

Edl (1915) Department.

his SERIES.

G.O. No. 596

DATED 7-6-15

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council

Communicating to the D.P.I. for information a
Copy of the ^{proceedings} ~~proofs~~ of the — held on 30-3/15
relating to resolution XVII regarding the qual-
ifications of the head masters of incomplete
Secondary School.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH RESOLUTION ON MATTERS OF
GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

[SUBJECT.—*Inquiry into the working of rule 23, Chapter III of the Madras Educational Rules.*]

The Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI :—

XX. This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that an inquiry be made into the working of rule 23, Chapter III of the Madras Educational Rules, which requires that headmasters of incomplete secondary schools should be teachers holding collegiate trained teachers' certificates, with a view to removing the inconvenience caused thereby to the management of such schools.

G.O. No. 509, Educational, dated 31st July 1906.

Rules 2 and 6, pages 1 and 3 of Educational Rules, Fourth Edition.

The Revised Educational Rules, Fifth Edition, which is now in force was introduced in 1906. Prior to its introduction schools for general education were classified into—

(i) Secondary—

- (a) Upper secondary or high schools containing forms IV, V and VI.
- (b) Lower secondary or middle schools containing forms I, II and III or standards V, VI and VII respectively.

(ii) Primary—

- (a) Upper primary schools containing the IV class or IV standard.
- (b) Lower primary schools containing classes Infant to III or standards Infant to III.

Rules 2 and 5 of Educational Rules, Fifth Edition.

Under the revised rules introduced in 1906 the schools for general education were reclassified into—

- (i) secondary, which may contain classes Infant to IV and forms I to VI, and
- (ii) elementary, which may contain standards Infant to VII.

It is laid down that the function of (i) is to afford a higher general education and that of (ii) to afford instruction to pupils the majority of whom are unlikely to continue their studies beyond an elementary stage. The aims of the two classes of schools are different and the character of the teaching in the one is of a different order and quality from that in the other. *Incomplete secondary schools* are schools of the former class which do not contain all the forms mentioned, but which nevertheless prepare students for higher education.

2. Under the rules in force prior to 1906, teachers (other than the headmasters of upper secondary schools who should be graduates) were required to be either First Arts men or Matriculates (or Upper Secondary men) according as they taught in upper or lower secondary forms. Under rule 23 of the Revised Educational Rules, the headmaster of a secondary school whether it contains the highest forms (*i.e.*, is complete) or not (*i.e.*, is incomplete) should ordinarily be a trained graduate. Thus while under the old rule a Matriculate or an F. A. would have sufficed for the headmastership of an incomplete secondary school with the III form, a graduate would generally be needed under the existing rules. The resolution alleges that the demand of higher qualifications for headmasters of

incomplete secondary schools has inconvenienced the managers of those schools and requests an inquiry in the matter. It is not known how many of these schools have now graduate headmasters and how many with lower qualifications.

3. It was from the beginning recognized that this raising of the standard of qualifications of the headmasters of incomplete secondary schools would have the effect of inconveniencing the managers of schools. Immediately after the introduction of

Papers recorded in G.O. No. 60, Educational, dated 24th January 1908.

Also page 12 of the printed précis with G.O. No. 3, Educational, dated 6th January 1910.

G.O. No. 60, Educational, dated 24th January 1908.

next revision of the Code and rules. In respect of the Ceded districts, however, the

Paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 78, Educational, dated 15th February 1907.

of teachers in each school would result in the closing of nine out of ten lower secondary schools in those parts; but that so far as rule 23 was concerned he felt at ease inasmuch as the rule left him a certain discretion in the matter of accepting the qualifications of the staff. In the special report submitted by him at the instance of

Page 2 of G.O. No. 515, Educational, dated 16th July 1908.

parts but also in the whole of the Presidency it had been found difficult to insist on strict compliance with its provisions owing—

(a) to the necessity for allowing in certain cases the continuance of unqualified teachers of long standing whose work had been favourably reported on, and

(b) to the real scarcity of fully qualified teachers.

A similar report submitted in 1910 also showed that the incomplete secondary schools in those parts had not improved in this respect. It is not unlikely that similar difficulty would have been and is

being experienced in other quarters also though not to such an appreciable extent as in the Ceded Districts.

4. It is, however, to be pointed out that this rule so far it affects incomplete secondary schools was deliberately introduced by the Government. Under the resolution of the Government of India of 1904 on the educational policy, the

Government are bound in the interests of the community to see that the education provided in the secondary schools was sound and the teachers employed therein were suitable as regards character, number and qualifications. The policy of the Government at the time of the introduction of these rules was to discourage as much as possible the

Page 1 of notes to G.O. No. 60, Educational, dated 24th January 1908.

December 1906 on this point will be significant:—

“Whatever changes may be made, to countenance the establishment of ‘incomplete’ secondary schools would be fatal to our policy. It is these ‘incomplete’ secondary schools, as a vast number of the secondary schools really were, that have been fatal to sound education, pampering parents with the belief that their children were receiving an education fitted to carry them on in time to the University. The *raison d’être* of our recent reforms is to extinguish this sham system to which the thousands of boys who fail for the matriculation are the abiding witnesses.”

Though in the recent resolution of the Government of India on the educational policy the same exhortation in the matter of procuring qualified teachers for secondary schools has been repeated, there has been since a change in the policy of Government in regard to the establishment of incomplete secondary schools. It has been found that “the need for preparatory secondary schools was very generally

Paragraph 59, page 17 of Volume I of Public Instruction Report for 1911-12.

