

DOWNING STREET,

November, 1923.

*Answer
attached*

Dear Eschiel,

In connection with the Kilindini Harbour and Major Grogan's Mbaraki Estate, reference has been made to a general plan of Major Grogan's project which was sent to the Crown Agents for the Colonies early in 1920, and it is said that the proposal was discussed by the Sub-Committee of the Colonial Economic Development Committee (in the presence of Major Grogan and Sir George Buchanan) on the 10th of May, 1920.

It has become important to know whether the plan then sent in, which was presumably (and as far as I remember) the basis of the discussion in the Sub-Committee, is identical with the plan which Major Grogan has now sent to us, and I shall be glad if your records of the Committee enable you to identify the plan, when we can compare it with Major Grogan's

I am afraid the matter is rather pressing.

P. H. EZECHIEL, ESQ., C.M.G.

as the discussion as to buying out Major Grogan depends entirely on how far his rights over the sea-front have been recognized, and that, in itself, depends on this plan.

Yours sincerely,

Wes

as the discussion as to buying out Major Grogan depends entirely on how far his rights over the sea-front have been recognized, and that, in itself, depends on this plan.

Yours sincerely,

Wes

COLONIAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

IMPROVEMENT OF KILINDINI HARBOUR.

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE TO MAIN COMMITTEE.

The Sub-Committee, consisting of Sir H. Read, Sir Owen Philipps, Sir E. Northey, Sir J. Eaglesome, and Sir W. Mercer, with Mr. Eschiel as Secretary, have held four meetings at the Colonial Office, on the 4th, 15th, and 29th of March and the 10th May. Mr. Bottomley of the Colonial Office was present at all the meetings, and evidence was furnished by Major H. Blake Taylor, late General Manager of the Uganda Railway, and Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice of the firm of Messrs. Coode, Matthews, Fitzmaurice and Wilson, the consulting engineers employed by the Government of the East Africa Protectorate.

2. At present the trade of the port is dealt with entirely by means of lighters, the vessels lying at anchor in the harbour either above or below a projecting point on Mombasa Island named Ras Kilindini. The desirability of providing alongside accommodation for vessels was recognised for some years before the war, and a scheme for a deep-water quay was studied in 1912 and rejected as impracticable. In 1913 the consulting engineers mentioned above prepared a plan after investigation on the spot by Mr. Wilson, one of the partners, a scheme for the construction, on Government land immediately to the north of Ras Kilindini, of a continuous quay providing for seven 500-ft. berths, with transit sheds, cranes, railway connexions, Customs and port offices and dwelling accommodation, and godowns situated on the quay some 600 yards behind the quay. They recommended, in the first instance, the construction of four berths at a cost which was then estimated at £700,000 in all, and which must now be amended to at least twice that amount. Steps were taken to obtain tenders for this work from the experienced firms, but before the tenders could be completed the war reached such a stage that the matter was postponed till its resumption.

3. During the war there was a considerable congestion of traffic at the port, but this was largely due to military requirement, and with better management and with improved facilities, such as the provision of better electric lighting to enable work to be carried on at night, Sir E. Northey considers that it should be possible to cope with the traffic for the present and until the completion of the Usin-Gishu railway. With a very rapid development of the cotton industry in Uganda, which is expected to increase rapidly, and the general development of both Protectorates, the existing lightering system will not be sufficient, and it is important therefore that early steps should be taken for the provision of deep-water berths.

4. The main alternative to the Government scheme referred to above is the scheme proposed by Major E. S. Grogan, who owns an area of about 220 acres of land at Mbaraki Creek, an inlet lying on the same side of Mombasa Island as Ras Kilindini, about 1½ miles below it. The history of this land has an important bearing on the matter, as will be seen from later paragraphs of this Report. In 1904 the Government executed with Major Grogan an agreement for a lease of about 100 acres at Mbaraki Creek to enable him to provide facilities (including the construction of wharves and railway sidings) for shipping his own timber from the large Eldama Forest (on the route of the proposed Usin-Gishu railway), of which a lease was given to him about the same time. Some years later negotiations took place in relation both to the forest and to the land on Mombasa Island, as a result of which he agreed to give up about 50 acres of the latter and was promised a lease of the remaining 50 acres (which is included in the area of 220 acres which he owns in all in the neighbourhood of the Mbaraki Creek) "free from all conditions." This lease, though the drafting of it has recently been carried to an advanced stage, has never yet been executed; but the Sub-Committee are informed that in the view of the Colonial Office the Protectorate Government are in honour bound by the terms negotiated, and are not free either to prevent him from constructing wharves and sidings on his land for the accommodation of traffic other than his own timber, or to refuse to allow him connexion with the Uganda Railway for general traffic.

5. Early in March, Major Grogan placed at the disposal of the Sub-Committee plans and a description of a scheme prepared by Messrs. Pauling to carry out his own ideas for the construction of five berths at the mouth of the Mbaraki Creek. This scheme, which was considered at the second meeting of the Sub-Committee, may be referred to as Major Grogan's first scheme. It provided for reinforced concrete pile island wharves accommodating five vessels, two on one side and three on the other side of the entrance to the creek, and also a lighterage wharf, with extensive godown accommodation on the cliff immediately behind and a direct conveyer system for loading and unloading between the quay platform and the godowns. Messrs. Pauling's engineer estimated that one berth on either side of the creek entrance could be completed with sufficient public services for £100,000 each, and that other berths would cost about £75,000 each. Sir M. Fitzmaurice pointed out the following objections to this scheme:—

- (1) The conveyer system is unsuitable for handling mixed cargo, consisting of a succession of packages of different weights, sizes and shapes.
- (2) If the machinery went wrong, the cargo could not be dumped on the wharf.
- (3) The scheme assumes that cargo would be lifted from the hold by ship's gear and deposited either on the platform outside, or, in the case of heavy lifts, into lighters, but all ships have not tackle to handle their heaviest packages in this way.

COLONIAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

IMPROVEMENT OF KILINDINI HARBOUR.

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE TO MAIN COMMITTEE.

