Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4369

DATED 8th November 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating, on the proposal of the Collector of Madura for the Construction of a new Cutcherry for the Dy. Tahsildar at Usilam patti, that the previous Sanction of Govt. is not now considered necessary for the preparation of Estimates &c.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5087.

From

The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, Madras

No. 794 REF.

Dated 18th July 1898

Received 20

Registered 20

Enclosures 4

Spare copies

Order mis No. 4369 d/8th November 1898

Under-G.O. 1701 W 6-7-98 communicating G.O. No. 3308 Rev 10-8-98 the previous sanction of Govt is rendered necessary for the preparation of estimates

RS 17-8-98

Mlle 18/8/98

2. The Collector ~~is~~ has accordingly been instructed to arrange with the local P.W.D authorities for the preparation of a plan & estimate; & after obtaining these to renew his application for sanction to the construction of a new cutcherry.

To the Bd of Rev (L.R) Mlle 25 R.S. Dispr 10.11.98.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government with the Board's support the proposal of the Collector of Madura to construct a new cutcherry for the Dy. Tahsildar at Usilampatti.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
		General Record papers. J. 6/8/98	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Rep. on. Cur. No. 442 of 1898
Genl.

Madura Collector's office
Dated Madura 26th April 1898

From

J. G. B. Partridge Esquire
Acting Collector
Madura

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue
Madras

Sir,

I have the honour to State that the Deputy Collector, Madura Division, represents that a new building for the Deputy Tahsildar's office and Sub-Jail at Usilampatty is highly necessary and the present old building has been Condemned on Several Grounds by Collectors and Divisional officers on inspection. A Similar representation was made to my predecessor, the year before the last and the

then the Executive Engineer was requested to inspect the building and suggest improvements. The Sub. Divisional officer, Tirumangalam who was deputed by the Executive Engineer for the purpose, reported in letter No. 1069 dated 9 August 1896 (Copy enclosed) that the several defects complained of in the present building are:-

(1) No sufficient accommodation for the Deputy Tahsildar's clerks who are obliged to occupy a portion of the Court room.

(2) No secure place for keeping prisoners out of cells during day time as per rules.

(3) No Sheds for keeping remanded cattle

(4) No latrines.

(5) Want of ceiling planks to the tiled roof of Sub Jail wards.

(6) The existence of private thatched Sheds in close proximity to the Cutcherry.

(7) The Treasury room being Concealed from the view of the Deputy Tahsildar.

He suggested several improvements, as may be observed from his report, to remedy the defects and estimated the Cost thereof at Rs 7200; but at the same time remarked that though the improvements as proposed might be Carried out at a great Cost, the Cutcherry as a whole would not be a satisfactory building and it was far more advisable to build a new Cutcherry as per latest standard plan which might Cost a little more than twice the sum proposed

proposed for improvements on the old buildings.

2. The Executive Engineer promised to inspect the building and report further, which he did in May 1897. In his letter No. 194 M. dated 14th May 1897 (Copy enclosed) he observed that taken altogether, "the building is in a most dilapidated Condition and is not worth spending Rs.7200," that some portions of the present building might possibly be used for a Sub Registrar's office and a Post office, and that for the Deputy Tahsildar's office and Subjail it were very much better to get the Sanction of Government for an entirely new building.

3. Thereupon Mr. Twigg ordered some urgent petty repairs to be made at a small cost and deferred taking action for a new building owing to the then financial pressure. It may be seen from the two ground plans of the Deputy Tahsildar's Cutcherry and the surroundings (herein enclosed) that the defects pointed out by the Sub Divisional officer, are such as should be remedied as early as possible. The Treasury having been since closed, the space occupied by it may be used for the Clerks but the other inconveniences Complained of have to be met. I also attach a Copy of the notes of Inspection of the office and Sub-Jail by the Deputy Collector Madura Division on 18th June 1895 which set forth some of the inconveniences which the

the office labours under.

