(1) Number of pages 29 58

(2) Date of repair 6/91

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 2946 - 2947 Press.
B.P. No: Mis.

Overseer P

Dated 15.11.1893 198 .

be folded or roughly handled

1--10,006 1 -80.

depend in law, it seems
hard that I should punish
them depend on it & it
does not always follow
that a man has not reached
the limit of his earning
capacity time in question
by reducing.
There may be some special
reason of this description
in my case. But in my
opinion it should be withdrawn
I also think that the
decision referred to by the pet
964 quoted in Bk 9th
shows the expression & has
been one of the Judges
Judgt.
I should therefore propose
to allow to Madan notice
& regard pending the
hearing and decide Judgt
upon in the respects.
I should in the issues Qus
in Para. 3 of this Petn
letter No 3117 a. 18.1.84
can be accepted, as affidavits

the Chief Engineer

Crews can be included
in the Holiday Allowance
& in para 3 last sent
of clause (1) of No 814 of
15-1-85 for S. & G.
& - Hands that attended
can not be included among
Holiday Attendance

Sd

the Chief Engineer

Ep 29460-43
15-11-43

Cus 9106

CN 29749
05 14

Dear

In this letter the C-in-C invites the Province to place the services of one officer of the Prov. mil. for the Province of Natal & Zanzibar on one roster for promotion.

His explains the recent telegram from India requesting that military promotions via Lieuts. Comm. & Sailors might be deferred.

The present scale of warrant for the under Prov. is as follows —

Dy. Comm — 1
Asst Comm — 1
Dy. Asst. Comm — 2
Conductor — 7
Subconductor — 10
Total 21

His Excellency the Chief Engineer

find in Rep. No. 1114 of
7/10.5.90 & the case
remained unchanged.

In its letter in re:
Conduct in Rep. No. 364 of
7/10.2.81, the G.P.S. points
out that the relative
strength of armies
in the Indian Prov. was
higher than in pri-
mary Cant. & pro-
posed to reduce the
proportion to one-third
of the whole actual &
military subordinate
under 6 Indian
only 36, & the num-
ber of armies was
then reduced to 12.
In letter No. 366 of 10.2.81
the purpose was ac-
cepted, but as no fur-
ther orders were
issued from India.
& no change was
made -

Brooke the
subject was again
brought forward
by Retd in its

letter printed with Sp.
No. 3116 W 7 18.12.84,
when it was proposed
to fix the proportion of
warrants at two-fifths
of the total number of
soldiers whose salaries
were at the same
time reported that
the then Government of
India. orders
of 1890 should
be passed on in one
sorter for promotion.
These proposals
were accepted in letter
No. 3117 W 7 18.12.84 -

In a further ref
from India No. 88 & 7
15.1.85 (vide Govt
notice 396 W 7 17.2.85)
it was pointed out
that there were some
points of difference
in the procedure
adopted by India &
ours in the matter
of military function,
the chief one being that
in India function for
Scrip to Sea Cus-

the Chief engine

was given by departmental
seniority, while in under
it was given by selection
seniority, & it was
reported that the dis-
practice should be
adopted here. This
was agreed to in letter
No 396 W dt 17-2-85, on
the understanding that
the proposed analga-
tion was carried
out.

In letter No
1066 E dt 16.10.85, the
Govt. intimated that
the Secy. of State had
agreed to the proposal
to fix the proportion
of warrants at ½ of
the total number of
civilians men, but
that as the Govt. of
Bombay had declined
to accept the manner,
the proposed analga-
mation could not
be carried out.

His Govt. had
agreed to the proposal
to cancel orders and

standing that the analga-
mation would be carried
out, & as the new pro-
portion would reduce
the number of warrants
from 21 to 18, the G.O.I.
was informed in letter
No 2853 W dt 1-12-85
that the Govt. withdrew
its acceptance.

In reply to this,
the G.O.I. said in letter
No 107 G dt 17-1-86
that the Madras Warrant-
establt. could be
continued on the
same footing as
before.

