

1924

E. AFRICA
TANGANYIKA

C.O.

26465

2 JUN 24

TREASURY.

DATE

31st May 1924.

CIRCULATION

AMANI INSTITUTE.

Prepared to sanction "interim" scheme if they could be satisfied as to provision of funds after expiration of current year. Observe that scheme necessitates purchase of Sigi Rly (cost to be borne by T.T.) raising total initial cost to £15,000. Remark as to proportionate contributions recommended and defer sanction to scheme as a whole until assurances regarding future upkeep are forthcoming.

Previous Paper

Vol. 2. 23678

Spec MINUTES

W. Bottomley -
Sir H Reed -

Please see [unclear] minutes within.

This letter is amicably expressed, but it does not advance matters much. C.S. 17.2

Possibly it might come up at the meeting with Director of Agriculture on Thursday. His motion is I think by no means hostile provided it doesn't interfere with the provisions for his own work.

If we can satisfy ourselves in this way but can't get...

Subsequent Paper

W. / 29948

Henry & Co. by debatable
 It would be a mistake,
 with prompt leader of
 the Henry & Co., to
 do anything without
 consulting them.

W. J. R. 4/7/24

Dear Sirs

I understood that a club
 was being formed, with
 Lord Dunsen as Chairman,
 to consider the question of
 the recruitment & training
 of A.P. officers.

The proposal for the
 recruitment of a man was
 brought before the next
 A.P. conf. at which I
 presided, & unanimously approved.
 Lord Dunsen took a great
 interest & was when he was
 S. J. & if it could be
 arranged that ^{no money} should see
 Lord Dunsen before his return
 to Congo - Jap. & Lord Dunsen
 would also like the
 scheme. We ought to stand
 a good chance of getting the
 desired contribution from Congo
 W. J. R. 4/8/24

Henry &c. by debatable.
It would be a mistake,
with present leader of
the Henry & Leg. Co., to
do anything without
consulting them.

C. W. S. 11/1/14.

Major Jones

I understand that a club
is now being formed, with
Lord Nelson as Chairman,
to consider the question of
the recruitment & training
of Lieut. & officers.

The proposal for the
recruitment of amateurs was
drafted before the recent
League Conference, at which I
believed it was unanimously approved.
Lord Nelson took a great
interest & means when he was
at the post & if it could be
arranged that we should see
Lord Nelson before he returns
to camp - Mr. & Lord Nelson
would also view the
scheme. We ought to stand
a good chance of getting the
desired contribution from Henry &c.
H. J. R. 4/8/14

Indian and Javan establishments*.

The buildings are said to have cost the Germans £20,000, and their total expenditure on the Institute to have been £100,000. It is connected with the Tanga Railway by a narrow-gauge line about 15 miles in length from Tengen to Sigi, which adjoins the grounds of the Institute, and is 1300 feet above sea level. The grounds, 300 hectares in area, extend to an altitude of 3600 feet, thus providing a wide range for testing the adaptability of plants to various altitudes; and a small station was maintained at Tengen in order to allow of investigation into the conditions of the lowland plains. The main buildings are at 2977 feet above sea level. They include, beside the laboratories and workshops, storehouses &c, eight houses suitable for Europeans, and several ^{small} bungalows also a small native hospital and dispensary. The situation is of great natural beauty, of which every advantage had been taken in the arrangement of the buildings and their surroundings. It may be mentioned that for 18 months during the war the Institute was devoted to the production from its own resources of foodstuffs, liquors, medicine, soap &c, for the use of the German forces. In the list of these articles appear 15,200 bottles of "whiskey and other alcoholic liquors", 4683 kilos of chocolate and cocoa, 10,000 pieces of soap and 300 bottles of castor oil. Quinine is grown, and might be developed as a source of supply to East Africa generally.

What was to be done with this remarkable Institute on the transfer of the Territory to British Administration was a question which presented itself soon

after

Indian and Javan establishments*.

The buildings are said to have cost the Germans £20,000, and their total expenditure on the Institute to have been \$100,000. It is connected with the fanga Railway by a narrow-gauge line about 18 miles in length from Tengeni to Sigi, which adjoins the grounds of the Institute, and is 1200 feet above sea level. The grounds, 300 hectares in area, extend to an altitude of 3600 feet, thus providing a wide range for testing the adaptability of plants to various altitudes; and a small station was maintained at Tengeni in order to allow of investigation into the conditions of the lowland plains. The main buildings are at 2977 feet above sea level. They include, beside the laboratories and workshops, storehouses *ac*, eight houses suitable for Europeans, and several ^{small} bungalows; also a small native hospital and dispensary. The situation is of great natural beauty, of which every advantage had been taken in the arrangement of the buildings and their surroundings. It may be mentioned that for 18 months during the war the Institute was devoted to the production from its own resources of foodstuffs, liquors, medicine, soap *ac*, for the use of the German forces. In the list of these articles appear 15,200 bottles of "whiskey and other alcoholic liquors", 4683 kilos of chocolate and cocoa, 10,000 pieces of soap and 300 bottles of castor oil. Quinine is grown, and might be developed as a source of supply to East Africa generally.

What was to be done with this remarkable Institute on the transfer of the Territory to British Administration was a question which presented itself soon

after

after that administration was established. In view of the severe limitation of expenditure on the Territory, and pending fuller consideration of the future of the Institute, it was placed under the Agricultural Department and a minimum European Staff (a Director, an Assistant Director and a Head Gardener) was sanctioned in 1920, as also sufficient funds to keep the place going on the most modest lines. The Director of Kew Gardens urged the desirability of making Amani a Central Research Institute for the East African Dependencies, in a letter of June 28th, 1920, (31877). After criticising the existing local arrangements in the Tropical African Dependencies, Sir David Prain said: "These urgent scientific problems the solution of which is essential if there is to be any advance in agricultural practice remain unsolved. The prevailing system is radically unsound on economic grounds. The idea of appointing to an agricultural department an officer of first-class scientific attainments whose duty is the conduct of physiological or pathological research and investigation, and then to utilise his services for technical agricultural duties, is as incongruous as that of putting a racehorse into the shafts of a wagon. The only real remedy of the existing arrangement, and the only effective means of meeting existing requirements is to be found in the establishment of a Scientific Institute, wholly independent of any technical and administrative department of Agriculture, devoted exclusively to the study of those fundamental problems which affect agriculture in Tropical Africa.

