

EAST AFR. PROT.
8160

8130
REC'D
19 MAR 10



Governor
Board

104

ESTIMATES 1910-11
INCREASES OF PAY

1910

20th Febr'y

Last previous Paper.

Trusts it may be found possible to agree to the increases proposed for Abdurrahman bin Ahmed, Sheikh-ul-Islam, the Paymaster of the 3rd V.A.M., Mr Eastwood, Messrs Wilson and Stanley, Mr Gray and Mr Parkinson. Is not prepared to press for the increase in Mr Gray's salary.

402
8159

W. Read. See also Gov 8159
Para. 3. The reasons for the increase of the Sheikh-ul-Islam's pay are good. The increase is provided for in the Estimates.
Para. 4. The Paymaster, in this statement, deserves the extra £50. Provision is made in the Estimates.
Para. 6. The memo. by the Manager makes out a case for giving Mr Eastwood £750 instead of £700. £750 is provided in the Estimates. By a lucky oversight I did not cut out the extra £50 in revising the Estimates.

copy cc. In no. 31 etc. d. ✓
233. 27 Sept 1910

Subsequent Enquiry
Incess
1910

& recommend the increases referred
to above, pointing out that the addition
of \$20 involved to the list, as approved
is counterbalanced by the omission of
the increase of \$20 for Mr Long, the
Accountant in the Post Office, which was
allowed to stand in the list pending
the receipt of the Governor's reply,
that the total of the approved
expenditure therefore remains the
same.

407

JAB

March 24

above.

H. J. H.

24/100

See attached correspondence.

JAB

ap. 13.

408

SP. Ed
can you let me
have the papers,
please?
H.B.
ap 8

Treasury Chambers,
Whitehall S.W.

8th April 1910.

Dear Butler

Your 8160/10 of 31st ultimo, would you mind helping me as to one or two points of detail?

1. What is the present salary of the Sheikh-ul-Islam? I cannot find him in the Estimates.
2. Currie says that Eastwood's salary is £700 per annum. The estimates, however, (Abstract E.p.8) show it as £750 both for 1910-11 and 1909-10. Which is right?
3. The Governor in his despatch of 1st November last 619 A. (enclosed with your Estimate letter) states that Messrs Wilson, Stanley and Gray have all "sanctioned scales" which would cover the proposed increases. If these

409

these scales have been sanctioned by us I do not think our authority is required for any increments (unless of abnormal amount) within their limits.

I take it that we are not asked to agree to the Governor's proposals respecting European Clerks referred to in the last paragraph of his letter?

Yours

W. E. Bohrens

Downing Street,
13th April, 1910.

Dear Behrens,

I think, if I may say so without offence, that our minds must be built on rather similar lines. The difficulties which we experience appear to be so very much alike.

I too found great difficulty in discovering the Sheikh-ul-Islam. He appears on page 23 of the Estimates for 1910-1911, under Sub-head "Mombasa Native Administration". He is now drawing £96 a year, and the proposal is to give him £120. The higher amount appears to be thoroughly well deserved.

Eastwood's salary is very baffling. His actual salary appears to be £700, but year after year it has been proposed to give him £750 and that amount has been included in the draft Estimates. Year after year the proposal has been negatived, but apparently by some oversight the provision originally inserted in the draft Estimates of the previous year (instead of the smaller amount actually sanctioned) has re-appeared as the provision actually made in the previous year. I failed to spot this in examining the Estimates here, and this is how it comes that, if you agree, we are able to give Eastwood the higher salary of £750 without having to knock out any other item in the Estimates.

As I understand it most of the Railway Officials, including Wilson and Stanley, are not entitled to

any

any increase of pay from time to time unless it is specifically sanctioned. It is open to the General Manager to recommend increases within certain specific limits, ^{which have been approved by the Treasury,} but those increases cannot be demanded by the officers as a matter of right. I think that, in speaking of sanctioned scales in connection with Wilson and Stanley, the Governor really means only the limits within which it is competent to the General Manager to propose increases for the approval of the Governor, ^{and} the Secretary of State, ~~and the Treasury.~~ I am not sure how far you expect us to refer such increases, within the sanctioned limits, to you. Gray, the Office Superintendent in the Secretariat, is certainly on the scale of £200-£20-£300. The Governor proposes, however, instead of giving him £220, the salary to which he would be normally entitled in 1910-1911, to give him a big jump up in that scale to £270. Such a departure from the recognised fall of increments surely requires your sanction.

