—06—19-4-06.

Educational (1906) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 495-496

DATED 25-7-06

No Notes

30 JUL 1906

25

[Despatch Abstract.]

Requesting the Govt. of India to obtain the sanction of
the Secretary of State to the proposition Statement
submitted with letter No. 185 d/27-3-05 on
the subject of the Reorganisation of
training Schools for primary teachers.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Goverment of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd. } 1906. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., &c., Nos. 495, 496, 25th July 1906.

N. P.

Requesting the Government of India to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State to the proposition statement submitted with letter No. 185, dated 27th March 1905, on the subject of the reorganisation of training schools for primary teachers.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

I

G.O., Nos. 625, 626, Educational, dated 15th September 1905.

Abstract.—Replying to the letter from the Government of India on the subject of the reorganization of the training schools for primary schoolmasters in the Madras Presidency.

II

Letter—from H. H. Risley, Esq., c.s.i., c.i.e., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Education).
To—the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Educational Department.
Dated—Simla, the 30th May 1906.
No.—378.

I am directed to refer to your letter No. 626, dated 15th September 1905, regarding the proposals of the Government of Madras for the reorganisation of training schools for primary teachers. The difficulty which the Government of India have felt in complying with the request of the Governor in Council that the present scheme, which relates only to the training of lower primary school teachers, may be sanctioned as a modest instalment of reform, while that which relates to the training of upper primary school teachers is deferred, arises partly from the objections which the Secretary of State has expressed to the submission to him of such schemes in piecemeal fashion.

2. The Government of India attach great importance to the establishment of some thoroughly well-equipped training schools for students who have passed through a lower secondary vernacular school and will be qualified after training to take charge of upper primary schools. The filling of such training schools with students appears to depend upon three conditions—the efficiency of the lower secondary vernacular schools in which the students will receive their preliminary education ; the adequacy of the stipends paid to them while under training ; and the prospects of their finding employment when they have been trained. The Government of India confidently expect that these conditions will be capable of fulfilment in the Madras Presidency.

3. The cost of the scheme for training lower primary teachers is estimated at Rs. 69,000 *per annum*. The Government of India observe from your letter No. 129, dated 6th March 1905, that when this money has been spent the whole of the eight lakhs grant made in 1902 will have been exhausted.

If the Government of Madras are able to give an assurance that an equal amount will be available should it be required for the reorganisation of the training of upper primary teachers, the Government of India will be prepared to recommend the present scheme for the sanction of the Secretary of State. If, however, that assurance is not forthcoming the Government of India must defer action until they have before them as a whole the schemes for training primary teachers of all grades.

Order—No. 495, Educational, dated 25th July 1906.

The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

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

Letter—from H. D. TAYLOR, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras, Educational Department.
To—the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Education).
Dated—Ootacamund, the 25th July 1906.
No.—496, Educational.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 378 (Education), dated 30th May 1906, on the subject of the reorganization of training schools for primary teachers in the Madras Presidency.

The scheme of reorganization proposed by this Government is estimated to cost Rs. 69,000 per annum and the Government of India state that, if the Madras Government are able to give an assurance that an equal amount will be available, should it be required, for the reorganization of the training of upper primary teachers, they will be prepared to recommend the scheme for the sanction of the Secretary of State.

2. In reply, I am to state that briefly the proposals of this Government were, as summarized in paragraph 5 of the Home department letter No. 509 (Education), of the 3rd August 1905,

(*a*) that the course of study in primary training schools should be remodelled so as to include general studies as well as training in the art of teaching,

(*b*) that the course in the Primary (but not in the Lower Secondary) schools should be lengthened to two years,

(*c*) that the monthly stipends in the two grades of training school should be raised from Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 to Rs. 6 and Rs. 7, respectively, and

(*d*) that a cadre of teachers should be provided for the practising schools attached to the training institution of both grades.

3. Of these proposals those which relate to the remodelling of the course of studies and the provision of a cadre of teachers for the practising schools may be considered together. The cost of the latter which is practically all the extra cost that has to be incurred on account of both proposals was estimated at Rs. 29,120 per annum, the reorganization of the staff of the training schools being expected to result in a net increased expenditure of Rs. 276 per annum only. The cost of giving effect to the proposals to lengthen the course in primary schools and to raise the stipends was estimated at Rs. 40,000 per annum.

4. As stated in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 185, Educational, dated 27th March 1905, the main reason for recommending an increase in the rates of stipends was to remove the difficulty that, it was feared, would be experienced in securing students of the primary grade for a course of training lasting two years. The Government are however now informed that in consequence of an anticipated general improvement in the condition and prospects of the primary schoolmaster, it appears probable that no great difficulty need be anticipated for the future in obtaining candidates for training in sufficient numbers on the existing rates of monthly stipends. The Government have therefore decided to abandon the proposal to raise the rates of stipends ; and in this connection I am to observe that the sanction conveyed in the Home department telegram No. 32 (Education), dated 23rd January 1906, has not as yet been acted upon. Any increase in cost consequent on an increase in the number of stipendiaries arising from the extension of the course for primary teachers to two years may also be left out of account as all the stipendiaries will not necessarily be Provincial stipendiaries : some being stipendiaries of Local Boards. The total number of Provincial stipendiaries can be regulated from time to time according to the funds available.

5. The sanction of the Secretary of State will thus be required only to the provision of a cadre of teachers for the practising schools at a cost of Rs. 29,120 per annum. These schools will serve as practising schools for training schools of any grade and their improvement is very desirable even if no other measure of reform were meditated. The staff which it is proposed to employ in these schools will set free the staff of the training schools to devote more time to the normal students, and the proposal, if sanctioned, will give the latter good schools as models.

6. At present there are six Inspectors' circles in this Presidency and the Governor in Council does not consider that more than one school for each circle will be required for the training of upper primary teachers. Such schools can and will be

established in centres where schools under the scheme now under consideration exist and in supersession of those schools. Fresh practising schools will thus not be necessary for the superior grade training schools when they are established and the only extra cost on account of these schools will be merely the cost of the superior staff required. That staff can, it is anticipated, be secured by an outlay of Rs. 200 extra per mensem in each of the three upper secondary training schools and of Rs. 340 extra per mensem in each of three of the lower secondary training schools in the scheme now under consideration. The total extra cost on account of the superior grade training schools when they are established will thus be between Rs. 20,000 and Rs. 25,000 per annum (Rs. 19,440 on account of the staff and the balance on account of contingencies). This sum can be spared from the total extra expenditure of Rs. 69,000 already proposed out of which, as stated in paragraph 4 *supra*, Rs. 40,000 will now be available.

7. In these circumstances I am to request that the Government of India will be pleased to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State to the proposition statement forwarded with my letter No. 185, Educational, dated 27th March 1905.

8. The Governor in Council would have at once formulated proposals for the establishment of the superior grade training schools which the Government of India have in view but for the fact that the need for better trained primary teachers is, as the Government of India are aware, very pressing. The "Educational Rules" of the Presidency have been undergoing material revision involving the creation of a sharp distinction between purely vernacular schools and schools intended to lay the foundation for secondary and higher English education. His Excellency in Council would wish to see the effect of this change before taking steps to establish the superior grade training schools referred to. Meanwhile teachers for the better class of these purely vernacular schools can be trained in some of the superior training schools which are already in existence.

Educational Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 495, 496, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 25th JULY 1906.

[Subject.—*Reorganization of Training Schools for Masters.*]

From the Government of India, Home Department, dated 30th May 1906, *No.* 378.

In their letter No. 185, Educational, dated 27th March 1905, the Madras Government submitted to the Government of India a scheme for the reorganization of the Training schools for masters in the Presidency. The extra cost of the scheme was estimated at Rs. 69,396—Rs. 29,396 on establishments and Rs. 40,000 on stipends—paragraphs 10 and 11 of the letter. The main features of the scheme were—

Please see abstract in paragraph 5 of the letter from the Government of India on page 3 of G.O., Nos. 625, 626, Educational, dated 15th September 1905.

(1) The course of study in primary training schools was to be remodelled so as to include general studies as well as training in the art of teaching.

(2) The course in the Primary (but not in the Lower Secondary) Schools and departments was to be lengthened to two years.

(3) The monthly stipends in the two departments was to be raised from Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 to Rs. 6 and Rs. 7, respectively, and

(4) A cadre of teachers was to be provided for the practising schools attached to the Training institutions.

