Public Works (1899) Department.

580 W

G.O., No.	463 W
DATED	13th Feby. 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Draftsmen in the office of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Recording papers on the subject of redistribution of salaries of the ——————.

.13

[P. W. 2 / 1,000—7-1-99.]

Indexed. 14/2

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1164

Read C. Nos: 9021 } of 1898
10246 }
1164 of 1899

[illegible] Orders

No: 463 W d/ 13.2.99

Recorded.

A.S.K.
11.2.99.
D.W.

H.C. May

A draft order is not essential, as E.I. proposal papers can be recorded

Order

A.S.K.
8.2.99.

From The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 52.

Dated 6.2.99

Received } 7.2.99
Registered }

Enclosures 1 & one file.

Spare copies

D.W.

Kindly see the office note from D.I. No. 52 of 6th February 1899. He says that formal orders are not necessary; meaning thereby that the draft orders sent to I for countersignature need not issue. The proposals made by E.I. were laid before H.G. who has passed certain orders. These orders should bear a G.O. number. The only objection brought forward by D.I. is that the draft order has not been countersigned - initialled by E.I. It will be seen from E.I.'s note of 30th January that he accepts H.G.'s decision. Orders are therefore requested as to whether the draft order may issue.

SUBJECT.

Re distribution of salaries proposed in the Construction Branch of the E.D. Nos. — Requests to see D.I.'s order d/ 30.1.99. and states that he did not countersign the order tho' [illegible] as the decision regarding the [illegible] is to be accepted, the formal order seems hardly necessary.

[illegible] 8/2/99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

The case was put clearly enough and H.E.'s decision must be accepted.

W.H.

30.1.99

Is it impossible to send one of the Superintendents over to the T.M.S. office where the appointment has been already promised

E.1.

In his note of the 18th inst: His Excellency passes orders on the proposal for filling up the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Appasawmy Row the Supt. of the construction branch of this office, and as the proposal was not approved either a new proposal must be made or the original proposal modified or reconsidered. The construction branch has been without a Superintendent since October when the arrangement was first proposed and it is very desirable that the matter should be settled at an early date —

The conclusion of H.E. that the two draftsmen to whom it was proposed to give a personal allowance of Rs 10 each are not fit for promotion appears to indicate that the notes submitted on the subject were not sufficiently clear

~~I give~~ The sanctioned scale of the Construction branch ~~and~~ the names ~~& pay~~ of the present holders are given ~~in the margin~~ below —

	Designation —	Name — — — ~~Pay~~ —	Pay.
1.	Superintendent —	vacant — ~~150~~	150
·	Draftsman	V. Varadaraja Modeliar	80+20 personal allowance
·	Statistical clerk	C.V. Narayanaswami Iyer	80
·	draftsman	W. G. Ellis	70
	do	T. Visvanatha Mod^r.	50
	do	P. Bhomarapulu Naidu	50
	do	N. L. Ramachendra Row	40
	do	C Veeraraghava Pillay	30
	do	V. Venkataranga Raju	30

~~If V. Varadaraja Mod^r. had been considered fit to take the post of Superintendent. If V. Varadaraja Mod^r. had been fit to take the post of Superintendent the other members of the office could have been given promotion in~~

Of these the Statistical Clerk has only recently joined the office and as his work is special work for which the services of a passed officer are considered desirable he need not at present be considered with reference to the question of filling up the vacancy of Supt.

Of the rest the two men who are considered most deserving of preferment are N. L. Ramachendra Row and V. Venkataranga Raju, but although this is the case ~~neither of them are fit to take the position of Superintendent which would~~ there is no reason to increase their pay from Rs 30 + 40 to Rs 150 per mensem —

If V Varadaraja Mod^r. had been fit to take the post of Superintendent, these two men could have been given promotion in the ordinary course, but I do not consider ~~the man~~ V Varadaraja Mod^r. fit for the post — He is 53 years old and is one of the old class of uneducated draftsmen. He was taken into the office of the E.I. in 1895 from the lithographic branch of W's office, and the reason he draws Rs 20 personal allowance is that Rs 100 is the rate of pay he drew in the lithographic office —