The Governor's proposals respecting European clerks referred to in the last paragraph of his despatch, are not at present before you. They involve considerable difficulties which we shall have to clear up with him before we are in a position even to approach you on the subject.

Jan
7.13.

Treasury Chambers,

Whitehall, S.W.

11 April 1910.

Dear Butler,

You will by this time have had our official reply to your 8160/10. Many thanks for the information which you gave me with regard to the case.

We said nothing in our letter as regards the grant of increments in "sanctioned scales" but in reply to your enquiry I had better say that our views are as follows.

If in sanctioning a scale of salary we have specified the amount of annual increment we only require to be consulted when it is proposed to grant an increment in excess of the amount approved.

In cases, moreover, (if there are any), where we have merely sanctioned the minimum and maximum of the scale we are quite willing that you should allow annual increments

of
Wilson
increments provided that their amount is normal, having regard to the increments allowed in similar scales in the Protectorates, and of course that the maximum of the scale is not exceeded.

If, however, the amount of this increment is in any way exceptional we should like to have a voice in the decision.

Yours

W. E. B. Williams



C O
8159
9 MAR 10

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
BRITISH EAST AFRICA.

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

February 25th 1910.

(No. 104)

413

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch No. 768 of December 25th and to make the following observations.

Handwritten notes:
Yes
20/3/10

2. I have already expressed my regret that the salaries of my Aide-de-Camps have been fixed at £250 instead of £300, vide my despatch of the 21st instant.

Memorandum
by Mr. Currie

Handwritten notes:
Yes
2/5/10

3. I trust that Your Lordship will find it possible to agree to the increase of salary recommended for Abdurrahman bin Ahmed, Sheikh-ul-Islam. The relations between the Sheikh and the Government are close and his duties have been always performed to our complete satisfaction. He is the Chief Kathi of the Protectorate and has appellate jurisdiction with the Judges of the High Court over all other Kathis.

Reference is made to him on all points of Mahomedan Law, of which his knowledge is profound and far reaching.

He is moreover a member of the Wakf Commission for which appointment he receives no emoluments. He is very highly respected and his integrity is beyond question.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE EARL OF CREWE, K.G.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

Handwritten notes:
x No. 37203
+ No. 8159

DOWNING STREET,
LONDON, S.W.

Handwritten notes:
4093-20

414

He has received no increase of salary since he was appointed in 1899.

4. The extra duties imposed upon the Paymaster, 3rd King's African Rifles, as accounting officer to the Volunteer Reserve are as follows. He is responsible for

Annual account to Treasurer

Monthly account to Treasurer

Compilation of the Volunteer Reserve Estimates

Checking and keeping Register of Volunteer Reserve Indents on Crown Agents

Passing all vouchers for Volunteer Reserve expenditure (these are forwarded to the Pay Office here by all the Company Commanders throughout the Protectorate)

Paying wages of markers, &c. attached to the Nairobi Company

Keeping Volunteer Reserve Vote Ledger and being responsible as to the various votes not being overdrawn.

Control of money involved, viz: £2,539 (vide approved Estimate 1909-1910).

The work in connection with these returns has steadily increased of late and in my opinion entitles the officer performing it to some extra remuneration.

5. I am not prepared to press for the increase in Mr. Long's salary in the present state of our finances.

6. I trust that the proposed increase in Mr. Eastwoods salary may be reconsidered. I attach a Memorandum by the Manager of the Uganda Railway which shows the very high opinion entertained of his

his

his capacity and ability. The schemes for Railway Extension now under consideration will, if they take shape, add very largely to his work and would in my opinion form a very justifiable ground for augmenting his salary.

7. As regards Messrs. Wilson and Stanley it is not proposed to give annual increments to these officers. The increase now asked for is recommended on the ground of their long and capable service and the heavy responsibility attached to their posts, which is felt to be insufficiently remunerated by their present pay of £375 per annum.

