(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 14

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 7/89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(11)

PWD துறை

அரசாணை எண். 1888 அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். பலவகை

நாள் : 15.7.1889. 19 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

7 sheets

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

1888

Circular No. X Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

Annual confidential reports on Royal Engineer Officers of the Accounts Branch.

To

THE GOVERNMENTS OF MADRAS, BOMBAY, BENGAL, THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH, AND THE PUNJAB.

THE CHIEF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CENTRAL PROVINCES, BURMA, ASSAM, AND COORG.

THE RESIDENT AT HYDERABAD.

THE AGENTS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL FOR CENTRAL INDIA, RAJPUTANA, AND BALUCHISTAN.

THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILWAYS.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA FOR RAILWAYS, CALCUTTA, CENTRAL DIVISION, AND LUCKNOW.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF TELEGRAPHS.

Simla, the 29th April, 1889.

SIR,

With reference to Government of India Circular No. III Public Works dated the 16th February 1889, regarding the submission of confidential reports on Royal Engineer Officers serving in India, I am directed to state that Royal Engineer Officers of the Accounts Branch holding independent charge shall be regarded as "Superintending Engineers" for the purpose of Rule 2 (*b*) of the Rules circulated therewith. Their reports will be signed as "Chief Engineer" by the Chief Engineer and Secretary of the Province in which they are serving, and will be countersigned by the Accountant General, Public Works Department.

2. In the case of Royal Engineer Officers not in independent charge, the heads of their offices shall be regarded as the "Superintending Engineer" for the purpose of the rule quoted; and their reports will be signed and countersigned respectively by the Chief Engineer and Secretary of the Province in which they are serving, and the Accountant General, Public Works Department.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

G. H. D. WALKER,

Under-Secy. to the Govt. of India.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 74 P. W. D.—1-5-89.—1,020.

No. 1521 W. dt 20 May 1889

Communicated to the
Examiner Public Works
Accounts with reference
to G.O. 695 W dt 5th March
1889.

[illegible] R.E.D.B.

Copy: D. W. Accts

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Camp: Kodaikanal 7th June 1889.

1688

No. A

From Lt. Col: A.C. Smith R.E.
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to the Confidential Re-
port forwarded to you yesterday duly
filled in according to orders I have the honor
to state that I treated it entirely as a
Departmental and not a Regimental
return and therefore filled up the whole
form as "Inspecting Officer" as well as
"Commanding Officer" for as a matter
of fact the latter title is a misnomer
when applied to me with regard to the
Officer reported on.

2. I would respectfully suggest
that the form be altered to suit cases
of this sort for it is certainly not in ac-
cordance with Queen's Regulations or
Articles of War that a Junior Officer
should report Regimentally on an Officer
Senior to him in his Regiment or Corps.

3. If the matter is treated as a purely
Departmental

Departmental one there is nothing anomalous
in the proceeding but the form should
I think be altered to such cases.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servant.
Al Smith Lieut. Col. D.E.
Superintending Engineer

1888

3

Sr. Rly 135 2 W dy 20-5-89

P.W.D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,

P. W. D.

No. A.

Dated 7th June 1889.
Received

Enclosure. —

Requesting for the reasons stated to make certain alterations in the Statement sent Confidentially.

D.O. 17/6- R. 12-7-89

D.S. 19/6.

D

P.W.D. 6th Circle

P.W.C. 5706

Sr 356 Dy 20 June 89

1888

P. W. Dept

Memo

From the Supdg Engineer VI Circle No. A of 7th June 1889

The attention of the Supdg Engineer is drawn to the rules communicated with G.O. 6981W of 8th March 1889, from which he will see that Supdg. and Chief Engineers take the place of Commanding and Inspecting officers for purposes of the Confidential Reports in question — No alteration of the form seems necessary.

Rueds
19.6.89

To
The Supdg Engineer
VI Circle

N.S. 4

No 1352 dy 20-5-89
- 6980 dy 2-8-89

No 3668 dy 20-6-

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Camp: Kodaikanal 25th June 1889.
Dec 27.

1888

No. 6371

From Lt. Col: A. C. Smith R.E.
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Actg: Chief Engineer
Col: Buildings & Roads Branch.

Sir,

D?

With reference to your Memo: No: 3668 / 20.6.89
I have the honor to state that I still think either the form of Regimental Confidential Report should be altered or the rule laid down in para 6 Clause 165 of Army Circulars India dated 31st October 1888 should be modified.

ENCLOSURES.

2. No doubt the above course should be adopted as a general rule but every rule has its exceptions and I cannot think it was ever contemplated by the Government of India that a junior should be called upon to report confidentially or otherwise on an Officer senior to him in his Regiment, such a proceeding being opposed to the Queens Regulations and Articles of War which are based on higher authority than the Government of India.

3. I have the honor to request

therefore

therefore that the case in question may be
referred for the particular orders of the
Government of India

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant

Al Smith Lt. Colo.
Superintending Engineer

1886

G. o. B. No. 69 dtd 8-7-89

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

(11)

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras.

No. 6375

Dated 25th June 1889
Received 27th

Enclosure. Nil.

Regimental Confidential Reports.

Requesting that the question of modifying the forms of may be referred for the particular orders of the Govt of India.

For Orders.

Put up the form of Report of the Army Regns cited

3.7.89

Submitted

over

Re. Submitted with reference to Hon'ble remarks dt. 5th July. The Army Circular referred to was issued with the full cognisance apparently of H.E. the C. in C. in India, and it is clearly intended that departmental qualifications are should be reported upon under para 2(a) (b), leaving regimental & similar qualifications to be dealt with under para 2(d), and that as in the case of Regimental Majors — Lt Cols. & Cols. of Rls it will be seen are not affected in their military capacity — Other orders —

5.7.89

The case of a junior reporting on one of his senior to him in the Corps must of course have been considered and I think Col. Smith should be informed that Govt decline to discuss the matter. The report does not purport to be a regimental or military one.

29/7. 4/8/89

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1888

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

From the Supdg Engineer VI Circle (No. 637 J. dt. 25th June 1889)

The Government sees no necessity for any reference to the Government of India and declines to make one — The report in question does not purport to be a regimental or one but in the case of a Military Lt Cols. & Colonels, a purely Departmental one —

8.7.89

To The Supdg Engineer VI Circle.

R/S