

Educational 1900
Local & Munl. (189) Department.

Plague. ①

PRINTED.

~~Letter~~
G.O. No. 371 & 372
DATED 18th August 1900

INDEXED.

9112-9

[Despatch Abstract.]

Collegiate Education

to the Govt. of India,
Submitting extracts from a letter from
the ~~late~~ Director of Public Instruction
showing the position of — in the Madras
presidency

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1900} of Madras. EDUCATIONAL.

— 0 —

Recd.

Regd.

} 1900.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., &c., Nos 371, 372, 18th August 1900.

AUGUST.

Collegiate Education.

Submitting to the Government of India, extracts from a letter from the Director of Public Instruction showing the position of—in the Madras presidency.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

Extract from Resolution of the Government of India, Home Department, No. 495, dated 28th October 1899.

6. The constitution of the Universities, as set forth in paragraph 51 of Mr. Cotton's Review, shows clearly that, though they are not under the control of the Education department, they are intimately connected with the Government. They are so constituted that the Government must be held in great measure responsible for their administration; and they are intended to co-operate with the Government in the advancement of higher education. They exercise the most powerful influence over high schools and colleges. They prescribe the courses of study for the entrance examination; and also for their degrees to which practically only students of affiliated colleges are admitted. The variations in the standard for the Matriculation and Degree examinations, referred to by Mr. Cotton in paragraphs 95 and 52 of his Review, exercise, therefore, a serious effect on higher education, in respect of which the Local Governments ought to recognize at once their interest and their responsibility.

7. It is, however, mainly with the colleges that the Government of India have to do in the present Resolution. The important figures for examination are those set forth in Mr. Cotton's table XLVII (page 77) showing the "Results of University Arts Examinations according to management of Colleges," and in his table LIII (page 96) showing the "Expenditure on Arts Colleges." These figures show that the principles laid down for the final and full acceptance of Local Governments in paragraph 30 of Home Department Resolution No. 10-309, dated 23rd October 1884, are not receiving due careful attention. It was laid down that for all kinds of "advanced education" private effort should in future be increasingly and mainly relied on, and that every form of private effort should be systematically encouraged in such ways as these: (a) by clearly showing that, whilst existing State institutions must be maintained in complete efficiency where necessary, "the improvement and extension of institutions under private managers will be the principal care of the department;" (b) by insisting only on "efficiency and the protection of neighbouring institutions from unfair competition;" (c) "by liberal aid and co-operation in the gradual raising of fees, so that less and less aid may be required," etc. Now these principles are inconsistent with the increase of expenditure from Provincial revenues on colleges under public management, and with the small rise in fees, during the quinquennium.

8. In a speech delivered in the Madras Council on 12th April 1894, as reported in the local Gazette, Lord Wenlock (then Governor) said: "It has been said, with some truth no doubt, that, whenever it is a question of providing money for a Government institution, money is forthcoming; but whenever it is necessary for other institutions, the reply is always unfortunately *non possumus* * * If twenty-one people are knocking at the door of Government for relief, who is the person that is likely to receive attention from Government first, Government institutions or what I may call strangers? Of the twenty-one it is only natural that Govern-

ment should be a little more tender-hearted to its own particular child. But when its child has been fed, I think we may be able to extend our attention to the other twenty." This is surely not to make the improvement and extension of institutions under private managers "the principal care of the Department." Lord Wenlock's language would be appropriate in the head of a rival concern, but in Home Department Resolution, dated 18th June 1888, it was distinctly laid down that "in this as in all other matters it is the policy of the Government of India, to avoid entering into competition with private enterprise." The remarks of the Director of Education in Madras quoted by Mr. Cotton in paragraph 71 of his Review show also that the principles laid down in respect to fees have been lost sight of; and that Government grants have become in some cases "a virtual subsidy to the managers of aided institutions, helping them to recoup a loss of fee income deliberately incurred." These remarks are not quoted because the Madras Government most manifestly transgress the principles laid down for guidance; but because they are perhaps the clearest statement of the transgression or neglect of these principles which the Government of India believe to be only too general. As a matter of fact, perhaps the most manifest transgressor is the Government of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh which has increased its expenditure from Provincial funds on colleges under public management during the quinquennium by a larger amount than in the case of primary education. This neglect of principles plainly laid down for guidance cannot be permitted; and the Government of India must insist on the practical observance of the instructions contained in the Resolution above quoted.

READ—also the following paper:—

Letter from the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, dated 25th June 1900, No. 6091.

ORDER—No. 371, Educational, dated 18th August 1900.

Ordered that the following letter be sent to the Government of India:—

(True Extract.)

