

13
329-13-1-91.

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 46

DATED 20. 1. 04

N. F.

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Salary grants

Approving the proposals of the
Director for the rendition of
scale of salary grants to the
teachers employed in the
in the Ceded districts

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 {1904} of Madras. EDUCATIONAL.

21

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

1904.

Spare copies

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 46, 20th January 1904.

JANUARY.

Salary Grants.

Approving the proposals of the Director to modify the concessions granted to teachers employed in the Ceded districts in respect of —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Granting certain concessions as regards salary grants to teachers employed in the Ceded districts.

G.O., No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900.

Read—the following paper:—

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 21st March 1900, No. 2957.

I have the honour to point out that the concessions in regard to salary grants made in G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, to teachers employed in the Ceded districts are calculated to bring about a distinct deterioration in the professional qualifications of teachers in those districts. In the first place, managers of schools, who have hitherto been under the necessity of obtaining the services of qualified teachers in view to securing aid for them on the salary grant system will no longer feel the necessity to apply for the services of certificated teachers, since no distinction is made between certificated and uncertificated teachers on the one hand and between persons holding trained and untrained teachers' certificates on the other in regard to the rates of salary grants allowed to them, so far as institutions for general education are concerned. In the second place, uncertificated teachers in the Ceded districts will not, in future, have the same inducement towards obtaining certificates as they had before the concessions referred to above were made.

2. Schools in the Ceded districts no doubt require exceptional treatment, at least for some time to come, but care should be taken to see that the concessions made are not such as are likely to lead to loss of efficiency. With this object in view, I would suggest that the following scale of salary grants, which has been graduated with reference to the nature of the certificates held by teachers, be substituted for the one sanctioned in G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899:—

A fourth grant to a teacher with a general education certificate.

A third grant to a teacher with an untrained teacher's certificate.

A half grant to a teacher with a trained teacher's certificate.

A two-thirds grant to a teacher with a trained teacher's certificate and employed in a training school.

Order—No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900.

The Government have no objection to the new concession suggested by the Director of Public Instruction for schools in municipal areas, but are not at present in favour of withdrawing or modifying concessions now in force in the Ceded districts.

(True Extract.)

H. TREMENHEERE,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

READ—also the following paper:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. BOURNE, D.Sc., F.R.S., Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 9th December 1903, C. No. 8983.

The concessions recommended by Dr. Duncan for teachers in the Ceded districts and approved by Government in G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, being considered by the late Director too liberal, it was suggested in this office letter No. 2957, dated 21st March 1900, that they might be revised so far as institutions for general education were concerned and a new scale graduated with reference to the nature of the certificates held by the teachers was proposed. Government, however, in G.O., No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900, declined to withdraw or modify the old concessions. From the experience gained in the course of the past four years during which the concessions have been in force, the Director was inclined to think that these concessions had removed all incentive to improvement, if they had not actually caused a deterioration in the professional qualifications of the teachers of high schools in the Ceded districts. This will be seen from the enclosed statement showing the qualifications of the teachers employed in these schools during the past five years.

The late Director evidently intended to again address Government upon the subject. I have, therefore, the honour to request that the matter may now be reconsidered and that the following scale of salary grants may be sanctioned in supersession of that now in force for teachers employed in schools in the Ceded districts whether in municipal or non-municipal areas:—

- (1) a fourth grant for a teacher with a general education certificate;
- (2) a third grant for a teacher with an untrained teachers' certificate;
- (3) a half grant for a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate;
- (4) a two-thirds grant for a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate and employed in a training school.

2. The new scale, if sanctioned, should not affect the salary grants already sanctioned in accordance with G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899.

3. These being special concessions for schools in the Ceded districts need not be incorporated in the Grant-in-Aid Code. The publication of a notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette* and in the *District Gazette* concerned for the information of the managers will suffice.

ENCLOSURE.
Statement.

4

No. 46, EDUCATIONAL, 20TH JANUARY 1904.

