

Government of Madras

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 754, 11th June 1917

Remuneration.

Sanctioning the proposals of the Director of Public Instruction regarding the payment of —
to examiners in connection with the examination in school-management and the art of teaching
held under the Code of Regulations for European Schools.

N. P.

INDEXED

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Number of copies { Letter.
Order.

N. P.

ORIGINAL.

Government of Madras

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 754, 11th June 1917

Remuneration.

Sanctioning the proposals of the Director of Public Instruction regarding the payment of — to examiners in connection with the examination in school-management and the art of teaching held under the Code of Regulations for European Schools.

READ—the following papers :—

I

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. J. H. STONE, M.A., F.R.H.S., C.I.E., Director of Public Instruction.

To—the Secretary to Government, Home (Education) Department.

Dated—Madras, the 9th March 1917.

No.—R.C. 9635/16.

Under article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European Schools, an examination in school-management and the art of teaching for European teachers in European schools is held in the month of December every year. The question papers for the examination are set and valued by departmental officers and no remuneration has been paid to them for the work done hitherto. For the examination held in December 1916, 25 candidates appeared of whom 22 passed, and the amount of admission fee realized at Rs. 5 each was Rs. 125. No contingent charges in connection with the examination have been incurred. Mr. Yates, Inspector of Schools, IX Circle, and Mr. Thompson, Assistant Inspector of European and Training Schools, set the question papers and valued them, and the Inspector of European and Training Schools suggests that these officers may be remunerated for the extra work done. I agree with him as there is no reason why they should not be remunerated like the examiners in connection with the European school and scholarship examinations. I beg accordingly to suggest that the examination under reference may be treated as part of the Teachers' certificate examination held under the Madras Educational Rules and that remuneration may be allowed to the examiners at the same rates as those fixed for the latter examination.

2. If my suggestion is approved, the amount calculated at these rates comes to—

Rs. 143-11-0 in the case of Mr. Yates

„ 119-11-10 „ Mr. Thompson

and I request that these amounts may be sanctioned. The charge may be met from the current year's provision under "Teachers' certificate examination charges."

3. The favour of early orders is requested.

II

Endorsement No. 1171-1, Home (Education), dated 13th March 1917.

Referred to the Accountant-General for favour of early remarks.

(By order)

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR,
Registrar.

To the Accountant-General.

III

Letter—from the Accountant-General.

To—the Secretary to Government, Home (Education) Department.

Dated—Madras, the 23rd March 1917.

No.—G.A. 74-22791.

In returning herewith the enclosure received with Home (Education) Department Endorsement No. 1171-1, dated the 13th March 1917, I have the honour to state that, if Government consider that the conduct of the examination in school-management and the art of teaching for European teachers in European schools does not come within the ordinary duties of the departmental officers who conduct them, there is no audit objection to these officers being granted honoraria on such a scale as Government may be pleased to fix. The grant of honoraria in such a case will come under article 72 of the Civil Service Regulations and the powers of sanction in individual cases will be regulated by rules (c) and (d) of that article.

Order—No. 754, Home (Education), dated 11th June 1917.

The Government approve the proposals of the Director of Public Instruction to treat the examination in school-management and the art of teaching held under article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European Schools as part of the examination for teachers' certificates held under chapter XI of the Madras Educational Rules and to allow the examiners for the former the same rates of remuneration as those fixed for the examiners for the latter.

2. The Government also sanction, under article 72 (b) and (d) of the Civil Service Regulations, the payment to Messrs. Yates and Thompson of a remuneration of Rupees 143-14-0 and Rs. 119-11-10, respectively, for their services in connection with the examination held in December 1916.

3. The charge will be met from the current year's budget provision under "Teachers' certificate examination charges."

(True Extract)

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
" Accountant-General.
" Financial Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 754, HOME (EDUCATION), DATED 11TH JUNE 1917.

[SUBJECT.—Remuneration to examiners in connection with the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers.]