“experienced, as without them many parents would either have to give up the idea of a secondary education for their sons or send them away from home at too early an age and it has consequently been decided to extend re-recognition as secondary to as many of the old lower secondary schools as could be shown to be necessary for this purpose.” With this change of policy a natural relaxation of the rigidity with which the rule was started might be expected, it is likely that under the discretion allowed to the Director in the rule by the use of the word “ordinarily” such relaxation is being freely allowed, where necessary. The absence of complaints to Government on this point may probably support this view.

5. The object of the Additional Member is apparently to have the rule modified and fix a lower qualification for the headmasters of the incomplete secondary schools. Such schools with the IV and V forms should ordinarily have headmasters of higher qualifications. It is only in the case of schools with the III form as the highest that relaxation may be needed. With ample means of affording such relaxation as that provided in the rule and in the absence of complaints it may probably be assumed that no serious inconvenience is caused by the rule. It may conduce more to efficiency to retain the rule and allow relaxation in suitable cases than to lower the standard of qualifications in the rule itself. In any case the Director of Public Instruction may be presumed to be fully aware of the effect of the working of the rule. In these circumstances it does not seem to be necessary to institute any elaborate inquiry into the working of the rule. There would, however, be no objection to call for a report on the question from the Director of Public Instruction. If this would satisfy the Additional Member, the resolution may be accepted.

The Director may be asked u.o. to offer his remarks on the resolution in the first instance.

C. RAMANUJACHARI—22-3-15.

Will the Director of Public Instruction please advise in the matter? No “inquiry” should, I take it, be necessary, as the Director of Public Instruction has no doubt sufficient information as to the working of rule 23. The Additional Member speaks only of “headmasters.” Presumably he is thinking only of those incomplete secondary schools which do not go beyond form III. (From form IV upwards even the “teacher” has to hold a collegiate trained certificate.) Rule 23 has been put in, I take it, with the object of toning up secondary schools; and it will be rather a pity to go back so far as the “policy” is concerned. The word “ordinarily” appears to give sufficient discretion to the Director of Public Instruction to relax the rule when he finds it necessary to do so. There are no doubt many cases where the discretion to relax the rule has been exercised. These could, I take it, be quoted to show that the rule is not being worked with undue rigidity.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—22-3-15.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

No. 77, dated 24th March 1915.

I agree that an enquiry is unnecessary. It will certainly be a retrograde step to delete the rule; exemption from its strict application is granted. Recognising that there is not a sufficient number of L.Ts., the policy is to recommend managers to appoint L.Ts. as headmasters or to have the work of their schools supervised by

an L.T. belonging to some neighbouring complete secondary school. In some cases an L.T. not on the staff of any school is appointed to travel round and supervise a small group of incomplete secondary schools. The inconvenience referred to in the resolution is, I take it, one of finance, *i.e.*, the difficulty experienced in providing a suitable salary for an L.T.

H. S. DUNCAN—24-3-15.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

His Excellency the Governor—

The resolution should, I think, be opposed. It will be decidedly retrograde to delete rule 23 ; and there is no case for an " inquiry."

Orders solicited as to who is to be in charge of the Resolution.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—24-3-15.

I agree Mr. Rajagopalachari will take charge and D.P.I. should be ready to speak if required.

Pentland,
24-3-15.

Extract from the Proceedings of an adjourned Meeting of the Council of the Governor of Fort St. George assembled for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations under the provisions of the Acts of Parliament, 24 & 25 Vict., C. 67, 55 & 56 Vict., C. 14, and 9 Edw. 7, C. 4.

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 A.M. on Tuesday, the 30th day of March 1915.

RESOLUTION *RE* QUALIFICATIONS OF HEADMASTERS OF INCOMPLETE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

The Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI :—" I am afraid the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar is not going to give me a similar pleasure by accepting the following resolution which I desire to move—

'XVII. This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that, with a view to removing the inconvenience caused to the management of such schools, an inquiry be made into the working of rule 23, chapter III, of the Madras Educational Rules, which requires that headmasters of incomplete secondary schools should be teachers holding collegiate-trained teachers' certificates.'

(Mr. Srinivasa Sastri.)

"Your Excellency, I have first to read to the Council the rule as it obtained some years ago. It was as follows:—

'The teacher of an upper secondary form shall possess a certificate of having passed the First Examination in Arts; the teacher of a lower secondary form, a certificate of having passed the Matriculation or Upper Secondary examination, or the late higher examination for women.'

