

10 19

EAST AFR. PROT

29802

Rec'd
29 JUN 15

29802

Governor	439
Belfield	

1915

31st May.

Last previous Paper.

G.A.
1915KILINDINI PIER
WAREHOUSE ACCOMMODATION.

Acting General Manager of Railway sees no objections to Consulting Engineers' proposals which will be adopted accordingly. Is sending separate despatch as to financial arrangements.

To Read.

This mid night. The letter enclosed will account and set out £370.00 for arrangements, general.

7 Feb 6

G.C.B.

79802

done

A.J.R.

29/6/15

See Govt/37146 (Enc)

S.P.D.R.

Last subsequent Paper

1915

in case of law this
case is not dissimilar from
that which formed the
subject of your letter No 635
of the 6th July 1816 and my
precedious reply A 7667
the 17th August 1816 - and
I am of opinion that
Mr. J. F. Hamilton shall
be called upon to ~~negotiate~~
as early as the amount
of the law.

Dr
28th Augst
1816

Original in
THE LAW LIBRARY

for 29801/1915-

~~Enc~~~~post~~

7 July 1915.

DRAFTEnc
to 502

Mr. H. C. Belcher

MINUTE

Mr. Hayes - 3/7/15-

Mr. Anthony 3/7/15

Mr. Appleton 5/7/15

Mr. Read

Mr. G. Fielder

Mr. H. Just

Mr. J. Anderson

Mr. Neal McDonald

Mr. Elmer Lee

Dr.

have the honor
to acknowledge receipt
of your despatch to us
of the 29th, giving
reporting the loss
incurred by the Bo.
Br. camp to entrenchments
by Mr. A. B. Mortimer
dated from 1st August

2. We will greatly
depend upon the
accuracy of your statement

MEMORANDUM

In consideration of the question of the liability of Mr. Hamilton, District Comptroller, Tidore, to repay the sum of Rs. 658/90 misappropriated by his clerk Mr. Martino, Council are of opinion that the defalcation was made possible by Mr. Hamilton's omission to check the details of all revenue receipt books in the possession of the clerk and confining himself to the examination of those only which the clerk presented to him.

It is however considered that the pecuniary responsibility of Mr. Hamilton in this case is established under Clause 220 of the Office Regulations but Council are not unanimous as to the extent to which Mr. Hamilton should be directed to make refund of the amount lost.

The Chief Secretary and Treasury consider that:

Mr. Hamilton should not be required to refund the full amount. His Excellency the Governor is strongly of opinion that there is no reason why the whole of the amount should not be so refunded. It is therefore decided to refer the matter to the Secretary of State with the request that he will instruct whether any variation and if so to what extent should be permitted.

W.V. Retford.

Sd/- R.P. Brown.

May 2nd, 1918.

- 9 -

(b) The rider of the jury, added to the verdict of
Hollings on the trial of Mr. Hartigan by the High
Court in July 1954, that "allowances in office
are compensation to allowances to every one's
'exp'" is a provision which demands consent.
Firstly it leaves the ~~allowances~~ in office, which was however admitted by the Testimony of
Hollings, and secondly imposes allowances on the
part of officers. This I consider was not the
case and that the provision was to allow a ~~testimony~~
only and prevent the ~~allowances~~ in office to
amount for the officer in which ~~allowances~~
were possible, which was clearly put before the
Court by Mr. Hartigan. It is apparent that
such a provision before legislation can would pro-
vide the public service system to a strong basis,
but just cannot be an ~~allowances~~ reason for
allowing allowances to all those ~~allowances~~
~~allowances~~ as well as to myself.

B. Finally another was raised over the issue compensa-
tion, that Mr. Hartigan was responsible, that he was ap-
pointed and confirmed by the High Court, and that Government
had not constituted a system of liability insurance for the
protection of the officers against defamation by their
clients. I respectfully would trust I should not be called
upon to enlighten the government on this of course, so
misappropriated by Mr. Hartigan.

I hope the Senator to be,

Sincerely,

John Hartigan,
John Hartigan
Witness Commissioner.

Mr. Justice

B

363

District Comptroller's Office:

Minneapolis

April 20th 1918.

REP.

REBUTTAL OF RE. 400/32 BY H. A. BURGESS

In reply to your Re. 400/32 dated April 18th, 1918. I have the honor to inform you that the facts of the case are so completely stated in the Auditor's report contained in his Re. 400/32 that I have nothing to add thereto.

2. My plea against being held responsible for the repayment of the sum of Rs. 100,000 is based on the following facts to

- (a) It is distinctly admitted that the auditor has some responsibility in the collection of revenue otherwise officers like myself would be entirely absolved by clerical errors.
- (b) The procedure has only preserved the amount of clerks entrusted with issuing receipts and collecting revenue, but it was also their duty to produce all remittances with the money collected for deposit into the Treasury.
- (c) The inadequacy of the audit upon the cashier's books is my case who are not recall and until the discovery of the defalcations at the time of the audit. Although the same procedure has been followed in this office for many years, it being in existence in November 1908 when I first came to Retired as Ass't. Collector.
- (d) The first disinterested check is to be accounted with those responsibilities you know and be the first to discover a lacuna for non-acceptation by sending his written duly, and to record the non-acceptation of days after his appointment.
- (e) And the possibility of such malfeasance has creased of by any of the treasury officers. Officers who have been appointed or retained for many years past. I have no doubt that the procedure could have been altered to preclude the possibility.

Respectfully yours,

H. A. B.

Principal Comptroller.

K. C.
APR 27 1918

(2) The

(8).-

almost impossible to prevent it being tampered with.
I am also of the opinion that more instructions are necessary for guidance of administrative officers to report early of cash, checking their accounts and depositing financial surplus to their principals in case of necessity.

