

No 1340 .G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Dated Simla, July 14, 1887.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 574W., dated 25th February, in which you bring to notice the serious hardships suffered by the military subordinates of the Madras Public Works Department, owing to the present block in the warrant grades, and recommend as a remedy for this state of things that the number of warrants should be temporarily increased.

2. It is observed that the number of military men in the Madras Upper Subordinate establishment is under 50, and that the number of warrants is 21, being therefore more than $\frac{2}{3}$ ths of the whole number. The scale of warrants on the Government of India list is $\frac{2}{3}$ ths of the whole number only. It is proposed to increase the number of Madras warrants by 7 to be absorbed on the occurrence of every third vacancy. The principal ground put forward for this measure is the comparatively low rank held by the sergeants and warrant officers in the Public Works Department to that held by men in the Military Departments and in the other lists of the Public Works Department.

3. After full consideration of the matter the Government of India cannot admit that there are sufficient grounds for such a measure of relief as that proposed. It is impossible to provide that the rate of military promotions should be the same on all lists, especially when the system under which promotions are made differ, being made in one, as in the Madras list, according to military service, and in another, as in the Government of India list, according to service in the Department. Moreover in regard to the military men of the Public Works Department the slowness of military promotion is considerably alleviated by the rule which makes their pay depend almost entirely on their departmental grading, so that they can in no case draw less than their civilian contemporaries.

4. It is observed that the case of Sergeant Temple is specially brought forward in paragraph 15 of Colonel Hasted's note as a hard one, on the ground that after 16 years departmental service he has not yet reached the warrant grade and that he cannot reach it till 1893. This is due, it is supposed, to Sergeant Temple being comparatively junior in military rank. As however he is about 26th on the list arranged in order of appointment to Department, his case does not appear harder than that of others. It is observed for instance that there are three sergeants who have more departmental service than Deputy Commissary Jackson who is at the head of the warrant list, and will have held that position for 10 years when he retires in 1890, although reckoning by date of appointment to the Department he is only 24th on the list. Again, Deputy Assistant Commissary Falvey is, it is observed, 3rd on the Warrant List, while in date of appointment to Department he is 16th.

5. So long as the rule of promotion to the warrant grade by military seniority alone is maintained, the position must be accepted that men of long service in the Department will be superseded by men of comparatively short service,

PWC No 5796

2

with longer service as soldiers; and the Government of India cannot undertake to provide a remedy for hardship inflicted by this state of things. In regard to salary as already observed the hardship inflicted by the supersession of men departmentally senior is to a great extent neutralised by the rule that not less than the civil consolidated salaries can be drawn. In regard to pension the supersession bears, it is acknowledged, more hardly on the men concerned, the result being that men of long departmental service draw considerably less than the pensions drawn by civilians of the same standing, while those with short departmental service draw more.

6. I am to say therefore that nothing can be done for the relief of the present establishment. I am however to recommend that in future promotions to the warrant grade be made by departmental instead of by military seniority, on the system applicable to the Government of India list, as described in this office No. 82 G., dated 15th January 1885; care being however taken to provide that legitimate claims under the present system are secured. Secondly, I am to point out that unless the recruitment of the establishment is regular it is impossible to secure a regular flow of promotion such as would enable men to reach the highest ranks before retirement and secure an adequate pension: and so long as men of long military service can enter the Department and in a few years rise to the highest grades, regular recruitment and regular promotion are impossible.

I have the honor to be

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

RMB Secretary

Colonel, R.E.,

Secy. to the Government of India.

50. 573. 4 Waf 25. 2. 87
 1664 W. 21. 6. 87
 573 W. 25. 2. 87
 3462 C. 6. 10. 86
 3122 C. 15. 9. 86
 2357 C. 2. 7. 86
 2757 W. 17. 11. 85
 649 W. 25. 9. 85
 1274 W. 26. 5. 84
 1006 W. 18. 4. 84
 44 C. 26. 3. 84
 3058 W. 18. 11. 82
 058 W. 18. 11. 82
 22 W. 9. 5. 82
 7. 15. 7. 76
 186. 26. 8. 75
 72. 10. 11. 75
 1082. 28. 4. 74
 9. 2. 9. 76
 16. 5. 6. 76
 150. 11. 12. 10. 87
 25. 7. 87
 25. 7. 87
 25. 7. 87

C. C. B. Press, Simla. — No. 332 P. W. D. — 15-7-87. — 101.

5796

Letter from G. B. J. No 13409
 of 14. 7. 87.

