

85 2
Educational (1905) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 475

DATED 11-7-05

28

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Building Grant.

Informing the D. S. I with reference to no. 474
of 11-7-05, that the execution of mortgage
deeds in the cases referred to by him
may be dispensed with.

8

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[E.]
1,500-12-12

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
The Secretary, United Free Church of Scotland Mission		6-4-05	1-5
D.P.I.	5644	7-4-05	6-11

Educational (1905) Department.

(2)

From

[Name] _____

[Designation] Secretary to the United Free Church of Scotland
Mission

[Station] Royapuram.

No. _____

Dated 6-4-1905

Enclosures

Received 7-7-4- 1905

Registered _____ 190_____

SUBJECT.

Forwarding copy of his letter to the Director of Public Instruction in connection with the application made by him for building grant.

BACK PAPERS.

166-10-3-04
131-6-3-05

FURTHER PAPERS.

7K-84

Edl CURRENT No. 667 4

The number of
SOS are awarded 10

United Free Church Of Scotland Mission
Royapuram Madras 6th April 1905.

The Secretary To Government

Educational Department.

Sir,

With reference to my personal interview with you on Monday the 3rd instant anent building grant for Rs 2333/ sanctioned in G.O.No 166 of 10th March 1904 at which you kindly asked me to forward to you a copy of my last letter to the Director of Public Instruction on the subject.

I have the honour to forward herewith copy of the letter referred to. As I explained to you in person there are special reasons why this grant should be treated apart altogether from the general question of mortgage deeds on the buildings for which grants are given. One reason is the fact that this particular grant was promised so long ago as 1901, long before the indenture question had been raised and that the grant was applied for in deference to the desire of the Inspectress that we should secure a more commodious building for the particular school using it. A second reason is the fact that the money used to purchase the building for which grant was applied for is involved in what is known as the "Scottish Church dispute" and that therefore we are not in a position at present to give a mortgage deed with a clear title on the building in question even if there were no other difficulties in the way. At the same time we are able to offer abundant security for the amount drawn in other ways. Indeed Government has ample security in its own hands in the monthly and annual grants drawn by our different schools, about seventy in number, which last year amounted to no less than Rs 20,000/-. Were we at any time to violate the conditions on which the present grant was given Government

vernment could by stopping our ordinary grants for only two months, more than recover the amount under consideration.

In these circumstances, and without at all touching the question of building grants in general I shall be glad if the Execution of a mortgage deed can be departed from in the present case and a G.O. issued cancelling G.O. No 131 of 6th March 1905 so far as the United Free Church Mission is concerned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

John Stewart
Secretary.

2 Encl

P.S. I regret that owing to my unavoidable absence from Madras for some days I have been unable to send the copy of letter to the Director encl.

4
6
United Free Church Of Scotland Mission

Royapuram Madras 21st March 1905.

Copy.

The Director of Public Instruction

Madras.

Sir,

I am in receipt of your proceedings No 1748 of 1905 dated 20th March 1905 forwarding G.O. No 131 of 6th March 1905 instructing you to reject any further application for building grant made by the U.F.C. Mission until we accept and execute the deeds of acceptance in the form prescribed by the Government.

I have the honour to point out that in submitting the matter to Government you were in error in referring to the grant under consideration as having been paid "under the special permission" given by Government authorising "the payment of certain building grants before the close of the official year, on the managers to whom these grants were due, promising to execute the deeds required by Government within a reasonable time". The particular grant referred to never came under that category as it was dealt with entirely on its own merits and the Government in issuing the order to reject any further application for building grant have apparently been misled to some extent by the reference made in your paper to the case coming under the category of grants for the payment of which the special permission referred to was given and have evidently overlooked the fact that in terms of their order No 166 "Educational" dated 10th March 1904 we were specially exempted from signing the deed of acceptance in the form prescribed as far as the particular grant under consideration was concerned. The then Secretary to Government made this perfectly clear to me in a personal interview which I had with him, the wording of the G.O. referred to fully confirming this. The payment of the grant was ordered to be made "on the understanding that the manager will execute any reasonable agreement that may be required to safeguard the interests of Government", these words being quoted from my letter to the Secretary to Government on the subject in which I expressed my willingness to execute such

