Executive Engineer's Off

No ii Party, T. M. Sc

Coimbatore, 17th June 87

No 13. C. E

Cancelled

From

C. H. T. Norfor Esq.
Executive Engineer
No ii Party, T. M. Scheme

To

The Secretary to Government
P. W. D.

Through The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

Sir

With much regret I beg to ask you to lay before the Government this, my application for a transfer from the Tank Maintenance Scheme No ii Party, Coimbatore to charge of one of the pucka Executive Divisions of this Presidency.

Some few years back, the Tank Maintenance Scheme was started which eventually comprised 4 Tank Divisions, each of which was made up of the following strength.

1 Executive Engineer (in ch. of Division)
1 Assistant Engineer
1 Sub Engineer
1 Supervisor
4 Overseers

The strength of the Executive Engineers Office Establishment was that of a 2nd class Divisional Office. Each Division had in addition to the Upper Subordinate Establishment, 4 Survey Parties, each party consisting of

Statement B. Page 6.

3 Surveyors
2 Draughtsmen
1 Financial clerk — with the usual compliment of lascar

Each Division was organized so as to constitute 3 Sub-Divisions: the Assistant Engineer, the Sub Engineer, and the Supervisor, respectively, being in charge.

2. Owing to Financial pressure, the Tank Divisions were abolished; but, shortly after, Tank operations were revived; and, on a reference to the Notes of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation which accompany G. O No 1103 W. dated ~~4th~~ 21st April 87, it will be seen # that

the Establishment is much reduced, and has been so formed as to suit an Assistant Engineer's charge. In fact, the Establishment therein allowed an Assistant Engineer is about the same strength as the Sub Divisional officers in the former Tank Divisions were allowed. In a word, the Chief Engineer for Irrigation+ admits that the work to be done, could well be performed by an Assistant Engineer.

+ as well as others

3. Under Section 325 of the P. W. Code Executive Engineers are told that

they

they must be prepared to undertake the duties of Assistant Engineers *in the event* of there being an excess number of Executives over the number of executive charges. It is further, in that case, left to the Government to select such Engineers, but the selection, it is ruled, should be made, excepting for special reasons, from the lowest Grade.

4. There are at present a greater number of Executive charges than there are Executive Engineers available for duty, in as much as there are no

less than 7 Executive Engineers Temporary rank, in charge of pucka Executive Divisions: one Division, Trichinopoly, being altogether vacant- an Upper Subordinate being in charge; and it will be seen from the Distribution Return that there are some 14 or 15 men, all my juniors, placed in charge of pucka Executive Divisions while I have been kept out of one.

5. I must here observe that I am not the only Executive Engineer so situated, but would

at

at the same time respectfully beg to state that all such appointments are irregular, and cannot but cause discontent to the officers concerned. Personally, I feel that I have been placed in an inferior position with reference to many of my juniors, and it cannot be in the interests of the Government to cause such feeling.

I have been in charge of No ii Tank Party but a short time, but long enough to see that the work could well be entrusted to an Assistant Engineer or even an Upper Subordinate of Standing.

6. I have special reasons for deeply feeling the punishment (I can view it in no other light) now inflicted on me, as there have been no less than three Government orders all of which, or certainly two of which, were obtained irregularly i.e without my being afforded an opportunity of any explanation. The first Government order I refer to, is of many years standing, but has affected me most seriously of all. It

G O
1294 B
7-5-75

reduced

reduced me in my Grade many steps, some 12 or 13, and as a consequence, the following officers, still remaining in the Department; who in Service, are all my juniors, now stand over me. They are all Royal Engineers.

1. Captain Smart R.E.
2. Captain Rawson R.E.
3. Captain Dorward R.E.
4. Captain Henderson R.E.
5. Captain Boddy R.E. (6) Captain Langly R.E.

5: These three Officers were graded above me [illegible] in 1875
Cu

I was quite young and inexperienced in the Department at the time. The Government order was the result of an innocent letter

I wrote and sent through my District Engineer Mr Rundall, asking for a transfer to another District, owing to ill health I had experienced off and on, at the foot of the hills about Courtallum. This officer had misconstrued my letter, and in sending it on to the Chief Engineer said that he believed my application for the transfer was not owing to ill health, but to my having been censured by him, or in other words my object

in

in the transfer was in his opinion, to serve under somebody else than himself. Considering this officer was about going away on 2 years' furlough, and absolutely did leave about 6 weeks after, his interpretation of my letter was obviously incorrect. It was unfortunate for me that I wrote that letter which, as I have said and proved, was written in perfect innocence. Had I not written it, I should not have been reported, and the officers who now stand over me would still be below me. This Government order which is now 13 years old, and which was passed when I was quite young and inexperienced is still allowed to stand in the way of my promotion, notwithstanding the fact that Mr Rundall has since favorably reported on me.

