

Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 571

DATED 9th July, 1895

INDEXED.

8 pages
14 lines

[Despatch Abstract.]

SPECIAL TEST EXAMINATION.

Considering that it is inexpedient to admit to any
-- a person whose general educational qualifications fall
below the standard required in the appointments for which
that Special Test is prescribed; and making certain
amendments to Article 4 of the Public Service Notification.

Govt. of (1895) Madras.
EDUCATIONAL.

Received

David

G.O., 9th July 1995, No. 571.

JULY.

Special Test Examination.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 11th September 1894, Mia. No. 670, Educational.

READ—also the following paper:—

From the Hon'ble Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc., Commissioner for Government Examinations, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 19th June 1895, No. 1792.

As G.O. of the 11th September last, No. 670, Educational, does not appear to me to have fully disposed of the question raised by Mr. Menon in his letter of the 25th July, No. 2145, I have the honour to enquire whether, under Article 4 of the notification now regulating the Special Test Examinations, a person in the position of a hospital assistant, who has not passed the Matriculation or the Upper Secondary examination, is eligible to appear for the Special Tests on the ground that he holds a superior appointment in the Public Service. Under the old rules which were in force up to the middle of last year, such a candidate could not have appeared for any of the Special Tests as not having passed the prescribed general education tests. The present notification, however, throws open the Special Tests to all persons who hold superior appointments, but as it nowhere specifies what these superior appointments are, it is not easy for the Commissioner to determine in all cases whether a candidate is eligible or not. In certain special departments, like the Medical, Forest and Postal Departments, there are persons employed in what must, I presume, be regarded as "superior service," who have passed no tests whatever, or only very inferior tests. Such persons could only, in very exceptional cases, have risen to superior service in other departments,—the Revenue and Judicial, for instance. The question at once arises whether they ought to be allowed to appear for the Special Tests. I cannot think that it was the intention of Government that service in those special departments, for which the Special Tests were never intended, should carry with it a privilege which is denied to persons in other departments to which the Special Tests more particularly apply. I am strongly of opinion that in all departments admission to the Special Tests should be restricted to those who have passed the Matriculation or the Upper Secondary examination, and I would respectfully urge upon Government that the old rule, a perfectly clear and simple one, be reverted to. If this recommendation is accepted, all that is necessary is to remove the phrase "under Article 2 of the Public Service Notification" in line 3 of Article 4 of the Special Test Notification and to place it after "who" in the second line, so that the phrase may apply not only to persons who are eligible to hold, but to persons who actually do hold superior appointments, but I think it would be better to rewrite the article and make it clear that admission to the Special Tests depends on the examinations passed and not on the appointments held by candidates. In individual cases, where proved merit might be regarded as making up for the want of any general test qualification, or where special reasons might seem to require it, the rule could always be relaxed on the recommendation of the Head of the Department to which the candidate belonged.

ORDER—dated 9th July 1895, No. 571, Educational.

The Government agrees with Dr. Duncan in considering that it is inexpedient to admit to any Special Test examination a person whose general educational qualifications fall below the standard required in the appointments for which that Special Test is prescribed. The proposal to amend Article 4 of the Special Test Notification by removing the phrase "under Article 2 of the Public Service Notification" from its present position and inserting it immediately between the words "who" and "hold" will accordingly be approved.

2. Article 4 should be further amended by inserting before "the Special Tests" the words "as modified by notes (3) and (4)."

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction,
Commissioner for Government Examinations.

No. 1799

Office of the Commissioner
for Government Examinations,
Madras, 19th June 1895.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. D. Duncan, M. A., B.Sc.,

Commissioner for

Government Examinations,

Madras,

To

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

Sir,

As by O. of the 11th September last, Mr. D. Duncan, Educational does not appear to me to have fully disposed of the question raised by Mr. Moore in his letter of the 28th July, 1895. I have the honour to enquire whether, under Article 4 of the Notification now regulating the Special Test examinations, a person in the position of a Hospital Assistant, who has not passed the Matriculation or the Upper Secondary examination, is eligible to appear for the Special Tests on the ground that he holds a "superior appointment in the Public Service." Under the old rules which were in force up to the middle of last year such a candidate could not have appeared for any of the Special Tests as not having passed the prescribed general education test. The present Notification, however, throws open the Special Tests to all persons who

who hold superior appointments, but as it nowhere specifies what these superior appointments are, it is not easy for the Commissioners to determine in all cases whether a candidate is eligible or not. In certain special departments, like the Medical, Forest and Postal departments, there are persons employed in what must, I presume, be regarded as 'superior service', who have passed no test whatever, or only very inferior tests. Such persons could only in very exceptional cases, have done a superior service in other departments, like the Revenue and Judicial, for instance. The question at once arises whether they ought to be allowed to appear for the Special Tests. I cannot think that it was the intention of Government that service in these special departments, for which the Special Tests were never intended, should carry with it a privilege which is denied to persons in other departments to which the Special Tests more particularly apply. I am strongly of opinion that in all departments admission to the Special Tests should be restricted to those who have passed the Matriculation or the Upper Secondary examination, and I would respectfully urge upon Government that the old rule, a perfectly clear and simple one, be reverted to. If this recommendation is accepted, it that is necessary is to remove the phrase 'under article 4 of the Public Service Notification' in line 3

the as finally
the permitted to
offer for the
examination
passing which are
to be as per
known to be
not also passed
the general
examination
which are per-
mitted for the
officers and
which the special
examination is
not

of Article 4 of the Special Test Notification and to place it after 'who' in the second line, so that the phrase may apply not only to persons who are eligible to hold, but to persons who actually do hold superior appointments; but I think it would be better to rewrite the article and make it clear that admission to the Special Tests depends on the examinations passed and not on the appointments held by candidates. In individual cases, where proved merit might be regarded as making up for the want of any general test qualification, or where special reasons might even require it, the rule could always be relaxed on the recommendation of the Head of the Department to which the candidate belonged.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

Commissioner

670-11-9-94
Educational (1895) Department.

