

Law (1921 ) Department.  
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 1784

DATED 12-12-1921

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council meeting.

October 13, 1921—question—Reformatory School, Chinglo, ut  
irregularities—in the administration—Director of Public  
Instruction requested to see that they do not recur.

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# NOTES.

## Premuners papers

Genl: 150 257 8 20.3.07  
 " " 1031 Home (Gen) " 28.9.16  
 " " 1253 " " " 1.10.17  
 " " 616 " " " 13.5.18  
 " " 1320 " " " 8.7.18  
 " " 2818 " (just) " 10.11.20  
 " " 833 Law (Gen) " 13.7.21

Question. 17th August 1921.

Mr. M.C. Raja. Can 2490 B  
26-8-22  
New (General) Department.

608. To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member to state (a) whether the Superintendent of the Reformatory School, Chingleput, obtained the sanction of Government for taking the pupils on excursion trips to Atkur, Thirumani<sup>ly</sup> and Melrodesapuram during Christmas holidays<sup>ly</sup> 1920 and what for and with what special object of interest he took them to these places;

(b) whether the punishment of twelve stripes given to Raghavan, pupil No.379, by the Superintendent, on 2nd February 1937 finds a place in the punishment register of the School, and whether this punishment was brought to the notice of the Committee of Visitors as required by the rules.

(c) whether it is a fact that Raghavulu was sentenced to two years on 14 th January 1921 for the offence of escaping from lawful custody and whether it is a fact that the Government, after consulting the Advocate-General

Handwritten notes on the document include:

- Top right: "Kide answer to Landa (b) of the question in the last blank" and "file".
- Bottom left: "p. 7 of notes" and "Linda file".
- Bottom right: "p. 17".

vide answer to  
clause (c) of Q<sup>n</sup>  
in the linked file.

Vide rule<sup>23</sup> (iii) on  
p. 5 of Bro. No.  
 $\frac{158}{20.307}$  (Q)

This is not req<sup>d</sup> under  
the rules.

Vide answer to clause 6  
(d) 5 in the linked file

Law/paints

Pi

Council Office.

(Question. 688)

Gov. No. 2818 just  
10-11-20 (I)

The boy was actually  
prosecuted. but  
the sentence was  
remitted to one  
month - 1.20  
Gov. No. 833 just (V)  
15.7.21

x Vide answer  
to (b) in the  
hired file. D.P.I.

the Inspector-General of  
Prisons, have considered the  
undesirability of prosecut-  
ing the boy;

(d) whether the Superin-  
tendent, before abolishing the  
night school, referred the --  
matter to the Director of --  
Public Instruction and obtained  
his orders; if so, what were  
the orders, if not, why;

(e) whether it is a fact  
that Mr. Duraiswamy Ayyar, the  
Second Master, who was teaching  
in the night school, is giving  
private tuition to the Superin-  
tendent's children, from the time  
the night school was abolished.

S.G.

CBF  
CBF



Vide answer to  
1.20 of Gov.  
15.7.21  
This is not right under  
the order.

Vide answer to question  
No. 7 in the hired file.

10-11-20

A.S.  
Key

(a) Prior to 1919, it ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> usual to obtain the sanction of Govt. to take the boys on trip to places of interest. Vide

(E) Govt. No. 1320 Home (Edn) of 8.10.18. It is not known why similar sanction was not obtained by the Supt. during the Christmas holidays of 1919 and 1920. In February 1918 the D.P.I. suggested

Rule 34 (ii) on an amendment in the rules relating to the <sup>working of the</sup> Reformatory Schools Act to the effect that the Superintendent shall have power to take pupils into

camp during the Christmas holidays. This and some other amendments were however left over for later consideration. Vide notes on pages

2-3 of notes to Govt. No. 616 of 13.5.18

The object of taking the pupils on excursion is to give them a complete change at least once a year from the surroundings and monotony of school life. The place need not necessarily be a place of interest. Vide Govt. No. 1253 Edn of 1.10.17 in which permission was granted to take

D.P.I.'s letter on Pt 1-2 of Govt. No. 1320 (E) of 8.10.18

(K)

take the pupils to Lehighampton which is not a place of interest. The answer may be - "the sanction of Board was not obtained for taking the pupils on excursion trips during the Christmas holidays of 1919 and 1920. The object of such trips is to give the pupils the benefit of a complete change at least once a year from the environments and monotony of Reform School life. The places to which the pupils are taken need not necessarily be places of interest."

