

40
1

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 39-40
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்
(3) ஆதாரப் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

மேலு துறை

அரசாணை எண். 40 மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள்: 22-1-1890	1890

வோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED *22-1-90*
No. *40*.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders on paper
relating to the dismissal
of J. C. grade, late Iowa
Gazette Dept. - see chain
of that Dept. and to the
held by Mr. Meyer in the

செப்பனிருபவர் பெயர்
செப்பனிருவதற்காக எடுத்துக்
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 12/6/67
செப்பனிரு முடிந்த நாள் 1/6/68
சர்ப்பார்க்கும்
மு. தி. பத. எ.
கையொப்பம்
இராசசுனி இது
யாளர்
கையொப்பம்

I

26-11-12

$\frac{40}{2}$

12/11/67

28/5/63

28/2/05 ✓

10.6.08 ✓

28.11.97 ✓

No. 3695

Govt. Press, Madras

12th November 1889

40/37

Office Note

Closures returned.

With reference to G.O., d.
9th November 1889, No. 871,
the Secy. Govt. Press submit
the following charges against
Mr. W. F. Fregrade, late for
the Gazette Dept.

(a) That Mr. Fregrade has
since 1888 from C. Muregader
telegraphman, the sum of
Rs. 42, and about April
he borrowed a further sum
of Rs. 20, thus placing him
under obligations to a sum
of Rs. 62 in his dept.

That as stated in
letter dated 26th January
marked A, Mr. Fregrade
obtained a loan of Rs. 50
a compositor in his de
named J. Bashim,
thereby placed himself
in obligation to favor
compositor with work,
infringing the Press re

ding the equal distribution
by foremen to Compositors.

1) That Mr. Fugate
bited the men from entering
names in the Compositors'
book, and took it upon
elf to enter their
to book, thereby

the established
cess which was
recent irregular
distribution of work
compositors.

2) That, on the 16th
ving out the main
notification relating
sition of Lands

the Public Works
he appeared in the

at date, part 2
3, he did not

distribute the
sure its prompt

but gave it to
erely delayed

necessary cost
overtime in
ding depts.

That Mr. Fugate
questioned by the

40
4

the August, acknowledged
the receipt in the evening of
8th July of the ~~sums~~ ~~slips~~ ~~slips~~
opposite to each of the names
of compositors in the list marked
B; and again in the morning
of the 8th August in the presence
of the Overseer, on being questioned
regarding the same slip, stated
that he had done wrong and
asked for forgiveness.

2. The undersigned will
give detailed particulars at
the enquiry and produce the
following witnesses.

C. Murugasan, galley pressman
as regards charge (a).

S. Bashim, compositor
as regards charge (b).

As regards (c), the Supt.
will submit the turn book
and the evidences of

P. Ruthnam

C. Chinmasamy &

Mr. A. Bronger

The Supt will state par-
ticulars as regards (d)

Overseer, Press & Machine
department, will be called
to the attention of his
superior as to the receipt
on the 18th July, of the monies
from the 8 compositors dismissed
and the irregularities committed
by him in his desire to
favor these compositors -
were the reasons which led
to their dismissal -

R. Hill
Superintendent

W. S. Meyer Esq.,
Assistant Secretary,
Public Works Dept.

The Superintendent
Government Press

W. S. Meyer Esq.,
Asst. Secretary,
Public Works Dept.

Dated 12th }
Recd 15th } Novr 1889

Enclosure 6.

Subject

Submitting certain charges
against Mr. W. G. Fregrade
late foreman of the Gazette

W. G. Fregrade, 20 November 1889
With ref to his letter of
14/11/89 Mr. W. G.
Fregrade is requested to submit
to the undersigned in writing
such evidence as he may
have to offer to the following
charges of misconduct charged
against him in the report of 1889,
at which that evidence, if any,
he is prepared to produce in
support of his allegations
(H. the charges in para 1
& 2 of the letter)

W. S. Meyer
16/11

John H. Fregrade }
21-11/89

40
6

W. S. Meyer Esq.
Assistant Secretary to Government
Public Department

Sir,

In obedience to the orders contained in your Memorandum dated 20th November 1889, I beg most respectfully to submit the following explanation with reference to the charges (a) to (c) brought against me by the Superintendent Government Press.

Charge (a) In this charge I am accused of having borrowed two sums of money from gally pressman C. Murrugasen. I admit the first transaction, but deny the second.

Charge (b) That I obtained a loan of Rs 50. from a compositor named S. Bashiem. This also I admit.

With reference to the above two charges I beg leave to state that both these men are professional money lenders and they have given loans to various persons in the office. My transactions with them were bona fide private ones, and the inference drawn by the Superintendent that I was thereby placing myself under obligations to them is quite incorrect. The gally pressman was not virtually under my orders, all pressmen though nominally attached to certain departments, are directly under the orders of the Press overseer, and such being the case I could not in any way benefit the said Murrugasen in my official capacity. Moreover as he was the only gally pressman attached to the Gazette Department, he had to go through all his work, and I could not even if I wished, lighten his labours in the least possible manner. All that the man looked to was the interest on his money, and when once I unfortunately failed to pay the stipulated instalment he took legal steps to recover the same. In the case of the compositor S. Bashiem also I beg to submit with due deference that the facts connected therewith are not

placed myself under an obligation to favor this compositor with work, and infringed the Press rules regarding the equal distribution of work by foremen to compositors. The very fact of this man also having taken action against me for the recovery of his money will show that I could not have favored him with work against the rules. If I had been in any way partial to him, he would have only been too glad to please me, and not go against me by filing a small Cause Suit as soon as I failed to pay the money due to him, and further he would have been anxious to remain in the department in which I was the foreman, which was also not the case in this instance. The man's average earnings will show whether I was partial in the distribution of work or not. Without unnecessarily taking up your valuable time, I beg to mention here that these matters were fully inquired into at the time by the Superintendent, and he was satisfied that, with the exception of borrowing the money there was nothing further unbecoming on my part and so he simply warned me to have no further pecuniary transactions with men employed in the Press, and to this I have scrupulously adhered. The Superintendent has evidently revived these charges now to maintain the unjust position he has assumed against me on the misrepresentations made to him by means of anonymous letters and otherwise by certain compositors who have now obtained what they were aiming at by being promoted to permanent posts made vacant by reason of my dismissal.