Previous papers :

G.O. 84, Educational,	17th February 1900.	G.O. 83, Financial,	13th February 1909.
" 283, Financial,	10th May 1907.	" 122, Educational,	4th March "
" 244, Educational,	27th March 1908.	" 269 "	3rd May "
" 285 "	14th April "	" 1018 "	10th November 1913.
" 503 "	7th July "	" 2078, Revenue,	13th September 1915.
" 701 "	8th October "	" 1096, Home (Education),	19th October 1916.
" 740 "	4th November "		

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 9th March 1917, No. R.C. 9635.

[Endorsement No. 1171-1, Home (Education), dated 13th March 1917—III.]

From the Accountant-General, dated 23rd March 1917, No. G.A. 74/22791.

Please see G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated the 4th November 1908, in which the Government sanctioned the proposals of the Director of Public Instruction to institute a separate examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European schools in order that they might qualify for Teachers' Certificates under article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European schools. The Government also stated that these examinations would be conducted departmentally for the time being.

With reference to the question then raised in this connection whether any fees should be paid to any of the examiners, Dr. Bourne, the then Director of Public Instruction, noted as follows (page 3 of the notes to G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908):—

"The whole thing will be on a very small scale. I expect the Inspector will be able to manage most of it. If other persons have to be deputed to assist him they should, I think, get some remuneration."

2. The Director of Public Instruction now recommends that the examination may be treated as part of the Teachers' Certificate examination held under the Madras Educational Rules and that remuneration may be allowed to the examiners at the same rates as those paid for the latter examination (page 6 of G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916).

3. In this connection attention is solicited to paragraph 5 of G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated the 3rd May 1909, in which the Government approved the payment of remuneration to the examiners whether officials or non-officials, who conducted the examinations under the Code of Regulations for European Schools. On this analogy there seems to be no objection to the grant of remuneration to the examiners in the present case.

4. Under article 72 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations—

"Remuneration shall not be given under this rule for superintending an examination rendered compulsory on persons belonging to the public service, or any other examination the conduct of which comes within the ordinary duties of the officer or officers conducting them. But remuneration may be granted to officers superintending an examination the conduct of which is declared by the local Government not to come within the ordinary duties of the officer or officers conducting them. If fees are levied from the candidates appearing at an examination and the amount of such fees is sufficient to cover the honoraria of the examiners, the reference required . . . to the Government of India or the Secretary of State in certain cases shall not be necessary."

In the present case although the examination may be considered to fall outside the ordinary duties of the officers, the remuneration proposed to be paid to them amounts to Rs. 268, while the fees realized from the candidates amounted only to Rs. 125. Thus the net cost to Government is Rs. 138.

5. Further, the proposal does not appear to be one of imperative necessity. With reference to the proposal of the Director of Public Instruction regarding the payment of remuneration to the examiners appointed in connection with the sub-assistant's and supervisor's tests, the Director was requested to renew his proposals after the return of normal financial conditions—vide G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated the 19th October 1916.

It is therefore for consideration whether the Director may be informed accordingly in the present case also.

The file may be sent to Financial for remarks.

T.K.—31-3-17.

If it be admitted that the examiners should be remunerated for the work done by them, and I have no doubt that they are entitled to some remuneration, the claim should be supported in this department; the fact that increased expenditure should only be on imperatively necessary objects is not, I venture to think, a ground for withholding from people what is rightly theirs. I do not know how far it is to be regarded as a rule that the examiners' remuneration should not exceed the fees realised; probably there is no such relation between the two. But in any case there seems to be no ground of any sort on which the amount realized in fees, i.e., Rs. 125 should not be devoted to the practical remuneration of the examiners.

E. A. HARVEY—2-4-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

In 1900 the Government decided that no remuneration should be granted to officers of the Educational Department for conducting the practical test of the general Teachers' Certificate examinations, but that fees at the ordinary rates might be paid for the written test and that those officers would also be entitled to fees for conducting the Technical and Gymnastic Teachers' Certificate examinations—paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 84, Educational, dated 17th February 1900. The scales of remuneration paid to the examiners who conduct examinations for Teachers' Certificates are as follow (vide page 6 of G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916):—

	For setting.			For valuing.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Organization and discipline ...	50	0	0	0	12	0
(2) General principles and education ...	33	5	4	0	8	0
(3) Methods of teaching ...	33	5	4	0	8	0

2. In 1908 Government declined to sanction the payment of any remuneration to officers of the Educational Department for assistance rendered by them in the conduct of the European Scholarship examinations (chapter IX of the Code of Regulations for European Schools) on the ground that the conduct of the examinations in question must be regarded as forming part of the regular duties of Educational officers and sanctioned payment of remuneration to the other examiners—vide G.O. No. 244, Educational, dated 27th March 1908.

