# Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

**G.O., No.** 463

**Dated** 3rd June 1895

---

## [Despatch Abstract.]

SCHOOL OF ARTS.

Declining to modify G.O., dated 13th February 1895, No.124, censuring Mr.Holder, Acting Superintendent,--, for the irregularities discovered in auditing the accounts of the school for 1893-94.

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

---

[G/11]
2,500—8-3-5.

✓

**ORDINARY, MS.**

Educl. DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 3rd June/95
No. 463.

INDEXED.

*When given for copying.* 6/6

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to modify G.O. of 13th Febry/95 No. 124 censuring Mr. Holder, Ag. Supt. School of Arts, for the irregularities discovered in auditing the accounts of the School for 1893-94.

18-6

6/6

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189 , NO. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT NO.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

Send DP 1 3 enclos
the duplicates –

---

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

BACK PAPER, NO. OF 189 .

FURTHER PAPER, NO. C 852 OF 1895.

C 146

Submitted to U.S. for
erusal of the C.S.'s note.
he G.O. has been issued

D/12/6

H.W.
13/6/95

---

Educational Department School of Arts

Dated 8th November 1894

No 687

Wm. E. Holder Esq
Ag Superintendent
School of Arts
Madras

To The Director of Public Instruction
Madras

Sir,

With reference to Proceedings No 9786 dated 17th October 1894 forwarding Mr Lewis' Report on the audit of the accounts of the School of Arts I have the honour to make the following remarks and to enclose a separate statement giving the explanations called for in the Proceedings

2. Mr Lewis' Report is not a fair one; Firstly there are statements in it made without thorough enquiry into the facts of the cases dealt with, & the particular

statement in para 16 page 40 of his report regarding the purchase of materials and sales of manufactures being as absurd and groundless as it is intended to be startling; secondly as regards the suggestions for the re-organization of the Industrial department they are mostly those made by me in the course of my conversation with him and thirdly as regards those ~~as regards~~ for the re-organization of the Artistic branch they are not only uncalled for but extremely impracticable. As a matter of fact Mr Lewis knows nothing about Drawing and he never set foot into any of the Drawing classes while he was here. There are also no discrepancies discovered by Mr Lewis and his assistant which were not first pointed out to them by this office. This fact Mr Lewis seems to have entirely forgotten to mention in his
report

Report. The work done by himself and his assistant (the clerk from the Office of the Director of Public Instruction) is therefore not so very praiseworthy as he tries to make out. The latter assumed rather an independent attitude when he was here; he consulted me about nothing and I never even saw the man. He got his information from clerks all of whom are new men. It is true that he acted as Mr Lewis's assistant, but when Mr Lewis was not here he ought to have consulted me before taking any notes of what appeared to him to be discrepancies. His remarks regarding the violation of scholarship rules are based on unreliable authority and are mostly not founded on facts. This is explained in the accompanying statement.

Mr Holder's statement here is inconsistent with his statement in his second explanation

8
28/5

It would

3. It would have been more complementary to the position of the Superintendent of the Madras School of Arts and would certainly have proved more satisfactory on the whole had a superior officer been deputed to examine the accounts of the School. The consulting architect to Government of Madras annually inspects and reports on the tools and apparatus and I think he could also have conveniently examined the accounts for a special report.

4. The discrepancies alluded to by Mr Lewis had all been discovered in this office and many of them had been rectified before Proceedings No 2681 of 21-3-94 was received and therefore long before Mr Lewis commenced his work. Had I been allowed a little more time everything would have been put right. I should have

Submitted

Submitted a full statement of the condition of affairs and so much time and trouble would have been saved. If I had had any idea of the real nature of Mr Lewis's inspection I should have asked for a postponement till my own statement should have been submitted; but I was under the impression that it was merely with a view to the re-organization of the institution that Mr Lewis was instructed to report on the financial condition of the School. It is very unfortunate for me that this inspection should have been considered necessary just at a time when matters were being put thoroughly to right. No such inspection had took place during Mr Havell's tenure of office although as is clearly stated in Proceedings No 2681 alone referred to he had asked for an audit of the accounts. Had his request been complied with discrepancies of the nature now pointed out would likewise have been discovered then.

5. It is clear from Proceedings No 2681 alluded to in para 3 and 4 that the existence of any discrepancies in the School accounts was first suspected when the revised and re-revised returns therein alluded to were submitted by this office. This although showing that the accounts of the School had not been maintained systematically also shows clearly that mistakes were discovered and that efforts were being made to rectify them. The reason why these mistakes were not discovered earlier is firstly because I was new to the work when I

took

took charge and secondly because I was left without proper assistance; the Head clerks having been changed frequently notwithstanding my protests. The following will explain my position more clearly.

