

785016

ACC

10000/143/1108

785016

10000/143/1108

LOSS OF TWO(2) MICROFILMS
AUG. - DEC. 1946

Mimite 1

TO : Executive Commissioner
thru VP. CAS.

Tel Ext ; 686
16 Aug 46

WGS
19/8

Please see 1A. It will be observed that enquiries to trace the Micro films have been abortive. The bags were sent from London unregistered and unclassified, therefore special record of the arrival of the bags was not made in the Message Centres at R.A.A.C. or A.C. However the method of dealing with the bags when delivered to C.E.M. Branch leaves much to be desired.

Each bag was addressed to that Branch and contained Receipt forms (see 1F) showing the nature and amount of the contents. Their arrival was reported by the Chief Clerk C.E.M. to Major Bates.

The latter knew the bags contained Micro films, (see 1E) and thought they were so important that he had the bags locked up in Lt. Col. Campbell's office for safe custody, but failed to take the elementary precaution of checking the contents.

This would seem to be inexplicable, for although the RUK files had been passed to Archives Branch, they were addressed to C.E.M. That being so and in view of their importance a check should, I submit, have been made immediately on receipt of the bags.

I understand the forms of receipt have not been completed and returned to the Air Ministry, London. I suggest this should be done without delay and the Air Ministry informed that 2 films were found to be missing on arrival of the bags at this Hq and an enquiry asked for as to whether in fact they were dispatched from London.

Ex 8/12/46

2

[Signature]
E. J. BIE Colonel
Acting Director
Public Safety S/C.
20/8

The facts of this case are that the films were in fact not in the hands of the Air Ministry but in the hands of the Air Ministry's security branch.

passed to Archives Branch, they were addressed to the Archives Branch, I submit, have been made immediately in view of their importance a check should, I submit, have been made immediately on receipt of the bags.

I understand the forms of receipt have not been completed and returned to the Air Ministry, London. I suggest this should be done without delay and the Air Ministry informed that 2 films were found to be missing on arrival of the bags at this Hq and an enquiry asked for as to whether in fact they were dispatched from London.

E. J. EYE
E. J. EYE Colonel
Acting Director
Public Safety S/C.
20/8

Ex 8/11/53

2

The fact of this case is that the film
were sent out by Air Ministry in security packets.
that S/Sgt. Robinson the first responsible person
to handle the bags did not check the contents
her own or counter signed the receipt: I should
expect a Staff Sgt. to consider the film here
security: it was omitted: finally I agree
Butler, knowing the nature of the contents
acquainted with their importance, failed
to check the contents or have the receipt.

Signed: omission no 2. Finally Days
 Harrison did check & forward the same
 mission & reported that no one applied
 advised the Air Ministry. This should

be done at once

The omissions should be pointed
 out to the Office & ~~also~~ concerned. I
 do not propose to take further disciplinary
 action.

MS/22/8. 4612

3

Enc. Comm.

Ref your min above. please see letter

out to the Office & WCPD concerned.
do not propose to take further disciplinary

action.
175/22/8. 4612.

3

Exc. Comm.
Ref your min above. please see letter
opposite. *AWB* 24/8 *TS* 25/8 *TS*

4

Archives Branch.
(Major Harrison.
Have you received films 68-79
mentioned in 3B..? *E. J. Dyke. Col.*
16-9-46 ..

P.S.O
Nothing has been received since AUGUST 17 (4a) opposite
17-9-46 - *John Harrison Major*

COPY

5^A

To:- Headquarters Allied Commission,
Office of the Executive Commissioner,
Archives Division,
A.F.C. 794,ROME.

From:- Directorate of Microgram Services,
Air Ministry, London.

Your Ref.:- 28/AB. (Date of last letter 1st November, 1946)

Our Ref. :- 810/iiiiI/D/Micros

Date:- 19th December 1946.

R.U.K. Files

With reference to our correspondence concerning six film copies of Jobs 68-79 which were lost in transit to you on July 17th, I have to inform you that the missing films (72 in number) were returned to us on December 17th.

