

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Public</i> DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 28-3-90
No. 238.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Passing orders on letter
from the Dist. Magistrate
of Tanjore raising certain
question with refer to Rule 11
of instructions issued for
guidance of the Supt of the
British Settlements Coolie
Depot at Nagapattanam.*

FURTHER PAPER, No. 893

~~or 189~~

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
188 , No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DATTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH 'DITTO'

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

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

Public Dep't.
Publ. C. 12857

AL/2/90 DE 114/8-Info

Yours

The Dist. Magistrate of
Tayore.

~~letter~~

3^d Question: the Colonial Secy
Singapore.

to the Chief Secretary to
Govt., Public Dept.
Madras.

With respect to your

letter No. 431 of 14.1.1890.

I am directed to forward

40 42 post. Solbr

From Dec 11. 1900
 Jackson No 1354/7. 8. 90.
 11/12/90

From the Jolly: 2/17/90. Noted com-
Nº 505. d/17. 3.90. munication

and to suggest that, in the

circumstances reported,

the second clause of said
11. 1938. be expunged

attention is invited

2. 5 para: 3 of the

2013
Collector's Endorsement

20/3/90.
ent. G. and L. 90: no: 238.
LL

Order. 28 2/3 1/2 1/3 2 1/3

The object of this note is
to show that we are compelled to

grate, and that they should be
to compel them to go

has not been he if he were to be
within would be if he were to be

But he has plenty of other things to do, and

the rule requiring the Dep. to Dep.

Case of the King's Bench
The King's Bench

thinking if he is mis-called that

Feb 21 [if I should have lost

To: [unclear] (From adeno) [unclear]

The following is drawn from

No 125. B.

C. No 857

1st class Sub Div. Magistrate's Office
Nagasaki 7 Dec 1890

From R. H. Campbell Esq
1st Class Sub Div. Magistrate
of Tempo

To The District Magistrate
of Tempo.

Sir, With reference to your Footnote No. 325
dated 25th February 1890 on G. O. No. 122 dated
15th February 1890 I have the honour
to report as follows:-

According to Rule 1 I have the honour
to inform you that at Mr. Hardaker's
request I have issued orders for the
closing of all the depots for coolies now
existing.

In Rule 11 it is stated that should
any cooly object to emigrate after having
matters explained to him information
must be given to the Local Protector
of Emigrants. I do not understand
whether I, as Protector of Emigrants, am
to pass orders in such cases. As there
is no provision of law under which a
cooly can be compelled to emigrate
I do not see what is to be gained by re-
-porting such cases to me. I think
that if a cooly objects to emigrate
he

he may be simply discharged by
the Superintendent I have no other
remarks to offer on the Rules.

Yours Vce

/Signed/ R.H. Campbell
1st Class Sub D. Surge
Singapore.

No 505 m.

/Impd/

Submitted to Government with reference
to G.O. No 122 Pub Date 15 February 1890.

2. It is not clear who is the local
Protector of Emigrants referred to in Rule 11.
This provision seems superfluous.

3. The Rules generally seem suitable.
It is desirable that, subject to the
superintendence of the Head Assistant
Collector Magistrate, the Superintendent
should be held entirely responsible
for the proper control of emigration
to the Straits.

Chit

Jt. Magistrate

Impd & Impd's Office
Vallam 17 March 1903

IM
dy

