Confidential No. 198
1891.

Judicial Department.
G.O., dated 26. xi. 91
No. 2415
Series. Mis

Confidential.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched

[Despatch Abstract.]

Chemical Examiner's Office

Deputy Colonel Waldon to enquire into the matter of the Ganjam letter of the 19th August in the Madras Mail re the Treplicane murder.

PRINTED IN G.O., dated

23d. Jany 1892, No. 56

Back Paper, No. 170 Corrfd of 189

Further Paper, No. 18 Corrfd of 189

Read again Order of Government, dated
189 , No.

Enclosures.

Spare copies.

Struck .. .. ..

Issued .. .. ..

Total ..

In Stock ..

Current No. 5123 = A
5160 = A.

Statement with ditto.

Order, &c., of Government– A.

Papers kept out of File for despatch in original (not paged).

Number of copies required.
- Order complete.
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

woman & signed by him) were
ly reprehensible.

ry: Major Pope has acquitted
self of all blame & the
regrets that the words
failure in duty" were used
the first instance in connection
the him.

(From orders)

[Copy
26/11]

Court

the Court of Police this day. [Desp 26/11] Print
Skeptical Exam.
the Surg. Genl.

(From orders)

Jud. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 8 Oct 1891, No. 2088 Jud.

Again G.O, dated 18 , No.

A — Current No. 5123 of 1891, dated 17 Nov. from Chemical Exam.
(Conf.: C. 2? 5179)

A — Current No. 5160 of 1891, dated 19 Nov. from Comr. of Police, Madras
(Conf. C. 2? 5181)

Order 926. XI. No. 2415

~~From what has now been stated before Govt. the case has now assumed a~~ appearance that further investigation is essential. There being reason to believe that Mr. Grant in writing his letter of the 19th August was acting upon information received from some person in Chemical Examiner's Office & ~~various communications passed to him~~ actually attached being that known as Mr. Newman as ~~the informant~~ Colonel Weldon will Hudson be deputed to enquire into the matter in view to ascertaining the identity of Mr. Grant's informant & he ~~will be~~ authorized with this object to question Dr. Pope Grant, Mr. Newman & all the members of the Chemical Examiner Office & to examine such records as he may consider necessary. The result of the enquiry will be reported Govt. thereupon upon receipt of Weldon's report will pass final orders on

Dr. Pope's explanation Surgeon Grant's failure to consult with Dr. Pope before ~~enquiring~~ entering upon the defence of the letter of the 20th Aug. from the Chemical Examiner's Office & his adoption of this letter in the first instant without any attempt to verify the statements contained therein (for it is assumed that the letter of the 20th Aug. was hereby placed before Surg: Grant

The matter certainly calls for further enquiry, with reference chiefly to Mr. Newman's conduct. Dr. Pope's letter is so wrapped up in ambiguous expressions, he so avoids categorical statements, and appears so afraid of incriminating others, that it produces the impression that there is a lot behind & that he is too timid to say all that ought to be said or that he knows. He requested an interview with me & called on me this morning, with the object he said of asking my advice whether he should allow Mr. Newman to take any further part in medico-legal work. I told him that was his responsibility & I took the opportunity of cross-examining him upon his letter with the following results. Some of them can be gathered but rather than from direct statements by implication from his letter.

The knife was not covered with rust if it had been the examination of the whole of the blade the rust, for traces of blood would have been perfectly easy. This is clear from the nature of the test which is the usual one for mammalian blood, and which

is merely one test was applied in
this case, viz. the guayacum - turpentine
test. (I write the first word phonetically)*
It consists in applying blotting paper
moistened with distilled water to the
substance examined; guayacum is
added when the red blood, if there
be any is absorbed by the blotting paper;
this produces a tawny colour which
on adding turpentine is changed to
a bright blue, the production of
which indicates the presence of mam-
malian blood. A further test, (which
was not used in this case) is the obtain-
ing of crystals of hæmin from the solution of
but neither of these tests will show
whether the blood is fresh or not.
The only test which will show this
is a spectroscopic one, and this
was not applied. Newman's reason
for his opinion that the blood was
fresh was simply the readiness with
which the knife responded to the
turpentine test, and this Dr Pope
says is no reason at all. From the
description of the test used it is obvious
that it could be applied to the
rust washed off the knife as easily
as to the implement itself or to
the (alleged) expired part of it
Newman himself or alone
drafted the reply sent by Dr Grant

* Look it out in Chevers. No doubt
the process is described there

The draft is in record the was seen
writing it by the office people. Newman
admits having given to Mr Ambrose a
verbal information similar
to that Mr Gantz got but denies
as does Ambrose that he com-
municated with Gantz. Col. Wilson
seems to allude to these matters when
he speaks of Newman volunteering
statements on the subject. Mr Shalab
Roy (?) Second assistant in the
Chemical Examiners office has told
Dr Pope that Newman admitted
in the office that he had given the
information to Gantz.
Gantz's letter is evidently based on
information of a detailed character
which could only have been obtained
from Newman or Dr Pope. The latter
is out of the question, and everything
points to Newman as the source of
it. The promptness & appositeness
of the reply which was clearly Newman's
confirm this view. If it is established
Newman will stand convicted of a
gross breach of confidence in pub-
lishing matters as to the procedure
in the Ch. Ex.rs office without the
permission or cognizance of his superiors
and not only this but of disseminating
statements which on Dr Pope's testi-
mony are distinctly false & under

A 25/11

to a degree which implies that they
seem to be his knowledge, or that his
knowledge is such that he is unfit
for his position. Under sec 510 C. Cr. P.
reports under the hand of the Assistant
Ch. Pr. are receivable in evidence
& may determine life or death or liberty
of individuals; and it is clear that
such a person as Newman cannot
be permitted to occupy such a position.

I think that Col. Waldron should
be deputed to make full enquiry
into & report on the matter, in view
to ascertaining whether the communi-
cation to Gantz can be traced to
Newman. He should have authority
to question him & the other members
of the Ch. Pr. office & to examine
the records therein. Also Dr. Grant
& Pope. He will, I think, get to the
bottom of the matter. It may be said
that he is an interested person to be put
to the enquiry, as the conduct of the Police
was impugned by Messrs Newman or Gantz
on his information; but I know
no one else so fit to make the enquiry
& I think Col. W's character & rank
stand too high to allow weight to
insinuations based on the circumstance
Dr. Grant's conduct in not referring to
Dr. Pope in the matter & his ignorant
adoption of Newman's draft reply
to Gantz are I think highly reprehensible
It is desirable, if may here be observed

Dr. G.O. 2415 Revd 26.XI.