In its present
letter, the G.O.I. again
point out that the
Madras Warrant establt.
is now quite out of
proportion to the under
civilian subordinates,
the percentage here being
5-6-7 against 42-4 on
the Bombay list, &

the Chief engineer

that if the authorised proportion of 2/5th be adopted the number of warrants cannot be reduced to 15. Should the 2-f.s. offer the alternative of serving the Military Secretariat on a combined scale for all India.

Since the commencement of 1886, the Indian Code has superseded the numerous Circulars, resulting generally favourably to the Indian profession, while there is little doubt that the Indian profession is unfavourably affected in matters of promotion (Govt. of India Resolution dated 1-3-1873).

There appears to be no objection whatever to accepting Indian's offer to combine the three lists, while measures will doubtless be adopted to secure fairness to Indians resulting from the amalgamation in the

fair effect to the proposed reduction in the number of warrants.

Some of the Indian men will probably not receive their promotion while they are now expecting it, as Sanderson & Nicholson, for as far as I can make out, rank first. The former is senior to the two last on the Indian list, while one on the Bombay list, the other on the Bengal list. The senior Indian list is senior to the Bombay list. The senior combatant on the Indian list is junior to seven combatants on the Bombay list & to two on the Bengal list. The senior Indian list is senior to three on the Bengal list & to one on the Bombay list. The senior Indian list is junior to two on the Bombay list & to one on the Bengal list.

the Chief Engineer

(5)

to 5 Selectors outside
Indian list and on
the municipal list. Our
Sergeants will however
benefit, for pre-
ference to Sergeants on
leave to the serving
in India generally.
After holders of
Ward certificates
who are vaccinated
more age vaccinia on
the London list until
the age of
in '97, when
only one, Sapper
will be some
until '99 -
Indian list on the
be a number of
returned in 1894,
& the prospects of
promotion between
one will be very
be improved by
Sept on this coming
on a Corps Selection
list.

If Indian
proposal be accepted, it will be
necessary to amend

formed annually
the recommendation roll
of Sergeant Instructors
in para 35 Chap V
Regs.

Inorders.

CR
1/11/93

the Chief Engineer

Cir 9226

3846
8

D.W.

Scale of Warrant-Officers of the Madras P.W. Depts.

In their letter, the G. of I. state that the measures indicated in their letter No 1025 dy 28.8.22, for regulating the promotion of military upper subordinate of the P.W. Dept. have been sanctioned by the Secy of State, but that the proposed amalgamation of the warrant lists of the three Presidencies cannot be carried out.

The six cases which have now been sanctioned are - that the number of warrants shall be fixed at two fifths of the

[illegible] the Chief engineer

total number of military upper subordinates in the dept, any fraction over one half to give an additional warrant; but if the total number of warrants thus arrived at, one seventh are to be in the higher grades of Dy. Commissary, Asst. Commy. & Dy. Asst. Commy, & that the rest are to be Conductors & Sub Conductors. The staff is to be fixed now for a period of five years, after which it may be revised & fixed for a further period of five years, & so on.

The existing scale of warrant posts for the Madras P.W.D. is —

Dy. Commissary	1
Asst do	1
Dy. Asst do	2
Conductors	7
Sub. Conductors	10
total	21

When letter to G. of I. No. 3117 W.D. 18.12.84 was written, there were fifty military upper subordinates in the Madras P.W.D., including apprentices, & it was proposed to accept the following scale for this Presy. —

Dy. Commy.	1
Asst do	1
Dy Asst do	1
Conductors	7
Sub Conductors	10
total	20

This contemplated the reduction of one warrant in the grade of Dy. Asst. Commissary, & it was proposed to effect the reduction by the absorption of the third vacancy in the grade.

