[Edl. / 6.]

800—15-7-03.

Educational (1903) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No 268

DATED 5. 6. 03

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mission School at Villupuram

Stating that the Governor in Council is not prepared to interfere with the Direc- refusal to aid the Evangelical Lutheran Mission primary School at Villupuram So long as it remains in its present

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[E. 1]

1,000—23-12-01.

Educational (1903) Department.

CURRENT No. 562

From

[*Name*] Rev. R. Schomerus

[*Designation*] Manager, E.L.M. Primary School,

[*Station*] Villupuram.

No. _____ *Received* 1. 4. 1903.

Dated 26. 3. 1903.

Enclosures _____ *Registered* 2. 4. 1903.

SUBJECT.

Stating that his school is in no way supernumerary for the town & requesting that sufficient encouragement be given in the matter of grants in aid.

BACK PAPERS.

Educ. G.O. 9907 5-3-'03

FURTHER PAPERS.

Ref. 3/4

No. 3.

2 Villupuram
26. March. 03

From.

Rev. R. Schomerus.
Member. S. Arcot. District Board.
& Manager. E.L.M. Primary School.
Villupuram.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT REVENUE DEPARTMENT
27 MAR 1903
No.

The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
1 APR 1903
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Slip K

Sir,

With reference to the proceedings of the Madras Government No. 99 dated 6th March 1903, I beg to submit the following facts for a favourable consideration

The E.L.M. Primary school was first opened in this town in the year 1896, when there were other Primary schools working side by side with the Practising department of the Local Govt. Training school. These Primary schools were managed by private bodies and enjoyed the privilege of grants from the Government. Subsequently these schools died out leaving the E.L.M. Primary school alone to work in the field along with the Practising department of the Govt. Trg. school. When this school first applied for Grants in the year 1899, the same was refused on the score that the educational needs of the locality were met by other schools. But even after those schools died out, the school received the same stereotype reply from the Director to all its subsequent applications for Grants.

2. When in previous years the school applied for grants, it was located in a rented building close by the Govt. Training school. Then it might be alleged that the educational needs of that part of the locality were met by the Practising department of the Training school. But even after the

Mission

mission school was removed to a different site, far from the Training school, the two being situated at a distance of more than a furlong from each other, the Director's reply is that he could not modify his Proceedings No. 3693 dt 27.3.1899, an order passed when other Primary schools were working in the town. From these facts it is evident that the Director did not mean one particular school to visit the Practising department of the Trg. school, but several other schools reported by the Inspecting authorities to have been working in the town.

3. When in 1901. the Mission secured the present site for the school house, the Govt. Training school was held in a rented building, and it never struck the Mission that the same rented building would be purchased for the Training school. Had the Mission an insight in this affair, and had it been clearly made to understand that the educational needs of that part of the locality where the Training school stands are met by that school, and that grants are therefore refused to the school, the present site would never have been bought for the erection of the mission school, but on the other hand arrangements would have been made to remove the school to some other part of the town remote from the Training school. But it is now too late to shift the school elsewhere after the school houses have been built at a considerable cost.

4. In the year 1900. the Mission took up the management of a Hindu Primary school which was located in a farther end of the town where a primary school was a sheer necessity. This school which was aided till april

1900

SECRETARY TO THE
27 MAR
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

1900, ceased to be as such from July 1900 i.e. from the time the Mission took up the management. When in the same year this school applied for grants the Department refused it because there was a break of 3 months in the continuity of school work. The Assistant Inspector of schools however wrote in his letter No 1090-S-J 25-12-1900 that he would examine the school for Grants for the following year, which Examination never came off. This school which started with 11 pupils on the Roll in July 1900 became 50 strong in the course of a year and a half and was working till February 1902 without any encouragement from the Department. It was then amalgamated with the E. L. M. Primary school with the consent of the Inspecting officers.

5. From these facts it will be evident that the Mission had till the last year two Primary schools located at the either ends of the town, and the Department was not pleased to sanction grants on behalf of either, although the Taluk Board, appreciating the work of the E. L. M Primary school and feeling its necessity, recommended the inclusion of the school in the aided list in its proceedings No 140 J 29-4-02.

