

EAST AFR. PROT
J. O. H. L.

C O
50427
SEP 1919

Blair
J

Electric Power Board

1919

Ref.

vious Paper.

370

In memo. resp -

next subsequent Paper.

17
E.A. 28
8

SOUTH AFRICA PROTECTORATETHE ELECTRIC POWER ORDINANCE, 1919

Letter to the
Under Secretary of State for the Colonies
from the
Electrical Engineer to the Protectorate Government.

To The Under Secretary of State
for the Colonies.

Ref. The East Africa Protectorate Electric
Power Ordinance 1919.

Sir,

I have the pleasure to inform you that I have had the pleasure of discussing in general terms matters in connection with the above mentioned Ordinance with Mr. Bottomley and Mr. Ellis.

At this interview it was realized that the Protectorate Government had not put the Colonial Office in possession of a knowledge of many facts and circumstances of vital importance to the protection of the public interest, particularly in connection with the affairs of the Nairobi Electric Power Co. It also appeared to me that the Protectorate Government or at least some of its officers, including myself, and also the public of Nairobi, have been labouring under a misconception as to the attitude of the Colonial Office, on the matters in question. As indicating the nature of this misconception, I may say that the Nairobi City Consulting Engineers are reported to have informed one of their employees who was leaving for the Protectorate, that they took no notice of the officials in the Colony, as they had friends at the Colonial Office and would get all they wanted.

Although

Although this accurately described their conduct it would have been regarded as mere gossip for the fact that certain insignificant notes made to the Company with the object of securing the more definite commitment of Government, coincided peculiarly at a point of time with steps being, or about to be, taken by Government. It is possible that this misconception is attributable either directly or indirectly to inadequate information from the Protectorate which permitted what the Director of Public Works has aptly described as the undesirable triangular form of negotiation carried on by the various companies by which they had access to the Colon. It is to be noted that the Protectorate Government

are able to do with impunity at the expense of the interests of the Colon and have happened to suit the interests for the time

These circumstances have resulted in what it is incumbent on me to reveal to you as a position of the utmost gravity involving as it does in the public mind, and in some quarters, especially, charges against the integrity of the Protectorate Government and the Colonial Office.

The reputation of the public servants attending essentially the defence of the public interest can only be attained by an honest and forthright which is directly secured by a statement of facts and circumstances entirely without reservation.

My statement is, however, a statement which contains the facts to be regarded as

In each of

impeaching the integrity or ability of my colleagues in the service. If any mistakes have been made either in East Africa or at the Colonial Office, I respectfully ask you to consider the facts that the public supply of electrical energy is the most involved of all public services, and that it was impossible for non-technical administrative officers to realize the disaster which could and is still threatened as result from the disregard of the advice of Government's professional technical advisers, or to appreciate the nature of the undesirable difficulties into which they were being inveigled by the adroit manipulations of the Nairobi Company, and also to consider that the war was responsible for an unusual pressure of work and depletion of staff.

With the object of presenting the present position as clearly and shortly as possible I have written some time in revising and this is the memorandum now being submitted. It is however incumbent on me to ensure that the present serious situation is not made worse by the inadvertency of information to your command of the matter. I have therefore decided that it would be unwise to further abridge the matter submitted. By implication it will be understood that much could be added to what I have already written.

I may here say briefly that these memoranda now:-

That the misconduct and abuse of their powers by the Nairobi Electric Power Company

Company, has for years been a public scandal.

That the continuance of this scandal which has caused great monetary loss throughout the district has worked the public and local bodies to a state of intense indignation, which now can be placated only by measures of stern justice.

That for permitting this scandalous condition to continue, the public blame Government or the Colonial Office, or both.

That Government was from the commencement unwise in not referring the Company on the question of water power to the D.P.W. from whom at any time they could have obtained under the established and equitable Water Rules more water power than they have ever had any prospect of utilizing.

That when Government had obtained professional advice on electro-technical matters they acted in direct opposition to or in complete disregard of the advice of their technical advisers.

