

Educational (1902) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 643

DATED 16. 10. 02

ORIGINAL

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Medical College

Informing certain ex-pupils of the Madras
+ the Prince of Wales Medical School,
Bangalore that Govt find no reason to interfere
with the order passed by the Medical
College authorities in regard to their
exclusion from further examination
for the grade of hospital assk.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1902} of Madras. EDUCATIONAL.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1902.

Enclosures

Spare copies

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 643, 16th October 1902.



OCTOBER.

Medical College.

Informing certain ex-pupils of the Madras — and the Prince of Wales' Medical school, Tanjore, that Government find no reason to interfere with the orders passed by the Medical College authorities excluding them from further examination for the grade of hospital assistant.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 341, Educational, dated 7th June 1902.

Read—the following papers:—

From Surgeon-General D. SINCLAIR, M.B., C.S.I., I.M.S., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 24th May 1902, No. T. 1/63.

I have the honour to forward, for favour of disposal, the accompanying petition from an ex-native military pupil to the address of His Excellency the Governor praying that the order of the Medical College Council excluding him from further examination may be cancelled.

2. The Principal of the Medical College reports as follows on the case:—

"Applicant . . . was dismissed at the end of 1896-97 for failure in his second-year subject. He was readmitted as a native military pupil in 1898-99 having completed the second-year course as a private pupil. Failing at the final examination at the end of 1898-99 in four subjects and total marks he was again dismissed in accordance with the college rules. Subsequently he made two attempts to regain admission as a private student, but the college council has rejected his petitions having regard to his record as a medical student."

3. Under the above circumstances I am unable to support the petitioner's prayer.

ENCLOSURE.

The humble petition of J. PARAMASIVAN PILLAI, Ex-medical student, Madras Medical College, to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor in Council (through the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras), dated 3/4 Muthugramony Street, Periamet, Madras, 18th April 1902.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—That the petitioner entered the Medical department as a student of the Hospital Assistant grade on notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, where annually the number of candidates required for the Madras civil, Burma civil, and military hospital assistant grades, is published with the prospects of the department.

2. Though the petitioner, who was entertained as a Government student, was allowed a stipend, yet it was with great difficulty and with additional expenses alone that he was able to prosecute the course of four years, medical study.

3. After successfully completing the collegiate course, the petitioner was allowed to appear for the final examination of the hospital assistant grade. Unlike other examinations, this examination is purely an oral one, lasting but for a few minutes in each subject, and it is needless to bring to your Excellency's notice the disadvantages of such oral examinations.

4. That your petitioner failed in such oral examination and, under a regulation framed by the Madras Medical College Council, *viz.*, students who fail in two or more subjects are dismissed, *i.e.*, declared ineligible for reappearing for the same examination any further, the petitioner was debarred from further appearing for the same examination.

5. That in consequence of this rule, your petitioner has been most grievously injured in his future prospects and career in life, having spent his prime and long years in a special study, failure to qualify in which shuts all doors of useful employment elsewhere, unfitting him at the same time for any other profession.

6. That, under the above circumstances, your petitioner humbly prays that the order excluding him from further examinations may be cancelled and that he be allowed to appear as a private student, for the examination at his own expense as often as he can, till he is fully qualified.

7. That your petitioner begs to point out that this rule, *i.e.*, that of permitting students to appear for future examinations, is one that applies to all other Government and university examinations, and would not, in any way, injure the ends of medical study, while at the same time it will give persons in the position of your petitioner a chance of usefully fitting themselves up for after life.

8. That your petitioner does not specially crave for this concession for sake of Government employment, if passed out, but only as a qualification for service in Native States, municipalities and railways, or for private practice.

9. Your petitioner also begs to point out that there is no lower qualifying public examination for medical practice other than the L.M. and S. which requires a F.A. and five years' college course, which is consequently beyond the means of many of the average students.

10. Your petitioner begs to submit that he has spent three or four years of his life's prime in studying for this special line and is, if completely thrown out, as he is now, by the operation of the above rule of the Medical College, quite unfit to take up any other line; and to aggravate the injustice in his case, he is not notified of this rule in the *Fort St. George Gazette* which calls for the candidates; and so when he entered his course, your petitioner was, and all students are, ignorant of the existence of a rule that as such a ruinous effect on their after career.

