

E. AFRICA
42222

78222

DEC 19

76

Priority Passages

1919

Dec

Minutes of and against abandoning priority system. Decision - to continue it for present. Model draft letter to Min of Shipping.

The booklet on the special steamer is rather altered in the minutes were written on the "Gardner" & "Phoenician" (with "Roya" J. 6 January)

Buy 4 Jan - 4 release the S. A. papers

CAS. 19/12/19

W.B. Hunter
I suggest that, as a first step towards causing the question of abolishing priority list, we should ask A.L. & B.

See 6 Dec 1919
B.S.W. 24 July 20 1919

Important Paper.

Widely in apprehensions

- totals of:
- (1) men
 - (2) women
 - (3) children

on the city list

(4) a subsidiary list

In California, after allowing

for those who will be cleared

of the Yankees

1-26

2-1-20

I agree with the proposed reply so far as the percentage division of accommodation is concerned. I hope that no one except the Ministry of Shipping wishes to abandon that basis of division. But I think we should follow the lead of the H. Comm. and discontinue our priority system, i.e. ask U.C. henceforth to register all applicants in order of application, to be given berths out of the 15%, as soon as the priority list and the already existing list of ordinary passengers has been wiped off. There are many grounds for abandoning the priority system. The results are wholly incommensurate with the amount of work it causes. The whole of my House's time and a fair part of mine is taken up with it and it makes a great addition to the Registry work. The priority list is already so long that placing anyone on it means very little. We do not know of course the number of waiting passengers for East Africa who are not on the priority list, but of the people who apply to us for passages considerably more than half come within our priority qualifications. Again all the persons with urgent reasons for going to East Africa who were detained in this country owing to the war have now either sailed or are on the priority list. The persons now being recommended are residents and their families who have come to this country for a trip since the armistice or persons going out for the first time to employment which can be regarded as urgent. As regards the latter, we are wholly dependent on the applicant or his employer for the evidence of urgency and such evidence is easily fabricated. The point is are we justified in going on putting such cases above the many really hard cases not qualified for priority e.g. a lady who was preparing to go out to East Africa to be married just when war broke out, who could not go during the

the war going to her fiancé being on active service in G.E.A. and who has no prospects whatever of getting out now owing to new applicants being constantly placed on the priority list. Again the existence of a priority system may easily be a spare to E. African residents thinking of making a trip here. They think that they will be able to return after a month or two here, whereas they are usually delayed a much longer time. If they were informed definitely of the shortage of accommodation and that they would have to take their place at the bottom of the list of bookings, the number coming over on "the trips" would be greatly reduced. Even those leaving East Africa for a health trip would probably go elsewhere than to the U.K.

Finally there is of course no reason why the U.C. should continue to be bothered with our priority system, was their dependence on the Union Govt. that led them to agree to priorities being instituted, and if, after the discontinuance of the Union's priority system, they agree to continue allotting East Africans 15% of the accommodation it is as much as we can hope for. The only other line which accepts our priority recommendations is the British India and the latest information about it is that it is unlikely to have an East African passenger boat for two or three years.

If in consideration of our giving up the priority system, the U.C. would agree to our booking passages for wives returning with their husbands (officials) it would of course be very convenient, but even if they will not agree I think the priority system should be abandoned. If an official has to leave his wife here, it is a comparatively small point whether she has to wait 6 months or 12.

? substitute for last part of reply to M. of S. that we are communicating with U.C.Co. as to discontinuance of C.O. priority system, and write U.C. saying that in view of the discontinuance of the Union system we propose to discontinue ours and say we presume they will continue to allot 15% of

of accommodation for E. Africans and 5% for Rhodesians and ask if C.A. can now be allowed to book passages for wives of officials returning with their husbands.

J.A.C.

16. 11. 19

Sir H. Lambert

Mr. Davis,

Sir H. Read,

78

The E.A. 15% includes officials and we must take care to reserve the power to book a certain number of berths for them. Also I agree that we should press for the right to book the passages of officials' wives. In present circumstances the married official is at a disadvantage as compared with other married residents in F.A. He may get off first but they travel with their wives since they go on the priority list together. This would continue under Mr. Calder's arrangement.

I do not agree with A. The hardship is at least proportional to the time and very often more so, since temporary arrangements can often be made with friends or relatives which could not last many months. On the main question - I am quite as tired of this priority work as Mr. Calder or Major House; but I am by no means sure that we shall end our troubles by ending the priority system - we should merely have a mass of applications - many of them deserving - for special treatment without any guiding principles by which to deal with them.

