

Educational (1916) Department.

His SERIES.

G.O. No. 331 EOL


DATED 27-3-16.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Subsidy

Sanctioning the payment to the district boards of Sabem and Ganjam of a _____ of Rs 160 and Rs 180 respectively to meet the cost of raising the pay of teachers in the sessional schools maintained by them.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.



5221 L Reed 4.10.15



Subject.

Sessional schoolmasters.

Submitting for sanction a proposition statement for increasing the pay of the ----- in the Salem District.

ENCLOSURES	
No.	2
Spare copies	

No. 214/901/15

Station -----, Dated the 30 September 1915

Despatched 30.9.15

From (Name) E. W. Leigh Esquire., I.C.S.,

(Designation) President, District Board, Salem.

To the Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Local and Municipal Department.

Sir,

with reference to G.O.365 L.Mis dated 6th March 1915, passing orders on this office letter 37/Govt dated 22-2-15, I have the honour to request the sanction of -- government for the proposals to increase the pay of the Sessional school masters in this district, as explained in that letter.

A copy of the resolution of the District Board reaffirming the proposals and a proposition statement --

are--

p-1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

are enclosed.

I have the honour to be,

sir,

your most obedient servant,

K. S. S. S.
President.

ad.
L
20.9.15

3/3
Extracts from the Proceedings of the District Board, Salem,
passed at its meeting held at Salem on the 17th September 1915.

Present:-

Ex-officio members.

1. R.W. Leigh Esquire, I.C.S., Collector of Salem-President.
2. M.B. Ry Rao Sahib D. Diravia Nadar Avl. Revenue Divisional officer, Salem.

Official members-Nominated.

3. M.B. Ry. I. V. Brinivasa Aiyangar Avl. B.A., Personal Assistant Deputy Collector and Vice-President.
4. John Inglis Esquire, Executive Engineer, Salem.

Non-official members-Nominated.

5. M.B. Ry. Rao Bahadur T. Subramania Aiyar Avl, President of the Salem Taluk Board.
6. " M. B. Vijayaranga Nayudu Avl.
7. " P. Muthiyalusami Chettiyar Avl
8. " K. T. Paul Avl, B.A.L.T.
9. Reverend Ralph Robertson B.D.

Official members-Elected.

10. M.B. Ry R. V. Krishnasami Aiyar Avl, Tahsildar of Attur.
11. " A. R. Kuppasami Aiyar Avl, Tahsildar of Krishnagiri.
12. " T. C. Ramaswami Aiyar Avl, Tahsildar of Salem.

Non-official members-Elected.

13. M.B. Ry Rajah Chinnathambi Mudaliyar Avl
14. The Honourable Mr. B. V. Narasimha Aiyar.
15. M.B. Ry M. D. Narayana sami Udayar Avl.
16. " M. B. Krishna Chettiyar Avl.
17. " M. N. Subbiah Avl.
18. Patel hasan Sahib Bahadur
19. N. Abdul Thader Sahib Bahadur.

x

x

x

4
17. Read correspondence ending with G.O.365 L.Mis.,
dated 6-3-15 intimating that the proposal to enhance the pay
of the Sessional schoolmasters from Rs20/- to Rs35-1-40
should be submitted so as to reach Government before 1st
October next with the recommendation of the Special Sub-
Committee thereon dated 30-8-15.

Resolution:- Government will be addressed.

(Signed) E.W. L e g h,
President.

(True Extract)

K. S. S. S. S.
For President.

S.K/30-9-15.

S. K. S. S. S.
30.9.15.

Seott. II-51-3-14.

PAGES _____ TO _____

(proposition
statement)

SUBSTITUTE FOR DETACHED ENCLOSURE.

Educational DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 331 Edl^{Mis}, dated 27-3-1916.

FORWARDED TO THE Local and Municipal Department.

WITH The G.O. mentioned above.
G.O. No. _____, dated _____ 191

DATE 28th March 1916

EXAMINER'S
DESPATCHER'S INITIALS *f*

READ AGAIN G.O. No., dated 191 ..

" " " " 191 ..

