Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 677 W

DATED 23. april 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

ce C.H.T. Norfor Ex. Engineer: Communi-
cating to —, ~~Govt~~ with remarks, Govt of
India letter on the subject of ~~his~~ that
fficer's claim to be admitted to the
more favourable pension rules

P.W. 25.
5,000—20-11-96.

Indexed. 28/4

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

B/ Demi orders

DEPARTMENT.

No. 1077 W. d/ 23-4-97

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Letter from Mr. C. A. T. Norfor No. 584 of 5th Feby 1897.
Govt. letter S.E. VI Circle No. 58 W of 8th — " —
Letter from Mr. C. A. T. Norfor, No. 630 of 8th — " —
Govt. letter S.E. V Circle No. 2 W/C of 14th — " —
Letter from Mr. C. A. T. Norfor No. 1057 of 9th March 1897
Govt. letter S.E. V Circle No. 86 W of 10th — " —
Letter from the Govt. of India No. 244 E of 16th — " —

The letter f
the Govt. of India above recorded wil
be communicated to M
Norfor, who must
accept the decision
therein contained as
a final settlement o
his claim to be ad-
mitted to the most
favourable pension rul

2. The Govt. sees
no reason to forwa
to the Govt. of India
the papers relating
re Rampur chann

P. W. 40.
1,000—26-2-97.

head sluice. Mr Norfor has already been informed in G.O. No 926W dated 14 March 1896 that the question of his supersession was decided without reference to his dispute with Mr Somers Esq.

14/4/97

14/4/97

2/4

C. H. J. Norfor Esqre
Ex. Engr
(through the S. E. V circle)

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 3180

Order

From
The Govt of India

No. 744 G

Dated 16. 3. 97
Received 29. 3. 97
Enclosures .
Spare copies .

SUBJECT.

Mr C. H. J. Norfor, Ex: Engineer.

Passing orders on memorial from —— urging his claim to admission to the more favourable pension rules of civil Engineers.

P. W. 29.
2,000—16-11-96.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
1226 C d/	3-3-97 ✓
2710-1 W "	23-9-96 ✓
2122 W -	21-7-96 ✓
2111 W -	20-7-96 ✓
1885 W -	24-6-96 ✓
1807 W -	18-6-96 ✓
397 D "	9-6-96 ✓
1566 W -	21-5-96 ✓
1549 W -	19-5-96 ✓
1361 W -	29-4-96 ✓
52 D "	24-4-96 ✓
1132 W -	30-3-96 ✓
1497 C -	17-3-96 ✓
926 W -	14-3-96 ✓
758 W -	2-3-96 ✓
667 C -	7-2-96 ✓
237 W "	20-1-96 ✓
157 W -	15-1-96 ✓
146 W -	15-1-96 ✓
3195 W -	13-12-95 ✓
3621 C -	22-11-95 ✓
2473 W -	8-10-95 ✓
2298 W "	16-9-95 ✓
2193 W -	2-9-95 ✓
711 D "	8-8-95 ✓
1305 C -	26-3-95 ✓
1296 C -	26-3-95 ✓
1054 C -	14-3-95 ✓
896 C -	7-3-95 ✓
379 C -	1-2-95 ✓
235 D -	25-5-94 ✓
2604 W -	13-10-93 ✓
2326 W -	9-9-93 ✓
626 D -	25-7-93 ✓
3382 W -	9-12-92 ✓
4719 C -	14-11-92 ✓
2352 W -	1-9-90. ✓
521 W -	17-2-90. ✓
900 W -	26-3-89 ✓
582-3 W -	28-2-89 ✓
2628 W -	27-8-88 ✓
2239 W -	22-8-87 ✓
1834 W -	8-7-87 ✓
2289 -	8-3-86. ✓
459	15-1-85. ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
2634 W	27-10-84 ✓
1072 W	25-4-81 ✓
1294 "	7-5-75 ✓
145 "	26-2-74 ✓
12 "	2-11-72 ✓
2375 "	10-10-72 ✓

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary.

No. 744. G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Calcutta, the 16th March 1897.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 2711 W., dated 23rd September 1896, forwarding for orders a memorial dated 3rd August 1896 addressed to His Excellency the Viceroy by Mr. C.H.T.Norfor, Executive Engineer, in which he urges his claim to admission to the more favourable pension rules of Civil Engineers under the provisions of Art.704 of the Civil Service Regulations on the ground that he was temporarily promoted to the rank of Superintending Engineer for a period of six months.

2. In reply I am to observe that the meaning of the terms used in Article 704 of the Civil Service Regulations is that the Government of India reserve to themselves a discretion to reject such claims, even in the case of officers of the class referred to who rise substantively to the Superintending Engineer class. I am therefore to state that the Government of India see no reason for a reconsideration of the decision communicated in Public Works Department letter No. 899 G., dated 18th April 1896.

