

EAST AFR. PROT.  
 No. 19350

19350  
 30 MAY 06

No. 2  
 Conf

(Subject)

1906

Mr. Naserwanji, Supt of Public Works.

Recommend that the post of Supt be abolished  
 and that Mr. Naserwanji be reduced on pension  
 or gratuity

(Minutes)

Mr. Road

Mr. Naserwanji has been overpaid for the last  
 year according to the Commr, and  
 will now be paid £130 a year for the rest  
 of his life for doing nothing at all.

The rate of his app<sup>nt</sup> judging from  
 Mr. Atharwanji's app<sup>nt</sup> (under 2) is  $\frac{16}{4}$ g, which  
 he has now served  $10\frac{1}{2}$  years, not  $9\frac{1}{2}$   
 as stated by the Commr - the final para  
 of the app<sup>nt</sup>.

Under sub 26 of the Suprem Act of '59 the app<sup>nt</sup>  
 of which to EAP is provided for by the 70  
 Reg<sup>s</sup> of 1903) Naserwanji would be  
 entitled to an allow<sup>nc</sup> on abolition  
 of office at the rate of  $\frac{1}{6}$  for each year  
 of service, a  $\frac{1}{6}$  plus on abolition  
 allow<sup>nc</sup> of  $\frac{1}{6}$  of his present app<sup>nt</sup>  
 (£4.50 + £40 = £44.50) +  $\frac{1}{6}$  of £44.50 = £130 pa.

? copy of app<sup>nt</sup> & enclos to the Trg, for review

Coppinole. Dec 24 1906 38422

unofficial Paper

stating the amount to which he appears  
to be entitled. My belief, under the  
cases mentioned by the Comr, it  
will be more economical to retire  
the ~~amount~~

[ I turned up Draper's case (9174 attached)  
in connection with this one,  
I am very sorry, found that though  
para 2 of my minute of 25<sup>th</sup> is correct,  
my ref- to the try (para 3) erroneously  
referred to Draper extra 3 years. It should  
be - in ref- of Justice - in unhealthy  
country, instead of in ref- of abolition  
of office. I wrote to the try to  
draw their attention to this mistake

WDB

Before going to the Treasury, we had better  
find out what Mr. Nassarang's  
age - also whether it is impossible to  
employ him in some other capacity  
outside the P. W. Dept. - write  
to the Comr accordingly & move us  
to the 2<sup>nd</sup> June of Mr. Lobb's  
minute  
at once.

W. J. R.  
8/6

Commissioner's Office

19350

Pr  
Rt 30. 11. 06

Nairobi

85

May 4<sup>th</sup> 1906

at Africa Protectorate

Confidential  
(No. 21)

My Lord

No. 66  
20 1896

Hardinge n. 17  
18 1896

Hardinge  
7 9 1896

Barnington  
16 1905

As the re organisation of the Public Works Department is now under consideration, I have the honour to recommend that the post of Public Works Superintendent held by a Parsee named Khursedj Nasewany

be

M. Principal Secretary of State  
for the Colonies  
Downing Street  
London

be abolished and the holder granted such pension or gratuity as he may be entitled to.

2. Mr. Kharsedj was gazetted as Superintendent of Public Works for the East Africa Protectorate in 1896 his appointment being sanctioned by the Foreign Office. The pay was (after the first six months) at the rate of Rs 400 per mensem rising by yearly increments of Rs 20 to Rs 600. As Mr. Kharsedj was paid the maximum amount of the post in 1901, he is in receipt of a salary of Rs 7200 or £480 per annum, and although no formal sanction was apparently given to his being granted a house, he occupies a dwelling which is rented at an additional £40 per annum. I have the honour to enclose herewith a copy of the Marquis of Salisbury's despatch

despatch no 66 of February 20, 1896

and of Sir A Hardinge's no

127 of April 18 1896 regarding

his original appointment I

also enclose a copy of a letter

from the late Mr Bradbridge

to Mr Kharsedji dated July

9<sup>th</sup> 1894 The Treasury letter

referred to in the latter is

not in our archives.

3. Formerly, when the Protectorate

was in its infancy, Mr

Kharsedji fulfilled all the

requirements of Superintendent

of the Public Works Department

but as long ago as 1900 it

was found that he did

not possess the necessary

training and ability to

cope with the increasing work,

and the late Mr Baty was

appointed Director early in

1901 on a salary of £ 6000

per

per annum. Two years later Mr  
 Tanner was appointed Assistant  
 Director at £400 per annum.  
 Since then other trained European  
 Engineers have been engaged  
 and are receiving from £250  
 to £400 per annum. When Mr  
~~Tanner~~ was appointed, Sir Eric  
 Barrington in a telegram dated  
 March 26<sup>th</sup> 1903 (copy enclosed)  
 questioned the course of paying  
~~£600~~ a month to an Asiatic  
 and I am informed that it  
 was ~~then~~ then considered  
 advisable to dispense with  
 Mr Kharsaji's services, but as  
 he was on the permanent staff  
 and had been gazetted as  
 an "officer" in an order of  
 precedence dated December 15<sup>th</sup>  
 1899, the legal adviser gave  
 as his opinion that his retire-  
 ment could only be effected  
 by paying him a gratuity or  
 pension. In consequence he  
 was allowed to remain on  
 in the Protectorate service  
 and now occupies the anomalous  
 position of an overseer on £400  
 (plus £40 house rent) whilst  
 his

his immediate superiors are drawing considerably less.