(An exception to this statement must be made of the period of the Administration as Acting Governor of Mr (now Sir Charles) Stanger. Not until Sir Charles took the reins of Government could we get the Electric Power Bill laid before the Legislative Council. And otherwise as far as it was possible for him to do so, Sir Charles gave effect to the advice of his engineering experts. There is of course also excepted the Administration of His Excellency Sir E. Northey).

That by following the advice so persistently given

Given the public interest would have been protected in 1915 and the present position could not have arisen.

That the unwisdom of Government in disregarding the opinions and advice of the experienced professional advisers of the Secretary of State and of the Protectorate Government, and the rash intrusion of non-technical officers of Government into the techniques of this involved service, have for years defeated the endeavours of the technical officers to protect the public interest, and threaten (if not actually accomplished) Government being publicly denounced as impotent and incapable, is not werga.

That these circumstances have directly aided and abetted the endeavours and complete success of the Nairobi Company in the matter of their proposed new concession, in getting this document drafted entirely to their liking, with its unquestionable gross prejudice of the public interest. Stated shortly these circumstances as relating to the proposed concession amount to the fact that the only technical advice in which Government acted, apparently with the concurrence of the Attorney General, was that of the technical adviser of this notoriously incompetent and defaulting Company, Mr. Hollenhouse.

That no suggestion emanated from Government that the Company should move their works to Thika or elsewhere.

That the Company designed in 1909 to secure control of further and more valuable water powers

before

before, they had any conception as to how or when that already secured to them could be utilized.

That they then inveigled Government into "negotiations" on the subject on the grounds that in the meantime they performed their obligations.

That the statement made by them to the Government Commission of 1912, to justify the refusal for these larger water powers were gross misrepresentations; which also demonstrate incredible incompetence.

That the Company's statement that they were "invited" by Government to spend money on auxiliary steam plant pending their removal to Thika is a perversion.

That, on the contrary, they undertook by the contract of 1906, to provide any plant which might become necessary for the discharge of their obligations.

That they were aware of these obligations (vide Mr Bayden's letter of January, 1909, and that of Mr Monkhouse of 27 April 1915).

That Government reminded them of these obligations at various stages.

That the Company have scandalously ignored their obligations since 1912 (1911) and that their misconduct has aggravated to an unpardonable extent by studied and continuous misrepresentations to the public, to the Colonial Office, and to Government.

That the Company on the 10th May, 1911, received from Government formal notice of default as required under their agreement.

That

That the abatement of the default was not effected, is established by the correspondence.

That the Company on the 5th February 1915 were informed by Government that their concession was open to abrogation without further notice, on account of their continued default.

That Mr. Monkhouse, the Company's Consultant and Acting Managing Director on the 14th April 1915, was informed by Sir H. Belfield that it only required his (Sir Henry's) pen to cancel all the Company's powers, and that their continuance would deprive the Company fully, discharging its obligations. This was confirmed to Mr. Monkhouse by a letter from Government dated 29th April, 1915.

That the venue in this matter is to the Protectorate, and the communications between the Company and Government and the Company's failure to supply, which were and still are repeated and publicly obvious, make it impossible in common sense to entertain any contention either that the Company had made good their default, or that Government's notice of default had been waived.

That by the 1906 agreement it was in the province of the Government, not that of the Secretary of State, to say whether the obligations of the Company had been discharged in such a satisfactory manner that the agreement might be extended.

That the Governor had decided that the Company have not so discharged their obligations.

That the Arbitrators Award, under the Street Lighting Agreement dated 17th July, 1915, is a legal

a legal judgment recorded against the Company in this respect.

That the Governor has ruled that no agreement exists and has acted accordingly.

That the eagerness and care displayed by the Company in securing legislation from the proposed new concession of any reference to British Enactments and Board of Trade Regulations and notwithstanding the extraordinary steps taken by the Protectorate Government officers to acquaint the Company with the provisions of the proposed legislation, their studied silence on this latter subject is evidence that they had no intention of being subject to the usual conditions under which electrical supply is conducted.