Names of schools.	1898-99.						1899-1900.						1900-1901.						1901-1902.						1902-1903.						
	Professors and teachers holding						Professors and teachers holding						Professors and teachers holding						Professors and teachers holding						Professors and teachers holding						
	Non-Indian diplomas.	Trained teachers' certificates.	Untrained teachers' certificates.	Approved service teachers' certificates.	General education certificates.	No certificate.	Non-Indian diplomas.	Trained teachers' certificates.	Untrained teachers' certificates.	Approved service teachers' certificates.	General education certificates.	No certificate.	Non-Indian diplomas.	Trained teachers' certificates.	Untrained teachers' certificates.	Approved service teachers' certificates.	General education certificates.	No certificate.	Non-Indian diplomas.	Trained teachers' certificates.	Untrained teachers' certificates.	Approved service teachers' certificates.	General education certificates.	No certificate.	Non-Indian diplomas.	Trained teachers' certificates.	Untrained teachers' certificates.	Approved service teachers' certificates.	General education certificates.	No certificate.	
CEDDED DISTRICTS.																															
Kurnool.																															
Municipal High school, Kurnool ..	..	5	1	..	1	1	..	3	2	..	2	1	..	2	2	..	..	4	2	..	2	4	..	5	1	..	3	..	1	3	2
S.P.G. High school, Nandyal ..	..	2	..	..	..	4	..	3	..	..	3	1	..	1	..	..	..	3	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	4	..	..	1	..
Bellary.																															
Bellary Wardlaw College (School department) ..	..	3	6	..	6	3	..	3	6	..	4	3	..	4	4	7	..	4	2	..	..	5	..	3	2	..	4	4	..	3	2
Municipal High school, Bellary ..	..	3	2	..	1	..	..	2	2	..	2	..	..	2	2	2	..	2	..	..	1	1	..	4	2	..	2	1	..	2	2
Boarj High school, Harpanahalli ..	..	2	2	..	2	..	..	3	..	..	1	..	..	4	4	1	..	1	..	..	1	1	..	3	..	..	1	1	..	1	2
St. Philomena's Girls' High school, Bellary ..	..	1	3	..	5	1	..	2	3	2	3	..	..	3	3	3	2	2	..	..	..	2	3	5	..	..	2	2	1	5	..
Anantapur.																															
London Mission High school, Gooty ..	..	1	3	..	2	..	..	2	1	1	2	..	..	3	2	1	..	2	1	1	..	1	2	3	1	..	3	1	..	2	2
Municipal High school, Anantapur ..	..	3	..	..	1	..	..	2	3	..	1	1	..	2	2	2	1	1	1	..	2	1	2	3	1	..	3	2	1	1	..
Oddapah.																															
Madanapalle High school ..	..	7	..	..	..	1	..	2	2	1	1	1	..	2	2	2	1	1	1	..	2	2	3	2	1	..	1	3	1	1	1
Municipal High school ..	..	2	2	..	2	2	..	2	1	..	2	2	..	3	3	1	..	2	..	..	..	2	1	1	..	..	3	2	..	1	..
Grand total ..	..	29	20	..	23	9	..	24	20	6	21	9	..	27	20	4	22	8	..	19	18	5	29	5	1	28	17	4	20	11	11

No. 46, EDUCATIONAL, 20TH JANUARY 1904.

5

ORDER—No. 46, Educational, dated 20th January 1904.

The proposals of the Director are approved and sanctioned.

2. The Director should arrange for the publication of the notification mentioned in paragraph 3 of his letter.

(True Extract.)

A. G. CARDEW,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Erd. P. Seetharam.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 46, EDUCATIONAL, DATED
20TH JANUARY 1904.

[SUBJECT.—*Rules of Salary Grants in the Ceded Districts.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 21st March 1900, No. 2957.

In its order No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, Government sanctioned the following special rates of salary grants to schools in the Ceded Districts:—

(1) Half salary grants to teachers who have passed a general education test irrespective of their professional qualifications.

(2) Two-thirds grants to teachers holding trained teachers' certificates and employed in training schools.

2. The Director of Public Instruction now reports that these concessions are calculated to bring about a distinct deterioration in the professional qualifications of teachers in the Ceded Districts, as managers of schools will no longer feel the necessity to apply for the services of certificated teachers, no distinction being made between certificated and uncertificated teachers on the one hand and between persons holding trained and untrained teachers' certificates on the other as far as institutions for general education are concerned, and as uncertificated teachers will not in future have the same inducement towards obtaining certificates as they had before the concessions referred to were made. The Director accordingly recommends the following scale in the place of that above mentioned:—

(1) A fourth grant to a teacher with a general education certificate.

(2) A third grant to a teacher with an untrained teachers' certificate.

(3) A half grant to a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate.

