

Ed. H. (1949) Department.

MS. SERIES.

G.O. NO. 1201 Edu.

Dated 20-4-49.

Op A

(B)

[Despatch Abstract.]

Back Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Memo 68468 B1/68	Edn		4-11-48				
G.O. 2012	Edn		15-9-47				

Further Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O. 2008	Edn		12-2-50				
G.O. 939	Edn		21-3-50				

The Hon'ble Sri K. CHANDRAMOULI,
Minister for Local Admn. & Co-operation.



Fort St. George.

1st March 1949.

Dear Sri Avinashilingam Chettiar,

I understand that grants for the construction of High School buildings have not been sanctioned last year to Guntur District Board. The lump sum grants given in this connection are, I understand, to be disbursed on a district-war basis. I do not know why Guntur District Board was deprived of such a grant last year. Again, this year the Guntur District Board have applied both for elementary and high school building grants. I shall be much pleased if you could go through the matter and see that the Guntur District Board is not deprived even this year also. I am herewith enclosing a list of Secondary schools for which grants are applied. Please see that immediate action is

p2 mpe

- 2 -

taken and also let me know the action taken.

Yours sincerely,

K. Chinnadramani
1-3-49

The Hon'ble Sri T.S. Avinashilingam
Chettiar,
Minister for Education.

ENCLOSURE.

Letter R.O.C.No.A2-8146-48 dated 28-1-49 of the Special Officer, Dt.Board, Guntur to the Secretary, Education and Public Health Department, Madras requesting the Government to sanction subsidy for the construction of Secondary School buildings in the year 1948-49 and 49-50.

Name of school.	Estimated cost.	Grant applied for.
1. Eddanapudi.	Rs 70,000	Rs 35,000
2. Kakumanu.	70,000	35,000
3. Gurazala.	16,000	8,000
4. Dachepalli.	9,600	4,800
5. Karempudi.	9,500	4,750
6. Vinukonda.	98,000	49,000
-----	-----	-----

3
LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT.

Subsidy - Buildings - Guntur District Board - construction of buildings for Secondary Schools - sanction of subsidy in 1948-1949 and 1949-1950 - requesting.

R.O.C. No. A.2-3146-D.B. of 48.

Guntur :- Guntur,

dated the 28th January 1949.

From

Sri T. Prabhakara Rao Nayudu, B.A.,
Special Officer, District Board,
Guntur.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Education and Public Health Department,
M a d r a s.

Sir,

Reference :- Government Memo No. 68463-B1-48-3 Edn.
dated 4-11-1948. - P237A

The villagers of Eddanapudi and Kakumanu have given cent donations and these are for provision of playground and equipment etc., for the Secondary Schools. In addition to these donations the people of Kakumanu had promised to construct a block of rooms for the School at their cost and hand it over to the Board. These four rooms will not be sufficient for the School. The District Board has taken up construction of six more rooms for the school. The building for the Secondary School at Eddanapudi has to be constructed by the District Board. The estimates for these two buildings schemes are under revision as per the schedule of rates. The revised estimates will be transmitted to the Director of Public Instruction for approval after they are received from the District Engineer, Guntur. A half grant of Rs. 35,000/- for each building in 1949-1950 from Provincial Funds may kindly be sanctioned.

2. With regard to the scheme relating to Board Headquarters at Gurazala, the School is a growing Institution and in the Headquarters and as the present accommodation was found inadequate, plans and estimates were approved by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, in his Proceedings R.O.C. No. dated 21-9-1946 for additional accommodation. The construction of the 1st floor is not yet completed. The work was executed in the year 1947 and the construction of the 2nd floor is likely to be completed in the current year. The amount of the work is Rs. 13,200/- and the full cost will be about Rs. 16,000/- inclusive of the premium tender. I request that a half grant of Rs. 8,000/- may kindly be sanctioned from Provincial Funds for the building work also.

3. The Board Secondary School at Dachepalli is being run in the Board Elementary School building. The institution is in good progress. The plans and estimates in respect of this School were approved by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, in his Proceedings R.O.C. No. dated 21-9-1946 for additional accommodation. I request that a half grant of Rs. 35,000/- for each building in 1949-1950 from Provincial Funds may kindly be sanctioned from Provincial Funds for the building work also.