1566 W d/ 21.5.96

2. Mr. Norfor should be informed accordingly.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

G. M. Walker

Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Documents accompanying :-

Nil

BACK PAPERS. FURTHER PAPERS.

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 2590

Order

From

The Supdg. Engineer
5 Circle

No. 86.W.

Dated 10 March 1897
Despd. 11.3.97
Received 11-3-97
Enclosures Nil
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

C.H. T. Narfor Esquire Ex. Engr.

Forwards a letter from — explaining why Somers-Eve case should be placed before Government and requesting to know if the Chief Engineer still declines to do so to admit of the Government of India being memorialised on the subject in question.

W

12/3/97

12.3.97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 1057.

Tanjore Divisional Office
9th March 1897.

From,

C. H. T. Marsh Esquire
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D. Madras
Thro: The Supt: Engineer
V Circle

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your memo No. 1226 C dated 3rd instant, I have the honour to state that I am quite in order in asking you to lay before the Government the complete file on the Somers-Eve Case, and, as representing the head of the Department, it seems to me, you are bound to do it.

2. I made this request in my letter No. $\frac{4868}{20.2.96}$, but you have never carried out my wishes.

$\frac{1497 C}{17.3.96}$

3. You state that the Chief Engineer's memo No. $\frac{3421 C}{22.11.95}$ had no bearing on the question of my re-appointment to the Office of Superintending Engineer, but I contend that if the Somers-Eve Case is fully placed before His Excellency the Governor in Council, he will look upon my grievance in a very different light

to what he does now, and I can hardly suppose you can have any objection to his taking a different view of my case.

4. I further contend that if the late Chief Engineer could go so utterly wrong in dealing with my reports against Mr Somers-Eve with the full particulars I placed before him, it is more than likely that he went wrong when advising the Government to pass its order No $\frac{2193 W}{2.9.95}$, especially when it is considered that that order was taken and passed only on my bringing to notice the promotion out of turn of a Royal Engineer Officer to the Class of Superintending Engineer with but 8 months Executive Experience at the time of his promotion, and in direct contravention of the P.W. Code ruling, which is to the effect that promotions to Superintending Engineer should be made from Officers of 1st grade Executives who have had long and varied Experience of out-door Executive duties (Vide para 30 Chapter III Volume I)*.

5. I have, moreover, been referred to this very Government order in answer to the question "how the Government of India came to the conclusion that I had been tried and proved a failure as a Superintending Engineer" and it is to shew the Government of India the value of that order that I wish my letters Nos. 584 and 630 dated 5th and 8th February /97 sent to them, and whether, in your opinion, they have any bearing on the matter or not I would prefer that you sho leave that point to be decided by the Government.

6. Again, I stated in my memorial to the Government of India that prior to G.O. No $\frac{2193 W}{2.9.95}$ there was not a single G.O. or Chief Engineer's memo animadverting on my qualifications for the post of Superintending Engineer, but I omitted to mention that subsequent to that order there was a Chief Engineer's memo touching on my qualifications, and, I wish this memo, with the one cancelling it, sent to the Government of India, as I am at liberty to bring to the notice of that Government all the evidence I can collect to shew that the late Chief Engineer, as the professional adviser to Government on matters of promotion, was biassed against me as I feel he was.

7. The reason assigned by you for the writing of memo $\frac{3621 C}{22.11.95}$ is that it was framed on a misconception as to the date upon which I issued orders fixing the site of Head Sluice and ordering the collection of materials. The subject of "Collection of materials" is not even referred to in the memo and it is extremely unlikely that a misconception on a mere matter of dates could have justified an Officer of such a position as Chief Engineer to animadvert on my qualifications in the way he did, except

---

* as of course it would be quite impossible to advise on professional matters without previous experience on them.

from prejudice.

8. If, after what I have now stated, you still decline to lay the Somers-Eve Case (with this letter) before the Government, I hope you will advance inform me, so that I might memorialize the Government of India, sending them direct a duplicate Copy under Code rulings. I say duplicate Copy because the question of my admission to the more favorable pension rules is still before them and I wish, if possible, that they defer arriving at any decision until they are in receipt of further particulars.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obt servt

Executive Engineer

No.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
No. 160 T.J.
10 MAR. 1897
V CIRCLE, P.W.D., MADRAS

From

C.H.T. Harper Esquire
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Dt.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras
Thro: S.E.

No 1057

Dated 9th } March 1897.
Despd 9th }

10.3.97
Papers
This letter should not have been folded.

No 86 W.

Forwarded.

10/3/97

Lt. Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

C.H.T. Harper Esquire — Explains why Somers-Eve case should be placed before Government and requests to know if he still declines to do so to admit of the Government of India be memorialized on the subject in question:-

---

P.W.D.

