

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	138	Press
273-274		Mis.
Dated	15-1-	1873.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

17

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th January 1873.*

No. 273. Read the following letter from Lieut.-Colonel R. A. ROBERTS, R. E.,
Superintending Engineer, 8th Division:—

Forwards, for information, an original letter
from Assistant-Engineer Mr. C. Norfor upon
certain remarks of the Superintending Engi-
neer. (Here enter No. 4,053, dated 2nd Dec. 1872).

No. 274. ORDER THEREON, 15th January 1873, No. 138.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 20.

His Excellency the Governor in
Council requests that Lieutenant-Colonel
Roberts will in future abstain from
addressing to the Government communications such as that noted above, which is
objectionable in tone, and relates in great part to subjects which do not concern
him.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To Lieutenant-Colonel R. A. Roberts, R. E.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

Madras

Superintendent Engineer's Office S^t. D.
N^o. 4053
Calcutta 2^d December
1873.

Dear Sir,
Lieut. Colonel R. A. Roberts Esq.
Superintendent Engineer S^t. D.
Colonel G. W. Walker Esq.
Secretary to Government
S^t. D.

Enclosure: 1.
1. Letter

I have the honor to forward
as requested therein, an original letter
N^o. 4 dated 16th October from Assistant
Engineer Mr. C. Taylor and received
by me and due course through the
Office of Executive Engineer Mr. J. W. Pender.
From his letter it would appear
that Mr. Taylor considers himself ag-
grieved by the remarks contained in
my letter quoted in the S^t. D. dated 2^d.
November 1872 N^o. 12, inasmuch as he is of
opinion that the certificate which he
holds from the Civil Engineering College
Madras

Madras, is sufficient guarantee for his fitness as Range Officer.

To me such an argument appears only too ridiculous! But as I feel satisfied that Mr Norfor will not be convinced by any arguments of mine, it appears to me a fitting opportunity to suggest to Government the necessity of laying down some rule as to the period of probation to be passed by a student of the Civil Engineering College Madras, in the actual working duties of a District before he be allowed to take charge of a Range, excepting of course for an merely temporary purpose.

There can be no doubt, but that Mr Norfor's somewhat inflated ideas of his own acquirements are not purely self-reliant. When it is considered that young Officers of the Royal Engineers have

have first to pass the competitive examination for Woolwich, an examination which I believe more than one member of the Civil Service of this Presidency has failed in, and that they are subsequently selected for Engineers out of the foremost of those passed candidates, and that they have further to go through a special training in Engineering, it is not too much to concede that these Officers represent, in their particular line of duties, the picked intellect of England. Yet these Officers, on joining the Madras Public Works Department, find themselves graded below young men like Mr Norfor, who are not only younger than themselves in actual years, but who have never been out of the country, and whose qualifications are simply the amount of Civil Engineering knowledge which they have managed to

to scrape up at the Civil Engineering
College, to enable them to obtain a
certificate; and who, it is not too much
to say, cannot even form an idea of
the style of examination and training
to which young Officers of Engineers have
to pass and undergo, at the present day.
The Examination for the Madras
Civil Engineering College certificate is far
easier to pass than that required by
the War Department in England from
a Clerk of the Works before he can be
nominated to the Public Works Depart-
ment. But the idea of grading these
individuals with the Officers of Engineers
would no more be entertained than
that young men like Mr. Norfox should
be locally nominated to the Civil
Service of this Country, and take
the

the part of those who have successfully
competed for it, and passed all the neces-
sary tests.
It is well known that the
Public Works Department of this Presidency
previous to 1866, was much respected, and
that it held a position inferior to none
in the service. On its enlargement, how-
ever, subsequent to that date, the Depart-
ment was allowed to become little more
than a Refuge for the Destitute, and
the result has been that no Department
in the service has been so publicly abused,
and is held in such general contempt
as is the Department of Public Works.
To those of us who have still
some esprit de corps the present aspect
of the Department is a source of sincere
regret. And not only for this reason, but
in

in the interests of Government, it appears
to me that Superintending Engineers are
bound to be most particular in the
selection of the Range Officers whom they
may appoint. In the remarks which
have led to this correspondence, I was
most particular in saying nothing
personal in regard to Mr. Norfor. And
I will only now say that while he has
proved his fitness for the post, which he
has certainly not done up to the present
time, he should not be appointed as
Range Officer.

