

1924

KENYA  
ZANZIBAR

C. O.

55810

FROM  
FOREIGN OFFICE.

DATE

27th November 1924.

28 NOV 24

FOR CIRCULATION:-

*Mr. Dorothy**Mr. ...**Mr.*

Asst. U.S. of S.

*Mr. Strachey*~~U.S. of S.~~

Parl. U.S. of S.

Secretary to State

Previous Paper

21345

PORT ORDINANCE, 1922.

187

Tre copy of further note from French Embassy, together with a memo prepared in F.O. Considers policy of Govt should have been defended on broader lines, and seeks concurrence in course as now explained.

## MINUTES

I am afraid that this has been rather long delayed, & will it say 45021/24, not a Kenya note as the Zanzibar Treaties has been over-referred, after discussion with you.

The note has been prepared with a view to a copy being given to Sir S. Henn, who has asked for information about these Treaties;

copy may also be of use to Lord Onslow in connection with the Jubaland debate in the House of Lords (notably by the

1 Amend  
2 To Sir S. Henn 20  
3 31 MARCH 1925

Copy, copy each copy & to Sir S. Henn copy con.  
to of H.C. Y'bar copy con. 31 MARCH 1925

OSB  
WPT  
WLD

Subsequent Paper

G.W. 5852  
25

The note is confined to the  
bare facts about the Treaty,  
and it is necessary to  
amplify it under the  
various heads in order to  
deal with these papers.

1. Property. The Treaty provisions  
are desirable and  
reasonable.
2. Right of entry. As stated  
in the note, the Treaty  
provisions on this point appear  
to give rise to little difficulty  
in practice.
3. Liberty to enter Zanzibar etc.  
No objection appears to have  
been raised by the Treaty  
<sup>1912</sup>  
<sup>1912/13</sup>  
<sup>2/13</sup>  
powers<sup>(sic)</sup> to the control of  
immigration at Mombasa  
and other Kenya ports in  
the mainland dominions  
of the Sultan of Zanzibar;  
but in the past the French  
have protested against such  
control.

The note is confined to the  
bare facts about the Treaty,  
and it is necessary to  
amplify it under the  
various heads in order to  
deal with these papers.

1. Property. The Treaty provisions  
are reasonable and  
unobjectionable.

2. Right of entry. It is stated  
in the note, the Treaty  
provisions on this point appear  
to give rise to little difficulty  
in practice.

3. Liberty to enter Zanzibar etc.  
No objection appears to have  
been raised by the Treat  
<sup>and 1st 16  
2nd 17/16</sup>  
(2nd 17/16) Powers to the control of  
immigration at Mombasa  
and other Kenya ports in  
the mainland dominions  
of the Sultan of Zanzibar,  
but in the past the French  
have protested against such  
control.

control being exercised in Tangier itself.  
 Recently, however, decretos have been  
 passed for the proper control of  
 immigration at Tangier, and no protest  
 appears to have been made, though the  
 F.O. admits that the legislation would  
 be difficult to defend if attacked.

#### 4. Taxation

1920 several  
 protests were  
 received from  
 the representatives  
 of Treaty Powers  
 against the levy  
 of municipal rates  
 etc in Tangier.  
 No conciliation was  
 however made

Although local rates etc have been  
 levied as shown in the note, it has  
 not been without protest. In 1914 the  
 French council protested against the  
 public health and street lighting  
 (in Tangier) legislation, though he made it clear  
 that no protest was purely formal.  
 In 1922 the French (<sup>and Belgians</sup>) protested against  
 the payment of poll tax, income tax  
 and trade taxes by French citizens  
 in the Kenya Protectorate. He did not  
 however admit the validity of the protest,  
 and the matter appears to have dropped.

1925/22 (provisional)  
 King's  
 1/6/25

#### 5. Commerce and Trade

##### 6. Import Duties

(i) Tangier - when the Tangier  
 import duty was raised to  $7\frac{1}{2}\%$  ad valorem  
 in 1908, the French protested in the ground  
 that

that they had an undertaking from the F.O. that the rate of 5% laid down in the Franco-Muscat Treaty would not be exceeded. The F.O. replied that the alleged undertaking was not absolute, and that the increase was required in order to enable the Tangier Govt. to carry out its obligations under the Berlin and Brussels Acts. The French insisted in their objection but no reply was sent and the duty was in fact remained at 7½% per cent.

(iii) Kenya When in 1904 the King's import duty was raised to the maximum of 10% ad valorem allowed by the Somers Declaration of 1890, the French protested. The increase was justified to them on the ground of the cost of administering the country in accordance with the policy laid down in the Berlin and Brussels Acts. Since the war the King's import duties have been altered considerably without any protest having been made on the ground of Treaty obligations.

(b) Export Duties As shown in the note 189 no practical difficulty has arisen under this head.

(c) Freedom of Trade. The Treaty provisions go farther than the Convention of Saint Germain-en-Laye, and the disadvantage of the Non-tariff was recently brought out when the question arose of the Government of Tangier controlling the price of clover in the interests of the industry.

#### 6. Light and Harbour Dues

No special difficulty has arisen as regards Tangier and Pemba; in fact when the increase to two annas was being discussed in 1921 the United States Government expressed their willingness to join the Convention if necessary. As regards Mombasa, the French have protested against the increase which will be imposed there in 1922 in reply to an attempt to defend the dues on the basis of the original text of the convention of Saint Germain-en-Laye, the French have pointed out that

there were  
no other  
ports  
(+ 0  
Ad 89, 1/21  
7/00)

+ 0  
(17180/1/21)

King  
2/00

(85810/24)

the French test of that conversion is the authoritative one, and that under it the Powers "conservent" the right to fix such dues freely, and they claim that this does not confer upon any Power a right which it did not possess before. The F.O. propose not to reply, but, if the French return to the charge, to use arguments similar to those which were employed in connection with the customs duties. The argument as to the financial needs of Kenya is however possibly somewhat thin, having regard to the proportion which the revenue received from here this year bears to the total revenue of the colony and Protectorate.

