

(1) Number of pages.....

(2) Date of repair.....

(3) Initials of the Reference.....

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Police DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2015	Press Mis.
Dated 21	1887

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 461. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 6th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Tanjore, 31st May 1869, No. 270 :—

IN returning the petition of Mr. Frantz, the late Draughtsman in my Office, which accompanied your Order No. 1,241, dated 27th May, I have the honour to inform you that I was very angry with Mr. Frantz on the 1st of April, and told

1 Petition with two enclosures
1 Copy of Memorandum to Mr. Frantz, from the Superintending Engineer, 6th Division, No. 28, dated 5th April 1868.

him he did not speak the truth; that he was a liar, (I may have used the word 'infernal'); that he was a man who had no honorable feelings relative to his duties, and did the minimum of work possible; and that the comparative liberty I had accorded him, and kindness I had shown him, had been thrown away upon him; and that henceforth I must keep him up to his work by coercive measures, such as by tasking him and by checking his work almost daily as is done with regard to that of the natives, as he was not to be relied upon to do his work otherwise. And on his replying to me, and repeating what was untrue relative to his work, I said if he continued to tell me lies I would horsewhip him; and I then directed him to leave the room. The interview lasted, I suppose, for five minutes. I admit I was very irate, for nothing annoys me so much as a man telling an untruth.

2. For the last two years I have been able to get very little out of Mr. Frantz; he has been incorrigibly idle, especially when I have been out in the district.

3. Though the Central Jail works at Trichinopoly were commenced in December 1866, the plans and estimates were not forwarded to Government till November 1868, Mr. Frantz* dawdled over these plans and estimates till July 1868, when he was taken ill, and was absent from duty for three months. I then undertook the revision of the estimates and found them full of errors, nothing could exceed the carelessness and inaccuracy with which they were prepared, and I disposed of these estimates without further aid from Mr. Frantz who, on his return to duty, was called upon to undertake the disposal of the Sub-Jail, &c., estimates. All the original estimates for these works were looked over by me, and approved in October or November, and after that there was nothing to be done but to repeat the plans and estimates with modifications for foundations and basements, according to the requirements of each locality, and information on these points was furnished by the Range Officers. I have for months kept an Assistant for Mr. Frantz, and paid him from private funds, to take tracings of plans, &c., and to relieve Mr. Frantz of the drudgery of the Draughtsman's work, and until I found that he was not making sufficient and proper use of the Estimator, I left the control of the estimating and draughtman's department to him.

* It is not meant that Mr. Frantz was employed on this work only.

4. When I left Tanjore on a tour on the 14th January, I directed Mr. Frantz to prepare estimates for certain Military works which were entered in the Budget, after completing the estimate for a Post Office and after completing the checking of an estimate for a road, and to dispose of the Sub-Jail estimates, towards which he had nothing to do but to keep the Assistant well employed in copying plans

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
21st June 1869.*

and estimates while he looked to the alterations to the foundations and basements. On my return on the 24th March I was otherwise employed for a day or two, and did not enquire into the work turned out by Mr. Frasz till the 1st April, when I found he had done about twenty days' work, and had not undertaken the Military estimates at all, neither had he completed nor disposed of the Sub-Jail estimates, though he states in his petition that he has done so. The angry interview then occurred, and on my directing Mr. Frasz to leave the room, he was perfectly well

* Attached to his petition.

aware he was not to leave the office, and after receiving my memorandum, No. 11, he sent me reply, * No. 2, whereupon I wrote and told him he was to attend at my office that afternoon, and if he did not do so I would dispense with his services; pointing out, at the same time, the untruth in his statement that I ordered him to remain away from office; and as he did not attend the office on Monday, as directed, I dispensed with his services in the enclosed memorandum, No. 28, dated 5th April.

5. On two or three previous occasions, when I had found fault with Mr. Frasz's work, he had absented himself from office on the plea of being unwell, which I ought not to have overlooked; and when in January he resigned his appointment I gave him an opportunity of reconsidering the matter, not wishing, badly as he had behaved, to deprive him of his daily bread. It is true I have not fined him, but not because he has not deserved it, but because of the very great reluctance I feel to reduce a man's pay, and because I prefer to appeal to a man's honour and to shame him into doing his work rather than to fine him.