91

I quite agree

25/11

Yes - I agree

Letter alluded to

Yes - I agree also to any suggestion that Col. Waldron should get his instructions short, as his time is short

H/L 22 Nov. 25/11

hereby placed before Dwg: Grant

It seems necessary to get an explanation from Mr. Newman.

Lu 28 Nov.

X 1891.

I believe that it is perfectly well known that Mr. Newman acted from Mr. Gantz's information. Dr. Pope appears however to be rather unwilling to be his accuser & 1891

Now case

With reference to Honorable Members' remark marked (A) overleaf, a copy of Mr. Grant's reply to Mr. Gantz will be found in the cutting from the Madras Mail in the original of E.P. 1911 of 16. IX. 91 [Confl. 155/1891], one of the papers in the file.

A second current [No. 5760] from the Commr. of Police on this subject is submitted

Cl. 20/11

Mr. Gantz' letter of the 19th August will be found printed in G.O. of 8 Oct. 1891 No. 2068 Revd

Lu 20 Nov.

Judicial Department.

C No. 5723.
Conf. 507.

From The Chemical Examiner

Dated 17 — 11 — 1891.

FOR ORDERS.

(A) I want to see the reply of the Chemical Exam.r to Mr. Gantz. It is not among the papers sent up.

Secy to Govt 24/11 20/11

Dr. Pope & Mr. Newman made the examination of the clapper together it appears & Dr. Pope drew up the formal certificate. Mr. Gantz' letter was received after Dr. Pope's departure, the answer to it was apparently drafted by Mr. Newman & placed before Dr. Grant who signed it. Mr. Newman was therefore responsible for the statements appearing in the reply to the effect that

(1) the whole clapper was covered with mud. Except at one edge;
(2) the mud was not examined because it was considered improbable that blood would be found;
(3) the blood found on the edge was fresh.

2. There seems a necessity for some further Enquiry in this case. Dr. Pope obviously suspects that Mr. Newman gave the information to Mr. Gantz which induced him to write on the 19th Aug. to the Chemical Exam.r & he further declares that

(1) the statement that the whole clapper was covered with mud was grossly exaggerated;
(2) the statement that the blood was fresh was unjustifiable on scientific grounds.

Strike out Newman Dr. Pope & insert Mr. Gantz specifically. Ask Mr. Gantz specifically whether he ever communicated to the Chemical Examr prior to the 19th Aug.t in connection with the case of the knife

24/11/91

CURRENT NO. 510

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE 19 NOV 91 SECRETARIAT-W.I.

CONFIDENTIAL. No. 510

From
The Commissioner of Police
Trinidad

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt.
Fort of St. George
Trinidad

Dated 19th } November 1891
Received.

No. 78

The Tripliccane Murder Case.

Submits further report on the letter from the Chemical Examiner's Office elicited and published by Mr. A. S. Gantz in reference to.

the true Character of this attempt
to Scandalise public Servants and
pervert the Course of Justice would
have been exposed.

8 ——— I find I was mistaken
in describing Mr Newman as an
Apothecary. I am informed that
he holds no medical qualification
and my apology is due to that
branch of the Service, the members
of which, so far as my experience
goes, fully justify the great
Confidence placed in their
integrity and abilities.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Thomas Colonel
Commissioner of Police

18 22

a more than usual ignorance of the subject I attempted to deal with" (paragraph 13) but he offers no justification of his severe criticism. I made no attempt to "deal with the subject" if by that Surgeon Grant means the various processes of Chemical Analysis, but encouraged by thirty years practical experience of evidence in Criminal investigations I did venture to express greater confidence in the resources of Science than appears at present to be entertained by Surgeon Grant, and in this I am fortified by the opinion of a Scientist of Dr. Pope's status and attainments. Had Surgeon Grant adopted the obvious Course of referring to his Senior Officer who had personally made the examination challenged, and who was responsible for the Official report resulting therefrom,

9

and opinions of his own invention. If enquiry be made it will probably be found that Dr. Newman drafted the indiscreet reply given to Dr Gantz' inspired queries, and Surgeon Grant not only accepted the responsibility of Signing this document but has gone further and defended it even after his suspicions should have been aroused.

7—— My Suggestion that if the Assistant Chemical Examiners Supplementary report was a true statement a further examination of the weapon would have been more in accordance with the traditions and practice of that important Office was shortly disposed of by Surgeon Grant boldly Charging me with "venturing to offer as a layman a Scientific opinion and thereby betraying

8

17 20

of Dr. Gantz's letter to the Acting Chemical Examiner dated 19th August 1891 will support my Conclusion. It is clear that the questions formulated by Dr. Gantz could only have been so framed on precise information given - Secretly as I understand Dr. Gantz admits, or perhaps he would prefer to say Confidentially - It is obvious this information could only have emanated from one of the two persons who undertook the examination of the knife, namely Dr. Pope and Dr. Newman - Dr. Pope was not in Madras when Dr. Gantz wrote his letter of 19th August 1891 a few hours after receipt of his information, and on other grounds I am in a position to say that Dr. Pope was no party to such Communication - Dr. Newman on the other hand has, out of office and unsolicited, been volunteering statements

when?

7

states in his Supplementary report.

5 ____ It can now be seen why no more extended examination of the weapon was made by the Chemical Examiner - The tests applied were sufficient for the purpose and the results were consistent with the history of the Case - If Dr. Newman thought otherwise at the time it was clearly his duty to have submitted his views to the Chemical Examiner under whose direction he was working and not have waited until, as he fancied, he had secured himself from Correction by better authority -

6 ____ I have above referred to Dr. Newman as having originated these Scandalous and false imputations of disgraceful Conduct on the part of responsible Officers, and a perusal

6

"Such a production should have been
"allowed to have been issued from my
"Office, but it was done (as you have
"observed) in my absence, and but for
"this would never have been written.
"I have the honor &c.
"(signed) J. A. Pope. M.D. B.Sc.
"Ag Chemical Examiner"

4 —— This I submit effectually disposes of the scandalous imputations originating with Mr. Newman published with and without privilege or justification by Mr. H. S. Gantz, and so credulously fostered by Surgeon A. E. Grant.

I may add that, apart from questions of Scientific opinion there is Conclusive evidence on the question of fact as to the Safe Custody of the Knife and its Condition when Submitted for Chemical Examination which fully bears out Dr. Pope's description and proves the impossibility of what Mr. Newman

No. 78 CONFIDENTIAL. City Police Office,

Madras, 19th November 1891

From Colonel J. Weldon, C.I.E.
THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
MADRAS.

