

EAST AFR. PROT
3975

C. O
33275
JUN 19

PROVINCIAL OFFICE
4 Jul

1919
4. JUNE

LAND SETTLEMENT.

at previous Paper.
3913
Subsidiary

Enquiries of Nairobi Selection Bd. making provisional selection on evidence in application form and if satisfactory detailed exams of applications will after Colony. States inevitable that and progress Selection Bd has not dealt fully with application for Colony and Colony not take place amongst definitely selected applicants only.

Subsequent Paper.
4308

R afterwards.

Sent 6 Nov 4/6/19
Priority A
4 June

RECEIVED
5 11

DRAFT. Feb.

Nairobi

MINUTE.

Hand 22306

land settlement induperans

I am informed that rulingly Nairobi Selection Board

making provisional

selection prima facie

evidence in application

from land is postponing

enshrined selected immunities

applicants will be let

Should be glad to meet

Mr. Jeffie. 4/5/19

Mr. Bottomley 4/6/19

Mr.

Mr. Grindle

Sir H. Lambert

Sir H. Road

Sir G. Fiddes

Col. Amery

Lord H. ...

checked for
with new

Afterwards.
Sent 6^{pm} 4/6/19
P. J. J. J. J.
4 June

RECEIVED
21

DRAFT.

Tel.

land settlement reference
Induperans

not

Nairobi

22306

I am informed that
rulingly
Nairobi Selection Board

MINUTE.

- Mr. J. J. J. 4/6/19
- Mr. Bothwell 4/6/19
- Mr.
- Mr. Grindle
- Sir H. Lambert
- Sir H. Ross
- Sir G. Fyche
- Col. J. J. J.
- Lord J. J. J.

making provisional
selection on prima facie
in application
evidence of
adjudicate
land is postponing

ended for
with new

entitled
examined
applicants will be called
should be given to read

allegation

contingent

but it is true, but in any case
and are open to using system unsubstantiated

alderman

and proposed it is

proposed

belonging

here

proposed that Selection Board should

dealing

alleged

deal with applications fully

acknowledges

before copy and that copy will shall

~~copy~~ spread

take steps management financially efficiently

A Miss Mackay, who called here this morning, having just arrived from E.A., mentioned to me that the Nairobi Selection Board were only going into the applicants' qualifications in detail after the lottery. This rather surprised me, but ~~it is not surprising~~ if it is true it clears up one or two difficulties in the interpretation of the Gov's scheme.

The procedure followed apparently would be -

- (1) ~~Applicants~~ Applicants whose qualifications are prima facie satisfactory, are 'provisionally selected' for a place in the lottery.
- (2) The lottery is held to decide the order in which statements of choice will be considered.
- (3) Applications, with statements of choice, are considered in detail by the Selection Board, in the order determined by the lottery, until all the farms have been allotted.

This procedure is not indicated anywhere in the local scheme in 286H, but there is nothing in that scheme to show that it is not being followed, although

the original interpretation of the scheme as the
one we have put upon it, i.e. selection
first, and a lottery only amongst those
finally selected. If the system of outlined
above is the one followed in Harrow,
however, it explains the use of the words
'provisionally selected' in the local scheme,
and also the Gov's assumption that the
Selection Board here could finish its work
by June 14th.

If we had been told at first
and other procedure (which means much less
work for the Selection Board) was to be
followed, we do not think that we should
have insisted so strongly on omitting the
necessity of a statement of choice for London
applicants. We have assumed, however,
that the Selection Board will to examine
all the applications and complete
its selection before the selection of
the other is to be one of indifference
against those who are not selected.
Inevitable if the really good applicants
are to have a fair chance. By our method
the Selection Board can include only the
obviously desirable settlers in the lottery
list of those to go on a fair

chance, the desirable man can only get the
same chance as the rest who cannot
definitely be turned down but who are
not possessed of the same qualifications.

If therefore the present arrangements
for the lottery stand, I think there can
be no doubt that the work of selection
must be completed first, if there is
to be any real selection at all. If
the other hand, it is decided to adopt
the other system, we must ~~only~~
return to the arrangement whereby the
lottery only determines an order in which
applications are to be considered, and
does not actually give the right to a
place. The arguments against the
lottery arrangement have been fully
given elsewhere, and do not
need to be repeated. It is questioned that the
allocation of places by lottery is the
best ~~and the fairest~~ method so far as
the London Board is concerned, and
even as a matter of principle I think
it is better that the governing authority
should decide which of a number of
carefully selected applicants obtain places
than

that which of a very large number of
unsuccessful only presumably satisfactory
applicants shall have their applications
considered at all. While this means
more work for the selection board, it
will be far better for S.A.P. in the
end.

We have so far departed from the
course already that, I do not think
we need mind using different methods
of selection here. It may be a while,
however, to tell the Gov. what we have
done in regard to it in fact, and why
we propose to do here.

Monday
2/16/17

In the telegraph I find nothing
in this paper which would have led
us to suspect the arrangement. If
we had known of it, it would certainly
have altered our plans, and I
am not sure that the selection
board would not be likely to
seize an opportunity for assuming
the task of interviewing.

But I do not think it is probable
for us to advise the arrangement. It
would seem that the government

lottery must be postponed till all
applications have been received, 366
with a view of interviewing afterwards,
and (under an arrangement) much
difficulty in adjusting the distribution
of farms - provisionally allotted to
persons found to be undesirable on
interviews - among the reserve of
prima facie good candidates which
would have to be found. A second
lottery, with a second reserve list,
would be necessary.

Wed 2/16/17

to paper

82 2615

3rd year