

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

FOR RECORD ONLY.

Recd.

Regd.

1912.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O. No. 18, 16th January 1912.

Exemption from the examination rules.

Sanctioning the temporary exemption of A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Srialvandar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering and requesting the Chief Engineer to issue instructions that — must, in future, be strictly applied for in advance.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

FOR RECORD ONLY.

Recd.

Regd.

1912.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O. No. 18, 16th January 1912.

Exemption from the examination rules.

Sanctioning the temporary exemption of A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Srialvandar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering and requesting the Chief Engineer to issue instructions that — must, in future, be strictly applied for in advance.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers:—

I

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.	A. Vaikunta Aiyar, age 28. Passed the following Government examinations:— (1) Surveying and levelling, intermediate grade. (2) Building, drawing and estimating, elementary grade. (3) Mensuration. (4) Practical plane and solid geometry. (5) Freehand outline drawing. (6) Book-keeping. (7) Commercial correspondence.
2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. <i>pro tem.</i> , or temporary.	Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O. No. 1045 W., dated 23rd August 1911.
3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Rs. 70. Rs. 70.
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering, Madras.
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Six months.
6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Six months from 16th November 1911 forenoon to 15th May 1912 afternoon.
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	This is the first application so far as this project is considered. (Previously employed on another project and exempted from examination rules from 23rd May 1911 to 22nd September 1911.) <i>Vide</i> Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 4757 C., dated 22nd August 1911, G.O. No. R. 258, Educational, dated 7th August 1911.

8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.

Applications were invited by notification in *Fort St. George Gazette* and this man having been employed in the various project works in Public Works Department and considered to be fit was selected. He was also employed in the Ukkaram tank project. Sanctioned in G.O. No. 290 W., dated 23rd November 1911. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience.

9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.

....

10. Remarks

....

Endt. No. 1116 S.E., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

R. W. FORMBY,
Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

Endt. No. 864-W/14-D., dated 29th November 1911.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

A. G. ROMILLY,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

II

Memorandum No. 8014 C., dated 5th December 1911.

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor A. Vaikunta Aiyar cannot be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

(By Order.)

W. G. MOLESWORTH,
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

III

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.

D. Srialvandar, age 23.
Passed the following examinations:—
(1) Lower Secondary examination (1903).
(2) Freehand outline drawing (1903).
(3) Maistry's class in Consulting Architect's Division, Madras, in 1906-1907.

2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting on sub. <i>pro tem.</i> or temporary.	Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O. No. 1045 W., dated 23rd August 1911.
3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Rs. 70. Rs. 70.
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering, Madras.
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Six months.
6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Six months from 17th November 1911 forenoon to 16th May 1912 afternoon.
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	This is the first application.
8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	Applications were invited by a notification in <i>Fort St. George Gazette</i> and this man having been employed in various projects in Public Works Department and considered to be fit was selected. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience whatever.
9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.	
10. Remarks	

Endt. No. 1117 S.E., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Madras.

R. W. FORMBY,
Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

Endt. No. 865-W/14-D., dated 29th November 1911.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

A. G. ROMILLY,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

IV

Memorandum No. 8015 C., dated 5th December 1911.

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor D. Srialvandar cannot be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

(By Order.)

W. G. MOLESWORTH,
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

V

Letter—from Colonel W. M. ELLIS, (Late) R.E., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Dated—Coimbatore, the 18th December 1911.

No.—904 W./14-D.

With reference to your Nos. 8014 C and 8015 C of 5th December 1911, I address to ask you to make a special case of this and recommend the exemption of these two men. Both men are experienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on project work without constant supervision. The passed applicants rejected by the Executive Engineer were inexperienced and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work on the spot.

It would have been waste of time and money to send inexperienced men alone on this work. Thus the alternatives left with the Executive Engineer were (1) to waste money by employing unqualified (although passed) surveyors; (2) to employ qualified although unpassed men; (3) to employ no one and let the work stand over until he had some one available to closely supervise the work of inexperienced passed men.