7. The second Government order came out when I was at Trichinopoly, officiating as Executive Engineer of that Division in 1881. I was reported by the Superintending Engineer for having

Mis. G.O. 1072 W d/ 25-4-81.

The original of the order with which the S.E's reports were attached is not forthcoming in the Works Office even after a careful search.

removed

removed the cross bund of a Tank, against orders, which action he said was injurious to the tank. Without my being called upon for any explanation whatsoever on the matter, I was ordered to restore the bund at my own cost, and was transferred and placed in Sub Division charge for 15 months which latter cost me in pay 1500 Rupees. The Government order stated that it was evident I was not as yet fit for the discharge of Executive duties, as the Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer for Irrigation (on the

Superintending Engineer's report which was not furnished me) showed that my action was injurious to the Tank, and therefore reduced me to a Sub Division. The Examiner further called upon me to state the cost of restoring the Bund, and I replied that, as it was never removed (my never having issued such an order) it cost nothing to restore, and the Superintending Engineer, I regret to say did not himself correct the Government on this point.

point. I respectfully beg to say that I consider this Government order most unjust, and there is no doubt that, but for the fact that the Government thought I had really removed the bund against orders, I should never have been transferred to a less important charge at a pecuniary loss to myself. I am prepared to prove two things:

1st That, had I cut the cross bund ~~dam~~ down to a certain level, as a temporary arrangement, which was my desire, it would have benefitted the Tank.

and Secondly that the Superintending Engineer in his letter to the Chief Engineer on the Subject had absolutely Supported my views — though, I admit, unintentionally. (There are two Contradictory paras in his letter which, if occasion requires I will point out) I had demi-official correspondence on this Subject with the then Chief Engineer, and Chief Engineer for Irrigation,

but

but was told to keep quiet — that from the correspondence my letters showed a Spirit of resistence. If so, I beg to observe that the remedy as suggested in the latter part of para 290 of the P. W. Code, was at hand, and that the punishment inflicted was out of all proportion to the offence.

8. The third Government order was in 1885, and is, with reference to the Chilka Lake Canal. Here also, without a word of explanation from me, I was severely censured for preparing an Estimate on

GO 45 I. 15.1.85
GO 228 I. 8.3.86

incorrect levels. I wrote at once, and pointed out the irregularity and called for the whole papers. It resulted in my showing that the levels were perfectly correct. It brought out other evidence also, and a second or modified Government order was issued when I was in England, a copy of which I have just called for.

9. I returned from furlough just as the Tank Operations were revived and it is possible that, on this account, I was posted to the charge of one of the Parties. If so, I would respectfully observe that such a reason would not justify my appointment to the Tank Maintenance when there were others available for the work. With due deference I beg also to point out that it is hardly fair that I should be placed in an inferior position with reference to Mr Davidson my junior, even as a temporary arrangement. It is observed that this officer has been placed in charge

of the Tank Maintenance Scheme.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt Servant

C. Hooper
Executive Engineer

P.W. No. 4739

CHIEF No. 187 18 JUN. 87 FOR IRRIGATION

From

C. H. T. Norfor Esq
Executive Engineer
No iv Party. T. R. Scheme

To

The Secretary to Govt
P. W. D
through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No 13 C. E.
Dated 17th }
Despd 17th } June 87.
Recd 22 }

Enclo — Nil.

Forwd to CE I
for disposal [illegible]

Requesting to lay before the Government his application for a transfer from No iv Party. T. R. Scheme to charge of one of pucka Executive Divisions

R. 20. 8. 87

Note by Ch Eng I
to W

In forwarding as requested Mr Nepeans letter No 13 CE dated 17th June 1887 it is remarked that it is not considered that the charge of a Tank Restoration party is derogatory to an officer of Mr Nepeans standing and he protests against the view taken by Mr Nepean of the work in his charge. Again Mr Nepean is wrong in stating that he is placed under Mr Davidson his junior. He is under the Ch Eng for irrigation Mr Davidson is the Assistant to the Ch Eng for irrigation and until another officer is available is doing the duty of Asst to the Ch Eng for Irrigation for the Tank ~~[illegible]~~ Restoration scheme. There is no reason for this Asst to be senior to the Ex Engineers in charge of parties anymore than for the Assts to the Ch Engs and the Ch Eng I to be senior to all the Sub. Engineers. The undersigned is not aware

that any Supt of Engs or
other officer has considered
it a hardship that the
Appts to the Ch Eng and
the Ch Eng I should be
junior to them and it
would be absurd if they
did so.
It is not thought
necessary for this office
to give any opinion
on the other points referred
to in Mr Nelsons letter

29/6/87

Returned by the Works Office on the 27th June. A file on this subject is said to have been sent to W last week.