We are having an investigation made into their whereabouts for the last five months, but apart from the fact that they were returned to us in a sack marked "U.S. MAIL" there appears to be no clue to the mystery. We will inform you in due course of the outcome of our inquiry.

Many of the tins containing the films have been badly crushed so we are having the contents examined to ensure that the films have not been damaged. They will then be repacked and despatched to you.

For Director of Microgram Services

I propose to send them out to you again after Christmas.

4614

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION

A P O 794

Office of the Executive Commissioner
ARCHIVES BRANCHC O P Y

Ref. ; 28/AB.

17 August 1946

SUBJECT : RUK Files.

TO : Director of Microfilm Service,
Air Ministry LONDON.

1. Receipt is acknowledged of three (UNCLASSIFIED) sacks of films dispatched from LONDON to The Captured Enemy Material Branch, Allied Commission.

2. After a careful check it has been established that TWO films Packs of Job No. 61 and 67 are MISSING. Will you please confirm that 6 packs of each Job were dispatched.

FOR THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER

s/ for Brigadier,
Executive Commissioner.

4610

 Copy to: Executive Commissioner File 4063.Enclosed:

Receipt No.	870	for 70 (only) films	Job No.	55 - 67
	908	" 72	"	Job No. 80 - 91
	918	" 54	"	Job No. 92 - 100.

ALLIED [REDACTED] COMMISSION
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM
ARCHIVES BRANCH

3A

SUBJECT: RUK Files.

FILE No. 28/AB.

TO : Public Safety S/C.

10 September 1946

10/10/46

Herewith copy of letter in reply to our 28/AB of
17 August 46.

Will you please state any further action necessary
by this Branch.

N.M. Harrison
Major

N.M. HARRISSON,
Major,
Chief Archives Officer.

4614

785016

38
AIR MINISTRY,
WHITEHALL,
LONDON, S.W.1.

To: Headquarters Allied Commission,
A.P.O. 794,
Office of the Executive Commissioner.
(for attention of Major Harrison).

From: Directorate of Microgram Services,
Air Ministry, London.

Your Ref: 28/AB.

Our Ref: 244/III I/D.Micio.8.

Date: 23rd August, 1946.

R.U.K. Files

It is confirmed that six films of jobs 61 and 67 were despatched.

In addition to the films already acknowledged by you, six film copies of Jobs 68-79 inclusive were despatched on 17.7.46. We should be pleased to know that you have received them.

461-4

s/ D.L. BIGEY
for Director of Microgram Services.

785016

2A

Tel. No. ROME 489081, Ext. 510.

Subject: Loss of 2 Micro-films.

Headquarters,
Allied Commission (ITALY),
C.M.F.

Ref: XCB/111/B.

23 August, 1946.

Executive Commissioner.

1. In accordance with your minute, I have explained individually to Major. BATES and to S/Sgt. ROBINSON their commissions, and pointed out that the action they took is not consistent with conduct demanded of a responsible Officer/N.C.O. holding the ranks which they hold.
2. Major. HARRISON informs me that he has notified the Air Ministry of the loss, and also that he is trying to ascertain whether there may have been any other losses.

KWJ/tjb.

White

K. WILBE-JONES,
Lt. Colonel,
Executive Officer (Br).

4610

(100)

CONFIDENTIAL

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION
A.P.O. 794
PUBLIC SAFETY SUB COMMISSION
SECURITY DIVISION

REF : SD/600

14 August 1946

SUBJECT : Loss of 2 Micro-films

TO : A/Director, Public Safety Sub Commission.

1. In accordance with your instructions I have made enquiries regarding the loss of two micro-films despatched from Air Ministry, LONDON to this HQ on 9 and 20 July 1946.

2. The films were contained in two canvas bags, both similar to military kit bags.

3. The bag forwarded on 9 July contained a form of receipt which showed that the bag should have contained 72 films, each packed in a circular tin container.

4. The bag sent on 20 July contained a receipt showing that 54 films were despatched, packed in identical manner.

5. When the bags were eventually checked at this HQ, some two weeks after original receipt it was found that two films were missing from the bag sent from LONDON on 9 July 1946.

