

carriage boat for Lake Victoria
 to be the defrayed out
 of the surplus earnings,
 no further will be
 made on the Treasury
 or on the General Revenue
 of the Protectorate for such
 purposes. Thus the General
 Manager would not
 be at all likely to induce
 rates to be collected which
 would make the surplus
 less & considerable surplus
 of next year, since he
 would know that it was
 only for the year that
 he would find funds for
 such capital work.

Mr. Stanley T. L.
 find any difficulty
 in approving the proposals
 submitted in the letter,
 but I hope would suggest
 that a conference should be
 arranged between a represen-
 tative of the Dept. of
 the Treasury, or advise
 that the matter may be further discussed.

L.R.A.

729
 DOMESTIC

EAST AFR. PROT.
 No. 20969

20969
 Recd
 12 JUN 06

Individual.
 & F
 1906
 June
 Previous Paper.

(Subject)

Provident Fund
 for non-pensionable Reg. Employees.

Urges introduction of an Act of Indian
 Scale Reg. Fund with alterations as suggested. Est-
 cost would be about £2,500 p a m commenced with

(Minutes)

Mr. Read.
 At present, pending the establish-
 ment of a Provident Fund, the
 Railway Reg. employees' are
 addition of 5 percent of his
 salary in lieu thereof. This
 of course is no more a
 substitute for a Provident
 Fund - the object of which is
 provide for the old age of the
 employees & to enable them to
 buy their way out of their work
 without hardship - since
 there is nothing to prevent the
 employees spending the 5 per-
 cent as soon as they receive it, as
 is a matter of fact most

Copy sent to Secretary 20th 4/1/06
 Copy sent to Chief Secy 20th 4/1/06

Subsequent Paper

If they do so.

The proposal of Mr. Currie, based on Indian rules is shortly that each employe shall contribute voluntarily $\frac{1}{12}$ of his salary to the fund, to which is to be added half yearly from the funds of the Railway

- (a) a sum ~~not exceeding~~ equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ the interest
- (b) ~~a sum~~ ^{not exceeding} $\frac{1}{2}$ the contributions, nor 3% on the net earnings of the Railway for the $\frac{1}{2}$ year.

The money will be placed or deposited at the Bank & interest allowed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 3% as may be found suitable.

The whole sum is payable to the debenture or in favour of the public works; or his death, or payable in the manner specified in rules by which is rather complicated & shd. be simplified.

The cost of the scheme to Govt. is estimated at about

Mr. Currie might this might not be by the capital nature the & expenses being estimated 1886

£5000 p.a. to start with & about £2500 more than the existing 5% out of the dividend fund 730

It is not myself quite like the idea of making the bonus partially dependent on the net earnings of the Railway, as it will make the question of what are net earnings a ~~more~~ ^{more} a burning question

& the Treasury still want us to provide for capital works or one annual contribution.

It is true that it will give the employe a direct interest in the prosperity of the Railway but this argument is far stronger if urged in favour of making the salaries of the higher officials ~~partially dependent on earnings~~ ^{not done} attached to not done. 1886

Dear Mr. Currie
Submit the Scheme to the Treas^r referring to previous correspondence on the subject - & send copy of the Bill with copy of my letter to the Treas^r & the Comm^r for info. etc. 1886

must say that I think there
 is a heavy case for the scheme.
 & subordinates were engaged
 & terms as to wages & li-
 ability to dismissal which, I
 presume, were understood
 & sides as not being based
 on scheme of pension of public
 service and the only
 sent in favour of the
 fact is that there will be
 suspension in getting rid
 of it.

I presume the Treasury
 wished to see raise of public
 fund. Certainly would
 recommend the scheme to

W.T.O.
 20/6

For the fund. It is clear that at present there is no
 net of profits in the £2500. It is a matter of mere
 25/6
 a Provident Fund is desirable
 & necessary
 25/6

C
 20969
 E.A.P.
 731

DRAFT

The Sec to the
 Treasury

MINUTE

- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~St. John~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Read~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Andrews~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Cox~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Lucas~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Graham~~
- Sir ^{27/6} ~~M. Ommanney~~
- Mr. ^{27/6} ~~Churchill~~
- The Earl of Elgin

25/6

3 July
 3 June 06

I am directed by the
 Sec of the Treasury
 to say to you, for the
 reason of the L.C. of
 the Treasury, the accom-
 panying copy of a
 letter from the Sec of the
 Treasury suggesting the establish-
 ment of a Provident
 Fund for the more
 favourable employments
 of the ^{the Treasury} ~~the Treasury~~ ^{the Treasury} ~~the Treasury~~
 following generally
 the terms laid down

Copy to be sent to July of 1896

Malvern to C.O. 12 June
 1896

for such institutions
on the Public Works
Dept. Code of the
Govt. of India, a copy
of which is enclosed.

In their letter of the
13th Sept. 1900 T.L. (F.O.P.P.)

are desirous to appear
of the institution of
such a fund but desired
that its issue shd. be
justified until the
Rutney was completed.

In the meantime all
regular employes have
drawing are Rs. 50

Sanction has renewed
an addition of 5 for
rest to the balance in
form of a Provident Fund.

The cost of this addition

15370/1900

is some £2500 a year,
but, as the monthly ¹⁹⁰²
income is in various
months, it
in no way fulfils the
purpose of such a Fund,
which is, to encourage
the men to make pro-
vision for their old
age and so to enable
the Govt. to get rid of
incompetent officials
without undue hardship.

The additional cost
of the Fund on the
lines proposed by Mr
Currie is estimated at
about £2500 p. a.,
but had they considered
that this additional
expenditure will be
compensated by the
greater contentment