

EAST INDIA (PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT)

54

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,  
dated 27 March 1890 ;--for,

“COPIES of or EXTRACTS from CORRESPONDENCE relating to the system  
of grading ROYAL ENGINEERS with CIVIL ENGINEERS on their first  
appointment to the PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.”

India Office, }  
31 March 1890. }

A. GODLEY,  
Under Secretary of State for India.

No. 34.—Public Works.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable The Governor General of  
India in Council.

My Lord,

India Office,  
London, 23 September 1886.

Paragraph 1. I FORWARD herewith copy of a letter, dated 28th July last,  
from the War Office, directing attention to a paragraph of the Report of the  
Joint War Office and India Office Committee on the Establishment of Royal  
Engineers to be retained in India, in which the present system of grading  
Royal Engineers with Civil Engineers on their first appointment to the Public  
Works Department is commented on.

System of grading  
Royal Engineer  
officers on first  
appointment to  
Public Works  
Department.

2. This Report was forwarded to you with my predecessor's Despatch in the  
Military Department, No. 101, dated the 15th April 1886, and the matter  
referred to is, for the reasons stated by the War Office, one to call for the  
careful consideration of your Government.

3. In requesting to be furnished with your Excellency's views on the point  
raised in regard to the first appointment of Royal Engineers and Civil  
Engineers to your Public Works Department, I would remind you of the  
discussions which have taken place on the subject of the relative positions of  
the civil and military members of the Department, and of the desire which has  
been expressed by my predecessors in office, in which I fully concur, to  
establish their relations on a perfectly equitable footing.

4. At the same time there appears to me *prima facie* evidence that young  
Royal Engineer officers have been placed at some disadvantage on their joining  
the Public Works Department, and if, after considering the subject, you are of  
opinion that there is ground for complaint on behalf of these officers, I shall be  
glad to receive any suggestion which you may have to make for altering the  
present system of grading them on their first appointment.

I have, &c.  
(signed) Cross.

Enclosure.

(No. 20.—Engineers.—1367.)

Sir,

War Office, 28 July 1886.

WITH reference to the Royal Warrant of 20th February 1886, I am directed by the  
Secretary of State for War to draw the attention of the Secretary of State for India in  
Council to the following paragraph, which appears at page 7 of the Report of the Joint  
War

War Office and India Office Committee on the Establishment of Royal Engineers to be retained in India, viz.:—

“1. We observe that the present system of grading Royal Engineers with Civil Engineers on their first appointment to the Public Works Department has been much complained of, and consider that (with a view to obtaining sufficient volunteers for continuous service in India) it is desirable that the Government of India should consider how far these complaints can be met.”

I am at the same time to enclose an extract from a communication recently received in this Office on the same subject.

As the matter is one that may hereafter deter officers from volunteering for service in India, I am to inquire whether any steps have been taken by the Government of India to remedy the supersession complained of.

The Under Secretary of State  
for India.

I have, &c.  
(signed) *Ralph Thompson.*

---

Enclosure in above.

*Second.*—It will be observed that no mention is made as to whether any steps are going to be taken to remedy what is, without doubt, the great grievance of the Royal Engineer officer serving in civil employ in India, viz., the subordinate position he holds as regards his Cooper's Hill contemporaries. For young officers who may not know how things stand the following information will be useful:—

“A.” an Engineer officer, goes out to India with, or before, a large batch of Cooper's Hill men. They land, say, the same day. The Cooper's Hill men are at once gazetted to the Public Works Department, where they are posted to divisions to learn the language, but which time counts for service. “A.” on the contrary, is sent to Roorkee for nine months or a year to do the same, then is brought in under his fellow-voyager, and then during his whole career has above him a batch, possibly two batches, of Cooper's Hill men.

---

No. 66.—Public Works.

Government of India.—Public Works Department.—General.

To the Right Honourable Viscount *Cross*, Her Majesty's Secretary of State  
for India.

My Lord,

Simla, 31 October 1887.

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's Despatch, No. 34, Public Works, dated 23rd September 1886, forwarding certain correspondence from the War Office, regarding the present system of grading Royal Engineer officers on their first appointment to the Public Works Department, and the disadvantage at which they are placed in comparison with the Engineers appointed from Cooper's Hill, whose appointments date from the time of passing out of the college.

