

DOMESTIC

EAST AFR. PROT.

No.

12496

C. O.

12496

R. P.

1899 9 12 08

Office or Individual

(Subject)

Whitehouse George

Lake Survey

1908

1 apt

Last previous Paper.

99

Subject complains of treatment he
has met in conn. with employment
under Co

(Minutes)

Mr. Tynd

The obvious reply to the
complaint is to ask
Mr. Whitehouse, whether he
considers that he has any
claims against the Govt,
and if so, that he will
state exactly what it is that
he wants.

It is clear that what he
has in his mind is that,
in view of the savings realized
on the Lake Survey account, we
ought to give him more
pay than we do for his work
in England.

also

Next subsequent Paper.

W/21196

Also he appears to want Mr Currier's head on a charger, & an admission from the S.P.S. that we have treated him badly.

I think that unless we definitely decline to reopen the whole matter which would I think be the best course, we should ~~write~~ reply as above, viz. that Lord's will be prepared to consider any claims which he (C^W) may consider that he has against Gov^{mt} if he will state them in precise terms.

NOTE
H

I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by continuing the correspondence with Lord Whitehouse. You & I have done our best to smooth things over & I think that we had come to the end of our resources. I still think that his work deserves recognition by C.M.S. but we ought to make quite sure that he is willing to take it. I should be inclined to put this paper by till the middle of April. If it is decided to recommend him for C.M.S. to write & ask whether he wd. be willing to accept it. If he refuses, there is an end of the matter.

H. J. R.
14/4

Mr Reed
on Mr Atkinson's instructions
add the following note for reference

1. C^W Whitehouse resigned his app^{nt} (for the reasons stated in para 1 of his letter on 4/10/06/07), in 1906.
2. In Oct 06 he asked to be allowed to work here in order to complete certain drawings & we agreed. "He raised no question of pay, and what now is due to him" (L.H. 22/06)
3. It was decided to give him $\frac{3}{4}$ pay for the period during which he worked here, viz. - 17-10-06 to 20-2-07. This amounted to £158-15-4.
4. He was despatched, & as the Governor has in the meantime recommended a bonus of £100, we gave C^W Whitehouse full instead of $\frac{3}{4}$ pay for the period mentioned, i.e. - £251-11-9, or an additional £62-19-5.
5. Work in this country was not provided for in his Agreement, & we pointed out to him that the rate of remuneration for any such work was entirely a matter for the S.P.S. to decide at his discretion.

6. I cannot help thinking that C^W Whitehouse regrets his resignation. Had he chosen to stay on & finish his work on the spot, he would have gone on drawing full pay as long as there were heavy funds

C^W
3958/06

W
7572/07

Gov
43701/07

to meet it:

7. He deliberately threw away this opportunity, however, by resigning, & although he succeeded in getting over 4 months full pay for relinquishment work in England, the knowledge that the balance of the money grant was never then repaid has evidently spurred him on to fresh efforts to repair the consequences of his hasty action ~~etc~~ at Govt expense.

8. In all his letters he has not once stated definitely that this is his object, but it certainly is.

9. He has been & promised nothing as far as loan account, & strictly speaking was not entitled to any of the £250,000 which we have given him.

RTE

Mr. Antrobus

I think he has been treated generously - we must not allow him to blacken our name because he has got hold of our money.
MOC 24/4

30.
4/7/57 was mentioned
to the effect that Comm

311
Mr. Chonae should see it, and it was sent to him accordingly.

Unfortunately the whole bundle was sent to him; and he was thus afforded an opportunity of sending many things which had been written about him in Uganda and in the Ad. Office, such as the Minutes on Comm. for 1957/58, in which he was referred to as being "an unsatisfactory officer", "always in error or laps bad health and", "so ill tempered" "no one can work with him".

He suppressed his feelings, however, and, although we know that he had a grievance, we thought that it related only to the amount of his remuneration and the delay in expressing appreciation of his services, on both of which points we hoped to be able to meet his wishes. His feelings were too strong for him to reveal, and recently

he alluded in this letter and other communications.

His survey of the Victoria Nyanga was a dangerous and difficult task, extending over several years, and the results are excellent. He has been strongly recommended for the Chair; and, but for an accident, he would probably have received it last year.