I trust that I shall be
excused for the length of these remarks.
But I submit them because I do not
wish it to be thought that I am dealing
harshly in this matter. I believe Mr.
Norfor to be a young man of
excellent

54
excellent principles and deserving every
legitimate encouragement. And I would
not willingly interfere with his prospects.
But it has always appeared to me
that the interests of the service should
be my first consideration, and it is
this season only that I have given
my views at length in submitting
Mr. Norfor's letter for the orders of
Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedt-Servt
Wm. H. R. S. S. S. S. S.
Superint Engineer 8th D.

Leamp
Chippewa
St.

I think Col. Roberts
should be informed that
the full report that
he will be promoted
to the position of Major
in the 1st Cavalry
as to the fitness of W. Norfer
to hold charge of a Range
It is three years since
he dropped out of the
Engineering College Madison
and until recently
has held this charge
whether when he held

to
the Bishop of England
the Secretary of State
the President of the
Senate
the President of the
House of Representatives
the President of the
Court of Sessions
the President of the
Court of Common Pleas
the President of the
Court of Chancery
the President of the
Court of Admiralty
the President of the
Court of Exchequer
the President of the
Court of Wards and
Livery
the President of the
Court of Requests
the President of the
Court of Sessions
the President of the
Court of Common Pleas
the President of the
Court of Chancery
the President of the
Court of Admiralty
the President of the
Court of Exchequer
the President of the
Court of Wards and
Livery
the President of the
Court of Requests

Dated 2^d December 1834
Received 11th —

1871
 Dear Sir,
 I am very glad to hear
 from you and hope you
 are well.
 I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Yours,
 J. B.

Paid to Mrs. Jane
 1/2/28. 15-
 1/2/28

brought exaggerated
approach in the D.P. W
in India have not
been confined to the
civil officers of the
Public Works depart-
ment - but in so
far Col. Roberts
reasoning is as
defective as his
style is objectionable
I think has much
sense has for some

distinct English
of ~~his~~ its own -
so we need not
trouble Col. Roberts
further about his
know for. If Col. R.
had any specific
instance of in-
capacity or inef-
ficiency to advance
he would doubtless
have advanced it
I quite concur as
to the proposed rebuke.
I O.S.

I would like to see
his letter in abstract
+ not just a full letter.

qualification the
information in the
to advise and on
the point of view
must I presume
other points
of Roberts
the proposed
improvement
I O.S.

Timonally is
has under a

charge of a Range he
performed the duty
satisfactorily shined
be capable of proof
from the reports of
officers under whom
he has served.
The tone of this
letter is I think very
mischievous and is
not I think justified
by facts. The failures
which have from
time to time

16 Aug 1875
C.D. 270
Ch. 138. 15 Aug 1875

lenie part been allowed
to Ed Roberts in his
style of official cor-
respondence.

I would strongly urge
that he be told that
the Govt very much
disapprove of this
communication - &
warn him to be
more guarded in
future. A.E.

Dec. 13. 72.

616 West 17th St. N.Y.

616 West 17th St. N.Y.
Dec. 13. 72.

117
Enclosure No. 1. Ena
letter from the Sup^r
Engineer 8th D^o dated 22^d
Decr 1872 N^o 4053.

To
The Secretary Gov^t
P.W. D.

P.W. 6433/72.

Letter from Assistant
Engineer Br. C. Hofer.

118
N^o 138
Rev. Mr. ...
Lead the following:-
From the Sup^r Engr 8th D^o (N^o 4053 of 2 Dec/72)

His Excellency the
Governor in Council
requests that Lieutenant
Colonel Roberts will
in future abstain
from addressing to the
Government commu-
-nications such as that
noted above; which is
objectionable in tone,
and relates in great
part to subjects which
do not concern him.

18
To Lieut^{Col} Roberts R.E.S.

Desp^d 17/1/73.

G.M.W.

Op. 6133 137

Govt. of 1872 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To *Quinto Collo R. A. Roberts R.C.*

Date

Recd.

Encl. ✓

G. O. 15th Sept 72 No. 138

Nos. 273 & 274

Correspondence.

Noticing the objection-
able line of Lt Col.
Roberts' communi-
cation regarding the
Apptmg for