

EDUCATION (1950) Department.

MS. SERIES.

closed
sh

G.O. NO. 3326, EDUCATION,

3326

Dated 18TH DECEMBER 1950.

*g. o. at p 7 c f. and notes
at p 1-5 n f. - 1 } [Order at p 7 c f]*

(8)

[Despatch Abstract.]

MADRAS EDUCATIONAL RULES - Rule 92 - Fee concessions - Admissibility to students who were earning - Ordered.

Back Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	1404	Edn	6.5.1949				

Further Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
588	Edn		12/3/57				



OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
MADRAS.

R.C. 1745 E.4/50 Dated 4-8-1950.

From

The Director of Public Instruction,

Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education Department, Madras.

Subject:-

Madras Educational Rules- Rule 92- Fee concession-
Admissibility to earning students.

In G.O. No. 1606 Edn. dated 11-10-1945 it was observed that Sri. A. Varadarajan, earning an income, should not be granted fee concession under rule 92, Madras Educational Rules for his M.L. course. This order was passed on Director's letter R.C. No. 1389 E/45 dated 6-9-1945 wherein it was pointed out clearly that the income of the student, or the income of the parent or both their incomes put together did not exceed the maximum limit prescribed for grant of the concession.

2. With reference to the orders quoted supra, all cases for the grant of concession to earning students belonging to the Backward classes were rejected holding the view that the smallness of an income is no criterion, that once a person enters life and begins to earn, he is no longer dependant on others, and that he should therefore pay for the cost of educating himself.

3. The Principal Law College, Madras has submitted a number of cases of permanent or officiating Government servants belonging to the backward and scheduled classes who have joined the law course. Most of these students are on leave on loss of pay and their income is therefore nil for the present. They have also produced the necessary certificates of income of their parents or guardians which are within the limits mentioned in rule 92 Madras Educational Rules.

4. I request to be informed early whether my view in para 2 above is correct and whether a person who entered life and was earning should not be granted the concession, even if his earning during the period of study is nil and that of his parent or guardian within the limits specified in 92 Madras Educational Rules.

Yours faithfully,

S. S. Sankaranarayanan
8/8

for Director of Public Instruction.

*Edn.
G.O. No. 1606 Edn.,
dated 11-10-45, quoted
above, has been called
for from the M.R.O. May
file over till 21-8-50.
15/8/50.*

*A.S./5-
18*

Please see the note in the margin
on page 1 ante. G.O. No. 1606. Edu.,
dated, 11-10-45, mentioned therein,
has not yet been received. N.R.O.
has been reminded to-day. This may
continue to lie over till 16-9-50.

6/9/50
6/9/50

7/9/80

CL no. 23130/50

M.E.R. Rule 92 - Fee Concession - Admissibility
to earning students.

P.I.C.

From the Director of Public Instruction
No. 1745/50 dt. 4.8.1950.

Memo. No. 23130/50-2D Edu. dt. 5-10-1950.

The D.P.I. is requested to ^{report} state the
probable ^{that may have} expenditure to be incurred by the
~~from state funds~~ ^{of} ~~out~~ in case the fee concession under
Rule 92 of M.E.R. is extended to ~~persons~~
earning students ^{on condition that} if their earning during
the period of study is nil and that ^{to earnings} of
their parents or guardians is within
the

the limit specified in Rule 92 of M.E.R.

1-10-50.
op
3/1/50

08/11/50
4/10/50

NE 80

To
The D.P.I.

add
6/10

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

From
The Director of Public Instruction,
M a d r a s.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
M a d r a s.

Rc.No.1745 E4/50 dated 31.10.50.



Sir,

Sub: MADRAS EDUCATIONAL RULES - Rule 92 -
Fee Concession - Admissibility to
earning students.

PP 3-4 ante

Ref: Government Memo. No.23130/50-2 D. Edn.,
dated 5.10.50.

The probable expenditure that may have to be incurred from State funds if fee concession under rule 92, Madras Educational Rules is extended to earning students, is estimated at Rs.1300/- per annum, as per details below:-

a) For 2 students in the F.L. class at full rate 2 x 200	...	Rs.400-0-0
b) For 8 students in the F.L. class at half rate 8 x 100	...	800-0-0
c) For one student in the B.L. class at half rate 1 x 100	...	100-0-0
Total	...	Rs.1300.0-0

The estimate is based on the strength of the classes and on the status of the students now on rolls during the current year on the presumption that there may not be any large variation from year to year.

Yours faithfully,

S.O. Pantelabie
for Director of Public Instruction.