I beg most respectfully here to express my great regret that I have been so foolish as to have contracted the above two loans. Had I been aware that the rules of Government in this connection affected persons holding such subordinate positions as myself I should have avoided incurring the liability, and, if my conduct in borrowing is blame-

46/7
Charge (c). That I prevented the men from entering their names in the fitable compositor's turn book, that I took upon myself to enter the names, and that, thereby I thereby infringed one of the established rules of the Press. I beg most deferentially to submit that there is no such established rule, as far as I am aware. Although I have not had the opportunity of satisfying myself as to the custom prevailing in the several departments, I may nevertheless state that if you are pleased to personally question the several foremen and examine the turn books kept up in the different departments, it will be seen that if there is any "rule" at all, it is for the foreman to enter the names. A compositor completes his work, strikes a proof of it, produces the same to the foreman, and obtains another copy, or if there is no copy sees that his name is entered in the turn book by the foreman. All that I can say is that the wording of the charge is, to say the least of it, misleading and not founded on fact. No such rule as is stated was "framed to prevent irregularities" or if it was, it has not been communicated to the parties concerned. The Superintendent never once spoke to me on the subject, and I beg to be permitted to add that this is also an "after charge" framed to strengthen the position the Superintendent has assumed. Charge (d). That on the 16 July last in giving out the manuscripts of a notification, I did not cut it up and distribute piece-meal so as to ensure its prompt setting up, but gave it to two compositors and thereby an unnecessary cost of 3 hours overtime in the machine and press departments was caused. This is also a new charge which the Superintendent did not think of when he summarily dismissed me (vide copy of his order enclosed in my petition). It has not been invariably the custom to cut up manuscripts, and sometimes, even of it was thought desirable, it is impossible to do so by reason of their being written on both sides of the paper. In such cases where there is a pressure, two or more hands are put on the copy to ensure its rapid setting up, and I followed this principle on the occasion in question. I may add here that only one forme was delayed on this account, and that forme was finally done and given to strike off by about 10 P.M. If there was proper supervision over the striking off there should not have been any extraordinary delay in finishing the work. It however is left to the management.

supervision at intervals of two and three hours, the result must inevitably be great delay and consequently unnecessary overtime. If a proper enquiry is made it will be found that it is the mismanagement in the Press department that causes unnecessary delay and overtime. I can confidently say that on this occasion no machine was idle, waiting for the forme in question; on the other hand, the forme had to wait some time before a machine was available to strike it off. And I cannot but consider it hard upon me to be visited with the faults of others. In this connection perhaps it may not be out of place to mention that I have often reminded the Superintendent of the standing orders of Government regarding Papers intended for the Gazette being sent within a certain stipulated time. The Superintendent, however, desires all papers to go in, no matter how late they are received. The consequence is the Gazette is always late, and overtime has to be paid every Tuesday. I would also add that since my dismissal, additional facilities have been afforded for turning out Gazette work and an Examiner is always in the department till a late hour, drawing overtime, and yet the Gazette has been delayed much longer than during my time, once even missing the morning post. If you will be pleased to personally enquire what has been the case during the past three months you will be convinced, and I presume the Superintendent will not but admit, that matters were not brought to such a critical state during my time.

Charge (c) That on being questioned by the Superintendent I acknowledged the receipt of the sums specified in the list marked B and again "in the presence of the Overseer" I stated that "I had done wrong and asked for forgiveness" I am indeed at a loss to understand why the Superintendent is so determined to make it appear that I admitted such grave charges. What I admitted I have already stated in my petition. This admission, as I have stated therein must have been misconstrued by the Superintendent and also by the Overseer, and as the latter has been cited as a witness against me, I beg you will be pleased to remember that having passed the rubicon and now awaiting the Superintendent's favor for rather years extension it is to his interest to side with the Superintendent in order to currow his favor for further extension till his 60th year.

famine, the fact that I have not in any way proved an unprofitable servant to Government (on the other hand I have always endeavoured to discharge my duties conscientiously and satisfactorily) and to pass their merciful orders in my case, for which I and my distressed family shall ever be grateful.

I beg to Remain
Sir

Your most obedient servant
W. E. Neegrade

Madras }
27 November 1889 }

W. S. Meyer Esq.

Assistant Secretary to Government
Public Department

40
/ 4
Sir,

I beg to be excused for troubling you a second time. I should not have done so were I aware of certain circumstances, namely:-

- (1) That there was to be an investigation like the present into my case;
- (2) That the Superintendent was to bring forward certain fresh charges against me;
- (3) That certain persons in the Press who have for sometime past been inimical to me were determined by some means or other to bear false witness against me;
- (4) That the Superintendent was determined, even at the loss of his own self respect to go asailing in the office for persons to come forward and give evidence against me.

I beg to assure you that it is far from my intention to prejudice your judgment in this case. All I seek is justice at your hands. Nevertheless I must beg leave to respectfully call attention to certain facts:- First and foremost you will be pleased to call for the order passed by the Superintendent in dismissing me (the original copy which received by me, I beg to enclose herewith). Comparing this with the charges for maladministration submitted by the Superintendent you

40
10

became known. As it was your intention to hold an investigation in the matter, the Superintendent made it so apparent that his great anxiety was to run me down at any cost, that he emboldened certain persons inimical to me to come forward and tender "voluntary evidence" - thus suiting a double purpose: - satisfying their evil intentions against me and in the meantime gaining the good will of the Superintendent. This will be clearly seen by the conduct of some of the witnesses that have freshly cropped up against me. I would respectfully beg of you to ask the Superintendent under what circumstances he has called upon Mr L. Passaigne, an Examiner, to give him a certain statement on the 28th ult.

When I submitted my explanation I fully expected that the charges against me would go no farther than what were contained in your memorandum. Now that I understand that the Superintendent is prepared to bring a medley of charges, I think it is but fair that I should beg of you to be so good as to be pleased to confine the charges originally framed against me. If however you are pleased to extend the scope of his inquiry I beg of you to give me the benefit of your protection, as I have not the ability, or the training to conduct a case, ^{especially} ~~with~~ ⁱⁿ ~~which~~ ^{large} I have to meet a formidable array of witnesses.

... it is to ... Please the Superintendent
in the hope of future success in some shape or other. I
beg especially you will be so good as to put to the
witnesses such questions as you may deem proper from
the information I tender with reference to each
Party.

I beg to Remain
Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

W. G. Beagrace

Nadras
2^d December 1889

180
11

Government Press.

Madras, 14th August 1889.

No. 2598

From

R. HILL, Esq.,
SUPERINTENDENT,
Government Press,

To

Mr. W. G. Fagade

Enclosure

His letter No. dated 14-8-89

The following is
the order passed on
his case.

" Mr. W. G. Fagade,
Foreman, Gazette Dept.
dismissed 8th August

1889 for taking sums of money from
of the Piece Work Compositors in his dept.
and thus placing himself under obligation
to these men to favor them with work
he had been warned on two former
occasions for irregularities in conduct
the Dept."

R. Hill
superintendent

40
13

From Mr. W. L. Fergader,
Madras.