"Unfortunately all these examinations are obsolete, but they all correspond to the school leaving certificate of the present day; so that the headmaster of an incomplete secondary school could, in the times to which I am referring at present, be a teacher with ordinary qualifications corresponding to the old Matriculation. Now, however, the headmaster has to be a teacher holding a collegiate-trained certificate which practically amounts to saying that he should be licentiate in teaching. I wish to say, in the first place, that the object of this rule is excellent on the ground that it is intended to speed up efficiency. But we have to see whether this ideal can be worked up to. The time when this requirement was newly added was a time in the history of secondary education in this Presidency when it passed through adverse circumstances. It was then considered that secondary education and elementary education were two distinct things and that they should be treated under separate rules. It was also considered that, as far as possible, elementary education should be stimulated, while a pause should be called in the progress of secondary education. In view of bringing about this state of things, amongst other changes, the department ruled that a large number of incomplete secondary schools which then taught up to the third form or up to the standard of, what was previously known as, the lower secondary examination, should be given the choice of either rising to the status of a high school or sinking to the status of an elementary school. They were given an inducement to sink to the status of elementary schools. If they desired to rise to the upper secondary stage, attempts were made to put difficulties in their way. Among the difficulties I may mention this: if a school desired to remain a secondary school, the requirement was put on that the teachers should all be either matriculates, and in the three upper forms licentiates in teaching and that the headmaster had necessarily to be a licentiate. Certain schools were told to make the choice in the course of two or three years. It was by a general circular that this process was accomplished. The result is to be seen in certain striking figures. Between the years 1907 and 1913 as many as 226 incomplete secondary schools were obliged to fall to the status of elementary schools. At present, we have 168 of these schools. There are 332 secondary schools, 155 of which are complete, with the fourth, fifth and sixth forms, 9 up to either the fourth or the fifth form, that is, in process of becoming complete. Taking 164 from 332 we arrive at 168, the number representing the present incomplete secondary schools. We have got to remember that all these schools have got the third as the highest form; and they correspond exactly to the lower secondary schools of a few years ago, of which the headmaster, under the rule, could have been an intermediate man or even a matriculate. Now as soon as this new requirement was put into the Code, it was discovered that there was a great deal of complaint that there were not sufficient L.T.'s for the demands made for them; and therefore a good many schools complained to the Director that, while they had every desire to appoint L.T.'s it was exceedingly difficult to find them. Many more schools complained in another sense; they said that these L.T.'s required a salary of Rs. 80 or 90 per mensem, and as they were incomplete secondary schools, they were unable to find the necessary money to pay them. Moreover, if they found L.T.'s, they always looked out for complete secondary schools and left the incomplete secondary schools. In that way this was really a hard rule.

"Then instead of abolishing the rule, as perhaps another Director might have done, at that time it was decided that certain correctives should be applied,—not that the rule should be abolished, but that certain provisions might be made for exempting a large number of these schools. Even to-day, out of the 168 schools that I have mentioned, only so few as 41 have been able to fulfil this requirement by having L.T.'s as their headmasters, while the remainder are in a very peculiar condition. The Director has offered them a sort of alternative. He has told them 'if you cannot find L.T.'s you had better find a headmaster of a neighbouring complete school who must be an L.T. and ask him to supervise your school. We will accept that as a substitute for fulfilling the first requirement.' That is the alternative that most of the incomplete secondary schools are now obliged to adopt. More than a hundred of these schools have now supervising headmasters. At the time when

(Mr. Srinivasa Sastri.)

Dr. Bourne propounded this alternative, he had in his mind the idea that every complete secondary school should have around it a number of incomplete secondary schools which he called its feeders, so that the curricula and examinations in those incomplete secondary schools could be controlled from the central complete secondary school. Now this might have been possible, if all these schools were under the same management or even under similar management. But, as a matter of fact, in most places, the management is all distinct. The headmaster of a complete secondary school has nothing whatever necessarily to do with the surrounding incomplete secondary schools. The artificial connection therefore was for the sake of the rule of the department which was found unworkable. The management of incomplete schools cast about in the neighbourhood for some headmaster who would be willing to take charge of supervision. Very often it was found that the headmaster of the nearest complete secondary school was either unwilling or unable to undertake that duty as Sir Alfred Bourne had hoped. Sometimes the management of secondary schools refused to spare the services of their headmaster. Sometimes he was found to be a disagreeable person. In nearly every case a practice came to be established of offering a sum as honorarium for undertaking this work, because it was not under his own management and he would not do it for anything less than Rs. 150 or Rs. 200. His visits numbered six or seven in the year; and from all accounts I have received he did precious little good. Sir Alfred Bourne has acknowledged it in his quinquennial report. I must ask, therefore, whether it is necessary to keep any longer this farcical arrangement of having a headmaster to come and supervise an incomplete secondary school, who has no interest in it except what arises from the offer of a few tens of rupees. Sometimes it happens, I am sorry to say, that this headmaster who supervises a school one year does not like to go again and then the supervision changes hands and it takes place very frequently, especially in Tanjore and other districts where these schools lie thick together. I know in Tanjore a school which is an incomplete secondary school goes for a headmaster 15 miles away and sometimes he adopts the practice of sending an assistant in his stead who is not himself a headmaster. At Vettapalam we find that instead of the headmaster being taken from Bezwada or Tenali or Bapatla which is near, a supervisor has been brought over from Guntūr a distance of 60 miles. It may be that these men had been tried and that they were found too exacting or they asked too much. It is obvious that this rule requiring that the headmaster should be an L.T. and that in the absence of that arrangement some headmaster near the place who is an L.T. should be asked to supervise is almost a mockery. If L.T.'s were procurable, nobody would object to that rule. It is eminently desirable to have them as headmasters; but as we know, in the first place, L.T.'s in sufficient numbers are not available and when available they demand too much from incomplete secondary schools, which they cannot afford to pay. I think this is a rule which, whether in its original form or in the unfortunate alternative that I have described, must be given up. We have to give up such an arrangement with regret. It would be a good thing if we can find sufficient L.T.'s. Why do we not find sufficient L.T.'s? They are turned out from the Teachers' College; but in that college, although great efforts have been made recently to increase the accommodation, there is yet insufficient accommodation. Out of 150 people that apply for admission every year, there is room for 93 or 94. I know that the Government have given their consent to the opening of a training college in Rajahmundry; and when that comes, there should be some more L.T.'s turned out, and till then it is difficult to work this rule. But that would happen only eight or nine years hence. Till then this rule must go in my opinion. But there is a very great difficulty, when once we get a rule, to make it disappear. It is somehow or other the practice of Government to try to work a rule though it may be hard,—to try and work it with some alternative or other. It is only as a last resort that the Government may be obliged to cancel a rule which they once promulgate.

