E.
20.
—27-12-01.

[illegible]

# Educational (1902) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 782

DATED 20.12.02

⑰

[Despatch Abstract.]

Budget estimates for 1903-04

Returning to the Director for revision the Educational ——

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

---

Stock Form No. 127
2,000—1-5-02.

1

# Educational (1902) Department.

2

urgent

CURRENT No. 1598

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. G. H Stuart, M. A.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

DESPATCHED
24 OCT. 1902

27 OCT 1902

Current No. 7663 of 02

Dated 24th October 1902.

Enclosures 3

Received 27. 10. 1902

Registered 27. 10. 1902

SUBJECT.

Sub: the budget estimate of Expenditure for the Dept. of public instruction for 1903-04 together with certain statements.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

2

24 - 10 - 2 DPI 1598

To

The Secretary to Government,
Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit the budget estimate of expenditure for the Department of public instruction for 1903-04, together with two statements, one showing the rate of pay on 1st April 1903 in the case of appointments to which progressive pay is attached and the other furnishing details of the provision made for "office expenses" and "miscellaneous" under contingencies.

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

F A Stuart
Director of Public Instruction.

---

Notes connected with G.O. No. 5 Finl dt 8/1/03
Notes ~~connected~~ Care with G.O. No 782 Edl dt 20/12/02

[E. & L. 6.]
500—8-9

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1598, From the DPI, Dated 24 - 10 - 1902.

Page 1 of current

Subject. Budget Estimates under 22. Education.

The Director places the estimate under 22. Education at 28.65 lakhs against 27.22 lakhs in the current year. The estimate for the latter year was originally placed at 22.92 lakhs but the Govt. of India first cut it down to 18.38, the figure for 1901-02, and then gave a recurring grant of 8 lakhs. To the latter .84 was added from the special grant of 10 lakhs. It ~~does not~~ appears therefore that the ~~case~~ ensuing year's grant should not exceed 26.38 unless Financial can spare the balance of 2.27.

2. The estimate provides for increase of ~~establishment~~ staff and of salaries in several cases. Some of these increases have been permitted while others are still under consideration. Under the circumstances, all of them may be allowed to stand subject to revision at the time of the preparation of the consolidated estimates in January next.

3. The estimate seems to call for the following remarks:—

(i). Direction. The provision made for the Deputy Director should be raised to Rs 12,000: the idea is that as soon as the creation of the appointment is sanctioned a senior officer of the Indian Service should be put in. The provision for Exchange Compensation allowance should be correspondingly raised.

Page 1 of ct

We know that the G. of I. have recommended the creation of the appt. of Dy. D. to the Secy of State.

(2). Inspection. The Senior inspector who is in receipt of the maximum amount (Rs 500) of one of the Senior allowances is expected to retire before the commencement of the year ~~The provision~~ and his successor will not be entitled to more than Rs 250. The provision under personal allowances may therefore be reduced by Rs 3,000 and a corresponding reduction made under Exchange compensation allowance.

(3). Govt. Colleges, General. The provision for the Professor of mathematics may be reduced to Rs 6,000 and a corresponding reduction made under Exchange compensation allowance.

(4). Govt. Colleges, Professional. College of Agriculture. The provision for petty works of construction should apparently be transferred to the P.W. budget as it exceeds Rs 1,000.

(5). Govt. Schools - General. Primary Schools for boys. There is a provision of Rs 4,000 for petty works of construction under this head. If any of these works cost more than Rs 1,000 it should be transferred to the P.W. budget.

(6). Grants in aid. The lump provision of 2.70 lakhs for subsidy to Local Boards should be transferred to adjusting heads. There is an increase of Rs 7,000 under the latter as compared with the Estimate for 1901-02.

4. If the Financial Departt. agree a draft will be prepared on these lines.

P.J.
11/11/2

Better draft at once.
A.S.
12.11.2

The draft placed below may issue.
Subject to what Finance may say.
A.E.P.

P.J.

Mr Marsden ?