2. The matter has been carefully considered by us, and we are of opinion that in this particular respect there is an inequality between the young Royal Engineers and the officers from Cooper's Hill, who enter the Department annually as recruits; and we should be willing to formulate a rule under which Royal Engineer subalterns recruited since the year 1872, when the Cooper's Hill Engineers first entered the Department, should count their departmental service as commencing two and a-half years after date of first commission, provided that they should not add more than, say, one year to their actual service in the Department.

3. Such a rule would place Royal Engineers and Cooper's Hill Engineers as nearly as could be on an equality in respect of the age at which departmental service begins to count. The men from the Indian colleges join the Department as apprentices, and do not come into competition with either Royal Engineers or with those from Cooper's Hill until at least a year, and generally a longer period, has elapsed since they passed out of college; so that Royal Engineers cannot be at any disadvantage in respect to this class.

4. With

4. With reference to the remarks in the third paragraph of your Lordship's Despatch under reply, we append a Minute by our honourable colleague Sir Theodore Hope, expressing his views regarding the relative position of Royal and Civil Engineers in the Public Works Department.

5. A Minute\* on the same subject by the Honourable General Chesney will follow.

\*This Minute will be found among the Enclosures.

We have, &c.  
(signed) *Dufferin.*  
*T. C. Hope.*  
*G. Chesney.*  
*A. R. Scoble.*  
*J. Westland.*

MINUTE by the Honourable Sir *Theodore C. Hope*, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.,  
dated 31st October 1887.

ALTHOUGH it may scarcely be possible to preserve an exact balance in the relative positions of Royal and Civil Engineers in the Public Works Department, I entirely concur in the general policy which I understand the Secretary of State to have laid down, that the two are to be equalised, and established on a perfectly equitable footing, as far as may be possible. This policy, I may point out, is in harmony with the principle adopted in the Report of the Committee on the Employment of Officers of Royal Engineers in Civil Departments of the State, presented to Parliament in 1871 [c. 276]. The correspondence regarding the reorganisation of the Department has proceeded upon this basis. Under the belief that the two were at that time pretty equal, I assented to the insertion, in the Government of India Despatch, No. 15, dated 20th April 1884, of a paragraph deprecating the enforcement of the order Lord Kimberley had issued, that the "net military pay" of Royal Engineers should be withdrawn.

Times have since changed, and as I was primarily responsible for that Despatch, I wish to take this opportunity of pointing out the fact.

2. While admitting that, in respect of the particular point of age to which the accompanying Despatch refers, Royal Engineers are at a disadvantage, as compared with the Civil Engineers who are recruited from England, I think it necessary, before proceeding to redress the inequality, to review the relative position of Royal and Civil Engineers in the Public Works Department, in regard to the advantages possessed by each class.

3. With this object in view, I would invite reperusal of the discussion which took place in 1883, in connection with the reorganisation of the Engineer Establishment, and which originated in the order given in Lord Kimberley's Despatch, No. 21, dated 22nd March 1883, paragraph 22, that the pay of Royal and Civil Engineers should be equalised by the net military pay of Royal Engineers being given up. In our reply to that Despatch, No. 15, Public Works, dated 20th April 1884, we strongly remonstrated against this order being carried into effect, on the ground that, combined with the advantages already conferred on Civil Engineers and those then proposed, it would so far reverse the previous position as to give the latter an advantage over Royal Engineers which was undesirable. This opinion was based on notes and calculations which accompany the Despatch. In those calculations, which attempted to reduce the relative advantages of Royal and Civil Engineers to an equation, the net military pay of the Royal Engineers on the one hand was set off against the following three factors which represented advantages of the Civil Engineers:—

*First.*—Certain increases in salaries which we proposed should be applicable to Civil Engineers.

*Secondly.*—The superiority of the pensions then just sanctioned for Civil Engineers.

*Thirdly.*—The start of one year in point of age possessed by the Civil

Table VI. of Enclosures to Despatch of 1884. over the Royal Engineers.

4. In paragraph 28 of our Despatch we said: "What has been written appears to us to establish the broad fact that if all advantages, including such as it is now proposed to confer on Civil Engineers, be taken into account the withdrawal of "net military pay" proper from the Royal Engineers will place the latter in a comparatively disadvantageous position."

