

Law (Education) (1925) Department.

Ord. SERIES.

G.O. No. 863

DATED 20. 5. 1925

[Despatch Abstract.]

School-Training

Remission of fees in
certain schools - ratified

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
1491	27-8-28			1491	27-8-28		
8-11	5-1-28			8-11	5-1-28		

C.F. 30-18,658-3-10-23.

Law (Education)

DEPARTMENT.

Received



192

Registered

192

Subject.

Fee concession in Model Schools attached to the
Government Training Schools.

ENCLOSURES.

No.

C.

No. 3276 C/24

Spare copies

Station Madras

Dated the 4-11-24

192

From (Name) R. Littlehales Esq., M.A.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction

Madras.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law (Education)

Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to state that in the year 1912, the question was raised whether the levy of fees in model schools attached to Government Training Schools should not be abolished with a view to making them more popular and better attended than they had been; and under the orders of Dr. (now Sir. Alfred) Bourne, then Director of Public Instruction, the inspecting officers were informed, in Proceedings Dis.No. 5862/1912 dated 23rd August 1912, that the levy of fees in model schools attached to Government Training Schools should be discontinued only in the case of pupils whose parents were unable to pay fees and that the concession should

be

4: p. 4 of D.O. No.

2435/C-24-2

29-10-24

2
be confined to standards infant to III- corresponding to the present standards I to IV. The Headmasters of institutions were given the discretion to grant the concession.

In his Office note ordering the grant of this concession, Dr. Bourne has stated that this was the policy of the Government of India. Which orders of the Government of India he had in view wherein this policy was laid down is not clear from the file. The Government of India's resolution No. 301 C.D. dated 21-2-1913 is of later date. The concession has, however, been continued and extended in subsequent years to the present Standard V in some schools. This extension was for the first time granted by Mr. (now Sir Henry) Stone in the case of the model school attached to the Government Training School, Kurnool.

The power to abolish fees in Government Elementary schools does not appear to vest in the Director. Rule 73 (ii) of the Madras Educational Rules only permits the modification of the prescribed rates but in the cases mentioned above, the Director's sanctions were based on the precedent created by Sir. Alfred Bourne, and the object kept in view was to secure adequate strength and attendance for the model schools attached to the Training Schools, as, without such attendance they could not serve their purpose as practising schools for students under training.

In these circumstances, I have the honour to request that Government may be pleased to approve of the procedure hitherto followed and also to delegate to me the power to accord similar sanctions in future wherever the necessity therefor may arise:

I have the honour to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

[Signature]
for Director of Public Instruction.

A.R. 4/11/24

Memo No. 2976 C/24-1 dated 22-11-24.

Reference: His letter No. 3276 - 24. dated 4-11-1924. Fee concessions in Model Schools attached to the Government Training Schools.

The D.P.I. is requested to furnish particulars as to

- (i) the nature and extent of the fee concessions that have till now been granted to pupils in the model schools of the several Government Training Schools and
- (ii) the financial effect of such concessions.

To

The D. P. I. *[Signature]*

Reminder: *one month* after issue.

Law Department.
Education Branch.

Law Edu 324c

REMINDER.

REPLY. 28.1.25

To

The Director of
Public Instruction.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Law (Education) Dept.

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~
is directed to invite
invites

Re 912 4/m 7 26.1.25

Re-submitted.

attention to the communication noted in the

margin and to
Memo. 2976 C/24-1 dated 22.11.24.

request that

this reminder may be returned at once with

information as to—

- (1) the stage at which the matter now is,
- (2) the date by which a reply may be expected, and
- (3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.

2 It is requested that the reply to this
reminder may be sent not later than

1/27

Mano
for Director of Public
Instruction.

Mananujahan
27/1

Office Law (Edu) Dept

Station Fort St. George.

Dated 22.1.25.

Signature.
Asst Secretary
Designation. to Govt.

Law (Edu) Dept

May be reminded
a month hence, if
heard be

28/1
28.1.25

SUBJECT.

Free concessions in Model
Schools attached to the
Govt Training Schools.

25/3

(68)



CF. 20-41,000-8-9-24.

LAW (EDUCATION)

DEPARTMENT.



