

EAST PROT

18518 APR 12



11850

Traveling Allowances

Date 2  
912

5. Fred.  
Previous Paper.  
6809  
N. J. G. H.

Submits this on J. A. S. Council's proposals.  
Considers that there are now strong and  
valid objections to their introduction at this  
stage. Considers in suggestion that the term  
"Subsistence Allowance" be used in preference to "Traveling  
allowance."

Print. is return papers to W. Batherbee.

Lab.

April 22

at me.

W. Butler

Return to East African Institute

2525/192  
OR  
Car 2 April 1900

18. 2/5

1912

Sir,

20482  
waf

With reference to your Confidential despatch of the 13th of October last, I have the honour to report as follows on the proposals in regard to Travelling Allowances made by the Tropical African Service Committee.

The recommendations have been carefully considered, and while they might suitably have been introduced in the early days of the Protectorate I am of opinion, with which I believe Sir Percy Girouard will agree, that there are now strong and valid objections to their introduction at this stage.

It should be remembered that the cost of living is steadily increasing in East Africa, and with expanding prosperity I see no reason to anticipate any cessation of this increase.

Further, it should be noted that the cost of travelling is also steadily increasing, and it is difficult to see how the proposed allowances could be maintained at their present level.

It is also to be noted that the proposed allowances are based on the cost of living in the United Kingdom, which is not representative of the cost of living in East Africa.

In the light of these considerations, I am of opinion that the proposed allowances should not be introduced at this stage.

to health. To travel in East Africa and keep well a good standard of living must be maintained, and I do not consider that the present allowances for these classes - who form by far the greater proportion of the travelling officials - of Rs. 10 per diem respectively are in any way excessive. I am afraid that would be counter-productive by a reduction in the allowances would be lost through illness to ill health. These reasons would appreciate any reduction as proposed.

2. That there should be only one fixed allowance for let class officers and Heads of Departments including the Chief Justice, Members of Executive Council and Puisne Judges, I have long considered an anomaly; at the same time I am of opinion that the proposed rate of Rs. 15 per diem is somewhat high and I would venture to suggest that a rate of Rs. 7.50 would be sufficient, fair and equitable in relation to the other rates of Rs. 5 and Rs. 4, except in the case of the Judges and Executive Councillors, who should, I think, draw the Rs. 15 per diem proposed.

3. The financial effects of the proposals of the Committee, i.e. a reduction of the existing rates of Rs. 5 and Rs. 4 to Rs. 4 and Rs. 2.50 together with an increase to Rs. 15 for the Chief Justice, Members of Executive Council, Puisne Judges and of Rs. 7.50 to all other Heads of Dept. would result in a decrease of expenditure of Rs. 4,00,000 per annum.

4. A consequence of the proposal which would be to disturb the existing balance of the budget.

of Rs. 200 per annum.

7. Were the higher rate of Rs.15 given to Judges of the High Court and Members of the Executive Council and Rs.7.50 to other Heads of Departments, while keeping the rates for all other officers as at present, i.e. Rs.5 and Rs.4, the increase would be Rs.200 per annum.

8. Summarised the financial effects of the three schemes would be as follows:

(a) Committee's proposals for reducing existing rates of Rs.5 and Rs.4 to Rs.4 and Rs.2.50 respectively giving (1) Rs.15 to Judges and Members of Executive Council, and (2) Rs.7.00 to all other Heads of Departments would result in a decrease of expenditure of Rs.500.

(b) To leave existing Rs.5 and Rs.4 rates as at present, but to give Rs.7.50 to all Heads of Departments would mean an increase in expenditure of Rs.200.

(c) To leave existing Rs.5 and Rs.4 rates as at present, but giving (1) Rs.20 to Judges and Members of Executive Council and (2) Rs.7.50 to all other Heads of Departments would result in an increase in expenditure of Rs.2000.

The figures listed above are based on the existing rates of Rs.5 and Rs.4 per annum for the Heads of Departments.

The figures listed above are based on the existing rates of Rs.5 and Rs.4 per annum for the Heads of Departments. The figures listed above are based on the existing rates of Rs.5 and Rs.4 per annum for the Heads of Departments.

4.

allowances might similarly be limited to 14 days, after which it would cease entirely. The introduction of these limitations would tend to reduce the figures summarized in paragraph 8.

10. It has been suggested that the term "subsistence Allowance" would be more applicable to the allowances than "travelling Allowance", and in this I concur. The adoption of the former term would also obviate the necessity of describing any part of the allowances as "detention allowance".

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,

*W. H. B. B. B.*  
ACTING GOVERNOR.