

1921



KENYA

G.O. 63704 493
Re: [unclear] 21
Recd: 13

DATE

28th December 1921

CONFIDENTIAL

CIRCULATION:—

SUBJECT

VITAL STATISTICS OF EUROPEAN COLONIALS

- Grindle
- H. Lambert
- H. Read
- Robertson Smith
- Wood
- Churchill

Returns for 1910 and 1920.

Previous Paper

M.O. 2224/20

MINUTES

~~FORWARDED~~

to Robertson
to Stanley

I submit returns for printing as usual for consideration.

The R.A. & W.A. figures compare as follows

1910-1920	Deaths	Invaliding
W.A. total rate per 1000	14.5	30.0
E.A.	14.2	14.2

I also attach for comparative purposes and not for reproduction a copy of the W.A. graph with the R.A. line marked on it in red.

24th December 21

After using the graph for 2 years, the rate for invaliding again shows a tendency to decline. These figures show a marked advantage in favour of East Africa both in respect of Deaths & Invaliding. *not*

Subsequent Paper

M.O. 64246/22

19 April 21
19 April 22
Kingya 574
W. Africa 208
Myson 119
W. Africa 63
W. Africa 7-235
W. Africa 92
W. Africa 92

MINUTES

MINUTES NOT TO BE WRITTEN
ON THIS SIDE.

showed to be on the coast

of the coast

The figures are satisfactory,

and the volume is

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

of the coast

~~The figures are satisfactory~~

of the coast

No observations

by the Committee

Put by Ref

11/4/22

alone

alone

service under other Colonial Governments who have resigned or left such service and are appointed to West Africa after 1st January 1919. I am inclined to think it was not intended to leave the second and wider meaning, but I am not at all sure. If a man has left the service, he is not likely to have any tropical kit in his possession.

(2) Why is "other" inserted before "Colonial Governments". Whatever is decided under (1) above, should apply in the case of officers with previous service in West Africa. If it is decided that an officer who is not transferred but is reappointed after 1.1.19 after a break is eligible for the outfit allowance, he should receive it whether his previous service was in West Africa or elsewhere, subject to the condition that if he has previously received anything towards outfit, it should be deducted. This is the case of Dr. Forde, file 11510/W.A. and he would be eligible for £60-£12. If it is decided that "transfer" includes reappointment after a break, the rule should apply whether the previous service was in West Africa or elsewhere. On this ruling Dr. Forde is not eligible for a grant.

The cases of Forde and Nash are similar, except that in Dr. Forde's case the £12 must clearly be deducted, if anything is paid.

J.A.C.
13.10.21.

It may be noted that in the case of the W.A.F.F. we have ruled on 47466/21 W. Africa that W.A.F.F. officers transferred to a civil post in

West

"This is not a transfer"

J.F.

Because an officer can't be transferred to W. Afr. from service under a Colonial Government
A.J.H.

point is - the appointment to the "civil post" or or on or subsequent to 1.1.19. If prior doesn't get civil kit allowance at all.
A.J.H.

West Africa may receive the difference between the W.A.F.F. and civil outfit allowance. The point arose on the case of Lieutenant Saltwell whose first appointment to the W.A.F.F., was subsequent to 1.1.19. The ruling in his case was therefore correct, but we have given the ruling generally without regard to whether the first appointment to the W.A.F.F. was prior or subsequent to 1.1.19. I think that is wrong. A civil officer, if appointed prior to 1.1.19, on transfer from one West African Colony to another, would not receive the grant and I doubt if a W.A.F.F. officer should.

J.A.C.
13.10.21.

An officer who resigns and is re-engaged is to my mind on exactly the same footing as a new officer. His previous service does not reckon for seniority or pension and it is not fair to say that because he had a post elsewhere once he should not get part of the emoluments of his appointment when he derives no advantage whatever from his former appointment. To take an extreme case of a Foreman of Works who served a tour in 1905 and is not re-engaged again till 1920. How could the outfit grant be refused on the ground of his previous service?

J.F.
13.10.

T.T. Dept.
W. Afr. Dept.

