

C O  
4773  
REC'D  
FEB 12

EAST AFR. PROT.  
4773

37

ING

Date

912

January

Evans Paper

ALLOWANCE FOR MR MEYER

Trusts that in view of further explanations given the allowance of Rs50 p.m. will now be sanctioned. Asks for general sanction to grant allowances up to Rs 75 p.m. to subordinates on the non-pensionable scale coming under the railway rules for non-pensionable employees.

*Mr Butler*

In view of the further explanations  
now given, I am not prepared to  
be held out by the grant of allowances as  
proposed. The Revenue estimate that the  
total amount of such allowances in my  
proposed scheme will be Rs 1,00,000 per  
annum which is a heavy charge on the  
Revenue and I do not think it is  
advisable to grant such a large sum.

Copy of report to Revenue and all  
other relevant authorities should be  
sent to you for their sanction to proceed.

Evans Paper

4773

... long from the ...  
... at least cases ...  
... a total ...

1375 2 1/2

Mr. Read

<sup>18th</sup> That <sup>difficultly</sup> ~~difficultly~~ <sup>priced</sup> ~~priced~~ from the introduction  
of the new leave rules. There are now no  
deductions from the pay of the higher railway  
officials, and therefore no savings from which  
the subordinates (who do not come under the  
new leave rules) can get acting allowances.  
The difficulty is that in passing the new  
leave rules on the Treasury we gave a  
solemn assurance that if the new leave rules  
were approved no applications for acting al-  
lowances would be entertained. The idea  
in giving this assurance was that no junior  
officers must set off their improved leave against  
the loss of acting allowances. There is no  
such set-off in the case of new railway sub-  
ordinates whose leave rules remain  
unchanged. Nevertheless, I am  
disinclined to go to the Treasury as

suggested. It will probably increase their  
suspicion of our assurances. 229

If we do go to the Treasury, we  
must explain that the case is one not  
contemplated when the assurance was  
given, and we must leave the matter in  
their hands. We are not in a position to  
insist.

The Govt makes it clear that any  
improvement in the leave rules for the  
Railway subordinates would be out of all  
proportion to us and no new

1375

21.12

I think that we can settle this  
without going to the Treasury.  
The next thing is to get a  
small number of the new rules to be  
seen to and drafted to meet  
with the highest rate of approval  
every thing ...

J. J. K.

22/12

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

NAIROBI.

RECEIVED FEB 12

BRITISH EAST AFRICA.

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE

January 16th 1912.

No. 37

230

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 725 of the 15th ultimo. I regret that it is not thought possible to allow Mr. Meyer the allowance asked for and venture to think that the circumstances have not been sufficiently explained.

2. Mr. Meyer is a non-pensionable Railway sub-divisional official. The Railway leave rules were introduced so recently as the 1st January 1909 and were drawn up after full and lengthy consideration. The Manager is not in favour of altering them on the lines indicated nor does he think that any such alteration is possible without a very appreciable additional expenditure.

3. At present when a senior subordinate goes on leave he next man fills his place but the Railway staff being at the absolute minimum it is often necessary to take on a temporary man in the most junior appointment to enable the work to be carried on.

4. To increase the amount of leave each man can earn would therefore multiply the number of

LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

DOWNING STREET, LONDON, S.W.

during absence of subordinates and would mean that the Railway would have to engage a larger staff in each Department to allow for more lengthy absence. Assuming that the leave is improved by say 5% the Manager estimates that with his existing staff it would mean a cost of some £2,000 a year to be in extra temporary employees and in salaries for men on leave for which the Railway would get no services in return.

5. The proposed allowance of Rs.50 per mensem to Mr. Meyer, represents in this instance some Rs.400 or Rs.420 only and such cases can never exceed 2 or 3 a year i.e. a maximum of say £80 a year.

6. The difference appears to be out of all proportion to the work to be attended. The alternative to the leave does not really required whereas a few allowances of Rs.50 per mensem in such cases on a large scale would show the extra responsibility to be small and cost very little.

7. I would therefore ask that a general power be given to sanction allowances up to Rs.75 a mensem to be paid to the non-ferrous scale staff under the Railway for non-pensionable employees, during the absence on leave of officers they are called upon to perform more responsible duties. This will not form an awkward precedent because it will apply to the Railway only - subordinates in other

departments

Departments get the better leave rules and are pensionable - and as already stated the number of instances in which it can occur are few and far between.

8. I hope therefore that the proposal will meet with your approval.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

*W. B. B. B.*

GOVERNOR.

C.D.  
23 FEB  
1912

for Lat  
4773

233

50

26 Feb 1912

Lee

DRAFT

to Mr

of the

MINUTE

#18 13/2

Order No 223

to

of

Anderson

of

of

I have the honor to  
ack the receipt of your

check no 37 of the 16<sup>th</sup> of

Jan and to inform you

that, in view of the

fact that explanation has been

returned, I advise the

grant of an allowance of

\$50 to be made to

the 17<sup>th</sup> inst. ~~amount~~

~~amount~~ by the Railway

being to allow a

share of the grant

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,  
[Signature]