

EAST AFR. PROT.

6508

0585

Individuals

Salary

909

Feb.

Previous Paper

Mr. J. Likeman

Inquire what economy will result from abolition of his post & whether he is given title to pension

10/10/09

Mr. Read

The note in the 1908-9 Estimate about Inspectorships of Police is "Some Officers are pensionable", and in view of our despatch of 27 Aug. the Government despatch of 7 Dec implies that Likeman's was one of the pensionable officers. In also 1891, 8301, 1908

In the Estimate for 1908-9 provision was made for 11 Inspectors at £2,081 in all, & in the Estimate for 1909-10 provision is made for 12 Inspectors (6 Inspectors) at £2,050 in all. There is a change in paper economy but not in real one as the provision for Inspectors for the Police has on the whole been increased by over £1,000

It is not clear on the whole that it is sufficient to have 12 Inspectors, as had before with the Commission. It is not clear that Likeman's office was pensionable. Colonial Dept. C/AD 24 700

I do not see how we can make out either

10/10/09

10/10/09
J. Likeman 16 April 1909

Subsequent Paper

10/10/09

economy in abolition of office in view of the
 fact that 6 inspectors, and 6 constables
 for in the Estimates instead of "inspectors"
~~the~~ ~~inspectors~~ ~~to be that~~ ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~
~~number~~ ~~of~~ ~~constables~~ ~~as~~ ~~before~~
 without careful investigation of the actual manner
 in which workmen's place in the force has
 been filled & it has been filled. It is
 certainly to be inferred from the papers also
 that he was not the inspectors whose appo-
 intments were plausible. But we must not
 state this categorically & seems to me
 prudent reference to the fact

The papers
 appear
 to show that
 the 6 constables
 were not

Mr. Riley
 Mr. Harris
 A copy of Mr. Williams' letter
 of 14th - enclosed - 21384/08. It says
 nothing about violation, harassment, or
 pressure. In his letter of the 26th of May 1908,
 the late Insp. for I say, that Mr. Williams
 was appointed under the old Police Act
 of 1801. Then in the Police Act, a
 copy of which I enclose. So far as I can
 make out in the whole case, there was
 nothing to be done in former office
 which is recognized by the Insp. for, that
 persons were appointed. The Insp. states
 in 21384/08 that we can find no
 orders

under existing Mr. Riley's appo-
 intment it seems to me that Mr. Riley
 claims to possess a very shadowy
 I may say we cannot say that the
 retirement will effect a saving or
 I think that we had better tell him
 at once that he cannot be given
 compensation

He did not state he was under
 instruction with the P. & C. as left.
 (Camp's letter attached to 21384/08)
 but it appears from 21384/08 & Mr. Williams'
 letter in that paper that he was
 an investigating Officer so that we
 are under no special obligation to
 him

- Library
1. These and have also been made to be submitted to the P. & C.
 2. Please review any Police orders which may have been submitted for the order of 5th of the
 3. Please review any Police orders which may have been made in P. & C.
- Mr. Riley
1. Regulations 3 of 1900 issued by the House of Commons in 1901. The latter are printed in the annual vol. of orders for 1903, pp. 26-27.
 2. Ordinance No. 23 of 1906 and No. 6 of 1907 amendments.
 3. None

Mr. Cox

As his previous no receipts under the local Police order
last please see the Reg. of 15 May 1905 in the
1905 Volume herewith
As he was not appointed by the S of S but employed
locally (22254/08) he appears to come within
class I of Subordinate Staff and therefore his
claim to pension or gratuity seems to be
supported by the Reg. of 15 May 1905
I think the Govt must be taken to imply
that Mr. Williams is pensionable and
so his claim appears to be valid on
the "recovery" point

25A 3/3

I originally thought Mr. Williams would come under
the regulations for Subordinate officers. (Reg. of 11 May 1905)
The Reg. did seem to me to be a more appropriate
for the case of those regulations - i.e. a matter.
But since the 2005 he came under class I, and
there is no practically the same footing as if
he were under the ordinary regulations.

