

1930.

Kenya.

No. 16259.

SUBJECT

CO 533/401

Department of Agriculture

Report 1929.

Previous

15764/29.

Subsequent

17322/31.

H.M.M. Moore for Gov. 486. .... 10th. July 30.

DESTROYED UNDER STATUTE

Two 3 typewritten copies of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year, 1929 - printed copies will follow.

Dep. copy in XEA

Mr Eastwood

? action as on 15th/29 copy to Trade office M.F. receive

- (1) Mr. Gregory & Stockdale
- (2) to Dept

W. Needham  
28/7/30

G. Eastwood  
29.7.30  
Donee

2. To E.A.T. + I.O. (w/c Report) 14/2A  
incl in 1) 29 JUL 1930

Mr Stockdale

You will wish to look at this in 15th  
can print copies sent since before you  
said?

G. Gregory  
29.7.30

I have read the Report, but not the appendices  
I should like a copy of the Report as soon as  
it is printed, as I should like to have it  
with me when in Kenya. If it is not  
available before <sup>1st</sup> Sept. 30, perhaps one could  
be posted out to East Africa to catch me

He will have got  
copy on board  
G

D. A. Stockdale  
21/7/30

See  
Gregory

I do not attempt to read this now  
as work is very heavy at present.

Await the printed reports  
Barnard's comments - letter of  
in a month.

J. H. Allen

1/19/30

at once

M. C. Casperson

for use as Mr. Allen's minutes  
at home for

W. H. Adams

16930

For app. review when the

printed copies of the Report &

in your comments may be

expected

J. H. Allen

2019 at once

To G. S. 202 - Sent Cms - 25/9/30

DESTROYED UNDER STATUTE

A 12 printed copies of Annual Report on  
Agricultural Dept for year 1929 received under  
order of 3pm for 9 Oct Dec, dated 23<sup>rd</sup> October 1930

1 copy below H  
Spent to library

Mr. Tinkler

This monstrous publication of 650 pages has no table of contents.

You said you would have a brief table which have prepared inserted in each copy. Perhaps when this has been done you would distribute as follows:-

- Mr Parkinson
- Mr Allen
- Mr Cressy
- Mr Rankin
- myself
- the file.

} 1 copy each.

~~Mr. Tinkler~~

I return the file to me.

*J. G. Rankin*

18 Dec. 30.

The table of contents has been inserted and copies of the report distributed as above  
mg.  
18/11

5 After hour 722 \_\_\_\_\_ 17 November  
Submits comments on report of Agricultural Dept. for year 1929.

I spent three gloomy hours <sup>reading</sup> this portentous publication, ~~and~~ must apologise for not having sent it on before.

It contains no table of contents so that

it

*J. G. Rankin*  
London.  
18/11

it is quite impossible to find one's way about. I attach opposite a short table.

There is a good deal of repetition in the report, since the Director's own report (pages 1-90) summarises the various appendices. It is to be hoped that with the division of the Agricultural Department into two divisions which has taken place as from the beginning of this year, the report may be produced in a more handy form and with less repetition. One may, in fact, hope for separate reports, one dealing with the division of plant industry and the other with the veterinary division. I hardly think that some of the appendices of this report are worthy of printing, e.g., those of the Agricultural officers in the various districts, European and native, pages 569 to the end. They are certainly far less interesting than the provincial reports of the ~~native~~ Administration which are not thought worthy of print. I think that we might write s.o. to Mr. Moore on the lines of the above paragraph.

Turning to ~~the~~ specific points in the

Page 36. Note the increase in quantities of milk butter etc.

Page 40. Indian Agriculture. Considerable expansion seems to have taken place among the Indians farming in the Kibos-Mwani area.

Page 41. Native Agriculture.

Page 44. Note the number of pupils from both the Scott and Bukura Schools who return to work at their homes instead of in definite employment. I am not quite sure whether this should be regarded as a good or a bad thing.

*A. Dutse last page 1  
224 3000*  
*X. I don't think we should  
look at the various  
in stock etc.*

*See p. 44. The table  
is not clear.*

Page 49. A table of native agricultural exports.

Pages 50 to 90. The Director summarises the appendices.

Pages 97 to 173. There are various interesting points about the Chief Veterinary Officer's report:—

Page 98. See the remarks as to ~~quarantines~~ <sup>squatters</sup>.