such an agreement. In your letter of 21st April 1904 you asked me to furnish you with a copy of the agreement which I was prepared to sign. As the matter was at that time under consideration by the Mission Council on aided education, I asked you kindly to defer it until the latter had arrived at some decision. But in my letter of 23rd January 1905 I sent you a copy of the deed which I was prepared to sign, and which I hold thoroughly safe guards the interests of Government in the matter and therefore meets the requirements of G.O. No 166 of 10th March 1904. ~~but~~ Instead of agreeing to accept this or pointing out in what respect it fails to comply with the requirements of the G.O. referred to, the Government without any explanation goes back on that order entirely and orders all building grants to be stopped until the indenture in the form which has been objected to is signed.

I shall be obliged if you will kindly request Government to be so good as to point out in what respect the proposed deed of acceptance submitted by me fails to meet the requirements of G.O. No 166 of 10th March 1904. I have the honour to request the favour of an early reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

John Stewart
Secretary.

Educational (190⁵) Department.

CURRENT No. 682

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. A. G. Bourne, D.Sc., I.R.S.

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction.

[Station] Madras.

Defon No. 5694/1

Dated 7 April 1905.

Enclosures one

Received 8 - APR 1905 190 .

Registered 8 - 4 - 1905



SUBJECT.

Building grant: — Submitting with remarks a Communication from the Secretary, K. I. C. M. Kayapuram, regarding his proposed deed of acceptance for grant drawn by him.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

7K. 8.4.

7
To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

K
H
With reference to G.O. No. 131 Educational, d/6th March 1905, I have the honour to submit a copy of a letter received from the Secretary, United Free Church of Scotland Mission, in which he requests me to ask Government to let him know in what respects the proposed deed of acceptance submitted by him fails to meet the requirements of G.O. No. 166 of 10th March 1904. I do not know whether it is necessary to give any reasons. Government have perused the deed of acceptance submitted by the Secretary with his letter dated 23rd January 1905, and have come to the conclusion that it is not such as is required to safeguard their interests. A mere reference to the deeds which have been finally approved by Government should have enabled the Secretary to find out for himself in what respects the deed of acceptance he has proposed differs from those required by Government, but there is one point about which some doubt arises which probably has suggested to Mr. Stewart the reference he now makes, though he does not mention it explicitly. The form of deed submitted by him does not, I think, necessitate the handing over of the title deeds to Government, though the mortgage deed required by Government, in the case of grants above Rs 1,000/, necessitates the deposit of title deeds. Finding that in Bengal the title deeds relating to the property mortgaged to Government, on account of building grants, are allowed to remain with the mortgager, after making enquiries from the Director of Public Instruction, Bengal, about the circumstances that led to such a course being adopted, I

8
9
asked the Government Solicitor to let me know whether there would be any legal objection to the adoption of the same procedure in this presidency and to address the Government on the subject if he thought that the Bengal plan could be followed here. He replied saying that he was unable to advise that the system of allowing the mortgagers to retain their title deeds should be adopted. His view was supported by the Advocate-General. Para 2 of G.O. No. 166 Educational, dated 10th March 1904, which dealt with Mr. Stewart's case seems however to suggest that the handing over of the title deeds was not contemplated as a necessary condition for the execution of the deed. I am not sure whether in preparing his own deed the Secretary, United Free Church of Scotland Mission, did not assume, on the strength of this paragraph, that there was no necessity for leaving the deeds with Government during the currency of the deed. I presume, however, that it is not the intention of Government to dispense with this condition even now in the case of the United Free Church Mission in view of the legal difficulties that may arise.

As for Mr. Stewart's surmise in the second para of his letter, I cannot agree with him that there is any evidence or likelihood of Government having been misled by the terms of Ref on Cur No. 5694 of 1901, dated 7th February 1905. The case is fully dealt with in the last para of that letter and Government were themselves aware of all circumstances that led to his case being dealt with exceptionally. Government have not demanded a refund of the grant paid to him on the strength of the G.O. No. 166, dated 10th March 1904, which left open for the time being the form of agreement which would be required; but they merely lay down the conditions upon which alone further applications for building grants made by the United Free Church of Scotland Mission can be entertained, because they find that the deed proposed is not such as is required to

safeguard their interests. The manager has therefore no cause for complaint as he has not suffered in any way.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. G. Bowers

Director of public instruction.