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Secretary to Government

LETTER—No. 372, Educational, dated Ootacamund, 18th August 1900, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

In the 7th and 8th paragraphs of the Resolution of the Government of India in the Home Department, No. 495, 28th October 1899, the position of collegiate education in Madras and other provinces was discussed.

2. As no special report from this Government has been asked for, His Excellency the Governor in Council does not now purpose making any remarks on the subject, but he believes that the annexed extracts from a letter from the Director of Public Instruction will be of interest to the Government of India as showing clearly that this Government has not failed to pay regard to the recommendations of the Education Commission, and also as correcting the erroneous impression which certain remarks made six years ago by His Excellency Lord Wenlock at a meeting of the Legislative Council, under an evident misapprehension of the facts, have not unnaturally created.

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

(14)

Annexure to letter to the
G. of I., No. 372 of 18th August/90 Educ.

(iii) The Department of Public Instruction in Madras has been closely following, in both letter and spirit, the recommendations of the Education Commission and the Government of India in regard to collegiate education, as will be shown presently and must be acquitted of the charge that it has done anything to ignore the orders of the supreme Government. At the close of 1882-83, it had three first-grade colleges (Presidency, Kumbakonam and Rajahmundry) and seven second-grade colleges (Berhampur, Bellary, Cuddalore, Madura, Salem, Calicut and Mangalore). At the close of 1896-97, it had three colleges of the first grade and only one of the second grade, three second-grade colleges (Berhampur, Cuddalore and Madura) having been transferred to native committees, two (Bellary—with its standard reduced—and Salem) having been transferred to Municipalities and one (Calicut) having been closed. My predecessor, Dr. Duncan, proposed the transfer of the only remaining second-grade college (Mangalore) to a local committee, but Government did not approve of his proposal (G.O., No. 793, Educational, dated 28th December 1896) on the ground that the cause of education in South Canara would suffer by the withdrawal of departmental control over the college.

I append below certain figures relating to Government colleges for the ten years ending with 1896-97 :—

Year.	Grade.	Number.	Average number on the rolls.	Total cost.	Cost to Government.	Cost per head.	Cost to Government per head.	Fees.	Percentage of fees to cost.
1887-88	1st grade.	3	616	Rs. 1,75,872	Rs. 1,35,615	Rs. 286	Rs. 220	Rs. 39,476	22
	2nd "	4	259	20,538	5,569	79	22	14,178	69
1888-89	1st "	3	649	1,80,664	1,37,246	278	211	42,718	24
	2nd "	2	159	18,125	6,406	114	40	10,938	60
1889-90	1st "	3	631	1,92,945	1,51,004	304	239	40,225	21
	2nd "	2	158	14,455	4,705	91	30	8,970	61
1890-91	1st "	3	619	2,06,626	1,66,898	334	261	38,492	19
	2nd "	2	119	13,014	5,616	109	47	6,625	51
1891-92	1st "	3	643	1,95,892	1,51,233	305	235	43,155	22
	2nd "	1	60	10,164	5,975	169	100	3,508	34
1892-93	1st "	3	751	2,05,227	1,53,811	273	205	50,493	25
	2nd "	1	53	6,861	3,387	129	64	2,924	43
1893-94	1st "	3	738	1,92,968	1,42,729	261	193	49,301	26
	2nd "	1	47	5,467	2,106	116	45	2,822	52
1894-95	1st "	3	708	1,97,761	1,49,066	279	211	47,609	24
	2nd "	1	48	5,820	2,437	121	51	2,723	47
1895-96	1st "	3	692	2,06,493	1,55,777	298	225	49,710	24
	2nd "	1	53	6,380	1,865	120	35	3,633	57
1896-97	1st "	3	652	2,01,432	1,49,289	309	229	51,708	26
	2nd "	1	66	7,003	1,674	106	25	4,339	62

It will be seen that in Government first-grade colleges the average number on the rolls rose during the decade from 616 to 652, the total expenditure by Rs. 25,560, the net cost to Government by Rs. 13,674, and the fee income by Rs. 12,232. The cost to Government per head advanced during the period from Rs. 220 to Rs. 229, while the percentage of fees to cost was 26 in 1896-97 against 22 in 1887-88. Of the increase of Rs. 25,560 in the gross expenditure, Rs. 25,538 appertained to the Presidency College and Rs. 1,694 to the Kumbakonam College, while in the case of the Rajahmundry College there was a decrease of Rs. 1,672. The increase in the cost of the Presidency College was due largely to the creation of the following appointments during the decade:—

