Archives I 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages

31 ~~30~~ (2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Finl. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 965
~~B.P. No.~~

Press.
Mis.

Dated 31- 5- 1881. ~~197~~.

28|29

V. S. H

Not to be folded or roughly handled

27
~~28~~

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

31st May 1881, No. 965.

Budget Estimates.

Read the following papers:—

From Surgeon-General W. R. CORNISH, F.R.C.S., C.I.E., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 23rd February 1881, *No.* 70 [*Current* No. 474].

In G.O., No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, the Government were pleased to approve of my suggestion that Rs. 450 and Rs. 200 should be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of Medical College respectively.

2. In my correspondence with the Director of Public Instruction, I was of opinion that one-half of the consolidated pay of the Principal and Professors would be a fair proportion with which to debit the Educational Budget. The Director held that the apportionment of the pay of the Professors should be made in proportion to the time spent by them on Educational work, and enclosed a letter from the Principal, Medical College, in which Dr. King suggested that the Educational Department should be debited with the difference between the pay of Professors and the pay of the same officers if restricted to Medical, to the exclusion of Educational, duties. The difference in the case of the Principal was shown to be Rs. 450, and in that of Professors, Rs. 200. I accepted these figures in deference to the Educational Department.

3. In the accompanying letter, however, the Director of Public Instruction requests me to forward to Government a copy of the correspondence that has passed between our offices, and contends that one-third of the consolidated pay of Professors would more nearly represent than one-half the equitable demand against Education. I have the honor to comply with the Director's request, and forward copies of the marginally-noted correspondence for submission to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, with the remark that what I have actually recommended to Government as a debit against the Educational Budget is less than the figure urged by the Director, viz., one-third of the consolidated pay of the Professors. I have no objection to one-third being debited to Medical Education.

No. 696, 17th February 1881.

To Director, No. 6461, 24th November 1880.
From Director, No. 5883, 18th December, and enclosure.
To Director, No. 7029, 23rd December 1880.
From Director, No. 431, 7th February 1881, and enclosure.
To Director, No. 910, 16th February 1881.

No. 462.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for any further remarks he may wish to make with reference to the conclusion of the Surgeon-General's letter, from which it appears that the debit against the *Educational* Budget under G.O., No. 271, of the 14th February 1881, is *less* than one-third of the consolidated pay of the Professors.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
9*th March* 1881.

(Signed) R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

From H. B. GRIGG, Esq., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 11th May 1881, *No.* 2155 [*Current No.* 1175].

Referring to your endorsement, No. 462, Financial Department, dated the 9th March last, I have the honor to return the correspondence sent therewith with the following remarks.

2. In his letter of the 24th November last, the Surgeon-General considered that a moiety of the pay of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College should be debited to Education.

3. Considering that the financial return of the Medical College was unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it did not represent the true cost of the education given, I was glad of the opportunity afforded of determining the question, and I referred Dr. Cornish's letter to the Principal of the College.

4. Dr. King suggested that only 200 rupees should be charged for each Professor and Rs. 425 for the Principal; and he based his calculations upon the salaries drawn respectively by the Principal and Professors and District Surgeons. But he also expressed an opinion that the pay proper of the Assistants should appear as a charge against Medical Education.

5. I could not agree with Dr. King in the proportion of the Principal and Professors' salaries which he proposed to show against Education. I therefore called upon him for statements of the time devoted to instruction; and, in the mean while, I informed the Surgeon-General that I thought a moiety too much. I also drew his attention to the fact that the pay of the Assistants ought to be made a charge. Dr. Cornish considered Dr. King's apportionment fair and practicable, and he drew attention to the fact that Local Fund Boards and Municipalities were contributing yearly towards the expenses of the Medical College.

6. Dr. King having sent me the statements I sent them on to Dr. Cornish pointing out that, with two exceptions, the Principal and Professors appear to give more than one-third of a working day to College work. I did not desire to understate the case, and therefore thought anything less than one-third would be an unfair proportion. What I thought should be aimed at was that the Budget provision should represent the actual proportionate cost, so far as it was possible to ascertain it, of the Medical Staff maintained for Educational purposes, the apportionment being based on the actual portion of his working devoted by a Medical Officer to his education work. I demurred to Dr. King's mode of calculation because there was no analogy whatever between the position of District Surgeon and of a Professor, although it offered a simple solution. I also pointed out that the contribution from Local Fund Boards and Municipalities did not affect the question, for I would observe that such contribution appears on the receipt side of the account.