10
11
Copy of a letter from the Secretary, United Free Church of Scotland Mission, Rayapiram, Madras, dated 21st March 1905.

K "I am in receipt of your Proceedings No. 1748 of 1905, dated 20th March 1905 forwarding G.O.No. 131 Educational, dated 6th March 1905 instructing you to reject any further application for building grant made by the United Free Church Mission until we accept and execute the deeds of acceptance in the form prescribed by the Government.

H I have the honour to point out that in submitting the matter to Government you were in error in referring to the grant under consideration as having been paid "under the special permission" given by Government authorizing "the payment of certain building grants before the close of the official year, on the managers to whom these grants were due promising to execute the deeds required by Government within a reasonable time." The particular grant referred to never came under that category as it was dealt with entirely on its own merits and the Government in issuing the order to reject any further application for building grant have apparently been misled to some extent by the reference made in your paper to the case coming under the category of grants for the payment of which the special permission referred to was given and have evidently overlooked the fact that in terms of their own order No. 166 Educational dated 10th March 1904 we were specially exempted from signing the deed of acceptance in the form prescribed as far as the particular grant under consideration was concerned. The then Secretary to Government made this perfectly clear to me in a personal interview which I had with him and the wording of the G.O. referred to fully confirmed this. The payment of the grant was ordered to be made "on the understanding that the manager will execute any reasonable agreement that may be required to safeguard the interests of Government," these words being quoted from my letter to the Secretary to Government on the subject in which I expressed my willingness to execute such an agreement. In your letter of 21st April 1904 you asked me to furnish you with a copy of the agreement which

Educational (190⁵) Department.

CURRENT No. 959

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras.

This is similar to the case of the
United Free Church of Scotland
Evangelical Union rules
and conditions and can be
land by the private rule of
Society or Association. If the
letter cannot conform to go.

regulation, they had difference
with the aid.
The balance of fund should
not be paid until the provided
agreement is executed
Wm
22/5/05

R.C. No. 5272/2

Dated 20th May 1905

Enclosures

Received 22 MAY 1905 1905

Registered 23-5-1905

SUBJECT.

Requesting orders of Government on the procedure of the Manager,
American Mission Training School for Mistresses, Madura in regard to
the execution of the necessary mortgage deed.

BACK PAPERS.

to 685-25-11-01 Mrs
" 564-16-9-02 Mrs
" 328-9-07-12-07
" 737-11-12-07 Mrs

FURTHER PAPERS.

Encl 1 to 6682 & all of 05

2

The Secretary to Government,
Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit the following case for the orders of Government.

2. In G.O. No. 685, Educational, dated 25th November 1901 a grant of Rs. 12,000 was sanctioned to be paid in three annual instalments for the construction of a building for the American Mission Training School for Mistresses, Madura. The grant was subsequently raised to Rs. 19666 and the condition as to the payment by instalment was removed in G.O. No. 564, Educational, dated 16th September 1902.

3. The execution of the work by the Public Works Department was also sanctioned by Government in its order No. 3389/W dated 7th December 1901 which was communicated with order No. 737 Educational, dated 11th December 1901.

4. In February 1903 payment of an advance grant of Rs. 19,000 was made on condition that the funds required to complete the work be lodged in the Bank of Madras to the credit of the P.W.D. This was accordingly done by the Manager. Payment of the grant previous to the completion of the work was not in accordance with the provisions of the Grant-in-aid Code, but an exception seems to have been made because the work was to be carried out by the P.W. Department and the whole money required for the execution of the work was to be lodged in the Bank to its credit.

5.

3

14

-- 2 --

5. On the 29th March last the Manager submitted the necessary completion certificate with the request that the grant still due to him viz., Rs. 666 may be paid. He was informed that he had to execute a mortgage deed and was required to submit the title deeds relating to the site on which the building has been constructed together with an encumbrance certificate. The following is his reply.