Received

Registered

192

Subject.

L. En 1175 RC
15/4/25

Fee concessions in Model Schools attached to Government
Training Schools -

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

R.O.C. No. 912-A/24.

Station Madras, Dated the 8th April, 1925.

From (Name) R.G. GRIEVE, Esq., M.A., F.R.C.S.,
(Designation) DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW (EDUCATION) Department.

Sir,

p 3 amt

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 2976-C/24-1 Law (Education) dated 22-11-24, I have the honour to furnish herewith a statement showing (1) the nature and extent of the fee concessions that have till now been granted to pupils in each of the Model Schools of the several Training Schools and (ii) the financial effect of such concessions.

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

R. G. Grieve
for Director of Public Instruction.

M.R.P. 14/4.

18p 6-7
infra

Name of School.	Nature and extent of fee Concessions.					Financial effect per annum.
	Standard I	Standard II	Standard III	Standard IV	Standard V	
1. Berhampore Higher Ely.	No Concessions to Non-backward classes.					Rs. As -p
2. Chicacole Higher Ely.	X Poor pupils exempted in all standards.					10-0-0
3. Russelkonda Lower Ely.	Poor pupils exempted in all standards except II.					45-12-0
4. Vinayakaram Higher Ely.	1 Indus	1 Indus	1 Indus	2 poor pupil	2 poor pupils	12-0-0
5. Parvatipur Lower Ely (Religious)	3 poor and 3 Indus	1 poor and 1 Indus	5 poor and 2 Indus	3 poor pupils	1 poor pupil	23-4-0
6. Rajahmundry Higher Ely.	1 boy	3 poor boys	2 poor boys	3 poor boys	Nil	8-10-0
7. Guntur Secondary Training	Concessions granted to poor pupils in all the 5 standards.					58-8-0
8. Buzole Higher Ely.	do do do do do					78-0-0
9. Nellore Secondary	do do do do do					33-12-0
10. Rayachoti Higher Ely.	1 Muthurani Boys 1	1 Muthurani and 1 Madani Boys 3 Jolla 1	1 Muthurani + 2 Balijas 3 Boys 1 Jolla	4 poor 5 Balijas 1 Kinsali and 1 Muthurani Boys 2 Jolla 1	1 Muthurani and 2 Balijas 6 Boys.	34-14-0
11. Kurnool Higher Ely.	Total suspension of Collection of fees ordered in G.O. 1187/24 for a year.					60-0-0
12. Bellary Secondary	X Poor pupils exempted in all the 5 standards.					57-0-0
13. Mantapur Higher Ely.	Total exemption in all the standards.					112-14-0
14. Madras Higher Ely.	do do do do do					132-0-0
15. Madras Indus Higher Ely.	Poor Indus exempted in standards 1 to 4.					96-0-0
16. Chittoor Higher Ely.	X Total exemption in all the 5 standards.					35-0-0
17. Ranipet Higher Ely.	1 girl	3 full paying and 1 half paying and 1 girl.	4 full paying 2 half paying and 1 girl.	4 full paying and 4 half paying	6 full paying and 1 half paying	43-2-0
18. Cuddalore Higher Ely.	20 poor pupils	18 poor	13 poor	8 poor	3 poor	77-8-0
19. Villupuram Secondary	4 poor	11 poor	15 poor	6 poor	6 poor	65-4-0
20. Tanjore Secondary	Total abolition of fees owing to the introduction of free & compulsory Ely. Edn.					—
21. Tirunelveli Higher Ely.	Only one pupil exempted out of a strength of 68 pupils.					almost Nil.
22. Tirunelveli Secondary	5 poor	3 poor	3 poor	4 poor	2 poor	25-8-0
23. Ramnad Higher Ely.	No fee concessions granted to poor pupils.					Nil.
24. Tirunelveli Secondary	Total abolition owing to the introduction of Compulsory and free Ely. Edn.					—
25. Salem Higher Elementary	14 poor	13 poor	11 poor	9 poor	16 poor	35-10-0
26. Coimbatore Secondary	Only 4 poor pupils exempted in the school.					6-0-0
27. Calicut Higher Ely.	X Poor pupils exempted in standards 1 to 4.					72-4-0
28. Cannanore Higher Ely.	Total exemption in all the 5 standards.					31-14-0
29. Malappuram Higher Ely.	No concessions to non-backward classes.					Nil.
30. Mangalore Higher Ely.	5 boys and 2 girls.	4 boys	2 boys and 1 girl.	5 boys and 1 girl.	Nil.	23-4-0
Total.						1185-0-0