Low

The question of promoting military Subordinates in mil. rank according to departmental, instead of military service, was discussed in the previous papers —

Proposed to call for the file from Madras. It will, if approved, be submitted to you, with a note, on your return from town. There is no urgency in the case.

Cir 23. 7. 87

Clair. Herewith file
 Approved
 23. 7. 87
 23. 7. 87

Letter from the Govt. of India
 No 13409 of 14. 7. 87.

Low

In this letter, the Govt. of India decline to sanction the proposals of this Govt. with respect to remedying the blocks in military promotion among military upper Subordinates of the Dept.

2. This is just what was expected —
3. The G. B. J. attribute the blocks to the system in force in this Presidency under which military promotion goes entirely by military seniority. The connection is not quite apparent, for the blocks is due to the dearth of vacancies for several years past.

The retirement of the senior
Warrant Officers is regulated
by the 33 years order - Lieut
Plummer will be the first,
for some time, to reach that
age in Deer West, & if we
do not have vacancies from
other causes, it will be
1890 before other warrant
officers attain that age. It
is difficult to see how
promotion would have
run better if ~~the~~ length
of departmental service
~~had~~ ^{military} regulated promotion.

The Govt. of India system
is that length of departmental
service regulates promotion
to the rank of Sub-Collector,
after that it goes by
seniority in military rank.

4. In para 3 of their
letter, the G. of I. say that
on the Madras list promotion
is made according to military
service, and again in para
5 they observe that promotion

to the warrant grade by
military seniority alone
is maintained". These
statements are not strictly
accurate, as will be seen
from a perusal of P.W. Code
paras 711 and 712. The former
says "All selection for promotion
from sergeant to Sub-Collector
will as a rule be made ac-
cording to merit" - and the latter
says "Recommendations for
promotion from sergeant to
Sub-Collector will not be
based on professional
efficiency alone, which is
separately recorded by
departmental promotion,
but on general respectability
of conduct irrespective of
educational or other qualifications". The Madras
system is therefore essentially
one of selection, where
a vacancy occurs in the
rank of Sub-Collector,
it is open to the Govt. to
select a man from

the whole body of ~~sergeants~~
sergeants to fill the vacancy.

5. When such a vacancy occurs, the usual plan is to circulate a note for orders, giving a complete list⁺ of Sergeants of the Dept, & saying a few words as to the character of the top three or four men. The first man on the list is not necessarily selected, but Ceteris paribus, the step would be given to the senior man.

6. As examples of this reasoning, the Govt of India quote the case of Capt Jackson, who is 24th on the list of ~~senior~~ military men, according to ~~length~~ length of departmental service, while he is first on the list in military rank. Also that of Lieut Talver, who though 3rd on the list in military rank, is 26th

+ arranged according to length of military service.

according to departmental service. These two cases are however exceptional. Capt Jackson attained the rank of Conductor in the Sappers in 1863, & he entered the Dept in 1872 with 9 years service in that rank. In consideration of his standing in the Sappers, he joined the P.W. Dept as a Sub-Engineer 3rd grade. Neither his military nor departmental rank was, or could have been, regulated by departmental service. Lieut. Talver joined the Dept in 1870, with twelve years military service, and nearly ten years service as a Supt. of Sappers. He could scarcely have been placed below his juniors in military rank.

7. The Govt of India recommend that in future promotions

the promotions to the warrant-
grade in Madras be made
by departmental instead
of by military seniority,
on the system described
in their letter No 82 of 27
15th January 1885. In the
letter in question, the system
is thus described; — "Steps
"are given in the estate under
"the Govt of India from Sergeant
"to Sub Conductor from among
"men recommended according
"to seniority. By seniority
"is meant departmental
"seniority. The College students
"fresh year who enter the
"depo on the same date
"after their year of practical
"training, are given seniority
"according to their standing
"in the final examination
"at the College". "Within the range of warrant men, promotion is given by
"pure seniority as much, provided no
"adverse report is received".