3. In the same year in G.O. No. 285, Educational, dated 8th April 1908, it was held that "under article 141 of the Educational rules it is the duty of the Inspector of Training schools and the staffs of the training institutions to conduct the preliminary examination for teachers' certificates" and the Government were not therefore prepared to sanction the payment of any remuneration to them for assisting in that examination.

4. But subsequently, on the representation of the Director of Public Instruction that the Educational officers who assisted in the conduct of the European scholarship examination and the preliminary examination for teachers' certificates in 1907 were led to expect remuneration for their work, sanction was accorded to the payment of

remuneration in respect of the examinations held in that year (G.O. No. 503, Educational, dated 7th July 1908). Government however adhered to the opinion that the conduct of those examinations should be regarded as forming part of the regular duties of Educational officers and that officers of the department should not expect to receive any remuneration for conducting examinations which are more or less directly connected with the work of that department (Memorandum No. 1710-1, Educational, dated 3rd August 1908—paper I as G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

5. In G.O. No. 701, Educational, dated 8th October 1908, the Director of Public Instruction was requested to arrange as best as he could for the management of the European school and scholarship examinations including the High School examination on the lines of the examinations held in the preceding year. The institution of a separate examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European schools to qualify themselves for teachers' certificates was sanctioned in G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908. In G.O. No. 122, Educational, dated 4th March 1909, pending final orders on the general question of the payment of remuneration to officers of the Educational Department for work done in connection with Government examinations remuneration was allowed to those officers who assisted in the European school and teachers' certificate examinations held in 1908.

6. In 1909 new arrangements were made for the conduct of the Examinations under the Code of Regulations for European schools by the European School Examination Board and the payment of remuneration to all examiners whether officials or non-officials in connection with Primary and Middle School and Scholarship examinations and High School examination was sanctioned (G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

7. In 1916 the Director of Public Instruction raised the question of payment of remuneration to the examiners in connection with the Sub-Assistant Inspector's and Supervisor's tests. The Director of Public Instruction was asked to renew his proposals after the return of normal financial conditions—G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916.

8. The present proposal of the Director of Public Instruction relates to the payment of remuneration to examiners in connection with the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers instituted under G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908.

The Director of Public Instruction stated in 1908 that the Inspector would be able to manage the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers and that the whole thing would be on a small scale—vide his note, dated 26th October 1908, on page 3 of notes to G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908. Up to date no remuneration has been paid to departmental officers for conducting the examination.

The case for the payment of remuneration now put forward by the Director of Public Instruction is that there is no reason why the examiners for the examination in question should not be remunerated like the examiners in connection with the European School and Scholarship examinations. His proposal is that the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers be treated as part of the Teachers' Certificate examination held under the Madras Educational Rules and remuneration allowed to examiners. With reference to what is submitted in paragraph 1 above, if the proposal to treat the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers is treated as part of the general Teachers' Certificate examinations, the payment of remuneration to examiners follows automatically.

Examinations for teachers' certificates do not fall under the head of technical examinations but they are departmental examinations. Please see Educational office-note, dated 30th March 1908, on page 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 285, Educational, dated 18th April 1908.

The reasons assigned by the Director of Public Instruction appear to be more sentimental and not sufficiently strong. Moreover the examination of 25 candidates cannot be any arduous task and the examination is not a self-supporting one and it seems scarcely necessary to incur an expenditure which is not of an imperative necessity at a time of financial stringency.

