

*Ingot
and the bar*

With very few exceptions
have been removed to
Asia and internal
forces in America
every resident have
not been removed from
the State and they
have either been interned
or placed on parole.
3 re above measures
were taken for
military reasons and,
so far as the Bonar Law
was aware there
was nothing in the Berlin Act
of 1915 which forbade
such action being taken
either by the British or
the Belgian Govt. In
fact

EAST AER PROT.

163
C.O.
44274
15

6/1/2 '14

Magistrate

1915

24 Sept

Last previous Paper.

No
3978

Govt Gov Confiscated & Detained

Next subsequent paper.

(2801-a) W. 14212-12. 26,000. 2/15 D & B.

British Ord c 1907

Sates has to open regarding the
amending Ord c 1907 would appear
to be abstract to apply mutatis
mutando to the 1907 Ord.

H.C. Bidder

hi J. Ammon

I am of 3978 & it seems
clear that the S. of 8 cannot
amount to the enactment of the
Amendt Ord c 1915 - or in view of 44274
it is a question whether the original Ord c
should not be repealed; although as it has
now been in force for 8 years without
justification & vested interests have no
objection under it they yet come
will probably be to let it stand.

You will see from para 3 of
the Attorney for the Crown in the
that the right duty of 1907
is implied further

T.O.

sufficient to afford any protection
to the local producer, & if it were
possible to raise the duty above the
level we could protect the local
producer & at the same time avoid
the difficulties raised by the Berlin
Act 1885 But under the general Act
of the Brussels Conf. 1889-90 the
import duties in the conventional Brus.
of the Congo cannot be raised above
10% ad val. Then comes the
situation suggested by the D.O. in
39848 - of assisting the industry
by grants - & aid - but I should be
dead against this. It will be
impossible to draw the line between
this & other industries, & an industry
which requires bolstering up the Govt
does not inspire confidence.

Send copy of Sft. £ 20 or 35145,
of 39848, & of 44274 in a conf.
desp. to the Fr^r, entering in
the sense of my minute & asking
him at Bedford to do the above.

H. J. R.

Attested

29/9/15

M 30.9.15 H.R. 29/9/15

46

Foreign Office

September 24th 1915

Sir:

C.O
44274

RECD
Oct 27 SEP 15

30

With reference to your letter, 39848/1915, of the 4th instant, enquiring whether Secretary Sir E. Gray had any observations to offer on the provisions of the East Africa Protectorate Ostrich Ordinance 1907 in the light of Article V of the General Act of Berlin, 1885, I am directed by him to state that the Ordinance of 1907 was not submitted to this Department for the observations of the Secretary of State at the time of its publication, and that in the circumstances it would appear to be a work of supererogation for him how to offer any observations upon this Ordinance eight years after it has been in force.

I am, however, to refer to my letter 107735/15 of the 26th ultimo, and to state that the observations made therein regarding the Amending Ordinance of 1915 would

(126146/15)

would appear in the abstract to apply, ~~which is~~
to the Ordinance of 1907.

I am,

Sir,
Your most Obedient,

humble Servant,

Maurice de Bruxelles

To 44274/1915 E.A.R.

466

5 October 1915.

b⁶

Sir,

[Gov.
35745]

Ans 2/13/2

With reference to your letter
to 279 of the 30th July I
have the honour to transmit
to you for your info.
the inclosed copy of communication
with the F.O. on the subject
of the District Amendment
Ordinance 1915.

DRAFT

E.A.R.

Confidential.

For Mr H.C. Balfeld.

MINUTE

Mr Harper 1/10/15

Mr Bottomley 1/10/15 f.

Mr.

Mr.

Sir G. Fiddes.

Sir H. Just.

Sir J. Anderson.

Mr. Steel-Maitland.

Mr. Bonar Law.

(35745)

(39848)

(44274)

(44274)

(44274)

2. In view of the
opinion expressed in the
letter from the F.O. it ^{is} clear
that assent cannot
be given for the enactment
of the Amendment Ord. 1915,
and it is a question whether
the original Ord. of 1907
should not be repealed.
In view however of the
fact that the earlier order
has now been in force for five
years without protest, and