(4) A two-thirds grant to a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate and employed in a training school.

3. Under article 13, clause (iv), chapter III of the Grant-in-Aid Code, however, uncertificated teachers who have passed a general education test and who are employed with the approval of the Inspector in schools in backward localities can draw third grants. The Ceded Districts excepting the

Educational Rules, pages 8 and 9.

towns of Kurnool, Bellary, Adóni, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Madanapalle come under the designation of backward localities. Except in the case of the above towns, therefore, the Director's first proposal has the effect of making the rules more rigid than at present. But it is a substantial concession that is required.

4. Again under clause v, article 13, chapter III of the Grant-in-Aid Code, masters holding untrained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second-grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade and who are employed in secondary schools, in non-municipal towns and in villages, in which the fees if levied at the standard rates do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure, can draw one-third grants. Schools for general education of a standard lower than upper secondary are not * eligible for salary grants and the fees in schools in the Ceded

* Article 4, chapter I.

Districts can never cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure. The Director's second proposal therefore makes very little advance on the existing state of things except in municipal towns.

5. Similarly under clause (v), article 12, chapter III of the code, masters holding trained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second-grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade and who are employed in secondary schools situated in non-municipal towns and in villages in which the fees if levied at the standard rates do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure can draw half grants. Consequently the Director's third proposal also does not make any great advance on the existing state of things.

6. The fourth proposal is the second one sanctioned in G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899.

7. In these circumstances it is submitted that G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, may remain unmodified—at least for the present or till it can be clearly shown that the present proposals are a distinct advance on the existing state of things under the code.

P. T. THARYAN—9-5-00.

As the Director of Public Instruction points out an ascending scale is a good thing. But I submit that the rate of one-fourth proposed is too low being below code scale.

R. ASHE—14-5-00.

Will Director kindly say whether he has not overlooked the Grant-in-Aid Code as follows:—

In recommending one-fourth grants to teachers in the Ceded Districts with general education certificates.	Article 13, clause (iv), chapter III, entitles them to one-third grants.
In recommending one-third grants for men with untrained teachers' certificates.	Article 13, clause v { These rates seem
In recommending one-half grants for men with trained teachers' certificates.	„ 12 „ v { generally claim- able at present.

H. TREMENHEERE—17-5-00.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Director's reply, dated 19th May 1900.	Note by the office, dated 22nd May 1900.	Director's further remarks, dated 2nd July 1900.
The Grant-in-Aid Code [III, 12 (v)] gives half grants to masters holding trained teachers' certificates employed in training schools.	A My proposal is to give them two-thirds grants in the Ceded Districts.	Two-thirds grant was sanctioned in G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899.
The Grant-in-Aid Code gives one-third grants to masters holding trained teachers' certificates [Article 13, (ii)].	B My proposal is to give them half grants in the Ceded Districts. At present under III, 12 (v), they get half grants only when employed in certain classes of schools* or in certain areas [non-municipal]† and under certain conditions‡. I propose to abolish these conditions and restrictions in the Ceded Districts. The proposal will be of no advantage to masters in schools included III, 12 (v) (b); but it will benefit those in municipal schools §.	* I.e., in secondary schools, but under article 4, chapter I, only upper secondary schools and schools for Europeans and higher class technical, industrial and art schools and superior indigenous schools are eligible for salary grants. † True. ‡ I.e., when fees if levied at standard rates do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure. But in the non-municipal areas of the Ceded Districts it is possible to have schools under a different condition? Practically therefore existing schools in non-municipal areas can draw half grants. § What is meant is, it is submitted, "schools in municipal areas."
		Yes. It is included here for the sake of completeness.
		H.T.
		H.T.
		Yes.

