

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை

54

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்

26.9.88

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

26

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பெரியபாளையம் துறை

அரசாணை எண்.

மு.கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

3116-3117W

அச்சகம்
புவனகை

நாள் :

18. 12. 1884

198.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

any

ஆவண. கா-1-18,000-15-6-87.

All communications
should be addressed
to the Secretary.

No. 1025 G

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

3116

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras
Public Works Dept.

Siml

Sir,

Referring to your letter of the 10th January 1881, on the subject of the proposals for improving the state of Warrant promotion of Military Upper Subordinates of the Public Works Department, I am directed to state that the Secretary of State has sanctioned the number of Warrants, for the Government of India list, being fixed at $\frac{2}{5}$ of the total number of Military Upper Subordinates, any fraction over one-half to give an additional Warrant.

2. Of the total number of Warrants, arrived at calculated as above, one-seventh are to be in the 3 higher ranks of Deputy Commissary, Assistant Commissary and Deputy Assistant Commissary, which carry

Army with them Honorary Commissioners,
with an additional one for any fraction
over half the rest to be Conductors and
sub-Conductors. The higher grades to be
divided as follows viz

Deputy Commissioners — 2

Assistant Commissioners — 2

Deputy Assistant Commissioners — 4

The grades to be divided between
and Sub-Conductors in the

by order of the
in the opinion of the
of His Excellency the Governor in
Council, as to the applicability of similar
measures to the Madras Establishment,
modified, so far as the higher grades
are concerned, owing to the much smaller
Establishment in Madras as follows viz

Deputy Commissioner — 1

Assistant Commissioner — 1

Deputy Assistant Commissioner — 1

Some details as to the effect of the change
upon the Establishment should also be given.

4 The Secretary of State has also
enquired whether, in the event of these
rules being made applicable to Madras,
it would not, in the opinion of His
Excellency in Council, be more conducive

to

to the general benefit of the Establishment
concerned, to place the 3 Warrant lists of
the Governments of India Madras and
Bombay on one roster for promotion.

I have the honor to be,
your most ^{obedient} servant

W. H. P. S.

Under-Secretary to the Govt of India

G.O. no 1172 W. 19. May 1882. Conf.
 " 364 W. 10. Feb 1881 do.
 " 365 W. 10. May 1880 do.
 " 1114 W. 10. May 1880 do.
 " 2601.2 W. 23. 10. 84.

W
 J. M. Ch. 7/51

Ans 10/9/84

Indias letter no. 1025-9.
 d/18 Aug. 84.

316
 317
 316

Taking the Classified
 List for the half year
 ending 30 June 1884. the
 latest published. It will
 be seen that there are
 46 Military Subordinates
 on the strength of the
 Madras P.W. Dept. The
 number of warrants
 allowed is 21. The percentage
 is therefore 45.6, which is
 somewhat lower than
 that given in para 6 of
 G.O. letter to Indias no. 1172 W
 d/9 May. 82.

The existing warrants
 are distributed as follows.

Dy. Com. my.	1
Asst do	1
Dy Asst - do	2
Conductors	7
Sub conductors	10

71 Total 21
 The

Circ. 12/12/84 R. S. 1/8
 Cir. 14/10

Revised to 11.9.84
 Reissued to 11.9.84

The proposals now made by India would have the effect of reducing the total number of Warrants to 18: distributed as follows.

Sy. Commg	1
Asst. - do	1
Sy. Asst. - do	1
Conductors	5
Subconductors	10
Total	18

The results are thus arrived at:-

$$\frac{2}{5} \text{ of } \frac{46}{1} = \frac{92}{5} = 18\frac{2}{5} = \underline{18 \text{ Warrants}}$$

$$\frac{1}{7} \text{ of } \frac{18}{1} = \frac{18}{7} = 2\frac{4}{7} = 3 \text{ of higher ranks.}$$

leaving for lower ranks - 15.
of which there will be - 5 Conductors
and 10 Subconductors

According to the proportions fixed by India.

If any change is to be made, it might be as well to adopt the suggestion in para 4 of India's letter - i.e. to bring all warrant officers on one roster.

for promotion. The revised scales will reduce the number of warrants to be allowed to Madras 39 percent on the total number of Military Subordinates. The percentages in other Presidencies will no doubt be higher. Madras would thus benefit by the amalgamation; although not, perhaps to an extent corresponding to its present favorable position.

3116
3117

L.S.
8.9.84

X

To D.W.

I shall be glad to have
your opinion on the
proposals made in
letter from India of
28-8-84, W. 1025-9

W.S.

8-9-84

Warrant Grades, P.W.D.

Madras

Letters that appeared in the
"Madras Mail" on the 1st., 6th.,
and 15th. October 1884.

3116
3117

WARRANT GRADES, D. P. W.

Sir,—In your issue of the 18th instant, I learnt
that the permanent strength of the Warrant
Grade, D. P. W., under the Government of India
is to be as follows:—

Deputy Commissioners 2, Asst. Commissioners 2,
Dept. Asst. Commissioners 4, Conductors 19, and Sub-
Conductors 32—Total 59.

The strength of the Warrant Grade in D. P. W.
under the Government of India, prior to the
above order was as follows:—

Deputy Commissioners 3, Assistant Commissioners 3,
Deputy Assistant Commissioners 3, Conductors 15, and
Sub Conductors 20—Total 44.