Note.

Mr C.H.T. Harper Ex. Engr., was appointed to the charge of the III Circle early in 1895, with the temporary rank of Supdg. Engr. 3rd Class, and in July of the same year he requested that the Govt. of India might be moved to admit him to the benefit of what are known as the more favourable pension rules, under the provisions of Art. 704 C.S. Regns.

Mr Harper having been appointed to the service from the Madras Engineering College, comes under the pension rules [illegible] latter having [illegible]

INTENDING ENGINEER'S

services – Article 704 C.S.R. states that in the case of Indian College Engineers who may rise to the rank of Supdg. Engr., the Govt. of India will be prepared to consider favourably their admission to the pension rules applicable to Engineers appointed from England –

On his application of July 1895, Mr Harper was told by the + Chief Engineer that the question could not be raised until he was confirmed in the rank of Supdg. Engr.

Memo No. 711 D of 8.7.95 flagged A

In August 1895, he pressed for a reference to the Govt. of India on the subject, + in letter No. 2185 W of 2.9.95, his claim was forwarded to that Govt. In reply, the Govt. of India stated (letter No. 2598 G of ÷ [illegible] 5) that it was pre-

+ flagged C.

÷ flagged D.

+ flagged E

application, & that in any case it could not be considered without the support & recommendation of the Madras Govt.

Shortly afterwards, Mr Harper intimated that if admitted to the latter pension rules, he would be willing to retire at the end of such furlough as might be due to him. + In letter No. 157 W dated 15 January 1896, his application was strongly recommended for the sanction of the Govt. of India – Mr Harper had meanwhile reverted to the rank of Ex. Engr. & the Govt. of India inquired what prospect there was of his being permanently or temporarily promoted to administrative rank in the event of [illegible] fur-

his return

latter having [illegible]

[illegible] Engr. [illegible]

refd., the Govt. of India was informed (letter No. 759 W of 2.3.96) that there was no prospect of his re-promotion to administrative rank – the Govt. of India thereupon declined to accede to Mr. Horsfor's admission to the more favourable rules, on the ground that the concession was a reward for good service, proved by an officer's promotion to the rank of Supdg. Engr., & was not intended for officers who had been tried in Supdg. Engr's posts, & failed, as Mr. Horsfor appeared to have done. (Letter No. 899 E of 18.4.96)

+ Flagged 7.

‡ Flagged 8.

Mr. Horsfor then submitted a memorial to the Govt. of India, which was forwarded with No. 2711 W of 23 [illegible]

φ Flagged 11

comes the matter on which orders are required.

During the period Mr. Horsfor was officiating as Supdg. Engr. III Circle, he made a report against Mr. Somers Eve, Ex. Engr. Bellary division, in regard to delaying work & neglecting orders in connection with a head sluice from the Rampur Channel. It is not necessary to go into the merits of the dispute but the result was that Colonel Pennycuick, the late Chief Engr. considered Mr. Somers Eve's explanation on the subject to be satisfactory, & told Mr. Horsfor that the matter was not one which need have come before [illegible] that latter having [illegible] necessity for a reference would not have arisen if he (Mr Horsfor) had possessed the qualifications expected in an officer holding the position of a Supdg Engr. (memo. No 3621 C of 22.11.95) +

+ flagged I

Mr Horsfor subsequently asked to see Mr Somers Swai's explanation, & on the further information supplied by the former officer, the undersigned saw that Colonel Pennycuick's memorandum had been issued on a misapprehension as to the date on which the Supdg Engr passed orders & definitely fixing the site of the head sluice & directing the collection of materials. The undersigned therefore

[illegible]

+ See memo No 52 D of 24.4.96. flagged J.

attached to paper ×. flagged K.

memo No 1226 C of 3.3.97 flagged K.

Cancelled Col. Pennycuick's memo. of 22.11.95 +

In a letter dated 5.2.97 ×, Mr Horsfor requested that, as the question of his admission to the more favourable pension rules was before the Govt. of India, Colonel Pennycuick's memo. of 22.11.95, & the undersigned's memo of 24.4.95 cancelling it, might be forwarded to that Govt. Mr Horsfor seemed to think that if the above papers were laid before the Govt. of India, they would have an important bearing on the question of his being passed over for promotion — He was then told × that the first memo. had been cancelled, & that as neither it, nor [illegible] celling it, had had any thing to do with the question of his re-appointment to the office of Supdg. Engr., it was unnecessary to lay them before Govt.

Mr Horsfor now presses for the submission of the papers to Govt., & he thinks that on seeing them, His Excy. the Govr in Council will look upon his grievance in a very different light; he also claims to have the complete file concerning his dispute with Mr Somers Lee sent forward to the Govt. of India – Mr Horsfor having taken up this position, it becomes necessary to briefly [illegible] in

the Dept: to show how little the one circumstance of his dispute with Mr Somers Lee had to do with his supersession.