31.10.50
31/10



CNo 23130/50

H.E.R. - Rule 92 - Fee Concessions - Admissibility to Students who were earning. ordered

1/2/54

Read again L.O No. 1404. Edo D. 6.5.49.

pic.

Read also from the L.P.D No 1745 E 4/50. D 4.8.50.

2/18/54

Order No. 3326 Edo dated 18.12.50.

The Govt direct that the fee Concessions admissible under rule 92 of the H.E.R. may be granted to persons who entered life and were earning but who subsequently joined the Law College, if they are not in receipt of any income during the period of their study in the Law Colleges and if the income of their parents or guardian is within the limit specified in the rule.

To
The Secy. to Govt.
The Chief Secy. to Govt.
3 opac cpi.

23/11/50

24/11/50

Note file

Education Department (D)

M.E.R. - Rule 92 - Fee concession - Admissibility to earning students.

From the DPI, No. 1743 B4/50, dated 4th August 1950.

Educational concessions are granted under rule 92 M.E.R. to pupils belonging to the backward communities whose parent or guardians are so poor that the grant of the concession is necessary to continue their studies. The poverty of the parent has been prescribed by the fixation of an income limit of Rs 1,500/- per annum in the case of pupils in High schools and Rs 1,800/- per annum in colleges. In 1945 the D.P.I. brought to the notice of the Government the case of one Mr. Varadarajan who had then finished his studies in the B.L. course with the educational concessions granted under rule 92 M.E.R. and was studying for the M.L. course in the Madras Law College while at the same time practising at the Bar earning about Rs 300/- per annum. It was estimated that the combined annual income of Mr. Varadarajan and that of his father did not exceed Rs 500/- per annum and was thus well within the income limit prescribed for the grant of educational concessions under rule 92 of the M.E.R. The D.P.I. wished to know whether in view of the fact that Mr. Varadarajan was then an earning member though he was earning only about Rs 25/- per mensem, he could be granted the educational concessions for his M.L. studies. Since Mr. Varadarajan was in a position to earn an income and was doing so it was held that he should not be granted the concession for his M.L. course and orders were accordingly issued in G.O.No. 1606 Education, dated 11-10-1945.

In 1948 the Surgeon General enquired whether medical graduates studying for the post graduate degrees and diplomas such as B.S.Sc., D.O., D.L.O., D.G.O., T.D.D. etc. were eligible for fee concessions under rule 92 of the M.E.R. It was then ordered that the Government had no objection to granting educational concessions under rule 92 of the M.E.R. to medical graduates who undertook post-graduate

p22 of BR No 151

p22 of MER

p19 of 1606 Ed
11.10.45

p1 (B)

(B)

1/12/50 11/10/45

(S)

2
courses such as B.S.Sc., D.O., D.L.O., D.G.O. etc provided these graduates were not engaged in earning their living that while undergoing the post-graduate course and/in the case of graduates who were actually earning an income during their post-graduate course the concession might be denied if their earnings together with those of their parents or guardians exceeded the income limit prescribed under rule 92 of the M.E.R.

Attention is, in this connection, invited to the notes of the then Secretary to Government of this Department, Mr. Lobo Prabhu and to the minutes of the then Minister of Education, Mr. A.B. Shetty and the Minister for Finance.

"The question for consideration is whether according to rule 92 of the M.E.R. girls in all institutions and boys belonging to backward classes, Harijans and Muslims should be allowed the fee concessions in respect of post graduate courses over and above the courses required to qualify them to earn a living. In the case of a student reading for his M.L. Degree it was held that the concession should not apply as he was already earning Rs 300. This Department has proposed and Finance has agreed that this precedent should be applied generally to all post-graduate courses. I am of the view (1) that the decision contravenes rule 92 which applies to all Arts and Professional colleges without any reference to the courses and (2) that the argument that the candidate is capable of earning his living can apply at any stage because if logically pressed there is no reason why a candidate should not stop at the middle or high school and earn his living. The fact that the candidate elects to take a higher degree instead of seeking employment is evidence that he has no employment suitable to his qualifications and expectations.

I would therefore press that the concession may be allowed according to the provisions of the section except to candidates engaged in earning their living in which case if their earning together with those of their parents exceed the limit fixed, the concession may be denied.

J.M.L.P.
19-4-49

*
'A' on page 1 ante is accepted.

A.B.S./21-4-49

I am inclined to agree with J.S. Let backward community students take to higher education with concessions.

B.G.R./25-4-49.