4. The Board Secondary School at Karempudi is being run in the P.W.D. Rest-House. The P.W.D. authorities were addressed to alienate the choultry in favour of the District Board free of cost for School purposes. There is an agitation against the location of the School in the P.W.D. Rest-House and it is found necessary to have a separate building for the School. Plans and Estimates were approved by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, in his Proceedings R.O.C. No. 1449-C2-46 dated 21-9-46 and the work is in progress. I request that a half grant of Rs. 4,750/- as per this Office grant application dated 6-9-1948 may kindly be sanctioned.

5. As regards the scheme relating to the Board High School Vinukonda, the plan was approved by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, in his L.Dis. No. 137-C-46 dated 9-4-46. The Estimate amount of this work is Rs. 98,000. The work is in good progress. A half grant of Rs. 49,000/- may kindly be sanctioned.

6. Regarding the scheme relating to the Board High School, Chirala, it is deferred for the present as suggested by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, in his R.C.No. 2059-C2-48 dated 22-10-1948 since the question of transfer of the School back to Chirala Municipality is under consideration separately.

7. None of the Schools referred to above were opened on the promises made by the villagers to provide accommodation etc., for the Schools nor have buildings been provided by the donors. Where such promises were made, the villagers are providing accommodation for the Schools and the District Board will not do anything on these schemes from its funds. Such promises were made by the villagers of Siripuram, Pedakurapadu, Modukur, Endrapadu, Edlapalli, Pedanalem, Intur, Pedapulivarru, Kavur, Prattipadu, Muthakki, Ravimuthala, Puddukur, Santanatala, Chinaganjam and Piduguralla. These schemes are not included in the grant application. This District Board is maintaining as many as 46 Secondary Schools and out of this, the allocation for building grant has been made in respect of only 10 schools. The financial position of the District Board is not sound as to meet the full cost of the building schemes from its own funds. The commitments of the District Board are growing and the brunt of paying the revised scales and the Dearness Allowance is borne by the District Board without any aid from Provincial Government. In view of the facts stated above, I request that the Government may be pleased to reconsider their orders passed in the matter already and to issue orders, sanctioning subsidy from Special Funds as applied for above at an early date.

Handwritten signature
For Special Officer, Dt. Bd.
Guntur.

1 *Handwritten mark*
31/1
Submitted to the Secretary to the Government, Local Administration
Madras.
The Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

15710/49

Subsidies - Buildings - District Board Guntur - Construction
of buildings for certain secondary schools - Application
for 1948-9 & 1949-50

From the S.O. Dt Bd Guntur R.O. no A. 28146-48 d.
28-1-49

Handwritten: 3/13
Memo 15710 B1/49-1 Edn d. 3-3-49

The D.P. is requested to state whether the letter from the S.O. Dt Guntur cited above has been received in his office and if so to forward it to Govt with his remarks ^{along with the application received from one local school}. He is requested to state for which of the schemes the plans & estimates have been approved and whether the schemes are so very urgent that they should be considered as a special case in 1949-50 instead of

being considered as Part II schemes for 1950-51 in the ordinary course.

13/49

1-3-49

to
the D.D.
Copy to the
D.D. Guntur
D.D. 2/3

R.C.No.2058-G2-48

Office of the
Director of Public Instruction
Madras, dated, 19th Mar. 1949.

FROM

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
M A D R A S.

24 MAR 1949

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE, M A D R A S.

Subject:- EDUCATION -- Secondary -- District Board --
Guntur -- Secondary Schools - Construction of
buildings -- Sanction of subsidy.

Reference:- Govt. Memo No.15710-B1/49-1 Education, dated
3-3-1949.

With reference to the Government Memorandum referred to
above I offer my remarks as detailed below in regard to the
several schemes mentioned in the letter Rc.No.A.2-8146-DB-48
dated 28-1-1949 of the Special Officer, District Board, Guntur,
addressed to Government (Copy already with Government).

Board High School, Kakumanu and
Board High School, Eddanapudi
Only plans were approved originally
by the Director in his letter Rc.
No.342-G2-47 dated 6-3-47 since
the expenditure was proposed to
be incurred from public dona-
tions. But subsequently it was reported that the cost would be met
from District Board funds and hence the Special Officer was asked to
send estimates for approval in Director's letter Dis.10/49 dated
3-1-1949. The Estimates have not yet been received. The schemes
under question cannot, therefore, be considered new for the purpose
of sanction of grant.

Board High School, Dacheipalli
Board High School; Gurzala
Board High school, Karempudi.
Plans and estimates were approved
in Director's letter Rc.No.1449-
G2-46 dated 21-9-46. The cost
of these Estimates were Rs.9,600;
Rs.9,800/- and Rs.9,500/- respectively.
But it seems from the letter under reference of the Special Officer
that the costs of the Estimates relating to Board High School, Dache-
palli and Karempudi on the basis of which he requests grant now is
the same as those referred to above while in regard to Board High
School, Gurzala the cost of the Estimates is said to be Rs.13,200.
Obviously the Estimate seems to have been revised in this case. But
it is not clear whether the Estimate so revised has been got approved
by the Director. The Special Officer may, therefore, be advised
to forward the Revised Estimate in regard to this Scheme to the
Director and get it approved if this has not been done already.

Board High School, Vinukanda:

The Special Officer states that
the plan was approved in regard
to this scheme in Director's L.Dis.
137-G-46 dated 9-4-46 but he does
not say anything about the Estimate
Since the Estimate cannot
The L.Dis file of this Office has been destroyed.

be considered now for sanction of grant.

But the Special Officer says that the work is in progress. It may, therefore, be suggested to the Special Officer that he should forward the Estimate for this Scheme to the Director for his approval unless the expenditure involved in the proposal is borne entirely from public donations and no amount is proposed to be spent therefor from District Board funds or from Provincial funds.

Thus only in the case of Board High School, Gurzala, Dachepalli and Karempudi, plans and Estimates for the Schemes were approved by the Director and hence these alone are eligible for consideration for payment of grant. The Schemes may be considered for payment of grant in connection with the Budget Estimate for 1949-50 instead of for 1950-51 since the Special Officer states that while the District Board is maintaining 46 Secondary Schools the application for building grant is made in respect of only 6 Secondary Schools and that the financial position of the District Board is not so sound as to meet all the commitments. But in so doing preference may be given to the Scheme relating to Board High School, Gurzala since this work is said to be actually begun which information is not furnished in regard to the other 2 Schemes (i.e.) Board High School, Dachepalli and Karempudi. I wish also to add that it is not clear from the letter of the Special Officer whether there have been any cash contributions made by the villagers towards these schemes. I invite your attention in this connection to G.O.No.2012 Education, dated 15-9-1947 which says that where the private benefaction is in excess of the local body's share of cost (i.e.) one half, such excess shall be taken in deduction of the Provincial half share of the cost.

The previous application of the Special Officer for consideration of these Schemes in connection with the Budget Estimate for 1949-50 was disposed of in Government Memorandum No. 68468-B1/48-3 Education dated 4-1-1948.

Yours faithfully

For Director of Public Instruction.

SJ/22/3.

Gurzala
Dachepalli
Karempudi

8000
4800
4750
17550

be considered for the purpose of the...

the Special Officer... that the...

progress... be suggested to the Special Officer...

should be towards the estimate for the scheme to the...

for the approval unless the expenditure involved in the proposal...

is borne entirely from public donations and no amount is proposed...

to be spent therefrom from District Board funds or from Provincial...

Thus only in the case of Board High School, Dachehalli and Karampudi, plans and estimates for the Board are approved by the Director and hence these alone are eligible for consideration for payment of grant. The Scheme may be considered for payment of grant in connection with the Budget Estimate for 1949-50 instead of for 1950-51 since the Special Officer, Dachehalli, while the District Board is maintaining a secondary school, the application for building grant is made in respect of only 6 secondary schools and that the financial position of the District Board is not so sound as to meet all the commitments. But in so doing preference may be given to the scheme relating to Board High School, Dachehalli since this work is said to be actually begun which information is not furnished in regard to the other 5 schemes (i.e., Board High School, Dachehalli and Karampudi). I wish also to add that it is not clear from the letter of the Special Officer whether there have been any cash contributions made by the Government towards these schemes. I invite your attention in this connection to the fact that the Board High School, Dachehalli, which says that the private contribution is in excess of the local body's share of cost (i.e., 10% share) and that the Government is contributing the Provincial share of the cost.

The previous application of the Special Officer for the construction of these schools in connection with the Budget Estimate for 1949-50 was disposed of in Government Order No. 68468-17/48-3 Education dated 1-7-1948.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

17/5/50

Subsidy - Buildings - District Board, Gunter - Construction of buildings for certain secondary schools - Sanctioned

From the S.O. of Bd Gunter Rec. no A-2-8146-88 of 28-1-49

From the D.P. Rec. no 2058 G2/48 3.17-3-49

Education dated 20/4/49

The Govt sanction subsidies not exceeding one half of the actual cost of construction of buildings for the secondary schools under the control of the District Board, Gunter, specified below, subject to the maximum limit of Rs. 10,000 against them.

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------|
| (1) Board High School, Gunzala | 16,000 | 8,000 |
| (2) Board High School Dachehalli | 9,600 | 4,800 |
| (3) Board High School Karampudi | 9,600 | 4,800 |

4750
17,550

3. The subsidies will be disbursed on the post execution system. The expenditure on payment of subsidies in the current year should be met from the sanctioned appropriation under "37 h. Education. Secondary- Grants to local bodies for Secondary Education A. Ordinary areas. 2 Buildings" or by reappropriation.

3. The S.O. Dt Bd Guntur is requested to forward to the D.P.D. the Revised Estimate for the construction of building for the Board High School Guntur, and get it approved, if it has not already been done. The S.O. is also requested to get the estimates for the construction of a building for the Board High School, Vinnukonda, approved by the D.P.D. if any portion of the expenditure on the execution of the work is to be met from the funds of the Dt Bd or if it is proposed to apply for a subsidy towards the cost of construction of the building.

p. 7 of

p. 8 of

4. The S.O. Dt Bd Guntur is informed that the question of giving a subsidy towards the cost of construction of buildings for the Board High School Kakinada + Suddamapudi cannot be considered now as the estimates for the works have not yet been approved by the D.P.D.

para 1 mp
2 of

To
The S.O. Dt Bd
Guntur
.. D.P.D.

.. Encl of 2
Accounts
.. AG through
Finance
4 of copies


18449

19-11-49

12/1

Grant - Buildings - Dt Bd Guntur - Construction of buildings for certain Secondary Schools

Letter R.O.C.No. A2-8146-48, dated 28-1-49 of the Special Officer, Dt.Bd.Guntur to the Secretary, Education and Public Health Department, Madras requesting the Government to sanction subsidy for the construction of Secondary School buildings in the year 1948-49 and 49-50.



Name of school.	Estimated cost.	Grant applied for.
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------

	Rs.	Rs.
1. Eddanapudi. ...	70,000.	35,000.
2. Kakumanu. ...	70,000.	35,000.
3. Gurazala. ...	16,000.	8,000.
4. Dandepalli. ...	9,600.	4,800.
5. Karimpudi. ...	9,500.	4,750.
6. Virukonda. ...	98,000.	49,000.

V. Vignesh
 Sec. to P.H.
 I understand that such grants were denied last year to Guntur Dt. Bd. The grants are on 50-50 basis. Hence, it is proper that grants are sanctioned at least for this year. Immediate action may be taken & files are circulated to some before final order is passed.
 2/3/49

The letter referred to have not yet been received in this Dept.
 2. Applications for grants for the construction of buildings for secondary schools should be submitted in the prescribed form furnishing information as to whether the plans & estimates have been approved by the D.P.D. and how it is proposed to meet the Dt Bd's share of the cost. The application should be subd. to govt through the D.P.D. It is not known whether the letter referred to has been sent through the D.P.D.

3. It was decided in Cabinet that a sum of Rs. 2.50 lakhs should be sanctioned as grants for the construction of buildings for secondary schools for boys in the current year & order distributing this sum towards the construction of buildings for certain secondary schools.

under private management & local bodies have already been issued and this has been included in the supplementary estimate. It is now too late to consider the question of giving any grants for any of the schemes mentioned on page 1 ante in the current year.

