

Public (1898) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 202

DATED 3.2.98.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Recording papers relating to the reinstatement
of R. Govindan and T. Mukunda, type-cast
in the Govt Press Madras.*

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[Pub.]
29.
2,000-5-3-97.

Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~4448~~ 4448.

AS
To await original

25/11/97

AS
The original has not yet come. As this duplicate has been given the same From
number as that disposed of by
Rmtine for 271 Pubd 22.11.97
Order it may be filed with
that order and disposed of

R. Govinden
late machine carter
Govt Press. Madras.

A.S.

The original has not yet come. Please
see Mr. Price's note of 20.4.97 on C 1346
of 97 lodgd.

C.W.
10.12.97.

Telephone to Supt. asking
when it may be expected.

M.L.
16
x11

Dated

20.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

No.

25 } 21.97

SUBJECT.

Stating that the original of
the enclosed memorial was
sent thro' the Supt. Govt
Press on the 15th inst.

Refuse.
The Govt. has issued notice
with paper (R 1271) 22.11.97
The Govt. will ensure has been
from the Govt. 24/11/97 P.117

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

A.
Government Press
Mint Buildings
Madras 22^d July 1897
No 3156.

From

R. Hill. Esq.
Superintendent.
Govt. Press

L.

In. R. Ry.
R. Govindan
93. Manamuruganai Coil Rd.
Royapuram

Informing with reference to his letter of
the 19th Instant that the Superintendent
declines to reinstate him

(Sgd) R. Hill
Superintendent.

The above is a true and correct copy of the original as the same was presented to the Court at the trial of the said John Brown.

1897
Feb. Dept.
Enclos. No. 2
To
C. No. 441

Genl. Press
Mort Building.
Madras 5th August 1897

№ 3432.

From. N. Hill. Esq.

Sept. Govt. Press.

L. H. R. Ry.

R. G. Smith dan

93. Mannanauwy coil. Pt. Royofman

With reference to his letter of the 29th ultimo, the
n/s gives below a copy of the order dismissing him

• R. Gossidan and + + + were dismissed on the 9th July 1897.

(1). for being impudent to the foreman, regarding the fine imposed on R. Murray on the previous day.

(2) for accusing the foreman of having received a bribe from + + + which on enquiry proved to be untrue "


429) R. Hill
Superintendent

Duplicate

No. 93, Munnarsawmy Covel Street
ROYAPURAM, MADRAS, 15th October 1897.

To

*Secretary
The Chief, to the Government
Fort St. George.*



*The humble memorial of Royapuram
R. GOVINDAN, late Machine Caster,
Government Press, Madras.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That Your Excellency's Memorialist's service in the Government Press as a Machine caster exceeds 10 years, during which long period he rendered his superiors honest and faithful service, and was regular and punctual in attendance.

2. That on the 8th of July last, a fellow workman named R. Moorogan in the course of his working with the machine accidentally broke a small nail hardly worth a couple of annas, which the Foreman Ruthnam took to the notice of the Superintendent and had him fined a Rupee. Whereupon Your Excellency's humble memorialist remarked that it was very strange on the part of the Foreman to take such severe steps for a petty offence as this, when there had been cases where damages of a greater value were left utterly unnoticed, and that it would be impossible to expect the machine castors to carry on their work without the occurrence of petty casualties like this. It should also be noted that the above remark was also made by the other workmen alike.

3. That the said foreman singled out Your Excellency's memorialist out of the whole lot on account of the private grudge which he bears towards him the memorialist, and misrepresented the whole case to the Superintendent who placing full confidence in the statements of the Foreman and without giving even the slightest chance for defence, dismissed Your Excellency's humble memorialist from the service.

4. That on the 19th July last, your memorialist petitioned to the Superintendent apologising for the miscomings on his part if any, and begging him to be pleased to reinstate him into the service, which the Superintendent sternly declined to do, by his endorsement No. 3156, dated 22nd July 1897, copy of which is herewith appended, marked A.