9. But please see the view expressed in Home Department note, dated 2nd April 1917. The grant of remuneration in the present case depends upon the question whether the conduct of the examination in question comes within the ordinary duties of the departmental officers who conduct them. This point has not been definitely settled in the Home (Education) Department note—vide paragraph 4 on page 2 ante. The papers were set and corrected by Messrs. Yates and Thompson. The former has nothing to do with the European schools while the latter is the Assistant Inspector of European and Training Schools. It is therefore submitted that the conduct of the examination does not appear to fall within the ordinary duties of Mr. Yates whereas it falls within those of Mr. Thompson. In this connection attention is drawn to the Assistant Secretary's note, dated the 14th August 1915, in the notes to G.O. No. 2078, Revenue, dated the 13th September 1915, wherein it was decided that there was no objection to grant honoraria to outside examiners—that is, officers of other departments.

This is not quite in point. All officers of the Forest department are not connected with forest education.

L.E.K.—17-4-17.

Schools and he may be granted the remuneration recommended by the Director. But as it comes within the ordinary duties of Mr. Thompson to conduct the examination in question, no remuneration need, it is submitted, be granted to him. For orders.

T.H.R.—14-4-17.

I am not at all sure that Financial can agree that the holding of these examinations is not a part of the ordinary duties of officers of the Educational Department. These officers have not only to teach but also to test the knowledge of students and I do not see how these particular examinations can be held to be non-departmental ones. If they are departmental then I submit the Government may require any officer of the department to undertake them without extra remuneration (cf. article 72 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations). I am not sure whether we have been guided by any definite principle in sanctioning the payment of examination fees to officers of the Educational Department, but it seems to me that it is wrong in principle to remunerate these officers for holding departmental examinations as opposed to outside examinations. In the present case teachers' certificates are granted by the department and all preliminary examinations are undertaken by the department—vide article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European Schools—and I beg to submit that any officer of the department may be deputed to set and hold a departmental examination without any claim to extra remuneration.

In my humble opinion therefore Financial should advise against the proposal.

For orders.

L. E. KERSHAW—17-4-17.

A doubtful case. Personally I incline to the view stated at A above according to which it is for Educational to decide whether the conduct of these examinations is or is not the ordinary duty of a particular officer. Of course it is open to Government to require any Educational officer to assist, and if he is so required, the work may be held to be part of his ordinary duties. Whether it should be so held, when the work is outside his previous sphere, e.g., the case of Mr. Yates in this file is another question.

Will Home (Education) kindly circulate to the Honourable Member (Financial) before orders issue.

L. DAVIDSON—21-4-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The question whether the officers of the Educational Department should be remunerated for their services in connection with the conduct of departmental examinations appears to have been discussed more than once before—please see pages 2-3 of notes to G.O. No. 503, Educational, dated the 7th July 1908, and pages 1-3 and 8-10 of notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated the 3rd May 1909. Sir Murray Hammick held that the officers should be remunerated (page 3 of notes to G.O. No. 503,

Educational, dated 7th July 1908), while Sir George Forbes declined to lay down any general rules in the matter (vide marginal note on page 10 of notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909). The latter's proposal was agreed to by the former and the question remains unsettled (page 11 of Notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

2. The particular question now raised by the Director of Public Instruction of remunerating the examiners in the "examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European Schools" may be submitted to His Excellency the Governor and the Honourable Member (Financial) for orders.

P.R.—24-4-17.

T.K.—26-4-17.

E. A. HARVEY—30-4-17.

The balance of sound opinion appears to be that the particular examinations in question are part and parcel of an Educational officer's duties whether he be attached to European schools or not. But there are precedents either way. Submitted for orders.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—1-5-17.

This should have been submitted to His Excellency first.

Anyway I do not think any net cost to Government should be incurred, and if a fee is to be given, it might be a lump grant of Rs. 60 to each examiner.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—2-5-17.

I understand from the Director of Public Instruction that he has now at my instance had an opportunity of conferring with Sir Alexander Cardew who permits him to say that Sir Alexander Cardew is willing to accept the Director of Public Instruction's proposal.

I agree with this decision.

P[ENTLAND]—29-5-17.

Draft order submitted. Perhaps it may be forwarded to the Financial Department for perusal before issue.

P.R.—30-5-17.

T.K.—2-6-17.

E.A.H.—5-6-17.

R.R.—6-6-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Seen and returned with thanks.

L. E. KERSHAW—7-6-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders whether the draft order may issue.

P.R.—8-6-17.

Yes.

E.A.H.—9-6-17.

[G.O. No. 754, Home (Education), dated 11th June 1917.]

Remuneration.

~~Sanctioning~~ the proposals of the D.P.I. regarding the payment of to examiners in connection with the examination in school management and the Art of Teaching held under the Code of Regulations for European schools.

Read:—

C.No. 1171. From the D.P.I.No.9635/16, dated the 9th March 1917.

C.No.1576. From the A.G.No.G.A.74-22791, dated the 23rd March 1917.

Order No. 754 dated 11-6-1917.

Press. The Government approve the

proposals of the D.P.I. to treat the examination in School Management and the Art of Teaching held under article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European schools as part of the examination for teachers' certificates held under Chapter XI of the Madras Educational Rules and to allow the examiners for the former the same rates of remuneration as those fixed for the examiners for the latter.

2. The Government also sanction under article 72 (b) and (d) of the C.S.R. the payment to Messrs.Yates and Thompson of a remuneration of Rs.143-11-0 and Rs.119-11-0 respectively,

for their services in connection with the examination held in December 1916.

2. The charge will be met from the current year's budget provision under "Teachers' Certificate examination charges".

P.R.
30-5-17.

page 125 of the B.E.
for 1917-18 (2nd ed. - revised)

To the D.P.I.
A.G.
Finl. Deptt. in print

May 16/17

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 754, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 11th JUNE 1917.

[SUBJECT.—Remuneration to examiners in connection with the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers.]

Previous papers:

G.O. 84, Educational,	17th February 1900.	G.O. 83, Financial,	13th February 1909.
" 283, Financial,	10th May 1907.	" 122, Educational,	4th March "
" 244, Educational,	27th March 1908.	" 269 "	3rd May "
" 285 "	14th April "	" 1018 "	10th November 1913.
" 503 "	7th July "	" 2078, Revenue,	13th September 1915.
" 701 "	8th October "	" 1096, Home (Education),	19th October 1916.
" 740 "	4th November "		

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 9th March 1917, No. R.C. 9635.
[Endorsement No. 1171-1, Home (Education), dated 13th March 1917—III.]

From the Accountant-General, dated 23rd March 1917, No. G.A 74/22791.

Please see G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated the 4th November 1908, in which the Government sanctioned the proposals to the Director of Public Instruction to institute a separate examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European schools in order that they might qualify for Teachers' Certificates under article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European schools. The Government also stated that these examinations would be conducted departmentally for the time being.

With reference to the question then raised in this connection whether any fees should be paid to any of the examiners, Dr. Bourne, the then Director of Public Instruction, noted as follows (page 3 of the notes to G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908):—

"The whole thing will be on a very small scale. I expect the Inspector will be able to manage most of it. If other persons have to be deputed to assist him they should, I think, get some remuneration."

2. The Director of Public Instruction now recommends that the examination may be treated as part of the Teachers' Certificate examination held under the Madras Educational Rules and that remuneration may be allowed to the examiners at the same rates as those paid for the latter examination (page 6 of G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916).

3. In this connection attention is solicited to paragraph 5 of G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated the 3rd May 1909, in which the Government approved the payment of remuneration to the examiners whether officials or non-officials, who conducted the examinations under the Code of Regulations for European Schools. On this analogy there seems to be no objection to the grant of remuneration to the examiners in the present case.



17 with G.O.
2 files

4. Under article 72 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations—

"Remuneration shall not be given under this rule for superintending an examination rendered compulsory on persons belonging to the public service, or any other examination the conduct of which comes within the ordinary duties of the officer or officers conducting them. But remuneration may be granted to officers superintending an examination the conduct of which is declared by the local Government not to come within the ordinary duties of the officer or officers conducting them. If fees are levied from the candidate appearing at an examination and the amount of such fees is sufficient to cover the honoraria of the examiners, the reference required . . . to the Government of India or the Secretary of State in certain cases shall not be necessary."

In the present case although the examination may be considered to fall outside the ordinary duties of the officers, the remuneration proposed to be paid to them amounts to Rs. 263, while the fees realized from the candidates amounted only to Rs. 125. Thus the net cost to Government is Rs. 138.