To The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George
Madras.

Sir,

The Tripliane Murder Case

In reference to the Concluding portion of paragraph 13 of the letter dated 21st September 1891 No. 808 from Surgeon Grant embodied in the Proceedings of Government dated 8th October 1891 No. 2068 (Judicial) I have now the honour to submit the opinion of Surgeon-Major J. H. Pope, M.D. B.Sc who personally examined the instrument produced in evidence in the above Case.

2 —— On Dr. Pope's return from

I saw I invited his attention to what had passed during his absence in Connection with this Case and enquired if he Confirmed the report of the Assistant Chemical Examiner as to (a) the Condition of the Chopper when received in his Office, (b) the freshness of the blood stains discovered, and (c) generally if he approved of the replies given to the questions put on the Subject.

3 ____ I have received the following reply from the Chemical Examiner:-

"
" Chemical Examiner's Office
" Madras 13th November 1891.

"No. 973

"From
" Surgeon Major J. H. Lope M. D., B. Sc,
" Ag Chemical Examiner.
" Madras.

"To Colonel J. Weldon, C. I. E.
" Commissioner of Police,
" Madras.

"Sir,
" With reference to your letter

" No. A/117/2 dated the 2nd instant and
" marked urgent, I have the honor to
" state I regret very much the delay in
" answering it, but this has been due to
" the illness of the Assistant Chemical
" Examiner and his inability to attend
" Office.
" 2. There are three special points referred
" to in your letter viz:- (a) the Condition of the
" knife (b) the apparent freshness of the
" blood found on it after examination, (c)
" whether I generally approved of the replies
" in the letter to Mr. Gantz.
" (a) The Condition of the knife. - I unest-
" distinctly state that the description of
" the same as given by the then Acting
" Chemical Examiner, (on the information
" conveyed to him by the Assistant
" Chemical Examiner) is decidedly
" misleading and exaggerated. A "thick
" coating of mud" did not exist. The knife
" was carefully observed by me and
" scrutinized, and speaking as accurately
" as I can, I should have described the
" Condition of the blade, as bearing the appearance
" of having lain in dirty water for some days
" and then removed; and then having dried,

3

"there was left on it a filmy layer of mud and
"mud, not continuous but with small portions
"of the metal exposed to view. With the aid of
"a large handlens I could still more
"easily note the bareness of the blade in parts.
(b) The apparent freshness of the blood stains.
"This is the opinion expressed by the
"Assistant Chemical Examiner, but it
"is one that would not for one moment
"have received my sanction. He has expressed
"to me the reasons for thinking the blood
"fresh, but from a scientific point of view
"his opinion has no foundation whatever,
"and under the Circumstances of the Case,
"was highly injudicious and indiscreet.
"It might have been the opinion of a
"layman speaking at hazard, but quite
"unworthy of the Carefulness and
"accuracy of a Scientific expert on
"whose opinion full Confidence is placed.
(c) Whether I generally approved of
the replies &c. :- I may say that I consider
the whole latter most unsatisfactory
and one quite unworthy of the hitherto
well merited high standard and dignity
of the Office of the Chemical Examiner.
"I have felt keenly, and do so still, that

1891

CURRENT No. 5123

From

The Chemical Examiner

to Madras

Hon.

CHIEF SECRETARY
17 NOV 91
GOVERNMENT

To

The Chief Secretary

to Government

CONFIDENTIAL No. 507

Judicial Department

Madras.

Confidential

No: 977.

Dated 17th } November 1891

Received. }

Subject

Forwarding an explanation of the "failure in duty" on his part as stated in Para 3 of G.O. dated 8th October 1891 No: 2068 Judicial, and giving his opinion on certain other points in connection with the correspondence that took place in connection with the "Triplicane Wounded "Case".

P.T.O.

Office or through a second party.
I wrote to Dr. Gantz asking him
if he could name his informer,
but he refuses on the score of a
pledge of Confidence. Hence I am
Constrained to think that there
has been a breach of Confidence
in my office on matters which
are at all times highly Confidential
and this subject will I think require
further investigation.

11. I trust that the
Government will be pleased to
accept this my explanation of
what they have considered on my
part a "failure of duty", to my
mind, the most serious charge that
can be laid on any officer, and
I can only state that their order
has caused me much regret,
anxiety and pain.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt.
T. H. Dp
Dr. D, B. Sc
Ag: Chemical Examiner

exercise the statement was thought
= lessly made.

10. Lastly I am obliged to bring to the notice of Government one point with regard to the questions put by Mr. Gantz to the Chemical Examiner in his letter. On reading his letter I was at once surprised at the minuteness of the information which he states he received on the morning of the 19th. August (a Government holiday) from what he considered a reliable source. The manner also to his letter from my office is such that every point mentioned by him gets what appears to me, a suitable reply. Mr. Gantz must be well aware that the only reliable source of information on such points must emanate from my office alone and such information must have been given him either directly from some one in my

Office

i.e. suitable to Mr. Gantz's views? Yes

"extreme improbability of finding
"blood after removal of the mud
"which latter could only have
"been removed by washing" must
be characterised in no other terms
than an unmeaning and baltry
excuse. I Cannot Conceive how such
a weak, thoughtless and distinctly
erroneous statement could have
been made by any Chemical
Analyser and more so by any one
in my office where blood is ——
repeatedly looked for, tested and
detected in mud of every shape.
I confess to being thoroughly
ashamed that such a statement
was made and placed before
the Government and published
far and wide by the Press as
originating in the Chemical Examiner
Office. I endeavoured to obtain
from the acting Chemical Examiner
as well as from Dr. Kenman ~~the~~ Test
an explanation on this point
but failed to do so. I can only

there was at the same time no
necessity to take advantage of it,
inasmuch as the opinion of the
blood being apparently quite
fresh was not one that could
be warranted or supported by
scientific reasons. The detected
presence then of Inflammation
blood in any one part of the
knife was sufficient for the
purpose, and any more that might
have been detected would only
have confirmed the same fact.
If the blood detected at the time
struck Drs. Inman as being
apparently quite fresh, it should
have been to him a still stronger
reason to support his opinion by
more confirmatory tests.