#### 7. Jurisdiction

#### 8. Administration of Estates.

In earlier papers refer to difficulties which have arisen when a Court was administering an estate which, because of some dispute has come before the Court, has refused to give evidence; but there appears to be no record of any recent special difficulty under these heads.

To sum up - the Treaty provisions are generally irritating and on occasion they definitely hamper efficient administration. In particular it would be extremely embarrassing if the French were to realise that, in their interpretation of the Convention of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, the Kenya customs tariff is open to attack, and that our position with regard to control of immigration in Tanganyika is now too secure.

In regard action, we desire

? Reply to F.O. concerning in this, propose not to reply & the French protest against the light and harbour dues, & saying that should the French return to the charge the question of the time to be taken can be further considered. Action the unexecuted statement regarding shipping.

? Send Kenya an reply to 45021/24 a copy of the note, and of the corres. with the F.O. in the subject.

subject of the Light and Harbour dues

[the despatch must be confidential],

and ask to what particular points

para. 2 of 45021/24 refers ~~respect~~

Off 2 3 25

### 1. The Note on the Treaties.

(a) Sir S. Home raised the question in the placard debate and told me afterwards that the S. G. had promised that he should have a note on the subject.

I warned him that great care would be necessary in using any information given, as the subject bristled with difficult international points, and I think that when the Notes are sent to him (?by the Private Secretary) it will not be amiss to repeat the warning.

(b) I suggest that in sending the Notes to Kenya we should ask them for any necessary comments and corrections, and that a copy should be sent to Zanzibar for the same purpose. Mr. Jeffries has taken much trouble, and I some, in checking the facts, but it is desirable that anything which local experience can add should be added.

### 2. The French objection.

I agree that we can follow the U.O.Y. lead

191

lead, in this matter of Port dues, but I think it necessary to emphasize the fact that ~~we have at any moment got a blot on the French Govt against us~~ <sup>we have at</sup> ~~now~~ <sup>now</sup> ~~realise~~ <sup>realise</sup> that the French argument applies ~~to the present high~~ <sup>with equal force to the</sup> Import duties; the financial system of Kenya depends on the high rates now prevailing, and if we had to reduce to the 5% of the Muscat Treaty, or even the 7½% of Zanzibar, Kenya's position would be gravely prejudiced.

There has been some discussion here, and it has been suggested that a general settlement with France over these Zanzibar Treaty questions might be obtained in discussion with some representative of the French Colonial Office. I venture to think that our troubles are due to the industry of the French F.O.

If we were ultimately defeated, I see no way of mending matters in Zanzibar itself and, as regards the mainland, no way except that of buying out the Sultan's rights and obtaining the same freedom from Zanzibar treaty burdens as the Germans obtained in the case of German East Africa and the Italians in the case of the Sultan's towns in Italian Somaliland. I should be sorry if it came to that: the Sultan would feel the loss of dignity very greatly and the Arabs of Mombasa, whose allegiance to the Sultan is real, would resent it.

Off 2 3 25

I have attempted to trace the origin of the Light & Harbour writings of the Convention of 1919 as I find a slip in my folder with 20 memo. In the particular case the writing was settled between H. R. and Mr. Jeffries before the memorandum which fully embodied A.D.'s contention met a question - G. G. and Dr. H. Reid. I can no longer find either preliminary meeting except as to the 2nd Dr. H. Reid's memorandum

hadly with Dally about 90-

I agree to proposed action

C.S.

26.3.25

Office

N.B. The "Note" does not refer  
to the personal immunity of councils  
from contribution to municipal &  
other rates. See leg H.G.

14982/25

2 bar.

27/4/25

Colonial Office comments on the "Note on  
the Zanzibar Treaties"

APPENDIX

1. Property. The Treaty provisions are reasonable  
and harmless. Similar provision is made  
in Art. 3 of the Convention of Saint  
Helena - in force of 10th Sept., 1919.
2. Right of agents of the Govt. to enter  
upon premises owned or occupied by  
foreigners. This right may be  
~~regarded as abrogated or the exercise  
of its treaty powers  
of extra-territorial jurisdiction, any  
difficulty under this head we could arise  
only if entry were demanded without  
an warrant. As stated in the "note"  
the Treaty provision in this connection give  
foreigners no right to no authority in  
possession. Any difficulty which might  
arise would be settled by the  
production of a warrant from the  
British Court, to which the  
exclusive powers of extra-territorial  
jurisdiction have been surrendered.~~
3. Right to enter Zanzibar to render  
aid.

### Trade & travel & have the territory.

No objection appears to have been raised by the Treaty Powers since 1916 to the control of the immigration at Mombasa & other ports in the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, although in the past the French Govt. have protested against the existence of such control in the island dominions. Recently, however, decrees have been passed for the proper control of immigration at Zanzibar, & no protest appears to have been made.

### 4 Taxation other than import & export duties.

Although local rates or have been levied as shown in the note, it has not been without protest. In 1914 the French <sup>local</sup> council protested <sup>locally</sup> against the public health & street lighting legislation in Zanzibar, though he made it clear that his protest was purely formal.

In 1915 the French Consular Agent at Mombasa protested <sup>locally</sup> against the new fuel tax and of conveyance fees upon French nationals and protected persons in the Sultan's mainland dominions.

It appears that no action was taken on this protest in the absence of a protest from the French Govt. (D.O. letter to C.O. No. 116253/15 of Sept. 13<sup>th</sup>, 1915, & connected cover.)

In 1920 several protests were received from the representatives of Treaty Powers against the levy of municipal rates at Mombasa. No conciliation was made.

In 1922 the French & Belgian Govts. protested against the payment of poll tax, income tax & trader licences by French & Belgian subjects in the Kenya Protectorate. The validity of the protest was not admitted by H.M.C., & the matter appears to have dropped.

