Archives I 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 122

(2) Date of repair 2—1—87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MIL NADU ARCHIVES

ERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	158	Press. Mis.
Dated	19-1-1881	197 .

e folded or roughly handled

Adjutant Generals Office
Fort Saint George.

No. 543. 26th November 1880.

From,
Brigadier General Godfrey Clerk
Off Adjutant General.

To
The Secretary to Government
Military Department.

Sir,

In reply to Memorandum, No. 250, Public Works Department, dated 4th August 1880, from the Secretary to Government Public Works Department, which was referred to His Excellency the Commander in Chief, under your endorsement, No. 4991, dated 7th August, I have the honor, by order, to report as follows.

2. In

2. In this Memorandum the Chief Engineer enquires, if there is any objection on the part of the Military authorities to the latter portion of para 733 of the new Public Works Code, which confers on the Chief Engineer the power "in cases when he may see fit "to offer Warrant Officers of long service "and good Conduct who may not "be considered eligible for promotion, "professionally and socially, the option "of retirement from the Department, "with the Honorary Commission or "of remaining in the Conductor Grade."

3. In reply, I am desired to state that it seems to the Commander in Chief, that it would be inconsistent, to refuse a Commission to a Conductor,

because

because he is professionally or socially unfit for it, and then to grant him the rank on retirement.

Further, the grant of an Honorary Commission is, His Excellency considers, an inappropriate reward for services rendered in the Subordinate grades, of what is practically a purely Civil Department, while the grant of it, under the conditions contemplated under the rule in question, to a Warrant Officer, who although from his respectability and his length of service he may be worthy of consideration, yet is not deemed to possess the qualifications to fit him for the position in the Public Works Department to which an Honorary Commission is ordinarily

attached

attached, would be especially objectionable, as tending to lower the value of all Military rank of the kind.

4. Moreover, though there is nothing financially objectionable in the rule as it stands, His Excellency observes that its financial effect would be materially modified, were the opinion of the Public Works Department accepted, and were a Warrant Officer pensioned under the conditions contemplated by the rule, granted the Pension, as well as the rank of a Deputy Assistant Commissary.

vide Memo No. 370 Public Works Department 27 August 1880 Communicated under Memo No. 5492 dated 28th August Military Department

5. Should this interpretation

of

3/15

of the Paragraph in question be accepted, the Commander in Chief feels called upon to protest against it. For to promote a man, and immediately to pension him on the Pension of the higher grade, because he is not fit for the position to which he has been raised, appears to His Excellency to be indefensible, and especially so, when, as in this instance, the Pension would be paid by one Department for services rendered to another.

6 Sir Neville Chamberlain is of opinion, that Conductors in the Public Works Department, whose length of service entitles them to promotion to the rank

of

153/4

of Deputy Assistant Commissary, should be promoted, if they are of good character, and are professionally qualified; even though they may be socially unfitted for the position of Assistant Engineer but that if they are professionally unfit, they should remain Warrant Officers, or, if they prefer retirement to supersession, they should receive the pension of the rank they are actually holding, when they quit the Service.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Brigadier General
Offg Adjutant General

G.O. 1157 - 17.4.70 P.W.D.
— 1912 - 23.7.71 "
C3. 3772 - 24.8.78.
G.O. 3823 W. 30.9.78 P.W.D.
— 4578 W. 29.11.78 P.W.D.
— 4579 W. 29.11.78.
— 524 W. 21.2.79.
— 250 - 4.8.80
— 370 - 27.8.80

Military / 1883 / Depts.

From No.

The Adjutant General

To

The Secy to Government

Dated 26th Nov.

Recd. 29th

No 343

Reports on the promotion of Warrant Officers of the D. P. W. receiving Asst. Commissions to the Higher Grades.

Transferred

No. 7618

Transferred to the Public Works Department, with an expression of the concurrence of Govt. in the Military Dept. in [illegible] the Commander-in-Chief's views.

2. The previous papers are returned.

By order,
[illegible] Colonel
Ag. Secretary to Govt.

Fort St George
6th Dec 1883

C. 17.1.82 [illegible]
K.C. 9.1. [illegible]
Cir 9.12.80 [illegible]

been promoted, but that attached to the grade which they ~~hitherto~~ occupied: in other words, to make an exception to para: 741 of the Code by refusing the higher pension ~~[illegible]~~ though ~~it be~~ earned by service, to officers retiring under para: 733.

The C.E.'s assumptions in para: 1 of his note are correct, but the second para: requires recasting with reference to the foregoing remark.

[illegible]

The other paper case was quite peculiar, being governed by a special G.O. applicable only to Ordnance Artificers, & possibly the G. of I. will decline to set aside the rules in that instance.

CAW

I think it would be only fair to recommend ~~that~~ a Warrant Officer who has put in his qualifying service in Asst. Commissaryships and who at the same time is not considered on all grounds fit for promotion ~~to the position~~ of Asst. Engineer in the Dept. should be allowed to have the option of Hon. Commn. and pension of Asst. Commissary. Col. M. agrees to this and the case may be sent up with ~~this~~ recommn. 20/11/83 pension of that rank at once.

4. But the point which the Adjutant General apparently wishes to raise, is, whether warrant officers of the kind to which para: 733 of the Code has reference are to be treated as favourably as their older companions, securing both pension and honorary rank.

5. The alternative which Col. Oliphant has in mind is to [illegible] to give such officers the honorary commission only, coupling with it the pension not of the grade to which they have just

the time of retirement. Lt. Wiffen, for instance, will draw the pension of a Deputy Commissary to which rank he was only raised last month.

Conductor Pick's service is incorrectly shown on page 14 of the Classified List, as it has been in three Classified Lists before. He has served 12 years & 4 months, & if information obtained unofficially last February from the Adjutant General's Office is to be relied on, more than 28 years in the Army. If promoted to D.A.C., he could therefore receive the

2.

have appeared to
be some misapprehension
which I did not
notice when writing
in the note to
Col. Mullins, & he
has made the same
mistake

2. A [illegible] officer
who need not have
three years in a
grade to [illegible]
the pension of
that grade so
long as his total
length of service
in [illegible] of
the Dept. fulfils
the conditions of
para 741 of the
P.W. Code, he can
get the pension
of the grade in
which he is at

W

It seems hardly
desirable to pursue
this discussion further,
the more so that
we have of late
quietly passed one
or two men without
asking to resign.

The following draft
will probably be
enough –

"Recorded.

The cases
coming under the
operation of the clause
in question will
so rarely that each
may be dealt with on
its own merits."

D 9/12

12/1886

158/8

To

Col Mullins RE

-

Col Shaw Stewart RE

-

Please let me have your opinion on this.

2. As I understand it, the Honorary Commission being only conferred on men in the Commissary grade, (at least* such has I believe been the custom hitherto) the Conductor who under this ruling would retire from the Department ought to be promoted to grade of Assistant Commissary in order to get the Honorary Commission and this would insure

* See para 747 of new Code.

v.l. Sheet 32 [illegible]

his being allowed to retire from the service after 3 years, taking with him the pension due to that grade.

3. I think we might at least try to secure these terms for a warrant officer so placed; and, if the Military Department will not concede them, subsequently fall back on the plan of giving the honorary Commission without warrant promotion.

16/8/80

To. W.

