



LAST AT THE PROT
nyl 670

C O
7670
REC
REC 14 MAR 10

General Conf
14

1910

6 Feb.

of previous Paper.

4
14902

Mr. P. Cobbs Land Concessions

*Submit report with memo by Comms of Lands
reaf. Mr. Cobbs proposals - replies also to
accusations made by Mr. Cobb regarding alleged
obstructive attitude adopted by Gov. auths*

Further for Conf 5-4-11

The reply to this despatch could be divided into two ^{separate paragraphs} parts. The first despatch would take up the various points directly connected with Mr. Cobb's concession, express the hope that the difficulties anticipated in paragraphs 4 and 5 will be avoided; and take note that the Governor will write further about Mr. Cobb's co-operative scheme. It would then go on to observe, with reference to paragraph 20 of the despatch, that, although the details of the concession were discussed with Mr. Cobb in this country, the Secretary of State did not indicate the general lines on which he thought an arrangement might be arrived at, leaving the actual settlement of the matter in the Governor's hands; point out that it was at the Governor's own desire that the Secretary of State intervened in the matter last summer (Gov./34531); and go on to observe generally as to the representations made by concessionaires in this country in the

sense

Subsequent Paper.
4
22060 154

sense of the latter part of Mr Fiddes's letter to Sir Percy Girouard of the 26th February on Gov./4702.

The second despatch should take up the reference in paragraph 7 to the opinion expressed by the Secretary of State as to the manner in which this case was handled by the local departments, and should be generally in the sense of the first two paragraphs of Mr Fiddes's letter of the 26th February on Gov./4702.

J.F.B.

March 18.

Mr Fiddes.

I have discussed this with Mr Butler. It is clear that the local authorities appear to have really gone wrong in the matter of the maps. If you compare the passage which I have marked with blue pencil on p. 3 of Mr Rastor Bright's memo: (2nd one: i.e. the deep.) with p.p. 15-17 of the Print attached to C 37722/09 you will see that no satisfactory explanation is given of the delinquent action of the local authorities in the matter. Proceed as proposed?

H. J. R.

19/10
W. 21

J.F.B.
21.3

at once

The Secretary to the Administration presents his Compliments to the Superintendent of the Printing Department, Colonial Office, and with reference to his memorandum of June 6th last returns duly corrected the inclosures contained therein.

Nairobi,

July 5th 1910.



CO
7573

217

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI, 14 MAR 10,
BRITISH EAST AFRICA.

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

February 10th 1910.

CONFIDENTIAL

No. 14

(Incl. 1)

6
39252
9
4

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch Confidential of December 10th last respecting Mr. Powys-Cobb's concession on the Mau Escarpment and various questions connected therewith.

2. I note that the transfer of Mr. Welford's and Mr. Hockley's farms is sanctioned.

3. I am glad to learn that Your Lordship does not wish that the 'pens' lying within the blocks chosen by Mr. Cobb should be excluded from the total acreage of his grant.

4. With regard to paragraph 4 I think that it would be possible and even desirable to throw in a few small suitable patches of forest land in lieu of the right to cut free timber for a term of years, and I shall endeavour to give effect to Your Lordship's suggestion, but I feel bound to state that this concession will probably lead to further

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE EARL OF GREVE, K.G.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

DOWNING STREET,

LONDON, S.W.

See also 4072-20

(2)

further demands on Mr.Cobb's part and I doubt very much whether his views, as to the number and size of these patches will coincide with those held by the Government of this Protectorate.

5. Similarly every effort will be made to lay out Mr.Cobb's boundaries as soon as possible on the lines indicated in paragraph 5 of Your Lordship's despatch but in this also the proviso that due regard is to be had to future grants in the neighbourhood is very likely to involve a divergence of opinion. Such a proviso is, I need hardly say, most reasonable, but the recognition of its necessity is in a large measure responsible for the delays which have hitherto taken place in settling the terms of this concession.

6. I shall be prepared to consider carefully the cooperative scheme now put forward by Mr.Cobb, but, as Your Lordship observes, the proposal is an entirely new one and I am not therefore delaying my reply to the other questions raised in order to review the arguments for and against it.