42
14

Read letter to Mr.
Fergader and the
compositors to appear
before me at the J. P. Court
at 4 pm on Monday next
& return the papers
of compositors' addresses and
with more entire & then
and for the J. P. Court
27/11

No.

Dated } 27 November 1889
Received }
Enclosures _____

SUBJECT.

Sub mitting his explanation
with reference to certain
charges brought against him
by the J. P. Court.

"The Capt. explains
that the bank is
a fellow pressman is
to put type in press
or receipt from
compositors."

x 4 I

CC/15

372-89.
C. Munningsman. "Billed" in the Gazette Dept.
about 18 years. I was formerly a fellow pressman
in Aug 1885. I lent the 42 to Mrs. Fugate. I was
then a fellow pressman working under Mrs. F.
directions. I showed 2 copies to her and handed
them over to him then she took I suppose ~~from~~ ^{of} the
of the small house land & houses in respect to the balance
of that debt. (Mrs. F. produces plain over
in respect of the same suit no 1708, 21888. Ex II)
about two years ago. I don't remember the exact date.
Mrs. F. borrowed ^{from} the sum of \$20 from me. She then
still working under his rules as a fellow pressman.
Mrs. F. gave me a bond for the money - about 10 months
ago. I gave the bond to a "biller" called Munningsman
& asked him to ask Mrs. F. for the money. Munningsman
told me that Mrs. F. had said that she'd go to his house &
he'd pay me gradually. About 6-7 months ago I sent
his house - he said he'd pay up to give him the bond
which he then tore up, putting the pieces in his mouth
then he turned me out. He has never paid me. I
took out a common option in the office (not the
one we discharged for want of evidence that Mrs. F. had
destroyed the debt. Then I brought a suit in the
small house land which was also dismissed.

X Examined by Mrs. F. The loan of the 42 made to Mrs. F.
in Aug 1885 was not paid down in cash. When I
had lent him money 30s before taken ~~at~~ ^{proceedings}
option for it moving in the small house land and
I stopped proceedings - and then Mrs. F. repaid -
first bond for the 42. I charged him interest of the
rate of 10% a year for interest. I have lent
money to other employees in the office besides Mrs. F.
to compositors & billers, but not to pressmen. I have however
lent money to a proof reader named Wilson. I got the
money from one of my female relatives who lives in
my house. I have not lent money for a year or more

"The Capt. explains
that a 'biller' is one
who draws the
forms
* Capt. says he has
not lent money
to pressmen"

No. 4. S. I lent Mr. F. money out of compassion not
because he was a freeman - I could not lend
money because this would not do as by the law!

Had an interview in Tamil & signed of him
in court.

Wheeler

* The 1st. & 2nd. explain
that there is pressure
is not in support
at present and is
known in the 3rd
but not finally as 2d
franchise

Sankar Nath Sen 2-12-89.
My service in the Press is 14 years. There have been
composers all the time. For about a year before Mr. F.
dismissed me working in the printer's department as a compositor.
On 27th April 1888. Mr. F. asked me for a bond for
Rs 50. I gave him Rs 35, but he gave me a bond for
Rs 50. I was working in his department then.
I had him the money because he troubled me for it saying
it was for his brother-in-law's wedding. I have lent money
to other employees in the office, among them a friend
of mine. I have not them in Mr. Sen's department.
As Mr. F. did not repay me I took out a summons
against him in the Small Cause Court.

My last February. I paid her 7 Rs 35 in cash and Rs 30
that being the money paid off on previous notes & then
looked at a consolidated bond for Rs 50. When taken in the
Dept. I have lent money to her - her Ryan - Examiner,
her Francis - Examiner, her French - Examiner
also to some of the impressors - men who, if
into paper form. First or six days ago the impressors
called dollar toward 2 copies of me. Got the money from
my brother-in-law Verdey - kind a money lender.
I knew it was forbidden to lend money to her servants,
but I did it because these people troubled me. When through
I gave them money to the printer, deciding that they could
not give me a proper quantity of work.
I charged 3 per cent per month - the money I lent her 7.
At interest of 1 per cent per month in making the loan
Before making the loan her servants were given to me than
to other compositors; afterwards I got the same as they did
I did not get home with them others
in the house, as I

I did not get home with them others
 By U.S. Nov. 7. never paid me any part of the loan, as I
 took proceedings against him in the Small Cause Court.
 I got a decree against him in the 18th June for Rs. 6.
 for which he has paid an attachment (being of no value)
 (III) purchased & sold ^{the same} I have never volunteered

Mr. [unclear] & that although I had taken no action & it
is now the more correct in place. Mr. [unclear] had
told me of Mr. [unclear] receipt of the letter.

turn-book is a book in which computers report & enter
their names as they are out of work so that they should not
lose again in the order in which their names appear.
The system was introduced & was then soon after I first
joined the office as a clerk in the foreman. The foreman
kept the book under the charge of the Dept. As long as I was
a clerk the book was kept up in a proper way. I produced
a turn-book of the Wash Dept. which has been regularly kept.
The data are regularly entered by the foreman when the
computers enter their names, a name being entered as
work is given to the computer in question. I produced
the turn-book kept by Mr. F. before his dismissal (p. 10
& 11). It will be observed that there are no dates of the
names are in the foreman's handwriting. The
irregularity of the turn-book in the way I have described
is not included in the printed office rules but it is an
understood custom of the office. I found however that
there was a custom in evidence that in the Wash Dept. the
turn-books had been kept in the same irregular way as
I had kept his. The fault lay with the book kept in the
Washington in not checking the books. The book was
not of the Dept. but which the names divided, I
found the books kept as long as three - evidence of the foreman
book which is now kept right. I discovered that these books
had been not put down with the foreman. I signed
the irregularity & as constructive of the evidence of dishonesty
on Mr. F's part & was furnishing by itself proof of dishonesty.
I called for Mr. F's book in receipt of an answering letter
about the book. I shortly before I dismissed him. I had
not had occasion to enter the irregularity before. I did
not tell Mr. F. to keep the turn-book properly because I
suspected his whole conduct & was not willing to

with
the book being
care

number
the 15th July last I received the foreman's letter
for the foreman's [unclear] Mr. [unclear] & the foreman
on Monday evening & when I went down to the Dept. on
Tuesday evening at 6 pm and the first thing I saw
was the work could have been done & would be
in the afternoon at least & on enquiring I found that
the day was [unclear] & was 7 having given the whole
work to two computers instead of being divided up
among 10 or 12 as usual. There is a paper in written on
both sides it is [unclear] for each computer & copy of it
copied for him the part he is to set up so that this need
not interfere with the division. The two computers
to whom the work was given are named [unclear]
[unclear] & [unclear]. They are two of the men who have been
dismissed because their names appear on the slip marked B in p. 2-11-88
p. 11.

