[E. / 3[illegible]]
300—[illegible] 12-01.

Educational (1902) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 555

DATED 11 · 9 · 02

N. P.

INDEXED.

ORIGINAL C

—10—

[Despatch Abstract.]

School of Arts

Confirming the appt of a painting instructor in the — on the understandg that his services shall be dispensed with on the completion of the course of instruction of the advanced painting class.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

02

Government {1902} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Recd. } 1902. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 555, 11th September 1902.

N. P.

SEPTEMBER.

School of Arts.

Confirming the appointment of a painting instructor in the — on the understanding that his services are dispensed with on the completion of the course of instruction of the advanced painting class.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 7th May 1902, Ref. on C. No. 1950.

I have the honour, in the circumstances stated below, to request that you will be so good as to obtain the sanction of Government to the appointment with effect from 1st March last of a painting instructor on Rs. 100 a month in the arts section of the School of Arts. Pending final orders of Government on the proposals for reorganizing the school embodied in G.O., No. 468, Educational, dated 22nd August 1901, Mr. Chatterton applied for sanction for this appointment on the ground that it was absolutely necessary for the efficient working of the arts section. In informing him that the sanction of Government should not be anticipated I required him to explain in greater detail the necessity for the additional appointment proposed. From his reply (copy enclosed) it will be observed that the appointment was made about nine months ago and that the instructor was kept on daily wages, the allowance being debited to the Aluminium department as a set off against the services rendered to that department by certain members on the establishment of the School of Arts. Mr. Chatterton has explained the circumstances that rendered the appointment necessary, but he did not apply for the requisite sanction, as he should have done, apparently under the impression that such sanction was not required in the case of temporary hands engaged on daily wages. The Accountant-General has now objected to the arrangement and the assistant instructor's pay has been stopped. In view, however, of the fact that as pointed out by Mr. Chatterton it was not possible to carry on the work of the arts section without an assistant instructor and that to dispense with his services now will dislocate the working of the department, I beg to recommend that the appointment be sanctioned.

2. The charges on this account will be met from the provision of Rs. 6,000 under "Stipends of apprentices" in the current year's budget. The balance of Rs. 4,800, it is reported, will be sufficient for expenditure on stipends. I would point out here that the fee-income of the school has also considerably increased of late. A statement of re-appropriation of funds and the usual proposition statement will be submitted through the Accountant-General on receipt of the sanction of Government.

Enclosure.

From A. CHATTERTON, Esq., Officer in charge, School of Arts, to the Director of Public Instruction, dated Madras, 19th April 1902, No. 27.

In reply to your R.C. No. 1950-2, dated 18th April 1902, I have the honour to offer the following additional explanatory remarks regarding the appointment of Narayanasawmi Nayudu as painting instructor. When I took charge of the School of Arts in February 1901 frequent representations were made to me by the students that for a long time they had received no adequate instruction in painting. I found that these statements were true and there was no one on the staff except M.R.Ry. M. Velayudasari who was competent to teach painting and that his time was fully occupied and that in fact he was overworked. Unless he was relieved to some extent there was great risk of his breaking down and it was urgently necessary that some temporary arrangement should be made to relieve the strain. I accordingly employed Narayanasawmi Nayudu on daily wages and charged his pay to the Aluminium department, whilst I recouped the Aluminium department by utilizing the services of certain members of the staff of the School of Arts. I imagined at the time that Government would pass some definite orders regarding the reorganization of the school within a comparatively short time and that it was distinctly desirable to test the qualifications of a probable applicant for any permanent appointment that might be created. The arrangement worked satisfactorily till the Accountant-General objected to it in February last and since then Narayanasawmi Nayudu has been unable to obtain any pay.

2. With reference to your order that Narayanasawmi Nayudu should not be entertained in anticipation of the sanction of Government I beg to point out that he has been at work here for the last nine months and I should be glad if you would let me know if I am to dispense with his services.

