

E AFRICA  
4726

REC'D  
REG'D  
4728  
JAN 12

Crown Agents

Passage allow to married officers

1915

28 Jan.

Last previous Paper.

Res/1120 <sup>14</sup>/<sub>15</sub> 3/4 bar.

Home paying cost of passages for  
mess. travel C. & Union Castle C. steamers.

Mr. Read  
Mr. B. (Pl. see also minutes in File 2635  
No 53).

Pl. see your minute on the question of  
continuing the £5 and £10 passage allow  
on 1120 <sup>14</sup>/<sub>15</sub>.

Mr. C. (File 2635 P.D) has applied  
for it, though he is travelling by the M.M.  
Line.

Mr. Drew of the C.A. has supplied these  
figures of the comparative cost of travelling  
by U.C. and ~~Port~~ <sup>M.M.</sup> under present conditions.

The cost of a 1<sup>st</sup> class (A/S) passage by U.C. via  
the Cape, (the only route now available is -  
Single £55.13.0 - 10% rebate allowed to Govt. officials  
taking their own or their wife's ticket

= £50.1.9

Return £100.3.6 - 10%

= £90.3.2

Put by

ext. subsequent paper

6978  
107  
107,000  
107,000

The

Single £59.11.8  
Return £92.14.10

no rebate

£99.11

at single passage by U.C. now costs less  
than a single passage by G.I. and a  
return passage £2.11.8 less.  
The reason for the institution of the allce  
code that men had to travel by U.C.  
and that U.C. was then the most expensive  
of the various lines to P.A.

i.e. the reason  
explained to

I deal with the particularities of In?  
Crisford's case in File 2630 P.A., but  
53  
more in his first argument here viz.  
"that he is obeying Govt orders in travelling  
by In. In."

There is something in this argument, though  
though we do not now compel our officers  
in all cases to travel by one particular  
line, there remains compulsion to  
travel by the first available steamer.  
When the first available steamer is M.M.  
a man has to travel by it, and now  
that the M.M. Line is more expensive,  
there appears to be some ground for  
claiming the allce. In In? Crisford's  
case there is as it happens, a U.C.  
steamer via the Cape sailing about a  
week later than the M.M. boat of  
March 4 (In's sailers). If we did not insist  
on his travelling by the first available  
steamer

Standard  
London

Single £59.11-8 } no rebate  
Between £92.14-10 }

at single passage by U.C. now <sup>£99.11</sup> less  
than a single passage by I. In. and a  
return passage £2-11-8 less.  
The reason for the institution of the allce  
was that men had to travel by U.C.  
and that U.C. was then the most expensive  
of the various lines to P.A.

i.e. the reason  
explained to

I deal with the particularities of In?  
Crisford's case in File 2630 P.A., but I  
mention his first argument here viz.  
"that he is obeying Govt orders in travelling  
by I. In."

There is something in this argument, though  
though we do not now compel our Officers  
in all cases to travel by one particular  
line, there remains compulsion to  
travel by the first available steamer.  
When the first available steamer is M.M.  
a man has to travel by it, and now  
that the M.M. Line is more expensive,  
there appears to be some ground for  
claiming the allce. In In? Crisford's  
case there is, as it happens, a U.C.  
steamer via the Cape sailing about a  
week later than the M.M. boat of  
March 4 (2 1/2 weeks). If we did not insist  
on his travelling by the first available

Standard  
London

steamer he would no doubt prefer to wait  
for the P. C. boat.

111

When the question of granting the allowance  
was first raised in paper (20/237/11),  
In Dattabai's letter (Jan 1911) the question of making  
some contribution towards the cost of passage  
of Officers' wives has often been under  
consideration, but hitherto we have not seen one way to  
do anything on account of expense. The  
question is sure to be raised again in  
the E. A. P. S., in view of our agreement  
with the U. C. Company, which imposes  
additional expense on an Officer in respect  
of his wife's passage.

This suggests that the question had  
been considered even before the U. C.  
agreement was made, though it is not  
clear on what ground the idea was  
entertained. <sup>However</sup> The only ground on which  
we based our arguments in writing  
to Treas. on 8/2/11 was that owing to the  
agreement with U. C. our officials <sup>had</sup> ~~had to~~  
pay more for their wives' passages than  
they previously had to pay. The point  
raised above in my minute viz that even  
without the agreement, compulsion to go  
by a particular steamer exists! <sup>does not</sup> ~~appear~~

appear

appear to have been considered.

