E. 15
300—9-11-00.

Educational (190/) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 141-142

DATED 12-3-01

INDEXED.

13

ORIGINAL.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Reports on Public Instruction

Addressing the Govt of India with reference to Mr Cotton's suggestions & recommendations for securing greater uniformity & completeness in the preparation of the ——.

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 {1901} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Recd. } 1901. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., &c., Nos. 141, 142, 12th March 1901.

MARCH.

Reports on Public Instruction.

Addressing the Government of India with reference to Mr. Cotton's suggestions and recommendations for securing greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers:—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.S.I., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Education), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Education Department, dated Calcutta, the 19th December 1900, No. 434.

In connection with the quinquennial report on education by Mr. J. S. Cotton, reviewed in Home Department Resolution, No. 495—506, dated 28th October 1899, I am directed to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, a copy of a confidential memorandum in which Mr. Cotton recorded certain suggestions and recommendations with a view to securing greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the Provincial reports and to convey the following remarks of the Government of India upon them.

2. The Government of India concur with Mr. Cotton that the Provincial Education reports which are prepared by Directors of Public Instruction should be drawn up on the general lines of the two last (Mr. Nash's and Mr. Cotton's) quinquennial reviews on education in India. It is important (1) that the reports should be as lucid as possible and as brief as is consistent with a proper account of the educational history of the period; (2) it is absolutely necessary that every change of importance should be invariably noticed in the body of the report; and (3) complete uniformity should exist between the entries in the statements attached to the report and the criticisms in the body of the report.

3. The Government of India are disposed to agree with Mr. Cotton in the following conclusions:—

(*a*) [(*1 and* 2) *of Mr. Cotton's Memorandum*].—That the common heading for both Arts Colleges and Professional Colleges should be "Collegiate" and not University education and that technical schools should be combined with industrial schools and that the heading "Technical and Industrial schools" should be substituted in the general tables and in the reports for "School education, Special."

(*b*) [(3) *of Mr. Cotton's Memorandum.*]—That in general table III advanced private institutions teaching "any other oriental classic" should be specially described and the subject taught in the school mentioned.

(*c*) [(4), (5) *and* (6) *of Mr. Cotton's Memorandum*].—It does not seem possible always to distinguish Provincial revenues according to their source as suggested by Mr. Cotton. Grants are made from Provincial revenues in general aid of Local Funds, and such grants could not apparently be shown as Provincial expenditure. Special grants are also often made from Provincial revenues to Local funds for educational purposes. But these sooner or later become merged in the general grants-in-aid as financial needs and conditions alter, and the change of transferring this expenditure from one head to another would be merely nominal. It appears to the Government of India that the best course would be to show in the general tables where necessary all expenditure from Local funds as such from whatever source their income may be derived, and to give supplementary figures in the body of the report showing the contribution from Provincial to Local funds in aid of education. Any changes in these figures such as is discussed above should be explained in the report. The heading "All other sources" in general table IV should be further sub-divided into "Private" and "Public," Native States and Imperial contributions being shown separately under the latter head.

(*d*) [(7) *and* (8) *in Mr. Cotton's Memorandum*].—In general table IV the expenditure on scholarships held in the two important classes of medical and technical schools should be shown, and under "Miscellaneous" the amount devoted to boarding houses should be distinguished.

(*e*) [(9) *of Mr. Cotton's Memorandum*].—In general table VI under Oriental Colleges proficiency in Urdu should have a heading of its own.

The Government of India would be glad to have the opinion of Local Governments and Administrations on the above proposals before they are finally adopted.

4. At pages 124 and 173 of his report, Mr. Cotton pointed out that the figures showing the number of institutions and pupils in primary schools do not convey the whole facts about primary education, because of the total number of pupils in secondary schools throughout India about three-fifths are in the primary stages of instruction. There are also pupils in primary schools who are in the secondary stage of instruction. With regard to the former Mr. Cotton states that speaking broadly the education thus given being primary instruction in secondary schools altogether evades detailed consideration in the reports. It appears to the Government of India that it would be advisable to give in the general tables or in the reports separate detailed figures including cost of boys and girls receiving primary instruction in secondary schools and also of schools giving secondary education which may now be classed as primary. The Government of India understand that in such schools in some provinces the teachers are employed part of the time on primary instruction and part on secondary instruction. In such cases it would be difficult to give an accurate statement of the cost, but information could be given showing that the primary students formed a certain percentage of the pupils of such schools and the same percentage of the cost of the school would, it is thought, represent the cost of the primary pupils. The statistics of primary education are also affected by the inclusion or exclusion of indigenous schools and infants (pages 177—181 of Mr. Cotton's Report). To secure more uniformity and precision in the figures for the future, it appears desirable that separate information should be given of (1) infants under 5 years of age, and (2) of all merely indigenous schools and their pupils until they have been continuously under the Education department for three years. I am to inquire whether these changes can be carried out and how they could be best given effect to.

