

DOMESTIC

EAST AFR PROT

23659

23659

Name of Individual

Colonel Commandant

1909

15 July

Previous Paper

W  
12515*Lake Survey**Request further consideration of his case.*

Mr. Read

Commander Whitehouse understands that the letter we suggested he should withdraw was that of 22 July 08 (26775), but the note on the draft of our letter of 31 Oct and Sir F. Hopwood's minute on 12496 show that it was his letter of 1st April (12496) to which in particular exception was taken.

He now says he will "look on any letter <sup>we</sup> may have written as non-avenue" and accept Lord Crewe's ruling that his claim for £90 on account of leave pay cannot be admitted, if we will withdraw our letter of 20 June 08 (just below).

On this question see minutes on 41392. Our letter was ungracious, but there is no other reason why we should withdraw it. The object of our asking him to withdraw a letter was to open the way for him to get a C.M.G. He must be fully aware of this, but, as was remarked on 41392, he rejects the olive branch.

S. E. W. 12515/17-1909-1709

Subsequent Paper

W  
12515  
10

I would reply that Lord Crewe <sup>is unable to</sup> regrets that he cannot accept the suggestion.

Exd 16 by

2/13  
July 17

W. F. Allen

Mr. Read is away & so I have

this on

2/13  
July 19

Of course this can be amended

before proposed

done P. 20

Exd 16 by

11a.

8, St. James's Square, S.W.

15th July 1909.

3659

Sir,

With further reference to your letter No. 39223 of 31st October 1908 - I now understand that the letter referred to in it is my No. 1a. 22nd July 1908.

In my reply to it No. 7a of 11th November 1908, I suggested that No. 19059 of 20th June 1905 should be regarded in the same way as it was suggested I should regard mine.

In December last, my readiness to look on any letter I may have written as non-avenu, provided No. 19059 was treated in a similar way was, I believe, intimated to you.

From the first sentence of the second paragraph of your letter No. 920 of 21st January 1909, I gather that my suggestion is not to be entertained.

In previous correspondence it was pointed out that the cost to me of my stoppage of work in 1905 amounted to £300, that I had then worked for the period entitling me to full pay leave when I was ordered home, and I therefore thought myself entitled to receive my passage money, and be placed on full pay for the period I was away from Africa in 1905.

The sum in question amounted £177. 7. 11.

The refunding of my passage money left a balance that I considered was due to me of £90. 0. 0.

I am willing to accept the Earl of Crewe's ruling as regards this amount, and to request that my letter No. 1a. of 22nd July 1908 may be looked on as non-avenu if I may understand that No. 19059 of 20th June 1905 may be looked on in a similar manner.

Trusting that I may receive a favourable consideration of my suggestion.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

*B. Whitehouse*  
Commander, R.N.

To the Under Secretary  
of State,  
Colonial Office.

W/ 23659

633

DRAFT.

Com. in C. B. Whitehouse, R.N.

23 July 1909

MINUTE.

- Mr. Packer 25/7
- Mr. Butler
- Mr. Just 20/5
- Mr. Anrobin
- Mr. Cox.
- Sir C. Lucas.
- Sir E. Hopwood.
- Col. Seely.
- The Earl of Crewe.

Sir,

I am directed by the  
 Earl of Crewe to acknowledge the  
 receipt of your letter of the  
 15th July, and  
 to inform you that  
 H. L. is unable to

accept the suggestion  
 made herein  
~~which you have put forward.~~

Yours  
 L. H.

WT

0