Paragraph 2 of the office-note, dated 30th August 1905, on page 3 of the notes with G.O., Nos. 625, 626, dated 15th September 1905.

Of the increased cost of establishments only Rs. 276 was proposed for the training sections; the balance of Rs. 29,120 was on account of the practising sections.

Please see abstract in paragraph 2 of letter No. 626, Educational, dated 15th September 1905.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of letter No. 626, Educational, dated 15th September 1905.

2. Upon this the Government of India suggested "that a limited number of large and well-equipped normal schools should be established in which the pay of the teachers should be much higher than it would be in any of the existing schools when reorganized under the scheme proposed by this Government; that the minimum qualification for admission should be the attainment of the Lower Secondary standard of education and the course of training a two years' course; and that the system of training in these institutions, which is described as 'the main system', should be supplemented by a subsidiary system or subsidiary systems of training to provide masters for schools where the salaries paid are insufficient to attract teachers trained in the new high grade training institutions." The Government of India desired to have the views of the Madras Government on these suggestions. In reply this Government said that what the Government of India suggested as a subsidiary system of training must remain for the present the main system in Madras, that the scheme submitted was a modest

scheme which applied only to primary students and aimed at improving the training of teachers whose salary would only in exceptional cases exceed Rs. 10 and was meant to be taken as a first instalment, that the training even with the improvements proposed was an inferior system of training, that it must for the present co-exist with any more elaborate system which might be inaugurated in a few institutions established for the purpose of providing more highly trained teachers for the few more highly paid posts and that schemes for the reorganization of the training of Lower Secondary and of Upper Secondary students would be submitted in due course. The Government of India were accordingly requested to approve separately and submit to the Secretary of State for his sanction the proposals submitted with letter No. 185 of the 27th March 1905.

Paragraph 8 of letter No. 626, Educational, dated 15th September 1905.

3. The Government of India now say that "if the Government of Madras are " able to give an assurance that an equal amount (Rs. 69,000) will be available, should " it be required, for the reorganization of the training of upper primary teachers, the " Government of India will be prepared to recommend the present scheme for the " sanction of the Secretary of State. If, however, that assurance is not forthcoming, " the Government of India must defer action until they have before them the schemes " for training primary teachers of all grades."

4. In his letter No. 9173, dated 13th December 1905, the Director requested sanction to raise from Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 per mensem from 1st January 1906 the stipends paid to students in the primary departments of Training schools, but sanction was refused, pending the final orders of the Secretary of State on the scheme for the reorganization of Training schools—G.O., No. 74, Educational, dated 9th February 1906.

G.O., No. 74, Educational, dated 9th February 1906.

5. Under the condition now imposed by the Government of India the total amount required for the reorganization of Training schools will be Rs. 1,38,000. It does not appear that it will be possible to spare this sum from the Educational budget. The Director may, however, be asked un-officially. Perhaps the part of the scheme effecting an increase in the rates of stipends may be abandoned. This will reduce the cost of the scheme submitted by about Rs. 20,000. There is no provision on this account in the current year's budget—G.O., No. 273, Financial, dated 7th April 1906.

	RS.
255 Lower Secondary pupils	3,060
730 Primary pupils—two sets	17,520
	20,580

Page 18 of the notes with G.O., Nos. 184, 185, dated 27th March 1905.

6. On receipt of the Director of Public Instruction's reply, Financial may be consulted.

P. T. THARYAN—9-6-06.

C. A. SOUTER—9-6-06.

To the Director of Public Instruction for remarks.

H. D. TAYLOR—11-6-06.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

The proposal which required the sanction of the Government of India and the Secretary of State was to provide a staff for the practising school attached to each training school and thus set free the training school staff to devote more time to the normal students and give the latter good schools as models. Cost for 28 schools is Rs. 29,120 per annum.

2. These schools will serve as practising schools for elementary or primary Training schools of any "grade". There need be no further expense in the matter of practising school whatever developments on the lines suggested by the Government of India may take place in regard to any of the training schools, provided some of the existing centres be selected and this may be done.

It is not quite correctly representing the facts to say that it is proposed to spend Rs. 69,000 on the training of lower primary teachers. The expenditure now proposed is to some extent a stage in any reform. In any case these practising or model schools are very desirable even if absolutely nothing else were done.

3. There were two other proposals which required no administrative sanction but would necessitate further budget provision :—

(1) to raise the Rs. 5 stipends to Rs. 6 and the Rs. 6 stipends to Rs. 7 ;
(2) to increase the number of stipendiaries.

The proposal to raise the stipends may be abandoned. There is an idea abroad that the elementary schoolmaster has a better time in store for him and candidates for training will doubtless come forward even on the old rate of stipend. The number of stipendiaries may be determined from time to time according to the funds available. Lengthening the course does not *necessarily* involve extra expenditure.

What I wish to emphasize is that the only expenditure which could not be reduced in connection with the exigencies of any particular year's budget is the Rs. 29,120. Further, that if this expenditure is now incurred any scheme for a different grade of training school (allowing one such for each circle) would cost Rs. 6,240 less per annum than it otherwise would as the necessary practising school will be already established.

4. The cost (for establishment) of any scheme likely to be adopted in the future may be set down at about Rs. 20,000 per annum (at any rate less than the Rs. * 25,000 limit). I obtain this figure by adding Rs. 200 per mensem to the cost of the three Secondary training schools and Rs. 340 per mensem to that of three of the present Lower Secondary schools.

* For which Secretary of State's sanction is necessary. The objection is however that partial schemes should not be sent up so as to evade this rule.

H. D. TAYLOR.

5. Funds may be found by making the Local Boards pay stipends to students being trained for employment in their schools. This would be a legitimate charge on the 6 lakhs grant. Boards cannot do much to extend primary education without teachers. Better establish 5 per cent. fewer schools and have them better staffed. This gives Rs. 30,000 per annum.

But this 6 lakhs does not belong to *Local*. It is Provincial money.

C. M. SCHMIDT.

Paragraph 2 of Finance and Commerce letter No. 1763 A., dated 23rd March 1905, on page 2 of G.O., No. 308, Financial, dated 10th April 1905.

6. I do not at present deal further with possible future developments as I hope that such a guarantee may be given as will induce the Government of India to apply for sanction to the proposals now before them namely an additional expenditure on establishment involving Rs. 29,396 per annum.

H. D. TAYLOR—13-6-06.

A. G. BOURNE—13-6-06.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The Director considers that from the scheme submitted to the Government of India which it was stated would involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 69,396, the portion relating to stipends, costing Rs. 40,000, may be omitted and the Government of India asked to obtain sanction to the rest.

Paragraph 3 of his note *supra*.

2. As regards stipends, the Director states that the increased rate from Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 to Rs. 6 and Rs. 7, respectively, is not very necessary at present, and that the amount required to pay the increased number of stipendiaries resulting from the extension of the course for Primary school teachers from one to two years may be met by adjustments in the budget (by asking local bodies to pay the stipends of students sent by them for training and allowing them to debit the cost of those stipends to the six lakhs grant or otherwise).

Paragraph 3 *ibid*.

But the 6 lakhs grant is not theirs. It is Provincial.

C. M. SCHMIDT.

Paragraph 4 of Director's note *supra*.

G.O., No. 200, Educational, dated 17th March 1906.

3. The additional amount required for 6 Secondary Training schools of the character suggested by the Government of India is put down at between Rs. 20,000 and Rs. 25,000 exclusive of stipends, and this is within the Rs. 40,000 which will now be set free. (There are now six ordinary Inspectors' circles).

4. May the Government of India be addressed on these lines with the concurrence of Financial and the Director asked meanwhile to submit at once his scheme for secondary schools or should the Director be asked to submit at once a comprehensive scheme so that it may be sent up to the Government of India to be substituted for the partial scheme already submitted. The adoption of the latter course will involve some further delay.

P. T. Tharyan—15-6-06.

Even though there may be some delay, it would seem advisable to send up the complete scheme. India apparently is willing to consider such a scheme.

C. A. Souter—16-6-06.

Will Director of Public Instruction please say when a detailed scheme for Secondary training schools may be expected? As the need for trained Primary teachers is urgent, it is desirable to obtain sanction for the proposals in their case without delay, but the sanction of India may be more speedily obtained if the full scheme for both classes of schools is before them.