7. The Surgeon-General thought my mode of calculation fallacious, because I did not take into calculation daily preparation for his work by a Professor; and he went on to remark that after all there was very little difference between us, as he had originally named one-half, and I had pointed to something more than one-third. Dr. Cornish also pointed out, very properly, that it was impossible, under present circumstances, to adjust the value of a Professor with mathematical precision. That value he considered ought to be higher than usual from the nature of the work required. Finally, he considered that, taking things as they stood, it did not matter very much whether one-third or one-half were taken as a debit against Education, and he informed me that the question had been disposed of by him in a letter to Government, a copy of which he sent me.

8. In this letter the Surgeon-General states that, in consultation with the Director of Public Instruction, he recommends the apportionment proposed by Dr. King. As it might naturally be concluded by Government from this statement that I approved the Surgeon-General's proposals, which was not the case, I in my letter of the 17th February at once put in my protest; and, in forwarding it to Government at my request with the whole correspondence, the Surgeon-General observes that he accepted the figures Rs. 450 (425 according to Dr. King) and Rs. 200 in deference to the Educational Department, that he has actually debited less than one-third, or what I contended for, and that he has no objection to one-third.

9. It will, I think, be seen from the correspondence that taking the Surgeon-General's own view his recommendation is inconsistent in the view first expressed by him as well as with those held by me. I am aware that if the view were adopted, that the charge against Education should correspond with the actual facts, a heavier debit against Education would result, but I consider it a matter of no mean importance that a charge in a budget should, whatever the difficulties in the way, correspond with actual, and not be a fictitious outlay. It may be true that, under existing circumstances, it does not much matter whether one-third or one-half is diverted in the Medical Budget towards the College, but the question is whether such a state of things is satisfactory, and further whether the condition to which it applies is likely to last. The spread amongst the people of the desire for scientific medical treatment, due to various causes, and the consequent increasing demand for skilled agency, will in time create a revolution in the educational machinery necessary for supplying the country with such agency. Apart, therefore, from mere account objections, I think it highly desirable that the Government should have put clearly before them in the Annual Budget of the Medical Department, the actual cost to the State of Medical Education, which the present system fails to do.

ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1881, No. 965.

The Government having carefully considered the Director's remarks are of opinion that the calculations of Dr. King are sufficiently fair.

2. The debit ordered in Proceedings, No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, will therefore hold good.

3. The question of the Assistants' pay will be taken up separately.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Offg. Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
,, Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.
,, Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of [1881] Madras.

FINANCIAL.

To

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC
INSTRUCTION,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated May, 31*st*.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 31st May 1881, *No.* 965.

MAY.

Budget Estimates.—The calculations of Dr. King respecting the amount to be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of the Medical College respectively, considered fair. The debit ordered in Proceedings, No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, to hold good.

965
3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

31st May 1881, No. 965.

Budget Estimates.

Read the following papers:—

From Surgeon-General W. R. CORNISH, F.R.C.S., C.I.E., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 23rd February 1881, *No.* 70 [*Current No.* 474].

In G.O., No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, the Government were pleased to approve of my suggestion that Rs. 450 and Rs. 200 should be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of Medical College respectively.

2. In my correspondence with the Director of Public Instruction, I was of opinion that one-half of the consolidated pay of the Principal and Professors would be a fair proportion with which to debit the Educational Budget. The Director held that the apportionment of the pay of the Professors should be made in proportion to the time spent by them on Educational work, and enclosed a letter from the Principal, Medical College, in which Dr. King suggested that the Educational Department should be debited with the difference between the pay of Professors and the pay of the same officers if restricted to Medical, to the exclusion of Educational, duties. The difference in the case of the Principal was shown to be Rs. 450, and in that of Professors, Rs. 200. I accepted these figures in deference to the Educational Department.

3. In the accompanying letter, however, the Director of Public Instruction requests me to forward to Government a copy of the correspondence that has passed between our offices, and contends that one-third of the consolidated pay of Professors would more nearly represent than one-half the equitable demand against Education. I have the honor to comply with the Director's request, and forward copies of the marginally-noted correspondence for submission to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, with the remark that what I have actually recommended to Government as a debit against the Educational Budget is less than the figure urged by the Director, viz., one-third of the consolidated pay of the Professors. I have no objection to one-third being debited to Medical Education.

No. 696, 17th February 1881.

To Director, No. 6461, 24th November 1880.
From Director, No. 5883, 18th December, and enclosure.
To Director, No. 7029, 23rd December 1880.
From Director, No. 431, 7th February 1881, and enclosure.
To Director, No. 910, 16th February 1881.

No. 462.

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for any further remarks he may wish to make with reference to the conclusion of the Surgeon-General's letter, from which it appears that the debit against the *Educational* Budget under G.O., No. 271, of the 14th February 1881, is *less* than one-third of the consolidated pay of the Professors.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
9*th March* 1881.

