Educational (190/) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 297

DATED 31.5.01

INDEXED.

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Educational Rules

Ordering the omission of art. 30

Chapter VI of the ———

The Notes
in these Proceedings have been printed.

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.

Read. } 1901. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 297, 31st May 1901.

MAY.

Educational Rules.

Ordering the omission of article 30, Chapter VI of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, dated Madras, 2nd April 1901, Ref. on C. No. 15141 of 1900.

I have the honour to recommend that the title of "Associate of the Teachers' College" may be conferred on the following Licentiates in Teaching who have been trained in the Teachers' College and otherwise satisfy the conditions laid down in article 30, Chapter VI of the Madras Educational Rules. The Principal of the Teachers' College considers them to be deserving of the title; and judging from the facts of their career as teachers and the testimonials they have submitted, I think they may be considered as having served with credit:—

(1) Anantanarayana Aiyar, K. C. S., Acting Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Nellore range.

(2) Bhavaniswami Rau, T. T., Acting 4th Assistant, Government College, Kumbakónam.

(3) Gnanakkan Nadar, A., Headmaster, Caldwell High School, Tuticorin.

(4) Ramaswami Aiyangar, M., Acting 1st Assistant, Government Training College, Rajahmundry.

(5) Venkateswara Aiyar, K., Headmaster, English Normal School, Trivandrum.

Order—No. 297, Educational, dated 31st May 1901.

The Government do not propose to take any action on the article to which the Director refers. That article will now be removed from the Educational Rules and the following notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*:—

NOTIFICATION.

The Governor in Council is pleased to direct that article 30 of Chapter VI of the Educational Rules shall be cancelled.

(True Extract.)

C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
Gazette.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Government {1901} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

I remember Venn up when first became in grammar singular; and perhaps awkward when situation. I still feel as awkward now it becomes plural.

But though the change of number in "Educational" question of protest I may be an "Educational" question I should like to know what "Public" has to say on it

Recd. } 1901. *Enclosures* 4 15/6.01
Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 297, 31st May 1901.

MAY.

Educational Rules.

Ordering the omission of article 30, Chapter VI of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, dated Madras, 2nd April 1901, Ref. on C. No. 15141 of 1900.

I have the honour to recommend that the title of "Associate of the Teachers' College" may be conferred on the following Licentiates in Teaching who have been trained in the Teachers' College and otherwise satisfy the conditions laid down in article 30, Chapter VI of the Madras Educational Rules. The Principal of the Teachers' College considers them to be deserving of the title; and judging from the facts of their career as teachers and the testimonials they have submitted, I think they may be considered as having served with credit:—

(1) Anantanarayana Aiyar, K. C. S., Acting Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, Nellore range.

(2) Bhavaniswami Rau, T. T., Acting 4th Assistant, Government College, Kumbakónam.

(3) Gnanakkan Nadar, A., Headmaster, Caldwell High School, Tuticorin.

(4) Ramaswami Aiyangar, M., Acting 1st Assistant, Government Training College, Rajahmundry.

(5) Venkateswara Aiyar, K., Headmaster, English Normal School, Trivandrum.

Order—No. 297, Educational, dated 31st May 1901.

The Government do not propose to take any action on the article to which the Director refers. That article will now be removed from the Educational Rules and the following notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*:—

NOTIFICATION.

The Governor in Council is pleased to direct that article 30 of Chapter VI of the Educational Rules shall be cancelled.

(True Extract.)

C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
Gazette.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Educational Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 297, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 31st MAY 1901.

[Subject.—*Associates of the Teachers' College.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, Ref. on C. No. 15141 *of* 1900, *dated 2nd April* 1901.

The current may be submitted to His Excellency for orders. This is the first nomination that has been sent up by the Director since the rule was framed in 1890.

Honourable Member's orders may be awaited.
C. J. Weir.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai.
8-4-01.