6. As art Instructor I had no opportunity of becoming acquainted with the office work of the accounts of the School. Mr Havell objected to any interference on my part, so that when I took over charge I was ignorant of the office work and as Mr Havell had been very ill and was hardly convalescent when he left and therefore not able to explain the work to me fully and also as the Head clerk was transferred shortly after I took charge and the Pottery assistant

dismissed shortly after that I was left without the means of learning the work as soon as might have been desired. The only experienced assistants that I had for months after I took charge were the 2nd clerk K. Sreenivasa Sastry in the office and the Pottery clerk S. Kuppusawmy Nayudu in the Industrial department. The latter I soon found out to be very careless and negligent and I also suspected him of dishonesty so I reduced and transferred him to the office where he had previously been for a few years. The man who was sent to relieve the Head clerk arrived here 24 days after the other had left. He seems to have been reduced for some fault and sent here as a sort of punishment; he

he was quite new to the work here and it is to his time that most of the irregularities and discrepancies noted by Mr Lewis are traced; as a matter of fact neglect in the keeping of accounts in the Pottery department commenced when Mr Howell was very ill and had to be removed to Dr. Hunt's residence, where when he was convalescent papers used to be taken to him for his signature; no person having been appointed to take charge during his illness. Since then the postings in the various books seem always to have been in arrears

Violation of the Rules regarding School fee Registers stipends employment of coolies &c are ~~done~~ due entirely to ignorance on the part of the new head clerk and myself of the existence of any such rules. No book of rules appears to have been kept in the office. The Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction were committed to memory by the Head clerk who received them and then either locked up in his desk or pigeon holed. Most of the rules were received in the time of the late Head clerk S. Rangachariar and when he died suddenly in 1890 his successors had very little information ready at hand to guide them; so that when the Superintendent happened either inadvertantly or ignorantly to pass any orders contrary to the Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction the Head clerk was not in a position to inform him of his mistake - Herein lay the evil of changing the Head clerks so frequently. Besides

all

all these disadvantages that I started with I had to write the annual report on the working of this School for the year 1891-92 which Mr Havell was too ill to do before he left; and the extra departmental duties I had to perform together with my work as Superintendent of this School were (A) Inspection and reports on the industrial work of four other Schools viz Technical Institute, Madura, Reformatory School, Chingleput, Lawrence Asylum, Lovedale and the Anjuman. (B) Complete revision of the syllabuses for the Government Technical Examinations in Drawing, Painting, Design, Engraving, Modeling, Cabinet making, Carpet Weaving and pottery and porcelain manufacture. (C) Duties of Superintendent of

Government Technical Examinations held in the School of Arts for which I received no allowance. (D) Serving on the committee appointed to draw up Rules and regulations for the future of the Madras Industrial School and (E) Preparation of the Monograph on the Brass and Copper ware of Southern India by order of Government. I do not exaggerate when I state that since I have been in charge I have not had a single holiday not even Sundays and very often I have had to sit up till midnight attending to all the extra departmental work not connected with the School. I do not here ~~to~~ mean to complain of the amount of work much of it is pleasant but I merely wish to show that my having been new to this

Kind

Kind of work when I took charge and the unsatisfactory condition of the staff of my assistants at the time are sufficient reasons for my not having been able to look thoroughly into the state of the accounts and make the necessary corrections earlier. That there has been no fraud I can vouch for; for I took steps as soon as I was in charge to prevent that by introducing the improvements noted in the accompanying statements. As regards other discrepancies I think Mr Lewis has tried to make mountains of mole hills and in some instances his statements are not based on facts. Evidently he expected to find some big frauds and very serious matters to report about but he was disappointed whether agreeably or not I cannot say; at any rate he or rather his assistant seems to have tried to make as long a report as possible by noting a number of unnecessary points which I could have explained to him had he consulted me and thus have prevented unnecessary waste of stationery.

In conclusion I beg to add that as an acting man I was not in a position to make any very radical changes in the management of the School so long as I expected Mr Howell to return; at the same time it cannot for a minute be supposed likely that I should have deliberately neglected my duties or have intentionally violated the orders of the Director of Public Instruction and as the accounts and all other matters connected with the management of this School are now in perfect order and have been so for the past 10 months, I trust you will be pleased to consider this explanation quite satisfactory.

The papers are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Sd Edwin Holder
Actg Superintendent

True copy
Edwin Holder
Actg Superintendent

Undated

## Statement

Submitted with letter No 687 dated 8th November giving explanation on the points referred to in Proceedings No 9786 dated 19th October 1884

| Reference | Remarks |
|---|---|
| I Regular Temporary Establishment | I regret that I do not understand this reference |
| (a) Unauthorized charges pointed out | The accounts of all charges were regularly submitted in detail to the office of the Director of Public Instruction where they are audited. No irregularities in these were at any time pointed out to me. In the absence of any definite orders on the subject, I was led to consider that as the Superintendent had a certain allotment of money for contingencies he was at liberty to spend it in any manner that he considered proper for the benefit and advancement of the Institution. |
| Employment of workmen on fixed salaries and of pupil teachers without sanction. | Most of the appointment of coolies on fixed pay were made by Mr Hamill |

