D-10

Educational (1905) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 501-02

DATED 20-7-05

√ (9)

INDEXED. C To be indexed & returned

9/8/5

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Addressing the Govt of I. on the subject of the Grant of fees to officers of the Educational Service.

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 of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

2

Recd. } 1905. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., &c., Nos. 501, 502, 20th July 1905.

Fees to Officers.

Addressing the Government of India on the subject of the grant of — of the Educational service.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

I

Letter—from J. B. Brunyate, Esq., I.C.S., Officiating Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Education).

To—the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras.

Dated—Simla, the 23rd May 1905.

No.—338.

With reference to the first sentence of paragraph 3 of the Finance Department letter No. 7542-Ex., dated the 2nd December 1904, I am directed to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, a copy of the letter noted on the margin which has been addressed to other Local Governments on the subject of the grant of fees to officers of the Educational service.

Nos. 329–336, dated the 23rd May 1905.

2. I am to ask that the Government of India may be favoured with an expression of the opinion of the Governor in Council on the questions dealt with in that letter.

Enclosure.

Letter—from J. B. Brunyate, Esq., I.C.S., Officiating Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Education).

To—the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Education Department, and other Local Governments.

Dated—Simla, the 23rd May 1905.

No.—329—336.

I am directed to address the Government of $\frac{\text{Bombay}}{\text{etc.}}$ on the subject of the grant of fees to officers of the Educational service for work of various kinds which they undertake outside the scope of their ordinary duties. The present reference will not, however, deal with scientific work such as chemical analyses and laboratory and mechanical tests.

2. Educational officers more frequently than other classes of Government servants receive fees for conducting examinations. It is probable that the same officer may be employed as an examiner in consecutive years, and in such cases the question has arisen whether the fees paid to him should be regarded as fixed or recurring fees within the meaning of the note to article 72 (*b*) of the Civil Service Regulations. On a reference on this point from the Government of the Punjab, the Government of India decided in 1901 that, although the note to article 72 (*b*) must be held to apply when an officer is selected for an examinership with reference to the appointment which he holds under Government, it need not be applied to an officer who is selected on purely personal grounds irrespective of his position under Government, though those grounds may bring about his appointment in successive years.

3. The Government of India think that this ruling may suitably be applied in all cases in which there is a question of the sanction necessary to the receipt of examination fees by Educational officers. I am to enquire if this proposal commends itself to $\frac{\text{the Governor in Council}}{\text{etc.}}$.

4. Applications have been also submitted at various times to the Government of India for the grant of permission to Educational officers to undertake private tuition and to receive fees for the work. In some cases the permission applied for has been granted: in others it has been refused. Thus the policy which has been pursued in the past has not been altogether consistent, and the Governor-General in Council considers it desirable that the matter should now be placed

on a more satisfactory footing. In a recent case His Excellency in Council was asked to approve the proposal that the Principal of an Arts College should undertake the teaching of a private pupil for the term of one year, at a remuneration of Rs. 150 *per mensem*. It was not explained whether the pupil was or was not a member of the college. The Government of India thought that in the former event a student should not be able by extra payments to the Principal to obtain better teaching than the college itself afforded. They deprecated such an arrangement as likely to hamper needed reform in such matters as the diminution in the large number of lectures, the partial substitution for them of informal classes, and the supervision of private study. If on the other hand the pupil had no connection with the college the Government of India questioned whether the Principal should be able to afford time for the private teaching of outside students and whether he should be allowed to supplement his income in such a manner. The Government of India are inclined to adhere to this position, but the matter is one in which they desire to be made acquainted with the views of Local Governments. I am accordingly to request that the Government of India may be furnished with an expression of the opinion of $\frac{\text{the Governor in Council}}{\text{etc.}}$ on the question whether the practice of private tuition should, as a matter of general policy, be permitted, and, if so, whether it should be subject to any conditions and restrictions.

II

Endorsement from the Secretary to Government, Educational Department, No. 331, dated 10th June 1905.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

A. Galletti,
Ag. Under Secretary to Government.

III

Letter—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, the 28th June 1905.

