[R.]

R—12-3-04.

D—6

Educational (1905) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., Nos 629-630

DATED 18-9-05

N. P.

(9)

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Reformatory Schools ~~Act, 1897~~

Addressing the Govt. of India on the Subject of the interpretation of Section 29, Subsection (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, read with the preceding Section, in respect of removal from a Reformatory School to a leper ward of a leper asylum.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd. } 1905. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

ORIGINAL

G.O., &c., Nos. 629, 630, 18th September 1905.

Reformatory School.

Addressing the Government of India on the subject of the interpretation of section 29, sub-section (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, read with the preceding section, in respect of removal from a Reformatory school to a leper ward of a Leper Asylum.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

I

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S., Director of Public Instruction.

To—the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.

Dated—Madras, the 26th July 1905.

No.—Ref. on Cur. No. 5784.

At the instance of the Superintendent, Reformatory School, Chingleput, I have the honour to request that arrangements may be made for the transfer of Kandan, pupil No. 654, to the Government Leper Asylum, Madras, as he has developed signs of acute anæsthetic leprosy and it is therefore necessary that he should be removed from the Reformatory School as soon as possible. The boy was admitted into the Reformatory on 16th January 1905 under the enclosed Committal Warrant issued by the Chief Presidency Magistrate.

Enclosures.

COMMITTAL WARRANT.

In the Presidency Magistrate's Court, Egmore, Madras.

To the Superintendent of Prisons for the Town of Madras.

Whereas Kandan was on the twenty-seventh day of December 1904 duly convicted before the undersigned Presidency Magistrate in and for the town of Madras on a charge of having between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth day of December 1904 in Triplicane of Madras aforesaid committed house-breaking by night and theft in a building in respect of 46 marbles, 2 pollums nuts and a quarter-anna piece, value in all 4 annas, the property of one Abdul Rhyman without his consent, after a previous conviction, punishable under sections 457, 380 and 75 of the Indian Penal Code and was sentenced to suffer rigorous imprisonment for a term of 6 (six) weeks [in lieu of the within mentioned punishment to be detained in the Reformatory School at Chingleput for a period of 7 (seven) years, if accommodation is available]. You are hereby required to receive the said Kandan into your custody in the Criminal Jail at Madras together with this warrant and there carry the aforesaid sentence into execution according to law.

Dated the twenty-seventh day of December 1904 at Madras.

W. E. Clarke,
Chief Presidency Magistrate.

Name	Kandan.
Father's name	Thulkana.
Sex and whether married or single ...	Male; single.
Race, religion and caste	Pulli.
Occupation prior to committal ...	*Nil.*
District and taluk	Triplicane.
Village	
Education	
Property	One cloth.

I hereby certify that the sentence of six weeks passed on 8745 Kandan 35312 by the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Egmore, in Calendar Case No. 35312 of 1904, has been duly executed up to date and that the said Kandan has this day been transferred to the Reformatory School, Chingleput, as per order of the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Egmore, dated 27th December 1904.

The Penitentiary,
Madras, 16th *January* 1905.

Marshall.
Jailor.

Order—Mis. No. 1286, *Judicial, dated* 12*th August* 1905.

The boy Kandan will be removed from the Reformatory School to the criminal ward of the Madras Leper Hospital and detained there pending the issue of further orders.

(True Extract.)

M. Hammick,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
,, Inspector-General of Prisons.
,, Surgeon-General.

II

Endorsement No. 3479, Judicial, dated 12th August 1905.

Referred to the Advocate-General for favour of opinion as to whether under the provisions of sections 28 and 29 (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, a boy in a Reformatory may be removed from the Reformatory to the criminal ward of the Madras Leper Hospital and be detained there for the remainder of the period for which he was sent to the Reformatory school.

(By order.)

J. F. Graham,
Ag. Asst. Secretary to Government.

To the Government Solicitor.

III

Letter—from Sutherland Orr, Esq., Government Solicitor, Madras.

To—the Chief Secretary to Government.

Dated—Madras, the 23rd August 1905.

No.—779.