*write in the  
margin already*

Page 115. A long account of the first recorded outbreak of rabies.

Page 129 to 149. As to native cattle and native training centres. I have already commented on these on a separate paper, as to veterinary development in native reserves, which is now going forward.

*Copy placed  
in P.F. 32283  
I think this might  
be notes in  
the off. 1/1/31*

Page 153. Note ~~to~~ the commendation of Stock Inspector Murray who bought at his own expense a cinema camera for demonstration purposes. A copy of this paragraph might be ~~put~~ <sup>registered</sup> on his file which should then be seen in Proms. Branch.

Page 154. Note that the ~~Mandi~~ have offered land for the erection of a native training centre, but owing to the scarcity of Government money it will only be possible to develop it slowly.

Page 169 to 171. Game as spreaders of disease.

Page 452 to 455. The activities of the predatory ladybirds. I have noted on the papers regarding the purchase of the insectaries.

*X. As to the  
acknowledgment  
of the commendations  
see the table  
in the book  
for 1930*

I hardly think the despatch requires official acknowledgment <sup>or</sup> <sup>Do any</sup> commendations <sup>are</sup> called for.

Mr. Greasy and Mr. Montgomery to see and subject to any observations which they may have, action might be confined to the s.o. letter suggested above.

*Eastwood  
3.2.31*

*J. V. M. 9/1/31*

*See the entry in the Standard some time back*

Suggested to him that he might try to get a  
new convenient format adopted for this  
Report. I imagine that he will recommend  
that the reports of all the specialists  
therein should be in the same format.

G. Creary

16.2.31.

I join in the hope that the Report  
of the Agricultural Department may in future  
be published in sections, convenient for  
exchange with those interested in specific  
subjects.

There are 320 pages of most valuable  
veterinary data, which, in its present form,  
is liable to be overlooked or not to reach  
the people it should.

The paragraphs on game as spreaders  
of disease (page 169) might be referred to  
the Game Sub-Committee of the Tsetse Fly  
Committee of the Economic Advisory Council.

It is incorrect to refer, as on page 115,  
to a case of Rabies as being the first to be  
recorded in Kenya. The Annual Reports for  
1912-13, page 37, and 1913-14, page 142,  
both contain references to a disease which  
is as indistinguishable from Rabies as that  
under reference. Considerable work was  
carried out at that time to verify this  
diagnosis.

E. Montagu

16.2.31.

5  
? ask receipt. say that the  
report has been read with  
interest & express concurrence  
in cases para. yellow fever -  
such as to no monkey  
(p. 183).-

? send copy of report to  
E.A.C. inviting attention of  
Tsetse Fly Com. to pp. 109-121 -  
copy of the letter to go in the  
relevant E.A.C. file.

? The print at X should  
be called up soon by Mr  
Montgomery with the C.V.O.  
O. E. Stevenson  
21.2.31

So proceed. in the report  
to include a list of cases (if any) saying  
anything would have been the report the  
most being discussed. There is  
separate reference for the Veterinary Section.

Feb. 23. 1931  
all

Has been Registration at Y. per 4<sup>th</sup> 31  
Review (a) to no Montgomery - to X  
(b) to establish a return  
format

Glendon  
23.2.31.

K. J. E. A. L. (A/c Repub) 27 FEB 1961

No. Gov. 148-5. Howard - 27 FEB 1951

S.O. to Binney Co cards - 4/3/51

9 K.A.C. \_\_\_\_\_ 2<sup>nd</sup> March

acknowledge no. 6, with thanks.

In Whitcombe

Put by

Thorn

10/3/51

P.F. Whitehouse

10/3/51

at once

In Stockdale

Please see minute of 23/2/51,

Thorn

12/5/51

I took the opportunity of discussing this question of the division of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for Kenya with Mr. Holm, the Director of Agriculture, yesterday.

I had previously discussed it with him in Kenya and he was then quite opposed to the suggestion. He defended his objection by reference to the policy in several of the Dominions.

Yesterday he informed me that the question had been discussed by him with the senior officers of his Department and, especially, with the Senior Veterinary Research Officer

and

and with the Government Printer. He says that the Government Printer estimates that it would be more costly to produce separate volumes, as the costs of binding two or three volumes separately would put up the total costs of publication. Against this I urged that he would be able to economize in the numbers issued, as the numbers of the separates could be reduced if separate divisions were issued separately to institutions only interested in sectional work. He further says that senior officers of his Department are opposed to the division as they feel that both farmers in Kenya and workers in other countries have become used to a composite report, and appreciate its issue as such. They urge that there would be considerable confusion in libraries if a division took place. Personally, I do not think this objection a serious one and believe that both farmers and libraries would soon become used to the issue of separate volumes.

