

Financial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 683

Dated 11th Sept. 1895.

INDEXED. 7/8

[Despatch Abstract.]

PETITION

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

CURRENT. No. 2133

Financial (1895) DEPARTMENT.

From C. J. Mac Cartie Esq J.C.S.
THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE

RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY



Dated 29 August 1895.

Received 29

Regd. 30

ENCLOSURE 3 spare copies.

Subject.

TRANSFERS a petition from Chinniadithai, late Postman, Butlaguon Post Office praying that he may be re-instated to his former post.

To Petitioner of date 13/9 19/9/95 14/9

Note. Butlaguon does not appear to be a District Post Office. Besides, the District Officer of Post Office has already reported that appeal (para 13 of Petition) we have no authority: all these matters are under the control of the P.O.

If it were a Post Office

for major office of the P.O. for minor: but it is not an office of the P.O.

Butlaguon has been a Post Office since 1895

and it is a Post Office since 1895

and it is a Post Office since 1895

Could we not transfer him to the P.O. of Butlaguon? 2/11/95

6/9/95

538: 19-7-95
344: 26-4-95
482: 20-5-93-22

C.S.

alt. m.

Order of 11th September 1895, no 683

Canal

The Govt. declines

to interfere - 22

C.S. 9/9/95

15/9/95

Petition from Chinnia Pillai, late
Postman, Butlagundu Post Office,
Dindigul Taluk, Madras Dt.

DATED _____ 189-

TRANSFERRED to the Chief Secretary to
Government for disposal.

(By Order.)

Chinnia Pillai

Private Secretary.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Chinnia Pillai
29 August 1895.

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL
Fort St. George
MADRAS.

The humble memorial of Chinnia Pillai late Postman,
Butlagundu Post Office, Dindigul Taluk, Madras
District, Madras Presidency.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

1. That memorialist was entertained in the Postal Department in July 1876 and has put in a service of 22 years during which period he has by assiduity and close attention to his work endeavoured to give every satisfaction and has merited the approbation of all his superiors.
2. That one Reghunatha Row late Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu was charged with falsification of certain documents and fabrication of a registered letter in lieu of one posted at Iyampolliem on the 21st November 1891 and which letter the said Reghunatha Row had allowed to pass through his Office as an unregistered letter.
3. That the defence unsuccessfully set up by him, was that the registered letter was not received on the 21st November in the Mail Bag from Iyampolliem, but that it was subsequently sent by the Branch Postmaster through the hands of his brother one Srinivasulu Naidu.
4. That the said Reghunatha Row cited memorialist and one Velliah Pillay, acting Village Postman, of the Butlagundu Office to speak to such matters as they may be aware of.
5. That in this connection memorialist was examined by the Inspector of Post Offices Dindigul on the 30th July 1892 and his statement was reduced to writing and signed by him. This statement runs as follows. "Some 4 or 5 months ago one evening at about 5 O' clock, on opening the Mail Bag brought by Velliah Pillay the Village Postman of Iyampolliem, the Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu told Velliah Pillay that the Branch Office accounts refer to a registered letter as having been sent to Butlagundu and asked him why it was not found in the Mail Bag and whether he (Velliah Pillay) knew anything of the matter. Velliah Pillay replied that he knew nothing and that he would ask the Branch Postmaster of Iyampolliem and let the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu know about it the next day. Two or three days after this one Srinivasulu Naidu the elder brother of Thirupathi Naidu Branch Post master Iyampolliem had come to Butlagundu and said that he had come there to deliver a letter that was not sent through a mistake. I cannot say

what particular date the above things occurred but all I now say is from memory as far as it serves me. The runner Velliah Pillay said that he was present when the Mail Bag was tied at Iyampolliem and that the Branch Post master did not send any registered letter that day."

6. That after the submission of these statements the said Reghunatha Row was found guilty after an exhaustive enquiry and in dismissing the said Reghunatha Row the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division thought it expedient to call on Your Memorialist and the said Velliah Pillay for their statements to show cause why they also should not be punished for having given false statements and Your Memorialist accordingly submitted his explanation reiterating as far as he knew what had happened and stated what he knew to be true to the best of his information and belief but much to the surprise of Your Memorialist he received an order of dismissal dated 13th July 1893.