2. The normal procedure to be adopted for sanctioning grants for the construction of buildings for secondary schools is to consider them as Part II schemes in October in connection with the next year's budget - Part II schemes for 1949-50 have already been considered & necessary provision has been included in the estimates of expenditure for 1949-50. No provision has been made for payment of grants for any of the schemes relating to the D.P.D. question. If the schemes cannot wait for consideration as a Part II scheme for 1950-51, the question of sanctioning grants should be considered during the course of the next year as a special case after obtaining the remarks of the D.P.D. in regard to the urgency & the necessity for the construction of buildings for the schools mentioned on page 1 ante.

3. A draft memo is submitted below for approval. It may come after perusal by HM(EN) & HM(CHA)

1682
11/3/49

in
1-3-49

10 2/3 49 | 14.17 (SW) 1/2
10 3/4 49 | 14.17 (LA) 3/4

15A
2.3.49

Secy., E. & P.H.

Please see herewith a letter from H.M., L.A. The matter may be looked into and put up.

H.M. Education.

The matter has already been noted as pages 1-2 ante. The Director's reply to the Memo on pages 1-2 of may be awaited till 1-4-49.

in
7-3-49

S. W. / 10

8 MAR 1949

8 MAR 1949

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

16202
S. 150f

Memo NO 15710 22/48-1 Edu 2 3.3.49

11-7-80f

22928 - From the D.P.D. RC. NO 2058-G.2/48 2 19-3-49

The previous application of the S.O. D.P.D. for grants for the construction of buildings for certain secondary schools was disposed of in Memo NO 68468 22/48-3 En 2 4.4.48. The D.P.D. did not recommend any of the schemes for consideration in connection with the budget for 1949-50 for the reasons given in his letter on p. 21 of the memo.

12307 (A)

180f

2. The D.P.D. now reports that plans & estimates for the schemes for the construction of buildings for the Board High Schools ^{at} Gursala, Dacheppalli & Karampudi have been approved by him and these three schemes may be considered for payment of grant in connection with the R.E. for 1949-50 and in doing so preference may be given to the scheme for the construction of a building for the Board High School Gursala as it is reported that the work has actually been started.

198 26/3/49 5678 11/3/49 (C) (R)

3. The maximum liability in respect of schemes for which grants have been sanctioned in the current year is Rs 185475 against which a subsidy of Rs 23,100 has been disbursed in the current year. The outstanding liability on 1.4.49 will be Rs 162375. It is proposed to sanction subsidies amounting to Rs

Rs 163250 in 1949-50. The liability will thereby be increased to Rs 275625. A provision of Rs 130000 only has been made in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1949-50 and the balance will have to be carried forward to succeeding years. In addition to these, there are 7 schemes for which grants have been sanctioned in previous years but which have not yet been disbursed yet on account of the fact that the schemes have not yet been taken up for execution or completed owing to the revision of plans & estimates. Only a small provision of Rs 5000 is included in the sum of Rs 130000 referred to above on account of these schemes.

The outstanding liability in respect of these schemes is 51015 but this is largely to be enhanced if subsidies are sanctioned on the basis of the revised estimates.

4. The points for decision now are

(1) whether Govt should undertake fresh liability in 1949-50 by sanctioning grants to new schemes which are considered to be urgent, and if so

(2) whether subsidies should be sanctioned to the D.T. Bd. Guntur for the three schemes recommended by the Director - the maximum subsidy payable in respect of these schemes will be Rs 17,550 - no subsidies have been sanctioned to the D.T. Bd. so far.

It seems inadvisable to take on fresh commitments in the circumstances mentioned above.

5. The remarks of Finance may be invited before the case is circulated to HM (Eon) + HM (LA) + HM (Fin) + H.P. if required.

W.S. 25.3.49

25/3/49

S. [Signature]

Edn. 1571081/49-2 25-3-49

Fin (Exp A)

Finance may agree with the view of E.P.H. Secretary above.

W.A. 26349 of the financial provision as indicated in the BE 1949-50, decided to sanction the amount to local bodies and private institutions for building of secondary schools. The budget



For 1949-50 has been balanced by taking credit for anticipated savings due to retrenchment proposals and taxation measures under consideration. It is possible that credits anticipated may not be realized in full. It is therefore essential to avoid new commitments. It can be therefore advised strongly against new commitments in the form of grants to the Guntur D.T. Bd. for building schemes for secondary schools proposed in this case.