With some reluctance Mr. Holm stated that another objection he had was that division would tend to revive in Kenya the desire in certain quarters to have separate Veterinary and Agricultural Departments. He holds very strong views on this question and maintains that Kenya would not be as well served under such a separation of Departments as it is under the combination which the recent Commission on Agriculture in Kenya strongly endorsed. Mixed farming is being encouraged as far as possible in Kenya, and there must be a definite policy in regard to it if progress is to be made. The definition of such a policy is the duty of the Agricultural Department and it would be rendered difficult if two Departments were concerned. Live stock industries, such as

dairying with co-operative creameries, were making progress, poultry keeping was extending, the production of hams and bacon and of meat was also progressing. These live stock industries have been developed in other countries by Agricultural Departments and could not be transferred over to a Veterinary Department, whose officers had no training in such subjects as dairying, co-operation, animal feeding, etc. The maize farmers of Kenya are beginning to realize that a possible outlet for their produce is through the animal, and, as in this country, it may be found to be more profitable to realize their cereal crops in the form of animal production than as grain.

There is a good deal in this contention and, as far as European agriculture is concerned in Kenya, live stock and <sup>cereal</sup> crops must be inseparably interwoven, and there is little doubt that the Government, putting personalities entirely on one side, would be better served by having to turn to one Department for advice than to two. Whether the position is quite so favourable in regard to native stock interests is doubtful, but there again the difficulties at present largely revolve around personalities than anything else. Veterinary officers are probably the best fitted people - on account of their contact with natives owning cattle over disease control - to effect improvements in stock owned by natives, but they should be guided in all husbandry questions by advice from live stock officers who have specialized in animal husbandry.

Such a live stock

officer

7

officer has been secured by the Department of Agriculture for European stock interests and he has specialized, whilst in Kenya, on improvements in the production of dairy produce and in bacon production. He knows both pig rearing for bacon production and all matters connected with dairying as one who has had personal training and experience in these industries should. His experience could be of use to the Veterinary officers interested in the production of ghee and butter from the Reserves, but, here again, the personal equation enters into the matter, and it is understood, whilst in Kenya, that there were difficulties. It is not for me to analyse the reasons for these difficulties, but there is little doubt that they have arisen from the Veterinary officers' feeling that their experience of Kenya and native stock owners is of greater value than any experience gained by the Live Stock Officer in Great Britain and from the difficult manner of the Live Stock Officer under certain conditions. Despite these difficulties - mainly due to personalities - I must confess that, if asked to give an unbiased judgment of Kenya conditions, I do feel that the best service to agricultural and live stock interests will be through a combined Department. This presupposes that the head of that Department will show no bias either to the Plant Industry or to the Animal Industry side of the Department, and that he will give either side a fair and equal chance of development. Whether this has happened in the past I am not to say. I have the feeling that proposals from the Veterinary side, as representing animal interests particularly in regard to the Reserves, have perhaps not been placed before Government with the



same force as have plant industry proposals, but Mr. Holm has always taken the view that every proposal must be able to bear the severest criticism from the economic point of view, and there is a doubt if some of the proposals put up by the Chief Veterinary Officer would bear critical scrutiny from this aspect. The Chief Veterinary Officer gave me a full account of his feelings over proposals that he has put forward which have not been forwarded to Government, and he stated that he had always worked as a loyal officer of the combined Department, but he did feel that sometimes his proposals had been hardly handled, and that they would not have been so handled if he had had direct access to the Government. If, therefore, it is not desired to raise the issue of the separation of the Agricultural and Veterinary departments again, some weight should be given to Mr. Holm's contention that a division of the report at the present juncture is undesirable. I, nevertheless, pointed out to him that, when the division of his Department into two main branches is complete, it might be desirable for the report to be divided into three parts - the first to contain the general report of the Director, divided into two sections covering in Section 1 a review of the position of the agricultural and live stock industries of the Colony and in Section 2 a review of the main work of the Department of Agriculture (this is the form which is now adopted in Mauritius, Ceylon and Malaya), and supported by two appendices printed

8

printed as separate volumes (i) containing the details of the work done for plant industry, and (ii) the details of work done for animal industry. Mr. Holm agreed that such a division would be possible, but he felt that it might be advisable to limit Appendix II to a record of work on Veterinary Research. I doubt if such a limitation should be desirable and suggestions on the lines indicated above might be put to Kenya for their consideration and the proposal made that economies might be effected by seeing that the distribution of the Appendices is limited to such individuals, organisations, institutions, and departments as will be directly interested in the work therein described.