5-12-89.

I desire to set down my charge (c) regarding the
turn-book - as I find a further enquiry that it was not
fully understood in the office that the computers were
to enter their names in the turn-books.
In the early part of July, before the occurrence which has
given rise to charges (d), a computer named Rafterman
came to me along with Mr. F. (as he is a regular computer
bringing charges against foremen to make them in the foreman's
presence) & complained that he was getting very little work
because of the irregular management of the foreman.
I sent for the pay abstract of [unclear] that in the previous
month he had not earned Rs 5-11-9. Mr. F. said this was
from his irregular attendance. I questioned Mr. Rafterman, where
he had been had to get away from office, and
found that he had been away from him. I then
considered a regular attendant. On examining the
pay abstract I found that [unclear] from him the very few
whereas he had earned more than the others
was making allowance for the fact that he had been
7 days absent. I spoke of this to Mr. F. on the matter

advised him to avoid irregularities in the arrangement of the list.

1. I examined the books containing the day-distributors' attendance registers, taking the names of the four men just above Retnam in the jagtha dept. getting following results:

Names of computer	Summary of figures	Days of absence from work & attendance register
Amber Singh	18. 12-6	3
C. Chinnay	12-2-7	-
A. Retnam	18-9-7	2-
I. Munnay	15-5-6	-
P. Retnam	5-11-9	-

7

The reference in the first part of para 3 of my report in No. 2-11-85 is to the Retnam business - June 1971 - a mistake for July.

On the 25th July I received the anonymous letter produced enclosing the slip marked B in No. 2-11-85 & asserting that the names of computers were those of the jagtha dept. other figures entered opposite the names. They had lost to pay his day's pay the previous day. Computers are paid on a month-price - when between the 16th or 18th of the month following that in which their wages are due. The last day pay, then, I recognized the names on the slip as being in the 7's handwriting. Being to pass the work I let the matter stand over till the evening of the 27th day when Mr 7 came to my room with some proofs. After this business was done, I took out the slip from a drawer from it & him & asked him to say if it was his handwriting. He replied that it was. I then asked him what the figures were opposite the names. He did not answer. I then said "do they represent sums that you received last day's pay?" He still said nothing. I said "tell me truthfully."

that it is. He said they did represent money taken from the computers. I asked him why he had taken money from these men. He said that since his salary had been stopped he asked and him on the half pay & then sums enabled him to pay his rent - Rs 10. The total of the sums on the paper comes to Rs 5 only. I pointed this out to him and he said "sometimes it was a little more, sometimes less." I asked him the meaning of the entry on the right hand corner who said that was Rs 2 that he had paid to the women. The words "paid to women" entered underneath in blue pencil as in my entry were written immediately after this interview was over. I told him that I did think the matter was over him in the morning, when they went away. Next morning on coming to office I sent for 7. After overruling to my inner private room. On their coming in I asked him to look at the slip & asked if in the women's presence would "do you still say that you said last night about the paper?" or words to that effect? He said he was very sorry for what he had done & asked for forgiveness. I told him that the thing was in connection with his past irregularities. I did not keep him as a prisoner any longer & showed him the names on slip B from him. I identified the names on the slip B from a copy which also accompanied the anonymous letter (B) is now attached to it. The addresses are those of these computers working in the jagtha dept. I sent for them; but I felt doubtful about the 54 name which is from the copy of Ramnagar. There is no computer of that name, but he had been complaining to me a few days before and did not seem likely to resign his money. So I sent for 7 again & asked him about this name. He said it was a mistake for C. Rajah, who is also a computer, & I made the correction in blue pencil in the copy of the list in his presence.

40/19

that that in the first conversation with him
a 8th day the Dept asked him if he was in the
it of taking money up from the computers as
he said of this month

My 7. When I came up the second time I found
7 closed there. I was not present. When Mr. 7 told
the Dept that Remington was a witness for the Dept
then I came up & left the same that 7 had already said so

Chas. F. Leblanc.

Read over letters & signed by him as correct
W. H. H. Jr.

413
21
Anderson Meyer.

5-12-89.

I have been 7 yrs in the post office. For the last 5
years I have been an imposer in the 7's Dept.
I am constantly seeing his handwriting. The names
& figures in slip B look as if they were written by him
My 7. I saw even that the names & figures are in 7's
writing. Mr. 7 frequently gives the imposers
slips with the names & computers written on them

14-12-89.

The post office Dept is undeniably close by the foreman
about 5:30 or 6 pm. I noticed that on the day the
five computers were paid the imposers were sent
off at 5, while the computers were retained. I noticed
this for more than 6 months before 7's dismissal. On
ordinary days imposers & computers were sent away
together. Imposers were not sent away before computers
on any other day except pay day. Computers are paid
in the afternoon, but at no fixed hour.

When one day a computer seemed familiar to me 7 had
asked him for money. He said about 5 or 6 months ago.
Familiar said. He (7) asked me for money, so I walked off
that was all he said. I did not enquire further.

My 7. I saw him at the Dept on 15-12-84. I saw and
wrote that it was at 7's request. I then drew the 20 &
the 40. I got the 100 by being foreman on
probation in consequence of 7's dismissal. I have often
asked 7 to leave to go away from office before it closed

Meyer

seen
14/12.

P. Ruthmann 14-12-83 computer -

137 in Pers. mostly the time in the 1st Dept.

68/33
About a year ago Mr. F. asked me to guarantee a loan for him. I refused. He then asked me to get him a loan somewhere. I said I could not do it.

This conversation took place in office. Nobody was present at the time. A month or two before that he asked me for money (witnesses, ^{hypothetically} ~~repeatedly~~ asked that were the end of it, never said 'ask me for money') I refused. Two or three times after that he asked me for money. I refused. Then he asked me for a fair share of work. I complained to the Capt. and he was not long before he was dismissed.

On three occasions I told him that he had asked him for money - once about a year ago; once about 6 months ago; once after he was dismissed.

About 5 or 6 months ago a compositor named Cooper was the last just been transferred to the 1st Dept. told me F. had asked him for money.

One day in the month of May I saw Parthesen, one of the compositors, give the foreman a paper. It was a pay slip, dated 5-30. The money fell from Parthesen's hands. He picked it up and gave it to the foreman.

by F. I did not tell the Capt. at the time about Parthesen giving the money to the foreman. I did not tell him that F. had been dismissed.

I did not tell Capt. about F. asking me to guarantee loans for him money. I was afraid.

P. Ruthmann.

(I have given his statement in full)

90
24

C. Chiun-ung Chelli. compositor. 14.12.89
30 yrs in post press. 12 or 13 yrs under F. - all his
service in post the Dept.