Apparently vide page 25 of the Clapp's list dated 1 Oct. '79

158

Sub Conductors & Conductors are Warrant Officers without Commissions and D.A., A. & Depy. Commissaries are Warrant Officers who at any rate usually have Commissions given to them. D.A.Cs & A.Cs are on the page referred to all Lieutenants & Depy. Cs Captains.

I should say that under 733 of the Code if a Conductor whose turn has come for promotion to a higher grade (Military) but who is not considered eligible to be made an Assistant Engineer & receive a Commission while in the Department, elects to retire in order not to miss getting a Commission he would be entitled to the pension of a Conductor only, as he must serve 3 years in the higher grade to get the higher pension — It would apparently make no difference in the matter of pension whether he were made a Deputy Asst. Commissary immediately before or immediately after his retirement from the Department; and which course should be followed seems to be a detail to be arranged with the Military Dept. and this you have taken steps to settle by your memo to that Department — I can offer no opinion as to whether it would be desirable to alter the 3 years rule which moreover may not be applicable to all warrant officers, though the Military Department held it to be so in Lieut. Joyce's case. If there be any difference in the rules it would seem to be only fair to make one rule applicable to all alike who have attained promotion to the same grade by service in the P.W.D.

Wy. 17/1/80

OF 187

933—

158/10

GOVT. OF MADRAS } 1880. { P. W
DEPT

SECRETARY.

Chepauk
~~Fort St. George~~ 12th January 80

OFFICE NOTE

To

The Secy: P.W. Code Committe

Please return the paper forwarded to you with mem No. 362 of the 30th September las Among them were notes on the warrant officers' promotion question, by Colonels Sankey, Mullins Shaw-Stewart and Major Pennycuick.

S
Dy. Sr.

A.P. 12/1
To W.d.

V.C.

Herewith.
D.M. 14/1

21/1 Secy. P.W. Code Committee

EXAMINER
No.
13 JAN 80
ENCA
P.W. ACCOUNTS

List of papers -

Keep-With d/ 5th June/79 -
Note "for orders" d/ 7/6/79 -
Note by Major Pennycuick d/ 25/6/79
Memo: by Chief Engr: for I. d/ 30th June/79
" - Col: Shaw Stewart d/ 8/7/79.
" by Col. Sankey d/ 27/6/80.
Note "for orders" d/ 9/7/79.
" by H.E. the Commander in Chief
d/ 25/8/79.
C.E.'s No. 263 d/ 30th Septr 1879 -

8

P. W. SECRETARIAT—1879-80.

KEEP-WITH 11

Endorsement
~~Letter~~ Number

dated the 11th May 1879

from the Chief Engineer for Irrig

Mr Ellis, a 1st Cl. Engineer, did
state very good service last year
when the head sluice of the
Main Canal, Godavery Central
Delta, was partially destroyed.
It happened at the time
that Mr Ellis had only
lately been promoted to
the highest grade, and
there was therefore some
discussion as to the
best way of rewarding
him. Col. Mullins, in
demi-official to Col. Sankey
urged the grant of
a personal allowance
as a donation in pre-
ference to raising Mr Ellis
in the Engineer Establishment.
The Govt. decided on
giving him three months'
salary as a donation,
subject to India's approval
which was accorded in

marginal force of the

List of papers -

Keep- With d/ 5th June/79 -

Or

note "for orders" d/ 7/6/79 -

Note by Major Rennyanck d/ 25/6/79

Memo: by Chief Engr: for S. d/ 30th June/79

" " Col: Shaw Stewart d/ 8/7/79.

" by Col: Sankey d/ 27/6/80.

note "for orders" d/ 9/7/79.

" by H.E. the Commander in Chief d/ 25/8/79.

C.E. No. 263 d/ 30th Septr. 1879 -

R

---

to course.

Mullins now requests that Govt. will raise him to the Engineer grade.

Mr Walch supports the application.

Colonel Mullins refers to the semi-official of Col Sankey for his views on the matter.

He does not recommend the promotion, on the general ground that there is or should be, a wide gulf between the Engineer and Upper Subordinate Grades; that it is not enough for a Sub-Engineer to possess high professional qualifications to entitle him to receive promotion into the Engineers; he should be fitted, from his general Education and otherwise, to take his place among them and be their Equal Socially.

Col. Mullins then goes into the question of promoting Military Subordinates to the

---

E.W. -

158/181

Note from Conductor Jack 15/6/79.

This Upper subordinate's case is

Bellary 15 June
1879

To Colonel J Mullins R.E.

Sir

I beg to take the liberty of writing the following few lines. I trust you will not be displeased at my doing so. Captain Smith belonging to this District leaves for Madras on

---

in Department [illegible] superior
that of many of his present
seniors who are infinitely better
qualified would be a very grave
injustice. He ought to be pensioned.
Mr Ellis, Nicholson, Mr Stephens
[illegible]

Then they

the marginal force of the

List of papers -

Keep-With d/ 5th June/79 -
note "for orders" d/ 7/6/79 -
Note by Major Pennycuick d/ 25/6/79
Memo. by Chief Engr. for I. d/ 30th June
" " Col: Shaw Stewart d/ 8/7/79.
" by Col: Sankey d/ 27/6/80.
note "for orders" d/ 9/7/79.
" by H.E. the Commander in Chief d/ 25/8/79.
Class 1st & 3 d/ 30th Septr. 1879 -

8

---

to course.
Mr Ellis now requests that
Govt. will raise him to
the Engineer grade.
Mr Walsh supports the
application

[illegible] I am given to
understand he is to take his
pension — if he does so — it
will leave a vacancy in the
Honorary Commission rank in
this Department — & as I am
the Senior Conductor, I am
first for promotion to Deputy
assistant Commissary — I
therefore beg you will
be good enough to
remember me when
the promotions are
being filled up —
which will be caused
by Capt. Smithers
taking his pension
I think I am about
three years senior
to any other Conductor
in the Dept.,
but I am still
only a 2nd Class
Supervisor —

E.W. 158/141

Note from Conductor Jock
15/6/79.

This officer subordinate's case is

him departmental rank superior
to that of many of his present
seniors who are infinitely better
qualified would be a very grave
injustice. He ought to be pensioned.
Supr. Ellis, Nicholson, Jr. Stephens
[illegible]

---

otherwise
place
be there equal senio
Col. Mullins then goes into
the question of promotion
Military Subordinates to

---

ld. While they

the marginal part of the

List of papers -

Keep - With d/ 5th June/79 -
Do
Note "for orders" d/ 7/6/79 -
Note by Major Pennycuick R d/ 25/6/79
Memo: by Chief Engr for I. d/ 30th June/79
" - Col: Shaw Stewart d/ 8/7/79.
" by Col: Sankey d/ 27/6/80.
Note "for orders" d/ 9/7/79.
" by H.E. the Commander in Chief d/ 25/8/79.
C.E.'s No 363 d/ 30th Septr 1879 -

---

to Course.
Mr Ellis now requests the
Govt will raise him to
the Engineer grade.
Mr Welch supports the
application

Hoping you will not be displeased at my troubling you with this - I remain
Sir
Your most obedient
servant
W. Jack
Condr
Sub Divl. Officer

---

small, & take
place: among them
be their equal Soci
Col Mullins then goes in
the question of promo
Military Subordinates to

E.W.