The Sub-Committee, consisting of Sir H. Read, Sir Owen Philipps, Sir E. Northey, Sir J. Eaglesome, and Sir W. Mercer, with Mr. Eschiel as Secretary, have held four meetings at the Colonial Office, on the 4th, 15th, and 29th of March and the 10th May. Mr. Bottomley of the Colonial Office was present at all the meetings, and evidence was furnished by Major H. Blake Taylor, late General Manager of the Uganda Railway, and Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice of the firm of Messrs. Coode, Matthews, Fitzmaurice and Wilson, the consulting engineers employed by the Government of the East Africa Protectorate.

2. At present the trade of this port is dealt with entirely by means of lighters, the vessels lying at anchor in the harbour either above or below a projecting point on Mombasa Island named Ras Kilindini. The desirability of providing alongside accommodation for vessels was recognised for some years before the war, and a scheme for a deep-water pier was studied in 1912 and rejected as impracticable. In 1913 the consulting engineers mentioned above prepared, after investigation on the spot by Mr. Wilson, one of the partners, a scheme for the construction, on Government land immediately to the north of Ras Kilindini, of a continuous quay providing for seven 500-ft. berths, with transit sheds, cranes, railway connexions, Customs and port offices and dwelling accommodation, and godowns situated on the cliff some 600 yards behind the quay. They recommended, in the first instance, the construction of ~~some~~ berths at a cost which was then estimated at £700,000 in all, and which must now be amended to at least twice that amount. Steps were taken to obtain tenders for this work from four experienced firms, but before the tenders could be completed the war reached such a stage that the matter was postponed till its conclusion.

3. During the war there was a considerable congestion of traffic at the port, but this was largely due to military requirement, and with better management and with improved facilities, such as the provision of better electric lighting to enable work to be carried on at night, Sir E. Northey considers that it should be possible to cope with the traffic for the present and until the completion of the Usin Gishu railway. Within a very few years from the present time however, with the growth of the traffic on that railway, the development of the cotton industry in Uganda, which is expected to increase rapidly, and the general development of both Protectorates—the existing lighterage system will not be sufficient, and it is important therefore that early steps should be taken now for the provision of deep-water berths.

4. The main alternative to the Government scheme referred to above is the scheme proposed by Major E. S. Grogan, who owns an area of about 220 acres of land at Mbaraki Creek, an inlet lying on the same side of Mombasa Island as Ras Kilindini, about $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles below it. The history of this land has an important bearing on the matter, as will be seen from later paragraphs of this Report. In 1904 the Government executed with Major Grogan an agreement for a lease of about 100 acres at Mbaraki Creek to enable him to provide facilities (including the construction of wharves and railway sidings) for shipping his own timber from the large Eldama Forest (on the route of the proposed Usin Gishu railway), of which a lease was given to him about the same time. Some years later negotiations took place in relation both to the forest and to the land on Mombasa Island, as a result of which he agreed to give up about 50 acres of the latter and was promised a lease of the remaining 50 acres (which is included in the area of 220 acres which he owns in all in the neighbourhood of the Mbaraki Creek) "free from all conditions." This lease, though the drafting of it has recently been carried to an advanced stage, has never yet been executed; but the Sub-Committee are informed that in the view of the Colonial Office the Protectorate Government are in honour bound by the terms negotiated, and are not free either to prevent him from constructing wharves and sidings on his land for the accommodation of traffic other than his own timber, or to refuse to allow him connexion with the Uganda Railway for general traffic.

5. Early in March, Major Grogan placed at the disposal of the Sub-Committee plans and a description of a scheme prepared by Messrs. Pauling to carry out his own ideas for the construction of five berths at the mouth of the Mbaraki Creek. This scheme, which was considered at the second meeting of the Sub-Committee, may be referred to as Major Grogan's first scheme. It provided for reinforced concrete pile island wharves accommodating five vessels, two on one side and three on the other side of the entrance to the creek, and also a lighterage wharf, with extensive godown accommodation on the cliff immediately behind and a direct conveyer system for loading and unloading between the quay platform and the godowns. Messrs. Pauling's engineer estimated that one berth on either side of the creek entrance could be completed with sufficient public services for £100,000 each, and that other berths would cost about £75,000 each. Sir M. Fitzmaurice pointed out the following objections to this scheme:—

- (1) The conveyer system is unsuitable for handling mixed cargo, consisting of a succession of packages of different weights, sizes and shapes.
- (2) If the machinery went wrong, the cargo could not be dumped on the wharf.
- (3) The scheme assumes that cargo would be lifted from the hold by ship's gear and deposited either on the platforms outside, or, in the case of heavy lifts, into lighters, but all ships have not tackle to handle their heaviest packages in this way.

- (4) There would not be, as in the Government scheme, a continuous length of wharf allowing elasticity of berthing and craning, and also of labour and supervision since the berths would be discontinuous and would be situated partly on one side and partly on the other side of the creek entrance. This is a very important consideration.
- (5) The island pile wharves, only 25 ft. in width and without lateral support, would not be strong enough to withstand the impact of ships, which would probably be frequent having regard to the strength of the current (stated on the Admiralty chart to be 3-4 knots at spring tides), and the life of the wharves would therefore be very short.
- (6) These impacts would certainly produce movements in the wharves throwing the machinery out of gear.
- (7) The length of each wharf—350 ft.—would not be sufficient for even moderate-sized ships.

6. At the fourth meeting of the Sub-Committee, Major Grogan attended to give further evidence with regard to his scheme, accompanied by Mr. Robert Boulton and Captain the Hon. Cripps (partners in Messrs. Boulton Bros. & Co.), and Sir George Buchanan. It appears that Sir George Buchanan, to whom on his recent return from India Messrs. Pauling's scheme was submitted, has rejected that scheme and prepared a new one in which the island pile wharves are to be replaced by ordinary reinforced concrete pile wharves 30 ft. in width and providing 32 ft. depth of water. He produced a plan showing such a wharf 1,000 ft. in a straight length at the south-eastern extremity of the entrance to the creek, designed to accommodate two ships 450 ft. in length. He estimated that the construction of this work, with railway connexions, conveyers and other necessary services, could be carried out in two years for £1,000,000. He considered that 16 berths could be constructed by developing the whole estate, but that the two berths to be provided in the first instance should be sufficient to deal with 300,000 tons of traffic per annum. He also considered that conveyers could be suitably used for mixed cargo, if not too heavy (say, not above 10 cwt.), and that most tropical export cargo could be shipped by such means. His scheme, however, also provided for railway trucks being brought upon the wharf so that heavy packages which could not be carried on the conveyers could be loaded directly on to the trucks from the ship.