Page 2 of ct

Pages 3 of ct

Page 7 of ct

no

Page 10 11

Page 15

| | |
|---|---|
| 1901-2- | 1,08,000 |
| 1903-4 | ×1,15,000 |
| × excluding | 2,70,000 |

---

First

HM

VPA

It all depends on the money available. The demands of the Edn. Dept are all in accord with the recent results of the "Educational Epidemic" and so far as the Dept is concerned we can spend the amount of this Budget & much more = I suppose the final figures will have to stand over to be settled when Finance knows how much we can have =

M
14 xi. 02

Finance to see for remarks.

Dup 14/11/2

Edl. No. no 381 D
14-11-02

Financial
1098K.
14. XI. 2

Paragraphs 3-(4) and (5) of Educational dept. note:.

In a telephonic message dated the 27th Nov. 1902, in another connection, the D. P. I. has reported that "all buildings to be constructed for "the Educational dept. during 1903-4 "are proposed to be carried out by the "P. W. D, there being none to be executed by "civil officers."

It is submitted that the provi

sion of Rs 1,400 for "Petty works of construction" in the College of Agriculture should be retained in the Educational budget and para. 2 of the draft order should be accordingly amended.

Para. 3 of the draft order should likewise be omitted.

A

Page 7 of C.B

2. Para 3-(6) of Educational Deptt. note

It is submitted that the lump provision of 2.70 lakhs for subsidy to local boards may for the present remain under 22 Education. The transfer of the amount, if retained in the final C. B. E. by the Govt of India, to Adjusting Heads may be effected in the course of the year. ~~There is a lump provision of 2.60 lakhs under grants-in-aid in the C. B. E. for 1902-3, which, however, does not include the lump provision of one lakh for subsidy to local boards entered under Adjusting Heads in the orders of the Local Govt. on the budget estimates of the Educational Deptt. for 1902-3~~

B

Page 15 of C.B

Page 139 C.B.E

Why should it not

for Eco 1123. Finl
11-12-02

3. The budget estimates for 1903-4 of charges of the Educational Deptt. submitted by the D. P. I. modified with reference to the suggestions above compare as under with the

grants for 1902-3:-

| | 22. Education | 30. Stationery and Printing - Printing at Private Presses | Adjusting Head |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Lakhs | Lakhs | Lakhs |
| Budget grant, 1902-3 | 27.22 | .01 | .94 |
| Allotted " 1902-3 | 27.07 | .01 | .94 |
| Revised Estimate, 1902-3 | 26.47 | .01 | 1.12 |
| Budget " 1903-4 proposed by the D.P.I | 28.65 | .01 | 1.15 |
| Budget estimate, 1903-4 modified as above | 28.61. | .01. | 1.15 |

~~4. It is submitted that as suggested in para. 2 of the Educational deptt. note above the budget estimates for 1903-4 under 22 Education may be provisionally accepted at ~~the~~ 28.61 lakhs, subject to revision in January 1904. ~~on the receipt~~~~

~~5. The draft order altered with reference to the remarks in paras 1 and 2 above may, it is submitted, issue for the present.~~

T.H.A
1-12.02

For the C.S.

It is submitted that the B.E. for 190 under 22. Education cannot well be placed at a higher figure than 26.38 lakhs - i.e. at the grant for 1902.3 (27.22)

X

less the allotment of ·84 lakh from the special grant of 10 lakhs. ~~Educational~~ ~~[illegible]~~ This figure (26·38) will include the grant as reduced for 1902-3 + the special grant of 8 lakhs which India have promised as a recurring assignment till the close of the current Provincial settlement

Fin: & Commerce Dept. letter No. 1423 of 10.3.02 on page 5 of G.O. 329 Fin. of 10.4.02.
↓
Flag 5

2 As pointed out at A on p. 4, paras 2 & 3 of the draft order seem to be unnecessary.

3. As regards point B on p. 4, India have stated that there is no objection to the special grant of 8 lakhs being spent on educational buildings ~~under heads other than 22 Education~~ although such expendre. is not debitable to 22 Education. They have also intimated that this grant of 8 lakhs is intended to meet in part the expendre. which will be the outcome of the recommendations of the Simla Conference of 1901. There seems, therefore, to be no objection to the amount required for subsidies to local boards being shown both in the R. E. for 1902-3 & in the B.E. for 1903-4 under Contributions to Local. In submitting the consolidated estimates to India, we can explain that portion of the 8 lakhs grant is so shown. It is better to have the