158/141

Note from Conductor Jack
15/6/79.

This upper subordinates' case is a remarkable instance of the difficulties entailed by the present system of promotion of Military Subordinates. Mr Jack was a very smart Sapper when he joined the Department more than 20 years ago. He became unsteady & was remanded to the Sappers. After some time there he became steady again, & was allowed to rejoin the Department, in which he has been ~~[illegible]~~ for 11½ years in this 2nd period of service.

Mr Jack is not qualified in any respect to enter the Engineer establishment as a regular Assistant Engineer & to give him ~~De~~partmental rank superior to that of many of his present seniors who are infinitely better qualified would be a very grave injustice. He ought to be pensioned.

Messrs Ellis, Nicholson, Jno. Stifflett
([illegible]) & Kelway

---

self.
the marginal part of the

List of papers -

Note by W.H. of 15th June/79 -

[illegible]
[illegible]

No 2. 20/6/79

C

To what pension would Conductor Park be entitled if promoted in the manner here proposed?

20/6/79

15

Engineer class ~~[illegible]~~ they
obtain Commissioned rank
in the Army; he argues
that Civilian Subordinates
of the D.P.W. may with
some reason feel aggrieved
at the practice, which
has had the result of
placing on the Madras
Engineer Establishment
several men in every way,
professionally and socially,
unfitted for their position,
who have passed over
the heads of Civilian
Sub-Engineers of longer
service and superior
qualifications.
In this way, some junior
to Mr Ellis may be
expected before long
to become entitled to
Commissions and consequent
promotion to the Engineer
grades.
Col: Mullins would abolish
the practice in question, or
if it is to be continued,
promote Civilians as
well.
The original force of the

Madras P.W. Code relate to the point at issue, and in Chief's Circular No. 76 of 7 August, 1867, you will find the grounds on which the practice which Col. Mullins objects to was based. The military men so promoted are not, as a rule, ever advanced to a higher grade than that of Asst. Engineer 1st grade; while there is no bar to Civilians, when once in the Engineer Class, rising to any position in it, - O'Shaughnessy, Morris, and Nardmann, for instance. This fact requires to be weighed in drawing any comparison between the Military and Civilian Subordinates. On the other hand, the Civilians have nowadays very little chance of obtaining admission into the Engineers. With regard to the Military men lacking the special qualifications which an Assistant

Chap. III iii. 32. page 37.
" " IV 8A " 44.
V. ii " 143

= although at no time is the Army must be classed with the Civilians -

Engineer should possess, this objection would be met by Supdg. Engineers being very careful in their recommendations - See Chief Engineer's Circular No. 46 dated 14 January, 1875, and P.W. Code V. ii. Oc. page 143 -

It may be safely conjectured that the Govt. of India would consider the arguments for the present practice, as set forth in the Circular already quoted, to be stronger than any which can be brought against them - So that the *special* case of Mr Ellis alone requires consideration -

The following order may meet it:-

The Government regret that, under the present circumstances of the Department, they are unable to reward the excellent service done by Mr Ellis in the manner desired by him.

A.S.P. 5/6

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

I do not see that any order is called for in Mr Ellis's case. It is simply an expression of a hope that he may obtain promotion hereafter.

As to the general question of promotion of Lt. & Sub Engr to the grade of Assist Engr I think the practice of promotion as a matter of course sh'd be superseded by selection on the principle stated by the C. Engr & that a G.O. sh'd be drawn on the lines indicated by him – A.D.

17/6

Cir 29.8.79 –
O.L. Cheel 58 Sept

For orders

Application by Sub-Engineer Ellis for promotion to the Engineers Estabt.

The merits of this case are so fully discussed in Colonel Mullins's memo of the 31st May and in the annexed Office note that a few words from me will suffice.

The chief complaint now is that soldiers unfitted socially and intellectually for the Officer grade are advanced thereto simply by seniority is thereby engendered among the Civilian members of the Upper Subordinate Class many of whom feel and as a fact may have better claims on purely professional grounds for a similar advancement in Status

But if the provisions of Code Ch V ii Oc are fully acted up ~~to~~, that no Engagement unless possessed of qualifications "which would make ultimate promotion to an honorary Commission in the Army, and the position of Hon: Assistant Engineer not an incongruity": there should be no valid grounds for complaint ~~objection~~, and the [illegible]

Expressly provided that men so promoted cannot have any claim to subsequent advancement beyond the position of Assistant Engineer 1st grade

Even as regards the promotion from the Upper Subordinate to the Engineer Establt: the Code does not absolutely guarantee this as a matter of right — Chap II para 53 merely says ~~that~~ "as a rule" such men will be promoted to the rank of Assistant Engineer

For myself I have always held that this permissive Clause gave Government a right to deny in any case where the promotion of a Warrant Officer would appear to be incongruous on social or unsuitable on professional grounds &c

matter how good
the general conduct of
the individual may
have been) ~~that they~~
could not retain the
man in the Department
The promotion would
in fact in such cases
be accompanied by
~~retirement~~ under such
pension as the individual
might at the time be
~~entitled~~ to
As it is now ~~Stated~~
~~that~~ owing to the seniority
of some of our Warrant
Officers promotions to the
Officers grade may soon
be looked for I would
now enquire whether
this principle is to be
acted on in future — and
in case it is whether I
shall draft an order
affirming it (for approval)

7/6/79

18/19

Please state whether
you gave to D.G.
the C. in C. as well
as Capt. [illegible]
with reference to
his d.o. of yesterday to
Sir N. Chamberlain's
note d/25/6/79 in
regard to the
promotion of
warrant officers.
The note was
sent to you
yesterday while
you were here.

4/9

C.A.W.

Yes — I handed
it personally to
Sir N Chamberlain
4/9/80 R.H.W.

matter how good the general conduct of the individual may have been) ~~that they~~ could not retain the man in the Department

The promotion would in fact in such cases be accompanied by ~~retirement~~ under such pension as the individual might at the time be ~~entitled~~ to

As it is now ~~stated~~ ~~that~~ owing to the seniority of some of our Warrant Officers promotions to the Officer grade may soon be looked for I would now enquire whether this principle is to be acted on in future — and in case it is whether I shall draft an order affirming it (for approval)

7/6/79

Noted.

See the plans
of Mr James, &
then send

6/9

5/79

The Com.-in-Chief's Minute on
promotion of Warrant
Officers of the W.D.
sent to Capt. Warwick
on D^o. propositions
for Col. Sankey.

3-9-79

7/25 Aug. 1879.

matter how good

Commissions altogether, and this, for the reasons given above, seems to be very inexpedient.

It may also be noted that the civilian subordinates are not so much worse off than their Military comrades as might at first sight be supposed.

The late Messrs. Smith and Sage, Messrs. O'Shaughnessy, Nordmann and Harris have all risen, *by obtaining their discharge and becoming civilians* to higher positions in the Department than have been reached by any warrant officer. If such

In other words the only instances adduced are the promotions of Military subordinates who, there being at that time no such rule as now exists, had to leave the Army in order to enter the grade of Assistant Engineer. Moreover they have nothing to do with the question under consideration. They were selected for promotion on account of their merit. The promotion of Mili

promotions have not been
common of late years, it
is because Government have
not thought proper to make
them; there is nothing to
prevent their being made
if Govt. desire to do so.

