[E.]

200—17-12-02.

Educational (1906) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 301

DATED 28- 4- 06.

[illegible] Rw 10/5/06

[Despatch Abstract.]

Govt

[illegible] University, that orders, placing [illegible] disposal of the Syndicate [illegible]: J. D. W. Sewell, will issue in the Financial Department.

BACK PAPERS.

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

THER PAPERS.

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

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

1

Recd.	1906.	*Enclosures*	
Regd.		*Spare copies*	

G.O., No. 301, 28th April 1906.

16

Grant.

Informing the Registrar, Madras University, that orders placing an additional — of Rs. 500 at the disposal of the Syndicate towards the payment of honorarium to the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell, S. J., will issue in the Financial Department.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

Letter—from C. A. PATERSON, Esq., M.A., LL.B., Registrar, University of Madras.
To—the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.
Dated—the 26th March 1906.
No.—888.

I have the honour, by direction, to forward to you for the information of Government a copy of a letter, dated the 16th March 1906, from the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell, S.J.

Dr. S. Satyanathan was originally appointed a member of the Commission for the inspection of colleges but after having spent two months in inspecting the mufassal colleges had to leave India. The Rev. J. D. W. Sewell was then appointed to take his place in inspecting the Madras Colleges, and the Syndicate proposed to divide the honorarium as follows: Rs. 2,000 to Dr. S. Satyanathan and Rs. 500 to the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell.

Reports on the inspection of the individual colleges were prepared as the colleges were inspected.

But after the inspection of all the colleges was finished, a general report had to be prepared. The Rev. J. D. W. Sewell took part in preparing this general report as explained in his letter. Also to that general report various statistical tables are appended. To the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell was assigned the work of preparing these tables and seeing them through the press. This additional work was not anticipated when the Syndicate offered him the honorarium of Rs. 500. The Syndicate is of opinion that his honorarium should be at least Rs. 1,000.

I have accordingly been directed by the Syndicate to ask that Government may be pleased to place at the disposal of the Syndicate an additional grant of Rs. 500 which will be paid to the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell for his extra work in connection with the preparation and printing of the general report and the statistical tables.

ENCLOSURE.

Letter—from the Rev. J. D. W. SEWELL, S.J.
To—the Registrar of the Madras University.
Dated—the 16th March 1906.

In October last year you wrote to me by order of the Syndicate, inviting me to join the Commission for the inspection of the affiliated colleges and offering me Rs. 500 for the work. I accepted the invitation and joined the Commission on the 9th October 1905.

From the 9th to the 21st October the Commission was engaged in the work of inspecting the Madras colleges, in revising a portion of the reports of the mufassal colleges and in deciding on the form of the general report.

The Commission then adjourned to the 25th November but did not, I think, meet till the 28th idem, when the sittings were resumed in the Director's Office and, Sundays excepted, were continued daily till the 19th December and usually from 11 A.M. till 4 or 5 P.M.

During these sittings the remainder of the reports on individual colleges were revised and passed for the press, the general report was read, discussed at length and typed and, it being thought advisable to prepare separate summaries of the defects noticed by the Commission in their reports on the several colleges in order to emphasise them, draft summaries of the defects of about half of the total number of colleges were prepared, read and approved.

When the Commission adjourned on the 19th December, I was asked to undertake the preparation of the statistical returns and it was further arranged that the drafts of the summaries of defects of the remaining colleges should be sent to the members who were remaining in Madras, myself among the number, for revision, and that the general report and such of the summaries as had already been approved should be printed and the statistical returns prepared for the final meetings of the Commission which, it was then hoped, might take place early in January.

The Christmas holidays next intervened, the Director had to be absent on tour, the other members were engaged with examination papers and I employed my time both in arranging and also in collecting statistics, revising the typed copy of the general report for the press, with the many unavoidable delays which usually accompany similar work and finally after some correspondence, in drafting the remaining summaries of defects which the member who had undertaken it found he could not conveniently accomplish in time for the next meeting of the Commission.

On the 10th and 12th February, the Commission met again, passed and signed the general report, decided that the summaries which had been prepared were unnecessary and suppressed them, saw and approved the forms for the statistical returns and entrusted to me the work of seeing them through the press.

