

Pension (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 26

DATED 9-1-97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Withholding the transmission of a Memorial to the Secy of State from Mr C. Powell,
late of the Madras Salt & Akari Dept. praying for the grant of an increased pension.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

D
5 1,000-5-2-95.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read

C. 1375

Secy

No. 9 Jan. 1897 No. 26.

The Govt. reports that Mr. Powell's memorial must be with the order para XII (3) of the Memorial Rules.

(from order)
8/1/97
8.7.97

Choke Ex.
late Secy of Govt.

with copy of Para XII (3)
to be sent to the Secy. of Govt.

Mr. H. M. Grose C.E.

Mr. H. M. Grose C.E. No. 1345

Pension
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From the B^d of Rev. (S.R.) No. 4342 of 19-10-96.

— " — Acct. Genl. Dated 12 Decr. 1896. No. 848.
421

FOR ORDERS.

Page A

Mr. Powell's case is a very hard one & knowing this, it was considered in Oct 94 with the intention of putting him as good a pension as we could. His new facts are adduced now, & there is nothing before us to prove

Page B

the "very exceptional & distinguished service" for which the Sec. of State will grant a special pension. Lord Napier's letter does not contradict but only confirms the view we took of the order dismissing Mr. P. from the Police & it must have been considered by the Sec. of State when his despatch was issued more than a month after it was written. In his letter to

the Hon. Mr. Blair, Mr. P. says the Sec. of State have given us a lead in his favour, but he is wrong in this. The Sec. of State simply said on his petition that the Sec. had in continuation

Please see note for orders under G.O. No. 1347 of 25-10-94. which sets forth Mr. Powell's case fully.

Mr. Powell served in the Madras Police from 3-3-68 till 14-12-70 when he was removed from the service for misconduct. He was then without employment for 10 years. In August 1880 he was re-entrained in the Madras Salt Dept. and his service since was continuous till his retirement on the 30 April 94.

In G.O. Just No. 1006 of 4-6-74, Mr.

Powell was given a compassionate grant of Rs 2000/- "in consideration of his then unfortunate circumstances"; and in G.O. Pension No. 1347 of 25-10-94 he was granted, for his service of 10 yrs. and odd in the Salt Dept., a Superannuation pension of Rs. 45/- pm. and was also recommended to the Govt. of India for ^{special exemption} being specially exempted from the reduction prescribed in Art. 521(a) C.S.R. ^{in view of the fact of a higher} and for being granted the full pension (of Rs 66-10-8) which India, however, declined to sanction - vide G.O. 337 Pension, of 28-3-95.

Mr. Powell then submitted a memorial

for a special pension through this Govt. to the Sec^y of State for India who in consideration of the ^{apparent} hardship ⁱⁿ enforcing the deduction from the Superannuation pension exempted Mr. Powell from the operation of art. 521(a) C.S.R., and he was accordingly

22/12
R. 7/1/97

granted a pension of Rs 66-10-8 pm

x f.o. 36 Pension
16.1.96

Mr. Powell has now submitted another memo. ^{reiterates his prayer} to the Secretary of State in which he ~~prays~~ ^{states} that the break of 10 years in his service may be condoned and that he may be given a special pension. He works his service out as follows:-

Madras Police	4 th mo. 2 nd dy.
	2 - 10 - 11
Famine Duty	0 - 5 - 10
Cabul Transport	0 - 5 - 0
Madras Salt	11 - 7 - 19
Total	15 - 4 - 10

He says that "when his memorial of March 1895 for a special pension was forwarded by the Madras Govt. to the Sec^y of State for India, neither the Madras Govt. nor the Govt. of India had any knowledge of Lord Napier's letter to Lord George Hamilton, of Sep^r. 95 which was intended to procure him a special pension much larger than the ordinary pension sanctioned viz. Rs 66-10-8."

With reference to Mr. Powell's working out his

service as 15 yrs. + odd, reference is respectfully solicited

(1) to page flagged A. in f.o. No. 1347 A. Pension of 25-10-94,

(2) to the Acctt. Genl's letter No. ^{JAL} 222 of 10-8-94 in f.o.