The above order reduces the strength in the
two upper grades, but increases the lower grades
by one Deputy Assistant, 4 Conductors and 12
sub-Conductors, making a total increase
in the Warrant Grade of 15; the total
strength of the Warrant Grades under the Gov-
ernment of India, prior to the last order, was
always 44, and that of Madras prior to 1880 was
as follows:—

Dept. Commissioners 2, Asst. Commissioners 2, Dept.
Asst. Commissioners 2, Conductors 9, and Sub-Conduc-
tors 12—Total 27.

During the late reduction of the P. W. Dept.
the Warrant Grades were reduced as follows in
the Madras Presidency:—

Deputy Commissioners 1, Assistant Commissioners 1,
Deputy Assistant Commissioners 2, Conductors 7, and
Sub Conductor 10—Total 21.

Or a total reduction of six Warrant Officers. The
late reduction of the Department was not
only in Madras Presidency, but through-
out the whole of India. Strange, yet true, the
Warrant Grades of the P. W. Department
of the Madras Presidency were the only ones
reduced. Colonel Sankey, who was then the
head of the department, said in the same order
reducing the number of W.O., that in the event
of the strength of the Department being in-
creased, the Warrant Grades would also be
increased. Since the reduction in 1880 the
Department has been increasing every year.
Last year another branch of the P.W. was
formed by the irrigation, which are called
the tank division, in which several of the
Warrant Officers have been transferred and
their places filled by others passing yearly out of
the C. E. College, so that the prospect of military
promotion in the P.W. Department for this Pre-
sidency is becoming worse every year; is al-
most hopeless. Many of the Sergeants will have
to retire long before there is a chance of getting
a step to the Warrant Grade, and it behoves
the Commander-in-Chief to take the matter up,
and look to the welfare of the soldiers under
his command, for the military men in the D. P.
W. are still under the control of the Commander-
in-Chief, who can re-call them at any time, as
was done during the Indian Mutiny, and again
during the late Afghan War. If the Madras
Government does not intend to keep to its
promise, at least it might grant the
military men the privilege of permitting them
to count their military service towards
civil pension on their resigning their military
rank. If this boon were granted, there would not
be many military men left in the Department,
and there would be no grumbling.

T. A.

Total Military Subes. in the Dept. 44.

" Upper " " " " 144.

" Military " " " " 42 (in-
cludes 4 Asst. Commrs.)

" Upper " " " " 162 (")

Present strength (1884) -

Military Subes. - 49

Upper " - 188

The words of the G.O. are:—

"but in view to the possibility of
future expansion, His Grace the
Governor in Council is of opinion
that the following scale is
suitable, & it will be adopted
accordingly."

WARRANT GRADES, P. W. D.

Sir,—In your issue of the 1st instant, "J. A." refers to the order reducing the strength of the Warrant Grades in the P. W. D., and states that Colonel Sankey said in that order "that in the event of the Department being increased the Warrant Grades would also be increased." I did not understand the order as such, and as far as I recollect the order stated that "with a view to further expansion of Department" the Warrant Grades were fixed at the reduced strength; in other words, were it not that there was a prospect of increase of the Department, the strength would have been reduced to a still smaller number. This rendering may be wrong, and I hope it is so, for the length of service of Warrant Officers in each grade, is, it is believed, unprecedented. The present strength of the Warrant Grade is:—1 Deputy Commissary, 1 Assistant Commissary, 2 Deputy Assistant Commissaries, 7 Conductors, 10 Sub Conductors. The Senior Conductor is 10½ years in that grade, and they Senior Sub-Conductor 10½ years in some rank. So that both these Warrant Officers are the seniors of their grades in India, including all Departments, and have been so for some years past. The services of the Conductors of that Grade are as follows:—

No. 1	Conductor	10½ years as Conductor.
No. 2	do	8½ do do
No. 3	do	7½ do do
No. 4	do	6½ do do
No. 5	do	6½ do do
No. 6	do	3½ do do
No. 7	do	2½ do do

The last known promotion made on the Bengal P. W. D. list is a Conductor, with four years' service as such, promoted Deputy Assistant Commissary; this Warrant Officer was six years junior to No. 1 and two years junior to No. 5 Conductors on Madras list, and it is even probable that in Bengal and other places, Conductors with three and even less years' services, as such, will be promoted Deputy Assistant Commissaries. Some of the Conductors in the Madras P. W. D. were that grade when some of the Deputy and Assistant Commissaries of other Departments were Sub-Conductors.

The services of Sub-Conductors in that grade are as follows:—

No. 1	Sub-Conductor	10½ years as such.
No. 2	do	8½ do do
No. 3	do	7½ do do
No. 4	do	6½ do do
No. 5	do	6½ do do
No. 6	do	4½ do do
No. 7	do	3½ do do
No. 8	do	2½ do do
No. 9	do	1½ do do
No. 10	do	1½ do do

No. 1 has 10½ years, and No. 2 8½ years' service as Sub-Conductors. Can Bengal P. W. D. show any thing like this? In that Department the motto appears to be "Ask and you shall receive," and in Madras "Ask nothing and you will get it."

If further proofs are wanted of the stagnation of promotion, and the necessity for an increase in all grades of the Warrant Rank, reference to Warrant Officers' dates of promotion in all Departments in three Presidencies will furnish ample.

The present Chief Engineer is most popular in his Department, and it is certain that, now the subject has been brought to his notice, our comparing the length of service of Warrant Officers serving under his orders and those of other Departments in Madras, Bengal and Bombay, he will do all that is in his power to forward the interests of the former.

Crowbar.

2nd October.