I mentioned the point of an index to Mr. Holm and he said that this could be attended to. If the report is, however, eventually divided into three volumes the necessity for an index will not be so urgent. I also mentioned the point raised in previous minutes about the reports of Assistant Agricultural Officers, and I understood that these reports have been asked for by Provincial Administrative Officers. Their inclusion in the report is useful to such officers and it enables the Director of Agriculture to defend expenditure on native agriculture in the Legislature when estimates are being considered. The local circumstances are possibly therefore such that the printing of some of these reports is desirable.

F. A. Stoddale

9.6.31.

Seen by Mr. Hartigan

10.6.31

R.T.O

same force as have plant industry proposals, but Mr. Holm has always taken the view that every proposal must be able to bear the severest criticism from the economic point of view, and there is a doubt if some of the proposals put up by the Chief Veterinary Officer would bear critical scrutiny from this aspect. The Chief Veterinary Officer gave me a full account of his feelings over proposals that he has put forward which have not been forwarded to Government, and he stated that he had always worked as a loyal officer of the combined department, but he did feel that sometimes his proposals had been hardly handled, and that they would not have been so handled if he had had direct access to the Government. If, therefore, it is not desired to raise the issue of the separation of the Agricultural and Veterinary departments again, some weight should be given to Mr. Holm's contention that a division of the report at the present juncture is undesirable. I, nevertheless, pointed out to him that, when the division of his department into two main branches is complete, it might be desirable for the report to be divided into three parts - the first to contain the general report of the Director, divided into two sections covering in Section 1 a review of the position of the agricultural and live stock industries of the Colony and in Section 2 a review of the main work of the Department of Agriculture (this is the form which is now adopted in Mauritius, Ceylon and Malaya), and supported by two appendices printed

8

printed as separate volumes (i) containing the details of the work done for plant industry, and (ii) the details of work done for animal industry. Mr. Holm agreed that such a division would be possible, but he felt that it might be advisable to limit Appendix II to a record of work on Veterinary Research. I doubt if such a limitation should be desirable and suggestions on the lines indicated above might be put to Kenya for their consideration and the proposal made that economies might be effected by seeing that the distribution of the Appendices is limited to such individuals, organisations, institutions, and departments as will be directly interested in the work therein described.

A

B

I mentioned the point of an index to Mr. Holm and he said that this could be attended to. If the report is, however, eventually divided into three volumes the necessity for an index will not be so urgent. I also mentioned the point raised in previous minutes about the reports of Assistant Agricultural Officers, and I understood that these reports have been asked for by Provincial Administrative Officers. Their inclusion in the report is useful to such officers and it enables the Director of Agriculture to defend expenditure on native agriculture in the Legislature when estimates are being considered. The local circumstances are possibly therefore such that the printing of some of these reports is desirable.

J. A. Stokdale

9.6.31.

Seen by Mr. Nuthgans

9.6.31

R.D.O.

X 22 -  
Review to Mr. Montgomery  
on 25 June: he will no  
doubt wish to write also.

all P  
11.6.31

Mr. Montgomery

Please see Mr. Nicholson's

note of 11/6/31 above.

Thom  
24/6/31

I agree with Mr. Stockdale's  
proposal in this minute of June 9th,  
and believe it would not only be more  
economical to produce, but that the separate  
minutes were likely to reach those  
who should benefit. The enclosure to the  
Director's Despatch of 20th July, 1929, shows  
that official and quasi-official recipients  
and the sections. This desire is much more  
marked in the case of factories and individuals.

It is clear that if the Departmental  
work in regard to these to expand, some  
separate minutes will become essential, and  
the above grouping will be -

Detailed work bearing on the Animal  
Industry;

Detailed work on the Plant industry;

General Departmental activity, and pro-  
gress with a non-technical summary of  
the work done.