5. At page 152 of his report, Mr. Cotton has given interesting figures showing the different classes of the candidates who appeared at the Matriculation Examination of the Madras Presidency. The classes specified are Brahmans, non-Brahman Hindus, Native Christians, Muhammadans and Europeans. Similar information is not given in the reports on Public Instruction in the other provinces and the sub-division into races and creeds in general table VI is made in less detail. The Government of India are of opinion that it would be interesting to give more detailed information as to the classes to which the successful candidates for the University and departmental examinations belong, and think that this can best be done by eliminating the column for Hindus now in general table VI, and adding four columns to show Brahmans, non-Brahman Hindus, Buddhists and Parsis respectively.

6. At page 74 of his report, Mr. Cotton refers to a discrepancy in the compilation of the results of the B.A. Examination of the Madras University. The result as Mr. Cotton points out of the mode of classification adopted is that a candidate who has passed more than one of the three divisions of the B.A. Examination is entered in the returns more than once and possibly three times. The Government of India concur with Mr. Cotton that it is only when a candidate has passed in all three divisions which may be taken up in different years that he can be said to have passed the B.A. Examination. I am to request that in future returns the figures may be compiled on this principle.

7. The want of comparative statistics relating to training schools is of considerable importance. Mr. Cotton has dealt with the question in chapter VII of his report and has expressed the opinion that the comparative statistics of training schools are of no value owing to the great divergencies in the character of these schools in the different provinces. He suggests that each Director of Public Instruction should be allowed to explain his own system as far as possible in his report. While the Government of India see no objection to this proposal, they think it would be better if some systematic classification of these schools could be adopted. In the opinion of the Governor-General in Council it is most important to watch the efficiency of all training colleges and normal schools, and for this reason he desires that besides a full description of the equipment, quality and results, figures shall be given showing exactly the sums spent upon them and the sources of the income. His Excellency in Council will be glad to be favoured with the opinion of Local Governments and Administrations as to the best means of doing this.

8. At page 250 of his Report, Mr. Cotton notices the defective state of the figures for industrial schools. There has been a yearly decrease in the number of pupils in such schools in Bengal, while in Madras and the Central Provinces the nomenclature of such schools has either been changed or they have disappeared altogether from the returns. The Government of India would be glad if more detailed information could be given in the reports of the causes which have led to the decrease in the number of industrial schools and pupils, and of the expenditure contributed from public funds towards such institutions.

9. Another defect which should now be remedied exists in general table III appended to the Provincial reports.* This table exhibits the different classes of educational institutions and the number of scholars in each class. At the end of the table are two entries:—

* Reports for 1898–99. Page 52 of appendix.

(1) Number of scholars on the 31st March learning—

(*a*) English,
(*b*) a classical language,
(*c*) a vernacular language,

and (2) number of scholars on the 31st March classified according to race or creed.

In neither of these entries are the scholars distinguished by sex, but the distinction would be useful because the figures would show at a glance as regards female education, first, the relative numbers of girls in the different stages of education as set out in the first of the two entries, and, secondly, would indicate the relative progress of female education in the different races and creeds. Such information for female education is obviously desirable, but it is not now given in any of the tables.

I am to request, therefore, that, in the first of these two entries, the sexes may in future be distinguished. As regards the second, it should be omitted from the table, and made with enlargements a new table, supplementary to table No. 3, and numbered 3A. The table should be in the form attached.

10. Mr. Cotton has complained of the inconvenience of having for some provinces only the figures of the first and last years of the quinquennium. I am to request that the next quinquennial Provincial reports may contain the returns of each of the five years under review.

Enclosure.

EDUCATION—GENERAL TABLE III A.

Number of Scholars on the 31st March, classified according to Sex, Race, or Creed.

—	Europeans and Eurasians.	Native Christians.	Hindus.	Muhammadans.	Buddhists.	Parsis.	Others.
Collegiate Education.							
Arts Colleges.							
English .. .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Oriental .. .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Colleges for Professional Training.							
Law .. .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Medicine .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Engineering .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Teaching .. .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Agriculture .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Total ..							
School Education—General.							
Secondary Schools.							
For boys—							
High schools .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Middle schools—							
English .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Vernacular .. Male ..							
Female ..							
For Girls—							
High Schools .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Middle Schools—							
English .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Vernacular .. .. Male ..							
Female ..							
Total ..							