11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that your Excellency in Council will kindly go into the whole subject and pass orders for the admission of failed students to subsequent examinations of the hospital assistant grade. And in doing justice to your petitioner, your Excellency will also be doing something in the interests of the public at large by passing an order enabling failed private or Government candidates for the hospital assistant grade to reappear for the examination, even if they fail in more than two subjects, and thus save many in your petitioner's condition from ruin for life for want of any other suitable course.

12. For which act of kindness and justice, your petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

The humble memorial of the ex-hospital assistant students of the Madras Medical College and of the Prince of Wales' Medical school, Tanjore, to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor in Council (through the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras), dated Madras, 22nd May 1902.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,—That the memorialists were trained in the above institutions for the hospital assistant grade examination, many at the expense of the Government and some as paying students. After successfully completing their three years' course in the college, they were sent up for the final examination in which failing to secure the required minimum in two or more subjects, and 50 per cent. of the total number of marks, they were, under the rules (copy enclosed Ex. A.), declared ineligible to appear for the examination any further, either as private or as paying collegiate pupils.

2. That the memorialists' prospects have been thereby seriously blasted, and in spite of their numerous petitions to the immediate authorities concerned, they have failed to secure redress, and they, therefore, venture to approach your Excellency with their sad case in the strongest belief that it will meet with your Excellency's favourable consideration.

3. That this provision is as singular as it is stringent and does not find a place in any other medical test in India not to mention the highest medical tests of England.

4. That unlike the L.M. & S and M.B. & C.M. Examinations, this is conducted purely *viva voce* and is not a fair test on which to determine once for all the success or ruin of a student's career and the memorialists also beg to point out that this severe test consists in the students being asked to answer on the spur of the moment one or two questions that may be chosen at random by the examiner.

5. That the Board of Examiners are conscious of the indeterminative character of this oral test is plainly evident from the fact that they hold a special competitive examination in writing for giving away the Government gold medal.

6. That even granting that this examination is a fair test of a student's capacity, it can hardly be contended that a failure in it could be regarded as sufficient to warrant the precluding of a student from ever attempting to pass in a subsequent year.

7. That a reference to the letter No. 6132, dated 26th June 1900, of the Director of Public Instruction (copy enclosed Ex. B) shows that both the Director and the Principal of the Medical College are of opinion that the dismissed students should be allowed to reappear for the examination after undergoing another year's course and that the existing rules should be revised.

8. That in accordance with the instructions conveyed in the above letter, a student, one of the memorialists, was allowed to attend the college pending the decision of the college council, but was dismissed again by the Principal, his dismissal being confirmed as it was said by the college council. By this strange procedure of the council, the unfortunate student has lost an appointment which he was then holding.

9. That it is clear that the college council is guided by no principle in the question of readmission of unsuccessful candidates since they do not enforce the rule on all unsuccessful students uniformly (for instance, *vide* copy enclosed Ex. C), and as for Mysore students, they are admitted into the college and allowed to reappear for the examination apparently for the reason that they are recommended by the Mysore Government, while the same privilege is withheld from the memorialists for the simple reason that they do not hold similar recommendations from the Madras Government.

10. That by shutting out the memorialists permanently from appearing again for the examination, the Government sustains the loss of the money spent on their education, and that even if the Government is not willing to spend anything further on their account, the memorialists respectfully beg to submit that they are prepared to study at their own cost and reappear for the examination, and to serve the Government after passing. The pupils who pay for their education are as much, and perhaps more, injured by this dismissal though they deserve better consideration.

11. That dismissal from college is a measure by which offences of a serious nature are punished. It is hard to conceive how failure in an examination could be regarded as an offence grave enough to merit dismissal nor could it be reasonably urged that the interests of medical science are compromised by giving the memorialists another chance for passing the examination.

It may not be out of place here to mention that medical education has not advanced as much as it is desirable in India and any rule such as the one we complain against, tending to discourage the medical education should be discountenanced.

In this connection, the memorialists beg to point out that they did not enter the college with any knowledge of the risk they were undergoing as the notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette* which invites students to enter on this career, gives absolutely no clue as to this curious provision.