1

I would suggest, however, that publication  
of detailed scientific or technical work is more  
appropriately made in the suitable scientific  
journals than in an Annual Departmental Report, at  
any rate until such time as the issuing Research  
Institute can carry its own publication.

b. vi. 3. Emmerson

we had better have a draft  
referred for comment on the  
lines of A & B in the  
Stockdale's minute & C  
Mr. Montgomery's minute.  
The point at D in the  
Montgomery's minute  
will also have to be  
brought in.

all P

9.7.31

atone 11/7/31

10 v. Cow 504. 5 Fisher Award - bono - 18 JUL 1931

AW

10.10

G. O.

- Mr. E. Wood 11/7
- Mr. C. G. 13/7/31.
- Mr. Stockdale 13.7.31.
- Mr. Montgomery 13.7.31.
- Mr. Parkinson 13.7.31.
- Mr. Tomkinson

- Sir C. Bottomley.
- Sir J. Shackburgh.
- Sir G. Grindle.
- Permt. U.S. of S.
- Parly. U.S. of S.
- Secretary of State.

C. D.  
 R 15 JUL  
 D 17..

*sent out on 14/322/31*

For consen.

**DRAFT.**

KENYA

NO. 504

DOWNING STREET

18 July, 1931.

Sir,

GOVERNOR.

With reference to

(2)

Mr. Moore's despatch No. 722 of the 17th November, 1930, in which he submitted his comments on the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for 1929, I have the honour to inform you that I have had under consideration, in conjunction with my advisers, the form which this Report should take in future years. The question has also been discussed with Mr. Helm.

2. In its present form the Report is somewhat unwieldy, and it has been suggested that its use would be greater if it were divided into separate parts, which could be distributed to persons and bodies only interested in a particular aspect of the activities of the Department.

The form which it has been suggested ~~that~~

should reports should take is as

follows:-

(i) A volume containing the general reports of the Director, divided into two sections as follows:-

(a) a review of the composition of the agricultural and livestock industries of the Colony, and  
(b) a review of the work of the Department. ~~As suggested~~

(ii) A second volume containing details of the work done for plant industry.

(iii) A third volume containing

details of the work done for animal

11  
animal industry.

3. I am advised that publication of detailed scientific or technical work is more appropriately made in suitable scientific journals than in an annual departmental report, at any rate, until such time as the station at which the research is carried out publishes its own periodical.

4. It has also been suggested that it would be useful if future Reports could contain a table of contents as well as an index.

5. I feel that not only would the publication of ~~future~~ Reports in the form suggested above be more convenient, but that it would lead to economy in that it would not be necessary to send all three volumes to all those who at present receive the complete Report; and <sup>1 should be paid</sup> if you would consider whether the suggestions

made

T  
made in this despatch might not be  
adopted in the Report for 1931  
and subsequent years.

I have etc.

(Signed) PASSFIELD.

16259/30

12  
9

Any further communication on this subject should be addressed to :-

THE SECRETARY,  
ECONOMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL,  
2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, S.W.1,  
and the following number quoted.

E.A.C./ 289/30

ECONOMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL,

2, WHITEHALL GARDENS,

LONDON, S.W.1.

RECEIVED  
4 MAR 1931  
CO

2nd March 1931.

Sir,

no 6

I am directed by the Economic Advisory Council to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo, 16259/30, transmitting for the information of the Tsetse Fly Committee a copy of the Report of the Department of Agriculture of Kenya for the year 1929, with special reference to pages 169-171, dealing with the question of game as spreaders of disease.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

*A.F. Hemming*

The Under Secretary of State,  
Colonial Office, S.W.1.



8/13

2, Richmond Terrace,  
London, S.W.1.

4th March, 1931.

Dear Bransley Edwards.

With reference to your paragraphs on Rabies, commencing from 115, in the Annual Report for 1929, it is erroneous to say that the brain from the Northern Frontier Province examined in June, 1929, represents the first confirmed case of Rabies.

Pages 37 of the Annual Report for 1913-1913 and 142 of that for 1913-1914 mention the occurrence at that period. I was at Kabets myself when the first case, in Johnston's dog, arrived, some three weeks after his fight with a jackal. The strain was passed to the usual laboratory animals, as well as to domestic species, and was maintained in rabbits for more than a year, being relinquished only when all danger of an "outbreak" seemed to have passed.