Since F's pay was attached I have seen compositors
- pay day dropping money into his drawer. I saw
Chelli do so as every month for 2-3 yrs past.

I am not sure enough to see how much he dropped. I
did not see the money. I only heard it dropped. I heard
as I am excited at my bank. I have heard Chelli
Chelli drop in money but not often. I have not seen
any other men drop in money. F. never asked me
for money, but once about two years ago he asked me to
go with him to Savings Bank. I did not go.

On 5th June I went to Dept. & complained that I did not
get a proper share of work & that I had said to me "off
of your pen and ink from you" (these words were said
in English). F. said to say these words to me every
month when I said I had no work. I have heard
him say the same words to other compositors
I did not write the anonymous letter marked by F.

4th June 1900. I am 50. Twenty years ago I used to come
from No 30 to No 50 weekly. Now I come from No 17 to No 25.

The rate of charges has been twice reduced in this
period. My night is paid except at night. I have told
F. that I do not work after 7 pm. I have said to come
late in the mornings except when I am indisposed. The
rate 1/2 is a 1/2 too late. I never told F. that I do not work
after 7 pm in morning because of brotherhood. In 1877

I was convicted of assault, fined & sentenced to 7 days simple
imprisonment. The Govt. suspended me. I petitioned
for the commutation of my re-entrainment. I have
had nothing to do with getting up committees yet the
present management of the Press.

I will swear that I saw him drop money into the drawer
drawn. I have not set up other people in the Dept.

Apr 7. I used to protest when I got low pay.
 I did not tell Supt of persons dropping money into F's drawer
 because of the pressure that at a computer complaining
 and a person would come with the pressure.
 I don't know if the Supt. is aware a computer alone. I
 never came to Supt. without the pressure till 5th July
 then I went to W. H. H. house. I never told Supt. that he
 is using a letter as a slip. Supt. asked me about the
 money and whether I said he did not write it.

C. Chirona waving
 when understood all the things
 upon the money found

Thomas Jenkins

14.12.85.

40/75

72 in Feb 1985. 3 yrs a computer in the Dept.
 On several occasions I asked him for money. He asked me
 three times. The first time was the first year of my
 working in the Dept. Said to me the money had
 up' asked for something. I said I was a poor state
 myself could not give him anything. He said he
 asked me again. I said the same answer. The same
 thing happened the next month. Since that time, 12 for
 two years more, he kept me alone. I told Mr. Jones on each
 occasion that I was asked for money. I used to tell the
 person before the whole Dept. that he gave me back
 with because he could not pay him money. I complain
 that he has always kept me out of my fair share of work
 and I found the person kept the person from work left of mine that
 allowing for periods of absence Jenkins' earnings were not below
 the average. The Supt. explains however that his earnings
 during part of this time he was working extra in the
 confidential Dept. which resulted in earnings. This
 the report shows due to confidential work cannot be shown
 to make out the letter

between, exposed by me? I was then in the Dept. in 1985.
 In Sept 86. When there is extra work in the Dept. I am
 taken up there with the others. I had not a fair share
 of work. I did not even complain to the Supt. because I
 was not being denied. There was some by whom he asked
 me for money. In consequence of F's distress and I am
 being asked to be imposed. I am used to know that I
 will more from me

J. Jenkins

40/24

R. Perumalsamy handu 14-12-83.

2 yrs in fort. Press. a compositor all the time. worked 6 months under F. It is not true that I lent you money to F in July last or on any previous occasion. I never asked me for any.

Person who made

P. Damodarum handu 14-12-83

12 yrs a compositor - 6 yrs in foyette Dept. - but true that I gave a lent any money to F in July last or on any previous occasion. I never asked me for money

P. Goposamy Pillay

1 1/2 yrs compositor - but not in foyette Dept.

V. Perthumathi handu

13 yrs in Press - 5 yrs in foyette Dept.

Syed. Fazelud. din

10 yrs in Press - 7-8 yrs compositor in foyette Dept.

P. Sanyasani Pillay

4 yrs a compositor - 6 months in foyette Dept.

Amma Singh

joined Press in 1936. compositor in foyette Dept. all the time

make the same statement

Syed Fazeluddeen
P. Goposamy
V. Perthasari
P. Sanyasani
P. Thamethu
M. Ananthu

100
27

At Rajah Chelva 14-12-85

12 yrs in gov. serv. At the time in Rajah Chelva.
He never gave money to F. in gov. serv. The name in the
list is not mine.

What I said in my petition to Govt that Mr. F. has
harassed me because he asked me for money & could
not give it is true. I did not give him money ever, but
he asked me twice. One time was five or six months
ago; the other a month or so before that date. The first
time F. said to me "give me 8 annas" This was three
or four days before pay day, in the room where I worked - he
was only. He implored me for the money. Did not say
why he wanted it. I said I had a large family & could
not pay. F. then went away without saying anything.
What happened the second time was just the same, the
amount, the way he asked for it, very urgent.

Ten or fifteen days after my refusal to give him money he
transferred me from a room where I was working, next
to the computer Chinnasami, to another in the same room
I forget whether this was after the first or second time he
asked me for money. After that I did not give him money
there & work. The last time F. asked me for money
was a month or a month and a half ^{before} after I was dismissed. He
did not ask me for money again after that.

Note On examining the signature times with other attendance
register found -

- (a) That computer Rajah Chelva got paid full pay in July '83
- (b) That in June his earnings, with 4 days absence commuted
to Rs 5-11-10 much below the average. Taking two other
names at random Anandaling, with 3 days absence, got
Rs 18-12-6; with C. Rangasamy, with full attendance, Rs 13-4-8
- (c) In May his earnings were ^{less} than his average. He was
absent 5 days of Rs 11-3-5. Taking two other names at
random again V. Perumal with full attendance got Rs 23-2-4.
P. Retnam with 3 days absence 14-15-7

(1) He paid his earnings over also and Rs 11-14-10 with
 his day's share. For the composition taken I understand
 in this case Rs 11-5-0 with one day's share. I
 homonymy Rs 17-5-0 with full attendance
 & he made his earnings over paid Rs 21-12-11 with
 full attendance

2. There is a card for 7.

One day I could not go to office late. That could be an
 excuse - must be a card to help in house late. Sometimes
 I get half a day's leave from the foreman, but this was rare -
 not more than once a month. Sometimes, but very rarely,
 I could stand away from my house that day evening late
 I don't know why I was absent from another place, except for the reason
 that I was not given 7 money. Not time that Chinamen were
 were fighting. Did not tell 7 that Chinamen were both things
 from my box.

i. Kapala & Hottly
 (underman from [?] [?])

William Gregory Fregede 2-12-89.