The German Administration of what is now the Tanganyika Territory, whatever its shortcomings in other directions may have been, was at least alive to the necessity

after that administration was established. In view of the severe limitation of expenditure on the Territory, and pending fuller consideration of the future of the Institute, it was placed under the Agricultural Department and a minimum European Staff (a Director, an Assistant Director and a Head Gardener) was sanctioned in 1920, as also sufficient funds to keep the place going on the most modest lines. The Director of Kew Gardens urged the desirability of making Arani a Central Research Institute for the East African Dependencies, in a letter of June 28th, 1920, (31877). After criticising the existing local arrangements in the Tropical African Dependencies, Sir David Prain said: "These urgent scientific problems the solution of which is essential if there is to be any advance in agricultural practice remain unsolved. The prevailing system is radically unsound on economic grounds. The idea of appointing to an agricultural department an officer of first-class scientific attainments whose duty is the conduct of physiological or pathological research and investigation, and then to utilize his services for technical agricultural duties, is as incongruous as that of putting a racehorse into the shafts of a wagon. The only real remedy of the existing arrangement, and the only effective means of meeting existing requirements is to be found in the establishment of a Scientific Institute, wholly independent of any technical and administrative department of Agriculture, devoted exclusively to the study of those fundamental problems which affect agriculture in Tropical Africa.

The German Administration of what is now the Tanganyika Territory, whatever its shortcomings in other directions may have been, was at least alive to the

after that administration was established. In view of the severe limitation of expenditure on the Territory, and pending fuller consideration of the future of the Institute, it was placed under the Agricultural Department and a minimum European Staff (a Director, an Assistant Director and a Head Gardener) was sanctioned in 1920, as also sufficient funds to keep the place going on the most modest lines. The Director of Kew Gardens urged the desirability of making Amani a Central Research Institute for the East African Dependencies, in a letter of June 28th, 1920, (31877). After criticising the existing local arrangements in the Tropical African Dependencies, Sir David Prain said: "These urgent scientific problems the solution of which is essential if there is to be any advance in agricultural practice remain unsolved. The prevailing system is radically unsound on economic grounds. The idea of appointing to an agricultural department an officer of first-class scientific attainments whose duty is the conduct of physiological or pathological research and investigation, and then to utilize his services for technical agricultural duties, is as incongruous as that of putting a racehorse into the shafts of a wagon. The only real remedy of the existing arrangement, and the only effective means of meeting existing requirements is to be found in the establishment of a Scientific Institute, wholly independent of any technical and administrative department of Agriculture, devoted exclusively to the study of those fundamental problems which affect agriculture in Tropical Africa.

The German Administration of what is now the Tanganyika Territory, whatever its shortcomings in other directions may have been, was at least alive to the

necessity of such scientific investigation. To this circumstance we owe the existence at Amani of an Institute for agricultural research, established with a view to the conduct of scientific research as contrasted with the administrative and technical work of the Department of Agriculture of the Colony. This scientific machinery has been taken over in good working order. The question for consideration, therefore, is what should be done with it. Three alternatives are possible.

The first of these is obviously to put the machine to the use for which it was designed. The second is to abandon the Institution. The third is to utilise it in some manner as an annex to the Department of Agriculture of the Tanganyika Territory.

The adoption of the second alternative is a course for which defence is possible. The only difficulties connected with its adoption are the consideration that by so doing what might be a valuable asset to the whole of East Tropical Africa is being thrown away, and the reflection that it might induce the erroneous belief that the new Administration differs from that which preceded it in regarding scientific assistance as of no consequence to the most important industry of the Territory. This we feel assured is not the case, and the argument for abandonment of the Amani Institute would really depend on a decision as to whether the financial state of the Territory is such as to justify the acceptance of responsibility for the recurrent expenditure which the maintenance of the Institute must involve.

The adoption of the third alternative is a course which is wholly indefensible. It would involve a resolution
to

necessity of such scientific investigation. To this circumstance we owe the existence at Amani of an Institute for agricultural research, established with a view to the conduct of scientific research as contrasted with the administrative and technical work of the Department of Agriculture of the Colony. This scientific machinery has been taken over in good working order. The question for consideration, therefore, is what should be done with it. Three alternatives are possible.

The first of these is obviously to put the machine to the use for which it was designed. The second is to abandon the Institution. The third is to utilise it in some manner as an annex to the Department of Agriculture of the Tanganyika Territory.

The adoption of the second alternative is a course for which defence is possible. The only difficulties connected with its adoption are the consideration that by so doing what might be a valuable asset to the whole of East Tropical Africa is being thrown away, and the reflection that it might induce the erroneous belief that the new Administration differs from that which preceded it in regarding scientific assistance as of no consequence to the most important industry of the Territory. This we feel assured is not the case, and the argument for abandonment of the Amani Institute would really depend on a decision as to whether the financial state of the Territory is such as to justify the acceptance of responsibility for the recurrent expenditure which the maintenance of the Institute must involve.

The adoption of the third alternative is a course which is wholly indispensable. It would involve a resolution

to repeat, as regards the Tanganyika Territory, and to do this necessarily on a more lavish scale, the well-intended but ill-designed and wasteful method already in vogue in some of the African Colonies that have throughout their history been administered by Great Britain".

Sir David Prain proceeded to outline a scheme under which the Institute should be maintained and extended, so as to serve as an agricultural Research Institute for the conjoint benefit of all the British Colonies and Protectorates in East Africa, independent of the control of any of the Departments of Agriculture in those Dependencies. The presence of scientific research officers in the agricultural Departments could, he considered, be dispensed with, and it might be possible to transfer them, or some of them, to Amani.

It is worth noting ^{here} that this was written on the 29th of June 1920, and that in fact the third alternative described as "wholly indefensible" has hitherto been followed and seems likely to be abandoned only in favour of the second. The subsequent history of the matter is briefly as follows:-

The Secretary of State (Lord Milner) adopted the views of Sir D. Prain as to the future of Amani, and on the 11th of August addressed a despatch to the Governors of Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar, Tanganyika and Nyasaland (Somaliland was excluded) strongly supporting those views. It was estimated that the total annual contributions to the cost of the Institute from the administrations concerned should be £10,000, divided up as follows:-

Tanganyika	£3,000
Kenya	£2,500

to repeat, as regards the Tanganyika Territory, and to do this necessarily on a more lavish scale, the well-intended but ill-designed and wasteful method already in vogue in some of the African Colonies that have throughout their history been administered by Great Britain".

