

EAST AFR. PROT

C O
19016

Recd
Reg. 22 APR 16

19016

MILITARY EXPENDITURE IN THE EAST AFRICAN PROTECTORATE OF WAR
IRRREGULARITIES IN EARLY MONTHS OF WAR

Thinks in circumstances report to Treasury should go from C.O. Encloses memo in endeavour to clear the situation. Asks if it is not so in. Asks for any general rules as to Treasury sanction for losses or irregularities in Colonial Accounts.

1916

20th A prft

Last previous Paper.

W/O 18969

Mr. Stephenson

I shall be glad to hear from you on the Crook's memo. It seems to me that the only rule to lay down is that where one of these losses or irregularities comes a service should be regarded as a "common charge" it should be dealt with as a common matter even though, at the time, the action was taken as a purely Prot. affair, but that where it relates to what is purely a Protectorate service (as in most of the items, which were before there could have been a C.C. Affc) the W.O. is not concerned.

To Mr Crookland 4 May '16

Next subsequent Paper.

W/O 2486

in charge of the E. A. Pay Comdr. (copy)
do not think it is out of the question
that the G. O.'s papers should extend
to those A/Cs. It would save much
elaboration, but my draft is non-
committal on that point - no doubt the
question will be clearer when we see the
reports which G.O. have received.

243

As to common charges, Mr. Stebbins
has ^{been} directed with the inclusion of
report - I had in mind rather the
incidence of loss. If the accounts for a
service have been merged retroactively
in the C. C. A/C (as is being done for
Ordnance stores & clothing for our own
forces) it is only reasonable that
the expenditures, as well as the reports
should be merged.

W. C. S. 3/5/16

done

H. J. S.

3/5/16

0165/7513. (F.1.)



349

Office,
Whitehall,

S.W.

20 April, 1916.

Dear Bottomley,

Re Colonial Office letter ^{22.11} 50260 of 3rd November 1915, enclosing a report from the Governor of the East Africa Protectorate as to irregularities in the early months of the war.

We have now received from the General Officer Commanding much fuller information in the shape of a series of enlightening reports from Major Patterson, Chief Paymaster of the East African Pay Corps. These require to be further considered in this Office before being sent to you, and I should like to come to some understanding on the question of procedure, especially as regards submission to the Treasury of any losses that may have to go to them.

The irregularities specially concern various military Protectorate Departments, etc., prior to their amalgamation with the corresponding Departments, etc., of the Indian Force, and I think that the report to the Treasury should

should go from the Colonial Office.

350

I enclose a copy of a memorandum I have written in the endeavour to clear the situation. (It has not yet been submitted for official approval here). Do you agree?

I suppose you have some general rules laying down beyond what is required by Treasury sanction for losses or irregularities. Are they set forth in any pamphlet and you could kindly send me a copy?

Yours sincerely

...in the peculiar circumstances it does not appear that either report could be dispensed with. In the case of losses of cash relating to charges made by the Chief Paymaster of the East Africa Pay Corps the official report would be that made by the Governor. The circumstances might or might not call for a report also from the General Officer Commanding to the War Office.

(As regard to writing off losses the General Officer Commanding has been given powers of a Commander in Chief of an Expeditionary Force as laid down in Army Order 22 of 1918 - see War Office letter 6162/1918 (accounts 1.A) of 6th January 1918; but this authority would apparently not be taken to cover losses of cash in connection with the East Africa Pay Corps Accounts. The write-off of such losses would generally be governed as regards report to Colonial Office or Treasury, by any lists laid down for the Colonial authorities.)

(Sd) J.B. Crookland

F.I. War Office.
18th April 1916.

in the peculiar circumstances it does not appear that either report could be dispensed with. At least of each relating to charges made by the Chief Paymaster of the East Africa Force. The essential report would be that made by the Governor. The circumstances might or might not call for a report also from the General Officer Commanding in the War Office.

(As regard to writing off losses the General Officer Commanding has been given powers of a Commander in Chief of an Expeditionary Force as laid down in Army Order 22 of 1912 & see War Office letter 6165/4212 (Accounts 1.A) of 24 January 1916; but this authority must apparently not be taken to cover losses of cash in connection with the East Africa Force Accounts. The write-off of these losses would probably be governed as regards report to Colonial Office or Treasury, by any limits laid down for the Colonial authorities.)

(Sd) J.R. Crookall

J.L. War Office,
18th April 1916.

66 & 1847



352

4 May 1846

Copy in duplicate

DRAFT

J. B. Croland Esq.

*sent 3/16
for Rev 3*

Inclosure

Dear General,

I am sorry that I have not been able to answer before this some letters of the 5/7 5/12 (71) of 20 April about the irregularity of the [unclear] in East Africa.

We had regarded the matter as being only a protection matter and in confiding with you as I should be, then as much as to have you advise as to obtain your views on any case in which you are concerned. As also, if it was necessary that you should have that advice had been [unclear] to [unclear]