I have been employed in the post office since 1860. I have
 been a foreman for the last 13 years

It is not true that I was from Kungjerson in Aug 1885.
 I was ^{with} ~~heard~~ ^{heard} to have up previous transactions but I
 had not heard from him before

In Aug or Sept 1888, after Kungjerson had been out
 a summons got me in the Police Court, but I did not
 for me was not having any further dealings
 with dealings with Press subordinates

I received money from the composition ^{before} Hodgman
 in April 1888. That was ^{before} I had been caused by ^{him}
 while in regard to the case with Kungjerson.

(The Press book shows that Hodgman was entering in
 the forgetful dept from Jan 1888).

It is not true that I gave Hodgman less work after before
 he had the money, more afterwards.

It is my turn book. The majority of the entries are by
 me, but there are some (other men) who took my place
 occasionally. For the last 10 years since I was foreman
 of the forgetful dept. the turn-book has been kept in ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{the}
 kept. There are changes within the names of the compositors
 myself & not between dates. I have never been told that
 this was wrong

5-12-89.
 It has not been the practice in the forgetful dept to put up a
 paper like Ex. I do not put up statements there it is possible, but
 this has so many columns that it was as possible to do so
 On forgetful days the men are busy with their work and
 I had not enough material (type & spaces) to get work done
 then two men in this paper

The small earnings of the compositor between were due to
 the fact that he came late in the morning & went away
 early in the afternoon. I used to give him leave without
 notice to the foreman. It is a fact that men cannot
 stand of the foreman except a dinner time unless he opens
 up & talks to the foreman, his deputy, or his assistant. Between work

Up at dinner time (1 pm) & went back & ended out
again & from I did not have them shown in the attendance
register. The attendance register is kept & the imp. res
in the present's responsibility.

[I have not attendance register for June. Found several
other 2 A: don't p. child's y. p. v. v. v. (7 y. old Return)
but no other 2 1/2: don't 2 day] come

Confession I was drawing No 70. They say that my
pages under attachment 2nd April 1885. I also had
attachments & given me in 1888 but these were shown off.
I was never in debt before 1888 & I don't think I was ever
any further.

The 1st of April sent me on the 7th day & showed me the slip B
I said that the names looked like my writing & that the
figures were not, that they must have been forged & some
one trying to injure me. I did not believe that I
had taken money or anything of that sort.

The names on the slip are names of competitors in my debt
I often write names on a slip like this to give me in distributing
proof to competitors. If I put the names on the slip in
question it was for some such purpose as this. The 1st of April did
ask me about the 5th name - the last. I said it was either
Reich or Remington.

12-11-87

Many the statements of Reich that looked him for
money. I compared him because to another friend
because he was always fighting with his neighbors & his enemies.
Reich that he was worse than any other because
he was a slow unknown.

The slips marked with ~~the~~ (handed in by the 1st of April) are
in my writing papers with. They contain names of
competitors with numbers of pages of proof given them
& such. The slip next on which I am disinterested
is the one that is contained in number 11.

Reichman and when she came late; sometimes I report them
the 1st of April
I have no more to say. but Dr. Berger has come forward
against me & take my place

40
29.

H. L. Keprade

here
14/12.

For Mr. George
16 Dec 1885

40
30

Evidence taken at
the enquiry of the for.
Press.
W. S. Meyer

From
W. S. Meyer Esq.
Agent Sec. to Government

To
The Hon. Mr. J. F. Price
Chief Secretary to Government,
Public Department

Sir,

As directed in the endorsement in Public Current
2703, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3084 & 3204 (vide fo. 2 Nov 1885 no 871)
I have the honor to report after enquiring ^{held} at the for. Press
on the petitions of Mr. H. E. Kepple late foreman for the Dept.
and certain compositors employed in that department.
Mr. Kepple, it will be remembered, was dismissed by the
Superintendent for having "borrowed" & extorted money from
these compositors, & the compositors for having given him
money, but the charges against the delinquents had
not been duly recorded on their explanations taken, as required
by the rules & so.

3. Resolving to commence proceedings by calling on the
 Mills to submit formal charges of this conduct against the
 dismissed men. In Ct. 362A the Supt. complied with this
 direction. In consequence of reference I give below the view
 charges against Mr. Ferguson, who answers thereto as evidence
 from the written replies put in by him (Ct. 372A) and his
 subsequent statements at the enquiry, which was held on the
 2nd, 5th & 11th inst. I omit charge (c) which the Supt.
 subsequently withdrew (p. 7) the witness then at the enquiry.

Supt's charges

(a) That Mr. Ferguson borrowed,
 in August 1883, from C. Thompson,
 fellow-passenger, the sum of
 Rs 42, & about April 1884 of other
 sum of Rs 20, thus placing
 himself under obligations to a
 subordinate working in his dept.
 (b) That as stated in the letter
 of 26 June 1884, in for 2 Nov 1884
 Mr. Spt. (marked A), Mr. Ferguson
 obtained a loan of Rs 50 from a
 compositor in his department
 named Morgan, and
 thereby placed himself under
 an obligation to form this
 compositor with work, & infringed
 the rules regarding the
 distribution of work to compositors

Mr. Ferguson's replies

(a) Admits the loan of Rs 42,
 but denies the other one. The
 fellow-passenger is not under his
 orders & he could not benefit him
 officially.
 (b) Admits loan, but denies the
 it induced him to show any partiality
 to Morgan. The latter's
 independence is shown by the fact
 that he acted for the small
 loan sent for the recovery of the
 money. Was not aware that it
 was any loan from subordinate

Supt's charges

40
 31

Mr. Ferguson's replies

(d) That on the 16th July 1884,
 in fixing up the business of
 the letter to be received from
 the 14th Dept., he did not ask of
 distribute the copy so as to ensure
 its prompt setting up; but gave it
 to two compositors & thereby delayed
 it, causing an unnecessary
 delay of about 3 hours mentioned in
 the machine standing stop.

(e) That Mr. Ferguson on being
 questioned by the Supt. on the evening
 of the 7th August last, acknowledged
 the receipt on the evening of the
 14th July of the sum specified
 opposite to each of the names of
 compositors in the list marked
 B filed in for 2-11-84, and
 given on the morning of the 8th
 August, in the presence of the
 messengers, on being questioned
 regarding the same list, stated
 that he had done every possible
 for fairness

(d) It is impossible to
 set up this list in view of the
 number of compositors employed,
 & its being written on both sides
 of the page

(e) He admitted the names
 on the list to be in his writing, and
 nothing more. The names were
 probably written by him in the
 ordinary course of business, and
 some evening then picked up the
 slip, put in the figures (which
 were not written by him), & sent
 it to the Spt. Denies having
 obtained money from any of the
 compositors mentioned in the list.