6. From what is stated above, it will be observed that Mr. Frasz's statement, that he has done double work, is utterly untrue; he has had not only the aid of the Estimator, but also of an extra hand paid by me, and yet has turned out very little work. Mr. Frasz's statement, that he has been twice ill owing to the hard duty imposed upon him in the office, is also untrue; his illness were due, I believe, to his own indiscretions; but this being a private matter I should not have introduced it here had not Mr. Frasz brought the matter forward. Mr. Frasz was specially directed to keep a register of his daily work, this he did not keep. I cannot accuse myself of any unnecessary harshness to Mr. Frasz, in fact I believe I have spoiled him with kindness when he has been ill and on other occasions, and that he has attributed this kindness, not to the ordinary promptings of humanity, which induces one to assist a fellow-creature when in distress or sickness, but because his services were indispensable to me. When he was permitted to withdraw his resignation in January, he was distinctly informed that I would not allow him to behave as he had done again.

7. I was extremely loath to deprive Mr. Frasz of his appointment, and I specially worded the order on the subject "His services are dispensed with" that it might not prove an hinderance to his obtaining employment elsewhere. About a month after his services were dispensed with, he asked to be allowed to rejoin, but as I informed him I had then made other arrangements, and that from work of his I had looked over subsequently to his leaving the office I had ceased to have that confidence in his care and accuracy which it was necessary I should have.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
21st June 1869.*

8. Mr. Frasz is an excellent Draughtsman, and can, if he likes, estimate accurately for any simple buildings, but he is incorrigibly idle and careless, and has been spoiled by too much consideration and kindness, the motive of which he has misunderstood; his dismissal will probably have taught him a lesson, and not having any wish to do him an injury I would urge that Government should not prohibit his being entertained in other Government Offices notwithstanding his extreme, ill-conduct in mine.

No. 462.

ORDER THEREON, 21st June 1869, No. 2,016.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 56.

THE Government regret that Captain Oakes should have been betrayed into the use of the intemperate language of which Mr. Frasz justly complains. Under the circumstances explained in this letter, however, His Excellency in Council will not insist upon Mr. Frasz's restoration to the post he lately filled in the Superintending Engineer's Office, but will not object to his employment elsewhere.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 6th Division.

Exd. S.-T. Augustin.

28-

Supr Eng's Office 6th 8th
Lancaster 5 April 1869.
52

Memorandum.

The Supr Engineer regrets to find that Mr. Franey in his reply to memo No 11 states what he must know to be untrue relative to his reason for absenting himself from office since the 1st viz because the Supr Engineer ordered him to do so, as the Supr Eng^r did not order him to leave the office but to leave the Supr Engineer's room -

Mr. Franey further refers to the Supr Engineer's assaulting him which he must also know is untrue: As Mr. Franey has failed to join the office this day his services are dispensed with from the 1st instant the date on which he ceased to do duty.

/Signed/ R. F. Oakes Capt. R.E.
Supr Engineer 6th 8th

W. F. Gates Capt. R.E.
Supr Engineer 6th 8th

No. 270

Sup^d Engineers & Co.
4th Division - Bangalore
31st May 1869. 12

From;

Captain R. H. Baker. R.E.

Sup^d Engineer 4th Division

To,

Colonel C. A. Cox R.E.

Secretary to Government
D.O.

Sir;

In returning the Petition of Mr. Francis
the late Draughtsman in my Office which
accompanied your Order No 1241 dated
27th May, I have the honor to inform
you that I was very angry with Mr.
Francis on the 1st of April, & told him
he did not speak the truth that he was a
liar (I may have used the word 'infamous')
that he was a man who had no honorable
feelings, relative to his duties, & did the
minimum of work possible, & that the
comparative liberty I had accorded him,
& kindness I had shown him, had been
thrown away upon him, & that hence forth
I must keep him up to his work by Coercive
measures such as by tasking him & by check-
ing his work almost daily as is done with
regards to that of the Natives, as he was
not

One Drawing in 1868
from the office of the
Engineer to the No 270
dated 31st May 1869.

17th 2349/09

Copy of Memo No 28
of the 5th April 1869
from Capt. Baker to
Mr. Francis.

not to be relied upon to do his work
otherwise? & on his replying to me, &
repeating what was untrue relative
to his work I said if he continued to
tell me lies, I would horsewhip him,
& I then directed him to leave the
room. The interview lasted I suppose
for 5 minutes, I admit I was very
irate, for nothing annoys me so much as
a man telling an untruth.