(Signed) R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

From H. B. GRIGG, Esq., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 11*th May* 1881, *No.* 2155 [*Current No.* 1175].

Referring to your endorsement, No. 462, Financial Department, dated the 9th March last, I have the honor to return the correspondence sent therewith with the following remarks.

2. In his letter of the 24th November last, the Surgeon-General considered that a moiety of the pay of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College should be debited to Education.

3. Considering that the financial return of the Medical College was unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it did not represent the true cost of the education given, I was glad of the opportunity afforded of determining the question, and I referred Dr. Cornish's letter to the Principal of the College.

4. Dr. King suggested that only 200 rupees should be charged for each Professor and Rs. 425 for the Principal; and he based his calculations upon the salaries drawn respectively by the Principal and Professors and District Surgeons. But he also expressed an opinion that the pay proper of the Assistants should appear as a charge against Medical Education.

5. I could not agree with Dr. King in the proportion of the Principal and Professors' salaries which he proposed to show against Education. I therefore called upon him for statements of the time devoted to instruction; and, in the mean while, I informed the Surgeon-General that I thought a moiety too much. I also drew his attention to the fact that the pay of the Assistants ought to be made a charge. Dr. Cornish considered Dr. King's apportionment fair and practicable, and he drew attention to the fact that Local Fund Boards and Municipalities were contributing yearly towards the expenses of the Medical College.

6. Dr. King having sent me the statements I sent them on to Dr. Cornish pointing out that, with two exceptions, the Principal and Professors appear to give more than one-third of a working day to College work. I did not desire to understate the case, and therefore thought anything less than one-third would be an unfair proportion. What I thought should be aimed at was that the Budget provision should represent the actual proportionate cost, so far as it was possible to ascertain it, of the Medical Staff maintained for Educational purposes, the apportionment being based on the actual portion of his working devoted by a Medical Officer to his education work. I demurred to Dr. King's mode of calculation because there was no analogy whatever between the position of District Surgeon and of a Professor, although it offered a simple solution. I also pointed out that the contribution from Local Fund Boards and Municipalities did not affect the question, for I would observe that such contribution appears on the receipt side of the account.

7. The Surgeon-General thought my mode of calculation fallacious, because I did not take into calculation daily preparation for his work by a Professor; and he went on to remark that after all there was very little difference between us, as he had originally named one-half, and I had pointed to something more than one-third. Dr. Cornish also pointed out, very properly, that it was impossible, under present circumstances, to adjust the value of a Professor with mathematical precision. That value he considered ought to be higher than usual from the nature of the work required. Finally, he considered that, taking things as they stood, it did not matter very much whether one-third or one-half were taken as a debit against Education, and he informed me that the question had been disposed of by him in a letter to Government, a copy of which he sent me.

8. In this letter the Surgeon-General states that, in consultation with the Director of Public Instruction, he recommends the apportionment proposed by Dr. King. As it might naturally be concluded by Government from this statement that I approved the Surgeon-General's proposals, which was not the case, I in my letter of the 17th February at once put in my protest; and, in forwarding it to Government at my request with the whole correspondence, the Surgeon-General observes that he accepted the figures Rs. 450 (425 according to Dr. King) and Rs. 200 in deference

to the Educational Department, that he has actually debited less than one-third, or what I contended for, and that he has no objection to one-third.

9. It will, I think, be seen from the correspondence that taking the Surgeon-General's own view his recommendation is inconsistent in the view first expressed by him as well as with those held by me. I am aware that if the view were adopted, that the charge against Education should correspond with the actual facts, a heavier debit against Education would result, but I consider it a matter of no mean importance that a charge in a budget should, whatever the difficulties in the way, correspond with actual, and not be a fictitious outlay. It may be true that, under existing circumstances, it does not much matter whether one-third or one-half is diverted in the Medical Budget towards the College, but the question is whether such a state of things is satisfactory, and further whether the condition to which it applies is likely to last. The spread amongst the people of the desire for scientific medical treatment, due to various causes, and the consequent increasing demand for skilled agency, will in time create a revolution in the educational machinery necessary for supplying the country with such agency. Apart, therefore, from mere account objections, I think it highly desirable that the Government should have put clearly before them in the Annual Budget of the Medical Department, the actual cost to the State of Medical Education, which the present system fails to do.

ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1881, No. 965.

The Government having carefully considered the Director's remarks are of opinion that the calculations of Dr. King are sufficiently fair.

2. The debit ordered in Proceedings, No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, will therefore hold good.

3. The question of the Assistants' pay will be taken up separately.

(True Extract.)

Offg. Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
" Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.
" Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

FINANCIAL.

To

The DIRECTOR of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated May, 31st.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 31st May 1881, No. 965.