The charge against the compositor is that they were employed by Mrs. Ferguson as having given him money.

I submit the following remarks upon the charges and the evidence adduced in support of the same.

Charge (a).

Mrs. Ferguson denies the second loan of Rs. 20, and as the witness Humberstone admits that a debt he brought for the money was dismissed for want of evidence, he is entitled to the benefit of the denial. Humberstone (p. 18 of the evidence) states that the Rs. 20 was in continuation of transactions that had previously occurred, but this Mrs. F. denies. On the matter coming to the notice of the Judge, in August or Sept. 1888, he sent for Mrs. Ferguson & reversed him against having any further money dealings with her subordinates. (Evidence p. 5) A gallery personage told a friend sitting in the audience that the witness & not the prisoner. The only way in which the prisoner can affect him is by complaining of him, & that is the way he does his work which is to put up in proof or receipt from compositors.

Charge (b).

Nashyann hindered Mrs. Ferguson's dept. in Jan. 1888. The Press compositors are paid by piece-work, and on the day of distributing work to them with the foreman, it is desired that his good will will not be unduly affected. This is more especially the case when work is slack, as then a foreman compositor may be given a full page, which others get nothing or only a few lines. Nashyann states that he lent Rs. 35 to Mrs. Ferguson, on a bond for Rs. 50, because Mrs. F. "troubled him", & that he made the loan partly on account of

the interest & the paid (3 per cent per annum) & partly through fear. Also that before making the loan he got her work then compositors, but after words were put in the same party with them, though not specially formed (Evidence p. 3). ^{40/30} At the end of last year he owed Mrs. F. for the money, which has not been repaid, & in Jan. 1888 he wrote the letter filed in Ex. 2-11-88 (marked A) & then through Sept. Mrs. Humberstone & his letter Mrs. Humberstone transferred him to another dept. On Mrs. Humberstone's return from leave in April last, the letter was shown to him. She again accused Mrs. Ferguson (Evidence p. 5) This witness Nashyann has a brother in law who is a money-lender, who appears to have transacted a considerable amount of business, & his brother-in-law's agent, among the Press employees. He produced documents showing that he had made loans to a foreman named Leahy, two specimens named French & Ryan, & an employee named French. I think it is probable, as he says, that he lent money to Mrs. Ferguson partly to Main F. & partly to pay of some business. Mrs. Humberstone says that Mrs. Ferguson, who herself has repeatedly issued verbal instructions forbidding money transactions between Press employees.

Charge (c).

The indignation which forms the subject of this charge will be found filed as Ex. 1. The allegation is that although it was a heavy piece of work, & ought to have been distributed among several compositors, Mrs. F. reserved it for two men, thus causing delay & payment of overtime work (to these men) which might have been

incident. The two men to whom the work was given, Nathaniel
better & Norman drawing hands, are two of the compositors
recently dismissed in connection with charge (c)
Mrs. Fitzgerald's explanation on this charge is, I think, not
much. The body of type will have been divided into strips
horizontally, other type explaining (evidence p. 7) that the paper was
written on both sides, the compositors (who have given some knowledge
of type) set up, not used for them, the paper, & then
taken by itself the change is not of much importance, - it will
have been an even judgment on Mrs. F's part, but it supplies another
evidence of unscrupulous dealings with the compositors

charge (c)

On the 25th July last the Dept. received the anonymous letter
dated as by VI. The writer enclosed the ship company
with file no. 2-11-85 (paper marked B), & a fair copy of the
letter dated 6th July, and stated that the compositors mentioned in
this list (the men now dismissed) had paid a bribe to Mrs.
Fitzgerald the money entered opposite their names. Mrs. Phillips
account of what occurred will be found on pp. 8-10 of the evidence taken
at the enquiry
Mrs. Phillips, Mrs. Brainer, states that on the morning of 28th August
Mrs. Phillips, speaking to Mrs. Fitzgerald in his presence, recalled the
version of the previous night regarding F's receipt of illegals from
from the compositors who were admitting the same, & that Mrs. Fitzgerald
said "Yes". Also that the Dept. asked F if he was in the habit of
taking money regularly from the compositors & that F said "of course
no" (evidence - pp. 11-12)
As might be expected, the dismissed compositors all deny having
paid money to Mrs. F. on this occasion, & seven of them say that they
had no previous money dealings with him & that he never asked them
for money (evidence - p. 13). The eighth, Rajah Chetty, repeats the

statement made in his petition to Dept. (C. 3284 - one 2 - one
paper) that the present report was called for) that Mrs. F had
on previous occasions asked him for money, & that in consequence
of his refusal to give it, he was deprived of his fair share of work (see p. 6)
My note on pp. 20-21 of the evidence will show that in April, May, &
June of this year this man's earnings compare badly with those of
other compositors.

Witnesses Rajah Chetty & Rajah Chetty (evidence pp. 13-14) state that
Mrs. Fitzgerald asked him for money, & that he refused to give it, & that the
Dept. asked him, one of the dismissed compositors, that he had the
previous evening he had given money to Mrs. Fitzgerald; also that the
by Mrs. F on the ship B on the 7th July & that the account of
the Dept. is to doubt the accuracy of Mrs. Phillips account of
Fitzgerald's statement to him on the evening of 27th Aug, & that
as it is by the evidence that Mrs. F was on the ship that same evening,
partially contradicted by Mrs. Phillips account of what took place the
next morning

5 The following corroborative evidence has been produced to show that Mrs.
F had on previous occasions endeavored to extort money from his
subordinates

- (1) Rajah Chetty, a compositor employed in the printer's Dept., states
that about a year ago Mrs. F asked him to procure a loan for him,
& that both before & after that he asked him for money (evidence - p. 15,
in consequence of his refusal to comply with these requests he lost
his fair share of work. He has complained about this to Mrs.
Phillips (see p. 7). From my note on p. 8 of the evidence it will
be seen that his earnings in June were much below the average
even allowing for the days he was absent.
Witness Rajah Chetty & the witnesses say that this witness
had been he had given money to the foreman (p. 14 of ev.)
+ Note. Two blank slips, submitted with Mrs. F, are filed for purpose of comparison
(see VII & VIII) with

Mr. Mearns, one of the inspectors, visited Jenkins and told him
I had asked him for money, but before the incident occurred
of 5 or 6 months ago (see p. 13)

(4) Andrew Meyer & C. J. [unclear] [unclear], two inspectors' in
the Dept (when they put the type into page form & set in
in deputy-jurymen), state that whereas on ordinary days
the compositors kept the wire together, on the days on which the
compositors were paid, they (the inspectors) were sent away
early while the jurymen were kept in the office (viz. 6 1/2 hrs).