It may be recognised at once that from an engineering point of view this second scheme produced by Major Grogan and his associates, being prepared by an engineer of reputation, is a great improvement on the first scheme. It is, however, more expensive than the first, and appears to be no cheaper in relation to the accommodation provided than the Government scheme, in comparison with which it suffers from the following disadvantages:—

- (1) A pile wharf cannot be as strong or durable as a wall of solid concrete blocks, and no competent engineer, in Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice's opinion, would recommend the former if the natural conditions allowed the latter to be constructed. The constant impact of ships would gradually damage the piles, and this would also lead to corrosion by the water of the iron in the reinforced concrete, as shown by recent experience at Southampton. After a life of 15 or 20 years the wharf provided in the Government scheme should, Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice is confident, be practically as good as new, while that of the "Buchanan" scheme would probably need long before that time very considerable repairs.
- (2) Sir George Buchanan has provided for a straight wharf of 1,000 ft. for two ships, but any extension of this accommodation would necessarily be discontinuous and lead to the difficulties referred to at (4) in paragraph 5 above.
- (3) The Mbaraki site appears to offer distinctly inferior accommodation for ships to that at the Government site, having regard to the narrower channel there (though wide enough) and more particularly to the strength of the current, which, as stated above, is 3-4 knots at spring tides, while at the Government site it is negligible.

8. The one important advantage of the Mbaraki site over the Government site seems to consist in the space available for storage on the latter. Messrs. Pauling's engineer speaks of the natural facilities of the place as "very marked," while Messrs. Boulton Bros. say in a recent letter: "We are struck with the advantages of the Mbaraki Creek site over that of the proposed Government site, more especially in regard to the space which is available on the former property. It is obvious that on the Mbaraki Creek site any finance will have much stronger support in the revenue-earning powers of the land round the creek. There are, including 20 acres of reclaimed land, a total of 220 acres, which would be utilised for railways, warehouses, business quarters, residential quarters, and all the necessary buildings for a busy entrepot. From what we can learn, all this is entirely wanting in the Government site."

9. The storage accommodation which could be made available at Mbaraki is certainly very extensive, but it is probably much greater than is really necessary, the climate of Mombasa not being either healthy for European residence, or for the storage for any length of time of perishable goods, unless they can be kept in cold storage. Moreover most of the accommodation is on the cliff behind the proposed wharf, and under Sir George Buchanan's scheme could only be reached directly from the ship by means of conveyers which are unsuitable for many kinds of cargo.

10. On the other hand the storage accommodation provided in the original Government scheme (apart from transit sheds) is very restricted, and the arrangement of the godowns at a distance from the wharf, involving transport by railway, is not convenient. Sir M. Fitz-

- (4) There would not be, as in the Government scheme, a continuous length of wharf, allowing elasticity of berthing and craning, and also of labour and supervision, since the berths would be discontinuous and would be situated partly on one side and partly on the other side of the creek entrance. This is a very important consideration.
- (5) The island pile wharves, only 25 ft. in width and without lateral support, would not be strong enough to withstand the impact of ships, which would probably be frequent having regard to the strength of the current (stated on the Admiralty chart to be 3-4 knots at spring tides), and the life of the wharves would therefore be very short.
- (6) These impacts would certainly produce movements in the wharves throwing the machinery out of gear.
- (7) The length of each wharf—350 ft.—would not be sufficient for even moderate-sized ships.

6. At the fourth meeting of the Sub-Committee, Major Grogan attended to give further evidence with regard to his scheme, accompanied by Mr. Robert Boulton and Captain the Hon. Cripps (partners in Messrs. Boulton Bros. & Co.), and Sir George Buchanan. It appears that Sir George Buchanan, to whom on his recent return from India Messrs. Pauling's scheme was submitted, has inspected that scheme and prepared a new one, in which the island pile wharves are to be replaced by ordinary reinforced concrete pile wharves 40 ft. in width and providing 32 ft. depth of water. He produced a plan showing such a wharf 1,000 ft. in a straight length at the south-easterly extremity of the entrance to the creek, designed to accommodate two ships 450 ft. in length. He estimated that the construction of this work with railway connexions, conveyers and other necessary services, could be carried out in two years for £1,000,000. He considered that 15 berths could be constructed by developing the whole estate, but that the two berths to be provided in this instance should be sufficient to deal with 300,000 tons of traffic per annum. He also considered that conveyers could be suitably used for mixed cargo, if not too heavy (say, not above 40 cwt.), instancing Basra and Port Sudan as ports where they are so used, and he added that most tropical export cargo could be shipped by such means. He observed, however, that provided for railway trucks being brought upon the wharf so that heavy packages which could not be carried on the conveyers could be loaded directly on to the trucks from the wharf.

7. It may be recognised at once that from an engineering point of view this second scheme produced by Major Grogan and his associates, being prepared by an engineer of reputation, is a great improvement on the first scheme. It is, however, a much more expensive one than the first, and appears to be no cheaper in relation to the accommodation provided than the Government scheme, in comparison with which it suffers from the following disadvantages:

- (1) A pile wharf cannot be as strong or durable as a wall of solid concrete blocks, and no competent engineer, in Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice's opinion, would recommend the former if the natural conditions allowed the latter to be constructed. The constant impact of ships would gradually damage the piles, and this would also lead to corrosion by the water of the iron in the reinforced concrete, as shown by recent experience at Southampton. After a life of 15 or 20 years the wharf provided in the Government scheme should, Sir Maurice Fitzmaurice is confident, be practically as good as new, while that of the "Buchanan" scheme would probably need long before that time very considerable repairs.
- (2) Sir George Buchanan has provided for a straight wharf of 1,000 ft. for two ships, but any extension of this accommodation would necessarily be discontinuous and lead to the difficulties referred to at (4) in paragraph 5 above.
- (3) The Mbaraki site appears to offer distinctly inferior accommodation for ships to that at the Government site, having regard to the narrower channel there (though may be it is wide enough) and more particularly to the strength of the current, which, as stated above, is 3-4 knots at spring tides, while at the Government site it is negligible.