When the Teachers' College was reorganized in 1890 and a code of rules was drawn up for its management, this rule was inserted as the last in the code. The reasons which induced the late Mr. Grigg to propose it will be found in paragraph 10 of his letter on page 4 of G.O. Nos. 21, 22, Educational, dated 14th January 1890. Subsequently, when the educational rules were revised, the above rule was transferred to these—*vide* rule 42 on page 22 of G.O. No. 271, Educational, dated 28th March 1892. They were again revised in 1896 and the rule now stands as 30 on page 75 of the book put up.

P. T. Tharyan.
9-4-01.

Mr. Stuart does not say whether he thinks that this "educational title" has any *raison d'être*. Mr. Grigg's remarks about it are not very convincing. If the five persons named in the current letter are to be made "associates," a similar distinction should be granted yearly or at some regular intervals, and Government ought to have some knowledge, it is thought, of what is intended. It looks at present as if the point had been forgotten since 1890; and it won't be much use making five associates now unless it is certain that they will be followed by others. Mr. Grigg's idea was to have fifty associates.

Perhaps they thought they had to wait 10 years from the date the rule was sanctioned.
C.J.W.
10-4-01.

The Director of Public Instruction could be instructed that names of persons eligible should be submitted yearly in future.
C.J.W.

2. The department has the appearance in this matter of trenching on the University in regard to the grant of degrees.

Secretary.

A. T. Pringle.
9-4-01.

Does the Honourable Member think it necessary to consult the present Director of Public Instruction as to the expediency of retaining the rule. Probably if Mr. Stuart had objected to it, he would not have sent these names up. Mr. Grigg seems to have been convinced the rule would do good.

Honourable Member.

C. J. Weir.
10-4-01.

I think it will be as well to ask Mr. Stuart his opinion and his reasons in full. This can be done demi-officially.

A. T. A[rundel].
19-4-01.

Demi-official letter from the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, to the Director of Public Instruction, dated 25th April 1901, No. 27.

With reference to your letter, Ref. on C. No. 15141 of the 2nd instant, please give your personal opinion with reasons in full as to the expediency of retaining rule 30 of chapter VI of the Educational rules.

Demi-official letter from the Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, dated 2nd May 1901.

Your letter of 25th April, about rule 30, chapter VI, Educational rules.

2. The rule carries out a proposal of Mr. Grigg's; he thought it would increase the popularity of the Teachers' College, the success of which he had very much at heart.

3. I was at first inclined to think that the rule could do no harm, and that those who were inclined to call themselves Associates of the Teachers' College might be allowed to indulge their harmless vanity. But on consideration, I think the rule might work harm to the Teachers' College at Rajahmundry (training section of the Rajahmundry College). It is, on the whole, advisable that Telugu teachers should be trained at Rajahmundry where they can practise on Telugu classes; but the prospect of being called "associate" (after ten years) *might* induce some of them to prefer the Teachers' College at Saidapet. This might be got over of course by extending the privilege to Rajahmundry.

4. I would never have proposed the rule myself, but I do not think it matters much whether it continues or not.

Only if it is to be abolished this should be done at once before any appointments are made under it. There is no such rule in regard to any of the other professional colleges, viz., Engineering, Medical or School of Arts, and I do not think it really has the effect of inducing more students to undergo training.

5. You will see I have no very strong opinion in the matter. A certain number of expectant "associates" will be disappointed if the title is abolished; but, unless Government is prepared to give the same title at Rajahmundry, I incline to abolition.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The Director has now replied to the reference made to him. He has no strong opinion in the matter, but unless the title is conferred also on graduates from the Rajahmundry training institution he is inclined to recommend its abolition. On the whole, therefore, it seems advisable not to confer any title at all and to omit the rule (No. 30 of chapter VI of the Educational rules).

