

163  
ESTATE

EAST AFR PROT.

C.O.

35269~

and 3205

all from dogs

Mr. Webb  
had a dog  
that had got  
into the house  
and got it out  
got it out  
M 26/9

Commissioner's Office

Mombasa.

August 25th,

33069

1905  
H. J. A. 35

15 APRILS PROTECTORATE.

No. 175

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a copy

of a despatch which I have received from the Manager of the

Uganda Railway protesting against the sum of nine thousand

two hundred and eighty five rupees on account of the Nairobi

144  
164  
July 27th. Municipal drainage scheme being debited to the Railway

Zone account, during the quarter ended March 31st last. Acting

in due authority of Foreign Office despatch No. 436 of July

2nd, 1904 the Treasurer has caused the total proceeds of sale

of stands in the Nairobi Bazaar to be credited to Railway Zone

account and then appropriated nine thousand, two hundred and  
eighty five rupees on account of drainage.

2. I have discussed the matter with the Acting Treasurer,

and I concur with him in thinking that the sum in question

Principal Secretary of State

for the Colonies,

Downing Street,

LONDON

440

was correctly debited to the sale of stands and credited  
to the cost of drainage.

R. Mr. Currie is of opinion, however, that the Lords of the Treasury were not in possession of all the facts when they sanctioned the appropriation of the sum of six hundred and nineteen pounds from the sale of stands; but even if this

were so, which I doubt, I consider it is rather late to

To take  
Recd 2  
Set  
raise the question now. Sir C. Eliot's despatch No. 271 of April 26th 1904 proposed the appropriation for drainage purposes of all the premis on stands. Before a reply to

this despatch was received he wrote on May 13th 1904 (No. 287)

For action  
Recd 2  
Set  
and gave full particulars of the scheme for drainage, specifically mentioning the sum of "nine thousand rupees to ten thousand rupees from sale of stands." By this latter

despatch Sir C. Eliot anticipated the questions raised in  
the office despatch No. 352 of June 17th 1904, and he was consequently not asked to make any reply to it, nor did he

do so. It appears to me reasonable to infer that the Treasury were aware of the facts when they sanctioned the proposal of the Foreign Office in their despatch of May

1904. How the Treasury enclosed a copy of Sir C. Eliot's

for his despatch No. 337 of May 15th in which reference is made to

his despatch No. 271 of April 25th.

4. Mr. Currie informs me that he does not wish to lay claim to these monies but that he desires to regularize the matter. He considers that the Treasury, when giving the sanction, did not realize that the six hundred and nineteen pounds was a debit against the Railway Capital Account. In his opinion an irregularity has been committed which from the Railway Capital point of view might form an awkward precedent, and I therefore have the honour at his request to refer the matter to you for your decision. The Manager's contention is that an error has been made by debiting the Railway Capital Account, when the intention of the Treasury was to debit the Protectorate funds and that by crediting the Railway Zone account with the proceeds of the sales and then debiting that account, the Capital Funds have been utilized without specific sanction from the Treasury.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

Humble servant,

A. J. G.

Mombasa

August, - 25th

SIR D. STEWART

No. 475

Reference

P.O. desp. No. 456 or  
July 20th, '04, or desp.  
Nos. 271 & 57 or April

Inclosure 1. 25th & May 15th, 1904  
& P.O. desp. No. 388 or

Received June 17th, 1904.

by bag

Plank Municipal Committee  
for various Questions & Inquiries etc.  
changes to Rainy & Capital etc.

F.A.P.

Conor

53063

112

DRAFT.

The Sec. to the  
Treasury

MINUTE.

Mr. Mo 26/9

Mr.

X Mr. Astrobust. 27/9

Mr. Cox.

Mr. Faucus.

Mr. Graham

for the Secretary  
to the Board of Starlborough.

for Selection.

In favor

to 00 Nov 45 15 M.A.T.