5. Since our Despatch was issued the position has changed:—

*First.*—In Lord Kimberley's Despatch, No. 71, Public Works, dated 13th November 1884, our proposals for raising the pay of Civil Engineers in certain grades were not accepted, but the salaries of the four lower grades were allowed to be raised indiscriminately.\*

◦ 3rd Grade, Executive Engineer.  
4th Grade, Executive Engineer.  
1st Grade, Assistant Engineer.  
2nd Grade, Assistant Engineer.

*Secondly.*—Under the Royal Warrant of 20th February 1886 Royal Engineers who elect for continuous service add to the pensions allowed under the Warrant of 1881 a proportion of the Staff Corps scale of pensions, according to the length of their service in India; and as in the future those Royal Engineers who elect for continuous service will have practically had their whole service in India, the pensions of Royal Engineers in the Public Works Department will virtually be the Staff Corps pensions. These pensions are paid in sterling, and are, on the whole, unquestionably superior to those of Civil Engineers.

*Thirdly.*—We are now asked, in the Despatch under reply, to consider whether the disadvantage under which Royal Engineers labour, as regards mode of calculating seniority in the Department, should not be adjusted.

6. Before, however, going further, I wish to notice a correction which should be made in the calculations referred to. When we assumed, as we did in the equation between Royal and Civil Engineers, that the net military pay was the whole measure of the advantage, in salary alone, possessed by Royal over Civil Engineers, we understated the advantage of the former. It is of importance to correct this error, because I have noticed that it has been stated on other occasions that the difference between the civil salaries and those of military men in the Department is necessarily the amount of the net military pay only. This is not the case, for those who draw on the staff scale, which was the original scale for all military men before the consolidated scale was introduced, may, under certain circumstances, draw either less or more than the consolidated rates. Thus a major, Royal Engineers, who is a chief engineer, 3rd class, would draw only Rs. 1,440. 14. on the staff scale, against Rs. 1,982. 10. drawn by a Royal Engineer of the same rank on the consolidated scale, and 1,800 rupees drawn by a Civil Engineer; on the other hand, a lieutenant-colonel, Royal Engineers, being an executive engineer, 1st grade, draws Rs. 1,493. 8., against Rs. 1,193. 8. drawn by an officer of the same military rank on the consolidated scale, and against 950 rupees drawn by a Civil Engineer. The above are somewhat extreme illustrations, but instances of the first were not unfrequent some years ago, and there are instances of the second at present. The table appended compares the rates drawn under the two military scales with the salaries of Civil Engineers, and an examination of these scales will show that when departmental promotion is rapid compared with military promotion, as it used to be some years ago, the consolidated scale is the more advantageous to Royal Engineers; but when departmental promotion is slow, as it is at present, and will probably be in future, the staff scale is considerably the best.

7. At the present time there are about 60 per cent. of the Royal Engineers in the Engineer branch of the Department who draw their pay under the "staff" scale. These officers draw on the average about 220 rupees a month each more than the civil salaries of their departmental rank, and about 65 rupees a month each more than they would do under the consolidated scale; that is, their salaries are, on the average, 65 rupees a month greater than the civil pay of their departmental grades, *plus* the "net military pay" of their regimental rank. The pay of all the Royal Engineer officers drawing pay under both scales, taken together, averages rather more than 40 rupees a month above the sum of civil pay, *plus* net military pay.

8. A second

8. A second table appended to this Despatch shows the departmental and regimental rank of Royal Engineer officers, and compares the differences between civil and military salaries at the present time. Moreover, the differences of the salaries of Royal and Civil Engineers are, it will be found, on careful analysis, greater now than they formerly were. Thus the average difference in 1867 and 1870, before the "consolidated" scale was introduced, was about 146 rupees and 167 rupees respectively. In 1887 the average difference of those who draw under the "staff" scale is about 220 rupees; and the average for those under both scales is about 200 rupees a month. The comparatively low average difference of former years is partly due to the fact that individual Civil Engineers not unfrequently drew higher salaries than Royal Engineers. This is a case, as will be seen by the first illustration in paragraph 7, which is only possible when departmental promotion is rapid, in which case the "staff" scale is less favourable than the "consolidated" scale. As departmental promotion at the present time is not rapid, and as it will, as explained in our Despatch, No. 10, Public Works, dated 2nd February 1886, become more retarded in future, the differences between the salaries of Civil Engineers and Royal Engineers under the two scales as a whole, and in greater degree under the "staff" scale alone, will probably tend to increase rather than diminish as time goes on. As the "staff" scale is the one under which the majority of Royal Engineers draw their salaries, and will certainly be the scale for which the great majority will elect in future, these differences not only will be larger than they are now, but will in almost all cases be larger than the amount of "net military pay."

