

64200
Rr
Dec 20 1921

DATE

DECEMBER 1921

LOYALTY

CIRCULATION

SUBJECT

OUTFIT ALLOWANCE

Minutes as to granting on second session.

- Grindle
- H. Lambert
- H. Reid
- Walter Smith.
- Wood
- Churchill

Previous Paper

MINUTES

lightened for record

*3888/21
Uga*

Hand to old - saying by...

*Copies of letter
to CA & letter
on 3958/22
Circulated to
all members of
Ed. R. T. Dept
to CA
2019/22*

*1958
22*

PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE

Reference: **CO 533 271**

Copyright Photographs - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM THE PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE, LONDON

5632 E.A.

Downing Street,
6 January, 1922.

Sir,

I am directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to acknowledge the receipt of your letter (Pass 3434) of the 18th of October, and to inform you that it has been decided that Mr. R. Carriline, Junior Postmaster, East Africa (Kenya and Uganda) may be paid outfit allowance of £50.

2. With regard to the second paragraph of your letter, I am to inform you that the privilege of outfit allowance was later extended to officers appointed or after the 1st of April, 1920. It is regretted you were not informed at the time this was done.

3. As regards officers who are reappointed, it has been decided that outfit allowance may be paid provided that there has been a gap between the two periods of service, and further, that the officer has not received any previous outfit allowance. Cases should arise in which an officer reappointed

previously

viously or smaller outfit allowance than that for which
would now be eligible, he would on re-appointment receive the
difference between the old allowance and the current allowance
provided that the time condition as to a gap between the two
periods of service is fulfilled.

I am,

Gentleman,

Your most obedient servant,

(SIGNED) H. J. READ

Mr. Flood
Mr. Harding
Mr. Ellis
Mr. Strachey

Two further cases in regard to outfit allowance herewith.

(1) Dr. Forde, file 11510/W.A.

(2) Mr. Nash, file 11915/W.A. Mr. Nash's first appointment in the Gold Coast dates from 30th August 1918. Therefore if he had (remained) in the Gold Coast service he would not have been entitled to outfit allowance, see the Gold Coast circular enclosed on 30/25/21 G.G. W.Afr. He resigned and is now being reappointed to Nigeria.

Paragraph 6 of our outfit allowance despatch stated "The allowance will not be issued to officers who are transferred to West Africa from service under other Colonial Governments or under the Government of India nor to those who have received such a grant on a previous occasion from any West African Government and are re-employed in the West African Service. The grants will not of course be made to officers, though appointed after 31st December 1918, who have already received a free outfit, and only the excess, if any, will be paid to those officers who - being otherwise eligible for the grant - have already received a monetary grant towards their outfit".

This paragraph is not exhaustive on several points: (1) Does "transferred" mean, as it normally does, a transfer without break of service, or is it intended to cover officers with previous service

But he didn't.

This seems to imply "without break of service"

Yes.

This seems to imply "break of service"

Yes.

Quite so

A.J.H.

Mr. Flood
Mr. Harding
Mr. Ellis
Mr. Strachey

Two further cases in regard to outfit allowance herewith.

(1) Dr. Forde, file 11510/W.A.

(2) Mr. Nash, file 11915/W.A. Mr. Nash's first appointment in the Gold Coast dates from 30th August 1916. Therefore if he had (remained) in the Gold Coast service he would not have been entitled to outfit allowance, see the Gold Coast circular enclosed on 30/12/21 W.Afr. G.C. He resigned and is now being reappointed to Nigeria.

Paragraph 6 of our outfit allowance despatch stated "The allowance will not be issued to officers who are transferred to West Africa from service under other Colonial Governments or under the Government of India nor to those who have received such a grant on a previous occasion from any West African Government and are re-employed in the West African Service." The grants will not of course be made to officers, though appointed after 31st December 1916, who have already received a free outfit; and only the balance, if any, will be paid to those officers who are otherwise eligible for the grant - have already received a monetary grant towards their outfit.

This paragraph is not exhaustive on several points: (1) Does "transferred" mean, as it normally does, a transfer without loss of seniority, or is it intended to cover officers with previous service

at he didn't.

is seems to
only "without
break of service"

Yes.

is seems to
only "break of
vice"

Yes.

Quite so
A.J.H.

service under other Colonial Governments who have remained 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 £12. If it is decided that "transfer" includes re-appointment after a break, the rule should apply whether the previous service was in West Africa or elsewhere. In 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 is a "civil post" or on or subsequent to 1.1.19. If prior to 1.1.19, can'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.I. Dept.
E.Afr. Dept.

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

we 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. Butterbee. 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 2572/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.S.J. 1/11/21.

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

H.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

what about the
other case where
did not
finally get
allowance?
J.F.

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 past 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 28549/21 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 can't get a Colonial kit and has never had one, and is entitled to considerable and unaccustomed expenditure on the matter.

If he has once served in the Colonial Service he has, or has had, a Colonial kit, and has received 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

the bar nurses
who get an
allowance of £30
each tour. Other
women can be
dealt with
specially

ast

and 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.R. 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 a 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.D.}
~~W.D.~~

Sir H. Read,

Mr. Harding will not be back for a week but I 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 American Department's viz. that there shall be no grant if 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 if only by a few days, and he is not granted leave on no pay to cover the gap, then I think he should have the outfit allowance if he has not had it before or the difference if he has had a smaller one before.

(A)
at once
H.J.R.
28.12.21.

J.A.C.
28.12.21.