"I wish only, before I finish, to read a paragraph from the quinquennial report of Sir Alfred Bourne in which he confesses that this attempt to work the rule has proved fruitless. He says 'I am bound to say that the results of introducing it have fallen short of our expectations. The work of the supervising headmasters is too often perfunctory and spasmodic. It is not altogether their fault that it is so. In the nature of things it is difficult for the headmaster of a large high school to find time for supervising other schools particularly as this often involves journeys of some length. The system works best where a local board

(Mr. Srinivasa Sastri; the Rev. Geo. Pittendrigh; Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar.)

'employs for a group of schools an itinerating headmaster who has no school of his own. This is done with conspicuous success by the Palghat Municipal Council and by the District Board of South Arcot. I do not consider that anything short of the provision of graduate headmasters for all these schools would be a permanently satisfactory arrangement. It will be long before this is possible and the grouping of incomplete schools under an itinerating headmaster is the best practicable solution of the problem of their staffing.' We now come upon the third alternative which struck Sir Alfred Bourne as perhaps in some ways the best under the circumstances. I am not responsible for the elegant phraseology 'itinerating headmaster with no particular school of his own.' You have three or four schools under the same management within a convenient area, as the municipal area of Palghat, or the district board area of South Arcot. There are two or three secondary schools and one man is appointed as headmaster of all of them, so that he divides his time of eight working months in the year amongst four schools, giving two months to each school and he is supposed to be the headmaster of every one of these schools. I cannot for one moment conceive that this is at all a feasible plan or that a headmaster who comes two months to a school will be anything but in a nominal sense a headmaster of that school. However, that struck the late Director as about the best possible arrangement under the circumstances, because he would not consent to cancel his own original rule. If we have many such schools managed by 'itinerating headmasters with no particular schools of their own', we might find a solution; but how many schools have come under this arrangement? Only fifteen out of 170 schools of this class have come under this arrangement, round which Sir Alfred Bourne's hopes were centred. I must say, your Excellency, that the whole thing stands condemned. A rule is made which only 40 out of 170 can observe. Fifteen have come under the third arrangement, which upon the face of it is not worth a moment's consideration.

"Besides proving ineffective this rule operates, I wish to put it to the Council, as a check upon the growth of these incomplete secondary schools. Any person who wishes to start an incomplete secondary school or any local body, a municipality or district board which ventures on secondary education, in spite of the discouragement offered by the department, would find, in this rule, that an L.T. should be a headmaster, an effectual block. They dare not go and ask for special exemption; and especially a municipality or a district board which has to please the Government Secretariat on the one hand and on the other the officers of the department would find it a very tremendous obstacle if they wish to have an incomplete secondary school. My Lord, I cannot travel beyond the terms of this resolution, but I wish to state that this is one of the many ways in which secondary education is put under discouragement. It is in that regard that I have ventured to bring this particular point before the Council at this time."

The Hon'ble the Rev. GEORGE PITTENDRIGH:—"I wish to say a word in seconding this resolution. It seems to me that the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri has established a *prima facie* case for inquiry and that is all that he asks for. I think this is just the kind of case which should be referred to the committee of experts that was promised. It may be argued that such questions concern chiefly the Grant-in-Aid Code. No doubt that is so, while this is concerned with a modification of the rules of the Madras Educational Rules. But if the Members will recall the Ootacamund meeting, they may remember that rule 99 of the Madras Educational Rules was submitted to that committee. It will save a good deal of trouble if Government will accept this resolution and refer the matter to that committee."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR:—"Your Excellency, the Honourable Member who has moved this resolution has travelled over wide ground and has dealt with what he thought to be the policy of the Educational Department in regard to incomplete secondary schools and generally the disastrous results that policy has led to. I do not, however, propose to cover the same ground. I shall confine myself to the specific resolution which he has moved. That resolution relates to the working of rule 23, chapter III of the Madras Educational Rules, in so far as that rule lays down that the headmaster of an incomplete secondary school shall be a teacher holding a collegiate trained teachers' certificate, that is, what they call an L.T. This rule, as the Honourable Member himself admits, is not an absolute one. It says that the headmaster shall *ordinarily* hold a collegiate-trained

(Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar; Mr. Ramabhadra Nayudu.)

teachers' certificate; that is to say, it is both a declaration of policy on the part of the department, as to what it is that they are aiming at, and also a rule of practice laid down for the department, so that gradually they may work up to a state of affairs in which every secondary school, even an incomplete one, shall have a duly qualified teacher at its head. So far as the policy is concerned, after the warm appreciation of it expressed by the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, there is absolutely nothing for me to say. He says that the object of the rule is excellent and that it is intended to secure efficiency. I have really nothing more to say in justification of the policy of that rule than what the Honourable Member has himself said.