The D.P.I. now brings to the notice the cases of permanent or officiating Government servants belonging to the backward and scheduled classes who have joined the Law College, most of them being on leave on loss of pay with no income

*On the same analogy perhaps medical graduates who undertake post-graduate courses such as B.S. Sc., D.O., D.L.O. D.G.O., T.D.D. etc. need not be granted the concessions under rule 92 of the M.E.R.

3
7
at all producing necessary certificate of income of their parents or guardians which are within the limits mentioned in rule 92 of the M.E.R. He says that with reference to the orders in C.O.No. 1606 Edn., dated 11-10-1945, he had rejected all cases for the grant of educational concessions to earning students belonging to the backward classes holding the view that the smallness of income is no criterion and that when once a person enters life and begins to earn he is no longer dependent on others and that he should therefore pay for the cost of educating himself. He wishes to be informed whether his views stated at 'X' above is correct and whether a person who entered life and was earning should not be granted the concession even if his earning during the period of study is nil and that of his parent or guardian is within the limits specified in rule 92 of the M.E.R.

The Law course is a post-graduate course. Since it may be construed that the permanent and officiating Govt. servants belonging to Backward and Harijan communities who have joined the Law College on leave on loss of pay receiving no income, is evidence that the employment held by them is not suitable to their expectations and on the analogy of the concession extended to the post-graduate medical courses, the students of Law College under reference may also be granted the educational concessions for their studies in the Law classes. It may be stated that unlike Mr. Varadarajan who was himself earning during the course of his M.L. studies, the students under reference are not earning any thing at present though they were before they joined the Law College. The concession may perhaps be extended to them so long as the income of their parents is within the limits prescribed under rule 92 of the M.E.R.

The D.P.I. may be informed that a person who entered life and was earning should be granted the concession, even if his earning during the period of study is nil and that of his parent or guardian is within the limit specified

in rule 92 of the M.E.R. It is not known what the additional cost to Government will be in case the concessions are extended to the students in question. Since it may not be much it does not appear necessary to call for this information from the D.P.I. Please see also the minute of the (7th) extracted at page 2 anti. Finance may see for remarks.

Op
19/9/50

DM
24/9/50 S

209

Fin.

Fin (Accts)

(Notes from p 1 above may be read.)
In order to advise on the correct financial procedure to be followed, if the suggestion of Edn. at 'A' above is to be accepted, it is desirable to have at least a rough estimate of the cost involved. Edn. may be requested to ascertain this information in the first instance.

DM
27/9/50

DM
28/9/50

Edn (D)

A draft memo. to D.P.I. is put up for approval.

DM
1.10.50.

DM
4/10/50 S

40

[Issued as Memo. No. 23130/50-20 Edn. dt. 5.10.50]

[From the D.P.I. No. 1745 EA/50 dt. 31.10.50]

PP 3-4 Cf.

P 5 Cf.

The D.P.I. estimates the additional expenditure to be incurred from State Funds, if the concessions under Rule 92 of M.E.R. is extended to earning students, at Rs. 1300/- per annum.




Edn. U.O. 23130/50-1D
20.9.50.




M
B
29.9.50
Juno 81354 Accts-1
28.9.50

Edn. U.O. 23130/50-3D
7.11.50.



Edn
File no 92933 Accts - 1

14 - 11 - 50



as per details furnished by him.
The file may now be sent to Finance for remarks.

DM
6.11.50.

DM
7/11/50

Finance (Accts)

[Previous Finance notes on p. 4 above]

With reference to M on p. 4 of this dept's previous notes, it is reported that the additional expenditure to be incurred from state funds, if the concessions under Rule 92 of M.E.R. are extended to earning students, is roughly estimated at Rs 1,300/- per annum. In the above circumstances, the suggestion of the Edn Deptt at A on p.p 3-4 above may be agreed to in Finance. No special financial procedure is necessary. H.M. Fin. may, how, see.

B
14.11.50

DM
13/11/50

B
14.11.50

DM
14.11.50

Edn. Deptt (D)

This file relates to the extension of fee concession under M.E.R. to earning students during the period of their studies, if their earning during such period is nil.

Finance have agreed to the proposal.

A draft is submitted for approval.

The file may be circulated to HM (EqL) and HM (Fin).

DM
21.11.50.

DM
24/11/50

DM
25.11

DM (Fin)

DM (Fin)

DM
24.12

as per details furnished in the
The file copy was sent to Finance

Finance (Adm)
I previously sent in Finance report of 11/11/50
with reference to M. H. Adams (Adm)

Adm. U. S. O. 25-50-37
7-11-50

Adm

Adm. U. S. O. 25-50-37
7-11-50

Adm