1347 of 25-10-94 - flag B. and (3) to the Acctt. Genl's letter

No. ^{JAL} 421 of 12-12-96 in the present current. As pointed

out by the Acctt. Genl, Mr. Powell's Police service amounts

to 2 yrs. 10 mo. + 11 dy, and out of this, the period of suspension

for 3 months and 21 days does not qualify for pension. His

remaining Police service is 2 yrs, 6 mo. + 21 dy; and this, it is

submitted, cannot under art. 460(a) C.S.R. count towards

pension + the subsequent break of 10 years can only be

condoned

FOR ORDERS.

in CN 1345
from letter no. 428 of 1.5.95 it appears that his prayer has substantially the same effect as now

counting "his service since 1868 except sick leave."

of the letter communicating the Sec of Madras Despatch deciding about two pensions. They do not hint that the decision can be reconsidered.

df
28/12/96

I am extremely sorry for Mr. Powell, but I do not think that it is possible
flag C in bundle tied with red tape.

that anything more can be done for him

AS
7/1/97

*
vide also Govt. of India letter in
f.o. 11/12 Pension
4.2.95

condoned by the Sec^y of State as the pension admissible

after condonation exceeds Rs 50 and as the interruption

exceeds 12 months. Further, Mr. Powell has already

been paid for the Police service, as noted above +

has never refunded the compassionate grant of Rs 2000

His Famine service of 5 mo. + 11 dy being only temporary cannot count.

His claim for 5 months' service in the Cabul Transport Dep^t is equally inadmissible.

His furlough for 1 year and other leaves cannot be treated as qualifying service as Mr. Powell had less than 15 years' service to his credit when he took the leave - vide art. 445^A C.S.R.

So Mr. Powell's qualifying service amounts to only 10 years and odd for which he has already been granted the full pension admissible, viz. Rs 66-10-8.

MS
18.12.96

This is a case to which ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~of~~ ^{of} A. Memorial Rules applies, unless Gov^t should be pleased to consider that Lord Napier's letter contains "new facts" - which "afford grounds for a reconsideration of the case". - The gist of his Lordship's letter is that "there was a confidential understanding between his colleagues & himself that Mr. Powell should at a fitting time be re-employed in some other position where he would be less

severely tried... The letter is dated
28th Sept 1895 & was addressed to
Lord George Hamilton, who must
have had it before him when
the Despatch of 7. Nov. 1895 - in
P.O. no. 36 Pension of 16.1.96
was ~~passed~~ issued. In that Despatch
the Secretary of State ~~expressly~~
~~states his opinion that "the only~~
~~"ground on which there is any~~
merely suggests that W. Powell
should be exempted from the deduction
on account of age (CER Art. 52(c)), &
it is improbable that His Lordship
would be disposed to make any
further concessions to W. Powell.

DA
18.12.96

 18/12/96

My dear Annet



Please have enclosed (recd. by last mail) put with Mr. Powell's pension papers, for consideration when his next memorial comes in -

Yours

BS

11/9/96

W.S.

Please see to this.

Atty. G. 9/6

see. await receipt of his memorial

Mr Powell's papers are put up -

11/9/96

11/9/96

18. 8. 96 / 75 Wiltshire Road Brixton London S.W.

Dear Mr. Blyp. - I beg to apologise ^{again} for asking

the favor of your sympathy and help. Acting as ad-
-vice rec^d in the India Office, I sent last week an-
-other Memorial to the Secy of State thro: the usual chan-
-nel addressed to the Secretary, Board of Rev: Madras and
it may have come, or is about to arrive. - You remarked in
your last kind note that Lord Napier's letter put a differ-
-ent complexion on my case and from the way in which the
India Office dealt with my last memorial, I have been
given the opportunity of pleading again with the aid the
letter affords. - I beg you will kindly consider my present
Memorial and support my prayer if possible. I will ask
to pass on your patience by paraphrasing the letter but
it is quite true that I did not deserve punishment, nor
was that intended, and I hope you will forgive me
for some (may be, needless) detail at this crisis of my
unfortunate career. - There were some noteworthy facts
connected with the enquiry that resulted in my re-
-cess from various causes was as bad if not worse
than any Police Sub Divⁿ in the Presidency when I took