No.—Ref. on C. 5226.

With reference to endorsement No. 331, dated 10th June, I have the honour to state that the ruling of the Government of India as to the manner in which the note to article 72 (*b*) should be applied in the case of Educational officers in receipt of examination fees appears to me to be sound.

2. With regard to the question of private tuition, I submit as already stated in my letter Ref. on Cur. No. 4550 of 1903, dated 6th February 1904, that under suitable control it is very desirable that it should be allowed in the case of Educational officers. It is good for the teachers as well as for the taught quite apart from the pecuniary benefit the former derive. It is usual for all classes of teachers except University Professors to undertake such work in England. These officers may be allowed to undertake the work subject to the conditions that previous permission should be sought in each case from the officer who appoints, controls leave, etc., and that the application should state the number of hours a week to be occupied and the fee to be received. The officers who should in my opinion be permitted to accept private tuition are teachers in Government colleges and schools and stipendiaries in training colleges and schools.

Order—No. 501, Educational, dated 20th July 1905.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

H. D. Taylor,
Ag. Secretary to Government

Letter—No. 502, Educational, dated 20th July 1905, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

I am directed to reply to Mr. Brunyate's letter No. 338, Education, dated the 23rd May 1905, on the subject of the grant of fees to officers of the Educational service.

2. The first question raised in the letter is whether the fees paid to an officer who may be employed as an examiner in consecutive years should be regarded as fixed or recurring fees within the meaning of the note to article 72 (*b*) of the Civil Service Regulations. On this point the Government of India decided in 1901 that, although the note to article 72 (*b*) must be held to apply when an officer is selected for an examinership with reference to the appointment which he holds under Government, it need not be applied to an officer who is selected on purely personal grounds irrespective of his position under Government though those grounds may bring about his appointment in successive years, and it is said that this ruling may suitably be applied in all cases in which there is a question of the sanction necessary to the receipt of examination fees by Educational officers. I am to state that this proposal commends itself to the Governor in Council.

3. The second question is whether the practice of private tuition should, as a matter of general policy, be permitted, and, if so, whether it should be subject to any conditions and restrictions. As regards this question the Government are of opinion that it is not desirable to lay any restrictions on the communication of knowledge by any one able and willing to impart it and that therefore the practice of private tuition should be permitted. The Governor in Council considers that teachers in Government colleges and schools and stipendiaries in training institutions may be allowed to accept private tuition, subject to the conditions that the previous permission of the controlling authority is obtained and that the number of hours a week to be occupied and the fee to be received are approved by such controlling authority.

H. D. TAYLOR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. A.F.E.

Educational Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 501, 502, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 20th JULY 1905.

[Subject.—*Grant of Fees to Officers of the Educational Service.*]

From the Government of India, Home Department, dated 23rd May 1905, No. 338.

Refer to the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

2. Meanwhile put up papers connected with the grant of allowances to managers of hostels, private tuition fees, etc. There have been several cases in the past year in which some discussion arose.

H. D. Taylor—10-6-05.

[Endorsement No. 331, Educational, dated 10th June 1905.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 28th June 1905, No. 5226.

The Government orders connected with the grant of allowances to managers of hostels and private tuition fees are submitted:—

(1) G.O., No. 497, Educational, dated 8th October 1903.
(2) „ „ 111 „ „ 15th February 1904.
(3) „ „ 375, Public „ „ 26th April „
(4) „ „ 479, Educational „ 8th August „
(5) „ „ 593, Financial „ 14th September „
(6) „ „ 588, Educational „ 21st „ „
(7) „ „ 808, Financial „ 17th December „
(8) „ „ 54, Educational „ 1st February 1905.
(9) „ „ 55, „ „ 1st „ „

2. In the first of the currents the Government of India enclose a copy of a letter addressed to other Local Governments on the subject of the grant of fees to officers of the Educational service and ask for the opinion of this Government on the questions dealt with in that letter.