READ ALSO:-

C. No. 3651 Sol, From the P. D.B Salem, No. 214, dated 30-9-1915

" " " " 191 ..

" " " " 191 ..

memo
ORDER.

No. 3651-2, dated 29-11-1915

With reference to the letter from the P. D.B, Salem, read above, the D.I. is requested to report whether ~~the compliance with the request for~~ from Provincial funds towards the additional charge involved in the proposals contained therein will not necessitate the grant of additional subsidies to other district boards towards the cost of raising the pay of sessional school teachers, and to furnish information as to the rate paid to the District Board.

a compliance with the request for

Notes in CB
30/11/15 2/12/15

by CA 27-11-15 27-11-15 28-11-15

To The D.I. (with letter Enclosure to be returned with reply)

Handwritten notes in Tamil script, including dates like 11-2-16 and 11-2-15, and various administrative remarks.

Local and Municipal

7 DEPARTMENT. C.F.-29.


Edl: 6-802 4-2-16



Registered C.No 1136 19-2-1916

Subject.

Requesting that Government may be pleased to order the payment of the grant of Rs.180/- to the Ganjam District Board sanctioned in G.O.No. 1109-L. Mis. dated 9-8-15.



ENCLOSURES.	
No.	
Spare copies	

C. No. 307 /D.B/16.

Station Chatrapur, Dated the 9th February 1916. 191

From (Name) N. Macmichael, Esq., I.C.S.,
 (Designation) President, District Board,
 Ganjam
 To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
 Local & Municipal Department.
 Through the Director of Public Instruction.
 Sir,

I have the honour to request that Government -- may be pleased to order the payment of the grant of Rs.180/- to the Ganjam District Board sanctioned in G.O.No.1109-L., Mis., dated 9-8-15 consequent on the revision of the pay of the -- teachers in the three sessional schools.

I have the honour to be,
 Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Thennalathumany
 11-2-16

Vice-President, District Board, Ganjam.

C.T.V.
 11-2-16.

11-2-16

2 8 7
N. Ref on Cur No. 1353/1916, dated 17th February 1916.

Submitted in continuation of my letter to
Go 13012dl Government (Educational) R. C. No. 3918/1915, dated 23rd
29/11/15 October 1915.

(S)

R. A. Arneve


for Director of Public Instruction.

M. S. S.

td
2d
11/2

to Reno 36512 est 2
29.11.1915.

Sept 20



13368
28-2-16

C N^o 847 28
7.3.16

N. R. C. No. 9563/1915 dated 28th February 1916.

† This is for next year. The card is available in the yr's lounge also - parcel of 20; note on p. 3 of ^{note 6 to} Gen. 1201 2011

29. 11. 11

R. A. Arneve.

for Director of Public Instruction.

Y. V.

10
9

STATEMENT.

NAME OF DISTRICT BOARD

RATES PAID

- (1) Anantapur
- (2) Arcot, North
- (3) Arcot, South
- (4) Bellary

Rs.30 per mensem
Rs.40-2-50 per mensem
Rs.25-1-25 per mensem
Rs.25 - in the sessional
schools maintained
from Provincial funds
Rs.30 do --
from Local funds.

- (5) Chingleput
- (6) Chittoor
- (7) Coimbatore
- (8) Cuddapah
- (9) Ganjam

Rs.25 per mensem
Rs.25 per mensem
Rs.30-1-35 per mensem
Nil

Rs.25-1-30 sanctioned
by Government in G.O.
No.1109 L Mis., dated
9th August 1915

- (10) Godavari
- (11) Kistna
- (12) Koraput
- (13) Kurnool
- (14) Madura

Rs.30 per mensem
Rs.30-1-40 per mensem
Nil

Rs.30
Rs.40-2-50 - pay in the
sessional school main-
tained from Provincial
funds.

Rs.25-1-30 - do -
from Local funds.

- (15) Nilgiris
- (16) Ramnad
- (17) Salem

Nil
Rs.40-1-50 per mensem
Rs.20 (a)

(a) Proposed to increase to Rs.35-1-40
and the Director has recommended
the increase in the U.O. note if
funds are available.