7. Your Lordship has not asked me for a reply to the strictures contained in Mr.Cobb's letter of the 19th November last to the Under Secretary of State and I should have been glad to think that they had been rated at their true value and that no explanation was therefore required. I am however given to understand that such is not the case and in justice to the Departments concerned I think it only fair to put the other side of the question before Your Lordship.

g
3/11/11
H

✓

(5)

8. The letter raises a number of points, many of them of minor importance which are dealt with in the attached Memorandum by the Commissioner of Lands and its enclosures. The Chief Conservator of Forests is away on tour and his remarks, if thought desirable, will be forwarded later.

9. I do not propose to weary Your Lordship with a detailed examination of Mr. Cobb's ^{various} accusations but I should like to record my opinion that they have been adequately answered by the heads of the Land and Survey Departments, and that it has been clearly shown that there was no desire on the part of the latter to obstruct the concession in any way.

10. Mr. Cobb has been kind enough in the opening part of his letter to congratulate me on the promptitude with which I directed my attention to his affairs. In point of fact, though doubtless I should in any case have dealt with the question of his concession at an early date, it was due to the representations of the Land Office, which had been unsuccessful in obtaining any definite reply from Mr. Cobb or his agents, that I took action as soon as I did.

11. In view of this his remarks on the spirit of the Protectorate Administration and on the lack of trust between settler and official would appear to be entirely irrelevant. They are however interesting as showing the strong prejudice which colours all ^{his} statements and renders it almost impossible for him to form an impartial judgment where his opinions differ from those of the officials with

whom

(4)

whom he has to deal.

12. I should like to summarize briefly the position as it appears to me after a perusal of the statements made on both sides.

13. In 1807 Mr. Cobb made an application for land in a district which had not been surveyed and was not therefore offered by the Land Office for settlement to ordinary applicants, though, so far from being unknown, it was recognized as suitable for a certain class of farming. Mr. Cobb's case presented certain special considerations. His possession of capital was undoubted and he represented a group of beneficiaries under a trust. The circumstances were held to justify exceptional treatment and Your Lordship sanctioned a grant of 35,000 acres within the boundaries described by Mr. Cobb. The latter were subsequently found on a rough survey to contain nearly 70,000 acres and Mr. Cobb was asked to make a selection. Difficulties arose immediately as he wished to pick out all the best pieces of land within the area and render the remaining 35,000 acres practically worthless for future allotment. He also proposed to include in his property, but not in his total acreage, certain 'pans' and marshy pieces of ground. The Land Office could not conscientiously consent to this and their action has been justified by Your Lordship's proviso that 'special stress should be placed on the importance of laying out the boundaries with due regard to future grants of land in the immediate neighbourhood' and by the decision that 'pans' must be included

(5)

included in the acreage of the estate.

14. Mr. Cobb then stated that he was unable to mark out what he wanted because the maps supplied were inadequate, whereas in point of fact the Survey Department was awaiting information which he alone could give as to his requirements and the delay was therefore entirely due to himself.

15. He then raised the question of free timber for estate purposes which he appears from his letter to have tacitly assumed would be granted to him, on what grounds I entirely fail to perceive. He was informed that the Governor had decided that he might be allowed to have it for ten years. He contested this and put forward a new claim for definite grants of forest land. At this stage in the negotiations, while a number of questions still remained unsettled, he sailed for England in July 1900 without leaving a representative in East Africa authorized to come to any decision on his behalf.

16. The Land Office naturally regarded this as an unsatisfactory state of affairs and brought it to my notice with a view to getting some definite reply out of Mr. Cobb. It is, to say the least of it, somewhat surprising that in the face of the delays so persistently caused by himself he should have had the hardihood to write his letter of November 19th to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. I may mention that he introduces into that letter the entirely new proposition of a co-operative scheme. This is very characteristic of his methods.

17.

17. I may state in conclusion that I am far from insensible of the benefits which the presence of men of means confers on this Protectorate, and I am more than willing to further Mr. Cobb's wishes in every legitimate direction, but I do take the strongest exception to the extremely unjust and unfounded accusations which he has seen fit to bring against departmental officials who have been actuated throughout by no other desire than to do their duty to the Government which they serve.

18. It would no doubt have been perfectly easy and would have saved those concerned an infinity of trouble and anxiety had they conceded everything for which Mr. Cobb asked and the result would have been eminently satisfactory to that gentleman, but I take leave to doubt whether the interests of the Protectorate as a whole would have been well served by such action on their part.