3. The questions dealt with in that letter are—

(1) *Grant of fees to Educational officers for conducting examinations.*—With reference to this the Government of India remark that the same officer may be employed as an examiner in consecutive years and in such cases the fees paid to him should be regarded as recurring fees within the meaning of the note to article 72 (*b*) of the Civil Service Regulations if he was selected for the examinership with reference to the appointment which he holds under Government; but should not be so regarded if he was selected on purely personal grounds irrespective of his position under Government.

(2) *Grant of permission to Educational officers to undertake private tuition and to receive fees for the work.*—Here the Government of India instance the case of a Principal of an Arts College who applied for permission to undertake the teaching of a private pupil for the term of one year at a remuneration of Rs. 150 *per mensem*. In this case the Government of India thought that if the pupil referred to was a student of the College, he should not be able by extra payments to the Principal to obtain better teaching than the College itself afforded; if on the other hand the pupil was not

a student of the College, the Government of India questioned whether the Principal should be able to afford time for the private teaching of outside students and whether he should be allowed to supplement his income in such a manner. The Government of India are inclined to adhere to this position; yet they desire to be made acquainted with the views of Local Governments in the matter and want to know whether the practice of private tuition should as a matter of general policy be permitted and if so whether it should be subject to any conditions and restrictions.

4. The Director of Public Instruction to whom the Government of India's letter was referred for remarks states that the ruling of the Government of India on the first question appears to him to be sound and that, as regards the second question, it is very desirable that the practice of private tuition should be allowed in the case of Educational officers, that these officers should be allowed to undertake the work subject to the conditions that previous permission should be sought in each case from the officer who appoints, controls leave, etc., and that the application should state the number of hours a week to be occupied and the fee to be received. He considers that teachers in Government Colleges and schools and stipendiaries in Training colleges and schools may be allowed to accept private tuition.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—5-7-05.

A. Galletti—6-7-05.

Submitted that the views of the Director of Public Instruction may be accepted generally. He would not make any difference between private tuition given to students of the institution in which the teacher is employed, and to tuition given to outsiders. I can see no reason for any distinction.

The Director of Public Instruction would not grant this privilege to inspecting officers.

2. Should any return be called for periodically as to the extent to which the staff of Government schools and colleges engage in private tuition?

3. The proposals may also apply to the grant of permission to clerks employed in colleges to which hostels are attached to undertake also the duties of manager of the hostel.

H. D. Taylor—7-7-05.

It is not desirable to lay any restrictions on the communication of knowledge by any one able and willing to impart it. The difficulty is in this country that the teacher may not always regard his official duty as to be ranked above and not to be subordinated to his private interests or private gain.

2. Assuming thorough control, the Director's proposals may be agreed to but Government had better be kept informed of how the sanction is made use of.

J T[homson]—8-7-05.

A[mpthill]—11-7-05.

Please, draft.

H. D. Taylor—13-7-05.

A draft is placed below for approval.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—13-7-05.

A. Galletti—13-7-05.

H. D. Taylor—14-7-05.

J. T[homson]—15-7-05.

A[mpthill]—17-7-05.

Issue.

H. D. Taylor—18-7-05.

[G.O., Nos. 501, 502, Educational, dated 20th July 1905.]

~~4~~ 1 5

[E./2.]

480—20-7-04.

Educational Departmen[t]

C. No. 1068 From the Govt. of India, Home Depth. No. 338, dated 23-5-1905.

SUBJECT

Grant of fees to officers of the Educational Service.

~~3~~

Endt. no. 331 d/10-6-05

Referred to the D.P.I. for remarks.

[initials] 9/6/05

[initials] 10/6/05.

Sec 4

[initials] 8/6/5

[initials] 8-6-05

Desp. 10-6

Despd. 10/6/5

Omit

Meanwhile put up papers connected with the grant of allowances or Managing Hostels — private tuition fees etc. There have been several cases in the past year on which some discussion arose.