6. I further beg to point out that two well-equipped Primary schools, to wit, the Practising department of the Trg. school and the E. L. M Primary school, are not too many for a town like Villupuram having a population of more than 9000 inhabitants with a Munsiff's Court, the Taluk and other offices, a large Railway junction, a mart for trade and a growing future. The town also maintains a Board High school and a Mission Lower Secondary school. Excepting the Practising department of the Training school and the E. L. M. Primary

school

school, there are only a few Panchama schools and a Muhomedan school which impart primary education exclusively to these two classes. Hence it will be seen that the E. L. M. Primary school is in no way supernumerary for the town.

In conclusion I beg that the Director may be moved to favourably reconsider the question of grants of the said school and encourage the educational work of the Mission in this town.

I beg to remain
Sir
your most obedient servant
R. Schoneveld.

Member. S. A. District Board.
& manager E. L. M. Pry. School
Villupuram.

[E. L. 6.]
500—S-5[illegible]

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 562, From the Rev. R. Schoneveld, Dated 26th March 1903.

Endl No 231 dy 7-4-03.
Referred to the D.P.I. for remarks.

dcsp
7/4/3

7.4.
4-4-03

Pd
4/4/3

J. Cunningham
4.4.03
for Secretary to Govt.

Dlf
7.4.03

cm no 2941/03

Papers
16/V.

2.0/4/03
a
Seal Stuart 9.53
2

Stock Form No. 127
2,000—1-5-02.

7 E 0 | 14 | 2941 | 03

Educational (1903) Department.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
25 MAY 1903
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

CURRENT No. 837

From

[*Name*] The Honourable Mr. G.H. Stuart, M.A.,

[*Designation*] Director of Public Instruction,

[*Station*] M a d r a s.

Ref on No. 2941 of 03.

Dated 22nd May 1903.

Enclosures one letter in original

Received 25 5 1903.

Registered 25 5 1903.

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting the endorsement of Government No. 231, Edl., d/7th April 1903 with the remark that the Rev. Mr. Schomerus has not adduced any fresh facts to justify a reconsideration of the orders already passed in G.O. No. 99, Edl., d/5th March 1903 in regard to the exceptional treatment of the primary school.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

In returning the endorsement of Government No. D 231 d/7th ultimo I have the honour to say that the Rev Mr. Schomerus has not adduced any fresh facts to render necessary a reconsideration of the orders already passed in G.O. No. 99 Edl. d/5thMarch 1903. The chief reason for the refusal of aid to the E.L.M. Primary School at Villupuram is as already stated not that the practising department of the Government Training School fully meets the educational requirements of the whole town but that it is sufficient for that part of the town which is now served by both the schools. That the working of the mission primary school has had a prejudicial effect on the strength of the practising department of the training school is patent from the fact that while the No. on the rolls of the latter rose steadily from 77 in 1892-93 to 123 in 1895-96, it fell to 98 in 1898-99 and further to 88 in 1899-1900 i.e. soon after the mission primary school was recognized in 1897-98. The practising department has not yet been able to recover its former strength owing to the proximity of the mission school. It may be true that the mission has spent a large amount of money on its school building, but it should, at the outset, have considered the advisability of incurring expenditure by starting a school in a locality where it was not needed. From the reports before me I find that the mission school was originally situated in a different locality but towards the end of 1901 was transferred to its present situation where it was amalgamated with a new primary school which the mission had started in the place of the defunct Hindu primary school referred to in para 4 of Mr. Schomerus's letter. I find also that when in 1896 the mission first opened its school in the town the Headmaster of the Training school fearing that the strength of the practising school would be affected by the opening of this new school suggested that the latter should not be recognized. Under the rules then in force however, recognition had to be given, but the practising school has suffered in consequence and is not now as strong as it should be to serve its purpose fully. In these circumstances it is clear that to aid the mission school would be really strengthening an institution that should not in the first place have been recognized, but which having been recognized now flourishes at the expense of the training school. In the interests of the latter it is necessary that the mission school should be removed to another part of the town where its rivalry cannot be so keenly felt and where it may be really useful. If this is not done the mission must be content to maintain its primary school independently of state aid.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G H Stuart

Director of Public Instruction.

[E. 2]

1,000—5-12-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 562 From the Rev. R. Schomerus No. dated 26-3-1903.
837 Director of Public Instruction 2941 22-5-1902

SUBJECT.