Mr Hanell. One of them seems to have continued from the time of Dr Hunter. The few appointments of this kind made by me were really not new appointments which incurred any additional expenditure but merely the employment on monthly salaries of men who had been in the School for years receiving daily wages. In making this arrangement I simply followed what had been done by Mr Hanell and his predecessors. I had no reason to suspect that the proceeding was an irregular one. The Head clerks having been changed frequently. No rules prohibiting the employment of coolies on fixed pay was ever brought to my notice. In fact I believe there were no definite orders on this point before; if there had been it is strange that this irregularity was not detected for so many years in the office of the Director of Public Instruction where all the accounts of this School are checked. But Mr Lewis appears to consider everything irregular which is not in accord with the rules by which he is himself bound in his limited sphere. I do not see that there was any irregularity in employing coolies on fixed pay in an institution like this so long as such men were not allowed any leave with pay and so long as there was a saving to be shown by such an arrangement. As regards the pupil teachers only one extra appointment was made by me viz that of Pupil teacher for the Drawing class newly opened from 9 to 11 Am. This matter I reported and applied for sanction stating that the fees collected in this extra class amounted to more than the allowance paid to the pupil teacher.

(W) — Raising.

(b) — Raising and reducing of the pay of the latter indiscriminately.

The raising and reducing of the pay of the employees referred to only shows that they were treated as coolies and nothing more; the Superintendent who had the authority to employ coolies as required used his own discretion in this matter for the benefit and advancement of the School

(c) Violation of the Scholarship Rules

(1) Payment of stipends in excess of sanctioned rates.

Stipends in excess of the sanctioned rates were not given to any apprentice. Mr Lewis's information on this point has been obtained from very unreliable authority namely from the registers kept by the Maistries in the several industrial classes for their own guidance. Correct lists of the apprentices in each section arranged according to the standards could have been obtained by application to me. Examinations are held regularly on the results of which promotions are made and stipends

stipends

stipends raised. Maistries have in some instances neglected to make the necessary changes when copying names into a fresh register.

(2) Payment of stipends to pupil teachers in addition to the sanctioned pay —

(3) Do Do to Government scholarship holders in addition to the scholarships.

Mr Havell made the following arrangement. Pupil Teachers in the Drawing classes who were not supposed to attend all day were allowed additional remuneration for attending extra hours and giving instruction in other branches. For example one Pupil Teacher received Rs 7/- for attending extra hours and giving instruction to the Silver smith's class in Inlaying with Metals and another received remuneration for attending extra hours and giving instruction in Modelling. Some scholarship holders

holders were allowed one or two rupees extra for keeping the industrial class registers and acting as monitors. The Maistries being all illiterate men were not able to attend to this kind of work. I considered Mr Hanell's arrangement a good one and saw no reason to alter it; but I made no additional arrangements of this kind after I took charge.

| | |
|---|---|
| (4) Payment of scholarships to Government scholarship holders for longer periods than were admissible under the rules. | There has been no mistake here according to the Revised Article VI regarding scholarships; the full period of training is limited to eight years, being 2 years in Standard I one year in each of the other 3 standards and 3 years in the Higher Examination class. No apprentice |

apprentice at any time received scholarship for so long a period as eight years. Mr Lewis has evidently been confounding the Revised article VI with ~~the~~ old article VI of the Rules and Regulations; fresh copies of which were not printed with the necessary alteration. The Revised article was printed separately as will be seen from copy enclosed in Mr Lewis' Report. This is another instance of a statement having been made without proper enquiry.

| | |
|---|---|
| (d) Violation of departmental orders<br>(1) Purchase of Stationery from a private contractor instead of from the Stationery office in contravention of G. O. No 222 of 22nd February 1892 | The G. O. referred to is merely a sanction for purchase of stationery from the Stationery office and not an order prohibiting purchase |

purchase from a private contractor. Mr Havell evidently found on enquiry that it was cheaper to buy from a private contractor and therefore did not make purchases from the Stationery Office. I simply continued what Mr Havell and his predecessors had all along done; but on making further enquiry myself in 1893 I found that stationery sold in the Stationery Office was not more expensive than that purchased outside, evidently the prices had been brought down to market-rates; so I made application and from April last stationery has been regularly purchased from the Stationery Office

---

(d 2) Failure to keep the register ordered to be opened in Proceedings No 5435 dated 26th July 1888 showing the value of materials plus the cost of approximate labour incurred with a view to fix the cost of making each article