Home Dept. letter No. 391 of 10. 5. 02 on pp. 2 & 3 of G.O. No. 325 Edl. of 29. 5. 02
↓ Flag 6

Yes.

budget framed so as to avoid transfers during the year. The Local estimates will ~~be~~ ~~[illegible]~~ moreover not show the expend= unless it is placed under Contributions now.

4 Educational may, it is subd, be asked to revise the estimates & the draft order with reference to these remarks

5. The allotted grant under 22 Education for 1902.3 stands at 27·07 lakhs. The Directors' R.E. works out to 26·47, or a saving of ·60 lakh. Seeing that this saving of ·60 virtually comes out of the special grant of 8 lakhs which India have given for Education, it seems to be questionable whether it can be treated as lapsing to the general Provincial balance. It ~~seems~~ is submitted that ~~might be [illegible]~~ India may be asked by telegram whether any such savings can be so treated. The point is of importance since the closing balance of Provincial funds for 1902.3 (i.e. the opening balance for 1903-4) will depend on the reply to this question. It might perhaps be suggested to India that any anticipated lapse in the grant this year might be added to the grant for 1903. 4

Cwl
2.12.02

× I do not follow this argument: From the manner in which the grant is made (see India's first letter para 6.) any savings on ~~the special~~ Edl. grant lapse into the Provl. balances. I do not think any reference need be made × India

What is the amount of [illegible]

8/ anticipated lapses.

2/12/02

**For the C.S.**

The ~~saving~~ lapse according to the Director's revised estimate is ·60 lakhs – as follows.

| | Lakhs |
|---|---|
| B.E. | 27·22 |
| Transfers during the year – Net | ·15 |
| Altered grant | 27·07 |
| R.E. | 26·47 |
| Lapse | ·60 |

C.M.S.
2.12.02

I asked the particulars of this lapse in the 8 lakhs grant.

3/12/02

**For the C.S.**

It is subd. that the 8 lakhs being absorbed in the budget grant of 27·22 it is not possible to compute at present the lapse from that grant as brought out by the Director's revised. The ~~B.E. altered grant irrespective of the 8 lakhs~~ position ~~seems~~ may, it ~~is~~ subd, be viewed as follows:

Perhaps it may [illegible] it suggest. His plan the whole ·60 does not come out of the 8 lakhs. 4/12/02

9

| | Original B.E. as reduced by India | | Special grant | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lakhs | | Lakhs | |
| | 19·22 | — | 8·00 = | 27·2 |
| Transfers — | + ·25 | — | − ·40 — | − ·1 |
| Altered Grant | 19·47 | — | 7·60 — | 27·07 |
| Director's R.E. | | 26·47 | | |

The Director expects to spend 7 lakhs more than the ~~altered~~ original B.E. as reduced by India & as altered during the course of the year. This 7 lakhs has, it is submitted, come out of the 8 lakhs grant which will not be fully spent, if the ~~Director's~~ R.E. is correct, on Education alone

& if the remaining lakh goes into the general balance

C.M.S.
4.12.02

It is unnecessary & inexpedient to earmark the money in this way. It will be sufficient to answer India when it raises any question. Meanwhile let the ordinary financial rules be worked as they are in respect to ordinary cases. We have satisfied India's requirements as far as we can.

4/12/02

The question whether more money can be found to Education than has been the case hitherto must be considered in Jan.y when the Budget is balanced.

V

H 4.12.02

Dd. 110

Educational departt

As regards A on page 44, if all buildings to be constructed for the Educational Departt during 1903-04 are to be carried out by the P.W.D. there should apparently be no provision for the purpose in the Educational budget. The provision made should therefore, it seems, be struck out and not retained. The ~~The follow~~ Director may however be asked for definite information as in the ~~below~~ draft telephone message placed below, before any thing further is done.