Sir David Prain proceeded to outline a scheme under which the Institute should be maintained and extended, so as to serve as an agricultural Research Institute for the conjoint benefit of all the British Colonies and Protectorates in East Africa, independent of the control of any of the Departments of Agriculture in those Dependencies. The presence of scientific research officers in the agricultural Departments could, he considered, be dispensed with, and it might be possible to transfer them, or some of them, to Amani.

It is worth noting ^{here} that this was written on the 29th of June 1920, and that in fact the third alternative described as "wholly indefensible" has hitherto been followed and seems likely to be abandoned only in favour of the second. The subsequent history of the matter is briefly as follows:-

The Secretary of State (Lord Milner) adopted the views of Sir D. Prain as to the future of Amani, and on the 11th of August addressed a despatch to the Governors of Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar, Tanganyika and Nyasaland (Somaliland was excluded) strongly supporting those views. It was estimated that the total annual contributions to the cost of the Institute from the administrations concerned should be £10,000, divided up as follows:-

Tanganyika	£3,000
Kenya	£2,500

Uganda	£2,000
Zanzibar	£1,500
Nyasaland	£1,000

Expenditure required for initial equipment etc. was to be divided between the administrations in proportion to their annual contributions. It was added that if the Governors agreed to these proposals, the Secretary of State would ask the Colonial Research Committee to consider favourably the question of supplementing the contributions by "a substantial grant" from the funds at their disposal. Early replies were requested.

The result of the Secretary of State's despatch was as follows:-

Tanganyika was entirely in favour.

Kenya did not reply definitely till February 15th 1921 (received April 24th, 8 months after the Secretary of State's despatch). They provided £500 in their estimates for 1921 "to cover necessary expenditure incurred in that year", but put forward various criticisms on the scheme and recommended that nothing should be done until the Heads of the Agricultural Departments of the Dependencies concerned had considered the subject in Conference.

Nyasaland were willing to contribute the £2,000 suggested but asked (and were allowed) to put £1,000 only on their estimates for 1921-22, as it seemed unlikely that more would be required.

Zanzibar had great doubts as to whether Amani would be of any use to them, but agreed to provide

provide the £1,500 asked for, provided that the other Dependencies came into the scheme, and on condition that they might withdraw if after a few years they decided that they got no corresponding benefit from the Institute.

Nyasaland: pleaded poverty and remoteness from Amani. They would be unable to dispense with any of their specialists in view of the peculiar requirements of agriculturalists in the Protectorate. They were unable to agree to any contribution.

These replies were communicated to Kew, and the Director, after considering them, agreed that a Conference such as was suggested by Kenya, was advisable. The Governors (including the Governor of Nyasaland) were asked to arrange one, to meet either at Amani or elsewhere in Tanganyika. The Conference was to submit two "detailed schemes", with estimates of cost:

- (1) For immediate action as to necessary repair and re-equipment of the Institute,
- (2) For the larger scheme as originally put forward, and also, if they had any objections or criticisms of the scheme, to state fully their reasons.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Churchill) reiterated the views expressed by his predecessor in favour of the original scheme. His despatch was dated July 14th, 1921, a year having now elapsed since the scheme was first put forward. (28694/21).

It took some time to assemble the Directors of Agriculture in Conference, and Nyasaland was unable to

spare a representative. The Conference however took place at Amani on December 6, 1921. The Directors first examined the full or "extended" scheme, considering that any interim scheme for immediate adoption should properly be drawn up with the larger scheme in view for future adoption. They estimated the annual recurrent expenditure involved under the full scheme at £18,390 rising to £20,490 of which £10,790 to £12,890 for staff and the balance (£7,600) for upkeep, travelling and other expenses.

The capital expenditure (Repairs, extensions, equipment) they estimated at £28,800, but this figure includes £5,000 for an electric-aerial railway and a lighting scheme, which the Governor of Tanganyika considered to be premature. The Conference however, while submitting this as an estimate of the cost of the full scheme as put forward by the Secretary of State, suggested certain amendments under which the annually recurrent charges would be reduced to £16,490 rising to £18,490 and the capital expenditure to £21,000 (omitting the works regarded as premature and allowing for only two new residential houses).

As regards the alternative "scheme for immediate action", its cost was estimated at £6,110 to £7,000 annually for salaries and £3,450 for other recurrent expenditure:

Total: -£9,560 to £10,400 recurrent; and £5,000 for capital expenditure (repairs and re-equipment). The estimate for salaries does not include "compensatory allowances" which were payable at the date of the report at the rate of 25% on salaries. This would involve an addition of £1,200 to the annual expenditure, but it

may

may be observed that these allowances are now being gradually diminished with a view to their abolition in two or three years' time.

This interim scheme provided for a European staff consisting of a Director at £1,000, and Assistant Director (£700 - £900), 2 Research Officers (£600 - £800) an Assistant Research officer (£500-£600) a Recorder-Librarian (£500-£600) a Head Gardener (£350-£450) a clerk (£250-£400) and an Overseer (£250-£300). It also included provision for one Asiatic and nine African subordinates.

The only serious criticism of the scheme put forward by Sir David Prain was directed against his view that if the Amami Institute were established on a proper footing the local agricultural Departments would be able to dispense with their scientific officers. The arguments brought forward were forcible, but it is unnecessary to recapitulate them here.

As regards the provision of funds, the Conference noted that the Secretary of State had intimated that if the respective Governments agreed to contribute on the lines suggested, he would ask the Colonial Research Committee for "a substantial grant". They accordingly proposed that the Governments should provide 75 per cent and the Colonial Research Committee 25 per cent of the annually recurrent expenditure. The contributions of the Governments would then be:-

Tanganyika	25%
Kanya	17 1/2%
Uganda	15 %
Syasaland	10 %
Zanzibar	7 1/2%

As to the capital expenditure, the Conference noted

may be observed that these allowances are now being gradually diminished with a view to their abolition in two or three years' time.

This interim scheme provided for a European staff consisting of a Director at £1,000, and Assistant Director (£700 - £900), 2 Research Officers (£600 - £800) an Assistant Research officer (£500-£600) a Recorder-Librarian (£500-£600) a Head Gardener (£350-£450) a clerk (£250-£400) and an Overseer (£250-£300). It also included provision for one Asiatic and nine African subordinates.