charge of it. Jungle fever, Man-eating tigers, suspicious
officers, bad examples, want of supervision, frequent
changes, service prejudice were among them. The Police
were a terror and there they had great power and support.
Having experience, I took it in at once, I had been trained
in the Punjab on different lines to Madras, and knew that
I had only to put in practice what I had long been used
to, to change the state. I could ride any distance required.
I cared nothing about food or comfort. I had 2 horses trained
to my habits - no one interfered with me, the Police
were never sure of my whereabouts, I continually surprised
them or caught them red-handed. Day or night was the
same to me and I sometimes left my wife at midnight
without notice saying that I should be heard of in 2 or 3 days.
I rec'd the Luk divisions in the work of candidates and not a suitable person
had been enlisted or could be then found. In less than 2 years I
made it over as to Crime and state of Force in a better state than
any part of the then Central Range, without a vacancy and with
many suitable candidates. In that time I had enlisted about
200 of the pick of the Hindoo people not a Brahmin - Mussul-
man or Pariah among them. At the same time I stopped the
serious Crime. (raids from Hyderabad) not one of which occurred
after I followed into the hyman territory a Gang of Dacoits, alone,
and obtained the conviction of the lot. Surely a man in the

habit of denying himself food, drink, sleep, for the sake of his
work could not have deserved dismissal. - Nor did I, but my
work on acct. of the state of things caused lots of bile and
bad blood because of the prejudice about ^{Madras} unassimilated men
in the Police particularly on the part of the then Lt. General. My
work was treason to the cause of Madras Military Officers for the Madras Police.
Had I seen a military man I should have been promoted by boards
for that which caused my dismissal. - I need say no more
perhaps I have said too much, if so, you must overlook it.
Nearly all concerned have gone from this world or are about to go
and I have always been tongue-tied on the subject for many
reasons. - I shrink from full explanation, nor do I make it
now, I trusted and hoped for reparation to the last and always
believed that when I retired at last I should receive consideration
if I still resisted the temptation to clear myself at
the expense of others. I have tried to behave with what
dignity and independence I could command about
it - from the first - but I have never really got over it. - never since
had the same spirit because I was victimized for good and
never bad work and my character of great value to me was
taken from me. - Of course I was impetuous but also well
disciplined and always tried to be a gentleman. -
Last hopes letter appears to afford the Madras Govt. an unique
opportunity to support my prayer which I pray may be done.

If so, the Govt of India which has been given a lead in my
favor, will I believe also do so.

I have already detained you too long - My case rests
chiefly with you, there is no one left likely to take so
liberal a view, no one who knows better how irksome
service as a Salt Inspector was to me, continually
suspected and treated as the dog with a bad name.
We are in straits, queer street I may say, & to support
on very little over \$1 per week - I have nothing to do and
the health of wife and self is bad - Indeed for clothes
and other necessaries we are quite dependent on others.
I need not say how thankful we should be for your
support of - Dad Kapur's recommendations and my prayer -
Pray excuse this indifferently worded and long appeal for
I write in constant pain from Rheumatism -

I beg to remain

Yours sincerely

Howell

P.S.

I hope you will not trouble to reply unless you like to send
a P.C. by way of acknowledgement -

Pension
Revenue

(1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1345



From

*The Secretary to the
Commissioner of Salt, Abkari
and Separate Revenue
Madras*

Order



His No. 4342.

Dated 19th October 1896.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT

*Submitting to Government,
for favorable consideration,
memorial from Mr C. Powell,
late Inspector in the Salt and
Abkari Department, praying
for the grant of a Special
pension.*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
80	1077	Pm.	11-11-96
80	1347A	do	25-10-96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To The Right Honourable The Secretary of State
for India in Council
through the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue)
Madras. His Excellency the Governor of
Madras in Council and His Excellency
The Governor General of India in Council.
The humble Memorial of Charles Lowrie
late Assistant Superintendent of Police Madras,
and Inspector 1st grade Salt Revenue Department
Madras (retired). - Humbly sheweth.