"The question, however, remains as to how this rule has been working. Has it been working oppressively or in such a way as to seriously militate against the maintenance of these incomplete secondary schools? To that also the Honourable Member has given a sufficient answer. His complaint appears to be that the rule does not appear to have been adopted with sufficient rigour, that devices have been adopted which enabled the Director to abstain from enforcing the rule rigorously, and that in the result the rule is practically a dead letter. I would put forward that as a strong reason why we should not disturb that rule. The rule is admitted to be an excellent one, and it is also admitted that it is our policy gradually to bring about a state of affairs under which every secondary school, even an incomplete one, shall have a collegiate trained man at its head; if you can cancel that rule you take away the only weapon which the Director has to bring about that state of affairs. The Honourable Member says 'let us wait for a time; some years hence we shall have a large number of B.A.L.T.'s, and then we can re-introduce the rule.' What does it mean? The moment you take away the rule, there will not be any inducement for the management to go in for an L.T. The managers will not raise the pay of head-masters, and the result will be that people will not go to the Teachers' College to get themselves trained, because there is no demand for them. The present rush for admission into the Training College is no doubt to some extent due to this particular rule. The rule gives power to the department to enforce gradually the substitution of a competent teaching agency for incompetent agency; and the result is that a large number of people are going into the training colleges. Your Excellency is aware that proposals are under consideration for an additional training college somewhere in the Northern Circars. At one time the Training College at Saidapet was the only institution of its kind in Southern India. We have now one in Travancore, there is going to be one at a later date at Rajahmundry, and the Mysore Darbar will soon have, I am told, one in that Province. We shall thus have four training colleges. This rule has been in force for the last nine years. To say at a time like this that we should abandon this rule and go back to a state of affairs under which it will be completely open to managers to employ cheap untrained agency is, I consider, unfortunate. It will be a most disastrous step for us to adopt.

"Both the honourable mover as well as the Hon'ble the Rev. Pittendrigh suggest that we should agree to an enquiry, but what is the inquiry to be about? Is it to be an inquiry about the policy of the rule or is it to be an inquiry in regard to the way in which it has been worked? In regard to the policy we have the testimony of the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri that it is an excellent policy. In regard to the way in which it has been worked, he seems to have adequate data. We can agree to an inquiry when we do not understand the facts, but here the facts are well known. In the face of these facts I do not see why we should agree to a cancellation of this rule or an inquiry in regard to its working. My own impression is that the leniency of the Educational Department in working this rule, evidently for the purpose of preventing trouble, is now being turned against them. If they had worked it rigorously it would probably have been better. You say we have worked this rule leniently and therefore this rule is needless and that we should have an inquiry. The Hon'ble Mr. Duncan will speak later on about it and he will give sufficient data as to the way in which this rule is being worked. I am not here to justify this or that particular deviation from the rule, but I stand on the main lines of the rule. Admittedly it has not been worked oppressively and there is no justification for accepting this resolution."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur V. RAMABHADRA NAYUDU:—"The figures given in answer to interpellation 66 (i) show that the college and high school departments are in great need of teachers who are professionally qualified. No doubt we

(Mr. Ramabhadra Nayudu ; Mr. Rama Ayyangar.)

welcome the large establishment of training schools in Native States and in the northern and southern portions of this Presidency. I doubt very much whether the establishment of those training colleges will be able to furnish teachers for the college and high school departments. When it would take a good deal of time for these training schools to supply the wants of these college and high school departments, I do not see how it would be possible to supply teachers for incomplete secondary schools. There is not much utility in having a rule which could not be carried into effect. The Honourable the Educational Secretary says that the rule must be in black and white so that it may be used as a weapon; but I have serious doubts whether that rule would be worth having at all. As the manager of a high school I know the difficulties that we experience in sending up our teachers to distant places where there are these incomplete secondary schools. I must confess that the visits which my headmaster gives to these incomplete secondary schools are few and far between. He simply goes and comes back within two or three days and the visits in a year are limited only to two. I do not think that much good result accrues by such occasional visits. I think that such a rule is of no use if it could not be carried into effect."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. RAMA AYYANGAR:—"I was really not able to understand the argument of the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar. The Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri in moving this resolution wanted to prove that it was impossible in the present circumstances to enforce the rule and therefore, it was a matter for consideration how the rule must be modified for the present or whether it should be deleted altogether. In beginning that argument, he wanted to hold up an ideal that ought not to be departed from. In fact if it were possible to have an L.T. for every incomplete secondary school, that was a position that might justify a rule like that being put on the statute book. The proper way of justifying the rule is to show that it is possible to find people of the necessary qualifications for the purpose. If the department was only adjusting difficulties, by modifying the rule or adapting it to the circumstances, that would not be an argument against the resolution of the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri. It would be an argument for the inquiry."

"The Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri quoted how much the number of these incomplete secondary schools was reduced by this rule; he brought to the notice of this Council that about 200 odd schools had to be abolished and brought to the grade of elementary schools."

"Further, your Lordship might recollect that there are rules which prevent boys from being admitted into ordinary secondary schools when they have been reading in these elementary schools for the simple reason that they are in the elementary grade and not in the secondary grade. Without the headmaster, it would not be styled an incomplete secondary school but only an elementary school. A boy who has to get from that school into a secondary school will have to be taken to a lower standard. At a recent discussion of the association of teachers at Madura I was able to hear the speeches of some managers of schools, missionary gentlemen and also Hindu managers; and they were loudly complaining that this rule was working considerable hardship and they were prepared to say—and an American missionary gentleman of Pasumalai, Mr. Miller, particularly noted—that this was a cause of complaint which ought to be placed before the authorities. I should think, My Lord, that one main point which was under consideration at the time this rule was introduced was to check secondary education. The policy of Government has now definitely changed and we are giving definitely large grants to aid secondary schools and also to place teachers of these schools on a better status and to encourage them in all possible ways and we have run up our expenditure on the Educational department considerably. There is no likelihood of the Government changing this policy of encouraging secondary education also. Under these circumstances, My Lord, it is only very proper that this rule, if as is conceded it cannot be worked as it is, must be either modified or otherwise disposed of, pending a change in the state of affairs. I do not think this Government would like to have a rule which cannot be worked and which it is agreed must be modified in some form or another. No argument that has been advanced by the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar on behalf of the Government can be considered sufficient to stop an inquiry. The circumstances will have to be considered by the Government and the rule for the present or for a definite period or otherwise must be so modified as not to hinder the progress of secondary education."