Abstract.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Advocate-General, dated 22nd August 1905 :—

Opinion.

I am of opinion that section 29 (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, only authorises the transfer of a boy detained in a reformatory to another reformatory, and does not authorise the transfer of the boy to a prison. Making the substitutions authorised by section 28 in section 29, the latter section authorizes transfer of a prisoner detained in a reformatory to any *other* reformatory in British India. I assume that the criminal ward of the Madras Leper Asylum has been constituted a prison, but that it has not been constituted a reformatory under Act VIII of 1897.

J. P. Wallis,
Advocate-General.

IV

Order—Mis. No. 588, Educational, dated 31st August 1905.

With reference to G.O., No. 1286, Judicial, dated 12th August 1905, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to sanction the discharge, under section 14 (*a*) of the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, of Kandan, pupil No. 654 in the Reformatory School, Chingleput, who was removed to the criminal ward of the Madras Leper Hospital pending the issue of further orders.

(True Extract.)

H. D. Taylor,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
,, Inspector-General of Prisons.
,, Surgeon-General.

Order—No. 629, Educational, dated 18th September 1905.

The Government of India will be addressed.

(True Extract.)

H. D. Taylor,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Letter—from H. D. TAYLOR, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras, Educational Department.
To—the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 18th September 1905.
No.—630, Educational.

I am directed to address the Government of India on the subject of the interpretation of section 29, sub-section (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, read with the preceding section, in respect of removal from a Reformatory school to a leper ward (constituted a prison) of a leper asylum.

2. A pupil of the Chingleput Reformatory School was reported to have developed symptoms of acute anæsthetic leprosy and it became necessary to remove him from the institution. Under section 14 (*a*) of the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, the Government could order his discharge from the school, but they were reluctant to do this before it was definitely ascertained that he was a leper or an incurable leper; and they were disposed to transfer him for observation to the Madras Leper Asylum.

3. The criminal leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras, has been constituted a place of confinement under section 541 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Accordingly on a literal interpretation of the provisions of the Prisoners Act, 1900, referred to, it would appear that the boy could be transferred to the criminal leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras.

4. His Excellency in Council has, however, been advised that section 28 of the Prisoners Act, 1900, only authorizes a consistent substitution of "Reformatory school" for "prison" in respect of Reformatory school *détenus*, and therefore only gives power to transfer a boy detained in a reformatory to another reformatory and not to transfer him to a prison; and that as the criminal leper ward of the Leper Asylum has not been constituted a reformatory under the Reformatory Schools Act, the removal of a reformatory school pupil suffering from leprosy to the criminal leper ward would be illegal.

5. I am directed to enquire whether the Government of India would have any objection to the leper ward of the Madras Leper Asylum being regarded and, if this is necessary, formally declared to be an infirmary attached to the Reformatory School, Chingleput, with the view of transferring thither for observation or treatment pupils of the Reformatory school who are reported to have developed symptoms of leprosy.

6. I am directed to add that in the case which gave rise to this reference, the pupil has been discharged under section 14 (*a*) of the Reformatory Schools Act.

Erd. A.F.E.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 629, 630, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 18th SEPTEMBER 1905.

[Subject.—*Transfer of a Reformatory School pupil to a prison.*]

Educational Department.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 26th July 1905, *No.* 5784.

For orders.

2. There is no provision either in the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, or in the rules framed thereunder for regulating cases of this kind.

3. Attention is however solicited to rule 1107 of the Jail Manual. This rule says that when any male convict is suffering from leprosy and if the disease is in an advanced stage, the Inspector-General shall order the transfer of the convict from the jail wherein he is confined to the criminal leper ward of the Leper hospital, Madras. Reading this rule along with rule 1077 of the Jail Manual which says that all the rules in the Jail Code apply to juvenile offenders except where they are inconsistent with certain provisions of the Jail Manual relating to the juveniles, it would appear that the transfer of a juvenile offender suffering from leprosy from the Reformatory School to the Government Leper Asylum at Madras is unobjectionable.

N.L.R.—28-7-05.