H. D. Taylor—18-6-06.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Office of the Director of Public Instruction.

The idea of sending up a complete scheme now, occurred to me when writing my previous note. I considered the question and came to the following conclusions:—

(*a*) that at present we do not know exactly what we really want;
(*b*) that it may be at least two or three years before we do know; and
(*c*) that as the Government of India now seem inclined to sanction the scheme already before them it might cause a good deal of extra delay to add to it or alter it in any way even if I knew how best to do so.

2. In the new Educational Rules I propose to recognize three grades of teachers—

(1) Trained graduates to serve as headmasters of all Secondary schools and as teachers in as many as possible of the forms thereof.

(2) Trained matriculates to serve as teachers in the lower classes of Secondary schools and as headmasters and teachers in the higher standards of Elementary schools.

(3) Trained men of lower qualifications for the lower standards of Elementary schools. Some of these will be better than others and their certificates will show exactly what is thought of their capabilities (see also proposed Rule 20).

3. Paragraph 2 of the current from the Government of India refers to thoroughly well-equipped training schools for students who have passed through a Lower Secondary Vernacular school (the same thing as our new Elementary school going up to standard VII). This seems to me to display a lack of knowledge of our conditions. The fact is that at present we have nothing worth speaking of in the way of "Lower Secondary Vernacular schools." I made a complete list of such schools which I subjoin.

Complete list for the Presidency of Lower Secondary Vernacular Schools with Form III showing the number of boys in that form:—

Ganjám Dhárákóta Raja's School	14
Berhampur Bretertha's School	3
London Mission School, Maddelipalem	19
Canadian Baptist, Samalkota	18
Church Mission, Masulipatam	12
American Baptist, Ongole	2
American Mission, Rentachintla	11
American Baptist, Bestwarpet	25
London Mission, Gooty	29
London Mission, Kadiri	4
Nandalúr School	7
P. V. Chetti's School, Vayalpad	3
Nagareddipalli School	8
S.P.G. School, Egmore	9
Wesleyan, Thousand Lights	15
Purasawalkam School	21
Free Church, Wallajabad	17
Wesleyan, Ikkadu	10
Siruvallur School	34
Six Board Schools in Tanjore District	68
Catholic School, Negapatam	10
Ayampet Coronation School	8
Municipal Muhammadan, Trichinopoly	8
Turaiyur School	13
Madura Technical Institute	9
Tinnevelly Technical Institute	7
Church Mission, Donavur	19
S.P.G., Kulasékarapatnam	3
Kaddyam School	4
Ariyanayakipuram School	8
Kanchupata School	6
London Mission, Palladam	4
Kodumudi (London Mission)	7
Kaniyur School	6
Kodumudi School	9
Sendamangalam School	3

It is obvious at a glance that these are not schools to which we can look for a supply of students to be trained nor for whom it would be worth while having thoroughly well-equipped training schools such as are contemplated by the Government of India. There has of course been no attempt up to now to have good vernacular schools. Schools which have been fit for anything have been classed as English schools and have aimed at preparing pupils for the Matriculation.

In this Presidency English has a different place from that which it occupies in the north of India. Hence the past treatment of vernacular schools.

G. S. F[orbes].

4. We must for the present look to trained matriculates for the staffs of higher Elementary schools. We have some provision for training them and this provision can be improved piecemeal if and where necessary without anything which could be called general reorganization.

The age question is another matter to be considered in connection with any scheme like that suggested by India. These pupils whom it is proposed to train will average 12 to 13 years in age, even after two years training they would be hardly old enough to take charge of schools.

5. Two or three years hence it may be possible to see more clearly what position the higher Elementary school is likely to take in the educational system and it may then be possible to say with some certainty what general further reorganization of the training schools is desirable. In the meantime an assurance that more money will be forthcoming when required appears likely to secure what is known to be urgently wanted now.

A. G Bourne—19-6-06.

Educational Department.

We may now address India in terms of Director of Public Instruction's note of 13th instant, asking only for sanction to the increased establishment at a cost of Rs. 29,000 odd per annum. The proposed increases in rates of stipends may be abandoned.

2. It may be explained that as the practising schools will already exist, the proposals for the improvement of secondary training schools will cost less in proportion,

K | say Rs. 20,000 per annum, and that Government will be prepared to incur this additional expenditure when a complete scheme is worked out.

H. D. Taylor—20-6-06.

To the Financial Department for remarks.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Page 11 of G.O., Nos. 825, 826, Financial, dated 8th December 1903.

In paragraph 27 of Finance and Commerce Department letter No. 4933-A., dated 13th August 1903, containing detailed proposals of the Government of India for the recent Provincial Settlement adopted for this Presidency, the Government of India remarked:—

"The settlement now proposed does not take into account the increased "expenditure which may be rendered necessary by reforms which are in contemplation "in the administration of Police and Education, except to the extent of the Rupees "8,00,000 a year already allowed under the latter head . . . . ."

Paragraph 59 of letter to India No. 826, Financial, dated 8th December 1903 (page 17).

* Among the projects already determined on were *the reform of training schools* and the further reorganization of girls' schools.

2. In reply it was pointed out by this Government that it had not been possible to make full use of the additional recurring allotment of 8 lakhs sanctioned in 1902–1903 owing to the necessity of first working out the schemes for the expenditure under several of the items, that the budget estimate for 1903–1904 of 23·98 lakhs (settlement figure proposed by India) made no provision for expenditure already determined * on and for schemes to be taken in the near future. This Government urged that Provincial funds would be unable to bear any large increase under Education and contended that the settlement estimate should be taken at 26 lakhs at least as against 23·98 lakhs proposed by the Government of India. In fixing the terms of the Provincial Settlement the Government of India adhered to their decision to fix the estimate under 22. EDUCATION at 23·98 lakhs, but added that the settlement did not take into account any contribution which the Government of India might find it desirable to make towards the expenditure rendered necessary by reforms which were in contemplation in the administration of . . . . . . Education.

Page 5 of G.O., No. 273, Financial, dated 7th April 1904, and paragraph 8 of Finance and Commerce Department letter No. 1863-A, dated 19th March 1904, on page 3 *ibid.*

3. In our letter No. 884, Financial, dated the 29th December 1905, the Government of India were requested to raise the assignment to the Provincial revenues of Madras by a further grant of 1 lakh during 1906–1907, and by a recurring grant of 2 lakhs from 1907–1908 onwards in order to meet the expenditure on account of Education on the ground that "the reforms resulting from the Educational Conference held at Simla in 1901 have now for the most part been sanctioned and are either in full operation or in course of introduction and that increased expenditure under this head has arisen from reforms carried out since the introduction of the current Provincial Settlement."

Paragraph 3 of letter No. 884, Financial, dated 29th December 1905.

Paragraph 11 *ibid.*

Financial Department letter No. 470-A, dated 25th January 1906, on page 2 of G.O., No. 125, Financial, dated 14th February 1906.

4. In reply the Government of India stated that beyond the grants of 6 lakhs and 1·05 lakhs which they had of their own accord sanctioned for expenditure on primary education and on university education, they could not admit any claim to further assistance from Imperial revenues.

Paragraph 1 of Educational office-note, dated 15th June 1906.

Paragraph 1 of Educational Secretary's note, dated 20th June 1906.

Paragraph 4 of Director's note, dated 13th June 1906.

Paragraph 2 of Educational Secretary's note, dated 20th June 1906.

5. It is now proposed to reduce the cost of the reorganization of primary grade training schools (training of Lower Primary school teachers) from Rs. 69,000 per annum which was estimated in this Government's letter No. 185, Educational, dated 27th March 1905, to about Rs. 29,000 per annum and it is also estimated that the amount required for the reorganization of higher grade training schools (training of Upper Primary teachers) may come to about Rs. 20,000 a year, so that the total cost of the reorganization of training schools amounts to about Rs. 49,000 a year which is less than the original cost of Rs. 69,000 a

year proposed by this Government for the reorganization of primary grade training schools alone. The Government of India require an assurance from this Government to the effect that Provincial Revenues will meet the amount required for the reorganization of the training of Upper Primary teachers—about Rs. 20,000 as *now* estimated. Submitted that there appears to be no objection to the Government of India being informed that the expenditure of about Rs. 20,000 can be met by Provincial funds when the scheme is worked out.