MAY.

Budget Estimates.—The calculations of Dr. King respecting the amount to be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of the Medical College respectively, considered fair. The debit ordered in Proceedings, No. 271, dated 14th February 1881, to hold good.

Office of Surgeon-General with the
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George, 24 November 1880

No. 6461

965
5

From

The SURGEON-GENERAL
with the GOVERNMENT of MADRAS,
Fort St. George,

To

The Director of
Public Instruction

Sir,

With reference to para 5 of G. O. No 1931 of 16 October/80 Financial Department (Copy enclosed) I have the honor to solicit favor of opinion as to what portion of the pay of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College should be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools".

2. The pay of the Officers in question for holding attached duties* (Principal excepted) rises from Rs 700 to Rs 1,250 according to rank.

* Vide statement IA recorded in G. O. No 577/12 Feby 1878. E. D.

3 A sum of Rs 1600 is allowed for holding the appointments of Principal Medical College Professor of Medicine and Physicians to the General Hospital without reference to grade.

4 It seems to me that a moiety of Consolidated pay in each case would

be a fair apportionment for Medical Education as distinguished from Medical Services.

I have &c

(Sd) W. R Cornish

Surgeon General with

the Govt of Madras.

(True Copy)

W R Cornish

Surgeon General

Fort St George }
23rd Feby 1881 } with the Govt of Madras.

Madras Medical College

7th December 1880

No 501

965/6

From

The Principal Medical College.

To

The Director of

Public Instruction

Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your Proceedings No 5572 dated 1st instant, I have the honor to enclose a statement shewing the consolidated salaries of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College. The total is Rs 8,550, no portion of which is debited to Medical Education.

2. I was preparing to address you on this subject when your memorandum under reply was received: to point out the illusory character of the Financial Statement of the Medical College, as it has hitherto been prepared; neither Principal

and Professors salaries nor pay proper of the Assistants, being included therein.

3 Although I am not called upon to express an opinion on the Surgeon General's proposals, I trust I shall be excused if I suggest that only Rs 200 per mensem for each Professor and Rs 425 for the Principal should be debited to Education. The Collegiated duties of a Professor are fully equal to those of a District Surgeon or a First Class Zillah Surgeon; and his pay exceeds that of one of these officials by Rs 200 only. The Principal is and probably will always be an Officer of twenty years' service; whose pay in a District would be Rs 1,050 with Rs 125/- house rent: while as Principal he draws Rs 1600/- the difference being Rs 425/.

I have &c

Sd/ Henry King A.M. M.B.

Principal Medical College

Statement shewing the consolidated salaries of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College per mensem.

	Rs
Principal and Professor of Medicine	1600
Professor of Anatomy	1250
— do — Surgery	1250
— do — Physiology	1250
— do — Midwifery	850
— do — Chemistry	700
— do — Pathology	800
— do — Materia Medica & Hygiene	850
Total	8550

Sd/ Henry King A.M. M.B.

Principal Medical College

True Copy

Wm Cornish

Surgeon General with the Govt of Madras.

Fort St George }
23 February 1881 }

GO Finl: 474/81

No 5883.

Office of the Director of
Public Instruction
Madras 18th December/80

965/6

From

The Director of Public Instruction

To

The Surgeon General
with the Government of Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 24th Novr 1880 No 6461, I have the honor to state that I fully concur in your opinion that a fair proportion of the pay of the staff of the Medical College should be debited in the Provincial Medical Budget to "Medical College and Schools", but I do not agree with you in regarding a moiety of the Consolidated pay in each case as a fair apportionment. I am disposed to think that the principle upon which the apportionment should be based is the proportion of time demanded of an officer for his Educational work. Thus the whole, I believe, of the

Principal's time is devoted to Educational work, therefore the whole of his salary and allowance should be debited to Education, but the case of some other Professors is different. I would therefore suggest that the proportion of Professor's pay to be debited to Education should accord with the proportion which the time he devotes to Educational work in a week bears to the time devoted by students to work in the same period according to the time table. Thus if a professor teaches 6 hours out of a total of (say) 30 hours devoted by the students to school work during the week, then one-fifth of his salary should be debited to Education.

2. I beg to invite your attention to the remark in the enclosed letter from the Principal Medical College that the pay proper of the Assistants as well, as of the Principal and Professors does not appear in the College Budget.

I have &c

(Sd) H. B. Grigg
Director of Public Instruction

True Copy.

W. R. Cornish
Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras.

Fort St George
23d Feby 1881.

C.W.

Ed Finl: 474/81

No 7029.

Office of Surgeon General
with the Government of
Madras. Fort St George 23 Dec/80

From

The Surgeon General
with the Government of Madras
Fort Saint George.