I have the honour to be,

R.W.

Your very obedient servant,

L. D. G.

For Justice.

(F).

appears to be unavoidable, in order that officers may carry out their administrative work. The practice is not mentioned by the Regulations, probably because it would tend to relieve officers of the responsibilities laid upon them by Colonial Office Regulation 200. There should be no objection to the practice provided that a regular and sufficient check of the accounts is maintained by the officer responsible.

3. I am informed that Mr. Bullock's accounts were checked by the Standard Accountant or Assistant District Comptroller on a weekly basis at the time of signing the cheques for payment to the officers to the Treasury. The system of check however appears to have been insufficient as it took as many as six months before full books were checked as Mr. Bullock professed to have used for the collection of revenue since the last date appearing in, and presented for inspection, during the period of service of the same commissioners. During his appointment, about six weeks of Bullock's books was made. It was undoubtedly owing to this omission that the funds of which were not received before.

4. I venture to add to this report a suggestion that the administrator should be prohibited or restricted from making any officer to pay him. In stations at which only one officer is posted, during his absence or absent the Service must be provided by the Doctor. I believe that he would be liable to be sued in any case to recover amounts of it, and

ADMIRALTY OFFICES.

Bahrain

17 November 1914.



Mr. A. R. Hartiner 1st District Clerk, Bahrain.

C. 7000.

Sir,

In reply to your note dated the 10th of November 1914 I have the honour to submit the following report.

2. Mr. Hartiner as District Clerk was by departmental arrangement entrusted by the Distress Commissioner with the duties of receiving and accounting for certain Revenue, including Fees for Assimilating Permits, Gas Tax, stamping Revenue, Dues Licences, and Native Poll Tax, which fees are accounted for by means of counterfoil receipt books.

3. The District Commissioner Bahrain is a Collector of Revenue and has a subdepartment. Upon audit of his accounts it was found that certain amounts of this revenue, the period of receipt of which ended from the 1st of April to the 31st of May 1914, had not been paid into the Treasury, and that the sum in the safe to meet the amount not paid in was short by Rs. 622/00. Other revenue however collected by Mr. Hartiner for the same period had however been fully paid in.

4. The returning of these offices to the Distress Clerk is in accordance with the general practice and

RECORDED PROVISIONALLY.

Bahrain.

3. The sum involved in Mr. Mortimer's defalcations was Rs. 653.50, but there were no means of recovering the amount from him.

4. The question of the District Commissioner's liability in the matter was discussed in Executive Council on 6th November, when it was decided to call for a report from the Auditor as to the circumstances under which the monies came into Mr. Mortimer's possession and whether such arrangements were in order.

5. On receipt of the Auditor's report, a copy of which I enclose, marked "A" it was decided in Council on 26th November that the District Commissioner (Mr. F. G. Hamilton) should be called upon, on his return from leave, to show cause why he should not be held responsible for the payment of the losses incurred.

6. On Mr. Hamilton's return from leave a copy of enclosure "A" was sent to him, together with a copy of Council's decision referred to in the preceding paragraph.

7. Mr. Hamilton's reply, a copy of which, marked "B" is enclosed, was discussed in Council on 1st instant, at which in addition to myself only the Chief Secretary and the Treasurer were present. I now attach a copy of the Council minute on the subject and await your instructions as to the extent to which you desire Mr. Hamilton to be held pecuniarily responsible for the amount embezzled by Mr. Mortimer.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,
Your humble obedient servant,

H. Lawrence,
GOVERNOR.

3. The sum involved in Mr. Mortimer's defalcations was Rs. 655.50, but there were no means of recovering the amount from him.

4. The question of the District Commissioner's liability in the matter was discussed in Executive Council on 6th December when it was decided to call for a report from the Auditor as to the circumstances under which the money came into Mr. Mortimer's possession and whether such arrangements were in order.

5. On receipt of the Auditor's report, a copy of which is enclosed, marked "A" it was decided in Council on 20th December that the District Commissioner (Mr. F. J. Hamilton) should be called upon, on his return from leave, to show cause why he should not be held responsible for the payment of the losses incurred.

6. On Mr. Hamilton's return from leave a copy of enclosure "A" was sent to him, together with a copy of Council's decision referred to in the preceding paragraph.

7. Mr. Hamilton's reply, a copy of which is marked "B" (enclosed), was discussed in Council on 21st instant, at which in addition to myself only the Chief Secretary and the Treasurer were present. I enclose a copy of the Council minute on the subject and await your instructions as to the extent to which you desire Mr. Hamilton to be held personally responsible for the losses suffered by Mr. Mortimer.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your humble obedient servant,

H. G. Way
H. G. Way
GOMER.

29801

353

GOVERNMENT OF UGANDA

BAKERS,

BAGGAGE EAST AFRICA.

SOUTH AFRICA PROUD STATE

LONDON

May 29th 1915.

Sir,

*X 1
5-406*

I have the honour to refer to my despatch No. 223 of 9th March 1914, and your reply thereto No. 329 of 9th April 1914, on the subject of the appointment of Mr. A. B. Hartiner to the post of District Clerk in the office of the District Commissioner, Nairobi.

2. Mr. Hartiner was appointed as from 2nd March 1914, and, owing to certain irregularities which were brought to light in the accounts of which he had charge, was interdicted from duty as from the 26th May with half salary. Subsequently he was tried and sentenced to 12 months rigorous imprisonment for an offence under Section 409 of the Indian Penal Code. I regret to find that this case has not been reported to you.

S. W.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

ADMIRAL HOBART LAY, P.C., K.C.B.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET,
LONDON, S.W.