Director's reply—cont.	Note by the office—cont.	Director's further remarks—cont.
The Grant-in-Aid Code gives one-fourth grant to masters holding untrained teachers' certificates. [III, 14 (i)].	C I propose to give them one-third grant in the Ceded Districts, subject to no conditions. Under III, 13 (v) they get one-third grants in certain schools* subject to certain conditions as to area †, etc. ‡. My proposal does not do any good to these schools, but will benefit § schools in municipal areas.	*, † & ‡ similar remarks as above. § True.
The Grant-in-Aid Code gives nothing to un-certificated teachers.	D My proposal gives ¶ them one-quarter grants in the Ceded Districts. At present under III, 13 (iv) such teachers in backward localities get one-third grants. I think this is too much, but do not propose to alter it at present ¶. But I propose to extend it to municipal areas (which are not reckoned as backward) in the Ceded Districts, except that I propose giving one-quarter grant only, instead of one-third. At present such schools in municipal areas get nothing. Schools for poor Europeans, Muhammadans and for backward and indigent classes will still continue to get one-third grants for the present.	¶ Only if they hold certificates of having passed a general education test. H.T. H.T. It is submitted that this is not expressly stated in the proposals and there is thus nothing to prevent the grants in these cases being reduced to one-fourth.
	G. H. STUART—19-5-00.	Certain modifications from the Grant-in-Aid Code rates were sanctioned only on 31st October last. Would it not be too soon to alter them again now? P. T. THARYAN—22-5-00.
		This is quite enough: I do not propose any grant for entirely unqualified teachers. The expression "uncertificated teachers" always means "a teacher not holding a teachers' certificate." To make this clear paragraph 2 of my letter No. 2957, dated 21st March 1900, may be altered as follows: For "a fourth grant to a teacher with a general education certificate." Read "A fourth grant to an uncertificated teacher who has passed a general education test, in cases not covered by article 13, (iv), chapter III, of the Grant-in-Aid Code." The reasons for the proposed alteration have been given in paragraph 1 of my letter quoted above. G. H. STUART—2-7-00.

Please see the Director of Public Instruction's reply above. A column of remarks by the office has been added.

P. T. THARYAN—22-5-00.

R. ASHE—23-5-00.

Mr. Stuart has perhaps not yet quite assimilated the rather indigestible Grant-in-aid Code.

2. Dr. Duncanson knew the ceded districts and obtained Government sanction for two concessions, of which only one need be mentioned, viz., half grants to untrained teachers with a general education certificate.

Mr. Stuart says this will be disastrous (as removing stimulus, etc.) so he proposes quarter grants for these men (below code scale!).

He has, I submit, made out no case for changing a policy of concession adopted so late as 31st October 1899 on the recommendation of a Director of long experience.

3. Then he goes on to suggest, with the same object in view (viz., to retain a stimulus towards certificate) to propose one-third grants for untrained teachers' certificates, and half grants for trained.

When it is pointed out to him u.o. that the ceded districts are backward localities, and that the code allows such grants now for such localities, he shifts his ground and says this is true for non-municipal areas, but he intended a new concession for municipal areas!

4. May be negated?

H. TREMENHEERE—28-5-00.

Ask Mr. Stuart for his remarks on the office comments against his explanatory note.

A. T. A[RUNDEL]—30-5-00.

The Honourable Member desires that the above office comments on the Director's explanatory note be submitted to the Director for remarks.

H.T.—1-6-00.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Remarks have been made in the margin of the Secretariat office-notes.

G. H. STUART—2-7-00.

The Director of Public Instruction's final replies to the criticisms on his proposals (lettered **A—D**) do not appear to be very convincing.

2. In **A** he proposed to give two-thirds instead of half grants to masters holding trained teachers' certificates employed in training schools in the "Ceded Districts". It was pointed out to him that this suggestion had been sanctioned months before, and he now replies that the proposal was included for the "sake of completeness".

3. In **B** he proposed to give to masters holding trained teachers' certificates in the "Ceded Districts" half instead of the normal one-third grants, abolishing certain restrictions and conditions now in force at the same time. It was pointed out that only schools of a particular class were eligible for salary grants, and that the conditions must in non-municipal areas of the Ceded Districts apply pretty generally, so that existing schools in non-municipal areas could practically draw half grants, without Government having recourse to an alteration of the code. Mr. Stuart explains that as nearly all the secondary schools in these districts are within municipal areas, the present rules do not help them.

4. Under **C** he proposed to give to masters holding untrained teachers' certificates in the same districts, one-third grants in place of one-fourth grants. The comments of the Secretariat were much the same as under **B** and his answers are the same. He allows that certain schools can already have one-third grants, but he lays stress on the difference between municipal and non-municipal areas, stating that it is the former his proposal is intended to benefit.

5. Under **D** he proposed to give to teachers not holding teachers' certificates but having certificates of general education, one-fourth grants in the same districts, thus extending to schools in municipal areas the principle under which such teachers in backward localities get one-third grants. To make his meaning clearer, Mr. Stuart proposes to alter the wording of his letter.