"Our Mission and the American Board cordially recognize the justness of the claims of Government on aided buildings as promulgated in the Fort St. George Gazette of April 10, 1900, "Grant-in-aid Code", Chapter VIII Para. 4, and we are quite prepared to pledge ourselves to abide by the claims as set forth in that rule. I note also that in Para. 3 (ii) of the same chapter it is laid down that a "manager shall also, if required, execute a deed of agreement in such form as may be prescribed from time to time".

But when our application for aid was made these were the only conditions required, and in our correspondence with the Hon. G.H. Stuart, then Director of Public Instruction, no further conditions were laid down, and no deed of agreement was prescribed. Nor in all our dealings with the Department of Public Instruction was there any intimation that any further conditions, such as mortgaging our property to Government, was even under consideration.

I have a further difficulty in complying with your request that a mortgage deed be made out, in the Rules and Regulations of our American Board. Under the heading, "Property of the Board" its rule reads, "none of its property is to be mortgaged or assigned for any debt without authorization of the Prudential Committee." plainly it would be illegal for me to make out such a deed as required, mortgaging the property included in the Girls' School, without authorization of the Prudential Committee. And

supposing

supposing that such authorization were given for the future, I am afraid they would not willingly give it for property secured when no such conditions were specified.

Just now the title deeds of the property are all filed in the District Munsif's Court in connection with a civil suit concerning the eastern boundary where certain idols are affected. This has been running for many months and is now adjourned until the 25th August.

No objection for
approval in form the
Munsif's Court
has been received

Considering, then, the conditions that were specified when the grants were made and the building constructed, and the difficulties involved in complying with the new requirements I respectfully request that the mortgage deed be not required. I have no objection to securing and submitting a registered copy of our title deeds."

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

E W Middlemast

For Director of Public Instruction.

B.L.
19-5-05

[E.
2.]
1,500-3-12-01

C. No. _____ From the _____ No. _____, dated _____ 190 _____

SUBJECT. Execution of Building grant
Agreements by the Secretary of
the United Free Church of Scotland
Mission.

Mr. Stewart urges that the grant to the
Free Church Mission was dealt with on
its own merits as a special case after
personal interview with Mr. Cardew
and was not intended to form one
of a group of cases.

2. Put up G.O. no. 131 Edl dated
6th March 1905 and G.O. no. 160 Edl
dated 10th March 1904, with notes.

H. D. J. 3-4-05

Submitted

P. J. J. 4-4-05

Execution of Building grant
Agreements by the Secretary of
the United Free Church of Scotland
Mission.

Mr. Stewart urges that the grant to the
Free Church Mission was dealt with on
its own merits as a special case after
personal interview with Mr. Cardew
and was not intended to form one
of a group of cases.

2. Put up G.O. no. 131 Edl dated
6th March 1905 and G.O. no. 160 Edl
dated 10th March 1904, with notes.
H. D. J. 3-4-05

Submitted

P. J. J. 4-4-05

My dear Caroline

Will you please
look through the enclosed files
and let me know with
reference to you with on the
penultimate page of Al 166
10300

(The 166) whether any
particular form of agreement
or undertaking was then
contemplated

Yours sincerely
Edmund B. 166 Howard



18

Madras - 5th Apr. 05

My dear Taylor,

The answer to your D.O. of yesterday, as far as I understand it, is in the negative.

In March 1904 the objections to the deeds prescribed in G.O. 644 & 529 dated 23.12. & 26.10. 1903 had already arisen, & it was known that the form of the deeds would have to be revised. That has since been done in L.P. No 513. D. dated 16 Aug 04. But in March 1904 it was not known in what respects revision would be necessary & therefore no "particular form of agreement or undertaking" could then have been contemplated.

Yours sincerely
H. Cardew.

I meant "was it intended to accept any special form of agreement with the Free Church Mission."

H.

I understand that a further representation is coming through the D.P.I. Await its receipt.

H.D.J. 6-4-05

~~From~~ the Secretary, United Free Church Mission 864.
From the D.P.I. no. 5694. dated 7-4-05.

Pages 2+3 of Cf.