	RS.
(1) Professor of Physics	500-50-1,000
(2) Assistant to the Professor of Physics	75
(3) Lecturers in Botany and Animal Physiology	350
(4) Additional Junior Assistant Professor	125
(5) Latin Master	100

and partly to increments to salaries and extra expenditure in connection with the working of the physical, chemical and biological laboratories. The appointments (1), (2) and (3) were created with a view to provide for the teaching of all the scientific subjects included in the new B.A. curriculum. The fourth appointment was rendered necessary by the increased strength of the college, the average number on the rolls having risen from 232 on the 31st March 1888 to 411 on the corresponding day in 1897. A Latin master had to be appointed because of the increased number of students who desired to be instructed in that language. Nearly three-fourths of the total increase in expenditure appertained to the new appointments above referred to. The increased outlay on the Kumbakonam College was the result of the re-organization of the college under G.O., No. 181, Educational, dated 16th March 1885: it was some time before the full financial effect of the change was realized.

During the decade the scale of fees was raised thrice, and the different scales, so far as the Presidency College is concerned, are compared below:—

	Previous to 1st January 1887 per term.	From 1st January 1887 per term.	From 1st January 1892 per term.	From 1st January 1896 per term.
B.A. whole course	RS. 30	RS. 36	RS. 41	RS. 52
English language Course only	..	18	14	18
Second language course only	..	..	7	9
Science course { Branch II or III only	..	20	23	35
do. I, IV, or V only	..	30	35	30
F.A. course	30	..	..	38

The fee for the full B.A. course was thus raised during the period by 73 per cent. and that for the F.A. course by 27 per cent. In consequence of the introduction of the enhanced scale on the one hand, and improved strength on the other, the fee income of the Presidency College advanced from Rs. 16,457 in 1887-88 to Rs. 33,810 in 1896-97 or more than doubled itself, and the increase in fees thus met about two-thirds of the total additional cost. The Government of India will thus be pleased to note that the expenditure on Government Colleges was not unnecessarily increased and that the department did not lose sight of the principle that additional expenditure should as far as possible be met from additional fee revenue. If the quinquennial ending with 1896-97 alone be taken into account, it will be found that the expenditure on Government first-grade colleges decreased during the period and that the fee revenue made a slight advance, though the average number on the rolls fell from 751 to 652.

6

Nor was the recommendation of the Education Commission in regard to the extension of higher education through the agency of private effort overlooked by the Madras Educational Department. The following figures relating to aided colleges for the ten years ending with 1896-97 speak for themselves:—

Year.	Number of aided colleges.		Average number on the rolls.		Grants-in-aid.		Fees.	
	First grade.	Second grade.	First grade.	Second grade.	First grade.	Second grade.	First grade.	Second grade.
1887-88	7	14						
1888-89	6	15	1,276	531	Rs. 47,951	Rs. 14,093	Rs. 67,719	Rs. 28,610
1889-90	6	15	1,235	482	41,998	20,314	67,729	26,955
1890-91	7	17	1,225	519	48,724	24,404	70,740	28,962
1891-92	7	17	1,443	630	57,444	23,071	80,288	33,893
1892-93	8	17	1,535	635	57,221	23,133	91,731	36,046
1893-94	7	19	1,752	708	67,353	22,235	94,840	33,295
1894-95	7	20	1,693	649	67,989	23,568	90,800	28,330
1895-96	7	17	1,617	615	67,770	24,960	93,782	27,783
1896-97	7	19	1,616	564	69,045	25,055	82,058	27,783
			1,662	710	65,410	23,571	84,902	32,914

During the decade the number of aided colleges increased by five; the average number on the rolls by 565 or 31 per cent., the grant-in-aid from Government by Rs. 26,937 or 43 per cent., and fees by Rs. 21,487 or 22 per cent. It will be noted that the increased contribution from Provincial revenues in the shape of grants-in-aid was about twice as much as the increased net cost to Government of Government colleges, that the average grant per student rose from Rs. 34½ to Rs. 37½ and that therefore the department cannot be charged with any partiality in favour of Government institutions or with any transgression of the principle enunciated by the Government of India, viz., that the improvement and extension of institutions under private management should be the principal care of the department.