19. I may mention in conclusion that Mr. Cobb has neither visited nor communicated with the Land office in regard to this concession since his arrival at the beginning of January nor has he sought an interview with myself or with the Secretariat. He is said to be now on a visit to German East Africa and is not expected back till the end of this month.

20. I cannot fail again to impress the undesirability of the details of such concessions being discussed at home. I feel positive that if Mr. Cobb had been told from the outset that the
Government

(7)

Government of the Protectorate were the only arbitrators in details, we would have come to more definite agreements long since. I would propose with Your Lordship's concurrence to follow this procedure in the present instance.

I have the honour to be,
Your Lordship's humble,
obedient servant,

GOVERNOR.

ENCLOSURE in No. 254

In Despatch No. 41 of 11/2/1908

254
C O
76 J
REF
14 MAR 10

MEMORANDUM.

The correspondence forwarded with the Colonial Office despatch of December 10th shows that Mr. E. Powys Cobb has been accusing practically every official with whom he has had dealings of either incompetence or obstructiveness, and in some cases almost of dishonesty.

I do not know if we are expected to defend ourselves from these accusations.

2. The Land Officer (Mr. Barton-Wright), who was acting Commissioner of Lands during my absence on leave, has written a note which is forwarded.

The Director of Surveys is absent on tour, but the Deputy Director of the Cadastral Branch has sent a copy of a letter, received from Mr. Cobb, dated November 23rd 1908, with a note which shows that Mr. Cobb's accusations against that Department are not correct.

A good deal is said against the Forest Department. I leave the Chief Conservator of Forests to deal with this part of the letter, and I forward this note to you first, as Mr. Hutchins is absent on tour.

3. Mr. Cobb has entirely misunderstood my action as regards the question of free timber. When he mentioned the subject to me I told him we had been dealing with the matter, and referred him verbally to the Gazette Notification of January 1st 1908, which contains the rules under which permits for free timber are given.

When

8

When I found that the Forest Department had given him a permit for one year, I at once had it corrected to one for two years as contemplated in the notice for new grants.

When Mr. Cobb wrote and demanded a permit for the term of his lease I wrote my letter to H.E. of May 10th 1909 (No. 36 in P.). This was referred to the Executive Council.

The decision come to was that, unless we were prepared to alter the rules of January 1st 1908 so as to extend the term of free permits to every farm in the Protectorate, and we did not think there were sufficient grounds to do this, Mr. Cobb's application could not be agreed to. But he was allowed a special concession for 10 years instead of two.

4. In one part of his letter Mr. Cobb has mixed up the question of the fixing of the boundaries of his blocks with that of free timber.

My letter of February 12, 1909 to the Chief Conservator of Forests, and that of March 2nd 1909 to Mr. Cobb had no concern with the free timber question. The heads of the Survey and Forest Departments urged that Mr. Cobb should first indicate what land he wanted on the plan which had been furnished him before sending officials to the spot at great cost of time and money. This appeared to me very reasonable.

5. Mr. Cobb is correct in the statement contained at the end of part 3 of his letter. At the interview with Sir James Hayes-Sadler he said he wanted the Forest strip "F" as he wished its shelter for his cattle, and

he was also desirous of building a house there. Mr. Hutchins said the strip contained valuable forest, and it was agreed that Mr. Cobb could use the glades and have the shelter he desired, he agreeing not to cut any of the trees.

I thought at the time, and still think, it would be better to include the strip in Mr. Cobb's grant. Its area is not large, and it might well be included among the pieces of forest to be given for "estate" purposes.

6. I may refer here to Mr. Cobb's accusation in part 2 that the secretary of state's letter of January 8th 1908 lay in the Governor's office and only reached him on May 4th.

That letter was addressed by the secretary of State to Mr. Cobb, and a copy sent to the Governor for information.

When in course of conversation with Mr. Cobb I found that the letter had not reached him, I gave him a copy of it from my file on May 4th.

7. With these preliminary remarks I proceed to comment on the despatch of the Secretary of State.

(Para. 3.) I note that sanction is accorded to the transfer to Mr. Cobb of Mr. D. Hockley's 5000 acre farm, and of Mr. Welsford's 1030 acre farm.

Also that Mr. Cobb's request to exclude "pans" occurring within his blocks is not agreed to.

(Para. 4) I have already explained the reasons for giving Mr. Cobb a permit for free timber for 10 years. It is not a case of restriction, but of giving him a concession

more 16

more favourable than has been allowed to other grantees of ~~the~~ Crown Land.