The D. P. I. may be requested to state why the sanction of Board was not obtained by the Super for these two trips and with what special object of interest the pupils were taken to these three places.

(6) From the copy of the judgment of the Sessions Judge, Lehighampton in page 19 of B. No. 833 Law General of 15.7.21 it will appear that the ~~sanction~~ <sup>furnishment</sup> of whipping was by inadvertence ~~not~~

or not from any  
order given by the Super  
himself 21/18

(V)

know verbatim of  
a rather serious kind  
as visitors may not  
have opportunity  
of checking as no or  
contents of punish-  
ments given by the last  
in Geo 158 251 (Q) 29/8  
20.307

D.P.I. may be  
asked to report on  
as reason for the complaint  
failure to enter  
as in punishment  
in the Punishment Regr

R/V/K  
29/8  
p. 1 of Geo No  
833  
(V) 15.7.4

(by McLeod X 5  
not entered) in the Punishment  
Register, though it was entered in  
the daily diary. It does not seem  
necessary to bring the fact specially  
to the notice of the Committee of  
Visitors as there is nothing in the rules  
to that effect, but there is nothing  
to prevent the Committee from looking  
into the Punishment Register  
at the diary should they wish to  
do so. The answer may therefore  
be:—

"The punishment was,  
through oversight, not entered by the  
Superintendent in the Punishment  
Register, though it was entered in  
the daily diary. The rules do not  
require that the matter should be  
specifically brought to the notice of the  
Committee of Visitors."

(c) The answer to the first part  
of the question is in the affirmative and  
that to the second part is in the  
negative.

(d) & (e) The D.P.I. may be  
requested to furnish the information  
= The file may be sent  
to



6  
to the D.P.I. for furnishing  
a complete answer as required

29-8-21.

*Th*  
29.8.21

RVL  
27/8  
2982

no No 24 20 B-1  
29-8-21

no No 500  
3.9.21

U.O. Reply No.

I suggest the following answer to (a):-

'The sanction of Government was not necessary since the pupils were not absent from school for any night. The excursions occupied a few hours each day and no additional expenditure was incurred. One of the objects of these trips is to afford the pupils a change from the environments and daily routine of their school life.'

I suggest as the answer to (b) 'The punishment was entered in the daily diary but not in the punishment register. The rules do not require that punishments should be brought specifically to the notice of the Committee of Visitors.'

The Secretariat has answered query (C).

(V) The night school was held last in December 1918. The question of resuscitating the night school was discussed between the present Superintendent and the D.P.I in person and in view, inter alia of the facts that the holding of the night school

9 7  
school offers facilities for the pupils to escape  
and ~~that~~ that very little real instruction can  
be ~~given to~~ the boys at the end of their day's  
work the Director did not order its resuscitation.

The name of the second master is Doraiswami  
Ayyanger and not Doraiswami Ayyar. Since the night  
school was last held in December 1918 and the pre-  
sent Superintendent took charge in August 1919  
query (e) is correctly answered by stating (a)  
(e) 'The answer is in the negative'.



Can 9562 B  
3.9.21

3.9.21

Law (Edn) Dept

The D O I has not furnished  
a direct answer to clause (d) of  
the question. The night school was  
last held in Decr 1918. In the usual  
course it should have been held  
for about two months in 1919, i.e.  
during November and December  
1919. It is not definitely known  
whether the Dir's orders were  
taken for not holding the night  
school during 1919. The Dir states  
that the question of resuscitating  
the school was discussed between  
himself and the present Supdt  
and he does not say when such  
discussion



discussion took place. However the  
the Dir's remarks at K may be  
furnished as the answer to clause

2 The answers suggested by  
the D.P.I. to clauses (a), (b), (d), (e)  
and the answer to (c) at p. 5 ante are  
for approval.