8. The one important advantage of the Mbaraki site over the Government site seems to consist in the space available for storage on the latter. Messrs. Pauling's engineer speaks of the natural facilities of the place as "very marked," while Messrs. Boulton Bros. say in a recent letter: "We are struck with the advantages of the Mbaraki Creek site over that of the proposed Government site, more especially in regard to the space which is available on the former property. It is obvious that on the Mbaraki Creek site any finance will have much stronger support in the revenue-earning powers of the land round the creek. There are, including 20 acres of reclaimed land, a total of 220 acres, which would be utilised for railways, warehouses, business quarters, residential quarters, and all the necessary buildings for a busy entrepot. From what we can learn, all this is entirely wanting in the Government site."

9. The storage accommodation which could be made available at Mbaraki is certainly very extensive, but it is probably much greater than is really necessary, the climate of Mombasa not being either healthy for European residence, or for the storage for any length of time of perishable goods, unless they can be kept in cold storage. Moreover most of the accommodation is on the cliff behind the proposed wharf, and under Sir George Buchanan's scheme could only be reached directly from the ship by means of conveyers which are unsuitable for many kinds of cargo.

10. On the other hand the storage accommodation provided in the original Government scheme (apart from transit sheds) is very restricted, and the arrangement of the godowns at a distance from the wharf, involving transport by railway, is not convenient. Sir M. Fitz-

maurice was therefore asked whether, by cutting the cliff further back, the scheme could be modified so as to enlarge the accommodation and to provide godowns near the quay, and it was suggested that these should be placed immediately behind the transit sheds, the passenger station being put behind the godowns. He considered these proposals quite feasible, though the cost would be somewhat enhanced. It was suggested to him that in lieu of the original berth scheme, which might now be expected to cost at least £1,400,000, a portion of the scheme as modified, with a length of quay sufficient to provide at least two berths and with corresponding storage accommodation, might be constructed for £1,000,000; and he has now prepared a plan within this estimate for the construction of 1,350ft. of quay wall, two transit sheds and one double-storeyed warehouse only in the first instance, railway connexions, &c. being included. These works can be extended as required.

11. On the basis of an expenditure of £1,000,000 Major Blake Taylor has, in the Appendix notes attached, estimated that the enterprise can be made to pay its way with cargo charges considerably lower than those paid at present. He assumes that the traffic handled will be 150,000 tons export and 100,000 tons import per annum; and Sir, E. Northey considers that these are conservative figures, on the assumption that no competitive port is constructed on the Mbaraki Creek site.

12. It should be decided to proceed with the Government scheme, the Sub-Committee recommend—

- (1) That the works should be carried out by contract, competitive tenders from suitable firms being obtained in the usual way through the Consulting Engineers.
- (2) That, as in the case of the Uasin Gishu Railway, the cheapest and best way to obtain the money required would be by the issue of a Government loan under the Colonial Stock Act, the necessary amount being added to the loan to be issued for that railway.

The Director of Public Works of the East Africa Protectorate has offered to submit an estimate for construction by his Department in competition with other tenderers; and as the preparation of this estimate would involve only a trifling expense, and that, even if it were not considered desirable to execute the work departmentally, the estimate would furnish a useful check on the tenders received.

13. If the Government were quite free from commitments in regard to Major Grogan's proposals, the Sub-Committee would have recommended without hesitation that the Government scheme with the modifications proposed in this report, and at an estimated cost of £1,000,000, should be proceeded with at an early date, and that the establishment of a competitive port at Mbaraki should be avoided as unnecessary and undesirable by refusing railway connexion to the latter or otherwise. In view, however, of the situation as described in paragraph 4 above this appears to be impracticable and it is necessary therefore to consider the financial and administrative proposals which Messrs Boulton Bros placed before the Sub-Committee at their fourth meeting with reference to the Mbaraki scheme.

14. These proposals are understood to be on the following lines. A stock company would be formed with an authorised ordinary share capital of £1,000,000, of which £800,000 would be issued as fully paid to the promoters and vendors without any cash subscription, £200,000 would be subscribed in cash as working capital, and the remaining £200,000 would be held in reserve to provide further working capital if and as required. Major Grogan would receive his consideration entirely in shares. First mortgage debentures would be issued for the £1,000,000 to be spent on the construction works, though the share capital subscribed for cash might be advanced for the work at the commencement. The Government would guarantee these debentures as to both interest and capital, and interest and sinking fund charges would not exceed 8 per cent. No public issue would be made, and the money would if possible be obtained from India or elsewhere out of the United Kingdom. In the first three years while the enterprise was unremunerative interest at 4 per cent. per annum would under the permission granted by the recent Act, be funded as part of the capital cost, and during the period it might be possible by means of special private borrowing arrangements to keep the debt charge low so as to reduce the payments to be made by the Government under its guarantee. It is not clear whether these payments would be recoverable from subsequent profits. Deferred shares would also be created, entitled to receive the whole or part of the profits after 7½ per cent. had been paid on the ordinary shares; and 50 per cent. of these deferred shares would be allotted to the Government both by way of consideration for the guarantee on debentures and in order to give the Government voting control. The company would be constituted as a Port Trust, with four directors appointed by the Government, four by the promoters and a chairman selected by mutual agreement between the Government and the promoters.

15. It will be noted that under the terms as thus set out the whole of the construction money would be found at the risk of the Government, while the promoters would find only £200,000; that the loan charges would amount to 8 per cent. per annum, instead of about 7 per cent. under a Government stock issue; that while Government control of the enterprise might be made fairly effective, the share of Government property in it would only be a deferred portion, less than half of the whole, and that the rates charged to shippers would have to cover, as compared with the Government scheme, not only the additional 1 per cent. in annual loan charges, but a payment of £60,000 a year on the £800,000 ordinary shares. Against this is the prospect of additional revenue from rents on the storage and residential accommodation.

maurice was therefore asked whether, by cutting the cliff further back, the scheme could be modified so as to enlarge the accommodation and to provide godowns near the quay, and it was suggested that these should be placed immediately behind the transit sheds, the passenger station being put behind the godowns. He considered these proposals quite feasible, though the cost would be somewhat enhanced. It was suggested to him that in lieu of the original 4-berth scheme, which might now be expected to cost at least £1,400,000, a portion of the scheme as modified, with a length of quay sufficient to provide at least two berths and with corresponding storage accommodation, might be constructed for £1,000,000; and he has now prepared a plan within this estimate for the construction of 1,350ft. of quay wall, two transit sheds and one double-storeyed warehouse only in the first instance, railway connexions, &c. being included. These works can be extended as required.