Condr: Beecrow - made Dy. Asst. Commisary in June 1894

2 statement is submitted showing in one list the names of the Warrant officers under the Govt. of India & Madras as they stood in the list for the half-year ending 31st June 1894.

The names of the Madras men are in red ink. The subsequent persons mentioned are to the increase of scale of the Govt. of India men are shown in blue ink.

3116
3117

Mr. P. Quinn, remanded to Militry duty as Gunner in March 1871, now an Ordnance Conductor.

Mr. R. Wolfe, remanded to Militry duty as Driver in November 1870, now an Ordnance Conductor.

Name	Date of promotion to			
	Sub-Condr.	Condr.	Dy. Asst. Commisary	Asst. Commisary
Fitzgibbon	Oct. 20 1872	June 30 1877	Sept. 6 1882	June 14 1893
Beecrow	Mar. 26 1874	Sept. 1 1880	June 12 1884	
J. Power	Sept. 7 1871	July 10 1874		
A. Milne	Nov. 14 1871	July 24 1876		
R. Lemmon	Nov. 6 1873	May 1 1877		
J. Nicholson	Feb. 15 1874	Jan. 20 1878		
J. Labor	March 9 1874	June 2 1878		

WARRANT GRADES, D. P. W.

Sir,—Your correspondent "Crowbar" in his letter regarding the excessively slow promotion of Warrant Officers, in the Public Works Department, omitted what appear important points. The principle applied to the reduction of Warrant Officers in 1880, was incorrect, and has proved to be unjust. The rule applied to reductions and increases in the Ordnance and other Departments, was not a fair one to apply to the Public Works Department, inasmuch as the Non-Commissioned Officers of these Departments were promoted as soon as vacancies occurred, whereas in the Public Works Department, no man was promoted until he had fifteen years' service, five years of which he must have been a Sergeant. A good example to show the advantages of one system over the other is that two men who were remanded from the Public Works Department to their regiments are now Conductors in another Department, while men who entered the Public Works Department with them are still Non-Commissioned Officers in the Public Works Department. The reduced number of military men in the Public Works Department was due to the abolition of the Local Army, and the introduction of the short service system, but the decrease was entirely in the Non-Commissioned Officers grade, and therefore the reduction should have been made first in the grades immediately above them, i.e., Sub-Conductors, then in the Conductors after all the Sub-Conductors had been promoted, and so on until the whole reduction was complete. Had promotion been given as soon as a vacancy occurred, and had promotion been made from one grade to another without requiring a certain length of service in each, then it might be fair to apply the rules of reduction to all grades at once. If more is necessary to show that the principle applied was incorrect and unjust, it is only necessary to show that two Bengal Conductors, serving in Madras, junior to five Conductors in Madras, have been promoted to the senior warrant grades; one of them has actually had two steps. If it is wished to equalize promotion, why not amalgamate Madras with Bengal? It is a well-known fact that the greater the number the more regular the promotion. When the civilian's position as regards pension is compared with the military, the hardship is clearer still. When they retire they receive half pay, while the military receive their military pension, which will be much less than the civil unless they happen to rise to the top of the warrant grades before retiring, which few can hope to do under present circumstances. Suppose a man a Sergeant and Sub-Engineer third grade to have to retire, he would receive but one rupee a day, while a civilian in the same position would receive at least Rs. 83 a month if he had but half his service in. The evil complained of could easily be remedied by increasing the number of Warrant Officers, or promoting each after being a certain time in each grade. This is not asking much, as Warrant Officers in the Public Works Department do not get increase of pay by military promotion except in the case of senior Warrant Officers, who receive Rs. 50 a month more, so that if the senior Warrant Officers were increased by two the extra expense to the State would be but Rs. 100 a month. The Conductors and Sub-Conductors might be increased to any number without increasing the expense of the Department. Your correspondent "Crowbar" is right in saying that the present Chief Engineer is most popular in his Department, and it is certain he will do justice if the matter is only put clearly.

3116
3117

WARRANT GRADES, D. P. W.

Sir,—Nothing can be more explicit than the letters sent to your valuable paper by your correspondents "Crowbar" and "A." It is a well-known fact that our present Chief Engineer has the interests of his military subordinates at heart, and it is highly desirable he should be appealed to on the subject; but the question is 17th Oct. 1894. WHO'LL BELL THE CAT?

6

to D.W.

3/16/87
I concur with you that our letter to India of 10.2.87, N^o 365, virtually binds us to accept the proposals made in paras 1.2.3.

of letter dated 28.6.84.

As suggested in the first letter, the necessary reduction should be effected by the absorption of existing third vacancies.

With respect to the point noticed by you at close of your remarks, it seems to me that the number of warrants must be calculated on the fluctuating number of Mil. Subordinates, and must therefore itself be liable to fluctuation, — one being added when the number admits, or one supernumerary being absorbed on occurrence of a vacancy. It does not seem to me necessary to touch on this in the reply to India.

With respect to the proposal in para 4 of the letter from India, I concur with you in opinion that it would be undesirable to amalgamate the Madras dist with those of India & Bombay.

Please have reply to India drafted accordingly, —
the instructions will be

the effect of the change, asked
for at end of para 3 of India's
letter

W

16-9-84

To W.

3/11/6
17/8

headmen as the proposal to fix
the number of warrants for the headmen
list (as sanctioned by the S. of S. for the
govt of India list) at $\frac{2}{5}$ of the total
number of military Subordinates is more
favourable than that which the Govt
of headmen accepted in their letter to
S. of S. no 365 W. of 10th July, 1877, we
are bound to consent, unless it be con-
sidered too favourable, which in my
opinion it is not.

