

EAST AFR. PROT.

RECEIVED JUL 12

20820

393

12

Paper.

IVORY REWARDS

Reports that question of paying rewards to informers in cases where ivory is confiscated without the infliction of a fine. States customs in the past and requests definite sanction to its continuance.

Mr. Stephenson.

I ~~understand~~ ^{gather that} the rewards are paid out of the fines or the proceeds of the sale before the latter are brought to account as revenue and that it is therefore only a net figure which appears in the revenue account. The actual result to Govt is the same whether this procedure is adopted or the gross amount is credited to revenue and the ~~estimated~~ amount of the rewards appears on the expenditure side. But is not the practice for which the Govt now seeks authority

Paper

as sum against established accounting
methods. The difficulty of course is that
if the amount of the rewards is now shown
as expenditure, though the net result will
be the same, the Govt will be hit under
the half-half principle which, in a case
like this, is a strong deterrent to the
adoption of proper accounting methods.
We do not know without enquiry of the
Govt what is the usual annual amount
of the rewards, and so we cannot judge
how seriously the Govt would be affected
if we insisted on the rewards or the full
proceeds of fines or sales being shown
in the accounts, and I think we must.

Have you any observations?

Yours

July 9

W. Lead

~~W. Lead~~

The estimate revenue in respect of "Commission and Sale
of unclaimed and confiscated goods", which includes
Spory, was £3000 in 1911-12 and £1500 in 1912-13.
The actual revenue in 1910-11 was £2067. In no
cases has the reward paid, I understand from the
Act Governor's list, exceeded one half of the proceeds
of sale, so that the maximum amount paid as
rewards

rewards through this channel cannot exceed and
possibly falls considerably short of, the actual receipts
under this subhead.

As to the amount of the rewards which
were deducted from fines it is impossible here to
frame even an approximate guess. The estimate
revenue under head 3 "Fines & Forfeitures" for 1911-12
was £3000, but how much of this had anything to do
with ivory is quite uncertain.

The existence of two Suspense Accounts in
connection with the purchase & confiscation of ivory
has before us here recently, and we took the view that
they did not contravene Rule 307 of the C. Regs., but
we were not then aware that rewards entered as
largely as they now appear to do into the meter.
Mr. Butler's view is no doubt strictly correct, but
I am inclined to think that, as the amounts involved
are shrinking rapidly and are ^{very} uncertain and
the whole of the circumstances are somewhat
unusual, there would be no harm in treating the
cases exceptionally and in sanctioning the continuation
of the present procedure as Mr. Dowling suggests.

In the special circumstances I should be
disposed to sanction the continuation of his
present system

[Signature]
25/7

As proposed by the
at all
H. J. K.
26/7/11

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

June 10th 1912.

No. 393

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the question has arisen of paying rewards to informants where ivory is confiscated without the infliction of a fine.

2. Under Sections 10 and 41 of the Game Ordinance 1909 any person - European or Native - who gives information which leads to the confiscation of ivory is entitled to a reward.

3. It has been the custom in the past to pay such rewards out of fines inflicted but in cases where no fine has been imposed the money has been found by selling the ivory and applying up to half of the proceeds for the purpose.

4. This system is both simple and cheap and I recommend that it be formally adopted. I think however that, as it is difficult to ascertain the value of the ivory at the time when the reward should be paid, it would perhaps be better to limit the reward to Rs. 2 per pound. It would scarcely be feasible to debit the sub-head "Rewards, Transport" &c. of the Game Department with the payment of these rewards as the Vote

would

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

DOWNING STREET, LONDON, S.W.

would not stand the heavy demands that would be made upon it unless it were considerably increased.

5. The present system of payment has been in vogue for some years but has never received a definite sanction. I would therefore ask you to approve its continuance.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,



ACTING GOVERNOR.

for Gal
20820

381

30 July 1911

R. 27 JUL
D. 57

Sir - S2C

Thank you for the
to ask the Board

DRAFT.

Your despatch 393
10th of June - the relation

MINUTE.

- Mr. W. S. 17/11
- Mr. Butler 27/6/11
- Sir G. Fiddes
- Sir H. Just
- Sir J. Anderson
- Lord Emmott
- Mr. Harcourt

to the question of
paying rewards to
informers in cases where
it is impossible to trace
the offender of a fine,
and to ask to inform you
that, in the several cases

D.C.A. to see I am the continuance
of the present system
of payment, subject to the

W.S.
17/11

limitation of the reward
to Rs. 2 per pound.

I have

EAST AFR. PROT.
297229

00022
REC'D 5 JUL 12

532

summits east should properly be at t.d



EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

June 11th 1912.

No. 398

533

Sir,

With reference to your despatch No. 242 of the 30th April, I have the honour to observe that it was never intended to charge Protectorate Funds with the £120 which is the total amount of the allowance to Mr. Rodrigues and expenditure required for extra clerical assistance, and consequently the question of making provision in the draft estimates for 1912-13 was never considered.

2. I venture to submit that such charges should properly be debited to Loan funds as the keeping of the loan accounts would appear to be just as much part of the necessary work as construction.

3. When Government eventually takes over the Waterworks and Thika Tramway any accounting in connection with them will of course become part of the ordinary duties of the Protectorate Treasury, but until then I trust that you will agree with me that the charge of £120 should be against loan funds.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

BOWING STREET, LONDON, S.W.

C. C. Bony
ACTING GOVERNOR.

OK 2000 12 E.A.P.

24 JUL 11 21

25th July 1902

534

The Secy to
the Treasury

G.P. 247

no order

24 7

2550/4

(12002)

Sir,
With reference to your letter of the 25th July 1902, in connection with the account to you, to be laid before the D.C. of the Treas, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the O.G. of the E.A.P., I do request you to make the necessary arrangements to sanction the expenditure, at the rate of $\text{£}120$ per annum in connexion with the accounts of the works of the $\text{£}250,000$ being charge against loan funds.

395 of 1 June

Copy for Secy. of Aug 11 1902

SIG. BY H. J. READ.

Home

For the Treasury, Secy. of State

in 2003