No.	Name of School.	Nature and extent of fee concession.					Financial effort per annum, Rs. As. Ps.
		Standard I	Standard II	Standard III	Standard IV	Standard V	
1	Quarter Master L. Ely.	All pupils of the Model School exempted					108-6-0
2	Bellary Higher Ely.	No concessions to non-backward classes					Nil.
3	Conjeveram Higher Ely.	11 poor	12 poor	8 poor	7 poor	Nil	28-2-0
4	Tanjore Palace H. Ely.	32 poor pupils in all exempted in the school.					27-12-0
5	Tichinapoy Indu H. Ely.	All pupils exempted from payment of fees.					76-0-0
6	Calicut Higher Ely.	do	do	do	do	do	128-4-0
Total							388-8-0

Grand Total (Mistresses and Mistresses) 1185 + 388-8-0 = 1573 1/2 Rs.

Rs. 1570 in round figures.

For sundary
for direct Public Instr.

MP 1-2 C. 6

MP 8-9 8 F
G.O. No. 121224
24-7-24

p 12 Ibid.

8

8

Law (Education) Deptt.

C. No. 2976 C - From the Director of Public Instruction, C.No. 3276 C/24 dated 4-11-1924.

Fee concessions in Model Schools attached to the Government Training Schools -

The general rule is that in Government institutions fees should be levied according to standard rates. The following exceptions are provided for in the rules:-

(i) Elementary schools - Rules 73 (i) and (ii).

The District Educational Officer, subject to the control of the Director of Public Instruction, is competent to modify the standard rates ~~according to local circumstances~~. It is further provided that fees at half the prescribed rates may be levied from Muhammadan boys and that pupils belonging to the backward classes may be admitted without payment of fees.

(ii) Secondary schools and colleges - ~~Exception~~
Rule 92.

Provision is made for the levy of fees at half the standard rates from Muhammadan and Oriya pupils and from pupils of backward classes and girls whose parents are so poor that they are unable to pay the full fees. In doubtful cases a certificate of poverty ~~may~~ ^{should} be required by the head of the institution.

2. There is no rule in the Educational Rules specifically regulating the levy of fees in the model schools attached to ^{Govt.} training institutions. In the absence of a specific provision applying directly to model schools of training institutions, the logical course would appear to be to follow the

A

rules quoted above according as the model school is of the elementary or of the secondary grade. If this position is conceded there appears to be no need for any ruling or order. It may be taken to be provided for by the following paragraph in rule 102 of the Madras Educational Rules under the heading "Training Institutions under public management":-

A

p 138 F

"Except as hereinafter provided, the rules in the previous chapters shall mutatis mutandis hold good in every training institution under public management."

3. The object aimed at in the Director's letter is however to provide for larger fee concessions in model schools so as to ^{render} popularise them ^{intensively} popular. It may also be noted that his letter seems to refer largely to model schools of the elementary grade. What is proposed to be done or what practice is in force in model schools of the secondary grade is not stated.

4. The case may be referred u.o. to the Director for remarks as to whether it will not suffice if the course at 'A' is followed.

I don't think there is much use in asking the D.P.I. as proposed. He knows the course at (A) is open so far as the schools are concerned: but his point is he wants more than what that course provide. The ordinary concessions are already available in the model schools. Some special concessions in addition are needed. No doubt model schools are not generally popular. There is a general impression prevalent that the ~~school~~ result of study in a model school is poor. That may be due to the fact

that the interests of the teachers more training ~~have~~ naturally ~~to receive~~ ^{require} more prominent attention than those of the students of the model schools. How far this is justified is not clear: but the impression is there and in the end model schools are ~~not~~ popular. It is therefore necessary to take special steps to restore their popularity. The D.P.I. letter makes out that special facilities have been granted since 1912. Their withdrawal now may affect very largely the schools. The D.P.I. apparently now seeks to regularise them. Before considering the matter further it may be desirable to ascertain what the special concessions hitherto granted have been, to what extent roughly in each of the schools, fee concessions have been granted & with what total financial effect. I approved a memo. may issue to the D.P.I.

