[Edi. 7.]
250 — 99-7-96.

Educational (~~189~~ 1901) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 338—9

DATED 21. 6. 01. ✓.

INDEXED.

9

ORIGINAL.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Director of Public Instruction.

Stating that the Govt of India will be addressed on the subject of raising the pay of the ——. Letter to the Govt. of India.

The Notes
in these Proceedings have been printed.

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 {1901} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

2

Recd. } 1901. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., &c., Nos. 338, 339, 21st June 1901.

JUNE.

Director of Public Instruction.

Stating that the Government of India will be addressed on the subject of raising the pay of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again G.O., No. 313, Educational, dated 8th June 1901.

Read—the following paper:—

From the Honourable Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Barrister-at-law, Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 6th March 1901, C. No. 1969.

* * * * *

2. In paragraph 8 of his letter, * No. 11029, dated 11th August 189?, Dr. Duncan proposed that the pay of the Director of Public Instruction in Madras should be fixed at Rs. 2,000—100—2,500, the same as the pay of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal. The Government of Madras approved of this proposal in G.O., † No. 33, Educational, dated 21st January 1893, remarking that it seemed to be only equitable that the Director in this presidency should receive as high a salary as the Director in Bombay whose duties are considerably lighter. The Government of India, without entering into the merits of the case, declared itself "unable *at present* to recommend to the Secretary of State the proposal for raising the pay of the Director" owing to the financial condition existing at that time ‡.

* Printed on pages 11—23 of papers relating to the reorganization of the Educational service in India (Selections from the records of the Government of India, Home Department, No. CCCLVIII).

† See page 25 of the papers.

‡ See No. 24 of the papers, page 58.

In a letter from this Government to the Government of India, No. 831, dated 13th November 1893, § cogent reasons were given why the Government of India should reconsider their decision, but nothing more appears to have been done.

§ See No. 34 of the papers, page 79.

In repeating Dr. Duncan's proposal I have only to add that since 1893 the work of the Director has considerably increased, as has also that of the Commissioner for Government Examinations. Only last year a large addition to the Director's work was made by assigning to him the direction of education in Bangalore and Coorg. This involves much more than the taking over of a number of schools: the systems in Bangalore and Coorg are different from that in force in Madras and from one another, and cannot be made the same; and there are numerous important questions to be considered involving much thought and considerable correspondence with the Resident in Mysore and Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

In his despatch No. 22, || Public, dated 12th March 1896, the Secretary of State remarked that "the office of Director of Public Instruction is one of very great importance and demands in the holder of it not only attainments of a high order but considerable administrative capacity. The questions that are raised are often of great public interest." These are given as reasons for leaving local Governments unfettered in their selection of a Director; but they are, I respectfully submit, also reasons for paying him on a liberal scale.

|| See No. 79 of the papers, page 178.

As the decision of the Government of India was based solely on the financial condition in 1893, and as the financial condition is now in a much more settled state, I request that that Government may be moved to address the Secretary of State to raise the pay of my appointment to an equality with that of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal, or, as an alternative, to grant a local allowance of Rs. 250 a month, as suggested by Dr. Duncan, for the work done by the Director in his capacity of Commissioner for Government Examinations.

Order—No. 313, Educational, dated 8th June 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed on the subject of the personal allowances which are attached to certain appointments in the Indian Educational service.

2. Separate orders will be passed regarding the pay of the Director.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Order—No. 338, Educational, dated 21st June 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Letter—No. 339, Educational, dated Ootacamund, 21st June 1901, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

I am directed to address the Government of India on the subject of the pay of the Director of Public Instruction in this presidency.

2. In Mr. Price's letter, No. 525, Educational, dated 22nd July 1890, chiefly on the ground that as the work of the Madras Director was not less heavy than that of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal he deserved to be placed on a footing of equality with them in the matter of salary, a recommendation was made that the pay might be fixed at Rs. 2,000 rising to Rs. 2,500 by annual increments of Rs. 100. The Government of India supported this proposal, with the modification that the increments should be biennial and not annual, and submitted it for the favourable consideration of the Secretary of State. In his despatch No. 145, Public, dated 20th November 1890, Lord Cross considered that a sufficient case had not been made out for the increase.

