ~~this restriction coupled with the limited staff to be sanctioned~~ will effectively would keep the ~~numbers~~ strength of the model schools within due limits. The Governor in Council will have no objection to go one step further and lay down a rule limiting the duplication of classes in the model schools, although he considers it neither possible nor desirable to forbid duplication altogether. Such a course might would, it is apprehended, not only involve great reduction in the strength of some ~~many~~ of the schools, ~~as a result of being taken over by Government,~~ but also would destroy the ~~deprive the institutions of the~~ opportunities for improved teaching organization which the duplication of classes, ~~would afford,~~ afford by an advantage which has hitherto been but little utilized and the value of which it will be an important function of the model schools to demonstrate.

7. In paragraph 4 of your letter, reference is made to the comparatively low expenditure incurred by Government on secondary education in this Presidency. The reason for this is that the

with reference thereto

though some expansion may in exceptional circumstances be permitted of the duplication of classes. Care will be taken to prevent such expansion from leading to competition with good private schools but it is

which it is proposed to convert into model institutions

7.

(Subject to certain limitations)

been based on the principle that such education should normally

NN

the policy of this Government in regard to secondary education has long been that it should be self-supporting. I am in this connection to invite attention to paragraph 7 of this Government's letter No.217, Financial, dated 9th February 1882, in which it was stated that "it has in practice "been found necessary to guard against "the tendency to provide superior "education at the cost of the tax- "payers for the children of a very "limited class, which is perfectly "well able to pay for it". I am at present advised that the Governor in Council "sees no reason to recede from that position. Under the existing Grant-in-Aid Code secondary schools are aided with (1) teaching grants (2) building grants and (3) grants for furniture and other special objects, and the following statement shows the assistance given under each of these heads in the past four years as compared with the provision made in the current year's budget:--

	1907-08.	1908-09.	1909-10.	1910-11.	1911-12 (Budget Estimate)
	₹.	₹.	₹.	₹.	₹.
Teaching grants	238,000	155,000	152,000	170,000	185,000
Building grants	35,000	23,000	61,000	38,000	72,000
Grants for furniture and other special objects.	52,000	16,000	26,000	39,000	120,000

In addition to the amount provided in the budget, a sum of ₹1,20,000 has been allotted for "grants for furniture

"furniture and other special ~~xxxxxx~~ "objects," out of the special assignment from the surplus opium revenues made by the Government of India in their letter No. 364, Education, dated 11th March 1911. If these special grants ~~are~~ be taken into account, ~~the~~ it will be seen that the aggregate Government contribution towards the cost of secondary education in this Presidency will rise substantially in the current year. It ~~and~~ will increase still further when the proposed scheme of model schools has been brought into operation.

10. With reference to paragraph 5 of your letter under reply, ~~I am directed to say that~~ H.E. in Council ~~regrets~~ to express the regret that it is not possible to furnish any reliable estimate of the amount of expenditure, recurring and non-recurring, which this Government are likely to incur on the improvement of secondary education in the next five or ten years. In the case of aided schools increase in recurring expenditure will normally take place under the head of teaching grants. The conditions under which secondary schools are eligible for these grants are set out ~~clearly~~ in articles 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code and the principles underlying ~~them~~ these articles are in the opinion

opinion of the Governor in Council eminently sound. If more funds were available, the Government would be prepared to consider whether the amount of teaching grant ~~might not be fixed at 50 per cent. more than~~ the ~~amount of~~ the income guaranteed to be annually provided by the management ~~(Article 33)~~, whether grants for buildings and equipment (articles 51 and 57) might not be made more liberal, whether a system of salary grants might not be instituted for ~~head~~ masters possessing special qualifications, ~~that is,~~ European graduates or graduates of European universities, and whether provision might not be made for ~~grants in aid~~ of provident funds started for the benefit of teachers in aided institutions. While ~~there is thus~~ considerable scope for increasing the Government contribution to secondary education by adopting some or all of the above measures, the actual increase in the expenditure will depend mainly on the ability of the managers to provide their share and it is therefore not possible even approximately to say by how much the expenditure could be increased.

11. In conclusion, I am to assure the Government of India that the existing policy of this Government in

21P

21

in regard to secondary education does not give any ground for dissatisfaction and that the alarm ~~raised~~ felt by ~~the~~ missionary bodies ~~that~~ last the Government are ~~going~~ intending to destroy private effort and alter the policy which they have pursued for years, ~~is unfounded~~.

reasonable

there is no real foundation for

I have etc.

D

10/11
5-9-11

E. & L. 42.

1,500—10-8-08.

PRESS SLIP.

ORDINARY. PREFERENCE. URGENT (a).

EDUCATIONAL ~~Literary~~ DEPARTMENT.

Current No....., dated.....190 .

G.O., No. 631 632, dated 8 9 1911.

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence including order or orders (b1) / Notes.....

Docket. Model High Schools.

Submitting the remarks of this Govt on the protest made by the Missionary Council &c. Advised G.O. at variance against the establishment of ~~a~~ in this

Number (c) of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are returned in the Press).	Complete Correspondence and orders.	Notes
For Record.*		
Madras Records	30	15
Ooty Records	7	8
For filing with original	1	1
Total ...	36	19

For Issue.†	Letter only.	Complete (c).	Special issue copies of G.O. (d) No.	Special issue copies of G.O. (d) Papers.	Notes.
Signature copies.....					
India Office.....					
Govt. of India.....Dept.	22				
Public Department.....					
Judicial Department.....					
Financial Department.....					
Revenue Department.....					
Public Works Department.....					
Local and Municipal Department.....					
.....Dept.....					
Total ...					
Spare copies. The Director of Public Instruction.....					
The Comr. for Govt. Examinations.....					
The Superintendent, Govt. Museum.....					
The Surgeon-General.....					
The Accountant-General.....					
The Collector of.....					
The P. D. B.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
Total ...	32				

* Copies distributed on.....*(Press Clerk.)

† Copies distributed on.....*(Despatcher.)

* To be initialled and dated.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b1) For rules regarding printing of notes, see the rules in G.O., No. 1220, Public, dated 30th November 1900.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for *one* week, and larger papers for *two* weeks only. *The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.*

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Deputy Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Deputy Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, but only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

P.T.O.

TO PRESS, MADRAS. / OOTY.

A	B	C
Please send proof in triplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.	Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated. Type may be released after usual interval / at once.	As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (*b*) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated. Type may be released after usual interval.
.....*Clerk.*	.....*Clerk.*	.....*Clerk.*
.....*Supdt.*	.....*Supdt.*	.....*Supdt.*

(*b*) Three copies of proof of all notes should be sent for approval, except when instructions are given to the contrary.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	
First proof furnished on.....	
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	
Final copies supplied on.....	

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....			
„ „ „ Issue.....			
For Volumes.....			
For E. T.....			
Total ...			

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature

Despatched in Print

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter.

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.