That if the Company had any representations to make on this subject the proper and in fact the only place where these could be made was to the Legislative Council of the Protectorate.

That the Company's eleventh hour antagonism to the Electric Power Ordinance, when it became obvious to them that they were not to be allowed to evade this measure which demands and will ensure the consistent conduct of electrical supply, completely establishes the conviction as to the true ideas of the Company.

That the statements made by the Company to the effect that but for the fact that the British Treasury prohibited them raising further capital they would have met all their obligations, is a deliberate distortion of the facts, as by the

exertions

exertions of Government's officers, more capital than that which they said would suffice was offered to them through Government.

That several methods by which the Company could have effected a vast and urgently required improvement in the condition of the supply of electrical energy to the public, were known and were available to them.

That the Company's non-adoption of one or more of these methods, was and is to the public and to business men and engineers of the community in particular, utterly incomprehensible.

That the only explanation for this inactivity of the Company is that the adoption of any of these methods would automatically have brought them under the provisions of the Electric Power Ordinance, i.e., would have completely annulled any prospect of obtaining this concession for the company-promoting scheme behind it.

That no doubt can be entertained on this point is evident from the fact that under the Electric Power Ordinance a bona fide and competent power supply company may obtain - almost automatically - such comprehensive powers for operation over a vast area (including all of the water powers required), and of such a liberal nature (the extent of which is automatically dependant on their good behaviour and performance), that the powers and privileges under the defunct concession and which it was sought to revoke under a new one, are simply incomparable, but the Electric Power Ordinance

effective

effectively precludes the possibility of the public interest in the public supply of electrical energy, being made the subject of individual company-promoting speculation.

On the facts it appears to be quite plain that the Nairobi Company cannot legally contend either that the agreement exists or that they have a right to its renewal.

Also on the facts it is however incontrovertible that if any flaw admits the possibility of a legal claim, the correct course was taken in passing the Ordinance as adopted at its Third Reading. It is, of course, generally recognised that it is highly undesirable to interfere by legislation with privileges however granted even if they are anomalous and in any case, however bad the bargain might be on the one side, if the other part performed his part of the contract, it cannot be contemplated that a Legislature would interfere. In the case of the 1906 Concession to the Nairobi Company, the terms were anomalous to an absurd extent. The anomaly and the absurdity were considerably aggravated by the terms of the proposed new Concession. So grossly irregular and prejudicial to the public interest were some of the provisions of both the 1906 agreement and the proposed new one, that even with competent performance so far as an adequate supply and other matters are concerned, it is impossible to contemplate any legislation of a competent nature which could avoid cancelling these provisions and making the agreements with respect to their subject-matter.

the law.

When in addition to this state of affairs, we find instead of any attempt at competent performance, that the contractor has almost from the first callously broken every one of his contracted obligations, abused his monopoly rights to the serious and irreparable injury of the public, and continued to the very last to attempt to turn attention from his incompetence and highly reprehensible conduct by brazenly making and repeating grossly false statements, then, I submit, it becomes the unquestionable duty of competent Government to ask the Legislature to correct the anomaly which has become a scandal.

This is precisely what has happened in the Protectorate in connection with the Nairobi Electric Power Company, and as entreaty and assistance, or the promise of sterner measures, failed to elicit from the Company the slightest practical evidence of bona fide intentions - quite the reverse - Government laid the matter before the Legislative Council, and after full consideration and debate the provisions of the Ordinance were adopted unanimously.

By the immediate application of the Ordinance (which is very urgently required and the delay concerning which is causing much public uneasiness) the position will be that no question can (read) arise or be disputed as to the validity or effectiveness of Government's rulings, and no pretext exists. In any case, to continue operation without obtaining a licence under the Ordinance, on this point the

opinions of the professional adviser to the Secretary of State, and of the Protectorate Government, and of no compromise as nothing will or can protect the public interest.

