

that vested interests have  
no doubt arisen under it,  
I am inclined to consider  
that the best course will  
probably be to allow it to  
stand remain in force.

3. Having regard to the Attorney  
General's opinion that a duty of  
10% ad valorem is insufficient  
to protect the local producer  
of the fact that a higher duty  
than 10% ad valorem cannot be  
imposed under the present Act  
of the Customs (Imperial 1889-90,  
it would seem that it is impossible  
to protect the local producer and  
at the same time avoid the  
difficulties raised by the Opium  
Act 1885 except by a prohibition  
aid as suggested by the F.O.

I am not however, in favour of this  
course as it would be difficult  
to differentiate between this and other  
industries, and I am unable to  
express with confidence an industry  
requiring such assistance.

4. Before proceeding further in  
the matter I shall be glad to receive  
your observations on the subject.

EAST AND PROT  
4567A

467  
C. O.  
45674  
Page 5 OCT 15

Foreign Office

1915

4 Oct.

Last previous Paper  
300/  
43143

Re Zaphiro's claim

for refund of export incurred in rebuilding  
port at Mozale.  
Submits further details & suggests  
examination of the Zaphiro's accounts in  
possession of Co.

Mr B...  
Mr Read

Please see Mr Harper's minute therein. I  
have worked through the books also  
and run up the position as follows:

- a) We have two accounts of Mr Zaphiro's  
expenditure between 1905-1909
  - (1) a general account for the period  
Oct 1905 - April 1908 amounting to 4789/08.
  - (2) a detailed account for the period  
April 1908 - Dec 31 1909 4653/10

(These are fragmentary but not complete  
details of the 1905-1908 expenditure - 2207/08)

(b) Taking the above accounts as all we  
possess, there is an Mr Harper says  
no trace of anything concerned with  
the claim of £282 for the rebuilding of  
Mozale port.

(c) No occurrence of the sum £282 for the  
rebuilding of Mozale (to which Mr. Zaphiro's  
has nothing to do with the present

Recd 16 Oct '15  
 Copy sent to Mr. Deane & Mr. B...

Next subsequent Paper  
187/16

Claim for £332 -

(d) As to the 30 day, Mr. Gophus must have  
built the fort and found the money for  
it however in view of his admirable  
work for many years in the territory, I  
wonder not but that there may be  
some foundation of his claim, provided the  
matter whatever Mr. Gophus may say.

I would accept only to the 30  
or thereabouts. It is in the accounts  
which we possess there is no trace  
of Mr. Gophus having included any  
part of his expenditure of £332 in  
connection with the building of the fort  
and that the amount of £330 to which  
he refers is so far as can be seen, at  
least \$3000. It is to say that we  
have no detailed account for the  
period 1905-1908 & that it is therefore  
impossible to say definitely whether the  
£332 was ever included in them or not.

And that we consider that if there  
are any detailed accounts covering this  
period at all, Mr. Gophus has probably  
examined and used with a view to  
clearing up the fort, but that if there  
are none or if the £332 cannot be  
traced in them, Mr. Gophus should  
be invited to make a sworn statement  
to the effect that he spent the £332 on  
the fort and that he never included the  
sum in his accounts with the fact that  
the sum has never been repaid to him.  
I conclude by saying that in receipt of

W.C.S.

Such a statement <sup>to the S.P.C.</sup> will be  
proposed to <sup>with the view of the S.P.C.</sup> consider most carefully  
whether the £332 cannot be met  
from other funds.

Gen 12/10/15 463  
W.C.S. 13/10/15

at home  
H. J. R.  
13/10/15

Robinson

Mr. Read

46J

I have examined this matter  
as requested.

12958/1915  
Mr. Zaphiro's claim is set out in  
detail in encl. to FO 12958/1915,  
the various items being dated  
from 3 Apr 1907 to 21 January 1908.

22187/08  
[ \$3468 does not represent £332 at  
any of the rates of exchange quoted  
in encl. to FO 22187/08, but Mr.  
Zaphiro has understated his claim  
that is his look-out ]

22187/08  
4653/10  
The FO suggest that the accounts  
in FO 22187/08 + FO 4653/10 may  
help, but the a/c in the latter  
are of a subsequent period (26 Apr 08 to  
15 Dec 09) + in any case do not  
appear to have any connection with  
the present claim.

with  
the possible exception of the items  
3.3.08 Corp. tools ... \$ 60  
(perhaps) 10.4.08 Working clothes \$ 57  
(in voucher 2) none of the accounts

in 22187 are of any  
assistance (The items quoted  
are of subsequent date to those  
in the claim)

The accounts in 22187 refer  
to a claim (which was admitted  
& paid) for "out of pocket expenses"  
incurred by Mr. Zylinski "for the period  
to 20 April 1908" - & represent "the  
cost of necessary extra men to  
prevent illegal trade in ivory"

None of the items shown appear  
to have any connection with the  
creation of the Post or the payment  
to Mr. Zaphirov has nothing to do  
with the present claim

[It should be noted that the  
ivory value £2000 confiscated  
by Mr. Z. & handed over to the  
Post, was used as a loan for  
obtaining Treasury approval for the  
pay of £330 to Mr. Z., and is now

3 apr

3 apr

4m

being used by him as a loan  
for obtaining payment of his latest  
claim

Yes; it is  
a loan  
for the present  
4m

There is no mystery in the  
recurrence of the £330  
as the Post seem to think.