Paragraph 3 of letter from the Government of India (Home), No. 378, dated 30th May 1906.

Portion marked **K** in Educational Secretary's note, dated 20th June 1906.

V.G.K.—23–6–06.

Paragraph 3 of Home Department letter No. 378, dated 30th May 1906.

C. M. SCHMIDT.

Hardly.

M. HAMMICK.

Letter No. 884, Financial, dated 29th December 1905.

This is a mania of Mr. Schmidt's.

G. S. F[ORBES].

* This is rubbish. The Imperial Government must be presumed to have the right to dictate a policy or to inaugurate a scheme. And in Education they have certainly pressed forward and assisted the interests of education to an extent which we as a Provincial Government would never have attempted to undertake.

G. S. F[ORBES]—7–7–06.

Director of Public Instruction's note, dated 19th June 1906.

The stipulation attached by India to their support of the partial scheme is, I think, unprecedented and, with due respect to that Government, seems to have been prompted by our request last December that they should keep to their engagement as regards expenditure on reforms in the administration of education in contemplation when the present settlement was under consideration. The Government of India are making the scheme for the training of Primary teachers depend upon the debit of the cost and not upon the *necessity* for the scheme. This letter instances the evils of these earmarked grants. India *before the present settlement* gave 8 lakhs for expenditure on educational schemes—mostly * their own—and now that they see that recurring expenditure amounting to 8 lakhs has been involved in the prosecution of those schemes they write as if the 8 lakhs were Imperial money, which it is not, and call for guarantees from Provincial as regards schemes still in the air. From what the Director of Public Instruction says it seems unlikely that any scheme for the training of Upper Primary teachers will be developed for some years yet, so Provincial may assume the guarantee for expenditure thereon with a light heart, though the procedure adopted by India in this case is objectionable. In agreeing to this guarantee and to the modified scheme for the training of Lower Primary teachers, this Department cannot, it is submitted, guarantee that the Educational grant will necessarily be increased. If necessary, portion, or the whole, of the cost should come out of the 6 lakhs grant for primary education. This grant, it seems necessary to point out, does not belong to Local Boards. It represents *Provincial* money and is at the disposal of Provincial. Local has no proprietary right—direct or indirect—in it.

C. M. SCHMIDT—3–7–06.

Paragraph 2 of Finance Department letter No. 1763-A, dated 23rd March 1905, on page 2 of G.O., No. 308, Financial, dated 10th April 1905.

No, but it has practically been all allocated I think.

M. HAMMICK.

It is the *Educational* Department and not *Local and Municipal* that are interested in the money!

G. S. F[ORBES]—7–7–06.

I don't think there is anything to object in the Government of India letter. They merely say "we don't like the scheme "unless you are prepared to supplement it "by a further one—and for that you must "find the funds". They have already told us they are not prepared to promise us further allotments and we have to accept that position. As far as I can see the Educational proposals will not involve us in any liabilities beyond what can be met from the existing Educational grant and I think their proposals may be accepted.

M. HAMMICK—4–7–06.

I agree.

G. S. F[ORBES]—7–7–06.

I take it that the position is that the cost of the reorganization of the training schools for Primary teachers of both the Upper and the Lower grades will be Rs. 49,000 and that we are asked in Financial to guarantee that this sum will be forthcoming when wanted.

2. The 6 lakhs grant is Provincial money, but we have accepted it on the understanding that it is to be applied to the development of primary education. The scheme of reorganization above referred to is a primary need of such development and its cost is therefore a perfectly proper charge against the 6 lakhs grant. Though Educational can and does assign in each year the whole 6 lakhs grant only part is recurring expenditure and such expenditure does not at present exceed or equal half the grant. Provided it is understood that any recurring or other expenditure which may be needed in connection with the reorganization of these training schools for Primary school teachers is a first charge on the 6 lakhs grant, I do not see any objection to our giving the assurance that India want. It will be for Educational and Financial to see that the total grant for primary education, viz., 6 lakhs *plus* the charge to Provincial when that grant was made (I forget the figures in this year's budget, it is 1,07,500, page 135, Civil Budget Estimate, it was about 1,00,000 or 1,25,000 as I remember) is not exceeded.

G. S. F[ORBES].

G. S[TOKES]—5-7-06.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Please see my note of 20th June 1906 India may be informed accordingly. The proper training of teachers for Primary schools is an important stepping stone towards the improvement of Primary schools, and there appears to be no objection to earmarking the amount required as a first charge upon the 6 lakhs grant in aid of primary education. When the charge comes to be incurred there will be less available for expenditure on the construction of new buildings.

No need to "earmark" it as a "*first* charge," the amount is trifling.

G. S. F[ORBES].

The bulk of the grant will be spent on instruction, not buildings. The expenditure on latter will soon be nearly exhausted.

G. S. F[ORBES].

H. D. TAYLOR—7-7-06.

Please draft.

G. S. F[ORBES]—7-7-06.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved should it go to Financial for acceptance?

P. T. THARYAN—10-7-06.

The draft may go to Financial for acceptance after approval by the Honourable Member.

H. D. TAYLOR—11-7-06.

Yes: approved subject to remarks of Financial Department.

G. S. F[ORBES]—11-7-06.

To the Financial Department.

H. D. TAYLOR—12-7-06.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft may be accepted, it is submitted, subject to the understanding set out in the Honourable Member's note, dated 5th July 1906. Educational may, it is submitted, be asked to send us copy of the notes and of the letter to India and also to intimate (i) what recurring expenditure has so far been incurred from the 6 lakhs grant and (ii) what expenditure (recurring and otherwise) is likely to be incurred in, say, the next two years.

C. M. SCHMIDT—12-7-06.

The Honourable Member should see this draft. I do not think Financial can raise any objection to it.

M. HAMMICK—13-7-06.

I see no objection to the draft.

G. S[TOKES]—13-7-06.

To the Educational Department.

C. M. SCHMIDT—14-7-06.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft letter to India is circulated to His Excellency the Governor for approval.

H. D. TAYLOR—16-7-06.

Approved.

A. L[AWLEY]—17-7-07.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—18-7-06.

[G.O., Nos. 495, 496, Educational, dated 25th July 1906.]

---

w
ools
ee

in
ub-
to
khs
in,
6.

[E.]

1,500—12-12

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

	From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
[933].	Govt of India	378	30-5-6	1.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No.

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, &c., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.
625-26	15-9-05	sc		
128-29	6-3-05	sc	35 of 04	
642-43	22-[illegible]-04	sc	251,52/03. 302,303/17-5-02	
449	25-7-04	sc	87,88/02.	
447	16-7-04	sc		
223	6-4-04	sc		
215-16	[illegible]-4-04	sc		
473	28-9-03	sc both		
698-99	11-11-02	sc ~~both~~		
696	12-10-99	sc both		
539	26-6-95			

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.

Advance copies circd.
To 128-9 6-3-05 ✓
„ 184-8/05 Cif ✓
„ 625-6/05 „ ✓

1

Edl CURRENT No. 933

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT.
8 - JUN 1906

No. 378

Regd. 6. 6. 06.

FROM

H. H. RISLEY, ESQ., C.S.I., C.I.E.,

Secretary to the Government of India,

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Simla, the 30th May 1906.

Home Department.
Education.

SIR,

I AM directed to refer to your letter no. 626, dated 15th September 1905, regarding the proposals of the Government of Madras for the reorganisation of training schools for primary teachers. The difficulty which the Government of India have felt in complying with the request of the Governor in Council that the present scheme, which relates only to the training of lower primary school teachers, may be sanctioned as a modest instalment of reform, while that which relates to the training of upper primary school teachers is deferred, arises partly from the objections which the Secretary of State has expressed to the submission to him of such schemes in piecemeal fashion.

2. The Government of India attach great importance to the establishment of some thoroughly well equipped training schools for students who have passed through a lower secondary vernacular school and will be qualified after training to take charge of upper primary schools. The filling of such training schools with students appears to depend upon three conditions:—the efficiency of the lower secondary vernacular schools in which the students will receive their preliminary education; the adequacy of the stipends paid to them while under training; and the prospects of their finding employment when they have been trained. The Government of India confidently expect that these conditions will be capable of fulfilment in the Madras Presidency.