BR

27.6.87

R-20-8-87

R. 254 15/81

FORMER CASES.

No. dated
" "
" "

Receipt No. 187
Dated 18-6-87

LATER CASES.

No. dated
" "
" "

Sent to Government with No. W. of 188 .
Printed with G.O., No. dated

REMINDERS RECEIVED.

No. 1, dated 188 .
" 2, " "
" 3, " "
" 4, " "
" 5, " "

KEEP-WITHS.

Pulled up by W.O. - recd. on 27.6.87.

R. 20-8-87

E. I. Form No. 29.

Receipt No. 187

From
C. H. T. Norfor Esq.
Ex. Engr.
No. IV Party
T. M. Scheme

No. 13 C. E.
Dated 17-6-87.

Subject—Transfer—
Requesting to lay before the Govt. his application for a transfer from No. IV Party Tank M. Scheme to charge of one of pucka Executive Dns. of this Presy.

ENCLOSURES.

From to
" "
" "
" "

24/6

Orders and Proceedings in File.

No.	Date.	No.	Date.
1103 W	21. 4. 87		
228 W	8. 3. 86		
45. J	15. 1. 85		
(Ed Mys) 1072 W	25. 4. 87.		

W.O. I 372 E 26-4-82.
S.O. 1785 = A - 25. 6. 75
S.O. 1294 - 7. 5. 75.

R.R. Pollock Please put up the references in para 6 of this letter. It will perhaps be well to put up also the original file connected with G.O. 1072 W 25.4.87

P.T.O.

+ referred to in the G.O.

No. 37. C. E.

Camp Puthur
29th June 87.

Cancelled

From
C. H. T. Norfor Esqr
Executive Engr.

To
The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.

Thro:
The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 13 C. E. dated 17th inst: para 7 I have the honor to request that I may be furnished with a copy of the Superintending Engineers letter reporting me for removing the cross Bund of the Thiroo-pheleyur Tank in the Trichinopoly District against his orders, together with copies of enclosures to that letter and the Chief Engineer for Irrigation's Notes + on the Superintending Engineer's letter and finally with a copy of the Govt. order thereon.

2. That I should be forced at this distance of time to recur to this matter is most distasteful to me: I further beg to state that there

is no Officer in the Department who has a greater claim on the Trichinopoly Division than I have. It was vacant on my arrival in this Country and I was wrongly turned out of it in 1881, and it is to prove the latter fact that I require to revise this matter.

3. I beg to state that I cannot admit that my letter the Superintending Engineer forwarded to the Chief Engineer acknowledges that I removed the Bund or that I gave the order to do so. I am quite prepared to interpret that letter and to state why I wrote it. The bodily removal of a Bund, and the lowering of it, for a certain length to F.T.L. as a temporary arrangement, are not one and the same thing; and there cannot be any reason why the Supt: Engr's opinion, should be accepted over mine to my detriment merely from the fact of his being my immediate Superior.

4. I say that his letter to the Chief Engr. contains misrepresentations on more than one point & that the Government Order was framed upon a misconception, and in contravention to Secs: 676 & 677 of the P.W. Code.

5. It was quite accidentally that I came to hear I was reported to the Chief Engr: and immediately I heard it I wrote to the Chief Engr. to stay ~~f~~ orders on the letter until it was placed before me for an explanation; he replied to say that the G.O. had already been taken.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
C. Moor[illegible]
Executive Engineer

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 19 I.
30 JUN. 87
FOR IRRIGATION.

From
C. H. J. Norfor Esqr.
Executive Engr.

To
The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.

Thro:
The Chief Engr.
for Irrigation.

Dated 29th June 1887
Recd.

No. 1
P.W. 5006/87

Calls for certain documents connected with the Thurithelayar Tank, in the Tri-Chinopoly district.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No 18 W.

Enclos.

The enclosed letter in original from Mr. Norfor Executive Engineer is forwarded to the Secretary to Government P.W.D as requested. In this letter Mr. Norfor requests to be furnished with certain papers. These have already been sent to the Secretary to Government P.W. Dept.

Chepauk }
1st July 1887 }

Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

67.

P.W.C. No. 5006

R 1.7.87

En: 1

20-8-87

No. 40 C.E.

Camp Coimbatore
5th July/87.

From
C. H. T. Norfor Esqr.
Exect: Engr.

To
The Secretary to Govt:
P. W. D.

Thro:
The Chief Engr.
for Irrigation.