He knows from reading the papers which were so unfortunately sent to him that he was recommended for the Chair; but whether he will accept it now, I do not know. If he would, I do not think that this outbreak (for which there is some excuse) should prevent its being offered him.

Wm. May 7

There is no chance of a Chair while this corruption remains in the papers. If he withdraws himself, he will not be considered as a man who can write in this wild way. He will not be permanently tainted by a Chair & may

has not again - He writes to you personally - but do you prefer to do with him? as you find reply

312

J. H. C.

Wm. May

15.5
at

he exploded in his letters and
other communications.

His survey of the Victoria
Nyanza was a dangerous and
difficult task, extending over
several years, and the results
are excellent. He has been
strongly recommended for the
Cmty; but, but for an accident,
he would probably have received
it last year.

He knows from reading
the papers which were so
unfortunately sent to him
that he was recommended for
the Cmty; but whether he
will accept it now, I do
not know. If he would, I
do not think that this out-
burst (for which there is some
excuse) should prevent its
being offered him.

What May 7

There is no chance of a Cmty
while the corruption remains on
the papers. If he withdraws
unwisely as a man who can
consider in this wild way will not be
permanently harmed by a Cmty & may

write me again - He writes to you
personally - Blue is your paper to
do with him? as you find to
reply?

Mr. Arthur

J. L. C.

15.5

at

8 St. James's Square, C. O.
S.W.

1st April 1908.

12496

Recd
Rm. 8 Apr 08

W-1100

Dear Mr. Antrobus,

In reply to your letter to me of 23rd March last, I decline to look on what I was paid, after a most uncalled for delay of from 12 to 14 months, as "additional remuneration." I consider I was entitled, under my agreement to full pay, and had I refused to continue working, unless it was paid, my maps would have remained disconnected. At my interview with you, on pointing this out, you informed me Officers did not generally take up such a position with the Colonial Office. I was not speaking to you as an Officer under your direction, but as a private person who has been treated in a way that I much doubt any Officer has ever before been treated by the Colonial Office.

You inform me now that the total amount of surplus from the Survey Grant "is £577 not £800 as I surmise." Duplicates of my Store and Wages Account have always been in my possession. I object very much to some of the items charged against my work and I repeat that if a proper adjustment of my accounts be made, the surplus will be about £500.

I note that you tell me the amount of £577 has now lapsed, which is very interesting. I conclude the previous surplus in 1901 of over £800 also lapsed, but if allowed for, makes the surplus on the whole of my work, over £800 - a very unusual ending for East African estimates.

Not a word was said to me during the 3½ months I remained in England, after leaving the Colonial Office as soon as I could after being given confidential correspondence about myself, and later, when I was over 7,000 miles away, you sent me a curt letter dated 17th June 1907, informing me that Lord Elgin gave me "three-quarters of my full salary."

Is that the way to treat your old officers?

More than a year after leaving the Office, and after another refusal, dated 31st August, 1907, you pay what Lord Elgin himself calls my "full salary."

On my return to England in 1906, I was determined to have an explanation of what had forced me to send in my resignation, but as I was told that "Mr. H.A.F. Currie was the best friend I had if I only knew it, and that the Colonial Office was entirely satisfied with me" or words almost exactly to that effect, I could of course proceed no further than

The Confidential remarks on my letter to Sir Montagu Omsley a month or so later, show exactly the official view of myself and my services, which were such that I am "not likely to be again employed."

Mr. H.J. Read appeared to be very much surprised indeed, when I told him all that had happened between Mr. Currie and myself, and, such comments on me, would have been made, had the Colonial Office not accepted Mr. Currie's secret attack without applying to me for the usual explanation customary in the public services on such occasions.

My treatment of the confidential correspondence in properly reporting how it came into my hands, when I was advised to at once force the matter before the Secretary of State, and if necessary get questions asked in the House of Commons, illustrated remarkably well the "uncontrollable temper with which I am unfortunately afflicted!"

It is noted in your office that I am "an impossible man to work with," and have "quarrelled with Officers."