If a rule of non-intervention could be adopted not admitting of any exception whatever (except in the medical cases for which a new rule has just been set up) I should have no objection to dropping the priority system, so long as officials' wives may be regarded as officials and the C.A.'s powers to book passages increased accordingly.

The

The case of the E.A. Land Allottees requires consideration in any case. It was decided not to give them priority, but eventually the "Garth Castle" was secured largely on their behalf. We must not keep them here indefinitely and I think they must be put on the priority list or the waiting list, as the case may be, with effect from the date on which they drew their forms.

W.C.B. 19.11.19.

I agree with Mr. Bottomley that we must retain the priority system.

Our officials on leave from Basutoland, Swaziland and Bech. Prot. are not entitled to free passages back at Govt. expense, unlike the E.A. officials, and hitherto they have had to take their chance of getting passages under the priority system. I think, however, that in future they should be allowed to book through the Crown Agents.

As regards wives of officials, I am afraid that this extension of official privilege would be resented by the public and I therefore do not support it.

I have a letter from Col. Garraway asking how he should get about getting 'priority' to enable him, his wife and children to return to Basutoland when his leave expires, but pending a decision on the general question, I am not able to answer him.

C.T.D. 19/11/19.

H.L. 20/11/19.

Colonel Anery

I think that we should continue the priority system for the present, but I share Mr. Calder's desire to be rid of the whole business and I think that the matter should be reconsidered at the beginning of the New Year. If we can extract another special steamer from the M. of S. before then, the position will have been eased considerably.

H. J. R.

21/11/19

Yes

Yes
L.E.A.

I am looking up the papers for action as to this

This was according to the practice with Union practices.

Yes, retain priority but reconsider at New Year. As regards another steamer I have spoken unofficially to Col. Wilson, but I assume we have already sent an official request?

L.E.A. 21/11/19 at once.

As to Col. Anery's Minute as to another steamer, we have sent official request to M. of S. who replied unsatisfactorily.

Papers now circulated for consn.

A.C.P.

26/11/19

We now know that our only hope is to get the Garth Castle again before she is re-conditioned (per in circuit)

Mr. Jeffries.

For action as at A. Bottomley's

minute.

(M.A. House to see)

A.C.P. 4/12/19

Mr. Parkinson

Mr. Bottomley.

Mr. Bottomley said that the best way of doing this was to be discussed with the Committee.

I think the best way will be to strike out from the list of allottees all those whom we know to have

gone or to be going for official or repatriation passages or to be on the priority list, and to send them a circular by the nearest draft, it will not matter if it goes to a few people unnecessarily, the great thing is not to leave anybody out.

I don't think it would be satisfactory to send a list to the Co. without circularising the allottees first - because we do not know which want to take their wives and families: and there may be

No ho
A.

some who do not want to go before a given date.

I suggest that if the draft were adopted, it would be unnecessary to register each application as it came in, but they could be put on one file, and a list kept up to date to be sent to the U.C.C. on the 1st of January.

W.S.J.
5-12-19

Draft passed
particular
can etc
copy
from
the
18 19

U.C.C.P

5-12-19

CC

W.S.J.

1939.

Sir,

I am directed by Viscount Halifax to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. T. 42619. A copy of the same is being forwarded to the High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa, and to the High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa, respectively, for their information and for passage to the High Commissioner.

2. In regard to the notice of discontinuance of the system of registration at the High Commissioner's Office for priority passages, and that it was no longer an agreed arrangement for the allocation to the Union of a percentage of the accommodation not reserved by the Shipping Controller for repatriation, and for Government duty passengers.

I am to point out that the High Commissioner's report from this arrangement for the allocation of accommodation to the High Commissioner in a letter dated 11th November, i.e. enclosure in date to the High Commissioner, expressly asked that the agreed percentage be adhered to in all respects. A copy of this letter was sent to the Ministry of Shipping on the 11th November.

4. As regards Rhodesia and the Protectorates concerned, the Secretary of State is of the opinion that the existing allocation should continue, and it is not considered practicable at present to discontinue the Colonial Office Priority List for filling the accommodation so allocated.

I am, etc.

(Sgt. H. Lambert)

WILBY

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING.

60
72222719 CU

6

4. 61

Aug 15 1874

DRAFT.

Union Castle Ind. Co
British India S. Co
POSTAL ORDER 1870

MINUTE

10 January, 1870

- Monday 3 Jan
- Parkinson 1870
- Post Office 1870
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...

and desired to inform
 high to ...
 when whether the present
 system of ...
 passengers desired
 proceed to ... can
 now be abolished

I am to ... that in
 after ... in ...
 at a ...