I would venture to
suggest that no order of
Govt. is necessary at all;
it might be desirable for
the Chief Engineer to issue
a circular calling the
attention of Supg. Engineers
to the necessity for caution
in their recommendations
of Sergeants for promotion
to the warrant ranks.

D. W.
25/8

Subordinates movt.
not based on merit but
follows as a matter of course
in the absence of glaring
demerit.

31/8/79

158/21

Note by Major
P.

Not so necessarily. Chapter V. 11. O.A.
[illegible] been withheld

Mr. A. 158/23

(d) is the plan which, as I gather, you are disposed to favour, but I venture to think that there are some objections to it.

In the first place it would not meet the grievance of the civilian subordinates at all. What it would do would be to quicken the flow of promotion among the Military subordinates of the Department, and thereby increase the extent of the supersession complained of.

Moreover it seems questionable whether the public service would gain all points injudicious to deprive the State of the services of an intelligent and experienced subordinate a subordinate too of the very class which is most scarce and most valuable merely because he is promoted to a grade where his duties, though under a different title, are precisely the same as they were before.

It must not be forgotten that the duties of Sub Engineers and Assistant Engineers are for the most part, precisely the same, and were they not, the transfer is only nominal, in a small

But there is also the consideration that it is injudicious to be unjust to the many in order to confer a privilege on the few. The results must be prejudicial to the public service.

If the promotion were merely nominal instead of being a radical change of position and status it would of course not be demanded as a matter of consequence by either Military or Civilian subordinates.

as it does not cause a vacancy in the Sub Engineer grade nor fill up a place in that of Assistant Engineer.

As a fact I do not think that any men glaringly unfitted for the position of Assistant Engineer have been promoted to it under the operation of existing rules; of course such men have not either the education or the social qualities which are expected in a young gentleman fresh from Woolwich and Chatham, but they are all they profess or pretend to be, respectable, honest men, from the very nature of their success in life above the average of their fellows in steadiness,

I do not concur, and could quote instances actual & prospective.

And the same may be said of many of the Civilians who are denied similar promotion.

energy and intellectual ability.

The existing rules prescribe plainly enough that no Sergeant is to be recommended for promotion to the warrant grades, unless he is of a character such as to render his ultimate promotion to an honorary commission and the rank of Assistant Engineer, *not an incongruity* and this appears to be all that can be fairly aimed at.

It appears in fact that there is no middle course practicable between maintaining the present custom and abolishing the grant of honorary

I think this is not quite all that should be required for, if Sergeants are improperly recommended for promotion to the lowest rank in the warrant grades or if, after being properly recommended they become unfit for further promotion, there should be some way of barring such further advancement

The note shows that this conclusion is not based upon the fa

unfit for the position of an Assistant Engineer.

(a) will probably not be seriously considered; the reason given by the Govt of India in their Circular No 76 dated 7th August 1867, for the provision of the officers in question to the Engineering Grades was that it "appeared undesirable that officers holding commissions should continue attached to departmental grades intended to be filled, (so far as they are held by Military men) by Warrant and Non Commissioned officers" and this view will certainly not be contested by any Military man; in fact the promotion to the rank of Assistant Engineer is made, not in compliment to the officer himself, but to the commission which he holds.

(b) would not only be exceedingly hard on the men themselves, who look to the attainment of an honorary commission as the final goal of a respectable and honorable career, but would greatly prejudice the interests of the department, as the best men would naturally seek for openings in departments where such prizes were still open to them.

It would be no further hardship than is now imposed on the Civilian subordinates but I have no desire to deprive Military subordinates of a privilege if it can be secured to them without direct Departmental injustice to Civilians

The balance of prejudice to the interests of the Department is now the greater owing to the many feeling themselves aggrieved

(c) is practicable, if the Military Dept. would accept it, but it should be unnecessary if the existing rules are properly worked; moreover it would not remove the grievance which is really felt by the civil subordinates of the department. It need hardly be said that this grievance is not the occasional promotion to the rank of Assistant Engineer of a warrant officer who is "socially and intellectually" unfitted for that position. It is the more frequent promotion (proportionately to numbers) to that grade, of Military subordinates, and the consequent supersession by

Alone it would not remove the grievance, but it would make it possible to reward the deserving of both classes by promotion of the kind [illegible] desired

Not merely more frequent but invariable promotion in one case and invariable denial practically of promotion in the other case.

Military men of civilians formerly their seniors.

It is obvious that this would not be removed by any exercise of selection in the promotion of Conductors. If Sub Engineer A. who has sixteen years service is aggrieved at being superseded by Conductor B who has only fifteen, he will not be in the least degree less aggrieved at both himself and Conductor B being superseded by a junior Conductor C. The relative social and intellectual merits of Conductors B and C are, it may safely be said, a matter of entire indifference to

Promotion, by merit, of Subordinates whether Military or Civil would be recognized by all as fair and reasonable and promotion on any other ground can be neither the one nor the other

[illegible] marginal [illegible] this note 158 [illegible]

W.

Promotion of Warrant Officers.

—

I am not sure that I clearly understand the nature of the orders which you wish to have drafted.

The only subject actually placed before Govt. in the papers under consideration is the promotion of Mr. Ellis to the rank of Assistant Engineer, and on that the members of Govt. apparently consider no order to be required.

In any case the order suggested in your first office note, that the circumstances of the Depts do not admit of the promotion would dispose of this question.

The question of the promotion of Military + Warrant officers holding honorary commissions, to the rank of Assistant Engineer only comes up incidentally in connection with the C.E.'s memorandum on Mr. Ellis's requests for promotion.

Before considering whether any alteration is necessary in the present practice with regard to these officers, it appears desirable to consider what that practice is.

Promotion up to the rank of Conductor is made by selection, but after that it is made by seniority

Certainly if the same decision is applied to the personal promotion of Military individuals but otherwise the injustice would remain

This appears to me an imperfect interpretation of the order quoted which really provides for length of service being taken into account and for limited supersession in certain cases

in the Conductor grade, and in one case (G.O. No 2524 of 5th Septr 1874) it was expressly admitted that a man's promotion to the higher warrant grades depended entirely on his seniority as a Conductor, and not on departmental position or total length of service.

It follows that a non-commissioned officer having once attained the rank of Conductor must in due course, if he lives and remains in the service, rise to the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissary and therefore of Assistant Engineer.

If it be accepted as a fact that "soldiers unfitted socially and withholding for the officer [illegible] to [illegible] to those by mere seniority and then the Commander in Chief shall call for remedy the alternatives in the present practice would be the use of the following powers:

(a) the withholding of promotion to the engineering grades as a necessary accompaniment to the grant of an honorary commission

(b) the withholding of the honorary commission itself

(c) the use of selection in promotion from the rank of Conductor to that of Deputy Assistant Commissary

(d) compulsory retirement [illegible] promotion to the officer [illegible] considered

---

Memo 15/27

Before moving further in this matter I should wish to have the opinions of Colonels Mullins and Shaw Stewart

Major Pennycuick's arguments are certainly cogent but if nothing further be done than he recommends we shall still occasionally have to deal with cases of men unfit in social and professional rank being unduly advanced

In marked cases of this kind I should certainly hold myself bound to submit proposals for pensioning off the man or otherwise dealing with the case

17/1/13

I have noted on Major
Pennycuick's report,
and have also for convenience
drawn up a separate Memo-
randum of this date on
the points which appear
to me to require to be specially
dealt with

30/6/79

Note enclosed

W.S. 8/7/79

The papers shd go to
H.G.