Number of Scholars on the 31st March, classified according to Sex, Race, or Creed—*cont.*

—		Europeans and Eurasians.	Native Christians.	Hindus.	Muhammadans.	Buddhists.	Parsis.	Others.
School Education—General—*cont.*								
Primary Schools.								
For Boys	Male ..							
	Female ..							
For Girls	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Total ..								
School Education—Special.								
Schools for Special Instruction.								
Training Schools	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Schools of Art	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Law Schools	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Medical Schools	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Engineering and Surveying Schools.	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Industrial Schools ..	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Other Schools	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Total ..								
Total of Colleges and Schools of Public Instruction								
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS.								
1. Advanced Teaching.								
(*a*) Arabic or Persian ..	Male ..							
	Female ..							
(*b*) Sanskrit	Male ..							
	Female ..							
(*c*) Any other Oriental Classic.	Male ..							
	Female ..							

Number of Scholars on the 31st March, classified according to Sex, Race, or Creed—*cont.*

—		Europeans and Eurasians.	Native Christians.	Hindus.	Muhammadans.	Buddhists	Parsis.	Others.
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS—*cont.*								
2. Elementary Teaching—Vernacular only or Mainly.								
For Boys	Male ..							
	Female ..							
For Girls	Male ..							
	Female ..							
3. Elementary Teaching—The Koran only.								
For Boys	Male ..							
	Female ..							
For Girls	Male ..							
	Female ..							
4. Other Schools not conforming to Departmental Standards.								
For Boys	Male ..							
	Female ..							
For Girls	Male ..							
	Female ..							
Total of Private Institutions ..								
Grand Total ..								

No. 4, Educational.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

(By order.)

(Signed) A. T. PRINGLE,
Assistant Secretary.

9th January 1901.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Director of Public Instruction, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, dated 8th February 1901, Ref. on C. No. 88-A.

I have the honour to resubmit with the following remarks endorsement No. 4, dated 9th January last, on the letter of the Government of India, No. 434, Home Department—Education, remarking on Mr. Cotton's suggestions and recommendations to secure greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the report on Public Instruction.

2. The Government of India are disposed to agree with Mr. Cotton in the following conclusions:—

(*a*) The common heading for both Arts and Professional Colleges should be "Collegiate" and not "University" education.

(*b*) Technical schools should be combined with industrial schools and the heading "Technical and Industrial schools" should be substituted in the general tables and in the reports for "School education—Special."

(*c*) In general table 3, advanced private institutions teaching "any other oriental classic" should be specially described and the subject taught in the school mentioned.

(*d*) In the general tables should be shown where necessary all expenditure from Local funds as such, from whatever source their income may be derived, and supplementary figures should be given in the body of the report, showing the contribution from Provincial to Local funds in aid of education, any changes in these figures being explained in the report.

(*e*) The heading "all other sources" in general table 4 should be further sub-divided into "private" and "public," Native States and Imperial contributions being shown separately under the latter head.

(*f*) In general table 4 the expenditure on scholarships held in medical and technical schools should be shown, and under "Miscellaneous" the amount devoted to boarding houses should be distinguished.

(*g*) In general table 6 under Oriental colleges, proficiency in Urdu should have a heading of its own.

Of the above proposals, (*d*) and (*g*) have already been carried out in this Presidency. There is a separate heading for proficiency in Urdu in general table 6. In general table 7 all expenditure from Local funds is shown as such from whatever sources they are derived, the contribution from Provincial funds being also shown separately under the head "Provincial grants."

The other proposals are all new and I see no objection to their being adopted.

3. In paragraph 4 of the letter of the Government of India, it is said that it would be advisable to give in the general tables or in the reports separate detailed figures including cost of boys and girls receiving primary education in secondary schools and also of schools giving secondary education which may now be classed as primary, and that in the case of schools in which the teachers are employed during part of their time on primary instruction and part on secondary instruction, the cost of the school might be distributed between the primary and secondary departments in proportion to the number of pupils in those departments. The Government of India further desire that to secure more uniformity and precision in the statistics of primary education, separate information should be given (1) of infants under five years of age, (2) of all merely indigenous schools and their pupils until they have been continuously under the Education department for three years. With regard to the distribution of cost between the primary and secondary departments of schools, the principle that is followed by the department is somewhat different from the one proposed by the Government of India. The average attendance of pupils in the departments is taken as the basis of distribution in regard to expenditure on furniture, appliances, contingencies and other items of expenditure which are common to the several departments, but the salaries of the teachers are distributed in proportion to the *time* spent by them in the several departments. This method of distributing the cost of a school between its several departments seems to be more equitable than the one proposed by the Government of India. The proposal that information should be furnished regarding infants under five years of age is hardly practicable as in this Presidency such infants are scarcely ever sent to school. A statement may be furnished of the very few that do attend school, but this will serve no useful purpose. With reference to indigenous schools, I may point out that the figures relating to them are excluded from the statistics given in the chapter of the report dealing with primary education. They are however included in the chapter on private institutions, though they are not separately dealt with. I understand that the Government of India now desire that information regarding all merely indigenous schools should be separately shown. This may be done in future reports. It is also required that this information should be given "until the schools and pupils have been continuously under the Education department for three years." This limitation would seem to have no application in this Presidency where indigenous schools are mostly independent of the department, or merely come under inspection year after year with no restriction as to the number of years they may continue in this connection with the department.