The Govt evidently considered him pensionable
and we may therefore make for an allowance -
but we must drop all idea of addition for
allowance - it was put very tentatively in our letter

Catt 3 Mar

Mr. Williams

Laurel 1870
5/3

W. H. Ingham
at once

W. H. Ingham

Mr. Thomas
Mr. Cox

As however no receipts under the local Police order
but please see the Reg. of 15 May 1905 in the
1905 Volume herewith

As he was not appointed by the 3 of 5 but was paid
locally (202504/02) he appears to come within
class of 8 above with Staff and therefore his
claim to pension or gratuity seems to be
established by the Reg. of 15 May 1905

and from the Govt. must be taken to imply
that the Pension is payable and that
his claim appears to be in order on
the "Revenue" point

JTA 3/3

I originally thought that he would come under
the regulations for Subordinate officers. (Reg. of 11 May 1905)
The fact did seem to me to be a man appointed locally
in the case of those regulations - i.e. a local.

But as he came under class 10 and
was not appointed locally the same footing as if
he were under the ordinary regulations

He has evidently considered him pensionable
and it may be possible to ask for an allowance -
but we must drop all idea of addition for
abandonment - it was put very tentatively in our letter

(with 3 Mar)

Mr. Anderson

Laurel 470
570

W. H. Nich. G.
at once

W. H. Nich. G.

In the reply to this Letter the following
Number should be quoted.

23 FEB 09

TREASURY CHAMBERS

3897

09

22 February 1909.

Sir,

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury Mr. Antrobus' letter of the 10th instant (44480/1908), relative to the retirement on reorganisation of Mr. J. Likeman, Inspector of Police in the British East Africa Protectorate.

In reply I am to say, for the information of the Earl of Crewe, that under the Superannuation Acts of this country (which have been applied to the Protectorate) My Lords could not approve the grant to Mr. Likeman of a compensation allowance in respect of the abolition of his office unless it has been recognised as pensionable and his retirement will effect an economy after allowing for the payment of compensation to him.

I am to enquire what economy will result from the abolition of Mr. Likeman's post.

I am also to ask whether Mr. Likeman has been given title to pension: the footnote to the Protectorate Estimates indicates that Police Inspectors in East Africa are not pensionable as a class.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office.

15-
16-
~~17-~~

March 1909

DRAFT

The Secretary
to the Company

I am directed by the Earl of

March 1909 to ask the receipt of your letter

MINUTE

- Mr. Hunter 11
- Mr. [Name]
- Mr. Just.
- Mr. Andrews.
- Mr. Cox.
- Sir C. Lucas.
- Sir F. Hopwood.
- Col. Seely.
- The Earl of Crewe

of the 22nd ult., on the subject of
the retirement or reorganization of

Mr. J. L. [Name] Inspector of Police in
the East Africa Protectorate

His Lordship expresses his
inability to approve the grant to Mr
[Name] of a compensation allowance
in respect of the abolition of his office
unless it has been recognized as
reasonable & his retirement will
effect an economy after allowing for
the payment of compensation to him

It is not clear that the office in question has been given

in full to promotion, but the ~~affair~~

~~is not to be considered in respect of abolition~~

~~was referred to the observations of~~

~~the Governor as being based on the~~

~~assumption that the office~~

~~is a permanent character and the~~

~~terms in Rule 10 of the~~

~~proposed of Mr. J. Hayes Sadler to deal with the~~

~~provision of a gratuity ~~consequently~~~~

~~based on the ground that no doubt~~

~~exists in his mind as to the~~

~~eligibility of Mr. Latham for promotion~~

3. As regards any

provision existing for the abolition

of the post of the Officer in Charge

of the Protection to 1908 of provision

was made for 11 Inspectors of Police at a total cost of £2,081

while in the Estimates for 1909 to

is proposed to make provision for

1 Inspector and 1 Assistant Inspector

at a total cost of £2,050. As,

however, the provision for the European

Staff of the Police is to include a

proposed increase of over £1,000

idea of economy cannot well be

urged and the question of compensation

for abolition must reasonably therefore

be allowed to stand

4. In these circumstances,

I am to enquire whether the Inspector

is prepared to approve the grant to

loss of office after

Mr. Latham, in respect of his three

years' service in the S. of Police to