* See file attached to
No 3964 of 17-2-85.

8. When the G. P. D. wrote
their letter of June 1885, it
was in contemplation
to place the military

men of the P. W. D. in all three
Presidencies on one roster
for military promotion, and
replying to the Govt of India,
it was
~~this report~~ stated that should
the amalgamation be carried
out, this Govt. would not
withhold their assent to
the G. P. D. system of promotion
being applied to the Madras
military men. The proposed
amalgamation however
fell through, matters
remained in status quo
as regards the system of
promotion in Madras.

9. It now remains for
consideration whether the
G. P. D. system of promotion
shall be adopted instead
of the system described
in paras 4 & 5 of this note.
In recommending the
adoption of their system,
the G. P. D. say that care
should be taken to secure
legitimate claims under

the present system. This no doubt would be done - the military men of the Dept are now recruited, it may be said, entirely from the College, & there would be no great difficulty in applying the G. P. S. system to future admissions. There may be cases of appointment under paras 96 (second part) 100 & 107 of the Code, and if such men come into the Dept with superior military rank, their cases would probably have to be treated exceptionally.

10 - Should it be decided to adopt the G. P. S. system, the following points will require consideration, vide G. P. S. letter No 82 G. P. S. 1. 85 - "The restriction that promotion to Dy. Asst. Commissioner is given only to subordinates who have reached the rank of Sub Engineer (under P. W. Code para 711) is not observed

* It is especially necessary that the recommendation for the promotion of Subordinate to the Commission grade should be confined to warrant officers on whom the Conference of an honorary Commission would not be an incongruity."

This seems somewhat paradoxical!

Cu

"observed by the G. P. India"
"The sentence also in para 712 quoted in the margin, which originally appeared in the orders of the G. P. S., has been expunged from the ~~under~~ P. W. Code at the instance of the military Dept. - nor are Conductors ever passed over on the ground of professional disqualification, as though they are made Asst. Engg. on social grounds (i.e. to avoid the incongruity of a Commissioned Officer serving as a departmental subordinate) there need not be any change of duty"

11. If the G. P. S. system of promotion from sergeant to Sub Conductor be adopted, it is a question whether the changes above indicated shall be introduced into the under P. W. Code, with respect to the higher

the ranks.
12. ~~As~~ with respect to
the present block in promotion,
apparently nothing more
can be done - If we have
no vacancies ~~other~~ for some
years, other than under
the 55 years rule, there
will be one retirement
in Dec^r next, and two
in 1890, but the block
will not be effectually
removed until 1893, when
there will be quite a run
of retirements - There was
some correspondence lately
about Capt. Jackson's
retirement papers being
sent in, but it is under-
stood that he has changed
his mind about going
immediately.

13. In para 3 of their
present letter, the G. B. S.
say they have given the
matter "full consideration"
and

+ In reality he is 25th.

and yet their para 4, in
which they review Serjt. Temple's
case, shows how cursorily
they have read the Ch. Engr's
note forwarded with this
dept letter no 574 W of
25.2.87. The G. B. S. say
that Serjt. Temple's case
is specially brought forward
as a hard one on the ground
that after 16 years departmental
service he has not yet
reached the warrant grade,
+ yet further on they say
that as he is about 26th
in order of ppt. to the depts
his case does not appear
harder than that of others.

Now, as a matter of fact,
Serjt. Temple will not
have 16 years departmental
service until 1890 - The
point specially brought
to notice in the Chief
Engr's note was that
Serjt. Temple had had
eleven years service in
the rank of Serjtant,
and

and that he had had only
one step of promotion in
military rank during 16
years service as a
non-commissioned officer.

14. This however does not
affect the main points, which
are that the G. P. D. decline
to sanction the remedial
measures recommended
by this Govt, & that they
suggest the adoption of
their own system of
promotion from Sergeant
to Subconductor.

In order.

Cu
24.8.87

note

Blocks in military promotion
among military officers & soldiers
of the P.W.D.