That when his Memorial of March
1895 for a special pension was for-
warded by the Madras Government to
the Secretary of State for India, neither
the Madras Govt. or the Govt of India, had
any official knowledge of Lord Napier's
letter to Lord George Hamilton of Sept-
1895 which was intended to procure
Petitioner, a special pension, much larger
than the ordinary pension sanctioned by
the Govt. of Madras of Rs. 66:10:8 per month
for 10 years service in the Salt Dept. only.

— When Petitioner retired, he understood
from the frequently recorded opinions of
responsible Officers of Govt. acquainted
with the circumstances of his case, that
the break in his Madras Service would
be condoned vide letters from Mr. G. S. S.

(original enclosed.)

(enclosed)

late 1st Member of Council Madras dated 6.3.92 and Mr. Arundel Commr. of Salt Revenue dated 14.4.94. enclosed, from which it will be seen there appeared to be little doubt on the subject, had there been any Petitioner would have made further efforts to serve longer, or would have obtained leave without pay, but he never contemplated retiring on such a pension as Rs 66. 10. 8. per month which may be seen from the enclosed memorial to Lord Wenlock of June 25th 1894.

Petitioner begs to explain that this Memorial was written under difficulties, in much weakness, just before a serious operation, from which recovery was doubtful, and he then forgot the Madras

Gvt. had no power to sanction the pension sought. He begs reference to the Memorial and that the letters from Lord Napier and other responsible officers noted in the margin may now be fully and favorably considered.

He respectfully submits that Lord Napier's letter to Lord George Hamilton goes to the root of the matter which really caused Petitioner's ruin in position, prospects and health, as well as eventually depriving him of reasonable opportunity to serve, long enough, under the circumstances, for any suitable pension under the present rules, except a special one; and indeed the pension now sanctioned by the Madras Gvt. is the lowest rate possible for the shortest

x Lord Napier 30.8.79
do - do - 9.79.
do - do 28.9.95
x Mr. Huddleston 29.8.88
x - Thornhill 21.8.79
x - Haffel 3.10.81
x vide pages 11, 12, 13 of printed Mem. to Secy of State
of 3.12.92. enclosed.
Mr. Arundel 14.4.94
" Garstin 6.3.92
" do 17.1.95
" Haffel 19.2.95
" Martin 24.2.95
enclosed.

Lowell

period any adjuv. pension is allowed —

Petitioner's prolonged efforts to re-enter Madras Gvt. service, and ultimate acceptance of a poor post- on inadequate pay, were due only to the belief that the intentions of the Gvt. which removed him would be carried out and the break in his service be condoned.

He begs to draw attention to the letter of the late Mr. Huddleston on the subject then when no one had a better knowledge of his case while Secretary to Gvt., Member of Council and Acting Governor between 1870 and 84. Mr. Huddleston was personally a stranger to Petitioner and rendered his opinion on the merits of the case only after careful examination.

Petitioner begs to point out that the adjustment of his pension at Rs 66. 10. 8. per month, is only what the Madras Gvt. proposed to the Gvt. of India before Petitioner memorialized the Secretary of State for a special pension in March 1895; and the stringency of the rules alone, prevented the Madras Gvt. from recommending a larger sum. The fact that Petitioner did not enter Gvt. service for the first time in 1880, but had served ^{for} some years before, and was then re-employed, after waiting ^{nearly} 10 years and memorializing the Secretary of State, made Article 521 of the Civ. Ser. Reg. (the 30 years rule) appear inapplicable to his pension, and suggest that exemption was unnecessary except for a technical purpose.

Page 13 printed Memorial
to Lord Kimberley.

2. Petitioner respectfully submits that he was dismissed, and thereby completely ruined, when it was only intended at the time, to remove him from one branch of service to another; that he was promised re-employment as Asst. Surg. Gen. in the Madras Army, that his suspension was ^{during inquiry} practically cancelled, as if he was not to be punished, by the Govt. which dismissed him, in order to make that period qualify for pension, and to prevent a break in service; and that the position it was arranged to appoint him to, was more suitable, and better paid, than the one he had been removed from. vide margin.