To,

The Director of
Public Instruction
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 5883 of 18th December/80, I have the honor to state that I have no objection to the proposal made by the Principal Medical College for the apportionment of Salary of the Principal and Professors as regards the Educational Department. In mentioning a moiety of pay I had not fixed definitely on the proportion and Dr King's suggestions are fair and practicable.

2. You will remember that Local Fund Boards and Municipalities are now contributing about Rs 50,000 yearly towards the expenses of the Medical College.

I

I have &c
(Sd) W. R. Cornish
Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras.

True Copy

Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras

Fort St George
23d Feby 1881

W Frul: 474/81

From
The Surgeon-General
with the Govt. of Madras,
Fort St. George, 188
To
The
No.
Dated
Despatched
Received
Subject

Office of the Director of Publi
Instruction Madras 7 Feby 8

No 431

965
V

From

The Director of Public Instruction

To

The Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madras.

Sir,

On receipt of your letter of the 23rd December last, I requested the Principal of the Medical College to furnish me with statements showing the time given by himself and each Professor to the Medical College work proper and the approximate average number of hours devoted by students to study each week according to the time-table

2. From the enclosed statements (to be returned), I gather that each student spends on an average 32 hours a week, in College, that the Principal spends 17 hours respectively in teaching. Excluding the Principal, the average time in a week spent by a

Professor in actual teaching is approximately 19 hours, or over 3½ hours a day, taking the working week at 6 days of 8 hours, exclusive of time given to study and preparation. It follows that the Principal and the Professors with two exceptions give more than one-third of a working day to College work. I trust you will agree with me in thinking that to debit any thing less than one-third of the total emoluments to the Cost of Medical Education is to understate the case, and that it is desirable that the Budget provision should represent the actual cost of the Medical staff, neither aggravating nor depreciating it. I fail to see why, because the Collegiated duties of a Professor are at least equal as Dr King states, to those of a Zillah Surgn., whilst his pay, it seems, exceeds the latter's by Rs 200, the difference in pay should be taken to represent the fair charge for the Medical portion of his duties, although the proposal is doubtless very practicable. Nor do I see how the Contribution from Local Funds and Municipalities affects the question, as that Contribution was ordered by Government (G. O. 28th July 1878 No. 147) to meet certain excess charges in the Medical College and Auxiliary Schools, which do not appear to include any increased cost on account of the Higher Professorial body, although in the estimate of expenditure in 1877-78 I notice that the College pay of seven Major Professors is set at 300 Rs each per mensem, whilst with a largely developed institution Rs 200 is thought adequate.

3 The question raised does not concern the Budget of this Department, but it is unquestionably of high importance that the approximate Cost of Medical instruction should be ascertained, and the amount distributed equally between Provincial and Local and Municipal Funds

I

I have &c

(Sd) H. B. Grigg

Director of Public Instruction

(True Copy)

W. R. Cornish

Surgeon General

with the Government of Madras.

Fort St George }
23d Feby 1881 }

CR

Ind Incl: 474/81

965/13

Statement shewing the time given by Principal and Professors to College work proper.

		Time for Lecture each day	How often in each week	
By Principal				
Medicine Lectures at the College during the Winter Session	W.	1 Hour	5 days	
Clinical Medicine Lectures at the General Hospital throughout the year		2 Hours	daily	
By Professors				
Anatomy Lectures	W	1	5 days	By same professor whenever a subject is available.
Dissection or Practical Anatomy	W	1 to 2 hours	each day	
Chemistry Lectures	W	1 Hour	5 days	By same professor
Organic Chemistry Lectures	S	1 do	3 do	
Practical Chemistry Lectures	S	2 do	3 do	
Materia Medica Lectures	W	1 do	5 do	By same professor
Chemical Lecture at General Hospital		2 do	daily	
Practical Pharmacy	S	2 do	2 days	
Hygiene Lecture	W	1 do	3 do	
Surgery Lectures at College	W	1 do	5 do	By same professor Operative Surgery whenever a subject is available
Clinical Surgery Lectures at the General Hospital		2 do	daily	
Operative and Minor Surgery	S	2 do	5 days	
Midwifery Lectures at the College	W	1 do	4 do	By same professor
Clinical Instruction at the Lying in Hospital		2 do	daily	
Diseases of Women & Children Lectures at the College	S.	1 do	4 days	
Pathology Lectures at the College	W	1 do	3 do	By same professor whenever a subject is available.
do do at the Post-Mortem Rooms General Hospital		1 do	6 do	
Physiology Lectures at College	W	1 do	4 do	
Ophthalmology Lectures at College	W	1 do	2 do	By same professor
Clinical Ophthalmology Lectures at Eye Infirmary		2 do	5 do	
Microscope Lectures at College	S	2 do	1 do	
Medical Jurisprudence Lectures	S.	1 do	5 do	
By Lecturers				
Botany Lectures	W	1 do	3 do	
Comparative Anatomy Lectures	S	1 do	3 do	

W. Winter Session 6 months

S Summer Session 3 months.