In conclusion, the memorialists, above all, humbly beg to call your Excellency's attention to the profitless waste of many years of hard labour and to the utter ruin of their future prospects which an enforcement of this extremely severe regulation involves, since it becomes too late for them to think of entering any other profession. The memorialists remain with the fervent hope that their humble prayers will receive a favourable consideration at your Excellency's hands and will result in the abolition of a rule so ruinous to the prospects of young men.

For which act of Justice we shall ever pray.

ENCLOSURES.

The following rules for the dismissal and remand of pupils of various classes of the Hospital Assistant department of the Medical college have been sanctioned by the Government (G.O., No. 697, dated 7th November 1899):—

(a) A military or civil medical pupil, who fails to obtain one-third of the combined total of marks given at the class examinations and the examinations conducted by the professors at

the end of each session in each subject, shall in ordinary cases be recommended for dismissal. In case of failure in only one subject, the pupil should have the opportunity of a special examination in that subject at the end of June so as not to involve the loss of a session.

(b) Every other pupil on the receipt of a stipend or scholarship from whatever source, who fails to fulfil the condition laid down in rule (a), shall also be liable to be dismissed, subject to the confirmation of the Director of Public Instruction and the consent of the authority by whom the stipend or scholarship is founded.

(c) A private pupil, *i.e.*, a pupil paying for his education, who fails to obtain the required proportion of marks, will not, by reason of such failure alone, be liable to be dismissed. He will, however, be remanded for an extra course of study of the subjects taught in the year in which he failed. He shall not be permitted to go on to his next year of study until the college council be satisfied that he has made sufficient progress in the year of remand.

(d) A civil or military medical pupil having failed at a final or annual examination may, on the recommendation of the college council and final examination committee and with the conjoint approval of the Surgeon-General and the Director of Public Instruction, be allowed one remand during his entire course with or without stipend. All stipendiary pupils, other than those in the service of the Government (Madras), may likewise be allowed the privilege, subject to the approval of the Director and with the consent of the authority by whom they are respectively paid.

(e) If a pupil fails at the end of the year of his remand, he should, in every case, be dismissed with the option of attending the college thereafter as a paying student, provided the college council be willing to admit him.

(f) If a pupil be disabled during his course by illness or fails from any cause beyond his control and which the council may consider sufficient to justify his being exempted from the operation of rules (a) and (b), such exemption may be granted. Each case of this kind will be separately considered and dealt with according to its own merits. In all such cases he should, however, be remanded for another year's study.

(g) If a third-year pupil at the end of his course be reported deficient, it shall rest with the Principal and the professor of the subject concerned whether that pupil shall be allowed to appear for his final examination or not.

PROCEEDINGS of the Director of Public Instruction, No. 6132, dated 26th June 1900.

Read—

Letter from the Principal, Medical College, No. 479, dated 21st February 1900.

Petition from J. Paramasivan Pillai, Tanjore, dated 13th March 1900.

Letters from the Principal, Medical College, No. 523, dated 21st March 1900, No. 532, dated 28th March 1900, and No. 104, dated 26th May 1900.

Resolution.—The Director entirely agrees with the Principal in thinking that no medical student who has failed in more than two subjects and total marks in any of the final examinations of the college should be permitted to reappear for the same before the Board of Examiners without a further full course of training in the final-year subjects. The Principal is requested to be good enough to carry out the necessary changes in the rules approved in G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1899, and to submit a draft of the revised rules for the approval of the Director and the sanction of Government.

2. With reference to his petition, dated 24th February last, J. Paramasivan Pillai will be informed that the Director sees no reason to modify the orders of the Principal, Medical College, on his case. The entrance fee paid by him will be refunded to him, the necessary orders being issued in separate proceedings.

G. H. STUART,

Director of Public Instruction.

To the Principal, Medical College.

„ J. Paramasivan Pillai (paragraph 2 only).

Memo. No. 1629.

[Reference.—His application of 11th January 1900.]

J. Paramasivan Pillai is permitted to appear for the ensuing final examination for the grade of hospital assistant as a private candidate on payment of the prescribed fee of rupees fifteen (15) on condition of his joining the military service should he successfully pass the examination.

MADRAS,
22nd January 1900.

W. R. BROWNE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Principal, Medical College.

Memo. No. 1731.

