

EAST AFR. PROT

C.O
14317

14317

29 APR 13

Governor 220
Field

RAILWAY ESTIMATES 1912-13

1913

States no excess on the Maintenance Vote is now anticipated but that there will on the contrary be a saving. There will however be an excess expdre under Special Expdre. Submits explanation.

April
Last previous Paper

1897
12-3

~~W. Bottrill~~ ~~W. Stephenson~~
W. Bottrill W. Stephenson

When 9521/13 & 12124/13 were under
consideration, it was not thought that
the re-allocations in question meant
that the expenditure was going to "Railway
Dept. Special Expenditure", as now
appears to be the case from this diff.
You have pointed out that this does
not matter very much in 1912-13,
as the "modified 1/2-1/2 principle"
really only takes effect from 1/4/13,
but in 1913-14 re-allocations of this
kind cannot be allowed.

? it will be sufficient to send
to the Treasury a copy of this diff.
with

W. BOTTRILL - SA
A. S. E. W.
Next Issue of Paper
14319

with the Supplementary estimates
proposed referring to C.O. 1st.

27 Jan. in Conf 1897 $\frac{12}{13}$ to which
it forms the succeeding paper -
but at the same time we shall refer
to C.O. 1st 29 March (9321/13), 18 April
(12124/13) with the latter to be sent to
Treasury on 14327/13 $\frac{1}{2}$ - but
have them to raise any protest
if they wish to.

all

I don't think the Treasury 9/5/13
can raise any difficulty over these transfers from
Railway Ordinary to Railway Special Expenditure
in connexion with the 1913-14 Estimates
arrangements, ~~as far as it is on account of~~
the expenditure - they are put here at nearly
£3,000 (I do not know how this figure is
arrived at, as I can not identify, from the
three quarterly returns received, £3,700, and from
 $\frac{73214}{15} + \frac{12124}{15}$ about £2,500, or say £6,200 in all
as having been transferred].

The point is that in connexion with the
1913-14 Estimates the Prof to be transferred from
Ordinary to Special the provision for new minor
works, formerly included under Abstract B.
It now appears that they consider themselves
bound to transfer in the same way certain
items from Abstract A also - I presume
the new minor works which are estimated
at £9,000 for this year. If they had
made this change in the 1913-14 Estimates
the permissible expenditure for the

Railway Special Expenditure

387

From Balances

From Ordinary

June Return

£ 2940 9 9

16 25 4 8

Sept. "

1230 13 3

Decr. "

2070 19 2

20 38 3 10

9321/10

1356 4 2

1204/10

1182 15 0

£ 6242 2 2

£ 6202 7 8

see below X

year would have been much reduced
We must send the papers to the Treasury
as proposed & I think we may leave them
to raise the point.

388

14319

It is not as if the figures we have
were above suspicion. The Supplementary
Estimate, received by the same mail as this,
from the ^{a Special Expenditure} Excess, [i.e. that total as there was no
consideration of it] is the £12,444 (Est. 5) of £14,000
- the figure quoted here also. Of this over £6,000
is definitely stated in the Supplemental Returns
to have been met from the £13,000 carried
over from 1911/12, which leaves only £8,000
as the sum transferred from Ordinary
Expenditure.

I attach a statement (on quarto paper)
showing what details we have of the Special
Expenditure. The total of £12,444 is
only £1,660 less than that given in the
Supplementary estimate, & this estimate of
additional expenditure up to March 31st
is insufficient to reconcile any discrepancy.
? as proposed, but I think
we must find out what the figures
mean.

W.L.S. 14.5.17

M. Read Agree as to action proposed to be taken
action


18/5

I asked Mr Stephenson to return the paper
to me so that I might qualify ~~X~~ above. In the
case of the Abstract B transfer the Treasury
allowed us to take it to account the fact that the year
1912-13

1913-14 was a year of transition and to
calculate on from authorized expenditure as if
the transfer had been ^{applied} in the case of the
1912-13 estimates. It is possible that they would
have agreed to the same course if the District
A transfer had been effected on the 1913-14
estimates. We need not therefore have any doubts
about this year but we must be careful, if the
transfer is included in the gross amount
deducted, not to ask for another consideration
over again.

Mr. Stephenson agrees W.C.S. 16.5.13

above
A. J. R.
16/5/13

C.O
14317 389

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI, RECD 29 APR 13
BRITISH EAST AFRICA.

AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

No. 220

April 3rd, 1913.

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to your despatch No. 67 of 24th January in which you presume that full details of the excess on the Railway Estimates for the current year will be furnished with the Supplementary Estimate in which the additional expenditure is included.

2. As a matter of fact no excess on the Railway Maintenance Vote is now anticipated, on the contrary a saving of £12,132 is shown in the Supplementary Estimate; against this however the provision for Railway Department Special Expenditure will be exceeded by £14,195, caused by, so far as regards £12,952, expenditure on capital works included originally under the Maintenance Estimate but transferred, in accordance with the regulations governing incidence of expenditure,

to

RIGHT HONOURABLE
LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET, LONDON, S.W.

to Capital and charged to the Special Expenditure
Vote. These transfers have been reported from
time to time to you and sanctioned. The balance
of the excess expenditure is for uncompleted
works of last year as approved in your telegram
of 2nd December 1912 and your despatch No. 389
of 6th idem.

*Recd
27/12/12*

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,

A. Ganga Baij

GOVERNOR.