

1924

E. AFRICA

C. O.
36099
30 JUL 24

Date

July 1924

447

Colonial Office

RELATION:—

East Africa Military Expenditure

U.S. of S.

U.S. of S.

U.S. of S.

U.S. of S.

These 50 cones with the Treaty of Commerce
regarding outstanding points in connection
with the apparatusment of —

Previous Paper

MINUTES

6. 30753

Mr. Ramsey
S.O. 23 July 24
S.O. (Sherrington)

Area

Subsequent Paper

41175/24

Call "WAR OFFICE"
Charge Number necessary.

413

War Office,
Whitehall,
S.W.1.

th
30. May, 1924.

Kenya
1895
1895
1895

Dear Bottomley,

With reference to the statement regarding Kenya military expenditure which you sent me with your letter of March 22nd, I enclose a copy of a statement prepared by our Accounts Branch showing that Captain Nicholson has credited the Colony in 1918/19 with 37,500 rupees more than the Colony say they have paid. The difference is small but it is worth while clearing up. It may arise out of the Zanzibar contribution or payment being improperly shown or omitted as the case made be.

For the purposes of the Report, Skevington suggests we take the lower figure given by the Colony but perhaps you will clear up the difference with the Governor of Kenya in due course.

Yours sincerely,

J. Roseway

Bottomley, Esq., O.B.E.,
Colonial Office,
S.W.1.

Kenya K.A.R. Contributions to March, 1919.

Amount reported by O.I/c E.A. War Accounts Clearance Section (in enclosure to Kenya despatch No. 1031 dated 30/6/23) as paid by Kenya, including Zanzibar.				Amount reported in S.B. to have been transferred to Central K.A.R. Pay Department.	
Rs. or Fl.	cts.	Rs. or Fl.	cts.	Rs. or Fl.	cts.
4/15	-	-	-	-	-
5/16	-	54,696	08	54,696	08
6/17	-	696,495	00	696,495	00
7/18	707,835	-	-	-	-
	707,835	-	-	-	-
	1,415,670	-	-	-	-
	less 255,300	-	-	-	-
		1,160,370	00	1,160,370	00
19	308,842	50			
	870,277	50			
	Zanzibar 18,750	-			
		1,197,870	00	1,160,370	00
	Totals	3,109,431	08	3,071,931	08
		Difference		37,500	00

Agrees with the amount credited in the E.A. Accounts under the head "Kenya K.A.R. Contributions to March 1919".

short cuts unnecessarily.

Roseway agrees that we ought to divide the deduction.

I am not sure that without guidance I could separate the items which would have been met from the King's African Rifles and the Common Charges Accounts respectively and in any case I have not the Kenya 1919/20 Estimates. May I ask you to make the division?

Yours sincerely,

J. H. G. 6/2

**Inter-departmental Committee on the apportionment
of the East African War Expenditure.**

A Meeting was held at the Treasury at 10.15 a.m.
on the 15th May, 1924.

Present -

Mr. Bottonley	Colonial Office
Mr. Cash	War Office
Mr. Forsey	War Office
Mr. Shevington	Treasury

Mr. Cash's memoranda of the 7th April and 9th May, 1924, on the points outstanding on the winding up of the East African and Nyasaland Accounts were considered.

1A. The 1919/20 Contributions.

Mr. Bottonley explained that the provision for the King's African Rifles in the 1919/20 Kenya Estimates showed clearly that £50,000 was included under Special Expenditure for the 2 Battalions and the Mounted Infantry Section temporarily retained in view of unrest in Southern Abyssinia. It was clear therefore that the agreed contribution of £250,000 covered the expenses of these units. He referred to the enclosures to Colonial Office letter of 3rd May, 1919, showing that the disbandment of 1½ Battalions was approved by 29th April, 1919 - which seemed to indicate that the contribution based on Estimates provision was favourable to the War Office.

Mr. Cash referred to the fact mentioned in Mr. Bottonley's letter to him of 10th May, 1924, that the total provision for the King's African Rifles shown in the Colonial Office copy of the Estimates as finally altered in manuscript was £196,000 (on the basis of 1915 & 16) whereas the figure consistently reported by Kenya was £250,000. Mr. Bottonley said

/that

Branch. Mr. Shevington asked whether it was clear that, subject to the outstanding queries re Uganda, the Protectorate had paid over as current contributions the full amounts provided for Pay and Allowances of the King's African Rifles in their Estimates for the war years. Mr. Roseway thought it was not possible to verify this from the Receipts and Expenditure accounts as the sums which had to be paid over formed a part only of the provision in Estimates for King's African Rifles expenditure. In the absence of proof to the contrary he thought it would be necessary to accept the word of the local Government that the proper amounts had been paid over. Mr. Shevington promised to examine the Receipts and Expenditure accounts.

2. Incidence of the Unclaimed balance of £22,000.

Mr. Dean said that the promised despatch to explain the nature of the expenditure in question had not been received. It was arranged to cable a reminder.

3. Outstanding Liabilities.

Mr. Duttonley stated that the local Governments had recently urged strongly the adoption of their original proposal that the unclaimed balances of pay of the Military Labour Corps should be paid over to the Tribes, and that the question was now before the Colonial Office Ministers. He would endeavour to expedite a decision, but, meantime, he did not think it would be possible to approach Kenya on the question of that Colony taking over all outstanding liabilities for an agreed sum. Mr. Duttonley said that it had never been alleged that there was any pledge to pay over unclaimed balances to the Tribes, apart from the Military Labour Corps. He agreed in principle that Kenya should take over all outstanding

/Liabilities

It was agreed that the calculation should be in the form adopted by Mr. Haseaway subject to the amplification of the description of items as far as possible to avoid as far as possible the necessity for footnotes.

Mr. Shevington referred to the King's African Rifles account calculations and suggested that it was not right to abate the agreed sterling contributions for 1919/20, by reason of that fact that these sterling sums were based on the R at 1/10d. whereas the total rupee expenditure had been converted at R = 1/8d. The total sterling expenditure arrived at by converting rupees at the uniform rate of 1/5d. was really the sum of the rupee expenditure for each year converted at the average exchange rate for the year. The War Office had paid on account of 1919/20 garrison expenditure X rupees which had cost them 1/10d. each, and $X \times 1/10d.$ was included therefor in the total sterling expenditure. The Protectorates were contributing X rupees at 1/10d. and their agreed sterling contributions would therefore exactly reimburse the War Office expenditure. If credit were given for the full agreed sterling contribution the net sterling expenditure to be apportioned would represent the sterling sum which the War Office would have provided if the Protectorates had paid their own 1919/20 garrison expenditure in the first place.

Appendix E (Total War expenditure already incurred by the Protectorates)

Mr. Bottomley submitted a draft based on the statements prepared by the Protectorates. Mr. Shevington undertook to examine the Receipts and Expenditure accounts with a view to verifying that nothing but bona fide Military expenditure had been included in the statements.

It was agreed that if the figures could be readily
/substantiated