11. On the basis of an expenditure of £1,000,000 Major Blake Taylor has, in the Appendix notes attached, estimated that the enterprise can be made to pay its way with cargo charges considerably lower than those paid at present. He assumes that the traffic handled will be 150,000 tons export and 100,000 tons import per annum; and Sir, E. Northey considers that these are conservative figures, on the assumption that no competitive port is constructed on the Mbaraki Creek site.

12. If it should be decided to proceed with the Government scheme, the Sub-Committee recommend—

- (1) That the works should be carried out by contract, competitive tenders from suitable firms being obtained in the usual way through the Consulting Engineers.
- (2) That, as in the case of the Uasin Gishu Railway, the cheapest and best way to obtain the money required would be by the issue of a Government loan under the Colonial Stock Act, the necessary amount being added to the loan to be issued for that railway.

The Director of Public Works of the East Africa Protectorate has offered to submit an estimate for construction by his Department in competition with other tenders, and as the preparation of this estimate would involve only a trifling expense, it might be obtained, as even if it were not considered desirable to execute the work departmentally, the estimate would furnish a useful check on the tenders received.

13. If the Government were quite free from commitments in regard to Major Grogan's proposals, the Sub-Committee would have recommended without hesitation that the Government scheme, with the modifications proposed in this report, and at an estimated cost of £1,000,000, should be proceeded with at an early date, and that the establishment of a competitive port at Mbaraki should be avoided as unnecessary and undesirable by refusing a railway connexion to the latter of otherwise. In view, however, of the situation as described in paragraph 4 above this appears to be impracticable and it is necessary therefore to consider the financial and administrative proposals which Messrs Boulton Bros. placed before the Sub-Committee at their fourth meeting with reference to the Mbaraki scheme.

14. These proposals are understood to be on the following lines. A dock company would be formed with an authorised ordinary share capital of £1,000,000, of which £800,000 would be issued as fully paid to the promoters and vendors without any cash subscription, £200,000 would be subscribed in cash as working capital and the remaining £200,000 would be held in reserve to provide further working capital if and as required. Major Grogan would receive his consideration entirely in shares. First mortgage debentures would be issued for the £1,000,000 to be spent on the construction works, though the share capital subscribed for cash might be advanced for the work at the commencement. The Government would guarantee these debentures as to both interest and capital, and interest and sinking fund charges would not exceed 4 per cent. No public issue would be made, and the money would if possible be obtained from India or elsewhere out of the United Kingdom. In the first three years while the enterprise was unremunerative interest at 4 per cent. per annum would under the permission granted by the recent Act be funded as part of the capital cost, and during the period it might be possible by means of special private borrowing arrangements to keep the debt charge low so as to reduce the payments to be made by the Government under its guarantee. It is not clear whether these payments would be recoverable from subsequent profits. Deferred shares would also be created, entitled to receive the whole or part of the profits after 7½ per cent. had been paid on the ordinary shares; and 50 per cent. of these deferred shares would be allotted to the Government both by way of consideration for the guarantee on debentures and in order to give the Government voting control. The company would be constituted as a Port Trust, with four directors appointed by the Government, four by the promoters and a chairman selected by mutual agreement between the Government and the promoters.

15. It will be noted that under the terms as thus set out the whole of the construction money would be found at the risk of the Government, while the promoters would find only £2,000,000; that the loan charges would amount to 8 per cent. per annum, instead of about 7 per cent. under a Government stock issue; that while Government control of the enterprise might be made fairly effective, the share of Government property in it would only be a deferred portion, less than half of the whole; and that the rates charged to shippers would have to cover, as compared with the Government scheme, not only the additional 1 per cent. in annual loan charges, but a payment of £80,000 a year on the £800,000 ordinary shares. Against this is the prospect of additional revenue from rents on the storage and residential accommodation

on the larger area of available land behind, but this is at best an uncertain prospect. (See paragraph 9 above.)

16. The alternatives before the Government may be put as follows:—
- To drop the Government scheme and to accept the Grogan-Buchanan-Boulton scheme with such modifications of the terms as it may be possible to secure.
 - To drop the Government scheme and to allow the other scheme to proceed as a private one without any Government guarantee, subject to such general regulations (including maximum tariffs) as the Government may be able to impose by legislation.
 - To proceed with the Government scheme in the expectation that the Mbaraki scheme will be immediately dropped or ultimately "frozen out."
 - To proceed with the Government scheme and to encourage the Mbaraki scheme as at A. or B.
17. The following remarks may assist in arriving at a decision in the matter:—
- While Messrs. Boulton have asked for a Government guarantee for the debenture issue, it cannot be assumed that they will not proceed without it: in fact they spoke of sending out a small staff early in June, and the Government guarantee only seems to have been suggested at the eleventh hour as an afterthought.
 - It is now recognised at almost every port in the world (except those developed entirely by a railway company such as Southampton) that it is very desirable that control should be in the hands either of the Government, or the Municipality, or a Special Port Authority with full representation of both the Government and the Municipality. The port of Mombasa has been developed by the Government railway and the control should be retained as far as possible by the Government. If the Mbaraki scheme is carried out, port dues to meet the expenses of the Port Authority could be charged in addition to the cargo dues payable to the dock company.
 - Even if the East Africa Protectorate and Uganda should develop as rapidly as is hoped, several years must probably elapse before the same is large enough to enable both a two-berth quay at Kilindini and a similar quay at Mbaraki to pay for themselves, and it seems likely that for a great many more years further extensions of either port could only be carried out to the detriment of the other.