For the last two years I have
been able to get very little out of Mr. Francis,
he has been incorrigibly idle especially
when I have been out in the District.

Though the Central Jail works at
Trichinopoly were commenced in December '66
the Plans & Estimates were not forwarded to Govt.
till November '68, Mr. Francis dawdled over
these Plans & Estimates till July '68 when he
was taken ill, & was absent from duty for
three months. I then undertook the revision
of the Estimates & found them full of errors,
nothing could exceed the carelessness, &
inaccuracy with which they were prepared,
& I disposed of these Estimates without
further aid from Mr. Francis who on
his return to duty was called upon
to undertake the disposal of the
Subsidiary & other Estimates. - All the original
Estimates

Estimates for these works were
looked over by me, and approved
in October or November, &
after that there was nothing to be
done, but to repeat the Plans &
Estimates with modifications for
foundations & basements according
to the requirements of each locality,
& information on these points
was furnished by the Range Officers.
I have for months kept an
Assistant for Mr. Francis, &
paid him from private funds
to take tracings of Plans &c., &
to relieve Mr. Francis of the drudgery
of the Draughtsmans work, & until
I found that he was not making
sufficient & proper use of the
Estimator, I left the control
of the Estimating & Draughtsmans
Department to him.

When I left Poojore on
a tour on the 14th January, I
directed

directed Mr. Francis to prepare
Estimates for certain Military
Works which were entered in the
Budget after completing the Estimate
for a Post Office & after com-
pleting the checking of an Estimate
for a Road, & to dispose of the
Sub-Jail Estimates towards which
he had nothing to do, but to keep the
Assistant well employed in Copying
Plans & Estimates while he looked
to the alterations to the founda-
tions & basements. On my
return on the 24th March I was
otherwise employed for a day
or two, & did not Enquire into
the work turned out by Mr. Francis
till the 1st April when I
found he had done about 20
day work, & had not undertaken
the Military Estimates at all.
Written had he completed or
disposed

3
disposed of the Sub-Jail Estimates
though he states in his Petition that
he had done so. The angry inter-
view then occurred, & on my direct-
ing Mr. Francis to leave the room,
he was perfectly well aware he
was not to leave the Office & after
receiving my Memo No 11 he
sent me reply No 2, whereupon
I wrote & told him he was to
attend at my Office that afternoon,
& if he did not do so I would
dispenise with his services pointing
out at the same time the intruth
in his statement that I ordered
him to remain away from Office,
& as he did not attend the
Office on Monday as directed
I dispenised with his services
in the enclosed Memo No 28
dated 5th April -
On 2 or 3 previous
occasions

directed Mr. Francis to prepare
Estimates for certain Military
Works which were entered in the
Budget, after completing the Estimate
for a Post Office & after com-
pleting the checking of an Estimate
for a Road, & to dispose of the
Sub-Jail Estimates towards which
he had nothing to do, but to keep the
Assistant well employed in copying
Plans & Estimates while he looked
to the alterations to the founda-
tions & Barracks.

On my
return on the 24th March I was
otherwise employed for a day
or two, & did not enquire into
the work turned out by Mr. Francis
till the 1st April when I
found he had done about 20
days work & had not undertaken
the Military Estimates at all
written had he completed or
disposed.

directed Mr. Francis to prepare
Estimates for certain Military
Works which were entered in the
Budget, after completing the Estimate
for a Post Office & after com-
pleting the checking of an Estimate
for a Road, & to dispose of the
Sub-fail Estimates towards which
he had nothing to do, but to keep the
Assistant well employed in Copying
Plans & Estimates while he looked
to the alterations to the founda-
tions & Sacraments. On my
return on the 24th March I was
otherwise employed for a day
or two, & did not Enquire into
the work turned out by Mr. Francis
till the 1st April when I
found he had done about 20
days work, & had not undertaken
the Military Estimates at all
neither had he completed or
disposed of

disposed of the Sub-Tail Estimates,
though he states in his Petition that
he had done so. The angry inter-
view then occurred, & on my direct-
ing Mr. Francis to leave the room,
he was perfectly well aware he
was not to leave the Office & after
receiving my Memo No 11 he
sent me reply No 2, whereupon
I wrote & told him he was to
attend at my Office that afternoon,
& if he did not do so I would
dispenze with his services pointing
out at the same time the intruth
in his statement that I ordered
him to remain away from Office,
& as he did not attend the
Office on Monday as directed
I dispenzed with his services
in the enclosed Memo No 28
dated 6th April -
On 2 or 3 previous
occasions