9. I am obliged to state
that the reason given by Drs.
A. E. Grant in his reply to Drs.
Gantz's letter as to the non-examination
of the unbolo blade viz: the

extreme

received my sanction. I have
interrogated Mr. Kenman on the
point and on expressing to me
his reasons for so considering it, I
informed him that from a
Scientific point of view his opinion
had no foundation whatever and
under the circumstances of the
case I characterise the statement
as highly injudicious and indiscreet
It might have been the opinion
of a layman speaking at hazard,
but quite unworthy of the carefulness
and accuracy of a scientific
expert on whose opinion full
confidence is placed and in a case
of such grave importance as a
trial for murder.

8. Bearing (a) and (b) of
paragraph (4) in mind I trust
the Government will be led to
see that as there was ample space
in other portions of the blade (without
so much thick coating of mud on
any part of it) to test for blood
there

the subject to me. I stated to
him the condition of the blade
was such as "possessing the appearan
"of having lain in dirty water fo
"some days and then removed, and
"then having dried there was lef
"on it a filmy layer of rust an
"mud, not Continuous, but with
"small portions of the metal
"exposed to the view. With the aid
"of a large hand lens, I could stil
"more easily note the bareness of th
"blade in parts." Hence I considered
the description of the blade as
stated in the reply to Insp. Grant's
letter and the information vouchsa
by Insp. Kennan decidedly mis
and exaggerated.

7. With reference to the
"blood being apparently quite fres
This is the opinion expressed by
Kennan who is entitled to his
opinion; but it is not one th
would for one moment have
received

to explain why" no attempt was
"made to test or remove or examine
"the mud which Covered the greater
"portion of the blade". I must
Connect with this explanation the
statement to both made by the
assistant Chemical Examiner
Insp. Dr. S. Kennan in the reply to
Insp. Gantz's letter (a) the blade
was covered almost entirely with a
thick Coating of mud (b) the blood
detected was apparently quite fre
b. With regard to (a) I
must distinctly state that a thick
"Coating of mud" did not exist.
The knife was Carefully observed
by me and scrutinised and sugges
were made by me before I han
it over to Insp. Kennan to apply
usual tests for the detection of
blood stains. I shall describe the
Condition of the blade in the
same terms as I have done in a
lately addressed to the Commissi
of Police, who has again referred
th

given by me. With a peciab reference
to Dr. Grant's letter I am obliged
to state that no little blame
attaches itself to my assistant Dr.
Dr. S. Hannan, inasmuch as he must
have known that the answer
which he drafted and placed
before the officer acting for me
(Dr. A. Grant) to approve of for
eign, contained information that
would not for one moment have
received my sanction or approval
on account of its inaccuracy. He
is well aware that although the
Government and the Chemical
Examiner place ample Confidence
in his practical knowledge as
Chemical testing & still in my
of grave consideration and tact
and judgment, and in Correspond
in general, he is not permitted
by the Chemical Examiner to act

5. In return now to
paragraph (1) of my letter and

to

me for an opinion. It would not have
might to have been done, firstly,
because I was within easy reach
as to distance and the original
certificate of analysis was mine;
Secondly, because the officer acting
for me had no knowledge or share
of the case, to say nothing of his
very short period of public service
and utter inexperience in such
matters; thirdly, because of the
great importance of the matter
of Colonel Waldon's letter and
lastly, because of the peculiarly
pointed questions in Mr. Gantz's
letter, the answers to which led
Mr. Gantz to make (as Colonel Wa
properly remarks) unjustifiable
insinuations impugning the good
of the prosecution.

4. From the above para
graph it will be seen that I
no handling whatever of the mat
and that no explanation ma

Given
to

bound to enquire [illegible] a wrong impression from the [illegible] mind of Government.

3. Before proceeding further I desire respectfully to bring to the notice of Government that the knife in question was examined by Dr. Kinnear and myself between the 2nd and 9th July 1891 and the usual certificate forwarded to the Commissioner of Police. Nothing further was heard of it by me in my official Capacity until the receipt of the Confidential order of Government now under reply. I proceeded on privilege leave to Ejrcand on the 15th August, and neither Dr. Grant's letter of 19th of August nor the Medical Boards very important letter received in my office on the 23rd September (the one at the very beginning and the other at the very end of my leave) were referred to me

to

Judicial Department.

tes on page 12 of letter from the I G f Jails, No 231 dated 22nd June 1891

" I consider that the orders already assed about the leper ward should hold"

(Intd.)H.E.S.

19th July.

" I object entirely-G.O. of the 16th Febry 91 No. 298 Judicial practically reverses he orders of Government laid down in G O's 21-4-90 No 302 & 24-10-90 No 1635. The ast G O was passed after circulation to ll the members of Government, but G O of ebruary 16th 1891 was issued on the sole ictum of the Honorable Mr. Stokes-a most mproper proceeding on the part of the hief Secretary seeing that it practically eversed the former order of Government- his last G O should be at once cancelled r reconsidered- I dont think it is a correct one as it constitutes the Leper ward a part of the Penitentiary."

(Intd.) J.H.G.
24-7-91.

I don't think G.O. 6 Feb 91 can be held
to a renewal of G.O. 21 April 90 No 302
& 24 Oct 90 No 1635.
The first of them said that the leper ward
was not sufficient importance to be
constituted a separate jail & quoted Dr
Cook's claim for an allowance. The
second said that the leper ward had not
been constituted a prison within the mean-
ing of Act V of 1869. The order of Feb 91 & think
my colleagues did not intend to
treat it as a separate prison but merely
made provision for the warrants &c being
kept in the Penitentiary & for the convict
being retained on the Penitentiary
books. Facts which had occurred showed
that provision on these points was necess-
ary. The order however made no change
in the position of the ward, merely made
the Supt of the Penitentiary responsible
for the matters above described. It imposed
no duties on the Keeper & no necessity
for him to visit the ward. The whole
thing is got up as a foundation for
claim to Extra allowances, for the jail
Estab^t, such claims as in my opinion
entirely groundless. If it is now made
an entirely separate jail, Dr Cook will
claim his 50 Rs. an Estab^t will have
to be organized, separate and kept in
Estab, & separate debit made
in , &c. All this is some waste of money
seeing that the work can be, and is
at present, being done for nothing &
without any Extra trouble to any body.

Yrs
Dalyell

Circulated.

According to orders passed
in Council all [redacted] G.O.s upon
the Criminal Leper Ward are
circulated.

A
Dalyell
5th Aug.