K

OK
13.11.24

Very well
VTK
18.11

A draft memo is subd.

OK
20.11.24

OK
21.11.24

[Memo No: 2976] C-24-1, d) 22.11.24) P.3, C-4
C-1175/C, from the D.P.I., R.O.C. 912-A/24, d) 8.4.25. (Asst. Secy, C-4)

From the statement at pp 6 to 7, C-4, it is observed that there has been no uniformity in the practice of levying fees in the model schools attached to training schools. In certain cases there has been a wholesale remission of fees. In a good number of cases poor pupils are exempted from fees. In a few remissions of fees is confined to backward classes. Apparently the determining factor has been ~~local need~~ the local need. In view of the admitted need that exists of making the model schools popular and well attended and in view of the fact that the concessions do not entail the foregoing of any large revenue, the present practice may be ratified and the Director empowered to extend it where necessary.

(*) The cost of the existing concessions is estimated at Rs 1,57,000 per year (P-2, C-4)

A draft is added. It may go to Finance w/o for acceptance.

21.4.25
21.4.25

shall discuss with Mr. Gueve Sat upon Monday
VTK 24/4

27.4.25

I do not see why we should go as far as the draft does.


2) The concessions now given may be ratified. But the D.P.I should investigate the necessity for continuing the concession of total remission of fees in the institutions - 7 to 9, 11, 13, 14, 16 & 28 & satisfy himself that they are really needed.
3) There is need to empower the D.P.I to remit "in suitable cases" "in future"

VTK 26.4.

A revised draft order is submitted. 24 approved, it may go to Finance. 30.4.25
30.4.25
30.4.25
VTK 1.5
Finance 11.5



Law 20-2976C-2
4-5-25



5-MAY-1925
17893
6.5.25

Finance (Acts)

The draft order may be accepted in Finance subject to the following remarks.

2 In his letter at K on page 2 of, the D.P.I. asks for delegation of power to sanction fee concessions similar to the ones till now granted in model sections of training schools. It is for orders if the Law (Secy) dept may be requested to add a para to the draft specifically ~~negotiating the request~~ stating that the Govt.

726 13.5.25

13.8.25

Levent Ekin)

2am (Edn)

Submitted:

8.5.25

GA
18/7/25

Add.

~~V.TK~~
~~19.5~~

A paragraph has been added to the draft.

19.5.25

7
19.5.28

V.T.K.
20/5

Issue

V.Tk 2013



L. du 1525C
 1873/25
 Finilo
 17893 Auk
 16.5.25

Date.

Initials.

When received for Fair-copying.

When copied

When examined

When signed

When despatched

Law (Education)

DEPARTMENT.

School-Training.

Remission of fees in certain schools -
ratified.

READ AGAIN G.O. No., dated 192

[illegible]

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 2976/c-24 From the D.P.I. C., No. 3276/24, dated 4-11-'24 192

324/25 & 1175 0/25 912-A/24 8-4-'25 192

" "----- " "

192

ORDER.

Misc.

No. 863 dated 20-5-1925.

The Director of Public Instruction brings to notice that, with a view to securing satisfactory attendance in the model sections of training schools, it has been the practice in the past to remit fees in certain cases. The Government ratify the ~~prac-~~
~~tice~~. The Director is requested to investigate further the necessity for continuing the concession of total remission of fees in the ~~model~~
~~the~~ undermentioned institutions: ~~for masters~~

1. Secondary Training School, ~~Channarayana~~
Guntur.
2. Higher Elementary Training ~~Channarayana~~
School, Ongole.
3. Secondary Training School,
Nellore.
4. Higher Elementary Training
School, Kurnool.
5. Higher Elementary Training
School, Anantapur.
6. Higher

remissions of fees
granted in the
institutions ~~star~~
named in the list
submitted by him

1986-7 ann

- 15
6. Higher Elementary Training School, Madras
 7. Higher Elementary Training School, Chittoor.
 8. Higher Elementary Training School, Cannanore.