I quite agreed that it will be best to let Mr. Cobb have some forest right out. That will obviate further representations for free timber. But I foresee that when we come to demarcating these bits of forest Mr. Cobb will demand a good deal more than the Forest Department is likely to concede. I doubt if Mr. Cobb will be satisfied with a "few small suitable patches of forest land" not exceeding half a square mile individually".

(Para. 5) We will communicate with Mr. Cobb and ask him to arrange a meeting on the spot with a surveyor and a copy of the instructions to the surveyor will be sent him.

I can confidently say that the Land Department has consistently made every attempt to meet his wishes "within reason". His requests have not always been characterised as such, and we hold that he could have marked off on the plan furnished him approximately the blocks he wishes to take up.

However, we will do our best again, and the Forest Department will be requested to say if Mr. Cobb's allegations that the tongue of forest jutting out into his property do not contain timber suitable for "estate" purposes.

It only remains to deal with Mr. Cobb's proposition for a co-operative organization alluded to in ~~paragraph~~ para. 6 of the despatch.

In so far as it is intended to bring undeveloped

farms into the Cobb property I am against the scheme. Our policy is to expect each grantee to develop his own farm, and when the minimum development has been carried out to allow a free right of transfer.

I do not see how we can prevent Mr. Cobb from bringing into his organization developed farms, the owners of which are desirous of transferring to him outright or in order to enable them to carry out further development.

Under existing rules such proposed transfers require the sanction of the Secretary of State if the transferee is already a holder of more than 10,000 acres.

~~Sd.~~ J. Montgomery.

Commissioner of Lands

21-1-10.

The Secretary to Administration

(passed thro' the Hon'ble the Commr. of Lands on his return from tour)

With reference to the long letter of November 13th, 1909, on which I have been asked to make remarks, I would say re (2) that it will be within the recollection of His Excellency that it was from a desire on the part of the Land Department to have this long outstanding matter settled which prompted the Ag. Commissioner of Lands to address His Excellency on 13.10.09 in a long note setting forth the facts of the case.

(3) No comment.

(4) The fact that Mr. Cobb reckons most of the Protectorate officials as his personal friends is I think a refutation of his statement that a deep feeling of distrust exists between official and civilian, and I consider a sweeping general statement of this kind as unjust as it is unwarranted.

(5) Paragraph 1 no doubt correct. There were doubtless other large tracts equally suitable for settlement regarding which insufficient was known to give information, and which like the area subsequently applied for by Mr. Cobb were not mentioned. The object of most settlers arriving in the country is early settlement, and obviously the Land Office's efforts are usually directed to indicate land which can be obtained in the minimum amount of time. If an applicant applies for a terra incognita, he should not, I think, be surprised if delay occurs in subsequent negotiations when the necessary enquiries are being carried out.

(7) I am not in a position to refute or confirm but I am prepared to accept Mr. Cobb's statement as correct, and to allow the genuineness of his intentions

to

2.

to energetically develop, but regarding (8) Mr. Cobb in stating that the delay is due to the action of the Protectorate Administration omits to state that one of the causes of the delay is due to the difficulty in getting Mr. Cobb to tell us what portion he desired of the total area defined as covering the 35,000 acre grant which total area turned out to be some 70,000 acres in extent, and he also omits to mention the further new issues raised by himself on the question of timber to be granted for development.

Regarding (9) I regret that I was under a misapprehension, and I thought that Mr. Cobb had actually occupied some of the land applied for.

Respecting Part II.

1. (a) Is a question for the Forest Department to answer.

(b) Is a question for the Survey Department to answer.

(c) As these notes pass through the Hon'ble Commissioner of Lands, with whom, together with the Colonial Office, these issues were negotiated, I will leave the reply under these heads to the Hon'ble the Commissioner of Lands, as also the long paragraph 2, which refers principally to interviews and negotiations with the Hon'ble Commissioner of Lands.

3. Is a question for the expert advice of the technical department concerned, i.e. the Forest Department, though from an outside point of view I would incline to the opinion that the practical method of dealing with matter from the point of view of economy, if it is conceded that so much free timber is to be allowed, would be to include a certain proportion of forest on the estate which lessee would be free to cut, and so do away with expense

3.

attendant on marking certain trees and the difficulty of so doing in remote situations such as the one under consideration. It would also allow of a much more practical external boundary for the estate, straight line give and take boundaries being employed instead of trying to follow an irregular and curvilinear forest edge.

