

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை: 8  
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்: 9/12/0  
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்: 10/12/0

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

(135)

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P-W-D துறை

|                                       |           |                  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| அரசாணை எண்.<br>மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். | 1075      | அச்சகம்<br>பலவகை |
| நாள் :                                | 18-4-1891 | 198              |

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

21/12

4. Sheets

சூ.க.க. 1-18,008-15-8-87.

P. W. D.

Office of the Consulting Architect to Govt.,

Chepauk, Madras,

2<sup>d</sup> April 1891.

No. 32

From

Henry Swin, Esq., C.S.E.,

Consulting Architect

to the Government of Madras,

To

The Chief Engineer

Public Works Department.

Sir,

Enclosures.

With reference to the appointments notified in the Fort Saint George Gazette of March 10<sup>th</sup> page 169, I have the honor to represent that I think that I am entitled to temporary promotion to the same class (Chief Engineer 2<sup>d</sup> Class) as Colonel A. C. Smith M. A. in as much as I am entitled to promotion, *pari passu*, with the officers of the same rank in the list. Independent of additional pay the temporary promotion for 3 months is a matter of the greatest importance to me, as it may materially affect my service for the highest rate of pension. Besides which my claims to future promotion will be seriously prejudiced if I am not promoted now as well as the effect of my own standing. I venture to hope that Government will favourably

Consider my claims now put forward.

I have the honor to be  
Sir

Your most obedient servant

Henry Bruce  
Consulting Architect  
to Governments.

1025  
2

Public Works Department.

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer  
P. W. D.

No. 32

Dated

Received

2<sup>d</sup> } April 1891.

No. of ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Requesting to consider  
favourably the claims  
of Mr. Irwin Esq. for  
temporary promotion.  
(Chief Engineer 2<sup>d</sup> Class)

111 May 16-1-90

3266 May 18-11-89

1120-21 May 26-4-89

1296 May 22-5-88

copy 4-4-91 12.4.91

1075/3

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:—

From the Consulting Architect to Govt. No 32 of  
2<sup>d</sup> April 1891

FOR ORDERS.

It is quite clear from the papers read  
in G.O. 22 May 1888 No 1296 W. that  
the post of Consulting Architect is  
sanctioned as open only to officers  
below the rank of Chief Engineer, and  
therefore the special arrangement  
that Mr. Irwin should receive promo-  
tion bona passu with the men of  
his rank must be limited by the  
General sanction & restricted to the  
Grade of Sup. Engineer. His request  
to be promoted to the rank of  
Chief Engineer must I think be  
rejected.

W  
7 Apr

The undersigned  
would be exceedingly  
glad if the promotion  
asked for could be given  
to Mr. Irwin, whose  
talents and good service  
deserve every considera-  
tion, but it is questionable  
whether under the terms  
of the decision conveyed  
in G.O. No 1296 W of 22<sup>nd</sup>  
May 1886 such promotion  
can be given without the  
special sanction of the  
Secretary of State; the  
undersigned does not  
think that it can.

2-

2. The undersigned is not quite sure whether this note should not go direct to H.B. the Governor, as it refers to a question of promotion, but the Honble Members will probably wish to take on the question of the interpretation to be given to the rule under which Mr. Irwin was appointed.

H. M.  
18/4/91

This only questions of nomination or election of officers for promotion or for particular posts which are vacant for H.B. the Govt. This is unconnected with a case.

Res  
7 Apr

What in  
office order  
18/4/91

In case of 2 & 1 R 14/11

L

W.  
4.9

11  
32  
11  
12  
1  
18/4/91  
16/4/91  
16/4/91

18/4/91

B  
From order  
C No 3897

No. 1075 W/ 18 April 1891

1075  
18

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that it is clear from the papers recorded with G.O. No 1296 W dated 22<sup>d</sup> May 1886 that the post of Consulting Architect is sanctioned as open only to officers below the rank of Chief Engineer, and therefore the special arrangement that Mr. Irwin should receive promotion pari passu with officers of his rank must be limited by the general sanction and restricted to the grade of Superintending Engineer. Mr. Irwin's request to be now promoted to the rank of Chief Engineer is

accordingly inadmissible

A.C.

18.16.4/01

12-4-11 ✓

*[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side]*

E.H.

No. 1075 Wap 18 April 1891

(18)

W.C. 10/4  
W.C. 14.11  
W.C. 16.11  
W.C. 16.11

To the Consulting Architect  
18.16.4/01  
12/4