4. With regard to Mr Kharsedji's ability, Mr Ross reports that he is not up to the requirements of the Department and is unable to do better work than was done during the construction of the Algaida Railway by Asiatic overseers who were engaged in India on Rs 200 or Rs 250 a month. His usefulness as an Engineer is much less than that of the European Engineers of the Public Works Department.

5. I have the honour to suggest that, as we have no further use for Mr Kharsedji's services, the post of Superintendent of Public Works be abolished and that he be permitted to retire on pension or leave the service with a generous retiring bonus. Regard should, I think, be

be had for his 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  years service  
in the Protectorate, and in  
view of the fact that his  
appointment will be abolished,  
I am of opinion that it would  
be well to allow him a  
pension.

I have the honour to be  
with the highest respect  
my Lord

Your Lordship's most obedient  
humble servant

Thy servant



INCLOSURE No. 2

In Despatch No. 1 of 1896

91  
19350

Foreign Office,

February 20th 1896.

30 MAY 05

Sir,

With reference to your despatch No. 212 of the 25th October last, you will have seen from the copy of the from the Treasury enclosed in my despatch No. 62 of 14th instant, that the Lords Commissioners have agreed to the appointment on the staff of the East Africa Protectorate of a regular Director (Parsee) of Public Works and a sum of two hundred and fifty pounds has been inserted in the estimates for 1896-1897 for the purpose. But in accordance with the wish of the Treasury this salary should be fixed and paid in Rupees, at the maximum rate of four hundred rupees by twenty to six hundred a month.

Their Lordships observe that from three hundred rupees to three hundred and fifty rupees a month is not an uncommon rate for a man of this class in India.

I am, etc.,

Sd/- Salisbury.

COPI.

INCESSANT  
J. A. ... No. 2101 ... 1906

No. 187

MORRIS

April 18th 1906.

CO  
19350  
30 MAR 06

92

My Lord,

I have the honour to report, with reference to Your Lordship's despatch No. 66 of 20th February last that I have engaged Mr. Ourastji, assistant to Mr. Bomanji, who as Your Lordship is aware is Minister of Public Works at ...  
 to be Director of Public Works for this Protector-  
 ate on probation for six months at three hundred and fifty  
 rupees a month, and have promised to recommend to Your  
 Lordship that if he is permanently appointed he shall receive  
 an increase of fifty rupees a month.

Rs. 350

Rs. 50

Mr. Ourastji is highly spoken of by Sir Lloyd Mathews who brought him over from India and has the advantage over a stranger of knowing something already of the country and people. He has now entered upon his duties which he took up on the 16th instant, and will proceed at once with the building of the official residences already sanctioned by the Treasury.

He has asked for a house and office allowance of fifty pounds or eight hundred rupees a year and this I think we may be able, should Your Lordship approve of it, to bring within this year's estimates.

Rs. 50

Rs. 800

I have &c.,

Sd/- Arthur H. Hardinge.

The Marquess of Salisbury, K.G.

Rs. 50      Rs. 50      Rs. 500

COPY.

Bombay, 9 July 1906.

Mr. Kharshedji Naservanji,

Superintendent of Public Works,

Bombay.

Sir,

I enclose her dated 2nd June the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury sanction the remuneration to be paid to you being fixed at Rs. 350 a month, rising in six months if the appointment permanent, to Rs. 400 a month and with the addition of quarters.

I understand that permanent quarters and office accommodation are now being made ready for you.

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- E. Bradbridge.

Treasurer.

91

C O

19350

REC'D  
30 MAY 06

Decypher Telegram  
from London

26 } March 1903  
28 }

Telegram of March 20<sup>th</sup>  
Ambassador surveyor is the best  
estimate for by you at Rs 600  
per annum which we thought  
gave sufficient salary for good  
European. Is that post already  
filled by an Indian?

Barrington

1935

Confidential

DRAFT

12 June 1936

EAT Confid (D)

Ans 29 Sept 36

Com

NOTE.

- Mr. Llew
- Mr. Pons
- Mr. Antrobus
- Mr. Cox
- Mr. Lucas
- Mr. Graham
- Sir M. Ommannay
- Mr. Churchill
- The Earl of Elgin

~~Handwritten scribble~~

1. Please the Com  
to seek the receipt of  
Mr confid sup H:21  
of the 4<sup>th</sup> of May 1936  
relative to the abolition  
of the post of P.O.  
Super<sup>sr</sup> in the EAT  
and the retirement  
of the present holder  
Mr Phauldys Messers.

38422

Copy Com. Law as per

2. Before coming to any  
decision on the matter  
I shall be glad to  
be kept fully as to  
Mr Messers' age & S.  
mainly as to the  
possibility of making

of his services — some  
other capacity outside  
the F. W. Dep.

I would invite your  
attention to the 2<sup>d</sup>  
para of Mr A. H. Hurd's  
Dep. 7<sup>th</sup> - 127 of the 18<sup>th</sup> of  
April 1896, <sup>as per subject matter</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>enclosed</sup> —  
your Dep. ~~in~~ reply,  
in which it is stated  
that Mr. Hurd's  
assumes the duties  
of the appointment in  
question on the  
16<sup>th</sup> of April 1896.

He would therefore  
appear to have  
already completed  
over ten years  
service and not  
~~approximately~~  $9\frac{3}{4}$  years, as  
stated in the final  
para of your Dep.

Yours