P. T. THARYAN.
6-5-01.

Submitted that there is no need to encourage the indulgence of "vanity" whether "harmless" or not, and that the grant of degrees, educational titles, or whatever they may be termed, is a matter which had better be left as a rule to the University. Government is interested in maintaining a certain standard amongst teachers, and this is done by the promotions, the degradations, or the refusals of promotion, in the case of such persons. There is really no more reason for having "associates" in teaching educational subjects than "associates" in anything else. On the whole, the present inducements of pay and pension, and in cases of extraordinary merit, of possible recognition by Government in the way of an honorary title such as Rao Bahadur, should be enough for those persons in Government employ; as regards those in private institutions, the State need not concern itself.

Secretary. A. T. PRINGLE.
7-5-01.

Has the Local Government any power to bestow titles. I thought it was the prerogative of the Government of India? I presume the Government of India approved of the Educational rules including rule 42, section VI.

Assistant Secretary. C. J. WEIR.
10-5-01.

I don't suppose Mr. Grigg ever contemplated Government of India being asked to bestow them.

C. J. WEIR.

But the rule calls it a "title".

C.J W.

The Local Government has no power to grant titles: of course although this is termed an "honorary title" it might be argued that it is a simple designation of a departmental sort. All the same, as observed to Secretary this morning, the letters "A.T.C." would be used by the men and would creep into gazettes; and in course of time there would be little to distinguish the term from such honorary titles as "Shams-ul-ulamá" or "Mahá-mahopádhyáya." We may perhaps ask the Public department for favour of opinion. As to the educational rules, these were *not* sent to the Government of India.

Secretary. A. T. PRINGLE.
11-5-01.

It appears from Mr. Stuart's demi-official letter that the rule is of very doubtful advantage from an educational point of view, even if the appellation is shorn of its dignity as a "title" and made a purely departmental recognition. Its bestowal might prove an inconvenient precedent; the rule as it stands appears to be *ultra vires* of the Madras Government. If it is decided to get rid of it, it would be best to do so on these grounds as it has stood so long among our educational rules.

2. As regards the disappointed expectants, the Director of Public Instruction could I fancy find means to solace them.

C. J. WEIR.
13-5-01.

To the Public Department u.o. for favour of remarks as to competency of this Government to bestow a title.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

In this matter there is no question of bestowing a title. What the rules propose to bestow is in fact a degree in the Teachers' College. It is on a par with University degrees *honoris causâ*. The mere existence of the rule in no way compels its use and Government may without assigning any reason refuse to use it. I see no reason to abrogate it or alter it.

If we are not going to use the rule we had better abolish it so as to avoid raising false hopes. The Director of Public Instruction will no doubt raise this question separately.

A[MPTHILL].
28-5-01.

[G. STOKES.
15-5-01.

To Educational u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The file is submitted for further orders.

P. T. THARYAN.
16-5-01.

With reference to the opinion expressed by the Chief Secretary, laws and rules which it is not intended ever to set in operation may at times be formally cancelled with advantage and I venture to think that it may be best to cancel the rule here. All that is necessary is to instruct the Director of Public Instruction demi-officially to remove the rule silently when the next edition of the Teachers' College Calendar is published.

If the rule is not to be used, it should, it is considered, be cancelled to prevent raising false hopes.

C. J. WEIR.
17-5-01.

Mr. Stuart thinks it should be cancelled at once if at all.

C.J.W.

I don't approve of the underhand method.

A[MPTHILL].

2. With regard to the Secretary's doubts as to whether it was not a question of a "title," Mr. Stokes does not take that view, and his opinion may be accepted on the point. The draft placed below may, with the Honourable Member's approval, now issue.

A. T. PRINGLE.
17-5-01.

My difficulty was that the rule itself calls it a "title."

C.J.W.

Secretary.

Submitted for orders.

C. J. WEIR.
17-5-01.

H.M. and H.E. the Governor.

I confess great lukewarmness on the subject. Great as the desire is in this country to write letters after one's name I see little or no material or moral value in the A.T.C., and I am sure the possibility of earning it after ten years' service will not convert an indifferent teacher into a good one nor add any incentive to a good one's exercise of his profession.

I should prefer removing the article altogether.

J. T[HOMSON].
21-5-01.

I agree.

A[MPTHILL].
28-5-01.

