B. ho 2104 W. 18. 1. 88
G. 6. 912 W. 20. 3. 88
B. ho 1539 W. 28. 5. 88
" 70 W. 8. 1. 87

P.W.C. No 83

G

R/ 21-8-88

Encls. 1.

No 2740 dated 4 Sept 1888

B

Approved, with the exception of para 8 (2) which seems to be unnecessary.

Sd
28/8/88

Exr P.W.a with drafts.

Sd 4/9

8/9

27-8-88

Sd 11/9

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1888. { P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 20 August 1888.

OFFICE NOTE No. 2113

Encl: 1

To

W.

With reference to the orders of Government noted in the margin, I beg to submit herewith for the approval of Government draft standing orders, based on those orders, regarding the folding and size of paper to be used in official correspondence etc.

2. Opportunity has been taken in this connection to embody in the standing orders, rules 8, 9 and 13 (first portion) published with G.O. 2596 public dated 13th. December 1886 communicated with G.O. No. 70 W. dated 8th. January 1887, which are not now in the Code and which it appears desirable to embody therein.

C.

Enc.

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

* G.O. No. 210 W. dated 18th. January 1888.
G.O. No. 912 W. dated 20th. March 1888.
G.O. No. 1559 W. dated 28th. May 1888.

This order does not appear to relate to the subject

1,000—7-2-88.

C. No 8336

I do

Rule 872 D seems to be unnecessary. The previous draft rules deal with the size & folding of papers - and have no connection with "rules regarding the nature of correspondence addressed by the Examiner to Govt". The paras are moreover incorrectly quoted - they should be paras 3 & 5-6. These paras being already in the Code do not require to be further indicated by a Standing order

28-VIII. 88

Apparently the paras are wrongly quoted. I agree that Rule 872 D is unnecessary

29/8/88