The standard rate of fees in colleges under private management was thrice raised during the ten years ending with 1896-97:—

	Previous to 1st January 1887 per term.	From 1st January 1887 per term.	From 1st January 1892 per term.	From 1st January 1896 per term.
B.A. whole course				
English language division only	Rs. 25	Rs. 30	Rs. 36	Rs. 42
Second do. do.	..	..	..	..
Science division { Branch II or III only	..	..	18	14
F.A. course { Branch I, IV or V only	..	..	20	25
	25	30	30	34

Nevertheless the fee income did not increase in proportion to the average number on the rolls and the average fee in 1896-97 was Rs. 50 against Rs. 53 in 1887-88. How far this was due to the discretion as to the rates and levy of fees given to managers in the Fee Notification which came into effect from the 1st January 1892 and how far to the exaggerated figures in the returns furnished by managers previous to 1892 when fees were required to be levied at certain prescribed rates it is not easy to ascertain. On the one hand, it cannot be denied that under the old compulsory Fee Notification the figures in the fee returns were to a large extent fictitious, owing to the practice followed by some managers of paying the compulsory fee or a portion of it from their own pockets or from a special "fee fund": on the other hand, under both the compulsory and the voluntary fee system competition between colleges in the same neighbourhood (a competition stigmatized as "unwholesome" and "unfair" by those who do not succeed in it) has in some cases had the effect of making collegiate education cheaper to the student, by lowering the fees actually charged and by increasing the number of free or partially free scholarships. The question of re-imposing a compulsory scale of fees has lately again been raised. The arguments

7

against such a scale which were stated in the Government order instituting the present system in 1892 seem to me to be irresistible; but with the view of ascertaining the opinions of those who are principally concerned in the matter, I have recently called upon managers of all aided and unaided colleges and secondary schools to report whether the existing system has worked well and may be continued or whether they wish to have a compulsory fee rate. Twenty-seven colleges have up to date replied, 17 being for the continuance of the present regulations. Father Sewell, who is the manager of one of the largest and most important of the aided colleges in Southern India, the St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, states as his opinion "not only that the present system has been found to work harmoniously and well but that a return to a compulsory fee rate could only be followed by the same calamitous results to public morals which brought the former Fee Notification into disrepute with the great majority of the educationists of the day and necessitated its abolition in 1892." The Reverend G. H. Smith, Principal of the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, a college whose fee collections are no doubt affected by the presence of its wealthy neighbour, writes that he has "no hesitation in saying that a compulsory rate of fees would be welcomed by all managers of schools and colleges, would increase immensely the efficiency of education generally, would restore it to its proper status in the eyes of the people of India, *provided* that the educational authorities can devise some means for insuring the *bona fide* collection of fees at the rates appointed, *i.e.*, that the fee returns should give the actual cash paid by students, their parents or guardians, instead of imaginary sums paid by friends in Europe or elsewhere or nominally by members of the staff. Unless such provision can be made, a compulsory fee rate will be no remedy for the present troubles, but a serious aggravation of them." There is absolutely no means of preventing a manager or any one else interested in a college from helping the students to pay their fees even if such prevention were desirable. I propose to address Government on the whole question as soon as I hear from all managers. From Bengal I learn that no prescribed scale of fees is in force and I am informed that the same is the case in Bombay, though the department sees that a reasonable fee is levied; I also understand that no scrutiny of fee receipts in aided colleges is exercised in either of the above provinces. So far as I can see at present, the best way of inducing aided colleges to co-operate in the gradual raising of fees so that less and less aid may be required is to reduce grants gradually and at the same time to raise the standard rates of fees. This will in many cases compel managers to raise the rates at which they actually charge fees so as to make up for the loss of grant. The rates of fees in colleges under public management would, of course, be simultaneously raised proportionately or more than proportionately. If this process be carried out, some of the weaker colleges may perhaps go to the wall in the competition with their wealthier rivals, but I do not think that this is a matter with which the department should concern itself as long as the provision for collegiate education is ample, as it certainly is at present. Through its rules of recognition and its annual inspections, the department is in a position to see that the education, moral and intellectual, given in schools and colleges is of the kind desired by Government; and as long as this is the case, it is unnecessary to interfere with the financial arrangements of these institutions. On this subject also I purpose addressing Government shortly.

4

(iv) Lord Wenlock's speech, referred to in paragraph 8 of the Government of India resolution, was unfortunately worded and not quite in accord with facts and figures. I have shown already that, comparing the first and the last year of the decade ending with 1896-97, the increase in the grant from Provincial funds to aided colleges was about twice as much as the increase in the outlay from the same funds on Government colleges. Lord Wenlock's speech was made with reference to the Hon'ble Dr. Miller's observations, who remarked at a meeting of the Legislative Council that an additional grant would be easily got for a scheme connected with Government institutions as in the case of the Rajahmundry Training College, but not so for a scheme connected with the improvement of an aided institution. Dr. Miller himself then explained "I am very far from saying anything against the Rajahmundry College and very far from bringing any general charge against the Government of discouraging private education. I only wanted to point out that there was elasticity in the one and inelasticity in the other case." The proposal, which has since been