Submitted that the provisions of the Jail Manual apply only to prisoners including juveniles confined in jails and not to juvenile offenders sent to the Reformatory School.

2. In the present case the pupil (Kandan) may perhaps be released under section 14 (*a*) of the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, and then sent to the Leper Asylum. Judicial may however be consulted.

P. T. Tharyan—2-8-05.

Jail Manual, 1108.

The criminal leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras, has been constituted a place of confinement under section 541, Criminal Procedure Code. Therefore under section 29 (2)* of the Prisoners Act, 1900, read with sections 2 (*b*) † and 28 of the same Act, the boy may be transferred to the criminal leper ward.

* As amended by Act I of 1903. These may provide for a transfer from Reformatory to Reformatory, but I do not think that it authorises, in the absence of direct specification, transfer from a reformatory to a prison.

H. D. Taylor.

† Is beside the question, but 28 is conclusive of this point.

G. S[tokes].

2. If an order issues to the above effect, it will perhaps be thought to be in conflict with G.O., No. 493, dated 17th July 1905. Under the natural construction of Reformatory Act, section 14, you cannot remove a boy from a reformatory to a prison but only to another reformatory. But it might be considered that the provisions of the Prisoners' Act (of subsequent date) were meant to supplement section 14 of the Reformatory Schools Act.

3. I think if the Legislature had had section 14, Reformatory Schools Act, in their mind with the intention of supplementing it when they re-enacted the Prisoners Act in 1900, they would have put in a reference to section 14 of the Reformatory Schools Act in section 28 of the Prisoners Act. The Prisoners Act is not an Act giving the Government power to vary punishments imposed by courts. Detention in prison is

I fully agree. The omission is significant.

H. D. Taylor.

punishment of a different nature from detention in a reformatory. I do not believe section 29 (2) of the Prisoners Act was meant to give the Local Government power to revise the sentence of a court that an offender should be sent to the Reformatory School and to direct instead that he should be sent to prison. The proper place for such a provision is the Reformatory Schools Act itself, not the Prisoners Act.

H. D. Taylor.

Hence I think Order No. 493 was right.

4. But the criminal ward of the Leper Asylum might be considered a subsidiary reformatory school as well as a subsidiary jail; it is just as much an annexe or part of the reformatory as of any other prison; for convenience there is not a criminal leper ward attached to each prison, but there is one for all the prisons in the Presidency. It might be argued that it is just with reference to cases like the present, which are not cases of varying the punishment but of providing for a contingency overlooked when the Reformatory Schools Act was framed, that the provisions of the Prisoners Act were intended to supplement the provisions of the Reformatory Schools Act. The case of leprosy is strictly analogous to the case of lunacy expressly provided for in section 30 of the Prisoners Act which—it can scarcely be doubted with reference to section 28—applies to reformatories.

What about section 30 (2)? Take a lunatic boy from a reformatory to Lunatic Asylum under 30 (1). Suppose he becomes sane. He should be returned to the prison (*i.e.*, reformatory) whence he came or to any other *prison*—in the Province. why not to a jail then? Yet this could not be admitted. Argue that after *prison* you should understand "of the same kind" *i.e.*, within the same section when "prison" is used more than once you cannot read it as "reformatory" and "jail" alternately or indiscriminately,—then 29 (2) has no ambiguity. You cannot take a boy from a reformatory (prison) to anything but a reformatory under 29 (2).

J. F. Graham—5-8-05.

The objection to this argument is that the difficulty of construing section 14, Reformatory Schools Act, still remains; you can't without quibbling bring the case within removal from one Reformatory school to another; and the assumption that the Prisoners Act meant to supplement the Reformatory Schools Act with reference to leprosy when leprosy is not, as lunacy is, specially provided for in the Prisoners Act, is perhaps farfetched.

A. Galletti—3-8-05.

This seems hardly a case for the splitting of hairs. The Prisons Act, 1900, was passed subsequently to the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, and provides for supplemental powers over and above section 14 of the latter Act. Under section 28, Prisons Act, detention in a reformatory counts as "confinement in prison"—but I agree that by sections 28 and 29, it was not intended to give authority to transfer a person detained in a reformatory to *any* other "prison." I think we may take it that the leper ward is not only a "prison" but also a hospital ward attached to a reformatory. It is in any case inexpedient to allow the pupil to stay on in the reformatory.