It might be argued that

think it would be in the spirit of the original proposal to allow that in all cases where a married officer is compelled by the leave rules <sup>to travel</sup> by the steamer of any line which is more expensive than the cheapest of the regular lines available, an allowance should be granted.

But after all an official is no more handicapped by the leave rule than a man going to E. Africa on business is handicapped by the requirements of his or his employer's affairs.

In both cases the man has to do certain work in the Post and must arrive in time to do it, and only the man who goes out for sport can expect to be able to choose his steamer. The agreement with the U.P. was a handicap because once

where an officer could have sailed by another line so far as the leave rules were concerned, he was

appear to have been considered.

It might be argued that

it would be in the spirit of the original proposal to allow that in all cases where a married officer is compelled by the leave rules <sup>to travel</sup> by the steamer of any line which is more expensive than the cheapest of the regular lines available, an allowance should be granted.

But after all an official is no more handicapped by the leave rule than a man going to E. Africa on business is handicapped by the requirements of his or his employer's affairs.

In both cases the man has to do certain work in the Post and must arrive in time to do it, and only the man who goes out for sport can expect to be able to choose his steamer. The agreement with the U.P. was a handicap because even where an officer could have sailed by another line so far as the leave rules were concerned, he was

The case for an allowance therefore seems to have disappeared and I think that "we may" inform CA and Gov<sup>s</sup> of P. A. Uganda and <sup>Realt</sup> 2'bur accordingly. But this would be best done when we write to the Gov<sup>s</sup> and CA. on the general question of the position created by the termination of the Agreement. We shall presumably do this when CA. reply to our letter asking for their detailed views on the situation.

? bring up with CA. reply on that subject

H.F.D. 2.2.15

As Mr. Bowie says, there is now no compulsion other than that arising out of the necessity for trying to get a man back to duty in decent time, and it is only the accident of the leave regulations, that puts the Govt. in the position of having to select the steamer. If the old regulations, under which the officer has to be back at the coast on a certain date, still existed, it would be for him himself to select the steamer with the object of getting back on that date at the risk of an

extension without making of he chose his boat  
without due caution

Whichever the Messageries become their  
boats are regular, and much greater than  
the U.S. Coast boats, just as an officer would  
choose them if he had to make his own  
arrangements. I do not think that this is  
compulsion in any proper sense of the word.

At the same time, the fundamental point  
of the allowance system - that it was not fair  
that an officer should have to choose between a  
pecuniary loss and the loss of his wife's society  
on the voyage - remains, and we shall have a  
good deal of criticism if we do not recognize  
that one shore may finish as much as the other.

I think we may leave the matter open till  
we hear from C.A. (? to remind them), when,  
if we decide to make the M.S. our regular  
service, we may be able to press them to make  
some reduction in passages taken for by a  
Govt. official.

As to Mr. Brinford, I propose on his file to  
keep him in suspense.

Wab. 3/2/15

A. L. has now come in from the  
C.A.

to me

4/17/15

Beltonley

This has now been dealt with on C.A. 11650/10

? put by.  
WMS 19.4.15 above  
2.7.17.4.15

It is a question  
we should not  
Govt. officials  
because we  
allowance of  
passages  
but

Passage allowance for married officers

R

Mr. D. D. D.

4728

REC-  
REG

JAN 11

In reply to your letter, the fares by Messageries Maritimes have been raised, there is now a war tax of 20% & the 15% Govt rebate is discontinued. The Union Castle Co state that should they have any steamers going to Mombasa via East coast route the fares would be as before. The only steamers at present are mail steamers via the Cape, such as 'Hollandia' built on 6 March. The rates will be as under. The 10% civil service rebate will be allowed to Govt officials paying for their own passages, but not to Crown Agents.

London to

to Mombasa first class

from Mombasa class return ticket  
 £ 44  
 8 16  
 52 16 5  
 rail ticket 6 15 5  
 £ 59 11 8

return ticket  
 £ 66  
 13 4  
 79 4  
 rail ticket 13 10 10  
 £ 92 14 10

20%

rail ticket

London to Mombasa

£ 55 13

first class return ticket

A 3 £ 100 3 6

Castle

rate

A. D. M.