6 The evidence put before me in the course of the enquiry which has been summarized above, leaves no doubt in my mind that Mrs. Fregeast, who admits that he has been in subordinated circumstances since 1888 (evidence - p. 23), has for some time past been habitually extorting & unduly exercising power from his subordinates. This petition for reinstatement

should, I think, be dismissed

As for the composers, it is for consideration whether, in view of the way in which an unscrupulous person has been it in his power to affect their earnings, they should be treated with leniency or severely. It is probable that they paid unwillingly, & giving them the benefit of the doubt, it may perhaps be assumed that they did so to avoid evil consequences to themselves & not to obtain an unfair advantage over their fellow workmen. It is submitted that they might be re-instated, being punished by suspension & deprivation of earnings for one or two months for the fault they have committed. If any composer is to be made an example of, it should rather be the man Baskin who is pointed out in my remarks in charge (66), appears to have established a regular money-lending business in the Press.

8 The Dept. should, I think, be directed to issue a printed standing order forbidding all money transactions with ~~Indian~~ ^{Native} ~~Indians~~ ^{Indians}. There are, I believe, a great many ~~Indians~~ ^{Native} ~~Indians~~ ^{Indians} employed in the Mass. Co. are heard of in debt, & those pecuniary circumstances form a standing temptation to the extortion of loans and 'handshakes' on the one hand, & to the divulging of official information on the other. Mr. Wall might be called upon to report whether there are no cases which ought to be dealt with under f.o. 376 1887-88/134, & if there are, to submit the necessary

remuneration to find. To get rid of a whole lot of men
and we don't let prejudicial to the working of the Press,
the last cases might be gradually cleared up.

Exemption on the part of a freeman is, I think, considerably
assisted by the existing practice of requiring compositors
who have any complaint to make to higher authorities
make it in the presence of the foreman (evidence p. 7). The
rule has been made to prevent printers' complaints
in regard to the distribution of work, but it is for consideration
whether its drawbacks do not outweigh its advantages.

10. In conclusion, I must observe that there has been considerable
activity on the part both of Mr. Hill & of his sometime business
Mr. Morris in dealing with Mrs. Fitzgerald. The letter marked
filed in file 2-11-85 was received by Mr. Morris, then by Mr. Hill,
871
January of this year, but though it contained a definite charge
of robbing a house from a compositor against Mr. F, the only action
taken was to transfer the compositor to another department.
Mr. Hill on his return to duty has shown the letter, but he
has had already had occasion to notice money dealings between
Mr. F & another subordinate (hunningsman), he has talked
himself with warning the foreman. The complaint of
compositor Reuben in file (evidence p. 7) was given previously
with a warning only, though Mr. Hill had shortly before been
warned by the veteran compositor Chinningsman that he

was in a very bad way in the ^{payable} Press department? Lastly,
of the anonymous letter which led to Mrs. Fitzgerald's dismissal
received on the 25th Feb, the Sup^{ts} took no action on it
42
35
the 7th August.

Then the honor the,
Sir,
your most obedient servant
W. S. L. J. or
by under Secretary

it should be altered.
if any may be in
the foreground
J. S.

The matter has been ~~carefully~~
 inquired into by Mr. Alley or
 Mr. Under Secretary to the
 for a careful consideration of
 the case and present of ^{his} report
 the Gov. in Council is of
 view that the charges against
 J. J. Isgrate have been fully established
 Isgrate admits that he has
 in embarrassed circumstances
 of 1888 and there can be no
 doubt that he has for some time
 been habitually extracting money from his subordinates
 in order to ^{do so} ~~maintain~~
 his position
 reinstatement will accordingly
 be dismissed

In regard to the dismissed
 reporters, Mr. J. J. Isgrate
 is prepared to ~~give~~ assume that their loans to
 the benefit of the ~~debt~~ ^{were due} Isgrate rather to a desire
 to avoid the evil consequences
 of a refusal to comply with
 demands than to an intention
 of obtaining an unfair
 advantage over their fellow
 workmen -

The discovery of any further ~~any~~ transactions of
 this nature on his part
 with his fellow-workmen
 or others in the Press ^{Department} office
 will result in his immediate
 dismissal.

5. The Superintendent will
 further issue a printed Standing Order
 forbidding all money transactions
 between Press employees, and will

to obtain an ~~unfair~~ advantage
 of his position ~~as a~~
 which ~~they~~ have already ~~obtained~~
 is in the opinion of the ~~authorities~~
 punishment for the ~~same~~ ~~as~~
 they will accordingly
 be ~~dismissed~~ at once.

40
 38

34 Rec. of the Febry 1685.

~~Reading for~~

2. Res, which requires

~~has a complaint to make~~

... is in the presence of the ...

~~Smart, W. H.~~

assist coloring on the part of
workmen.

looked out before and then

2000 my / any case of ...
and ...

and the

Como consecuencia de esto se creó

by ~~discontinued~~, Inquiry of
~~closed~~ ~~recognition~~

Force necessary being lost in the
course of the process

By _____

The enclosed of Mr. Burns
is referred to.

in reference to the letter from
Shyam K.

Myam Nardie recovered to him
in Ag. Supp. N. T.

Supp. A. in ~~the~~ January
calls for it.

calls for notes. It is observed
the only one.

the only action taken by that
on this date

on this letter and

- advisable
- ~~desirable~~ to deal with

It appears to follow the
the drawbacks of the for
practice in the press w

Complaints from Camps
to fight an hour in the presence
of the foreman outweigh
advantages. In fact

~~all complaints will be~~
It will be sufficient if
inquiring into a complaint
is conducted in the press

of the Government if that
considered necessary
Complaints should at
be listened to.

leaving the charge itself to
lie over for consideration
until the return of the
Superintendent.

Several facts elicited on
the inquirer recently held
show clearly that the
discipline in the Press is
far from being as strict
as it should be. This is
a matter which requires
immediate attention at
the hands of the Superintendent
~~and the fact deserves to be
in that office the necessity
for ensuring an improvement
in the press.~~

14
25 Jan - 1/2 m/c

12

∴ distinct charge of ~~extortion~~ ^{extortion}

W. F. Grade, ~~leave to transfer the~~
composer to another Dept. ~~leaving~~
~~the charge~~
~~months before the date of~~

~~The Sheriff~~ W. Morris hereby in
this particular is responsible
that he will be informed that he
has missed the deaf treasure of
Jesse.

The faculty in the discipline
of the Press, under the influence

~~It is clearly from the evidence of~~
~~which is clearly proved by several~~
~~facts~~
~~which in this ongoing lately held~~

Small amount of material should receive the
immediate attention of the Supd. R. &

responsibility for ensuring ^{in future} that the

discipline in his establishment is

To
17th September