

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 24
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 04-05-1990
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/9

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1378W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	16-5-1890	1990

1990

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

P. W. D.

1378

Office of the Consulting Architect to Govt.,

Chopauk, Madras,

1st April 1890.

No. 15

From

Henry Swin, Esq., C.I.C.,

Consulting Architect

to the Government of Madras,

To

The Secretary to

Government

Public Works Department

Sir,

Enclosures.

I have the honor with reference to
Fort Saint George Gazette of 18th March 1890, notifi-
cation of Transfers No. 633, to Enquire whether
it is intended that my designation of Consulting
Architect to Government of Madras is cancelled
or whether it is to be continued so far as I am
personally concerned. The designation of
Residency Architect merely applying to the
Officer who may hold Executive charge of the
Division.

2. I fear that the abolition of the
former designation if such is intended may
seriously affect my prospects with regard
to pension.

3. In order to avoid difficulties in
the future I am anxious that this matter
should

Don't copy for India

should be made plain and would request that
a reference be now made to the Government of
India Enquiring whether considering my
rank in the department, my service if
approved as Consulting Architect to the
Government of Madras (and as Presidency
Architect) will be considered as qualifying
me for the special additional Pension
mentioned in article 714 (a) and (b) Civil
Service Regulations, according to my rank
& service at the time of retirement.

When the Government of
Madras accepted the Government of India's
offer of my services as Consulting Architect
to Government, with promotion to Super-
intending Engineer permanent rank, I
fully understood that my prospects as
regards promotion and pension would
not be prejudicially affected, it could
hardly be intended that I should be a loser
in the shape of pension by the transfer.
But I fear that the transfer now made
and the change of designation may
probably cause a difficulty hereafter.

The Civil Service Regulations
special additional Pension, Article 714,
states that these may be allowed as rewards
of approved service in certain special
responsible positions.

Enclosed
for India

2/13/78
I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

Henry Druce
Consulting Architect
to Government

P. W. C. No. 3357 ✓
Public Works Department.

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to
Government
P. W. D.

No. 15

Dated

Received

1" } April 1890.
2

No. of ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Enquiring if the change
of the official designation
from the Consulting
Architect to Presidency
Architect will affect
Mr. Irvine's prospects

No. 1360 C of 13-2-1890
724 C of 10-2-1890
723 C of 10-2-1890

4
1378 P. W. D.
Letter from the Pres. Architect No 15 of 1-4-90
Chief Engineer's reply No 1827 C of 12-4-90.

Submitted to
the Hon Member in
accordance with
instructions given
in Council on 18-4-90.

It will be seen
from Article 714 (b) CSR
that the extra pension
of Rs 1000 per annum,
so far as regards the
P. W. Dept. is given
for three years after
providing service in
the rank of Suby.
Engineer, - not in
any particular
appointment.

Not according to the opinion of
the Act. Secy. in his report
on the application of Mr.
J. A. Jones. But this is

W.S.

W.S.

Mr. Irwin holds
the substantive rank
of Suptg. Engrs., and
his powers as such have
not been affected
by the change of
designation of his
appointment. In fact
the Govt. granted him
increased powers of
sanction up to Rs
2,500 after the change
of designation was
ordered. It is ~~at~~
submitted therefore
that his claim to the
additional pension
will be decided on
his service as a Suptg.
Engineer, and cannot
be affected by the
designation of the appo.
held by him.

The ~~change~~ decision
of the Govt. of India
in

The whole question is whether
service in the Architects appo.
will be considered service as
Suptg. Engineer.

Mr. Brannington was being
graded as a Suptg. Engr. &
not serving in an appo.
claimed as that of a Suptg.
Engineer was not eligible

for the extra pension.
Mr. Irwin has the rank & pay
of a Suptg. Engineer but not
to the Govt. Gen. that is not
sufficient. He must actually
serve as Suptg. Engr. which
he is not doing.

The point is a very doubtful
one, it is one which we cannot
decide, and one which vitally
affects Mr. Irwin.

The J. L. should not have
sent out memo No 182 of
his own bat.

I think it will have to
go to India, and also that
there is no advantage in
the change of designation when
many have the effect of pre-
judicing the status of the
appo. It would be just as
well to call the Govt. the
Govt. Arch. division as Pres.
Arch. Div.

W. B. B.

Case - vide G.O. No

140 W of 18.1.90 -

makes the point clear.
Mr. Brannington's claim
to the extra pension
was rejected because
he was not graded
as a Suptg. Engineer.