4. In paragraph 5 of the letter under reference it is suggested that in general table 6 a more detailed classification as to race or creed should be given of the successful candidates at the various examinations. As the materials for this table are mainly gathered from the reports of the University and of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, the suggestion is not feasible unless the proposed classification is adopted also in those reports. Information again is not given in the University reports to enable this office to compile the figures relating to the results of the B.A. examination on the principle proposed in paragraph 6. It should, however, be available in the Registrar's office.

5. Paragraph 7 deals with training schools and it is required that full information as to the equipment, income, expenditure, &c., of these schools should be given in the report. I beg to invite the attention of Government to paragraphs 103 to 115 and appendices J and K of the report on Public Instruction for 1896–97, from which it will be seen that the required information is already given. The remark does not therefore seem to apply to this Presidency. The only additional information perhaps that may be required to enable Government to gauge the efficiency and usefulness of training institutions may be given in a comparative statement for the quinquennium ending with the year under report, showing for each district—

(1) the number of recognised schools;
(2) the number of teachers employed in them (*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained;
(3) the increase or decrease during the year in the number of (*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained teachers;
(4) the number of training schools of each grade;
(5) the number of students of each grade that passed out during the year;
(6) the number that secured employment (*a*) in the district, (*b*) elsewhere.

In regard to the classification of these institutions, I cannot think of any better principle than the one adopted in this Presidency, where they are graded according to the general education qualifications of the students trained in them.

6. The points referred to in paragraphs 8 and 9 will be attended to in future reports. Part of the information required in regard to industrial schools, viz., that relating to expenditure from public funds is already given, as may be seen from paragraph 129 of the report on Public Instruction for 1896–97.

———

Order—No. 141, Educational, dated 12th March 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

———

Letter—No. 142, Educational, dated Fort St. George, 12th March 1901, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 434, Education, dated 19th December 1900, forwarding, with remarks, the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr. Cotton with a view to secure greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the reports on public instruction.

2. In reply, I am to state that, of the proposals mentioned in paragraph 3 of the letter, two have already been carried out in this Presidency, and that the Governor in Council sees no objection to the adoption of the others.

3. As regards paragraph 4, I am to observe that the principle which is followed in this presidency in distributing the cost of schools between the primary and secondary departments is somewhat different from the one proposed by the Government of India. The average attendance of pupils is here taken as the basis of distribution in respect of expenditure on furniture, appliances, contingencies and other items which are common to the several departments, but the salaries of the teachers are distributed

in proportion to the time spent by them in each department. This method seems to the Governor in Council to be more equitable than that suggested in your letter.

In this presidency scarcely any infants under five years of age are sent to school; while therefore there is no objection to the preparation of a statement it would not serve any useful purpose.

With reference to indigenous schools, the figures relating to them are excluded from the statistics given in the chapters of the Madras report dealing with primary education. In the chapter on private institutions they are included but not separately dealt with. If it is the desire of the Government of India that information regarding all merely indigenous schools should be separately shown, this will be done in future reports. The requirement that this information should be given until the schools and pupils have been continuously under the Education department for three years would seem however to have no application to the Madras presidency, where indigenous schools are mostly independent of the department or merely come under inspection year after year with no restriction as to the number of years they may continue in such a connection.

4. In paragraph 5 of your letter, it is suggested that in general table 6 a more detailed classification as to race or creed should be given of the successful candidates at the various examinations. As the materials for this table are mainly gathered from the reports of the University and of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, the suggestion is not feasible unless the proposed classification is adopted in those reports also.

5. Similarly, information is not at present available in the University reports which will be of assistance in the compilation of the figures relating to the results of the B.A. degree examination on the principle suggested in paragraph 6 of your letter.

6. With reference to paragraph 7 of your letter, I am to invite attention to paragraphs 103 to 115 and appendices J and K of the Madras report on public instruction for 1896–97, from which it will be seen that the information required by the Government of India is already furnished in Madras reports. Additional information will be given, if it is so desired, in a comparative statement for the quinquennium ending with the year under report, which shall show for each district—

(1) the number of recognized schools;
(2) the number of teachers employed in them—(*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained;
(3) the yearly increase or decrease in the number of (*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained teachers;
(4) the number of training schools of each grade;
(5) the yearly number of students of each grade who passed out;
(6) the number of students who secured employment—(*a*) in the district, (*b*) elsewhere.