14th May 1920

H. J. READ, Chairman.

APPENDIX

Notes by Major H. B. TAYLOR, March, 1920, for the Revision of Estimates of Expenses to Chief Secretary Nairobi DATED 15th OCTOBER 1913. His

Capital Cost	
Probably cost double of that estimated in 1913. £1,500,000 would be required for four berths.	
Suggest that for the present two berths be completed and construction of a third berth proceed so far as the expenditure of £1,000,000 will permit.	
Maintenance Charges, &c.	
Interest at 5 per cent on £1,000,000	50,000
Sinking Fund, 1 per cent on £1,000,000	10,000
Maintenance at 2 per cent on £600,000	12,000
Salaries of Port Staff	5,000
Labour and handling of	
150,000 tons Export at 1s.	7,500
100,000 tons Import at 1s. 6d.	7,500
Total Harbour Expenditure	£1102,000

Revenue	
By Consolidated dues on 905,000 tons as per Schedule No. 1 of 1913, at 5d. per net ton per 24 hours and half shipping on 2nd day	50,000
By Cargo dues, Landing cranes, &c.	
150,000 Export cargo at 5s.	37,500
100,000 Import cargo at 7s. 6d.	37,500
By Miscellaneous Revenue	5,000
	—
	£120,000

Traffic Estimates

(1) 150,000 tons Exports
(2) 100,000 Imports

(1) In 1913 a figure of 100,000 tons of 20-cwt. was accepted as a fair estimate for 1915-16, but was stopped development and even forcing the closure of work already in hand, and with the great shortage of shipping the export tonnage has kept to a figure about half this estimate, but we can safely accept 150,000 as the probable figure in say three to five years time, or possibly earlier if the extension of Railways and the opening out of a new country by the settlers prospers as it should.

(2) The figure of 100,000 taken for Imports is the average tonnage of the last three years. The War, no doubt is the cause of the heavy increase, but the estimate of 70,000 made in 1915 for 1915-16 might, I think, safely be put at 100,000 for 1922-23.

Cargo Dues.

The proposed charges 5s. Exports, and 7s. 6d. Imports should be readily met by the trade.

The present cost, I understand are something like 20s. per ton. Terminal charges average Rs. 2.20 per ton weight and at 2s. this means 4s. 6d. Lighterage per ton is Rs. 3 per ton at Bill of Lading tonnage, i.e. weight or measurement. Average import cargo equals 80 cubic feet, and export 90 cubic feet. (Coffee 80, Cotton and Sisal 85, Hides 160). Therefore average lighterage cargo charges Rs. 6j equal 12s. 6d. Add present Railway terminal to this, we get no less than 17s. 3d. per ton of Import and Export exclusive of incidental loss, say 2s. 6d., or a total of 20s. per ton at Port.

Traffic census of Uganda Railway wanted and possibilities of future and to see the Main Line carrying capacity is kept well ahead of development of British East Africa, Uganda, &c.

on the larger area of available land behind, but this is at best an uncertain prospect. (See paragraph 9 above.)

16. The alternatives before the Government may be put as follows:—
- To drop the Government scheme and to accept the Grogan-Buchanan-Boulton scheme with such modifications of the terms as it may be possible to secure.
 - To drop the Government scheme and to allow the other scheme to proceed as a private one without any Government guarantee, subject to such general regulation (including maximum tariffs) as the Government may be able to impose by legislation.
 - To proceed with the Government scheme in the expectation that the Mbaraki scheme will be immediately dropped or ultimately "frozen out."
 - To proceed with the Government scheme and to encourage the Mbaraki scheme as at A. or B.

17. The following remarks may assist in arriving at a decision in the matter:—
- While Messrs Boulton have asked for a Government guarantee for the debenture issue, it cannot be assumed that they will not proceed without it: in fact they spoke of sending out a small staff early in June, and the Government guarantee only seems to have been suggested at almost every port in the world except those developed entirely by a railway company such as Southampton) that it is very desirable that control should be in the hands either of the Government, or the Municipality, and the Municipality with full representation of both the Government and the Municipality. The port of Mombasa has been developed by the Government railway and the control should be retained as far as possible by the Government. If the Mbaraki scheme is carried out, port dues to meet the expenses of the Port Authority could be charged in addition to the cargo dues payable to the dock company.
 - Even if the East Africa Protectorate and Uganda should develop as rapidly as is hoped, several years must probably elapse before the traffic is large enough to enable both a two-berth quay at Malindi and a similar quay at Mombasa to pay for themselves, and it seems likely that for a great many more years further extensions of either port could only be carried out to the detriment of the other.

14th May, 1920

H. J. READ, Chairman

APPENDIX

NOTES BY MAJOR H. B. TAYLOR, MARCH, 1920 FOR THE REVISION OF ESTIMATES SUBMITTED IN HIS LETTER TO CHIEF SECRETARY WATSON DATED 12th OCTOBER 1913

Capital Cost

Probably cost double of that estimated in 1913 — £1,400,000 would be required for four berths.

Suggest that for the present two berths be completed and construction of a third berth proceed so far as the expenditure of £1,000,000 will permit.

Maintenance Charges, &c.

Interest at 5 per cent on £1,000,000	50,000
Sinking Fund 1 per cent on £1,000,000	10,000
Maintenance at 2 per cent on £200,000	4,000
Salaries of Port Staff	5,000
Labour and handling of	
150,000 tons Export at 1s	1,500
100,000 tons Import at 1s 6d	1,500

Total Harbour Expenditure £102,000

Revenue

By Consolidated dues on 905,000 tons as per Schedule No. 1 of 1913, at 5d per net ton per 24 hours and half shipping on 2nd day	30,000
By Cargo dues, Landing charges &c.	
150,000 Export cargo at 5s	37,500
100,000 Import cargo at 7s 6d	37,500
By Miscellaneous Revenue	5,000

£120,000

Traffic Estimates

(1) 150,000 tons Exports

(2) 100,000 tons Imports

(1) In 1913 a figure of 100,000 tons of 20-cwt was accepted as a fair estimate for 1915-16, but was stopping development and even forcing the closure of work already in hand, and with the great shortage of shipping the export tonnage has kept to a figure about half this estimate but we can safely accept 150,000 as the probable figure in say three to five years' time or possibly earlier if the extension of Railways and the opening out of a new country by the settlers prosper as it should.

(2) The figure of 100,000 taken for Imports is the average tonnage of the last three years. The War, no doubt is the cause of the heavy increase, but the estimate of 70,000 made in 1913 for 1915-16 might, I think safely be put at 100,000 for 1922-23.

Cargo Dues.

The proposed charges 5s Exports, and 7s 6d Imports should be readily met by the trade.