Claims for the exemption of foreign countries from taxation, & for the revision of death duties of on the estates of foreign nationals have been made <sup>(both in Kenya & in Zanzibar)</sup> on several occasions but have been rejected.

### 5 Commerce & Trade

(a) Import Duties The protest of the French Govt. <sup>as regards</sup> when the Zanzibar duties were raised to 7½ per cent ad valorem was

was ignored, and no protest appears to have been made against the much higher rate.

A duty now in force in Kenya.

(b) Export Duties. As shown in the "note" no practical difficulty has arisen under this head.

(c) Freedom of Trade. circumstances might arise in which the ~~freedom~~ restrictions on the establishment of a fixed price for goods or of a monopoly might be found to cause difficulty.

#### 6. Light & Harbour Dues.

No special difficulty has arisen as regards the islands & in fact, when the increase of the rate to 2 annas was being discussed in 1921, the United States Govt expressed their willingness to revise the convention if necessary. The French Govt have protested against the dues imposed in Kenya in 1922, but the protest has been ~~overruled~~.

#### 7. Distressed Vessels & Crew

#### 8. Immunity of Consular Officers

#### 9. Administration of Estates

It does not appear that any special difficulty is experienced under those heads, except (as regards the last two) in the matter dealt with under Head 4 ( taxation) above.

was ignored, and no protest appears to have been made against the much higher rate

of duty was in force in Kenya.

(b) Export Duties. As shown in the "note" no practical difficulty has arisen under this head

(c) Freedom of Trade. ~~Trade restrictions or~~ Circumstances might arise in which the

establishment of a fixed price for goods or of a monopoly might be found to cause difficulty.

## 6. Light & Harbour Dues

No special difficulty has arisen as regards the island & in fact, when the increase of the rate to 2 annas was being discussed in 1921, the United States Govt. expressed their willingness to revise the convention if necessary. The French Govt. have protested against the dues imposed in Kenya - 1922 but the protest has been ~~unofficially~~.

## 7. Destroyed Vessels & Crew

## 8. Immunity of Consular Officers

## 9. Administration of Estates

It does not appear that any special difficulty is experienced under these heads, except (as regards the last two) in the matter dealt with under head 4 (parah) above.

F

Shipping entered and cleared at Kewa Point

	All nationalities			French.		
		Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	
920-21	Sailing	Entered Cleared	392 442	23,824 26,931	1 1	164 119
	Steam	Entered Cleared	221 223	673,006 678,735	11 11	37,095 37,095
21 to December	Sailing	Entered Cleared	114 285	6,810 17,430	7 5	462 320
	Steam	Entered Cleared	164 165	519,574 525,179	8 8	28,859 28,859

No later figures.

any further communication  
on this subject, please quote  
No. A 5261/1979/60.

Address—

not to any person by name,

To—  
the Under-Secretary of State,  
Foreign Office,  
London, S.W.1.



193

FOREIGN OFFICE

S.W.1.

27th November, 1924.

Sir,

26

With reference to the letter from this department No. A 2608/1979/60 of May 2nd last, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain to transmit to you herewith a copy of a further note from the French Embassy regarding the enforcement of the Kenya "Port Ordinance, 1922" at Mombasa and other ports of the coastal strip of the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, together with a memorandum on the question prepared in this department.

2. Mr. Chamberlain feels that it would have been preferable if it had relied in the reply to the French Ambassador of May 2nd on the letter of an incorrect English translation of the text of article 2 of the Convention of 1919 revising the Berlin and Brussels Acts and that the policy of His Majesty's Government would have been defended on broader lines. He now considers that the best course will be to follow the precedent set when the seven and a half per cent. import duties were imposed in 1908 and to return no reply to the French note of the 3rd September. Should the French Ambassador revert to the original, Mr. Chamberlain would propose to justify a continuation of the enforcement of the Ordinance in question against French ships, by the arguments contained in paragraph 8 of the enclosed memorandum.

3. I am to enquire whether Mr. Avery-Andrews is in this course.

Under-Secretary of State,

Colonial Office.

193

glad to learn the approximate number and tonnage of French vessels annually affected by the ordinance and how the figures compare with those for other countries.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

G. M. Ward.

NOTE ON THE ZANZIBAR TREATIES.

At the outbreak of the War, the Treaties in force applicable to the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar were as follows:-

- (1) Treaty between the United States and Muscat - September 21, 1833.
- (2) Treaty between France and Muscat - November 17, 1844;
- (3) Treaty between the Hanseatic Republics and Zanzibar, June 13, 1859;
- (4) Treaty between Portugal and Zanzibar - October 25, 1879.
- (5) Treaty between Italy and Zanzibar - May 28, 1885.
- (6) Convention between Belgium and Zanzibar - May 30, 1885.
- (7) Convention between Austria Hungary and Zanzibar - August 11, 1887.
- (8) Agreement between Russia and Zanzibar - August 12/24, 1896.

The German and Austrian Treaties lapsed at the outbreak of War, and have definitely not been revived. The Russian Treaty lapsed with the fall of the Empire, and it was agreed with the Soviet Delegation of August, 1924, that it should be considered as one of the Treaties which had lost its force. The Italian Treaty will be cancelled when the Treaty for the cession of Jubaland takes effect.

As regards the surviving Treaties, the provisions as to extra-territorial jurisdiction in Zanzibar have been surrendered; the remaining privileges conferred by these Treaties on nationals of the Powers concerned are as follows:-

1. Property. The right to acquire, possess and sell property appears in all the Treaties except that with the United States.

2. Right of Agents of the Government to enter upon premises owned or occupied by foreigners. Under Article 3

of the French Treaty and Article 7 of the Portuguese Treaty, such entry is not permitted without the consent of the occupant or of the Consul representing the country of which the occupant is a national. The provision does not give trouble in the case of Police, who enter under a warrant from the British Court, which in view of the surrender of Consular jurisdiction exercises the functions of the Consul; nor, in practice, in the case of the Sanitary Officers. Objections are sometimes raised by Consuls to Regulations issued by the Zanzibar Government for the proper control of buildings, the Survey Decree and the Preservation of Plantations Decree.