Regarding inclusion of a primary School in Villupuram in aided list

Please see the notes and orders in G.O. No. 99 Edl dt 5th March 1903. The Rev. Mr. Schomerus came up to Government in November 1902 with a ~~petition emphasising~~ complaint that the Mission School at Villupuram of which he was the manager did not receive aid of any kind from the Educational department. The Director to whom a reference was made in the matter stated in reply that under rule 1 of the Grant-in-aid Code aid was to be given with due regard to the requirements of each locality and that these requirements having been satisfied by the practising department attached to the local Government training School ~~the existence of~~ the primary School in question was unnecessary. ~~but as the other hand it paired the efficiency of the existing institution~~. He however added that if the School was removed to some locality where it was urgently wanted he was prepared to admit it to the aided list. The Government agreed with these views of the Director and informed Mr. Schomerus accordingly - Vide G.O. No. 992 Edl dt 5-3-03.

2. The Rev. Mr. Schomerus, ~~afterwards~~ not satisfied with this decision of Government, requests a reconsideration of the orders already passed. He bases his main argument on the fact the it is now too late to shift the School elsewhere after the School houses had been built at a considerable cost. But the Director

to whom the present letter was referred for remarks, is [redacted] of opinion that the mission should at the outset have considered the advisability of incurring expenditure by starting a school where it was not needed. Mr. Schomerus also contends that when the mission secured the present site for the school the Training School was held in a rented building and that the mission had no idea that the same building would be purchased for the Training School. He goes on to say that had the mission known to the slightest extent that the ~~establishment of the mission school~~ educational needs of that part of the locality where the Training School stands, are not by the school ~~was in any way detrimental to the interests of the practising~~ and that grants are school therefore refused to the mission school, it would have refrained from erecting a building at such enormous cost. But the Director states that the mission school was originally situated in a different locality and was transferred to its present situation towards the end of 1901 when it was amalgamated with a new primary school which the mission had started in the place of the defunct Hindu School referred to in para. 4 of Mr. Schomerus's letter. He however explains that the chief reason for the refusal of aid is not that the practising department of the Government training school fully meets the educational requirements of the whole town but that it is sufficient for that part of the town which is now served by both the schools.

How much?

3. The Director holds that the working of the mission primary school has had a prejudicial effect on the strength of the practising department of the training school and that the latter has not been able yet to recover its former strength owing to the proximity of the mission institution. He suggests that so long as the mission school

continues to be located by the side of the training school the mission must be content to maintain its school independently of State aid.

4. For orders as to whether the Director's conclusion may be adopted and Mr. Schomerus informed accordingly.

With all due deference to the Director it is submitted that a little departmental jealousy appears to lie at the bottom of the whole thing. The practising branch of the Govt. Training School cannot apparently hold its own against the mission school which in spite of its missionary character & of the want of encouragement is thriving. The Govt. has however already come to a decision in the matter and it seems inexpedient to reconsider that decision now.

H2Q 29/5/03

PH 23/5/03

The Otaki case & his defence are, it seems to me, alike singularly weak, & it is probable - as I said above - that departmental jealousy is at work.

2. I do not see why the recent orders recently passed should not be reconsidered; of course finality is a good thing, but

there are further facts before the Government which may be regarded as sufficient to warrant some modification of that was based on partial information.

I do not think it is expedient to overrule the Director's opinion on this matter.

A.G.L.
1.6.03

HM

The Director's position is very plain & perfectly just so far. Let the Schomerus move his school if he wants aid. His school is interfering with the proper role of the Training School. There is no ground for imputing jealousy

A
4.6.03

Please draft accordingly

A.G.L.
3.6.03

The draft placed below may issue.

P.Z. 3/6/03

A.G.L.
5.6.03

[E. 12]
1,000—7-5-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

12

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 99, dated 5 - 3 - 1903

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 562, From the Rev: R. Schomerus, No. , dated 26 - 3 - 1903.

" " 837, " " D.P.I., " 2941, " 22 - 5 - 1903.

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

ORDER No. 268, dated 5 - 6 - 1903.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared ~~regrets his inability~~ to interfere with the Director's refusal to aid the R. C. Mission primary school at Villupuram so long as it remains in its present locality.

A.G.L.
5.6.03

P.Z.
3/6/03

dispd 5/6/03

To the Rev: R. Schomerus dispd 5/6/03
" D.P.I. dispd 10/6/03

n given for copy
n copied
hen examined
'ven signed
} 190 .

AGAIN G.O , No. , DATED
190 .

RRENT No.

CLOSURES TO C. No.

ER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
TER OF GOVERNMENT.								
ATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
APERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
H = Copy heading only