I have in the last three years had much experience of surveyors on investigation work and I think there is little doubt that many men fresh from the college although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot.

In this case the Executive Engineer employed the competent men in anticipation of sanction and they now have been a month at work. Much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with. I ask you to make an exception of this case.

If you feel unable to do so I request you to refuse by wire when I will order the Executive Engineer to dispense with the men employed which I am not doing pending receipt of further orders from you. A copy of the Executive Engineer's letter (No. 1189-S.E./60-I. of 15th December 1911) on the subject is enclosed.

ENCLOSURE.

Letter—from R. W. FORMBY, Esq., Executive Engineer, Coimbatore division.

To—the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, Coimbatore.

Dated—the 15th December 1911.

No.—1189-S.E./60-I.

With reference to your endorsement Nos. 1092 C.I. and 1093 C.I., dated 7th December 1911, I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to address the Chief Engineer specially, for favour of obtaining the sanction of Government to retain the existing men as a special case for the following reasons:—

(1) The present surveyors understand the work and have been working for the last about a month.

(2) It will take time to find and appoint fresh men.

(3) The passed candidates who put in applications had no experience.

(4) There is no special officer in charge of the project and I have already spent much time in explaining to the present men, what they have to do.

(5) The completion of the investigation work will be delayed as passed men are to be selected and their arrival is to be awaited.

(6) Of the two surveyors employed on the project, one was previously on the Ukkaram tank project investigation work, and the other man has been paid travelling allowance for joining the appointment. If fresh men are to be appointed, the two should again be granted travelling allowance for joining the appointment and returning, at the expiry of the period.

In anticipation of sanction I am still retaining these persons and request the favour of your approval.

Order—No. 18, Educational, dated 16th January 1912.

The following temporary exemptions from the examination rules are sanctioned with retrospective effect as a special case :—

A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Srialvandar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering from 16th November 1911 to 15th May 1912 and 17th November 1911 to 16th May 1912, respectively.

2. The Chief Engineer will be requested to issue instructions to his subordinates that it must be a strict rule in future that exemptions from the examination rules must be applied for *in advance* and that no exemption whatever will be granted where unqualified persons are appointed without the prior sanction of the authority who is competent to sanction such exemption.

(True Extract.)

L. DAVIDSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 18, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 16TH JANUARY 1912.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

[SUBJECT.—*Exemption of certain unpassed candidates from the examination rules for employment in the Public Works Department.*]

From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 18th December 1911,
No. 904 W/14-D.

With his endorsements No. 864 W./14-D., dated 29th November 1911, and No. 865 W./14-D., dated 29th November 1911, the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Mr. Romilly) submitted applications for exemption, from the examination rules, of temporary surveyors A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Srialvandar employed in the Coimbatore division on the investigation of the Aliyar project. The particulars furnished in column 8 of the applications showed that these unpassed men had been selected

*Vide Memoranda, No. 8014 C., and No. 8015 C., dated 5th December 1911. for the work in preference to passed candidates. The Chief Engineer therefore *declined to move Government to sanction the exemptions applied for, it being the policy † of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

† Vide G.O. Mis. No. 522, Educational, dated 1st August 1911.

2. In his letter read above (No. 904 W./14-D., dated 18th December 1911), the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Colonel Ellis) requests re-consideration of the matter and asks that the exemption applied for be recommended to Government as a special case. The grounds urged by the Superintending Engineer in support of his request are—

(1) that the passed candidates rejected were inexperienced, and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work on the spot;

(2) that many men fresh from the college, although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision, are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot;

(3) that the men now recommended for exemption are both experienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on project work without constant supervision—that they have now been a month at work—and that much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with.

3. The Superintending Engineer also requests that if the Chief Engineer still refuses to recommend the exemptions applied for, such refusal may be intimated to him by wire.

4. In the circumstances now explained by the Superintending Engineer, the exemptions sought may perhaps be recommended to Government for sanction. If so, the file may, it is submitted, be sent u.o. to Educational for orders.