Experience having shown me that the preparation of these documents and the passing them through the press would be endless as well as unsatisfactory unless I were on the spot to watch the work and the entries and calculations in the statistical returns requiring much care and personal supervision to ensure their accuracy, I remained in Madras till they were completed and did not get away before the 12th March.

When I accepted the invitation of the Syndicate in October last I supposed that at most three weeks or a month would bring the work of the Commission to a close. The writing and passing of the reports and the preparation of the returns took up much more time than any of us anticipated when we began and, under the circumstances detailed above, including the printing, occupied five months, during which I not only assisted in the inspection of the Madras Colleges and attended the 31 meetings of the Commission, unavoidably spread over four months, but with the exception of the month from the 21st October to 28th November and about a fortnight at Christmas, I spent most of my time in Madras working for the Syndicate. The other members of the Commission did two months of hard work, inspecting and travelling, before I joined them but to give a satisfactory finish to our labours it was necessary that one of us should undertake that part of the work, and not by any means the most pleasant part of it, which fell to my lot during the last month of my stay in Madras and thus I worked for a month after the others had ceased their labours.

Under these circumstances I trust I shall not be thought unduly grasping if I ask the Syndicate kindly to reconsider the question of the honorarium which they were good enough to offer me and as it is not for me to appraise my own work I leave it to them to do what they may think fitting in the matter.

Order—No. 301, Educational, dated 28th April 1906.

Orders will issue in the Financial Department placing an additional grant of Rs. 500 at the disposal of the syndicate.

(True Extract.)

H. D. TAYLOR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Registrar, Madras University.
,, Director of Public Instruction.
, Financial Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 301. EDUCATIONAL, DATED 28TH APRIL 1906.

[SUBJECT.—*Additional honorarium of Rs. 500 to the Rev. Father Sewell. Member of the Commission for inspection of colleges.*]

From the Registrar, Madras University, dated 27th March 1906, *No.* 888.

This is the first Government have heard of the matter. Dr. Satyanathan has not been quite straight-forward in the matter. Having accepted the duty he should have seen it through. There was no *necessity* for him to leave India and if he had been on duty instead of leave at the time he would, as in Dr. Bourne's case, have received no remuneration. Instead of that he rushed off to earn additional honorarium by lecturing at Yale.

Happily this suspicion proved unfounded.
G. S. F[ORBES]—14-4-06.

Father Sewell seems entitled to the amount asked for. The question is whether Government should pay it. It would be more proper to take it off Dr. Satyanathan's honorarium.

H. D. TAYLOR—27-3-06.

Would it not be better to refer the matter un-officially to the Director of Public Instruction? It is believed that Dr. Satyanathan was to have gone to America in 1904 and that he had to postpone his visit as he was appointed to act as Deputy Director. It is possible that the Director of Public Instruction may have had full information on the point when Dr. Satyanathan's name was proposed in connection with the University Commission. As it is, it seems only equitable that the remuneration of Rs. 2,500 allowed by the University should be distributed in the proportion of 1½ : 1 and that nothing extra should be paid.

P. T. THARYAN—28-3-06.

Government's point of view seems plain enough. The total amount of the honorarium was Rs. 2,500. If the Senate think that Mr. Sewell should get Rupees 1,000 then Dr. Satyanathan gets Rs. 1,500. The honorarium was intended to cover all the work done in connection with the Commission. Perhaps Director of Public Instruction may be consulted un-officially.

C. A. SOUTER—29-3-06.

Will the Director of Public Instruction be good enough to append his views.

H. BRADLEY—30-3-06.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

It was known when Dr. Satyanathan was appointed that he would not complete the work. He accepted on that understanding. I and, so far as I know, the other members of the Syndicate considered that he would be a most valuable member of the Commission. He was. When he left we thought four-fifths of the work was done and he even did his share of the other one-fifth in writing an independent report which was considered by the other members in compiling the final report. This compilation took about three times as long as I anticipated owing to the difficulty there was in discovering the furthest limit of condemnation to which all were prepared to assent. Father Sewell undertook in addition all the statistical work which proved very onerous, hence his request for more.

2. Father Sewell has not actually any claim to more than was offered but he certainly did more work than he expected to have to do and the Syndicate thought that an extra Rs. 500 might well come out of the amount which was offered to me I do not think that Dr. Satyanathan should be paid less than the amount which was understood to be his share. I do not think that there is any ground whatever for accusing him of a want of straight-forwardness. If we had thought that only three-fifths of the work was done we should have told him so.