A Register of the kind alluded to was opened by me of the carpentry and Wood carving work done in the school when I was first put in charge of that
department

department; I did so of my own accord; the Proceedings referred to was not communicated to me; in fact it was received before I had any connection with the carpentry class. I found it impossible to keep up this register for want of time; besides it was found to be quite useless; the cost of material in any article can be told approximately at a glance and pretty accurately by measurement or weight. As for the actual cost of labour this is impossible to calculate with any degree of precision in a school like this where the work turned out is more or less experimental. What is done at one time in a fortnight for Rs 20/- might take a month at another time and cost ~~Rs~~ 30/-. It
must

must be remembered that the student in this School are not taught merely to imitate as in the Reformatory or most of the other industrial schools; here they are required to make their own designs; some are sharp at this, others slow in the beginning; so it is impossible to calculate what is spent on labour by the amounts paid to the students in the form of scholarships. All articles made in the School are priced a little above bazaar rates and somewhat below the prices fixed in European shops such as Messrs Dechamps & Co; P. Orr & sons &c &c. I recollect well that all this was explained to Mr Griff personally by Mr Havell in my presence and Mr Griff was satisfied with the explanation. I have no doubt also that the matter was also explained by letter. The Superintendent is or is supposed to be a qualified officer and

is therefore

is therefore expected to use his own discretion on matters of this sort and I fail to see how this can be considered as a violation of departmental orders. I maintain Mr Havell's opinion about this matter and consider the register quite unnecessary. If the Director of Public Instruction requires that it should be kept another clerk must be appointed, with the present staff it is impossible to keep any more account books. Here it will not be out of place to show how inconsistent are the remarks made by Mr Lewis in one place he says too many account books are kept and the method of keeping accounts too complicated; in another place he finds fault about certain books and registers not being maintained.

(d3) Discontinuance of the school fee registers prescribed in GOs Nos 1841 and 268) dated 1st & 25th March 1889.

The school fee registers were discontinued long before I took charge. I did not even know of their existence nor perhaps did the Head clerks as they were being frequently changed. If I had known anything about these registers I should have certainly reported the neglect and have continued them from the time I took charge. However I took steps to prevent any fraud as regards the payment of fees; not considering the counterfoil registers which was all that I at first saw sufficient. I issued instructions through the several teachers that students should always have their school fee receipts with them and produce

produce them when required and I often went round personally and examined the receipts. This method I knew was adopted in English Schools of Arts and by it I was enabled to discover several irregularities and correct them at once. For the accuracy in the accounts that is as regards the amount of fees remitted weekly to the Bank I always examined the counterfoils in the receipt book and to prevent any fraud in the office I had all the serial numbers on the receipts and counterfoils printed. Later on I discontinued the issue of receipts and adopted the method prescribed in the Madras Educational Rules and followed by all other schools. The present Head clerk who is the only ~~efficient~~ efficient assistant I have had in the office discovered by reference to the various documents that there had been serious neglect in this matter in the office and with his assistance I was able to put matters to rights and maintain all the necessary registers ordered to be Kept.

Failure to clear outstanding more than three months due vide Pros No 7603/22-7-90

One of the first things I did when I took charge was to have forms for a reminder printed, in this I gave the necessary information that credit was not allowed for more than three months; to those who failed to pay after the receipt of this reminder I issued other reminders threatening to place the case in the hands of the Government solicitors. As a rule most persons paid

paid up on receipt of such reminders; but there were persons of high position not only here but in England to whom such threats would have been unnecessary and certainly very offensive. For instance Mr. Carmichael Surgeon Lieut Col Hendley and some high officials in Madras. All of whom I knew would pay up in good time. This matter has already been explained and this is another instance where Mr Lewis has ventured to find fault without proper enquiry.

Over production of unsaleable articles

Any statement made by Mr Lewis as over production of unsaleable articles since April 1892 is without foundation. There are at present not more than a dozen articles in stock which were made since that time and the rest have been sold. The only unsaleable articles now in stock are the ornamental vases made years ago. Messrs Frangie & Co used to buy these in very large quantities before but latterly they have discontinued ordering them.

---

Delay in the submission of Monthly Returns in a complete form

Due to change of Head clerks and the dismissal from the service of the Pottery assistant T. Subbarayalu Nayudu.

---

(2) Other irregularities writing off without sanction several sums.

---

In July 1888 Mr Hamle wrote off about Rs 300/- the value of articles supposed to have been destroyed by squirrels rats and also damaged in packing &c. I followed this example in writing off certain sums also but I always satisfied myself that the damaged articles were all there and were satisfactorily accounted for. Failure to report the matter and obtain sanction I acknowledge to have been a mistake; but I was not aware that sanction for such matters was necessary any more than it is for taking orders and manufacturing articles.

---

Reducing and raising the prices of articles after they had been brought to stock.

---

The Government has from time to time ordered that the stock of manufactured articles should be disposed of and not allowed to increase. Prices of articles were reduced generally at the at the time of auction sales and when sending large quantities to Exhibitions for sale, also when offers were made for articles that had long been in stock and were being spoilt by keeping such as carpets rugs painted fans &c.