- (18) Tanjore
- (19) Tinnevely

Since recommended
Rs.30-1-35
(page 9 ante)

Rs.25-1-30
Rs.60 from Provincial
funds
Rs.60-5-80 from Local
funds.

- (20) Trichinopoly

Rs.30-1-35 per mensem
from Provincial funds
Rs.30 per mensem from
Local funds.
Rs.20-1-30

- (21) Vizagapatam

Rs.30

- (22) Malabar

R. A. Arive.

for Director of Public Instruction.

25.1.16

OFFICE NOTE.

Lans M. Dyer

SUBJECT. Increase of pay of sessional school masters in the Salem District.

From the President of the Salem P. Bd. No 214 of 30.9.15

Register No. 52212
2.10.15.

p. 1 of G.O. 3652
6.3.15 (P)

There are two sessional schools working in the Salem District. One of them is borne on the permanent establishment. The other is temporary and is maintained out of Provincial grant. which is the same as the one referred in G.O. 3652 of 3.12.15 for late submission.

p. 6 of ibid.

(P) The present proposal is to increase the pay of two sessional school masters in the two schools referred to above from their present pay of Rs 20 per mensem to Rs 35-1-40, the increment being biennial. The scale recommended by the Inspector of Schools is Rs 30 to 40 with a house rent allowance of Rs 5. The reason for the increase is stated to be that the existing pay does not attract teachers of suitable educational qualifications. The average extra cost involved is Rs 18 per mensem for each school. The President states that the extra cost involved in the case of

p. 3 of ibid.

pp. 1 and 3 of ibid.

p. 2 of ibid.

12990-5652 (P)
6.3.15

(Z)

(T)

(N)

(U)

one of the schools will be met from the normal income of the District Board. He requests that in the case of the other school, the Provincial subsidy sanctioned for the purpose of sessional schools might be increased by Rs. 200. The usual amount of recurring subsidy granted towards the cost of maintenance of sessional schools is Rs. 1420 - vide G.O. 660 Ed. dated 26th July 1912, G.O. 1113 Ed. dated 26th November 1912, and G.O. 1027 Ed. dated 31st August 1914 and G.O. 244 Ed. dated 7th July 1915.

The Educational Department may, it is submitted, be consulted w.o. with reference to the request of the President for increased Provincial grant.

Sommarau
17.10.15

Yes: the request seems reasonable.

Est. no.

20.10.15

Educational Department



CN. 3651 Est
26.10.15

Attention is directed to G.O. 265.12, 6.3.15, which contains the proposals of the P. D. B., Salem.

2. Instructions have recently been received from the Govt. of India pointing out the necessity for strict economy throughout and requesting the Local Govt. to discontinue all non-essential expenditure.

inconvenience. It does not appear that the proposal of
the Salem St. Board to increase the salary of the
Sessional school masters from \$20 to \$35¹⁻²
p.m. is so urgent that its postponement will result
in any sudden inconvenience to the public service.
The D.P.B. has submitted separately proposals for the full utilization of the income
^{under Article}
It is therefore for consideration whether the
Govt. may regret their inability to increase
the subsidy during the continuance of the war,
^{to report the D.P.B.} ~~to report the D.P.B. to forward the application of the D.P.B.~~
3. If the above view is concurred in the file
may be returned to them without counselling the D.P.B.

PA CR
27.10.15 28.10.15

It seems to me that \$20 is
absurd pay for the teacher of
a general school and that it
would be better to close one of
the two schools than to maintain
them on such a scale. At the
same time it might not be
impossible to find \$200. Will the D.P. ?
phase advise?

29.00.15

D. P. 9: w. o.

No. 128 of 2. 11. 15

I certainly think 20 too little for a
session at school in winter and it is

decided by below what many
boards are paying. I should
support the proposals of the Bd
as involving necessary expenditure
if the money can be found

for xi. 15.
2 xi. 15.