We have now 50 military Subordinates
on our list (counting 2 apprentices) and
the proposed proportion would give us
20 warrants against the 21 we at
present have.

C. A. W. in his calculation based on
the latest Classified List omitted to
take into account the 2 apprentice
overseers. They have since been brought
on to our regular Establishment and 2
new military students have taken their
place, thus giving 50 mil. Subs. in all.

The distribution of the warrants suggested
by S. of S. seems to me fair. There is no
reason why headmen should be permanently
better off in this respect than the listed
Presidencies.

But I do not see what is to be
gained for headmen by placing our
warrant list on one roster for promotion
with that of Bengal & Bombay. Decentrali-
sation was I thought the order of the day,
but here we would have centralisation
with a vengeance.

Our Senior Sergeant is of 1869—there
came 2 of 1871, then 2 of 1872. On the
India list the Senior Sergeant is of 1863—
then came 2 of 1868, then 4 of 1870. It
is to be inferred that the first steps due

to casualties in barracks would probably
(certainly probably) go to form a India
list, if the undetermined to service not
and apart from this immediate result,
I fear that, service and qualifications
being equal, preference would be given
to men who had done their service
in the India P.W.D.

But setting aside the above somewhat
petty & provincial arguments, is there
not the broad consideration that men
serving in barracks should look solely
to the military & Departmental authorities
of that Presidency for reward & recognition?

I may be wrong in all this, but there
is nothing in the record to show exactly
how the suggested change would be "to
the general benefit of the establishment
concerned". Nothing in support of this
inference has, so far as I can see, been
adduced.

I have not touched on the doubtful
question as to whether the proportion
of $\frac{2}{5}$ is to be calculated on a fixed
or fluctuating number. Our number
of military subordinates fluctuates, and
may fall in the near future, but
perhaps that point might be left for
consideration from time to time.

Ed.

11.9.84

P.W. Dept. so that, unless
a fixed number be laid
down, the number of warrant
officers would be liable
to fluctuation, if they
are to be $\frac{2}{5}$ of the
total number of military
subordinates, as suggested
in the Govt. of India letter
now received.

Please send
C.A. W's note of 8.9.84
on the subject.

Ed.
10.9.84

3116
3117
/9

9

11.9.84

DW

The notes attached to the original Pros. now put up, particularly those attached to L.P. No. 364 w dated 10.2.87, will give some idea as to how the present scale of warrant officers was arrived at.

The L. & S. do not appear to have replied to letter from this office No. 365 w d 10.2.87, so that the numbers still remain as fixed in L.P. No. 1114 w d 10.5.90, viz.

Dy. Commg	—	1
Asst do	—	1
Dy Asst do	—	2
Conductors	—	7
Subconductors	—	10
Total		21

There is no fixed number of Military Upper Subconductors for the Madras

S. A. W.

31/6/31/10

In last night's "Madras Mail" there was a long letter about the warrant officers of the P.W.D. and the hardship inflicted by the recent order reducing the scale. It seemed to me that the writer had nothing to go on, at any rate the reduction could not be helped. I should like, however, the case to be sifted carefully by E, to ascertain if any reasonable grounds exist for the complaint. I shall then go through the file again myself.

Cd.
7.10.94

GA

10

These papers might be
kept back until reply
comes from Bengal,
— similar to that lately
received from Bombay,
— on subject of Warrant
Officers.

On receipt of that letter
these papers should be
brought forward.

31/6
31/6
31/6
3.1.84

40

1 May 77
30 Jan 78
16 June 78

122

31/6/317/12

If warrants were to fixed at
twenty, and the proportion of the
several grades would be as follows:-

By: Commissary	—	1
Asst. - do	—	1
By: Asst. - do	—	1
Conductors	—	7
Sub-Conductors	—	10
		<hr/> 20

The effect upon the Establishment
would therefore be a reduction of
one warrant in the grade of Deputy
Assistant Commissary; and, to ^{mitigate} ~~alleviate~~
hardships, I am to suggest that
this reduction be effected by the
absorption of the third vacancy in
the grade.

4. With reference to the proposal
in para 4 of your letter under reply,
I am to state that His Excellency
the Governor in Council has no objection
to the amalgamation of the headward
list of warrant officers with those of
Bengal and Bombay, inasmuch as,
judging from the relative lengths
of service of the warrant officers of
the Public Works Dept^{mt} of this Presidency
& of those of Bengal, the former, whose
promotion has hitherto been comparatively
very slow, will apparently benefit
thereby; whilst the rate of promotion
of non-comm^d. officers to the warrant rank
will eventually be equalised for all three
Presidencies ~~to the change~~. It is presumed
that, should effect be given to this proposal,
steps will be awarded ~~in~~ in the order
of seniority, provided always those to be
promoted have been recommended by the Dep^{ty}
& locally-authorised of their respective Presidencies.

37 1 May 77
39 20 Jan 78
46 20 Jan 78

CN: 7557 Warrant office
 To the Secy. to Govt.
 Proc. to the Secy. to Govt.

The following letter will be addressed to the Secy. of India.

Sir,
 In acknowledging receipt of your letter No. 10258, dated 28th August, 1884, I am instructed to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council accepts the proposal that the number of warrants for the headwag Public Works Dept. be fixed at two-fifths of the total number of military upper subordinates, any fraction over one half to give an additional warrant.