5. Further, the proposal does not appear to be one of imperative necessity. With reference to the proposal of the Director of Public Instruction regarding the payment of remuneration to the examiners appointed in connection with the sub-assistant's and supervisor's tests, the Director was requested to renew his proposals after the return of normal financial conditions—vide G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated the 19th October 1916.

It is therefore for consideration whether the Director may be informed accordingly in the present case also.

The file may be sent to Financial for remarks.

T.K.—31-3-17.

If it be admitted that the examiners should be remunerated for the work done by them, and I have no doubt that they are entitled to some remuneration, the claim should be supported in this department; the fact that increased expenditure should only be on imperatively necessary objects is not, I venture to think, a ground for withholding from people what is rightly theirs. I do not know how far it is to be regarded as a rule that the examiners' remuneration should not exceed the fees realised; probably there is no such relation between the two. But in any case there seems to be no ground of any sort on which the amount realized in fees, i.e., Rs. 125 should not be devoted to the practical remuneration of the examiners.

E. A. HARVEY—2-4-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

In 1900 the Government decided that no remuneration should be granted to officers of the Educational Department for conducting the practical test of the general Teachers' Certificate examinations, but that fees at the ordinary rates might be paid for the written test and that those officers would also be entitled to fees for conducting the Technical and Gymnastic Teacher's Certificate examinations—paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 84, Educational, dated 17th February 1900. The scales of remuneration paid to the examiners who conduct examinations for Teachers' Certificates are as follow (vide page 6 of G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916):—

	For setting.			For valuing.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Organization and discipline	50	0	0	0	12	0
(2) General principles and education	33	5	4	0	8	0
(3) Methods of teaching	33	5	4	0	8	0

2. In 1908 Government declined to sanction the payment of any remuneration to officers of the Educational Department for assistance rendered by them in the conduct

of the European Scholarship examinations (chapter IX of the Code of Regulations for European Schools) on the ground that the conduct of the examinations in question must be regarded as forming part of the regular duties of Educational officers and sanctioned payment of remuneration to the other examiners—vide G.O. No. 244, Educational, dated 27th March 1908.

3. In the same year in G.O. No. 285, Educational, dated 18th April 1908, it was held that "under article 141 of the Educational rules it is the duty of the Inspector of Training schools and the staffs of the training institutions to conduct the preliminary examination for teachers' certificates" and the Government were not therefore prepared to sanction the payment of any remuneration to them for assisting in that examination.

4. But subsequently, on the representation of the Director of Public Instruction that the Educational officers who assisted in the conduct of the European scholarship examination and the preliminary examination for teachers' certificates in 1907 were led to expect remuneration for their work, sanction was accorded to the payment of remuneration in respect of the examinations held in that year (G.O. No. 503, Educational, dated 7th July 1908). Government however adhered to the opinion that the conduct of those examinations should be regarded as forming part of the regular duties of Educational officers and that officers of the department should not expect to receive any remuneration for conducting examinations which are more less directly connected with the work of that department (Memorandum No. 1710-1, Educational, dated 3rd August 1908—paper I as G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

5. In G.O. No. 701, Educational, dated 8th October 1908, the Director of Public Instruction was requested to arrange as best as he could for the management of the European school and scholarship examinations including the High School examination on the lines of the examinations held in the preceding year. The institution of a separate examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European schools to qualify themselves for teachers' certificates was sanctioned in G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908. In G.O. No. 122, Educational, dated 4th March 1909, pending final orders on the general question of the payment of remuneration to officers of the Educational Department for work done in connection with Government examinations remuneration was allowed to those officers who assisted in the European school and teachers' certificate examinations held in 1908.

6. In 1909 new arrangements were made for the conduct of the Examinations under the Code of Regulations for European schools by the European School Examination Board and the payment of remuneration to *all* examiners whether officials or non-officials in connection with Primary and Middle School and Scholarship examinations and High School examination was sanctioned (G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

7. In 1916 the Director of Public Instruction raised the question of payment of remuneration to the examiners in connection with the Sub-Assistant Inspector's and Supervisor's tests. The Director of Public Instruction was asked to renew his proposals after the return of normal financial conditions—G.O. No. 1096, Home (Education), dated 19th October 1916.