Average numbers of Hours devoted by Students every wee

		Senior Department				2nd Department		Junior Department	
		M. B Section		L. M. S Section					
	Session	College	Hospital	College	Hospital	College	Hospital	College	Hospit
1st year students	Winter	13	18	21	18	21	21	9	21
	Summer	10	18	10	18	14	21	12	21
2nd – do –	Winter	21	18	9	18	19	21	12	21
	Summer	10	18	4	18	9	21	12	21
3rd – do –	Winter	9	18	14	18	19	21	14	21
	Summer	10	18	5	18	19	21	17	21
4 – do –	Winter	12	18	19	18	..	..	..	..
	Summer	14	18	14	18	..	..	..	..
5 – do –	Winter	10	18	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Summer	10	18	..	..	..	..	..	..

A. B. Dissections during Winter Session are made whenever a dead subject is available from 6 to 10 A.M. on such days

Madras Medical College
21st January 1881

Sd/ Henry King A. M. M. B.
Principal Medical College

True Copy

W R Cornish
Surgeon General
with the Government of Madras

Fort St George
23 Feby 1881

CD

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Fort St. George, 16 February 1881.

No. 910

965
~~15~~
14

FROM

THE SURGEON-GENERAL
WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George,

TO

THE Director of
Public Instruction.

SIR,

× Encr retd

With reference to your letter× No 431 of 7 instant, I have the honor to state that the method of Calculation, resorted to by you seems to me to be fallacious, you take the actual time employed by Professors in their lectures and demonstrations, but I think you must admit with me that this is but a portion of the time the several Officers devote to the cause of Medical instruction. The preparation of a lecture or demonstration, often takes more time than the actual delivery, and you give nothing for this, and the reading & thought on current professional subjects to enable a man to teach up to the standard of existing knowledge.

2. In my first letter on this subject I expressed a view that a moiety of

the consolidated salaries of the Professors should be debited to Medical Education. You think this is too high, but the facts brought out in your letter as to the actual time spent in College, seem to show that it was not much over the mark

3. It is impossible to adjust with mathematical precision the money value of the Medical Officers services in Education, as apart from their Collegiated duties, and whether one-third or one half be taken, will not very much matter - Your enquiries show that at the lowest estimate, the proportion should be somewhat more than a third, you have valued moreover the teaching faculty at the same rate as ordinary professional work, whereas as a matter of fact men are generally selected for professorial chairs, on account of special attainments

4. The question however of the amount debited to the Educational Department for the pay of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College has already been disposed of in this Office letter to Government - Copy enclosed. No 45 of 3 Feb 1881.

965/~~16~~ 15

I have &c
Sd/ W. R. Cornish
Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madra

True Copy

W R Cornish
Surgeon General
with the Govt of Madra

Fort St George }
23 Febry 1881 }

188

From
The Surgeon-General
with the Govt of Madras,
Fort St. George.

To
The

Dated
Despatched
Received

No.

Subject.

M Genl: 474/81

2°

No. 696.

Office of the Director
of Public Instruction,
Madras, 17 February 1881.

965
17/2

From
The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

To The Surgeon General,
with the Government of
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 910 dated 16 Instant, with Enclosures.

2. As from your letter to Government, it might possibly be inferred that the proposal to debit monthly to "Medical College and Schools," a sum of Rs. 450 for the Principal and Rs. 200 for each of the Professors was in accordance with my views. I beg that you will be so good as to forward a copy of the correspondence, that has passed between our offices, to Chief Secretary for the information of Government.

3. I agree with you that one-third of their salaries is rather too large a proportion, but on the whole, I am disposed to think that it represents more nearly than one-half the equitable demand against Education. It is true that a Professor has to spend some time in preparing for his lectures, but so too, I presume, must a Surgeon in general practice, if he is to keep himself au pace with the development of Medical Science, and be prepared to deal efficiently with any exigencies which may arise in the course of his work.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant,

[illegible] Griff
Director of Public Instruction

G. M. B.

965/78

298/81

181.

From
The Director of
Public Instruction
Madras.

No 696

Dated 17th Feby/81.
Recd

No

Requesting that
certain Corres-
pondence may
be sent to Govt
regarding the ap-
portionment
of the salaries of the
Principal and
Professors of the
Medical College

1881

In Finl: 474/81

G.O. (Finl) 965/14

18

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL
WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George, 23rd Feby 1881

No. 70

965/19

From
THE SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George.