2. The existing scale of warrants for the headwag P.W. Establishment is as follows:—

Dy. Commissary	—	1
Asst. — do —	—	1
Dy. Asst. — do —	—	2
Asst. — do —	—	7
Conductors	—	10
Sub-conductors	—	24

3. There are at present fifty military upper subordinates in the Department including two upper officers, in accordance with the proposals made by the Secy. of India, the number

Warrant officers.

To W.

3/18/13

I submit for consideration rough proposed draft on the subject of warrant officers, to supersede that of 29-9-84.

It is a question whether in para 4 any reasons need be given for accepting the proposed amalgamation of the lists. It is, I presume, only because of the increased position to our men, that their Govt. would consent to the proposal, for the objection holds that headwags ought to have the patronage of headwag men.

Cd.

11-12-84

Yes. I think the draft will do. It may be copied for circulation, and should be accompanied by a brief note explaining why it is proposed to set aside the previous draft, initialed on 29-9-84, and to substitute the one now circulated.

J. H.
 11-12-84

37 1 May 77
 39 20 Jan 78
 46 20 June 78

W.

Warrant Officers.

31/6/77
31/7/77

The list of the warrant officers of the P.W.D. under the for^{mt} of India which was written for goes distinctly to show that it will be, in the first instance, to the advantage of the hill & Subordinates on our list to amalgamate into one the 3 warrant lists of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay.

A list is put up showing the warrant officers of the 3 Presidencies with dates of promotion to present rank & dates of retirement under the 55 years rule.

You will observe that Madras men head the lists of each of the 5 ranks by virtue of seniority. It would therefore appear that the first steps made available by the retirement of either a Bengal, Madras, or Bombay warrant officer would go to a Madras man.

The first two men to be retired in consequence of age (in 1886) are Dy. Commr. Capt. W. Johnston and Dy. Asst. Commr. J. Keenan, both of the Bengal list.

Johnston's retirement would promote Asst. Commr. Plummer of Madras, and steps would follow to Dy. Asst. Commr. West, to Conductor J. Power, & Sub-Conductor J. Corrae, all of Madras.

Keenan's retirement would in like manner promote Conductor A. Milne and Sub-Conductor W. Cairns, both of Madras.

The next men to retire will be (in 1887) Lt. Plummer and Conductor E. Hughes. The former is in the Madras, the latter in the Bengal list. Both steps will go to Madras.

And so on, for some years, Madras men will benefit by the retirement of Bengal men as well as by the

37 1 May 77
39 20 Jan 78
46 20 June 78

57

122

Retirement of men on their own list. It will be the same in regard of our Sergeants, looking at the lists as they now stand.

This presumption of course that promotions will go by seniority only. I presume, however, that after a lapse of time it must come to pass that there will be no particular advantage to husbands to have their wives officers on one list with those of Bengal & Bombay - the chances will be the same whether there be but one or 3 separate lists.

The Secretary of State has asked India whether the establishment of one list would not be conducive to the general benefit. I do not exactly know where the benefit would lie, unless it be considered a benefit to qualify the value of military promotion of military subordinates in all their residencies.

It will be seen from the list that the value of promotion has hitherto been for Bengal very much better than for husband. What has been the cause of this I cannot say. It is apparently a privilege of our own, but possibly disease & death may have accelerated promotion in the hands of India.

CD.
2.12.84

List of

Warrant Officers under the Governments of India and Madras.

N.B. Names of married men in red ink

Names.	Date of Birth.	Date of Present Rank.	Remarks.
--------	----------------	-----------------------	----------

(3) Deputy Commissaries. (2)

Jackson. Capt. William	19 April 35	5 Mar. 80.	
McArthur. Capt. George	31 Mar. 37	16 Sept. 82.	
Johnstone. Capt. Mathew	28 April 31	1 Dec. 82.	
St. Prindon. Lieut. Charles	6 June 37	16 Sept. 82.	
North. Lt. Andrew	21 June 35	17 May 84	
Smith. Lt. F.		31 Aug. 84	
For. Lt. E.		31 Aug. 84	

(3) Assistant Commissaries. (2)

Hummer Lieut. Samuel Charles	5 Dec. 32	23 Nov. 80.	
Forbes Lieut. Andrew	21 June 35	16 Sept. 82.	made Nul. Commsy. 17 May 1884
Jarvis Lieut. William	7 Feb. 34	26 Jan. 83	
Fitzgibbon. Lieut. James	31 Dec. 35	14 June 83	

(3) Deputy Assistant Commissaries. (4)

West. Lieut. W. G. Samuel	10 Dec. 39	5 Mar. 80	
Calvey. Lieut. Daniel	10 June 35	23 Nov. 80	
Pyatt. Lieut. Philip Justus	2 Feb. 37	10 Jan. 83	made Nul. Commsy. 17 May 1884
O'Farrell Lieut. John Henry	15 Oct. 38	26 Jan. 83	
Quilter. John Howlett	3 Jan. 37	14 June 83	

(15) Conductors (19)

Joseph. Daniel	15 Mar. 38	10 July 74	
Andrew	21 Sept. 38	24 July 76	
Richard. Patrick	8 Nov. 37	1 May 77	
John	15 Feb. 39	20 Jan. 78	
John	2 Dec. 46	22 June 78	