5. That again on the 29th of July Your Excellency's humble memorialist appealed to the Superintendent begging to be informed of the grave offence for which he has dismissed him as he the memorialist was quite ignorant of the same: for which he received that officer's Endorsement No. 3432, dated 5th August 1897, copy of which is herein enclosed, marked B. By this endorsement

1897
Pub. Dept.
Enclos. No.
To 444
C. No. 487

the charges against your Excellency's memorialist are (1) for being impudent to the foreman regarding the fine imposed on R. Murugan on the previous day (2) for accusing the foreman of having received a bribe from * * which on enquiry proved to be untrue. Of these your humble memorialist begs to deny the latter *intoto*.

6. At this crisis of the memorial, the memorialist thinks it nothing more than his bounden duty to bring to your Excellency's notice the following facts which will give an idea of the private hatred which the Foreman bears towards him, and an idea of the respectability of the Foreman's character, for the alleged impeachment of which, the Superintendent has dismissed a poorman from service and deprived him of his livelihood in these famine days:—

(a.) The Foreman Ruthnam was fined Rs. 15 for having been careless in allowing a solid lead type to be stolen away from the Press.

(b.) The Foreman Ruthnam having been found guilty of having *dishonestly* removed from the Press from time to time copies of the Gazette before its publication and supplying the same stealthily to one school-master Ragoonatha Mudaly was fined *only* Rs. 5.

(c.) The same Foreman having been found guilty of *dishonesty* by marking a Government servant as present in the office, and making him do the private work of white washing his own house, was fined *only* Rs. 5. The above three can be well proved by a perusal of the Fine Book kept at the Government Press.

(d.) To create an idea of the hatred of the said foreman towards the memorialist it is to be put forth, that the Foreman tried to hush up and kept quiet for over 3 days without bringing to the notice of the Superintendent the report of your Excellency's Memorialist against one Theeruvengada Moodelly and Arunachella Acharry, who had secreted brass sheets and spoons with intent to take away the same to their houses. But on the fourth day when the memorialist reported the matter to the gate-keepers lest the theft should make the whole lot of workmen in the Department to be suspected, the said foreman as his last resource was obliged to take it to the Superintendent's notice who on enquiry fined Theeruvengada Moodelly only Rs. 2, and Arunachella Achary Rupee 1, both trivial fines indeed, in comparison with the atrocity of the crimes for which they have been imposed. Ever since the foreman bore a deadly hatred towards the memorialist, and has even more than once manifested by his actions that he was determined to see him out of the Press, which he artfully contrived in bringing about so successfully as shown above.

7. That when the foreman whose greivous guilt was proved beyond all doubt on several occasions, was permitted to escape by mere fines the memorialist is at a loss to understand how the Superintendent dismissed him by the misrepresentations of such a guilty personage. To punish a Government servant there is first of all the imposition of a fine, secondly there is the punishment of suspension for a period. Unfortunately neither of these were resorted to, in the miserable

memorialist's case nor did the Superintendent weigh adequately the manifold losses resulting by a dismissal. The humble memorialist has not only lost his livelihood at present, but also the benefit of his long service under Government which he clung to so tenaciously for the last ten years and more with the fervent hope that he can thereby be protected by a pension in his old age. This loss is also of an irreparable nature since he should give up every hope of re-entertainment newly into the service any longer on account of the age bar regulations.

8. Under all the above circumstances Your Excellency's humble memorialist has no other alternative but to lay his deplorable case into the hands of a good charitable, and Christian Government with the fervent *Prayer*. That the Government will render the memorialists case the consideration it deserves and see the ends of justice met with, by being graciously pleased to order his re-instatement to his post from which he has been most unjustly oosted.

For which act of charity memorialist and his poor family will as in duty bound,

Ever pray.

Mudras
20th Nov. 1897 } (Signed) P. Gorindam
(Signed) Mukundhar

Handwritten notes, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through from the reverse side.

We humbly beg
your honor. that we have
the original copy of this
honor through the Super
Government Press, Made
15th instant.

We beg to,
Honor
Your most obedt
(Scribe) R. G. Smith
(Scribe) M. K. M.

1897
Sub. Dept.
Enclos. No. 1
In 425 446

[G
118]
500-11-0-97.

Pub Department.

C. No. 4448

TELEPHONE MESSAGE.

From

2nd Asst

CHIEF SECRETARIAT,

To

Supdt Govt Press

Dated Dec 7 1897

When may
memorial from
R. Govindan, late
machine caster,
Govt Press for-
warded thro'
you on the 15th
November 1897
be inspected?

W.C.
17.12.97
(fr. H.S. orders)

16-12-97
17/12/97
43

Code
Class.

INDIAN

TELEGRAPHS. Monthly
Number.To
(Office)

Telephonic

From message
(Office)

Words.

Day.

17

Hour.

13

Minute.

20-

Official

Instructions.

To
(Person)Second asst-
Chief Secy.From
(Person)Super-
Govt-Pres

~~(11-12-97)~~ - Memorial from R. Goundani
late machine caste Govt-Pres. will
be sent next week.

B

17-12-97

84 Word Form.

As
17-12-97

R

Return when I come

ad
18/12/97

Recd from

LN.

Sent to

LN.

At

Hrs.

Mts by

At

Hrs.

Mts by

Telegraph Master.

Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 24.



Order

From

*The Superintendent,
Government Press,
Madras*

No. 5661

Dated 30th December 1897

Received 4th Jan 1898

Registered 4th January 1898

Enclosures *three*

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Submits with remarks the
petition of R. Govindan and
J. Mukundam, type casters, regarding
their dismissal and requesting
to be reinstated*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
1271	722-11-97		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 93, Munnarsawmy Covil Street
ROYAPURAM, MADRAS, 15th October 1897.

To

*The Chief Secretary
Through The Superintendent
Government Press.*

*The humble memorial of Royapuram
R. GOVINDAN, late Machine Caster,
Government Press, Madras.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That Your Excellency's Memorialist's service in the Government Press as a Machine castor exceeds 10 years, during which long period he rendered his superiors honest and faithful service, and was regular and punctual in attendance.

2. That on the 8th of July last, a fellow workman named R. Moorogan in the course of his working with the machine accidentally broke a small nail hardly worth a couple of annas, which the Foreman Ruthnam took to the notice of the Superintendent and had him fined a Rupee. Whereupon Your Excellency's humble memorialist remarked that it was very strange on the part of the Foreman to take such severe steps for a petty offence as this, when there had been cases where damages of a greater value were left utterly unnoticed, and that it would be impossible to expect the machine castors to carry on their work without the occurrence of petty casualties like this. It should also be noted that the above remark was also made by the other workmen alike.

3. That the said foreman singled out Your Excellency's memorialist out of the whole lot on account of the private grudge which he bears towards him the memorialist, and misrepresented the whole case to the Superintendent who placing full confidence in the statements of the Foreman and without giving even the slightest chance for defence, dismissed Your Excellency's humble memorialist from the service.

4. That on the 19th July last, your memorialist petitioned to the Superintendent apologising for the miscomings on his part if any, and begging him to be pleased to reinstate him into the service, which the Superintendent sternly declined to do, by his endorsement No. 3156, dated 22nd July 1897, copy of which is herewith appended, marked A.

5. That again on the 29th of July Your Excellency's humble memorialist appealed to the Superintendent begging to be informed of the grave offence for which he has dismissed him as he the memorialist was quite ignorant of the same: for which he received that officer's Endorsement No. 3432, dated 5th August 1897, copy of which is herein enclosed, marked B. By this endorsement

the charges against your Excellency's memorialist are (1) for being impudent to the foreman regarding the fine imposed on R. Murugan on the previous day (2) for accusing the foreman of having received a bribe from * * which on enquiry proved to be untrue. Of these your humble memorialist begs to deny the latter *intoto*.

6. At this crisis of the memorial, the memorialist thinks it nothing more than his bounden duty to bring to your Excellency's notice the following facts which will give an idea of the private hatred which the Foreman bears towards him, and an idea of the respectability of the Foreman's character, for the alleged impeachment of which, the Superintendent has dismissed a poorman from service and deprived him of his livelihood in these famine days:—

- (a.) The Foreman Ruthnam was fined Rs. 15 for having been careless in allowing a solid lead type to be stolen away from the Press.
- (b.) The Foreman Ruthnam having been found guilty of having *dishonestly* removed from the Press from time to time copies of the Gazette before its publication and supplying the same stealthily to one school-master Ragoonatha Mudaly was fined *only* Rs. 5.
- (c.) The same Foreman having been found guilty of *dishonesty* by marking a Government servant as present in the office, and making him do the private work of white washing his own house, was fined *only* Rs. 5. The above three can be well proved by a perusal of the Fine Book kept at the Government Press.
- (d.) To create an idea of the hatred of the said foreman towards the memorialist it is to be put forth, that the Foreman tried to hush up and kept quiet for over 3 days without bringing to the notice of the Superintendent the report of your Excellency's Memorialist against one Theeruvengada Moodelly and Arunachella Acharry, who had secreted brass sheets and spoons with intent to take away the same to their houses. But on the fourth day when the memorialist reported the matter to the gate-keepers lest the theft should make the whole lot of workmen in the Department to be suspected, the said foreman as his last resource was obliged to take it to the Superintendent's notice who on enquiry fined Theeruvengada Moodelly only Rs. 2, and Arunachella Achary Rupee 1, both trivial fines indeed, in comparison with the atrocity of the crimes for which they have been imposed. Ever since the foreman bore a deadly hatred towards the memorialist, and has even more than once manifested by his actions that he was determined to see him out of the Press, which he artfully contrived in bringing about so successfully as shown above.

7. That when the foreman whose greivous guilt was proved beyond all doubt on several occasions, was permitted to escape by mere fines the memorialist is at a loss to understand how the Superintendent dismissed him by the misrepresentations of such a guilty personage. To punish a Government servant there is first of all the imposition of a fine, secondly there is the punishment of suspension for a period. Unfortunately neither of these were resorted to, in the miserable

memorialist's case nor did the Superintendent weigh adequately the manifold losses resulting by a dismissal. The humble memorialist has not only lost his livelihood at present, but also the benefit of his long service under Government which he clung to so tenaciously for the last ten years and more with the fervent hope that he can thereby be protected by a pension in his old age. This loss is also of an irreparable nature since he should give up every hope of re-entertainment newly into the service any longer on account of the age bar regulations.

8. Under all the above circumstances Your Excellency's humble memorialist has no other alternative but to lay his deplorable case into the hands of a good charitable, and Christian Government with the fervent *Prayer*. That the Government will render the memorialists case the consideration it deserves and see the ends of justice met with, by being graciously pleased to order his re-instatement to his post from which he has been most unjustly oosted.

For which act of charity memorialist and his poor family will as in duty bound,

Ever pray.

R. Govinden.
Mukkundru.

15/11/97

*fined 14th Jan'y
1894 Rk*

*fined 28th Jan'y.
1896 Rk*

ditto Rk

*fined 2nd May
1897 Rk*

Government Press
Print Buildings,

Madras, 22nd July 1897.
No 3156

From
R. Hill, Esq.,
Superintendent,
Government Press,

To
Mr. R. Hill,
R. Hill, Esq.,
93 Abanma saamy street
Araduram

This is to certify

reference to his letter of
the 14th instant, that
the Superintendent declines
to restate him.

R. Hill.
Superintendent

1898
Public

3

16

24.

Government Press,
Mint Buildings.
Madras, 5th August 1897.
No 3432.

From
R. Hill Esq.,
Superintendent,
Government Press.

To
" R. S. S.
R. Govinden.
23, Moannarswamy Coilst.,
Royapuram.

His No. Dated
The reference
to his letter of the 29th ultimo,
the M/S gives below a
copy of the order dismissing
him.

" R. Govinden and
X X X X now dismissed.

on the 9th July 1897—

(1) for being impudent to the foreman
regarding the fine imposed on R. Marugan
on the previous day.

(2) for accusing the foreman of having
received a bribe from x x x
which on enquiry proved to be untrue."

R. Hill
Superintendent.

8
P. H. C.
1
2.

CURRENT

No. 5661

Govt. Press, Madras,

30th December 18

Office Note

In forwarding the accompanying
petition, dated 15th October 1897,
from R. Govindan and J. Krishnan
type-casters, regarding their
dismissal on the 9th July last,
the Superintendent submits for
the Chief Secretary's information that
the delay in forwarding this
petition has been caused by an
enquiry into the loss of certain
type-punches which were found
missing after receipt of an anonymous
letter on the 23rd August last,
and for a time there was reason
to suspect that one or both of these
men had assisted in removing
these type-punches from the department
to bring about the reduction or
dismissal of the foundry foreman.
2. For some months previous
to their dismissal there had been
considerable ill-feeling existing
between certain of the type-casters,
the type-cutters, and the foreman,
and the petitioners were frequently
making complaints against the

remain and others, many of these complaints being small and vexatious; in one instance only was there sufficient ground for accepting these statements, as stated in paragraph 6(d) of the petition. To bring a type-cutter into trouble, a cutter's stone was stolen, and after enquiry, there was reason to suspect that Mukundee had taken it away. To put a stop to these losses, in August last nearly everyone in the department was fined to pay for the new stones.

3. On the 8th July a type-caster named R. Mungana was fined one rupee for breaking a certain screw of his machine, and causing two days' loss of work. The screw was one that could not have been easily broken, considering its position in the machine. On hearing of the fine both petitioners created a disturbance in the department, and abused the foreman & they further charged him with receiving a bribe of Rs. 4 from P. Ramaswami, another type-caster on the occasion of his joining an appointment in Rangoon. From the explanation given by Mr. Fisher, the Deputy Superintendent, and P. Ramaswami as to his engagement by the British Burma Press, it was

clearly shown that beyond knowing that some money was received for the foreman for P. Ramaswami's post to Rangoon, they had no knowledge how it was disposed of.

As to the other men by their conduct in the department, and making the other casters disobedient to the foreman, and the department was working in an unsatisfactory manner through their influences, they were dismissed (1) for being impudent to the foreman regarding the fine imposed on R. Mungana on the previous day, and (2) for accusing the foreman of having received a bribe from & & which on enquiry proved to be untrue.

The following shows the services of these men:-

J. Mukundee
 Service 9 years
 Pay on date of entrance Rs. 8
 - dismissal - 9
 Age 36 years
 Recorded Punishment - Dismissed
 three for absence without leave -
 from 1st Dec. 88 to 14 April
 1889, and from 1 Oct 91 to 22 Jan 93

Attendance	since Jan 93	C. leave	medl.	N. d.
1893		$\frac{1}{2}$ day		25 $\frac{1}{2}$ days
1894				75
1895				28
1896	2			23 $\frac{1}{2}$
1897	2			3

R. Gannaden
 Service 8 years
 Pay on date of entrance Rs. 6
 - dismissal - 10
 Age 42 years
 Recorded Punishment - Dismissed
 for absence without leave
 from 22 Oct 90 to 25 Sep. 91;
 Pay reduced from Rs. 8 to Rs. 7
 for irregular attendance from 1st
 Nov 92 to 22 Jan 93.

Attendance	since Jan 93	C. leave	medl.	N. d.
1893		1 day		9 days 28 days
1894		$\frac{1}{2}$		33 40 $\frac{1}{2}$
1895	1			16 26 $\frac{1}{2}$
1896	1 $\frac{1}{2}$			37
1897	3			24

5. The petitioners did not assist in the enquiries made. The foreman was fired on the occasions referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of the petition.

6. The Superintendent respectfully submits that these petitioners should not be restored to the service for the reasons stated in paragraph 4 above. The department has been working quietly ever since their removal.

Office.

Superintendent.

The Chief Secretary
to Government.

Public Dept

C14448

C1 247

note for the And Key -

The Supdt for Press submits his report on the Memorandum from R. Govindan (I. M. K. S. D.) promising in his telephone of the 17th ultimo.

The Reference reports that there are no previous papers with up to para 4 of C24.

Please refer 534 Pubd 129.6.95
flagged K

Ces
14/10/98

note for C.S.

Submitted for orders. Petitioner was dismissed on a former occasion. The foreman appears to have given colour to the accusation of Petitioner that he had received a bribe. It is not clear from para. 5. a. f.

P. T. O.

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

There is a difficulty in disposing of these papers. The P.S. deals with these appeals as head of the Dept., not as Chief Secretary to Govt. and so it does not seem proper to dispose of the lts by a S.O.

K.

Please see S.O. 539

1893
An appeal lies to Govt.

appt the orders of the P.S. in his capacity as head of the Press Dept. This would mean that Govt. was to revise its own orders.

It is, of course, necessary to register these papers in the Chief Secretariat, but could not a separate current list be opened for the matters with which the P.S. deals in other capacities than as P.S.? eg. Press, & St Mary's Church Fund. It would then be closed by orders of the P.S. without necessitating the issue of a S.O.

MLP.

19 8

the appeal petition whether petitioners desire having made the accusation, or merely desire that the accusation was false.

MLP.

19 8

Indt (C. Secy) No. 276

Considering the result of the enquiry into the complaint ~~made~~ against the foreman the petrs should not have been dismissed for making this charge. As a punishment for impertinence dismissal is too severe. ~~The petrs have already been dismissed & reemployed for misconduct but were reemployed. A last chance will now be given them & they will be reemployed by the Supt. but any further misconduct will involve the penalty of dismissal.~~

At 17.1.98

N.

Stet

No 202 of 3.2.98

To the Secy to Govt Press (S/P)

CL 4448997 & 24495

Recorded

MLP.

29 8

17.1.98

This is a Dept. matter. An appeal lies from the order of the P.S. to Govt. I shd have said 'Fair' instead of 'draft'.

MLP.
19 8

Ch. for remark

At 20.1.98

To the Superintendent South Press. Dec 2/2/98

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

There would be no difficulty opening a separate register for such papers (and if it is incorrect to bring such papers on the records of Govt., it is equally incorrect to register them in the registers maintained for papers received by Govt.) and to keep a separate disposal list; but the registry and the disposal of a paper are merely the first steps in record keeping and the point which has to be considered is the difficulty which would arise from the separation of these papers from the Govt. records. If the Chief Secy's orders on appeals from employees in the Press are not brought on record in the Secretariat they cannot go on to the indexes maintained in the Secretariat or on to the Tables of Contents. There would thus be some difficulty in tracing the papers when required again and a great chance of their being overlooked altogether. The procedure advocated by the Asst. Secy. would multiply the registers and disposal lists in the office, which are sufficiently numerous as matters at present stand, and I submit that the number of papers falling under the heads referred to in the last para. of the Asst. Secy's note is not sufficient to warrant a disturbance of the

cords.

The red ink disposal at the foot of the Chief Secretary's order on the petition is, I submit, the best solution of the matter. ~~I submit that~~ there is nothing technically incorrect in the Chief Secretary's order of dismissal being recorded in a proceedings of Govt. in other words, ~~there is~~ nothing irregular in the Chief Secretary, as head of the press, sending to Govt. for information a copy of his order on each petition and this order being brought on record in the Public dept. This is virtually what the red ink disposal proposes to do, avoiding of course the unnecessary and roundabout procedure of the Chief Secretary as head of the press, forwarding to himself, as Chief Secretary to Govt., a copy of his order in the former capacity. The disposal of the petition is the Chief Secretary's endorsement, not the recording order, and the former is the only paper which issues from the office. This procedure has various advantages, the chief of which are that it keeps the papers on the regular registers of the office, brings them on to the index of proceedings and facilitates work in every branch.

3. Another course would be to return the papers in original to the Supt. with the Chief Secy's endorsement and to keep as little as possible in the Secretariat. But this again would be

very

very inconvenient as a suitable place would have to be found for the office notes which might be written, and we have better means of keeping records and tracing them when occasion arises for reference than the Supt. of the Govt. Press has. I would not advocate this procedure.

Curb
22.1.98

The existing procedure should continue. Any change of record-keeping involves unforeseen results & no case has been made out for a new departure.

22.1.98

When given for copying 1/1/2
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

1898

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only