I was working in a foreign country, and after the only assistant I ever had was invalidated, dealt, at his special request, only with Mr. Currie, several hundred miles away, and I say plainly, that he refused all my requests for help, and that he deliberately suppressed the fact that he had in February 1905, at Port Florence, refused to lend me Mr. Townsend, then 1st Officer of the S.S. "Sybil," refused to lend me Mr. McClure on me; that I told him I had Mr. Townsend's consent to serve with me in writing, at which he showed the greatest annoyance; that he insisted Mr. McClure could do my work; that then I said he could therefore do the steamer work too, he refused to take him for the "Sybil," and lend me Mr. Townsend in his place; that he then refused to lend me the S.S. "Feroz Anderson," and that he wrote to me when Mr. Hunter was invalidated, asking me if I could go without an assistant as he was so hard up for Officers, and it would suit him better if Mr. Hunter Assistant but that I said I would rather not have one! It is quite true I said so at first, but when I found the work was going to be too much for me, in February 1905 the above happened.

The statement that no one was willing to work with me is therefore untrue. He also deliberately suppressed the fact that the motor cutter had not been got ready for me as expected. The work therefore had to be done in pulling boats at 2 to 3 miles an hour, instead of the motor cutter towing them at 5 to 6. It is hardly necessary to point out the obvious fact that work at 2 to 3 miles an hour with tired men, takes more than twice as long as work at 5 to 6 miles, under power, as was estimated for.

Mr. Currie wrote to me early in 1904 saying "it would be difficult to explain the delays on account of motor cutter when more money was asked for." He later asked for a further sum of £500, told me the survey would go on for some time, and when I blamed his mismanagement, got over the difficulty he wrote to me about by suppressing it altogether, although I had officially pointed it out as the cause of delay in a letter which he wished to destroy, but on examining in a calmer mood, found to be perfectly correct and fair.

I do not know who the other officers are that I have quarrelled with. Official friction occurred between me and the Local Superintendent over certain matters connected with my work, and it was settled between us, as official friction generally is, when treated as it should be. I also had occasion several times to write very sharply on navigation matters to Officers in the Marine Staff, and a proof of its necessity lies in the fact, that every accident to the ships has occurred when their Commanders were disobeying my written instructions, and had I been in charge of their navigation, the disastrous accident to the "Sybil" would have been an impossibility.

After speaking to Mr. H.J. Read very freely on this subject last May, I gave him to understand that the matter was settled, and it would not again have been referred to by me, had not your letter 30609 of 1907 of 31st Aug. 1907 brought it up again, by referring to letter 19059 of 1905 of 20th June 1905, the principal cause of my resignation, calling on me to survey a vast extent of Central Africa, unassisted, at the rate of less than 10d per square mile!

I have no hesitation in stating that such a remarkable letter should never have been sent to any Officer, and certainly not to one situated as I was, working in a foreign country among foreign officers, and I am greatly surprised that it should have been referred to a second time when refusing pay I was entitled to.

At the time it was written, I know that Mr. H.J. Read was absent on leave. As Mr. W.D. Ellis was not, the letter I soon saw was written by him. This Official seems to have taken some dislike to me for which

I am quite unable to account. I have spoken to him as far as I can recollect, three times, and the remarks he makes on me and my work, seem to be of an exceedingly hasty and ill-considered description. If bag this gentleman may be informed, that if I have given him any cause for offence, I trust he will accept my assurances that it was entirely unintentional, and that I do not even know the occasion on which any such offence may have been given.

I also spoke very freely to this gentleman on my return in 1906, and I am now altogether surprised that he should have agreed with me that, possibly, the Colonial Office having so lately taken over charge of East Africa, it did not know I was working under the Railway Manager when it wrote me the letter 19059 of 1905 of 20th June 1905, as of course it is quite plain now, that this letter was written entirely on Mr. Currie's confidential attack on me, and Mr. W.D. Ellis must have known that when we were speaking to each other, quite well indeed!

This letter, however, bears your signature, and I conclude you would not have signed it without reading it, as the circumstances, such very serious ones for me, must have been known to you, and if not, they certainly ought to have been.

At the interview quoted above, I also spoke very freely to you about Mr. Currie's treatment of me, and you will please understand that I did not tell you anything that was not true, and that I consider his conduct to have been unbecoming a Government Officer and a gentleman.

The whole of his demi-official letters to me are still in my possession and form a very striking contrast to his official confidential ones. You asked me how his confidential letters came into my hands, but as I had reported that, I am unable to understand why you should have been surprised, or why you should inform me that I had no right to copy confidential documents that were sent to me, marked to be shown to me, questioning my honesty, and giving entirely opposite views to what I had been told by everyone concerned.