I concur in the opinion
expressed in the note
of the Ch: Engr.

The provision made
in the Code by the Com-
:mittee, for the principle
of selection being observed
in the matter of promotion
from the Warrant to the
Commissioned grades
(as it is now in the
case of promotion
from the Non-Comd. to
the Warrant grade)
is, I think, most [illegible]

Recd 22.7.79 - Rear 24
Cir 907-[illegible] Retd 22.7.79
[illegible] Sheet [illegible]

For orders

I think it necessary
~~that~~ the H.M. should
peruse and if necessary
pass orders on the
vexed question of the
promotion of military
Subordinates to Temporary
Commissions and the
position of Assistant
Engineers

This question, which
has been more noted
on in detail by
Colonels Mullins &
Shaw-Stewart and also
by Major Pennycuick,
came lately prominently
before the Code
Committee in dealing
with Chapter V

It appears to me that the provisions under which promotion will for the future be made should if completely acted up to go far to rectify the evils of the present system.

In future there will not only be selection of Sergeants for promotion to the Conductor grade, but again for promotion from the latter to the position of Deputy Asst. Commissary —

At the present moment it only therefore remains to consider the case of men who are already enlisted under the existing regulations to have acquired rights of promotion &c

requirements of the case as regards future admissions to the Warrant Grades in the O.S.D.

And I am with Lordship in the rule proposed as regards those now in the Warrant Grades who may be held to have claims by prescription to promotion to the Commissioned Grades — Instead of admission to the grade of Assist Commy. they will have the option of waiving the Commissioned rank or of retiring from the Dept.

The rule will I think be established in fairness to the Dept. both on public & individual considerations.

I am averse to extend it to other Depts in wh. Warrant Officers are employed for the same considns. are not prevailing in them.

G.P.

21.7.79

I approve of the Distinct list for Hon: Assist. Commy.

and Assistant Engineers for which they are not fitted socially nor professionally.

My own opinion on this point has been indicated with sufficient clearness in the course of this discussion, and I have now no hesitation in saying that in such cases the man should have the option of either retiring with the honorary Commission, or of remaining as in the Conductor grade.

In this I think all the officers who have noted on the subject would agree, and if this course be concurred in by Government it might take the shape of a Standing order.

As the men who
have

under the present defective System are cleared off we may hope that the Cases, which will subsequently have to be dealt with of a similar Character, will be comparatively few, but in any case I think with Colonel Mullins that All men holding honorary Commissions should in the Classified Lists of the Departments be shown in a class by themselves immediately below the Officers of the same nominal departmental rank

It remains for the Hble. to consider whether in adopting the measures indicated similar corresponding steps should not be taken in other Departments

For my own part I do not think this necessary as the men are markedly differ-

---

No 4991 dated
7 August 1880

Adjutant General's Office
Hd Qrs Ootacamund
12 August 1880

15/32

No 446

From,

Adjutant General

To,

The Secretary to Government
Military Department

The Officiating Adjutant General, has the honor, with advertence to Military Department Endorsement as per margin, referring correspondence regarding promotion of Warrant Officers of the Public Works Department, to request, that he may be informed whether, in when recommending, as an inducement to retire, the grant of an honorary Commission to a Conductor considered, on other grounds than departmental, not qualified for such Commission, it is intended, that the promotion should carry with it, the pension of a Deputy Assistant Commissary or simply that, as in the cases of Commissioned Officers retiring, he receive the step of honorary

rank

rank without benefit of increased pension

(By order)

Colonel

Offg: Adjutant General

Cr. 250 a/4 - 8.8

Mily: 1880: Deposits.

No. [illegible]

From

Offg: Adjt: Genl.

To,

The Secy to Govt.

Dated 12 } August
Recd. 13 }

Do. 4466

No. 4468

Reg: promotions of warrant officers.

No. 5724 Referred to the Public Works Department

Ootacamund } 13 Aug 1880

[illegible] Colonel
Secretary to Govt.

P. W. D.

34

No. 370

Memorandum.

Endorsement from the Military Dept. No. 5724 of 13th August 1880.

It is considered in the Public Works Department that a warrant officer who has served sufficiently long to be entitled to retiring pension, and who, on account of his not being considered on all grounds fit for promotion to the position of Assistant Engineer, may be recommended for an Honorary Commission under paragraph 733 of the P. W. Code, should be allowed the pension of a Deputy Assistant Commissary.

Ootacamund }
[illegible] August 1880 }

[illegible] Col. R.E.
Secy. to Govt. P. W. D.

To,
The Secretary to Govt.
Military Dept.

NO. 267 G.D. Irrigation. 15/35

FROM,

THE ~~Civil~~ Ag SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
1st Circle
~~GODAVERY DISTRICT.~~

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
MADRAS.

Encl. 1

~~CAMP~~ DOWLAISHWERAM, via 2nd May 1879.
Despd 7th

SIR,

I have the honor, at his request, to forward herewith a letter from Mr. I. W. Ellis dated 24th April & in doing so to say that it will afford me pleasure whenever it may be found possible to grant to Mr. Ellis the advancement he so earnestly wishes, from the "Upper Subordinate" to the "Engineer Establishment".

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Ag Supt Engineer 1st Circle

Irrig. 80 Depr

No.

From
The P.W.D.
370

Dy 27 } Aug 80
Rq 28 }

Ref

No. 5292

Copy furnished to the Actg Supdt in reply to his Memo No 246 of 12 Aug 80

Ostrogaum
28 Aug 80

To
The Actg Supdt. Despd 28/8

G.O. 1821. 3.6.69
" 62. 13.4.71
C.E. 3772. 24.8.78
G.O. 564 W. 21.2.79
" 3823 W. 30.9.78
" 4579 W. 29.11.78

Irrigation.

FROM,

THE OFFG. SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
1st Circle
~~GODAVERY DISTRICT~~

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

FOR IRRIGATION

MADRAS.

DATED 2d }
RECEIVED 4 } May 1879.

No. 267 G.D.

ENCLOSURE. 1

Ellis - Mr J -
Sub Engineer - Recommends the advancement of - from the Upper Subordinate to the Engineer Establishment

[illegible]

No 1

Central Delta Sub Division Office
Gummaram 24th April 1879

36

From Mr J W H Ellis
Sub Engr ~~[illegible]~~ Officer in Charge
Central Delta Sub Dn Godavery

To

The Actg Superintending Engineer
1st Circle Godavery District

Sir

I beg most respectfully to offer my sincere thanks to Government for the grant of three months salary sanctioned to me in G.O. No 564 W dated 21st February 1879 and for the kind congratulations of the Superintending Engineer to me thereon. I highly value the appreciation of my services by Government and will endeavour to deserve further acknowledgments from them.

In G.O. No 3822 W dated 30th September 1878 para 2 I was led to believe that Government intended taking into consideration my further advancement in the department; but I now regret to find they have put a pecuniary value on my services

services. Although I am thankful for the large sum of money now given to me, I trust this grant will in no way bar my future promotion into the Assistant Engineer grades. Towards this, I have steadily worked gaining all through my service of upwards of seventeen years the high opinion of my superiors. I am now these nine years in charge of the Central Delta and what I have done here is well known both to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and to Government.