Recd:

R  
355  
1004

30 September 1905

Sec I am directed by  
Mr. Sec Lightfoot  
to transmit to you, for  
the consideration of the L.C.  
of the Treasury,  
the accompanying copy  
of a draft on the subject  
of a charge of £19,205  
for the  
drainage out of the  
imprincipality of Nairobi  
which has been debited  
against the Railway  
by Zone account

Messrs dear, as the  
Bank of Canada points out  
that the L.C. by their  
letter of 21 July 1904, (dated on 1st 554 F.O.  
did sustain this part 44)

charge against the  
Railway Zone account,  
since the words "£1685  
by the specific savings  
indicated" refer to  
Sir C. Elliott's draft

No 337 of the 13 May (dated on 1st 112 a.s.b.  
F.O. 48)

in which it was  
proposed to afford  
doubt 9,000 to 10,000  
Refers from the sale  
of stamps to this  
amount.

Mr. Currie, however,  
concludes that there  
had been no such

negotiations or agreement  
between the Bank  
and Mr. McNeill would  
be given if a decision  
would be given in the  
matter. 412A

4. If it is decided  
that the amount in ques-  
tion (£ 619) must be  
refunded from  
Postmaster accounts to  
the Railway Zone:  
account, a suffi-  
cient estimate will  
probably become necessary  
as there is naturally  
an opinion on the  
estimates for such  
a day.

(a) R 2 a

33069

No. 144  
164

Maurice Ritter

Nairobi July 20 1904

413

I am informed by the Chief Accountant that Rs. 9885/- on account of the Nairobi Municipal drainage scheme have been debited to the Railway Zone Account during the quarter ended 31st March last, the authority quoted being the Foreign Office despatch No. 456, dated 29th July 1904.

In this connection I have the honor to draw your attention to Sir G. Elliot's despatch No. 271, dated 25th April 1904, to the Foreign Office - enclosing Mr. Sowring's No. 60 of the same date - in which sanction is asked for names on the sale of leases in the Nairobi Ditch and utilized on the trains instead of being credited to the Railway Capital Account.

The Foreign Office reply to this is contained in Sir G. Hill's despatch No. 359, dated 17th June 1904, an is a qualified refusal.

The next communication bearing on the question which should be read is the Foreign Office despatch, dated 15th July 1904 to the Treasury. It is important to observe that this despatch was written before a reply could have been received to the one to Sir G. Elliot already quoted and therefore evidently with the idea of obtaining sanction by the township draining being debited to the Protectorate. The wording of paragraphs 2 and 3 of

TOMORROW

a Protectorate.

BALTIMORE

(2)

414

This account has this absolutely clear, the Railway Capital account and the Proletariate funds being separated.

The Treasury sanction is contained in despatch No. 17554, dated 1st July to the Foreign Office communicated to you in the Foreign Office despatch No. 456, dated 1st July 1904. The Foreign Office does not appear to have communicated Sir C. Eliot's despatch No. 971, dated 1st April 1904, to the Treasury, so their sanction was born of ignorance of the fact that, in addition to the 17550 specified as being debitable to the Railway Capital account, 2018 was debitable to the Railway Zone account I.S. to Railway Capital Funds.

The Foreign Office appears to have failed to inform them that such sanction was not in accordance with the instructions given in their despatch No. 458, dated 17th June.

Therefore, I entreat you to consider that the Railway Capital account has been debited with Rs. 908/- without authority and I refer the matter to you for consideration.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,  
Your obedient servant,

(Sd). H. A. F. Currie,

H.M.A.C. L.  
Secretary.

444

not from Protectorate Estimates: B.

that the produce of salaried  
or land should be credited to  
the Railway Capital Account -  
as has apparently been done -  
and not applied in reduction  
of it. Mr. Eliot seems to have  
contemplated

Yours sincerely,

Robert Wilkes

In times past we have made  
a bad better exchange official letters  
in order to find the decision fully  
recycled.