3. The cost of the scheme for training lower primary teachers is estimated at Rs. 69,000 per annum. The Government of India observe from your letter no. 129, dated 6th March 1905, that when this money has been spent the whole of the eight lakhs grant made in 1902 will have been exhausted.

If the Government of Madras are able to give an assurance that an equal amount will be available should it be required for the reorganisation of the training of upper primary teachers, the Government of India will be prepared to recommend the present scheme for the sanction of the Secretary of State. If, however, that assurance is not forthcoming the Government of India must defer action until they have before them as a whole the schemes for training primary teachers of all grades.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

H. H. Risley

Secretary to the Government of India.

2

Notes Circulated with G.O. No. 495-496 dt 25-7-06

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT. 13 JUN 1906

[E.]
500—8-1-06.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 933 From the Govt. of India, Home Depart. No. 378, dated 30-5-1906.

SUBJECT.

Re-organization of Training schools for Masters.

A.

In their letter no 185 Edl dd 27th March 1905 the Madras Govt. submitted to the Govt. of India a Scheme for the re-organization of the Training schools for masters in the Presidency. The extra cost of the Scheme was estimated at Rs 69,396 – Rs 29,396 on Establishments & Rs 40,000 on stipends – paras. 10 & 11 of the letter. The main features of the Scheme were

Please see abstract in para. 5 of the letter from the Govt. of India on page 3 of G.O. nos 625-626 Edl dd 15th September 1905. S

(1) The course of study in primary training Schools was to be re-modelled so as to include general studies as well as training in the art of teaching.

(2) The Course in the primary (but not in the lower Secondary) Schools & departs. was to be lengthened to two years.

(3) The monthly stipends in the two departs. was to be raised from Rs 5 & Rs 6 to Rs 6 & Rs 7 respectively &

(4) A cadre of teachers was to be provided for the practising Schools attached to the Training institutions.

Of the increased Cost of Establishments only Rs 276 was proposed for the training sections & the balance of Rs 29120 was on account of the practising sections.

Para. 2 of the office note dd 30-8-05 on page 3 of the notes with G.O. 625-626 15-9-05. S

2. Upon this the Govt. of India suggested "that a limited number of " large and well equipped normal schools should be established in which " the pay of the teachers should be much higher than it would be in any " of the existing schools when re-organized under the scheme proposed " by this Govt.; that the minimum qualification for admission should

Please see abstract in para. 2 of letter no 626 Edl dd 15-9-05. S.

&c.

" the attainment of the Lower Secondary standard of Education " and the course of training a two years' course, and that the " system of training in these institutions, which is described as 'the " main system', should be supplemented by a subsidiary " system or subsidiary systems of training to provide masters " for schools where the salaries paid are insufficient to " attract teachers trained in the new high grade training institutions". The Govt. of India desired to have the views of the Madras Govt. on these suggestions. In reply this Govt. said that what the Govt. of India suggested as a subsidiary system of training must remain for the present the main system in Madras, that the scheme submitted was a modest scheme which (applies only to primary students and aimed at improving the training of teachers whose salary would only in exceptional cases exceed Rs 10 (and was meant to be taken as a first instalment), that the training even with the improvements proposed was an inferior system of training, that it must for the present coexist with any more elaborate system which might be inaugurated in a few institutions established for the purpose of providing more highly trained teachers for the few more highly paid posts, that schemes for the re-organization of the training of Lower Secondary & of Upper Secondary students would be submitted in due course. The Govt. of India were accordingly requested to approve separately & submit to the Secretary of State for his sanction ~~[illegible]~~ the proposals submitted with the letter No 185 of the 27th March 1905. ~~might be separately approved and submitted to the Secretary of State for his sanction~~.

Paras 4 & 5 of letter no 626 Edl dd 15-9-05.

Para. 8 of —do—

A

3. The Govt. of India now say that "if the Govt. of Madras are " able to give an assurance that an equal amount (Rs 69,000) will " be available should it be required for the re-organization of the " training of upper primary teachers, the Govt. of India will

" prepared to recommend the present scheme ~~of~~ for the
" sanction of the Secretary of State. If however that assurance is
" not forthcoming the Govt. of India must defer action until
" they have before them the schemes for training primary teachers
" of all grades".

G.O. No 74 Edl dt 9th February 1906 T

4. In his letter No 9173 dt 13th December 1905 the Director requested sanction to ~~the payment of enhanced~~ raise from Rs 5 to Rs 6 per mensem ~~to~~ from 1st January 1906 the stipends paid to students in the primary departts of Training Schools – but ~~this was not~~ sanction was refused pending the final orders of the Secretary of State on the scheme for the re-organization of Training schools – G.O. No 74 Edl dt 9th February 1906.

T.

5. Under the condition now imposed by the Govt. of India the total amount required for the re-organization of Training Schools will be Rs 1,38,000. It does not appear that it will be possible to spare this sum from the Educational budget. The Director may however be asked u.o. Perhaps the part of the scheme effecting an increase in the rate of stipends may be abandoned. This will reduce the cost of the scheme submitted by about Rs 20,000. // There is no provision on this account in the current year's budget – G.O. No 273 Edl Finl dt 7th April 1906.

253.	Lower Secondary pupils.	3060
730	Primary pupils at [illegible]	17520
		20,580

Page 18 of the notes with G.O. No 1844-185 dt 27-3-05. A.

V.

6. On receipt of the D.P.I's reply Financial may be consulted.

PBJ
9/6/6

Lee

CW

C.b.O.6.

dsp
11/5/6

D.P.I. u.o for remarks

H.D.B
11-6-06

Edl No. 429 D
11-6-06.

4

4956 [illegible]

Office of the D.P.I.

1 The proposal which required the sanction of the Govt. of India and the Secretary of State was to provide a staff for the practising school attached to each training school and thus set free the training school staff to devote more time to the normal students and give the latter good schools as models.

Cost for 28 schools, Rs. 29396 29120 per annum.

2 These schools will serve as practising schools for training schools of any "grade." Elementary or primary

There need be no further expense in the matter of practising school whatever developments on the lines suggested by the G. of I. may take place in regard to any of the training schools, provided some of the existing centres be selected and this may be done.

It is not quite correctly representing the facts to say that it is proposed to spend Rs. 69000 on the training of lower primary teachers. The expenditure now proposed is to some extent a stage in any reform.

In any case these practising or model schools are very desirable even if absolutely nothing else were done.

3 There were two other proposals which required no administrative sanction but would necessitate further budget provision:-

(1) to raise the Rs. 5 stipends to Rs. 6 and the Rs. 6 stipends to Rs. 7;

(2) to increase the number of stipendiaries.

The proposal to raise the stipends may be abandoned. There is an idea abroad that the elementary schoolmaster has a better time in store for him and candidates for training will doubtless come forward even on the old rate of stipend.

5 5P

The number of stipendiaries may be determined from time to time according to the funds available.

Lengthening the course does not necessarily involve extra expenditure.

What I wish to emphasize is that the only expenditure which could not be reduced in connection with the exigencies of any particular year's budget is the Rs.29396. Further, that if this expenditure is now incurred any scheme for a different grade of training school (allowing one such for each circle) would cost Rs.6240 less per annum than it otherwise would as the necessary practising school will be already established.

4. The cost (for establishment) of any scheme likely to be adopted in the future may be set down at about Rs.20000 per annum (at any rate less than the Rs. 25000 limit)×. I obtain this figure by adding Rs.200 per mensem to the cost of the 3 Secondary training schools and Rs.340 per mensem to that of three of the present Lower Secondary schools.

× For which S of S's sanction is necessary. The objection is however that partial schemes should not be sent up, so as to evade this rule HG

600 1020
1620
19440

5 Funds may be found by making the Local Boards pay stipends to students being trained for employment in their schools. This would be a legitimate charge on the 6 lakhs grant. Boards cannot do much to extend primary education without teachers. Better establish 5 per cent fewer schools and have them better staffed. This gives Rs.30,000 per annum.

But this 6 lakhs does not belong to local money. It is Provl CWG

Para: 2 of Dir: Com: letter 1763A-B 23-3-05 on page 2
Offg 308 dated 10-4-05
flag 24

I do not at present deal further with possible future developments as I hope that such a guarantee may be given as will induce the Govt. of India to apply for sanction to the proposals now before them namely an additional expenditure on establishment involving Rs.29396 per annum.