I do not see anything else done
to benefit the G. P. D. decision
to send the letter - but I will answer
any remarks C.A.W. & D.W. may
make on this after passing the
letter.

Note submitted through
B.W. R.P.
12.10.87

Statement A

Names.	Date of Birth for compulsory retirement.	Date of enlistment	Date of promotion to Sergeant.	Date of appointment to P.W.D.	Departmental Rank.
1. Webb H.	23 April 44	20 July 63.	8 Sept 71	Sept 70	Supervisor 2 nd Grade.
2 Macalister R.W.	31 Jan 49	31 Jan 67	25 June 72	June 71	do 1 st do
3 Patton J.E.	18 Jan 50	17 Jan 68	26 Nov 72	December 71.	do 1 st do.
4 Mlyett J.H.	10 Sept 53	9 June 69	24 Nov 73	October 81	do 2 nd do
5 Green, J. RE.	7 Nov 50.	5 April 70	1 Jan 75	August 76.	do 2 nd do
6 Smith, C. RE	14 May 52	12 Aug 71	1 June 76	August 76.	do 1 st do.
7 Temple, A.	15 Aug 46	14 Dec 68	24 June 75	June 74.	do 1 st do.
8 Macintosh D RE.	7 June 48	4 July 68	1 Nov 75	August 76	do 1 st do
9 Humbley J. RE.	1 April 37	31 Dec 58.	1 Feb 76.	August 76.	do 1 st do
10 Nealy, R.J.	17 October 50	16 July 69	1 Nov 76.	June 74.	Overseer 1 st do.
11 Cope, E.	13 Sept 48	11 Sept 67	24 Sept 77	August 72	Supervisor 1 st do.
12 Ainley, S.	23 Sept 46	21 Sept 71	1 Jan 79	September 76	do 2 nd do.
13 Joyce J.S.	11 Dec 46	11 Dec 66	9 Dec 81	24 Sept 74.	Foreman, Mechanics.
14 Donaghue, L.	8 July 56.	7 July 75	1 Nov 82	October 81	Supervisor 2 nd Grade
15 Slaney, H.	12 July 51.	11 July 72	1 Nov 82	October 81.	do 2 nd do
16 Kearne, S.	14 Feb 58	12 March 72	6 Feb 83	6 Feb 83.	Overseer 1 st do.
17 Cherry J.	14 March 58	13 March 76	12 July 83	12 July 82	Supervisor 2 nd do.
18 Blake, J.G.	1 March 50	30 May 65	12 July 83	12 July 82	Overseer 1 st do.
19 Rule, W.	2 Oct 56	1 July 74.	26 June 84.	26 June 83	do 1 st do.
20 Turner, Thos.	11 Feb 56.	10 Feb 75	26 June 84.	26 June 83.	do 1 st do
~~Donaghue, Alex~~	~~11 June 58.~~	~~9 July 77~~	~~20 June 84.~~	~~20 June 83.~~	~~Removal 1st do.~~
21 Alford, J.	18 March 60	16 Sept 74.	9 July 84.	10 July 84.	do 1 st do
22 Coghlan, C.	19 April 59	19 Oct 77	1 July 86.	July 84.	do 1 st do.
23 Huson, E.	8 Dec 57	7 June 79	8 July 86	8 July 85	do 1 st do
24 Lewis, W.	5 Dec 57	7 April 79	16 July 86.	16 July 85	do 1 st do.

Statement B.