Surely this is hair-splitting with a vengeance.

G. S[tokes].

H. D. Taylor—4-8-05.

To the Judicial Department for remarks.

Judicial Department.

I do not see how an occupant of a reformatory can be transferred either under the Reformatory Schools Act or under the Prisoners Act to any other place of detention except it be a reformatory. Under Secretary has suggested that as the Criminal Leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras, has been constituted a place of confinement under 541, Criminal Procedure Code, therefore, 29 (2) of the Prisoners Act permits or may permit transfer from a reformatory to this leper ward. This cannot be unless the leper ward be considered a reformatory for it cannot be doubted I think but that whichever meaning be given to "prison" in Part VI of the Prisoners Act whether jail or

reformatory you must in any one section of Part VI keep to the one meaning, *i.e.*, section 29 (2) cannot be read as " . . . . . in a 'jail' in the province to any other 'reformatory' in the province" or *vice versâ*.

In other words when the word prison is used more than once in a section you must read after it, wherever it appears after the first time, the words "of the same kind".

2. It is only therefore a question of whether the leper ward referred to can be considered a reformatory since it has been constituted a place of confinement under section 541, Criminal Procedure Code.

Section 541, Criminal Procedure Code, only refers to places of confinement for persons liable to be imprisoned or committed to custody under the Criminal Procedure Code and therefore for punishments under the Indian Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code.

Detention in a reformatory is, I think, not such a punishment. Section 399, Criminal Procedure Code, refers to detention in a reformatory—but is only in force where the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897, is not in force and therefore does not apply in the present case.

Further detention in a reformatory is not a punishment possible under the Indian Penal Code. I do not see therefore how the fact that under section 541, Criminal Procedure Code, the leper ward of the Madras Leper Asylum has been constituted a place of confinement warrants considering it a reformatory.

It was merely constituted a place of confinement for the purpose of one of the punishments of the Indian Penal Code or Criminal Procedure Code.

3. The question of expediency is another matter altogether. If it is expedient that as in the present case a leper boy confined in a reformatory should not be retained there a clause should be inserted in the Reformatory Schools Act constituting the leper ward a reformatory for the purposes of that Act.

4. The Inspector-General of Prison's argument in his note of 13th July 1905 on page 3 of the notes to G.O., No. 493, of 17th July 1905, is of course incorrect. Section 16 of VIII of 1897 merely precludes any court from altering or reversing on appeal or revision an order which substitutes detention in a reformatory for transportation or imprisonment.

J. F. Graham—5-8-05.

It would be well to see what the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Prisoners Act or the debates say about section 28, Prisoners Act. If it was not intended to give power to transfer from reformatory to prison, it is difficult to see why it was introduced into the Act as section 14, Reformatory Act, does all that is necessary.

I do not delay the paper because it is no doubt very advisable to take the boy away at once and I submit that the boy may be *temporarily* removed to the criminal ward and then we can look the point up and see if it is within the power of Government to do it and if not we can cancel the order and let the boy go and tell the authorities to take him into the non-criminal part of the asylum if the relations won't keep him.

It is a very special case and may I submit be treated specially.

M. Hammick—7-8-05.

It seems to me that a reformatory is a prison and that section 78 of Act VII of 1900 simply recognises this fact. I am of opinion that there is no legal objection to transferring the boy to the criminal leper ward since that is a prison. I agree with Chief Secretary that the boy should be removed accordingly at once. As to the legal point we had better ask the Advocate-General. I do not myself agree with G.O., No. 493, dated 17th July 1905, paragraph 2.

G. S[tokes]—8-8-05.

Draft accordingly please and look up the debates and objects and reasons of the Prisoners Act and show.

M. Hammick.

Assistant Secretary—

A draft Government order and a draft reference to the Advocate-General are submitted. If approved they may be sent to the Educational department for acceptance.