8. The case of Mr. Gray, Office Superintendent in the Secretariat, stands more or less by itself. The appointment would naturally fall under the heading of European Clerks, but it was thought desirable owing to his being necessarily brought into close contact with matters of a confidential nature to give Mr. Gray the privileges and status of an officer of the superior staff. As I have found occasion to remark elsewhere life in Nairobi is exceedingly expensive and it is really impossible for an officer to live decently on less than a substantive salary of £250 per annum. I therefore recommended an increase in Mr. Gray's scale, but if this is thought to be unduly large, I would suggest that from April 1st next he may draw £250 with increments of £20 up to £300 the maximum of his present scale.

1/10

9. As regards the proposed incremental scale for

for the Administrator General, it was only omitted by an oversight in the first instance and when Mr. Parkinson was a candidate for the post its re-insertion was made a condition of acceptance. This was subsequently waived by him but it was still recommended in our telegram No. 89 of July 2nd 1909. As matters stand he has been a loser by taking the appointment, which he thought would be placed on an incremental scale in 1910-11 at any rate, and I trust therefore that Your Lordship will withdraw the objection raised.

*for
22/3/09
/a*

10. With regard to the proposals made for regulating the pay and conditions of service for European clerks I would refer to my despatch No. 100 of the 25th instant in which the matter is discussed in detail.

*for
F157*

I have the honour to be
Your Lordship's humble,
obedient servant,

R. S. S. S.
GOVERNOR.

No. 1234 / 5 No. 157

ENCLOSURE

In Despatch No. 104 of 1907 117

MEMORANDUM.

2100
9 MAR '10

Writing in 1907, vide enclosure to my confidential letter No. 122/74 dated the 19th November, 1907 I stated that I had formed a high opinion of Mr. Eastwood's capabilities. I said that I considered he was greatly above the average in ability and that as a reward for the careful and efficient way in which he controlled the financial arrangements on this Railway I hoped he would be given a personal allowance of £50/- per annum from the 1st April 1908.

The total funds (i.e. earning and expenditure) under the Chief Accountant's control amount annually to some £400,000 and it is obvious that it makes a great deal of difference whether the Chief Accountant is a capable man or not. As I have already stated I consider Mr. Eastwood a very efficient officer and he undoubtedly is worth a great deal more than he gets viz: £700/- per annum.

He has been over 12 years on the Railway and from 1st November 1899 to 1st April 1903 was actually drawing £750/- per annum. His salary was however, with many others, reduced to £700/- when construction ceased and the staff was recast.

It is unreasonable to expect a man in his position to retain his energy and keenness when he gets no recognition, or hope of recognition, of his services, any falling off of Mr. Eastwood's energy would cost Government far more than the £50/- per annum asked for. Even supposing that this personal allowance is refused I feel sure that Mr. Eastwood will continue to render good services to Government but he will feel disappointed and this is sure to be reflected in his work, whereas if he is given the increase he will feel that his exertions are appreciated

and

and he will be a much more efficient servant.

*I doubt
H.J.K.*

When at home in 1909, with the late Governor's permission, I spoke to Mr. Read of the Colonial Office and Mr. Causton of the Treasury about him and they both said that they agreed with me that his is a case that deserves recognition. They both said that if His Excellency would recommend him this year a personal allowance of £50/- would be agreed to.

I beg that His Excellency will use his best endeavours to get it sanctioned.

Nairobi,
February 18th 1910.

Sd/- H. F. CURRIE
Manager, Uganda Railway.

6

Govt Secy. Cab.

904

W

DRAFT

Secretary to the Treasury

21 Dec 1910

MINUTE.

Sir

- Mr. Pakenham 29/13
- Mr. Buxton
- Mr. Fiddes.
- Mr. Just.
- Mr. Cox.
- Sir C. Lucas.
- Sir F. Hopwood.
- Col. Seely.
- Lord Crew.

29/13

In reference to the letter from this Dept. of the 21st of Jan^y & enclosed ^{concerning the} estimates relating to the financial year 1910-11, I am directed by the Earl of Howe to transmit to you to be laid before the ^{Lords} of the Treasury, a copy of a despatch from the Secy of the Cab. ^{relating to certain} increases of pay for certain

From for 15 Feb

8/60