The matter
seemed so clear
that it was thought
unnecessary to submit
Mr. Irwin's question
for the orders of
Government.

Queer

23.4.90

1827cd/12.4.90. ✓

1360c " 13.3.90 ✓

724c " 10.2.90 ✓

713c " 10.2.90 ✓

G.O. no. 140W " 18.1.90 ✓

3529.30W " 11.12.89 ✓

1697W " 9.7.89 ✓

1729W " 14.7.89 ✓

2781W " 2.12.89 ✓

2277W " 1.10.89 ✓

1120.1W " 26.4.89 ✓

690W " 8.3.89 ✓

173.4W " 20.1.89 ✓

869W " 21.3.89 ✓

1256W " 22.5.88 ✓

1944W " 28.8.88 ✓

1908W " 3.8.85 ✓

789W " 31.3.85 ✓

568.9W " 11.3.85 ✓

1329W " 27.5.84 ✓

1729W " 14.7.81 ✓

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

111W " 16.1.90 B.

3266W " 12.11.89 B.

S.W. Department.

Note.

With reference to the Honorable Member's instruction on the enclosed note for orders, G.O. dated 10th April 1890, no. 291 Public, regarding Mr J. A. Jones' application, has been obtained and put up.

Several other papers respecting the terms on which the appointment of Consulting Architect was continued as a permanent arrangement on the retirement of Mr. Chisholm, have been obtained from Madras, and included in the file.

Not long after the issue of the orders granting the additional pensions of Rs. 200. and 1000 per annum to

+G.O. no. 1329Wd/27-5.84.

Chief and Supg. Engineers was
the question of Mr. Chisholm's
to the extra pension was
raised, vide Proceedings 568
-69 W dated 11th March 1885

The Govt. of India
said at first that it had
no power to grade him as
a Supg. Engineer, but that
certain correspondence was
going on with the Secretary
of State which might favour-
ably affect Mr. Chisholm's
prospects. A few months
afterwards it was intimated
that the Secretary of State
had admitted Mr. Chisholm
to the benefit of the additional
pension of Rs. 1000 per annum.

Reading these letters in
the light of para 2 of letter
from the Govt. of India
no. 527 G dated 11th March 1887,
it would appear that certain
officers of the P.W. Department,
Mr. Chisholm among the
number, who were drawing

* G.O. no. 789 W of 31st March 1885

* G.O. no. 869 W of 21st March 1887

2/1378

pay equivalent to that of Chief
and Supg. Engineers, were
admitted to the benefit of
the extra pensions.

The terms on which
the appointment of Consulting
Architect is at present held
are stated in the correspond-
ence printed with G.O. no.
1296 W dated 22nd May 1886,
viz. that it shall be open
to an officer of any rank
below that of Chief Engineer,
and should the officer
be a Supg. Engineer, or
should he rise during such
employment to the rank
of Supg. Engineer, he shall
be treated as supernumerary
to the ordinary establishment,
and receive promotion in
his turn. It will thus be
seen that the Govt. of India
clearly contemplated the
contingency of the post being
held by an officer in the
position of a Supg. Engineer,
and

inter alia, qualifying
for the additional pension.

not at all.

U.S.

It will further be seen
from the letter printed with
G.O. No. 1120 W dated 26th
April 1889, that in nominating
Mr. Irwin, the Govt. of India
stipulated that he should
be brought on the Madras
Establishment as a super-
numerary Supg. Engineer.
He now holds the substantive
rank of Supg. Engineer; ex-
ercises the powers of one
within his charge, and
was recently granted in-
creased powers of sanction
up to Rs 2500 as a Supg.
Engineer. There appears little
room to doubt that his
title to the extra pension
is unquestionable, supposing
him to fulfil the condition
of approved service.

The change in the designation
of the appointment recently
ordered, was made at
the

All the above argument is entirely
inconclusive, the terms of the rule
being what they are.

I hope & believe that India will
decide that Mr. Irwin remains
an Asst. Archt. & qualify for
the extra pension; but the point
is too doubtful for us to decide
as well as being a ^{complicated} ~~question~~
& too important to Mr. Irwin to
be handed over.

Let the question be referred to India
stating that all the arguments in
favor of the view held here

U.S.

Certainly not.

I suggested its being called
the Presidency Circle which
clearly maintains the position
as that of a Sup. Eng.

I assented with reluctance
to the proposal to call the Divn.
the Presd Architects Division
& Mr. Irwin the Presd Archt.