Mr Horsfor was appointed to the service from the Madras Engineering College, in August 1870, as an Asst. Engr 3rd Grade. In Octr 1872, his Supdg. Engr + reported that he had neither the professional nor departmental experience qualifying him for the charge of a range – In January 1874, the District Engineer Tinnevelly submitted to the Chief Engr some rather voluminous correspondence which had taken place between himself & Mr Horsfor – The latter having [illegible]

+ Paper flagged L.

against the District Engr's Comments on his carelessness & neglect of duty, the papers were submitted to the Chief Engr+, who stated that the Dist. Engr's remarks were amply justified.

Again in March & April 1875, the Dist. Engr Tinnevelly reported Mr Kaspar as "inefficient & unfit for the post he holds". In submitting the case for the orders of Govt, the then Chief Engr, while recommending Mr Kaspar's reduction, remarked‡, "But the Depr would be the better of being rid of such an incumbrance altogether, for he is reported utterly unfit for charge of a range". The Hon.

+ Memo No 145 of 26.2.74, flagged M.

‡ note flagged N

Mr W. R. Robinson (afterwards Sir W. R. Robinson) then Hon. member, after seeing Mr Kaspar, remarked on the (Mr Kaspar) Chief Engr's note+, "he is simply useless, ignorant & self sufficient, & not likely to be anything else". In the G.O. passed‡ on these papers (No 1294 of 7.5.75) Mr Kaspar was reduced several steps in the list of Asst. Engrs 2nd Grade; he was warned not to expect promotion to the 1st Grade, till reported fit for range charge, & told that further reports of continued incompetence would involve dismissal from the Dept.

In G.O. No 1072 W* of 25.4.81 (the original of which is missing) Mr Kaspar was declared to be not possessed of the requisite experience

and [illegible]

[illegible]

+ flagged N.

‡ flagged O.

* abstract flagged P.

& judgment for the position of a divisional Ex. Engineer, & he was censured for disobedience of orders.

In G.O. No. 45 I of 15.1.85, Mr. Horsfor was censured for carelessness in the preparation of an estimate for improving the Chilka Canal; in G.O. No. 228 I of 8.3.86 the censure was modified.

+ Flagged Q

† Flagged R

Mr. Horsfor afterwards pressed for its entire withdrawal, but in G.O. No. 1834 W of 8.7.87 the Govt. saw no reason to modify its order No. 228 I of 8.3.86.

⊕ Flagged S

In June 1887, Mr. Horsfor addressed two letters to the Secy. to Govt., the first asking for a transfer from the charge of a Tank Restoration Party & in this he questioned

+ Slip & flagged P

⁜ Flagged T

the justice of the various orders passed against him & stated that the charge of a Tank Party had been given to him as a punishment. It was a usual thing however at that time to place Tank Parties under Ex. Engrs. In the second letter he asked to be furnished with the Supdg. Engr's report on which G.O. No. 1072 W of 25.4.81 was passed, & went on to say that the G.O. was based on misstatements made by his superior officers. Under advice, Mr. Horsfor was led to withdraw these letters, & their cancellation was ordered in G.O. No. 2239 W of 22.8.87.

In January, 1890, Mr. Horsfor applied to be restored to his original position in the record, it seemed improbable that Mr Hopper would be selected for promotion to the grade of Supdg. Engr. Thus so far back as 1892, doubts were expressed as to Mr Hopper's fitness for administrative rank. The H.M. (Sir A.E. Stokes) +remarked on Mr Walch's note that while Mr Hopper claimed credit for his work in the Negapatam & Tanjore divisions, he appeared to be the officer mainly responsible for the shocking state of neglect into which the irrigation works in Pattukotta taluk had been allowed to fall. Mr Walch however replied that Mr Hopper was not wholly responsible for [illegible] the [illegible] order on

+ attached to G.O. flagged V

+ Flagged V

the appeal was (G.O. No. +3382 W of 9.12.92) that Mr Hopper was expected to go where he was ordered, & that the Govt. was the best judge of where it was proper to employ him –

In July 1893, Mr Hughes, Supdg Engr VI Circle, proceeded on leave, & Major Baddeley was placed temporarily in charge of the circle – The Senior Ex. Engr at that time was Major Boddy, but he was in the Secretariat & could not be spared for the time being – Mr Hopper came next, & he was passed over by Major Baddeley. The minute making the appointment is minuted ‡626 D of 25.7.93, but

‡ Flagged W

the Secretary's note which was circulated with it is not now forthcoming. Apparently, however, Major Baddeley was selected on account of Mr Walch's note of Nov. 1892, expressing doubts as to Mr Horsfor's fitness for a Circle charge. Mr Horsfor immediately appealed, & he was told in G.O. No 2326 W dated 9-8-93, that appointments to the grade of Supdg Engr are made by selection only. +

+ Flagged X

In May 1894, the I Circle became vacant on Mr Wybrow's departure on leave, & in submitting the question of a successor, Colonel Pennycuick remarked, — "the senior Ex. Engr ÷

÷ Note flagged Y

is Mr Horsfor, but I have serious doubts as to his competence to take charge of any Circle". — Mr Garrett, a junior officer, was then posted to the charge of the I circle.