6. As to **A** it does not seem worth while to repeat the sanction already given.

Under **B** and **C** a case for relief in regard to schools in municipal areas is now perhaps made out.

And as to **D** the same remarks apply. But the variation in the rate is hardly justified. The Director of Public Instruction gives it as his opinion that one-third where already allowed is too much; that may be so, but it would be prejudging the matter to give one-fourth grants to schools in these municipal areas on the score that the existing one-third grants were excessive in the case of schools not in such areas.

A. T. PRINGLE—9-7-00.

Submitted, the Director may be told Government has no objection to the new concession he suggests for municipal areas, but it is not in favour of withdrawing or modifying concessions now in force in the Ceded Districts.

At present.

A.T.A.—11-7-00.

H. TREMENHEERE—10-7-00.

A. T. A[RUNDEL]—11-7-00.

[G.O., No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 8983, dated 9th December 1903.

In its order No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, Government, on the recommendation of Dr. Duncan, sanctioned the following special rates of salary grants to schools in the Ceded Districts:—

(1) Half salary grants to teachers who have passed a general education test irrespective of their professional qualifications.

(2) Two-thirds grants to teachers holding trained teachers' certificates and employed in training schools.

2. In March 1900 the late Mr. Stuart represented that these concessions were calculated to bring about a distinct deterioration in the professional qualification of teachers in the Ceded Districts and recommended the following scale of grants in their place:—

(1) A fourth grant to a teacher with a general education certificate.

(2) A third grant to a teacher with an untrained teachers' certificate.

(3) A half grant to a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate.

(4) A two-thirds grant to a teacher with a trained teachers' certificate and employed in a training school.

3. Government declined to substitute Mr. Stuart's scale for the rates of grants sanctioned in 1899 but said it had no objection to the new scale for schools in municipal areas—*vide* G.O., No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900.

4. The present Director now states that the late Mr. Stuart, from the experience gained during the past four years, was of opinion that the concessions granted in 1899 had removed all incentive to improvement, if they had not actually caused a deterioration in the professional qualifications of the teachers of high schools in the Ceded Districts and intended to again address Government on the subject. In support of Mr. Stuart's opinion Dr. Bourne encloses a statement showing the qualifications of the teachers employed in the High schools in the Ceded Districts during the last five years. According to this statement teachers holding trained teachers' certificates have decreased from 29 to 28; those holding untrained teachers' certificates, from 20 to 17; and those holding general education certificates from 23 to 20; while those holding no certificates whatever have increased from 9 to 11 and a new class of four teachers holding approved service certificates have come into being.

5. The Director therefore requests that the question may now be reconsidered and that the scale suggested* by Mr.

* The Director does not say so; but the scale he gives is the one suggested by Mr. Stuart. Stuart may be sanctioned in supersession of that now in force for all schools in municipal and non-municipal areas in the Ceded Districts on the understanding that it will not affect the salary grants already sanctioned in accordance with G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899.

† These districts with the exception of Municipal areas and kasha towns are included among backward localities—*vide* G.O., No. 636, dated 14th October 1902.

6. The following statement compares the rate of grant now drawn as a special case by teachers in the † Ceded Districts, the rates allowed by the Grant-in-Aid Code and the rates proposed by the Director:—

	Rates now in force.	Code rates.	Rates proposed by the Director of Public Instruction.
A Teachers with general education certificates in backward localities—the whole of the Ceded Districts excepting municipal towns and kasba stations.	One-half ..	One-third [rule 37 (iv)].	One-fourth.*
B Teachers with general education certificates in municipal towns and	One-fourth ..	Nil. ..	One-fourth.
C kasba stations in the Ceded Districts—not included among backward localities.	One-half ..	Nil. ..	One-fourth.
D Teachers holding untrained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade, and who are employed in secondary schools in non-municipal towns and in villages, in which the fees, if levied at the standard rates, do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure.	One-half ..	One-third [rule 37 (v)].	One-third.
E Teachers holding untrained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade, and who are employed in secondary schools in municipal towns and	One-third ..	One-fourth [rule 38 (i)].	One-third.
F other teachers holding untrained teachers' certificates anywhere in the Ceded Districts.	One-half ..	One-fourth [rule 38 (i)].	One-third.
Teachers holding trained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade, and who are employed in secondary schools in non-municipal towns and in villages, in which the † fees, if levied at the standard rates, do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure.	One-half ..	One-half [rule 36 (v)].	One-half.
Teachers holding trained teachers' certificates of the collegiate, second grade collegiate, or upper secondary grade, and who are employed in secondary schools in municipal towns and other teachers holding trained teachers' certificates anywhere in the Ceded Districts.	One-half ..	One-third [rule 37 (ii)].	One-half.
Teachers holding trained teachers' certificates and employed in training schools.	Two-thirds ..	One-half [rule 36 (vi)].	Two-thirds.