In regard to the classification of these institutions, the Governor in Council cannot think of any better principle than the one adopted in this presidency where they are graded according to the general education qualification of the students trained in them.

7. The instructions in paragraphs 8 and 9 of your letter will be attended to in future reports.

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Ead. A. D. Xavier.

Educational and Legislative Department.

CONFIDENTIAL.

M. Cotton's memorandum

ENCLOSURE.

[CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.]

Having completed my Quinquennial Review on the Progress of Education in India from 1892-93 to 1896 97, from which anything in the nature of criticism has been scrupulously excluded, I venture now to submit to the Government of India, in a confidential Memorandum, certain comments upon the educational system which have forced themselves upon my attention in the course of the work. These comments will be confined to the external characteristics of the system, as disclosed by the General Tables and the Reports of the several Directors of Public Instruction. They will not deal with the actual working upon which I feel myself incompetent to express an opinion of any value. My chief object is to indicate minor inconsistencies in the system, and to suggest means for effecting greater clearness and uniformity.

With regard to the General Tables, upon which the entire plan of my own work is based, I must begin by stating that they appear to me to stand in need of very little change. I would only suggest that in future General Table VIII, dealing with hostels or boarding-houses, should be framed on the same plan as the rest; and that an additional table might be given for European education, as is done in some of the provincial reports.

It is with much diffidence that I submit some criticisms upon the classification of institutions and sources of expenditure in the general tables, which must be taken for what they are worth.

(1) The common heading for both arts colleges and professional colleges should be "Collegiate" and *not* "University" education. Not only would this be more exact, but it would save confusion with the heading "University."

(2) Under "Special Schools," there should either be a separate heading for technical schools, or they should be combined with industrial schools as "Technical and Industrial Schools." It is evident that in most provinces they have been thus combined, whereas Madras alone has thrown almost all its technical schools into miscellaneous class of "Other Schools."

(3) Among private institutions, I am altogether sceptical about the actual existence of those advanced ones (*c*) described as teaching "any other oriental classic" (*see* page 360 of any Review).

(4) Provincial revenues should uniformly be distinguished according to their source, and *not* (as seems to be the case in Bengal) according to their object. If I understand the Bengal report aright (pages 9, 10, 72), when a sum of money is diverted from schools managed by Government to schools managed by Boards, it is then transferred in the accounts from Provincial Revenues to Local Funds. I suspect, also, that something of the same kind has taken place in Coorg.

(5) The grant from Imperial Revenues to the Punjab (for the Lawrence Asylums, etc.) disappears among "Other Sources" in General Table IV. I observe that in Madras the expenditure on the Lawrence Asylums is provided from Provincial Revenues.

(6) In the total expenditure in General Table IV there should be a separate heading for Native State Revenues, which are at present included among "Other Sources." If Imperial Revenues and Native State Revenues could be eliminated from "Other Sources," this heading would then practically consist of subscriptions and endowments, with a few miscellaneous receipts, and might properly be considered as forming (with fees) "Private" as opposed to "Public" funds.

(7) If possible, under "Scholarships held in Special Schools other than Training Schools," scholarships held in the two important classes of Medical and Technical schools should be distinguished. At present, there is no means of ascertaining how much is spent on scholarships for technical instruction.

(8) Under "Miscellaneous," it would be very desirable to distinguish the amount devoted to boarding-houses, which, I apprehend, forms a large proportion of the whole.

(9) General Table VI, showing the results of prescribed examinations, has given me a great deal of trouble, which is not entirely due to the fact that the system of examinations varies excessively in the different provinces. With regard to examinations in arts colleges, I will content myself here with calling attention to what I have said on page 74 of my Review. It is futile to add totals when the items are not homogeneous. Under Oriental Colleges proficiency in Urdu should have a heading of its own. Under Law Colleges all the entries for master of law are incorrect (*see* page 111 of my Review). Under Medical Colleges the totals given cannot be reconciled with the items in the provincial reports. So again for both the matriculation and the middle school examination, the totals cannot be reconciled with the provincial reports.

I now pass on to the reports of the Directors, which I propose to take up in order. And here I must carefully guard myself against any suspicion of personal feeling. I am not concerned with their ability, their devotion to their work, or even with the results. It would be absurd for me to presume to criticise their administration. All I can attempt is to draw attention to certain features in their reports, which seem to me capable of improvement. I take the general tables as my basis, and I consider the reports chiefly from that standpoint. My own object has been to try to understand the several systems, and to focus them all upon one scale. I proceed to mention some of the difficulties that I encountered in my task, owing to the imperfections of the materials provided in the reports.