3. Liberty to enter Zanzibar and to reside, trade and travel, and leave the territory. This is the subject of a definite provision (Article 2) in the French, United States and Portuguese Treaties; and applies to Belgians by virtue of the most-favoured-nation clause in the Belgian Convention.

4. Taxation other than import and export duties.

Article 2 of the French Treaty is as follows:-

(translation) "The subjects of His Highness the Imam of Muscat shall be en toute liberté" permitted in full liberty to enter, reside, trade and travel in France with their merchandise. The French shall enjoy the same liberty in the dominions of his Highness the Sultan of Muscat, and the subjects of each of the two countries shall have reciprocally the right, in the other, to all the privileges and advantages which are or may be accorded to subjects of the most-favoured-nation." Article 6 of the United States Treaty is as follows:- "The citizens of the United States resorting to the ports of the Sultan for the purpose of trade shall have leave to land and reside in the said ports without paying any taxation or imposition whatever

for such liberty other than the general duties on imports which the most-favoured-nation shall pay."

These clauses have not been held to prevent the imposition of a public health and street lighting rate in the town of Zanzibar, or to preclude the levy of municipal rates in Mombasa, and the application of the Kenya non-native poll tax to foreigners in the coastal dominions of the Sultan.

#### 5. Commerce and Trade.

(a) Import Duties. Article 3 of the United States Treaty, Article 10 of the French Treaty and Article 3 of the Portuguese Treaty lay down that the ships of those countries entering the harbour of Zanzibar or any other harbour in the Sultan's dominions shall not pay more than five per cent duty on the cargo landed, which shall be considered as an equivalent of all import and export duties, tonnage, pilotage, anchorage or any other tax. This limitation applies to Belgian ships by virtue of the most-favoured-nation clause in the Belgian Convention.

This limitation was overridden by the Brussels Declaration of 1890, which with the rest of the arrangements under the Berlin and Brussels Acts is now replaced by the Convention of Saint Germain-en-Laye of the 10th September, 1919.

(b) Duties on goods exported in French, Portuguese, American or Belgian ships are forbidden by the Treaty provisions just quoted. It has been held that the duty charged on cloves exported from the <sup>Zanzibar</sup> Protectorate is not an export or customs due, but a duty corresponding to the old native taxes. Certain duties on other exported produce have been tacitly accepted by all the Treaty Powers for many years.

(c) Freedom of Trade. Article 2 of the United States Treaty, Article 11 of the French Treaty, and Articles 2 and 4 of the Portuguese Treaty provide that there shall be no restriction

restriction upon the nature of articles to be imported and exported, that trade shall be completely free, and that no fixed price or monopoly shall be established. These provisions apply to Belgium through the operation of the most-favoured-nation clause.

#### 6. Light and Harbour Dues.

These are forbidden by the Treaty sections quoted under the preceding head, but a separate Convention was signed with the United States on June 5th, 1903, under which it was agreed that, subject to the consent of the other Treaty Powers to a similar arrangement being obtained, light dues at the rate of 1 anna, and harbour dues at the same rate, upon every registered ton should be leviable on vessels of the United States entering ports in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. The consent of the other Treaty Powers was obtained in 1904. The dues were, in return for certain concessions, reduced to 1 anna in all from January 1st, 1914, but raised again (by general consent) to 2 annas, on the ground of the increased cost of the service, with effect from October 1st, 1921.

#### 7. Distressed Vessels and Crews.

Under Article 15 of the French Treaty and Article 6 of the Portuguese Treaty the Zanzibar Government must assist in the refitting of shipwrecked or damaged ships, in the salvage of property and its delivery to the owners or the Consul. Under Article 5 of the American Treaty they must also maintain the crews of shipwrecked vessels at the public expense.

#### 8. Jurisdiction. Immunity of Consular Officers

In view of the immunity of the British Agent and Consul General (now the British Resident) from the jurisdiction of the Courts, a similar immunity has been claimed

202

The British Resident did not however succeed to  
the privileges of the British Agent & Consul General in  
his report, and any immunity which foreign Consuls  
~~might have claimed~~ could only be based upon Article 9 of the  
United States Treaty of 1833, which confers plenary immunity upon the United States  
for the Consulate of Treaty Powers, by virtue of the most-  
favoured-nation clauses of the Treaties.

#### 9. Administration of Estates.

The agreement with France as to the surrender  
of Consular jurisdiction reserves to France her previous  
rights with regard to the administration of the estates of  
French citizens and protected persons, in so far as this does  
not involve a direct or indirect return to the exercise of  
Consular jurisdiction. A similar privilege extends to the  
other Treaty Powers by virtue of the most-favoured-nation  
clauses.

Copie.

202

3261/1979/60).

Note verbale.

Par sa lettre No. A 2608/1979/60, en date  
du 1er Mai dernier, le Foreign Office a fait savoir à  
cette Ambassade que, de l'avis du Gouvernement  
Britannique, la Convention de Saint-Germain, du 10  
Septembre 1919, portant révision de l'acte de Berlin,  
du 26 Février 1865, met fin aux avantages du Traité  
de 1844, avantage consentis à la France par l'Imamat  
de Mascate, aux droits duquel est le Sultanat de  
Zanzibar.

De l'article 2, paragraphe 2 de la Convention  
de Saint-Germain, il résultera, d'après le Gouvernement  
de Sa Majesté, que les Etats intéressés - au nombre  
desquels est Zanzibar - "ont le droit de fixer  
librement les règles et les tarifs de douane ou de  
navigation applicables sur leurs territoires".

