

C1
1922-23

KENYA

420

C O
1677

DATE

5TH DECEMBER 1922

Re-
P. 9 JA 23

GOV'S DEPUTY
BOWRING

1651

CIRCULATION —

Mr. Jewell 24/12/23

Mr. Jeffries 25/1

Mr. Bottrill

Mr. Grindle

Sir H. Lambert

Sir H. Read

Sir J. Masterton Smith

Mr. Wood

Mr. Churchill

SUBJECT

RAILWAY PENSIONABLE APPTS

CHIEF ENGINEERS, RAILWAY MARINE

Recommends revision of conditions
qualifying for admission to pensionable grade

Previous Paper

See
33375

MINUTES

The existing arrangement was originally put forward in para 16 of the then S.M.'s memo. in $\frac{900}{42138/14}$ S.A.P. + was approved in para 7 of the despatch on that paper. No special reasons given either in the papers or the minutes for requiring 5 years service as Chief Engineers rather than 5 years total service (i.e. as Second Engineer or Chief Engineer before admission to the pensionable establishment). The comparison in para 3 should have been made with Second Officers + Chief Officers, not with Chief Officers + Commanders. A Chief Officer carries his Second Officer's service into pensionability after 5 years approved (total) service. (See para 4 of the)

Subsequent Paper

See
33375

Ord 152 29 Jan 23

The analogy between
Secured Inquiries & Secured Officers
is fairly close, but it is not
quite complete since the former
have secured class privileges, as the
latter first class.

But in view of the fact
that it is proposed to cater
to the "previous admission to
Officers' status," I think that
the Gov's proposal may be
approved?

Ref
24.1.23

As regards X, the reason
is given at A in your
minute on 42138/14.
It might be explained to
the Gov., adding, however,
that if the reason is
thought to have lost
its force in present
circumstances, the proposal
now made is
approved

Approved ? 421

C. J. J. 25. 1. 23,

The reason in my minutes on
42138/4 was the reason for
making the posts of C. G. persworth
or all; and ~~Second Superior~~
was a two family, and the
special condition attached to it
locally was accepted here. It
could have been justified as a
ground that ~~Second~~ ^{Chief} ~~Second~~

English name ~~is~~ ~~is~~
from ~~Chief~~ ~~Second~~ ~~Office~~ ~~is~~

to that a Second Office is
an "Office" from the start.

I suspect this, of being ~~is~~
at least to some good

~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~
of the Chief Superiors - that

would account for the falling
no enclosure, but I do not

think we need offer

approval of the ~~is~~

C. H. upheld the view of his
predecessor.

C. J. J. 29. 1. 23

supra.

Ch A

try to issue a

Feb 83

likely

The analogy between
Second Engineers & Second Officers
is fairly close, but it is not
quite complete since the former
have second class privileges, and the
latter first class.

But in view of the fact
that it is proposed to cater
to the "previous admission to
Officers' Quarters," I think that
the Gov's proposal may be
approved.

and

24.1.23

As regards 'X', the reason
is given at A in your
minute on 42138/14.
It might be explained to
the Gov., adding, however,
that if the reason is
thought to have lost
its force in present
circumstances, the proposal
now made is
approved.

approved?

C. J. J. 25.1.23.

The reason in my minute on
42138/14 was the reason for
making the ports of C & E permissible
at all, and Second Engineer
was a first privilege, and the
Special Commission attached to it
being accepted. It
could have been justified on the
ground that being Second
Engineer means is not permitted
from being Second Officer means
is that a Second Officer is
an "Officer" from the start.
I suspect that, if being more
difficult to secure good
retained transfer for one or
two of the Chief Engineers - that
comes account for our getting
no such transfer, but I do not
think we need approve
approval of the Gov.
C. J. J. upheld the case of his
predecessor.

C. J. J. 27.1.23

approved?

421

C. J. J. 25.1.23.

The reason in my minute on
42138/14 was the reason for
making the posts of C.E. posts worth
at all; and ~~Second Officer~~
The grade of Senior
was a bar to it, and the
Special Consideration attached to it
locally was accepted etc. It
could have been justified on the
ground that being Senior

Engineer senior is distinguished
from being Senior Officer senior
with a Senior Officer is
an "Officer" from the start
I suspect this; if being an
attempt to secure good
retrenchment terms for one or
two of the Chief Engineers - that
would account for our passing
no enclosures, but I do not
think we need oppose

Approval of the Board
C. H. upheld the views of his
predecessor.

(Post) 29.1.23

KENYA.

No. 1651.



GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
KENYA.

5th December, 1922.

1677

My Lord Duke,

Rec

9 Dec 22

I have the honour to refer to Mr.

Bonar Law's despatch No. 583 dated 6th August, 1915, in which was enclosed a printed list of pensionable appointments on the Uganda Railway.

2. In that list it is stated that all appointments of Chief Engineer in the Uganda Railway Marine will be pensionable, but a footnote D adds:-

" subject to five years approved service as Chief Engineer and to previous admission to officers' status."

At the suggestion of the General Manager of the Uganda Railway, I desire to recommend that this footnote should be amended to read as follows:-

" Subject to five years total approved service of which two years as Chief Engineer and to previous admission to officers' status."

3. Chief Engineers in the Uganda Railway Marine have always been promoted to that rank from Second Engineers, and it seems unnecessary that, after promotion, they should be liable to serve on probation for so long a period as 5 years. It is therefore proposed to reduce their probationary period to 2 years subject to a total approved service of 5 years. In the case of Commanders, who are usually promoted from Chief Officers, a total approved service of 5 years -

years -

HIS GRACE

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, K.G., P.C., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET, LONDON, S. W.,

Gov Kenya
1677/22-23

424

adg

DRAFT.

Amool
35851
113

~~53~~

30 Jan 1923

Sr

I have the honor to ask the

Kenya No 182

Mr. J. J. ...
MUTE.

receipt of your despatch No 1651

of the 5th of Dec. recommending

that Chief Engineer in the
Uganda Railway Marine

should be made pensionable

after 5 years total

approved service of which two
years are service as Chief



Waterton Smith

Mr. J. J. ...

Inquiries subject to previous admission
to Officers' status; instead of after
5 years service as Chief Engineer as
at present

2. If the new General Manager
upholds the view of his predecessor

I approve your recommendation.

DE VONSHIRE