There is no other man at present in the office who would make so good a Superintendent as the man recommended who now draws Rs 115 per mens: as head draftsman of the T. D.s. office

The proposal was to give him Rs 130 and to distribute the balance of Rs 20 between the two deserving men. ~~[illegible] such times as~~ In the ordinary course if this arrangement were sanctioned it would remain in force until V. Varadarya Modeliar retired in about two years. ~~then~~

No proposal would have been made for interfering with the ordinary scale had it not been felt that some radical reform in the form of new blood was necessary in the branch. It is difficult to do this without being hard on deserving juniors if the scale is to be adhered to rigidly. A possible solution which would not interfere with the sanctioned scale would be to take away V. Varadarya Mod.r's personal allowance and give it to the other two whom I consider deserve it more

J.H.
27/1/99

[illegible]

E. I. Form No. 22—2,000—8-8-96.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 1899. P. W. DEPT.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Madras, 6th February 1899.

OFFICE NOTE No. 52

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
DW	DEJ		

KEEP-WITH.

No. , dated 189 .

With reference to Draft order submitted for DO Counterinitials please see DO order dated 30th January 1899 flagged he did not Counterinitial the order apparently by oversight. As the decision is to be accepted and other arrangements have now been made which do not require any

any

Government sanction
a formal order seems
hardly necessary.

D. E. I.

6/

B

From Orders

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

READ the following :—

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 315 d/ 20th Oct. 1898

Endorsement thereon by the Examiner P.W. a/cs No. 1266 $\frac{A}{E}$ d/ 28 Oc

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 372 d/ 4th December 18

Circulated to

I for C.I

ORDER.

His Excellency the Governor in Council does not consider that there are sufficient reasons for sanctioning the redistribution of salaries proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his office notes read above.

APK
22-1-99

23.1.99

To.

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation.

[P. W. 4
1,000—14-11-98.]

23.1.99

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

13

READ the following:--

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No 315 dy 20th October 1898
Endorsement thereon by the Examiner. P.W. Accts. No 1266 A/E dy 28th October 1898
From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. No 372 dy 4th December 1898

Circulated to His Excellency the Governor.

FOR ORDERS.

o Flag A

If the Head draftsman's pay be now reduced from Rs. 150 to Rs. 130, he will soon clamour for its being again raised to Rs. 150, and the Dept. will most unfortunately recommend this. It will be next to impossible, if this contingency should arise, to take away the odd Rs. 20, which it is proposed to give to the lower men. Thus a substantive increase of Rs. 20, will accrue. It is possible that the two lower men may suffer by being passed over, but this is the unavoidable result of their not being fit for promotion. Tinkering of this kind with a sanctioned scale of salaries is to be deprecated.

W.

In his note No 14W dated 30th Marc 1896, Col. Brockman, the then Chief Engineer fo Irrigation, represented that the pay of his head draftsman, viz. Rs100, was less than that of the head draftsman of Superintending Engineers' Offices, who were drawing a progressive salary of Rs100 to Rs130 per mensem, although the former had to scrutinise the estimates received from Superintending Engineers; that the pay of the corresponding appointment in the Office of the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. was Rs200 to Rs250 p mensem; that his head draftsman had to supervise the work of 9 draftsmen and one statistical clerk; and that his work was very onerous and important, and strongly recommended that the man's pay be raised from Rs100 to Rs150. This recommendation was sanctioned in G.O. No 1706W. dated 8th June 1896.

2. The head draftsman, who was draw Rs150, having retired, Mr Hughes the presen

Chief

[P. W. 43 / 500—14-11-98.]

148. 11.1.98. R20.1.55

Chief Engineer for Irrigation, proposes to reduce the pay of the head draftsman from Rs150 to Rs130, nd to utilise the balance of Rs20 in increasing the pay of a draftsman on Rs40 to Rs50 and f another draftsman on Rs30 to Rs40.