3. The fees of the students have been raised and the fee-income is fully four times as much as it was and it is in my opinion absolutely necessary that in a Government institution the instruction should be given for which fees are paid. The efficiency of the instruction in the School of Arts is exceedingly low and I think it would be a mistake to decrease it still further as would be the case if the services of the second most useful member on the staff were dispensed with.

* * * * *

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 1st July 1902, Ref. on C. No. 1950.

In reply to the reference from Government No. 127, Educational, dated 15th May 1902, I have the honour to state that the necessity for a painting instructor was suggested to Government in the proposals for the reorganization of the School of Arts read in G.O., No. 468, Educational, dated 22nd August 1901. Those proposals included the appointment of two senior instructors on Rs. 100 per mensem each. The main justification for the appointment is however the necessity for giving the instruction for which the students are paying fees.

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 21st August 1902, Ref. on C. No. 1950.

Referring to Memorandum No. 180, Educational, dated 9th July 1902, calling for information as to the officer by whom and the extent to which instruction in painting was given in the School of Arts during the time of Messrs. Havell and Porterfield, I have the honour to state that when Mr. Havell was Superintendent instruction in painting was given by Mr. Holder, the Assistant Superintendent, under the supervision of Mr. Havell; when Mr. Holder was Acting Superintendent he took the special painting class himself, the acting Assistant Superintendent M.R.Ry. Velayudasari teaching the elementary and intermediate painting class, and there being no advanced painting class; when Mr. Porterfield was Superintendent there was also no advanced painting class, but instruction in the elementary and intermediate classes was given by M.R.Ry. Velayudasari. Mr. Chatterton reports that the number of hours spent by the Assistant Superintendent in giving instruction in painting alone cannot be definitely stated as he had also to teach other subjects within the two hours, viz., 7 to 9 A.M., that the art section worked every day. There is now an advanced painting class, and the present Superintendent is not qualified, as former Superintendents were, to give instruction in painting.

Order—No. 555, Educational, dated 11th September 1902.

Mr. Chatterton acted most irregularly in entertaining an instructor in painting without the sanction of Government; but his proceedings will be confirmed on the understanding that the services of the person engaged are dispensed with as soon as the completion of the course of preparation for technical examinations of the advanced class will admit of this. A proposition statement should be submitted for formal sanction.

2. The Government will consider what arrangements should be made for the teaching of advanced painting when they pass orders on the reorganization of the School of Arts.

(True Extract.)

A. T. PRINGLE,
Assistant Secretary to Government
in charge.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
„ Accountant-General.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 555, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 11TH SEPTEMBER 1902.

[SUBJECT.—*A painting instructor for the School of Arts.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 1950, *dated 7th May* 1902.

Orders are solicited as to whether the appointment of a painting instructor on Rs. 100 a month in the School of Arts may be approved with effect from the 1st March 1902.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—8-5-02.

Here is another instance of Mr. Chatterton's disregard of all rules and orders. He takes care to commit Government to a certain line of action. With the Assistant Superintendent M.R.Ry. Velayudasari on Rs. 200 it is not clear why such an expensive painting instructor is wanted, but he may perhaps have his hands full with aluminium work.

P. T. THARYAN—9-5-02.

As a school of arts, the School of Arts cannot be said to exist at present, and anything which may help towards its revival is to be welcomed. I submit that the irregularity may be passed over and sanction accorded. The fee income of the school is on the increase.

A. T. PRINGLE—10-5-02.

In the whole of the much correspondence regarding the School of Arts that has come before us has there been any hint that a painting instructor was required? I see nothing to this effect in the proposals for the reorganization. It is for the Director to explain this and his putting the matter before Government in the present way.

J. T[HOMSON]—10-5-02.

The draft reference placed below may issue?

P. T. THARYAN—14-5-02.

A. T. PRINGLE—15-5-02.

[*Reference No.* 127, *Educational, dated* 15*th May* 1902.]