3. Subsequently in connection with the reorganisation of the Educational services in India, this Government made a similar proposal in paragraph 4 (*a*) of their proceedings, No. 33, Educational, dated 21st January 1893, copy of which was forwarded with Mr. Galton's letter, No. 34 of the same date. It was then stated that the grounds for the increase were even stronger than in 1890, and that it seemed to be only equitable that the Director in Madras should receive as high a salary as the Director in Bombay as the latter's duties were even lighter. In Mr. C. J. Lyall's reply No. 259 of the 22nd August following, the Government of India observed that the financial condition was such that proposals for additional expenditure on points

not essential to the reorganization could not be entertained. A reconsideration of this decision was urged in Mr. Price's letter No. 831 of the 13th November 1893, but the Government of India adhered to their decision of the previous August.

4. Nearly eleven years have passed since the proposal was first made, and all the arguments used by this Government in 1890, and accepted as sound by the Government of India, still hold good, while their cogency has been largely added to by the increase which has meanwhile occurred in the Director's duties. In 1888–89, the latest year for which information was available in 1890, the Madras Director as Commissioner for Government Examinations had to arrange for the examination of 19,854 candidates: in 1899-1900 he had to do the same for 46,855 candidates. In 1888–89 he controlled 10,586 schools and colleges under public management, attended by 378,130 pupils, as compared with 8,517 institutions and 499,936 pupils in Bombay: he now controls 15,468 such institutions and 590,263 pupils against 9,599 and 548,079 in Bombay. He has also the additional work of controlling education in Bangalore and Coorg, the statistics of which are not included in these figures. This, I am to observe, involves much more than the taking over of a number of schools: the systems in Bangalore and Coorg are different from that in force in Madras and from one another, and cannot be made the same. Numerous important questions involving much thought and considerable correspondence with the Resident in Mysore and Chief Commissioner of Coorg have to be considered.

5. Under these circumstances, the Governor in Council is decidedly of opinion that very strong grounds exist for placing the Director of Public Instruction in this presidency on a footing of equality with the Directors in Bengal and Bombay, and I am accordingly to request that the Government of India will be pleased to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State for raising his pay from Rs. 2,000—50—2,250 to Rs. 2,000—100—2,500. The increased charge will be only Rs. 166-10-8 per mensem or Rs. 2,000 per annum. The Government propose, I am to add, to make the declaration contemplated in article 171 (*a*) of the Civil Service Regulations in order that Mr. Stuart may draw Rs. 2,100 to start with counting time for increments as if he had commenced on the minimum pay. A proposition statement accompanies this letter.

C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Educational Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.Os., Nos. 313-314 and 338-339, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 8th and 21st JUNE 1901.

[Subject.—*Personal allowances in the Indian Educational service and the pay of the Director of Public Instruction.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 6th March 1901, *Ref. on C. No.* 1969.

In his letter read above the Director makes two proposals. The first relates to the personal allowances which are attached to certain appointments in the Indian Educational service. There are four such allowances in this presidency—two of Rs. 250—50—500 to be given to the principal, Presidency college, and the senior inspector of schools, and two of Rs. 200—10—250 to be given, respectively, to the principals of the Rajahmundry and Kumbakónam colleges. It is however open to this Government to give one of the lower allowances to an inspector of long standing and approved service if in their opinion his claims to it are superior to those of one of the principals, and one of these allowances is now actually held by the junior inspector.

2. The Director proposes that one of the higher allowances (Rs 250—50—500) should be reserved always for the principal, Presidency college, and that the remaining three allowances should not be attached to any office but should be open to the principals of the Rajahmundry and Kumbakónam colleges, the two inspectors and the two senior professors of the Presidency college. The Director gives good reasons for the proposed change and orders are solicited as to whether the Government of India may be moved to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State thereto.

3. The second proposal of the Director is that the pay of his appointment (Rs. 2,000—50—2,250) may be raised to Rs. 2,000—100—2,500 so as to make it equal to that of the Directors of Bombay and Bengal, or that he may be granted a personal allowance of Rs. 250 a month for the work done by him as Commissioner for Government examinations.

4. A proposal to raise the pay of the Director from Rs. 2,000—50—2,250 to Rs. 2,000—100—2,500 was made to the Government of India in letter No. 525, Educational, dated 22nd July 1890, and that Government recommended it for the sanction of the Secretary of State. But the latter authority considered that a sufficient case had not been made out for the increase and that the requirements of the case could be met by the grant of a personal allowance of Rs. 250 to Mr. Grigg—*vide* G.O., No. 101, Educational, dated 10th February 1891.

5. Three years later, in connection with the reorganization of the educational services, this Government again made a similar proposal, observing that the grounds for it were even stronger then than in 1890—*vide* paragraph 4 (*a*) of G.O., No. 33, Educational, dated 21st January 1893. But the Government of India in paragraph 3 of their letter No. 259, dated 22nd August 1893, explained that the then financial condition was such that proposals for additional expenditure on points not essential to the reorganization could not be entertained and declined to recommend the proposal to the Secretary of State. This Government in paragraph 3 of their letter No. 831, Educational, dated 13th November 1893, however, requested a reconsideration and gave good reason for the request, but the Government of India adhered to their decision.

6. The Hon'ble Mr. Stuart states that the financial condition is now in a much more settled state than in 1893 and requests that another reference on the subject may be made to the Government of India. Orders are solicited as to whether this may be done.

T.K.
12-3-01.

The appended statement shows that both in point of schools as well as of scholars Madras is now far ahead of Bombay. As Commissioner for Government examinations also his work is ever on the increase.

1899.

Institutions.	Bombay.		Bengal.		Madras.	
	Schools.	Scholars.	Schools.	Scholars.	Schools.	Scholars.
Colleges	14	2,794	58	9,295	46	4,235
Secondary schools	467	44,073	2,550	233,161	754	94,558
Primary ,, ...	9,237	508,747	51,040	1,292,291	20,839	623,417
Special ,, ...	50	3,256	375	11,496	128	5,161
Total ..	9,768	558,870	54,023	1,546,243	21,767	727,671
Government schools	63	9,949	170	25,517	415	24,170
Board and Native State schools	7,317	436,402	200	13,800	3,006	147,555
Total ..	7,380	446,351	370	39,347	3,421	171,725
Aided schools	2,219	101,728	38,641	1,164,193	12,047	418 538
Unaided ,, ...	169	10,791	15,012	342,703	6,299	137,408
Total ..	2,388	112,519	53,653	1,506,896	18,346	555,946
Grand Total ..	9,768	558,870	54,023	1,546,243	21,767	727,671

P. T. THARYAN.
16-3-01.

There is not one iota of principle in the refusal to place the Madras Director of Public Instruction on the same footing as the Directors in Bengal and Bombay, and it was really absurd to urge financial reasons against the proposal to equalise them in regard to their pay. How could the financial equilibrium of the Indian empire be affected by disbursing Rx. 300 more or less a year from Provincial funds?

2. It is submitted that both of the Director's proposals should be supported by this Government.

Secretary. A. T. PRINGLE.
22-3-01.

As regards the first proposal, Mr. Stuart has given reasons which merit consideration, and he says the present system is causing discontent. This discontent must be confined to the professors of the Presidency college. If his proposal is accepted it might happen that three out of the four allowances would be held in the Presidency college—one by the principal and two by the senior professors, leaving only one for the inspectors and principals of mufassal colleges. I doubt if this would be desirable altogether. A professor at the Presidency college has, I imagine, an easier task, and certainly a less responsible one, than the principal of a mufassal college and his life is altogether cast in pleasanter places, and I think the same may be said of his work as compared with that of an inspector.