Rabies bodies were demonstrated throughout, and were also found in two or three other strains originating during this period (I recollect that one of these was a jackal shot on the Government Farm). The records of

H. N. Bransley Edwards, Esq., M.R.C.V.S.

8113

2, Richmond Terrace,  
London, S.W.1.

4th March, 1931.

Dear Brassey Edwards,

With reference to your paragraphs on Rabies, commencing from 115, in the Annual Report for 1929, it is erroneous to say that the brain from the Northern Frontier Province examined in June, 1929, represents the first confirmed case of Rabies.

Pages 37 of the Annual Report for 1912-1913 and 142 of that for 1913-1914 mention the occurrence at that period. I was at Kabete myself when the first case, in Johnston's dog, arrived, some three weeks after his fight with a jackal. The strain was passed to the usual laboratory animals, as well as to domestic species, and was maintained in rabbits for more than a year, being relinquished only when all danger of an "outbreak" seemed to have passed.

Bogrip bodies were demonstrated throughout, and were also found in two or three other strains originating during this period (I recollect that one of these was a jackal shot on the Government Farm). The records of

H. E. Brassey Edwards, Esq., M.R.C.V.S.

these "specimens" and of the experiments should still be at the Laboratory.

Johnston's "boy" was bitten by Case No. I, and Brandt working with the medicals, watched him and some other natives who had been bitten by suspected animals; and the Akikaya spoke of the new "fierce" species of jackal that had arisen. So far as we could ascertain, no human being contracted hydrophobia at that time. About that same period the French in West Africa had a controversy about the danger to man of a form of canine rabies prevalent there.

Failure to infect man is the only element of doubt in a diagnosis otherwise certain on clinical, histological, and experimental grounds.

Indeed, your present record is also, fortunately, incomplete in this respect.

Yours sincerely,

  
(Signed) EUSTACE MONTGOMERY

G. O.

15239/30/Kenya

15  
G. O.  
26 FEB  
D

DOWNING STREET,

February 1931.

S 84

Mr. *Eastwood*  
Mr. *Allen*  
Mr.  
Mr. Tomlinson.  
Sir C. Bottomley.  
Sir J. Shuckburgh.  
Sir G. Grindle.  
Parlt. U.S. of S.  
Parly. U.S. of S.  
Secretary of State.

DRAFT 8

KENYA

(5)

NO. 148

Govr.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Moore's despatch No. 722 of the 17th November <sup>1930</sup> in which he submitted his comments on the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for 1929, copies of which ~~have~~ <sup>had</sup> already been received under separate cover.

2. I have read the Report with interest, and concur in Mr. Moore's opinion that the Director and members of his staff are to be congratulated on the record of <sup>achievement</sup> ~~efficiency~~ on both the scientific and administrative sides.

3. I have been pleased to <sup>and I fully concur</sup> agree with ~~note~~ the commendation of the work in page 15 of the Report.

*Copy to Govt. Secy.*

*In this action*

*with a hot show*  
entirely & ~~initially~~

of Mr. G. L. Murray, Stock

Inspector, in giving demonstra-  
tions with a cinema camera *(purchased at his own expense)*  
of *and better* ~~the~~ *demonstrations* of  
better types of stock ~~and~~

methods of animal husbandry, etc.

I have,

etc.

(Signed) RASFIELD.

Page

1. Report of Director of Agriculture

Appendices:-

90-97

A & B Staff etc

97

C. Report of Chief Veterinary Officer

74

D. Report of Chief Veterinary Research Officer

417

E. Report of Agricultural Chemist

432

F. Entomologist

464

G. Mycologist

486

H. Plant Breeder

506

I. Senior Coffee Officer

525

J. Livestock Officer

529

K. Grader & Inspector

576

L. Locust Invasion

539 - 584

M & N

districts of Nakuru

& Eldoret

Agricultural Laboratories

16259/30

175



GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
NAIROBI,  
KENYA

KENYA.

No. 722

RECEIVED  
-9 DEC 1930  
COL. OFFICE

17<sup>H</sup> November, 1930.

My Lord,

No. 3

I have the honour to refer to Your Lordship's despatch No. 747 of the 25th September, 1930 on the subject of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1929. Twelve copies of the Report have already been transmitted under cover of third personal note dated the 22nd October.