I regret Each Rt Hon Sir Frederick should have
considered my action in passing out G O No 293
dated 7th Feb 1891 as a most improper proceeding.
It did not occur to me at the time that there
was anything calling for circulation or any
reversal of an order passed under the common
instructions of the Collective Govt.
The Hon must I think admit that I am
very particular with regard to the circulation
of papers and that of I err in this respect
it is in circulating too much and not too
little. It is impossible with constant press
of work and the unceasing worry and
distractions that a Chief Secretary has
not to occasionally overlook something
or fail to see a matter in a light which
afterwards have done. The omission to which
the Hon has taken exception in the strong
terms that he has was perfectly unintentional
and innocent. It was quite immaterial
to me whether the suggestions made in my
note were approved or not, as I have said
it did not occur to me that I should have
struck out the "Hon" with which the L.G.'s Sec
came up to me & substituted "Exc"

A
Dalyell
5 Aug.

In my opinion there is no doubt whatever that the G.O. of Feb. 16. 1891 most distinctly altered the character of the Criminal Leper ward, and by the actual wording constituted it a branch of the Penitentiary. This was in direct contravention of the previous resolution of the Govt. and the late Secretary ought most certainly to have cir. called it. I have already stated that in my opinion a great many papers are circulated unnecessarily, but this was clearly one that should have been circulated and I think the Hon. Mr. Forbes has perfectly justified in taking exception to the course adopted.

As regards the withholding of Dr. Cooke's letter of Jan. 27. 91 and the Surgeon Generals of Feb. 2 - forwarding the same - both very important documents - I should be glad to receive the Chief-Secretary's explanation.

—

As regards the future treatment of the Criminal ward of the Leper Hospital - which is stated by the I.G. of Jails to be as regards accommodation both insufficient and unsatisfactory, I should like to have further information -

1. as to the average number of Criminal Lepers in the Presidency - also

C. N°. 2913

The report of the I.G. of Jails on D. Cotheridge's Jail report.

I regret I cannot agree with my Hon: colleague Mr. Stokes that G.O. of Feb. 16/91 N°. 293 Jud. is not a reversal of G.O's of April 21/90 N°. 302 Public & G.O. of 24th Oct: 90 N°. 1635 Jud. -

The former (when the 2 G.O's cited by him) left the Lepers under an institution of sufficient importance to necessitate steps being taken to constitute it a separate Jail "for treating & confining" "it as any other branch of the Leper Hospital" whereas the 16th Feb/91 N°. 293 G.O. lays down that "the Leper Ward shall, in fact, be "treated as a branch of the "Penitentiary" - These 2 orders are quite opposed to each other - the latter clearly [illegible] G.O. of the former - N°. 1635. J.D. was passed on a Oct 24th/90 letter from the I.G. of Jails which pointed out the [illegible] & regarded the management of the Leper convicts in the Leper Asylum and at the Lunatic Asylum as [illegible] & made certain additions & alterations in the Jail Code. The G.O. in question of the 16th Feb. did not bring the Leper convicts [illegible] but [illegible] Lepers who had not been declared [illegible] within the meaning

of Act V 9/69, + as long as it is expended merely on a portion of the hospital it was necessary to effect any alteration in the Jail Code - the Direct opposition to the order it is laid down in S.O. of Feb.y 16th/91 N.293 just. that the Lepers criminal and [illegible] should be placed & confined under Sec: 521 of the C.P.C. must be regarded as under the inspection of the Insp.r Jails & the general charge of the Superd.t of Prisons."

Then 2 orders cannot be in direct conflict the latter & later annulling the former & earlier.

Their Lordships, therefore, see any important change in the position of the case. It places it under the Inspector Genl of Jails - rather than under officially. (as he has done in virtue of Sir Walter's report) that in consequence of this last S.O. the Keeper of the Penitentiary will have to undertake any of the responsibilities which regards the criminal lepers and which have to pay periodical visits to it which will form part of duties for which his legitimate duties at the Penitentiary, I think a very distinct charge for them can be incurred.

2. as to the work that would be required to place the Criminal Ward at Madras in a proper condition to deal with leper convicts (vide Dr. Cooke's letter)

3. As to the proposed transfer of the all criminal lepers to Calicut, making use of the Jail there - when abandoned for the treatment therein of criminal and non-criminal lepers.

When this information is produced, I think we shall be in a position to deal properly with the subject. Meanwhile I do not think it advisable to disturb existing arrangements.

W
8/8/91

Draft S/O

as they have colleagues & annulled that the Chief Secy for the Govt. of Madras claim to extra allowances for claims to differ from him, I can only say Col: Smith's remarks at page 12 of his report where he draws attention to the fact that it is not necessary for the Officer in charge of the Leper Asylum to be convicted a special charge of Jails but should be

S.O. of Feb.y 16/91 No. 293 cancelled & the following S.O. substituted in its place

Should issue:

G.O.

The powers & duties of the Superintendent of Jails, relative to the management & control of the convicts kept and working in the Leper Hospital, in virtue of previous (dated the 22nd June 91 No 231) Standing Orders of Government, will be exercised by the Medical Officer in charge of the Leper Hospital, Madras.

2. This officer in charge of the Leper Asylum will receive an allowance of Rs 50 a month - he will be

submitted to jails; the clerical work of the ward, if possible, be conducted by the Hosp^l Estab^t.

~~if possible~~

I have inserted words granting an allowance to Dr Cook, because in G.O. of 21/4/90 No. 302 Public, it was admitted that if there were a separate Dept. Jail, his application for a charge allowance would be entitled to support.

With reference to the Chief Sec's remarks taking exception to my observation that the issue of G.O. of Feb. 16th/91, No. 293 Pub. without being first of all circulated was very improper, I observe that that G.O. was issued on a letter from the Insp^r Gen^l of Jails dated Jan^y 14/91 - No 11. and that it was not sent to the Hon: Mr Stokes till the 12th Feb. In the meanwhile a letter had been received in the Chief Sec's office from the Surg^n Gen^l, on the 3rd Feb^y forwarding a letter from Dr Cook, complaining that the system of treating the convict [illegible] wards as part of the hospital did not work well, & urging that it sh^d be placed under the Jail Dept. & that it sh^d be left to him, as Dept^l & Med^l officer, to decide what diet & work they sh^d get. There was no apparent reason why this letter sh^d not have been sent to the Hon Mr Stokes with Col: Smith's letter, seeing that the letter did not go to

2/

x this appears from a slip in Mr Und. Sec^y Butterworth's handwriting - (vide G.O. of 10/4/91 - No 667)

x I most readily admit that the C.S. is very hardworking & very hardworked & he does his best. I believe [illegible] whatever [illegible] the Hon: Mr Stokes' note on the G.O. of Feb. 16th/91 was based should have been noted, as it, in my opinion, clearly warranted writing orders as I have shown above.