6. It was learned from the Chief Clerk, Message Centre, this HQ (S.S.M. Seed) that unregistered mail or packages are not recorded on receipt but delivered to the Section or Sub Commission to which the package is addressed. From an examination of the two labels he identified both as coming from Message Centre, R.A.A.C.

7. From enquiries made of the civilian staff of this office it was found that one clerk remembered collecting the first bag from R.A.A.C. on or about 21 July 1946.

4609

this HQ on 9 and 20 July 1946.

2. The films were contained in two canvas bags, both similar to military kit bags.

3. The bag forwarded on 9 July contained a form of receipt which showed that the bag should have contained 72 films, each packed in a circular tin container.

4. The bag sent on 20 July contained a receipt showing that 54 films were despatched, packed in identical manner.

5. When the bags were eventually checked at this HQ, some two weeks after original receipt it was found that two films were missing from the bag sent from LONDON on 9 July 1946.

4608

6. It was learned from the Chief Clerk, Message Centre, this HQ (S.M. Seed) that unregistered mail or packages are not recorded on receipt but delivered to the Section or Sub Commission to which the package is addressed. From an examination of the two labels he identified both as coming from Message Centre, P.A.A.C.

7. From enquiries made of the civilian staff of this office it was found that one clerk remembered collecting the first bag from P.A.A.C. on or about 21 July and delivering it to the Chief Clerk's office, C.M.M. Branch, the following morning. So far as his memory goes the bag was securely fastened with string.

8. On 29 July, this same clerk delivered the second bag to C.M.M. Branch and obtained the signature of one of the military clerks (J. Dalmer). This package was received at this HQ on 28 or 29 July 1946.

9. The responsibility for checking the contents of such unregistered and unclassified packages, according to practice in Message Centre, appears to be the responsibility of the Section or Branch to whom the packages are addressed.

10. The Chief Clerk, C.M.M. Branch (S/Sgt. ROBINSON) was seen and from his statement he says he remembers finding one bag in his office some days previously, this would be about 20 July 1946. He opened the bag and it contained a number of tins and found a receipt form inside. He did not check the contents against the receipt, further he does not remember what details were on this receipt.

11. S/Sgt Robinson on finding the tins contained films he reported the receipt of this bag to Major Bates. The bag was then taken into Lt. Col. CAMPBELL's office and locked in a cupboard.

CONFIDENTIAL

/.

Ref: 4608

No 1

12. This N.C.O. remembers receiving the second bag on or about 29 July, 1946, and by feeling the bag on the outside decided it contained similar tins to the previous one. He did not open this bag but reported its receipt to Major BATES and it was locked up in the same cupboard as the other.

13. The following day, 30 July 1946, S/Sgt. ROBINSON, on the instructions of Major BATES delivered both bags personally to Archives Branch.

14. Major BATES was interviewed and agreed that his Chief Clerk reported receipt of both bags and that he arranged for them to be locked up in Lt. Col. CAMPBELL's Office.

15. The key of this particular cupboard is hidden in Col. CAMPBELL's office and its whereabouts is supposed to be known only to the Colonel's Secretary and Major BATES.

16. Major BATES stated he told Col. CAMPBELL of the receipt of the films after the second bag was delivered. He claims he assumed the films were connected with the RUK files as they were, so far as he knows, the only documents micro-filmed for C.R.M. Branch.

17. From his statement it will be seen that he admits he considered it dangerous to leave them in C.R.M. Branch, yet he did not at any time think it desirable to check the contents of either bag. His reason for not doing so is that RUK files are no longer connected with C.R.M. Branch.

18. On receipt of the two bags in Archives Branch on 30 July 1946, they were checked by Major HARRISON against the receipt contained in each bag. It was then discovered that two tins, each contained a micro-film, were missing from bag sent from Air Ministry, LONDON on 9 July 1946.

19. I have examined both bags and find that the string used to secure them at the top is of extremely poor quality and could quite easily be broken in normal handling during transit. 4603

20. The fact that both packages have received very rough handling during transit is evidenced by the crushed and battered condition of some of the tins now in Archives Branch.