4. I presume that, under these Circumstances, the Board will be Convinced of the serious defects of the present building. The question, however, is whether it may be improved or a new building Constructed. The Deputy Tahsildar's Court room was built in 1890 at a Cost of Rs 2500 and the rest of the building must be very old. The Executive Engineer who has personally and Carefully inspected the present building thinks it is useless to spend money on it. I therefore request that the Board will be pleased to move Government for the erection of a new building and issue instructions to the Public Works Department

with LO.
1095 W
12-4-98
in LO. 2427
24-4-98

Department to prepare the necessary estimates.

I have the honour &c

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Gramyanasama Ayi
For Acting Collector
26-4-98

4.

Notes of inspection of the Subjail and Sub Treasury at Veilampatti by the Deputy Collector, Madura Division on 18th June 1895

The office is not Commodious. The Deputy Jaboildar's office or Court room is not in view of the Treasury. There is no place for the Custody of remanded Cattle which are Consequently kept inside the office and near the Subjail and Treasury room. The Stink is awful and, from Sanitary point of view, is very objectionable. The office Compound is not Spacious. Thatched roofs adjoin the Deputy Jaboildar's and Sub Registrar's office and when fires occur which are too frequent in this Town, the houses are a source of danger. It will, I think, be on the whole

ver

1895
COLLECTOR'S DEPARTMENT.
Volume No. 1
Current No. 581

very desirable to acquire some houses to the east to make the office Compound more spacious and to afford space for the keeping of Cattle and for making other improvements. The Deputy Tahsildar should make a thorough report after necessary enquiries.

2. x x x x

3 x x x x

4 x x x x

5. The District Magistrate has remarked on the insanitary and unsafe Condition of the Subgail and that rule 1351 of the Jail code that the prisoners should not be kept in their wards during the day, should be enforced. There is a petty officer and three Constables in Charge of the Treasury and Subgail and it is reported that it will not be safe to let the prisoners out of the cells without stronger Guard, Considering the state of the building. Some improvements should be made which I have indicated to the Deputy Tahsildar. He will report in more detail in Consultation with the Police Inspector

Signed M. Tirumalai Pillai
Deputy Collector

(True Copy)

Gnanasundaram
For Collector
26.4.48

Encl: V to Madura Collector's
letter

Rone No 462/98

dated 26-4-98

Copy of two notes of Inspection
of Pari: office at Vesilampatty

1898
CIVIL SECRETARIAT
Accession No. 3
Case Current No. 1981

Copy of Tirumangalam Subdivision
officer's letter No 169 dated 9th
August 1896 to the Executive
Engineer, Madura Division with
reference to Collector's letter No 1641 dated
11th December 1895.

I beg to report I sometime ago inspected the Deputy Tahsildar's Cutcherry at Vesilampatti and understood clearly from the Deputy Tahsildar the difficulties and inconveniences experienced in Connection with the present building.

2. They are briefly:—

1. No sufficient and Convenient space for Deputy Tahsildar's clerks who are obliged to work now in a part of Court room on north side.

(2) No secure place for keeping prisoner

prisoners out of cells during
day time as per rules
(3) No shed for keeping remand Cattle
(4) No latrine
(5) The Treasury room being Concealed
from the view of Deputy Jaboildar
(6) Want of Ceiling planks to roof
of Sub Jail wards.
and (7) The existence of private thatched
sheds in close proximity to the
Cutchery.

3. For reference, I forward herewith a ground plan of the building as it stands now and also a site plan showing its surroundings.

4. After Carefully inspecting the building I am led to think and propose

(1) that Post office should be removed from its present room and asked to find Accommodation elsewhere.

(2) that a new Police station house should be Constructed in the vacant Ground west of Court room and at site indicated in plan, the present house which does not appear to be a safe factory building, being pulled down.

(3) that lands of east side with thatched Sheds standing thereon, Coloured Yellow in site plan, should be acquired

5. Assuming the above proposals are accepted, the improvements which may be effected to the present building are:-

(a) A shed for remand Cattle and a proper latrine be built in Court yard No 2 at sites shown in plan.

(b) The present big door in the west wal

wall of Court yard No 1 be removed and the wall made up.