I agree.

G. S. F[ORBES].

A. G. BOURNE—2-4-06.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The Director says that Father Sewell has not really any claim for more than was offered to him, namely, Rs. 500, but that he did more work than he expected to have to do. The question for consideration is whether the additional Rs. 500 which the Syndicate proposes to give him should come out of the remuneration of Rs. 2,000 actually received by Dr. Satyanathan. The Director thinks that it should not.

3. To meet the initial expenditure involved in the inspection of colleges by a Committee of the Senate the Government have already paid :—

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Under G.O., No. 425, Financial, dated 15th June 1905 ...	15,000	0	0
(2) „ „ „ 59, Educational, dated 1st February 1906.	720	11	0
(3) Under G.O., No. 249, Financial, dated 30th March 1906.	151	10	0
Total ...	15,872	5	0

In the current year's budget there was a provision of Rs. 55,000 for any further expenditure in this direction and for the travelling allowance of members of the Senate for attending University meetings. This amount will, it is believed, be reduced by Rs. 35,000 in the final issue of the budget, but the balance will be ample for all actual needs as there is not likely to be a prolonged tour of inspection this year as there was last year.

[A telegram was received last night from Japan to say that Dr. Satyanathan is now no more.]

P. T. THARYAN—4-4-06.

C. A. SOUTER—5-4-06.

The Rev. Father Sewell is apparently, though not actually entitled to more than Rs. 500, well within the limits of decency in thinking that he ought to get more than that sum. He appears to have done a good deal of work for his 500 rupees, and it seems fair to give him more. There seems to have been no ground for cutting the late Dr. Satyanathan.

H. BRADLEY—5-4-06.

May be sanctioned.

G. S. F[ORBES]—14-4-06.

Please draft. Financial must accept. It is to be regretted that the application was not received in sufficient time to admit of the debit of the expenditure to last year's grant.

H. D. TAYLOR—17-4-06.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved it may be forwarded to Financial for acceptance.

P. T. THARYAN—17-4-06.

C. A. SOUTER—18-4-06.

To the Financial Department.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

There is a provision of Rs. 20,000 in the Civil Budget Estimate for 1906–1907 (final issue) under the head 22. EDUCATION—UNIVERSITY, from which the amount now required, viz., Rs. 500, can be met. The draft may, it is submitted, be accepted.

V. GOPALAKRISHNAN—20-4-06.

C. M. SCHMIDT—20-4-06.

The draft may, I submit, be accepted.

M. HAMMICK—21-4-06.

I suppose this comes out of the grant for University education.

G. S[TOKES]—23-4-06.

Submitted "yes."

C. M. SCHMIDT—24-4-06.

The draft is accepted.

M. HAMMICK—25-4-06.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Issue.

C. A. SOUTER—27-4-06.

[G.O., No. 301, Educational, dated 28th April 1906.]

[E.]
1,500—12-12

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
[C. 525] Registrar, University of Madras	888	26-3-06	1-2
Enclosure to ditto. (Letter from Rev. Fr Sewell S.J		16-3-06	3-5

30/Ed

[P. T. O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No.

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, &c., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.
659	6-10-05	S.C		
609	11-9-05	"		
559-560	15-8-05	"		
310	12-5-05	"		
59	1-2-06	SC		
585	28-8-05	O		
447+8	1-7-05	SC		
425	15.6.05	SC		
19[illegible]	28.3.05	SC		

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.
Public	375	26-4-04	SC	

Urgent

Edl CURRENT No. 525

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL SECRETARIAT

6

University of Madras.

Recd } 27/3/06
Repd }

No. 888

30 Edl
28/3/06

Enclosures.

SENATE HOUSE, MAR 26 1906

FROM

C. A. PATERSON, ESQ., M.A., LL.B.,
Registrar, University of Madras,

To

The Secretary to Government
Educational Department.

Sir,

I have the honour, by direction, to forward to you for the information of Government a copy of a letter dated the 16th March 1906 from the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell, S.J.

Dr. S. Satyanathan was originally appointed a member of the Commission for the Inspection of Colleges but after having spent two months in inspecting the mufassal colleges had to leave India. Rev. J. D. W. Sewell was then appointed to take his place in inspecting the Madras Colleges, and the Syndicate proposed to divide the honorarium as follows: ₨2,000/- to Dr. S Satyanathan and ₨500/- to Rev. J. D. W. Sewell.