18

To
THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Financial. DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

In G.O. No 271 dated 14th February 1881, the Government were pleased to approve of my suggestion that Rs 450/ and Rs 200/ should be debited to the head "Medical College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of Medical College respectively.

2. In my correspondence with the Director of Public Instruction I was of opinion, that one half of the consolidated pay of the Principal and Professors would be a fair proportion with which to debit the Educational Budget. The Director held that the apportionment of the pay of the Professors should be made in proportion to the time spent by them on Educational work, and enclosed a letter from the Principal Medical College in which Dr King suggested that the Educational department should be debited with the difference between the pay of Professors and the pay of the same Officers if restricted to medical, to the exclusion of educational duties. The difference in the case of the Principal was shown to be Rs 450/ and in that of Professors Rs 200/-. I accepted these figures in deference to the Educational Department.

In

3. In the accompanying letter, however, the Director of Public Instructions requests me to forward to ~~an~~ Government a copy of the correspondence that has paſsed between our Offices, and contends that one third of the consolidated pay of Professors would more nearly represent than one half the equitable demand against education. I have the honor to comply with the Director's request and forward copies of the marginally noted correspondence for submiſsion to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council with the remark that what I have actually recommended to Government as a debit against the Educational Budget is leſs than the figure urged by the Director – namely one third of the consolidated pay of the Profeſsors – I have no objection to one third being debited to Medical education.

No. 696 – 17 Feby '81

To Director No. 6461 – 24th November 1880.
From Director No. 5883 – 18th Decr & Enclosure.
To — Do. — " 7029 – 23d Decr '80
From — Do. — " 431 – 7 Feby '81 & Enclosure
To — Do. — " 910 18 Feby '81

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obdt Servant.

WRCornish
Surgeon-General
with the Govt. of Madras.

C.W.

Go 271 – 14 – 2 – 81 Fnl
Go 1911 – 16 – 10 – do Fnl
Go 57 – 12 – 2 – 70 Sdn
Go 147 – 28 – 1 – 70 Fnl
G 1527 – 6 – 10 – 75 Fnl
Go 1066 – 10 – 10 – 70
Go 906 – 22 – 5 – 70

Finl (1881) DEPARTMENT.
(Budget Estt.)

From

THE SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Fort St. George,

R.D.
5 III 81

No. 70 Ed

Dated 23rd February 1881.
Recd. 25

No. 474

No 965/81

SUBJECT.

Forwards copies of correspondence and remarks that what he has recommended to Govt. as a debit against the educational Budget is less than the figure urged by the Director of Public Instruction.

No. 462 Financial Department

965/24 20

Letter from the Surgeon General with the Government of Madras dated 23rd February 1881 No 70.

26

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for any further remarks he may wish to make with reference to the conclusion of the Surgeon General's letter, from which it appears that the debit against the Educational budget under G.O. No 271 of the 14 February 1881 is less than one third of the consolidated pay of the professors.

Fort St. George
9th March 1881

J. Davidson
Chief Secretary

To
The Director of Public Instruction
Madras.

Office of the Director of Public
Instruction
No. 2155. Madras, 11th May 18[illegible]

CURRENT No. 117

From,

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

965
~~22~~
4

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

Referring to your Endorsement No. 462, Financial Department, dated the 9th March last, I have the honor to return the correspondence sent therewith with the following remarks.

In his letter of the 24th November last, the Surgeon-General considered that a moiety of the pay of the Principal and Professors of the Medical College should be debited to Education.

Considering that the financial return of the Medical College was unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it did not represent the true cost of the Education given, I was glad of the opportunity afforded of determining the question and referred Dr. Cornish's letter to the Principal of the College.

Dr King suggested that only 600 Rs should be charged for each Professor and Rs 425 for the Principal; and he based his calculations upon the salaries drawn respectively by the Principal and Professors and District Surgeons. But he also expressed an opinion that the pay proper of the Assistants should appear as a charge against Medical Education.

I could not agree with Dr King in the proportion of the Principal and Professors' salaries which he proposed to shew against Education. I therefore called upon him for statements of the time devoted to instruction; and in the meanwhile I informed the Surgeon General that I thought a moiety too much. I also drew his attention to the fact that the pay of the Assistants ought to be made a charge.

Dr Cornish considered Dr King's apportionment fair and practicable and he drew attention to the fact that Local Fund Boards and Municipalities were contributing yearly towards the expenses of the Medical College.