Notes in CR
4/11/15

Since disposed of in
Go. 1301 Sd. 1
29.11.15
1000000000

Submitted that the Financial Department may
be requested a.s. to state whether it will agree
to incur an additional expenditure of Rs 200 per
annum on account of the temporary ^{seasonal} school.
Salem. It has been suggested in the
PR ^{5.11.15} looked file (dealing with the distribution
of balance of subsidies) that provision
may be included for this item also.
CR
10/11/15

I think this item may pass.
It is impossible to get efficient teachers
for seasonal schools in Rs 20

For u.o.
12.11.15

Item (6) on
page 394

P.T.O

Financial dept.

Recurring grant of Rs. 200
on account of the revision of
salaries of teachers in Sessional
Schools under the Salem District Board.

The proposals in the top
file take into account this
grant - which is item (6) in
para: 4 of Educational note
on page 3 of notes ibid.

bek.

24.11.55

P.S.

25.11.55

P.T.O.

Salem is not peculiar I suppose - If we pass for Salem we must pass for other Districts and what extra cost on the whole will that involve?

A. Butterworth,
25-11-15.

In his note dated 2nd November 1915 on pages 3 - 4 ^{ante}, the D. P. I. has remarked :-

"I certainly think Rs. 20 too little for "a Sessional School master and it is decidedly "below what many Boards are paying".

It is proposed in the present case to raise the pay of the teacher in the Temporary Sessional School in the Salem district, which is maintained from Provincial funds, from Rs. 20 to Rs. 35-1-40^p (average Rs. 38 $\frac{1}{3}$). The extra cost is Rs. 18 $\frac{1}{3}$ per mensem or Rs. 220 per annum. An additional subsidy of Rs. 200 per annum from Provincial funds is accordingly suggested by Education^{cal.} (pages 3 and 4 ^{ante})

2. Besides the above subsidy of Rs. 200 per annum, the proposals in the main file provide for a recurring subsidy of Rs. 180 per annum for raising

of the scale since
supported by the
DPI is Rs 30-1-35
(page 9 CF)

Individed



the pay of three teachers in the Sessional Schools

in the Ganjam district from Rs. 20-1-25 to Rs.25-1-30

Flag C

G.O. 1109 L., dated 9-8-15 - [flag X in linked file

and item (2) on page 3 of notes in linked file.]

3. No information is available as to the rates of pay now drawn by the teachers in Sessional Schools in the Several districts of the Presidency. Submitted that Educational may be requested to obtain information from the Director of Public Instruction as to whether these proposals will not necessitate the grant of additional subsidies to other district boards towards the cost of raising the pay of Sessional School teachers. In the meanwhile, the sanction may be held in abeyance to the grant of subsidies to the two district boards, viz. Salem and Ganjam (Vide paras. 1 and 2^{1/2} above)

V.G.K.
26-11-15.

L. E. Kershaw,
26-11-15.

Educational U.O.



Educational Department

A draft memorandum is submitted for approval.

27.11.15
27.11.15

28.11.15

p. 6 of

[Memo No: 3651-2811, d/ the 29th Nov: 15]

[L. 847 all: from the D.P.S. N. R. O. C. No. 9562/15]

d/ the 28th Feb: 16.

please see the file. dept. notes on p. 6 of 7. ante.

For the circumstances

now stated by the D.P.S. on p. 6 of 7.

this dept. away, it is submitted, agree

to meet the additional cost involved

from school funds. The Director

however now suggests a scale of Rs

30-1-38 instead of Rs 35-1-40 originally

proposed. The extra cost will therefore

be only Rs 13 1/3 ^{p. 11} or Rs 160 per month +

it is for order whether the school:

Subsidy may be limited to Rs 160

instead of Rs 200 provided in the

proposals dealt with in G.O. No: 1301 all

d/ the 29th Nov: 1915 - item (ii) and

in para 1 of the ^{Ed. Dept.} file note on p. 3 of the

note with the G.O. at 5.

From para 2 of Ed. note on

page 3 of the notes at 5 it will appear

Existing scale - Rs 20.
that recommended 30-1-38
by D.P.S.
Extra cost p. M = 13 1/3
p. a = 13 1/3 x 12
= 160

A


5



vide appl. no. 707

CURRENT NO.
1719
FINANCIAL

15-3-16
Vol. 3651-3/15



page 9 CF

that the amount of Rs 180 provided for raising the pay of these teachers in the Sessional Schools in the Ganjam dist. has also been held over. This amount may also be paid now.

