

Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 787

Dated 26th Sept. 1895

INDEXED.

9-10

[Despatch Abstract.]

HEADMASTER OF THE MAYAVARAM HIGH SCHOOL

Declining to modify G.O., No. 925, M., dated 5th June 1895, rescinding the condition imposed upon M.R. RY. Narayanaswami Aiyar --, that he should pass the L.T. Degree Examination.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
C 1291			95				

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

Madras, 8 August 1895

No. 8449.

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,

Adverting to para 2 of G.O. N^o 925, M. this dated, 5 June 1895, I have the honour to submit the following explanations.

2. Three distinct communications bearing on the following subjects were received from the Inspector of schools, Southern Circle on the 30th July 1894.

(i) N^o 12, dated, 27 July 1894 — Submitting the Assistant Inspector's report on a complaint against the conduct of the Headmaster of the Municipal High School.

(ii) N^o 13, dated, 27 July 1894 — Submitting the Assistant Inspector's remarks on the

the Chairman's letter about the delay in the submission of the annual report and forms.

iii) N^o 14, dated, 27 July 1894. - Submitting the Assistant Inspector's letter on the Headmaster's application to exempt him and the First Assistant from passing the L. F. degree Examination.

I find that all the three papers were submitted to Mr. Monro for orders on the 3rd August, and on the 4th idem he wrote as follows on the first of the papers mentioned above: "The question of confirming the Headmaster will be deferred until the results of the next Matriculation Examination are published and until the receipt of the Inspector's next report on the school. In the meanwhile, the Headmaster should appear for the L. F. degree."

As

As he passed no orders on any of the other subjects dealt with in the papers, his note was mistaken for an office order, intended to be incorporated in the Proceedings disposing of the above papers. The Government is aware that in the months of August and September this office is fully occupied in the preparation of the Annual Report and the Budget and in October and November in formulating proposals for all the District Board, Taluk Board and Municipal budgets, besides urgent references. Both Mr. Grigg and myself have found from experience that during the above months almost every holiday and nearly all the Sundays have to be sacrificed by the senior members on the establishment and the strain has been felt to be very great in December. The accumulation of arrears papers is partly disposed

disposed of and in January the views of the Director on the consolidated Local and Municipal budgets have to be resubmitted to Government. It thus happened that the Mayavaram papers, which were not considered as of an urgent nature and which contained several conflicting statements, were not taken up for disposal before January.

But as it was then considered that Mr. Monro's view could not form part of my Proceedings his remarks were separately communicated, as a distinct order, to the Chairman.

I have explained in my letter recorded in G.O., No. 464, dated, 18 March 1895,

that the Headmaster made no effort whatever from the beginning to fulfil the conditions of his appointment. In fact, in one of

his

The excuse offered is very lame. - The paper read out the head of the Directors Proceedings is the Assistant Inspector's report on a complaint against the Headmaster, which the order relates to the exemption of the Headmaster from passing the L. F. degree examination. The third of the papers referred to in para 2 of this letter relates to the fact that this order was not a disposal of all the papers & that it was mistaken for an office order & therefore to be rather strained.

No. On the other hand it appears that he was prevented from appearing for the exam. by causes which were beyond his control - vide para 3 of the L.F. note of 5.6.95 No 725.

No. If the order had been reached the Headmaster in time, he might perhaps not have applied at all for exemption. Even if he did, his claim would not be reasonable. He lost the only chance he had of appearing for the exam. by the delay in coming to the order.

No argument.

only one?

Mr. Monro

or on can himself. this is a mistake which B. D. has been repeating from the time the question arose - vide 80

2165 m
7-12-91

his communications he wrote that his duties as Headmaster of the institution did not allow him time to prepare for the L. F. degree Examination and on this ground he sought exemption from passing it. I submit, therefore, that the late

despatch of the order in the present case could not have prejudiced the Headmaster in any way.

3. I need hardly bring to the notice of Government that the total exemption granted to the Headmaster is likely to be misconstrued as an overthrow of the recommendation of two successive Directors. The Educational Rules were promulgated in February 1891 and in November 1891 Mr. Grigg recommended the appointment of M. R. Ry. Narayanaswami Aiyar as Headmaster on condition of his passing the L. F. degree Examination before

before

before December 1893. In several other
cases of Teachers employed in Government
institutions he insisted on the Teachers
qualifying for the L. J. diploma and
some of them have, accordingly, qualified,
while others are being required to so
qualify. There is nothing special or
unusual in the case of the Headmaster
of the Mayavaram Municipal
High school and when he saw me in
person with a note from the Chairman
of the Municipality I distinctly told
him that there was no reason to
recommend a special departure on
his behalf. I beg to request, therefore,
that the order of Government may
be reconsidered in the interest of
the general discipline of the
Department and that the exemption
be extended to two or even three
years

2165
7-12-91

Yes. He is a successful
Teacher of fourteen
years standing.