In modification of this office No. M./1629, dated 22nd January 1900, J. Paramasivan Pillai is informed that on reconsideration of his case it has been decided not to permit him to appear for the ensuing final examination for the grade of hospital assistant. Seeing that he failed in four subjects and total marks at the last examination, undersigned considers that he must undergo another year's full course before he presents himself for re-examination. He need not therefore pay in the fee for the next examination.

MADRAS,
15th February 1900.

W. R. BROWNE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Principal, Medical College.

PROCEEDINGS of the Director of Public Instruction, No. 8042, dated 15th August 1900.

Read—

Petition from J. Paramasivan Pillai, Tanjore, dated 1st July 1900, requesting permission to continue his studies in the Medical school, Tanjore, and to appear for the final examination for native military pupils.

Letter from the Principal, Medical College, Madras, No. 204, dated 18th July 1900.

Endorsement of the same officer, No. 642 M., dated 24th July 1900.

Read—also petition from J. Paramasivan Pillai, Tanjore, dated 26th July 1900.

Resolution.—The Director sees no reason to interfere with the decision of the Medical College Council and the petitioner's request cannot be granted.

G. H. STUART,
Director of Public Instruction.

To the Petitioner.

Copy to the Principal, Medical College.

Memo. No. 438.

J. Paramasivan Pillai's application, dated 16th June 1900, will be laid before the College Council for their consideration at the next meeting.

Meanwhile he may attend the College on the 2nd July pending the decision of the Council, should he desire to do so.

MADRAS,
28th June 1900.

G. L. WALKER, M.D., Lt.-Col., I.M.S.,
Ag. Principal, Medical College.

Memo. No. 574.

With reference to his application, dated 16th June 1900, J. Paramasivan Pillai is informed that the college Council confirmed his dismissal at their meeting on the 13th instant and have declined to admit him as a private student.

MADRAS,
17th July 1900.

G. L. WALKER, M.D., Lt.-Col., I.M.S.,
Ag. Principal, Medical College.

Names.	Subjects failed.	Recommendation of the Examiners.	Previous record.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	G.	H.	Recommendation of the College Council.	Further recommendation of the College Council.	Remarks.
Madras-Burma pupil— 1. P. Veerasamy Naidu	D.F.H.	..	1900-1901.	100 33½ 68	100 33½ 40	20 6½ 16	50 16½ 15	50 16½ 20	50 16½ 15	50 16½ 34	420 210 208	Remanded without stipend.	Allowed to study as a private pupil.	In this year all the students that failed in two subjects and total were uniformly dealt with and remanded for another year.
Maisur State pupil— 2. F. A. Jayasriaraya Pillay.	D.F.H.	..	..	56	44	17	13	20	12	34	196	Do.	..	..
3. A. Masilamony Mudali	D.E.H.	..	..	60	45	14	8	12	20	32	191	Do.	..	..
Tanjore private pupil— 4. S. Doraiappan	D.F.H.	..	..	66	38	14	10	17	10	30	185	Remanded.	..	..
Madras civil pupil— 5. Muhammad Abdul Aziz	A.E.H.	..	1901-1902.	..	50	15	40	5	25	28	163	Dismissed.	Allowed to study as a private pupil.	This year the punishment differs for the same class of students. Two were remanded with stipend and three were dismissed. Of the three that were dismissed, two were allowed to study as private pupils except No. 9. In these two years of all the students that failed in two subjects and total this student has got the highest number of marks in total besides maximum in minor surgery. This is the first year that he ever failed in his course. The reason for this severe step in his case is unknown.
6. V. Saiyid Ahmad	A.F.H.	..	..	20	65	15	20	40	5	37	202	Remanded with stipend.	..	..
Madras-Burma pupil— 7. V. A. Muttya	C.E.H.	..	..	36	60	5	17	10	24	27	179	Dismissed.	Allowed to study as a private pupil.	..
Maisur State pupil— 8. H. Gangadhar Rao	D.E.H.	..	..	43	75	14	12	4	17	38	203	Remanded with stipend.	..	..
Tanjore private pupil— 9. P. V. Veerasamy Naidu	A.E.H.	..	..	25	60	20	30	15	20	39	209	Dismissed.	Not allowed to study as a private pupil.	..
Maisur State pupil— 10. A. Venkatarajah	A.F.G.H.	..	..	25	45	15	20	15	5	13	141	Do.	Allowed to study as a private pupil.	..
Tanjore L.F. pupil— 11. A. Govindasamy Pillay	A.E.F.H.	..	..	5	52	15	25	15	5	38	155	Do.	Not allowed to study as a private pupil.	..
Madras-Burma pupil— 12. A. Gnaniah Michael	A.E.F.H.	..	..	25	75	15	20	10	10	27	182	Do.	Allowed to study as a private pupil.	Of the three students Nos. 10, 11, 12 that failed in three subjects and total, two were allowed to study as private pupils. Of them, No. 12 was plucked for the second time in his course and yet he was allowed, whereas No. 11 was not allowed even though it is his first year.