Sir,

I have the honor to request you will be good enough to consider my letters Nos. 13 ~~7~~ C.E and + * 37 C.E dated 17th & 29th ulto: Cancelled- One of my objects in writing them and reccurring to past Govt: orders was the fear that my old supposed

+ No 5006 sent to Coty 4/7/87

13 C

+

* Ed No 18 W 7.7.87

faults would interfere with my promotion.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obt. Servant

Exect: Engr.

B No. 1834 W dd 8/7/87 & file

No. 19 W dated 7 July 1887.

Forwarded to the Secretary to Government P.W.D.

H Davidson
for Chief Engineer for Irrign.

C/e

PWC No. 5194

(1)

From
C. H. J. Norfor Esqre
Exect: Engr

To
the Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D

Thro:
the Chief Engr for
Irrigation

Dated 5th July 1887

Recd: 7.7.87

W
7.7.87

Reports that letters Nos: 17 C.E & 37 C.E be considered Cancelled.

Cancel letters accordingly

Joa
11/7/87

W

C.A.W
8/7/87

C. 8: 7. 87.

No. 355 D of 18.7.87.

PWD

Memo

In Mr Norfor's letter No 40 C.E. of 5th July 1887, he requests that his letters No 17 C.E. dated 17th, & No. 37 C.E. dated 29th June 1887 may be cancelled. The letter from Mr Norfor of 17th June, received in this office is numbered 13 C.E. & he is requested to state whether 17 C.E. has been quoted by a clerical error.

Note – The letter disposed of by G.O. No 1832 W d/ 8.7.87. is 16 C.E. d/ 24.6.87

Jell
16/7/87

C.H.T. Norfor Esqre
(through the Ch. E. Irrd)

No 355 Day 18.7.87

+ at botm

Old. 89.vii

despatched 18/7/87

No. 48

27th July 1887.

From

C. H. J. Norfor Esq
Exect: Engineer

To

the Secretary to Govt:
P. W. D.
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your memorandum No: 355 D dated 18th inst: I have the honor to state that 17 C.E is a clerical error for 13 C.E.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most: obd: Servant
C. Norfor
Exect: Engr

Thro:
The Chief: Engr
for Irrigation

No. 23 W.

Forwarded.

Col. R.E.

Chief Engr. for Irrigation

Ootacamund
3rd August 1887.

Madras office
5th August 87

O. 6.8.87. R. 20.8.87

P.W.C. No. 6098

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 257
13 AUG 87
FOR IRRIGATION.

(3)

From
C. H. T. Norfor Esqr.
Exect: Engr.

To
The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.
Madras.

No. 48 C.E.

Dated 27th July /87.

Recd: 6. 8. 87

States that 17. C.E. is a clerical error for 13 C. E.

30/7/87

Papers in

With Endorsement

G. Order No. 1072 W of 25 Apl/81

Mr. C. H. T. Norfor - Not considered to be yet possessed of the requisite experience and judgment for the position of a Divisional Executive Engineer and censured for disobedience of orders.

Original G.O. not forthcoming - Copy in the file

---

5 Aug

Send to Ooty
4.7.87

G.O. No. 1072 W of 25th April /81 - Mis:- Cannot be found.

This order was ~~for~~ on several occasions looked up but could not be traced - the last entry in the "drawing sheet" is given for C. Aw. at Ooty on the 24th April /83.

A careful search has been made for the paper but without success.

4/7

E

Can you give any clue as to where the G.O. required has got to?

F.B.

No. I gave R. R. all the latest papers on re Mr. Norfor but this G. O. No. 1072 W of /81 could not be found.

4.7

The G.O. referred [illegible] be traced

F.B.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2239 W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 22d August/87

READ the following

Endorsement by the Ch. E. for I. d 29.6.87 on P.W. Cons 4739.

" " — Do — No 18W d 1st July 1887.

From Mr C. H. J. Norfor No 40 C.S. d 5-7-87.

Endt by the Ch. E. for I. No 19W d 7. 7. 87.

From Mr C. H. J. Norfor No 48 C.S. d 27.7.87.

Endt by the Ch. E. for I. No 23W d 3-8-87.

Ordered accordingly that Mr Norfor's letters No 17 C.S. & 37 C.S. d 17th & 29th June 1887 be cancelled.

17/8/87

C. H. J. Norfor Esqre
(through the Ch. E. for Irrn)

O. 6.8.87, R. 20.8.87

G.O. 1834 W a/ 8.7.87
" 1294 W a/ 7.5.85
C.E. 372 d/ 27.8.80.
Copy of 1072 W a/ 25.4.87.
Ab 2285 W/ 8.3.86

d 2239 W a/ 22d August/87

M/ 25.8

P.M. Circd 26/8

6.8.87, R. 20.8.87