2. Mr. Stuart, however, proposes no hard and fast rule, and Government would have full discretion to refuse to give it to a professor at the Presidency college on the mere ground of seniority. I submit therefore that his proposal may be supported.

3. As regards the pay of the Director's appointment, the arguments in favour of placing it on an equality with the pay of same appointment in Bengal and Bombay

were well put in 1891—*vide* Sir H. Stokes' note. The Secretary of State gave absolutely no reason for rejecting the proposal which had been supported by Government of India. But as he sanctioned a personal allowance to Mr. Grigg at the same time, he perhaps thought the matter was sufficiently disposed of for the time being.

4. The matter has never been subsequently discussed on its merits by the Government of India, the proposals from this Government being simply put aside on financial grounds.

5. All the arguments used in 1891, which convinced the Government of India then, still hold good, and there is the additional one that extra work has been thrown upon the Director by the recent arrangement regarding Coorg and Bangalore schools. The present financial position cannot, I consider, be held to be so critical as to necessitate a refusal of the request. Mr. Stuart suggests as an alternative proposal that a local allowance of Rs. 250 a month should be given for Commissionership of Government examinations. If Government decides to support the proposal, the alternative might perhaps be put to Government of India.

Honourable Member. C. J. WEIR.
His Excellency the Governor. 23-3-01.

I think Mr. Stuart has made out a good case for both proposals and that India may be addressed accordingly. The letter regarding pay of Director of Public Instruction should recapitulate past correspondence. I do not like Mr. Stuart's alternative of a personal allowance. He has held the office for far too short a time to allow of such a proposal. Our position is that the Director of Public Instruction of this presidency should take equal rank with the Directors of Public Instruction of Bombay and Bengal.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].
20-4-01.

I agree.

A[MPTHILL].
25-4-01.

Draft. C. J. WEIR.

The drafts below may issue.

P. T. THARYAN.
6-5-01.

Proofs please. A. T. PRINGLE.
6-5-01.

Proofs of four drafts are placed below.

P. T. THARYAN.
13-5-01.

Clean proofs, please, as altered, and print the proceedings separately according to instructions given personally.

A. T. PRINGLE.
14-5-01.

Clean proofs are placed below.

P. T. THARYAN.
17-5-01.

The letters may issue.

A. T. PRINGLE.
20-5-01.

Secretary—

After approval by Honourable Member and His Excellency.

C. J. WEIR.
20-5-01.

The letters have been approved by the Honourable Member and His Excellency, but under the memorandum from the Financial department, No. 2142, dated 5th

October 1898, the letter about raising the pay of the Director of Public Instruction should have gone to that department for acceptance before circulation. The existence of this memorandum, which I don't remember seeing till now, was overlooked.

2. It is submitted that the letter regarding personal allowances may now issue, and that about the Director's pay may be sent to the Financial department for formal acceptance.

P. T. THARYAN.
6-6-01.

Yes, with an expression of regret that the need for obtaining their concurrence in the first instance was overlooked: the point did not occur to me until yesterday when the proofs came up for approval, and the office was not aware of the rule.

A. T. PRINGLE.
7-6-01.
C. J. WEIR.
7-6-01.

Financial Department u.o.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

The Civil Budget Estimate for 1901–1902 makes provision for the salary of the Director at Rs. 2,050 which the Director drew on the 1st April 1901. In the ordinary course he will begin to draw Rs. 2,100 from December next. The increased expenditure due to this increment will be met from the Educational grant. Similarly, if the new scale (2,000—100—2,500) is sanctioned by the Secretary of State, the additional cost involved will have to be met from the Educational grant, or the Director will come up to Government for an additional allotment, if necessary, in the course of the year. The draft order and letter may be accepted.