7. That before commenting upon the procedure of the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division in this connection it would be proper to call Your attention to a correspondence emanating from the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu reporting Your memorialist and on that report Your memorialist was transferred to Paramakudi as village Postman. This order of the Superintendent is dated 26th December 1892 No. $\frac{11983}{B. 4}$ and runs. "Post man Chinniah Pillay of Butlagundu Office having been reported against by the Sub-Post master Batlagundu as inattentive to his duties and quarrelsome with the other subordinates of the office and also given up to wicked habits, is hereby transferred to Paramakudy as Village Post man on equal pay Rs. 6—8—0 and he will report himself to the Inspector Paramakudy Sub-Division in view to his being taken in service. The Sub-Post master Butlagundu will relieve him and send him to Paramakudi at once."

8. That Your memorialist begs it to be borne in mind that he was dismissed for attempting to screen a person who is his greatest enemy. There is a receptivity to the human mind when absurd theories are advanced!!

9. That Your memorialist was charged for screening an Official charged with a most serious offence and that memorialist was also an abettor. Whereas it will be seen that the evidence given by memorial was simply the conversation held by two or more persons as far as his memory serves him and therefore it could not be said that he wilfully and maliciously gave evidence in a case to screen others.—

10. That memorialist appealed against this unjust decision to the Post master-General and that Officer in his No. $\frac{13894}{P. R. 50 N}$ dated 23rd September 93 declines to interfere. It may be urged here that the Post master General is of opinion that memorialist altered his statement because "he knows now that as he himself puts it", the Sub Post master of Butlagundu carelessly allowed the registered letter to pass as an unregistered letter and that he is aware no other theory is tenable.

11. Your memorialist begs to state that his first statement was so worded only from memory and how any blame of giving intentionally false evidence can be imputed to him is more than one can conclude.

12. Your memorialist begs to state that the Officials had come to a conclusion that the conversation relating to Srinivasulu Naidu the brother of the Sub Post master of Iyampolliem is false. Under what circumstances they have arrived at this conclusion is a matter for Your consideration.

13. That Memorialist appealed to the Director General of Post Offices and that Officer also declined to interfere *vide* his No. $\frac{28573}{ap. 44-94-95}$ date 30—11—94.

14. Your memorialist only urges two points in his favour (1) Will he befriend his own enemy (2) Was the conversation he stated hearsay. To the above first question memorialist begs to state he has above shown sufficient reasons for his enmity and therefore the finding of the Postal authorities is unsound and cannot be maintained.

In regard to the 2nd question, memorialist begs to state that it is impossible to state with exact precision what happened a few hours ago, and how the Postal authorities except a man of the stamp of petitioner who it must be remembered is illiterate to describe with all accuracy all what happened some months ago is beyond comprehension.

15. Memorialist prays You will call for the records connected with his case, to peruse them, and in consideration of his long service and the trivial offence if any, he pleased to reinstate him in his former post.

Dindigul }

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL
Fort St. George
MADRAS.

The humble memorial of Chinnia Pillay late Postman,
Butlagundu Post Office, Dindigul Taluk, Madura
District, Madras Presidency.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

1. That memorialist was entertained in the Postal Department in July 1876 and has put in a service of 22 years during which period he has by assiduity and close attention to his work endeavoured to give every satisfaction and has merited the approbation of all his superiors.

2. That one Reghunatha Row late Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu was charged with falsification of certain documents and fabrication of a registered letter in lieu of one posted at Iyampoliem on the 21st November 1891 and which letter the said Reghunatha Row had allowed to pass through his Office as an unregistered letter.

3. That the defence unsuccessfully set up by him, was that the registered letter was not received on the 21st November in the Mail Bag from Iyampoliem, but that it was subsequently sent by the Branch Postmaster through the hands of his brother one Srinivasalu Naidu.

4. That the said Reghunatha Row cited memorialist and one Velliah Pillay, acting Village Postman, of the Butlagundu Office to speak to such matters as they may be aware of.

5. That in this connection memorialist was examined by the Inspector of Post Offices Dindigul on the 30th July 1892 and his statement was reduced to writing and signed by him. This statement runs as follows. "Some 4 or 5 months ago one evening at about 5 O' clock, on opening the Mail Bag brought by Velliah Pillay the Village Postman of Iyampoliem, the Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu told Velliah Pillay that the Branch Office accounts refer to a registered letter as having been sent to Butlagundu and asked him why it was not found in the Mail Bag and whether he (Velliah Pillay) knew anything of the matter. Velliah Pillay replied that he knew nothing and that he would ask the Branch Postmaster of Iyampoliem and let the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu know about it the next day. Two or three days after this one Srinivasalu Naidu the elder brother of Thirupathi Naidu Branch Post master Iyampoliem had come to Butlagundu and said that he had come there to deliver a letter that was not sent through a mistake. I cannot say

what particular date the above things occurred but all I now say is from memory as far as it serves me. The runner Velliah Pillay said that he was present when the Mail Bag was tied at Iyampoliem and that the Branch Post master did not send any registered letter that day."

6. That after the submission of these statements the said Reghunatha Row was found guilty after an exhaustive enquiry and in dismissing the said Reghunatha Row the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division thought it expedient to call on Your Memorialist and the said Velliah Pillay for their statements to show cause why they also should not be punished for having given false statements and Your Memorialist accordingly submitted his explanation reiterating as far as he knew what had happened and stated what he knew to be true to the best of his information and belief but much to the surprise of Your Memorialist he received an order of dismissal dated 13th July 1893.

7. That before commenting upon the procedure of the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division in this connection it would be proper to call Your attention to a correspondence emanating from the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu reporting Your memorialist and on that report Your memorialist was transferred to Paramakudi as village Postman. This order of the Superintendent is dated 26th December 1892 No. $\frac{11983}{B. 4}$ and runs. "Post man Chinniah Pillay of Butlagundu Office having been reported against by the Sub-Post master Butlagundu as inattentive to his duties and quarrelsome with the other subordinates of the office and also given up to wicked habits, is hereby transferred to Paramakudy as Village Post man on equal pay Rs. 6—8—0 and he will report himself to the Inspector Paramakudy Sub-Division in view to his being taken in service. The Sub-Post master Butlagundu will relieve him and send him to Paramakudi at once.

8. That Your memorialist begs it to be borne in mind that he was dismissed for attempting to screen a person who is his greatest enemy. There is a receptivity to the human mind when absurd theories are advanced!!

9. That Your memorialist was charged for screening an Official charged with a most serious offence and that memorialist was also an abettor. Whereas it will be seen that the evidence given by memorial was simply the conversation held by two or more persons as far as his memory serves him and therefore it could not be said that he wilfully and maliciously gave evidence in a case to screen others.—

10. That memorialist appealed against this unjust decision to the Post master-General and that Officer in his No. $\frac{13894}{P. R. 50 N}$ dated 23rd September 93 declines to interfere. It may be urged here that the Post master General is of opinion that memorialist altered his statement because "he knows now that as he himself puts it", the Sub Post master of Butlagundu carelessly allowed the registered letter to pass as an unregistered letter and that he is aware no other theory is tenable.

11. Your memorialist begs to state that his first statement was so worded only from memory and how any blame of giving intentionally false evidence can be imputed to him is more than one can conclude.

12. Your memorialist begs to state that the Officials had come to a conclusion that the conversation relating to Srinivasalu Naidu the brother of the Sub Post master of Iyampoliem is false. Under what circumstances they have arrived at this conclusion is a matter for Your consideration.

13. That Memorialist appealed to the Director General of Post Offices and that Officer also declined to interfere *vide* his No. $\frac{28573}{ap. 44-94-95}$ date 30—11—94.

14. Your memorialist only urges two points in his favour (1) Will he befriend his own enemy (2) Was the conversation he stated hearsay. To the above first question memorialist begs to state he has above shown sufficient reasons for his enmity and therefore the finding of the Postal authorities is unsound and cannot be maintained.

In regard to the 2nd question, memorialist begs to state that it is impossible to state with exact precision what happened a few hours ago, and how the Postal authorities except a man of the stamp of petitioner who it must be remembered is illiterate to describe with all accuracy all what happened some months ago is beyond comprehension.

15. Memorialist prays You will call for the records connected with his case, to peruse them, and in consideration of his long service and the trivial offence if any, he pleased to reinstate him in his former post.

Dindigul }

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL
Fort St. George
MADRAS.

The humble memorial of Chinnia Pillay late Postman,
Butlagundu Post Office, Dindigul Taluk, Madura
District, Madras Presidency.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

1. That memorialist was entertained in the Postal Department in July 1876 and has put in a service of 22 years during which period he has by assiduity and close attention to his work endeavoured to give every satisfaction and has merited the approbation of all his superiors.

2. That one Reghunatha Row late Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu was charged with falsification of certain documents and fabrication of a registered letter in lieu of one posted at Iyampoliem on the 21st November 1891 and which letter the said Reghunatha Row had allowed to pass through his Office as an unregistered letter.

3. That the defence unsuccessfully set up by him, was that the registered letter was not received on the 21st November in the Mail Bag from Iyampoliem, but that it was subsequently sent by the Branch Postmaster through the hands of his brother one Srinivasalu Naidu.

4. That the said Reghunatha Row cited memorialist and one Velliah Pillay, acting Village Postman, of the Butlagundu Office to speak to such matters as they may be aware of.

5. That in this connection memorialist was examined by the Inspector of Post Offices Dindigul on the 30th July 1892 and his statement was reduced to writing and signed by him. This statement runs as follows. "Some 4 or 5 months ago one evening at about 5 O'clock, on opening the Mail Bag brought by Velliah Pillay the Village Postman of Iyampoliem, the Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu told Velliah Pillay that the Branch Office accounts refer to a registered letter as having been sent to Butlagundu and asked him why it was not found in the Mail Bag and whether he (Velliah Pillay) knew anything of the matter. Velliah Pillay replied that he knew nothing and that he would ask the Branch Postmaster of Iyampoliem and let the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu know about it the next day. Two or three days after this one Srinivasalu Naidu the elder brother of Thirupathi Naidu Branch Post master Iyampoliem had come to Butlagundu and said that he had come there to deliver a letter that was not sent through a mistake. I cannot say

what particular date the above things occurred but all I now say is from memory as far as it serves me. The runner Velliah Pillay said that he was present when the Mail Bag was tied at Iyampoliem and that the Branch Post master did not send any registered letter that day."

6. That after the submission of these statements the said Reghunatha Row was found guilty after an exhaustive enquiry and in dismissing the said Reghunatha Row the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division thought it expedient to call on Your Memorialist and the said Velliah Pillay for their statements to show cause why they also should not be punished for having given false statements and Your Memorialist accordingly submitted his explanation reiterating as far as he knew what had happened and stated what he knew to be true to the best of his information and belief but much to the surprise of Your Memorialist he received an order of dismissal dated 13th July 1893.

7. That before commenting upon the procedure of the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division in this connection it would be proper to call Your attention to a correspondence emanating from the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu reporting Your memorialist and on that report Your memorialist was transferred to Paramakudi as village Postman. This order of the Superintendent is dated 26th December 1892 No. $\frac{11983}{B. 4}$ and runs. "Post man Chinniah Pillay of Butlagundu Office having been reported against by the Sub-Post master Batlagundu as inattentive to his duties and quarrelsome with the other subordinates of the office and also given up to wicked habits, is hereby transferred to Paramakudy as Village Post man on equal pay Rs. 6—8—0 and he will report himself to the Inspector Paramakudy Sub-Division in view to his being taken in service. The Sub-Post master Butlagundu will relieve him and send him to Paramakudi at once.

8. That Your memorialist begs it to be borne in mind that he was dismissed for attempting to screen a person who is his greatest enemy. There is a receptivity to the human mind when absurd theories are advanced!!

9. That Your memorialist was charged for screening an Official charged with a most serious offence and that memorialist was also an abettor. Whereas it will be seen that the evidence given by memorial was simply the conversation held by two or more persons as far as his memory serves him and therefore it could not be said that he wilfully and maliciously gave evidence in a case to screen others.—

10. That memorialist appealed against this unjust decision to the Post master-General and that Officer in his No. $\frac{13894}{P. R. 50 N}$ dated 23rd September 93 declines to interfere. It may be urged here that the Post master General is of opinion that memorialist altered his statement because "he knows now that as he himself puts it", the Sub Post master of Butlagundu carelessly allowed the registered letter to pass as an unregistered letter and that he is aware no other theory is tenable.

11. Your memorialist begs to state that his first statement was so worded only from memory and how any blame of giving intentionally false evidence can be imputed to him is more than one can conclude.

12. Your memorialist begs to state that the Officials had come to a conclusion that the conversation relating to Srinivasalu Naidu the brother of the Sub Post master of Iyampoliem is false. Under what circumstances they have arrived at this conclusion is a matter for Your consideration.


13. That Memorialist appealed to the Director General of Post Offices and that Officer also declined to interfere *vide* his No. $\frac{28573}{ap. 44-94-95}$ date 30—11—94.

14. Your memorialist only urges two points in his favour (1) Will he befriend his own enemy (2) Was the conversation he stated hearsay. To the above first question memorialist begs to state he has above shown sufficient reasons for his enmity and therefore the finding of the Postal authorities is unsound and cannot be maintained.

In regard to the 2nd question, memorialist begs to state that it is impossible to state with exact precision what happened a few hours ago, and how the Postal authorities except a man of the stamp of petitioner who it must be remembered is illiterate to describe with all accuracy all what happened some months ago is beyond comprehension.

15. Memorialist prays You will call for the records connected with his case, to peruse them, and in consideration of his long service and the trivial offence if any, he pleased to reinstate him in his former post.

Dindigul }



CURRENT No. 2133

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL
Fort St. George
MADRAS.

The humble memorial of Chinnia Pillay late Postman,
Butlagundu Post Office, Dindigul Taluk, Madura
District, Madras Presidency.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:—

1. That memorialist was entertained in the Postal Department in July 1876 and has put in a service of 22 years during which period he has by assiduity and close attention to his work endeavoured to give every satisfaction and has merited the approbation of all his superiors.
2. That one Reghunatha Row late Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu was charged with falsification of certain documents and fabrication of a registered letter in lieu of one posted at Iyampoliem on the 21st November 1891 and which letter the said Reghunatha Row had allowed to pass through his Office as an unregistered letter.
3. That the defence unsuccessfully set up by him, was that the registered letter was not received on the 21st November in the Mail Bag from Iyampoliem, but that it was subsequently sent by the Branch Postmaster through the hands of his brother one Srinivasalu Naidu.
4. That the said Reghunatha Row cited memorialist and one Velliah Pillay, acting Village Postman, of the Butlagundu Office to speak to such matters as they may be aware of.
5. That in this connection memorialist was examined by the Inspector of Post Offices Dindigul on the 30th July 1892 and his statement was reduced to writing and signed by him. This statement runs as follows. "Some 4 or 5 months ago one evening at about 5 O' clock, on opening the Mail Bag brought by Velliah Pillay the Village Postman of Iyampoliem, the Sub Postmaster of Butlagundu told Velliah Pillay that the Branch Office accounts refer to a registered letter as having been sent to Butlagundu and asked him why it was not found in the Mail Bag and whether he (Velliah Pillay) knew anything of the matter. Velliah Pillay replied that he knew nothing and that he would ask the Branch Postmaster of Iyampoliem and let the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu know about it the next day. Two or three days after this one Srinivasalu Naidu the elder brother of Thirupathi Naidu Branch Post master Iyampoliem had come to Butlagundu and said that he had come there to deliver a letter that was not sent through a mistake. I cannot say

3 P.C. of under to C. No 2133

what particular date the above things occurred but all I now say is from memory as far as it serves me. The runner Velliah Pillay said that he was present when the Mail Bag was tied at Iyampoliem and that the Branch Post master did not send any registered letter that day."