P.V.—20-12-11.

W. G. MOLESWORTH—20-12-11.

Under the circumstances as now explained by the Superintending Engineer, I recommend that the exemption be granted on the grounds that although men technically qualified were available they were not really qualified whereas the unpassed men were really so and therefore the Executive Engineer's selection was correct.

C. A. SMITH—21-12-11.

To the Educational Department

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 522, Educational, dated 1st August 1911, is put up. The Honourable Member's orders in that case will be found on page 3 of the Government Order.

2. The practice obtaining in the Public Works Department of appointing unpassed candidates "in defiance of all rules as to qualifications—being thus not only against the definite orders of Government but to the prejudice of Government's getting competent men for their work and also creating a plain discouragement to other men to qualify"—has been the subject of criticism by Government on more occasions than one—*vide* Sir George Forbes' notes on page 2 of notes to G.O. No. 419, Educational, dated 15th July 1909, and on page 2 of notes to G.O. No. 244, Educational, dated 9th May 1910, and the Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick's note on pages 5 and 6 of G.O. No. 670, Educational, dated 23rd September 1911.

P.R.—21-12-11.

There do not seem to be sufficient grounds for sanctioning exemption in these two cases, as qualified men were available. But the Superintending Engineer puts the case strongly and the Public Works Department support the Superintending Engineer's recommendation.

R. SUNDARAM AIYAR—21-12-11.

For orders.

L. DAVIDSON—22-12-11.

There was absolutely no reason why sanction should not have been asked in this case before the men were appointed. Mr. Formby speaks of the expense in travelling involved in appointing new passed men now; it would be quite proper to make Mr. Formby pay the travelling, as his irregularity is the cause of the additional expenditure.

Public Works Department officers have a fascination for breaking the rules in this matter. It is absurd to suppose a passed man with sufficient experience could not have been found for these posts carrying a pay of Rs. 70.

I will sanction in this case, but I must ask the Chief Engineer to inform all Superintending Engineers to take note and let their subordinates know that it must be a strict rule in future that exemption in all these cases must be asked for *in advance* and that no exemptions whatever will be granted where non-qualified men are appointed without prior sanction in future.

M. H[AMMICK]—27-12-11.

A draft order is submitted for approval.

P.R.—3-1-12.

R. SUNDARAM AIYAR—3-1-12.

I am not certain that paragraph 2 should not run "orders will issue in the Public Works Department etc., etc."

Public Works Department u. o. for acceptance of the draft and perusal of notes.

L. DAVIDSON—4-1-12.

Public Works Department.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted that the notes may be perused and the draft order accepted.

P.R.—9-1-12.

P.V.—10-1-12.

W. G. MOLESWORTH—10-1-12.

Accepted in Public Works Department.

C. A. SMITH—10-1-12.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft order has been accepted by Public Works Department. For orders whether it may issue with paragraph 2 as it stands.

P.R.—12-1-12.

R. SUNDARAM AIYAR—12-1-12.

Yes.

L. DAVIDSON—13-1-12.

Issue.

R. SUNDARAM AIYAR—13-1-12.

[G.O. No. 18, Educational, dated 16th January 1912.]

7P
READ AGAIN G.O., No., dated 191
" " " " 191

READ ALSO:-

C. No. 3170, From the Supd Engineer, Circle No 865W, dated 29. 11. 1911
14.2.
" " " " - 20. " 865W, 29. 11. 1911
14.2.
" " " " 191

ORDER.

No. 18, dated 16. 1. 1912

Min.

(Print for recording)

The following temporary exemption[s] from the examination rules ~~is~~ ^{are} sanctioned ^(as a special case) with retrospective effect.

A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Sri-
alvandar from the Lower Subordinate
test of the College of Engineering from
16th November 1911 to 15th May 1912 and
17th November 1911 to 16th May 1912,
respectively.