Remember for [illegible] days afterwards, but this letter from the Surg^n Gen^l was never sent to him at all, or having been sent [illegible], but apparently was kept back in the office by the Chief Secretary's express order x & subsequently a G.O. was passed on it, (again the Chief Sec's orders) merely recording it with reference to G.O. of Feb. 16th - that is with reference to the G.O. based on the Hon: Mr Stokes's order on Col: Smith's letter.

There was thus a grave irregularity committed here: I consider it very improper - It arose probably out of oversight or carelessness or some other species of neglect - but I regret that from the way in which the Surg^n Gen^l's letter of Feb. 2nd was withheld by the Chief Sec's orders, as appears from the papers - I cannot acquit him of blame - It is quite possible that in the press of work in his office he did not notice the Surg^n Gen^l's letter of Feb 2nd nor even did not see it for several days after its receipt to have given his orders to keep it back after the note on Col: Smith's letter had gone in care of the Hon. Mr Stokes - but somebody blundered in his office & therefore I hold him responsible. x

Had the Surg^n Gen^l's letter, forwarding one from Dr Cook's, gone to the Hon: Mr Stokes along with Col: Smith's letter & had his attention been called to G.O.s of April 21/90 No. 302 & 24th Oct/90 No 1635 the G.O. of 16th Feb. might possibly not have been drafted & issued -

[illegible initials]

6/8/91

Cairo
Privâ pollicem.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE
22 SEP 91
CAIRO

31/8/91

My dear Price

I am desired to ask you to kindly circulate this file to Mr Justin Mr Bloker & Mr Scott (after return).

Yours sincerely
J. Reay

2 & 4 were very unnecessary, and caused needless annoyance to the High Court and the Senate, and placed the Govt. on each occasion in an awkward position, which better management would have entirely obviated.
With no desire whatever to press hardly on the Chief Secretary, and making all due allowance for pressure of work in his office, I still think the Govt. cannot pass over these "slips" without comment - regretting that they have occurred, and sincerely hoping that no more of a similar kind will take place in the future.

W
20 Sep.

I cannot admit this - though I readily admit that the Chief Secretary might have seen the case - Dr Cook asked that the leper ward should be placed under the Jail Department - that is under the Director of Prisons - but the S.O. No 293 places it under the Principal Medical Officer of Prisons & Medical Officer of Health & Member of Sanitary Council

HHS

Judicial Department

C. No 2913.

I submit the explanation called for in H.E. the Governor's Note.

The note of the Under Secretary written on the 9th February on the Surgeon-General's letter giving cover to Dr Cook's did not come to me until the 14th February and then with a note of that date which cancelled the prior one.

Why the paper did not come to me until then the Under Secretary at this distance of time cannot remember.

It came to me linked with the draft order in C.O. No 293 of 16th February 1891.

Dr Cook's letter asked for what was de facto ordered in C.O. 293 - viz - that the Criminal Leper Ward should be brought under the Jail Department quâ a place of confinement for Criminal lepers.

It is not and never has been the practice in the Secretariat to circulate communications which have been disposed of by some other C.O. and which ask merely for orders

on

on a matter finally dealt with on such Q.P. The disposal on this is invariably "Recorded with reference to Q.P. No .. dated ...."

The Under Secretary on the 14th February sent me up the Note which will be found on the back of the Surgeon-General's letter and I, after seeing that what Mr. Butterworth said was correct, approved of his suggestion that the paper should be recorded.

I respectfully submit that there was nothing else to do.

I did not order the papers to be withheld. The Honorable Mr. Garstin writes as if I had first directed that they should be kept back and then to be recorded but this is not the case as dates on the papers themselves show - viz -

14th Febry - Under Secy. sent up the papers docketed with draft Q.P. 293 with a note pointing out that the matter to which they referred had since their receipt been disposed of by the order contained in the draft suggesting that they might be recorded

Chief Secretary approved this on the same date. This is what is referred to in the "chit of the Under Secretary, to prevent any blundering as to what the orders were to be, initialled on the same day the order "Recorded &c" at the foot of his note of the 14th February. The office on the 10th April numbered and dated the Q.P.

I saw the papers only once - viz. on the 14th February. What the U/S note to the office of the 8th April referred to was that I initialled in token of approval on the 14th Feby.

I believe that I have distinctly shown that I did not order the papers to be withheld. There was no reason of any sort or kind why I should. I simply on the 14th February sanctioned a course which, as can if necessary be proved by thousands of examples, is in accordance with the practice of the Secretariat for a long series of years before I entered it.

I observe that the Honorable W. Garstin says "I regret that "from the way in which the "Surgeon-General's letter of February "2nd was withheld by the Chief "Secretary's orders as appears from "the papers I cannot acquit him "of blame."

J.

I respectfully submit that it is perfectly clear that there was no withholding of the papers under my orders, and I trust therefore that as the ground upon which the Honorable Mr. Garstin bases the expression of his inability to acquit me of blame has been removed, he will see cause to reconsider what he has said in the matter

25th Augt.

I regret that this explanation has been delayed but I have often had so much to do that I have been obliged to let this stand over until I could speak to Colonel Hill

E.

I do not think the hon. Mr. Garstin can justly be charged with persistency in hunting out this case against the Chief Secy whom I gladly acquit of any intentional mistake. It may well be as pointed out by the hon. Mr. Stokes that the work of the Chief Secretary may be such as to render him liable to slips of this kind, and that he should therefore be dealt indulgently when they occur - but I must say that I hardly think they can or should be overlooked entirely. It is unfortunate that since I have been here, four of these "slips" should have occurred

1. in connection with the P. of Wales
2. The delay in sending the letter to the Kilfinane
3. This case, &
4. The manner in which the file on the Bye-laws of the Lunatic Asylum was marked for me although it was known that I would not be back from leave till Sept. 7.

[To opposite side]

had almost ceased in the time of the hon. Member's predecessor in office. One or two letters of this kind were sufficient for me.

The hon. Member for Kilkenny

H.C. the first again without any of the 2 points of this present. I did not believe the C.S. knew, or could have known, with the ordinary routine of work in his office, that any other right or power than the ordinary right of access to the Chief Secretary existed in the case of letters addressed to this office in their capacity as the persons who would be more competent in future.