The only serious criticism of the scheme put forward by Sir David Prain was directed against his view that if the Amani Institute were established on a proper footing the local agricultural Departments would be able to dispense with their scientific officers. The arguments brought forward were forcible, but it is unnecessary to recapitulate them here.

As regards the provision of funds, the Conference noted that the Secretary of State had insisted that if the respective Governments agreed to contribute on the lines suggested, he would ask the Colonial Research Committee for "a substantial grant". They accordingly proposed that the Governments should provide 75 per cent and the Colonial Research Committee 25 per cent of the annually recurrent expenditure. The contributions of the Governments would then be:-

Tanganyika	25%
Kenya	17½%
Uganda	15%
Nyasaland	10%
Zanzibar	7½%

As to the capital expenditure, the Conference noted

noted that Sir David Prain had expressed the view that it might be met from Imperial funds, in view of the importance of the Institute to the Empire generally. They also suggested that the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation might be invited to contribute towards the capital expenditure. They were afraid that if the Governments concerned had to meet these charges, the operation of the scheme would be delayed and restricted. It may be added that one of the recommendations of the Conference was that the branch railway to Sigi, near Anani, referred to above, should not be disposed of to a private firm, but should be retained by the Government of Tanganyika.

Taking the estimate for the interim scheme at £10,000 annual and £5,000 capital, the distribution of expenses would work out as follows (without allowing for any contribution from the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation).

Annual (£10,000)

(a) If Colonial Research Committee contributes 25%

Colonial Research Committee	£2,500
Tanganyika	2,500
Kenya	1,750
Uganda	1,500
Nyasaland	1,000
Zanzibar	750
	<hr/>
	£10,000
	<hr/>

(b) If the whole charge is borne by the Governments:-

Tanganyika

Tanganyika (say)	£3,334
Kenya	2,333
Uganda	2,000
Nyasaland	1,333
Zanzibar	1,000
	<hr/>
	£10,000
	<hr/>

Capital (£5,000)

If borne by the Governments in the same proportions

Tanganyika (say)	£1,667
Kenya (say)	1,166
Uganda	1,000
Nyasaland (say)	667
Zanzibar	500
	<hr/>
	£5,000
	<hr/>

This estimate for the Interim Scheme, known as "Estimate C" was recommended by the Conference for adoption with the suggestion that the whole of the £5,000 for Capital charges should be borne by the Imperial Government and that the annual charges should be distributed as in (a) above, the Colonial Research Committee bearing a quarter of the cost, and that the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation might be induced to give a subscription - in which ^{case} the contributions from other sources could be pro tanto reduced.

The Governors now gave their opinions on the Conference proposals:-

Tanganyika (Sir H. Byatt) accepted the proposals (9981/22)

Kenya:- (Sir E. Northey) rejected them without examining the scheme, as the financial position "absolutely precluded any contribution for the present". This was in

March, 1922 (17487/22).

Uganda (Acting Governor Jarvis) said that he was not prepared to commit the Protectorate to any definite recurrent expenditure, but would be prepared to provide "as liberally as circumstances would permit" (20678/22)

Nyasaland: (Sir G. Smith) Again pleaded poverty and dread of further commitments if the scheme were extended. The Protectorate was in financial straits, and the Governor felt that any money available could be better spent (e.g. on medical and educational work for the natives) (28307/22)

Amisibari: (Resident Sinclair) would not object to contributions under "Estimate C" provided that Colonial Research Committee contributed as proposed. (22864/22).

Since these despatches were received, no progress whatever has been made. It was considered impracticable to insist on Kenya making a contribution, and in view of the deplorable state of Nyasaland's finances (and of the fact that she was really less concerned than Kenya) it was thought hopeless to ask the Treasury to sanction a contribution from Nyasaland. The only thing that was done was to approach the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation for a grant towards the upkeep of the Institution, but they decided that the situation of Amani rendered it unlikely that the Institution would be of sufficient direct benefit to their work to justify a contribution (37171/23). Kew Gardens has urged that the ~~matters~~ should not be allowed to drop and has expressed the hope that the larger scheme as amended at the Conference will be adopted.

In the meantime the Governor of Tanganyika has been carrying on with his original skeleton staff. We had to tell him on August 13th last (37171/23) that the scheme for a central research institute must be

March, 1922 (17487/22).

Uganda (Acting Governor Jarvis) said that he was not prepared to commit the Protectorate to any definite recurrent expenditure, but would be prepared to provide "as liberally as circumstances would permit" (20676/22)

Nyasaland: (Sir G. Smith) Again pleaded poverty and dread of further commitments if the scheme were extended. The Protectorate was in financial straits, and the Governor felt that any money available could be better spent (e.g. on medical and educational work for the natives) (26307/22)

Amoy: (Resident Sinclair) would not object to contributions under "Estimate C" provided that Colonial Research Committee contributed as proposed. (22664/22).

Since these despatches were received, no progress whatever has been made. It was considered impracticable to insist on Kenya making a contribution, and in view of the deplorable state of Nyasaland's finances (and of the fact that she was really less concerned than Kenya) it was thought hopeless to ask the Treasury to sanction a contribution from Nyasaland. The only thing that was done was to approach the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation for a grant towards the upkeep of the Institution, but they decided that the situation of Amoy rendered it unlikely that the Institution would be of sufficient direct benefit to their work to justify a contribution (37171/23). Kew Gardens has urged that the matter should not be allowed to drop and has expressed the hope that the larger scheme as amended at the Conference will be adopted.

In the meantime the Governor of Tanganyika has been carrying on with his original skeleton staff. We had to tell him on August 13th last (37171/23) that the scheme for a central research Institute must be

regarded as "in abeyance".

In the estimates for 1923-4 provision was made for an expenditure of £4,614 on the Institute (salaries £3,039, other charges £1,575).

The Governor has included in his Estimates for 1924-5, now under consideration and shortly to be submitted to the Treasury, a provision of only £2,172 (salaries £1,227 other charges 945) and says that in future years about £1,800 will probably suffice. His separate despatch (49434/23) is of such interest and should be read as giving a brief history of the subject. He points out that under the present arrangement there is a waste of money. He cannot bring himself to recommend the abolition of the Institute, but as there seems no prospect of any joint scheme being adopted, and as he has to justify to the Colonial Office and the Treasury every penny of expenditure, he feels that things cannot go on as they are. He consequently proposes, and has budgetted accordingly, to spend the very minimum to keep the place from ruin, and to dispense with all the staff except a gardener - caretaker and some labourers. The apparatus, Library, Collections, and the fabric, will be inspected from time to time by officers deputed for the purpose.