(Mr. Narasimheswara Sarma ; Mr. Narasimha Raju.)

The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur B. NARASIMHESWARA SARMA:—"The Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar is perfectly right in finding fault with the wording of the resolution—with its asking for an inquiry into the working of this rule when all the facts are known. When the facts have led to but one result, the Honourable mover should certainly have asked for abrogation of that rule, pending the regular working of those colleges which are proposed to be started here, there and elsewhere with a view to make this rule workable and to improve the state of education generally. I think more than one reason can be advanced for asking for an abrogation of the rule even without an inquiry. I think it is the general impression—and I do not believe it is a wrong impression—of almost every one who has watched secondary education during the past ten years that the effect of this rule has been to retard the progress of secondary education by throwing obstacles in the way of starting incomplete secondary schools in places where they would have been started but for the promulgation of such an admittedly unworkable rule. The total number of schools is put down as 332 out of which 155 are complete secondary schools, so that practically the number of incomplete secondary schools is about the same as the number of complete secondary schools. If we ask what the result of this rule is, it is, as put by the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, that it takes away some headmasters of complete secondary schools from their legitimate work and asks them to supervise incomplete secondary schools which they are not in a position to do, because they do not find time. That is only making an unworkable rule work an unnecessary hardship and you affect the efficiency of secondary schools which cannot afford to give the time of their headmasters to supervise incomplete secondary schools. That itself would be a sufficient argument for saying that this rule should be abrogated, because it does not do any good to incomplete secondary schools, but does harm to secondary schools, because it takes away the headmaster at least for a portion of his time from his legitimate duty. Another reason can be advanced for an abrogation of the rule. When Government promulgate a rule it must be like the laws of the Medes and Persians and people must not be expected to find loop holes to find a way out of the difficulty. They must see that the rule does work. The Government admits that this rule could not be worked and consequently various means had to be invented in order that hardship might not be inflicted upon the people in incomplete secondary schools; but I think it is bad discipline to teach people to look to Government for getting round a rule in this indirect manner. They practically admit the inefficiency of the rule; and simply to save the prestige of the Government when once they have framed a rule, they do not repeal it though they find it unworkable. The question at issue is with the present number of graduates available in the market for equipping the teaching staff of the various schools, is it possible for these incomplete secondary schools to find the men required by the rule at a reasonable cost? If you cannot, we must wait for better conditions before we promulgate a rule of that kind. For these and various other reasons which have been urged here, on the platform, in the press and at conferences with regard to the progress of secondary education under these rules, I hope the Government will be able to see their way to abrogate the rule without inquiry. All that has been asked for is an inquiry and I do not see why any objection should be taken to such an inquiry being undertaken."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"It was admitted by the mover of the resolution that the rule was an ideal one but he wanted to make out a case that it was unworkable. I am not able to follow him in this respect. He mentions two cases of hardship: the first is the question of cost; and the second is the question of men available to fill up these offices. As to the question of cost I want to remind him that, as far as local bodies are concerned, in 1913-1914 the Government were pleased to make a decent amount of grant to meet the salaries of teachers. In that Government Order, the Director of Public Instruction made special mention that headmasters' salaries must be improved. Of the 168 schools, he says, 48 or 46 are provided with graduates and there are only 120 schools which are not provided with trained graduates and the boards would do well to consider the question whether they can well improve the salaries of headmasters and get trained graduates or L.T.'s as headmasters with the aid of this subsidy. Secondly, he refers to the supply of men but admits that a large number of L.T.'s are being sent out year after year from the Training College and therefore in course of time all secondary schools can well equip themselves with trained graduates. The rule is not absolute. The rule says that

(Mr. Narasimha Raju; the President; Mr. Narasimha Ayyar; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Ramachandra Rao.)

ordinarily the headmaster shall be a trained B.A. Now as a matter of fact I know that trained undergraduates are allowed, if they work efficiently, to be headmasters and those schools are not placed under supervising headmasters. I may mention the Parvatipur incomplete secondary school as an instance in point. The Director of Public Instruction was pleased to say that the school has been working very efficiently under the trained undergraduate; and he was pleased to exempt him from this rule. That discretion can well be exercised in all the schools which are well managed by men of that stamp and they can be exempted from this rule. I do not see any reason why the rule should be given up. No doubt a good case is made out as regards the supervising headmaster and I hope the Government will move in that direction and take away the provision regarding supervising headmasters. All schools which are not provided with efficient headmasters will be directed to be closed or to employ trained graduates. This ideal should never be given up."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"I hope the Council will now think it fit to close the discussion. The matter has been thoroughly discussed and it is a subject of limited scope."

