

DOMESTIC

EAST AFRICAN PROT

19140

C.O.
19140REC'D
2 JUN 38

See or Individual.

Anglo-Egyptian

1909

8 June.

Previous Paper.

180-13

Concession of land.

Sends copy letter to Commr of Lands offering present position of negotiations. Describes the fact of the two ^{colonial} authorities preparing a mutual code subject to mutual features agreed by Commr of both offices.

W. Reed.

We have had no substantial news of this affair for two years. In his letter of the 27th March 1907 (no 6) Sir K Mackenzie stated the arrangement he desired. The C.A. were instructed to prepare an agreement. The thing dragged on till Aug 19 (27979/07) so far as the C.O. was concerned, & apparently for about another year so far as the C.A. were concerned (27981/08). The C.A. then wrote to say that it appeared that Sir K Mackenzie intended I think that the lease to would

Arrived 19/1/07

Sectary

6/9/07

2nd

8/9/07

3rd

10/9/07

4th

17/9/07

5th

24/9/07

6th

1/10/07

7th

18/10/07

8th

25/10/07

be granted locally.

Suddenly (18003/09) Mr. Faulkes appears on the scene & endeavours to rush the C.A. & us into making an agreement which bears a very different look from what prepared on the basis of Sir R. Mackenzie's letter of the 27th of March 1907, which we were prepared to go through with. The main difference is (as altered draft in 18003), that he cuts out all the preliminary agreement about the provision of tools & has to go back to our letter of the 15th of April 1906 (or 17th 1906), which merely sent a statement showing the conditions on which the Govt. was granting land for cotton growing in the P.C. district, & went on to say that in all cases the negotiations for a lease must be initiated in the P.C.

Everything is now in a racing hurry according to Mr. Faulkes. If he isn't able to proceed in the next few days, he will lose another season, etc., etc. He has been to see you once, some twice, within the last few days, to say this & similar things.

We must not be bluffed. We must
visit on

72

- (1) getting to know from the D.A.C. exactly how things stand in the p.t. with reference to this question.
- (2) retaining his obligation as to the provision of capital which in this case took the place of ~~forwards~~ confidential inquiries as to financial standing.

As he is so excited, we wish to avoid any imputation of delay here. I think we might reasonably send a further telegram, of which I submit a draft. But we must be firm, I think, on the two main points referred to above, and we must continue very closely any other alterations which Mr. Faulkes may desire to make in the agreement originally drafted.

2 P.M.

June 10

47. VICTORIA STREET.
WESTMINSTER.

S.W.

June 8th 1909.

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies,
Colonial Office, London, S.W.

C.O.
19140

REC'D
8 JUN 09

Sir,

Referring to the cable from Mr. Foulkes and I made upon my Reed yesterday, I enclose, by request, a copy of the last letter received by me from the Commissioner of Lands at Mafeking, the original of which I have not seen.

On behalf of Lady Mackenzie and Mr. Foulkes, I write to say that of the two alternatives mentioned in paragraph 5 of Colonel Montgomery's letter, they are prepared to accept the first with the modifications suggested by Mr. Hollis, the Commissioner of Native Affairs, which are to the following effect:

That the boundaries defined by the Government Surveyor in connection with Mr. Foulkes, be adhered to so far as regards the Sabati River on the North and the Jelata Road on the South, but that the extreme Eastern boundary shall be determined by the Land Commission when formed, as that is the boundary in dispute owing to Native rights.

Should you not be able to grant the exact Eastern boundary fixed by the Surveyor, which includes the disputed area, and should the section in dispute be moved more to the Northward, then compensation should be made by the Eastern boundary being reduced proportionately so that the 50,000 acres already granted may be retained.

Answer - 2347-11

nonsense
In the terms of the
agreement drafted in San Francisco
letter of 27 March 1907 that for
the present bars

With reference to the Lease, what the grantors are anxious to do is to come to an agreement strictly as to the terms set forth in Lord Elgin's letter to me of April 10th. That is to say, to those terms they agreed to be bound, and it was on those terms that they then went out to measure the land and to mark the boundaries. It was also an understanding that no large an expense had been incurred up to now.

It is most important that permission be granted for work to be undertaken at once and delay will I will therefore entreat it is given forthwith. We will then proceed with the work and endeavor to expedite matters as much as possible, and the foregoing Lease prompted us that we may not have another reason.

I am, Sir,

Yours very truly
Matthew Mackenzie

133
+ to 134
133
134

Under Secretary State for the Colonies,
Colonial Office, L O N D O N, S. E.

C. O.
19140
REC'D
JUN 09

- 6 0 2 8 -

Office of the Commissioner of Lands,
Nairobi.

5th January 1909.

Sir,

I have the honour to reply to your letter of the 19th November regarding the land which you have applied for in the Malindi District.

2. It is true that the Land Officer gave Mr. Foulkes a permit to occupy 20,000 acres; this was done at Mr. Foulkes' request after he had shown Mr. Barton Wright a telegram he received from the District Officer. The telegram ran as follows:-

"Wired to Land Officer re your application. I will inform you on hearing from him. No local objections exist if natives have spaces reserved for development of their shambas."

Mr. Foulkes will have seen from this that there were a number of natives on the land whose claims would have to be considered.

Mr. Foulkes was also written to on the 19th February 1907 that forest areas might have to be deducted.

3. The land has been gone over several times by Surveyors and District Officers, and all inquiries have shown that there are many native claims on the land for which Mr. Foulkes received a permit to occupy. This has been pointed out the last time in a letter which the Land Officer wrote to Messrs. Byron & Harrison on the 6th July 1902 stating that the two areas of 10,000 acres would be taken, provided there is sufficient land available on

the land + 500 acres, Regd.

survey, and provided that this land is clear or native and other claims.