(c) Sub Jail ward No 2 be Converted into a passage between Court yards Nos 1 and 2 by removing a good portion of ~~its~~ south wall and removing an iron door therein and refixing it in its north wall. To make up for the loss of a ward, Ward No 3 be extended on east side and made a bigger one than what it is now

(d) Edges of Verandahs in front of Sub Jail wards be provided with iron gratings for prisoners to stop during daytime

(e) To enable Deputy Tahsildar to have a view over Treasury transactions from his Courtroom the existing walls A. B. C be removed and doorways opened in north wall of Court room and South wall of Treasury Clerk room. A part of the present Post office room be improved for Deputy Tahsildar's clerks to work in and

(f) Teak plank ceiling be provided to roof of Subjail wards.

6. I submit hereunder a rough estimate of Costs.

(a) Acquisition of lands and sheds on east side and enclosing the same with a masonry Compound wall . . . Rs 2,000

(b) Construction of a new Police Station House east of Court room . . . Rs 2,500

(c) Construction of a shed for remand Cattle and latrine in Court Yard No 2 . . Rs 700

(d) Execution of improvements dweln on above and necessary repairs Rs 2000

Total Rs 7,200

7. In Conclusion I beg to express my Conviction that though the above proposals and improvements are Carried out at a Great Cost, the Cutcherry as a whole will not be Considered a Satisfactory building. I agree with the Deputy Tahsildar and Deputy Collector in thinking that it will be far more advisable to construct a new Cutcherry as per latest Standard design at a Site far removed from Village and Native Habitations A new building will Cost a little more than twice the Sum now proposed to be laid out.

Signed V. Vedhanayaga Mudaliar
Sub divisional officer

(True Copy)

Gnanayanasampathy
for Collector
26.4.98

H

Encl. I to madura Collectors
letter.

Rone no 442/97 dt 98

Dated 26-4-98

—

Copy of Sub D. officers letter
no 1069 dt 9-8-96.

1902
CIVILIANS DEPARTMENT.
Volume No. 3
Document No. 5087

Copy of Communication No 194-M
dated 14th May 1897 from the
Executive Engineer, Madura
Division to the Collector of Madura

—

In reply to your Ref. on. Cur No 1641/Mag
dated 26th January 1897, I beg to
report that I examined the
Cutcherry in question on May 11th.
It is, taken altogether, in a much
dilapidated Condition and is
not worth spending the 7200 Rs
as mentioned in No 1069/9th August 1896
of Sub divisional officer of
Tirumangalam.

2. Some portions of the present
building might possibly be used
for a Sub Registrar's office and
a Post office

3. For the remainder it were very
much

much better to get the Sanction of Government and prepare an estimate for an entirely new building.

Gnanayanasam'Aiyar
For Collector
26-4-98

Enc: II to madura Collector's
letter
Roc no 442/98 of 98
dated 26-4-98

Copy of Executive Engr's
letter No 134 M. dated 16th May
1897.

1898
SERVICES DEPUTED &c.
Enclosure No 4
Ex Current No 5087

Roc No. 442/Genl 98

Madura Collector's Office,
2nd July 1898.

From

J. G. D. Partridge Esq.,
Acting Collector of
Madura

To

The Secretary to the Commissioner
of Land Revenue
Madras.

Sir,

In reply to Board's Reference no. 573/21st May 98
I have the honor to state that the Executive Engineer reports that the present building in the site will fetch about Rs 3,500 and that a suitable site for the construction of a new office is also available.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Swaminathan
For Collector
2-7-98.

Enc

Ex Current No 5087

1998
Rs. 5

P.W.D.
6- AUG. 98
TIRUMANGALAM
6- JUL 98
TIRUMANGALAM

Deputy Tahsildars Office at
Usalampatty
Site plan of the

Thatched Roof

24-9

45-0"

Mud walls with Thatched Roof.

23-0

13-0

7-0

Lane.

Mud walls with thatched Roof.

Mud walls with Thatched Roof.

24-9

24-

39-0"

7-0

Registrars office.

Terraced Building

Shops.

31-0"

Mud walls with Thatched Roof.

Shops.

88-0"

E

leading to Madura.

Shops.

Shops.

S

Note

ABCDEFA. Dy Tahsildars Kutchery.
Shaded yellow.
Coloured portion will have to be acquired.

Houses.

Ulthiranandam
9.8.96. S.D. Officer

J Venkata Ramanujam
4/11

Mud walls with Thatched Roof.

Lane.

Brick in Mud

12-6" Roof Thatched

Brick in Mud

Terraced Building

32-0

Terraced Building

36-6

31-0

Terraced Building

31-0

B

Wet Cultivation

Wet Cultivation

S

N

E

W


Dated 26-9-

Tahsildars Office
at
Usilampatty
Site Plan of the
Scale 1 200

Thatched Roof


W

Encl: III to Madura Collector's Letter
Revenue No 442 dt 28
Dated 26-4-28



Thatched Roof
Treasury
Subja
41-6
Police Stat
49-6
51-6
51-0
Lane.
16-0
Mosque
lea
Hou
Dindigul.
— Usalam Patty — Konmoi
Road leading
W
E
212
Court Room
36
18-0
Gate.
F.
Te ple.
Roa
Shops
S
Bandy Petta
Lane.
Houses
oad leading to
Periakulam
Shops
Shops
leading to
aptur


W
E
S


Private Room of Magistrate.
Clerks Seat.
2½'×4'
2½'×4' Venetion
1½'
15'-0"
Dias.
Court. Room.
4'-0"
3½'×7½'
1½'
6'-0"
18'-0"

Cattle Shed.
2½×6'

Guard Room

Police Station

Inpectors Room

Door.

I.V.

Ward No 3

Ward No 4

Ward No 5.

SUB.

TREA

Record. Room.

Record Room.

Dwelling Houses.

Proposed Police Station

Lock up.

Guard Room.

Verandah

Inspectors Room

Lock up.

Sub Registrar's office.

Dwelling Houses.

Public Road.

Village Road.

Village Road.

Sub Registrar's office

9.8.96

J. Venkata Ramayya

8/8/96 amend

Deputy Tahsildar's Office
Usalampatty
Ground Plan of the.—

Rec: IV to Madura Collr's Letter
Rec No 443/98
Dated 26-4-98


Ground Plan.

1898
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
Sanctioned No. 4
Current No. 1501/97

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Deputy Tahsildar's Kutchery at Usalampatty
Ground Plan of Existing Building.
Scale. 1/100

Shaded yellow
Coloured Portions will be Removed.



OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),
Madras, 18th July 1898.

READ— letter from J.C.D.Partridge Esquire, Ag.Collector of Madura to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, Ref.on Cur.No.442-G1., dated 26th April 1898; and reference thereon No.573 dated 21st May 1898.

Read also letter from the same officer, Ref.on Cur.No.442/ Genl., dated 2nd.July 1898.

Reference No. 794 dated 18th July 1898.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The present Deputy Tahsildar's office and sub-jail at Usalampatti in the Madura District has been condemned on several ~~occasions~~ grounds by the Collector and Divisional officers. At the instance of the Collector the buildings were subjected to a regular inspection by a Sub.Divisional officer of the Public Works Department in August 1896, who reported that in their present state they were unsuitable for the purpose which they are intended to serve, owing to the following defects:-

(1) the absence of sufficient accommodation for the Deputy Tahsildar's clerks who are in consequence obliged to occupy a portion of the court room;

(2) the want of a secure enclosure within which to keep prisoners in the day time during those hours when they should be employed on outdoor work outside the sub.jail;

(3) the want of a latrine;

(4) the want of a shed in which to keep cattle remanded in connection with Criminal cases;

(5) the fact that the tiled roofing of the sub-jail wards is not provided with ceiling planks;

(6) the fact that the Treasury room is out of the Deputy Tahsildar's sight; and

(7)

to Revenue Dept. with reply.

(7) the existence of that sheds on private lands immediately adjoining the cutcherry.

5. The Sub.Divisional officer suggested various improvements the cost of which he estimated at Rs.7200,but at the same time recorded the opinion that even if the improvements he recommended were carried out the cutcherry would still be an unsatisfactory building,and that it would be on the whole preferable to construct a fresh building according to the latest designs,the approximate outlay on which would be about double the cost of the repairs proposed.The Executive Engineer who inspected the buildings in May 1897,concurred with the Sub.Divisional officer and reported decidedly that it was not worth spending so large a sum as Rs.7200 on offices which are in such a dilapidated condition.When this report was received by the Collector,he postponed taking immediate action,except in regard to the execution of certain urgent petty repairs,because of the financial pressure which was then being generally felt.The matter has now been brought to the Board's notice,and the situation has only changed in one trifling respect,viz., that the recent closure of the Sub-treasury has rendered it possible for the clerks to find accommodation outside the Court room.The Board agrees with the local officers in considering that the buildings are unsuitable and the site neither sanitary nor safe.It would seem,therefore that the proper course is to build a new cutcherry on the standard design in a fresh site;and the Board accordingly recommends that orders may be issued in the Public Works Department for the preparation of the requisite plans and estimates.It is reported that the existing buildings may be expected to fetch a sum of Rs.3500 including the site and that a suitable site for the construction of a new office is available.

Lovell Davidson
Ag.Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government,Revenue Department,with Collector's letter & enclosures in original to be retd.

Q.B.

Current No. 1 of 98

Revenue Department

Read B.P. 794/18.7.98 (Ref). (Govt 50

Note.

In the Proc: read above the Board of Rev supports a propos made by the Collector of Madura for the Construction of a new Sh Taluk Office at Vailampatti and recommends that orders may be issued in the P.W.Dept for the preparation of the necessary estimate.

2. The defects in the existing building (which also accommodates the Post Office) as pointed out by the Sub. Divisional officer are as under:—

(i) the absence of sufficient and convenient accommodation for the Dy Tahsildar clerks, who are in consequence obliged to occupy a portion of the Court-room;

(ii) the want of a secure place for keeping prisoners out of cells during day time, as per rules

(iii) the want of a shed to keep remanded cattle in;

(iv) the want of a latrine;

(v) the treasury-room being

Copy of rule letter No. 1641 11-12-95 G

Vide P.W. Sub. divisional officer's letter 1069 9-8-96 G.

out of the view of the Dy Tahsildar (VI) the roofs of the sub-jail wards being without ceiling planks; and (VII) the existence of private thatched sheds in close proximity to the Cutcherry.

The P.W. Sub-Divisional Officer who inspected the buildings was of opinion that the Taluk office should be asked to find accommodation elsewhere, and estimated the cost of the necessary improvements including the construction of a new Police Station at Rs 7200, but observed that it would be advisable to construct a new Cutcherry as per latest standard design at a site far removed from village and native habitations" and estimated the cost of a new office as per type design at Rs 15,500 with pan-tiled roofing and Rs 17,790 with Mangalore tiled roofing. The Executive Engineer who subsequently examined the building has expressed the opinion that the building is in a most dilapidated condition and is not worth spending the Rs 7200" on, but some portions of the building might possibly be used for a Sub-Registrar's office & a Post-office & that for the latter purpose it were much better to get sanction & prepare an estimate for a new building

Paras 4, 5 & 6 ibid

Vide pp 13 & 26 of annexure to with Rs 889 W 11.3.98 U

Vide letter from Dy R. R. dy 14.1.97 No 194 M T

G

3. The Sub-treasury at this station having recently been closed, it has become possible to accommodate the Dy Tahsildars clerks in the rooms thus vacated. Defects Nos. (V) and (VI) above do not therefore now exist. But in view of the other inconveniences detailed above the Collector of Madura recommends, and the Board of Rev supports, the construction of a new Cutcherry, a site for which is reported to be available. The old Cutcherry with site is expected to fetch about Rs 3,500 on sale.

4. In view of the opinion expressed by the Executive Engineer that the existing building is in a most dilapidated condition, it is submitted that the proposal to construct a new Cutcherry may be approved. The site of the new building should, however, be as near the village as possible and not far removed from the village and native habitants as proposed by the P.W. Sub-Divisional officer in his letter dy 9th August 1896 11.12.96

To Under Secretary
Govt sanction not much necessary for the preparation of estimates: please see draft on the docket sheet
RS 17-8-98

8.8.98

Secretary 18/8/98 T.P.

The construction of a new cutcherry is sanctioned.