Colonel Fischer R.E. then Superintending Engineer in his letter No 2863 dated 16th February 1871 recommended me for promotion to Assistant Engineer, and Colonel Beatty R.E. Superintending Engineer in his No 3368 dated 22nd January 1878 also recommended me for that promotion. Should Colonel Mullins R.E. Chief Engineer be consulted, I have not the slightest doubt but that he would highly recommend me. With such opinions to back me I beg Government will take my case into their kind consideration and reward me when an opportunity offers with the promotion I so earnestly seek.

I beg the Superintending Engineer will do me the favor of sending up this letter to Government with his remarks, as I am fortunate in having such an Officer here who more or less has heard of and seen my works, for the last few years.

I beg to remain
Sir,
Your Most Obdt Servt
J. M. Ellis
Sub Engineer

Sir

Enclosure in a letter
No 267 G.D. dated 2nd May 1879
from the Ag Superintending
Engineer 1st Circle

From Superintending Engineer Godavari
No. 267 G.D. 2d May 1879 with an
enclosed letter from Mr Sub.
Engineer Ellis.

No. 32-E.W.

Transferred to the Chief
No. 2. Engineer P.W.D.

The views of the undersigned with reference to the promotion of Mr J. W. H. Ellis, now a Sub Engineer of the 1st grade, to the Engineer class, are given in a paper attached to the original file of Letter No. 4579 W. of 29th November 1878, to Government of India.

2. It is necessary however to state in explanation of the opinion, there expressed, that it was inadvisable to make Mr Ellis an Assistant Engineer, to say that this is based on the general ground that the Eng[illegible] Upper

Subordinate grades are intended, or should in the opinion of the undersigned, be filled from very different classes. Professional qualifications only should not be deemed a sufficient ground of promotion, but a Sub Engineer to be considered fit for promotion to the Engineer class should, in all but very exceptional cases, be from general education, and otherwise, qualified to take his place among the officers of this class, and to be treated socially as their equal.

3. It is considered that the promotion of Military Subordinates to the rank of Assistant Engineer on their being promoted to Commissioned rank in the Army as Lieutenants and Assistant Commissaries is objectionable. There are several Assistant Engineers at present time who are unfit for that position, whether professional or other qualifications be considered. The undersigned would be glad to see the practice abolished but, if it is to be retained, Civilian Upper Subordinates will have valid cause of complaint if, with equal claims, they be left unpromoted. Some of them undoubtedly do feel aggrieved. There are Civilian Sub Engineers of the 1st grade who are of longer service and of professional qualifications superior to those of Military men, who have received the coveted promotion, and this cannot be just in a Department like that of Public Works.

4. There is only one Assistant Engineer, Lt and Assistant Commissary W Jackson, of those promoted from the Upper

Subordinate class, who is of shorter service than Mr Ellis, but he was promoted after 5 years' service in the Department while Mr Ellis had then served for 16 years, and it is believed had much stronger claims to promotion on the score of professional qualifications. It is probable however that ere long other Military Upper Subordinates who are Mr Ellis's juniors will become entitled to promotion in the Army, and either the practice of giving them rank as Assistant Engineers should be given up or, as a matter of justice, the Civilians who are their seniors and quite as, if not more, fit for the duties of Assistant Engineers should be secured their relative position in the Department by being similarly promoted.

Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Ootacamund
31 May 1879

To
The Chief Engineer P.W.D.

fo. N. 2892 - 3-9-79
— " — 2524 - 5-9-79

2796

G. Ltr, 363 of 30th Septr/79.

Recir 26.7.79 Dto 29-8.79
Recir 22.7.79 Dto 26.7.79
Recir 9.7.79 Dtd 22.7.79
Recir 7 Dto 7.9.79

Recd 2nd June /79

158/41

Note.

Promotion to the Engineer grade of Military Subordinates on receipt of honorary Commissions.

This question is beset with difficulties, which are entirely due to the anomalous position occupied by the military men who hold places in the subordinate ranks of the Public Works Department.

2. I have long held, with Colonel Mullins, that the existing system, under which military subordinates are promoted to the rank of Assistant Engineer on receiving honorary commissions in the army, was highly objectionable, for two chief reasons, both of which are adverted to in these papers; —

(1) that it is unfair to the Civilian

subordinates, who have no similar chances of promotion, — and (2) that, in virtue of the system, many men are raised to the Engineer grade who, in respect of general education, and in respect of what, for want of a better expression, I must term social qualifications, are, in my opinion, entirely unfitted for the position.

3. Major Pennycuick states that he does not know of any man glaringly unfit for the position of Assistant Engineer, who has been promoted to it under the operation of existing rules. My experience differs greatly from his. I could name several cases, if there were any object in doing so. In support of my view as to the tendency of the existing system, I will only point to the case of Conductor Jack. If Major Pennycuick were to read Mr. Jack's letter to Colonel Mullins, dated 15th June 1879, and Colonel Mullins' remarks thereon, I think he would agree with me, that, if no exception be made in Mr. Jack's case, at least one man would be raised to the Engineer grade who is unfitted, in respect of general education and of social qualifications, for the position.

4. If the provisions of the Code (V. ii. 0c.) were invariably carried out, and if no man were recommended for promotion to the grade of Sub-Conductor, unless possessed of "qualifications which would make "ultimate promotion to an honorary "commission in the army and the "position of honorary Assistant Engineer "not an incongruity," the second of the above-cited objections to the existing system would disappear. Whether

however it is due to the varying estimate which different officers form of the qualifications suited to the position of Aſsistant Engineer, — or whether it is due to the fact that, at the time of recommendation, the honorary commission and the honorary position in the Engineer grade are in the far distance, — there can I think be no doubt that, in many cases, men have been recommended for promotion to the rank of Sub-Conductor who are altogether unfitted for an honorary Commission and for an Aſsistant Engineership.

5. However this may be, it must be beyond question that the exercise of all possible caution and scrupulousness in recommending a Sergeant for promotion to the rank of Sub-Conductor would be

of no avail against the first and major objection to the existing system, vizt, that, under it, military men are treated differently from non-military men; — that its action is unfair to the latter class, who have no similar chances of promotion, and who are often obliged to see men promoted over their heads, in every respect their inferiors.

6. The only thorough remedy for this state of things would be to make military men leave all army status behind them on entering the subordinate grades of the Department, and enter on precisely the same footing as non-military men. That this will ultimately be the solution of the difficulty, I have not the slightest doubt, and that at a not very distant date. At present

however, what we have to deal with is an existing system, full of imperfections and anomalies.

7. Major Pennycuick states that any improvement in the existing system must take one of the following forms:-

(a) The withholding of promotion to the Engineering grades as a necessary accompaniment to the grant of an honorary commission.

(b) The withholding of the honorary commission itself.

(c) The use of selection in promotion from the rank of Conductor to that of Deputy Assistant Commissary.

(d) Compulsory retirement on promotion to the officer grade, of men considered unfit for the position of an Assistant Engineer.