3  
3.9.21

As req (c) instead of  
a D.P.I.'s answer which  
looks too much like quibbling  
we may state the facts (these  
marked portion) mentioned by him at page 7

on 3.9.21  
H2 box 38

3 Answer D.C. is not satis-  
fying. The point is whether Sunday is for private  
life to his superintendent's children. He has it  
begin immediately after the night school was  
started or later after parent experienced with  
change smaller later is not of consequence. Please  
ascertain if are making of fact the teacher is  
doing private work; also whether he is satisfied  
to do so if he is paid for that. There seems to be  
a good deal of inquiry in the school  
3/5/21

8  
4/9

was not  
satisfactory  
3/9/21

AS  
Secy

is subd for approval  
6.9.21 3/5/21 3/6/21

A draft no note to the D.P.I.

W/K  
6/9

No note

Legislative Council

Question No 688 (c) :-

"Whether it is a fact that  
"Mr Doraiswami Ayyar, the Second Master,  
"who was teaching in the night school  
"is giving private tuition to the Super-  
"intendent's children from the time  
"the night school was abolished."

In reply to the above question  
the D.P.I has, in his no note No  
500 of 3.9.21, stated as follows:-

"The name of the second master  
"is Doraiswami Ayyangar and not  
"Doraiswami Ayyar. Since the night  
"school was last held in December  
"1918 and the present Superintendent  
"took charge in August 1919 query  
"(c) is correctly answered by stating  
(1) The answer is in the  
negative."

The point is whether Mr Doraiswami  
Ayyangar is, as a matter of fact,  
giving private tuition to the Super-  
intendent's children. Whether it  
began



11  
I could wish that the remarks of Mr. Whyte, the President of the Legislative Assembly made at the meeting held in Simla on September the 5th could be communicated to all members of the Legislative Council, Madras.

In reply to a reference which I made to the Superintendent I have been informed that the second master Doraiswami Ayyangar had oral sanction of the late Superintendent for taking up private tuition. He has been engaged as private tutor to the children of the present acting Superintendent from September 1919.

Permission should have been obtained but it was not obtained.

newspaper  
current at  
step (Y)

17.9.21

Two orders whether the answer to clause

(2) may be as follows:—

The night school was last held in December 1918 and the present Superintendent took charge in August 1919. Mr. Doraiswami Ayyangar has been giving private tuition to the Superintendent's children from September 1919.

2 With reference to the Director's remark at 'A' on p. 10 ante, it is submitted that ~~the fact~~ an inaccuracy in the question should not be taken advantage of to evade the issue raised therein.

It is true that the tuition did not begin

22/9

p. 2 ante

12  
begin when the night school was abolished, but Mr. Doraiswami Ayyangar has, as a matter of fact, been giving private tuition and this information has to be furnished to the M.L.C. in reply to the question "whether he is giving private tuition."

3 The file may be circulated to C<sub>3</sub>

21.9.21

21.9.21

RW 12  
21/9

C<sub>3</sub> The D.M. is not aware of the form of the question in the proper way, he is the member, the Legislative Council. He has sought to answer a question asked of him of the fact if it is not his province to tender unasked advice in the matter of disciplining the members of Council in the matter of accuracy. Serious irregularities have been brought about in the administration, the reformatory school at Chingleput of the question of the D.M. is that he should be drawn to them & he is requested to see that such irregularities do not happen.

24/9/21



AS The answer to (a) (b) & (d) at paragraph 7 ante, the answer to (c) at p. 5 and the answer to (e) at p. 11 ante may now issue to the Council office. After issue further action will be taken.

intaken with reference to H.M.'s remarks  
at M on p. 12 ante.