Since the date of this dept letter to India of 18th Dec. 1884, the

the Chief engineer

figures for this Presidency have made some allegation, some have now 45 military subordinates & 3 apprentices, giving a total of 48 -

But in this letter No 82 G.G. 15.1.85, para 3, last paragraph but one, the G.G. stated that Apprentices are not included among military subordinates; - if present figures be taken, we can make the calculation only on a total of 45 -

This would give 18 warrants divided as follows:

By Commissary	1
Asst Commy	1
By asst do	1
Conductor	6
Sub Conductor	9
	18

By three less than the existing scale, & two less than the number proposed to be accepted in Dec 1884.

It is a point for consideration whether this lower scale of 18 shall now be fixed for Madras.

Military promotion in the Presy is already very slow, & this proposed reduction would retard it more than ever. And further, the G.G. in their letter of 15.1.85. No 82 G, said that economy would be effected by making no promotion for every second vacancy.

It must be observed however that in letter to India No 365 W & 10.2.85 this Govt proposed to accept a total number of only 14 warrants for Madras, & in letter of 18.12.84. No 3117 W,

the Chief engineer

the two portions of two-fifths was acquiesced in.

It would appear therefore that there is no help for it but to accept the reduction now advised.

There are one or two other points in this file which require consideration & orders.

In the Madras Presy. promotion from Sergeant to Sub Conductor is made by election according to merit (Code para 863) & the election from those recommended is guided by military seniority, irrespective of departmental rank. Madras Code para 864 Notes that "Recommendations for promotion from "Sergeant to Sub Conductor "should not be based

"on professional efficiency "alone, which is liberally "rewarded by departmental "promotion, but on general "respectability of conduct, "irrespective of educational "or other cognate qualifications".

The principle in fact is to give military promotion according to priority of military rank among those recommended, irrespective of departmental rank.

In letter No. 82 dy 15-1-85 the Govt of India state that on the Indian list steps are given from Sergeant to Sub Conductor, from among men recommended according to departmental seniority, the men being graded on first entry into the dept,

the Chief engineer

according to their standing
at the final College Examina-
tion.

This system is
entirely different to that
practised in India, and
it seems a question
for consideration whether
the G. of I. system should
be adopted here, or
the present principle be
continued -

Diversity of practice
in such matters in the
different Presidencies
usually leads to confu-
sion being made
by the men appeals
every step to discontent

In the India Ser
promotion within the
Warrant grades, i.e.
from Sub Conds up
to Dy. Commissary is
given by pure seniority - this accords
with the practice in

2866 12

in Madras.

The restriction in
Madras Code para 863,
that promotion to Dy. Asst.
Commissary is given only
to Subordinates who have
reached the rank of
Sub Engineer is not
observed by the Govt
of India -

It is also stated
that the second sentence
in Madras Code para
864 - "It is especially
"necessary that the recom-
"mendation for the promotion
"of Conductor to the Commy.
"grade should be confined
"to warrant Officers on
"whom the conference of
"an honorary Commission
"would not be an incon-
"gruity" "has been ex-
punged from the India
Code at the instance of
the Military dept.

It is for con-

the Chief engineer

consideration whether some changes shall be made into this Proceedings

Cs
30.10.85

1866
13

L
W.

In Madras, promotion from Serjeant to Sub-Conductor is made according to merit & those selected are promoted by Military reasons. By Govt of India these promotions are made according to departmental reasons. From Sub-Conductor to Commissary promotions are upon Military reasons the object of the Govt of India is I presume to select the best men for promotion to the warrant grades & that a man who passes higher in the College & in service in the Department (Commissary) better than his junior. I think this system might be considered in case the Military

the Chief engineer

duty as has sometimes
been done a consequence.
I convey the Madeira
with the letter, as it
does not follow that a
[illegible] desire [illegible]
[illegible] for [illegible]
to cause you to [illegible]
[illegible] of the Madeira
with the best wishes
recommend a few [illegible]
the Madeira wine
selected, to that may [illegible]
for Canada. Upon my
arrival [illegible]
[illegible] provided that
the Madeira wine of the
recommended and a copy
to the [illegible].
By the Madeira Coa
[illegible] to the Cost Comm
in Canada by the time she
shall reached the Port
of Montreal. I do not
see the object of the
sale of [illegible] in the

the Chief engineer

be the remark in the second sentence of Code para 864.