3116
317/15

114

93

Chalmer, Robt. H. P. H. & Co. 10 Oct 36 1 Sept 80 made by Asst. Commr. 17th May 1884
 Keenan, James. 14 April 31 1 Sept 80 — do — 12th June 1884
 Littlewood, Charles J. 5 Mar 38 23 Nov 80
 Marr, William. 30 Oct 40 25 Jan 81
 Sanderson, John David 1 Oct 38 1 Sept 89
 Tobin, William Lambent. 29 July 35 16 Sept 82.
 McAuley, James. 22 June 37 16 Sept 82.
 Miller, Robert. 26 July 44 16 Sept 82.
 Algar, Alfred. 19 Sept 45 16 Sept 82
 Mudge, Henry. 13 Sept 43 10 Jan 83.
 Syers, Thomas. 6 Sept 40 26 Jan 83
 Chapman, John. 28 June 40 27 April 83
 Largill, W. Moberly 23 Nov 50 7 May 83
 Edwards, James. 5 Oct 40 14 June 83

(20) Sub Conductors. (32)

James, James. 3 Sept 38 1 Sept 74
 James, William. 5 Sept 38 1 July 76
 Smith, Joseph. 10 Sept 39 14 Feb 77
 Frankland, Henry. 26 Feb 44 2 May 78
 Bennett, Edward, William 5 Jan 38 8 May 78
 Kelly, John. 7 Feb 45 21 Jan 79
 Duggan, B. H. 5 Sept 40 15 Mar 80
 Duggan, B. H. 5 Sept 40 15 Mar 80
 Gray, Thomas. 10 May 40 2 July 80 made Conductor 7th May 1883
 Fraser, Samuel. 10 Feb 40 1 Sept 80 — do — 19th Feb 1884
 Gunning, Daniel. 2 Dec 39 7 Sept 80 — do — 8th May 1884
 Pearson, William. 29 Aug 39 23 Nov 80 — do — 17th May 1884
 Grindal, William. 17 Oct 36 21 Dec 80 — do — 12th June 1884
 Dainton, Edwards. 16 Dec 45 26 Jan 81 — do — 12th June 1884
 Taylor, George. 30 May 39 17 Oct 81 — do — 12th June 1884
 Jackson, Richard. 21 Oct 38 22 April 82 — do — 12th June 1884
 Haining, F. 16 Sept 44 1 Sept 82
 Chapman, Thomas. 5 Feb 44 16 Sept 82 }
 1st July 1882

Hart, John. 2 Sept 72 9 Aug 77
 Anderson, Alex. 16 Sept 71 1 Sept 77
 Learmontto, Andrew. 14 Aug 67 1 Sept 77
 Morrison, John. W. May 68 1 Sept 77
 Cope, E. 13 Sept 48 24 Sept 77
 Porter, William. 30 Sept 66 11 Oct 77.
 Browne, John. 26 July 67 4 April 78
 Franklin, James. 27 June 73 4 April 78
 Lambert, Samuel. 24 Aug 74 4 April 78
 Eddow, John. 12 Aug 70 8 Sept 78
 Clog, Robert. 1 Feb 72 14 Sept 78
 Penley, P. 22 Sept 46 1 Jan 79.
 Williams, Joseph James. 2 Aug 70 1 Sept 79
 Thornton, Edward. 25 Jan 70 1 Sept 79
 Lewellyn, J. 28 Mar 72 6 Sept 79
 Rich, John, Peter. 1 Aug 71 1 Sept 79
 Macdonald, Duncan Kennedy 9 Sept 71 18 Sept 79
 Sullivan, A. 14 April 71 1 Mar 80
 Lee, J. 8 April 67 15 Aug 80
 Malpas, Arthur. 10 Oct 64 1 Sept 80
 Whitley, William. 26 Aug 69 1 Sept 80
 Rogers, Henry Alfred. 12 Jan 74 1 Sept 80
 Smyleton W. 23 Sept 67 1 Sept 80
 Westwood, Thomas. 28 April 70 1 Sept 80
 Perry, Charles. 22 Oct 63 1 Oct 80
 Truher, G. 25 Aug 70 23 Dec 80
 Gentry, E. 24 Mar 71 1 Sept 81
 Adams, George. 1 Dec 70 1 Sept 81
 Pellord, P. 23 May 72 1 Sept 81
 Donaghy, E. 8 July 56 1 Nov 82.
 Olaney, H. 12 July 51 1 Nov 82.
 Olaney, P. 14 Feb 58 6 Feb 83.
 Ralph, J. — 1 April 83
 Wiseman, F. — 1 April 83
 Cherry, J. 11 Mar 58 12 July 83
 Blake, J. G. 1 Mar 50 12 July 83
 Kelly, P. — —

3116
3117/16

14A

1055

10

Challoner, W.
 Sydeman, C. J.
 Hunter, Jas.
 Lynch, A.

Bradley, Thomas Christie.	12 Sept 33	16 Sept 82.	made Conductor. 12 th June 1884
Macartney, Hugh	16 April 40	16 Sept 82	
Straughan, Robt.	23 July 41	16 Sept 82	
Callins, Patrick.	25 Nov 42	16 Sept 82	
Read, Robt.	25 Mar 50	1 Dec 82.	
Young, John Joseph.	14 Dec 44	10 Jan. 83.	
McKinn, John.	23 July 35	26 Jan. 83	
Heenan, Michael	8 April 44	31 Mar. 83	
Power, John.	21 Jan. 47	27 April 83	
Shaw, John.	-	7 May 83.	
Donovan, James.	-	5 th July 83	
Kay, George.	-	14 th June 83	
Hollingsworth, Henry.	5 Oct 42	21 Aug 83	

3116
 3117 17

Sergeants.