In February 1895, Mr Lawrence, Supdg Engr, proceeded on leave, & Col. Pennycuick then recommended that Mr Horsfor should be given a trial as Supdg Engr of the III circle — Col. Pennycuick remarked that the III circle was the easiest circle in the Presy. & was a good one for trying an officer about whose qualifications there was a doubt, but that he was not sanguine as to its being found then. +

+ note flagged Z

that Mr. Harper possessed the qualities necessary to make a successful Supdg. Engr. Mr. Harper was then posted to the charge of the III circle with the temporary rank of Supdg. Engr. —

In August 1895, Mr. Harper was informed demi-officially from the Secretariat, that he would have to revert to the rank of Executive Engr. on the return from furlough of Colonel Campbell as Supdt. Mr. Harper submitted an official protest against this arrangement, as Major Baddeley, who was junior to himself as Ex. Engr. was still the temporary rank as Supdg. Engr. — Colonel Pennycuick in submitting the matter for orders, stated that the experiment of making Mr. Harper a Supdg. Engr. was not one that should be repeated, & that Mr. Harper had shown an ~~a~~ entire want of the strength of character, & power of maintaining influence over junior officers, which were essential for the proper fulfilment of the duties of a Supdg. Engr. — The G.O. on this Case, No. 2193 W of 2.9.95, was that the Govt. was not prepared to accept Mr. Harper's views as to his qualifications, or to waive its right to select such officers that distribute to the

+Flagged B I.

for promotion to the rank of Supdg Engr.—

This was before the matter of the dispute with Mr Somers Eve about the Rampur Channel head sluice had come before the Chief Engr.—

In G.O. No 2295W+ dated 16 Sept. 1895, Comment was made on the inefficient way in which Mr Worsfor, as Supdg Engr, had dealt with a case in which an Asst. Engr in the Kurnool division had occasioned loss to Govt. by carelessness.

In Decr 1895, when Mr de Winton was promoted to the temporary rank of Supdg. Engr, Mr Worsfor protested against the senior

+ Flagged C.I

+ Flagged D.I

his supersession, & asked to be furnished with the grounds on which he had been passed over.

In G.O. No 146W+ of 15.1.96 his attention was drawn to the previous order No 2193W of 2.9.95.

In February 1896, Mr Worsfor again appealed against his supersession, compared Major Baddeley's experience & abilities unfavourably with his own, & dragged in the history of his dispute with Mr Somers Eve in ~~the~~ connection with the Rampur channel head sluice. The whole matter of his supersession was then reviewed by the undersigned in a note for orders attached to.

flagged B. The G.O. stated that the Govt was not disposed to reopen the question of Mr Worfor's supersession, & he was told distinctly that his supersession had been decided upon without reference to the dispute with Mr Somers-Eve - this clause was inserted in the note for orders by H.E. Lord Wenlock himself.

A further appeal was answered by G.O. No 1361 W of 29. 4. 96, + which called his attention to previous orders.

+ flagged E I

In June 1896, Mr Worfor again claimed to be informed of the grounds on which the decision arrived

at the decision that he had proved a failure as a Supply Engr, & in G.O. No 2111 W of 20. 7. 96, + he was once more told that the Govt. was not prepared to accept him at his own valuation, nor to waive its right of selection -

+ flagged F I

Mr Worfor's history has thus been fully gone into to show that the decision against his further promotion was arrived at on other grounds than that of his dispute with Mr Somers Eve - No object would therefore be gained by sending the file relating to

Govt. of India - Since Mr. Horfor raised this claim to have the passes [illegible], the Govt of India has finally rejected his application for admission to the more favourable pension rules - vide letter from G. of I. No 7449+ dated 16.3.97 - The G. of I. now points out that it reserves to itself the right of rejecting claims of the kind even when advanced by officers who rise permanently to the rank of Supdg Engrs. Mr. Horfor might be told that he must accept this as a final settlement of the question, & that the Govt. does [illegible]

+ Telegram G.I.

I do not think there is sufficient ground for taking special notice of this.
A.SH
13.4.97

the Rampur channel passes.

Attention is invited to the tone of Mr. Horfor's letters No 584 of 5.2.97 & No 1057 of 9.3.97. Both contain imputations against the late Chief Engr, Col. Pennycuick, & the second one is decidedly insubordinate towards the present Chief Engr.