Names.	Subjects failed.	Recom- mendation of the Examiners.	Previous record.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	G.	H.	Recom- mendation of the College Council.	Further recommendation of the College Council.	Remarks.
Madras-Bornia pupil— 1. S. Singaravelu Pillay	D	..	1900-1901. Failed last year before the Board in B.E.H. and therefore remand- ed for a year. Failed in B. before the Board last year, re- examined after three months and having failed, was remanded for a year. Failed in D.F. at last final examination and remanded with stipend	76	81	14	10	35	20	83	269	Dismissed ..		
Godavari L.F. pupil— 2. M. Seethapathi	E	..	Failed in B. before the Board last year, re- examined after three months and having failed, was remanded for a year. Failed in D.F. at last final examination and remanded with stipend	76	46	16	47	4	40	40	269	Do.		
Madras-Bornia pupil— 3. M. Venkatachalam	D.E.	..	Failed in F.H. at last final examination and remanded. This is omitted.	54	65	15	12	6	25	38	214	Do.		
Tanjore private pupil— 4. K. Samy Nadu	A.F.	..	Failed in F.H. at last final examination and remanded. This is omitted.	25	60	18	40	20	15	44	222	Remanded with stipend.		

pupil. The reason for omitting the previous record of No. 4 is not clear. A reference to the calendar of 1900-1901 will make the matter clear. A council that does not take the trouble of ascertaining these matters cannot be said to consider every case according to its own merits.

Order—Mis. No. 341, Educational, dated 7th June 1902.

The petitions read above will be referred to the Director of Public Instruction for full report.

2. The Government are not aware that any alteration in the rules regulating the dismissal and remand of hospital assistant pupils is called for, but as the Director appears to have favoured such a course in 1900, any recommendations which he may make will be considered.

(True Extract.)

H. A. STUART,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

READ—also the following paper:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Director of Public Instruction, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated 1st August 1902, Ref. on C. No. 4781.

In returning the papers received with G.O., Mis. No. 341, Educational, dated 7th June 1902, I have the honour to enclose copy of a letter from the Principal, Medical College, No. 164, dated 14th ultimo, reporting fully on the various points mentioned in the memorials. The provision under which students who have hopelessly failed in their college examinations are debarred from further attendance at college or further appearance at examinations seems to me to be a very salutary one. The college council is composed of the Principal and the professors who are thoroughly acquainted with the capabilities of the students, and the question of readmission to examinations or continuance in the college must, it seems to me, necessarily be left to the council.

ENCLOSURE.

From Lieut.-Colonel W. R. BROWNE, M.D., Principal, Medical College, to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, dated 14th July 1902, No. 164.

Adverting to your N. Ref. on C. No. 4781, dated 30th June 1902, and the two printed petitions forwarded therewith, I have the honour to report as follows:—

(a) Taking first the conjoint petition and its paragraphs *seriatim*—

1. The question of the readmission of a student after dismissal is decided on its merits. A student whom the college council knows from his past record at college to be incapable of ever being made into an efficient practitioner is not allowed to rejoin.

2. All the signatories have not petitioned as stated by them. It is true that they were all "dismissed" in the first instance by the college council. Eleven of the seventeen petitioned for readmission and two of the eleven were granted permission to rejoin as "private students".

3. It is not known if the test referred to in this paragraph is employed in the other Medical colleges in India, but it is a fact that steps are being taken by the Medical colleges at home to prevent "chronics" uselessly filling the benches of the schools and being allowed to proceed to their examinations.