Le Gouvernement français ne peut admettre ce  
point de vue. Après avoir posé, à l'Article 1er, le  
principe de la complète liberté de commerce et à  
l'article 2, Paragraphe 2 exclu du libre accès à tout  
le littoral et à tous les ports maritimes des territoires  
énumérés à l'Article 1er, l'article 2, Paragraphe  
3, poursuit, en laissant cependant aux Etats intéressés  
"le droit de fixer librement les règles et les tarifs  
de douane ou de navigation applicables sur leurs  
territoires"; formule qui, manifestement, veut dire  
que la liberté du commerce et de l'accès du littoral et  
des ports ne s'étend pas jusqu'à la franchise des droits  
de douane ou de navigation, mais qui, en aucun cas, ne  
peut restituer à l'Etat côtier une maîtrise totale  
que, par traité antérieur, il eût perdue. "Sous

réserves de ces dispositions, dit l'article 2, paragraphe 3, les Etats intéressés conservent le droit de fixer librement les règles et les tarifs de douane". S'ils la conservent, c'est qu'ils l'ont: or, dans le cas actuel, l'Etat intéressé n'a pas ce droit, par suite il ne saurait le conserver. En conséquence, l'article 2, paragraphe 2, est insoplicable.

A l'égard de l'article 2 de la Convention portant révision de l'Acte Africain, le Gouvernement britannique invoque l'article 6, qu'il lit ainsi: "Pourront être érigés des taxes et droits qui auront le caractère de rétribution pour services rendus à la navigation". Or, non seulement le droit à 2 1/2 shillings par tonne dépasse la limite du service rendu, mais le texte déclare "Pourront seuls être érigés....." ce qui veut dire qu'il ne sera possible de percevoir des droits de navigation que pour rétribution de services rendus. Si bien que les traités stipulent sciemment cette limitation de ces taxes, sera-t'il possible d'en percevoir? C'est en effet comme une tout autre question.

Inscrives dans l'acte du 1er octobre 1910, pour limiter la liberté de commerce et d'accès, les réserves de l'article 2, paragraphe 2 et de l'article 6, paragraphe 3, ne peuvent s'entendre que comme une exception à la liberté de commerce et d'accès que l'Acte Africain offre, non comme un affranchissement des réserves auxquelles les Etats compris dans la zone de la liberté de commerce et d'accès n'auraient pas craint de se soumettre au regard d'un Etat étranger. Cet Acte qui leur laisse entière, pour l'avenir,

20

la maîtrise des douanes et des taxes de navigation, rémunératrices des services rendus, ne peut paralyser sans le passé les effets de cette même maîtrise. Les Conventions doivent être ici à l'entière respectées que les principes nouveaux, formulés dans l'acte, ne prétendent en rien diminuer, si ce qui concerne les droits de douane et les taxes à navigation, le libre exercice de la pleine capacité de l'état territorial.

Enfin, le Foreign Office remarque que son interprétation des articles 2, Paragraphe 2, et 6, Paragraphe 3 de la Convention du 10 Septembre 1919, déjà donnée par lui le 15 Août 1921, n'a reçu de cette Ambassade aucune réponse. De cette absence de réponse, il serait inexact de conclure à un acquiescement du Ministère français des Affaires étrangères au point de vue britannique: la protestation contenue dans la note de l'ambassade, du 22 Mars dernier, en fait foi.

En conséquence, le Chargé d'affaires de France a reçu pour instructions à maintenir auprès du Gouvernement de la Majesté la protestation formulée dans la note du 22 Mars ci-dessus mentionnée.

Ambassade de France à Londres,

Albert Gâte House,

3 Septembre 1924.

Validity of the Franco-Muscat Treaty of 1844.

It may be well in the first instance to consider the attitude hitherto adopted by His Majesty's Government in particular relation to the protests by the French Government, with regard to the abrogative effect on the Zanzibar treaty position of the Act of Berlin of February 26th, 1885, and the Act of Brussels, with the annexed Declaration, of July 2nd, 1890.

2. On the 22nd June, 1892, a circular was sent to the Powers Signatories of the Berlin Act notifying them that from the 1st July following the British Protectorate of Zanzibar would be placed under the free-zone provisions of Article 1 of the Berlin Act, as modified by the Declaration annexed to the Brussels Act. It was stated, however, that there was no present intention of levying at the Port of Zanzibar itself the duties authorised by that Declaration, with the exception of duties on spirits, arms, etc. It was at the same time clearly explained that "the existing system under which the tariffs and duties are regulated by Commercial Treaties with individual Powers will be extinguished by the substitution for it of the system frame" for the free-zone by the assembled Powers in 1885, and that in all the other ports of the Sultan's dominions "the five per cent duty on imports now levied under Treaty will be replaced by a similar duty under the Declaration annexed to the Brussels Act."

3. On August 26th, 1892, the French Government addressed a reasoned protest against the British notification

and in a despatch of October 31st, 1892, addressed to Lord Dufferin, Her Majesty's Government replied to each of the objections raised by the French Government. With regard to the doubts of the French Government as to the completeness of the adherence of Zanzibar to the Act of Berlin, Her Majesty's Government maintained that, considering firstly her position as an independent state, Zanzibar was fully entitled to the privileges and bound by the obligations of signatories of, or adherents to, the Act of Berlin, all of whom had participated in the Act of Brussels. If there were a doubt as to the completeness of the adherence of Zanzibar to the Act of Berlin and, inferentially, of her right to benefit by the Brussels Declaration, Her Majesty's Government contended that there could be no doubt whatever as to the position of Great Britain. The preamble of the Declaration, conferred its benefits upon Powers having possessions or protectorates in the conventional basin of the Congo, and Great Britain therefore had the right to claim its application to her protectorate of Zanzibar. With regard to the reservation of the rights and immunities of French citizens (under the Treaty of Jussumet of 1844) which was made on the 5th August 1890 when France acknowledged the Protectorate of Great Britain over Zanzibar His Majesty's Government argued that, being subsequent to the signature of the Brussels Act, it could only be considered as preserving such rights as that act left unimpaired and it was, moreover, with the express purpose of dealing with such a case that provision was made in Article XCVI of the Act for the repeal of all "Contrary Stipulations" contained in the Conventions previously concluded between the Signatory Powers.