What is your rule on this point? The idea of the grant to West African officers was that at

had any
C.J.J. 19/20

was limited to such officers on first appointment and not paid to officers on 2nd, 3rd or 4th appointment even if they had not received outfit allowance on previous appointments.

A.J.H.
19.10.21.

Mr. Batterbee. Mr. Bottomley
Mr. Strachy
Mr. A.J. Harding.

Discussed with you and Mr. Parkinson this afternoon. We have no practice as to this in East Africa because we have not hitherto had a case of the kind. A case has now arisen, however, viz. that of Mr. A. Carriline (file 1632/E.A.), who was appointed to Kenya in January 1914, reverted to the Home Postal Service in December 1916, and was re-appointed to Kenya in June 1920.

Our view is that in such cases outfit allowance should be paid on re-appointment (a) when there has been a gap between the two periods of service, and (b) when the officer has not received any outfit allowance in respect of any previous period of service; but not otherwise.

C.J.J. 1/11/21.

It is difficult to devise a perfectly logical rule, but the above on the whole seemed the most equitable.

H.J.B. 2.11.21.

I agree that where (a) and (b) are satisfied outfit allowance should be granted. Also that when (a) is not satisfied outfit allowance should not be granted.

But

431

But I think that some latitude (according to the length of the gap or other factors) may be allowed in the case of the re-employment of an officer who originally got outfit allowance. Otherwise we are open to the charge of saving money and getting the benefit of part experience at the same time. The original outfit does not last for ever.

W.C.B.
2.11.21.

C.S. 2/11.

I would accept the rule as laid down by Mr. Jeffries but as regards (b) if a man had received a smaller allowance originally he might be granted the difference between that and the new allowance.

J.F. 4.11.

I won't follow Mr. Calder in his critical verbal examination of the despatch on 23549/21 W.Afr.

The essential thing to bear in mind, I consider, is that the grant is intended to be a grant to a man on first entering the Colonial Service. In such a case the natural assumption is that he hasn't got a Colonial kit and has never had one, and is put to considerable and unaccustomed expense in getting one.

If he has once served in the Colonial Service, he has, or has had, a Colonial kit, and has earned a Colonial rate of pay. It is not his first Government job nor his first job in the Colonies. So he ought to have some kit available or some money to buy one.

I would therefore confine the grant of the kit allowance to a male officer appointed to a civil

at what about the
order case where
did not
originally get
allowance?
J.F.

the bar nurses
who get an
allowance of £20
each year. Other
women can be
dealt with
specially

cost

post in West Africa after 31st December 1918 whose appointment to such post is his appointment to a civil post in the Colonial Service and who has not previously served in the Indian Service.

If you once tie yourself up in questions of breaks of service and how long such must be to qualify for a first or second grant, there will be hopeless controversy and fine distinctions.

A. J. H. 21.12.21.

Mr. Harding's proposal would mean a modification of the ruling in the despatch and I would give it to officers who have not received the allowance before on re-employment in West Africa after a gap of not less than a year since their previous tropical service.

Mr. Harding

If you can't agree to above please get Sir H. Read to decide.

W. P. Ellis
23.12.

Sir H. Read,

Mr. Harding will not be back for a week but it is very desirable we should have a ruling on this subject. The different proposals seem to be:

(1) Mr. Harding's viz: that the grant should be strictly confined to cases of first appointments to civil posts in the Colonial Service.

(2) the East African Department's viz. that there must be a gap and that the officer has not before received any outfit allowance.

(3)

(3) Mr. Flood agrees with (2) except that he would give the difference if the second allowance is higher than the one originally received.

(4) Mr. Ellis would give the allowance to officers who have not had it before if appointed after a gap of at least one year.

(5) Mr. Bottomley goes further than anyone else and suggests that an officer might be given the outfit allowance twice if there was a sufficiently long gap.

Mr. Harding's view is the strictest and easiest of application. If it is not accepted, I agree with (2) as modified by Mr. Flood. I do not think we can lay down a period for the gap. If the officer's service is actually broken, even temporarily by a few days, and he is not granted leave on no pay to cover the gap, then I think he should have the allowance if he has not had it before or the difference if he has had a smaller one before.

J. A. C.

28.12.21.

AS (A)
W. P. Ellis
28.12.21.