

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8-15
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் _____
(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் _____

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

மொத்த குறை

அரசாணை எண். 935 மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : 21-11-1889	1989.

மடிக்கலோ கண்பாடி கையாளலோ கூடாது.

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 21. 11. 89
No. 935.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

*"Indian Engineering" removed
from E.T.'s list.*

*Recd of letter from
the Secy to Govt
21/11/89*

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 188

CURRENT No.

[9]

24/3/87 No 124 Jio Pin

DEPARTMENT.

FURTHER PAPER, No. 2504

OF 188

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

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A

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.

From

The P. W. Dept.

No. 5037 C.

Dated . 4

Received 5

Enclosures 5

November 1889

SUBJECT.

Transferring for necessary
action papers re removing
the journal, "Indian Engineering"
from the Editors' list.

OFFICE NOTE.

To *M. P. S.*

Questions, &c.	Answers, information, &c.	Rejoinders, final instructions, &c.
Date <i>12/10/89</i> <i>In this Indian Engineering is published a copy of my Inspection Notes Redrawn in Care.</i> <i>How can this have been sold off?</i> <i>It cannot have been put on the "Editor's table".</i> <i>John</i>	Date <i>21.8.89 was not placed on the "Editor's Table".</i> <i>It was communicated to E.I., S.E. VI, C. & Rev. Dept, & the editor of "Indian Engineering" must have unauthorisedly obtained a copy from someone, in one of the above named officers, or in from the P.W. Secretariat.</i> <i>The same periodical in the same way recently obtained & published unauthorisedly, & P.W. notes on the East</i>	Date

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Madras,

14/10 1889

OFFICE NOTE.

No 289

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
W	J		17.10.89
J	W	17.10.89	18.10.89

KEEP-WITH.

No. dated 1889

I certainly think under the circumstances that the matter should be brought to the notice of Govt., and the Editor be brought to book in this matter.

Ruedx
17.10.89 W

Note to my office 12/10/89 about unauthorized publication in "Madras Engineering" & reply by "C.A.H." - So far not think some steps ought to be taken, but the Editor's note that he gets the documents & cause given for to be correct off the Editor's list.

For my

14/10/89

14.10.89
Mr
"Madras Engineering"
occurred to State
of Govt. might be
that the publication
is taken as evidence
of the Government
information.
line with official
information to supply
admission some at
that the Editor's
is evidence that
"Engineering" are
very much "Madras"
action, find that
intended for public
officials seem not
having been
Court-Record.

17/10/89

Read the following:—

Office Note 289-14/10/89
to "W" + accompaniments.

FOR ORDERS.

Should the Editor be
remonstrated with or
threatened? It is probably
useless asking him to
state how he gets hold
of the unauthorized documents,
in the special case under
consideration or even
tell from which office
the documents must
have been sent.

Call on the Editor to state
when he got the papers
if he declines to give
the information strike
him off the list.

But it is in the office that
strong measures are wanted.
If the offenders are known
or suspected they should
be sent up country or
dismissed.

Wes
19 Oct

Geo. J.

To W
Geo
19/10/89



90.395 J d 21.8.89

2
10.3.89

P. W. S.

No 2998 W. ay Oct 21. 1889

To

The Editor, Indian Engg,

Calcutta.

Sir,

It has been observed
that article by Mr C. E. Fox
reg^d the Madras, on the
Madrasiam Canal has
been reprinted almost
verbatim at page 294
of the Indian Engineering
of the 5th October 1889, -
and as the Proceedings
of the Madras Govt in
which that note was
embodied, were not
communicated to the
Press in the usual
authorised manner, I am

No 1889 81

directed by the Governor
in Council to request
that you will be good
enough to state by what
means you obtained
a copy of the document.
2. I am to add that
this letter is not written
for publication.

I have ~~two~~

(S.) R. R. E. D. B.

W

PAT. DOYLE, C.E.

"India"

19, LAL.

Calcutta, 26/...

Lt. Col. R. R. E. D. B.
Secy to Govt., Madras
MADRAS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
P. W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS
APR 21 1898

Sir, I am in receipt of your
letter No. 2978 of 21st Oct. current,
and am rather surprised at
the request contained therein.
I am glad to learn that
the information published in
this journal is true and substan-
tially correct; but I must decline,
absolutely and unconditionally,
to state how I came by that
information.

I have only to add that
I reserve to myself the right of
publishing this correspondence,
and commenting on it, should
occasion arise for doing so.
Yours faithfully, R. R. Doyle
Editor, Indian Enquirer

1889

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 10.253

From

Mr. P. Doyle
Editor Indian Engineering

ENCLOS. —

No. —

Dated 26 " } Oct 1889
Received 31 " }

SUBJECT.

Replying to letter
No. 2978W of 21st
Oct 1889.

RECEIVED
25 NOV 1889
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DISPOSAL.

No. 5037 C Dated 4 November 1889

Transferred to the
Public Department for
necessary action.

Amesbury - Buchanan
Local Asst.
Asst. Secy to Govt.
Prod

Here

Submitted with
reference to the Hon.
Remarks on the note
for orders attached
to No. 2978W of 21st Oct
1889.

The supply of "Editors'
Table" papers to Indian
Engineering was sanctioned
in L.O. dated 21-3-87
by Lt. Col. Public, and
it is proposed to forward
this file to the Public
Dept., in view of the
journal being removed
from the editors' list.

Amesbury

31.10.89

Approved
It would have been better
to have omitted the reference
to publication of the letter to the
Editor. H.C.
P.H.

Read C.Nº 3499.

G.O. of 21st nov 89 No 935.

It is observed that the editor of the
"Indian Engineering" published in his
journal of the 5th October last, almost
verbatim, a note by the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation on the Vadamirum Canal.

The Pros of Govt in which the note is

printed were not placed on the

editors' Table, and therefore, ^{in the} ~~the~~ note
showing ~~from the contrary~~, the note
in question ~~could not have been~~
must be presumed there been
obtained by illegitimate means. And,

As the editor declines to explain the
how it came into his hands,
~~Suspicion attaching to him in the~~

~~unauthorised publication~~, the

Government resolves to remove

~~that publication~~ from the list

M.S.

11 Nov.

of those admitted to the Editors Table.

The Indian Supp

(2 orders)

8/11

(2m orders)

Note: This is sent to the
Mess. Mr. P. Doyle will
probably publish his own version
of the incident?
Lam

Hur

North

let him
Wes

The Editor's Indian Supp. "C. H. H. H."
- copy of the Secretariat
for note & return. 21/11/89
Despatches to note. C.H.H.

notes
22-11-89

ick

notes in Mr. R. 22/11

C.H.H.
R.14/11