It was also pointed out to the French Government that the Powers assembled at Berlin established a fiscal system and expressed their anxiety that Zanzibar should adopt it. This system was altogether inconsistent with that hitherto prevailing under separate commercial treaties with certain Powers, and its adoption of necessity implied the abrogation of Slavery in such treaties conflicting with it. The Powers, by assenting to the substitution by Zanzibar of a new system for the old one, could not have intended to stipulate that the Sultan should be debarred from accepting their invitation unless he should obtain the separate assent of each Power with whom he might have concluded a Treaty. The collective assent implied in the invitation rendered individual assent superfluous. If then, it was contended, the Acts of Berlin and Brussels were applicable, Zanzibar and Great Britain, as co-extinctors over her, were expressly released from any treaty stipulation conflicting with them.

4. Zanzibar remained a free port until September 15th, 1899, when the five per cent import duty was re-imposed. This decision was referred to by the French Ambassador in his conversation in January 1900 in connection with the negotiations for the abandonment of French consular jurisdiction, and in notes to the French Ambassador dated February 15th and August 7th, 1900, His Majesty's Government gave an undertaking which, as appeared later, was interpreted by the French Government as an assurance that import duties should not exceed five per cent. In the note of February 15th, 1900, it was

stated:/

stated: "Finally, Your Excellency wished to have an assurance that the duties now imposed on the French imports into Zanzibar in consequence of its having ceased to be a free port would not exceed the maximum of five per cent ad valorem stipulated by the French Treaty (i.e. of 1844).

I have communicated with Her Majesty's Agent and Consul General on this point, and have ascertained that no compulsory charge will be levied in consequence of the renewed imposition of custom duties in excess of the limit of five per cent ad valorem, any charge which may be made if merchants voluntarily elect to make use of Government wharves or warehouses is obviously not a tax but a payment for services rendered"

In the note of August 7th, 1900, it was stated: "The statistical tax is over and above the five per cent allowed by treaty, and it must be compulsory if it is to be levied at all".

5. In 1904, an Ordinance was issued announcing that a ten per cent ad valorem import duty would be levied in the British East Africa Protectorate (including the mainland dominion of the Sultan, but not the islands). The French Government, while not referring to the notes of 15th February and 7th August, 1900, renewed their protest of 1892. In Lord Lansdowne's note of 16th December, 1904, His Majesty's Government explained their attitude in the matter both as regards the legality of their action in raising the duties and

the/

the necessity for this step from an administrative point of view. In the note it was stated: "The entire administration has been in the hands of His Majesty since the 14th December, 1895, and consequently all the expenses of the civilisation of the territory - the very purpose for which the Declaration of 1890, enabled ten per cent import duties to be levied - have fallen on this country. The connection of Zanzibar with the import duties in East Africa is now, therefore, merely technical. The case is one which comes precisely within the spirit of the Declaration of 1890, namely, that of a Power (Great Britain) signatory to the Berlin Act, exercising a Protectorate within the conventional basin, subjected to onerous duties by the Berlin and Brussels Acts for the pacification of the land, the opening of its trade, and the suppression of the Slave Trade, and yet (unless the Declaration applies to it) deprived of the power to raise funds to carry out those duties".

Q. The rate of import duty at Zanzibar was raised from five per cent to seven and a half per cent ad valorem on 1st January 1908, and the French Government immediately requested explanations on the ground that the increase appeared to be contrary to undertakings given in the notes to the French Ambassador of 15th February and 7th August, 1900. While admitting that, having regard to the wording used in the notes in question, the contention of the French Government could not be rejected as unreasonable, His Majesty's Government defended their action on the ground that there was no intention that the undertakings given should be regarded

as an assurance that the import duties should always remain at five per cent and explained that the Notes had reference only to wharfage dues and a statistical tax and did not deal in any way with the charges which His Majesty's Government might find it necessary to make at some future time. His Majesty's Government also justified the increase in duty as a step that was required in order to enable the Government of Zanzibar to meet the expenses entailed in carrying out the obligations of the Brussels Act. The French Government, however, maintained their contention that they had been given a distinct promise that the rate of import duty would not exceed five per cent, but no reply was sent by His Majesty's Government and the seven and a half per cent duty continued to be levied.

7. During the time therefore that the Berlin and Brussels Acts remained in force, His Majesty's Government may be said to have maintained the attitude that the stipulations in the Franco-Muscat Treaty of 1844 were superseded in so far as they were inconsistent with those Acts, that the Declaration attached to the Brussels Act authorised the imposition of customs duties at Zanzibar up to a maximum of ten per cent ad valorem, and that the increase of the duty above five per cent was justified by the necessity of meeting the expenditure of the Zanzibar Government incurred in carrying out the obligations accepted by the Powers in their adoption of the system imposed by the Berlin and Brussels Acts.

X 8. It now remains to consider what is the position of the Franco-Muscat Treaty of 1844 in the light of the Convention of St. Germain of 1919, which abrogates the Berlin and Brussels Acts. Although the Convention does

not/

not contain any clause repealing all contrary stipulations of previous treaties, it is legitimate to hold that such is, by implication, the effect of the Convention. Further, it seems reasonable to contend that such contrary stipulations include those provisions of previous treaties which so restrict the freedom of action of a party to the St. Germain Convention as to prevent the adequate fulfilment of the objects of the Convention. As a party to the Convention of St. Germain, Great Britain is bound by the system laid down in that Convention. If therefore the Zanzibar Government is prevented, by clauses in the Franco-Muscat Treaty of 1844, from increasing the customs and navigation tariffs and this is a step which is necessitated by the financial needs of the Zanzibar Government in administering the system imposed by the St. Germain Convention, it may be argued that the restrictive clauses in the Franco-Muscat Treaty should be held to be superseded.