. I pointed out that the increase of pay given in G.G. No 1706W, dated 8th June 1896, was sanctioned as an additional charge to the state, that the reasons advanced in 1896 for the higher rate of pay, *viz.* onerous work and responsibilities, were applicable to the present incumbent also, that it would be very difficult to raise the pay again, if once reduced, and that a proposal to improve the status of draftsmen generally would be submitted to Government, as soon as financial prospects brightened (~~vide No 5217C dated 23rd November 1898)~~, and asked the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to reconsider his recommendations, and to state whether he still thought advisable to propose a reduction in the pay of e head draftsman *vide* No: 5217C d/23-11-98

4. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation now explains that the appointments of draftsmen in the Head Offices not being graded and ~~that~~ mere length of service carrying with it no increase of pay, the men look to promotion in the Office on the death r retirement of one of their seniors; that during the ast year two vacancies occurred in the Construction ranch of the Office, both of which were filled up by men not already in the branch, for which circu the two junior draftsmen, to whom an inc of Rs10 each has been proposed, are in no w to blame; that the two men are personally deserving of encouragement; and that the present head draftsman is willing to accep the post for Rs130. He also adds that the increases to the two junior draftsmen ma be treated as personal pending any change of circumstances. The effect of this recommend will be that the head draftsman cannot expect promotion until the personal allowance proposed to be granted to the two junior drafts are absorbed.

A.C.K.
5.1.99.

The proposal is recommended for sanc

9.1.99 W.

..cated.

I do not consider there are sufficient reasons for sanctioning the proposed redistribution of salaries.

A.G.H.
18.1.99

Flag A

Flag B

I conclude they were not fit for promotion.

A.G.H.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 10246

From

The Chief Engineer for Sing

Order

No. 372

Dated 4. 12 98

Received —

Registered } 10. 12. 98

Enclosures /

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding a note by D.E.I explaining the position as regards the draftsman's pay and stating that his proposal may be considered as personal to the three men pending any change of circumstances -

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
5217C	23·11·98 (Issue of office copies)
2264W	2·9·98
22413C	25·10·98
816W	25·3·98
1225C	1·3·98
1969W	5·6·97
1706W	8·6·96
490C	24·1·99 / papers

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

E1.

With reference to his note on the proposed revision of pay in E1s Construction branch, the reasons for making the proposal were briefly given in E1s note dated 20th October — viz that while it was considered desirable to secure the services of a particular individual (Viz Vasudeva Iyer now the head draftsman in the T.Wks. branch of E1s office drawing Rs 115 per mens.) as head of our construction branch, it was also thought that two of the draftsmen already in E1s office should receive some increase of pay.

It is submitted that the conditions of service in the head offices are not the same as those appertaining to the Supt. Engrs. and Ex. Engrs. offices – In the Head office the appointments are not graded and mere length of service carries with it no increase of pay – Practically draftsmen who enter the E's office can only look to getting preferment in the office and they look to getting promotion on the death or retirement of one of their seniors. What is often done on the retirement of a senior is to promote the whole office below him and to appoint a new and inexperienced hand to the lowest post in the office, but there are occasions on which it is not expedient to do this but to bring in a new man from outside

The retirement of the late Superintendent causes the second vacancy which has occurred in the Branch during the last year and in both cases it has been deemed necessary to ~~bring~~ appoint men not already in the Branch – For this fact the two draftsmen whom it was proposed to give an increase of pay are in no way to blame and as they are personally deserving of encouragement it is considered ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ that they should get an increase if it can by any possibility be managed. this not only as an act of justice to themselves but as act of good policy – The opportunity for doing so arises from the fact that the man whom it is believed will suit the post of Superintendent is now only drawing Rs 115 and would it is believed accept the appointment for Rs130

It is submitted in short that it is in the interests of the best results ~~not~~ in the head offices not to adhere rigidly to service promotions by rules, but to take some account of the personal element – ~~there would be no objection to giving Vasudeva Iyer Rs 150 per mens. if so doing would not prevent the two draftsmen named from getting the increase recommended~~

Although it is supported that for the present the pay of the Supt. should be Rs130 it is quite possible that on some future occasion it might be advisable to raise it again –

There would be no objection except that of unnecessary expense to giving Vasudeva Iyer Rs 150 per mens. if so doing would not prevent the two draftsmen named from getting the increase recommended. If it would meet the objections raised to the proposal the pay of Rs 130 to Vasudeva Iyer and the increases to the other two draftsmen might be made personal to themselves –

1/12/98

Q.S.1/10 Jan 66

E. I. Form No. 22—2,000—8-8-96.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 189 . P. W. DEPT.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

~~Madras~~, Camp 4 Dec 1898.