(9) Mr. Cobb's letter of September 9th was passed to Survey Department, who told me they were dealing with the matter. It was a question dealing purely with maps and surveys, and the Director of Surveys is I think in a position to satisfactorily answer the quibbles raised.

Last paragraph of 9 is not correct.

On July 23rd, 1908, he is sent a plan asking him to define where he wants his land. In February we are still without the desired information.

In March, 1909, he is again asked to do this by the Hon'ble Commissioner of Lands.

Mr. Cobb has shown himself an adept at evasion. He first pretends the first map sent him is too small a scale and too wanting in detail to make it possible to define what he desires; a larger scale plan is supplied, and he asks before replying that he may be assured in possession of those points of great natural beauty for which he has contended. Not being gifted with second sight, and these "beauty spots" being unknown to us we were unable to proceed. Finally a meeting was arranged, which took place on 7.5.09, when Mr. Cobb indicated roughly the position of the land he wanted. At his request the area was roughly computed by planimeter, yet he has the audacity to state that the important calculations for which he had so often asked were then made in less than half an hour, when up to that date the areas were undefined.

I think that with the perversion of facts before me, did I not incline to the view that Mr. Cobb's memory is at

Fault

15

4.

fault, that there would be a good deal of excuse for the official treating, not the settler in general, but Mr. Cobb in particular, with a feeling of qualified trust. From this point forward the facts are known to His Excellency as it was as a result of not being able to get a reply to my letter of July 7th, that I placed the facts before His Excellency with a view that Mr. Cobb be obliged to complete settlement.

I am pleased to see that His Lordship the Secretary of State is in accord regarding the exclusion of the useless swamps falling within the area granted.

Yet in the last paragraph but three Mr. Cobb says that the Acting Commissioner of Lands has misunderstood him and makes fresh proposals, which should not in my opinion be accepted. If such a principle were accepted, we should be inundated with similar absurd requests.

Sd/- R.B.Wright.

Land Officer.

I asked D.C.B. to check this note before passing to you as I wished to be certain that no independent correspondence between Cobb and Survey altered anything which I have stated above.

Mr. Townsend's minute of 11.1.10 covers a letter from Mr. Cobb, which is interesting, inasmuch as Mr. Cobb writes on November 1st to the Director of Surveys saying that he must still delay the marking off of boundaries.

Intd/ R.B.W.

12.1.10.

Land Officer,

I cannot find whether Mr. Cobb was supplied with the information regarding area before date mentioned, but this letter (copy) is rather interesting, inasmuch as if Mr. Cobb had complied with the Director of 'Surveys' request he would have received the areas asked for long before he did; the mistake Mr. Cobb makes is asking for calculations instead of asking for area; we naturally thought he wished for the arithmetical work, and not as appears from his remarks simply the area. The area of this irregular block had to be taken out by planimeter, as in addition to being irregular it was a plane table survey and not theodolite.

Mr. Cobb constantly refers to the various portions of his land and we were awaiting his plan being returned showing what portions he desired in the area surveyed, and until the plan came we could give him no information on the subject.

Sd/- A.E. TOWNSEND.

11. 1. 10

14

5, Vasco da Gama Street,
Mombasa,
23rd November 1908.

The Director of Surveys,
re Establishment of Beacons after Survey

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter No.455 of the 18th inst.:

I beg to thank you for being so good as to recognise that we have been discussing this matter at cross purposes.

I regret I am unable to send you the plan supplied to me because I have marked thereon certain additional information which is of use to me, and I have no staff at my disposal to make another copy.

Moreover since ^{we} now both understand the situation and since I have given the necessary information notice of the Hon'ble Commissioner of Lands notice published in the Gazette I do not feel that further action on my part is immediately called for.

Doubtless in a sense you are correct in calling the survey in question a final one, but in another sense your statement is inaccurate because by the memo which you cannot find some of the boundary lines have to be fixed by me and that I have not yet done.

I entirely agree with you that the action of the other Departments does not concern yours but I venture to submit that their action does concern me very materially, and until the matters to which I referred in my last letter are adjusted I fear I must delay the marking off of the boundaries which will make the survey final.

Some months ago I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with the Director Cadastral Surveys and we then came to an arrangement which was satisfactory to me, and I believe to him also.