21. It is true that one piece of string has a lead seal, but in view of the weakness of the string it seems reasonable to assume that the bag in question may have been accidentally opened during transit rather than wilfully opened with some criminal intent.

22. Further the tins or wrapping material bears no marks or indication of what information is recorded on the films which would be likely to attract the attention of some person not acquainted with the importance of RUK records.

so is that RUK files are no longer connected with C.E.M. Branch.

18. On receipt of the two bags in Archives Branch on 30 July 1946, they were checked by Major HARRISON against the receipt contained in each bag. It was then discovered that two tins, each contained a micro-film, were missing from bag sent from Air Ministry, LONDON on 9 July 1946.

19. I have examined both bags and find that the string used to secure them at the top is of extremely poor quality and could quite easily be broken in normal handling during transit.

20. The fact that both packages have received very rough handling during transit is evidenced by the crushed and battered condition of some of the tins now in Archives Branch.

21. It is true that one piece of string has a lead seal, but in view of the weakness of the string it seems reasonable to assume that the bag in question may have been accidentally opened during transit rather than wilfully opened with some criminal intent.

22. Further the tins or wrapping material bears no marks or indication of what information is recorded on the films which would be likely to attract the attention of some person not acquainted with the importance of RUK records.

23. There is no reason whatsoever to doubt that the missing films were ~~not~~ despatched from Air Ministry as the receipts were obviously completed at the time of packing each respective bag and any request made to Air Ministry for confirmation of the contents of each bag would only elicit the same information as contained on each receipt.

24. The two bags in question were sent unclassified and enquiries along the route of transit would undoubtedly prove fruitless as the many people engaged on the handling of the packages could hardly be expected to remember these identical items after such a long period.

25. I do respectfully suggest, however, that when these bags were received in C.E.M. Branch their contents should have been immediately checked, as this Branch, with the exception of Archives, were the only people in a position to appreciate the importance of these films.

26. Particulars of the two films missing are:-

- (i) Job 67 - No. 53 tin.
- (ii) Job 61 - No. 58 tin.

10/6.

27. I attach copies of statements taken together with copies of the receipts forwarded inside each bag.

17/6

A.H. Ellis Capt.

A.H. ELLIS,
Captain,
Security Division.

AHE/nb

4801

1B

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION
A.P.O. 394
PUBLIC SAFETY SUB COMMISSION
SECURITY DIVISION

3 August 1946

Statement of S/54921 S.S.M. SEED L., R.A.S.C., Allied Commission
HQ.

I am the Chief Clerk of the Message Centre at Allied Commission.
The two bags and labels shown to me should have passed through
this office because on examination of the two labels I find that both packages
were received at this HQ from Message Centre, R.A.A.C. Such packages are not
registered when received at this HQ.

On examining the receipt books of the Messengers I find that
the bag bearing label N. 1836 was signed for by a "J. DALLMAR" in C.E.M. Branch
on 29 July 1946 at 0900 hours.

Both the packages in question were addressed to C.E.M. Branch
and therefore the contents would not be inspected or checked in this Message
Centre. The responsibility for seeing the contents of such packages are
correct rests with the addressee.

S/ L. SEED S.S.M.

4600

10

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION
A.P.O. 794
PUBLIC SAFETY SUB COMMISSION
SECURITY DIVISION

3 August 1946

Statement of PIANTINI Oswald, Via Savoia 33, Rome

Commission. I am employed as a clerk in the Message Centre of Allied

About two weeks ago I went in the course of my work to the Message Centre of Rome Area Allied Command where I was handed various mail this included a bag in which was a number of tins. The top of the bag was so far as I remember tied up with string, I do not remember if it was sealed or not. I took the bag to the Message Centre at Allied Commission. The next morning I took this bag to C.E.M. Branch and handed it to one of the soldiers, I do not remember who, a signature was given in the book which I have for that purpose.

A few days ago I found another bag, put for me to deliver from message Centre A.C. to C.E.M. Branch. This bag I remember was tied securely with string. This I took to C.E.M. Branch and gave it to one of the clerks. He signed in my book for it.