The Director is requested to state whether the necessity for a painting instructor has at any time been suggested to Government and if not how the present application can be justified.

From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C. No. 1950, *dated* 1*st July* 1902.

The Director states that the necessity for a painting instructor was suggested in the proposals for the reorganization of the school (*vide* statement **A** referred to in paragraph 3 of the Director's letter in G.O., No. 468, Educational, dated 22nd August 1901), and that the justification for the appointment is the necessity for giving the instruction for which the students are paying fees.

2. It appears that instruction in painting was formerly given by M.R.Ry Velayudasari. He has now to supervise the work of all the teachers in the arts section and spends most of his time with the modelling class and in designing. Hence the necessity for a separate painting instructor.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—4-7-02.

Ask whether painting instruction was given in Mr. Havell's and in Mr. Porterfield's time and, if it was, by whom.

A. T. Pringle—5-7-02.

The draft placed below may issue.

T. Kanakasundaram Pillai—5-7-02.

A. T. Pringle—5-7-02.

[*Memorandum No.* 180, *Educational, dated* 9*th July* 1902.]

With reference to his letter R.C. No. 1950, dated 1st July 1902, the Director is requested to be good enough to state whether instruction in painting was given in the School of Arts during the time of Messrs. Havell and Porterfield; and if so, by whom and to what extent.

From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C. No. 1950, *dated* 21*st August* 1902.

The Director reports that instruction in painting was given during the time of both Messrs. Havell and Porterfield. During Mr. Havell's time Mr. Holder took the class in painting; during Mr. Porterfield's time there was no class for teaching advanced painting, but the elementary and intermediate classes were taken by M.R.Ry. Velayudasari. At present there is a class for advanced painting but M.R.Ry. Velayudasari has no time to give his exclusive attention to it as he takes the arts section in other subjects as well. The Superintendent is not competent to teach painting.

P. T. Tharyan.—23-8-02.

This should I think stand over until the question of reorganizing the School of Arts as a whole is taken up. But orders in regard to the irregularity, Mr. Chatterton having engaged an instructor without the sanction of the Government, are necessary. Please draft an order for the Honourable Member's approval confirming Mr. Chatterton's action, with remark that it was irregular and stating that the arrangement must be terminated.

A. T. Pringle—2-9-02.

The draft placed below may issue with the concurrence of the Financial department.

P. T. Tharyan—3-9-02.

Draft is placed below for approval.

2. With reference to the Honourable Member's note, dated 10th May 1902, instruction in painting is not a new thing at the School of Arts, but under previous superintendents it was possible to arrange for giving it without engaging a man. Some students are now desirous, it would appear, of passing in the subject at the technical examinations, and it is to meet their case that Mr. Chatterton entertained an instructor. As there is no one in the school except Velayudasari who is qualified to teach, and as he has his hands full, some such arrangement must be made, or else those students who wish to appear at the technical examinations of the advanced class must go to a private instructor. When the school has been reorganized, there should be no occasion for having a special man for the work. Velayudasari, if still the head of the art section, would no doubt take the "advanced" class, when there were students in it, and the "elementary" and "intermediate" classes would fall to Mr. Letoille and one of the senior instructors. See please statement **A** appended to G.O., No. 468 of the 22nd August 1901.

In 1901–1902 there were only three students in the "advanced class."

3. As it is understood that the Honourable Member is disinclined to sanction the present arrangement, and as there is no absolute necessity that the Government should pay for an instructor on Rs. 100 in the interests of a few students, the draft proposes to terminate the appointment. When orders are passed on the reorganization of the school it may be ruled that all instruction in painting shall be given by the staff itself. At present we are awaiting the report of Colonel Clibborn's committee, which Mr. Stuart asked the Government of India to let us have a copy of.

A. T. Pringle—6-9-02.

Demi-official from the Director of Public Instruction, dated 9*th September* 1902.

I don't quite know what is meant [by saying that the instructor's services should be dispensed with] "on a month's notice." As the instruction is justified for special reasons—preparation for technical examinations of the advanced class—it must go on till this is ended or the school reorganized. Make this clear please.

