I
5/4/99.

2-1-27 VI ✓

2-3-14
13.9.26 V

[Poll. / 8]
500—15-4-98.

Political (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 237

DATED 30-3-99

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording certain notes & papers regarding the officers serving under this Govt who are entitled to wear the political uniform.

T
307.188

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cno D/o	3314 No 293/	Public/99 of 99.–	~~[illegible]~~ See Dis D/o No 199 / 15-7-99				

227-8 Pub / 3-3-00

1153-4 Pub / 6-11-00

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

OOTACAMUND,

July 1st 1897

My dear Sir.

I spoke to you the other night about Forbes wearing political uniform and told you that it was forbidden by the G of I and that Macleane had been pulled up for wearing. I now enclose the papers.

That paragraph A refers to Macleane

you in place for any more formal communicn

AA

Mr. F. to whom I spoke on the matter tells me that the Secs. under Govt. of India & Bengal all wear the Pol. uniform & that the Foreign Office order only applies to officers under that Dept.

Write to Home Secy & find out their usage.

AA. 17.1.98.

[G. / 73]
2,000—25-11-96.

NOTE FOR THE C.A.

No correspondence can be traced from the old indexes in the General Record dept on the subject of uniform for Members of Govt. A file of papers containing the revised Dress Regulations prescribed by the Govt. of India is herewith submitted.

LR
31/1/98.

Fair the D.O.
2/2/98

WT
2-2-98

CHIEF SECRETARIAT,
D. O.
No. 65
Dated, 3 · 2 · 1898

D.O.

Political Dept:
3-2-98

~~My~~ Dear ~~Sir~~ Mr Hewett,

Will you please refer to the list of appointments, the holders of which are entitled to wear the political uniform, communicated with Foreign dept. No.540-G, d/30th March 1893. That list includes, so far as this Presy. is concerned, the Chief Secy. to Govt., the Private Secy. to the Governor, one Under Secy. to Govt., the Resident / and the Asst. Resident in Travancore and Cochin. ~~It is understood~~ I am informed that the Secretaries to the Govt. of India in depts. other than the Foreign dept. and all the Secretaries to the Govt. of Bengal wear the political uniforms and that the ~~As the~~ list to which reference is made above applies only to officers under the Foreign dept.. Will you please let me know if this information is ~~so~~ correct, and supply me with a copy of the rules on the subject. I should also be obliged if you would inform me of the regulations governing the wearing of uniforms by Members of Council.

D

copd + Exd 3.2. EH

To J.P. Hewett Esq. C.I.E
~~The~~ Secy. to the Govt. of
India, Home dept.

Cws.
1.2.98

AH.
2.2.98

Despd
3/2/98

Note

Please see the note by the Record dept. flagged C as regards Member of Council

[G. / U]
1,000—19-2-97.

Pol (189) Department.

D. O No. 119

From
J. P. Hewett Esq. C. I. E.

D. O.

No. 54/D.

Dated 18-2-98
Received 23-2-98
Registered 24-2-98.
Enclosures -
Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Regarding the officers entitled to wear political uniform

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
DO	65		3-2-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 54/D

HOME DEPARTMENT INDIA

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
23 FEB. 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

D.O. No 119

Calcutta, the 18th February 1898.

Dear Mr. Arundel

The list of appointments, the holders of which are entitled to wear the political uniform, referred to in your demi-official letter of the 3rd instant, applies only to officers exercising political functions.

No 65. E

There are no regulations governing the wearing of uniforms by civil officers other than those performing political duties. The Members of Council, the Secretaries to the Govt. of India in Departments other than the Foreign Department, and the Secretaries to the Government of Bengal, wear uniforms, but they are not properly speaking political uniforms, in as much as they are worn

worn only in accordance with practice or long usage and not in the exercise of political functions. The wearing of political uniforms by officers other than political officers is provided for in the foot-×note to the list referred to in the first part of my letter.

Yours sincerely,

J. P. Hewett.

× This note was not printed on the G.O but is reproduced in M/s on the Press G.O at page 23 of Stock file of Pol Uniforms. (See also the note on next page thereof)

23/6

The Hon'ble Mr. A. T. Arundel,
Chief Secy. to the Govt. of Madras

Flag D

[G./74]
1.[illegible]—3-9-97.

B

Original not available with S.

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

The note referred to in the concluding paragraph of Mr. Hewett's D.O. will be found printed in the original of India's letter No. 540-G. of 30 March 1893 recorded in G.O. No. 221 Pol. of 17 April 1893. This note was not reproduced in the ~~printed~~ extract from the list contained in our printed order, probably because there are no cases in this Presidency, beyond Members of Council, which are based on local practice or long usage - but more probably because it was overlooked in printing.

These papers might usefully be recorded for future reference, all mention of D.O. correspondence being omitted

Cus
25/2/98

G.O. with the note.

AH

- I have spoken to H.E. the Govr. who is in favour of the extension of the practise or usage of India & Bengal being extended to Madras.

AH 4.3.98.