12/9/91

I am still of opinion that G.O. 16 Feb 91 made no real change in the position of the Lepers wards and was not a recital of the previous orders. It was certainly not intended to be, as those orders had long since ceased to be in force. Mr Thompson does not blame the C.S. for the full commencement. However, on that point I am apparently in a minority as to the letter of Feb. 2. I am pointed out never saw it. If I had, I don't think it would have made any difference in the note I wrote, on which G.O. 16 Feb 91 was based. And I therefore regard the view taken by the C.S. that it was unnecessary to circulate it as a very venial error of judgment, if an error at all. If Mr. E. or any low colleague had personal experience of the vast mass of papers which pass through the Chief Secretariat & the everlasting worry to which the unhappy head of that office is subjected, they would I think be more indulgent in regard to slips of this kind, and any low colleague less persistent in hunting them out.

HH
14 Sept

PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE
29 OCT 91
GOVERNMENT PAPERS

This note is intended for the first & H.L. the Lord. Became to me some days ago in a box with a large number of other papers and was sent home today

28/10/91

The papers are submitted to H.E. the Lord. They were circulated to the Hon Mr. Garstin first as it was understood from a D.O. letter by him to the C.S. that he wished to express a remark made by the Hon Mr. Stokes and it was supposed that he would do so before the papers were circulated to H.E. the Lord. & his Hon Colleagues.

29 Oct

* [This has been taken out as it is wanted for early circulation with another file. H.E. will however remember the case; his remarks are appended by the Chief Secy's letter of the 25th Aug.]

Irl. DEPARTMENT.

No. 2913.

Dated 189 .

FOR ORDERS.

This current is recirculated to H.E. the Governor. It is not understood whether H.E. agrees with the Hon. Mr. Stokes or the Hon. Mr. Garstin as to the future status of the Criminal Lepers Wards.

H.E. asks what the average population of criminal lepers is. The ward contains 16 beds but recently an addition of 6 beds has been sanctioned. This will enable the I.G. of Jails to transfer thither all the criminal lepers in the Jails who are under sentence of more than 3 months imprisonment.

2. His Excellency remarks that the circulation of the * current on which Gr. J. 19 Sept. 1891 & 9709 Edn. was passed was unnecessary & instances it as an Example of bad management. As this paper was circulated by H.E. under orders of the G.O. only & without the knowledge of the Chief Secretary I think it right to submit an Explanation.

The Registrar's letter of the 20th August 1891 contains nothing whatever to show that it was in any way urgent. Had it done so the current would not have

been detained pending ... return from tour. The ... being the case & the ques... raised being of some impo... it was considered advis... let H.E. see the papers ... the order issued. A meeting ... Senate was in fact adjourn... account of the absence of ... reply from Govt. but the Gov... soon informed that a meet... was to be held shortly & ... the Question.

That all reasonable despa... (apart from the unnecessary ... H.E.) was used in the offic... be clear from the following

Letter received	21
Passed on by U.S.	29
" " " C.S.	25
" " " Hon. Mr. Stokes	26 "
" " " Hon. Mr. Garstin	31 "
Returned to office	31 "
Passed by U.S. to be sent for H.E. the Govr.	
Sent to Govt. House	6 Sept
Returned from " "	16 "
U.S. drafted	16 "
C.S. passed draft	17 "
Order despatched	19 "

6/
25 Sept.

H.E. the Governor has observe... upon the Hon. Mr Garstin's note ... 6th August that he consi... it advisable not to disturb the ... existing arrangements in regard ... the Criminal Leper Ward until ... information is forthcoming, ... the following points, viz.

(1) As to the average number ... of Criminal lepers in the ... Presidency.

(2) As to the work necessary ... place the Criminal Ward for ... lepers at Madras in a posi... to accommodate all the cri... lepers:

(3) As to the proposed transfer of ... Criminal lepers to the abandoned ... Calicut District Jail.

Calicut Jail Criminal Lepers

Notes connected with G.O. No 2391 P 21-X-1-91 July 7.

CONFIDENTIAL.

1

No 1

wish, if there be any of their transmitting their disease to the healthy prisoners.

I think on the whole it would be better to leave the lepers as they are, criminal & non-criminal alike, and as regards their accommodation I think anything like over crowding in the criminal ward can easily be prevented, by ordering Jail Superintendents not to forward to Madras such prisoners as are only suffering from slight or incipient forms of leprosy. Dr. Cook showed me several convicts that could apparently have been easily put to work in their respective Jails.

As regards the administration of the Criminal Leper Ward, I am still most strongly of opinion that the Superintendent of the Leper Hospital should also be the Superintendent of the Leper Criminal Ward, the Govt declaring it to a separate prison.

W
31 Oct.

* The draft is under consideration but I am already certain that was what said.

10

2

As regards the first of these remarks the attention of H.E. the Govr is invited to Col. Smith's letter in G.O. of 4 Sept. 1891 No 1754 dated 28th which is in the bundle marked "Papers re Leper Ward." It will be seen from this that in August last there were 42 Criminal Lepers in the Jails of the Presidency under sentence of more than 3 months' imprisonment. There are however 42 beds in the Criminal Leper Wards, as stated above, there were 22 lepers in the Jails, therefore the accommodation is just sufficient for present requirements.

As regards the second question also attention is invited to G.O. of 4 Sept. 1891 No 1754 dated. There are now 42 beds in the Criminal Leper Ward, as stated above, there were 22 lepers in the Jails, therefore the accommodation is just sufficient for present requirements.

As regards the third question:— The proposal to transfer criminal lepers to the abandoned District Jail at Calicut will be found in para. 72 of Mr. Cadrow's Report. This suggestion appears not with the approval of the Hon. I. G. of Jails, Col. Smith, & the remarks on this subject in Mr. Cadrow's Report. In the draft order on Mr. C's Report it is said that orders will be issued after the I.G. of Jails has communicated with the Govt of Malabar on this subject before final conclusion can will be arrived at it will be necessary to consult the Surgeon-General as he will probably object to

the transfer of the whole Leper hospital & Cabinet partly on account of the difficulty of obtaining skilled attendance there & partly because the climate of the West Coast is said to be particularly unfavourable to sufferers from this disease. H.E. M.L. considers that the question of the future position of the Leper hospital & its criminal wards should be referred to the Surg: Genl: for remarks & definite orders & that effect can be given to G.O. 293. This will perhaps be the best way out of the difficulty caused by the disagreement of the other Hon. Members as it will enable the order on G.O. 293 to issue at once & the manner this takes place the better.

The Hon. Mr. Grantin observes in connection with the duty of Sporons for Burmese Convicts referred to on p. 11 of Col. Smith's letter that he would entirely agree with H.E. the Govr on this point were the Sporons of wood. I have asked Mr. Candler about this & he says the sporons are of wood.