Fin 50 20384 EA-1 26.3.49

25/3/49

Exp (M)

Notes from page 3 ante may be read. The point for decision is whether as a special case grants should be sanctioned to the District Board, Guntur, towards one half of the cost of construction of buildings for the Board High Schools at Burzala, Dachehalli + Karampudi recommended by the Director. or whether the D.T. Bd. may be asked to renew the application for consideration in connection with the BE for 1950-51. Finance Dept. have agreed with this Dept. that in the circumstances stated in para 3 of this Dept's note on pp 3-4 ante, that it is inadvisable to undertake fresh commitments at present. The file may be circulated to HM (Eon) and HM (LA).

p. 804

25.3.49

28/3/49

S. [Signature]

TSA

29.3.49

The grants were sanctioned on D.T. Bd basis. but unfortunately

26/3/49

even last year, the grants were not given to Gurukul A-BD on same reason or other - it is not proper and against the spirit and Committee met for the Cabinet Policy. I strongly recommended that the grants may be given this year at least without hesitation. I would like H.M. (En), to reconsider and give the grant due to Gurukul A-BD without any delay.

29/3

grants may be sanctioned as a special case. H.M. (En)

It is presumed that it is the intention that subsidies should be sanctioned to the D-BD Gurukul in the current year as a special case for the construction of buildings for the Board High schools at Gurrzala, Dachehalli & Karempudi for which plans & estimates have been approved by the Director. The total subsidy to be sanctioned for the three building schemes amounts to Rs 17550

Finance may see the orders in circulation & they may

A
784

06/EX

requested to say whether it will be sufficient to circulate the case to H.M. (En)

7-4-49

E&P.H. U.O. No.

15710 B, 149-3 Edn.
7-4-49

23768

Finance (Exp A)

Previous Finance note on pp 4-5 above

Please see the orders in circulation on pp 5-6 above and the further note of E&PH on pp 6-7 above.

The estimated cost of the building schemes and the grants applied for and proposed to be ~~sanctioned~~ ^{sanctioned} are as shown below:

	Estimated cost	Grant applied for and proposed
Gurrzala	18000	8000
Dachehalli	9600	4800
Karempudi	9500	4750
Total	35100	17550

As the ~~cost involved in~~ ^{proposed grant on account of each} ~~individual~~ scheme does not exceed the limit of Rs 20,000/- (non-recurring), ~~no particular financial procedure is necessary~~ it will be sufficient if the case is circulated to H.M. (Finance) also for orders.

7-4-49

7-4-49

E&PH

E&PH (M)

15710A
06 APR 1949

ASE

Fin. HO. 23768 Exp A-1

7-4-49

The file may now be circulated to H.M. (En) for approving the proposal to grant a subsidy.

not exceeding Rs 17,550 to the St Bd Quater in the current year, towards the cost of construction of buildings for the three secondary schools specified on page 7 ante. The subsidy will be disbursed on the post execution system, and the St Bd can claim at the end of the current year subsidy towards one half of the expenditure actually incurred on the execution of the work subject to the maximum limits that will be fixed in each case ^{as shown on page 7 ante} the expenditure on payment of the subsidy will be met from the sanctioned appropriation

in the current year's budget or by reappropriation in the course of the year. Attention is directed to the minutes of St Bd (20/1/49) and (20/1/49) on page 13

W.S. 8.4.49

W.S. 8/4/49

May approved

8/4/49

H.N. (Fin)

I want to know what has done last year. For how many schools in how many districts, how many were given last year or in previous years.

What is our order regarding these parts.

A.S. may meet me in person and explain.

8.4



A statement furnishing the information is submitted (2) In regard to policy re these grants please see the part II Scheme note on page 3 of (3)

W.S. 9.4.49

The proposal may be accepted.

8.4

Please see the orders in circulation on page 8 ante

A draft order is submitted below for approval

W.S. 18.4.49

W.S. 19.4.49

20/4

13

Please see the order in the enclosure on page 1
A draft order is submitted below for approval

10-10-11
10-10-11

10-10-11
10-10-11