Draft please.

C. J. WEIR.
29-5-01.

The draft placed below may issue.

P. T. THARYAN.
30-5-01.

I think so. His Excellency has passed the first part of it.

2. I may, perhaps, note for the Secretary's information that the "underhand" appearance of the suggestion on page 3 of these notes did not occur to me. My idea was merely to avoid emphasising what was being done. My use of the word "silent" was not happy. I was thinking of the withdrawal of the rule as being in a manner "obsolete."

A. T. PRINGLE.
30-5-01.

Secretary.

Seen.

C. J. WEIR.
31-5-01.

NOTES ON THE SUBJECT OF THE USE OF THE SINGULAR OR PLURAL VERB AFTER THE WORD "GOVERNMENT".

ORDER—No. 297, Educational, dated 31st May 1901.

The Government *do* not propose to take any action on the article to which the Director refers. . . .

C. J. WEIR.
Ag. Secretary.

What is it to be—*do* or *does*?

J. T[HOMSON].
17-6-01.

It is submitted that the plural, which has the high authority—to name two excellent prose writers—of Southey and Arnold * (of Rugby), may prevail in proceedings. † Every department of the Government of India *now* uses the plural; and the plural pronoun "they" has the advantage of being convenient in sentences in which—as so often is the case in Government orders—the pronoun "it" has to be used in reference to the subject under discussion.

* His son Mathew Arnold, an equally good authority, used the singular. So did Ruskin.

A. R. KNAPP.
7-8-01.

Mr. Knapp has perhaps mistaken my meaning. I had no intention of saying that excellent authorities for the use of the singular did not exist, and I imagine they are much more numerous than the others. I wished to plead for liberty when drafting to do what Southey and Dr. Arnold did, and to suggest that Government might do more harm than good by laying down grammatical rules. The first part of the Chief Secretary's note exactly states the views which I venture to hold, but I think that in proceedings of Government the plural verb and plural pronouns will often be found more convenient.

A. T. PRINGLE.

† It is hardly necessary to say that the "proceedings" of the Educational department were alone referred to.

A.T.P.

A. T. PRINGLE.
18-6-01.

C. J. WEIR.
18-6-01.

I remember years ago when Government became in grammar, singular; and feeling awkward in the situation. I shall feel as awkward now if it becomes plural.

2. But though the change of number may be an "Educational" question or property, I should like to know what "Public" has to say on it.

J. T[HOMSON].
19-6-01.

Secretary—

Will you please after Council on Friday ask the Honourable Member whether he will mind this case being delayed for ten days more or thereabouts? In passing it on to the Public department I want to quote some papers, and these may not be immediately traceable. Perhaps it might be mentioned to the Honourable Member that there was no notion of troubling him or any one else to alter their present practice. All that has been done in the matter in this department has been to give general instructions to drafting clerks to prevent the use of conflicting practices in the same proceedings and also to desire the more frequent use of the term "Governor in

Council" in preference to "the Government" when a verb follows. For the use of the plural verb in this particular case and some others I was responsible; having always used the plural, I shifted to "Governor in Council" or other terms of expression, while in Madras, to avoid the singular, and then after nearly four years at Calcutta where the plural was always employed it was more difficult than ever to alter one's practice.

A. T. PRINGLE.
3-7-01.

Assistant Secretary—

I mentioned the matter to the Honourable Member.

C. J. WEIR.
6-7-01.

Secretary—

I regret the delay; but now put up few instances of what the orders of Government in this matter lead to. Government being officially declared to be a word which shall govern a singular verb and nothing else, the use of such words as "they" and "them" becomes incorrect. Then the Board of Revenue, adopting the view that a collective noun may not govern a plural verb, follow suit with such results as appear in paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings of 18th July 1896 and in the Board's proceedings of the 31st idem. I have seen proceedings of the Board in comparison with which *these* were models of elegant English, but of course it is impossible to trace them now.

