

Govt. of {1895} Madras.
FINANCIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 3rd May 1895, No. 359.

MAY.

Casual Leave.

Empowering District Superintendents of Police to grant members of the force, who are not allowed to avail themselves of Sundays and other casual holidays, — for periods not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in a year, and intimating that this concession is not to apply to members of office establishments in the Police Department.



GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 17th October 1894, No. 853, Financial.

ABSTRACT.—Issuing certain instructions in regard to casual leave.

G.O., dated 6th April 1895, No. 301, Financial.

ABSTRACT.—Stating that the rule that applications for privilege leave should be considered with reference to the amount of casual leave previously granted to the applicant, does not apply to gazetted officers.

READ—also the following paper :—

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th March 1895, No. 1811.

I have the honour to say that the existing rule restricting casual leave to five days at a time has been represented to me as a hardship on the police. Mr. Mullaly, the Superintendent of Police, Salem, represents the peculiar position of the police.

He says—

“It has been represented to me, and with good cause, I think, that the recent orders of Government regulating the grant of casual leave operate very harshly with regard to inspectors and the rank and file of police.

“The men never get any holidays of any sort; gazetted holidays, third Saturdays in the month and times of public merry-makings are enjoyed by all other classes but are of no account to the policeman, who is supposed to be ‘always on duty.’ Men working in district offices get these privileges but not so men working in divisions, and I submit that an appeal might be made on their behalf. Men have their vows to perform at distant places, marriages and domestic festivals to attend, and often it occurs that they have no privilege leave due or that the five days’ limit of time is insufficient, and if ten days’ casual leave cannot be given when necessity arises, dissatisfaction must prevail when the men see others enjoying public holidays from which they are debarred by reason of the duties they have to perform.

“I would therefore respectfully submit that the rule should not be made applicable to inspectors and the rank and file of the force and that as formerly the discretion to grant casual leave for a period not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in the year should rest with District Superintendents.”

3. I agree with Mr. Mullaly, and should be very much obliged if the Government could see its way to make a special concession in the case of the police.

No. 849.

Transferred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) L. DAVIDSON,
Ag. Under Secretary.

19th April 1895.

ORDER—dated 3rd May 1895, No. 359, Financial.

District Superintendents of Police will be empowered to grant members of the force who are not allowed to avail themselves of Sundays and other casual holidays casual leave for periods not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in a year. This rule will not apply to members of office establishments in the Police Department.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police,
,, Accountant-General.

Exd. A. Raith,

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 17th October 1894, No. 853, Financial.

ABSTRACT.—Issuing certain instructions in regard to casual leave.

G.O., dated 6th April 1895, No. 301, Financial.

ABSTRACT.—Stating that the rule that applications for privilege leave should be considered with reference to the amount of casual leave previously granted to the applicant, does not apply to gazetted officers.

READ—also the following paper:—

From M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th March 1895, No. 1811.

I have the honour to say that the existing rule restricting casual leave to five days at a time has been represented to me as a hardship on the police. Mr. Mullaly, the Superintendent of Police, Salem, represents the peculiar position of the police:

He says—

“It has been represented to me, and with good cause, I think, that the recent orders of Government regulating the grant of casual leave operate very harshly with regard to inspectors and the rank and file of police.

“The men never get any holidays of any sort; gazetted holidays, third Saturdays in the month and times of public merry-makings are enjoyed by all other classes but are of no account to the policeman, who is supposed to be ‘always on duty.’ Men working in district offices get these privileges but not so men working in divisions, and I submit that an appeal might be made on their behalf. Men have their vows to perform at distant places, marriages and domestic festivals to attend, and often it occurs that they have no privilege leave due or that the five days’ limit of time is insufficient, and if ten days’ casual leave cannot be given when necessity arises, dissatisfaction must prevail when the men see others enjoying public holidays from which they are debarred by reason of the duties they have to perform.

“I would therefore respectfully submit that the rule should not be made applicable to inspectors and the rank and file of the force and that as formerly the discretion to grant casual leave for a period not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in the year should rest with District Superintendents.”

3. I agree with Mr. Mullaly, and should be very much obliged if the Government could see its way to make a special concession in the case of the police.

No. 849.

Transferred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) L. DAVIDSON,
Ag. Under Secretary.

19th April 1895.

ORDER—dated 3rd May 1895, No. 359, Financial.

District Superintendents of Police will be empowered to grant members of the force who are not allowed to avail themselves of Sundays and other casual holidays casual leave for periods not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in a year. This rule will not apply to members of office establishments in the Police Department.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
„ Accountant-General.

Exd. A. Raitt.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., NO. 359, FINANCIAL, DATED 3RD MAY 1895.

From the Inspector-General of Police, No. 1811, dated 20th March 1895.

For the Chief Secretary—

With reference to paragraph 1 of G.O., No. 853, Financial, dated 17th October 1894. The position of the rank and file of the Police is no doubt peculiar, and some concession might be made. It may, however, be remarked that if men require more than five days for marriages and domestic festivals, they should reserve their privilege leave for those occasions.

C.M.S.
20-4-95.

Circulate.

There seems no objection to a compliance with the Inspector-General's suggestion. The Police are hard worked, the service is unpopular, and it is undesirable to make it more so than it is.

J. F. P[RICE].
23-4-95.

There is a good deal in the case put forward. I think we might allow 10 days' casual leave at a time in the case of men who do not get Sundays and other casual holidays, not in the case of office hands, who do get them.

H. W. B[LIES].
24-4-95.

Yes.

J.G[ROSE].
26-4-95.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.
FINANCIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 3rd May 1895, No. 359.

MAY.

Casual Leave.

Empowering District Superintendents of Police to grant members of the force, who are not allowed to avail themselves of Sundays and other casual holidays, — for periods not exceeding ten days at a time or fifteen days in a year, and intimating that this concession is not to apply to members of office establishments in the Police Department.