If however it be decided to maintain the Madras system of selection by military seniority, it would perhaps be advisable to retain the restriction in Code para 863+864.

C.
9.11.95

the Chief engine

under the V.P.

Note by
the Chief Engineer P.W.D

I am very decided
on that the

The accompanying note
No 9126 appears to
matters thus
It is a question whether
the number of vacant
offices should be proportioned
to the number of existing
subordinates as the time
the proposals were made, or
whether the number
should be proportioned to
the present strength of
the Subordinate Establishment
In the former case the
number would be 20
in the latter 18
the present strength being

21.
In either case there
would be vacancies, but
this cannot be objected
to as this Govt agrees
to a certain number of

14. on 1851

The difference in the
Rules providing Months
in the Madras and
Orissa in the Notes, and
whether it is advantageous
to accept the Indian Rules
as not appear to be
Immediate on this
Par letter No 396 of
17th Feb 185 in which
"his Excellency the Governor
"in Council will not
"withhold his assent to
"the procedure in force
"under the Government of
"India in respect to Months
"being applied to Months
"in Divisions of the
"Madras Presidency.
Corresponding the Rules
must be adopted

2/10/85

Note by

To D.W.

The undertaking on the part of this Govt. to accept the G.N.I. procedure in respect to promotion to warrant rank, was made contingent on "the contemplated "amalgamation of the three lists "of Military Subordinates being "carried into effect."

As that amalgamation has fallen through, it seems to me that this Govt. is free to maintain the present procedure if considered best.

I shall be glad to know your views as to the respective advantages of the two modes of procedure. I am disposed to think that our present practice is best.

With respect to the number of Warrant Officers, I should be disposed to accept, for the first period of five years, the figures given in para 3 of this Govt. letter dated 16·12·84 No. 3117 W.

III

Kate Ley

The proposal
of Sir G. H. S. to
bring the building
between a
contracted scale
for the India
House Mint
is accepted —

It is not proposed
to reduce the scale
sanctioned for
Madras, although
the proportion of
Coinage to building
between the
two mints is
considerably higher
than that
under the Govt.

although this
expected promotion
of a few men with
be delayed by
the continuance of
the P.W.D. proposal
the General appeals
with pressing the
benefit this
will subordinate
now list.

Note

Scale of Warrant Officers
for the Madras P.W. Dept

—

Draft order submitted
for approval.

In letter to India No
3117 W dt 18.12.24, it
was stated that there
were fifty military
upper subordinates
in the dept, including
two apprentice overseers,
& the proportion of Warrant
Officers was worked
out on that number.
The scale arrived at
was 20 warrants against
the existing scale of
21 — ~~20~~ or a reduction
of one.

The numbers 50, appear
to have been arrived at
as follows.— In a note

of the Chief Engineer

dated 8.9.84, C.A.W. (Mr R. Parsons) referring to the Clerical list corrected to 30.6.84, gave the total No. of Military subordinates as 46. In this number of 46 were however included Lieuts. Fitzgibbon & Keenan, who belong to the Bengal warrant list.

D.W. (Major Bowen) in a note of 11-9-84 brought the number up to 50. by adding two military apprentices who had recently become supernumerary on the establt, & two military students who had not been appointed apprentices.

It seems clear that Lieuts. Fitzgibbon & Keenan must be omitted from the calculation, as they are borne on the India list for military promotion & the two apprentices must also be omitted, in accordance with letter from India No. 82 dy & 15.1.85. It therefore the calculation be based on the number of military subordinates existing on the date of letter to India No. 3117 W of 18.12.84, the total must be taken at 46, & the number of warrants at 18.

At the present date we have the same number 46 (excluding apprentices & the two Bengal warrant officers), so that it will make no difference whether the scale be now fixed on present numbers, or on the number which existed on 18.12.84.

CC
21.11.85 JW

of the Chief Engineer

Note by
the Chief Engineer P.W.D.