4. The test has always been a *viva-voce* one and has always been considered a sufficiently accurate test of the amount of knowledge that a member of the hospital assistant class should possess.

5. So many of the class are found to be nearly on a level that a resort is had to the written test to separate them according to their merit.

6. Only gross failure totally prevents re-examination.

7. An untrue averment is made in paragraph 7. It was not the intention of the Director or the Principal in the proceedings quoted that students in the position of the petitioners should be allowed to reappear for the final examinations; the only change made related to the provision of a further course of study of such students as the college council decided were worthy of readmission and further teaching.

9. As already stated, the mental capacity of each student and his career in college are considered in determining the question of readmission. Who stipends the student has nothing whatever to do with the question of readmission.

10 and 11. It is unfortunately true that a certain pecuniary loss results, but this is much better than letting loose incapable men to prey on the public generally.

It is untrue to state that the petitioners were not acquainted with the provision of dismissal and remand of students at college. They are printed in the college calendar and a copy of the same has always been attached to the general notice board. But over and above these printed rules there is the fact that every student of every department of the college becomes acquainted at a very early period of his career with the pains and penalties appertaining to failure in any examination he may have to undergo.

(6) Regarding the single petition from J. Paramasivan Pillai—the facts relating to his case are already before Government (*vide* letter from the Surgeon-General, No. T. 1/63, dated 24th May 1902), and the general questions raised by him are fully treated in the above reply to the conjoint petition.

ORDER—No. 643, Educational, dated 16th October 1902.

The papers read at the head of these proceedings relate to the exclusion from further examination for the grade of hospital assistant of certain pupils of the Madras Medical College and of the Prince of Wales' Medical school at Tanjore. The Government have given their careful consideration to the representations made by the petitioners and to a report on the subject from the Principal of the Medical College, and find no reason to interfere with the orders passed by the Medical College authorities.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Petitioners.

„ Director of Public Instruction,
„ Surgeon-General,

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 643, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 16TH OCTOBER 1902.

[SUBJECT.—*Memorial from dismissed hospital assistant pupils.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 4781, dated 1st August 1902.

At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd June last the Hon'ble Ratnasabhapatil Pillai asked—

(1) whether the Government had received a petition from seventeen ex-hospital assistant pupils memorializing against their exclusion from the final examination for the hospital assistant grade owing to their having failed at the final examination in two or more subjects and 50 per cent. of the total number of marks;

(2) whether the examination for the grade of hospital assistant was purely *viva voce*, and if so, why;

(3) whether Government would make it partly written and partly *viva voce*;

(4) whether any proposals had been submitted by the Director of Public Instruction to revise the rules for the dismissal and remand of hospital assistant pupils sanctioned in G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889, and if so, what orders were passed on them;

(5) whether two Mysore State pupils A. Jayasilaraya Pillai and A. Masilamani Mudali, who failed in two subjects and in total marks at the examination held in March 1900, were permitted to attend another year's course, while the same concession was refused to P. R. Viraswami Nayudu who similarly failed at the examination of March 1901;

(6) whether Government would place the examination for hospital assistants on a footing of equality with other examinations; and

(7) whether any and, if so, what orders had been passed on the petition from hospital assistant pupils referred to in clause (1) of his question.

2. The petition referred to by the Honourable Legislative Member was received five days after the receipt of his question. This fact was made known to the member at the council meeting and he was further informed that no orders were passed on the petition and he was requested to repeat the question at a subsequent meeting as there had not been sufficient time to obtain complete information on the points raised.

3. Five days after the meeting the petitions received from the seventeen ex-hospital assistant pupils were referred to the Director of Public Instruction for full report and he was informed that any alterations he might recommend in the rules for the dismissal and remand of hospital assistant pupils would be considered—*vide* G.O., No. 341, Educational, dated 7th June 1902.

4. The Director now resubmits the petitions with a letter from the Principal, Medical College, which, he says, reports fully on the various points mentioned in the petitions. The Director says that the provision under which students, who have hopelessly failed in their college examinations, are debarred from further attendance at college or further appearance at examinations is a very salutary one and that the question of readmission to examinations or continuance in the college must necessarily be left to the college council (medical) which is composed of the Principal and the Professors who are thoroughly acquainted with the capabilities of the students.