S.R. 1918

The preparation of estimates is sanctioned: but reference to Govt. is not necessary on this point vide G.O. 1701 W. dt 11.5.

The paper is resubmitted with the following information as to the practice that prevailed prior to 1892 in regard to the obtaining of previous sanction of Govt for the construction of new buildings &c. before calling upon the P.W.D to prepare estimates

2. The Code rules which appear to have governed the case at the time were paras 289 and 988 of the Madras P.W. Code; these, however, do not throw any clear light on the point but the following precedents are definite:—

G.O. 528/24-1-88 in which the Govt first approved the proposal to construct a Taluk Cutcherry at Cuddapah, and referred the question of the preparation of plans and estimates to the P.W.D—

G.O. 525/24-1-88 Do: New Taluk cutcherry at Masulipatam

G.O. 790/2-2-91 Do. Pattikonda

G.O. 3636/14-6-90 Do Taluk offices Anjengo and Tangasseri

G.O. 84/9-2-91 Do: Tanuvaram Taluk office

G.O. 2119/2-4-91 Do. Bapatla

G.O. 4670/31-8-91 Do Proddatur & Royachoty printed in 5156/5-10-91

The above relate to the construction of new buildings; the following relates to repairs and additions in which the same procedure was followed:—

G.O. 1433/3-3-91. Improvements to the buildings of the Nurnool Collector's office

The only case (forwarded by the Reference) in which the Collector called upon the P.W.D to prepare estimates in anticipation of sanction is that dealt with in G.O. 1267/28-2-89; in this the Govt approved of only

Volume of 1886 put up.

They seem to show clearly that estimates should be prepared before a project is put up for Govt. The 14th Sept

Tied with red tape into a bundle.

Note submitted to C.A. P.W.D. 19-2-98

To be kept back with the papers prior to 1892 when sanctioned. 20-2-98

8/2/98

Current No. 1508/97

some of the improvements proposed to the Collector's Cutchery Anantapur.

3. Till ~~now~~ recently every estimate which ~~was~~ exceeded Rs 500 required the prior sanction of Govt. Now Executive Engineers are to be guided by ~~orders~~ section 59 of chap ix of vol I of the P.W. Code. Orders have now to be passed in this Dept as to in what cases Collectors should ask the prior sanction of Govt before calling upon Executive Engineers to prepare estimates. Some such orders are necessary as it is obviously undesirable that estimates should be prepared for new buildings or repairs which the Govt would not approve.

RS
12-10-98

Secy

I understand the present position to be as follows If the Collector* the Executive Engineer are agreed as to necessity of the new work repairs etc., the proposals should be submitted to Govt with estimate for giving effect thereto. The Govt is obviously

* or the Supdg Engineer or Collector

G.O 1701.W 6-7-98.

then in a much better position to judge whether the proposals should be sanctioned or not.

In cases however where the necessity is not apparent to the Supdg Engineer, the Collector is to address the Govt for orders as to the preparation of estimates. The order to prepare Estimates will not, I take it, carry with it any sanction as to Construction of the work repairs etc either in the present or in the future. Such sanction can only be given after estimates have been placed before the Government.

I understand that the Secy wishes this Question to be looked into before the Paper was circulated.

As the 2d Asst has kept it two months since I noted on 19/8 I cannot now

Has D.W. any remarks
to offer on the procedure
proposed?
D.W. 24/10/98

No. 4723 C. dy 27 Octr. '98.

The prior sanction of
Government is not now necessary
to the preparation of estimates,
vide G.O. 1701 W dated 6th
July 1898, and para 59
Chapter IX Vol. I of the P.W.
Code. No work can, however,
be commenced until the
estimates are duly sanctioned
by competent authority and
a specific allotment of
funds has been made.
There is thus no danger
of important works being
carried out without the
knowledge of Government.

H.L.K
26.10.98.

DW

To
The Rev. Dept U.O.

Secy
Please see amend
dd 27-10 (in accordance with
the P.W.D note a Secy
note on back of above

given for copying
copied
examined
signed
} 189

AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

No.

OBURES TO C. No.

R OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

TER OF GOVERNMENT.

T WITH DITTO.

S 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.