It will be remembered that the expense of the "Interim Scheme" was estimated at £10,000 a year plus £5,000 capital expenditure. The proposals (agreed to by Mr. Ormsby Gore) in the Minutes on the Governor's despatch 49434 only amounted to this:- That when the Nyasaland Estimates were submitted to the Treasury, the Treasury should be asked to sanction £1,000 from Nyasaland funds i.e. an addition of that amount to the Grant-in-Aid - as a contribution to the Institute, telling them that if they sanctioned this we would "approach" Kenya again, and

regarded as "in abeyance".

In the estimates for 1923-4 provision was made for an expenditure of £4,614 on the Institute (salaries £3,039, other charges £1,575).

The Governor has included in his Estimates for 1924-5, now under consideration and shortly to be submitted to the Treasury, a provision of only £2,172 (salaries £1,227 other charges 945) and says that in future years about £1,800 will probably suffice. His separate despatch (49434/23) is of such interest and should be read as giving a brief history of the subject. He points out that under the present arrangement there is a waste of money. He cannot bring himself to recommend the abolition of the Institute, but as there seems no prospect of any joint scheme being adopted, and as he has to justify to the Colonial Office and the Treasury every penny of expenditure, he feels that things cannot go on as they are. He consequently proposes, and has budgetted accordingly, to spend the very minimum to keep the place from ruin, and to dispense with all the staff except a gardener - caretaker and some labourers. The apparatus, Library, Collections, and the fabric, will be inspected from time to time by officers deputed for the purpose.

It will be remembered that the expense of the "Interim Scheme" was estimated at £10,000 a year plus £5,000 capital expenditure. The proposals (agreed to by Mr. Ormsby Gore) in the Minutes on the Governor's despatch 49434 only amounted to this:- That when the Nyasaland Estimates were submitted to the Treasury, the Treasury should be asked to sanction £1,000 from Nyasaland funds i.e. an addition of that amount to the Grant-in-Aid - as a contribution to the Institute, telling them that if they sanctioned this we would "approach" Kenya again, and

regarded as "in abeyance".

In the estimates for 1923-4 provision was made for an expenditure of £4,614 on the Institute (salaries £3,039, other charges £1,575).

The Governor has included in his Estimates for 1924-5, now under consideration and shortly to be submitted to the Treasury, a provision of only £2,172 (salaries £1,227 other charges 945) and says that in future years about £1,800 will probably suffice. His separate despatch (49434/23) is of such interest and should be read as giving a brief history of the subject. He points out that under the present arrangement there is a waste of money. He cannot bring himself to recommend the abolition of the Institute, but as there seems no prospect of any joint scheme being adopted, and as he has to justify to the Colonial Office and the Treasury every penny of expenditure, he feels that things cannot go on as they are. He consequently proposes, and has budgetted accordingly, to spend the very minimum to keep the place from ruin, and to dispense with all the staff except a gardener - caretaker and son - labourers. The apparatus, Library, Collections, and the fabric, will be inspected from time to time by officers deputed for the purpose.

It will be remembered that the expense of the "Interim Scheme" was estimated at £10,000 a year plus £5,000 capital expenditure. The proposals (agreed to by Mr. Ormsby Gere) in the Minutes on the Governor's despatch 49434 only amounted to this:- That when the Nyassaland Estimates were submitted to the Treasury, the Treasury should be asked to sanction £1,000 from Nyassaland funds i.e. an addition of that amount to the Grant-in-Aid - as a contribution to the Institute, telling them that if they sanctioned this we would "approach" Kenya again, and

and also the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation. This has not been done, for the following reasons.

1. When the Nyasaland Estimates were examined, they revealed such a depressing financial position that the chances of the Treasury being persuaded to make an addition to the Grant-in-Aid for a purpose which admittedly concerned Nyasaland less than any of the other Dependencies seemed most remote.
2. The Treasury would naturally say that the British tax-payer did not come into the matter until all the local governments had done their share.
3. On looking into the whole question, it became apparent that Kenya was not the only Dependency which had objected to contribute. The latest pronouncement of Uganda was to the effect that they could not promise anything definite, but would be "as liberal as circumstances admitted", and Zanzibar only promised to contribute if the Colonial Research Committee bore a quarter of the cost (as to this, see later). This meant £750 a year on that condition and (possibly) £500 down for capital expenditure. This stipulation on the part of Zanzibar was rather unreasonable, as it was laid down at the first that any request made to the Colonial Research Committee was conditional on the Governments concerned agreeing to contribute.

The position therefore is that we have nothing definite whatever to put before the Treasury as regards contributions from any local Government with the exception of Tanganyika Territory, and even if we persuaded the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation to give £500 a year, which in view of their recent refusal is most improbable, that would be only a trifling part of what is required

and also the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation. This has not been done, for the following reasons.

1. When the Nyasaland Estimates were examined, they revealed such a depressing financial position that the chances of the Treasury being persuaded to make an addition to the Grant-in-Aid for a purpose which admittedly concerned Nyasaland less than any of the other Dependencies seemed most remote.

2. The Treasury would naturally say that the British tax-payer did not come into the matter until all the local governments had done their share.

3. On looking into the whole question, it became apparent that Kenya was not the only Dependency which had objected to contribute. The latest pronouncement of Uganda was to the effect that they could not promise anything definite, but would be "as liberal as circumstances admitted", and Zanzibar only promised to contribute if the Colonial Research Committee bore a quarter of the cost (as to this, see later). This meant £750 a year on that condition and (possibly) £500 down for capital expenditure. This stipulation on the part of Zanzibar was rather unreasonable, as it was laid down at the first that any request made to the Colonial Research Committee was conditional on the Governments concerned agreeing to contribute.

The position therefore is that we have nothing definite whatever to put before the Treasury as regards contributions from any local Government with the exception of Tanganyika Territory, and even if we persuaded the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation to give £500 a year, which in view of their recent refusal is most improbable, that would be only a trifling part of what is required

and the utmost that they could be expected to say (like the Treasury) would be that the dependencies were the parties mainly concerned and that when the latter had done their duty the Corporation might then reconsider the matter.