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR:—"I will add one sentence after what has fallen from the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Raju. I wish to raise my voice to warn the Council against adopting a policy which would in the name of efficiency do a great deal of harm. To say that we must strike off a device which enables us to keep on at least the existing number of schools in the hope of affording a higher standard of education is to say something which would never commend itself to the public and to the Council. I hope that in any resolution that we adopt we shall not sacrifice the substantial interests of a large portion of the population of this country."

The Hon'ble Mr. H. S. DUNCAN:—"Your Excellency, I shall not detain the Council long. I only want to refer to one or two points touched upon by the Honourable mover of the resolution. He made a great point of the possibility of a person wishing to start a secondary school being frightened from doing so because he would have to put into that school a B.A. L.T. as its headmaster, and urged that for that reason secondary education and the opening of secondary schools are being given a set back. I think he might also have brought it to our notice that in many cases secondary schools that have started with matriculates or F.A.'s as headmasters have succeeded in getting L.T.'s as headmasters and have grown into high schools, that is, into complete secondary schools. These are cases where schools have not been frightened, but by giving a proper salary and getting an L.T. as headmaster have grown into efficient secondary schools. Then about supervision by headmasters. To my mind, if it is properly done, it is an excellent thing that a headmaster should undertake the supervision of incomplete secondary schools; and we should see that he does it properly. The Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri says that the headmaster of a complete school has nothing to do with incomplete schools. I think in many ways he has a great deal to do with them. If he is the supervising headmaster of a few schools, then those incomplete schools, are, I take it, feeders to his complete secondary school; and in that way I think he must feel a great interest in the efficiency of the instruction given in these schools and in the way in which they are managed. One of the chief criticisms offered against this rule this afternoon seems to be that the department has not carried it out with sufficient strictness; that the rule is there and that it has been broken and that therefore we should remove the rule. The number of trained collegiate-grade teachers that are being turned out every year now is a little over a hundred and I think that in course of time it will be possible to meet the wants of these incomplete schools. I am very much against having this rule taken out of the Madras Educational Rules. I hope that this rule will remain, because I feel sure that eventually we shall be able to place these incomplete schools upon a better footing than they are at present."

The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO:—"I only wish to say one word with reference to the second portion of the Hon'ble Mr. Duncan's speech, that is, with reference to the supervision by headmasters in incomplete secondary schools. I am afraid that the present method of supervision is something like the inspection of subordinate judges' courts and district munsifs' courts by district judges. This is a matter of a few hours, usually ending with signing a few forms and making out

(Mr. Ramachandra Rao; the President; Mr. Srinivasa Sastri.)

that the court has been thoroughly inspected. But I have seen some of these gentlemen going about the country making this as a sort of pleasure-trip and as a time of enjoyment rather than of instruction to the headmasters of these incomplete schools. I may compare the present state of things to the inspection of public offices with which so many of us are familiar. I wish at least to that extent the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar would see that the ideal has never been carried out and which is certainly not at all likely, for, a good long time to come, to be carried out or to produce substantial results in improving educational methods in incomplete secondary schools. I find it absolutely impossible therefore, from what I have seen, that these schools could produce better results by the inspection of supervising headmasters. In places where there are secondary schools along with incomplete schools there has been strong rivalry and jealousy between institutions which possess the same set of classes. Considering everything, whatever may be the ideal set up in this rule, I see absolutely no justification for the continuance of these supervising headmasters which is outside the scope of this rule and which has been insisted upon by the department. I hope that this source of annoyance of inspection of schools will be removed. When we are certain that trained teachers cannot be had for all schools in the near future, the rule may be withdrawn, though the ideal in the rule has kept up for getting qualified headmasters. I may perhaps suggest to the Hon'ble Mr. Duncan that he may call for statistics showing the days that supervising headmasters spend in their work of supervision. I am certain that the results would not justify the continuance of this practice."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"If the Honourable Member has information, in his official capacity as chairman, of the way in which any supervising headmaster has neglected this duty, he might communicate it to the Director of Public Instruction, who will look into the matter."

The Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI:—"When I first proposed to certain friends of mine in the Educational Department the bringing forward of a resolution of this kind, certain of them turned round on me and said 'Are you going to get the rule abolished which greatly increases the demand for L.T.'s a class to which you yourself belong?' I was almost reminded to-day of the plaintive cry of my L.T. friends when the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar spoke in defence of the rule. He seems to think that the demand for L.T.'s has been greatly increased by the existence of this rule and that for that reason it has merit. That is hardly the case. As a matter of fact, the demand for L.T.'s was far greater than the supply even before this rule came into existence. We never could, during the last 20 years, supply the necessary number of L.T.'s. It is not for the purpose of increasing the emoluments open to L.T.'s that a rule of this kind should be made. I certainly do not blame the department for working the rule leniently. It was very good that at a very early stage it was recognised that it was an unworkable and impracticable rule, that it was a mistake to have made the rule and that certain palliatives should be, from time to time, applied. I should have been pleased even to withdraw the resolution, if either in the speech of the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar or the speech of the Hon'ble Mr. Duncan, I had any indication that the facts of the case were fully understood. As it appears to me, however, the essence of the system is the supervising headmaster, because this rule applies to one-fourth of the schools, and the great majority of the schools come under the supervising headmaster; and if the supervising headmaster was an efficient institution and if the department were sure of that, one could let the rule stand. But apparently the department is not quite aware how the institution of 'supervising headmaster' has utterly broken down. Everywhere the supervising headmaster and his visits are looked upon as matters of amusement rather than anything else. It affords variety in school life. An inspector who goes out, makes suggestions and sees that those suggestions are carried out. The supervising headmaster, who gets Rs. 150 for half a dozen visits in the year, has no power; he has no voice in the appointment of masters, he does not frame time-tables, does not fix the salaries of teachers and does nothing whatever except going there to see the schools in working order, talking a few words to the headmasters and others and perhaps in some cases putting down a few hints in writing. The next time he goes, he finds things exactly where they were. I am afraid that the Hon'ble Mr. Duncan is not quite

(Mr. Srinivasa Sastri; Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar; the President.)

aware of this fact. If so, this is a case for inquiry. If he will inquire how this institution of supervising headmaster is working and whether it really subserves a good purpose, then I think we shall be able to see the rule properly worked.