Dr King having sent me the statements I

sent them on to Dr Cornish pointing out that with two exceptions the Principal and Professors appeared to give more than one-third of a working day to College work. I did not desire to understate the case and therefore thought anything less than one-third would be an unfair proportion. What I thought should be aimed at was that the Budget provision should represent the actual proportionate cost, so far as it was possible to ascertain it, of the Medical Staff maintained for Educational purposes the apportionment being based on the actual portion of his working devoted by a medical officer to his Education work. I demurred to Dr King's mode of calculation because there was no analogy whatever between the position of a District Surgeon and of a Professor although it offered a simple solution. I also pointed out that the contribution from Local Fund Boards and Municipalities did not affect the question for I would observe, that such contribution appears on the receipt side of the account.

The Surgeon-General thought my mode of calculation fallacious, because I did not take into calculation daily preparation for his work by a Professor; and he went on to remark that after all there was very little difference between us, as he had originally named one-half and I had pointed to something more than one-third. Dr. Cornish also pointed out, very properly, that it was impossible, under present circumstances, to adjust the value of a Professor with mathematical precision. That value he considered ought to be higher than usual from the nature of the work required. Finally, he considered that, taking things as they stand, it did not matter very much whether one-third or one-half were taken as a debit against Education, and he informed me that the question had been disposed of by him in a letter to Government, a copy of which he

he sent me.

In this letter the Surgeon-General states that in consultation with the Director of Public Instruction, he recommends the apportionment proposed by Dr. King. As it might naturally be concluded by Government from this statement that I approved the Surgeon-General's proposal, which was not the case, I in my letter of the 17th February at once put in my protest; and in forwarding it to Government at my request with the whole correspondence, the Surgeon-General observes that he accepted the figures Rs 450 (425 according to Dr. King) and Rs 200 in deference to the Educational Department, that he has actually debited less than one-third, or what I contended for, and that he has no objection to one-third.

2. It will, I think, be seen from the correspondence that taking the Surgeon-General's own view his recommendation is inconsistent with the view first expressed by him as well as with those held by me

I am aware that if the view were adopted, that the charge against Education should correspond with the actual facts, a heavier debit against Education would result, but I consider it a matter of no mean importance that a charge in a Budget should, whatever the difficulties in the way, correspond with actual, and not be a fictitious entry. It may be true that under existing circumstances it does not much matter whether one-third or one-half is diverted in the Medical Budget towards the College, but the question is whether such a state of things is satisfactory, and further whether the condition to which it applies is likely to last. The spread amongst the people of the desire for scientific medical treatment, due to various causes and the consequent increasing demand for skilled agency will in time create a revolution in the Educational Machinery necessary for supplying the country with such agency. Apart, therefore, from these account objections, I think it highly desirable that the Government should have put clearly before them in the Annual Budget of the Medical Department, the actual cost to the State of Medical Education, which the present system fails to do.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

Director of Public Instruction.

965/25

24

~~Educational~~ Finl, Dept. (1881.)

(Budget Estt.)

From,

The Director of Public
R.D. Instruction
6 MAY 81
Madras.

To.

The Chief Secy to Govt.

No. 2155

No 965 Finl

Dated 11th May 1881.
Recd 16

CURRENT No. 1175

~~Subject~~

Returning with remarks the correspondence on the apportionment of the Salaries of the Principal and Professors Medical College.

Financial Department

965
~~916~~ 78
25

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following letters from

The Surgeon General with the Govt. of Madras, d 23rd February 1881, No. 70.

The Director of Public Instruction, Madras, d 11 May 1881, No. 2155.

Order thereon, 31st May 1881 No. 965

JM

but the cost of the Assistants shd also be considered

The Government having carefully considered the Director's remarks are of opinion that the calculations of Dr. King are sufficiently fair. ~~near the mark~~

2. The debit ordered in Proceedings No. 271, d 14 February 1881, will therefore hold good.

Despatcher
Return under cover to Finl. Dept. after despatch

To
The Dir. of Public Inst. 6
" Surg. Genl. with the Govt. of Madras 6
" Accountant General 6

Desp. 9/6

3.

Govt. of {188 } Madras.

To

Dated }
Recd. } 188 , No.

Nos.

Sorn

Hon. M. [illegible]

Despatch
The question of the
Assistants' pay
will be taken up
separately

Sd. 30/5/88

After issue
return to me
[illegible]

R 23.5
R 26.5

965
~~28~~
27

Recd 4/6

Sorn

Govt. of {1881} Madras.

Genl

DISPOSED OF

31 MAY 81

28

BY.G.O.Nº. 965

Budget Estimates. The calculations of Dr King respecting the amount to be debited to the head "Medl. College and Schools" for the pay of the Principal and each Professor of the Medl. College respectively, considered fair. The debit ordered in Proc. No 271 dated 14th Feby 1881, — to hold good.