

no  
art  
enc  
Exp  
90  
fort  
last  
res  
is  
east  
ep  
ran  
e  
he  
brit  
ase  
ossi

*My very kind regards to your family and to the friends of Cambridge, and to my dear friends in office. I am glad to hear of your success in the office, and will be glad to hear of your success in the office.*

*read by diseu. aim consisted be elected from annated in various nated by the Eg quality was to be provide for the reg lected represent As app difficulties andi*

*the direction would lions and with the gypt, the question nuously. His re tums, he forwarded Rough Notes to e System of L e rough not already of*

*their control over il to deal at*

**PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE**

*the direction of the*

*him at n*

*the direction of the*

*ink. parts are int.*

*at 1900, but abe e assign this qd nos hery*

*ulation which finis*

**PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE**

**CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS FILM**

# PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

CO/533/121

ORDER NO.           ⇒162  
CAMERA NO.         ⇒23  
OPERATOR.           ⇒JV  
REDUCTION.         ⇒12  
EMULSION NO.       ⇒292011  
DATE.                ⇒17/9/70

## CROWN COPYRIGHT

THESE COPIES ARE SUPPLIED FOR INFORMATION  
AND RESEARCH ONLY-NO REPRODUCTION MAY BE  
MADE FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE ASSENT OF  
THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

# **PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE**

**THE PAGES IN THIS VOLUME ARE TOO  
TIGHTLY BOUND FOR ALL WORDS TO BE  
REPRODUCED IN ENTIRETY**

obtained by Mr. P. J. Rainey. 140

During the two years 1910-11 and 1911-12, nine hundred and fourteen lions were killed in the East Africa Protectorate and this total only represents those of which I was able to obtain a record and there is no doubt that many more were shot and poisoned by farmers and natives of which no record was obtained.

During the last 12 months, excluding Mr. Paul J. Rainey's expeditions in which he killed 80 odd lions, bags of 17, 16 and 13 were made by some shooting parties and in the present year bags of 12 and 9 have already been made, and I have received a report of 22 having been killed on the Northern Game Range. There is no doubt whatever that lions form the greatest attraction for sportsmen who visit the Protectorate and it must be apparent that if the present unrestricted slaying of lions is allowed to continue, a state of affairs will be reached at no very distant date, when lions will have become so rare in all but the most inaccessible parts of the country and the Game Reserves that only a very few sportsmen will be lucky enough to bag one.

Under such conditions there is little doubt that the revenue derived from Game Licences, which varies round about a figure of £10,000 annually, may be expected to be reduced to little more than half this amount.

A sum of £10,000 is of course not of serious a consideration to the country but it is nevertheless an acceptable addition to the revenues, more particularly in view of the fact that this sum is derived from the unoccupied areas, most of which are so suitable for settlement that it is unlikely any other

other revenue will ever be obtained from them. 141  
 Besides this financial plea for some protection for  
 lions there is the still more legitimate one of the  
 sportsman and naturalist.

I am of opinion therefore that it is entirely justifiable and sound policy to strictly preserve the game in these unoccupied areas and it is not even open to question that lions are valuable game animals. I have discussed the subject with numerous settlers, sportsmen and Government officials and I have not yet heard one really substantial objection put forward against the proposal and opponents have usually become supporters as soon as they clearly understand what the proposition is. The greatest difficulty to be overcome is in reality the universal conservative objection to adopt any conspicuously new measure, and the true merits of the case are usually lost sight of on this account.

Half measures are not likely to be successful in any policy and particularly in matters of Game preservation. Game which is interfering with the interests and progress of private land owners cannot be tolerated in any country and had better be got rid of, but game in the unoccupied shooting grounds and Game Reserves, should be strictly preserved and if the lion is to be recognised as a valuable game animal, as it undoubtedly is, it is equally entitled to reasonable protection.

I consider four lions quite a generous enough allowance on a licence and this number should satisfy any reasonable person, especially in view of the fact that any additional number may be killed on and near the occupied areas without any licence. Sportsmen who wish to kill large numbers of lions for the purpose

purpose of making records should be discouraged, and not encouraged, unless they kill these lions in the districts in which they are a source of danger and annoyance to farmers.

The proposal to prohibit the hunting, killing or capturing of lions under a Traveller's licence may appear unnecessary, but it is not so for the following reasons and is an essential condition of the measure.

The traveller's licence was originally created to meet what was felt to be a need in cases where persons were bona fide travellers and had not come to the Protectorate for big game shooting. It was supposed that such persons were in search of farms or employment or were making a tour of the country with a view to eventually becoming settlers in some capacity, or that they were perhaps genuine sight seers or scientists and not "sportsmen". It was felt that although they might not wish to hunt game, they might however require to kill a certain amount for purposes of food. The idea was a reasonable and considerate one, but like other concessions and privileges in actual practice the spirit and not unfrequently the letter of the law has been greatly abused.

The facility for obtaining large bags of game on one or more Traveller's licences which are allowed under Section 20 of the Game Ordinance and the practical impossibility of preventing a certain amount of illegal shooting on Crown lands have led to the Traveller's licence being extensively used by visiting sportsmen and residents and this has directly robbed the revenue of the Protectorate of at least £3,000 annually.

With special regard to lions, any person by taking out two or three Traveller's licences can spend two or three months hunting lions in any part of the Protectorate and a considerable number of lions are annually killed in this way. It is not the case that a Traveller's licence is necessary to kill lions, for no licence at all is needed at present to kill lions, but some meat is necessary for the journey and the nine animals allowed on Crown land under the Traveller's licence supplies this need and a few extra Zebra or Kudu can not easily be detected, and for this reason it is necessary to prohibit the shooting of lions on a Traveller's licence in the protected areas.