9. The conclusion, then, to be drawn from what is said in the above paragraphs 4—8 is, first, that two of the factors in our former equation, namely, the proposed increase in Civil Engineers' salaries and the Royal Engineers' pensions, have wholly changed; secondly, that the advantage of salary on the side of the Royal Engineer was understated. To this we may add that the exchange was assumed in the calculation at 1 s. 8 d., whereas it is now under 1 s. 6 d., and this would give a still further advantage to the pension of Royal Engineers if the original equation were recast.

10. There is yet a further very material advantage which has been gained since the correspondence of 1883 took place, and this is, that under the Royal Warrant of 20th February 1886 Royal Engineers of the Public Works Department who elect for continuous service come under the furlough rules of Chapter V. of the Civil Leave Code; and as military officers subject to civil leave rules, they become entitled, amongst other advantages from which Civil Engineers are excluded under this chapter, to minimum ordinary furlough allowances of the Covenanted Civil Service. The effect of this is, that the Royal Engineer receives his full pay, if it does not exceed 500 l. a year; if it does exceed that amount, he draws 500 l. until his half pay exceeds that amount, and he then draws his half pay. The Civil Engineer, on the other hand, can only draw the equivalent of his half pay, whatever that may be. The effect of this, taking the exchange at 1 s. 6 d., is that a Civil Engineer cannot draw as much furlough pay as a Royal Engineer of the lowest rank, namely, assistant engineer, 2nd grade, until the Civil Engineer has been an executive engineer, 3rd grade, for three years; and a Royal Engineer of the rank of executive engineer, 4th grade, will draw more than a Civil Engineer who is superintending engineer, 3rd class, or four grades above him, and proportionately more than Civil Engineers below that class, but of rank higher than, or equal to, his own. It may be added that the Royal Engineer still retains an advantage, which he has all along possessed over the Civil Engineer, namely, that his maximum furlough allowance is 1,000 l. a year, against 800 l., the maximum of the Civil Engineer.

11. Summing up the above, it appears that all the advantages credited to the Civil Engineer in the former comparison have disappeared; that the advantages of Royal Engineers in point of salary, and in the exchange value of the rupee and £. sterling, were considerably under-rated, and that the advantages in furlough pay were wholly omitted. At the present moment there can be no doubt that the rates of pay, pension, and leave allowance of the Royal Engineers are considerably higher than those of Civil Engineers in the same Depart-

ment and doing the same work, and that the difference is greater than it ever was.

On the other hand, it may be said that the superiority in pay, over and above that of which the net military pay is a true measure, is liable to be affected at any time by new Warrants, which affect the rate of military promotion; and in this connection it may be mentioned that the military pay, with the regimental rank of colonel, has practically disappeared since the majority of officers now in the Department made the election between the staff and consolidated scale; the effect of this is to reduce the highest pay obtainable on the staff scale, by amounts varying in different grades from Rs. 60. 14. to Rs. 263. 1., and the highest net military pay by Rs. 60.14.

It may be added that there is one very obvious disadvantage which affects Royal Engineers and not Civil Engineers, namely, that the former are compelled to leave the Department on promotion to major general, if they do not then hold the rank of chief engineer, 1st class, and that they are compelled absolutely to vacate when promoted to lieutenant general. In several cases such promotion and consequent retirement has happened, and will happen in the future, from the first of these causes, some time before the officer attains the age of 55 years, so that Royal Engineers are liable to lose entirely the emoluments of the highest grades in the Department.

12. Taking all these points into consideration, it is clearly impossible to place the two classes on a perfect equality; but, on the whole, I feel no doubt that at the present time the Royal Engineers have a considerable advantage over the Civil Engineers. My own reply, therefore, to the Secretary of State's Despatch of the 23rd September last is, that I do not recognise any necessity for remedying the small disadvantage under which Royal Engineers labour, who may not be able to enter the Department within two and a half or three years of their gaining their commissions; unless, indeed, it be made a part of a comprehensive revision calculated to bring about a far more complete and equitable balance of advantages between the two classes of officers than exists at present. I may add that any such alteration in the present rules seems to me the more unnecessary because, as observed by Lord Salisbury in his Despatch, No. 61, dated 9th November 1876, written in connection with the same subject, it would give colour to the idea that seniority rather than merit confers a right to promotion.

