1928 Kenya

No. 15442

SUBJECT CO 533/382

Governor's Salary and Subsistence Allowance.

Overpayment of Salary to Sir Ed. Grigg

Previous

Gov 12509/25

Subsequent

See 15809/28

15754/29 (Exemption from customs duty)

16587/30 (Gov's Salary)

FILE C.

1. GOVERNOR 675. 30th NOVEMBER, 1928.

Submits for information a query raised by the Auditor in his report for 1927 regarding the payment of his salary as Governor from the 27th May, 1925. Would like to raise the questions of the heavy reimbursements on account of custom duties, taxes and other charges which he [illegible] annually and of subsistence allowance, which [illegible] involves on leave.

[illegible]

[illegible] to date.

[illegible]

I have [illegible] deal [illegible] various points in the despatch.

1. Overpayment [illegible]

[illegible] Note [illegible] in this and in [illegible] the D.O.S. [illegible] letter from [illegible] given [illegible] No. 1 No. 2 from the [illegible] correction was [illegible]

It would appear that

(1) The overpay[illegible] to the Governor [illegible] prior to [illegible] instead of [illegible] contrary to [illegible] irregular.

[illegible]

the [illegible]

not [illegible]

the [illegible]

which [illegible]

require the [illegible]

the Governor's Pension [illegible]

(3) Exceptional expedie[illegible] (1) [illegible] the overpayments as special allowance instead of salary

* The amount overpaid would [illegible] the [illegible] between £500.

salary, or (ii) [illegible] the recipient from a refund on the ground that he had [illegible] reason to suppose that he was not entitled [illegible] payment alth[illegible] scheme [illegible] seem to be pec[illegible] to [illegible] affect[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] allowance [illegible] [illegible] casual overpay[illegible] [illegible] be [illegible] [illegible] and the [illegible]

[illegible] refund [illegible] [illegible] on the ground [illegible] [illegible] more reasonable and justifi[illegible] special circumstances.

[illegible] normal case of over-payment steps [illegible] taken to fix [illegible] responsibility; and [illegible] the facts are not yet available it would seem necessary, unless the Secretary of [illegible]

authority at once as an exceptional measure to take steps as suggested at X. and Y. on last two pages of Memorandum A., i.e., ascertain (1) who initiated the action leading up to the issue of the [illegible] the part, if any, [illegible] by Go[illegible] [illegible] Colonial [illegible] would [illegible] Audit [illegible] [illegible] involved, (3) [illegible] issue of the allow[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] allowance in lieu of exemption from taxation.

taxation. It has been the general policy for many years to get rid of such allowances as those in lieu of customs duties, and the matter was recently considered by a Group Council which proposed that a memorandum should be prepared setting out fully the facts and stating the arguments against retention of the privilege with a view to ascertaining from the Colonies concerned (which I believe are very few) what is the approximate value, and securing a corresponding addition to the Governor's emoluments on its withdrawal - the change to be made on change of Governor. The matter is therefore one for General Department. It may, however, be pointed out that the emoluments of the Governor of Kenya have already been very substantially increased and that if they are now to be regarded as inadequate, this suggests that a standard of living is being set up which will make things very difficult for future Governors. It may be noted that the present emoluments of the Governor of Kenya (which include £1,000 as Hdr. for Transport and £2,500 duty allowance) not counting special local allowance, which is still drawn by his Governor, exceed those of any other Colonial Governor.

4. Subsistence Allowance. Memorandum C. covers this point. It shows that the Governor's version in paragraph 4 of what happened when he was last in England on duty is (i) not quite complete, and (ii) in one respect incorrect, since (i) according to the records he himself stated that he did not wish to press the matter, if it is not the practice to give such allowances; and (ii) that far from the Colonial Office not being aware of the Coryndon case in 1923, Sir S. Wilson definitely referred to it in his semi-official letter to Sir E. Grigg, with the remark that it was exceptional. It must also be mentioned that Sir D. Cameron has also been called home on duty. If, therefore, in spite of the general objections to creating such a precedent Sir E. Grigg is given a subsistence allowance, it would seem necessary to extend a similar concession to Sir D. Cameron, although he has not asked for it.

Sir E. Grigg proposes to discuss these matters with the Secretary of State.

(Sd) H.T. ALLEN
16.1.29.

Mr Allen has gone into all this very thoroughly.
I pass the papers through the Gen. Div. with special reference to the points marked ✓ above.
As regards these:-
C.R. 65: I do, I am sorry to see any change - the half pay for the voyage applies to Governors General & Governors of Australian States & S. Rhodesia, as a general rule - i.e. it never more than half pay & is necessarily that; the Govt in question has to be consulted as to the pay

Do it be asked
X Remember this, as
Hanna stated rather too
hypothetically; I mean,
of course, that no case
of full pay on the voyage
was found to any member
— D.O. Ed.

who may be available & who are willing to grant.

Jeans — It will be contrary to general policy to introduce [illegible] or allowances to compensate for customs duties etc.