RW 12

26/9

13

after receiving  
an order

21  
X 23  
27/9/21

not answer to  
the question  
of the question

DESPATCHED  
27 SEP. 1921

Reformatory School, Chingleput.

794 Q.—Mr. M. C. RAJA: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member to state—

(a) whether the Superintendent of the Reformatory School, Chingleput, obtained the sanction of the Government for taking the pupils on excursion trips to Atur, Tirumani and Melrosapuram during the Christmas holidays in 1919 and 1920, and what for and with what special object of interest he took them to these places;

(b) whether the punishment of twelve stripes given to Raghavan, pupil No. 379, by the Superintendent, on 2nd February 1920, finds a place in the punishment register of the school, and whether this punishment was brought to the notice of the Committee of Visitors as required by the rules;

(c) whether it is a fact that Raghavulu was sentenced to two years on 14th January 1921 for the offence of escaping from lawful custody and whether it is a fact that the Government, after consulting the Advocate-General and the Inspector-General of Prisons, have considered the undesirability of prosecuting the boy;

(d) whether the Superintendent, before abolishing the night school, referred the matter to the Director of Public Instruction and obtained his orders; if so, what the orders were; if not, why; and

(e) whether it is a fact that Mr. Duraiswami Ayyar, the second master, who was teaching in the night school, is giving private tuition to the Superintendent's children, from the time the night school was abolished.

A.—(a) The sanction of Government was not necessary since the pupils were not absent from school for any night. The excursions occupied a few hours each day and no additional expenditure was incurred. One of the objects of these trips is to afford the pupils a change from the environments and daily routine of their school life.

(b) The punishment was entered in the daily diary but not in the punishment register. The rules do not require that punishments should be brought specifically to the notice of the Committee of Visitors.

(c) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative and that to the second part is in the negative.

(d) The night school was last held in December 1918. The question of reusitating the night school was discussed between the present Superintendent and the Director of Public Instruction in person and in view, inter alia, of the facts that the holding of the night school offers facilities for the pupils to escape and that very little real instruction can be given to the boys at the end of their day's work the Director did not order its reuscitation.

(e) The night school was last held in December 1918 and the present Superintendent took charge in August 1919. Mr. Duraiswami Ayyangar has been giving private tuition to the Superintendent's children from September 1919.

2 with reference

to

14

to H.M.'s orders at M on p. 12 ante,  
a draft order is sub'd for approval.

21/9/21

7.12.21

21/9/21

7.12.21



say 21/9/21  
9/12/21  
21/12/21

Cy 21/12/21

Law/Edw) DEPARTMENT.

When received for Fair-copying.

Date.

Initials

When copied . .

When examined

When signed

When despatched

READ AGAIN G.O. No. ...., dated .....

" " " .....

192

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 2490 R.

From the

... No

dated

192

2582B

" " 2779

"

22

"

192

50

99

21

22

192

ORDER.

No. 1784 dated 12. 12. 1921

Miss

Copies of ~~the~~ question  
~~asked~~ relating to the  
 Reformatory School, Ichinglepuri,  
 asked by Mr M.C. Raja at  
 the meeting of the Legislative  
 Council held on the 13<sup>th</sup> October  
 1921 and of the answer given  
 thereto are forwarded to the  
 S.P. I who is requested  
 to see that such ~~un~~  
 irregularities in the  
 administration of the school  
 as those brought to light  
 by the question <sup>however</sup> do not  
 recur.  
 Ld  
 5/11/21

Sd/- RVK  
 8/11/21

Tc

The D. P. I. (order & copies  
of q's & answers  
on p. 13 of

DESPATCHED  
13 DEC. 1941

13 DEC 1921  
me

one

$\frac{12}{2.12.24}$

5822 RV12  
9122 8712

When given for copying—  
 When copied—  
 When examined—  
 When signed—

192

READ AGAIN G.O. No.  
 192

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DETAIL.

PAYERS NOT PAID UP, BEING MEANT FOR REPEATUM  
 IN ORIGINAL

N.B.—

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