6. That after the submission of these statements the said Reghunatha Row was found guilty after an exhaustive enquiry and in dismissing the said Reghunatha Row the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division thought it expedient to call on Your Memorialist and the said Velliah Pillay for their statements to show cause why they also should not be punished for having given false statements and Your Memorialist accordingly submitted his explanation reiterating as far as he knew what had happened and stated what he knew to be true to the best of his information and belief but much to the surprise of Your Memorialist he received an order of dismissal dated 13th July 1893.

7. That before commenting upon the procedure of the Superintendent of Post Offices Trichinopoly Division in this connection it would be proper to call Your attention to a correspondence emanating from the Sub-Post master of Butlagundu reporting Your memorialist and on that report Your memorialist was transferred to Paramakudi as village Postman. This order of the Superintendent is dated 26th December 1892 No. ¹¹⁹⁸³ B. 4 and runs. "Post man Chinniah Pillay of Butlagundu Office having been reported against by the Sub-Post master Butlagundu as inattentive to his duties and quarrelsome with the other subordinates of the office and also given up to wicked habits, is hereby transferred to Paramakudy as Village Post man on equal pay Rs. 6-8-0 and he will report himself to the Inspector Paramakudy Sub-Division in view to his being taken in service. The Sub-Post master Butlagundu will relieve him and send him to Paramakudi at once."

8. That Your memorialist begs it to be borne in mind that he was dismissed for attempting to screen a person who is his greatest enemy. There is a receptivity to the human mind when absurd theories are advanced!!

9. That Your memorialist was charged for screening an Official charged with a most serious offence and that memorialist was also an abettor. Whereas it will be seen that the evidence given by memorialist was simply the conversation held by two or more persons as far as his memory serves him and therefore it could not be said that he wilfully and maliciously gave evidence in a case to screen others.—

10. That memorialist appealed against this unjust decision to the Post master General and that Officer in his No. ¹³⁸⁹⁴ P. R. 50 N dated 23rd September 93 declines to interfere. It may be urged here that the Post master General is of opinion that memorialist altered his statement because "he knows now that as he himself puts it", the Sub Post master of Butlagundu carelessly allowed the registered letter to pass as an unregistered letter and that he is aware no other theory is tenable.

11. Your memorialist begs to state that his first statement was so worded only from memory and how any blame of giving intentionally false evidence can be imputed to him is more than one can conclude.

12. Your memorialist begs to state that the Officials had come to a conclusion that the conversation relating to Srinivasulu Naidu the brother of the Sub Post master of Iyampoliem is false. Under what circumstances they have arrived at this conclusion is a matter for Your consideration.


13. That Memorialist appealed to the Director General of Post Offices and that Officer also declined to interfere vide his No. ²⁸⁵⁷³ ap. 44-94-95 date 30-11-94.

14. Your memorialist only urges two points in his favour (1) Will he befriend his own enemy (2) Was the conversation he stated hearsay. To the above first question memorialist begs to state he has above shown sufficient reasons for his enmity and therefore the finding of the Postal authorities is unsound and cannot be maintained.

In regard to the 2nd question, memorialist begs to state that it is impossible to state with exact precision what happened a few hours ago, and how the Postal authorities except a man of the stamp of petitioner who it must be remembered is illiterate to describe with all accuracy all what happened some months ago is beyond comprehension.

15. Memorialist prays You will call for the records connected with his case, to peruse them, and in consideration of his long service and the trivial offence if any, he pleased to reinstate him in his former post.

Dindigul }



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

189.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURE 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.

1895
 2nd
 1
 2173