Reports on the inspection of the individual colleges were prepared as the colleges were inspected.

But after the inspection of all the colleges was finished, a general report had to be prepared. Rev. J. D. W. Sewell took part in preparing this general report as explained in his letter. Also to that general report various statistical tables are appended. To Rev. J. D. W. Sewell was assigned the work of preparing these tables and seeing them through the press. This additional work was not anticipated when the Syndicate offered him the honorarium of ₨500/-. The Syndicate is of opinion that his honorarium should be at least ₨1,000/-.

pages 3-5 of c file

G.O. No. 310 Edl / 12-5-05 – D

There was no talk about it. He was on leave on his own account. If he had been on duty he wd have recd no honorarium.

This is the first I've heard of the matter. Dr. Satthianathan has not been quite straightforward in the matter. Having accepted the duty he ought to have seen it through. There was no necessity for him to leave India – if he had been on duty instead of leave at the time he would, as in Dr. Bourne's case, have recd. no remuneration. Instead of that he rushed off to earn add'l honoraria of lectureship at Yale. Father Sewell seems entitled to the amount asked for. The question is whether Govt. shd pay it. It wd be more proper to take it off Dr. Satthianathan's honorarium.

27.3.06

I have accordingly been directed by the Syndicate to ask that Government may be pleased to place at the disposal of the Syndicate an additional grant of ₹500/- which will be paid to the Rev. J. D. W. Sewell for his extra work in connection with the preparation and printing of the general report and the statistical tables.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

C. A. Paterson,

Registrar.

From

The Rev. J. D. W. Sewell, S.J.

To

C. A. Paterson Esquire, M.A., LL.B.

Registrar of the Madras University,

Senate House, Madras.

Sir,

In October last year you wrote to me by order of the Syndicate, inviting me to join the Commission for the inspection of the affiliated colleges and offering me ₹500/- for the work. I accepted the invitation and joined the Commission on the 9th October 1905.

From the 9th to the 21st October the Commission was engaged in the work of inspecting the Madras Colleges, in revising a portion of the reports of the mufussil colleges and in deciding on the form of the general report.

The Commission then adjourned to the 25th November but did not, I think, meet till the 28th idem, when the sittings were resumed in the Director's Office and, Sundays excepted, were continued daily till the 19th December and usually from 11 a.m. till 4 or 5 p.m.

During these sittings the remainder of the reports on individual colleges were revised and passed for the press, the General report was read, discussed at length and typed and, it being thought advisable to prepare separate summaries of the defects noticed by the Commission in their reports on the several colleges in order to emphasise them, draft summaries of the defects of about half of the total number of colleges were prepared read and approved.

When the Commission adjourned on the 19th December, I was asked to undertake the preparation of the statistical returns and it was further arranged that the drafts of the summaries of defects of the remaining colleges should be sent to the members who were remaining in Madras, myself among the number, for revision, and that the General Report and ~~of~~ such of the summaries as had already been approved should be printed and the statistical returns prepared for the final meetings of the Commission which, it was then hoped, might take place early in January.

The Christmas holidays next intervened, the Director had to be absent on tour, the other members were engaged with examination papers and I employed my time both in arranging and also in collecting statistics, revising the typed copy of the general report for the press, with the many unavoidable delays which usually accompany similar work and finally after some correspondence, in drafting the remaining summaries of defects which the member who had undertaken it found he could not conveniently accomplish in time for the next meeting of the Commission.

On the 10th and 12th February, the Commission met again, passed and signed the general report, decided that the summaries which had been prepared, were unnecessary and suppressed them, saw and approved the forms for the statistical returns and entrusted to me the work of seeing them through the press.

Experience having shown me that the preparation of these documents and the passing them through the press would be endless as well as unsatisfactory unless I were on the spot to watch the work and the entries and calculations in the statistical returns requiring much care and personal supervision to ensure their accuracy, I remained in Madras till they were completed and did not get away before the 12th March.