I have etc.,
(Sd/-) E. Powys Cobb.



Gov. G. A. P.
7670

5th apt
~~March~~ 1910

DRAFT.

G. A. P. (Conf.)

Sir,

Genl. Sir P. Guouard.

I have the honour to

MINUTE.

Mr. Butler March 24

Mr. Read 24

✓ Mr. Fiddes. Mar 24

Mr. Just.

Mr. Coz.

Sir C. Lucas.

✓ Sir F. Hopwood. Mar 29, 3

✓ Col. Seely.

✓ Lord Crewe. 30.3.10 III

acknowledge the receipt
of your confidential
despatch N^o 14 of
the 10th of February
relating to Mr.
Powy's C.O.W.'s con-
cession.

2. I trust that
you will be able to
arrive at a satisfactory

It was at your instance
that I took up the
question of the
concession with Mr. Cobb
in this country. ⁸/₁₄

consequence of your
telegram, N^o 149 of
the 19th of October, and
Mr Jackson's telegram
N^o 158 of the 26th of

F N^o 3451
(3452/69)

(35287/69)
E N^o 3526

H N^o 35281

October, a letter was
addressed to Mr. Cobb
by my direction calling
upon him to reply
definitely, with the least
possible delay, to the
enquiry addressed to
him by the Protectorate
Court as to the choice

(on 35287/69)

✓

had passed and
making one or two
suggestions for meeting
difficulties, agreed in
the main with the
attitude taken up by
the Protectorate
Govt on the questions
at issue, and left
to you the task
of ^{effecting} ~~making~~ a final
settlement.

DRAFT

MINUTE.

- Mr.
- Mr.
- Mr. Fiddes.
- Mr. Just.
- Mr. Cox.
- Sir C. Lucas.
- Sir F. Hopwood.
- Col. Seely.
- Lord Crewe.

5. I have ~~no~~ ^{no} ~~desire~~ ^{to} ~~of~~ establish
~~ing~~ a practice by
which final terms
will be offered to
concessionaires in this
country without the

with concessions, subject
257
to the observance

of any general guiding
principles which may
have been laid down.

6. It must, however,
be clearly understood
that I cannot refuse
to receive and consider
representations which
may be addressed to
me in this country, even
on the subject of
negotiations which
have been proceeding
in the Protectorate.
I am sure that you
will ^{see} agree with me in
~~thinking~~ that such a
refusal would play

with concessions, Subject
257
to the observance
of any general guiding
principles which may
have been laid down.

6. It must, however,
be clearly understood
that I cannot refuse
to receive and consider
representations which
may be addressed to
me in this country, even
on the subject of
negotiations which
have been proceeding
in the Protectorate.
I am sure that you
will ^{see} ~~agree with me in~~
~~thinking~~ that such a
refusal would flag

7670

Gov. E. O. P

258



7670

~~Handwritten scribble~~

5th April 1910

DRAFT.

a P (Conf.)

Sir,

Sir P. Girouard

I have in another

MINUTE.

Mr. Butler March 24

despatch replied

Mr. Read 24

Mr. Fildes 11/2/24

Handwritten note

to your conf. despatch

Mr. Just

Mr. Cox

Sir C. Lucas

N^o 14 of the 10th of

Sir F. Hopwood, 7/11/23

Col. Seely

Handwritten calculations:
7/11/23
30.3
C 31 III

+ February on the

Lord Crewe

subject of Mr. Pooys

Col's concession. I

desire to take up

separately the

reference made in

2 after 4078-20

7. 11. 7670

Mr. Com supported his statement with copies of ~~a~~ ^{and} extracts from the correspondence which had passed between himself and the Protectorate officers, and it was on this correspondence that my view was formed. In fairness to the officers involved, I should state that my opinion was based more particularly on the correspondence relating to a map or plan of the concession which took

place ^{from} ~~the~~ ~~to~~ ~~clear~~

July 1908 ^{awards} ~~awards~~

I regret to be
compelled to ~~state~~ ^{say}

that I ~~see~~ ^{find} nothing

in your despatch or
its enclosures calculated

to remove ~~the~~
impression made by a

perusal of that cor-
respondence.

1 APR 1910

3. I may add that
the general references
made by Mr. C.M. to
the administration of
the P.E. and the relations

between officials and
settlers were ignored
by me as a matter of
course, and had no
sort of influence on

my treatment of the
I have on
Grew