Pass. 1 of p. 5-6 p. 11, No.
925 in. Distinctly state that
this is a precedent.
as precedent.

years instead of being made absolute
I may add that the condition of passing
the L. J. was insisted on even in the
case of the two Miss Parsons, who, instead
of trying to wriggle out of a condition
of service which they had accepted
appeared for and passed the L. J.
Examination within a year.

in the 3 of
the 12th Ruber
it was in the
the same case

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
J. G. S. S. S.
Director of Public Instruction

S. J.
C. S.

Local & Municipal Reps.

2570M

9254 5-6-95 ✓
4644 18-3-95 ✓
2534 16-2-95 ✓
4164 31-3-94 ✓
9322 13-4-92 ✓
2165 12-7-91 ✓
155 1-2-91 ✓

Am
misc. order

The Government sees no reason
to reconsider its order dated 15th June 1895,
~~XXXX~~ No 925M.

2. The explanation offered in
para. 2 of the Director's letter cannot
be considered satisfactory.

P.A.
16/8/95

11.18.8.95

I submit this to you as the D.S.
seems to be inclined to make it
a personal matter. The explanation
offered does not seem a satisfactory
one.

HP
22/8/95

Note.

It has taken two months for the
Director to send in his explanation, not
withstanding the fact that he was re-
minded of it ~~twice~~. Delays in the Dept.
are becoming frequent.

11.18.8.95

Agree with the draft S.O. - But
Educ. Dept. also see.

HP
26/8/95

S.
The Chairman, M.C., Mayavaram.
" Director of Public Instruction.

HP
26/8/95

L.M. DEPARTMENT.

No.

Current 2570M

From

Dated

189

FOR ORDERS.

My inclination would be,
as a matter of principle, to
uphold the order already
issued. But I have no
strong feeling on the matter
I am quite prepared to
leave the settlement of the
question to the Educ. Dept.
to which it really belongs

HP

31/9/95

A D.O. from D. Duncan, which
has been obtained from the U.S.
Educ. Dept. of which nothing was
known in L.M. before is now attached
to the papers and submitted to H.M. for
perusal. 2. The papers have been gone through
again, & though the pencil marginal
notes on the current appear to show a
bias in favour of the Headmaster on the
part of the clerk who drafted them, it
cannot be discovered that any mis-
statement or misrepresentation has been
made in any of the notes for orders
put up to the office.

Orders are solicited as to whether
the papers may still go to Educ. Dept.
for perusal.

11.18.8.95

The D.O. was looked up by
me in my comp. album
and enclosed by me. It was not
until the U.S. reminded me of it
that I remembered that it bore on
this case

HP
31/9/95

C. No. 1060 of 95.

The Director is wrong in saying that
but have gone against the Director
in regarding the condition. Mr. Grigg
seems to have said nothing about
the matter & Mr. McNeill has
repeated a decision which had
been arrived at before
his time. There are certainly
special circumstances about this
case. The man is a certificated
man of 14 years good service
& his school has proved successful.
I think, therefore, the order should be
advised to, but what Dr. Duncan
says about Discipline is right,
& Mr. will be very glad to
attach importance to his suggestions
& accept them generally, though he
cannot always agree. It was
expressly stated in the G.O. that
the exemption should not be treated
as a precedent.

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the L & M dept
note on the current and also
the Ed. dept note under cover
of G.O. & 5th June 1895. no 925 M.

When Dr. Duncan — not Mr.
Grigg as wrongly stated in the
Current — imposed the Special
Condition on the teacher, he
was fully qualified for the post
of Headmaster as he is now.
Vide art 2 (3) Section II of the
Madras Ed. Rules.

The case of the Miss Parsons
referred to at the end of the current
is not to the point. When they were
appointed Asst. Mistresses in the
Pres. Training School for Mistresses,
they had only recently taken their
degrees & were uncertificated. The
condition of passing the G.T. degree
exams. was therefore of necessity
imposed upon them — vide art. 3
Section IV of the Madras Ed. Rules.

* vide para 6 of Mr. Grigg's letter recorded
in G.O. & 15th Aug-91 no 639 Col.

Exemption of Head Master
Mayaram High School
from L.T. Exam.

2570 M

(for orders)

fm

Educ. Dept.

Current No. 1060

No. 1259 of 5-7-95

Transferred to the Educational
Dept. with notes of the Hon^{ble}
Member in original.

W. R. S. S. S.
as under Secy.

Recd 6/9/95
Encls. 1+1 confd.
cover.

2/2/96
all the
from
2570 M
Curat
6/9

H.M.'s attention is invited to
the Conf. D.O.; the teacher has
certainly secured the support of the
office & Mr. Duncan evidently feels
strongly in the matter. The gist of
his contention is that the man was
expressly appointed on a condition, that
he has never made any attempt to
fulfil it

$\frac{2}{1895}$
18/9/95.

H.M.

FOR ORDERS.

Exemption of Head Master Munt.
High School Mayavaram from
L.T. Examinations.

[G.]
[24.]
500-21-5-95.

Educational DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 5th June 1895, No. 925 M.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 1060 of 1895, dated 5.9.95 from L & M. Dept.

" " " 189 , " , "

" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER. 26th September 1895, No. 787.

The Govt. is not prepared to
modify the order passed above. The
exemption granted is justified by
the special circumstances of the
case, viz. the facts that S.
Narayanaswami Aiyar is a certified
teacher of 14 years good service
and that his school has proved
successful

2. It is observed that the
Director appears to be incorrect in
writing that Mess^{rs} Grigg and
Munro have recommended the
imposition of special conditions
in this case. So far as the Govt.
can ascertain, Mr. Grigg did not
deal with the matter and Mr.
Munro merely repeated a decision
which had been arrived at before
he

he was appointed to act as Director.
3. It is hardly necessary to say that the Govt. is in general agreement with Mr. Duncan in the remarks which he makes regarding the discipline of the Dept; but in the present instance sufficient cause has not been shown for a reconsideration of the order passed.

(From orders)

25/9/95

Exemption of Headmaster,
Municipal High School, Mayavaram,
from L. J. Examination.

C.S.

(From Orders)

The D. P. J. Madras
5/10/95
2/11/95

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTERS 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.

CONFIDENTIAL.

D. O.

Confidential

Ed. Cor. 120-12.6.95.
21

Office of Director of Public Instruction,

Madras, 8 Aug 1895.



My dear P. J.

Kindly look at the latter part of my letter, N^o 8449 dated 8th Aug 1895 (this day's date). I do not know on what grounds Govt. has exempted the Headmaster of the High School from fulfilling the by no means onerous condition on which he was appointed; but it is bad for the discipline

of the Department
weakening to the au-
thority of the Head of
it to have the rules
which Government has
itself sanctioned for
the guidance of the S. P. ^{??}
set aside. I can write
strongly on this point
because the condition
was laid down not
by me but by Mr. Grigg.
Grigg, Nixon, & myself
(three Directors) have taken
the view that the condition
should be fulfilled;
and their opinion should,

I respectfully submit, be
upheld, unless there is some
strong reason to the con-
trary. The delay of six months
or so in sending a certain
Proceedings to the Chairman
had absolutely no influence
in keeping the Headmaster
from complying.

I don't believe the
Headmaster ~~ever~~ had the
smallest intention of
complying, but trusted
to getting the condition set
aside. The Headmaster is
one of those municipal servants
who get too much power
into their hands, owing
to the Chairman not
knowing English, & conse-
quently being glad of the
help of a man who knows

that language. I have
had my eye on this Head-
master for the past three
years & consider that he has
had far too much to do with
municipal affairs.

I may now mention
what I at one time thought
of bringing to your notice
when my previous letter about
this case was submitted.

The Headmaster came to call
& did his best with certain
subordinates in your office
to get his case presented to
you in a favorable light.
He also went to my first host's
house & tried to get him round
to his view, telling my assistant
that ~~so~~ everything depended
on the nature of the office note
put before me when I had to dis-
pose of his application.

I think Government has been
most unfortunate in selecting a scheming
man like this as the recipient of a favor.
Truly yours D. D. Williams



encl 2 to ext. c no 1060/95