I consider I had every right to take a copy of a plain statement that "as things stand at present there is no inducement for him" (myself) to hurry on with the work, in fact, quite the opposite, and if he returns under the same conditions, the work will take a long time to complete."

I do not require "inducements" to make me honest.

You told me that you saw at that interview I was a most difficult person to deal with. I may be, after your treatment of me, (the Foreign Office Officials did not find me difficult) but that does not make me dishonest, and what I told you about Mr. Currie when he tried to force another quarrel on me, in a most gratuitous manner on board the S.S. "Winifred", was absolutely correct.

In my opinion, as he is a most passionate and dictatorial person, he hardly knew what he was saying, when he found I blamed his mismanagement, and as he is that sort of person, and his liver had just had an abscess on it (which I did not know at the time) his temper was not surprising to one who knew him. On noticing it, I made enquiries from the Ships Officers who had been standing under the bridge watching us, and found he had been ill.

Equatorial Africa is not quite the place it seems to be considered in Downing Street, and the treatment that its officials get, might, as in my case, be altered with advantage. It is certainly not a safe place to treat Officers in, as I have been treated.

I note you left my letter unanswered for a month, on the principle I conclude of further extending the lapsed time. Your concluding remarks rather astonish me.

Your decision to give me my full pay was apparently made in my presence, without any reference to Lord Elgin at all. It seemed strange to me that after quoting him so much previously, you should be able to say off-hand that I should have what I was entitled to, and that you would not pay anything else as I was ill in 1905. You declined to accept my statement I was not ill as stated by Mr. Currie. His statement that I had continually complained of slight illness since 1903 is untrue.

If you will consult the certificate under which I was sent home, you will see that all that was wrong then, was said to be "cataract."

The expert I consulted upset that, and when I asked Sir Patrick Manson if, in his opinion, my eye would have got well out there, he replied: - "Yes, why shouldn't it have?" - Your own medical adviser - who you may believe although you do not me - Kindly refer to him and Mr. Chas. Higgins of 54 Brook Street, W. should you want any more information on the subject.

You appeared anxious that I should admit the survey was finished. I have always told your Department it was not, and the proof of it lies in a letter I have just received from my late Assistant, Mr. C.S. Hunter of the Uganda Railway, the only Assistant I ever had, who writes to me from Munyonyo, telling me he has gone back to the Lake. He is now working on an extension of our Munyonyo Sheet, and he is to carry out other surveys as soon as he has finished there.

Mr. Hunter worked very well with me for a long time, till he was invalided. He now writes to me in a way he hardly would have, had our relations not been good, and I conclude you are not likely to again say the survey was finished, when I have told you another Officer, and one whom Mr. Currie said was "averse to going back to the Lake" has been sent to carry it on again.

I trust he will receive better treatment than I did, in what must always be very trying work.

I beg to draw your attention to the difference of treatment given to me, and Mr. R. Grant, Assistant Loco Superintendent. This Officer who worked on the railway, with the telegraph at his disposal at any moment, was given a bonus of £600 for building two ships, roughly two years of his work. I, am called on, "as an unsatisfactory Officer who can be got rid of," to work for a fixed sum over an unknown extent of country, and having left surpluses of over £800, am told, after refusing three-quarters, that I may be given full pay for four months -- one year after it became due!

In spite of my frequent requests for the official accounts, they were never sent me, and now you tell me no useful purpose would be served by going into them!

You wrote and told me, 31st Aug. 1907, that the Governor of East Africa would be referred to, but have not favored me with his reply, beyond a statement of a surplus of £377, which I consider too small.

You declined to accept my view that I had suffered under your management, and insisted that there was nothing in Mr. Currie's attack on me, although you are altogether unable to explain why, if there was nothing in it, on his letters alone, without the slightest reference to

for any explanation, I was, after years of hard work under the Foreign Office, registered as "an unsatisfactory Officer who under his Agreement could be got rid of," or why, a Colonial Office Official should note that it was "better not to say anything to me in recommendation of my work!" that is proved by others to be of such very good value.

You informed me that it was necessary that such confidential letters should be written, and if they were not, the Office would never know anything about anyone. I tell you now you are wrong, and have no right to treat Officers in that way. You could easily have found out all about me by enquiry. My whole life, the greater part of which has been spent in the Tropics, contradicts Mr. Currie's silly twaddle about my flunking the lake districts, and his statement that I was not working properly for want of inducement, is a scandalous libel on an Officer who had all his requests for help refused by the writer, and which would have at once involved him in legal proceedings had such a sentence been written about anyone in any other line of life, and I am altogether astonished that you should uphold such extraordinary treatment of Officers under you. Your system puts a weapon into the hand of an unscrupulous person, who as in this case, used it and vented his spite on me, for objecting to him for his mis-management of my affairs, as he thought, safely in private, and when he knew what his illtemper and mis-statements had brought on me, left me without the slightest attempt at explanation, to blame a dead man for what he had done.

You asked me angrily, how I knew confidential letters were in the file; when I told you I had sent it out of my room the first time it was brought to me while knowing it held them, and only looked into it when it was brought back a second time in a most ludicrous fashion.

You greatly under-rate my intelligence if you imagine I did not know all along that your letter of 20th June 1905 was written on some confidential letter sent from Nairobi. That is plainly discernible from its opening sentence, stating that letters had been received, and the letter that caused it was referred to in my presence at the Office, the handwriting of Mr. Bell, Assistant Secretary being very large indeed, I could not help seeing the sentences I object to, and the treachery I saw evidence of, taking me completely by surprise I did not, I ought to have, state that had occurred, and demand explanations. I gave my promise in Nairobi to Mr. Currie not to complain of his treatment. And kept it although I knew crooked work was going on. I stayed in Africa to finish up so as to leave my work in a satisfactory condition, knowing I had been sold by someone, and had I ever thought Mr. Currie had written these letters, I would have refused to have had any more to do with him in any way whatever.

He gave me a clear promise to "write nothing," but to leave me entirely free to settle matters with the Colonial Office, and when he had known your letter of 20th June 1905 was caused by his secret letters, he made no explanations to me, advised me not to mind what had been said to me at home, when I was unfortunately travelling in his own railway coach with him, and sold me again a week or two later, Colonel Hayes-Sadler, Commissioner of Uganda, flatly denying he had made the arrangements he said he had with him, for me, about the S.S. "William Mackinnon," and producing some of Mr. Currie's letters to him, thrust them into my hands, asking me in the most heated way, "what I thought of them?"

You do not seem to know we care, what the wrecking of my official career in Africa means. For about nine years I worked in a way that no surveyor ever has before, or is again likely to in East Africa, after our treatment of me. In trying to get other employment, it is generally

necessary to refer to the latest. I conclude you will quite understand how very unlikely I am to refer to your Department, and have remarks about me made in accordance with your confidential notations - possibly by Mr. W.D. Ellis! As far as my future is concerned, I lose ten years' work from having been connected with you for about two.

You say you are sorry to gather that I do not consider your decision as satisfactory as you hoped it would be to me.

How you could possibly expect me to be satisfied, passes my comprehension. The Foreign Office treated me well and gave me the help I needed when I asked for it. I have their official thanks for my work, and the acknowledgment of the late Head of its African Department, that the improving position of the Uganda Railway is partly owing to my work. I saw the possibilities of the Lake from the first, and spent 8 years of my life helping them on. I worked like a negro, and lived like one, under the most unpleasant and disloyal circumstances. I was refused help on every occasion I asked Mr. Currie for it. I have paid through the nose for the privilege of being allowed to finish my work up to a point from where it could be properly carried on. I was finally forced to resign owing to my treatment by him and you, and to top it all, had the whole confidential correspondence that wrecked me, handed up to me like a pound of groceries, when it was not meant for me to see!

Now, after trying for a year to avoid payment, you give me my full pay, tell me the lapse of time prevents further discussion, refuse to discuss the matter when I point out how I was treated, and express surprise that I am not satisfied!

I really cannot understand the different positions you take up. There has been a complete exposure of the misconduct of the Railway Manager, and had you referred his letters to me at once, as you should have, I would gladly have arranged with your Office to finish up my work to any point you desired, under my own management, or hand in my resignation at once.

