

1911

EAST AFR. PROT.
 CHIEF CLERK.
 148

C O
 486
 REC'D
 6 JAN 11

CO.
 Date.
 6 Jan
 Last previous Paper.
 759170/10
 E.A.P.

Precedence
 Status of Police in E.A.P.

22243 Chalk
 1909

Mr. Butler.

Have had two extracts from Captain
 Edwards' Reports on the Police
 of E.A.P. registered separately,
 so that the question of Status can
 be dealt with by itself without
 hampering up the action on the
 rest of the Reports.

Butler by

to Chief Clerk's Dept. for
 comment

General Dept.

The first recommendation is

for 1922/1913
 Chalk

to have a nature to be dealt with.
Will you please consider No (2)?

Tab
non

The Strains

As you note Inspector General was acquiescent
in the Governor's leaving just him immediately after
the Provincial Commission. Whether the other Police
officers should be given definite precedence will
depend upon the scope of the new Table. In
any case their ^{present} positions seem to be unduly
high. As the F.O. in their Tables included so
many subordinate officials, it will probably
be found impossible, as in the case of the proposed
to restrict the new table within the usual limits.
But we cannot do anything until we hear
what the Governor has to say.

the new
copy!

C.H.
18

Mr. C. L. S.

The views are already expressed on
22/1/04. I do not like encouraging these
Police officers to search after his ideas.

Let us not see what the Inspector General
will do of the affair either?

C.H.
24/1/13

The Road

since
M. 31

In the Table submitted by the Gov in
1922/13. + in the revised Table sent to him
for his concurrence, the Inspector General
alone is included? Just?

C.H. 24/10/13

at once
K.S.H. 24/1/13

to agree a nature to be dealt with.
Will you please consider No (2).

Yours
Tran

The Staines

As regards Inspector General we acquiesced
in Mr Governor's leaving post being immediately after
the Provincial Commissioners. Whether the other Police
officers should be given definite precedence will
depend upon the scope of the new Table. In
any case their ^{present} positions seem to be unduly
high. As the F.O. in their Tables included so
many subordinate officials, it will probably
be found impossible, as in the case of regular
to restrict the new table within the usual limits.
But we cannot do anything until we hear
what the Governor has to say.

has usual
copy
C.A.H.

C.A.H.
18

Mr Field

His views are already expressed on
22.11/04. I do not like encouraging these
Police officers to make after his ideas.

Let us wait & see what the Gov says as
a result of the above advice.

C.A.H.
24/11/13

The Road

Reference No. 31

In the Table submitted by the Gov in
1922/13, & in the revised Table sent to him
for his concurrence, the Inspector General
alone is included. ?

C.A.H. 24/10/13

at once
K.S.H. 24/11/13

C O
486
REC'D
Page 6 JAN 11

12

EXTRACT from General Report on the Police of the East Africa Protectorate, dated August 12th, 1909.

x x x

us of Police
cers now re-
ended.

180. My recommendations therefore in this matter are as follows:-

- (1). That the status of the whole police force must be raised, and that the present time of re-organization is a favourable opportunity in which to undertake it.
- (2). That the various ranks should be allotted precedence as follows:-
 - (i). The Inspector General of Police next below the Principal Judge.
 - (ii). The Commissioner of police should retain his position as a Head of Department next below the Navy or Marine.
 - (iii). The Assistant Commissioner next below the Crown Advocate or Crown Prosecutor (if not member of the Council) that is next above the District Commissioners.
 - (iv). Superintendents next below District Commissioners.
 - (v). Assistant Superintendents next below Assistant District Commissioners.

x x

EXTRACT from Supplementary Report on the Police of the East Africa Protectorate, dated September 12th, 1910.

Police
Pr. XV.

for 22nd 11/3/10
Chief Clerk

The question of precedence of Police Officers was, since the writing of my report, been referred to the Secretary of State, who ruled as follows:-

- (i). That the place assigned to the Inspector General of Police by Mr. Jackson C.B., I.M.S. is probably correct.
- (ii). That as regards Police Officers generally it is unusual, and probably unnecessary, to give them any precedence in the present table.
- (iii). That it is unnecessary to assign, either to the Inspector General or to any other officer of the Force any uniform besides his Police Uniform.

Concerning the case I have nothing further to add, but with regard to other officers of the Force I would again wish to urge on Government the importance of settling, on some acceptable principle, the precedence of Police Officers generally, not only in so far as this Protectorate's service is concerned, but since it cannot be otherwise than a mistake, as at an official function or on occasion of emergency, for Officers of the Force - high and low - should be assumed a precedence of equal standing; while to place the high officers who are junior in ordinary work-a-day life - for this is what the ruling of the Secretary of State virtually does - can only lead to heart burning and friction. The question is not other than

Police

Police Uniform is not contended for, this since the place an official holds in the table of precedence constitutes the determining factor in respect of his seniority, no matter whether Civil or Police Uniform is worn. I trust that the above explanation will be sufficient to induce Government to support the recommendations which I have recorded in Sub-Section 2, 3, 4 and 5 -, Sub-paragraph 2, of paragraph 1A8 of the Chapter now under reference.

x

x

x