4. A few days after this your solicitors, having received your letter of the 2nd. June, wrote practically in the terms of it on the 17th. July, stating that their clients did not recognise that the Government has any right to deprive them of land which had been previously granted to them. They did say that you might be prepared to take other land in lieu of any that might be found to belong to natives; but this was left an open question. The whole case was then considered by my legal adviser, and the letter written of which you complain. It was written in order to make our position clear, but you were told that your case would still be considered if land could be found for you.

5. The position is in effect this. You have asked for a large area and we have told you we will give it you. The land you want is partly waste land with no claims, partly waste land with claims, and partly under the cultivation of natives. How far the claims will be proved we cannot say until the Land Court has tried the cases. We have every wish to give you the area you asked for, but we can only do it in one or two ways.

If you must have land at once we will survey the area you have asked for and make it over to you, but subject to all rights which may be proved on any part of it. In this case you may find yourselves left with much less land than you have applied for.

Or if you will wait till the Land Court has decided claims, we will do our best to give you the full amount you want, though not necessarily in one block.

If you are prepared to accept one of those ~~two~~

written to you at home and your solicitors Mrs. Yeville
and Mr. White who have

arrived, and I will write again next week.
I enclose a copy of my letter to Mr. Yeville and Mr. White and the survey fees.

You had requested off that amount for the survey
which you need had already been made up of right
amounts of land you had sent. And of course
as much as that you can still be sent to us at
Makindu now that we are still the owners of those
lands. Now we are the owners of those lands and
you are still entitled to half the cost of the survey.

Now you are still entitled to half the cost of the survey
now that we are the owners of those lands. And if you
are not bound by

any other contract or
any other agreement you have made with us
while on the land there will be time for you to
see and return to us, while the land is still
belonging to us. We would like to make it
clear that we have had out letter to you
now and you have not yet given us any reply and we
would like to see if you can give us some
more time to send to you again.

Now if you do not want to pay us the survey fees
then you do so because of the value of the land or the fact that the
land is not very good for anything but
we will still give you half the cost of the
survey and we will still give you half the cost of the
survey. And if you do not want to pay us the survey fees
then you do so because of the value of the land or the fact that the
land is not very good for anything but
we will still give you half the cost of the
survey and we will still give you half the cost of the
survey.

alternatives I shall enclose the letter to your Solicitors
of October 1908.

6. This applies to 30,000 acres in the Malindi
District. I am unable to give you more elsewhere than
this in Wit or elsewhere. The separate fee for the survey
fees for the third application for 10,000 acres in Wit
will be refunded to your Solicitors.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) J. Montgomery.

Commissioner of Lands.

Established value of vessel and income £12,000 I believe

.30001 Macmillan, 1908 6/12 29

Estimated sum of £100,000 or nothing more .8

Actual expenditure shown by evidence of Mr. Johnson

£100,000 plus expenses and expenses of entry of ship

£100,000 plus £100,000 for maintenance of ship and cost

of insurance and £100,000 for wages of crew and £100,000

for cost of supplies and £100,000

for cost of insurance and £100,000

for cost of supplies and £100,000

M. EAP

119140

929

28

11 June

Sent 2.45 P.M.
11/6/09

DRAFT Telegram

Jackson
Force not

Nairobi

MINUTE.

Mr. Butler June 11

Mr. Read 11

Mr. Just.

Mr. Antrobus.

Mr. Cox.

Sir G. Lucas.

Sir F. Hopwood.

Col. Seely.

The Earl of Crewe.

for cost

With ref to my tel. 3rd June

under floor

state portion of
negotiations perfect
as to
reprode annuity
MacLaurie concession

as fully as possible

by telegraph

stridulus

confidential

73

Nairobi

June 17th 1909

My dear Macnaghten.

[MS. A. 7. 2. v. 164] In confirmation of my telegram of to-day's date I am sending you gen. - officially certain papers containing the depositions of one of the witnesses in the enquiry held by Judge Baillie into the charges against Silberad as taken by him and subsequently given to the Defendants before him, the provincial Commissioner of Nairobi.
I doubt there is very little doubt that Routledge represented himself as a Government Officer in order to influence the evidence of some witnesses in the original enquiry
and

by them.

89

and that both he and his
coached them and instructed
them as to what they were
to say, in order to strengthen the
case.

That case, it must be remem-
bered, was very weak at the
outset, as the incident of the
police woman only came
into the knowledge of the Rout-
ledge because I thought Mr Routledge
after they had brought them to a Government Officer "certain
charges," which originally rested on the face of it this statement
on the evidence of the two girls a poor complement to the
whole case. The Rout-
ledges had evidently made up
their minds that that evidence
was to be of the nature of

The papers were seen by the
own Advocate who, while ad-
mitting that they established
the fact of the witnesses having
been tampered with beyond any
real doubt, was sceptical as
to their having much legal value
and considered that it would
be advisable to try to make
public also of other, more
particularly in view of the state-
ment, "I gave false evidence

because I thought Mr Routledge
had given me a Government Officer "certain
charges," which originally rested on the face of it this statement
on the evidence of the two girls a poor complement to the
whole case, though I think there is
doubt that it merely indicates
a tendency, although inevitable
among natives, to reply to questions
put

put by a Government Officer
the sense which they think
desires.

My tendency is well known
to all our magistrates and
hears the necessary allowance
for it in trying cases. Routledge
was equally aware of it and
made use of it for his own
purposes.

If committed with the
closed papers he would do
say that they had been ob-
tained by intimidation. This I well
scarcely say was not the case.

However, you and your
wife doubtless know how
make the best use of the
information.

Very sincerely yours
W. Thomson