T. HARI RAO.
11-6-01.

For the Chief Secretary—

The bearing of sections 173 and 171 of the Civil Service Regulations on the Hon'ble Mr. Stuart's pay, if the new scale is sanctioned, does not appear to have been considered in Educational.

Financial may, it is submitted, accept the draft otherwise and so far as the question of funds is concerned.

C. M. SCHMIDT.
12-6-01.

Yes. Accepted.

G. STOKES.
12-6-01.

To Educational u.o.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

I have made an addition in red ink to the draft which may now issue.

A. T. PRINGLE.
13-6-01.

Approved.

C. J. WEIR.
13-6-01.

Government {1901} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Recd. } 1901. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 338, 21st June 1901.

MAY.
June

~~Pay of the~~ D. P. I.

Stating that the Govt of India will be addressed on the subject of raising ~~the pay of the~~ .

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again G.O., No. 313, Educational, dated 8th June May 1901.

Read—the following paper:—

From the Honourable Mr. G. H. STUART, M.A., Barrister-at-law, Director of Public Instruction, to the Secretary to Government, Educational department, dated Madras, 6th March 1901, C. No. 1969.

* * * * *

2. In paragraph 8 of his letter, * No. 11029, dated 11th August 1892, Dr. Duncan proposed that the pay of the Director of Public Instruction in Madras should be fixed at Rs. 2,000—100—2,500, the same as the pay of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal. The Government of Madras approved of this proposal in G.O., † No. 33, Educational, dated 21st January 1893, remarking that it seemed to be only equitable that the Director in this presidency should receive as high a salary as the Director in Bombay whose duties are considerably lighter. The Government of India, without entering into the merits of the case, declared itself "unable *at present* to recommend to the Secretary of State the proposal for raising the pay of the Director" owing to the financial condition existing at that time ‡.

* Printed on pages 11—23 of papers relating to the reorganization of the Educational service in India (Selections from the records of the Government of India, Home Department, No. CCCLVIII).

† See page 25 of the papers.

‡ See No. 24 of the papers, page 58.

In a letter from this Government to the Government of India, No. 831, dated 13th November 1893, § cogent reasons were given why the Government of India should reconsider their decision, but nothing more appears to have been done.

§ See No. 34 of the papers, page 79.

In repeating Dr. Duncan's proposal I have only to add that since 1893 the work of the Director has considerably increased, as has also that of the Commissioner for Government Examinations. Only last year a large addition to the Director's work was made by assigning to him the direction of education in Bangalore and Coorg. This involves much more than the taking over of a number of schools: the systems in Bangalore and Coorg are different from that in force in Madras and from one another, and cannot be made the same; and there are numerous important questions to be considered involving much thought and considerable correspondence with the Resident in Mysore and Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

In his despatch No. 22, || Public, dated 12th March 1896, the Secretary of State remarked that "the office of Director of Public Instruction is one of very great importance and demands in the holder of it not only attainments of a high order but considerable administrative capacity. The questions that are raised are often of great public interest." These are given as reasons for leaving local Governments unfettered in their selection of a Director; but they are, I respectfully submit, also reasons for paying him on a liberal scale.

|| See No. 79 of the papers, page 178.

As the decision of the Government of India was based solely on the financial condition in 1893, and as the financial condition is now in a much more settled state, I request that that Government may be moved to address the Secretary of State to raise the pay of my appointment to an equality with that of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal, or, as an alternative, to grant a local allowance of Rs. 250 a month, as suggested by Dr. Duncan, for the work done by the Director in his capacity of Commissioner for Government Examinations.

Order—No. 313, Educational, dated 8th June May 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed on the subject of the personal allowances which are attached to certain appointments in the Indian Educational service.

2. Separate orders will be passed regarding the pay of the Director.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. J. WEIR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Order—No. 338, Educational, dated 21st June May 1901.

The Government of India will be addressed.

[Here enter letter, No. 339, Educational, dated 21st June May 1901.]