[initials] 10/6/05

Stock Form No. 135
3,000—6-10-04.

Educational (1905) Department.

CURRENT No. 1222

From

[*Name*] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[*Designation*] Director of Public Instruction,

[*Station*] M a d r a s

Ref. on cur No. 5 2 2 6 /05

No.

Dated 28th J u n e *190* 5

Enclosures one in original

Received 30 JUN 1905 *190* .

Registered *190*5.

LEGAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT.

SUBJECT.

Submitting remarks on Government Endorsement No. 3 3 1 Edl. dated 10th June 1905 regarding the grant of fees to officers of the E d u c a t i o n a l Service.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

3

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

4P

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 3 3 1 Educational dated 10th June I have the honour to state that the ruling of the covernment of India as to the manner in which the note to article 72 (b) should be applied in the case of Educational officers in receipt of examination fees appears to me to be sound.

2. With regard to the question of private tuition I submit as already stated in my letter Ref on Cur No. 4 5 5 0/03 dated 6th February 1904 that under suitable control it is very desirable that it should be allowed in the case of Educational officers. It is good for the teachers as well as for the taught quite apart from the pecuniary benefit the former derive. It is usual for all classes of teachers except University Professors to undertake such work in E n g l a n d. These officers may be allowed to undertake the work subject to the conditions that previous permission should be sought in each case from the officer who appoints, controls leave &c. and that the application should state the number of hours a week to be occupied and the fee to be received. The officers who should in my opinion be permitted to accept private tuition are teachers in Government Colleges and schools and stipendiaries in training Colleges and schools.

I have the honour to be,

S i r ,

Your most obedient servant,

E.W. Middlemast

for Director of Public Instruction.

[E. 12]

1,000—21-9-04.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

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

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1068 , From the G of I. H.D. , No 338 , dated 23rd May 1905

" " 1222 , " " D.P.I. , " 5226 , " 28th June 1905

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

ORDER No. 501 , dated 20-7- 1905.

P.S.

The Govt of I. will be addressed.

7th 13.7.05.

14.7.05.

Letter to no. 502 dy 20.7.05.

The Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Home Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to reply to ~~reply to~~ Mr. Brunyate's letter no 338, Education, dated the 23rd May 1905 on the subject of the ~~request for grant of fees~~ Educational ~~Officers of the Educational service~~.

2.

Standing 5.8

2. The first question raised in the letter is whether the fees paid to an officer who may be employed as an examiner in consecutive years should be regarded as fixed or recurring fees within the meaning of the note to article 72 (b) of the C.S.R. On this point the Govt. of I. decided in 1901 that, although the note to article 72(b) must be held to apply when an officer is selected for an examinership with reference to the appointment which he holds under Govt., it need not be applied to an officer who is selected on purely personal grounds irrespective of his position under Govt, though those grounds may bring about his appointment in successive years and it is said that this ruling may suitably be applied in all cases in which there is a question of the sanctions necessary to the receipt of examination fees by Educational Officers. I am to state that this proposal commends itself to the Governor in Council.

3. The second question is whether the practice of private tuition should,

(Standing)

as a matter of general policy, be permitted, and, if so, whether it should be subject to any conditions and restrictions. As regards this question the Govt are of opinion that it is not desirable to lay any restrictions on the communication of knowledge by any one able and willing to impart it and that therefore the practice of private tuition should be permitted. The Governor in council considers that teachers in Govt. colleges and schools and stipendiaries in Training institutions may be allowed to accept private tuition subject to the conditions that the previous permission of the controlling authority is obtained and that the number of hours a week to be occupied and the fee to be received are approved by such controlling authority.

7.H.
13-7-05

[initials] 13-7-05

[initials]
14-7-05

[initials] 15-7-05

[initials]
17-7-05

opy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

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

AGAIN G.O., No. 190 , DATED

ORRECT No.

TORRE TO C. No.

DER OF GOVERNMENT .. ..

ER OF GOVERNMENT.

WIRE, DITTO.

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

B.—

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