

be required to cover  
these initial costs  
which are met from  
from the...  
fund... Some

In addition to expenditure the  
amount...  
at present be foreseen will  
also be involved under the  
head of transport in  
connection with the...  
of the parties on the...  
Railway and also in connection  
with their... between  
the... and...  
on future occasions...  
charge will, of course, be...  
to Railway receipts and will  
therefore...  
compare...  
inspectors...

DESPATCH

EAST AFRICA PROT.

C. O.  
33236

No. 33236

Recd  
10 SEP 05



Form No. 460

1905

1/2 9/27

Page Paper

1000

12/2

(Subject.)

Land Grant to Mr Chamberlain

Explains why he did not consider it  
necessary to reopen the question if it is still  
thought desirable, will explain why his opinion  
was reduced to 20-000 acres

(Minutes.)

Mr. Antrobus

See on 33257.

Of course Mr. C. knows why the  
F.O. refused the grant but  
it might be explained to him  
in writing -

MAR 20/4

I am not at all sure that  
he does know why. The F.O.  
explained their view of the  
matter to Sir D. Stewart in a  
despatch of 21 Oct. 1904 (in 37404)  
but it seems to me that, as  
the F.O. suggest in 10552/05...

33257

I should have been informed on  
these applications in the first  
place if so, he ought  
to have been informed  
of the same. Various  
other

of 20 in total  
of 11

8

33236

REC'D  
COMMUNICATIONS  
MORNING  
MORNING

349

August 16th - 1905.

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

No. 440



Sir,

I have had the honour to receive your despatch No. 281 of June 23rd, regarding the grant of land to Mr. Chamberlain at Nakuru.

As I have already reported to you, I had many interviews with both Mr. Allen, Mr. Chamberlain's solicitor, and with Mr. Fletcher, and as I was of opinion that both thoroughly understood the whole situation, I did not consider it necessary to re-open the question, Mr. Chamberlain having accepted the terms offered him. The mere fact of his taking possession of the land seemed to me to close the incident, and I did not wish to re-open the controversy over again. Besides, Mr. Chamberlain's letters in such abusive and insulting language, I was of opinion that he deserved no consideration. I regret, however, that I did not give him

In

M. Principal Secretary of State  
for the Colonies,  
Downing Street,  
London, S.W.

249

No. 20258

in writing the explanation of the grounds on which his original contract with Sir C. Eliot was repudiated or why the area comprised in his concession was reduced to twenty thousand acres. Should you consider this still necessary, I shall have pleasure in carrying out your instructions.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

Humble servant,

S. Stewart