

1811

EAST AFR. PROT.

28411



Foot Expire on Great lightning. Accurate

*reasonable essentially from transparency.
 deals with other letters from local and
 submitting question of charging finally in
 account or as advance.*

minutes within

Long list of letters from local and other agents

1811

C O
28411

Enclosure in File No. 1177. GENERAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

Date of Paper.	Date of Receipt.	Register Number.
22.7.11.	27.8.11	435/11.

Subject. (Mr. Mugo).

Government expenditure on street lighting, Nairobi
recoverable eventually from Municipality.

Question of charging finally in accounts or as
advance.

Referred to:-

A.R.S. 16/8.

Mr. Head.

Mr. Butler.

Will you please look at this? From an accounting point of view there is, I think, no doubt that the Acting Auditor is correct in his opinion of the manner in which the definite condition imposed by the Treasury, in the letter to the Secretary of State of 18.12.0 should be acted upon and, in the absence of evidence that such condition has since been modified, I propose to so inform him. Are there any other papers on the subject?

A.R.S. 16/8.

Mr. Stephenson

Mr. Head.

The condition imposed in the 3rd paragraph of Treasury/46510/08 is clear enough, and it has not been modified.

modified. But perhaps we had better go to the fountain-head.

? Tell the Treasury that the question has been raised, and ask whether it was their intention that the amount should actually be shown in the Protectorate accounts as an advance recoverable from the Municipality, or that the expenditure should be included in the expenditure of the Protectorate in the usual way, the Government being responsible for obtaining a refund of the amount from the Municipality when an appropriate occasion presented itself, and the amount refunded being credited to Revenue as a reimbursement. A copy of this correspondence should, I think, go to the Treasury.

F.S.A.B.

August 23rd.

I agree.

A.E.S.

23/8.

As above.

H.J.R.

24/8.

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE. 3 AUG

271213/80.

AUDIT OFFICE,
NAIROBI.

22nd July, 1911.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit for your consideration a copy of a letter to the Secretary to Administration of East Africa Protectorate on the subject of Audit Query No. 219 of 1910/11 and of a minute by the Comptroller the Governor in which he has expressed my opinion that certain expenditure incurred with Lighting the Streets of Nairobi should be shown in the accounts as an advance and be charged off finally to the vote for Public Works Extraordinary, Major Works, Electric Light installation.

This opinion I have maintained in view of a ruling given by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in Sir G.H. Murray's letter No. 17840/1908 to the Under Secretary of State Colonial Office that so much of the expenditure as relates to the Lighting of the Streets shall not be regarded as a final charge on Government funds but be treated as an advance to the Municipality to be repaid as soon as the municipality is self-supporting.

Copies of correspondence referred to above are attached herewith.

I have, etc.,

(SD) W.A. Kempe,
Acting Auditor.DIRECTOR OF COLONIAL AUDIT,
41, CHANCERY CROSS,
LONDON, S.W.

25411
 EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE

No. 204/80.

AUDIT OFFICE,

NAIROBI.

18th July, 1911.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit for His Excellency's consideration a copy of a Query on the subject of the Expenditure incurred in lighting the streets of Nairobi by electricity.

During the year 1909/10 Rs. 18298.81, and during 1910/11 Rs. 5701.19, making a total of Rs. 24,000 has been finally charged off against Government under "Public Works Extraordinary Major Works Nairobi Electric Light Installation", although the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury directed that the amount spent on lighting the streets "should not be regarded as a final charge on Government funds, but should be treated as an Advance to the Municipality to be repaid as soon as the Municipality is self-supporting". The Acting Treasurer does not agree that this amount should be shown as an Advance and so far, I consider, the accounts both of the Protectorate and the Municipality do not give a correct view of the financial position.

I am not aware of what instructions the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have given on the question of the water supply nor of what the ultimate position of the Nairobi Municipality may be with regard to the Protectorate, and I

maintain

maintain that in this instance, in face of the express directions of the Treasury the final accounts as submitted for the year 1909/10 have been and for 1910/11 will be incorrect.

I have, etc.,

(SD) W.A. Kemp.

Acting Auditor.

SECRETARY

TO THE ADMINISTRATION,

NAIROBI.

28411

Expenditure Query No. 219 of 1910/11

REPLY

From
AUDIT OFFICE.
Dated 7th June, 1911.

To
The Honourable the
Treasurer,
Nairobi.

Query.

Reply.

It is requested that this
query may be settled before the
accounts of the financial year
1910/11 are closed.

P.V.D.

Electric Lighting
Street Lighting

Acting Auditor,
Reply attached.
(SD) Henry P. Espie.
Acting Treasurer,
16.11.

Attention is called to the ruling on this expenditure of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in Sir G.H. Murray's letter No. 17840/1908 dated 16th December, 1908, to the Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office, (vide S.M.P. No. 1409/1908) enclosure (32). It is therein laid down that "so much of the expenditure as relates to the lighting of the streets shall not be regarded as a final charge

28411

MARCH 11

Query.

Reply.

charge on Government funds but be treated as an advance to the Municipality to be repaid as soon as the Municipality is self-supporting.

It is asked why these instructions have not been carried out.

(SD) W.A. Kempe.

Acting Auditor.

C O
28411

Minute No. 92 on S.M.P. No. 100/100-17 His
Excellency the Governor.

I agree with Treasurer - Any Government
Charges for water, lighting, etc., will as soon as a
Municipality is formed to subject of adjustment.

(Ind.) R.P.C.G.

20/7.

Appropriate occasion

Present's staff, and
the amount expended
being credited to Province
as a reimbursement

1

I had to be informed
that the amount of the expenditure
should actually be shown in
the Provincial account
as an advance received
from the Municipality,
as that ~~is~~ ~~is~~
should be included in
the expenditure of the
Prov. in the usual way,
the prov. being responsible
for obtaining a copy
of the account from the
Municipality when an