5. The following questions are raised in the memorials of the hospital assistant pupils—

(1) The provision that hospital assistant pupils failing to secure the required minimum in two or more subjects and 50 per cent. of the total number of marks at the final examination should be prevented from further appearance at the examination

is as singular as it is stringent and is not enforced in respect of any other medical test in India or England (paragraph 3 of the petition).

(2) The examination being purely *viva voce* is not a fair test for determining the capabilities of students (paragraph 4 of the petition).

(3) The medical college council is guided by no principle in considering the question of readmission of unsuccessful candidates and the provision to debar from further examinations of pupils failing in two or more subjects and in the total marks is not enforced on all unsuccessful pupils alike (paragraph 9 of the petition).

(4) Failure in an examination is not an offence which should be punished with dismissal (paragraph 11 of the petition).

(5) No previous information of the punishment of dismissal for failure in examination was given to the petitioners before their admission.

6. As regards the first point mentioned in the previous paragraph, the Principal of the Medical College says that it is not known if the test referred to is employed in other medical colleges in India, but that it is a fact that steps are being taken by medical colleges at home to prevent "chronics" uselessly filling the benches of the schools and being allowed to proceed to their examinations. The Principal, however, has not shown that these petitioners are "chronics".

7. With regard to the *viva voce* character of the examination, the Principal says that it has always been so and has always been considered a sufficiently accurate one to test the knowledge of the hospital assistant pupils. But the fact that recourse is had to the written test to determine the award of the Government gold medal given to the best pupil of the hospital assistant class points to the conclusion that the oral examination is not a sufficiently accurate one.

8. As for the principle guiding the college council in considering questions of readmission, the Principal states that the mental capacity of each student and his career in college are considered in determining the question of readmission, but does not refute the allegation that the rule about dismissal is not enforced on all alike. He has also not explained the different treatment accorded to the Mysore pupils which the petitioners refer to in paragraph 9 of their petition and the Hon'ble Ratnasabhapati Pillai in clause (5) of his question. It seems necessary to get an explanation of the matter.

9. On the general question raised that failure in an examination is not an offence which should be punished with dismissal no comments have been made.

10. As to the allegation that the petitioners were not previously informed of the punishment of dismissal for failure in examination, the Principal states that it is untrue; that the rules about dismissal and remand of students are given in the college calendar and that a copy of them is always attached to the general notice board.

A There seems to be some confusion of ideas here: the Principal refers to the rules sanctioned in G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889, which are given in the college calendar, page 35, while the petitioners refer to the rule that students failing in two or more subjects and in the total number of marks shall be dismissed and prevented from further appearing for the examination. This rule is not one sanctioned by Government and finds no place in the calendar.

11. Of the seventeen pupils who have signed the petitions, eight have previously petitioned Government without success—*vide* G.Os., No. 620, dated 30th October 1901, No. 621, dated 30th October 1901, No. 674, dated 19th November 1901, and No. 679, dated 21st November 1901. There does not appear to be any good grounds for a reconsideration of their case. In G.O., No. 419, Educational, dated 22nd July 1902, the Government have refused compliance with a similar request. In these circumstances the request of the petitioners to be allowed to appear for the examination as private candidates may be refused.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—23-8-02.

It is submitted that the college council may be left to deal with each case on its merits and that interference on the part of Government is not advisable. It is noteworthy that there is a larger number of "dismissals" in the final year than in the first

and second years, and it is difficult to believe that it is entirely due to the difficult nature of the course in the third year or to a stiff examination. On the other hand, as observed in the office-note stitched with G.O., No. 419, Educational, dated 22nd July 1902, the military and Burma pupils are as anxious to get through their course of study as they are to get out of their agreement to serve in any place they are sent to.

P. T. THARYAN—25-8-02.

Yes. Please draft accordingly. There is no shadow of a case. But the point at A may be referred to and the rule regularised.

A. T. PRINGLE—1-10-02.

The draft placed below may issue.

P. T. THARYAN—3-10-02.

Please typewrite as altered.

A. T. PRINGLE—7-10-02.

Done.

P. T. THARYAN—8-10-02.

The draft may issue.