7/4/97

CE

~~H.E.~~

Mr. Norfor's claim to be admitted to more favourable pension rules.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

From the Suptg. Engineer V circle No. 50 W of 8th Feby 1897
" " —— do —— " $\frac{2W}{C}$ of 14th Feby 1897
" " —— do —— " 86 W of 10th March 1897
" " Govt. of India " 744 G of 16th March 1897
Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D. of

FOR ORDERS.

8/4/97
W.

Mr. Norfor may be written to in the terms of the last para. but one of the Note, — marked. A.

ASH
13.4.97

FOR ORD

[illegible] thing [illegible] draw the [illegible] meeting of the [illegible] being why this was [illegible] on his first application [illegible] taking his last letter which is absolutely insubordinate.

In acting on these papers could the history of the papers which comes here be given this is continued in most of the notes already written & has only to be completed.

There are several very strong [illegible] that these files [illegible] are very [illegible] letters & these [illegible] [illegible]

13/3/97

S. A. W.

Join notes with the [illegible] here as flagged & then return to me.

7/4/97

Flagged [illegible]

H.E. 9/4/97 R 14-4

No. 1226 C of 3.3.97

P. W. D.

Memo

With reference to letters from Mr C. H. J. Norfor, Ex. Engr., Nos 5821 & 6030 of 5th & 8th Feby 1897, the undersigned has the honor to observe that the Chief Engr's memo No 3621 C dated 22nd Nov. 1895 was cancelled by Ch. Engr's memo No 52 D of 24th April 1896, and as neither memo. had any bearing on the question of re-appointing Mr Norfor to the Office of Supdg. Engr., the undersigned considers it unnecessary to lay them before the Govt.

25/2/97

CWM 26.2.97

W/DW

4/3/97

C. H. J. Norfor Ex. Engr. (through the S. E. circle)

5/3/97

W.

Mr Nafor is not satisfied with Mr Smers Loi's conduct towards him being dealt with by the Chief Engineer, but wishes the matter to be dealt with by Government. Col: Pennycuick's

Flagged W

memo No. 3621 C dated 22-11-95, having been found to be issued under a misapprehension, was cancelled in Govt memo No. 520 D of 24-4-96. And he wishes these two memoranda to go forward to Government apparently with the object of shewing that Colonel Pennycuick was mistaken in his view of Mr Nafor as a Superintending Engineer. It should, however, be borne in mind that Col: Pennycuick's memo in no way affected Mr Nafor's promotion for it was issued subsequent to

Document flagged E

G.O. No. 2193 W of 2nd Sept 1895 attached to which is Mr Nafor's letter No. 13 C of 17-8-95 with Col: Pennycuick's side notes, and also his note for H.E. Lord Wenlock with H.E.'s rescript thereon dated 27-8-95. It is clear that

the G.O of 2-4-95, based as it
was on these comments, decided
the question of Mr Napier as a
Superintending Engineer – So why
he wishes the correspondence
connected with Mr Sauer's bad
conduct to go up to Government
now – since it has no
bearing on the case – is not
understood. He writes in the
last para of one of his letters
now received – that dated 5th
Feby 1897 – "When I reported the
matter I said I considered
the Executive Engineer's conduct
should be brought to the notice
of Government" and he does
not consider it fair to himself
that the complete file should
not have been placed before
Government. As the complete
file – and notably that
connected with his official
quarrel with his Executive
Engineer – does not concern the
subject of his promotion or
supersession, the question

of submitting the file to
Government should surely
be left to the discretion
of the ~~Supg~~ Chief Engineer.
And if one Chief Engineer
issues a memorandum against
him and the next Chief
Engineer cancels the same
memorandum, it is submitted
that that should satisfy him.
In his other letter to hand, that
of 8th Feby 1897 he wishes the
Chief Engineer to point out to
the Government that not only
was the Executive Engineer
disobedient to orders but even
positively insulting. Though this
looks as if Mr Napier's main
object was to bring Mr Sauers
Esq under the ban of the
Government's displeasure –
he states in para 3 of his
letter of 5th Feby 1897 that
the submission of the two
memoranda to Government

may be of value to himself, owing to the fact that his qualifications were not called into question until issue of the memorandum which was subsequently cancelled. But he does not make it clear that the Government was bound to call his qualifications into question by corresponding with him. He might have inferred that there must have been correspondence in this office calling his qualifications into question, or G.O. No. 2193 W of 2-9-90 could not have been passed. He did not consider this G.O. to mean — so he states in para 4 — that he "would be again passed over by an officer whose claims were considered" at the time he was promoted and rejected, so he says, in his favour.