Lord Napier's letter to
Lord George Hamilton

Madras Govt.	344
do do do	17.3.71
do do do	387
do do do	28.3.71
do do do	1013
do do do	25.7.72.
do do do	1006
do do do	4.6.74

3. With reference to Lord Napier's opinion, his Lordship in 1879, strongly recommended him to Sir Michael Hicks Beach then Secretary of State for the Colonies, for the responsible post of Protector of Emigrants vide Lord Napier's letter dated Sept. (-) 1879, extract enclosed. The Madras Govt. also recommended him for the same position vide Madras Govt. Pro: dated Fort St George 5th April 1880. Sir Michael Hicks Beach

Lord Kimberley, and Lord Knutsford successively recommended that he was the best candidate for the next vacancy, and in 1891 Lord Knutsford said to Petitioner "We shall be very glad Mr. Powell, to secure your services for this vacancy and I will write to Lord Wenlock, so that you may leave without delay, when it occurs."

Page 18. printed
Mem: to Lord Kimberley

Colonial Office
recd. Whitehall

W. Powell.

The vacancy alluded to, which only occurred last February, was, Protector of Emigrants Trinidad. Pay with travelling allowance £1050 per year. Lord Wenlock also selected and recommended Petitioner to the Govt. of India for the post of Protector at Port Darwin vide Mr. Farquhar's letter enclosed dated 6.3.92.

Petitioner respectfully draws attention, to the great difference, between the responsible post of Protector of Emigrants and that of a Salt Inspector Madras! After Lord Hobart's death, prejudice arising from age, delay, and an imperfect knowledge of circumstances connected with his removal from the Police, so very long before; not only further delayed his re-employment for many years, but compelled him to serve when re-employed in an unsuitable position which ruined his health and prevented more service qualifying for pension in the Salt Department. The fact, that he was continually promised better and more suitable employment, which he never obtained, that he served satisfactorily at the top of the rank of inspectors from 183 to 194 although reduced through reorganization, and was never afterwards promoted, but constantly superseded by juniors; also the statement that his reduction on reorganization of the Dept. was ^{partly} due to unfavourable opinion, recorded for the first time, in the reply of the Madras Govt. to his memorial for a personal allowance; after a good

vide page 7. also 2.3
4. 5. and 6 of printed
memorials to Lord
Kimberley

read of 9 years, but never before, may all, clearly be traced, to the same causes, to his indigible age, and bad health, resulting.

4. Petitioner begs to point out, that the compassionate grant sanctioned in G.O. 1006/1874. (copy enclosed) had no reference whatever to satisfaction for service, or to pension rules: He submits, that such a grant could not, at all, be considered under the circumstances, as any equivalent, to the complete relief entailed by dismissal, which Petitioner was informed would only result in removal from one branch of service to another; It could by no means make up for the loss of good character, of position gained through that character, of all former service for pension, a promotion, also, for loss of livelihood in India, with a wife and young family to support, when health affected by service, made change necessary; neither does that appear to have been so intended; on the contrary in G.O. 1006 of 1874 in sanctioning the grant, it is plainly stated, that his removal was not intended to be his dismissal and that the grant was made in consideration of his present unfortunate "circumstances" which he and his family had been reduced to through waiting in vain nearly 4 years for the appointment promised in 1871. G.O. No: 1006 of 1874 seems to have been expressly worded to confine the same

Howell

sanctioned therein to the special object of relieving the distress this delay had brought Petitioner and his family into, declared in the order to have been unintentional, and at the same time to prevent the grant interfering at all with any future claim to pension.

It seems to Petitioner that G.O. 1006/74 is sufficient proof that this was the meaning and intention of the Madras Govt. of that time, when the actual circumstances of his case were best known to the Govt, before lapse of time, want of interest, or of effectual representation, had hidden or weakened material points in his favor.

He was at the same time promised re-employment and had not Lord Hobart died, Petitioner would certainly have been appointed to a suitable post under his Lordship's Govt. then. Your Petitioner therefore, respectfully submits that the compassionate grant sanctioned in G.O. 1006/74 should not bar or interfere with his present appeal.