Absence of counterfoils of receipts for fees paid and noted in the fee register.

This is due to fees being collected in the evening class on certain occasions by the pupil teacher in charge when the clerk has been absent on leave or so owing to sickness. The fees were collected in the night and paid to the Head clerk next morning or perhaps if the School happened to be closed for certain holidays not till two or three days after when perhaps the student who paid the fee would have left or forgotten to apply for the receipt. These are little mistakes which will take place even in the very best of regulated institutions.

Sd/ Edwin Holder
Ag Superintendent

True copy

Edwin Holder
Ag Superintendent

Mr Holder's explanatn

No. $\frac{687}{8.11.94}$

Edl
3
405

---

Educational Department

School of Arts
Madras
14th December 1894

No 826

From E Holder Esq
ag Superintendent
School of Arts
Madras

To The Director of Public Instruction
Madras

Sir,

With reference to Your Proceedings no 9/56 dated 1st December 1894 I beg to apologise for the tone of my letter no 687 of the 8th November last with which You are not pleased. In writing as I did I had no other intention than ~~that~~ of representing to You as concisely and at the same time as strongly as possible that I had neither neglected any portion of my duties nor had I knowingly violated Your orders, and that seeing that I had really improved the condition of the

School. It was not fair of Mr Lewis to note the discrepancies of one particular period without referring to their causes or mentioning the very important fact that everything was in good order when he came to examine the accounts. Had he alluded to these it would have shown you that the discrepancies noted were not due to any carelessness on my part.

2. In remarking that the Consulting architect would have been the suitable person to examine the accounts of this School I did not think I was acting unwisely considering Mr R. F. Chisholm the former Consulting architect was in charge of the very School before the appointment of Mr Havell and considering that at the present time the register of tools &c is annually inspected by the officer holding that appointment now.

This is beside the point as Mr Irwin has succeeded Mr Chisholm
D/28/5

In para

3. In para 1 of your Proceedings referred to above it is remarked that since my appointment the monthly accounts of the School of Arts have not been submitted punctually or in a complete form. I beg to state that by reference to the records in this office I find that even in Mr Havell's time the accounts were not regularly submitted. Materials accounts, Stock accounts and Bills Payable accounts for December 1890 were not submitted till 11th May 1891. School fees return, Materials account, Stock account, Bills Receivable account for January 1891 were not submitted till 24th June 1891. Stock accounts for June 1891 was not submitted till 16th December 1891. Materials account from April to August 1891 were not submitted till 27th January 1892.

But this is no excuse.
D
28/5

Revised stock accounts also for August and September 1891 were submitted on 18th February 1892; there are reminders regarding this from your office and also some very severe remarks by Mr Grigg vide Official Memoranda nos. 6983/19-8-89, 12306/12.12.90, 663/23-1-91 and Proceedings no 7603/22-7-90 &c.

I mention this merely to point out that this is not possible with the small staff of assistants here to submit these returns as you have ordered them to be submitted. In my letter no 315/26-4-92 I applied for a storekeeper but in your Proceedings no 6624/13-5-92 you ruled that this extra appointment was not necessary.

If it was possible to submit them all late, it would have been possible to do so punctually. D. 28/5

4. The Memorandum referred to in para 3(ii) of your Proceedings was brought to me by my Head clerk one day when I was very busy with some important work I made some hasty remarks on this and in doing so distinctly told the Head clerk to ask Ramanujulu Nayudu to come and see me personally by and by if he required further information on any point; but this he failed to do although he continued to examine the accounts here for days after that. He made no attempt to get from me any information besides those hurried notes.

This statement is distinctly inconsistent with his previous explanation. it. D 28/5

it orig: "he (Ramanujulu) "consulted me "about nothing"

5. With reference to the next para in your Proceedings I beg to state that from the time I took charge up to the time when Mr Lewis examined the accounts there has been three changes of Head clerks. Ramalinga Aiyar the permanent Head clerk was transferred directly I took charge, he was again sent back in February 1893 and then again sent away in August 1893. These changes I beg

I beg to say must necessarily have interfered with the office routine and have led to disorder in the state of the accounts. The Superintendent has a considerable amount of work to do which cannot possibly be attended to by any other member of the staff and he cannot therefore often spare the time to look minutely into the details; he is obliged to depend to a great extent on the Head clerk and the Pottery assistant for the accuracy of the accounts. It will not be out of place to note that Mr Lewis was assisted by Ramanjulu Nayudu, by all my five clerks and by his own head clerk; and yet it took him nearly three months to examine only one year's accounts and to prepare the statements; during this time all sales had been stopped and in fact nothing but very important and urgent business was attended to by my assistants; almost all their time was devoted to Mr Lewis' work while the Head clerk and the Pottery assistant took home work with them to do at nights. I mention these facts to show that what it took Mr Lewis three months to do working at that rate it took me more than a year to get through together with all my other work and assisted by three clerks by the end of the last official year; that is before Mr Lewis commenced his inspection everything was in good order as I have already said. ~~The apparent~~

because they were in such disorder

(iv)

