

EAST AFR. PROT
22621

CO
22621
REC'D 8 MAY 20

MERCER SIR W.

UASIN GICHU RAILWAY - ESTIMATES

1880

5th MAY

Trans rough notes on

Last previous Paper.

21794

Partly

Sir H. Gladstone
I do not know that Mr. S. North
is attending any estimate.

If it is to be assumed that the
construction of the line is based on
an estimate of cost receipts, given
some changes, a telegram might be
required on the points raised in
the last two boxes of L. G. Harmer's
note. - However, a detailed and
sure, if it is necessary at all.

I may point out that the
probability of such a gross receipt
for the main line has been

Subsequent Paper.

2139

much greater before the war than
the 25% assumed by L. W. Harmer.

In 1912-13 the figure was 43.4% &
in 1913-14 39.5%. Something higher
than 30% could be looked for, at all
events as regards the additional
main line traffic, which would have
little additional expense beyond
actual running expenses.

The decision, ^{as to policy} arrived at as a
result of the conference with the
Government on April 22nd was as
follows -

1. The 1920-21 Agreement & R.A.P. ~~is~~
to stand & there to be no
amplification, but rather to look to
the railway as a source of
revenue. It is not to be
used for the benefit of any supplies,
either for improvements or for the
reduction of rates.

"The question of the incidence of
the annual charge for the
Main Line Railway has been
also considered and it was
decided that this should come
out of railway revenue:

That appears to be the
policy. By the time the
income begins to fall, the
policy is to cut out of the
net available a reduction of rates

and to the Main Line was
430
charges, and there should be no
question of a deficit. Sir G. Keynes
£700,000 in $\frac{10}{3}$ years is little more
than on that of what Sir G. Keynes
regards as the yield (31% on the
capital cost) which should be aimed
at in fixing main line rates. The
remaining two-thirds can go to
service rates, for the other
alternatives, &c.

G.S. 6.5.20.

R. J. Fisher

I agree - I think that
this can be put by

* J. D.
7/5/20

Col. Amey

You may like to see

R. J. Fisher
17/5/20

R.R.A.

(VICTORIA 7720)

5. 522621

REC'D

MAY 6 1920

Dear Paul -

I understand the

matter has been working out

satisfactorily for the Union

Gibson Railway. (etc.)

Have not seen any figures.

I have had a start at it

myself and under note.

The Road Committee seem

to stickulate for "reasonable

railway rates", and probably

have far from contemplating

a general increase of them.

431

Sevinchy affed. The already
marked kaffe extra-Patch.

The similarity
between

Uasin Gishu Railway.

Estimates

Assume that we borrow £2,000,000 at 6 1/2% c., + sinking fund & charges at 1/2% = 7 1/2% c. = £160,000 a year. Assuming

that payment of interest begins six months after commencement of construction the loan payments during 2 years of construction and the three following years estimated for by the local committee will =

Saving by borrowing as required before issue say £ 630,000
30,000

The yearly earnings there 600,000

years after completion are estimated at

(1) on the new line Rs 443,000

(2) from increased traffic on the old 1,362,000

Total 1,805,000

Assuming that the net earnings are 30% of gross (this was about the average of

1917-18 and 1918-19), the gross Rs 541,500

= £ 56150

It is estimated that 150,000 acres will be cultivated in the 3 years (assume

that 50,000 are cultivated in the 1st year

100,000 in the 2nd, and 150,000 in the 3rd

and that traffic increases proportionately

of the total Rs 1,000,000 the 1st year

yields Rs 600,000, and the 2nd Rs 1,200,000

gross, and the net earnings are £ 180,000

30,000 1st year
54,000 2nd year

Total £ 108,000

leaving a deficit after 5 years from

commencement of construction of £ 500,000

Sincerely yours, the Director

Assuming that increase of cultivation continues at the estimated rate (= £18,000 a year) it will be nearly 5 years more before the net earnings equal the loan payments, and the deficit would be raised to say £700,000.

The earnings however are estimated at existing rates, and the settlers are willing to pay rates equal to what they are now paying for road transport, as they would get quicker transport. They reckon that it costs them R. 1 per ton here to get their produce to the existing line. A fair road distance to take a ton from Eldoret = 60 miles, at R. 60, and as from road to Nakuru is about double that distance they would be paying R. $\frac{1}{2}$ per mile. The estimated tonnage 3 years after completion is about 100,000: gross earnings would be say Rs. 6,000,000, i.e. £500,000, net £125,000. The contribution to the benefit of the old line could also be taken into account.

That would be the ordinary output of the proposed rate, and a charge would be paid.

The Government should be strong of opinion that the whole railway should show by means of a general increase of rates over the Uganda railway. In that case the question arises what increase would be necessary to balance accounts and what effect that increase would have on existing traffic.

at what
time will the
at what price
the 1st 2 years
10,000 only
(years.)

complete
have
in the
months
the way to
the line

In 1918-19 the net revenue was £152,255. Distributing the above deficit of £700,000 over ten years, = £70,000 a year, the net revenue, & balance accounts, would have to be raised by nearly 50 p.c. Would the existing traffic stand this, and what would Uganda say?

On the other hand, 1918-19 showed the lowest net earnings since 1912-13, owing to various restrictions. It would be very useful to ascertain the general result of 1919-20. If the net earnings can be put at about £220,000 (a sum exceeded in 1915-16 and 1916-17) a reasonable equilibrium is established without any increase of charges so far as the extension is concerned, but it would have to be considered whether the expenditures in those years could be taken as a fair guide or whether it was abnormally low owing to the difficulty of getting shillings; also whether the traffic, being greatly swollen by military requirements, can be relied on as any guide for the future.

What we want to ascertain is what increase of rates would be required to meet a possible deficit of £70,000 a year for 10 years (a question for the Railway Accountant), and what the Road Committee in estimating the future traffic

took such an increase with account, and if
not what effect it would have on their
estimate.

435

Wright
5/5