[illegible]
14/VI

Submitted. I regret that I have been so pressed of late that I have been unable to take up this paper.

I think that under the explanation offered by Mr. Butterworth I may be entirely exonerated from blame with regard to the circulation of the paper touching the Senate. I had no idea that this matter would

Criminal Lepers
Madras

I have been over the Leper ward in Madras, and I found there that the accom.ⁿ for criminal lepers was much as described by the S.G. of Salem viz: "insufficient and unsatisfactory". How though it would be perhaps a good use to put the Cabinet Jail to, that is to take all the criminal lepers in the Presidency. Yet it does not seem to me that this could be done merely to accommodate 22 of this class. How would it be possible to transfer the entire Leper hospital from Madras to Cabinet, as even if this were advisable, there is no means of compelling the patients to go, and if left to themselves, I am satisfied that none of them would leave the East Coast for the best.

Under all these circumstances, the only other alternative would be to start a second Leper hospital at Cabinet. And this I am decidedly opposed to, as though such a hospital might possibly be the means of keeping alive a certain number of lepers, for a few years longer, than they w.ᵈ otherwise live, I do not think we should be justified in incurring this expense, no matter how small, there is no instance of a case of leprosy being cured, nor even arrested at the particular stage of the disease when first brought under treatment, nor does the system enable the authorities to segregate lepers from the rest of the community. I do not therefore think it advisable to open another Leper hospital. The one at Madras serves a very good purpose in keeping in a central spot an institution available for the close & careful watching of the disease, ensures the proper treatment of criminal under detention, while keeping them out of the other prisoners, and however

I am glad that H.E. the Gov.ʳ in his remarks of 20th Sept last has expressed his view of opinion that the accumulation of files which I was persistently & unduly accused of on the part of the Chief Secretary's office was unjust as in this case at all events it enabled me to contest myself with the absolutely denial of the accusation of the existence of official documents.

The G.O. of July 19-4/89 No. 1245- that is now over 2 years ago directed that all criminal lepers should be collected together from the different Jails in the Presidency & brought to Madras. More than 16 months have elapsed since then & the beds in the Leper Hospital have been ready, but there are now only 10 criminal lepers in the Hospital, & there are no more available - as the new buildings are provided for the reception of criminal lepers only. The Govt was proposing the former policy that is reconsidered & no more criminal lepers whose only sufferings from slight forms of leprosy, we should be justified I think in transferring the criminal lepers to a separate Jail at Cabinet, & I still urge that course, but I do not think that Govt will consent to it. Dr. Cook has stated that he considers that the West Coast climate is bad for lepers - This seems to me to be an unfortunate reason for not adopting the Govt's proposition - because the

[illegible] brought up and recorded by another as an instance of carelessness or want of judgment. Had I thought that it would have been I would have submitted a written statement on the subject and so have avoided a position at any rate of the censure upon me which H.E. the Governor & his Council.

Mr. Butterworth has sent to me the annexed note.

"Nothing further has been written in explanation of the failure to circulate the G.O. now in question as H.E. and Hon. Mr. Franklin observed, indeed the matter is the subject. There is however one further point to which the Hon. Mr. Franklin refers by the delay and issuing G.C. No. 663 - dated 10-4-91. This was due to the fact that G.O. Jud. No. 293 dated 16.2.91 was in circulation with my explanation regarding the delay in sending on to the Govt. Record during the interval. The G.O. of 293 seems to have returned from there on the 30th March and the necessary orders were passed by C.S. on the 8th April.

It is my belief that there is what occurred C No. 533 G.O. dated 10-4-91. No. 663 was marked for Hon. & Circ. in the first instance, since I thinking it necessary to circ. the papers marked it for Hon. only and took a note on the G.O. for some reason which I cannot explain now I did not circulate it with the comment on which G.O. No. 293 dated 16-2-91 was passed but kept it back till G.O. dated 16.2.91. No. 293 returned C.S. the

14th. Feby when I called the two Cases
to Court Number to C.S.
C.S passed the Draft on the 14th on
one Current and enclosed Note
marked for Hon on the other Current.
The Papers have returned to me. E.O
No. 293 dated 16.2.91 was
despatched at once and cancelled
with my explanation about the
delay with the E.O. Renew but
for some reason or other again I cannot
find Case No. 533 in 2 Cir.
Calendar Hon. When E.O dated 16.2.91
No. 293. returned again I took to
C. No. 533 to C.S. and I thought
it was no good recalling the
Hon and suggested that it
might be recorded as it had pre-
viously been disposed of by E.O No
293. C.S agreed and it was
recorded on 8th April
All the Cases for perusal & mentality
lies with me. I am very sorry that
mistake occurred but I cannot
now explain how it happened. I
think they may be Remitted to
the Hon'ble Secretary.
I feel fully certain now that when
C.S initialled the Note on C. No.
533 on 14 Feby it was intended for
Hon & it was only at my subsequent
suggestion that C.S called it record
not to any further. It was because
it was originally marked for Hon
that I specially wrote a Note slip to
the Office that it need not go to Hon
This may have been which occasion
I have however no recollection

xx Case of Lakes in Khedma
forbid any more being
sent there. E.O of
19/7/89 No. 1245 with Govt
again undistributed.
Of course we can't have no
lepers, many happen to be
leper, from a Hospital in
Calcutta
Leper to me in Calicut -
I quite agree with Hon'ble
for the Hospital taken
Hospital No. 2 Ward of the
Civil Lepers have the No.
Kasba as separate jail in
future - E.O of 26th 16th
January -
191 Nos. also to cancelled a
modified & a E.O. in the
hand a sum of the Hospital
Hospital fund (in my note
of the 6th May & Cash) being the
items leaving out Item 2,
relating to an additional
to Dr. Cook, if Hon'ble Hadow
does not think it necessary to
touch on that point.

HS
6/11/91

I agree with Hon'ble Sir that convicts
suffering actually from leprosy merely
in the initial stages of the disease
need not be transferred to the
Criminal ward of the Leper Hospital
Madras, if there are any such
now in the ward they should be
ordinary stages leaving
transferred to Jail. There is not
room for any but cases which may be received
in jail hospital. The idea is to reduce
gradually the number
of leper convicts, which is now 22.
with leprosy increase and it
is unnecessary to form a special
leper jail at Calicut for so small
a number.

HS
7 Nov.

and Commodore called to mind the Ld. S having spoken to me about No. 533 or my having seen him again after the 14th. July.

X

22 Octr.