The opinion I have formed is this. If the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, it must be at the joint expense of the dependencies who will benefit by it. It is too big a thing for Tanganyika Territory alone. Outside bodies such as the Colonial Research Institute and the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation can hardly be asked to contribute until the Administrations primarily concerned, which are all under the control of this Department, have decided to do so. As regards the Colonial Research Institute, it will be remembered that all we undertook to do was to ask them for "a substantial grant" if the Governors agreed to make contributions. The assumption of the local Conference that this could be interpreted to mean that the Institute might be asked to bear 25% of the annual cost - £2,500 a year - seems to be quite baseless. I am informed by Mr. Barnley that their disposable funds amount to less than that amount per annum, and that it is contrary to their practice to promise annual payments.

If therefore the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, the other dependencies must contribute, and as none of these is prepared to do so unconditionally, they must be required by the Secretary of State to provide the money. Kenya is far the most important of the group concerned, and as long as we acquiesce in their refusal to contribute it seems to

and the utmost that they could be expected to say (like the Treasury) would be that the dependencies were the parties mainly concerned and that when the latter had done their duty the Corporation might then reconsider the matter.

The opinion I have formed is this. If the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, it must be at the joint expense of the dependencies who will benefit by it. It is too big a thing for Tanganyika Territory alone. Outside bodies, such as the Colonial Research Institute and the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation can hardly be asked to contribute until the Administrations primarily concerned, which are all under the control of this Department, have decided to do so. As regards the Colonial Research Institute, it will be remembered that all we undertook to do was to ask them for "a substantial grant" if the Governors agreed to make contributions. The assumption of the local Conference that this could be interpreted to mean that the Institute might be asked to bear 25% of the annual cost - £2,500 a year - seems to be quite baseless. I am informed by Mr. Barnley that their disposable funds amount to less than that amount per annum, and that it is contrary to their practice to promise annual payments.

If therefore the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, the other dependencies must contribute, and as none of these is prepared to do so unconditionally, they must be required by the Secretary of State to provide the money. Kenya is far the most important of the group concerned, and as long as we acquiesce in their refusal to contribute it seems to

and the utmost that they could be expected to say (like the Treasury) would be that the dependencies were the parties mainly concerned and that when the latter had done their duty the Corporation might then reconsider the matter.

The opinion I have formed is this. If the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, it must be at the joint expense of the dependencies who will benefit by it. It is too big a thing for Tanganyika Territory alone. Outside bodies, such as the Colonial Research Institute and the Empire Cotton-growing Corporation can hardly be asked to contribute until the Administrations primarily concerned, which are all under the control of this Department, have decided to do so. As regards the Colonial Research Institute, it will be remembered that all we undertake to do was to ask them for "a substantial grant" if the Governors agreed to make contributions. The assumption of the local Conference that this could be interpreted to mean that the Institute might be asked to bear 25% of the annual cost - £2,500 a year - seems to be quite baseless. I am informed by Mr. Barnley that their disposable funds amount to less than that amount per annum, and that it is contrary to their practice to promise annual payments.

If therefore the Institute is to be retained as a centre of research, the other dependencies must contribute, and as none of them is prepared to do so unconditionally, they must be required by the Secretary of State to provide the money. Kenya is far the most important of the group concerned, and as long as we acquiesce in their refusal to contribute it seems to

is impossible to ask the Treasury to provide money for a contribution from Nyasaland, which is only somewhat remotely concerned.

If we are not prepared to make Kenya contribute, the scheme of a joint Institute must be dropped, and there is nothing for it but to accept Sir Horace Byatt's conclusions as embodied in his last despatch, and close down the Institute, keeping only a caretaker staff.

CS

February 25, 1924.

See P

1924

M. Douglas

M. Clutterbuck has proposed
 a summary of the question of
 the Nelson in connection of the
 Agricultural Advisory Committee.
 The Nelson is considered
 whether he has any, or could
 be interested if indeed it
 comes within the terms
 of reference.

M. Clutterbuck will keep the
 Dept informed of developments

Bill 6/10/27

read Posing up on 5 June 1927
 6 to 26
 Above

W.C.

I have spoken to M. Clutterbuck

Bring up in one month

read

Conescha
28.10.27

think to a
 (Eds for 1/12/26)
 10/1/27

We suggested to the Treasury that a total of 28000 should be found for Amani in 1924-5, making no distinction between recurrent and capital requirements. The distribution which we suggested was:-

Colonial Research Committee	£1,000
Tanganyika (£2,172 already provided)	5,000
Kenya	nil
Uganda	1,000
Zanzibar	1,000
Nyasaland	<u>nil</u>
	<u>28,000</u>

Services £1237
Other
charges. 1945
22172

The Treasury ask that Kenya should give £250 and Nyasaland £100, allowing the Tanganyika contribution to be reduced by £360; i.e. to £4,640. I do not follow the statement at the end of the penultimate paragraph about a consequent reduction of the provision in the Tanganyika Territory estimates.

But the Treasury do not as far as I can see sanction anything at all in this letter. They require, besides the contributions of £250 and £100 from Kenya and Nyasaland mentioned above, an assurance that in "future years" contributions will be forthcoming from all the administrations, and from the Colonial Research Committee, approximately on the lines laid down by the local Conference and tabulated in this letter. We told the Treasury that the offer of the Colonial Research Committee was confined to two grants of £1000 each, so that we cannot expect anything from

the Committee after 1955-56. Therefore the proportions from other sources will have to be increased when that year is over.

As to the Sigi railway, to which reference is made, I have discussed it with Sir H. Byatt and he is not in favour of not buying it. £10,000 is provided for the purpose in the Estimates, but Sir H. Byatt says that he believes that a motor road could be made from a place called Muhesa (on the Tanganyika Railway) to Am N. or its neighbourhood for much less than £10,000 and would sufficiently serve the purposes of the Institute. He suggests referring this to the Officer Administering the Government with the exception of this point about the Railway.

I feel more in the dark than ever. The Treasury make their sanction to the arrangements for this year dependent on assurances from the various contributing parties which assurances will involve an indefinite period in the future. This is not unreasonable from a Treasury point of view, but we come back again to the old point: can we require the necessary annual payments from Kenya, Uganda and Zambia?

There is a further rather obscure demand - in the last paragraph - for further particulars of the capital expenditure involved. We can send the Treasury a copy of the Report (Lr. Gov./9921/22) containing the various estimates, but I am not certain that that is what is required.