Major Pennycuick goes on to state the objections to each of these courses, and I cannot but agree that he makes out his case

8. It appears to me however that he overlooks one course by which much of the objection which attaches to the existing system might be avoided. I see no reason why it should not be left to the Chief Engineer to decide whether the Conductor, who ~~stood~~ stands next for promotion to an honorary Commission, ~~was~~ is, or ~~was~~ is not, fitted to hold the position of Assistant Engineer. In the event of the Chief Engineer being of opinion that it ~~was~~ is not desirable to promote the senior Conductor to an Assistant Engineership, he might be given the option either of obtaining his honorary commission, subject to the condition of leaving the Public Works Department, or of remaining in the Department as a Conductor. In the latter case, the provisions of the Code (V. 11. Oa. last clause) would

allow of his remaining as a Conductor without being superseded in his military rank; but even in the event of his being passed over in military rank by a junior Conductor, he could not regard it as a grievance. This is the course suggested by Major Conway-Gordon in paragraph 3 of the Postscript to his Office Note No. 7, dated the 9th June.

9. I freely admit that the adoption of this suggestion would not meet all objections; inasmuch as the injustice to the non-military men would remain untouched. As I have said before, the only mode of dealing with all the objections to the existing system would be to alter it altogether, and to do away with every atom of difference between military and

non

non-military subordinates, by making it a condition of service with the former that they lay asid all military status on entering the Department. I presume, howev that the time for this change has not yet come; and the suggestion brought forward alone, in paragraph 3, appears to me the most practicable mode, under all the circumstances, of dealing with the existing state of things. By its adoption, the promotion, in virtue solely of their militar rank, of men glaringly unfitte for an Assistant Engineership, woul be impossible. Its adoption would not put an end to the unequal manner in which existing rules press on non-milit subordinates; but they would at least be spared the mortification of seeing themselves passed over by men, to whom many among them must be ~~anxious~~ conscious of being in every respect superior.

Colonel R.E.

Ootacamund
8 July 1879.

To the Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
with papers returned.

Note by
Col. Shaw-Stewart

Memorandum.

Promotion of Subordinates receiving honorary Commissions to the Engineer grade.

Under present rules Subordinates of whatever grade in the Department, if warrant officers, are liable to be promoted over the heads of their Departmental seniors irrespectively of their merits as members of the P.W.D. The matter has come under discussion in connection with a particular case, but it deserves to be considered on its general merits. The general contention is that the practice as now carried into effect is unfair to Civilian Subordinates and is felt by them to be unjust.

P.S. to Examiner's
Office Note No 9

It has been advanced

1st. that Civilian subordinates suffer no absolute injustice as these were the conditions and the practise of the service when they voluntarily joined it.

This would not be a sufficient answer even were it true, for as the rule relating to the promotion of Military Subordinates was introduced to obviate an incongruity, the still more numerous and equally deserving class of Civilian subordinates has a claim to equal consideration.

It appears however that the promotion of Military Subordinates to the Engineer grade dates only from 1867, so that the rule does actually entail an absolute injustice on all who entered the Department prior to that date

Government of India Circular No 76 - 7 August 1867. Bmy. No 2692. 3rd Septr./67

~~154~~ 158

and from the classified Departmental list corrected to 1st October 1878 it appears that the following Civilian Subordinates so entered

				Full Number
Sub Engineers, of the	1st Grade	.	4	4
do.	" 2nd	"	2	3
do.	" 3rd	"	5	7
Supervisors	" 1st Grade		10	16
do.	" 2nd	"	8	26

Or 11 out of 14 Sub Engineers and 18 out of 42 Supervisors are liable to be superseded under this rule, and will certainly be so superseded unless in some way the relative claims of Civilian upper subordinates are provided for.

Deputy Chief Engineer's. G. B. Note of 25th June 1879.

2ndly that nothing beyond the requirements of the present rule as regards recommendation of serjeants to promotion to the first step in the Warrant grade. The rule runs "Recommendation should not in these cases be based on professional efficiency alone, which is separately rewarded by Departmental promotion, but on general respectability of conduct, and on a man's possession of qualifications which would make ultimate promotion to an honorary Commission in the Army and the position of honorary Assistant Engineer not an incongruity." The present rule is that promotion from Serjeant to Sub Conductor is made by selection, thereafter in the warrant grades and to an honorary Commission, by seniority.

The recommendations for the promotion of Serjeants are necessarily made by several or many officers, no two of whom probably have the same idea of the qualifications required

These qualifications moreover are essentially different as regards eligibility for warrant rank and for holding an honorary Commission. If the latter were steadily kept in view few Serjeants would be made Sub Conductors, but when the claims of a Serjeant for promotion to Sub Conductor have to be disposed of, an honorary Commission is still a distant goal. Moreover a Serjeant may be very well qualified to hold warrant rank though not fitted to be brought into the Commissioned rank, and it would seem to most officers, on whom the responsibility of recommending or refusing to recommend a Serjeant for promotion might rest, hard to refuse him a step which he deserved and was well qualified for, because he was not suited to get a commission a great many years afterwards. If to this the consideration be added that qualifications in the absence of any fixed standard are mere matters of opinion, it cannot be a matter of surprise that all fairly well conducted serjeants do get recommended for the step to Sub Conductor, and the rest follows.

Under these circumstances, seeing that the many are fitted for warrant rank and the few only for a Commission, it is submitted that it would be a better rule to ? Int. allow promotion in the Warrant grades to go, as at present by seniority, and to select from the grade of Conductor for promotion to an honorary Commission. Not only would this be a better rule as regards Military Subordinates taken by themselves, but it would very materially lessen the difficulty of dealing with the claims of Civil subordinates.

2. I apprehend that when the question comes to be fully considered it will be admitted that equally deserving Subordinates Military and Civil should be treated impartially and that whatever standard of qualifications be fixed to regulate the promotion of the one class, will be applied to the other. The advisability or otherwise then of making promotion to the honorary Assistant Engineer grade common or comparatively uncommon has to be considered. If the modification of the rules now regulating the promotion of Military Sub-

ordinates, above suggested, be approved and adopted such promotions will be occasional and exceptional, and there would remain no practical difficulty in selecting Civilian subordinates of like superior qualifications for similar promotion. Under the rules as they now stand Military promotions will be frequent, and if they are to be retained unchanged all Civilian subordinates, of similar or higher standing, and with qualifications, confessedly equal or superior, should in fairness be promoted. I have no doubt myself as to the alternative which involves selection being the best for the public service, and probably also for the subordinates concerned, and I

think too, even should its adoption occasion some difficulty as regards the relative opportunities for promotion of warrant officers of the P. W. D. and other Departments, such as the Ordnance, Commissariat &c, it is of very much greater importance that the Military and Civil subordina of one and the same Departmen should be dealt with impartially than that equal chances should be secured to the Military subordinates of different Departments.

It may be useful to give a case in point on the supposition that a Military subordinate who is also a Warrant officer, will get his Commission by seniority irrespective of merit. The Conducto [illegible] stands first for Military promotion is, it is understood, a supervisor of the 2nd grade, and he is believed to be of doubtful qualifications for even his present position, and among his Departmental seniors there are many who have much stronger professional claims, and several who are otherwise better qualified for promotion from the subordinate to the Engineer grade. Supposing then only those Civilian subordinates who are conspicuously superior are promoted it is probable that the number to be advanced as honorary Assistant Engineers will amount to about a dozen, out of 25 or 30 who are his seniors. And not only so there are Military subordinates (Warrant Officers too) who are his Departmental seniors and of decidedly superior qualification.

that they too ought to be saved by promotion from supersession.