* In this case the Director perhaps means that this rate being only a concession will not supersede the code rate in backward localities.

† In no school in the Ceded Districts can the fees possibly cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure.

7. Orders are solicited as to whether the Director's proposal may be accepted.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—17-12-03.

The Director may be asked whether the statement in paragraph 6 *supra* correctly represents the actual facts. If it does his proposal affects only the classes of teachers marked A, C, D and F. In the case of teachers marked A their position will be worse than under the code and it does not appear that the proposed change can be allowed. In the case of C, D and F the proposals may be approved.

P. T. THARYAN—17-12-03.

Paragraph 3 of the Director's letter: the Director seems to have overlooked rule 37 (iv), Grant-in-Aid Code, which contemplates special exemptions from the operation of the Educational rules. He may be asked u.o. whether he wishes rule 37 (iv) to be altered and whether the table drawn up by the office is correct.

A. GALLETTI—18-12-03.

A. G. CARDEW—18-12-03.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

The table at the top of this page gives the rates now in force as one-fourth under B and one-third under E and if they were so I should be satisfied and should never have written the letter under reference.

2. They are so given presumably because G.O., No. 282, dated 14th July 1900, has been spoken of on page 1 of the note as allowing (in certain cases) the new scale, i.e., the scale proposed by Mr. Stuart and again by me.

3. Mr. Stuart did not however place this interpretation upon it nor can I. The order speaks of new concessions but says that no concessions now in force are to be withdrawn or modified.

4. Mr. Stuart proposed no new concessions in his No. 2957, dated 21st March 1900,—he did propose to reduce the grant to one-third in some cases, to one-quarter in others and as by the concession given in G.O., No. 736, dated 31st October 1899, no grant was to be less than the half, G.O., No. 282 had no effect. It so happens that Rule 37 (iv) does not apply in this case. The only schools in the Ceded Districts entitled to salary grants are not in "backward localities" as will be seen from the following list; they are all in municipal areas, or kasba stations (except the Sanskrit school at Kampli the teachers of which come under rule 37 (ix) (a) and as they have no general educational qualification they would not be affected by the present proposal):—

Cuddapah District—

Madanapalle High school Kasba station.

Anantapur—

London Mission High School, Gooty } Kasaba station.
London Mission Training school, Gooty, }
Sanskrit school, Hindupur Do.
Municipal High School, Anantapur Municipality.

Bellary—

Wardlaw College, Bellary } Municipality.
Sanskrit Bashamanjeri Patasala, Bellary }
Sanmarga Samaj Sanskrit School, Bellary }
Sanskrit School, Kampli Rural tract.
St. Philomena's Girl's High school, Bellary } Municipality.
Municipal High School, Bellary }
Board High School, Harpanahalli Kasba.

Kurnool—

S. P. G. High School, Nandyal Municipality.

5. So in the table on page 6 for all practical purposes A may disappear and the table becomes—

	Present rates.	Code rates.	Proposed rates.
B and C	$\frac{1}{2}$	Nil.	$\frac{1}{4}$
D	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$
E and F	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3}$

6. But for the concession there would be no grant under B and C and in my opinion the most important proposal now made is to reduce the half grant in this case to a quarter grant and so try to diminish, or at any rate check the present increase in, the number of uncertificated teachers.

7. The object holds good *mutatis mutandis* for the other grades of teachers.

8. Mr. Stuart seems to have been led by the u.o. correspondence in this file into comparing his proposals with the Code rules rather than with the rules in force under G.O., No. 736, dated 31st October 1899, and I think that G.O., No. 282, dated 14th July 1900, was based upon a misconception and that as I have pointed out above it had really no effective meaning.