J. T[homson]—10-9-02.

Issue as altered.

A. T. Pringle—11-9-02.

[G.O., No. 555, Educational, dated 11th September 1902.]

1,000—16-3-01.

1

Educational (1902) Department.

6

CURRENT No. 740

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. G. H. Stuart, M.A.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras

DESPATCHED
7 MAY 1902

7 MAY 1902

Refnc No. 1950 of 02

Dated 7th May 1902

Enclosures One

Received 190 .

Registered 8-5- 1902.

SUBJECT.

Requesting sanction of Govt. to the apptt. with effect from 1st March last of a painting instructor on Rs 100 a month in the Arts section of the School of Arts.

BACK PAPERS.

468 — 22-8-07 SC
Fund 5 — 2-1-02 budget

FURTHER PAPERS.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour, in the circumstances stated below, to request that you will be so good as to obtain the sanction of Government to the appointment with effect from 1st March last of a painting instructor on Rs.100 a month in the Arts section of the School of Arts. Pending final orders of Government on the proposals for reorganizing the school embodied in G.O. No 468, Educational, dated 22nd August 1901 Mr. Chatterton applied for sanction for this appointment on the ground that it was absolutely necessary for the efficient working of the Arts section. In informing him that the sanction of Government should not be anticipated I required him to explain in greater detail the necessity for the additional appointment proposed. From his reply (copy enclosed) it will be observed that the appointment was made about nine months ago and that the instructor was kept on daily wages, the allowance being debited to the Aluminium Department as a set-off against the services rendered to that department by certain members on the establishment of the School of Arts. Mr. Chatterton has explained the circumstances that rendered the appointment necessary, but he did not apply for the requisite sanction, as he should have done, apparently under the impression that such sanction was not required in the case of temporary hands engaged on daily wages. The Accountant-General has now objected to the arrangement and the Assistant Instructor's pay has been stopped. In view however of the fact that as pointed out by Mr. Chatterton it was not possible to carry on the work of the Arts section without an assistant instructor and that to dispense with his services

---

Stock Form No. 137
2,000—1-5-02.

7 11

Educational (1902) Department.

CURRENT No. 993

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. G. H. Stuart, M.A.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras

DESPATCHED
11 JUL.1902

Refer Cur No. 1950/02

Received 2-JUL.1902 190 .

Dated 1st July 1902.

Registered Do. 190 .

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Subj: further remarks regarding the appointment of a painting instructor for the School of Arts.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O. 468: 22-8-01 Cy ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

EP/1

R. 12

6

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

In reply to the reference from Government No 127, dated 18th May 1902 I have the honour to state that the necessity for a painting instructor was suggested to Government in the proposals for the reorganization of the School of Arts read in G.O.No 468, Educational, dated 22nd August 1901. Those proposals included the appointment of two senior instructors on Rs.100 per mensem each. The main justification for the appointment is however the necessity for giving the instruction for which the students are paying fees.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Director of Public Instruction.

Stock Form No. 127
2,000—1-5-02.

5 15

Educational (1902) Department.

8

CURRENT No. 1227

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. G. H. Stuart, M.A.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

DESPATCHED
2/AUG.1902

Refd No. 1950 of 02

Dated 21st August 1902.

Enclosures

Received LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT 22AUG1902 190

Registered 22—8—1902.

SUBJECT.