In his letter of the 6th April 1905
The Secretary of the United Free Church Mission requests that the execution of a mortgage deed may not be insisted ^{on} in the case of the building grant sanctioned for the U.F.C. Mission Girls' School, North Block Town and ^{that} G.O. no. 131 Edl dated 6th March 1905 may be cancelled so far as the U.F.C. Mission is concerned.

K

2. The case is as follows:—

A grant of Rs 2,383 towards the purchase of a building for the U.F.C. Mission Girls' School was sanctioned on the 10th July 1903 — G.O. no. 331 Edl D 10.7-03.

V

The Grant in aid Code then in force said:—

"The Manager shall also, if required, execute a deed of agreement in such form as may be prescribed from time to time". vide rule 114 of the Code for 1903-04. Managers of Schools were not, however, until then required to

Pubup.

to execute any deeds nor had any form of deed been then prescribed. But in G.O. no. 305 Rd dated 23rd June 1903 the provision in the Grant in aid Code above referred to had been altered by omitting the words "if required" but the notification ordering the change had not then been published in the Gazette. (It was published only on the 14th June 1903). Thus the Secy of the U.F.C. mission practically had no notice that he would be required to execute a mortgage deed in respect of the grant sanctioned for the school. But before he could complete the purchase and draw the grant the execution of a mortgage deed had become a necessity and he took objection to the deeds presented in G.O. nos. 529 & 644 Rd dated 26th Oct. & 23rd Dec. 1903 respectively. And as it was then known that these deeds would have to be revised payment of the grant was sanctioned on the understanding that the Secretary of the U.F.C. Mission would execute any reasonable agreement that might be required to safeguard the interests of Govt. - G.O. no. 160 Rd & 10-30-04. The mortgage deed was subsequently revised in G.O. no. 634 Rd & 20th Oct. 1904. As the Secretary was not inclined to execute

even this deed and proposed to execute a deed of acceptance prepared by him, the Director brought the facts to the notice of Govt. and Govt. ordered the Director to reject any further application for building grants made by the U. F. C. M. until it accepted and executed the deed required by Govt. G.O. no. 131 Edl & 6th March 1905.

3. The Secretary of the Mission requests the cancellation of the above order on the grounds that the grant in question was promised in 1901 long before the question of executing a mortgage deed for building grants was raised and that owing to the "Scottish Church dispute" at home the Mission authorities in India are not in a position at present to give a mortgage deed with clear title on the building in question. These are the grounds urged in the Secretary's letter to Govt.; in his letter to the Director he contends that under G.O. no. 160 Edl & 10-3-04 he is specially exempted from executing a mortgage deed. This is not correct and as he has not repeated this in his letter to Govt. the Secy has apparently given it up.

J.H.
1-5-05

In the letter of the Secretary of the United Free Church of Scotland Mission, addressed to the

K

H

A very good reason
for not making
them grants
H

Pages 10 + 11 of c.f.
also pages 4 + 5

very good reason
for not making
them grants
H

DDP he simply asks for information as to how the deed of acceptance submitted by him fails to meet the requirements of 80-100 166 of 10th March 1904. It is submitted that no useful purpose can be served by furnishing this information - but so long as the Scottish Church dispute remains unsettled he will be under a real disability to execute the deed required by Govt.

PH 3/5/5 H 4/5/5

How can it hurt the Secretary to affix his signature? Surely the other side would not think of naming him personally?
H

Submitted that at present he has no title to the property.
K
PH

Sec 4 Please see 90 136 SE 61 Macle 1901
In the course of an interview I gathered from the Rev J Stewart that he was under the apprehension that the grant already made and paid would be withdrawn. No steps to this effect have been moved, nor are they contemplated. The Rev Secy. also seems to think that some slur has been cast on his Mission by its being pilloried in the G.O.

2 He states that he had an assurance from Mr Cairns that the offer of agreement proposed by him would, in the circumstances be accepted. Please see Mr Cairns note on page 7 of the file 28-0 166 ED 10/3/04 which rather bears out this view - but Mr Cairns reply to my DD. reference (p.3. supra) does not support this view.