By this officer he presumably refers to Mr de Winton. Attention is accordingly invited to Col. Pennycuick's note of 11-2-95 who, it is evident, considered the professional qualifications of both Mr de Winton and Mr De Morgan superior to those of Mr Nafar but recommended the last named, as the senior officer, for a trial in the 3rd circle as being the "easiest in the Presidency" ~~&~~ and "a good one for trying an officer about whose qualifications there is a doubt" Six months later Col. Pennycuick wrote as follows in the margin of Mr Nafar's letter No. 13C of 17th August 1895:– "that is there was no reason why he should not be given a trial; he has now been tried and has failed most dismally." The Somers Case was not dealt with till two months after, and as that affair has in

Flagged L

document flagged E.

no way affected Mr. Nafar's prospects he might perhaps be informed that Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 3621 C dated 22nd November 1895 having been cancelled by Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 52 D dated 24th April 1896, and as neither memorandum had any bearing on the question of re-appointing Mr. Nafar to the office of Superintending Engineer it is considered unnecessary to refer the matter to Government.

Yes
24/2/97

CWH
24.2.97

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1681

Order

W
For orders
CM
18.2.97

From The Superintending Engineer
5th Circle.

No. 2 W/c

Dated 14th February 1897.
Received 16. 2. 97
Enclosures "
Spare copies "

SUBJECT.

C. H. T. Nosfor Engineer.

Forwarding letter No. 630 dated 8th February 1897. from — requesting to lay the complete file of Mr. Somers E.W.E. Case before the Govt. & to draw its particular attention to para 6 of his letter No. 1862 of 10th Septr./95 addressed to the irrigation Chief Engineer.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2710-11	P.W.D.	23.9.96
	3978	"	9.6.96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 630.

Tanjore Divisional Office
8th February 1897

From,

C. H. T. Norfor Esquire
Executive Engineer
Tanjore

To,

The Secretary to Government
P.W.D.
Thro: the Supg Engineer
V circle.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No $\frac{584}{5.2.97}$ I have the honour to request that in laying the Complete file of the Somers-Eve Case before the Government you will be good enough, as a professional man, to draw the particular attention of the Government to para 6 of my letter No *$\frac{1862}{10.9.95}$ to the address of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, from which it will be seen that not only was the Executive Engineer disobedient to orders but was positively insulting.

Vide 3621 C dd $\frac{22.4}{95}$
* Flag C.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obdt servt

Executive Engineer

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 1027 J
12 FEB 1897
V CIRCLE, P.W.D., MADRAS.

From

C. H. T. Nosper Engineer
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Dt.

To,
The Secty to Government
P.W.D.
Thro: S.E.V.
Madras

No 630

Dated 8
Despd 11
Recd. } February /97.

12.2.97
Papers - the E.E.'s No 584 / 5.2.97
1862 / 10.9.95

C. H. T. Nosper Engineer —
Requesting to lay the complete file of Mr. Somers-Eve Case before the Govt. and to draw its particular attention to para 6 of his letter No 1862 / 10.9.95 addressed to the Irrigation Chief Engineer.

No 28/c

Forwarded in continuation of this office No 50. W dated 8.2.97.

C. S. Lawson
14/2/97
Lt. Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1450

Order

Confidential with S.a.w. 493 W / 2.9.95

From
The Supdg Engineer
5th Circle.

No. 50 W.

Dated 8th February 1897.
Received 10.2.97
Enclosures 2,
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

C. H. T. Nosper Engr Executive Engineer

Submitting copies of certain correspondence ~~with~~ in connection with his supersession to be forwarded on to the India Government as the question of admitting him to the more favorable pension rules is still before that Government.

BACK PAPERS.				FURTHER PAPERS.			
G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 5021 6

Government of Madras.

Public works Department.

Memorandum

Dated Madras, 22d November 1895.

Endorsement from the Superin-tending Engineer III Circle, No 2430, dated 31st October 1895.

Endorsement thereon by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No 65 E dated 6 November 1895.

Mr. Norfor, late Superintending Engineer III Circle, having made a report against Mr. Somers Eve, Executive Engineer Bellary Division in regard to delaying work and neglect of orders in Connection with a head sluice from the Rampur Channel the Superin-tending Engineer now submits Mr. Somer Eve's Explanation.

2. It would seem that there had been Considerable difference of Opinion between these two Officers regarding the design and site for the work: but though the Controversy apparently beg in March the Superintending Engineer passed no definite orders till Septembe when

orders

hen he directed the Executive Engineer to do the work "according to the recently sanctioned plan prepared by the Chief Engineer". Mr. Somers E.E. states that this recently sanctioned plan was not received by him till August 22nd, too late for work to be commenced as the Channel cannot be closed till January on account of the Irrigation. Under the circumstances Mr. Somers E.E. will be informed that his Explanation is considered satisfactory.