(1) The Madras Report is quite the most elaborate of all, and leaves little to be desired in respect of fullness of information. I have already mentioned the inclusion of technical schools among "Other Special Schools," and the error about arts degrees in General Table VI. The only other points that have attracted my notice are: the omission of any description of principal institutions (*e.g.*, the Presidency College); inadequate explanation of the various systems on which grants are made to aided institutions; some confusion in stating the results of examinations (*e.g.*, girls not always distinguished from boys); and insufficient treatment of boarding-houses. However, when the Madras Director has given so much, I am ashamed to ask him to give more.

(2) The Bombay Report unfortunately adopts throughout the year 1892-93, instead of the year 1891-92, for comparison with 1896-97. The division of the Report into Parts I and II is confusing, especially as the arrangement in each part is not quite identical. Considering the effects of the plague, it would have been desirable to give in all cases (as has been done in some cases) the corresponding figures for 1895-96. A separate chapter should have been given for Native States, and Native State Revenues should throughout be distinguished from "Other Sources." The accompanying maps colour Baroda, but the statistics for Baroda are not (except incidentally) included in the Report. Insufficient mention is made of the education of backward classes, of private institutions, of boarding-houses, of physical and moral training, of educational conferences, and of text-books and libraries. Altogether, while the Report gives the relevant figures and facts, it is deficient in elucidatory explanation.

(3) The Report for Bengal deserves similar praise to that for Madras, though the copy supplied to me is unfortunately without maps. I must, however, observe that it is disfigured by occasional misprints and slipshod English. Mention has already been made of the illegitimate transfer (not confined to the period under review) from Provincial Revenues to Local Funds. While recognising the object of the Director in appending supplementary sections to his chapters, I think that most of what is contained in them would preferably have been included in the chapters themselves. Considering the importance of the "Aided" system in Bengal, a special chapter might be devoted to it. The description of the middle and primary examinations is not readily intelligible. From pages 47, 48, it would seem that there are some secondary schools maintained by Native States in Orissa and Chota Nagpur, which are returned as "Unaided." There must also be primary schools of this class, though no

mention is made of them. It ought not to be impossible to obtain educational statistics from Kuch Behar and the State of Tipperah.

(4) The Report for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh is throughout compiled on a system of its own, not readily reconcilable with the general tables. No reference is made to Mr. Nash's Review, nor are his statistics adopted for comparison. Schools are classified, not as secondary and primary, but as Anglo-Vernacular and Vernacular. High schools are ignored, nor is any distinction made between schools managed by Government and those managed by boards. Private institutions are scarcely alluded to. So again with expenditure. No distinction is drawn between Provincial Revenues and Local Funds, so that I am unable to learn with certainty from which source came the special grant of R75,000 for extending primary education in 1896-97. No list is given of the inspecting staff. Nothing is said about educational conferences, or about the education of backward classes. The information about special institutions (*e.g.*, the Rurki Engineering College) is extremely meagre, particularly in respect of expenditure and comparative statistics. The figures given in the report frequently do not agree with those given in the General Tables (*see* pages 237 and 239 of the Review). While I admit that the copious and free spoken criticisms of the Director will probably be valuable for those who understand the provincial system (which seems sadly to need some regenerating influence), I regret that I have been unable to contrast the system intelligibly with others.

(5) The Punjab Report is clear and consistent, therein reflecting the progressive character of public instruction in that province. The condensed reports on the several colleges might advantageously be imitated elsewhere. Nothing is said about the finances of the Punjab University. The three chapters on secondary, primary and female education are confined to natives of India. This is, I think, a mistake, partly because it prevents comparison with other provinces, and also because European education has a chapter to itself. It is bewildering to find three sets of general tables, for pupils generally, for Europeans and for natives. It would be enough to have two, for pupils generally, and for Europeans, as I have recommended above. I have already commented upon the inclusion of grants from Imperial Revenues under "Other Sources." On pages 217, 218 of my Review, I have referred to an inconsistency by which the expenditure on scholarships in primary schools is returned as R13,219 in General Table IV, and as only R342 in the Report (pages 41, 42).

(6) The Report for the Central Provinces likewise requires little comment. The important question of education in the Native States is generally distinguished with success, but it deserves a special chapter.