9. My office letter C. No. 8983, dated 9th December 1903, is not sufficiently clear about the two-third grant for teachers in training schools or rather it should have stated that there was nothing new about the proposal—if the other proposals are sanctioned it would be well to notify the entire scale, hence the mention of it.

10. Paragraph 2 of my letter of course merely provides against existing grants, given on behalf of present teachers, being affected.

A. G. BOURNE—20-12-03.

The Director says that Rule 37 (iv) of the Grants-in-Aid Code does not apply in this case, as the only schools in the Ceded Districts which are entitled to salary grants are situated not in "backward localities" but in municipal towns and kasba stations. Such being the case the principal objection to the proposed scale disappears and it may be approved.

T.K.—23-12-03.

P. T. THARYAN—23-12-03.

Brevity was studied at the expense of clearness in the two orders (of 1899 and 1900) dealing with salary grants in the Ceded Districts.

2. *Mr. Stuart's interpretation of the order of 1899.*—The late Director understood the order of 1899 to modify the Grant-in-Aid Code in respect only of the amount of salary grants admissible, but not in respect of (1) the limitations laid down in the Code to certain categories only of teachers (2) the conditions laid down separately under some categories which further limit admissibility to grant. Thus, according to Mr. Stuart's interpretation of the order—

(1) the categories, (a) uncertificated teachers who have passed a general education test and are employed, etc., in municipal and kasba towns, Ceded Districts, (b) masters holding untrained-teachers' certificates of the, etc., in secondary schools in municipal towns, Ceded Districts, had not been affected by the order of 1899 because they are not among the categories in the Grant-in-Aid Code;

(2) the condition as to fees under the Grant-in-Aid Code's 5th category in section 37 had not been affected by the order of 1899.

3. The Government accepted Mr. Stuart's interpretation of their order, but did not accept all his proposals. His proposals were new concessions as far as categories go only in respect of (1) (a) and (b) above (new categories not in the Code). They were new concessions also in respect of the abolition of the condition referred to in (2) above. The Government in its order of 1900 approved of the new concessions proposed in respect of municipal areas, but did not accept the rest of the proposals (some of which were restrictions and not concessions).

4. *Dr. Bourne's interpretation of the order of 1899.*—Mr. Stuart's successor now returns to the order of 1899 and gives us his interpretation of it. He starts with the assumption that it should not be read subject to limitations as to categories or conditions. He therefore is of opinion that the half rate sanctioned in the order of 1899 is in force throughout the Ceded Districts for all categories and subject to no condition and that the order of 1900 is unintelligible [as indeed it would be if his view as to the order of 1899 is correct].

5. If the Government adheres to its interpretation of its order of 1899, the table on page 2 of these notes is correct except that the words "and kasba stations" under B should come out with reference to the order of 1900 and a new category C, for which the grant is *nil*, added. That no grants should be made to these teachers in kasba stations was of course not the intention of the order of 1900, which was badly drafted, but only its effect.

6. Particular attention is drawn to the first sentence in the Director's note. If Secretary agrees with the above, perhaps the file might go back to the Director who might no longer wish Government to introduce the changes shown in the table on page 6, but would be content to have the old orders in an intelligible shape.

7. It would appear from Dr. Bourne's note that half grants have in practice been made where, if the above is correct, smaller grants should have been made. If so, his predecessor would seem to have interpreted the order of 1899 in one way when discussing it with Government and in another when applying it in practice. Should we ask for information as to grants actually given in these cases?

A. GALLETTI—2-1-04.

G.O., No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899, though passed without any proper examination, such as a note for orders would have supplied, seems fairly clear. It approved two concessions to salary-grant schools in the Ceded Districts, viz.—

- (1) half salary grants to teachers possessing a general educational qualification irrespective of any professional qualification, and;
- (2) two-third salary grants to teachers in training schools who possess trained teachers' certificates.

I do not think we need concern ourselves with what interpretation the late Mr. Stuart put on this order in 1900. If he thought that the concessions of 1899 could be limited by further conditions, the authority for such a view is not plain. Dr. Bourne's present proposals may be considered independently of the G.O., No. 282, dated 14th July 1900, and on their merits they should, I think, be approved.

A. G. CARDEW—2-1-04.

I agree that Dr. Bourne's present proposals should be accepted.

G. S. F[ORBES]—9-1-04.

Please draft accordingly.

A.G.C.—11-1-04.

A draft is placed below for approval.

T.K.—12-1-04.