From either the point of view of their incompetence or from that of their unqualified conduct and misrepresentation, the Company have fully deserved the cancellation of their concession at any time for years past. Therefore, the permission to apply for the necessary Licenses under the Ordinance is, as the Director of Public Works has pointed out, the extent of the indulgence which can be held out to them.

On any such application being made it must necessarily be left to the Governor in Council to decide on the application, which must be made with full publicity as to intent and end of the applicants.

If the application is refused the Governor in Council may authorize any successful applicants to acquire the Company's works. The provisions which govern such an acquisition have been elaborated with great care in order to preclude the possibility of a deserving power developer being prejudiced by the purchase. These provisions were designed at the instigation of the Director of Commerce and were fully considered and approved by that body and the Special Committee of the Legislative Council. In the person of the person whose views were desired to protect a very necessary and desirable element to the development of the

organisation of the power scheme of the Protectorate. It should therefore be obvious that if it became necessary to purchase the works of this Company the application of these provisions in the acquisition would ensure generous justice being done.

I will here conclude my reference to this Company with the information that by the law which has been in force since 1901, it is not competent for the Secretary of State, or for Government to grant monopoly rights to supply in any area. Also that the Concession which was proposed was an unworkable document. That the monopoly area which it is presumed to give to the Company, Government has already been forced to allow others to enter in order to give supplies which were urgently required and which this Company had promised would be available years ago.

The plant from which these supplies are being given has been in its entirety purchased and erected during the war.

Important settlers who are engaged in large developments in what was proposed to be this Company's area, have asked that they be allowed to take supplies from works now being constructed on the Maraga River, as they decline to jeopardize their business by relying on this Company for supplies. They have been told that they may take the offered supplies. Had they been refused they would have installed their own power plants.

(initialled) J.M.B.

321

C O
50427
Recd
Prnc SEP 19

~~30~~

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

322

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

Wesley, Thomas, 1733-1803

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the bill of exchange of the 1st inst. and in reply to inform you that the same has been duly cashed and the proceeds forwarded to you by the bank of New York.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Your obedient servant,
 J. M. Smith

New York, 10th Decr 1854

Dear Sir,
 I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the bill of exchange of the 1st inst. and in reply to inform you that the same has been duly cashed and the proceeds forwarded to you by the bank of New York.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Your obedient servant,
 J. M. Smith

New York, 10th Decr 1854

Dear Sir,
 I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the bill of exchange of the 1st inst. and in reply to inform you that the same has been duly cashed and the proceeds forwarded to you by the bank of New York.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Your obedient servant,
 J. M. Smith

New York, 10th Decr 1854

... of People ... the ...

... the ...

... have been ...

... negotiations ...

... the ...

... the ...

... the ...

... the ...

[The page contains several lines of extremely faint, illegible handwriting, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the paper. The text is mostly obscured by noise and low contrast.]

... are to be placed in the
... of the ...
... the ...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

and the ... position - could not

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

The ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

21/11/15

Dear Mr. [Name] I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

I am sorry to hear that the
last made good their defects
[illegible]

[Faint, illegible handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly including a date and a name.]

[The main body of the page is almost entirely obscured by a dense, dark, and heavily textured layer, likely ink bleed-through or a similar artifact, rendering the original text completely illegible.]

[Faint, illegible handwritten text at the bottom of the page.]

in proof of these methods, was not and
in the middle and to be in an

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

in the middle of the

... the ... Council ...
The
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

of their competence or from that
 of their questionable conduct and
 misrepresentation. We do have
 fully discussed the true nature
 of these concessions. It is
 a great mistake

To suppose the Commission
 apply for the recognition of the
 under the Proclamation of 1763. We
 have pointed out the
 of the Commission which
 we shall not do them

Our only duty is to
 state the facts as they are
 to the Commission. It is not
 the duty of the Commission to
 make any such statement
 which is not true and which
 is not in accordance with the
 facts of the case.

If the Commission had
 the Commission is not
 any. The Commission is
 the Commission. The Commission
 which you are not

It is not the duty of the
 Commission to make any
 statement which is not true
 and which is not in accordance
 with the facts of the case.