Subject to order on the point raised at A in para 2 supra a draft order is submitted. If approved it may be forwarded to Financial and LHM for acceptance. ~~After the order is accepted for submission to the Govt. of Madras, the draft order, to be submitted with the sanction to be submitted to the Govt. of Madras.~~

Salem.

10-3-16

13/3/16

Jul and 13/3/16
W.

Financial dept

Attention is invited to this dept's note on pages 6-7 and and to the Endorsement by the D. P. J. on pages 9-10 of CF. The D. P. J. suggests that the salary of the teacher in the Sessional School, Salem, may be raised from Rs. 20 to Rs. 30-1-35 (instead

page 9 CF.

of to Rs. 35-1-40 as proposed by the District Board). The D.P. 9. also remarks that it does not appear that compliance with the present request will ~~not~~ necessitate the grant of additional subsidies to other district boards as the salaries paid in Salem are lower than in any other district. From the statement on page 10 C.F., it will be seen that in certain cases, the pay of the teachers is less than Rs. 30-1-35 which it is now proposed to adopt for Salem.

2 In the draft order it is proposed to sanction annual subsidies of Rs. 160 and ^{Rs.}180 to the District Boards of Salem and Ganjam respectively towards the cost of raising the pay of teachers in the Sessional Schools maintained by them as shown below:-

(1) Salem

1 teacher on Rs. 20 to 1 teacher on Rs. 30-1-35 (average Rs. $33\frac{1}{3}$)

Extra cost, Rs. $13\frac{1}{3}$ per ensem or Rs. 160 per annum

(2)

(2) Ganjam

3 teachers on Rs. 20-1-25 to
3 on Rs. 25-1-30.

Extra cost = Rs. 3 x 5 per mensem
or Rs. 180 per annum

For orders whether the draft
may be accepted.

163.16.

For orders with re.
furnish to C. & S. note on
p. 16.

CS 182-
17.3.16

Pass as to Salem.

As to Ganjam order seems to have
issued in fr. 1107 L & 9.8.15 which,
quite irregularly, was not sent to
Fin.

Ans
17/3

L & M u/o.



CNO 1729 L
18-3-16

of to Rs. 25-1-40 as proposed by
the District Board. The B.P. 2
also remarks that it does not
appear that compliance with the
present request will necessitate
the grant of additional subsidies
to other district boards as the
salaries paid in Salem are lower
than in any other district. From
the statement on page 10 of it will
be seen that in certain cases the
pay of the teachers is less than
Rs. 20-1-25 which it is now proposed
to adopt for Salem.

In the draft order it is proposed
to sanction annual salaries of Rs. 160
and Rs. 180 to the District Boards of
Salem and Ganjam respectively
towards the cost of providing the pay
of teachers in the Government schools
maintained by them as shown below:

(1) Salem

Teacher on Rs. 20 to 1 teacher on
Rs. 20-1-25 (average Rs. 20)

Extra cost Rs. 180 per annum

Secy this is

21
Lor Dept

Submitted that para. 3 of the draft order may be accepted in this Dept.

16.3.16
Lor
20.3

With reference to the irregularity about G.O. 1109-159-8-15. pointed out by the chief Secy, it is submitted that the Eds Dept. has indicated the source from which the grant required could and did not suggest any reference to Fund. he met. It was therefore considered unnecessary to send the G.O. to Fund. for acceptance. For a precedent please see G.O. 2273-15 21-12-14.

2. The file may be passed on to Eds. uo

Noted in A.L.
23.3.16

21/3/16 1/16
24.3.16

V.TK
22.3.

Ed. l. u.o



23
Educational Department.

With reference to the Chief Secretary's remark at 'A' on page 11 supra it is submitted that the payment of the subsidy to the Ganyam Dr. Bd. was not sanctioned in L.P. no. 1109 L., dated the 9th August 1915. The Director was merely requested to include the grant in his proposals for the distribution of the savings in the provision under 'subsidies' for the current year. He accordingly included this amount in ^{his proposal for} the distribution of the savings under subsidies - item (2) in para. 3 of L.P. no. the letter on page 3 of L.P. no. 1301 Edl., dated the 29th November 1915. These proposals ~~were~~ ^{as well as that for the Salem Dr. Bd.} with certain modifications were sent to Financial for acceptance. Financial suggested that the payment of ^{this grant} might be held over pending receipt of some further information called for from the D.P.D. This information has been received and it does not ~~show~~ indicate that there is any objection to the payment of the grants above mentioned. The acceptance of Financial has accordingly been sought for for the disbursement of the grants. It will thus be seen that no grant has been actually paid either to the Salem or the Ganyam Dr. Bd. It is therefore submitted that the draft order already put up may issue with

(C)
But a grant is definitely for me is
"The additional cost will be met by a grant" is as that.
The G.O. said. 1915

page 7 supra

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

the concurrence of Financial.

23.3.16
23/3/16

L. L. Leo

24.3.16

CURRENT NO.
1996
FINANCIAL

24.3.16

Vol no 3651-4/15

24.3.16

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
24 MAR 1916
GOVT. OF MADRAS

cf. Section II in para 1
of the order. Reg C

Reg. XII

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
25 MAR 1916
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT

Final 1996-1
25/3/16

Vol 1162-1
25-3-16

Financial dept.
It is respectfully submitted that as observed by the Chief Secretary on page II ante, G.O. No. 1109 & dated 9-8-15. in which the Govt. were actually committed to the expenditure should have been sent to Financial for acceptance before issue - vide Rule 9 A of the Interdepartmental Reference Rules.

2. The draft order may, if it is submitted, be accepted in Financial.

24.3.16

CS. 24.3.16

70
Conclusion

24/3

It is respectfully submitted that the draft order may now be submitted to the Chief Secretary for his consideration. The draft order is dated 12-8-15 in which the Government were actually committed to the expenditure should have been sent to Financial for acceptance before issue - vide Rule 9 of the Interdepartmental Reference Rules.

The draft order may now be submitted to the Chief Secretary for his consideration. The draft order is dated 12-8-15 in which the Government were actually committed to the expenditure should have been sent to Financial for acceptance before issue - vide Rule 9 of the Interdepartmental Reference Rules.

1901
JANUARY
11

1-1996-1
25/3/16

1-1996-1
25/3/16

1-1996-1
25/3/16

Educational Department.
Submitted that the draft order may now be submitted.

25/3/16
25/3/16
26/3/16

Financial Dept.
It is respectfully submitted that the draft order may now be submitted to the Chief Secretary for his consideration. The draft order is dated 12-8-15 in which the Government were actually committed to the expenditure should have been sent to Financial for acceptance before issue - vide Rule 9 of the Interdepartmental Reference Rules.

1-1996-1
25/3/16

Education

$$\begin{array}{r} 17,23,488 \\ - 9000 \\ - 10000 \\ - 20000 \\ \hline 16,84,488 \end{array}$$

Education - Govt. Schools,
General - Payment in
support of local board and
municipal schools"

3 Further orders will
issue in the L & M Deptt:
~~Report~~ on the proposition
stat: Submitted by the P.D.B.,
Salem

10.3.16
13/3/16.
M. S. H.

- To
- The D.P.B. ✓ (940)
 - " A. G. ✓ (940)
 - " Finl. Deptt. ✓ (940)
 - " L & M Deptt. ✓ (940)
 - " P.D.B., Banjara ✓
 - " P.D.B., Salem ✓

27/3/16

(C) Log T 27/3/16
as
forwarded 27/3/16

with post. Shall be original

Handwritten notes in Urdu script, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through.

Handwritten notes in Urdu script, including a date '21/5/01'.

Handwritten notes in Urdu script, enclosed in a bracketed section.

given for copying
copied _____
examined _____
signed _____ } 191

AGAIN G.O. No. _____, DATED
191 .

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

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