The Acting Manager and Loco Superintendent was good enough to say, when I was leaving Harfobi, that my departure was a great loss, as they now had no one to advise them on ship matters, and that my presence on the Lake was a great check on its navigation. It was kind of him to make such acknowledgments, and had I been treated with consideration, and after Mr. Currie's attack, been given entire charge of my work, instead of being left to his tender mercies a second time, I should have been glad to have kept the work going, as it is now being carried out, till I could report enough was done. As it was, it was galling to me, to know that orders were given, that the Captains of the steamers were not to be interfered with in navigation questions, thus leaving them completely their own masters in that respect, while an old and tried Officer like myself, of great experience in ship and survey work, was still kept under the direction of a railway Manager, altogether ignorant of all shipping and Marine Survey work, while I was not even rationed! Possibly the Colonial Office Officials have not looked at my position in that light before. I trust now it has been pointed out to them, they will begin to see a few of the difficulties under which I served them.

From your treatment of me, you seem to think with Mr. Currie I was ready to swindle the Government if I got the chance. I have not quite depended so far, after serving Government for about 30 years all, and you will find it difficult to get anyone else in Africa to admire Mr. Currie's conduct, while you certainly cannot expect your treatment of me, to encourage men still serving you there, as one never knows when one's own turn may not come to be put in the cart.

I regretted very much that my invariable rule against writing anything in a hurry that might possibly cause friction, prevented me from adding my remarks below those of the Department on me and my work. That will be rectified now, if you will be good enough to have this letter registered with the rest.

In reply to your expression of sorrow that I am not satisfied with your treatment, I beg to inform you as plainly as possible, that I do not consider that I have received from the Colonial Office the treatment that I - as a British Officer deputed by the Foreign Office to work in foreign territory by agreement of the British and German Foreign Offices - expected, or was entitled to, nor do I consider that I have received the "utmost consideration" that the late Sir Donald Stewart especially requested for me when forwarding Mr. Currie's unscrupulous attack on me and my work, but on the contrary I consider your treatment of me to have been altogether the reverse.

I decline to treat any of this correspondence as confidential in any way.

I am,
Yours very faithfully,

B. Whittham

Commander, R.N.

To
H. A. Antrobus, Esq. C.B.
Head of the East African Dept.
Colonial Office

Memo by Commander E. Whitehouse R.N.

1. East Africa Protectorate Report for 1905-6.
Page 25 (F) Lake Survey.

"The survey of the Lake Victoria is now practically complete. In view of the considerable expansion of lacustrine trade in the course of the year, the charts which are in course of preparation, will prove most useful, and will render almost impossible such accidents as the grounding of the S.S. "Sybil" near Bukoba."

The above paragraph was not referred to me in any way, and is most misleading.

I have pointed out several times to the E.A. Dept. of the Colonial Office that the survey is not complete. I wish to again warn them against the use of White Passage by the steamers until it, and its approaches, have been thoroughly examined by a detailed survey. Should this warning be disregarded and any accident occur, the results may be as serious as on the occasion quoted above when my advice was disregarded:- The disaster to the S.S. "Sybil" had nothing to do with the maps or charts.

It was caused by the ship being (as stated) out of sight of land, when her compass had not been adjusted, its error (as stated) had not been properly found and her patent log (as stated) was not in use. Under these conditions it was quite impossible that her course could have been correctly set, as was found by the Board of Enquiry. The ship therefore did not know what direction she was going in, or the rate at which she was travelling, so it was not surprising that she ran on rocks of which full notice had been given to the Captains by me personally, some 2 months before, and warning for the locality given by me some 2 years before, the rough position of the rocks struck on, identified by wreckage, being found on the German map of the S.S. "Winifred" (where I had placed it before leaving) on my return from England after the disaster, that information having been given (as stated) to the S.S. "Sybil" by a tracing.

The maps therefore had nothing to do with the disaster and the statement in the above paragraph that these being now prepared (they left my hands some 14 months ago) will make such accidents impossible in the future, is a sanguine one that will probably lead to further loss of money in the future if my recommendations remain disregarded.

My report on this disaster was not thought worth acknowledging by Mr. H.A. F. Currie, Manager of the Uganda Railway. It is to be hoped that he will for the future take experienced advice when offered to him on subjects of which he has no knowledge or experience whatever.