2. The Chief Engineer will be requested
to ^{issue instructions to} instruct his subordinates that it
must be a strict rule in future that
exemptions from the examination
rules must be applied for in advance
and that no exemption whatever
will be granted where unqualified
persons

best 7/11
16-1-12

16 6
84

persons are appointed without the
prior sanction of the authority who
is competent to sanction such
exemption.

PP 3.1.12 De 3.1.12

LT 4.1.12

To,

12/1/12

The P.W.D with a copy of
the note

in print

A	B	C
Please send proof in triplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.	Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.	As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.
Type may be released after usual interval at once.	Type may be released after usual interval at once.	Type may be released after usual interval.
..... Clerk.	 Clerk.	 Clerk.
..... Supdt.	 Supdt.	 Supdt.

(b) Three copies of proof of all notes should be sent for approval, except when instructions are given to the contrary.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	22-1-12
First proof furnished on.....	31-1-12
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	29/2/12
Final copies supplied on.....	9/3/12

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....			
" " " Issue.....			
For Volumes....			
For E. T.....			
Total ...			

PRESS SLIP.

ORDINARY.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT (a).

EDUCATIONAL
DEPARTMENT.

Current No., dated 190 ..

G.O., No. 18 .., dated 16 - 1 - 1902

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence including order or orders
(b)
(b¹)
Notes

Docket..... See docket please

Number (c) of copies required when struck off (not including
copies for volumes and editors' table which are returned
in the Press).

Complete
Correspondence
and orders.

Notes

FOR RECORD.*

Madras Records 30

Ooty Records 3

For filing with original 7

Total 39

FOR ISSUE.†

Letter only.
Complete
G.O.
Special issue copies
of G.O.
No. Papers. Notes.

Signature copies.....

India Office.....

Govt. of India.....Dept.

Public Department.....

Judicial Department.....

Financial Department.....

Revenue Department.....

Public Works Department.....

Local and Municipal Department.....

Dept.

Total ...

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE
SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed
urgently, the Superintendent of the section
concerned should sign the Press slip. The
Superintendent should exercise a careful discre-
tion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set
of orders, in the file of correspondence should be
headed in succession with the Roman numeral I,
II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink
or blue chalk above the item. The particular
papers to be printed in the special issue-copies
should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I,
II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in
the correspondence file. All matter, including
marginal remarks or references, to be printed
should be written in ink and matter which should
not be printed should be encircled. Initials and
signatures that are not quite legible should be
re-written distinctly.

(b¹) For rules regarding printing of notes,
see the rules in G.O., No. 1220, Public, dated
30th November 1900.

(c) The number of copies and the details of
distribution should be filled in by the Superin-
tendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to
the Press to keep matter standing for a specified
period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under
will be kept standing for one week, and larger
papers for two weeks only. The type of notes
and of all confidential papers is distributed
immediately after striking.

(e) This slip, properly and completely
filled in, should accompany every paper sent to
Press; it will be returned by the Press when
proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the
Press when a call is made for revised proofs or
when a corrected proof is sent for striking.
When finally returned by Press it should be
filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of
the Press, a paper has been marked urgent
unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to
the Deputy Registrar with a remark to that
effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made
against the matter, pencil entries should not
be printed. The Superintendent of the Press
may bring to the notice of the Deputy Registrar
any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the
Secretary of State or to the Government of
India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press
to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it
will be sent back to the Press when proofs
are returned corrected and should be finally
returned to the Secretariat when struck-off
copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members
should be printed in full when they occur on
the right hand side, but only the first time when
they appear on the left side, the initials alone
being printed later.

Spare copies.

The Director of Public Instruction....

The Comr. for Govt. Examinations....

The Superintendent, Govt. Museum....

The Surgeon-General.....

The Accountant-General.....

The Collector of.....

The P. D. B.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

The.....

Total ...

* Copies distributed on.....*(Press Clerk.)

† Copies distributed on.....*(Despatcher.)

* To be initialed and dated.

(P.T.O.)