3. In any case I do not see how the

10

p. 4 of p. 11 - H.

terms of G.O. 131 No. 6th March 1905 can affect
 the United Free Church Mission. Mr Stewart
 refers to the opinion of his legal advisers,
 but overlooks the fact that he has no legal
 claim to any future grants - G.O. 131
 affects the future only.

3. Rev Mr Stewart told me that he was
 prepared to execute the deed in the
 case of any future grants. If he is
 in a position to execute that deed in the
 case of future grants he can equally
 well do so in respect of the grant
 under reference, which G.O. is then
 G.O. 131, now under appeal, make
 a condition antecedent to future
 grants in the case of this mission.

It is submitted that there are no
 sufficient grounds for altering or
 modifying the G.O. in question

HST
 7.5.05

my.

[E.]

1,500-7-10-03.

C. No. 959 From the D.P.D.

No 5272/2 dated 20-5-1905.

SUBJECT.

Executing the mortgage deed by
managers ^{of schools} receiving building grants.

This is similar to the ~~one~~ case of the United Free Church of Scotland.

Government prescribes ^{its} own rules and conditions and cannot be bound by the private rules of Societies or associations. If the latter cannot conform to Government regulations, they must dispense with Government aid.

A | The balance of grant should not be paid till the prescribed agreement is executed.

H.D.T.

22.5.05.

For orders as to whether the D.P.D. may be informed as at A above or as to whether the orders of the Honble Member on the Case of the United Free Church Mission of Scotland referred to Supra should be awaited.

26/7/5

7/11

29-5-05

File went to H.M. on 4.5.

14/29/515

M | The real question is whether S.O 160 dated 18th March 1905 - is to be specifically enforced in respect of grants made, or promised prior to its issue. The line of argument

adopted by these minority bodies is
 that ~~as~~ as not specific form
 of greenback ~~is~~ to mortgage was
 prescribed at the time of the grant,
 they are not bound to execute the
 new forms.

The old G. & A. code says
 "The Manager shall also, if required,
 execute a deed of agreement in
 such form as may be prescribed from
 time to time".

The argument appears to be that
 "agreement does not include a mortgage".

In the present case there is no
 reason why the Local Agent of
 the Mission should not obtain
 the sanction of his Prudential
 Committee to the execution of the
 prescribed deed.

If it be not executed should
 further grants be made to this body?

ADJ
 30.1.07

Am.

Please see notes in the linked file.

2. A draft is placed below for approval.

Sum 7.4.
 3.7.05
 14.4.05
 ADJ
 57.05

Best
 Am
 Mue
 on

[E.]
12

1,000-24-9-04.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.

dated

190

" " " " " "

190

READ ALSO:-

C. No. 667, From the Secy., U. N. C. S. M.

No. dated 6th April 1905.

" 682 " " D.P.I.

" 5694/1, " 7th April 1905.

" 959 " " "

" 5272/2, " 20th May 1905.

ORDER

No. 475, dated 11-) - 1905.

his

beck - 10-7.

p. 4 of the notes in the
linked file.

With reference to G.O. no. 47480
of this date, the D.P.I. is informed
that the execution of mortgage deeds
in the cases referred to in his
letters read above may be dis-
pensed with.

7H.	M	A2
3-7-05	U. N. C. S. M.	5-7-07

h
6702

To

The D.P.I. 940.

25/10/14
14/7/15

When the Paul to the Free Church
 Mission was dealt with on its own
 merits as a special case after being
 passed in favour of the Church
 Feb. 1. 1877
 it was not intended to form one
 of a group of cases.

28

When put up

K.
$$\begin{array}{r} \text{G. 6. } 131 \text{ 20.} \\ \hline 6 \text{ 2 07.} \end{array}$$

H.
$$\begin{array}{r} \text{L. 166} \\ \hline 16 \text{ 166 07.} \end{array}$$

but when

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{A} \\ \hline 3. 4. 03 \end{array}$$

Submitted.

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{P. 7} \\ \hline 4 \frac{3}{4} / 4/5 \end{array}$$

A statement that a further representation is
 coming through B.P.D. Await its receipt.

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{P. 7} \\ \hline 6 \text{ 4} \end{array}$$

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

190 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
 190 .

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, 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.