S/

Where is the D.O. file which was "recorded" and circulated to Secretaries as "political uniforms"? I asked for about this time two ago

Cul
15/6/98

Subd CA asked
Ref
[illegible]

Ref
[illegible]
15/6/98

For the CA

No G.O. on DO 119 can be traced a note was sent round all the depts to ascertain if the file is in any of these ~~depts~~ & their replies are herewith submitted. I have written to the Madras office to ascertain as to when the file went round.

A.S.
15/6/98

C.A.

The file cannot be traced anywhere. A thorough search has been made in both the Madras & Ooty offices. Ooty Secrt Depts too say that they have not got the file. Please see the typewritten notes attached. Mr Munis's reply is flagged J. & S's report is at H.

[illegible]
23/7/98

HC

The G.O. was passed by C.S. (Mr. Arundel) & I remember seeing it after being passed on Head Clerk's Mr. Munis' table. Look up ~~the~~ the Despatch books ~~to~~ about this & ask HC/[illegible] to report at once.

S. should report how paper was dealt with by how a first [illegible]

Urgent

Note for Head Clerk $\frac{\text{Rev}}{\frac{\text{L+m}}{\text{P.W.D.}}}$

File regarding 'Secretaries wearing uniform' was circulated to the Secretaries to Govt. ~~depts of the Secretariat~~ about the end of February or the beginning of March. Will you kindly say whether the file is any in your department.

10/6/98

It is not in the R.D.

10/6/98

The file is not here - I have asked the Madras office to make a search and report

10/6/98

Madras office has been written to

11/6/98

Note for the Head Clerk.

Will you kindly let me know when D.O.No.119 was circulated to the Secretaries. I think the Despatcher. Register can show this. The D.O. was received here on the 24th February and the C.A. says that it was circulated to the Secretaries. The subject of the D.O. is "the wearing of uniform by Secretaries to Govt." Please let me ~~know~~ have the information soon as the C.A. wants it urgently.

(Id.) S.P.

14-6-98.

Despr.

See in the Register and if found show me.

(Id.) C.C.

17-6-98.

H.C.

D.O.No.119 docket of which is enclosed was circulated to Sectt.Depts. for perusal or information by an endt. or a memo about the end of February or in March and the file is not forthcoming now. I inquired e in all the Depts. but they say that they have not got the files with them. C.A.wants me to make further inquiries here and wants you also to have all the Despatch registers at Madras thoroughly examined and report at once. Therefore w [illegible] you please have the registers [illegible] looked up and

let

let me know by return post, if possible, to which dept. of the Sectt. the file was sent and when. No disposal has been marked against the D.O. in the D.O. receive register.

(Id.) K.P.

18-6-98

Ref.

Please say if you know anything about the papers refd. to in the accompanying slips.

(Id.) K.M. (Kunhunni Menon)
21-6-98.

The papers referred to are not with me.

(Id.) K.R. (K. Ruthnaswami Reddi)
21-6-98.

The paper is not with me.

(Id.) M.S. (Samarapuri)
21-6-98.

Not traceable here.

(Id.) M.R.V. (Vardaramanuja Aiyangar)
21-6-98.

H.C.
O

I regret to say we can get no information about this paper here.

(Id.) C.C.
21-6-98.

Public Works Department.

From H.C., C.S.
To H.C., P.W.D.

File regarding Secretaries wearing uniform was circulated to the Secretaries to Govt. about the end of February or the beginning of March. Will you kindly say whether the file is in your department.

-

R.K.

Will you kindly reply to this inquiry.

(Id.) M.A.J.
10-6-98.

H.C., Ooty.

I have not been able to trace anything later than 776 W, dated 16th March 1897! on the subject of uniforms or costumes to be worn by officers.

There is no note in our Register of papers for counterinitials of such a file. S.A.W. and Mr. Lyons do not remember seeing the papers the H.C., C.S., refers to.

(Id.) F.J.

13-6-98.

that

H.C., C.S.

able though

not transpire

For information.

(Id.) M./ our ill you

15- nts looked up and

let

Local and Municipal Dept.

Note for the Head Clerk, Pub. Dept.

The Madras Office has replied that the file "Secretaries wearing uniform" is not there.

(Id.) N.H.S.
16-6-98

A.J.
-98.

P.T.O.

H. C.

With reference to the notes attached re: the file relating to Secretary's wearing political uniform, C.A. says th that he remembers seeing the file after being passed by the C.S. (The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel) on the Head Clerk's table (Mr. Munis's) and he therefore desires that Mr. Munis may be consulted as to what he remembers about the file. Please get this information from Mr. Munis and let me know sharp. At the same time kindly have another *careful* search made in our despatch registers and report the result. If the file had gone to any of the Sectt. departments surely some note of it must have been made either in the despatch book or in the Serjean book. I think Serjeant keeps a list of all the covers that go out of the off with the G.O. numbers etc.