Sub: Information as to the officers who gave instruction in painting in the School of Arts during the time of Messrs. Havell and Porterfield.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

6

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

Referring to Memorandum No 180, Educational, dated 5th July 1902 calling for information as to the officer by whom and the extent to which instruction in painting was given in the School of Arts during the time of Messrs. Havell and Porterfield, I have the honour to state that when Mr. Havell was Superintendent instruction in painting was given by Mr. Holder the Assistant Superintendent under the supervision of Mr. Havell: when Mr. Holder was acting Superintendent he took the special painting class himself, the acting Assistant Superintendent M.R.Ry. Velayuda Asari teaching the elementary and intermediate painting class, and there being no advanced painting class: when Mr. Porterfield was Superintendent there was also no advanced painting class, but instruction in the elementary and intermediate classes was given by M.R.Ry. Velayuda Asari. Mr. Chatterton reports that the number of hours spent by the Assistant Superintendent in giving instruction in painting alone cannot be definitely stated as he had also to teach other subjects within the two hours, viz 7 to 9 A.M., that the art section worked every day. There is now an advanced painting class, and the present Superintendent is not qualified as former Superintendents were, to give instruction in painting.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Director of Public Instruction.

Educational Department.

7

NOTE FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Orders are solicited as to whether the appointment of a painting instructor on ₨.100 a month in the school of arts may be approved with effect from the 1st March 1902.

T.K.
8-5-02.

Here is another instance of Mr. Chatterton's disregard of all rules and orders. He takes care to commit government to a certain line of action. With the Assistant Superintendent M.R.Ry. Velayudasari on ₨.200 it is not clear why such an expensive painting instructor is wanted, but he may perhaps have his hands full with aluminium work.

P.T.T.
9-5-02.

H.M.

As a school of arts, the school of arts cannot be said to exist at present, and anything which may help towards its revival is to be welcomed. I submit that the irregularity may be passed over and sanction accorded. The fee income of the school is on the increase.

A.T.P.
10-5-02.

In the whole of the much correspondence regarding the School of Arts that has come before us has there been any hint that a painting instructor was required? I see nothing to this effect in the proposals for the reorganization. It is for the Director to explain this, and his putting the matter before Government in the present way.

J. T(homson).
10-5-02.

D. O. 8 10

Office of the Director of Public Instruction,

Madras, Sep 9th 1902

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
10 SEP 1902
GENL. & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

68

My dear Pringle

Please see my Ref as Cir. No. 1950/2 dated 21 Aug 1902. about a painting Instructor at the School of Arts. He has now been 6 months without pay & naturally does not like it. I do not wish to send him away

~~The file returned from Cir: this morning and is now on the A.S.'s table.~~

~~11/9/2~~

GOVERNMENT MADRAS

as there is
ample work
for him

When may I
expect an order on
the subject?

Yours sincerely
G H Stuart

[E. / 12]
1,000—7-5-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

(1)

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

9 P

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 740, From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 1950, dated 7th May 1902.

" " 993, " " Director of Public Instruction, " 1950, " 1st July 1902.

" " 1227, " " Director of Public Instruction, " 1950, " 21st August 1902.

Desp. orders from here
11/9/2

ORDER No. 555, dated 11-9-1902.

P.S.

'on a months' notice'. I don't quite know what is meant. As the instruction is justified for special reasons — preparation for technical examinations of the advanced class — it must go on till this is ended or the School reorganised. Make this clear please.

Issue as altered
A.G.P.
11-8-2

Mr. Chatterton acted most irregularly in entertaining an instructor in painting without the sanction of Government; but his proceedings will be confirmed on the understanding that the services of the person engaged are dispensed with as soon as the completion of the course of preparation for technical examination of the advanced class will admit of this. ~~on a months notice.~~ A.G.P. A proposition statement should be submitted for formal sanction.

2. The Government will consider what arrangements should be made for the teaching of advanced painting when they pass orders on the re-organization of the School of Arts.

P.T.T.
3-9-2.

A. T. P.
6-9-2.

10-9-02

To
The D.P.I. desptd 12/9/2 993/1227
,, A. G. despd—A. 12/9/2
~~,, Finl. Deptt.~~

st copy sent to Press.

eturned for signature.

espatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.
- Order complete. 40
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter.

Print with thanks
& close [illegible]

TB
15/9

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

10

URRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

RDER OF GOVERNMENT.

ETTER OF G VERNMENT.

ATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

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