

1923

KENYA

57

C O  
19839  
REC  
Reg 20 APR 23

FROM  
BOWRING, SIR C.C.

DATE  
23rd MARCH 1923.

FOR CIRCULATION :-

Mr. *B. Atkinson*  
Mr. *St. Aubrey*  
Mr.

SUBJECT

ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNOR'S DEPUTY.

Asst. U.S. of S.

Considers allowance should be regarded as granted for extra responsibility during period of Governor's absence, and not merely as compensation for expense of entertaining. States as to expense incurred by Colonial Secretary in extending hospitality, in ordinary course of his duties.

Perm' U.S. of S.

Part' U.S. of S.

Secretary of State.

Previous Paper

*Govt 24/284/21 Nypd*

MINUTES

I thought this might as well be registered for record. <sup>seems first to</sup>  
In C. Bowering ~~minutes~~ suggests that Col. Sec. who normally deputises for the Governor in Kenya should not merely have this special allowance when deputising, but because his entertaining ~~is~~ expenses are not limited to these periods. I gather, however, that he does not suggest a permanent all' for the Col. Sec., but that he only ~~is~~ suggest a daily all' to the deputy (provided he deputises for not less than 7 days at a time) & this to be given irrespective of the

20 *Mr. Bowering's Secretary's* 20th April 23

Subsequent Paper

*N.A.S. 22450*

Sheer actually spent in  
entertaining.

Mr G. Smith in receipt of  
Hypocrite really  
took the same point.  
No then he based  
the obj: on the  
implications of  
the deputy having  
to submit accounts  
of his entertaining  
exp: in order to  
draw the allowance.

I sympathise with  
both Mr C. Bowring  
and Mr G. Smith.

Indeed, our original  
proposal in HC/44133/10  
I believe was for an  
unconditional allow:  
of £1 a day to the  
deputy: but the  
Deas: were most  
obstinate throughout  
& in the end we had  
to accept the

Deputy arrangement  
in 20/11/11 Coy.

for the sake of  
convenience with  
Mr K. G. G. in  
that regard.

...  
the this up again; but  
... we have a  
more reasonable

58

Deputy now, think  
to deal with, exp: of  
Mr Bridges, who is  
entirely human &  
helpful, comes into  
things. The fact remains  
that we think  
~~...~~

~~...~~ the present  
arrangement ~~...~~  
wrong: what we  
need is an unconditional  
allow: for a deputy  
to meet certain  
responsibilities &  
entertaining: £1  
a day (with a  
minimum of 7 days  
depending to draw  
allowance at all)  
is entirely reasonable.

This proviso might  
be unnecessary  
even to get our  
proposal through  
best

On the whole, I believe  
it might be worth  
while to tackle the  
Deputy again  
why to put things  
right. Dec 11. 11

T.D.

I haven't any hope. The Treasury  
officially expressed the view that  
extra pay could not be given  
for extra responsibility, and they  
expressed a substantial readiness  
to their own words.

What we can try?

W.C.S. 29.4.23.

I don't object. [But I think that the account for a  
"responsibility" etc. was very strong. We dropped it & let the  
Treasury draw the present unsatisfactory conditions of a pay  
"entitlement" etc. I shall have Royce Red-in-Lad letter  
try to get those conditions altered & must to revise the elements of  
responsibility, which makes a rather microscopic mixture - to my  
mind - with entitlement, & can't be (like the letter) expressed in cash.]

C.S.  
29/4  
C.P.M.

Evernor's absence. I would suggest that the daily allowance be fixed independent of any question of entertaining but that it only be paid to the Deputy Deputies for not less than a certain number of days (say 7) at a stretch.

It isn't a matter that concerns me personally at all, but I want to thank goodness, (about as any more departing, but it might be borne in mind at your end if the question is ever raised.

I have no intention of putting in any claim for arrears!

Yours sincerely  
C. B. Rowley

C.O.  
19839

20 APR 23

Kaundi,  
March 23<sup>rd</sup>  
1923.

Dear Matthew,

Many thanks for your of Feb. 17<sup>th</sup>. The enclosure to the estimate despatch was a little like a pigeon puzzle but we attributed the condition to (what is with us a chronic state of) shortness of cloth!

The Evernor leaves here on Sunday 25<sup>th</sup> and I accompany him to Mowbray to try and get the cloth done before I start in again in the thickened coils of O. S. & C.

In looking through certain files

COPYRIGHT PHOTOGRAPH NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, LONDON

533 306

C.O.