2. The whole thing rose from an * assertion, which I believe was quite incorrect, made by Mr. (Sir James) Westland to Sir Henry Stokes in conversation. Sir James Westland was rather given, as any one who had to do with him officially at all would know, to off-hand statements of the kind, which would not always bear examination. At any rate, the secretariats of the Government of India have been † converted in a very surprising manner since the time when Sir James Westland said they all by "standing order" used the singular verb.

* "It is a standing order in the Government of India secretariats that the singular (verb) shall be used".

† The file will show that every department uses the plural.

3. ‡ In the Home department Mr. Hewett personally preferred the singular verb, but the plural is used in all official letters from him. Mr. Arundel compromised the matter by using the plural verb after the words "the Government of India" and the singular after the words "the Government of Madras"—a curious but surely not satisfactory plan.

‡ I may mention that Macaulay's practice varied. I examined some years ago several of his manuscripts and came to the conclusion that he used the singular oftener, but he varied it when the context required and would use the plural. He was not fond of the term, which is generally used in his writings in another of its several senses.

A. T. PRINGLE.

4. The notes may now be sent u.o. to the Public department.

A. T. PRINGLE.
30-7-01.

I think the Assistant Secretary gives good reasons for adopting the plural.

C. J. WEIR.
31-7-01.

To Public u.o.

Chief Secretary—

The argument of the Assistant Secretary is not apparently * so much that the use of the plural verb is correct, as that it is convenient. As regards correctness the standard authorities appear to be pretty equally divided, some adhering to one or other of the two alternatives and some, like Macaulay and Burke, using either form according to the requirements of the context or of euphony. It is impossible, however, to judge † Indian official correspondence by the standard of the English classics, and if, as seems proper, the authority of ordinary usage is accepted, the Assistant Secretary will find on a reference to Murray's New English Dictionary, that out of the six quotations ‡ under the word Government in which it is possible to say which number is used, the singular is employed in five cases. This is only what was to be expected for, though collective nouns may for purposes of convenience sometimes be made to govern a plural verb, the tendency certainly is to make them govern the singular. "Council" for example (which necessarily consists of more than one person while a Government does not) is almost invariably used with a singular verb.

* Is there one word in my notes which can be regarded as arguing that one or the other number is the more correct?

A. T. PRINGLE.
10-8-01.

† True: but surely the standard of good writers may be enough for us in this (Educational) secretariat? That is my point, and it seems a reasonable one. Why should Mr. Weir, the Secretary, be compelled to consider Lord Wenlock and Mr. (Sir Henry) Stokes final authorities on a point in English?

A.T.P.

‡ I don't think myself that much can be founded on six quotations. But the argument that the singular is the commoner is no doubt correct.

A.T.P.

2. As regards convenience, the passages in the Board's proceedings referred to by the Assistant Secretary as examples of the difficulties which arise when the neuter pronoun singular is used merely show § bad drafting. Whatever rule be laid down a drafting officer cannot expect that his phrases will run mechanically and without any necessity for attention to euphony and clearness. It is not difficult to invent ‖ instances in which the plural, if used without discrimination, would lead to similar confusion.

§ Is not this purely a matter of opinion? I may be quite wrong, but think differently from Mr. Knapp; and I have in the note, dated 18th June 1901, given one reason at any rate for the view that the singular verb and pronouns may give rise to more trouble, in the drafts of some persons, than the plural.

A.T.P.
29-8-01.

‖ Doubtless.

A.T.P.

3. The chief argument against any change in the existing practice is, however, supplied by the Assistant Secretary himself in his note, dated 3rd July 1901, on page 1 of these notes. If he after a few years' experience of the system of employing the plural has found it so difficult to alter his practice, what will be the difficulty experienced by the whole of the Secretariat and by heads of departments in abandoning a usage which has ¶ now been in force for twelve years! The order of 1889, which decided that the singular should be used, was passed with a view to uniformity. Whether Sir James Westland was right or wrong in saying that the use of the singular verb was laid down in the Government of India secretariats by a "standing order" is ** not of importance: it undoubtedly was the practice of the Government of India in 1889 to make Government govern a singular verb. This is shown by an examination of the resolutions of the Government of India in the Home, Finance and Revenue departments during 1889, which are printed in this Government's

¶ Has it been *in force*?