A.M.A. C

P.T.
4/12/2

As at C

A.S.P.
5.12.2

[Telephone message dd 5-12-02]

From the D.P.I. dd 6-12-02.

The Director says that the provision is intended for making roads & culverts, constructing drains & such things but that the works will be executed departmentally. ~~[illegible]~~ The provision under College of Agriculture is Rs 1400 and under G.O. No 2631 W dd 3rd October 1901

Dd – Para 1 of appendix A.

~~It~~ it would seem that the amount should go to the P.W. Budget. ~~The~~ Drains & Culverts may be taken as different works but if so it will be only for evading the rules. It is submitted therefore that ~~[illegible]~~ paragraph 3 of the draft seems to be all right.

In other respects Financial has accepted the draft. It has now to go to the H.M.

P.T.
5/12/2

I am inclined to think that the remark at V means not the acceptance of the draft but an intimation from Finance that we should repeat last years grant only; then, next January Finance will see whether they can give the additional amount.

A.S.P.
6.12.2

D

Better let the Budget stand & be cut down later on if necessary
J.A.

For H.M.

A.H.

As to your increases for the Deputy Director I understand that even if a higher grade officer is put on that job the new

Man to replace him will be a Rs 500 wallah. Hence no doubt the Director's figure.

8.12.02

Issue draft

9th Dec.

9.

The provision under Govt. colleges - General - Arts colleges - is accordingly reduced.

9/12/02

Edl u.o. no. 412
9.12.02

desp 9/12/02

Financial DEPT.
U. O. No. 1214 R.
Dated 9. 12. 1902

9.12.2

V Finl dept u.o.

With reference to the note in the Educational Department, dated the 8th December 1902 at D that it is better to let the budget stand and be cut down later on if necessary, it is thought that the Chief Secretary intended at V on page 10 to approve of the suggestion on page 5 of the notes that the budget for 1903-1904 under 22 Education (together with the lump grant for subsidy to local boards proposed to be transferred to Adjusting heads), should not be placed at a higher figure than 26.38 lakhs.

Page 11 of notes

For orders whether the Educational department may be asked to alter the budget accordingly.

F.H.R. 10.12.02

10.12.02

It seems better to place the Educational Budget as low as possible and to add to it afterwards when we know what our resources are. If then the Budget can be reduced at the close. It would seem that the Budget can be reduced from the above rates.

11/12/02

u.o 1214 R

Edl. u.o.

Educational Departt.

For orders.

The H.M. has approved of the suggestion at D on page 11 supra.—

12/12/02

If the H.M. ready to reconsider the matter — I thought it best to make the Budget as high as is necessary at first & cut it down later on — we want to keep our Educn. figures as high as possible as every anna can be spent.

12th Dec.

I do not know the grounds of X on page 5 of the notes. But I supposed that this was a preliminary estimate of requirements & intended to give the minds of the Dept as to its necessities — which have hereafter to be accommodated to the facts of the money available. That would seem

14

wiser procedure than of adding [illegible] if the fact of more money available becomes apparent. I would therefore accept the figures.

15.12.02

Seen by Secy

Fin. dept. [illegible]

Desp 15/12/2

Edl no. No. 4198
15.12.02

Financial DEPT.
U.O. No. 1243R.
Dated 15. 12. 1902

CHIEF SECRETARY
15 DEC 1902
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

P.T.O

---

15

For the CS

Please see remarks (h) and (m) on page 2 of the budget estimates.

Page 4 of C. 7

2. The Educational dept. draft order on the D. P. I.'s letter R.c. No 7197, dated the 3rd October 1902, in the linked file proposes to sanction only two of the several proposals made; viz to raise the pay of clerks in the offices of ordinary sub-assistant inspectors from Rs 15 to Rs 15-1-20 and to strengthen these offices by the appointment of permanent attenders.

U.O. No 1223. R
11-12.02

3. The alterations necessitated in the budget under 22 Education on this account are the following:-

Page 6 of C. 7

(i) Of the 61 clerks on Rs 15 each under Sub-assistant inspectors' establishment, 52 clerks should be shown as on Rs 15-1-20 and the remaining 9 on Rs 15. As the 52 clerks will continue to draw Rs 15 only in the first year, no additional provision will be required in the budget for 1903-4.