Luck, James.	6 Aug 60	7 Sept 63.	made Sub Conductor. 12 th June 1884
Perks, Arthur.	28 July 63	1 Aug. 68	Entered Dept: in Sept: 1872
Smith, J. B.	5 Mar. 44	3 July. 69	do do 12 th June 1884
Fryer, Robert.	3 Jan. 60	1 Sept 70	made Sub Condr.: 19 th Feb 1884
Simpson, John.	11 Sept 62	1 Sept 70	do 12 th June 1884
Luer, James.	7 Dec. 57	15 Sept 70	do 8 th May 1884
Quens, John.	25 May 67	7 Dec. 70	do 12 th June 1884
Ward, R. W.	12 Feb. 39	8 July 71	
Webb, H.	23 April 44	20 July 63	
Carkeiv, Martin.	30 Sept 65	21 Sept 71	do 14 th June 1883
Hilton, Charles.	21 April 64	21 Sept 71	do 12 th June 1884
Golly, William.	8 Dec. 60	3 Jan. 72.	do 12 th June 1884
Hanley, & Mallock	10 Oct 59	18 June 72	
MacArthur, R. W.	31 Jan. 49	25 June 72	
Adams, John.	29 Sept 64	1 Sept 72	do 12 th June 1884
Cameron, Elsie Robt.	29 June 69	10 Sept 72.	do 12 th June 1884
Highway, Edwards.	19 Sept 67	6 Sept 72	do 12 th June 1884
Devine, Joseph.	26 Feb. 67	18 Sept 72	do 12 th June 1884
Edwards, Robert.	14 July 62	22 Sept 72	do 12 th June 1884
Clarke, Charles James.	5 Jan. 58	23 Sept 72	do 12 th June 1884

Patton, J. L.	18 Jan. 50	26 Nov. 72	
Haywood, Wm.	7 July 64	7 Feb. 73	made sub bond. 12 th June 1884
Battman, Janel.	18 Jan. 70	13 Aug. 73	
Hamron, Michael.	16 Nov. 64	6 Sept. 73	— do — 12 th June 1884
Butler, Charles.	4 Jan. 64	14 Sept. 73	
Cheria, John.	19 Sept. 55	26 Sept. 73	— do — 12 th June 1884
Ulyett, J. H.	10 Sept. 53	24 Nov. 73	
Fitzpatrick, Thos.	16 Feb. 63	10 Jan. 74	
De Burgh, W. Thomas.	3 Sept. 72	1 Mar. 74	
Baker, Frederick Ostian.	15 June 70	1 May 74	
Ince, Michael.	26 Aug. 64	13 June 74	
Leau, Edward.	4 Dec. 68	16 Sept. 74	
Bell, John.	10 Oct. 70	19 Sept. 74	
Crofton, Malby Daniel.	21 July 70	20 Sept. 74	— do — 12 th June 1884
Lewis, Charles.	8 Feb. 61	21 Sept. 74	— do — 12 th June 1884
Watson, John.	20 Nov. 66	21 Sept. 74	
Kirk, David.	7 May 69	22 Sept. 74	
McDowell, Ansell.	11 May 69	22 Sept. 74	
Green, B. R. E.	7 Nov. 50	1 Jan. 75	
Bradford, Thomas.	24 Feb. 46	17 Feb. 75	
Smith, C. R. E.	14 May 52	1 June 75	
FitzGerald, Wm.	4 July 70	24 Aug. 75	since deceased
Grapple, J.	15 Aug. 46	24 June 75	
Macintosh, D. B. E.	7 June 48	1 Nov. 75	
Reynolds, Geo.	4 Mar. 72	28 Nov. 75	
Hamblin, F.	12 Feb. 27	21 Dec. 75	
Largett, George.	22 Feb. 64	22 Oct. 76	
Rebman, Peter.	16 Feb. 69	22 Oct. 76	
Bealy, B. J.	14 Oct. 50	1 Nov. 76	
Ross, Peter.	21 Dec. 72	17 Mar. 77	
Watson, William.	6 Jan. 73	14 Mar. 77	
Parcell, William Boyd.	1 April 72	9 May 77	
Singleton, Wm.	16 Sept. 67	20 July 77	

316
317/18

16

17

P. W. Dept

Note. 31/6/19
31/7/19

Scale of Warrant officers
in the Public Works Dept.

Since circulating for
approval the draft letter
to the Govt of India on this
subject, initialled on 29th
Sept 1884, the Secretary
has received from the
Governments of India and
Bombay, lists showing
the relative length of
service in the various grades
of the Warrant Officers
of the P. W. Dept. warrant
officers serving in those
Presidencies.

These lists show that
it would be to the
advantage of Madras men

to amalgamate the
three lists for purposes
of military promotion,
for Madras men head the
lists of each of the five
grades by virtue of seniority.

It has also been
ascertained that an
amalgamation would be
^{acceptable to}
~~gladly hailed~~ by the
senior warrant officers
of the Madras M. Dept.

It is proposed therefore,
with the approval of
Govt, to substitute the
accompanying letter for
the one previously drafted.

W.
12.12.84

W.

cu

3116
3117/20

18

Mr. Hon H.B. Sullivan
His Secy. Mr. Comm. in Chap



3116 3117 W

Ans: 12/12/84 R 18/12/84

P. H. Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Prob.

Under date the

3116
3117 1/2

Read the following:-

From

The Prob. of India. (H.C. No. 1025 G. of 28th Aug 1884)

Superintendent

The following letter
will be addressed
to the Prob. of India.

813 11/1

(H.C. No. 1 of)

Is the Secy to the
Prob. of India.