A.T.P.

** But why "not of importance"? It was the statement that a "standing order had been laid down" that influenced Mr. H. E. Stokes and the Government of the day.

A.T.P.

records. For some reason, the practice in the Government of India secretariat has changed since then and there is no guarantee that it will not change again. It seems unnecessary that the Madras usage should be liable to alteration whenever the idiosyncracies of the secretaries to the Government of India lead to a change in that Government's practice. In these circumstances it is submitted that the existing order, which rules that Government should be followed by a singular verb, may be left undisturbed.

A. R. KNAPP.
7-8-01.

It seems to me a matter of tweedledum and tweedledee. You may have one or the other. The only thing to avoid is having both in the same proceedings. I think we may as well stick to our own rule till we get an order from the Government of India to do otherwise. Let us keep our independence while we have it.

Good heavens! The Government of India would not interfere!

G. S. FORBES.
18-11-01.

G. STOKES.
8-8-01.

To the Educational department u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Secretary—

The Public department replies to the reference about the use of plural verb after "Government."

2. Mr. Knapp's note seems to labour to overthrow certain propositions which no one ever advanced—for instance the necessity of subordinating every body's practice and views to the Assistant Secretary's. That this was not suggested, surely hardly needs to be asserted—see passage marked in my note under date the 3rd July. The proofs marshalled in support of the contention that the singular verb has sponsors without number were unnecessary, as no one ever said that the singular verb was wrong.

3. I have ventured to remove from the file a collection of weighty volumes put up to prove the incorrectness of my guess that Sir James Westland had made a mistake about the "practice" of the Government of India secretariat twelve years ago. Of course it is enough that Mr. Knapp has satisfied himself that my suggestion did wrong to Sir James Westland. The point is a side-one and absolutely unimportant; but if Mr. Knapp had had to do with Sir James for some four years, he would have understood how the guess came to be made.

4. The following statements will, it is thought, be admitted without dispute:—

(i) Government may be followed by a plural verb or a singular verb.

(ii) Some prefer one, some the other; some use both, of negligence; some use both, for ease of movement and to avoid ambiguities and cacophonies.

(iii) Government have not often assumed the *role* of a grammatical Pope. In 1889 they did so in the interests of "uniformity", and ruled that the use of one of two equally allowable English constructions—one which, if less common than the other, had nevertheless been hall-marked by certain authors of the highest eminence—was in future to be tabooed, was not to be written in any official document on which the eyes of Government might rest.

(iv) A consideration which moved the Government of the day—the members of which were divided amongst themselves—was the practice of the Government of India in 1889. That practice was exactly the opposite to the practice of the same Government in 1901.

5. It is submitted that, with all respect to the Government of Madras in 1889, it is silly for the State to lay down in proceedings grammatical rules for the guidance of officers, and especially so when such rules practically take the form of asserting

that what (to name certain authors whose practice has been referred to in the notes) such masters of English as Burke, Southey, Arnold the historian, and Macaulay, countenanced or practised, is incorrect and to be for ever eschewed.

6. The *personnel* of a Government is constantly changing; it is certain that in matters of grammar different members of the council may have different views. At this date His Excellency the President not infrequently uses the plural verb and plural pronouns with "Government". Is he to be moved to bind himself by the doctrine of the Government of 1889?

7. It is submitted that Government have always Secretaries to settle points such as this; all of them are necessarily officers of long standing and high rank, educated men, and often selected for office as being facile of expression; these Secretaries see every order of any consequence whatever before it issues. One * of them not many years ago made a vigorous protest and refused to admit that a member of Government (Sir Henry Bliss) was in virtue of his position a better authority as to what was good English than the Chief Secretary. He contended that he alone, as the "Secretary", was responsible for the English of the orders in his departments.