6. The apparent strangeness of my statement alluded to in para 3 (iii) of your Proceedings is easily explained. The second clerk's work consists chiefly of

fair copying and despatching letters; he is not expected to be acquainted with all the Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction and as a matter of fact he was not acquainted with the particular orders referred to by Mr Lewis. The Proceedings of the D P I are not all secured in bound files after 1890. Proceedings are not filed not in those that were then filed before 1890 arranged in accordance with the subject matter it was therefore not possible to ascertain whether there were any orders that were not being attended to without going through all these files. I simply followed Mr Harrell's procedure with regard to accounts and office work not suspecting that there had been any irregularities or violation of the Rules. The mistake from the first was

letter neglects

Mr. Harrell's mistakes are no excuse for Mr. Holden.

that no separate register of these rules had been maintained. The unsatisfactory condition of the stock accounts was due chiefly to the neglect of S. Kuppusami Nayudu the Pottery clerk who I must acknowledge was a most intelligent and smart young man. In the beginning he did his work remarkably well and as he always produced statements for the returns which were initialled by the Head clerk and sent to me for signature I did not at first suspect anything wrong but when I examined the stock I found that he had failed to bring a number of articles that were in the store room into account and he had also neglected to post items from the day book into the Ledger which shows in detail the accounts each article manufactured in the School. When questioned he said that he had too much to do after the Pottery assistant T. Subbarayalu Nayudu's dismissal and could not find time to attend to the ledger. To prevent any further neglect and to put matters right I reduced S. Kuppusami Nayudu at once by sending him back to the office as second clerk and by placing K. Sreenivasasastry in charge of the stock accounts; from that date the latter worked hard for fully nine hours a day and for weeks together to bring the accounts into the ledger up to date. It will be seen from this that I did not fail to exercise proper control over the work of my subordinates; but with so much work to do as I had and without the Head clerk and the Pottery assistant I was not able to have the work done quicker.

Shutting the stable door after the horse was stolen

7. With reference to para 3 (iv) of your proceedings I beg to state that I was not wrong in stating that Mr Lewis was misled by the old article IV of the rules and regulations. No body that I have yet met has been able to get satisfactory information by merely reading over the prospectus in its present form. Mr Lewis never once referred to me about the matter when he was examining the accounts here; had he done so I should have explained everything to him clearly. The registers kept by the maistries were not meant to be examined; they were merely introduced as a sort of check on the apprentices many of whom were in the habit of leaving their

(vi)

their classes and playing on the public road for hours together. At first these registers were kept by pupil teachers or monitors who for their own convenience in the beginning arranged the names according to the various standards but as these pupil teachers left the school for employment the maistries continued the registers as best they could. When promotions were made the Head clerk noted the amount of increase of scholarship; but the maistries failed to make the necessary alterations in their registers regarding the standards. As regards the case of Kalimuttu Asari to which reference is made as an instance of scholarship having been paid for longer periods than were allowed by the rules I beg to state

state that he did not pass any advanced Examination in Wood carving, as there is no such examination; what he did pass was Section B. of the advanced grade in Design which any good designer without necessarily being able to carve might easily pass. Besides even if Kalimuttu had passed any advanced test in Wood carving he could hardly be considered to have completed his course considering as Mr Lewis well is aware that wood carving is not a separate subject but a branch of Cabinet-making in which Kalimuttu had not even appeared for the Intermediate test. Again as regards the case of E Newman who Mr Lewis said Rs 7/8. while he was only in Standard IV I beg to state that Newman pass

register

passed the Elementary grade in Cabinet Making in November 1891 and the Intermediate grade in November 1893. This is clear proof that the entries in the Maistries registers were not correct and it is strange that Mr Lewis should have taken notes from them without consulting me; the illegible writing and untidy manner in which these books were kept should have shown Mr Lewis that they were not meant for inspection but only for the purpose I have mentioned above. Briefly the facts are these. No scholarships were paid in excess of the sanctioned scale nor for longer periods than was allowed by the rules but scholarships were paid at lower rates and this I could not help for want of

funds

fund; apprentices were very often promoted twice during the year without receiving a proportionate increase of stipend. The above statement will I trust make clear what I meant by the word "information" alluded to in para (VII) of your Proceedings. The word "lists" in my letter No 687 was a clerical error. The whole sentence should have been "Correct information from which the lists showing &c &c could have been prepared". As the explanation that is my letter No 687 was both drafted and also fair copied in great haste on account of your reminder dated 30th October 1894 I beg to state that I did not notice the error. At the time there were no other correct lists except the

register

It ~~is clear~~ looks as if that Mr Holder first gave ~~false~~ incorrect information on ~~this~~ point (para 3 VII of the D.P.I. Pro- C 56 / 1.12.94) but subsequently had to correct himself when the error was found out

D/
28

the register kept by the Head clark; and this did not show the classes of standards.