(7) The Burma Report is even more confusing than that for the North-Western Provinces. As in Bombay, the year chosen throughout for comparison is 1892-93, though the maps rightly give 1891-92. No list is given of the inspecting staff. The expenditure sometimes is omitted altogether, and never properly discussed. The details, and also the totals for primary schools in the Report (page 14), are irreconcilable with those given in General Table III. The figures for female education (page 64) are vitiated by the inclusion of boys attending girls' schools. No description is given of schools for surveying which seem to be numerous and well attended. We are told (page 2) that "in technical education a great advance has been made"; whereas, as a matter of fact, it appears (*ib.*) that the only two technical schools formerly existing have been closed, though 12 industrial branches have been opened in schools for general instruction. In General Table III, all the six training schools are classified as managed by Government, though it is evident from page 52 that five of them are missionary institutions. Nothing is said about boarding-houses, which are exceptionally numerous, with a total expenditure larger than in Bengal. No returns of expenditure are furnished for 2,216 unaided primary schools, with 42,359 pupils. Above all no explanation is given of the change in system by which the total number of pupils in primary schools for boys has dropped in five years from 128,554 to 119,250, or by 8 per cent., while the increase for India generally is 13 per cent. No doubt the system of education in Burma is complicated, and not yet firmly established. But the Director gives no intelligible explanation of it; and it is evident that

the Department has a large field before it in bringing indigenous schools under its influence.

(8) The Report for Assam errs on the side of meagreness, which may be due to the fact that the Director responsible for it was only officiating. He has for the most part contented himself with supplying the figures required to bring up to date the statistics in Mr. Nash's Review. He gives no explanation of the recent extraordinary progress in female education, nor any description of the work of the missionaries among the Hill tribes. The system of primary examinations seems weaker in Assam even than in Bengal; and it is astonishing that the province of the tea-planters cannot maintain a school for Europeans worthy of the name.

(9) The Report for Berar shows praiseworthy industry on the part of the Director, who is a native of India; but it is open to some criticisms. The system of Berar is peculiar in that practically all the Secondary schools are managed by Government, and nearly three-fourths of the primary pupils attend Board schools. The Director, therefore, is naturally led to concentrate his attention on these two classes, to the comparative neglect of aided and unaided schools. In other words, his Report tends to be a report on the work of the Department only, and not on the condition of public instruction at large. The treatment of fees is altogether unintelligible. As mentioned in page 34 of my Review, the total expenditure from fees is returned in General Table IV as only R48,696, as compared with R90,699 five years before. But this ignores the fees paid in Board primary schools, which are variously returned in the report as amounting (page 5) to R38,412 and (page 26) to R41,745. I can only assume that these fees are not credited to the Department, but retained by the schoolmasters. Similarly, the fees in primary Board schools for girls are returned on page 43 of the report as R301, but are ignored in General Table IV. The result, of course, is that all the returns for fees from Berar are worthless.

(10) The Coorg Report requires no comment, except that no explanation is given of the fact that local funds (apparently a plough tax) have diminished in five years from R6,564 to R1,202.

Finally, I would humbly recommend, for the benefit of the compiler of the next Quinquennial Review, that the reports of Directors (or at least their next Quinquennial Reports) should be drawn up in every case on the general lines of my Review, which itself follows Mr. Nash's Review. It would not be necessary to copy all my tables, still less all my percentages and averages. Directors should not be discouraged to supply additional information (such as about the aided system or the extent of missionary contributions); but their first duty should be to explain the general system of public instruction, including the effects of any changes introduced, as revealed by the figures shown in the General Tables, which furnish the only uniform standard for all India.

I would further suggest a few minor recommendations. In the next Quinquennial Reports of the Directors, the tables generally should contain the figures for each one of the five years of the quinquennial period (as has been done by the Madras Director), in order to show continuity of progress; and the figures for the two preceding quinquennial years should be included for comparison. The statistics required for the maps should always be given according to the divisions or groups of districts adopted. The educational statistics for Ajmer and Bangalore ought to be included; possibly also those for such advanced Native States as Mysore, Travancore, and Baroda.

January 1899.

JAS. S. COTTON.

G. I. C. P. O.—No. 715 H. D.—18-12-1900.—300.—P. K. B.

Educational (190/) Department.

CURRENT No. 9

From

[Name] J. P. Hewett Esq C.S.I. C.I.E.

[Designation] Secretary to the Govt of India Home dept.

[Station] Calcutta.

No. 434

Dated 19. 12. 1900.

Received 24. 12. 1900.

Enclosures 2

Registered 7. 1. 1901.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding a Copy of a Confidential memorandum containing certain Suggestions & recommendations for securing greater uniformity & Completeness in the preparation of the reports on public Instruction, & Conveying certain Remarks of the Govt of India upon them.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

1,000—16-11-00.

3 412

Educational (190/) Department.

CURRENT No. 177

ASSISTT SECY TO GOVT
11.FEB.1901
JUDL EDL & LEG DEPT

From

[Name] The Honourable Mr.G.H.Stuart,M.A.,Bar-at-Law,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

FEB 1901

Ref. *No.* 88 (a) of 01

Dated 8th February 190 1.

Enclosures 4

Received 11. 2. 190/.

Registered 12. 2. 190/.