2. The gazettes containing the objects and reasons of and the report of the Select Committee on the Bill which became Act III of 1900 are submitted. Reports of debates are also put up. Section 28 of Act III of 1900 is a reproduction of section 1 of Act VII of 1894. The gazette containing the Objects and Reasons of the Bill which became Act VII of 1894 and the reports of debates on the Bill are submitted.

Gazettes of India, 1899, Part V, page 101.
" " 1900 " " 23.
Legislative Proceedings Vols. for 1899–1900.
Gazette of India, 1893, Part V, page 105.
Legislative Proceedings Vols. for 1893–1894.

J. A. DEROZARIO—10–8–05.

J. F. GRAHAM—10–8–05.

To the Educational Department for acceptance.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

May be accepted. Whatever the legal aspects of the case may be the immediate removal of the pupil from the reformatory is desirable.

H. D. TAYLOR—11–8–05.

Accepted.

J. T[HOMSON]—12–8–05.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Draft may issue.

J. F. GRAHAM—12–8–05.

[G.O., No. 1286, Judicial, dated 12th August 1905.]

[Memo. No. 3479, dated 12th August 1905.]

From the Government Solicitor, dated 23rd August 1905, No. 779.

Please see the notes connected with G.O., No. 1286, Judicial, dated 12th August 1905. The Advocate-General is of opinion that section 29 (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, does not authorize the transfer of a boy from a reformatory to a prison. If this opinion is accepted the boy Kandan whose detention in the criminal leper ward was directed should be discharged from that place. He should also be discharged from the reformatory under section 14 of the Reformatory Schools Act and with reference to the Chief Secretary's note, dated 7th August 1905 (page 9 of G.O., No. 1286, dated 12th August 1905) enquiries should be made of his parents or relatives as to whether they will take charge of him.

For orders.

J. A. DEROZARIO—26–8–05.

Either the boy should be released and handed over to his relatives under section 14 of the Reformatory Act or else the criminal leper ward of the Madras Asylum should be declared a reformatory for the purposes of the Reformatory and Prisoners Acts. The latter seems the preferable course as it will obviate in future any such difficulty as has arisen in the present case.

J. F. GRAHAM—26–8–05.

Under the Reformatory Schools Act, Government may—

(1) establish a school—
(2) use as a school a school kept by a private person.

It does not seem as if Government had any power to declare the Leper Criminal Asylum a reformatory school. Government cannot * establish a school there—5 (*a*), nor is it already a school—5 (*b*). I submit in this case the boy's parents may be asked if they will take care of him and if so he may be released, if not he may be released and transferred to the non-criminal ward of the Asylum. I do not think Government can declare the criminal ward of the Leper Asylum a reformatory.

* They could of course, but merely declaring a place a school is not establishing a place a school.

M. HAMMICK.

M. HAMMICK—27–8–05.

I think the Advocate-General's opinion is wrong both as a matter of expediency and a matter of law. Section 32 of the Reformatory Act shows that the pupils are undergoing imprisonment and if a reformatory is not a prison I do not know what a prison is. I wonder if the Advocate-General thinks the pupils go home for the holidays. Anyway the only way we can deal with the case is to discharge the pupil under section 14 of the Reformatory Schools Act. We cannot declare the criminal ward of the Leper Asylum a reformatory school.

G. S[TOKES]—28–8–05.

It is section 14 of the Reformatory Schools Act that places limitations on the powers of the Local Government as to dealing with inmates of such schools. That Act created places of detention which are not prisons, and if a youthful convict is converted into a Reformatory School inmate his after life must be controlled by that Schools Act and not by the Prisons or Prisoners Acts. But there is no reason why India should not be asked its opinions on the subject.

I agree this boy should be discharged.

J. T[HOMSON]—30–8–05.

I think so.

J. F. GRAHAM—30–8–05.

Draft please discharging the boy and draft to India please too—should the orders go in Education? If so send papers there.

M. HAMMICK—30–8–05.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

A draft order is placed below for approval. If approved, it may issue with the concurrence of Judicial. After issue of the order a draft letter to India will be submitted.