2. The Government are unable to do not think it necessary to empower approve of the proposal that the

Director of Public Instruction should be empowered to sanction remission of fees in suitable cases in future.

9. Higher Tg. Schools, Chittoor
10. Secondary Tg. Schools, Bellary

The Govt. do not propose to empower the D.P.I. to sanction such remissions of fees in ~~other institutions~~ other institutions, To the D.P.I.

Copy to the A.G. (Through Finance Department) with a list of institutions
Finance Department.

hr 657 cf


DESPATCHED

21 MAY 1925

Telephone message dated 2-6-'25

From

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.



The Secretary to Government,
Law (Education) Department.

Reference:-- Government Order No. 863 Law (Education) dated 20-5-'25.

Kindly let me know whether the ratification in para 1 of the G.O. relates to the remissions of fees granted in the past only or even to those that may be granted in these schools in the future as well.

2. It may also kindly be stated whether the existing concession may be temporarily continued until final orders are passed regarding levy of fees in the Model schools attached to the 10 training schools in respect of which further investigation has been ordered.

3. Please let me know whether the terms "other than institutions mentioned in para 2 of the G.O. relates to institutions other than those enumerated in the list submitted to Government with the Director's letter R.O.C. No. 912A/24 dated 8-4-'25 or whether it includes any of them.

For Director of Public Instruction.

(post copy) To the Secretary to Government,

Law (Education) Department.

S.S.S. 4/6

Law (Education) Dept.

The following telephonic message is for approval:-

"Yours T. M. on G.O. No. 863 Ed., dt 20.5.25 - fee remissions in model schools attached to training schools"

The ratification in paragraph 1 of the

Q. 6. relates ^{also} to future re-examination of two in all the schools mentioned in the Director's list except the two schools in respect of which further investigation has been directed. In respect of the latter, existing concessions may be continued pending advice on the results of the further investigation. The term "other institutions" in paragraph 2 of the Q. 6. refers to institutions other than those enumerated in the Director's list.

Q. 6. Sec 6
note at
p. 12 of
No 863 (2)
20.5.45

Q. 6.
11.6.45

Q.
9.6.45

5 with ref. to position under the act

V.K.
10.6

P.C. to go to
the D.P.D.
P.C.
10.6

Printed Sheet only
Case No 864 Law Education
dt. 21.5.1925
(1)

Government of Madras

Received 1925 Registered 1925

Abstract

Subsidy - Voted and non-voted - elementary education statement showing distribution to Taluk Boards Bellary district - Communicated.

Law (Education) Department

G.O.No.864, dated the 21st May 1925.

Order :

In continuation of G.Os. No.545 and 546 Law (Education) dated the 17th April 1925 a statement showing the amount payable to the Taluk Boards in the Bellary district, as reconstituted, is forwarded to the Accountant-General who is requested to instruct the Treasury officer, Bellary to adjust the amounts as shown therein.

(By Order of the Government, Ministry of Education)
V. T. Krishnam Achariyar,
Secretary to Government.

To the Accountant-General, Madras.

- .. Director of Public Instruction with reference to his endorsement No.282-B/25, dated the 13th May 1925
- .. Examiner of Local Fund Accounts
- .. President, District Board, Bellary with reference to his letter C.R.No.2142/24, dated the 9th May 1925
- .. President, District Educational Council, Bellary
- .. Presidents, Taluk Boards in Bellary district.

—0—
FORWARDED
(By Order)

S. A. Venkiteswara
Superintendent.
18 21.5.25
PTD

2

Name of Taluk Boards	Amount payable in the current year.	Amount payable for each of the first eleven months of the year 1925-26.	Amount to be paid in March 1926
Voted subsidy			
Adoni	3324	277	277
Bellary	4240	353	357
Harpanahalli	5048	421	417
Hospet	1304	109	105
Total	13916	1160	1156
Non-voted			
Adoni	25453	2121	2122
Bellary	20556	1713	1713
Harpanahalli	13650	1137	1143
Hospet	16698	1392	1386
Total	76357	6363	6364

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

192

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
192

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, 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.