(Examinations)

Current No. 702

From

To Honble Mr. B. Duncan, M.P.,
Minister of Education

Commissioner for
Government Examinations
Madras.

To Honble the Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George

No. 1799.

Dated 19th }
Received 20th } June 1895



Enclosures...

Subject.

Regarding a notice, under Article 4 of
the notification now regulating the
Special Test Examinations, a person
in position of a Hospital Assistant
who has not passed the Matriculation
or the Higher Secondary Examination
is eligible to appear for the Special
Tests on the ground that he holds
superior appointment in the
public service and recommending
revision of Article 2 of the Public
Service Notification.

FOR ORDERS

On reconsideration I agree
with the Commission that persons
who are in the position of the
Hospital Assistant are eligible to
appear for the Special Tests
on the ground that they are
superior appointments for the
public service. This proposal is
in accordance with the provisions
of the Public Service Notification
of the 11th March 1895 for the
purpose of recommending the
revision of Article 2 of the Public
Service Notification. I do not see any
objection to the proposal.

29/6

C. No. 702 of 95.

Under Article 4 of the Special
Test Examination Notification, the
Special Tests are, subject to
certain limitations, open to all
persons who hold, or are
eligible, under Article 2 of the
Public Service Notification, to hold
superior appointments carrying
a salary of Rs 15 per mensem
or upwards in the public
service. Take for instance,
the case of a Hospital Assistant
who holds a Substantive Appoint-
ment under Government in the
public service. This man, or one
holding a superior appointment
of Rs 15 per mensem or upwards
in the public service, is eligible
to appear for the Special Tests
under Article 4. The question now is,
whether, by thus passing

the special tests, this man
 renders himself eligible
 for appointment to posts
 for which those tests are
 prescribed, notwithstanding
 the fact that he has not passed
 the General Education Test
 prescribed for such appointments.
 Evidently he is not eligible.
 But there seems to be no reason
 why he should not be permitted
 to appear for the Special Tests.
 Dr. Duncan says that he should
 not be permitted & accordingly
 suggests a certain modification
 of Art. 4. He seems to
 assume that a mere passing
 of the Special Tests immediately
 renders the man eligible for appointment
 to the posts for which the tests
 are prescribed, ^{to qualify for the posts} ~~without modification~~
 is based on this assumption.
 But it is not so. It does not
 seem therefore necessary that any
 modification should be made
 in Art. 4. There seems to be
 no harm in permitting to appear
 for the Special Tests persons
 who are eligible, under Art. 4,
 to appear.

FOR ORDERS

Infinitely will
 not want to appear
 2
 11/1/95

and, however, in the possibility of
 preserving one from appearing for the
 Special Tests who can receive no benefit
 from passing them.

Notes 3) 4) do not contain
 "limitations". by modifying
 the limitations in notes 1) 2)
 if any alterations
 were required, should be
 to "limitations in notes
 1) 2) 4) as modified by note
 3) 4) 5)

I think we need no limitation
 in note 1 or as modified by
 note 3. I do not know of any
 person having been examined

In this connection, it
 is submitted that Art. 4
 appears to stand in need of
 of a slight modification;
 the expression "limitations
 in notes 1) and 2)" should be
 altered into "limitations
 in notes 1) to 4)" or "following
 limitations". There are four
 notes to the article, but the
 body of the article refers to
 only two.

It appears to me that D. D. is right.
 What is the use of new passing Special
 Tests when doing so can be of so
 little benefit? The effect of passing
 them is the position of the
 Director, ^{to appear for them} will be that he will
 be permitted to continue by those who
 may be successful in passing
 the test of the General Education
 Test which will be all that would
 then stand in the way of their
 seeking advancement to posts
 for which the Special Tests
 qualify.

28/1/95

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Special Lect. on 2. 10. 1904

Again G. O., dated

189 , No.

Again G. O., dated

1 Sept 1894

No. 170

Current No.

702

of 1894; dated 19.6 from the D.P.

Current No.

of 189 , dated

from

ORDER.

At 9th July 1895 No 571

The Govt agree with D. Mason
in considering that it is inexpedient
to admit that Special Lect. Masonry
a person whose general educational
qualification falls below the standard
required in the appointments for which
the Special Lect. is presented.
The proposal to amend Art 4 of the
D.P. by amending the
phrase "and Art 2 of the D.P."
"and Art 2 of the D.P."
and inserting "and Art 2 of the D.P."
to read "and Art 2 of the D.P." will accept
to be approved

2. Art 4 should be further amended
by inserting before "the Special Lect."
the words "as notified by notice"

Art 4 with up to 6 lines. I cannot
"I do not know of any Art 4
"being then mentioned". In a letter
written to the Govt under the
present in the Special Lect. Art 4 p.
p. (not white life) - which is a mistake
(4) I notified the Govt (19)

(For order)

In Ed. L. 10
9/7/95 No 571

No 571

No 571

Special Test Certificate

6

No.

Drift for approval

Print

First copy sent to Print.

Returned for signature.

Dispatched in V

State of U.S., No.

187

County No.

Division of U.S. No.

State of Massachusetts

County of Berkshire

Notary Public

Witness my hand and seal this 1st day of January, 1877.

1877

1. In Print in full.
2. In full to be printed.
3. In full printed only.
4. In full binding only.

Form of copy
attached.

Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

57-5208

14-10-12

26-4-16 BTU

30-1-17

9