Should any other information be desired on this subject, no doubt the Board of Trade, or the Corporation of Trinity House, of which I am a member, will be able to explain to the E.A. Dept of the Colonial Office the probable result of navigating on a lake on which the change of variation is practically nil, with unadjusted compasses whose error, there or thereabouts, goes up to 28 degrees! and whatever Ordinances may be made regarding loss of life or cargo on the lake, in or out of foreign territorial waters, no Ordinance the Colonial Office can ever make, can possibly prevent heavy damages being obtained if it is again proved that a ship did not know where she was going, or how fast, when she piles herself up on a previously reported danger.

2. Page 125 of same report, eighth paragraph.

"The question of extending the railway terminus to a deep water pier I have before brought to notice, and every year the necessity for it will become more apparent. The lake rises and falls considerably, and should it ever fall as much as it has risen this year, our ships could not enter Port Florence."

This was not referred to me either and is incorrect. That year (1906) the correct level was + 1 foot on the Port Florence gauge. (Average of first week in February). The level had risen on 14th May to the highest ever recorded + 3 feet 5 inches. Therefore the rise that year was 2 feet 5 inches. Had there been a similar fall the level would have been at - 1 foot 5 inches, or just equal to the lowest level ever recorded, 29 Oct. 1903, when the S.S. "Winifred" was working. The recorded range of level at Port Florence, has been just under 5 feet, viz., from - 1 foot 6 inches to + 3 feet 5 inches on gauge. The level of - 1 foot 6 inches being acknowledged all over the Lake to be abnormally low.

Of course if it is thought that the level may fall below its lowest recorded, an equal amount to its rise, people may get anxious but quite unreasonably so, as there is no necessity to think anything of the sort. Overlooking might make the present vessels draw so much that at low level there might be difficulty in entering the harbour, that might be obviated in the first place, by not overloading, and in the second, by dredging. From overloading, the same difficulty would apply to many ports, for instance to one I have just come from, Buenos Aires, where millions of tons are annually dealt with in a shallow harbour.

These are technical points which no doubt the E.A. Dept. will understand should be dealt with by a technical person who, as I have pointed out, is not at the disposal of the Uganda Railway Manager at present.

This paragraph probably caused Mr. Winston Churchill to make the statement that the railway should be extended to a deep water port, overlooking the fact that Port Florence can be made deeper at very much less expense than building more railway to another part of the same sheet of water, adding the same distance to every train journey from the coast. That is hardly the way to develop new countries, although it would of course swell the railway traffic receipts — by extra unnecessary expense to every one using it.

The sixth paragraph, page 117 of same report concludes with "....." increases the desire to see it" (the dry dock) "restored as speedily as possible, which is rendered more difficult due to the unusual height of the lake."

I have also pointed out to the Manager of the Railway that if the Lake level rises to old watermarks I found on the lake shores, it will be standing at 5 feet 1 inch on the gauge, or just above the top of the dock gate and walls. Should a S.W. wind blow as is usual on most afternoons, the consequent rise of another foot at Port Florence will put the dock that amount under water.

The most serious trouble up to the date of the report quoted in this "too shallow harbour," has been from too much water instead of too little, which is very interesting.

As regards dredging I have been told that the mud was too soft to dredge. As piles for piers etc. have been driven into this mud, I do not understand how dredging would fail to deepen the approach to the piers, if properly done.

3. I heard Mr. Winston Churchill say at a late Colonial Institute Meeting, that he would shortly bring forward "quite a cheap scheme for connecting the Victoria Lake and the Nile."

If projected German railways are built, they will hit the Uganda Railway so hard, that, if not already made, this connection will have to be built. The Beira Railway first construction was a very good object lesson on "cheap" schemes, and it is to be hoped we will be no more in connection with the Uganda Railway. I hope to see this connection working in my time, but beg to point to Mr. Winston Churchill and the E.A. Dept. that I cannot conceive anything better calculated to interfere with getting the necessary money for building it, than the former's extravagant statements, so wrong in figures, about the "enormous cost of the Uganda Railway." Churchill starts his new scheme by giving it away. The Uganda Railway is a going concern, built by competent engineers, under conditions not likely to occur again, and had its accounts received in proper credit for all it handed over to the E.A. Protectorate its cost (like my survey) would have been much less than officially given.

Central Africa being what it is, Mr. Churchill's statements that he is going to do there, against what has been already done, will not be very convincing to people who have to supply the money for schemes.

R. H. St. John

Commander R. H.

1 April, 1908