8. With reference to para (XII) of your proceedings I beg to draw your attention to the slight error that has been made by your omitting the figures for 1893-94 the very year regarding which Mr Lewis' report has been written and to give below a statement for the last six years showing the amount of sales value of stock and outstandings.

| Year | Sale proceeds of manufactures | Value of stock and stock materials | Outstandings |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1888-89 | 8647 | 7328 | 3961 |
| 1889-90 | 9875 | 12389 | 2220 |
| 1890-91 | 8213 | 13253 | 2306 |
| 1891-92 | 8997 | 13625 | 1798 |
| 1892-93 | 7620 | 14380 | 2087 |
| 1893-94 | 12699 | 14212 | 1455 |

From the above table it will be seen that the state of finances

finances last year showed considerable improvement and if the statement of expenditure were also compared the result would prove still more creditable.

The sales were better, but there was no appreciable reduction in stock
D
8/75

I beg to draw your attention to the figures for 1891-92 and 892-93. The total of sales and value of stock in each of the two years will be found to be Rs 22622 and ~~Rs~~ 22000 respectively; ~~thus~~ it is very evident ~~that~~ from the time I took charge there was no overproduction of unsaleable articles. I have already explained in the annual report for 1892-93 (page 12 para 23) that the only unsaleable articles at present in stock are the ornamental vases which were all manufactured before I took charge.

This seems to be a point in his favour accepting the figures as correct but they are unreliable
D
28/5

Directly I took charge I stopped ~~the~~ manufacture of these articles

9. With reference to para (viii) regarding unauthorized charges I beg to point out that there had been coolies on monthly wages from the very beginning. A reference to the records for the past 3 years shows that there were seven coolies on monthly wages in April 1890, 9 in April 1891 and 9 in April 1892 when I took charge. When this irregularity was not noticed in ~~the~~ office of the Director of Public Instruction for so long a period that is till August 1893 how was it possible for me even to suspect ~~that~~ that it was an irregularity. I followed Mr Hawkes arrangements not suspecting that it was

against

No excuse
B
28/5

Hardly an excuse
B
28/5

---

against the rules to employ the coolies on fixed monthly salaries

10. With reference to the last para of your Proceedings I beg to state that I do not see what connection the censure conveyed by Government in the G.O. referred to has with the case in question. In applying to Government for re-examination I did so after consulting my superior officer and from facts which I laid before him he was himself of the opinion that I should not have been made to sit to three Examinations in one day and work without any lunch from 11 to 5-30 P.M. I have reason to believe that Mr Monro forwarded my appeal to Government with

recommendation

The connection is clear. Mr Holden then accused examiners of unfairness. In this case he made a similar charge agst Mr Lewis. Both accusations were improper.
B
28/5

recommendation -

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your Most obedient Servant

Sgd Edwin Holder
Asst Superintendent

True copy

Edwin Holder
Asst Superintendent

Mr Holder's Explanation

No 826
14.12.94

Edn 5
2
405

---

CURRENT No. 379

SCHOOL OF ARTS,
*Madras,* 25th March 1895.

No. 290

FROM E. Holder Esq

~~The~~ Ag SUPERINTENDENT,
SCHOOL OF ARTS,
MADRAS,

TO

THE Hon'ble the Chief Secretary
to Government of Fort
St George

SIR,

I have the honour to submit for favour of your perusal a copy of my letter no 288 of 25th March 1895 with enclosures, the originals having this day been submitted through the Director of Public Instruction.

I have the honour to be
&c,
Your most obedient Servant
Edwin Holder
Ag Superintendent

189 .

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,

SCHOOL OF ARTS, MADRAS.

To

Dated

Received

No.

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

CURRENT No. 379

Educational Dept

1895.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT, SCHOOL OF ARTS,
MADRAS,

To

~~THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,~~
~~MADRAS,~~
The Hon.ble the Chief Secretary
to Govt. of Fort St George.

Dated 25 of March 1895
Received
Regd 26

CHIEF SECRETARY
25 MAR 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No. 290

ENCLOSURE. 3

Subject.

Submitting for perusal copies of explanation of the Supdt. on the audit report of Mr Lewis.

To await the receipt of the copy sent thro' the D.P.I. 490 124/13-4-95.

27. 3. 95

---

Educational Department.

SCHOOL OF ARTS,
Madras, 25th March 1895.

No. 288

FROM
E. Holder Esq
~~The~~ Superintendent,
School of Arts,
Madras,

To
The Hon.ble the Chief Secretary
to Government of Fort St George
Thro' the Director of Public Instruction.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose copies of two letters from me to the Director of Public Instruction explaining certain discrepancies noted by Mr Lewis in his report on the audit of the School of Arts accounts &c for 1893–94. The first letter of explanation No 687 dated 8th November 1894 was returned to me by the Director with the remark that it was not written in a proper tone; and as only certain points were referred to by the Director in his Proceedings on this letter I responded to them by sending in the second letter No 826 dated 14th December 1894.