The more valuable and rarer animals are not allowed to be killed on Crown land on a Traveller's licence and lions should certainly be included in this category. There is no hardship at all entailed in the prohibition. The Traveller's licence will still enable the holder to have a cheap shoot on private land and within the 20 mile zone and on private land and with to shoot as many lions as he can find, but it will prevent lions in the valuable shooting grounds being killed without proper payment, and will consequently add considerably to the Revenue. No person who sets out with the sole object of hunting game or lions with a Travellers licence is a "bona fide traveller" in the sense in which the licence was framed, and in my opinion no visiting sportsman should be able to enter the shooting grounds unless he is the holder of the £50 Sportsman's licence. The unoccupied shooting grounds of this Protectorate will become more valuable as time goes on if properly protected and should



(8)

should be looked upon as Game "Preserves" as opposed to game "Reserves" in which no shooting is allowed.

With regard to 20 mile zone around private land and the five mile zone of the Railway line as suggested I believe it will be found quite sufficient. Lions do of course travel about to some extent, but as the game gradually disappears from the occupied areas as it inevitably must, there will be less likelihood of lions straying into the occupied areas. There is no intention of making absurd quibbles over such a question as to whether a lion is killed a mile or so beyond the 20 mile limit and I do not think any serious objection can be raised on this point. As a matter of fact, with the exception of farms in the neighbourhood of the Southern Game Reserve, there are a few farmers if any in this Protectorate who have suffered from the depredations of lions which have come from a greater distance than 20 miles.

The other alternative to the 20 mile zone, would be to state definitely the boundaries of those areas in which lions may only be shot on a Sportsman's or Resident's licence. However this appears to me to be a far more complicated and difficult method. The 20 mile limit will not in any way prevent lions being killed on the farms and in their neighbourhoods while it excludes the gluttonous sportsmen from killing large numbers of lions in the valuable shooting grounds, and will thus prevent the gradual extermination of the lions in these areas.

It may perhaps be held that some of the areas, in  
which

which it is proposed to prevent the extermination of lions are occupied by natives and that even the partial protection of lions in these areas, is consequently unjustifiable. There is no doubt that a strong case could be made out against the protection of lions on these grounds, but it would not in reality be a sound or practical argument. The natives have always existed successfully with the lions both before and since the advent of the white man, and the occasional cases of native stock being killed by lions are accepted in the ordinary course of events and are in no way considered to be the fault of the white man, but are considered to be the ordinary conditions of every day life. In the present proposals there is no suggestion to make these conditions worse but only to leave them as they are, for large numbers of lions will still continue to be killed by sportsmen and the pastoral tribes will still be at liberty to kill lions in defence of their cattle as they have always done under Section 36.

If it is not justifiable to allow these conditions as to lions and natives to remain as they are at present then it follows as an obvious corollary that it is incumbent upon Government to set at once and <sup>to</sup> exterminate all lions in the Native Reserves, which is certainly unnecessary.

I must point out that in the preservation of such animals as elephants, rhinoceroses and lions, unless the necessary measures are taken in good time nothing can be achieved. Once the numbers of such animals have been reduced below a certain point it is too late to endeavour to protect them and their complete extermination in the districts concerned.

is then only a matter of time.

If therefore it is desired to prevent the extermination or serious depletion of lions in the shooting grounds steps must be taken at once.

With regard to the cheetah the arguments which have been put forward in favour of the protection of lions in certain districts are equally or more applicable in the case of the cheetah. It is an interesting and beautiful animal, they are probably less numerous than lions and far less destructive to domestic stock. The cheetah is so easily ridden down and killed, and is so little able to defend itself that it certainly cannot be termed a dangerous wild animal, and its exterminations would be a matter of great regret. I have therefore proposed giving it similar protection to the lion except that I consider that only two should be allowed on a licence.

In conclusion I must point out that if this amendment for the protection of lions is passed it will have absolutely no effect, except a beneficial one, upon farmer and landholders. No difference will be noticed, no one will even be aware that it has been passed, except that it will hasten the extermination of lions in the occupied areas and neighbouring districts.

It will also have little effect upon the majority of visiting sportsmen. It is quite the exception for sportsmen to obtain more than four lions or to have the opportunity of shooting more than four. Besides this limitation to four only refers to certain protected areas, outside which and on private land, any number may be killed.

be  
The only people who will practically effected  
by the measure, will be those sportsmen who may be  
said to be almost specialised in lion hunting and hunt  
lions only and who wish to kill large numbers of  
lions with the object of breaking records, or for  
any other reason.

It is at such persons that the present amendment  
is aimed and the restriction which it will place  
upon lions in certain areas, is I maintain a neces-  
sary and justifiable one.

~~Sd/-~~ R.B. FOSSHAM

Game Warden.

Com 31997 Cont



DRAFT

CP (No. 789)

reg

33 Sept 1913

MINUTE

Li.

- Mr. ~~Reed~~ 20/4/13
- Mr. ~~Hutton~~ 20/4/13
- Mr. G. ~~Stoddart~~
- Mr. H. ~~Scott~~
- Mr. J. ~~Anderson~~
- Mr. ~~Edwards~~
- Mr. ~~Hughes~~

Please the hon. to ask the  
 receipt of W. Bell's list No.  
 627 of the 19<sup>th</sup> August  
 submitting a statement  
 of the grounds on which  
 the Game Amendment  
 Ordinance 1913 was  
 enacted, & to inf. you  
 that the hon. will not be  
 advised otherwise his  
 power of disallowance

\* No 31997