When I accepted the invitation of the Syndicate in October last I supposed that at most three weeks or a month would bring the work of the Commission to a close. The writing and passing of the reports and the preparartion of the returns took up much more time than any of us anticipated when we began and, under the circumstances detailed above, including the printing, occupied five months, during which I not only assisted in the inspection of the Madras Colleges and attended the 31 meetings of the Commission, unavoidably spread over ~~four~~ four months, but with the exception of the month from the 21st October to 28th November and about a fortnight at Christmas, I spent most of my time in Madras working for the Syndicate. The other members of the Commission did two months of hard work, inspecting and travelling, before I joined them but to give a satisfactory finish to our labours it was necessary that one of us should undertake that part of the work, and not by any means the most pleasant part of it, which fell to my lot during the last month of my stay in Madras and thus I worked for a month after the others had ceased their labours.

Under these circumstances I trust I shall not be thought unduly grasping if I ask the Syndicate kindly to reconsider the question of the honorarium which they were good enough to offer me and as it is not for me to appraise my own work I leave it to them to do what they may think fitting in the matter.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
(sd) J. D. W. Sewell, S.J.

Trichinopoly,
16th March 1906.

(True Copy)

C. A. Paterson
Registrar.

Senate House,
26th March 1906.

Notes connected with G.O. No. 301
d/28-4-06

C. No. 525 Edl. – From the Registrar University, No. 888 &,
27. 3-06.

[Subject. – Addl. honorarium of R 500 to Rev Fr Sew. member of the Commn. for Inspn. of Colleges]

Educational Department.

301 Edl. – vide

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
4 - APR 1906
SECRETARIAT.

Happily this suspicion proved unfounded
S.J. 14/4

G.O. No. 655 96-11-05
E

This is the first Govt. have heard of the matter. Dr. Satyanathan has not been quite straightforward in the matter. Having accepted the duty he should have seen it through. There was no necessity for him to leave India and if he had been on duty instead of leave at the time he would, as in Dr. Bourne's case, have received no remuneration. Instead of that he rushed off to earn additional honorarium by lecturing at Yale.

Father Sewell seems entitled to the amount asked for. The question is whether Govt. should pay it. It would be more proper to take it off Dr. Satyanathan's honorarium.

H.D.T. aylor.
27-3-06.

Would it not be better to refer the matter U.O. to the D.P.I.? It is believed that Dr. Satyanathan was to have gone to America in 1904 and that he had to postpone his visit as he was appointed to act as Deputy Director. It is possible that the D.P.I. may have had full information on the point ~~before~~ when Dr. Satyanathan's name was proposed in connection with the University Commission. Assuming, it seems only equitable that the remuneration of Rs 2500 allowed by the University should be distributed in the proportion of 1½ : 1 and that nothing extra should be paid.

P.J. harigan
28/3/6

Lee.

Govts point of view seems plain enough. The total amount of the

2 7 24 11

honorarium was 2500/-. If the Senate think that Mr Sewell should get 1000/- then Dr Satyanadhan gets 1500/-. The honorarium was intended to cover all the work done in connection with the Commission. Perhaps D.P.I. may be consulted wo.

C.L.Souter
25.3.06

Will the Director of Public Instruction be good enough to append his views.

H.Bradley
30 3 06

Edl wo. 2602 / 30.3.06

Desp 30/3/6

To the D.P.I. wo.

Notes 32 dt 3-4-6.

It was known when Dr Sathianathan was appointed that he would not complete the work – He accepted on that understanding – I and so far as I know the other members of the Syndicate considered that he would be a most valuable member of the Commission – He was. When he left we thought 4/5ths of the work was done and he even did his share of the other 1/5th in writing an independent report which was considered by the other members in compiling the final report. This compilation took about 3 times as long as I anticipated owing to the difficulty there was in discovering the furthest limit of condemnation to which all were prepared to assent. Father Sewell undertook in addition all the statistical work which proved very onerous hence his request for more.

Father Sewell has not actually any claim for more than was offered but he certainly did more work than he expected to have to do and the Syndicate thought that an extra Rs 500 might well come out of the amount which was offered to us. I do not think that Dr Satthianathan should be paid less than the amount which was understood to be his share. I do not think that there is any ground whatever for accusing him of a want of straightforwardness. If we had thought that only 3/5ths of the work was done we should have told him so.