Names.	Date of Birth for compulsory retirement.	Date of enlistment	Date of promotion to Sergeant	Date of Appointment to P.W.D.	Departmental Rank.
1. Webb H.	23 April 44	20 July 63	8 Sept 71	Sept 70.	Supervisor. 2 nd Grade
2. MacAlister R.W.	31 Jan'y 49	31 Jan'y 67	25 June 72	June 71	do 1 st do
3. Patton J.E.	18 Jan'y 50	17 Jan'y 68	26 Nov 72	Dec 71	do 1 st do
4. Cope, E.	13 Sept 48	11 Sept 67	24 Sept 77	Aug 72	do 1 st do
5. Temple A.	15 Aug 46	14 Dec 68	24 June 75	June 74.	do 1 st do
6. Healy R.T.	17 Oct 50	16 July 69	1 Nov 76	June 74	Quartermaster 1 st do.
7. Joyce J.S.	11 Dec 46	11 Dec 66	9 Dec 81	24 Sept 74.	Foreman Mechanics
8. Macintosh D. RE.	7 June 48	4 July 68	1 Nov 75.	Aug 76.	Supervisor 1 st Grade
9. Humbly F. RE.	1 st April 37	31 Dec 58	1 Feb 76.	Aug 76.	do 1 st do
10. Smith C. RE.	14 May 52	12 Aug 71	1 June 75.	Aug 76.	do 1 st do
11. Green J. RE.	7 Nov 50	5 April 70	1 Jan'y 75.	Aug 76.	do 2 nd do.
12. Kinley S.	23 Sept 46	21 Sept 71	1 Jan'y 79	Sept 76	do 2 nd do.
13. Ulyett J.H.	10 Sept 53	9 June 69	2 Nov 73.	Oct 81.	do 2 nd do.
14. Donaghue d.	8 July 56	7 July 75	1 Nov 82	Oct 81.	do 2 nd do.
15. Slaney H.	12 July 51	11 July 72	1 Nov 82	Oct 81.	do 2 nd do.
16. Cherry J.	14 March 58	13 March 76	12 July 83	12 July 82	do 2 nd do.
17. Blake J.G.	1 March 50	30 May 65	12 July 83.	12 July 82	Quartermaster 1 st do.
18. Kearne P.	14 Feb 58	12 March 72	6 Feb 83.	6 Feb 83.	do 1 st do.
19. Rule Wm	2 Oct 56.	1 st July 74.	26 June 84.	26 June 83.	do 1 st do
20. Turner Thos.	11 Feb 56.	10 Feb 75	26 June 84.	26 June 83.	do 1 st do.
~~Donaghue Alec.~~	~~11 June 58~~	~~9 July 77~~	~~30 June 84.~~	~~30 June 83~~	~~Revised 1st do.~~
21. Alford J.	18 March 60	16 Sept 74.	9 July 84.	10 July 84	do 1 st do.
22. Coghlan C.	19 April 59	19 Oct 77	1 July 86	July 84	do 1 st do
23. Huson E.	8 Dec 57	7 June 79	8 July 86.	8 July 85	do 1 st do
24. Lewis W.	5 Dec 57	7 April 79	16 July 86.	16 July 85.	do 1 st do.

Year	Month	Day	Event
1880	Jan	1	Birth of John
1881	Feb	15	Death of Mary
1882	Mar	10	Marriage of John & Mary
1883	Apr	25	Birth of John
1884	May	10	Death of Mary
1885	Jun	15	Marriage of John & Mary
1886	Jul	1	Birth of John
1887	Aug	15	Death of Mary
1888	Sep	10	Marriage of John & Mary
1889	Oct	25	Birth of John
1890	Nov	10	Death of Mary
1891	Dec	15	Marriage of John & Mary
1892	Jan	1	Birth of John
1893	Feb	15	Death of Mary
1894	Mar	10	Marriage of John & Mary
1895	Apr	25	Birth of John
1896	May	10	Death of Mary
1897	Jun	15	Marriage of John & Mary
1898	Jul	1	Birth of John
1899	Aug	15	Death of Mary
1900	Sep	10	Marriage of John & Mary

W. deniro.

Promotion in military rank of military upper subordinates of the Dept

10W.

I have now had
three statements prepared -

Statement A. Shows
the present seniority list
of all the Sergeants of the
Dept. for promotion to
Sub Conductor - i.e. ac-
cording to date of pro-
motion to Sergeant.

Statement B shows
how they would stand
if arranged according
to date of app't. to the Dept,
i.e. the plan advocated
by the Govt. of India.