3. It may be further noticed that the Departmental lists as at present made out do not quite conform to the rules. There is no reason why Subordinates promoted to honorary Assistant Engineerships should be placed among the Assistant Engineers of the regular establishment. They do not belong to the latter, but are expressly separate therefrom and additional thereto, and it is desirable that they should be placed after the regular establishment under the designation to which they are alone entitled viz Honorary Assistant Engineers of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade as the case

may be.

4. This paper it will be understood does not in any way refer to promotions made from the Subordinate to the Engineer grade on the ground of exceptional professional merit and efficiency. Such promotions will necessarily be rare and when subordinates of conspicuous merit are brought forward and promoted they will be welcomed by Engineers, as has been the case in the past, as an accession of real strength to the superior grades.

Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irriga.

Ootacamund
30 June 1879

To
The [illegible]

Note by
Colonel [illegible]

Para 733(23) of the new Public Works Code:-

Recommendations for promotion from Sergeant to Sub-Conductor should not be based on professional efficiency alone, which is separately rewarded by departmental promotion, but on general respectability of conduct, irrespective of Educational or other cognate qualifications. It is especially necessary that the recommendation for the promotion of Conductor to the Commissary Grade should be confined to Warrant Officers on whom the conferrence of an Honorary Commission would not be an incongruity. It must be clearly understood that personal good conduct and seniority will not compensate for professional unfitness for promotion. The Chief Engineer has the power in cases when he may see fit, to offer Warrant Officers of long service and good conduct who may not be considered eligible for promotion professionally and socially, the option of retirement from the Department with the Honorary Commission [illegible] remaining in the [illegible] grade

P. W. D.
105/55

No. 250.

Memorandum.

The undersigned has the honor to invite attention to the latter portion of paragraph 733 of the new Public Works Code, and to enquire if there is any objection thereto on the part of the Military Department.

2. Sometime since a case came before Government, in which it seemed advisable to give to a Conductor the option of remaining in the P. W. Department, or of retiring with the honorary commission, and doubts were expressed as to the certainty of the Conductor's obtaining the honorary commission, as the grant of it lay with the Military Department.

3. Cases of the kind will, it is hoped, be in future very rare. The possibility of their occurrence must however be borne in mind; and unless the Military Department are prepared, when such a case does arise, to confer the honorary commission on the recommendation of the Public Works Department, the rule which

obtained the approval of Government* prior to its introduction in the Code, cannot well be acted on.

4. It also requires to be decided whether retirement in such a case should precede or follow the receipt of the commission; the former would seem to be more desirable.

* The correspondence that passed on the subject prior to the introduction of the Code paragraph is enclosed.

R. H. Sankey Col: R.E.
Secy. to Govt. P. W. D.

Ootacamund
4th August 1880

To,
The Secretary to Government
Military Dept.

Military 1880 Dept

No 5798

From
The P. W. D.

250

Dt 4 } Aug. 80
Rd 5 }

with file

On the promotions of Warrant Officers of the P. W. D. receiving Hony: Commissions to the Higher grades.

N/1793 1880 8/78

REQUESTED TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

No 4991 Referred to His Exc. the Commander-in-Chief

(By order)

Ootacamund
7 August 1880

Colonel
Secretary to Government

To the Adjutant General –

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT. 158

UNDER date the 57

Read the following :—

Letter from the Adjutant Genl
No. 543 d/ 26th Novr 1880
thro' The Military Dept (F.E. No. 7618 d/ 6th Decr 1880)

Recorded.

2. The cases coming under the operation of the clause in question will be so rare that each may be discussed on its own merits.

8/12/80

I do not understand the intention of this proposed G.O. – I think the 5 of Code should be amended or moved from Military Dept.

13/12

see ...

App. W. Hudleston
H. E. Sullivan

P. W. D.
13/58

I feel bound to do all
I can to ~~discount~~ uphold the
prestige of Military rank.
It seems to me ~~that~~ honorary
preferment of the kind
should be strictly guarded,
& the rules of the D. D. be
framed accordingly —
Soldiers discharging Military
duty, rise to honorary
rank under the most
strict scrutiny & then very
rarely - It is therefore an
injury to such rank that
it should be considered
as the suitable reward
for second rate men of
a civil branch of the
administration.

Ap. 7/12

C. 121 12.81.
R. Cy. 7.1.81. A. C.
RU. 11. 80

et like I knew what
y. the Civil Engr
proposal.

I have marked in the
le the R.S. copy of the
ra 733. but if a
inted copy can be
pended to the note it
y prevent mistakes

L.H. 11/1/81

Printed copy of
agement of Code
nt to the file
e p 116 - para 733.

Note

It is explained with reference to the enquiry of the Honorable Member on the draft G. O. of 8th December 1880 that the Govt. of India Rule is that shown in ordinary type in para 733 of the Madras Code, the latter portion in Italics being a local addition.

2. It is suggested that the simplest course would be to omit the words from "The Chief Engineer

R.S.

has the power" to the end of the para, and substitute

"Warrant officers not possessing the necessary professional qualifications are liable to be passed over for promotion to the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissary, and save in special cases any Conductor who has not reached the departmental rank of Sub-Engineer will be so passed over."

3. This will remove the objection taken by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and will represent the existing practice more accurately than the rule as it now stands.

4. It is believed that the existing rule was drawn up under the impression that the Military Department would not consent to the promotion of a Conductor over the head of a senior.

A. H. Lankey Col. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

The alterations proposed seem to me to be advisable & to be thus far a step in the right direction.

But I am distinctly of opinion that a further modification of existing rules is required, as these no longer permit of Honorary Military rank being the reward of proficiency as a Civil Engineer.

The rule is a relic of old days, when Military rank was the only reward at the disposal of the authorities — but that condition of things has passed away.

W. H.

~~Hon'ble [illegible]~~

H.E. the C. in C.

12.1.81

158 W

C. 12.1.12.1.81

C. 7.1.81

No. 158 W 5th [illegible]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT. 158

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT. 160

UNDER date the 19 January/81

Read the following:—

Endorsement in the Military Dept. on letter from the Adjutant General No. 543 d/26th. Nov. 1880 } (H.C. No. 7618 d/6th. Decr./80)

The following alteration will be made in para: 723 of the P.W. Code.

The words from "The Chief Engineer has the power" to the end of the paragraph will be omitted, and the following substituted.

"Warrant officers not possessing the necessary qualifications are liable to be paſsed over for promotion to the rank of Deputy Aſsistant Commiſsary, and save in special cases any Conductor who has not reached the departmental rank of Sub-Engineer will be so paſsed over."

J 10/

10/1/87

S. E. ✓
S. S. of Wks ✓
Mily Dept ✓
S. Supt. I. W. Codes ✓
[illegible] ✓

Despd
31-8-87

8

Govt. of 1871 Madras 87
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Passed

Regd. Encl.

G. O. 19th Jany 1887 No. 1884

Nos.

P. W. Code.

Ordering certain alterations in para 733 of the — regarding promotions of unqualified Warrant Officers to the grade of Dy. Asst. Engineers

13/10