3. In the Opinion of the Chief Engineer the matter is one which it should not have been necessary to submit to him and the necessity for any such reference would not have arisen if the late Superintending Engineer had possessed the qualifications expected in an Officer holding that position.

(Sd). J Pennycuick Col. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

(True Copy)
(Sd) C. C Rawson Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer V Cir:

True Copy.

P.W. E.1/1450/97

5th February/97

C Kirky
Executive Engineer

P. W. Department

Memorandum

No. 52 D of 24th April 1896.

From the Supt. Engineer V Circle, No 98 W of 30th marc
——— do ——— do ——— No 101 W of 31 march/
——— do ——— do ——— No 111 W of 9 April/9

The Chief Engineer in Cancelling Memorandum No 3621 C dated 22d November 1895, has the honour to observe that it was issued under a misapprehension as to the date on which the Superintending Engineer passed orders, definitely fixing the site, and ordering the Collection of materials for Rampur Channel Head sluice. In point of fact these orders were passed for the first time on the 6th June 1895, and not in the following September as supposed. And it is obvious that the Executive Engineer might have carried them out if he had really wished to do so. Therefore, setting aside the question as to the merits of the two sites, concerning which the Superintending and Executive Engineers differed, it is considered that the disregard of orders

orders on the part of the latter officer is blameworthy.

(By order)

(Sd) C.H.B. Bulton

Dy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 87
6 FEB. 1897
V CIRCLE, P.W.D., MADRAS.

No. 147 I.f.

To

The Executive Engineer Tanjore with reference to his letter No. 1356 dated 8th April 1896.

En. 1 Copy of memo 3621.C

(Sd) C.C. Rawson

Lt Col. R.E.

29th April 1896. Supdg Engineer V Circle

True Copy.

5th February /97

Executive Engineer

R.S. 2/2 1450/97

No. 584

Tanjore Divisional Office
5th February 1897.

From,

C.H. T. Norfor Esquire
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division,

To,

The Secretary to Government
P.W.D.

Thro: the Supdg Engineer
V Circle.

Sir,

As the question of my admission to the more favorable pension rules is still before the Government of India, I have the honour to enclose copies of two memoranda as per margin, to be forwarded to the Government of India, with this letter.

Memo No. 3621.C / 22.11.95 and No. 52 D / 24.4.96.

2. I stated in my memorial forwarded to the Government of India with G.O. No. *2710.W / 23.9.96, that prior to G.O. No. †2913.W dated 2nd September 1895, there had not been a single Chief Engineer's memo or G.O. animadverting on my qualifications for the post of

* Flagged F.

2193 W (Confdl)

† Flagged E

Superintending Engineer, a position to which the Government did me the honour of promoting me.

3. It may be of value to me as well as serve as a guide to the Government of India if the enclosures be forwarded to them, as memo No *3621.C/22.11.95, for the first time, calls into question my qualifications for the post of Superintending Engineer with the result now known to Government.

* Flagged W

4. On receipt of G.O. No +2193W/2.9.95 I did not construe it to mean that I would be again passed over by an Officer whose claims were considered, at the time I was promoted, and rejected in my favor – and it was not until I received Chief Engineer's memo No #3621.C/22.11.95 that I learnt the intention of Government.

+ Flagged E

Flagged W

5. Beyond saying, ~~I think~~ that I think he is absolutely mistaken (vide paras 5 & 6 of my letter No 4048§/19.12.95 and Chief Engineer's reply memo

§ Flagged H

No *1497.C/17.3.96) I with-hold, for the present, my comments on the reason now assigned by the present Chief Engineer for the writing of that memo: and will add that I asked the then Chief Engineer to uphold my authority as Superintending Engineer and to insist on the Executive Engineer carrying out my positive orders to him. The way he helped me in the matter of maintaining discipline in the Department, will be known to the Government if they call for the complete file on the subject. When I reported the matter I said I considered the Executive Engineer's conduct should be brought to the notice of Government. This appears never to have been done and I do not think it is fair to me after G.O. No +2193W/2.9.95 that the file on this subject should have been withheld from the Government.

+ Flagged E (Confidential)

I have the honour to be
Sir
your most obt servt

Executive Engineer

From

C. H. J. Napier Esquire
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Dt

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S
No. 87 T.J.
6 - FEB. 1897
V CIRCLE, P.W.D. MADRAS.

To

The Secretary to Govt
P.W.D
Madras
Thro S.E.V

No 584

En: 2

Dated 5th
Despd 5th } February 1897.
Recd
6.2.97

C. H. J. Napier Esquire. Executive Engineer —
Submits Copies of Certain documents in Connexion with his supersession, to be forwarded on to the India Government as the question of admitting him to the more favorable pension rules is still before that Government.

No 50 M.
Forwarded.

C. Lawson
8/2/97
Lt Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

8th February 1897