The men who would
gain or lose places by the
adoption of the S. & D. system
are as follows -

Gain —

Cope - 7 places
Temple - 2 places
Healy - 4 places
Joyce - 6 places
Cherry - 1 place
Blaise - 1 place

Loss

C. Smith - 2 places
Green - 6 places
Wright - 9 places
Deane - 2 places

all the rest would stand
as they are -

Webb stands at the top
in both lists, but he has been
"not recommended" for departmental
promotion, & would probably
be passed over for military
promotion -

With either system, only
"recommended" men would
be selected for promotion
to warrant rank -

Statement C shows
how our men would stand
if a fixed scale of warrants
be done away with, & pro-
motion according to average
service in ~~the~~ the order &
Comm. depts. be adopted.
This would give immediate
promotion to a large
number of men, & the extra
cost would be, as shown
in the statement, Rs 31,929
per annum - It does not
seem at all likely that
the Govt. of India would
sanction the measure.

C
15.9.87

Circ. 2-12-87 R. 6-12-87

To W
through B.W.

Note

Military promotion of Upper Subordinates.

In continuation of the
note prepared by S.W. it may
be observed that the adoption
of the system of promotion
recommended by the Govt.
of India will not meet the
difficulty of the block. It
will only substitute one
man for another; and
so far as the present state
of things is concerned its
advantages over the Madras
system are doubtful. It
may be urged that in a
Civil Dept. like the Public
Works, departmental seniority
should carry more weight
than Military standing. To
this it can be replied that
departmental service is
rewarded by departmental
promotion, and that the
legitimate ^{only} ground on which
Military promotion can be
given in a Civil Dept is
length of service in the
Military grades.

The Govt. of India do
not see their way to sanctioning
an exceptional remedy.

for the present block, and it
can be met in no other way.
The block will probably last
till 1893. Meanwhile there
will be one ago vacancy in
December next, and two
vacancies in 1890.

It would afford some
relief if the length of service
qualifying for promotion
from Sergeant to Subconductors
were fixed at, say, 7 years,
without reference to vacancies.
This is a little above the
actual average service in
other Depts. holding warrants,
but it is feared that the
proposal, involving, as it does,
immediate extra expense,
is not likely to find more
favor with the Govt of India
than that already rejected.

Wherever there is a
fixed scale, blocks of pro-
motion must, necessarily, at
times occur, and there seems
no help for it but to accept
the position if the ruling
authority cannot be induced
to apply an exceptional remedy.

The hardship in the
present case is entirely in
the matter of retiring pensions.
but all grades do not suffer
alike. A Conductor Super-
visor ^{2^d grade} retires on a larger
pension than a ^{1st} Clerk or
Supervisor, and a Sub. Con-

+ Rs 85

+ Rs 75

40

Rs 70

& Rs 50

Subconductors Overseers 1st
grade would draw more than
a Clerk of the same grade

As regards pay, while
in the Dept. the Military
Upper Subordinate is, as a
rule, much better off than
the Clerk. He joins in the
1st grade of Overseer, thereby
surpassing all the 2^d & 3^d
grades in the ^{he} Dept. and gets the
staff salary of his grade in
addition to the pay and
allowances of his Military
Rank. These advantages
are not inconsiderable. &
should, it is thought, be
taken as a set off against
the smaller pension

R.S.
12-4-87

Under the circumstances,
it will be better not to make
any change in the present
system of promotion of Assistant
Officers in the P.W.D. -

W.C.M.
17.10.87

The letter may be seconded &
sent with these notes to the Secy. for
reference.

Secy
1/12/87

Military promotion
of Upper Subordinates

Public Works Dept.

Read letter from the Govt of India No: 1340 G. dt
16 July 1887.

Order thereon No. 33450
dt 6th December 87.

PFH
4 Dec

Recorded.

File
2/12/87

I have read the notes. Naturally
I find some difficulty in understanding
all the bearings of the question but
it is obvious nothing can now be
done. The point does not seem to
be touched on & that is the suggestion
that soldiers of long military service
be allowed to enter the Dept
either very sparingly or not at all.
This might be borne in mind.

Note

Attention is invited to
the accompanying office
notes in which the question
of military promotion of
Upper Subordinates is fully
discussed.

Let me have to know
for Council.

Explains letter by the
Govt.

Note

The matter is outside the office
note dt 8. 87. prob. The cases
were quite exceptional.

C.S.

1894

25 10 ay ✓

1890 18-1-94

3345 way 6th Decr/87

2/12

4712

Jan 1898

12-87 P. 6-12-87