9. Such freedom of action would appear to be in accordance with the English translation of article 2 paragraph 3 of the Convention of St. Germain. The French Government however point to the French text which runs:- "les Etats intéressés conservent le droit de fixer librement les règles et les tarifs de douane ou de navigation..." and they argue that "s'ils le conservent c'est qu'ils l'ont: or dans le cas actuel, l'Etat intéressé n'a pas ce droit, par suite il ne saurait le conserver". The French text is the only authoritative text but there is some reason to doubt whether the paragraph in question was intended to be read in this restricted sense. In this connection attention is invited to a private letter of November 20th, 1919, to

Mr. Berbes from Mr. Strachey of the Colonial Office  
who was the British representative on the Committee at  
the Peace Conference dealing with the revision of the  
Berlin and Brussels Acts. (A copy of this letter is  
annexed; the original is kept with the Paris archives).  
Mr. Strachey points out in his letter that the English  
translations of the Liquor and Arms Traffic Conventions  
and the Convention revising the Berlin and Brussels Acts  
are not really translations at all. He states: "They  
were prepared as English texts, of equal validity with  
the French. As a matter of fact, the French texts are  
to a very great extent translations of these English  
texts. It was only two days before signature that in  
order to please the French it was decided that only  
the French text was to be valid. Consequently our  
texts have to be called translations. They were most  
carefully prepared, and I think can be accepted without  
question". It is possible therefore that the French  
phrase "conservent le droit de fixer librement" was  
intended to interpret the wider English phrase "reserve  
to themselves complete liberty of action". There is  
unfortunately no official information to this effect  
and in these circumstances it would be difficult to  
appeal from the authoritative French text to the possible  
intention of the framers of the article.

- X 10. Finally, the validity of the Franco-Muscat Treaty of 1844 can be considered from another point of view.  
In their protest of 1894, the French Government stated  
"le traité de 1844 étant perpétuel, ne peut être aboli  
"par les dispositions arrêtées soit à Berlin, soit à  
"Bruxelles, et qui n'ont qu'une durée limitée. Ce ne  
"serait donc pas d'une abolition du Traité, mais  
simplement/

"l'implément d'une suspension qu'il s'agirait dans  
l'espace". This point whether a perpetual treaty would  
be extinguished by an Act whose duration was limited  
did not at the time present practical importance and it  
was not therefore dealt with by Her Majesty's Government.  
Precedents dealing with such a point have however  
occurred in the past and a Library memorandum on the  
subject was prepared in 1914 in connection with the  
German Zanzibar Treaties of Amity, Commerce, and  
Navigation of 1859 and 1885. In that memorandum the  
argument put forward, based on the attitude adopted  
by His Majesty's Government in a similar case in 1913,  
was as follows: "The treaty of 1859 (with no denuncia-  
tion clause) between the Hanse Towns and Zanzibar, which  
by a later exchange of notes became a treaty between  
Germany and Zanzibar, was superseded in 1885 by a more  
comprehensive treaty between Germany and Zanzibar which  
provided for denunciation, and the denunciation of the  
latter and its termination in 1911 swept the board clear.  
As to the position with regard to the termination of  
treaties which have no provision for denunciation, it  
will be sufficient to mention here that it could appear  
from precedents that while a treaty containing no time  
limit can in any case be terminated by the mutual consent  
of the contracting parties, in the case of one which is  
commercial in character such consent might from its very  
nature, as requiring revision from time to time in order  
to harmonise with changed conditions, reasonably be  
expected to result from the expressed wish of one of  
the parties to terminate it. The point was also  
referred to the Law Officers in 1909, in connection with  
our Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation of 1885 with  
Colombia.

Colombia, who after observing that the question was not free from difficulty, as some of the provisions of the treaty appeared to be of a permanent character, stated that: "On the whole we think that the main object of the treaty is commercial and that it would be held to be temporary in character and terminable by the withdrawal of either party on reasonable notice".

(Sgd.) A.F. Orchard.

FOREIGN OFFICE,

November 1st, 1924.

Mr Jeffries 26/3/24

Mr. Balfour 47.3.25

Mr.

Sir. Shuckburgh

Sir. J. Shuckburgh

Sir G. Davis

Sir G. Grindie

H. Lambert

Sir J. Morrison Smith

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Mr. Amery.

DRAFT.

SP

SIR

31 March 1925

anglovar

inf

H. Cr.

I have the pleasure to transmit to you the

ac. copy of a note which has

been prepared in the colonial

office showing the present position,

so far as it can be ascertained

here, with regard to the Lusitania

treaties.

2. This is important to a condition  
of this kind should prevail in any case,  
and I shall be glad if you

will furnish me with any

comments which you may wish

to offer on this note, and  
with

the European Treaties  
copy  
in 55810/24)

Mr. Jeffries 26/3/26  
Mr. Bottamley 27.3.26

Kunya  
Zanzibar

216

Mr.

Sir. Simochy.

Sir. J. Shuckburgh.

Sir G. Davis.

Sir G. Grindall.

H. Lambert

Sir G. G. C. Smith.

Mr. Ormeby-Gore.

Mr. Amerg.

DRAFT.

SIR

3 P. March

1925

Kunya

Conf.

A.G.

(45021/26)

of Mr. A. G. Conroyne's desh. No.

1944 of the 25<sup>th</sup> Aug., 1924, in

which he asks for an opinion

as to ~~the~~ effect greater consideration

upon the various Zanzibar treaties

of the convention signed at Saint

Bernard - en - Laye on the 10<sup>th</sup> of

Sept., 1919, revising the General Act

of Berlin of the 26<sup>th</sup> of February,

1865 and the General Act and

Declaration of Principles of the 2nd

of

of July, 1890.

2. I regret that it has not been possible to reply to the despatch at an earlier date.

It was necessary in the first instance to examine the Tanganika treaties with a view to ascertaining which and what portions of them remain in force. A note on this subject has been prepared and is enclosed for your information. I shall welcome any comments or corrections which you may consider necessary in connection with this note.