A G B 2.4.6
Bourne

I agree
S J Kottes

BL 6.4.06

The Director says that Father Sewell has not really any claim for more than was offered to him, namely, Rs 500, but that he did more work than he expected to have to do. The question for consideration is whether the additional Rs 500 which the Syndicate purposes to give him should come out of the remuneration of Rs 2,000 actually received by Dr. Satyanathan. The Director thinks that it should not.

2. To meet the initial expenditure involved in the inspection of colleges by a Committee of the Senate the Govt. have already paid—

		Rs
IV.	(1) under G.O. No 425 Fin'l d/ 15th June 1905	15,000 ..
XIII.	(2) under G.O. No 59 Edl d/ 1st February 1906	720. 11
XV.	(3) under G.O. No 249 Fin'l d/ 30th March 1906	151-10
		15,872. 5

In the current year's budget there was a provision of Rs 55,000 for any further expenditure in this direction & for the travelling allowance of members of the Senate for attending University meetings. This amount will, it is believed, be reduced by Rs 31,000 in the final issue of the budget, but the balance will be ample for all actual needs as there is not likely to be a prolonged tour of inspection this year as there was last year.

PJ Hartog
4/4/6

[A telegram was received last night from Japan to say that Dr. Satyanathan is now no more]

PJ Hartog
5/4/6

Lee

CESouter
5.4.06

[illegible] 30/1/06

The Hon Mr Forbes CSI

The Rev Father Sewell is apparently, though not actually entitled to more than Rs 500, well within the limits of ~~[illegible]~~ decency, in thinking that he ought to get more than that sum. He appears to have done a good deal of work for his 500 rupees, & it seems fair to give him more. There seems to have been no ground for cutting the late Dr Sathianadhan.

HB 5.4.06
Bradley

May be sanctioned

GF 6/4
Forbes

Please draft. Finl. must accept. It is to be regretted that the application was not recd. in sufficient time to admit of the debit of the expenditure to last year's grant.

AD Taylor
17.4.06

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved it may be forwarded to Finl for acceptance.

CA Souter
18.4.06

PN Narayan
17/4/06

To ~~the~~ Fin. Dept (u.o.)

Ed. no. 312 D
19.4.06

CHIEF SECRETARIAT.
19 APR. 1906
OOTACAMUND.

Disp
18/4/06

CURRENT NO.
1806
FINANCIAL

Reqd. 19.4.6.

72
C. 23. 4. 06
R 24. 4. 06

(11)

6P

15

Financial dept.

Chief Secretary.

viz Appendix to G.O. 273 Fin. d. 7-4-06
III

There is a provision of Rs. 20,000 in the C.B.E. for 1906-07 (final issue) under the head 22 Education – University, from which the amount now required viz Rs. 500 can be met. The draft may, it is subd., be accepted.

V. Gopalakrishnan
20-4-06.

C.M. Schmidt
20. 4. 06

ASSISTT SECY TO GOVT F.S.
27 APR 1906
LOCAL MUNL EDL & LEG DEPTS

The draft may I submit be accepted

Warnick
21. IV. 06

I suppose this comes out of the grant for University Education.

Stokes
23/4/06

C.S.

Subd. yes.

C.M. Schmidt
24. 4. 06

Fwd. G.O.D. 1806-1
25/4/06.

To Ed. Deptt. ...

The draft is accepted

Warnick
25 IV

Issue
Cusonter
27.4.06.

[E./12]
000-21-9-04.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

5 P 16

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

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 525 , From the Registrar, Madras University, No 888 , dated 26 - 3 - 1906.

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

ORDER No. 301 , dated 28 - 4 - 1906.

PS

Desp in ms from here & print here
27/4/6

Orders will ~~accordingly~~ issue in the Financial Departt placing an additional grant of Rs 500 at the disposal of the Syndicate.

PS
17/4/6

Clas
18.4.06.

23/4/06.

To the Registrar, Madras University ✓
" DPI ✓
" Finl Departt ✓

Desptd
30/4/06.

sent to Press.

for signature.

ched in print.

Numbers of copies required.
- Order complete. with notes 15
- Letter only. without notes 30
- Order complete with Letter.

G.O., No. , DATED
190 .

ent No. 525. A

Please show proof

Os
3/5

ures to C. No. 525. A

Government .. .. A

Government.

with ditto.

not filed up, being meant for despatch
in original.

= Print in full.
= Not to be printed.
= Print abstract only.
Print heading only.