Reference

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE  
1 2 3 4 5 6  
7 8 9 10 11 12

Evernor's claim. I would suggest that a daily allowance be fixed independent of any question of ascertaining cost that it only be paid to the Deputy deputies for not less than a certain number of days (say 7) at a stretch.

It isn't a matter that concerns me personally at all, thank goodness, (about as I don't) any more deprecating, but it might be borne in mind at your end if the question is ever raised.

I have no intention of putting in any claim for arrears!

Yours sincerely  
C. H. ...

C.O.  
19839

APR 23 1923

Kaide,  
March 23<sup>rd</sup>  
1923.

Dear Walter,

Many thanks for your of Feb. 19<sup>th</sup>. The enclosure to the estimate default was a little like a pigeon fever but we attributed its condition to (what is with us a chronic state of) shortness of cloth!

The Evernor came here on Sunday 25<sup>th</sup> and I accompany him to Mombasa to try and get the state shown before I start in again in the thousand role of O. ob. G.

In looking through certain files

file connected with acty  
Governor & Governor's Deputies  
come across in Bedford  
No 286 of 17 February 1921, on  
the subject of a <sup>allowance</sup> <sup>allowance</sup>  
allowance. It arrived <sup>18424</sup>  
when I was on leave and I <sup>21</sup>  
am ashamed to say I  
had not noticed it before!

That I have never dream  
a row under the conditions  
prescribed, which appear to  
be a departure from your  
original intention (see  
your No 770 of June 3<sup>rd</sup> 1920.)

The penultimate appears to <sup>1916</sup>  
me to be all wrong. It <sup>20</sup>  
is <sup>16/Jan/21</sup>

would make it possible  
for the officer who frequently  
acts as Deputy to arrange  
his "entertainment" so that  
they took place when the  
Governor was away. The  
it is necessary not  
to extend hospitality to a  
number of distinguished  
visitors, Deputations etc. etc.  
apart from what he is  
expected to do for local  
magnates, and it would be  
absurd to give him an  
allowance for doing so when  
he happens to be Deputy and  
not at other times.

Clearly the allowance should  
be on extra responsibility.  
He frequently has to preside  
over Ex. Co. and to make  
important

DOWNING STREET,

30 April, 1923.

Annual  
 22450

My dear Bridges,

I am not sure whether you dealt with certain correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Treasury ending with your letter S3784 of the 3rd of February, 1921 about an allowance for the Officers who deputise for Governors in the East African Dependencies. If you are not concerned, you will no doubt pass this letter on to the right quarter.

We had at that time a prolonged official correspondence with the Treasury on the subject, and in the end accepted - *faute de mieux* - the Treasurer's decision in the letter quoted, and informed all the Governors that a Governor's Deputy might be refunded necessary expenditure on entertainment actually incurred by him up to a maximum not exceeding £1 a day for the period during which he acts as Deputy.

This, of course, was not what we

originally

E. E. BRIDGES, ESQ., M.C.

originally wanted, but we thought that we might communicate your decision and then see whether any complaints came in. From time to time representations have been made to us since, but with one exception these were made semi-officially, because the point at issue was not one that the officers concerned liked to raise formally.

As the ruling now stands, a Deputy can only claim a reimbursement of the actual expenditure incurred. It is obviously unpleasant for any Colonial Secretary or other highly-placed officer who is deputising to have to send to the local Treasury and Audit a statement that he has spent such and such a sum on entertainment in the Governor's absence.

It is no use our writing to you officially if you are going to turn down any fresh suggestion at once, but, do you see any objection to an arrangement by which an

unconditional



unconditional allowance of £1 a day is paid to a Governor's Deputy to meet incidental expenses while so acting? We should be quite prepared, if you wish it, to fix a minimum number of days at a stretch for which a Deputy must act before he can draw the allowance - say, seven days. Thus, a Deputy, if he acts for seven days or more, would receive £1 a day without any question as to the actual expenditure incurred, which might certainly be more than the allowance in some cases. If he deputises for less than seven days, then he would get nothing at all. Of course, the limitation of seven days is arbitrary, and if you could see your way to agree to the unconditional allowance without any such restriction, so much the better.

The present position is clearly unsatisfactory, and I believe it is the fact that the Deputies refrain from making claims in respect of the allowance, as things now are, owing to their dislike of the condition which compels them to say exactly what they have spent on entertainment. I am bound to say that I sympathise with them in this view.

I believe you will too.

*accf*