The present cost, I understand, are something like 20s per ton. Terminal charges average Rs. 2.20 per ton weight and at 2s this means 4s 6d. Lighterage per ton is Rs. 3 per ton at Bill of Lading tonnage, i.e. weight or measurement. Average import cargo equals 80 cubic feet, and export 90 cubic feet. (Coffee 80, Cotton and Sisal 85, Hides 160). Therefore average lighterage cargo charges Rs. 61 equal 12s 6d. Add present Railway terminal to this, we get no less than 17s 3d per ton of Import and Export exclusive of incidental loss, say 2s 6d., or a total of 20s per ton at Port.

Traffic census of Uganda Railway wanted and possibilities of future and to see the Main Line carrying capacity is kept well ahead of development of British East Africa, Uganda, &c.

C D
R 8 NOV
D 9

G.53735/23 Kenya.

DOWNING STREET,

November, 1923.

*Coates & Co
2.50pm
8 Nov '23
[Signature]*

[Handwritten initials]

Your telegram 30 October 315

DRAFT. TELEGRAM.

NAIROBI.
NO:
GOVERNOR.

*(40125)
21*

MINUTE.

Mr Bottomley 11.23.

Mr.
Mr.

~~Mr L. D'Almeida~~

Mr G. Francis

+ Mr H. Head

Mr J. Masterton Smith

Mr Ormsby

Drake of Despatch

[Handwritten signature]

Mbaraki with regard to foreshore rights Grogan refers to correspondence enclosed in my despatch of 17 August 1921, 1274, and also Colonial Secretary correspondence with letters of 24th October 4th November

1921
Letter from Grogan to Northey 2 Aug 1921 previously on record here but

you may have copy Grogan produces plan which he states is identical with that referred to in correspondence. This is being enquired into but in my opinion his case for foreshore rights over whole area will probably hold good

Grogan points out that Company's titles are not complicated as they have been confirmed by Land Court

and

practically the whole of the useable

~~the~~ front is contained in the ~~ground~~ *area*

se area or freehold block. Prices

in my telegram 29th September are

areas concerned free of all mortgages,

hypothecations and ground rents other than

~~mentioned~~ *mentioned* ground rents payable in certain

cases to Sheikh Alfi or his father and

subject to lease of Alderman Wharfage Coy.,

and the benefit of the same.

Coded & Sent
12.5 pm
13th Nov. 23
G.P.O.



13th November

and Mr. Tre. 8th November

MBARAKI 1/ am

DRAFT.

Telegram

Governor
Nairobi

[Handwritten signature]

~~was~~ satisfied that the
1921 assurance covered
~~the~~ whole ~~of~~ foreshore
held by ~~the~~ Proprietor's

company and not merely
foreshore covered by the
Crown lease despatch
follows

MINUTE.

Mr. Williamson

Mr. Parkington 11.23

Mr. Holt only 12.1.23

Sir C. Davis

Sir G. Grenville

Sir H. Read

Sir J. Maesterson Smith

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Duke of Devonshire

Levic in disp
& Min action
as in minutes
and

Gov. 53735 Kenya.

*Encl*Downing Street,
15 November, 1923.**DRAFT.****KENYA**No. 1602

Gov. Sir R.T. Coryndon,

MINUTE.Mr. Bottomley
14.11.23. f.s.

Mr.

Mr.

Sir C. Davis.

Sir G. Grindle.

Sir H. Read.

Sir J. Masterton Smith

Mr. Grenaby-Gore

Duke of Devonshire.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram No. 315 of the 30th of October, and to confirm my telegrams of the 8th and 13th of November, from which you will have learnt that, in my opinion, it is necessary to admit the rights of the Kilindini Harbour Wharves and Estate Company over the seafront of the whole of their holdings at Mbaraki.

2. I enclose a copy of the correspondence which has taken place with Major Grogan on this subject. The plan which he has submitted is identical with one preserved in the records of the Sub-Committee of the Colonial Economic Development Committee and described

Major Grogan 5th Nov.
(53831)From do. 6th November
& all typed
enclosures. (53735)

cciro.

described

described in the Sub-Committee's Report

in the following terms:-

"Early in March 1920 Major

Grogan placed at the disposal of

the Sub-Committee plans and a

description of a scheme prepared

by Messrs Pauling ... This

scheme, which was considered at

the second meeting of the Sub

Committee ... provided for

reinforced concrete pile island

wharves accommodating five vessels,

two on one side and three on the

other side of the entrance to the

Creek and also a lighterage

wharf

3. At the fourth meeting of the Sub-

Committee, on the 10th of May, 1920, another

plan was exhibited by Sir George Buchanan

showing a wharf of different design at the

south eastern extremity of the entrance

to the Creek, but that plan was certainly

not the "plan prepared by Major Hickes" and

described in the Sub-Committee's Report

in the following terms:-

"Early in March 1920 Major Grogan placed at the disposal of the Sub-Committee plans and a description of a scheme prepared by Messrs Pauling ... This scheme, which was considered at the second meeting of the Sub Committee . . . provided for reinforced concrete pile island wharves accommodating five vessels, two on one side and three on the other side of the entrance to the Creek and also a lightering wharf".

At the fourth meeting of the Sub-Committee, on the 10th of May, 1920, another plan was exhibited by Sir George Buchanan showing a wharf of different design at the south eastern extremity of the entrance to the Creek, but that plan was certainly not the "plan prepared by Major Hickey" and

it did not, therefore, illustrate the
"whole scheme" which was the subject of
the assurance sought for and obtained
by Sir Edward Northey from my prede-
cessors in 1921.

I have, etc.

(Signed) L. VON SIEB

G. H. Henge
53735

~~53735~~

15 Nov. 1923

Sir,

I have the honor to
ack: the receipt of your
tel. no: 315 of the 30th of
October, and to confirm
my telegrams of the 8th
and 13th of November from
which you will have heard
that, in my opinion, it is
necessary to admit the
reputable the London & Harbour
Charges and Estate Company
over the management of the
share of their holding & at 1/4 barnd
2. I enclose a copy of the
copy which has been taken
there into here. Every one on
this subject. The plan which
he has submitted is
identical with one prepared

Amos
4431
24

DRAFT.

Henge no: 1672

Mr. R. G. Gwynne

MINUTE.