Then it should be changed in
a G.O. or Mr. Irwin's letter
to Comd Archt. & Comd Architects
Division.

U.S.

In sending on Mr. Irwin's
letter to India, the portions of it
relating to the change of designation
should be omitted.

It may be left to India to raise
this objection. When they do, we
can easily combat it. Or Mr.
Irwin can take it as a warning that
he had better ^{U.S.}
such a transfer.

the instance of
Member - Vide note on
No. 724 C dated 10th February
1890 - There appears to be
no objection to cancelling
the order, and restoring
the designation to the old
one of "Consulting Architect
to Government," so that
the distinctive character
of the appointment may
be maintained.

If desired by the
Honorable Member, the
Govt. of India will be
addressed with respect
to Mr. Irwin's claim to
the extra pension, but
this will perhaps be
unnecessary, if the change
of designation be can-
celled - Attention is also

invited to Article 995 Civil
Service Regulations.

Pueda

5.5.90
W.

Ca

Am.

Don't know

No 1378W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

9
1378

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 18th May 1890.

Read the following

From the Consulting Architect
to Government... (H.E. No 15 of April, '90)

* These are the original documents.
The file number is 723C
No 2 of 91360 C 2, 12-2-90.

240
12 May

On reconsideration,
His Excellency the Governor
in Council resolves to
cancel Gazette Notification
No 608 dated 11th Feb'y '90
para 1, and No 633 dated
18th March '90, altering
the designation of the
appointment and charge
of the Consulting Architect.
The officer holding the
appointment will, as
previously, be designated
the Consulting Architect
to Government, and his

charge the Consulting
Architect Division.

The question raised
by Mr. Inwin whether his
service in the appointment
will be regarded as
qualifying for the special
additional pensions granted
under article 714 Civil
Service Regs will be
referred to the Govt of
India.

H.E. No 1379 W. a/16 May 1890. The Consulting Architect to Govt
17/5

The Secy to the Govt of India,
P.W.D.

Sir,
I am directed to
forward extracts from a
letter No 15 dated 1st
April '90 to the Hon. Secy

10
1378

to this Government,
and to request a decision
on the question raised
by that officer whether
his service as Supt
Engineer in the appointment
of Consulting Architect
will be regarded as
qualifying for the special
additional pension
granted under article
714 Civil Service
Regulations.

2. The terms on which
the appointment of
Consulting Architect
to this Government was
continued as a permanent
measure on the retirement
of Mr. Chisholm, were

stated in your letter
No 1432 G dated
19th September 1885, viz
that ^{it} the appointment
should be open to
any officer below the
rank of Chief Engineer
Engineer, and it was thus
clearly contemplated
that the appointment
might carry with it
the position of a
Suptg Engineer. According
to Article 714 Civil
Service Regs, the
additional pension
of the 1000 per annum
is admissible to any
officer who may render
three years approved

11
1378

service as a Suptg
Engineer, and this Govt
has therefore no reason
to doubt that Mr. Irwin's
claim to the extra pension
will be recognised
supposing him to fulfil
the condition of three
years approved service.
As however the question
is one of great impor-
tance to Mr. Irwin,
it is desirable to
have a definite ruling
on the point.

3. Under the terms
of your letter No 905 G
d/27th March 89, Mr.
Irwin was brought on the
Madras establishment

with the substantiated
rank of Suptg Engineer.
He exercises the powers
of that rank within
his charge, which since
the transfer of Military
Works at Madras
to the Military Works
Dept., includes all
civil works at the
Residency Town, and
owing to this extension
of his charge he was
recently granted
increased powers of
sanction up to a
limit of Rs 2500 under
para 67 (b) Chapter
II G.O. Public Works

12
1378

4. In your letter No.
44 G dated 8th January
'90, Mr. Brassington's
claim to the extra pension
was negatived because
he was not graded as
a Suptg Engineer, but
this disqualification
will not, it is presumed,
apply to an officer
holding the appointment
of Consulting Architect
with the rank of
Suptg Engineer.

5. The favor of an
early reply is requested.

17/5 1900
P. 10/10.5.90
P. 10/10.5.90

On

10-4-11✓

[Faint handwritten mark]

[Faint handwritten mark]
11-5-90

[Faint handwritten text]
copy
for the president

No. 1378 - 9W. 4/16 May 1890.

Note - after some delay
returned to date to avoid
reply from Gov. The
file has been returned
as not.

[Faint handwritten mark]
11-5-90

Return to
copy - 30-5-90
[Faint handwritten mark]

9/20/5