4

8

carried out, to start a college at Rajahmundry in order to train teachers for employment in the Telugu districts, did not involve any additional cost to Government, and the establishment of such a college was in itself highly desirable. Dr. Miller evidently did not care to ascertain whether any extra money was spent by Government on the Training College or not, and Lord Wenlock was apparently not fully informed. The Madras Christian College received in salary grants Rs. 19,501 in 1888-89, which rose to Rs. 20,081 in 1889-90, to Rs. 22,321 in 1890-91, to Rs. 23,055 in 1891-92, to Rs. 27,208 in 1892-93 and Rs. 28,205 in 1893-94, showing an increase of nearly nine thousand rupees in six years, and sufficient elasticity of funds so far as this particular college at least was concerned, and so Dr. Miller was unable to bring home to Government a definite charge of discouragement of private effort. Had His Excellency Lord Wenlock been aware of these facts he would not and could not have made the unfortunate statement referred to.

Lord Wenlock's statement has been utilized in certain quarters for all it is worth; but I submit that the Educational Department should not be judged by a casual remark of this kind, even when uttered by a gentleman in the high position occupied by Lord Wenlock; it should be judged rather by the actual work it has been able to accomplish with the scanty resources placed at its disposal.

Equally unfortunate is the statement in the Madras Report quoted in paragraph 71 of Mr. Cotton's review and referred to by the Government of India. It has plainly been made from a misapprehension of the facts of the case. Under the Grant-in-aid Code and the Fee Notification Government grant to an institution is limited to its net expenditure, *fees being calculated at the standard rates*, and no portion of the grant can, therefore, be considered as a subsidy intended to help a manager in recouping the loss of income from fees. No doubt most managers have shown a tendency to levy fees at rates lower than the standard rates. But this loss they make good and are expected to make good, not from increased grant, but from their private resources.

From a perusal of the figures given below the Government of India will be pleased to see that Madras has been encouraging private effort more than either Bengal or Bombay if the total grants paid to colleges be taken into account, and paid on an average more than twice as much as in Bengal for each student in an aided college:—

Year.	Madras.				Bombay.				Bengal.			
	Number of colleges.	Average number on the rolls.	Government grants.	Grant per head.	Number of colleges.	Average number on the rolls.	Government grants.	Grant per head.	Number of colleges.	Average number on the rolls.	Government grants.	Grant per head.
1892-93	..	25	2,460	Rs. 88,258	36	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1893-94	..	26	2,342	90,554	39	4	631	40,400	64	7	1,154	Rs. 25,120
1894-95	..	27	2,232	90,347	40	5	941	44,825	48	8	1,296	25,153
1895-96	..	24	2,080	89,930	43	5	1,024	47,927	47	8	1,340	25,624
1896-97	..	27	2,375	87,813	37	5	1,007	47,707	47	7	1,432	25,373
						950	49,942	53	7	1,426	25,293	18

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., No.	, dated	190
Again G.O., No.	, dated	190
Current No.	of 190 , dated	, from
" "	" 190 , "	" "
" "	" 190 , "	" "

Calli & H.R.

ORDER. No 371 d 18.8-00

The following letter will be sent to the Govt. of India.

H.P. 30.7.00

H.R.

Letter No 372 d 18.8-00
To Secy. D.G. of I.
Same dept.

Sir

In the 7th & 8th paragraphs of the Res. of the Government of India in the same Department, No. 495, 28th Oct. 1898, the position of Collegiate Education in Madras & other provinces was

Let me again see Mr. Cotton's Report the Govt. of I. Res. thereon, Mr. Stuart's Report when all the letters have been despatched.

*MA. 13.8.00
R.S.H.
15.8.00*

MA. Will be sent.

15.8.1900

attended to.

25/9/00

discussed.

2. As no special report from this Government has been asked for, & as the Gov. in Council does not now purpose making any remarks on the subject, but he believes that the ^{annexed} ~~appended~~ extracts from ^{a letter from} the Director of Public Instruction will be of interest to the Government of India, as showing ~~in a very clear way how far the local Educational department has paid~~ regard to the recommendations of the Education Commission, & also as correcting the erroneous impression which certain remarks made ^{ten years ago} by His Lord Melbourn at a meeting of the Legislative Council, under an evident misapprehension of the facts, ^{not unethically} have created.

Substitute for []
"clearly that this Govt. has
not failed to pay"

(It is the Govt., not the Educ.
Dept. that must assume
responsibility.) M.A.

Six.

30.714800

10 mm
00

W. S. H.

15.8.00

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189 .

DAYTON

Судант No.

ENCLOSURES to O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B. —

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