- Mr. *H. H. Henge*
- Mr. *14.11.23*
- Mr. *for*
- Mr. *Vfd.*
- Mr. *C. C. C.*
- Mr. *G. G.*
- Mr. *H. H.*
- Mr. *J. J.*
- Mr. *O. O.*
- Mr. *U. U.*
- Mr. *V. V.*
- Mr. *W. W.*
- Mr. *X. X.*
- Mr. *Y. Y.*
- Mr. *Z. Z.*

2 copy Henge 53735
(52031)
6 NOV (53)25

Revised.

in the records of the Sub-Committee
of the Colonial Economic Development
Committee and described in the
Sub-Committee's Report in the
following terms:—

"Early in March, [1920] Roy's design
planned at the disposal of the
Sub-Committee plans, and a
description of a scheme prepared
by him: Puckling... This scheme,
which was considered at the meet-
ing of the Sub-Committee...
provided for reinforced concrete
piers and abutments accommodating
five vessels, two on one side of the
and three on the other side of the
entrance to the creek... and also
a lightning wharf..."

3. At the fourth meeting of the Sub-Committee,
on the 10th of May, 1920, another
plan was submitted by Sir George
Buchanan showing a wharf of
different design at the south-
eastern extremity of the entrance
to the creek, ~~but which was~~

was certainly not the plan
prepared by Roy's design,
and I ~~submit~~ did not,
the report, illustrate the
"whole scheme" which was
the subject of the assurance
sought for and obtained
from Sir George
Buchanan from my predecessor
in 1917.

DRAFT.

MINUTE

- Mr.
- Mr.
- Mr.
- Mr. C. Dixon
- Mr. G. Grenville
- Mr. H. Read
- Mr. J. Masterman Smith
- Mr. Ormsby Gore
- Duke of Devonshire

Signed DE VONSON, 4.4.21

was certainly not the plan
proposed by Major Walker
and ~~Edward~~ had not,
therefore, illustrated the
"whole volume" which was
the subject of the assurance
sought for and obtained
from Sir Edward
Knoxley from my predecessor
on 19 21.

DRAFT.

MINUTE.

- Mr.
- Mr.
- Mr.
- Sir C. Lewis
- Sir G. Arncliffe
- Sir H. Read
- Sir J. Maisteron Smith
- Mr. Ormsby Gore
- Duke of Devonshire

WILSON DE VONCE 11, 44

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

C0533/306

END

TOTAL EXPOSURES →

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

C0533/307

ORDER NO. ⇨ 777
CAMERA NO. ⇨ 19
OPERATOR. ⇨ CE
REDUCTION. ⇨ 12
EMULSION NO. ⇨ 311081
DATE. ⇨ 5/7/71

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

1923

VOL. 16

(12207) 22/10/20 K.900 10/25 M. & S. Ltd., Co. 411

FROM	DATE	SUBJECT
<u>Individuals</u>		
Hammond Col B.	1 Feb.	Railway Development
	21 "	" " Sleepers (Wood & Steel)
Hall - the Admiral	22 "	Cedar Pencil Wood.
Hendler Lord	19 May	The Taveta Railway
Hadley G.S.	26 June	Immigration of Apppt. as Railway, & Railway Manager
Hanan J.A.	26 July	Stamps & Customs of Native Tribes
Hudson R.	29 Oct.	Slavery
Jennings G.	15 Jan.	Jubaland
Inchcape Lord	20 May	Helmsdon Station & Barotse River
Jennings G.S.	28 June	Down Hill Tolls at Usondu - Lines
	5 July	
Inchcape Lord	28 Nov.	in Barotse State
Kearse G.L.	24 Sept.	Part of Blacksmith Machine & Locomotive
Kearney-Lucas G.S.	22 May	Location of Jubaland to Italy
Kearse Major G.T.	16 Sept.	Re-arrangement of Medical Officers
Llewellyn J.A.	28 Jan.	Position of Indians
Lugard Sir F.D.	27 May	"
Lugget Sir H.	1 June	Govt. of East Africa
Leather W.S.B.	6	Wireless Stations
Lusher		Immigration of Apppt.
Marshall C.	26 July	" of Railway Co.
Murrol E.W.	16	Kenya Settlement.
Moody J.A.	8 Oct.	Apppt. as Id. Inspector.
Parsons W.S.	22 Nov.	Petition
Peto H. & S.	28 "	Lt. Col. F.C. Robinson
Scudlough G.	23 Mar.	Position of Indians
Swyneston C.F. M.	22 "	Relations of S.A. Tribes Thus to Flora & Fauna
Telford H.L.	3 May	Electric Power Order 1919 - Draft App't
Tucker Cunningham W.S.	1 June	Magadi Soda Co

FROM	DATE	SUBJECT
Scott Leslie	2 June	Position of S. G. Plantations ✓
" Lt Col. J.	6 "	J. S. Campbell - management of Col. Scott's farm
Sutton Olanoway	27 "	Mayade Soda Co - liquidation
Stone Jb	26 July	Timberoona Petals for
	17 Sept	Timber concessio
Sutton H	26 "	Draft Electric Power Regs
Scott C F	2 Nov	Indian Question
Truscott R F	25 May	Position of Indians: Brit Policy in East Africa
Tait A W	20 "	Mayade Soda Co liquidation
Therrell O H	20 June	
	12 Feb	
	27 "	
eye 15	11 Aug	Press attack on the Cape Chamber
Higginson A	17 Sept	East Africa Trade Association

FROM	DATE	SUBJECT
Scott Leslie	2 June	Position of S. A. Plantations
Lt Col J.	6	J. S. Campbell - management of Col. Scott's farm
Sutton Okunnamung	27	Magade Soda Co - Liquidation
Stone J.	26 July	Timbera Estate Lt
	17 Sept	Timber concession
Sutton H.L.	26	Draft Electric Power Regs
Scott C.F.	2 Nov	Indian question
Truscott R.F.	25 May	Status of Indians Brit Policy in East Africa
Tait A.W.	20	Magade Soda Co Liquidation
T. H.	22 June	
	10 July	
	28	
Lynn J.P.	11 Aug	Press attack on the Lega Char.
Wiggleworth A.	17 Sept	East Africa Trade Negotiations