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting with remarks letter from the Government of India, Home Department/Education, No 454, dated 19th December 1900 remarking on Mr.Cotton's suggestions and recommendations to secure greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the report on Public Instruction.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

13/4

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to resubmit with the following remarks endorsement No 4, dated 9th January last on the letter of the Government of India, No 434 Home Department Education remarking on Mr.Cotton's suggestions and recommendations to secure greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the report on Public Instruction.

2. The Government of India are disposed to agree with Mr.Cotton in the following conclusions.

(a) The common heading for both Arts and Professional Colleges should be "Collegiate" and not "University" education.

(b) Technical schools should be combined with Industrial schools and the heading "Technical and Industrial schools" should be substituted in the general tables and in the reports for "School education-Special".

(c) In general table 5, advanced private institutions teaching "any other oriental classic" should be specially described and the subject taught in the school mentioned.

(d) In the general tables should be shown where necessary all expenditure from local funds as such, from whatever source their income may be derived, and supplementary figures should be given in the body of the report, showing the contribution from provincial to local funds in aid of education, any changes in these figures being explained in the report.

(e) The heading "all other sources" in general table 4 should be further subdivided into "private" and "public", Native States and Imperial contributions being shown separately under the latter head.

ORDER—No. 141, Educational, dated 12th March ~~February~~ 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed.

[Here, enter letter No. 142 Educational, dated 12th March ~~February~~ 1901.]

(True Extract.)

Assistant Secretary to Government.

Exd. P. Seetharam.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

The Secretary to the Government of
Fort St. George,

To

The Secretary to the Government of India,
Home Department.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 434, Education, dated 19th December 1900, forwarding, with remarks, the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr. Cotton with a view to secure greater uniformity and completeness in the preparation of the reports on public instruction.

2. In reply, I am to state that, of the proposals mentioned in paragraph 3 of the letter, two have already been carried out in this Presidency, and that the Governor in Council sees no objection to the adoption of the others.

3. As regards paragraph 4, I am to observe that the principle which is followed in this Presidency in distributing the cost of schools between the primary and secondary departments is somewhat different from the one proposed by the Government of India. The average attendance of pupils is here taken as the basis of distribution in respect of expenditure on furniture, appliances, contingencies and other items which are common to the several departments, but the salaries of the teachers are distributed in proportion to the time spent by them in each department. This method seems to the Governor in Council to be more equitable than that suggested in your letter.

In this Presidency scarcely any infants under five years of age are sent to school; while therefore there is no objection to the supply of a statement it would not serve any useful purpose.

With reference to indigenous schools, the figures relating to them are excluded from the statistics given in the chapters of the Madras report dealing with primary education. In the chapter on private institutions they are included but not separately dealt with. If it is the desire of the Government of India that information regarding all merely indigenous schools should be separately shown, this will be done in future reports. The ~~limitation~~ requirement that this information should be given until the schools and pupils have been continuously under the Education department for three years would seem however to have no application to the Madras Presidency, where indigenous schools are mostly independent of the department or merely come under inspection year after year with no restriction as to the number of years they may continue in such a connection.

4. In paragraph 5 of your letter, it is suggested that in general table 6 a more detailed classification as to race or creed should be given of the successful candidates at the various examinations. As the materials for this table are mainly gathered from the reports of the University and of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, the suggestion is not feasible unless the proposed classification is adopted in those reports also.

5. Similarly information is not at present available in the University reports which will be of assistance in the compilation of the figures relating to the results of the B.A. degree examination on the principle suggested in paragraph 6 of your letter.

6. With reference to paragraph 7 of your letter, I am to invite attention to paragraphs 103 to 115 and appendices J and K of the Madras report on public instruction for 1896–97, from which it will be seen that the information required by the Government of India is already furnished in Madras reports. Additional information will be given, if it is so desired, in a comparative statement for the quinquennium ending with the year under report, which shall show for each district—

(1) the number of recognized schools;
(2) the number of teachers employed in them—(*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained;
(3) the yearly increase or decrease in the number of (*a*) trained, (*b*) untrained teachers;
(4) the number of training schools of each grade;
(5) the yearly number of students of each grade who passed out;
(6) the number of students who secured employment—(*a*) in the district, (*b*) elsewhere.

In regard to the classification of these institutions, the Governor in Council cannot think of any better principle than the one adopted in this Presidency where they are graded according to the general education qualification of the students trained in them.

7. The instructions in paragraphs 8 and 9 of your letter will be attended to in future reports.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Fort St. George,
February 1901.

Asst. Secretary to Government.

Ead A. D. Xavier.

copy sent to Press.

rned for signature.

atched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. 60 / Order complete with Letter. 20

AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
1 .

6

RRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

RDER OF GOVERNMENT.

ETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
AL.

N.B.—

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