I am very decided
of opinion that the
proposed amalgamati
of the warrant officers
would not be to the
advantage of the State
or to that of the Mad
officers concerned.

The present prac
in Madras is that p
-motions to and amo
the warrant grades a
regulated by militar
Seniority tempered by
rejection of unfit men
implied in the provi
that no warrant offic
who has not attained
the departmental pass
Sub Engineer shall b
appointed to the gr
of Deputy Assistan
Commissary, and by
right (very rarely exer
of the Chief Enginee

use to recommend a
geant whom he considers
ut for promotion to
rank of Sub Conductor.

Promotions on the
vernment of India
t are regulated by
artmental seniority,
this principle appears
he altogether wrong.
connection with a
ilar proposal in 1885,
. Shaw Stewart, who
then Chief Engineer
arked that "Professional
ciency is sufficiently
ognised by the grant
epartmental promotion,
that it should also
late military promo-
would in my opinion
omewhat unfair. But
urse no Sergeant
is professionally
t should be placed
he warrant grades."
this opinion which
adopted by the
ernment of the day
tirely concur.

I am directed
to that this Govern-
ment now proposes to
fill the vacancy caused
by the retirement on the
3rd october 1893 of Hony.
Lieut J. B. Sanderson.

I have &c

S
W

Mil
1.1.50. Sept 1893
D 1911

Ce

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary.

No. 27294.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Simla, the 19th October 1893.

Sir,

With reference to Public Works Department telegram No. 2680 G. dated 14th October 1893 and to correspondence ending with your letter No. 2875 W. dated 1st December 1885, I am directed to state that the Government of India have again had under consideration the question of amalgamating the Warrant Offices of the Public Works Department under the Governments of India, Madras and Bombay on one roster for promotion.

2. According to the latest informa-

The following figures show the actual position of that class of Establishment.

	Total number of military Subordinates.	Number of Warrant Officers.	Percentage.
Government of India.	139	59	42·4
— " — of Madras	37	21	56·7.

The scale of 59 Warrants for the Government of India Establishment, that is 2/5^{39} of the total number of military Subordinates, was fixed on a strength of 148 and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in 1884 for a period of 5 years which sanction was subsequently extended for a further period of 5 years.

3.. When the question of amalgamating the Warrant officers under the Governments of Madras and Bombay with those under the Government of India for purposes of promotion was first considered the Madras Military Office Subordinate Establishment numbered about 45 and the

number of warrants were 21. But the number of men has since considerably decreased. The Madras Military Office Subordinate Establishment according to the latest classified list shows a strength of 37 only excluding Deputy Assistant Commissaries, Cormac and Sanderson just retired. It is observed that the scale of Warrant is now quite out of proportion to the number of Military Subordinates employed in Madras and the number of warrants for which it provides is relatively much higher than that allowed in the Government of India scale. Under the Government of India proportion of 2/5^{39} of the total number of Military Subordinates the scale of warrants for Madras should provide for 15 instead of 21. Instead, however, of reducing the scale there will perhaps now be no objection to bringing the Military Subordinate

P. W. CURRENT No. 9106

in Madras on a combined scale for all India.

4.- I am accordingly to request that this proposal may be placed before His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, and that an early expression of his views may be forwarded to the Government of India.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Ywood

Offg. Under Secy: to the Govt: of India.

Documents accompanying:-

- Nil -

Rec: 26.10.93

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

Letter from the Govt of India, P.W.D.
No 2729 G dated 19 October 1893
Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D dated
31st November 1893.

IOR ORDERS.

I fully agree with C.E. Engineer's views as to the amalgamation and would resist the proposal. I don't see that it is possible to keep the question of reduction separate and I think that the only chance of successfully resisting the scheme of amalgamation is to postpone reduction in the proportion of Madras vacancies, which certainly seem very high. I would undertake to reduce it to 2/5 of total strength & to keep it at that limit.

Wls
4 Nov

J. W.

43—200—29

FOR ORDERS.