OFFICE NOTE No. 372

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
W	J	8.12.98	

KEEP-WITH

No. , dated 189 .

Your No 5217 C dy 23 Nov.

I forward a note by D.E. explaining the position as regards the draughtsmans pay. I don't think Rs150 too much for the head man in any drawing office but I proposed compelling Vasudeva Iyer to take Rs130 in order to provide money to compensate two men whose promotion will now be blocked for the second time lately

The Salaries I have
proposed may be considered
as personal to the three
men pending any change
of circumstances.

W. H.

4.12.96

S

& Vide G.O. 1706 W. of 8-6-96.
(Flag A)

P. W. Department.
C. No. 9021.

Note. for W.

In his note No. 14 W, dated 30th March, 1896, Col. Brockman the then Chief Engineer for Irrigation, represented that the pay of his Head Draftsman, viz, Rs 100, was less than that of the Head Draftsman of Superintending Engineer's offices, who were drawing a progressive salary of Rs 100 to Rs 130 per mensem, although the former had to scrutinise the estimates received from Superintending Engineers; that the pay of the corresponding appointment in the office of the Chief Engineer P. W. D was Rs 200 to Rs 250 per mensem; that his draftsman had to supervise the work of 9 draftsmen and one statistical clerk; and that his work was very onerous and important, and strongly recommended that the man's

pay

pay be raised from Rs 100 to 150. This recommendation was sanctioned in G.O. No. 1706 W dated 8th June 1896. (Flag A)

2. The head draftsman, who was drawing Rs 150, having retired, Mr Hughes, the present Chief Engineer for Irrigation, proposes to reduce the pay of the head draftsman from Rs 150 to 130, and to utilise the balance Rs 20 in increasing the pay of a draftsman on Rs 40 to Rs 50 and of another draftsman on Rs 30 to Rs 40.

3. The increase of pay sanctioned in G.O. No. 1706 W, dated 8th June, 1896, was not given from any saving, but as an additional charge to Government. (Flag A) The reasons advanced in 1896 for the increase of pay still hold good, and it ~~does not~~ is therefore ~~seem fair~~ not expedient to reduce the pay of the present incumbent. ~~There is no doubt that the head draftsman to be now appointed will appeal in course of time for his pay being raised to Rs 150,~~ ~~and~~ There is also a proposal to raise the status of the draftsmen in the department generally. In the event of ~~either of these cases~~ these being favourably considered by Government, the additional charge will fall on the State.

4. ~~If the pay of Rs 150 fixed in 1896 was on account of the long service of the then incumbent, the increase viz Rs 50 should be treated as personal allowance and lapse on his retire~~~~ment~~. As ~~If~~ the increase was due to onerous work and responsibilities, there seems to be no justification to reduce the pay now.

It was not given as a personal allowance. Appasawmy Rao was never recommended for anything of the sort.

5. His Excellency who carefully scrutinises the charges under "Establishment" is certain to ask why the increase of pay specially sanctioned to the head draftsman should be distributed to others without

without being credited to Govt, Submitted for orders.

Mais
22/11/98

thro' D.W.

and it may be said that it is absolutely necessary to have a man of superior qualifications to check the estimates sent in by S.Es.

ACR
22.11.98

No. 5217C. d/23 Novr 98.

E.I.

Please read above & say if you still think it advisable to propose a reduction in your headman's pay. It will be very difficult to raise it again, if needed - & when financial prospects brighten. I am going to propose to improve the pay of draftsmen.

[illegible]

22.11.98

ENGINEER
TION.
24 NOV. 1898
276

[illegible]/Coll