N.L.R.—30–8–05.

P. T. THARYAN—30–8–05.

A. GALLETTI—31–8–05.

To the Judicial Department.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Accepted.

J. F. GRAHAM—31–8–05.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—31–8–05.

[G.O., No. 588, Educational, dated 31st August 1905.]

The Government order has been despatched. A draft letter to the Government of India is placed below for approval. If approved Judicial may be asked to accept it.

P. T. THARYAN—7–9–05.

Type as revised and submit to Secretary.

A. GALLETTI—7–9–05.

Typed and submitted.

P. T. THARYAN—7–9–05.

H. D. TAYLOR—8–9–05.

To the Judicial Department for acceptance.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

May be accepted.

J. F. GRAHAM—9–9–05.

Accepted.

M. HAMMICK—11–9–05.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

For approval.

H. D. TAYLOR—12–9–05.
J. T[HOMSON]—13–9–05.
A[MPTHILL]—15–9–05.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—16–9–05.

[G.O., Nos. 629, 630, Educational, dated 18th September 1905.]

[E 12] 1,200–7-1903

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 588 Edl., dated 31st August 1905.

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. , From the , No. , dated 190 .

" " , " " , " 190

" , " , " 190

ORDER No. 629, dated 18-9- 1905.

MS.

15-9-05

LETTER:

The Government of India will be addressed.

A.G.
7-9-05.

No. 630 & 18-9-05

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Home Department.

Sir,

I am directed to address the Govt. of India on the subject of the interpretation of Section 29, sub-section (2) of the Prisoners Act, 1900, read with the preceding section, in respect of removal from a Reformatory School to a leper ward constituted

Page 57 of the act

a prison,) of a leper asylum.

2. A pupil of the Chingleput Reformatory School was ~~recently~~ reported to have developed symptoms of acute anaesthetic leprosy and it became necessary to remove him from the institution. Under Section 14(a) of the Reformatory Schools Act,1897, the Government could ~~him~~ order his discharge from the school but they were reluctant to do this before it was definitely ascertained that he was a leper or an incurable leper; and they were disposed ~~would have preferred~~ to transfer him for observation to the Madras Leper Asylum.

3. The criminal leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras, has been constituted a place of confinement under Section 541 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Accordingly on a literal interpretation of the provisions of the Prisoners' Act,1900, referred to, it would appear that the boy could be transferred to the Criminal Leper ward of the Leper Asylum, Madras.

4. His Excellency in Council has, however, been advised that Section 28 of the Prisoners Act,1900, only authorizes a consistent substitution of "Reformatory School" for "prison" and therefore only gives power to transfer a boy detained in a Reformatory to another

Page 14 of the act

in Respect of Refg. School detenus,

3 9 38

Reformatory and not to transfer him to a prison; and that as the Criminal Leper ward of the Leper Asylum has not been constituted a Reformatory under the Reformatory Schools Act, the removal of a Reformatory School pupil suffering from leprosy to the Criminal Leper ward would be illegal.

5. I am directed to enquire whether the Government of India would have any objection to the Leper ward of the Madras Leper Asylum being regarded and, if this is necessary, formally declared to be an infirmary attached to the Reformatory School, Chingleput, with the view of transferring thither for observation or treatment, pupils of the Reformatory School who are reported to have developed symptoms of leprosy.

6. I am directed to add that in the case which gave rise to this reference, the pupil has been discharged under Section 14 (a) of the Reformatory Schools Act.

A.G.
7-9-05.

15-9-05

First copy sent to Press.

[Ret]urned for signature.

[D]espatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 588 E.R., DATED 31st August 1905.

(A)

[C]URRENT No.

5/

[ENCLO]SURES TO C. No.

Press

Please print the G.O. with the letter ~~& the~~ & show proof. Also print notes please.

N.A.G.
25/9/15

OF GOVERNMENT .. .. (A)

OF GOVERNMENT. (A)

[...]ENT WITH DITTO.

NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
[C] = Print abstract only.
[D] = Print heading only.