*It is important that a copy of this letter should be given from memory and*

3. With regard to the particular question raised by Mr Robert Corryam,

of July, 1890.

2. I regret that it has not been possible to reply to the despatch at an earlier date.

It was necessary in the first instance to examine the Zanzibar treaties with a view to ascertaining which and what portions of them remain in force. A note on this subject

has been prepared and is enclosed <sup>(It is important that a copy of this kind should be kept from unnecessary use)</sup> for your information. I shall welcome any comments or corrections which you may consider necessary in connection with this note.

3. With regard to the particular question raised by Sir Robert Corrydon,

Mr.

Sir J. Shuckburgh

Sir O. Davis

Sir O. Grindle

Sir J. Maserston Smith

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Mr. Amery.

DRAFT.

Corrydon, I enclose copies of

correspondence with the F.O., from which it will be seen that the question matter has come

up in connection with the

enforcement of the Port Ordinance,

1922, at Mombasa and other ports in the coastal dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar. A

decision of much difficulty would arise if the French Govt. were to

challenge the Kenya import

duties on similar grounds to those on which they challenge

the port dues, and for this reason it is desirable to avoid drawing

drawing attention to the matter  
by any public discussion of  
the effect of the convention  
of Saint Germain upon the  
treasures. I shall however  
be glad to learn the particular  
instances in which the subjects  
of treaty powers have claimed  
special treatment, as stated  
in Robert Coryndon in  
para 2 of his despatch

(for the Secretary of State)  
(Signed) W. ORMSBY GORE

drawing attention to the matter  
by any public discussion of  
the effect of the convention  
of Saint Germain upon the  
treasures. I shall however  
be glad to learn the particular  
instances in which the subjects  
of treaty powers have claimed  
special treatment, as stated  
by Mr Robert Coryndon in  
para 2 of his despatch

(for the Secretary of State)  
Signed W. ORMSBY GORE

Jeffries 26/3/25  
Mr. Bottomley 27.3 f.s.

70/55810/24

Kenya  
Zanzibar

Mr.  
Sir Strachey  
Sir J. Shuckburgh.  
Sir C. Davis.  
Sir G. Grindell.  
H. Lambert  
Sir L. Merton Smith  
Mr. Ormsby-Gore.  
Mr. Amery.

DRAFT.

SIR

1. 6/3.

7. 0.

31 MAR 1925

any figures  
not of minutes or  
70/55810/24

copy to be kept

copy

to be kept

copy

copy

copy

copy

copy

31 March 1925

I am to ask the receipt  
of your letter No. A 5261/1979/60 of  
the 27th of November, in which was  
enclosed a copy of a note from the  
French Embassy regarding the  
enforcement of the Kenya Port Ordinance  
1922, at Mombasa and other ports  
of the mainland dominion of H.H.  
the Sultan of Zanzibar.

1. I express my concurrence
2. I am to request you  
inform her Secy. Chamberlain's  
proposal that no reply should  
be sent to the French note.

Shored

drawing attention to the matter  
by any public discussion of  
the effect of the convention  
of Saint Germain upon the  
treasures. I shall however  
be glad to learn the particular  
instances in which the subjects  
of treaty powers have claimed  
special treatment, as stated  
by Mr Robert Coryndon in  
para 2 of his despatch

J  
(for the Secretary of State)  
(Signed) W. ORMSBY GORE

drawing attention to the matter

by any public discussion of

the effect of the Convention

of Saint Germain upon the

treaties. I shall however

be glad to learn the particular

instances in which the subjects

of treaty powers have claimed

special treatment, as stated

by Mr Robert Coryndon in

para 2 of his despatch

J

(for the Secretary of State)  
(Signed) W. ORMSBY GORE

Showed the French Govt. press  
it is suggested that,  
for a reply, [the question of  
the arguments to be adopted  
by H.M.'s Govt. ~~may be~~ should then

\* be further discussed between  
the Foreign Office and the Colonial  
Office, when the time comes.

3. I am to enclose a note  
of the most recent figures with  
regard to the ~~most~~ proportion  
instant the number of French  
vessels bears to the total number  
of ships entered and cleared  
at Kenya port.

W. C. BOTTOMLEY

Showed the French Govt. press  
it is suggested that  
for a reply, [the question of  
the arguments to be adopted  
by H.M.'s Govt. ~~may~~ <sup>should then</sup>

\* we further discussed between  
the Foreign Office and the Colonial  
Office. ~~when the time was~~

3. I am to enclose a note  
of the most recent figures with  
regard to the ~~most~~ proportion  
which the number of French  
vessels bears to the total number  
of ships entered and cleared  
at Kenya port.

(W. C. BOTTOMLEY)

Ref. Jeffries 26/3/25  
Mr. Bottomley 27/3/25 f  
Mr.  
Sir. Strathe  
Sir. J. Shuckburgh.  
Sir. O. Davis.  
Sir. G. Grindell.  
H. Lambert  
Sir. Henderson Smith  
Mr. Ormsby-Gore.  
Mr. Amery.

To/ 55810/24

219

Kenya  
Zanzibar

27 MAR

30

For the P.S.'s signature

DRAFT.

Dear SIR,  
Henry Herr, M.P.

31 March

1925

*The Langton Trustees  
available in 55810/24*

I believe that at the time of  
the Jubaland debate in the  
House of Commons, Mr. Amery  
proposed that you should have  
a note showing the present  
with regard to the Zanzibar  
Treaties.

Mr. Amery gave directions  
for a note to be prepared, but  
the collation of the information  
has necessarily taken some time,  
and it has not been possible  
to send the note to you until  
now.

now.

In forwarding the note,

I am pleased to say that the  
subject in sue which involves  
many difficult international  
points Mr. Avery felt sure  
that you would appreciate  
this, and that you would  
explore great care in writing  
one of the reports given  
in the case.

ed H C

*handwriting*