C.S.

June 30, 24.

TREASURY CHAMBERS

The Secretary,
 THE SECRETARY,
 TREASURY
 WHITEHALL, LONDON, S.W.1.
 and the following number quoted



May, 1924.

B. 23545.

Sir,

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury Sir G. Grindle's letter of the 15th ultimo (9483/1924), and enclosures, relative to the future of the Scientific Institute at Amani, Tanganyika Territory, and Their Lordships direct me to request you to convey to the Secretary of State for the Colonies the following reply.

My Lords agree with the Secretary of State that the abandonment of the Institute would be regrettable both for scientific and for political reasons. They are equally in agreement that the expenses of an Institute which is to be conducted in the interests of the East African Dependencies generally cannot fairly be borne by Tanganyika alone, nor would it be defensible to impose on a Mandated Territory more than an equitable share of these expenses.

They

Under Secretary of State,
 Colonial Office.

They have considered the "interim" scheme for maintaining the Institute, which it is desired to adopt and which is estimated to involve capital expenditure amounting to £5,000 and an annual outlay of £10,000.

To this scheme They would be prepared to give Their sanction provided that They could be satisfied as to the provision of funds not only for the current year but for the succeeding years when the scheme is in full working order. Moreover the adoption of the scheme would necessitate the purchase of the Sigi Railway at an estimated cost of £10,000, which is apparently to be borne entirely by Tanganyika. This raises the initial cost of the whole scheme to £15,000.

My Lords have not been furnished with any recent information regarding the Sigi light railway, and They are not aware whether it is at present working and whether the rolling stock is in good order, or, if not, whether any considerable expenditure would be involved in bringing it into use. From the information at present before Them

They

They gather that the railway will be required solely for the purposes of the Institute, and that consequently a deficit on working may be anticipated, leading to a further recurrent charge on Tanganyika funds. I am to enquire whether any estimate has been framed of this charge and whether any traffic may be expected from the saw mill to which reference is made in Memorandum B on the Estimates for 1923-24, or otherwise. Further the valuation of £10,000 was stated in that Memorandum to be unreliable, and Their Lordships desire further information on this point.

My Lords are disposed to think that it may be desirable for the ownership of the Institute and of the Railway to be vested in the Government of the Tanganyika Territory, wherein they are situated, and that there may be some case therefore for the capital expenditure to be borne by the Territory's funds; but as regards annual charges They do not consider that the temporary inability to contribute of the other Protectorates etc. which, it is assumed, are bound to benefit from the Institute, affords any justification for imposing any additional proportion on

Tanganyika.

They have considered the "interim" scheme for maintaining the Institute, which it is desired to adopt and which is estimated to involve capital expenditure amounting to £5,000 and an annual outlay of £10,000.

To this scheme they would be prepared to give their sanction provided that they could be satisfied as to the provision of funds not only for the current year but for the succeeding years when the scheme is in full working order. Moreover the adoption of the scheme would necessitate the purchase of the Sigi Railway at an estimated cost of £10,000, which is apparently to be borne entirely by Tanganyika. This raises the initial cost of the whole scheme to £15,000.

My Lords have not been furnished with any recent information regarding the Sigi light railway, and they are not aware whether it is at present working and whether the rolling stock is in good order, or, if not, whether any considerable expenditure would be involved in bringing it into use. From the information at present before them

They

They gather that the railway will be required solely for the purposes of the Institute, and that consequently a deficit on working may be anticipated, leading to a further recurrent charge on Tanganyika funds. I am to enquire whether any estimate has been framed of this charge and whether any traffic may be expected from the saw mill to which reference is made in Memorandum B on the Estimates for 1923-24, or otherwise. Further the valuation of £10,000 was stated in that Memorandum to be unreliable, and Their Lordships desire further information on this point.

My Lords are disposed to think that it may be desirable for the ownership of the Institute and of the Railway to be vested in the Government of the Tanganyika Territory, wherein they are situated, and that there may be some case therefore for the capital expenditure to be borne by the Territory's funds; but as regards annual charges they do not consider that the temporary inability to contribute of the other Protectorates etc. which, it is assumed, are bound to benefit from the Institute, affords any justification for imposing any additional proportion on

Tanganyika.

Tanganyika, which is itself loan-aided. They must ask therefore that, as regards future years, assurances may be obtained by the Secretary of State that contributions to the upkeep of the Institute and to the loss, if any, on working the railway will be forthcoming in approximately the proportions recommended by the East African Conference on this subject, viz:-

Colonial Research Committee.	20%
Tanganyika.	25%
Kenya.	17½%
Uganda.	15%
Nyasaland.	10%
Zanzibar.	7½%

My Lords have not been furnished with the basis on which these proportions were assessed nor would it appear necessary to adhere to them strictly. In particular Their Lordships would regard the percentage proposed for Nyasaland as excessive having regard to its distance from the Institute and to its slender resources and They would view with favour a reduction to 5% in this case balanced by an increase of 2½% for Kenya and Zanzibar.

As regards the current year, during which the total expenditure, whether on capital or recurrent services,

is estimated to amount to £8,000, My Lords consider it essential that an earnest of the future cooperation of all the partners in the undertaking should be given. But in the circumstances stated in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply They would be content that the contributions of Kenya and Nyasaland should be limited to nominal sums of £250 and £100 respectively. The offer of £1,000 by the Colonial Research Committee and the proposed contributions of £1,000 each by Uganda and Zanzibar together with the contributions named above should enable the net amount to be provided by Tanganyika for maintenance during the current preliminary year to be reduced from the provision in the Estimates to a sum more closely approximating to the proportion due by the Territory under the future arrangements.

My Lords will await further particulars of the capital expenditure involved at the Institute, and of the capital and running costs of the Sigi Railway and They must defer according Their sanction to the proposed scheme as a whole until the requisite assurances have been received from the various contributing parties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
Edw. Buxton

Tanganyika, which is itself loan-aided. They must ask therefore that, as regards future years, assurances may be obtained by the Secretary of State that contributions to the upkeep of the Institute and to the loss, if any, on working the railway will be forthcoming in approximately the proportions recommended by the East African Conference on this subject, viz:-

Colonial Research Committee.	38%
Tanganyika.	25%
Kenya.	17½%
Uganda.	15%
Nyasaland.	10%
Zanzibar.	7½%

My Lords have not been furnished with the basis on which these proportions were assessed nor would it appear necessary to adhere to them strictly. In particular Their Lordships would regard the percentage proposed for Nyasaland as excessive having regard to its distance from the Institute and to its slender resources and they would view with favour a reduction to 5% in this case balanced by an increase of 2½% for Kenya and Zanzibar.