Warrant officers of the P.W.D.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2946 W. Dated 15th November 1893.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the Govt. of India P.W.D. No. 2729 Gaj 19 Octr. 1893 (forwarded by the Chief Engr. P.W.D. — dated 3 Novr. 1893).

The following reply will be sent to the Government of India.

W. 11 Nov. H.E. No. 2907 W. dt. 15 Nov. 1893.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of India P.W. Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 2729 Gaj 10 October 1893, and in reply to state that in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, the proposal to amalgamate the warrant officers of the P.W. departments under the Governments of India, Madras and Bombay on one roster for promotion would

(10—2,000—11-10-93.)

would not be to the ad-
vantage of Military upper
subordinates in this
Presidency, and that this
Excellency in Council is
therefore not prepared to
accede to it.

3. I am to say that
this Government admits
that the proportion of
warrants to the total
number of Military upper
Subordinates is relatively
high in this Presidency,
and would be prepared
to accept, in preference
to the proposed amalgama-
tion, a reduction of the
scale to two fifths of
the total number of
Military men, if ordered
by the Government of
India. I am however
to express a hope that
the reduction, if decided
on, may be effected by
the absorption of every
third vacancy, as formerly
suggested in this office
letter No. 3117/W dated 18th
December 1884.

3. I a

Apart from this, th
system of promotion b
departmental seniority
has the inconvenience th
such seniority depends u
promotion conferred b
different authorities wo
have different standar
of efficiency and princip
of selection and that th
subordinates of one
departmental list wo
be constantly at an un
advantage or disadvan
as compared with tho
or others owing to th
different views of th
respective Chief Engine
as to departmental ef
-ciency.

The above remar
are made on the suppo
that promotions on
amalgamated list
be made purely by dep
-mental seniority;
selection in any degre
brought into play a
objection would be in
tenfold for the subord
of the Madras depart

would for various
cons be at a hopeless
dvantage as compared
those on the Govt
dia lists.

I consider that the
posed amalgamation
ld only be accepted
he condition that
notions on the
algamated list are
e rigidly and invariably
ilitary Seniority, and
not to be supposed
the Govt of India
ld consent to this.
acceptance of the
lgamation is offered
alternative to the
tion of the number of
nts on the Madras
the two questions
ld I think be kept
rect, and discussed
tely, but in the interest
Subordinates concerned
ld in my opinion
tter to accept the
tion, should it be
t on us, than the
lgamation.

9

Government of Madras.

1893.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 9106

DISPOSAL.

No. dated

From

The Government of India

ENCLOS.

No. 2729-Q

Dated 19. 10. 93

Received 26. 10. 93

SUBJECT.

Warrant officers of P.W.D.

Requesting to be furnished with the views of the Madras Govt. in regard to the question of amalgamating the —— under the Governments of India, Madras and Bombay on one roster for promotion.

No 1081. D. dy 20. 10. 93.
" 214. W. dy 26. 1. 86.
" 2854-5 W. dy 1. 12. 85.
" 396. W. dy 17. 2. 85.
" 169. W. dy 21. 1. 85.
" 43. W. dy 7. 1. 85.
" 1099 D. dy 25. 10. 93.
" 1065 D. dy 17. 10. 93.
" 1052 D. dy 14. 10. 93.
" 987. D. dy 5. 10. 93.
" 953 D. dy 5. 10. 93.
" 940. D. dy 28. 9. 93.
" 2016. W. dy 23. 7. 90.
" 539. W. dy 1. 3. 93.
" 2829. 30. W. dy 12. 9. 85.
" 2382 W. dy 24. 8. 83.
" 573. 4 W. dy 25. 2. 87.
" 3117. W. dy 15. 12. 84.
" 3116 W. dy 18. 12. 84.
" 2381 W. dy 24. 8. 83.
" 1172 W. dy 9. 5. 82.
" 365 W. dy 10. 2. 81.
" 364 W. dy 10. 2. 81.
" 1114 W. dy 10. 5. 80.
" 3346. W. dy 6. 12. 87.

29—1,000—10-8-93.