8. The present proposal of the Director of Public Instruction relates to the payment of remuneration to examiners in connection with the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers instituted under G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908.

The Director of Public Instruction stated in 1908 that the Inspector would be able to manage the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers that the whole thing would be on a small scale—vide his note, dated 26th October 1908, on page 3 of notes to G.O. No. 740, Educational, dated 4th November 1908. Up to date no remuneration has been paid to departmental officers for conducting the examination.

The case for the payment of remuneration now put forward by the Director of Public Instruction is that there is no reason why the examiners for the examination in question should not be remunerated like the examiners in connection with the European School and Scholarship examinations. His proposal is that the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers be treated as part of the Teachers' Certificate examination held under the Madras Educational Rules and remuneration allowed to examiners. With reference to what is submitted in paragraph 1 above, if the proposal to treat the examination in school management and the art of teaching for European teachers is treated as part of the general Teachers' Certificate examinations, the payment of remuneration to examiners follows automatically.

Examinations for teachers' certificates do not fall under the head of technical examinations but they are departmental examinations. Please see Educational office-note, dated 30th March 1908, on page 2 of Notes to G.O. No. 285, Educational, dated 18th April 1908.

The reasons assigned by the Director of Public Instruction appear to be more sentimental and not sufficiently strong. Moreover the examination of 25 candidates cannot be any arduous task and the examination is not a self-supporting one and it seems scarcely necessary to incur an expenditure which is not of an imperative necessity at a time of financial stringency.

9. But please see the view expressed in Home Department note, dated 2nd April 1917. The grant of remuneration in the present case depends upon the question whether the conduct of the examination in question comes within the ordinary duties of the departmental officers who conduct them. This point has not been definitely settled in the Home (Education) Department note—vide paragraph 4 on page 2 ante. The papers were set and corrected by Messrs. Yates and Thompson. The former has nothing to do with the European schools while the latter is the Assistant Inspector of European and Training Schools. It is therefore submitted that the conduct of the examination does not appear to fall within the ordinary duties of Mr. Yates whereas it falls within those of Mr. Thompson. In this connection attention is drawn to the Assistant Secretary's note, dated 14th August 1915, in the Notes to G.O. No. 2078, Revenue, dated 13th September 1915, wherein it was decided that there was no objection to grant honoraria to outside examiners—that

This is not quite in point. All officers of the Forest department are not connected with forest education.

L.E.K.—17-4-17.

is, officers of other departments. For the purpose of Article 72 (c), Civil Service Regulations, Mr. Yates may be considered as an outside examiner as he has nothing to do with European and Training Schools and he may be granted the remuneration recommended by the Director. But as it comes within the ordinary duties of Mr. Thompson to conduct the examination in question, no remuneration need, it is submitted, be granted to him. For orders.

T.H.R.—14-4-17.

I am not at all sure that Financial can agree that the holding of these examinations is not a part of the ordinary duties of officers of the Educational Department. These officers have not only to teach but also to test the knowledge of students and I do not see how these particular examinations/each be held to be non-departmental ones. If they are departmental then I submit the Government may require any officer of the department to undertake them without extra remuneration (cf. article 72 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations). I am not sure whether we have been guided by any definite principle in sanctioning the payment of examination fees to officers of the Educational Department, but it seems to me that it is wrong in principle to remunerate these officers for holding departmental examinations as opposed to outside examinations. In the present case teachers' certificates are granted by the department and all preliminary examinations are undertaken by the department—vide article 65 of the Code of Regulations for European Schools—and I beg to submit that any officer of the department may be deputed to set and hold a departmental examination without any claim to extra remuneration.

In my humble opinion therefore Financial should advise against the proposal. For orders.

L. E. KEESHAU—17-4-17.

A doubtful case. Personally I incline to the view stated at A on page 4 according to which it is for Educational to decide whether the conduct of these examinations is or is not the ordinary duty of a particular officer. Of course it is open to Government to require any Educational officer to assist, and if he is so required, the work may be held to be part of his ordinary duties. Whether it should be so held, when the work is outside his previous sphere, e.g., the case of Mr. Yates in this file is another question.

