

Public Works (1898) Department.

EXAMINED,
P. W. ACC. NTC.
13 DEC. 1900
No.

G.O., No. 2083

DATED

15th August 1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

Casual Leave - Two. The Deputy stating that the period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house, shall be reckoned but shall not be counted against him that may be due, communicate to the officer of the I. and.

B/Ck/nd

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

ected by the head of his office to
of infectious disease in his house
t may be due.

15

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th May 1898, No. 649-A—2.

Please see the accompanying correspondence, copy of which is enclosed.

2. Mr. DeMonte — a clerk in my office whose case gave rise to that correspondence—was absent from duty from 25th April to 5th May, both days inclusive. He is not entitled to privilege leave under the rules, and under G.O., No. 853, Financial, dated 17th October 1894, casual leave cannot be granted for a longer period than five days at a time.

3. As, however, the present case is a very special one, I would recommend that Government be moved to grant Mr. DeMonte casual leave for the period of his absence, viz., eleven days.

4. I take this opportunity to suggest that, if Government think it necessary, the general question of how enforced absences of this nature from duty should be dealt with may also be considered, and orders passed thereon for the future guidance of heads of offices.

ENCLOSURES.

Copy of letter from E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, to the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, dated 6th May 1898, No. 573-A.E.

I have the honour to request that you will favour me with your opinion as to how the absence of a clerk from duty, owing to the prevalence of infectious disease in his house, is to be treated, i.e., whether he should be considered on duty or on casual leave (under the special orders of the Local Government) or be granted such other leave as may be admissible to him under the Civil Service Regulations.

2. The case that has given rise to this reference is that of Mr. DeMonte, a clerk of my office, who, having reported on the 25th of April 1898 that his son was attacked with small-pox, was directed not to attend office until he could produce a medical certificate to the effect that there was no further fear of his bringing infection to office.

3. Mr. DeMonte having returned to duty on the 4th April 1898 from three months' privilege leave, is not now entitled to privilege leave, nor can he, under the existing orders of this Government, be granted casual leave for a longer period than five days at a time.

4. If, therefore, the clerk is not treated as on duty, there will be no option but to grant him such "long leave" as is admissible under chapter XIV, Civil Service Regulations, and to regulate his allowances, while absent, accordingly.

COPY of letter from A. R. BECHER, Esq., Accountant-General, Public Works Department, to the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, dated 14th May 1898, No. 611-E.

In reply to your letter, No. 573-A.E., dated 6th May 1898, I have the honour to state that the Government of India have ruled that a clerk who is forced to be absent from office, under the Examiner's orders, owing to small-pox in his family should be granted any casual leave which his official superior may consider admissible, and if no such leave is thought admissible, he should be granted such leave as may be admissible under the rules, for the period of absence from duty, together with the allowances, if any, also admissible. The period of absence may however, reckon, if necessary as a *dies non*, that is, it will not count for or against any other leave that may have been earned or may be earned in future.

Endt. No. 417-D.

Transferred to the Financial Department for consideration.

6th June 1898.

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—No. 626, Financial, dated 18th July 1898.

The period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house shall be reckoned as casual leave, but shall not be counted against casual leave that may be due.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.
„ all other Departments of the Secretariat.
„ Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretary.

addition suggested.

In the event of an office being weakened by the absence of one or more of the office hands temporary men may be employed at the discretion of the official concerned with the sanction of his immediate superior—

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

In S. & office & P.W.D. there is often only one clerk.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 626, FINANCIAL, DATED
18TH JULY 1898.

From the Public Works Department, No. 417 D., dated 6th June 1898.

For the Chief Secretary—

The Public Works Department transfers correspondence from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts asking for instructions as to how the absence of a clerk from duty, owing to the prevalence of infectious disease in his house, is to be treated, *i.e.*, whether he should be considered on duty or on casual leave or be granted such other leave as may be admissible to him under the Civil Service Regulations.

2. The case which gave rise to this reference was that of a clerk in the Examiner's office who, having no privilege leave due to him, reported that his son was attacked with small-pox and was directed by the Examiner not to attend office until he could produce a medical certificate to the effect that there was no further fear of his bringing infection to office.

3. The Examiner referred the matter to the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, who has replied that the Government of India has ruled that a clerk who is forced to be absent from office owing to small-pox in his family should be granted any casual leave which his official superior may consider admissible, and that if no such leave is thought admissible, he should be granted such leave as may be admissible under the rules, for the period of absence from duty, together with the allowances, if any, also admissible. The Accountant-General states that the period of absence may, however, reckon, if necessary, as a *dies non*, that is, that it will not count for or against any other leave that may have been earned or may be earned in future. The result of this clause of the Government of India ruling is to convert the leave into casual leave.

4. It is submitted that the rules as regards casual leave may be relaxed in cases such as that reported by the Examiner. It would be hard on a clerk or a subordinate to cause him to take leave on half-pay or to use up his privilege leave when he himself is quite well and fit for his duties, but when he is obliged to absent himself from work in view to the protection of the remainder of the establishment. It is thought that in such cases heads of departments should be authorised to grant casual leave to such extent as may be absolutely necessary.

C.M.S.
16-6-98.

H.M. and Circ.