3.6.0

495-6-Edn notes

Educational Departt

Para. 3 of his note on pages 4 & 5 supra.

The Director considers that from the scheme submitted to the Govt. of India which it was stated would ~~cost an~~ involve an additional expenditure of Rs 69,396. the portion relating to stipends, costing Rs 40,000, may be omitted and the Govt. of India asked to obtain sanction to the rest.

Do

2. As regards stipends the Director states that the increased rate from Rs 5 & Rs 6 to Rs 6 & Rs 7 respectively is not very necessary at present, and that the amount required to pay the increased number of stipendiaries resulting from the extension of the course for primary school teachers from one to ~~2~~ two years may be met by adjustments in the budget (by asking local bodies to pay the stipends of students sent by them for training and allowing them to debit the cost of those stipends to the six lakhs grant or otherwise.)

But the 6 lakhs grant is not theirs – It is Provl.

Para. 4 of Director's note – page 5 supra.

3. The Additional amount required for 6 secondary Training Schools of the character suggested by the Govt. of India is put down at ~~Rs~~ between Rs 20,000 & Rs 25,000 exclusive of stipends, and this is within the Rs 40000 which will now be set free. (There are now six ordinary Inspectors' Circles).

Go. No 200 Edl dd 17-3-06.

4. May the Govt. of India be addressed on these lines (and the Director asked meanwhile to submit at once his scheme for secondary schools with the concurrence of Financial) or should the Director be asked to submit at once ~~his proposals regarding the Secondary Schools so that~~ a comprehensive scheme so that it may be sent up to the Govt. of India ~~in substitution~~ to be substituted for the partial scheme already submitted. The Adoption of the latter course will involve some further delay.

Lee.

Even though there may be some

delay, it would seem advisable to send up the complete scheme. India apparently is willing to consider such a scheme.

Carter
16.6.06

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
20 JUN 1906
SECRETARIAT.

Will D.P.I. please say when a detailed scheme for Secondary Training schools may be expected. As the need for ~~[illegible]~~ trained primary teachers is urgent, it is desirable to obtain sanction for the proposals in their case without delay, but the sanction of India may be more speedily obtained if the full scheme for both classes of schools is before them.

H. Baylor
18.6.06.

desp
18/6/06

To the D.P.I.

~~be may, address India in terms of~~

~~D.P.I.'s u.o. note~~

Ed no. 446 D
18-6-06

Office of the D.P.I.

The idea of sending up a complete scheme now, occurred to me when writing my previous note I considered the question and came to the following conclusions:-

that at present we do not know exactly what we really want,

that it may be at least two or three years before we do know and

that as the Government of India now seem inclined to sanction the scheme already before them it might cause a good deal of extra delay to add to it or alter it in any way even if I knew how best to do so.

2. In the new Educational rules I propose to recognize three grades of teachers

(1) Trained graduates

to serve as headmasters of all secondary schools and as teachers in as many as possible of the forms thereof

(2) Trained matriculates

to serve as teachers in the lower classes of secondary schools and as headmasters and teachers in the higher standards of elementary schools

(3) Trained men of lower qualifications for the lower standards of elementary schools. Some of these will be better than others and their certificates will show exactly what is thought of their capabilities (see also proposed Rule 20)

3. Para 2 of the current from the Government of India refers to thoroughly well equipped training schools for students who have passed through a lower secondary vernacular school (the same thing as our new elementary school going up to Standard VII) This seems to me to

display a lack of knowledge of our conditions. The fact is that at present we have nothing worth speaking of in the way of "lower secondary vernacular schools". I made a complete list of such schools which I enclose subjoin, it is obvious at a glance that these are not schools to which we can look for a supply of students to be trained nor for whom it would be worth while having thoroughly well equipped training schools such as are contemplated by the Government of India. There has of course been no attempt up to now to have good vernacular schools. Schools which have been fit for anything have been classed as English schools and have aimed at preparing pupils for the Matriculation.

4th paragraph.

In this Pr. English has a different place from that wh. it occupies in the N. of India. Hence the ~~of~~ past treatment of vernacular schools

817 [illegible]

4. We must for the present look to trained Matriculates for the staffs of higher elementary schools. We have some provision for training them and this provision can be improved piecemeal if and where necessary without anything which could be called general reorganization.

The age question is another matter to be considered in connection with any scheme like that suggested by India. These pupils whom it is proposed to train will average 12 to 13 years in age, even after 2 years training they would be hardly old enough to take charge of schools.

5. Two or three years hence it may be possible to see more clearly what position the higher elementary school is likely to take in the educational system and it may then be possible to say with some certainty what general further reorganization of the training schools is desirable.

In the meantime an assurance that more

In the Am. Baptist
has a different
class from that
[illegible] in the
[illegible] these
[illegible]

Complete list for the Presidency 9a of Lower Secondary Vernacular Schools with Form III showing number of boys in that form:—

Ganjam. Dharakota Rajah's School	14
Berhampur Breterthis School	3
London Mission School, Maddelipalem	19
Canadian Baptist, Samalkota	18
Church Mission, Masulipatam	12
American Baptist, Ongole	2
American Mission, Kentachintla	11
American Baptist, Nestwarpet	25
London Mission, Gooty	29
London Mission, Kadiri	4
Nandalur School	7
P. V. Chetti's School Vayalpad	3
Nagareddipalli School	8
S.P.G. School Egmore	9
Wesleyan, Thousand Lights	15
Purasawalkam School	21
Free Church. Wallajabad	17
Wesleyan, Ikkadu	10
Tiruvallur School	34
6 Board Schools in Tanjore Dist.	68
Catholic School, Negapatam	60
Ayampet Coronation School	8
Municipal Muhammadan, Trichinopoly	8
Thuraiyur School	13
Madura Technical Institute	9
Tinnevelly Technical Institute	7
Church Mission Donavur	19
S.P.G. Kulasegarapatnam	3

9(b) 12

118p

Kadayam School	4
Ariyanayakipuram School	8
Kanchupata School	6
London Mission, Palladam	4
Kodumudi (London Mission)	7
Kanigur School	6
Kodumudi School	9
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Sendamangalam School	3

Educational Departt

p 4-5 supra

We may now address India in terms of DPI's note of 13th inst, asking only for ~~the~~ sanction to the increased establishment at a cost of R29000 odd per annum. The proposed increases in rates of stipends may be abandoned.

2 It may be explained that as the practising schools will already exist, the proposals for ~~[illegible]~~ the improvement of secondary training schools will cost less in proportion, say R20000 per annum, and that Govt. will be prepared to incur this addl. expenditure when a complete scheme is worked out

H B Taylor
20.6.06

6.30 P.M. BS 5+am Curl 21.6.06

Edl no. 455 D K
21.6.06.

[illegible]

ment

H

495-496 Enclosures

13 10/ 12P

CHIEF SECRETARIAT.
21 JUN. 1906
OOTACAMUND.

CURRENT NO.
2761
FINANCIAL Deptt

Regd. 21.VI.06

Page 11 of G.O. 825-6 Fin. d 8-12-03
K

In para: 27 of Fin: & Com: Dept. letter No. 4933A d 13.8.03 containing detailed proposals of the Govt of India for the recent Provincial settlement adopted for this Presidency, the Govt of India remarked:—

"The settlement now proposed does not take "into account the increased expenditure which may "be rendered necessary by reforms which are in "contemplation in the administration of Police and "Education, except to the extent of the Rs. 8,00,000 "a year already allowed under the latter head..."

Para: 59 of letter to India No. 826 Fin. d 8.12.1903 (page 17)
K

2. In reply it was pointed out by this Govt. that it had not been possible to make full use of the additional recurring allotment of 8 lakhs sanctioned in 1902-03 owing to the necessity of first working out the schemes for the expenditure under several of the items, that the budget estimate for 1903-04 of 23.98 lakhs (settlement figure ~~adopted~~ proposed by India) made no provision for expenditure already determined⑧ on and for schemes to be taken in the near future. This Govt. urged that Provincial funds would be unable to bear any large increase under Education and contended that the settlement estimate should be taken at 26 lakhs at least as against 23.98 lakhs proposed by the Govt. of India. In fixing the terms of the Provl. settlement

it..