5. Petitioner respectfully pleads, that G.O. 1006 of 1874, Mr. Hudleston's and Lord Napier's letters, considered with Mr. Thornhill's letter and the retraction of the charge for which Petitioner was removed, are the best evidence in his case, which, though shrouded by lapse of time, and weakened by ineffectual attempts to obtain

redraft, still resolves itself, into consideration, of the suffering and loss entailed by a dismissal only intended to be a removal from one branch of the service to another, and by a delay of nearly 10 years, instead of the more immediate re-employment intended from the first by the Governments of Lord Napier, and his Lordship's successor the late Lord Hobart, which certainly had, by far the best and most complete knowledge of his case.

Petitioner submits, that that dismissal, delay, & ineligible age, and bad health resulting, with the abortive appeals, which eventually procured him re-employment in a very inferior position, prejudiced everybody and everything connected with his subsequent service, and reduced to him to a position on reorganization of the Salt Dept, which completely ruined his health and prospects, and compelled retirement.

In 6. In the Salt Dept according to enclosed Memo: Petitioner served ^{years months days} 13 " 8 " 24, out of which, only 10 years qualify for pension under the new rules promulgated in 1889. ^{years months days} 3. 8. 24, being lost through sick leave, Furlough instead of sick leave, (taken in the belief that 1 year furlough for every 10 years service would be allowed to qualify for pension according to the rules in force up to 88/89) and the odd months which do not count. Petitioner begs to point out that the Medical Certificates

Memo: with Madras Rev: Board's Proceedings -

vide a number of Med: Certificates enclosed

9
enclosed show that this loss of qualifying service for pension is due to efforts to serve in the position of Salt Inspector Madras, which his age former service and antecedents unfitted him for.

7. Temporary service in the Famine Dept Madras, and Transport Dept Affghanistan, not ordinarily pensionable, was rendered while Petitioner was led to expect and was awaiting, promised re-employment under the Madras Govt; The delay, beyond his control, was not intended by the Governments of Lord Napier or of his Lordship's successor the late Lord Hobart; Petitioner would not have undertaken this very arduous and hazardous service, ^{but} for the hope, that in his case under the circumstances, it would be allowed, eventually, to qualify for pension, being aware that acting and temporary service of a certain nature, had in some instances, been so treated.

— After enquiry in the Accountant General's Office Madras, he expected to be allowed to retire under the old rules in force up to 88/89. The resolution of the Govt. of India on reserved points of the Unconquered Servants case, published in Jan 7/88 when the old were changed to the present rules, appears to contemplate that permission, if an Officer had entered and served up to that time under the old rules.

8. Petitioner respectfully pleads, that all Officers of the Madras Govt, and of the Departments he has served in since 1868, acquainted with his case and career, including Lord Napier & Ethiey R.T.P.C. the late Mr. Hudleston, Mr. Morchill C.S.I., Mr. Bley C.I.S., Mr. Garstin C.S.I., Mr. Master C.S.I., Mr. Arundel, and the Board of Revenue Madras, are in favor of condoning the break in his service, and Lord Napier, who had special knowledge of the real facts, urges benevolent and exceptional treatment, in adjusting his pension - Petitioner humbly submits, that on account of the lapse of time alone, no one could be so well acquainted with the facts as Lord Napier, the late Lord Hobart, the late Mr. Hudleston, and Mr. Morchill, and he prays, that his case, may be mercifully considered, from the stand point of their statements and recommendations. He prays also that the hardships and suffering, he and his family have endured for 26 years, and any good service he has been able, notwithstanding misfortune, to render, may be compassionately considered.

9. Your Petitioner respectfully urges, that misfortunes of service quite beyond his control, and irreparable losses resulting, alone prevented him serving long enough in Madras to qualify for a suitable pension, under the present rules, that from the same causes, and from the heavy loss for 15 years on remittances for his family at home, and himself on sick leave, he has been unable to save anything,