2. The crops of 1929, both in settled areas and in native reserves, attained a record volume of production. The heavy fall in prices of primary products, which has occurred in 1930, was not to be anticipated in the preceding year and expectations that farmers would reap the benefit of a good year after two adverse seasons affected by drought and locusts have not been realised. The exigencies of the recent situation which have to some extent been met by emergency measures of a temporary character, of which Your Lordship is aware, was wholly unforeseen by the agricultural industry during the period under review.

Answered 27 FEB 1931  
18 JUL 1931  
Luther

The position as it stood in October, 1929 was analysed by the Agricultural Commission, whose Report has been fully dealt with in separate correspondence.

3. The following are the figures of actual production of the main crops in settled areas, where the total area under cultivation at the 31st July, 1929 was 635,590 acres :-

-----  
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD PASSFIELD, P.C.,  
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,  
DOWNING STREET,  
LONDON, S.W.1.

- 2 -

	<u>Production in 1928 - 1929.</u>	<u>Production in 1927 - 1928.</u>
Maize	1,099,317 bags.	1,088,706 bags.
Wheat	228,141 "	173,958 "
Coffee	145,880 cwt.	246,292 cwt.
Sisal	316,180 "	290,190 "

The total value of agricultural exports in 1929 was £2,372,976, a decrease of £364,272 as compared with the previous year. Exports of the main crops were :-

	<u>1929.</u>	<u>1928.</u>
Maize	£ 305,892	£ 306,078
Maize meal	£ 20,768	£ 48,690
Wheat.	£ 38,281	£ 75,195
Wheat flour.	£ 31,996	£ 17,549
Coffee.	£ 703,158	£1,119,894
Sisal	£ 553,572	£ 459,959

The estimated values of agricultural exports of native origin (£500,740 in 1929) are detailed on page 49 of the Report. Export of maize was restricted early in 1929 on account of famine conditions, and the lateness of the 1929 season further affected the tonnage of exports.

4. In regard to the livestock industry, the Agricultural Commission noted with satisfaction that the serious drop in the number of breeding cattle in 1926 had been checked and that there was some progress in cattle breeding and dairying. It is interesting to note that the animal products sold by Europeans in the year 1928 - 1929 showed a remarkable increase as compared with the previous year. This increase is due largely to the better organisation of the dairy industry on a co-operative basis and to better rainfall. Butter to the value of £15,126 was exported in 1929, as compared with £4,917 in 1928.



- 2 -

	<u>Production in 1928 - 1928.</u>	<u>Production in 1927 - 1928.</u>
Maize	1,099,317 bags.	1,088,706 bags.
Wheat	228,141 "	173,958 "
Coffee	145,880 cwt.	246,292 cwt.
Sisal	316,180 "	290,190 "

The total value of agricultural exports in 1929 was £2,372,976, a decrease of £364,272 as compared with the previous year. Exports of the main crops were :-

	<u>1929.</u>	<u>1928.</u>
Maize	£ 305,892	£ 306,078
Maize meal	£ 20,768	£ 48,690
Wheat.	£ 38,281	£ 75,195
Wheat flour.	£ 31,996	£ 17,549
Coffee.	£ 703,158	£1,119,894
Sisal	£ 553,572	£ 459,959

The estimated values of agricultural exports of native origin (£500,740 in 1929) are detailed on page 49 of the Report. Export of maize was restricted early in 1929 on account of famine conditions, and the lateness of the 1929 season further affected the tonnage of exports.

4. In regard to the livestock industry, the Agricultural Commission noted with satisfaction that the serious drop in the number of breeding cattle in 1926 had been checked and that there was some progress in cattle breeding and dairying. It is interesting to note that the animal products sold by Europeans in the year 1928 - 1929 showed a remarkable increase as compared with the previous year. This increase is due largely to the better organisation of the dairy industry on a co-operative basis and to better rainfall. Butter to the value of £15,126 was exported in 1929, as compared with £4,917 in 1928.

5. The Report indicates the wide scope of the activities of the Department. In regard to the Department's work in native areas, I would invite particular attention to the Annual Report of the Assistant Agricultural Officer, Embu and South Nyeri Districts, published as Appendix Q on page 605 of the Report. This Appendix presents a fair picture of the work being done by Agricultural Officers in the native reserves.

The Director and the members of his staff are in my opinion to be congratulated on the record of achievement on both the scientific and administrative sides, presented in this Report.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servant,

*John A. Thomas*

ACTING GOVERNOR.