P. T. THARYAN—12-1-04.

I have put in words to make it clear that the Grant-in-Aid Code is to be superseded. But (1) should the condition laid down in 36 (v) and 37 (v) of the Code [that the fees, if levied at the standard rates, do not cover an adequate portion of the current expenditure] be inserted? (2) The Director says "these being special concessions for schools in the Ceded Districts need not be incorporated in the Grant-in-Aid Code". But the first proposal [one-fourth grant for teacher with general education] is not in form (whatever it may be in fact) a concession [*vide* Code, 37 (iv)] but as far as comparison is possible a restriction (the Code gives one-third grant). It should be made plain that teachers can only claim under this scale and not alternatively under section 37 (iv) of the Code, if that is the intention. There are no schools at present that could claim under section 37 (iv), but there is no reason why they should not be started in the near future. The draft, as submitted by me, makes claims under 37 (iv) inadmissible. But I imagine that is not the intention. In that case for the Director's No. (1) "a fourth grant for a teacher with a general education certificate" we should substitute (1) "For a teacher with a general education certificate (a) in municipal towns and kasba stations one-fourth, (b) in other parts of the Ceded Districts one-third." Then the new scale will be complete and will provide for case (b) as soon as it arises.

A. GALLETTI—12-1-04.

The addition made by the Assistant Secretary would have the effect of suspending such rules of the Grant-in-Aid Code as rules 26, 28 and 29, which is not, I think, intended. All that is meant is to give a revised scale of grant, more liberal than the Grant-in-Aid-Code, less liberal than the G.O., of 31st October 1899. I agree, however, that the condition as to fees in 36 (v) and 37 (v), though not important, are not intended to be superseded and the draft won't effect this supersession. It is not necessary, I think, to sub-divide the Director of Public Instruction's No. (1) so as to provide for the cases of schools not yet in existence. I have accordingly passed the draft.

A. G. CARDEW—18-1-04.

[G.O., No. 46, Educational, dated 20th January 1904.]

BRAD ALSO:—

No. 46, dated 20 1, 1904

R.S.

and the new scale will
apply ^{unconditionally} to all teachers
throughout the Ceded Districts
notwithstanding anything
to the contrary in the
Grant in Aid Code

The proposals of the Director
are ~~accepted~~ approved & sanctioned,
2. The Director
should arrange for the publication of the
74 notification mentioned in para: 3 of his letter

Phy 24/1/4 M_{12-1.4} 24.18.04

Educational (190³) Department.

CURRENT No. 2039

From

[Name] A.G. Bourne, Esq, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

C. No. 8983 of 1903.

Dated 9th December 1903.

Enclosures

one

Received

190 .

Registered

12. 12. 1903

SUBJECT.

Requesting that concessions granted to teachers employed in schools for general education in ^{the} Ceded districts in the matter of payment of salary grants may be modified.

BACK PAPERS.

to 736-31-10-49 m ✓
u 282-14-7-00 u ✓

157-19-2-95

FURTHER PAPERS.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

B
P
P
The concessions recommended by Dr. Duncan for teachers in the Ceded Districts and approved by Government in G.O.No. 736, Educational, dated 31st October 1899 being considered by the late Director too liberal, it was suggested in this office letter No. 2957, dated 21st March 1900 that they might be revised so far as institutions for general education were concerned, and a new scale graduated with reference to the nature of the certificates held by the teachers was proposed. Government, however, in G.O.No. 282, Educational, dated 14th July 1900 declined to withdraw or modify the old concessions. From the experience gained in the course of the past four years during which the concessions have been in force, the Director was inclined to think that these concessions had removed all incentive to improvement, if they had not actually caused a deterioration in the professional qualifications of the teachers of high schools in the Ceded districts. This will be seen from the enclosed statement showing the qualifications of the teachers employed in these schools during the past five years.

The late Director evidently intended to again address Government upon the subject. I have therefore the honour to request that the matter may now be reconsidered and that the following scale of salary grants may be sanctioned in supersession of that now in force for teachers employed in schools in the Ceded districts whether in Municipal or non-Municipal areas.

to Press.

Retn for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
190

DATED

URGENT

ENCLOSURES TO G.O.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

= Print in full.
= Not to be printed.
= Print abstract only.
= Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

Order complete.

Letter only.

Order complete with Letter.

Print with note
following print

7/10
2/10/1