Howell

that he is quite unable to support himself and family (entirely dependent on his pension) with the sum sanctioned by the Madras Govt; he therefore humbly prays, that the recommendations of Lord Napier and other responsible Officers named, may be allowed to prevail, and that a special pension may be sanctioned of the kind suggested by Lord Napier, without strict adherence to the letter of the present rules, and that as a compassionate measure all his service since '68, except sick leave may be allowed to qualify according to the rules in force up to 88/89, under which he served about 20 years, and expected when retiring, that his pension would be allowed to be adjusted by - Should this act of grace, be conceded, his total qualifying service since 1868, including Famine (Madras) and Cabul Transport comes to 15 " 4 " 10 - viz -

vide Testimonials
pages 14 to 19 printed
Memo: to Lord Kimberley


Verifications. -					
Accountant Genl's letter enclosed -	Madras Police	4	m.	d.	
Madras Famine -	do Famine	2	"	10	"
Sir Mr. Kennedy, Lord Napier, Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Curzon, Mr. Bley, & Affidavit (Madras)	Cabul Transport			5	"
Cabul Transport -	Madras Salt	11		7	19
Sir Mr. Kennedy's letter enclosed -	Total	15	"	4	"
Madras Salt -					
Madras Rev Boards					
Pro: and Memo enclosed.					

* Including 1 year's furlough qualifying under the rules in force before 88/89.

Enclosures 4 packets - marked 1. 2. 3. 4.

Howell

The humble Memorial of—
Charles Powell late Inspector
Salt Revenue Dept. Madras
To The Right Honble The Secre-
tary of State for India in Council
through the Board of Revenue
Madras— His Excellency the
Governor of Madras in Council
and His Excellency the Governor
General of India in Council.
Dated 12. 8. 96
75 Wiltshire Road
Brixton
London S.W.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue),

Dated 19th October 1896.

His No. 4342.

Read the following letter from Mr.
C. Powell, late Inspector, Salt Revenue Depart-
ment, 75 Wiltshire Road, Brixton, London,
dated 12th August 1896:—

"I beg you will be kind enough to
read the enclosed Memorial to the Secretary
of State and do me the favor to place
it before the Board for transmission
to Government in as favorable a manner
as possible, for which I shall be
grateful."

Resolutions
Submitted to Government
with

with the enclosures in original for
favorable consideration.

(True Copy and Extract)

Commisariat
Assistant Secretary

To

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department
with enclosures in four packets

through
the Accountant-General, Madras

Copy to Mr Powell

75, Wiltshire Road
Brixton, London

2/382
- 20/10

N^o J.A.E

421

Fort St. George
Accountant General's Office
12th Decr 1896.

Submitted to Government. From the statement of
service forwarded by this office on the 10 August 1894, it
will be seen that out of the Police service of 2⁷ 10¹⁴ 11² days men-
tioned in the last paragraph of Mr. Powell's memorial the period of
suspension of 3 months and 21 days does not qualify for pension as in
the Government Order under which full pay for the period was paid
as a special case, there is no mention that it should count for pension.
Neither the service of 5 months and 10 days in the temporary
Revenue Department nor that service in the Cadet Transport (of
which there is no mention in the previous statement of service,
counts for pension.

The break in service of about 10 years cannot be condoned
by the Government of India under 465 Civil Service Regulations.
Even if the break be condoned under special orders of the Secretary
of State the condonation will not enable Mr. Powell to count his
previous Police service as the fact of removal from Government
service entails forfeiture of past service. So long as the order of
removal remains in force, Mr. Powell cannot count his previous
service under 460 (a) Civil Service Regulations.

The concession of allowing leave with allowances out of
India to count towards pension was embodied in Civil Service
Regulations in December 1890 (vide Article 445 A) and Mr. Powell
can get the benefit under that Article if his total service is
not less than 15 years. As his total service in the Salt Depart-
ment is 13. 8. 24, Article 445 A does not apply in his case.

Mr. Powell was first granted for his service in the
Salt Department a pension of Rs. 45 under Government Order
N^o 1347 dated 24 October 1894 which was afterwards increased to
Rs. 66. 10. 8 on the Secretary of State exempting him from the
operation of Article 521 (a) Civil Service Regulations.

A compassionate grant of 2000/- was also assigned to him in 1874 under Government Order No 1006 dated 14 June 1874 in consideration of his the then unfortunate circumstances following upon his removal from the Police.

As the latter sum appears to have been granted in consideration of his Police service, it should be taken into account if it is intended to recommend ^{him for} any special concession on account of this service.

Herbert Gordon
 Jnr Offy Accountant General.

To The Secretary to Government
 Pension Department.

R. G.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____
 189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. -
 A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only.