(ii) Provision should be made for 52 attenders under Sub-assistant

Rs 53 × 10 × 12 = 6,360.

inspector's establishment, ie Rs 6,360.

(iii) The lump provision ~~of~~ Rs 6,200 for temporary establishment under the same head should be reduced to Rs 2,200 with reference to para. 4 of Educational dept. note dated 21st Novr 1902 on the D. P. I's letter referred to in para 2 above.

Page 4

In the linked file

(iv) The whole of the lump provision of Rs 12,000 in the budget for revision of establishment of inspecting offices should be eliminated.

Page 6 of C. F.

These alterations will reduce the budget allotment under 22 Education by Rs 9,640.

4. It is submitted that the ~~[illegible]~~ Educational Dept may be asked to consider & carry out the necessary revision of the draft order & of the estimates. Ed. may also be asked to carry out in the estimates the other alterations necessitated by the draft order.

E.

[illegible] 16.12.02

Cud. 16.12.02

Ed. u.o

17/12/02

---

10 P. 12

Educational Departt

Certain proposals of the Director are approved in the draft order in the linked file and the Financial Departt suggest that the budget estimates under 22 - B. Inspection may at once be revised accordingly. It will however be observed that no proposition statement has been received from the Director as yet - one is only called for in the draft - and there is no definite information before Govt. as to how much can be deducted from the provision for temporary attenders. The best course seems therefore to be to issue the order as now passed and to wait for the proposition statet. Some other alterations also may be necessary before the middle of January and all these may be effected at one and the same time.

2. As regards E on page 16 it is submitted that Educational seems to be responsible for only the draft order.

I agree. The Hon. Member has passed the draft order & I think it should issue as it stands. The course proposed in the Fin. note would entail much trouble

17/12/2

& delay

Surely, the alterations at E.K can be carried out more satis:factorily by the trained acctts. under Mr Schmidt ~~than~~ by our men; it is perfectly certain that if our clerks corrected the budget in M.S. every figure they wrote would have to be checked & rechecked, & examined by the Financial dept. If I am not mistaken, the pro:posal that we should proceed as at E.K is novel.

A.J.P.

17.12.2

I agree that we must wait for proposition statements before altering the Budget figures.

As to E – I cannot say what the Customs has been but it seems to me the Finance Depts are better able to do this work than we are.

JM
18 xii 2

To the Finl. Departt. No.

Financial
No. 1268R.
Dated 19. 12. 1902

Edl. No. No 426D
19–12–02

Desk 19/12/2

---

Financial DEPARTMENT.

148 13

For the C.S.

It is submitted that this dept. cannot accept estimates containing provisions which, from information supplied by the administrative dept, are in excess of probable requirements. The argument that other alterations may also be necessary before the middle of January would support the inclusion of lump allotments in every budget & would virtually abolish the practice of working out ~~[illegible]~~ budgets in detail. The position is, it is submitted, that according to the a decision arrived at in the Edl. dept. certain allotments proposed in the Edl. budget are in excess of what Govt. are prepared to sanction. These allotments should therefore be reduced so far as can be safely done on the information now before Govt. The entire Provincial Estimates will shortly be consolidated ~~[illegible]~~ & the position of Provl. funds during the next year will depend on the totals of individual budgets. It does not seem to be right, it is subd. that one dept. should lock up Provl. funds (which may, for all we know, be required by) ~~against~~ other spending depts. The inclusion of ~~[illegible]~~ allotments for ~~[illegible]~~ new charges which have not been sanctioned by competent authority is, moreover, against the rules

Financial

governing the preparation of budgets [§ 155(g) of the C. A. Code.]