*T. C. Hope.*

---

Enclosures to the Honourable Sir *Theodore Hope's* Minute, dated 31st October 1887.

121.

TABLE I.  
SALARIES drawn by Royal Engineers in the Public Works Department, under the "Staff" Scale.

|                              | CHIEF ENGINEERS. |                  |                  | SUPERINTENDING ENGINEERS. |                  |                  | EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS. |                  |                  |                  | ASSISTANT ENGINEERS. |                  |                  | REMARKS. |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|
|                              | 1st Class.       | 2nd Class.       | 3rd Class.       | 1st Class.                | 2nd Class.       | 3rd Class.       | 1st Grade.           | 2nd Grade.       | 3rd Grade.       | 4th Grade.       | 1st Grade.           | 2nd Grade.       | 3rd Grade.       |          |
|                              | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i>          | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i>     | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i>     | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> | <i>Rs. a. p.</i> |          |
| Colonels - - - -             | 2,804 6 0        | 2,304 6 0        | 2,154 6 0        | 2,065 5 0                 | —                | —                | —                    | —                | —                | —                | —                    | —                | —                |          |
| Lieutenant Colonels - -      | 2,743 8 0        | 2,202 4 0        | 2,002 4 0        | 1,802 4 0                 | 1,752 4 0        | 1,593 8 0        | 1,403 8 0            | 1,143 8 0        | —                | —                | —                    | —                | —                |          |
| Majors - - - -               | 2,682 10 0       | 1,840 14 0       | 1,610 14 0       | 1,440 14 0                | 1,390 14 0       | 1,340 14 0       | 1,240 14 0           | 1,082 10 0       | 982 10 0         | 892 10 0         | —                    | —                | —                |          |
| Captains - - - -             | —                | —                | —                | 1,233 10 0                | 1,183 10 0       | 1,133 10 0       | 1,033 10 0           | 933 10 0         | 883 10 0         | 783 10 0         | 690 0 0              | —                | —                |          |
| Lieutenants, over 3 years -  | —                | —                | —                | —                         | —                | —                | —                    | 765 12 0         | 715 12 0         | 615 12 0         | 565 12 0             | 515 12 0         | —                |          |
| Lieutenants, under 3 years - | —                | —                | —                | —                         | —                | —                | —                    | —                | 663 5 0          | 563 5 0          | 513 5 0              | 463 5 0          | 413 5 0          |          |

SALARIES drawn by Royal Engineers in the Public Works Department under "Consolidated" Scale.

A 4

|                              |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |           |          |          |         |         |         |   |   |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---|---|
| Colonels - - - -             | 2,804 6 0  | 2,304 6 0  | 2,104 6 0  | 1,001 6 0  | 1,654 6 0  | 1,404 6 0  | 1,254 6 0  | —         | —        | —        | —       | —       | —       | — | — |
| Lieutenant Colonels - -      | 2,743 8 0  | 2,243 8 0  | 2,043 8 0  | 1,843 8 0  | 1,593 8 0  | 1,343 8 0  | 1,193 8 0  | 1,043 8 0 | —        | —        | —       | —       | —       | — | — |
| Majors - - - -               | 2,682 10 0 | 2,182 10 0 | 1,982 10 0 | 1,782 10 0 | 1,532 10 0 | 1,282 10 0 | 1,132 10 0 | 982 10 0  | 882 10 0 | 782 10 0 | —       | —       | —       | — | — |
| Captains - - - -             | —          | —          | —          | 1,740 0 0  | 1,490 0 0  | 1,240 0 0  | 1,090 0 0  | 940 0 0   | 840 0 0  | 740 0 0  | 640 0 0 | —       | —       | — | — |
| Lieutenants, over 3 years -  | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | 870 0 0   | 770 0 0  | 670 0 0  | 570 0 0 | 470 0 0 | —       | — | — |
| Lieutenants, under 3 years - | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | —          | —         | 760 0 0  | 660 0 0  | 560 0 0 | 460 0 0 | 410 0 0 | — | — |

After three years' service as assistant engineer, 2nd grade, an increment of 50 rupees is admissible.