(True Extract.)

Assistant Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Government {1901} of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Recd. } 1901. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 339 , 21st June **May 1901.**

MAY.

~~The Hon'ble~~ D. P. I.

Requesting ~~to obtain~~ that the Sanction of the Secretary of State may be obtained for raising the pay of the ——— from Rs 2000-50-2250 to Rs 2000-100-2500

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—from

C. J. WEIR, ESQ., I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
HOME DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I am directed to address the Government of India on the subject of the pay of the Director of Public Instruction in this presidency.

2. In Mr. Price's letter, No. 525, Educational, dated 22nd July 1890, chiefly on the ground that as the work of the Madras Director was not less heavy than that of the Directors in Bombay and Bengal, he deserved to be placed on a footing of equality with them in the matter of pay, a recommendation was made that the pay might be fixed at Rs. 2,000 rising to Rs. 2,500 by annual increments of Rs. 100. The Government of India supported this proposal, with the modification that the increments should be biennial and not annual, and submitted it for the favourable consideration of the Secretary of State. In his despatch No. 145, Public, dated 20th November 1890, Lord Cross considered that a sufficient case had not been made out for the increase.

3. Subsequently in connection with the reorganisation of the Educational services in India, this Government made a similar proposal in paragraph 4 (*a*) of their proceedings, No. 33, Educational, dated 21st January 1893, copy of which was forwarded with Mr. Galton's letter, No. 34 of the same date. It was then stated that the grounds for the increase were even stronger than in 1890, and that it seemed to be only equitable that the Director in Madras should receive as high a salary as the Director in Bombay as the latter's duties were even lighter. In Mr. C. J. Lyall's reply No. 259 of the 22nd August following, the Government of India observed that the financial condition was such that proposals for additional expenditure on points not essential to the reorganization could not be entertained. A reconsideration of this decision was urged in Mr. Price's letter No. 831 of the 13th November 1893, but the Government of India adhered to their decision of the previous August.

4. Nearly eleven years have passed since the proposal was first made, and all the arguments used by this Government in 1890, and accepted as sound by the Government of India, still hold good, with perhaps considerably greater force. In 1888–89, the latest year for which information was available in 1890, the Madras Director as Commissioner for Government Examinations had to arrange for the examination of 19,854 candidates: in 1899–1900 he had to do the same for 46,855 candidates. In 1888–89 he controlled 10,586 schools and colleges under public management, attended by 378,130 pupils, as compared with 8,517 institutions and 499,936 pupils in Bombay: he now controls 15,468 such institutions and 590,263 pupils against 9,599 and 548,079 in Bombay. He has also the additional work of controlling education in Bangalore and Coorg, the statistics of which are not included in these figures. This, I am to observe, involves much more than the taking over of a number of schools: the systems in Bangalore and Coorg are different from that in

force in Madras and from one another, and cannot be made the same. Numerous important questions involving much thought and considerable correspondence with the Resident in Mysore and Chief Commissioner of Coorg have to be considered.

5. Under these circumstances, the Governor in Council continues to be decidedly of opinion that very strong grounds exist for placing the Director of Public Instruction in this presidency on a footing of equality with the Directors in Bengal and Bombay, and I am accordingly to request that the Government of India will be pleased to obtain the sanction of the Secretary of State for raising his pay from Rs. 2,000—50—2,250 to Rs. 2,000—100—2,500. The increased charge will be only Rs. 166-10-8 per mensem or Rs. 2,000 per annum.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

OOTACAMUND,
May 1901.

Assistant Secretary to Government.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Copy of telegram from Sec.t Educational to the Director of Public inst.n Madras

State - Secretary

Please send urgently through Acc.tt. General prop.s. Statement raising directors salary from

2000 50 2250 6

2000 100 2500.

Dept.l 20/8/01

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. 20 / Letter only. 50 / Order complete with Letter. 20

Print D with
no Tea
VB

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 139 , 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.

N.B.—

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