* Mr. Arundel when Chief Secretary.

The members of Government have of course nothing to do with the *mere* English of the orders, except in the way of suggestion, and insisting that the exact sense of their resolutions shall be made clear.

G. S. FORBES.
18-11-01.

8. The Hon'ble Mr. Forbes from his knowledge of the Government of India Secretariats will, I think, confirm me in saying that this is the view of the case which is always held there. There is a "committee of Secretaries" indeed, which might sometimes settle matters like this, and the "standing order" of which Mr. (Sir James) Westland spoke in 1889 was probably an office instruction (subsequently † cancelled) by such a committee.

† There was no such order there in 1895–98.

A. T. PRINGLE.

9. This department may, I submit, recommend "toleration" and deprecate "uniformity".

The Chief Secretary does the same in the first part of his note, but then, on the ground that the "independence" of this Government should be preserved, advocates the maintenance of the orders of 1889.

But Government can maintain their "independence" just as much if they allow those orders to remain a dead letter as involving absurdities, and permit people to express themselves in their own way and leave it to the Secretaries, each for his own departments, to determine how drafts shall be worded.

10. The Revenue Secretary may be asked to join in advocating freedom.

A. T. PRINGLE.
29-8-01.

I would prefer uniformity myself as the effect will be rather odd if Government is plural in one department and singular in another.

C. J. WEIR.
15-9-01.

To Revenue u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Secretary—

The notes above give a variety of reasons for the use of either number. I will not add to this volume by further argument. Personally I would plead for uniformity and the adoption or rather retention of the singular.

E. S. LLOYD.
21-9-01.

The reason why the singular so often seems inappropriate in a draft is that if we use the singular Government becomes *neuter* or "it"; and when the Secretary who drafts is conscious that far from being neuter the Government has three strong personalities, a sense of incongruity arises which is annoying and it is this personal equation which I believe is at the root of the mutiny against the use of the singular. By employing Government as a *plural* you at once connote something that lives and thinks and has a mind. Personally I have so long used the plural that I prefer it. But I do not know that strict uniformity is called for. Of course the use of the singular is often quite appropriate.

G. S. Forbes.
18–11–01.

Educational Department.

The notes may now go to the Hon'ble Mr. Thomson and to His Excellency.

P. T. Tharyan.
2–12–01.

So far as drafts in this department are concerned, it is hardly necessary for me to say that, while advocating liberty, I shall take care not to place before the Hon'ble Mr. Thomson (as he now prefers the singular) any draft in which the plural is used; the term "Governor in Council" is preferable, and with a little care in drafting the word "Government" need not be used as the subject of a non-auxiliary verb. But I venture to trust he will not place a further burden on me.

It will make drafting more difficult if we are restricted in this way.

C. J. Weir.

A. T. Pringle.
3–12–01.

Submitted to Hon'ble Mr. Thomson and His Excellency the Governor.

C. J. Weir.
3–12–01.

Will His Excellency please say whether Government is on paper to be singular or plural, or either as pleases the writer? I am sorry I let loose such a flood of writing, but the plural came as a shock to me after so many years.

J. T[homson].
5–12–01.

I have always had a strong preference for the plural, and I have on several occasions pointed out the awkwardness of the neuter "it" which arises out of the use of the singular. At the same time I am not inclined to lay down any rule which might cramp the style of the Secretaries. I shall be content if they will either agree among themselves to use one or the other, or if each of them follows his own bent, so long as both singular and plural do not appear in the same draft.

A[mpthill].
9–12–01.

To Hon'ble Mr. Thomson again—

Seen.

J. T[homson].
11–12–01.

This may now circulate to all branches of the Secretariat.

C. J. Weir.
12–12–01.

Public, etc., departments,
Revenue department,
Local and Municipal department,
Public Works department (all branches),
Marine department,
} To be kindly passed on.

Public, etc., Departments.

Seen.

G. S. Forbes.

To Revenue u.o.

Revenue Department.

Seen.