2. There is a point, however, which might, it is thought, be dealt with demiofficially. There is nothing in the rules (page 35 of the Medical College Calendar) in regard to the exclusion from further examination of pupils who have come to grief in two or more subjects and have failed to obtain half the total number of marks, but it is become a practice to exclude such pupils. This is on the face of it quite right; but in consequence of statements that such and such students have been excluded on these grounds, an attempt has been made to found a grievance on the practice and to make out that it goes beyond the rules.

3. Obviously rule 91 completely covers such a practice, but it was a mistake to be too explicit and to let pupils know the precise reasons for their exclusion: they should in every case have simply been told that the council would not allow them to come up again; it was immaterial how many subjects they had failed in and why the council so decided. I think the Director might be told to suggest to the Principal that it is better not to "give reasons" as in his No. 1731, dated 15th February 1900.

A. T. PRINGLE—10-10-02.

I would not limit the "giving of reasons" if the Principal chooses to do so. Since a rule not sanctioned by Government is being applied, rule 91 had better be amended or conformed to.

J. T[HOMSON]—11-10-02.

Rule 91 should be amended.

G. S[TOKES]—15-10-02.

[G.O., No. 643, Educational, dated 16th October 1902.]

Educational (190²) Department.

CURRENT No. *1137*

From

[Name] The Honourable Mr. G. H. Stuart, M.A.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

Ref-on C No. 4781/02.

Received 4 AUG 1902 190 .

Dated 1st August 1902.

Enclosures one file of papers in original.

Registered 4-8 1902

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting with remarks memorials from J. Paramasivam Pillai & others
Native Military pupils praying that the order of the Medical College
Council excluding them from further examinations may be cancelled.

BACK PAPERS.

353-12-6-02

419-22-7-02

FURTHER PAPERS.

EB 4/8

To

The Secretary to Government,
Educational Department.

Sir,

In returning the papers received with G.O.No 341,
Educational, dated 7th June 1902, I have the honour to enclose copy
of a letter from the Principal, Medical College, No 164, dated 14th
~~ultimo~~
~~instant~~, reporting fully on the various points mentioned in the
memorials. The provision under which students who have hope-
lessly failed in their college examinations are debarred from
further attendance at college or further appearance at examinations
seems to me to be a very salutary one. The College Council is
composed of the Principal and the Professors who are thoroughly
acquainted with the capabilities of the students and the question
of readmission to examinations or continuance in the college must,
it seems to me, necessarily be left to the Council.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

T. Stokes

For Director of Public Instruction.

* p. 5 of the
current file

Principal that ~~such~~ it is better
not to "give reasons" as in
his No. 1731, of 15 February 1900.

It is evident that
10.10.2

Hon. Mr. Thomson, C.S.I.
Hon. Mr. Stokes.

I would not limit the giving
of reasons of the Council chosen
to do so. Since a rule not
sanctioned by Govt is being applied
Rule 91 had better be amended or
conformed to.

h " 15.02

I can not find the Medical College
Calendar among my books & do not
know what Rule No 91 is.

T. Stokes

Resubmitted to the Hon. Mr. Stokes with a copy of the Medical
College Calendar. The Calendar should
have gone with the papers

14.10.02

14.10.2

571072

1,000-7-5-02.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 341, dated 7th June 1902.

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 1134, From the B. P. I., No. 4781, dated 1st August 1902.

" " " " " "

190

ORDER

P. S.

No. 643, dated 16-10-1902

The papers read at the head of these proceedings relate to the exclusion from further examination for the grade of hospital assistant of certain pupils of the Madras Medical College and of the Prince of Wales' medical school at Tanjore. The Government have given their careful consideration to the representations made by the petitioners and to a report on the subject from the Principal of the Medical college, and have come to the conclusion that it is to the best interests of all concerned to leave it to the college council to deal with each

case

find no reason to
interfere with the above names
of the medical college
authorities

case of exclusion on its merits. The
petitioners will be informed accordingly.

P.T.T.

3-10-2.

A. T. P.

7-10-2.

To

The petitioners

,, D. P. I.

,, Surgeon General.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
190 .

, DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

A.B.—

A = Print in full.

B = Not to be printed.

F = Print abstract only.

G = Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

Order complete.

Letter only.

Order complete with Letter.

*Print both sides
& show proof
7/19*