

that the Secretary of State for India would

have no objection to an arrangement by which the

Government of India would accept the certificate of the

East Africa Protectorate that a certain note had been

surrendered in a damaged condition and that it had been

destroyed and ~~that~~ another note had been issued in

its place, without requiring that payment should be made

for the substituted note. It would be understood that

the numbers of both notes would be reported to India.

3. The Treasury also point out that rules would

be required to make it impossible for payment to be

claimed in respect of two different fragments of the same

note. Mr. Long would be glad to have the Secretary of

State's views as to what rules should be made in the

Protectorates with this object.

I am etc.,

*P. P. Massey*

*for the Under Secretary of State*

EAST AFR. PROT.

14675

REC.  
MAR 25 18

14675

*Swearing*

1918

MILITARY EXPENDITURE  
REPAYMENT OF £107,000

*23rd March*

Last previous Paper.

*Leas  
4271*

Agree £107,000 repaid in January may be treated as cash payment cancelling whole of outstanding debt due by the Prot.

*Copy of 4271, etc., to Mr. to Mr. Compt. LF.*

*G.C. 26.3.18*

*Copy sent out 3 April 18*

Attachment Paper

THE SECRETARY

TREASURY CHAMBERS

533

10679

18

13 March, 1918

C.O.
14675
MAR 18

Sir,

In reply to Sir H. Read's letter of the 14th instant (4271/1918), I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to say that on further reconsideration They agree that the sum of £107,000 repaid by the East Africa Protectorate in January last may be treated as a cash payment cancelling the whole of the outstanding debt due by the Protectorate.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,



The Under Secretary of State,  
Colonial Office.

ON