As regards the current year, during which the total expenditure, whether on capital or recurrent services,

is estimated to amount to £8,000, My Lords consider it essential that an earnest of the future cooperation of all the partners in the undertaking should be given. But in the circumstances stated in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply they would be content that the contributions of Kenya and Nyasaland should be limited to nominal sums of £250 and £100 respectively. The offer of £1,000 by the Colonial Research Committee and the proposed contributions of £1,000 each by Uganda and Zanzibar together with the contributions named above should enable the net amount to be provided by Tanganyika for maintenance during the current preliminary year to be reduced from the provision in the Estimates to a sum more closely approximating to the proportion due by the Territory under the future arrangements.

My Lords will await further particulars of the capital expenditure involved at the Institute, and of the capital and running costs of the Sigi Railway, and they must defer according their sanction to the proposed scheme as a whole until the requisite assurances have been received from the various contributing parties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Edw. Beckett

AW

Tanganyika, which is itself loan-aided. They must ask therefore that, as regards future years, assurances may be obtained by the Secretary of State that contributions to the upkeep of the Institute and to the loss, if any, on working the railway will be forthcoming in approximately the proportions recommended by the East African Conference on this subject, viz:-

Colonial Research Committee.	35%
Tanganyika.	25%
Kenya.	17½%
Uganda.	15%
Nyasaland.	10%
Zanzibar.	7½%

My Lords have not been furnished with the basis on which these proportions were assessed nor would it appear necessary to adhere to them strictly. In particular Their Lordships would regard the percentages proposed for Nyasaland as excessive having regard to its distance from the Institute and to its slender resources and they would view with favour a reduction to 5% in this case balanced by an increase of 2½% for Kenya and Zanzibar.

As regards the current year, during which the total expenditure, whether on capital or recurrent services,

is estimated to amount to £8,000, My Lords consider it essential that an earnest of the future cooperation of all the partners in the undertaking should be given. But in the circumstances stated in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply they would be content that the contributions of Kenya and Nyasaland should be limited to nominal sums of £250 and £100 respectively. The offer of £1,000 by the Colonial Research Committee and the proposed contributions of £1,000 each by Uganda and Zanzibar together with the contributions named above should enable the net amount to be provided by Tanganyika for maintenance during the current preliminary year to be reduced from the provision in the Estimates to a sum more closely approximating to the proportion due by the Territory under the future arrangements.

My Lords will await further particulars of the capital expenditure involved at the Institute, and of the capital and running costs of the Sigi Railway, and they must defer according their sanction to the proposed scheme as a whole until the requisite assurances have been received from the various contributing parties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
G. B. ...

Tanganyika, which is itself loan-aided. They must ask therefore that, as regards future years, assurances may be obtained by the Secretary of State that contributions to the upkeep of the Institute and to the less, if any, on working the railway will be forthcoming in approximately the proportions recommended by the East African Conference on this subject, viz:-

Colonial Research Committee.	25%
Tanganyika.	25%
Kenya.	17½%
Uganda.	15%
Nyasaland.	10%
Zanzibar.	7½%

My Lords have not been furnished with the basis on which these proportions were assessed nor would it appear necessary to adhere to them strictly. In particular Their Lordships would regard the percentage proposed for Nyasaland as excessive having regard to its distance from the Institute and to its slender resources and They would view with favour a reduction to 5% in this case balanced by an increase of 2½% for Kenya and Zanzibar.

As regards the current year, during which the total expenditure, whether on capital or recurrent services,

is estimated to amount to £8,000, My Lords consider it essential that an earnest of the future cooperation of all the partners in the undertaking should be given. But in the circumstances stated in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply They would be content that the contributions of Kenya and Nyasaland should be limited to nominal sums of £250 and £100 respectively. The offer of £1,000 by the Colonial Research Committee and the proposed contributions of £1,000 each by Uganda and Zanzibar together with the contributions named above should enable the net amount to be provided by Tanganyika for maintenance during the current preliminary year to be reduced from the provision in the Estimates to a sum more closely approximating to the proportion due by the Territory under the future arrangements.

My Lords will await further particulars of the capital expenditure involved at the Institute, and of the capital and running costs of the Sigi Railway, and They must defer according Their sanction to the proposed scheme as a whole until the requisite assurances have been received from the various contributing parties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

Edw. Buxton

Tanganyika, which is itself loan-aided. They must ask therefore that, as regards future years, assurances may be obtained by the Secretary of State that contributions to the upkeep of the Institute and to the loss, if any, on working the railway will be forthcoming in approximately the proportions recommended by the East African Conference on this subject, viz:-

Colonial Research Committee.	28%
Tanganyika.	25%
Kenya.	17½%
Uganda.	15%
Nyasaland.	10%
Zanzibar.	7½%

My Lords have not been furnished with the basis on which these proportions were assessed nor would it appear necessary to adhere to them strictly. In particular Their Lordships would regard the percentages proposed for Nyasaland as excessive having regard to its distance from the Institute and to its slender resources and they would view with favour a reduction to 5% in this case balanced by an increase of 2½% for Kenya and Zanzibar.

As regards the current year, during which the total expenditure, whether on capital or recurrent services,

is estimated to amount to 28,000, My Lords consider it essential that an earnest of the future cooperation of all the partners in the undertaking should be given. But in the circumstances stated in paragraph 3 of the letter under reply they would be content that the contributions of Kenya and Nyasaland should be limited to nominal sums of 2250 and 2100 respectively. The offer of 21,000 by the Colonial Research Committee and the proposed contributions of 21,000 each by Uganda and Zanzibar together with the contributions named above should enable the net amount to be provided by Tanganyika for maintenance during the current preliminary year to be reduced from the provision in the Estimates to a sum more closely approximating to the proportion due by the Territory under the future arrangements.

My Lords will await further particulars of the capital expenditure involved at the Institute and of the capital and running costs of the Sigi Railway and they must defer according their sanction to the proposed scheme as a whole until the requisite assurances have been received from the various contributing parties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

G. B. ...