Will Home (Education) kindly circulate to the Honourable Member (Financial) before orders issue.

L. DAVIDSON—21-4-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The question whether the officers of the Educational Department should be remunerated for their services in connection with the conduct of departmental examinations appears to have been discussed more than once before—please see pages 2-3, of notes to G.O. No. 503, Educational, dated the 7th July 1908, and pages 1-3 and 8-10 of notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated the 3rd May 1909. Sir Murray Hammick held that the officers should be remunerated (page 3 of notes to G.O. No. 503, Educational, dated 7th July 1908), while Sir George Forbes declined to lay down any general rules in the matter (vide marginal note on page 10 of notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909). The latter's proposal was agreed to by the former and the question remains unsettled (page 11 of Notes to G.O. No. 269, Educational, dated 3rd May 1909).

2. The particular question now raised by the Director of Public Instruction of remunerating the examiners in the "examination in school management and in the art of teaching for teachers in European Schools" may be submitted to His Excellency the Governor and the Honourable Member (Financial) for orders.

P.R.—24-4-17.

T.K.—26-4-17.

E. A. HARVEY—30-4-17.

The balance of sound opinion appears to be that the particular examinations in question are part and parcel of an Educational officer's duties whether he be attached to European schools or not. But there are precedents either way. Submitted for orders.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—1-5-17.

This should have been submitted to His Excellency first.

Anyway I do not think any net cost to Government should be incurred, and if a fee is to be given, it might be a lump grant of Rs. 60 to each examiner.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—2-5-17.

I understand from the Director of Public Instruction that he has now at my instance had an opportunity of conferring with Sir Alexander Cardew who permits him to say that Sir Alexander Cardew is willing to accept the Director of Public Instruction's proposal.

I agree with this decision.

P[ENTLAND]—29-5-17.

Draft order submitted. Perhaps it may be forwarded to the Financial Department for perusal before issue.

P.R.—30-5-17.

T.K.—2-6-17.

E.A.H.—5-6-17.

R.R.—6-6-17.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Seen and returned with thanks.

L. E. KERSHAW—7-6-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted for orders whether the draft order may issue.

P.R.—8-6-17.

Yes.

E.A.H.—9-6-17.

[G.O. No. 754, Home (Education), dated 11th June 1917.]

Vd L. E. Kershaw

PRESS SLIP.

ORDINARY.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT (a).

Scott. II-38-1-17.

Home (Eon) DEPARTMENT.

Current No. dated 191 ..

G.O. No. 754, dated 11-6-1917.

Number of MS. pages sent

(b)	Correspondence.....	4 + 1
(b ¹)	Notes.....	13

Brief subject.....

(c) Number of copies required when struck off (including copies for volumes and editors' file which are retained in the Press).	E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
FOR RECORD.*			
Madras Records ...	4	13	12
Ooty Records ...		3	4
For filing with original ...		1	1
Total ..		17	17

FOR ISSUE.†

		Letter	Compl G.O.	No.	Papers.
Signature copies			1		
India Office					
Govt. of India		Dept.			
Revenue Department					
Public Works Department					
Local and Municipal Department					
Educational Department					
		Dept.			
Public Dept.		} Total	5		
Judicial Dept.					
Political					
Financial Dept.					
Marine Dept.					
Ecclesiastical Dept.					
				Total	...
Spare copies	The	20-3	10		
	The	py	10		
	The				
	The	2	10		
	The	2			
	The				
	The				
	The				
	The				
	The				
	The				
	The				
Total			36		

Copies distributed on ‡ (Press Clerk).

† Copies distributed on ‡ (Press Despatcher).

‡ To be initialled and dated.

P.T.O.

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 rule 315 of the office Manual.

(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 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 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, only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

TO PRESS, MADRAS OOTY.

A
Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.

B
Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.

C
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 at once.

Type may be released after usual interval.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Supdt.

Supdt.

Supdt.

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.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....				
" " " Issue.....				
" " " for Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.				4
For Volumes.....				
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.				
Total ...				