The £330 ref. to in 22187 is  
cleared up above. The items  
£240 + 90 for 25 Abyssinian soldiers  
which are included in the statement  
(sent in 12958) showing how <sup>Zylinski</sup> ~~the~~ deployed  
of his annual £900 are without  
doubt correctly stated - as Mr. Zylinski  
certainly had at least 25 Abyssinian  
soldiers, & quite as certainly had to pay  
them.

12958/10

3 apr  
4m

There is a marked passbook  
p. 12 of printed order in G. 36633/10  
which refers to the "Colonie des Zaphirov"  
and is dated in connection with ~~the~~  
Post <sup>Mr. Zylinski</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Mr. Zylinski</sup>  
at Mr. Z's contention that he paid for the

33/09

labour.

I have not noticed anything else  
in the notes. That is helpful.

To sum up

(1) Mr. Zaphiro built the fort.

(2) There is no record of his  
having been paid for it.

i.e. so far as  
of the list at the  
disposal of

[The reason for the apparent  
non-payment to Mr. Z. may  
have been due in the first  
instance to the fact that it  
was in what was then Egyptian  
territory, & later to Mr. Z's  
neglect to bring the matter up.]

(3) The fort does not deny that  
the buildings are now occupied  
by the fort.

~~That is the case of the~~  
(4) In view of (1) (2) & (3) Mr.  
Zaphiro appears to have a  
good claim for the refund  
of £332, provided that the claims  
of the claim can be accepted as reasonable  
as to which I cannot judge

I think we  
can pay for Zaphiro's  
claim for Zaphiro's  
claim for Zaphiro's  
claim for Zaphiro's  
claim for Zaphiro's

W. H. S. 1/15

471

In any further communication  
on the subject, please quote

No. 136837/15.

Foreign Office

October 4th, 1916.

C.O  
45674  
REC<sup>d</sup>  
Rrc 5 OCT 15

and address—  
The Under-Secretary of State,  
Foreign Office,  
London.

Sir:-

With reference to your letter 43143/1915 of the  
22nd ultimo, regarding Mr. Zaphiro's claim for refund of  
expenditure incurred in rebuilding the fort at Mogale, I  
am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to observe that  
there seems no doubt that this fort was built, and if  
payment for it was not made by the Government it must  
presumably have been made by Mr. Zaphiro.

The accounts relating to Mr. Zaphiro's mission were  
sent to the Colonial Office in Foreign Office letters  
20542/08 and 4982/10 of June 19th, 1908, and February 15th,  
1910, respectively, and I am to suggest that these  
accounts should be examined with a view to ascertain  
whether any money was actually paid by His Majesty's  
Government for the work of construction.

In connection with these accounts I am to observe  
that Mr. Zaphiro was to have received Nine hundred pounds  
plus

30  
22197  
8  
4653  
10

C.O.  
553  
139  
ALL WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE  
PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE LONDON

Under Secretary of State,  
Colonial Office.

plus his salary and subsistence allowance, which together amount to Three hundred and eighty two pounds, but he includes the latter in his account of Nine hundred pounds.

The amount now claimed is Three hundred and thirty two pounds and the extra sum which Mr. Zaphiro received after the building was finished, on the ground that he had incurred expenditure on extra men, was also Three hundred and thirty pounds. Also the cost of 25 Abyssinian soldiers which was included in the account was Three hundred and thirty pounds.

It is stated elsewhere that Mr. Zaphiro received special payment for engaging extra men, but he mentions in a note that he engaged fifteen extra soldiers which expense was paid by the Government three years later. Mr. Zaphiro may therefore have made some mistake in his accounts.

I am,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

humble Servant,

*Maurice de Bunsen*

2  
300  
332

330  
1295

1
2
3
4
5
6

C.O. 553 / 159

BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, LONDON

FO 45674/1915  
EAP

473

R. D.  
OCT 16

JS

16 October 1915

DRAFT.

The U.S. Govt.  
FO

Ans #  
17/16

Sir,

I am to ask

the receipt of your

letter of the 4<sup>th</sup>

Oct., No 136837/15,

regarding the claim

of Mr. Zaphiro for

expenditure incurred in

building Fort Narrington

at Moyale, and to

request you to inform

myself whether they have

in the accounts on the

MINUTE.

Mr. Harper 14/10/15

Mr. Cottonley 14.10.15

Mr.

Mr.

Sir G. Fiddes.

Sir H. Junt.

Sir J. Anderson.

Mr. Steel-Maitland.

Mr. Bonar Law.

Copy sent to Mr. G. Fiddes 13/16

C.O. 533  
PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, LONDON

170

possession of his Dept.  
there is no trace of Mr.  
Zaphiro, having included  
any part of the expense  
of £332 in connection  
with the building of the  
Jot, and the recurrence  
the same amount  
of £330, to which you  
refer, is, so far as can be  
seen, not in point in  
connection with ~~the~~ the  
claim under conser

2. I am however, to  
add that there are no  
detailed accounts in this  
Office for the period 1905-1908,  
that  
and it is therefore impossible  
to say definitely whether the  
expense of £332 upon the Jot  
shall ever be included in her or

2. Mr. Bone Law would  
suggest that any detailed  
accounts which there may  
be at this Abbea among  
the papers included in  
Mr. Zaphiro's claim should  
be carefully examined once  
again with a view to  
clearing up the matter,  
and that if there are  
no such accounts, or  
if there is no trace in  
them of the £332 expending  
the present claim, Mr.  
Zaphiro should be invited  
to make an honour  
statement to the effect  
that he expended the  
amount of £332 on the