⑧ Among the projects already determined on were the reform of training schools & the further reorganization of Girls' Schools.

the Govt of India adhered to their decision to fix the estimate under 22 Education at 23.98 lakhs but added that the settlement did not take into account any contribution which the Govt of India might find it desirable to make towards the expenditure rendered necessary by reforms which were in contemplation in the administration of . . . . Education.

Page 3 of fo 273 Finl dd 7-4-04 Y
+
Para: 8 of Finst Com: letter 1863 A dd 19.3.1904 on page 3 ibid

M **3.** In our letter No 884 Finl dd the 29th Dec 05 the Govt of India were requested to raise the assignment to the Provincial revenues of Madras by a further grant of 1 lakh during 1906-07 and by a recurring grant of 2 lakhs from 1907-1908 onwards in order to meet the expenditure on account of Education on the ground that "the "reforms resulting from the Educational Conference "held at Simla in 1901 have now for the most "part been sanctioned and are either in full "operation or in course of introduction and that increased expenditure under this head has arisen from reforms carried out since the introduction of the current Provincial settlement.

Para: 3 of letter No 884 Finl dd 29.12.05.
M
+
Para: 11 ibid

4. In reply the Govt of India stated that beyond the grants of 6 lakhs and 1.05 lakhs which they had of their own accord sanctioned for expenditure on primary education and on University education, they could not admit any claim to further assistance from imperial revenues

Finl: Depl letter No: 470 A dd 25.1.06 on page 2 of fo 125 Finl dd 14-2-06
N

15

14P

revenues.

5. It is now proposed to reduce the cost of the reorganization of Primary grade training Schools (training of lower primary school teachers) from Rs. 69,000 p.a. which was estimated in this Govt's letter No 185 Educl. d 27.3.1905 to about Rs 29,000 p.a. and it is also estimated that the amount required for the reorganization of higher grade training schools (training of upper primary teachers) may come to about Rs. 20,000 a year, so that the total cost of the reorganization of training Schools amounts to about Rs. 49,000 a year which is less than the original cost of Rs 69,000 a year proposed by this Govt for the reorganization primary grade training schools alone. The Govt of India require an assurance from the Govt to the effect that Provincial ~~funds~~ revenues will meet the amount required for the reorganization of the training of upper primary teachers — about Rs. 20,000 as now estimated. Subd that there appears to be no objection to the Govt of India being informed that the ~~cost~~ expenditure of about Rs. 20,000 can be met by Provincial funds when the scheme is worked out.

Para: 1 of Educl. office noted 15.6.06. on page 6 supra and Para: 1 of Educl. Secretary's noted 20.6.06 on page 9(b.) supra.

A

Para: 4 of Director's noted 13.6.06 on page 5 supra + Para: 2 of Educl. Secretary's noted 20.6.06 on page 9 (b) supra.

Para: 3 of letter from the G. of I. (Home) No 378 d 30.5.1906 (current)

Portion marked K in Educl. Secretary's noted 20.6.06 on page 9 (b) supra

Vzk.
23.6.06.
CS

The stipulation attached by India to

16

18P

Para: 3 of Home Dept. letter 378 d 30.5.06 (current)

Hardy-?

Letter 884 Dated 29.12.05

their support of the partial scheme is I think, unprecedented &, with due respect to that Govt., seems to have been prompted by our request last December that they should keep to their engagement as regards expendre. on reforms in the administration of education in contemplation when the present settlement was under consideration. The G of I. in making the scheme for the training of primary teachers depend upon the debit of the cost & not upon the necessity for the scheme - [illegible] This letter instances the evils of these ear-marked grants. India gave 8 lakhs for expendre. on educational schemes - mostly their own - & now that they see that recurring expendre. amounting to 8 lakhs has been involved in the prosecution of those schemes they write as if the 8 lakhs were Imperial money, which it is not, & call for guarantees from Provl. as regards schemes still in the air. From what the D.P.I says it seems unlikely that any scheme for the training of upper primary teachers will be developed for some years ...., so Provl. may assume the guarantee

This is a mania of Mr Schmidt's S.T. [orders]

before the present settlement

+ This is unbelievable. The Imperial Govt. must be presumed to have the right to dictate a policy or to inaugurate a scheme. And in Education they have certainly pressed forward & assisted the interests of education to an extent which we as a Provl. Govt. would never have attempted to undertake.

S.T. [orders]

D.P.I.'s note of 19.6.06 in pp. 8-9 supra

BOX NO 61
C.R. 4/5. 7.06

for expendr. thereon with a light heart – tho' the [illegible] procedure adopted by India in this case ~~seems to be~~ is objectionable.

In agreeing to this guarantee & to the modified scheme for the training of lower primary teachers, this Dept. cannot, it is subd, guarantee that the Educational grant will necessarily be increased. If necessary – portion – or the whole – of the cost should come out of the 6 lakhs grant for primary Education. This grant, it seems necessary to point out, does not belong to local boards. It represents Provincial money & is at the disposal of Provincial. Local has no proprietary right – direct or indirect – in it

Awd.
3.7.06

Para: 2 of Fin: Dept. letter 1763A of 23.3.1905 on page 2 of G.O. 308 Edn of 10.4.1905 Flag 24

No – but it has practically been all allocated I think.

It is the Education Dept and L & M. that are interested in the money! 8/7 [Forbes]
7/7

HM

I don't think there is any thing to object in the Govt of India letter. They merely say "we don't like" "this scheme unless you are prepared to supplement" "it by a further one – & for that you must find" "the funds" They have already told us they are not prepared to promise us further allotments & we have to accept that position.

I agree 8/7 [Forbes]
7/7

As far as I can see the Educational

proposals will not involve us in any liabilities beyond what can be met from the existing Educational Grant & I think these proposals may be accepted.

4 vii 09

I take it that the position is that the cost of the reorganisation of the Training Schools for primary teachers of both the upper & the lower grades will be 49,000 Rs. and that we are asked in Finl. to guarantee that this sum will be forthcoming when wanted.

The six ~~grant~~ lakh grant is Provl. money ~~and~~ but we have accepted it on the understanding that it is to be applied to the development of primary education. The scheme of reorganisation above referred ~~is a~~ to is a primary need of such development and its cost is therefore a perfectly proper charge agt. the 6 lakhs grant. Though Edl. can and does receive in each year the whole 6 lakhs grant only part is recurring expenditure and such expenditure does not at present exceed or equal half the grant. Provided it is understood that any recurring or other expenditure which may be needed in connection with the reorganisation

817 [works]

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
7 - JUL 1906
SECRETARIAT.

of these Training Schools for Primary School teachers is a first charge on the 6 lakhs grant. I do not see any objection to our giving the assurance that India wants. It will be for Cd. & Fin. to see that the total grant for Primary Education, viz 6 lakhs plus the charge to Govt. when that grant was made. (I forget the figure; in this year Budget it is 1.07.500 p. 135 C.B.S it was about 1.00,000 or 1.25.000 as I remember) is not exceeded.

5/7/06.

Finl. no. 2761-I
6. 7. 6.

To Edl. no.

H
6 vii 06

L.H.M.

P 9 (11) supra

Please see my note of 20.6.06. India may be informed accordingly. The proper training of teachers for primary schools is an important stepping stone towards the improvement of primary schools – and there appears to be no objection to earmarking the amount required as a first charge upon the 6 lakhs grant in aid of primary education. When the charge comes to be incurred there will be less available for expenditure on the construction of new buildings.

7.7.06

No need to "earmark" it as a "first charge" the amt. is trifling
817 [others]

The bulk of the Grant will be spent on instruction, not buildings. The expense on latter will soon be nearly exhausted.
817.

120

19P

Please draft

87 [Forbes]
7/7/06

HDT
9-7-06.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved should it go to Financial for acceptance?

BH
10/7/6 The ~~file~~ draft may go to Fin^{l}. for acceptance after approval by the Hon. Member

WM

H D Taylor
11-7-06.

Yes: app^{d} subject to remarks of Fin^{n}
87 [Forbes] 11/7

8/A

Fin. ce.

12-7-06

disp
12/7/6

Edl. no. 5048
12. 7. 06

CHIEF SECRETARIAT,
12 JUL. 1906
OOTACAMUND.