/Intd./ K.P.
6-7-98

:-:-:-:-:-:-:

Dear Mr. Munis,

Do you know please
thing of the file re: Secretaries w
ing uniform? It would seem that it
circulated to Secretaries about Feb
March last, but where it is now nob
knows. At one time it appears that
C.A. saw it on your table though
stage this was does not transpire

Yours

/Intd./ C.C.
8-7-98

Dear Mr. Clarke,

I think I saw the paper- but what has become of it I cannot help you to find out. I fancy I saw it in the tappal, for I have no recollection of having seen any "disposal" on it.

Yours sincerely,
/Intd./ G.J.M.
8-7-98

:-:-:-:-:-:-:-:-:

H. C.
O.

The Despatcher has made another and very close search but can find nothing. The Serjeant's book contains no information. On the reverse you will find Mr. Munis's reply to my enquiry.

/Intd./ C.C.
15/7

I told him. There were Confl. put up papers.
Vide below

Note for the C.A.

With reference to the C.A.'s note of the 14th June 1898 at the bottom of the paper flagged A it is submitted that all that I had to do with the file regarding political uniforms was to despatch the D.O. to to the Govt of India and to register the reply. On receipt of the latter the C.A. said that there was nothing Confidential about it and took the file from me. I beg to state that I never saw the file afterwards.

V.L.M.
22/7/98

H.C.
O.

Urgent

The Referencer has started this enquiry lately. What I told him was that the correspondence was Recorded and the order was then to O to Secretaries to Govt. I remember this distinctly as the Hon. Mr. Arundel (Chief Secy) questioned the regularity of "recording" D.O. correspondence. It was explained to him that in the recording the subject & not the D.O.s would be mentioned. My recollection is that he passed the draft & I distinctly remember seeing it on the Head Clerk's side bench. The G.O. was not apparently numbered before circ to Secretaries as I cannot find it in the Public & Pol. letters. But as S. will remember there were papers in the file – the original of one order was especially required – where are these papers. There were also some old Confid. D.O.s of 1880 or thereabouts re Mr. Maclean wearing Pol. uniform & later Confid. D.O.s from Mr. Price to Mr. Forbes

× These are not traceable in the Confidential books

Where are these? S. must throw further light on the matter. If he registered the D.O. from India what ~~becam~~ does his register show as disposal? Where is the Pol. uniforms file (a small stock file). Has the Confidential Almirah been looked up ~~at~~ Madras & here to see if this file has been stuck away – All these points must be looked into sharp and the D.O.s must be found. I do not want another 6 weeks delay over this. The whole matter should be cleared up at once. All the points I have mentioned will help to find the papers & they must be found.

C.W.S.
23.7 4

I registered it in the ordinary D.O. register only and not in the Confid'l register. as C A thought that it need not be treated confidentially

V.S.N.
26/7/98

The Confid'l almirah here has been looked up and the file has not been found.

V.S.N.
28/7/98

H.C.
M.

Kindly see whether the Stock file re Pol uniform refd. to by C A is in the Madras Office. It is not in the Confid'l. Almirah here. I do not remember to have seen a Confid'l stock file of this description. Please also see whether Cir 144 of 2-11-94 is in the bundle [illegible]

Beyond despatching the letter to India and registering the reply in the ordinary D.O. register I do not remember to have done anything [illegible] with the file. C A remembers to have seen the file on the Head Clerk's table at Madras. Thus it will be seen that the file was not dealt with confidentially. Would you also kindly look up the S.O. papers referred to?

5. I don't find a Confdl. clerk file but I send a non. confdl. one. I also forward Confdl. No. 144/94 letter from its bundle. I looked thro' the 1840 bundle but there were no d/os such as you ask for there.

C.R.
29/7

C.A.

Please see H.C's note above. I have searched the Confidential almirah here but could not get the D.O. correspondence to. It is respectfully submitted that the file was not dealt [illegible]th confidentially and C.A's recollection that he saw the file on the Head Clerk's [illegible] bench tallies with this. The file must be somewhere in the non-Confidential portion of the Secretariat

S lock

Lhw
9/8/98

Speak
Cecil
11.8.98

Spoken twice
/8/98

Note for the C.A

From enquiries made in the Revenue Department I understand that the file referred to is now in the Hon Mr Forbes's office room here. Perhaps the C.A. might ask him for it or ~~get~~ obtain his permission to get the Head Clerk, Reve Dept, to take it out of his room and send it to this Dept if done with.

W.hw
2-3-99

The Hon Mr. Forbes says that he will return the paper

Cecil
4/3

Political

Order/Mi No 237 of 30-3-98
Recorded

Cir. S.
5/3/98

7.3.98

To: The Secretaries to Government
for perusal.

Office Index and special index the subject of the papers and notes but do not mention "D.O." correspondence in Index or Tables
Cir.

Noted
KK.
6/4/99

Returned to Mr.
Schmidt
29.3.99

Keep file intact
and return to S after
tabling, indexing &c
Returned
KK
6/4/99

(1) Addendum to Handbook
(2) Correct all copies of G.O. 221 of 93

When given for copying ____
When copied ____
When examined ____
When signed ____
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

APERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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