"The Hon'ble Mr. Duncan spoke of feeders. That is a point on which it is a surprise that he has not got at the facts. The schools supervised by a headmaster do not act as feeders to his school. As I told the Council, in many cases the schools are situated at a greater distance from his school than the schools of other headmasters and students of those schools prefer nearer schools. Even if they go to his school he has to examine the pupils over again, and he can take them only if he finds by a severe test whether they are competent, although he has supervised the work of those schools. The boys of those schools are not accepted as a matter of routine as fit for higher forms; but are once more subjected to an entrance examination and if they are fit for the class into which they seek admission they are admitted into it. The idea of feeder schools has also broken down. I should think therefore that there is a case for inquiry and I think I am obliged to ask for it. Unless the Hon'ble Mr. Duncan says that he will look into this matter, it should be put to the Council."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR:—"May I inquire what is exactly the matter about which the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri wants an assurance? Is it about the way in which the supervising headmasters are doing their work?"

The Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI:—"The working of rule 23 in consequence of which the institution of supervising headmasters has become a necessity and how this system is working."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR:—"A great deal has been said about the supervising headmasters; but that is not a portion of this resolution. The supervising headmaster is a device introduced by the department so as to make things easy, and this device has been turned against the department to show that they acted wrongly. By all means let us make an inquiry into this question as to how supervising headmasters have been doing their work; but I do not want to commit Government in any way or make Honourable Members think that we are likely to go back upon rule 23. That is a matter upon which the Government have made up their minds—the policy of having collegiate-trained men for headmasterships. I would not say anything which would induce Honourable Members to think that we agree to that question being reopened. The Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Raju has approached the question from a different point of view and he has largely supported my contention in regard to this matter."

"It is said that the object of the rule is to give a check to secondary education and that the effect of it is to retard secondary education. General statements like this it is easy to make and I have simply to give a general denial. I deny that the object of the rule is to give a check to secondary education or that its effect has been to retard secondary education. Our object has been to develop secondary education. If in the process a number of mushroom schools have disappeared, the efficiency of secondary education has improved and it has not had a set back."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"The Honourable Member may rest assured that this debate will be noted by the department; but the department will not give an assurance that they will make an inquiry into the working of the rule, because it will give an impression that the rule will be abrogated. Some very sweeping statements have been made which I am not able to deny or accept. For instance, very sweeping statements were made about the supervising headmasters and they have been condemned root and branch in regard to the discharge of their duties. Probably the truth lies between the two extremes; but I have no definite information. I welcome the information of those who spoke with authority in this Council and stated that some of them do take their duties lightly while others discharge them honestly and courageously. I do not know what the truth is. I can give the honourable gentleman the assurance that all that has been said in this debate remains on record and that it will be scrutinized by the Department of Public Instruction and examined; and if improvements can be made in the working of the rule, which admittedly is worked with great consideration, and if improvements can be made and other substitutes can be found to tide over the transition, till we shall have a larger

(The President; Mr. Srinivasa Sastri.)

number of collegiate-trained teachers, I am sure the department will welcome that as much as the managers of schools and the Council. Does the honourable gentleman wish to divide the Council?"

The Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI:—"I withdraw the resolution, my Lord."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"I can assure the honourable gentleman that all that has been said will be borne in mind."

With the permission of His Excellency the President, the resolution was withdrawn.

J. P. BEDFORD,
Acting Secretary to Government, Legislative Dept.

Educational Department

In view of the Secretary's and His Excellency's remarks on page 14 and 15 and no specific action appears to be called for on the resolution. A copy of the proceedings may be communicated to the S.P.D. for information. He may be left to take such action as he considers necessary.

2. A draft order is submitted for approval.

PP CR
4.6.15 4/6/15
[Signature]
[Signature]

17

READ AGAIN G.O. No., dated 191

" " " " 191

READ ALSO:-

C. No., From the, No., dated 191

" " " " 191

" " " " 191

ORDER.

No. 596, dated 7. 191

Supervising
Heads. Masters.
7/16

A copy of the proceedings of
Leg. Council held on the 30th March
1915 relating to resolution XVII -
regarding the qualifications of headmasters
of incomplete secondary schools -
will be communicated to the D.O.
for information and for such
action as he considers necessary.

PA 4.6.15 CR 4/16/15
The attention of the
D.O. is called to the
fact that the 23rd of
a new letter from
the Comptroller
General

In the D.O. with a copy of
the Prop. of 30.3.15 re. Resol. XVII

7/16/15

7/6/15

88

When given for copying—
When copied—
When examined—
When signed—

191 .

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH BITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED 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.

[Handwritten notes in Urdu script, including dates like 1311 and 1312, and various administrative remarks.]