CURRENT NO.
3060
FINANCIAL Dept

Reg^{d}. 12. 7. 06

~~Chief Secretary~~

~~[illegible]~~ The draft may be accepted it is sub^{d}, subject to the understanding set out in the H. M's note of 5. 7. 06

Pages 15 & 16 supra

BOX No. 61

21

20P

C 13.7.06
R. 14.7.06

Educational may it is sub^d. be asked to send us copy of the notes of the letter to India & also to intimate (i) what recurring expend^re has so far been incurred from the six lakhs grant & (ii) what expend^re is likely to be incurred in the say the next two years.

recurring & otherwise

LOCAL & MUNIC. SECRETARIAT. 16 JUL 1906

CWS [Schmidt]
12.7.06

Hon Mr Stokes.

The H.M. Ch. Sec. has seen this draft. I do not think Financial can raise any objection to it.

Ch [Cunningham?]
13 vii 6

I see no objection to this draft

[Stokes]
13/7/06.

Fair copy D.3060-1 75/ 14.7.06 Desp. Del. no.

DeM

CWS [Schmidt]
14.7.06

Sent to Press 18/7/6

The draft letter to India is circulated to His Excellency the Governor for approval

HST [Taylor]
16.7.06

Approved

[Lawley]
17.7.06.

Issue HD 18.7.06

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ AGAIN G.O., Nos 625-626, dated 15-9-1905.

" " " ", " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 933, From the Govt. of India, Home Departt, No. 378, dated 30-5-1906.

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

18

ORDER No. 495, dated 25-7-1906.

P.S.

Desp.

To be numbered & dated in proof - to be printed here

1st letter be put in type first -

18/7/6

Proof sent 28/7/6.

17-7-06.

11/7

C no 933.

Desp/ dd 25/7/6

The following letter will be despatched to the Govt. of India.

HDJ
11-7-06.

P.T.
10/7/6

Letter 496 dd 25-7-06

To the Secretary to the Govt. of India
Home Departt

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter no 378 (Education) dd 30th May 1906 on the subject of the re-organization of training schools for primary teachers in the Madras Presidency.

The scheme of reorganization proposed by this Govt. is estimated to cost Rs 69,000 per

Para. 3 of current.

annum and the Govt. of India ~~say~~ state that if the Madras Govt. are able to give an assurance that an equal amount will be available, should it be required. for the re-organization of the training of upper primary teachers. they will be prepared to recommend the scheme for the sanction of the Secretary of State.

Page 3 of G.O. No 625 Edl dt 15th. September 1905. S.

2. In reply I am to state that briefly the proposals of this Govt. were, as summarized in para. 5 of the Home Departt letter No 509 (Education) of the 3rd. August 1905,

(a) ~~that~~ the course of study in primary training schools should be re-modelled so as to include general studies as well as training in the art of teaching,

(b) ~~that~~ the course in the primary (but not in the Lower Secondary) Schools should be lengthened to two years,

(c) ~~that~~ the monthly stipends in the two grades of training school should be raised from Rs5 and Rs6 to Rs 6 and Rs7, respectively, and

(d) ~~that~~ a cadre of teachers should be provided for the practising schools attached to the training institution of both grades.

3. Of these proposals those ~~about~~ which relate to the re-modelling of the course of studies and the provision of a cadre of teachers for the practising schools [illegible] may be considered together. The cost of the latter which i practically

Rs 86 $\frac{2}{3}$ × 28 × 12 = 29,120
(pages 18 – 23 of f.c. nos 184 – 185
Edl dt 27th March 1905) A

practically all the extra cost that has to be incurred on account of both proposals, was estimated at Rs 29,120 per annum; the re-organization of the staff of the training schools being expected to result in a net increased expenditure of Rs 276* per annum only. The cost of giving effect to the proposals to lengthen the course in primary schools and to raise the stipends was estimated at Rs 40,000+ per annum.

* Rs 29,396 – 29120 = 276.
Para. 10 of letter no 185
dt 27th March 1905. A.

+ Para. 11 of – do –.

A. 4. As stated in para. 4 of my letter no 185 Edl dt 27th March 1905 the main reason for ~~proposing~~ recommending an increase in the rates of stipends was to remove the difficulty that, it was feared, would be experienced in securing students of the primary grade for a course of training ~~for~~ lasting two years. The Govt. are however now informed that in consequence of an anticipated general improvement in the condition and prospects of the primary school master ~~there will be~~ no difficulty ~~the~~ for the future in obtaining candidates for training in sufficient numbers on the existing rates of monthly stipends. The Govt. have therefore decided to abandon the proposal to raise the rates of stipends; and in this connection I am to observe that the sanction conveyed in the Home Departt ~~letter~~ telegram no 32 (Education) dt 23rd January 1906 has not as such been acted upon ~~as yet: nor will it be in the future~~.

it appears probable that

great

need be anticipated

Page 3 of f.c. no 74 Edl
dt 9th February 1906.

Any

Any increase in cost consequent on an increase in the number of stipendiaries arising from the extension of the course for primary teachers to two years may also be left out of account as all the stipendiaries will ~~need~~ not necessarily be Provincial stipendiaries: some, ~~may~~ being ~~Local Fund~~ stipendiaries of Local Board ~~; and~~. The total number of Provincial stipendiaries can be ~~determined~~ regulated from time to time according to the funds available.

5. The sanction of the Secretary of State will thus be ~~[illegible]~~ required only to the provision of a Cadre of teachers for the practising schools at a cost of Rs 29,120 per annum. These schools will serve as practising schools for training schools of any grade and their improvement is very desirable even if ~~absolutely nothing else were done~~ no other measure of reform were meditated. The staff wh. it is proposed to ~~be~~ employ~~ed~~ in ~~them~~ these schools will set free the training schools staff of to devote more time to the normal students, and the proposal, if sanctioned, will give the latter good schools as models.

6. At present there are six Inspectors' circles in this Presidency and the Governor in Council does not consider that more than ~~an equal~~ one school for each circle ~~number of Schools~~ will be required for the training of upper primary teachers. Such schools can and will be established in centres where ~~[illegible]~~ schools

G. R. No 200 Edl d/ 17th March 1906. B.

schools under the scheme now under consideration exist and in supersession of those ~~elementary~~ schools. Fresh practising schools will not thus be necessary for the superior grade training schools when they are established and the only extra cost on account of these schools will be merely the cost of the superior staff required.

[it is anticipated.

That staff could be secured by an outlay of Rs 200 extra per mensem in each of the three upper secondary training schools and of Rs 340 extra per mensem in each of three of the lower secondary training schools in the scheme now under consideration. The total extra cost on account of the superior grade training schools when they are established will thus be between Rs 20,000 and Rs 25,000 per annum (Rs 19,440 on account of the staff and the balance on account of contingencies). This sum can be spared from the total extra expenditure of Rs 69,000 already proposed out of which, as stated in para. 4 supra, Rs 40,000 will now be available.

(3×200+3×340)×12 = 19,440

600
1020
1620

7. In these circumstances I am to request ~~that~~ the Govt. of India will be pleased to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State to the proposition statement forwarded with my letter No 185 Edl dt 27th March 1905.

A

8. The Governor in Council would have at once formulated proposals for the establishment

of the Superior grade training schools which
the Govt. of India have in view but ~~the~~
"Educational Rules" of the Presidency have
~~just been revised and~~ ~~the~~ a sharp distinction
~~drawn~~ between purely vernacular schools
and schools intended to lay the foundation
secondary &
for higher English Education. His Excellency
in Council would ~~like~~ to see the effect of this
change before taking steps to establish the
Superior grade ~~of~~ training schools referred to.
Meanwhile teachers for the better class of these
~~for the present~~
purely vernacular schools can be trained in
some of
the Superior ~~classes~~ training schools which
are in ence
already exist ~~in this Presidency~~. ~~While~~ the
need for better trained primary teachers
is, as the Govt. of India are aware, very
pressing.

for the fact that

been undergoing material
revision involving the creation of
~~[illegible]~~

~~desire~~ wish

PJ
10/7/6

HDS
14-7-06

irst copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

espatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.
- Order complete.
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter.

EAD AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED 190 .

Press.
Please show proof. Only
Collection copies are
required.

18/
30/7/16

RRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

TER TO GOVERNMENT

MENT WITH DITTO.

APERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN GINAL.

N.B.—

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