I am now informed by the Director in his Proceedings No 3309 D/19-3-95 that this letter of mine was also not considered satisfactory explanation and was therefore not forwarded to Government together with Mr Lewis' report; on which I understand the Madras Government has passed a severe order to the effect that I am not fit to manage the School. I beg to state that when my explanations have been withheld by the Director of Public Instruction such a remark of censure on my work is to say the least very disheartening to me, especially after the unceasing manner in which I have worked to improve the condition of the School. I have not denied all the irregularities pointed out by Mr Lewis but in my first letter to the Director of Public Instruction I have fully explained my position when I took charge of the School. I therefore pray that the Government be pleased to peruse the enclosed papers and kindly reconsider its decision with regard to my work.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
Edwin Holder
Ag Superintendent

4 — Copy heading only.

1895.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

From

The Superintendent, School of Arts,

Madras,

To

~~The Director of Public Instruction,~~

~~Madras.~~

The Hon^ble. the Chief ~~Secretary~~

to Govt. of Fort St George

thro' the D.P.I.

Dated 25 } March 1895
Received }

Encls. 1 to D.P.I's
letter no. 3728/95

No. 288

ENCLOSURE. 2

Subject.

Submitting for perusal ~~Copies~~ of Explanation of the Supdt. on the audit report of Mr Lewis.

---

Office of the Director of
Public Instruction,
Madras, 27 March 1895.

No. 3728.

From

The Honorable Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
Director of Public Instruction,
Madras,

To

The Honorable The CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

At the request of the Ag. Superintendent, School of Arts, I have the honour to submit herewith his letter to your address, No. 288, dated, 25 instant, and invite the attention of Government to his admission of the irregularities pointed out by Mr. Lewis.

2. It will be observed from this office Proceedings, No. $\frac{C}{56}$ of the 1 December 1894 (enclosure to my letter to Government No. 12612 of the 24 idem) and from the copies of explanations, that Mr. Holder did not account satisfactorily for most of the serious omissions

C 1466/94

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-94.

Q = Copy heading only.

omissions and that he attempted to throw blame on others and to indulge in unnecessary comment. As his explanation was fully reviewed in the Proceedings referred to I do not think it worth while to dwell upon it further. I consider, Mr. Holder, as Head of the Institution, primarily responsible for its efficient management and for the correct maintenance and submission of all accounts in accordance with the orders of the Department, and for exercising the necessary supervision over the work of his subordinates.

3. When Mr. Havell went on leave in the beginning of 1892, it was not contemplated that the school was to be left so

long

long without a Superintendent, otherwise I hardly think Mr. Gregg would have recommended the acting arrangements he proposed. Unfortunately the question raised by the Secretary of State has led to the continuance of the temporary arrangements for three years. The Ag: Superintendent, with the staff at his disposal, cannot possibly administer the affairs of the school in an efficient manner.

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

D Duncan

Director of Public Instruction.

Edn
405

From,
The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras,
To The Hon'ble the Chief Secretary
to Government,
Fort St George

DESPATCHED
28 MAR 1895

No 3728
Dated 27th March 1895
Despatched 28th Do
Recd
Enclosure 3
Recd 29th

Subg with remarks letter
rom the Ag: Superintendent,
School of Arts, with copies
of his explanation on the
audit of the accounts
f the school.

To lie over till the return
... No 124 d 13-2-95 Ed. in circ
D
24-3-95

Mr. Holder and the
School of Arts

P. 3795 405

H.M.
JG 31/5

Order 3 June 1895, No. 463.

The Govt. sees no reason to modify the terms of G.O. of 13 Feby 1895 No. 124. Mr Holder's explanations in no way exculpate him from the more serious of the charges against him

D
28.5.95

The D.P.I. G.O.
with 3 enclos

DESPATCHED
10 JUN 95
IN M.S

30/5/95

Note.
I have been carefully through Mr Holder's second defence, & the marginal pencil notes will shew that it does not better his position

D
28.5.95

I have also been through the defences put in by Mr. Holder.
It is evident enough what happened. Mr. Holder when he became Ag Supt. remained to all intents & purposes what he was before - Art Instructor - and leaned for all matters of account &c on the Head Clerk & Pottery Instructor both of whom were unfortunately for him broken reeds. He is evidently not up to office management and has no powers of discipline. He is a teacher & nothing more - nor will he ever be anything else

30/5/95

31/5
P 1/6

(Seen by Dr D.) [illegible]

---

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

[R. O.]

*When given for copying* ____
*When copied* ____
*When examined* ____
*When signed* ____
189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189 ,

CURRENT NO.

ENCLOSURES TO C. NO

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.