P. H. Dept.

Sir,

In acknowledging
the receipt of your
letter No. 1025 G. dated

28th August 1884, I am
 directed to state that
 His Excellency the
 Governor in Council
 accepts the proposal
 that the number of
 warrants for the
 Madras Public Works
 Department be fixed
 at two-fifths of the
 total number of
 Military Upper
 Subordinates, any
 fraction over one
 half to give an
 additional warrant.

2. The existing scale
 of warrant officers
 for the Madras

Public Works Deptt.
 is as follows:-

3116
 3117/22
 Dy. Commissary 1
 Asst. - do - 1
 Dy. Asst. do - 2
 Conductors - 7
 Subconductors - 10,
 a total of twenty one

3. There are at
 present fifty Military
 Upper Subordinates
 in the department,
 (including two Ap-
 prentice Officers)
 In accordance with
 the proposals made
 by the Govt of India,
 the number of warrants
 would be fixed at
 twenty, and the

28th August 1884, I am
 directed to state that
 His Excellency the
 Governor in Council
 accepts the proposal
 that the number of
 warrants for the
 Madras Public Works
 Department be fixed
 at two-fifths of the
 total number of
 Military Upper
 Subordinates, any
 fraction over one
 half to give an
 additional warrant.

2. The existing scale
 of warrant officers
 for the Madras

Public Works Dept.
 is as follows:-

3/16
3/17/22
 Dy. Commissary 1
 Asst. - do - 1
 Dy. Asst. do. - 2
 Conductors - 7
 Subconductors - 10,
~~to~~ a total of twenty one
 3. There are at
 present fifty Military
 Upper Subordinates
 in the department,
 (including two Ap-
 prentice Officers)
 In accordance with
 the proposals made
 by the Govt of India,
 the number of warrants
 would be fixed at
 twenty, and the

proportion of the
several grades would
be as follows:—

Dy. Commissary — 1
Asst. — do — 1
Dy. Asst. do — 1
Conductors — 7
Sub Conductors — 10

The effect upon the
establishment would
therefore be a reduction
of one warrant in
the grade of Deputy
Assistant Commissary;
and, to obviate hardship,
I am to suggest that
this reduction be effected
by the absorption of the
third vacancy in that
grade.

4. With respect to
the

the proposal in
para 4 of your
letter under reply,
I am directed to state
that His Excellency
the Governor in
Council does not
advocate the amal-
-gamation of the
Madras list of
warrant officers
with those of Bengal
and Bombay.

Cy.
22.9.84

W.S.
29.9.84

Cy.

22

The Hon. H. S. Sullivan

Hon. Secy. to Govt.

7/12/84

N^o 3116. W

gentl
not abt

Public Works Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 18 December/84

Read the following:—

3116
3117

Letter from the Govt of India (H.E. N^o 1025 Gd/Augst 28. 1884)

The following letter
will be addressed to the
Govt of India:—

(H.E. N^o 3117 Wd/18 Decr. 1884)

To

The Secy. to the Govt of India, Secy

Sir,

In acknowledging
receipt of your letter N^o 1025
d/28 August 1884, I am
instructed to state that
His Excellency the Governor
in Council accepts the
proposals that the number

Recd: 12/12/84

OKd 19/9 Cir: 14/10

William Shank 1/9
Bellary 27.9.84

of warrants for the Madras
P.W. Dept. be fixed at
two-fifths of the total
number of Military
Upper Subordinates, any
fraction over one half
to give an additional
warrant.

2. The existing scale of
warrant officers for the
Madras P.W. Establishment
is as follows:—

Deputy Commissary	1
Assistant	1
Deputy Assistant	2
Conductors	7
Sub Conductors	10
	<u>21</u>

3. There are at present
fifty Military Upper
Subordinates in the Dept.,
including two Apprentice

3116.
3117/25

Overseers. In accordance
with the proposals made
by the Govt of India, the
number of warrants would
be fixed at twenty, and
the proportion of the several
grades would be as follows.

Deputy Commissary	1
Assistant	1
Deputy Asst.	1
Conductors	7
Sub Conductors	10
	<u>20</u>

23/ The effect upon the
Establishment would
therefore be a reduction
of one warrant in the
grade of Deputy Assistant
Commissary; and, to
mitigate hardship, I am

to suggest that this reduction be effected by the absorption of the third vacancy in the grade.

4. With reference to the proposal in para: 4 of your letter under reply, I am to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council has no objection to the amalgamation of the Madras list of warrant officers with those of Bengal and Bombay, inasmuch as, judging from the relative lengths of service on the warrant

31/6
31/7/26
officers of the I. W. Dept in this Presidency and of those in Bengal, the former, whose promotion has hitherto been comparatively slow, will apparently benefit thereby; whilst the rate of promotion of non-commissioned officers to the warrant rank will eventually be equalised for all ^{these} Presidencies. It is presumed that, should effect be given to this proposal, steps will be awarded in the order of seniority, provided always those to be

promoted have been
recommended by the
Department, and Military
authorities of their
respective Presidencies.

W.

12-12-84

W. C. C.

Circ: 12/12/84 R 18/1/84

3116
3117/27

25

26

22-11-07 ✓

7557

Govt. of (1884) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

(25)

22/12

Dated

Recd.

Encl. ✓

G.O., 18 Dec. 1884, No. 316

3119

Warrant Officers

Orders in letter from the foregoing
in the subject of the
proposals for improving
the state of the road
between the village of
the village of the village of

40
2

40
2

Warrant Officers

By order of the
Secretary to the
Public Works Department

19/12