As regards the correction of the estimates in Ed., the procedure which was accepted four years ago is described in rule 284A of the Office Manual [Ed. called for the original of the paper in which this procedure was adopted as regards the budgets falling to that dept, but cannot now lay its hands on the paper]. It will be seen that the estimates should be returned "corrected" to Financial. The estimates will, of course, be checked here thoroughly, but it is subd. that Ed. should do its part of the work. Revenue budgets are worked on this system without any difficulty. The system affords a double check which is necessary & useful

Has V

Cml
15.12.02

I have spoken to the Secy. Ed. and he now agrees that the Ed. Dept must correct the estimates & get them corrected thro' the D.P.I. Send the estimates back to Ed. therefore. The second question of principle raised above must be circulated. Prepare in form as directed.

20/12/02

Fin.

128
14

Spoke about this matter this morning and he stated that in his note above he had dealt with the matter only as Member in charge of the Educational Dept. and not from the Financial point of view and that the Budget was now to be dealt with from the latter standpoint. As there is practically no likelihood that the finances will allow of an extra assignment to Ed. of 2.23 lakhs extra this year it will save time if Ed. will examine the Budget again and indicate where it can be cut down to that extent. Meanwhile for Fin. purposes the grant to Ed. will be taken at 26.38 lakhs.

20/12/02

T.B.
18.12
Cml

The grant of 26.38 lakhs has been ~~[illegible]~~ entered in the Budget Register for Financial purposes. It is submitted that the file may now go to Education.

20/12/02

Ed. no

Educational Departt.

The revised draft placed below may issue.

20/12/02

21.12.02

Educational Departt

Telephone.

From the Secretary Educational Departt

To the D.P.I.

In the budget Estimate under 22-Education for 1903-04 there is a provision of Rs 1,400 for petty works of construction under Govt. Colleges-Professional-College of Agriculture and of Rs 4,000 under Govt. Schools-General-Primary Schools for boys. Will you please say what the works concerned are and if they are to be executed by the P.W.D.

P.J.
4/12/2.

5.12

Please despatch & return original.

P.J.
5/12/2

No.
15.58
5.12.02

Educational Depart

Telephone.

From the Secretary Educational
Depart

To the DPI.

In the budget estimate under
22-Education for 1903-04 there is a
provision of Rs4100 for petty works of
construction under Govt Colleges - Professional
- Colleges, Agriculture and of Rs4000 under
Schools - General - Primary Schools
[illegible] will you please say what
[illegible]

---

V 37

16

Code. }
Class. }

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly }
Number. }

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **To** (Office) Telephonic | | | | **From** (Office) Message | |
| **Words.** | **Day.** 6 | **Hour.** 17 | **Minute.** 5 | **Official Instructions.** | |
| **To** (Person) Secretary Educnl = dept | | | | **From** (Person) Director of Public Instruction | |

Reply.

Your telephone message of yesterday. The works cannot now be specified. The allotments are required for the execution of such works as may be found necessary in the course of the year, ~~a~~ as for instance the making of roads and culverts the construction of drains etc in the farm attached to the college of Agriculture. The Vice principal says the increased allotment is necessary to keep the farm in good order. The work are not to be executed by the P.W.D. but will be done departmentally

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recd. from | LN. | Sent to | LN. | |
| At Hrs. Mts. by | | At Hrs. Mts. by | | Telegraph Master. |

64 Word Form.

F. C. 2.

O G P—No. 307 T—2] 10 1901—400000

[E. / 12] 1,000—7-5-02.

Revised draft.

17

20

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

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

" " " " ........, " ........ 190 .

*READ ALSO:*—

C. No. 1598, From the D.P.I., No. 7663, dated 24—10— 1902

" " ........, " " ........, " ........, " ........ 190 .

" " ........, " " ........, " ........, " ........ 190 .

**ORDER**

Mis

No. 782, dated 20th December 1902.

The Estimates are returned to the Director for revision. They should be framed for 26.38 lakhs which is the total of the normal allotment and the special grant of 8 lakhs given by the Govt. of India.

D.P.I.
28/12/2

21/xii/02

21. 12. 2

To the D.P.I. with Estimates. P.T.O.

Despatched
21/12/2

*hen given for copying* ____
*en copied* ____ } 190 .
*en examined* ____
*en signed* ____

o AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
190 .

URRENT 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, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

*N.B.*—

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