M. Hammick.
20–12–01.

To Local and Municipal u.o.

Local and Municipal Department.

Record.

C. J. Weir.
23–12–01.

To Public Works (all branches) u.o.

Public Works Department.

W. B. deWinton.
12–1–02.

A. W. Smart.
22–1–02.

E. I. Shadbolt.
23–1–02.

S. B. Murray.
23–1–02.

A. T. Mackenzie.
17–1–02.

R. W. Egerton.
23–1–02.

To Educational u.o.

Educational Department.

This may perhaps be now printed and brought on record.

P. T. Tharyan.
8–2–02.

Yes. (As a lodged Educational paper only.)

A. T. Pringle.
8–2–02.

1,000—16-11-00.

Educational (190/) Department.

10

CURRENT No. 491

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. G. H. Stuart. M.A. Barr.-at-Law,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

DESPATCHED
2 APR. 1901

ASSIST SECY TO GOVT
LOCAL MUNL PDL & LEG DEPTTS
3 APR. 1901

Report No. 15141 of 00.

Dated 2nd April 1901.

Enclosures

Received 3. 4. 1901.

Registered 3. 4. 1901.

SUBJECT.

Recommending that the title of "Associate of the Teachers College" may be conferred on certain Licentiates in Teaching who have been trained in the Teachers College and who satisfy the conditions laid down in Art: 30. Chapter VI of the Madras Educational Rules.

BACK PAPERS.

77 Min Dy 15-2-'01,
337 Copy 6-6-96 Pp

FURTHER PAPERS.

EC 6/4/01

Q = Print heading only

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to recommend that the title of "Associate of the Teachers' College" may be conferred on the following Licentiates in Teaching who have been trained in the Teachers' College, and otherwise satisfy the conditions laid down in article 30, Chapter VI, of the Madras Educational Rules. The Principal of the Teachers' College considers them to be deserving of the title; and judging from the facts of their career as teachers, and the testimonials they have submitted I think they may be considered as having served with credit:-

1. Anantanarayana Aiyar K.C.S.--Acting Sub-Assistant Inspector of schools, Nellore range

2. Bhavaniswami Rau T.T.-------Acting 4th Assistant, Government College, Kumbakonam

3. Gnanakkan Nadar A.----------Headmaster, Caldwell High school, Tuticorin

4. Ramaswami Aiyangar M.-------Acting 1st Assistant, Government Training College, Rajahmundry

5. Venkateswara Aiyar K.-------Headmaster, English Normal school, Trivandrum.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G H Stuart

Director of Public Instruction.

[G/24.]
1,000—20-3-00.

3

Educl. DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 481 From the Dpi, No. 1741/1900, dated 3.4.1900/1901

" " " " " 190 .

" " " " " 190 .

" " " " " 190 .

A

28/5

The Government do not purpose to take any action on the article to which the Director refers.

A.S.P.

17.5.

[E. / 4]
1,500—8-11-00.

4

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

20 - 12

READ AGAIN G.O., No. ....., dated ..... 190 .

" " " " ....., " ..... 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 491, From the Dy.P.I., No. 15141, dated 2nd April 1901.

" " ....., " " ....., " ....., " ..... 190 .

" " ....., " " ....., " ....., " ..... 190 .

ORDER No. 297, dated 31-5- 1901.

P.J.

Orders also to be issued.

Desp 31/5/1

Stat

The Govt. do not propose to take any ~~action~~ action in the article ~~to which the director refers~~. That article will now be remained from the Educational rules and the following notification will be published in the Fort St George Gazette:-

Notification

The Governor in Council is pleased to direct that Article 30 of Chapter VI of the ~~Under~~ Educational rules shall be cancelled.

/ true order /

P.H
30/5/01

Desp 8/6
to the Dy.P.I
Gazetted. 11-6-01

31.5.01 S.O.S. 1

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

Number of copies required. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter. }

35

3

Read again G.O., No. 1 , Dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government.

Letter of Government.

Agreement with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch as original.

N.B.—

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