SALARIES drawn by Civil Engineers in the Public Works Department.

|                         |           |           |           |           |           |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Civil Engineers - - - - | 2,500 0 0 | 2,000 0 0 | 1,800 0 0 | 1,600 0 0 | 1,350 0 0 | 1,160 0 0 | 950 0 0 | 800 0 0 | 700 0 0 | 600 0 0 | 500 0 0 | 400 0 0 | 350 0 0 | 250 0 0 |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|

This table shows that—

Colonels who are 3rd class chief engineers, or below that rank - - - - }  
 Lieutenants Colonels who are 2nd class superintending engineers, or below that rank - - - - }  
 Majors who are 3rd class superintending engineers, or below that rank - - - - }  
 Captains who are 3rd grade executive engineers, or below that rank - - - - } Draw higher salaries under the "Staff" scale than under the "Consolidated" scale.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (EAST INDIA).

7

57

TABLE II.

STATEMENT showing Departmental and Military, Regimental, Ranks of Royal Engineer Officers in the Engineer Grades of the Public Works Department in 1887.

|  | CHIEF ENGINEERS. |            |            | SUPERINTENDING ENGINEERS. |            |            | EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS. |            |            |            | ASSISTANT ENGINEERS. |            | REMARKS.   |    |
|--|------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|------------|--|----|
|  | 1st Class.       | 2nd Class. | 3rd Class. | 1st Class.                | 2nd Class. | 3rd Class. | 1st Grade.           | 2nd Grade. | 3rd Grade. | 4th Grade. | 1st Grade.           | 2nd Grade. |  |    |
| Colonels . . . . .   | 1                | 1          | —          | —                         | —          | —          | —                    | —          | —          | —          | —                    | —          | In 1887 there were 93 Royal Engineers "above the line;" of these, 64 were drawing salaries under the "Staff" scale which were greater than the Civil salaries, <i>plus</i> "net military pay." |    |
| Lieutenant Colonels . . . . .  | 4                | 4          | 3          | 10                        | 5          | 4          | 14                   | —          | —          | —          | —                    | —          |  |    |
| Majors . . . . .   | —                | —          | —          | —                         | 1          | 7          | 20                   | —          | —          | 4          | —                    | —          |  |    |
| Captains . . . . .   | —                | —          | —          | —                         | —          | —          | 2                    | 24         | —          | 16         | 7                    | 6          |  |    |
| Lieutenants . . . . .  | —                | —          | —          | —                         | —          | —          | —                    | —          | —          | —          | —                    | 27         |  | 10 |
|  |                  |            |            |                           |            |            |                      |            |            |            |                      |            |  |    |
| Difference between the salaries of Royal Engineers and Civil Engineers . . . . . | Maximum          | 304 6 0    | 304 6 0    | 243 8 0                   | 243 8 0    | 402 4 0    | 493 8 0              | 543 8 0    | 140 0 0    | 282 10 0   | 183 10 0             | 190 0 0    | 115 12 0   |    |
|  | Minimum          | 243 8 0    | 202 4 0    | 202 4 0                   | 202 4 0    | 40 14 0    | 162 10 0             | 83 10 0    | 133 10 0   | 140 0 0    | 140 0 0              | 65 12 0    | 70 0 0   |    |



MINUTE by Lieutenant General *Chesney*.

THE Despatch, as now sent home to the Secretary of State, is limited to the simple issue raised by his Lordship, whether the Royal Engineer officers should be put on the same footing as the Civil Engineers from Cooper's Hill in respect to standing on first entering the Public Works Department. The Despatch proposes that they should be, and there I venture to think the matter should be left. For with respect to the points raised in the Minute by Sir Theodore Hope, it appears to me that to attempt to appraise in specific values the relative advantages and disadvantages attaching to the two services is, from the nature of the case, impracticable. This, I think, is sufficiently shown by the complicated calculations and considerations which are brought out in Sir Theodore Hope's Minute, which seem to me to leave the matter pretty much as before. This service has one advantage, that has another, and so on; but surely each advantage is incommensurable, and the so-called equation of conditions perfectly indeterminate. As well attempt to establish an equation of beauty between a blonde and a brunette.