S/ Osvaldo PIANTINI

4600

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION
A.P.O. 794
PUBLIC SAFETY SUB COMMISSION
SECURITY DIVISION

2 August 1946

Statement of S/3254721, S/Sgt. ROBINSON K., R.A.S.C., Chief Clerk
C.E.M. Branch, Allied Commission.

About 10 to 12 days ago I returned to my office at HQ Allied Commission and saw a kit bag standing on the floor. The bag was loosely tied with string at the top and bore a label addressed to "Chief Commissioner - Captured Enemy Materials Branch, HQ., Allied Commission". I opened the bag and found it contained a number of tins. I did not count them. I also found a receipt form requesting acknowledgement be sent to Air Ministry. I do not remember if the contents of the bag was contained on this sheet. On examining one of the tins I found it contained films. In view of this I took them to Major BATES and the bag was then locked up in a cupboard in Lt. Col. CAMPBELL's office.

On or about Monday, 29 July 1946, a second bag arrived at the office, this was also loosely tied and contained similar tins I think. I did not open this bag as it was addressed in a similar manner to the other. This was locked in the same cupboard as the other.

On 30 July, in accordance with Major BATES' instructions I handed the two bags to Archives Branch.

At no time were the contents of these bags checked whilst in C.E.M. Branch or has any notification been received as to how many tins each bag contained. No receipt has been given for the contents of the two bags by this Branch so far as I know.

S/ K. ROBINSON S/Sgt.
S/3254721 R.A.S.C.

4604

HEADQUARTERS ALLIED COMMISSION
A.P.O. 794
PUBLIC SAFETY SUB COMMISSION
SECURITY DIVISION

6 August 1946

Statement of Major A.C.G. BATES, R.A.S.G., C.E.M. Branch,
HQ. Allied Commission

On or about 20 July 1946 I cannot be sure of dated S/Sgt. ROBINSON the Chief Clerk of C.E.M. Branch reported to me that a bag containing micro-film was in his office. I saw the bag but did not open it. I instructed the Staff Sgt. to take the bag into Lt. Col. CAMPBELL's office where we would lock it in one of the cupboards. This we did and the keys were returned to a secret hiding place in the office. So far as I know only the Colonel's Secretary and myself know of this hiding place. Lt. Col. CAMPBELL was told by me that the bag had been placed in one of his cupboard and he instructed that it should remain there for the time being. About a week ago on Monday I think, a second bag arrived and I instructed that this was to be locked in the same cupboard this was done.

The same day I spoke to Col. CAMPBELL about these films, which I had every reason to assume were connected with RUK as these were the only files so far as I know micro filmed for C.E.M. Branch, as I considered it was dangerous to leave them where they were and as my Branch is no longer interested in the RUK files it was agreed that with Col. WALTON's consent they should be handed over to Archives Branch. The consent was obtained and I instructed S/Sgt. ROBINSON to deliver them to Archives Branch, this was done same day and a receipt was obtained. I did not at any time check the contents of the two bags. Both bags were tied with string and so far as I remember they were not sealed in any way.

As I have previously said C.E.M. Branch is no longer connected with RUK matters and I did not therefore consider it my duty to check the contents of the bags, I was only concerned with their safe custody until I could obtain instruction for their disposal.

S/ A.C.G. BATES, Major

C O P Y

Receipt No. - 918

Date sent out : 20/7/46Dispatched to The Chief CommissionerCaptured Enemy Material BranchMicrogram Prints

Received from Directorate of Microgram Service, Air Ministry

6 duplicates negs for
Mobiles 92-to-100 incl. (M.5)

(54 films)

Signature _____

Date Recd. _____

C O P Y

Receipt No:- 870

Date sent out: 9/7/46Dispatched to The Chief CommissionerCaptured Enemy Material Branch.Microgram Prints

Received from Directorate of Microgram Service, Air Ministry

6 Duplicates films for
.....

Mobile 55-to-67 inclusive

(72 films)

Signature _____

Date Recd. _____

1G
4602

0860