It is not likely that heads of departments will allow a clerk to be absent to the detriment of the working of the office longer than is necessary, and so perhaps the proposal in the last sentence of the note will work. But it should, I think, at the same time be laid down that such casual leave shall count against any casual leave due to him under the rules.

G. STOKES.
18-6-98.

H.W.B[LISS].
20-6-98.

As the man is ordered by the head of his office to stop away and does not do so of his own accord, I would certainly reckon the period of absence as casual leave, but I do not think it would be equitable to count it against casual leave that may be due under the rules. It is quite an exceptional matter.

A.T.A[RUNDEL].
21-6-98.

Honourable Sir. H. Bliss again, with reference to the point whether such absence should count against casual leave under the rules. The Honourable Member seems to think it should.

G. STOKES.
27-6-98.

I think so. Indeed, I think there is a recent India order to this effect.

H.W.B[LISS].
29-6-98.

No orders of the Government of India on the subject of casual leave referred to by Honourable Member can be traced.

S.P.
4-7-98.

For the Chief Secretary—

Honourable Members differ as to whether the casual leave granted to clerks who are obliged under orders of the head of an office to absent themselves from duty owing to infectious disease in their houses, should count against casual leave that may be due under the rules.

C.M.S.
5-7-98.

Submitted to His Excellency the Governor as Honourable Members disagree on the point referred to.

G. STOKES.
6-7-98.

I do not consider that a period during which an officer may stay away from his work under orders to that effect should count as casual leave.

A.E.H[AVELOCK].
9-7-98.

21-11-14 ✓
2-5-19 ✓

3-9-28 BILL ✓

Public (1000) Department

P. W. Dept.
Government (1898) of Madras.
FINANCIAL.

Recd. } 1898. Enclosures
Regd. } Spare copies

G.O., No. 626, 18th July 1898.

No. 2083 Wd 15th August 1898

Countd to officers of the
JULY. P. W. Department.
(sd) A. S. R.
Sw

Ch. R. Ford
Ch. R. for Ry.
S. E.
Ch. R. for Ry.
S. of W. Lt. H. D.
Exr., P. W. Accts
Exr., Ry. Accts.

Casual Leave.

Stating that the period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house shall be reckoned as —, but shall not be counted against — that may be due.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th May 1898, No. 649-A—2.

Please see the accompanying correspondence, copy of which is enclosed.

2. Mr. DeMonte — a clerk in my office whose case gave rise to that correspondence—was absent from duty from 25th April to 5th May, both days inclusive. He is not entitled to privilege leave under the rules, and under G.O., No. 853, Financial, dated 17th October 1894, casual leave cannot be granted for a longer period than five days at a time.

3. As, however, the present case is a very special one, I would recommend that Government be moved to grant Mr. DeMonte casual leave for the period of his absence, viz., eleven days.

4. I take this opportunity to suggest that, if Government think it necessary, the general question of how enforced absences of this nature from duty should be dealt with may also be considered, and orders passed thereon for the future guidance of heads of offices.

ENCLOSURES.

Copy of letter from E. A. DENNYS, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, to the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, dated 6th May 1898, No. 573-A.E.

I have the honour to request that you will favour me with your opinion as to how the absence of a clerk from duty, owing to the prevalence of infectious disease in his house, is to be treated, i.e., whether he should be considered on duty or on casual leave (under the special orders of the Local Government) or be granted such other leave as may be admissible to him under the Civil Service Regulations.

2. The case that has given rise to this reference is that of Mr. DeMonte, a clerk of my office, who, having reported on the 25th of April 1898 that his son was attacked with small-pox, was directed not to attend office until he could produce a medical certificate to the effect that there was no further fear of his bringing infection to office.

3. Mr. DeMonte having returned to duty on the 4th April 1898 from three months' privilege leave, is not now entitled to privilege leave, nor can he, under the existing orders of this Government, be granted casual leave for a longer period than five days at a time.

4. If, therefore, the clerk is not treated as on duty, there will be no option but to grant him such "long leave" as is admissible under chapter XIV, Civil Service Regulations, and to regulate his allowances, while absent, accordingly.

COPY of letter from A. R. BECHER, Esq., Accountant-General, Public Works Department, to the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, dated 14th May 1898, No. 611-E.

In reply to your letter, No. 573-A.E., dated 6th May 1898, I have the honour to state that the Government of India have ruled that a clerk who is forced to be absent from office, under the Examiner's orders, owing to small-pox in his family should be granted any casual leave which his official superior may consider admissible, and if no such leave is thought admissible, he should be granted such leave as may be admissible under the rules, for the period of absence from duty, together with the allowances, if any, also admissible. The period of absence may however, reckon, if necessary as a *dies non*, that is, it will not count for or against any other leave that may have been earned or may be earned in future.

Endt. No. 417-D.

Transferred to the Financial Department for consideration.

6th June 1898.

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—No. 626, Financial, dated 18th July 1898.

The period of absence of a subordinate directed by the head of his office to absent himself from his duties in consequence of the prevalence of infectious disease in his house shall be reckoned as casual leave, but shall not be counted against casual leave that may be due.

(True Extract.)

G. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.
„ all other Departments of the Secretariat.
„ Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretary.