

Educational (190 2) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 768

DATED 15. 12. 02

N. P.

INDEXED.

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Medical College

Requesting the D.P. I to revise the rules of the — so as to regularize the practice of excluding from further examination pupils who have failed in two or more subjects & in total number of marks.

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. 768, 15th December 1902.

N. P.

DECEMBER.

Medical College.

Requesting the Director of Public Instruction to revise the rules of the — so as to regularize the practice of excluding from further examination pupils who have failed in two or more subjects and in total number of marks.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers:—

G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889.

Read—the following paper:—

From H. B. GRIGG, Esq., M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 28th September 1889, No. 8481.

I have the honour to state that certain recommendation recently made by the Medical College council regarding the dismissal of students for failures in single subjects at the college examination having appeared to me to be rather arbitrary, as it affected not only civil and military stipendiary pupils but private pupils also, I called upon the Principal, in consultation with the college council, to submit, for approval of Government, certain definite rules for regulating the dismissal and remand of students. These rules were referred to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras for opinion, and that officer has made certain suggestions which are concurred in by the Principal. I approve of the rules enclosed and consider that rules of this character should exist for the guidance of the officers of the college, otherwise great hardship may be inflicted on the students. I beg accordingly to request that you will be good enough to obtain the sanction of Government for the adoption of the rules and for their notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, if approved.

ENCLOSURE.

Draft rules for the dismissal and remand of pupils of various classes of the junior department of the Medical College.

1. 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 September, so as not to involve the loss of a session.

2. Every other pupil on the receipt of a stipend or scholarship from whatever source, who fails to fulfil the condition laid down in rule 1, shall also be liable to be dismissed, subject to the confirmation of the Director of Public Instruction and consent of the authority by whom the stipend or scholarship is found.

3. 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.

4. 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 Government (Madras), may likewise be allowed the same privilege, subject to the approval of the Director and with the consent of the authority by whom they are respectively paid.

5. 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.

6. 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 1 and 2, 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 case he should, however, be remanded for another year's study.

Referred to the Surgeon-General with Government for remarks.

(By Order.)

A. G. CARDEW,
Under Secretary.

15th October 1889.

Memo. No. 272.

Approved and returned with a copy of my remarks on the original draft.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
21st October 1889.

G. BIDIE,
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

ENCLOSURE.

From G. BIDIE, Esq., M.B., C.I.E., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Director of Public Instruction, dated Ootacamund, 28th August 1889, No. O/549.

In returning the draft rules relative to students at the Medical College referred under your No. 7123 of 22nd August 1889, I have the honour to state that I approve of those in so far as they relate to civil and military stipendiary students, except that I think they should always, in case of failure in only one subject, have the opportunity of a special examination on it at the end of September so as not to involve the loss of a session.

2. In the case of private students, I hardly think they should be subject to dismissal except for gross misconduct. At the present day the subjects to be studied for an University degree in Medicine are so numerous and the required standard so high that some latitude should be allowed to students paying for their education. Some lads develop late and are slow in acquiring knowledge, yet nevertheless eventually become better practitioners than their more precocious class-fellows. I am greatly averse to anything akin to hustling in the case of students of medicine, and the faculty of cramming up for examinations does not always betoken the most solid or practical abilities. Besides although a lad may in one or two subjects lose a year in his classes, he will probably during this delay be picking up a good deal of practical knowledge in the hospital wards.

Order—No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889.

The Government approves the rules submitted with the foregoing letter as standing orders of the Medical College, but sees no need to publish them in the *Gazette*. Rule 12 of the rules, published at page 802 of the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 20th May 1889, Part II, is quite sufficient as a warning to candidates for stipendiary education.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

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

ORDER—No. 768, Educational, dated 15th December 1902.

The Medical College rules sanctioned in G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889, do not specifically provide for the exclusion from further examination of pupils who have failed in two or more subjects and in the total number of marks, and the practice which now obtains of excluding such pupils has been construed in some quarters as a departure from the regulations. The Director of Public Instruction will accordingly be requested to revise the rules so as to regularise the practice.

(True Extract).

M. HAMMICK,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 697, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 7TH NOVEMBER 1889.

[SUBJECT.—Rules for the dismissal and remand of pupils of the junior department of the Medical College.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 28th September 1889, C. No. 871.

In this current the Director of Public Instruction proposes a set of rules for the removal or remand of students in certain classes of the junior department of the Medical College in case they fail at the periodical examinations.

2. These rules are to apply to civil and military medical pupils and to stipendiary students generally, but not to paying pupils, except that the latter are to be deprived of promotion in cases of failure. The principle of stopping a student's promotion if he fails to pass the "prescribed examinations" is so well understood that it need not, it is submitted, be formally laid down by Government in the case of the private pupils of the Medical College.

3. As regards the civil and military medical pupils, the Director of Public Instruction does not say whether he or the Surgeon-General or Principal of the Medical College or how many of these authorities together should have the power of removing a student from the college. At present the Surgeon-General appears * to have the power of removing military medical pupils, but it is not certain whether he can exercise a like control over the civil

medical pupils. The Director of Public Instruction says the Surgeon-General has been consulted on the subject of these rules; Dr. Bidie's opinion not having been forwarded to Government with C. No. 871, it was called for and is now submitted.

4. The words *dismiss* and *dismissal* used to express the removal of a student in consequence of his failure at an examination sound rather harsh.

5. The last set of rules laid down by Government for regulating punishments at the Medical College was in G.O., No. 189, dated 24th May 1878, regarding offences against discipline.

6. It is proposed by the Director of Public Instruction to publish the present rules, if approved, in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, but this course seems unnecessary where only a portion of a single institution is concerned.

A. G. CARDEW—24-10-89.

J. F. PRICE—29-10-89.

I think the rules are clear enough and would approve them as standing orders of the college, but I don't see any need to gazette them. Rule 12 at page 802 of the Gazette is quite sufficient as a warning to candidates for stipendiary education.

H. E. S[TOKEs]—31-10-89.

[G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889.]

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 768, EDUCATIONAL, DATED
15TH DECEMBER 1902.

[SUBJECT.—*Revision of the rules for the dismissal and remand of pupils of the junior department of the Medical College.*]

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 Ratnasabhupati 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 1899, 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 be dealt with demi-officially. 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.]

The order has issued; the draft below calling on the Director of Public Instruction to submit a draft of the alterations to be made in the rules approved in G.O., No. 697, Educational, dated 7th November 1889, may now issue.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—8-12-02.

P. T. THARYAN—9-12-02.

A. T. PRINGLE—10-12-02.

M. HAMMICK—12-12-02.

[G.O., No. 768, Educational, dated 15th December 1902.]

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

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 Rathasabhapati 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 *visu 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 *visu 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 ~~be dealt with~~ be dealt with ~~demis-~~ officially. 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. THOMSON—11-10-02.

Rule 91 should be amended.

G. S. [TOKES]—15-10-02.

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

The order has issued; the draft below calling on the S.P.S. to submit a draft of the alterations to be made in the rules approved in G.O. no. 697 of 7th Nov. 1889 may now issue.

Fair copy as altered please

Done 10.12.02

7/12
K.N.N.

697 7th November 1889

READ ALSO:—

No. 768, dated 15.12. 1907

The Medical college rules sanctioned in G.O.No.697 Edl. d/ 7th November 1889 do not specifically provide for the exclusion from further examination of pupils who have failed in two or more subjects and in the total number of marks, & the practice which now obtains of excluding such pupils has been construed in some quarters as a departure from the regulations. The D.P.I. will accordingly be requested to revise the rules so as to regularise the practice.

T.K.
8-12-2.

P.T.T.
9-12-2.

A.T.P.
10-12-2

To

The D.P.I.

REVISIONS AND NOTES

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. 50
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. , DATE
190 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

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

*Print with letter
& show proof
7/11/10
W.H.N.*

8