Even if the conditions of the two services were so laid down as to present the appearance of equality, this equilibrium is liable to be immediately upset by any Royal Warrant which may be published altering the status of the Royal Engineers. This has happened before, as, for example, when the grade of colonel was abolished; again when the establishment of general officers was altered; again in the rules limiting the tenure of office of lieutenant colonel to five years; and again when the Royal Engineers were admitted to the benefits of Indian pensions; there is no reason to suppose that we have arrived at finality in the matter of change. Are we then, whenever a change of this sort is made, to reopen the whole of this question again?

A main point to be kept in view in dealing with the two services, the conditions of which are and must be necessarily different, appears to be that the terms of remuneration should be sufficiently attractive to secure a superior class of men in each, especially at the outset. As regards the Civil Engineers from Cooper's Hill, the initial rate of salary has been fixed at a rate which experience shows is sufficient to attract a superior class of candidates to the service. As regards the young officers of Royal Engineers, the rate of remuneration now fixed at starting for them is somewhat higher. But it is not more than sufficient for the purpose in view, for we should fail to secure them for the Indian service if the subalterns of Royal Engineers entering the Department after from four to five years' previous service were to find that he is practically getting the same pay as his younger brother doing duty with a native infantry regiment. It is not proposed, I believe, to raise the pay of the Civil Engineer in this grade; the effect of cutting down that of the Royal Engineer would probably be that very few would be willing to enter the Public Works Department. So long, therefore, as it is considered desirable to maintain a reserve of Royal Engineers in that Department during peace time, I submit that it is not desirable to alter their emoluments, especially at the outset. And without admitting the validity of the calculations given in my honourable colleague's Minute, or opposing them by another set of calculations to bring out a contrary result, I would deprecate this mode of dealing with the subject as being really inconclusive.

31 October 1887.

*G. Chesney.*

No. 2.—Public Works.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable The Governor of India in Council.

My Lord,

India Office, London, 19 January 1888.

Grading of Royal  
Engineer officers  
on first appoint-  
ment to the Indian  
Public Works  
Department.

YOUR Excellency's Public Works letter, No. 66, dated the 31st October 1887, suggests, in reply to my Public Works Despatch, No. 34, dated 23rd September 1886, the formulation of a rule under which Royal Engineer subalterns recruited since 1872 (when Cooper's Hill College engineers first joined the Indian Public Works Department) should be permitted to count their departmental service as commencing 2½ years after date of first commission, provided that they do not add more than one year to their actual service in the Department.

2. The laying down of such a rule would, in your opinion, remove an existing inequality between the Royal Engineer and civilian officers of the Department in respect to their first entry into the public service, and would place them as nearly as practicable on an equal footing as regards the age at which departmental service begins to count.

3. The remarks of the Joint Committee of the War Office and this Office on the Establishment of Royal Engineers to be retained in India, as transmitted to you with my Public Works Despatch, No. 34, dated 23rd September 1886, evidently pointed to the adoption of some such arrangement as that proposed by you, and as your Government, after a careful consideration of the matter, has decided on recommending this concession to Royal Engineer officers on their first joining the Department, I am prepared to assent to your proposed ruling. In doing this, however, I would remark that, as the principle on which advancement in the Department is based is selection for merit, the influence of seniority alone will be of secondary importance in most cases, and I see no reason to dissent from the views expressed in Lord Salisbury's Public Works Despatch, No. 61, of 9th November 1876, which was referred to in Sir T. Hope's Minute of 31st October 1887.

I have, &c.  
(signed)    Cross.

---

EAST INDIA (PUBLIC WORKS  
DEPARTMENT).

---

COPIES of of EXTRACTS from CORRESPONDENCE  
relating to the system of grading ROYAL ENGINEERS  
with CIVIL ENGINEERS on their first appointment  
to the PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

(*Sir Roper Lethbridge.*)

---

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,  
14 April 1890.*

---

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY HENRY HANSARD AND SON;  
AND  
Published by EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, East Harding-street,  
London, E.C.  
and 32, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W. ;  
ADAM and CHARLES BLACK, North Bridge, Edinburgh ;  
and HODGES, FIGGIS, and Co., 104, Grafton-street, Dublin.

[*Price 1½ d.*]

121.

H.-5. 5. 00.

*Under 2 oz.*