occasions when I had found fault with Mr. Francis's work he had absented himself from Office on the plea of being unwell which I ought not have overlooked, & when in January he resigned his appointment, - I gave him an opportunity of reconsidering the matter not wishing badly as he had behaved, to deprive him of his daily bread. - It is true I have not fined him, but not because he has not deserved it, but because of the very great reluctance I feel to reduce a man's pay, & because I prefer to appeal to a man's honor & to shame him into doing his work rather than to fine him.

From what is stated above, it will be observed that

that Mr. Francis's statement¹³⁵ that he has done double work is utterly untrue, he has had not only the aid of the Estimator, but also of an extra hand paid by the Govt. yet has turned out very little work, Mr. Francis's Statement that he has been twice ill owing to the hard duty imposed upon him in the Office is also untrue, his illness were due, I believe, to his own indiscretions, but this being a private matter I should not have introduced it here, had not Mr. Francis brought the matter forward, Mr. Francis was specially directed to keep a Register of his daily work this he did not keep; I cannot accuse myself of any unnecessary harshness

harshness to Mr. Francis, in fact
I believe I have spoilt him
with kindness when he has been
ill and on other occasions, &
that he has attributed this kind-
ness not to the ordinary prompt-
ings of humanity which induces
one to assist a fellow creature
when in distress or sickness,
but because his services were
indispensable to me: when he
was permitted to withdraw
his resignation in January
he was distinctly informed
that I would not allow
him to behave as he had
done again. —

I was extremely loath
to deprive Mr. Francis of his
appointment, & I specially
worded the order on the subject
"His services are dispensed with"
that

that it might not prove an
hindrance to his obtaining
employment elsewhere. —

About a month after his
services were dispensed with,
he asked to be allowed to
rejoin, but as I informed
him I had then ^{made} other arrange-
ments, & that from work of his,
I had looked over subsequent-
ly to his leaving the Office,
I had ceased to have that
confidence in his care &
accuracy which it was ne-
cessary I should have. —

Mr. Francis is an excellent
draughtsman, & can, if he likes,
estimate accurately for any
simple buildings, but he
is incorrigibly idle &
careless & has been spoilt
by

by too much consideration &
kindness, the motive of which he
has misunderstood, his dismissal
will probably have taught him
a lesson, & not having any wish
to do him an injury I would
urge that Government should
not prohibit his being enter-
tained in other Govt Offices
notwithstanding his extreme
ill-conduct in mine. —

I have the honor to be

^{Yrs}
Your most Obedient Servant,

W. F. Gates Capt R.E.

Sup^d Engr ^{to} the ^{Govt}

1

To H. B. 1839
From H. B. 1839
The Supy Engineer
No 2349
The Secy to Govt
H. B. D.

Dated 31st May 1869
Recd 5 June 1869

No. 270.

En: 2.

18. 11. 1869
Reporting on the Re-
tion of Mr. Francis
late Draftsman
of the Supy Engrs.
Office - H. B.

No 2016-21st June 1869.

No 461

28 June 1869. H. B.

19/20
11th Sept.
No 2016

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the 21st June 1869.

Read the following

From the Supy Engineer
H. B. D.

(Here enter No 270 of 31st May 1869)

The Government
regret that Captain Oakes
should have been betrayed
into the use of the inter-
perate language of which
Mr Francis justly com-
plains. Under the cir-
cumstances explained in
this letter, however, His
Excellency in Council
will not insist upon Mr
Francis's restoration to the
post he lately filled in the
Superintendent's Office, but

1869

1869

will not depart to his
employment elsewhere.

To Mr. [unclear] 6th [unclear] ✓
Dec 22/6/69

200 June 69 A. 110

Cue 2349

Govt. of 1869 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Superintending Engrs
6th Division

Date

Recd

G. O. 21st June 1869

Nos. 46-462

Trans. Mr. Papingordon,
the letter from the Lady Engr
of the 6th Div. respecting the
petition of Mr. Evans, formerly
Draftsman in his Office re-
questing the renewal of his
Appointment.

Conjunctly A. H.