As to passage allowances — it will be very difficult to justify this in the present circumstances.

A C Parsons
22.1.29

I confine my comments to the general question

(1) The rule of half pay on the voyage is of long standing and I see no reason whatever for altering it

(2) We have decided to abolish "duty allowances" where they should exist. It seems to me worst of the question to start on this business.

(3) I can see no justification for a substitute allowance which, as Sir Malcolm points out to Sir E. Grigg in 1927, has not been paid to any other Governor

J V Verma
28.1.29

as in the case of the King.

I have never been quite sure that this is a very strong argument, as I know what it means having to pay Customs Duties as a Governor, and the conditions in a Colony where most of the revenue is derived from Customs Duties are not really very similar to those in the United Kingdom.

The [illegible] of the Department is that if a Governor's salary is not enough to enable him to pay Customs Duties, his salary should be raised. I don't personally think that this is quite a sound [illegible] experience to our thinking [illegible] Customs [illegible] of Customs [illegible], there be [illegible] his [illegible] increased. I am afraid I find it very [illegible] Sir E. Grigg's request [illegible] the time of the [illegible] Sir D. Cameron [illegible] that as [illegible] free of [illegible] Sir D. Cameron) [illegible] privilege. I [illegible] put in an application [illegible] and I had to honour my [illegible] I found it was [illegible] to the policy of the Department.

Sir E. Grigg says in his despatch that his Customs Duties cost him £2,000 per annum. I don't think that this can be quite correct, as the Kenya duty is, I think, 30% ad valorem, and if Sir E. Grigg pays £2,000 it means

means that he must import goods to the value of £10,000, which I should say is very unlikely.

I think before coming to a decision as regards relieving Sir E. Grigg of his Customs Duties it would be well if I could discuss the whole question with you. If he is relieved of paying Customs Duties I think he should give up the extra £500 a year salary, which, contrary to your instructions, he allowed the Legislative Council to vote him shortly after he arrived in Kenya.

As regards subsistence allowance when in this country. I do not know why Sir E. Grigg has again raised the question of drawing this allowance at the time of the Colonial Office Conference. I had several communications with him on the subject and I had hoped that the matter was closed. No one else drew it and there was really no reason why he should be allowed to draw it, as most of those attending the Conference were on leave and no one else has asked for it. As he and Sir D. Cameron have, on this last occasion, been brought home on duty I have instructed the Crown Agents to pay them each £3. 3. 0. per diem subsistence allowance during the time that they have been here, and I really think that this ought to satisfy Sir E. Grigg.

12.3.29.

13.3.29.

Mr. Bottomley.

I have spoken to the Secretary of State about this and he is anxious to know the exact circumstances under which Sir Edward Grigg was allowed to draw full salary from the date on which he was offered the Governorship of Kenya. Would you please get somebody to prepare a short Note, or else mark in the attached papers the relevant pages.

21.3.29

This, unfortunately, is just the info. which we have not got: see X on p. of memo A. It will be embarrassing to ask the Off., — Sir E. Grigg is in this country, & the only alternative is to ask Major Dutton, who may be in a position to supply the info., as the Dept. received for Kenya have withheld.

My sincerely for review

A.E. Robinson

22.3.29

W.C.S. 22.3.29

3 To Dutton 22 March/29

DEC. UNDER STATUTE

To Dutton 11 April/29

SIGNATURE

Dutton 11 Apr 29

1

6. Note of discussion with Sir E. Grigg on 8th April 1929

If there had been more time, or fewer subjects, for the discussion on Monday, I should, I hope, have pointed out that the course indicated at the end of Mr. Allen's ~~minute~~ Note will get us no further with the auditor. The passing and approval of a Supplementary Estimate is in no way a confirmation of all the payments made. Suppose there had been no excess on the Vote: would the original Estimates and the appropriation Ordinance have validated all irregularities in advance?

The Auditor has raised the question of the authority for this use of public money, and until a decision has been taken on that there is nothing to say to him and no need to say anything to him.

As to action:

(a) P.S. should be asked to ascertain if there was any undertaking, or discussion, as to Sir E. Grigg not suffering through his premature departure in 1925.

If there were reasons for liberal treatment on this account, they would justify half-salary, but hardly full salary.

(b) We should write to Sir E. Grigg giving the upshot of (a); explain as in the first part of this minute; and say that it is understood that he proposes to discuss the question of refund with the S. of S.

W.C.S. 8.4.29

I keep this book for reference in registered papers on to (?). There is nothing in it to look through & signed extracts only the undertaking to

terms of the Supplementary [illegible]

(Quoted by Mr. Allen in his [illegible]: A)

constituted an Act of Indemnity

by [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible] are

[illegible] of other Colonie

[illegible] much better, if

the standard of enter

[illegible] live on the

[illegible]

course to [illegible]

[illegible]

1827 and to say [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to the [illegible]

Mr. Amery

~~Secretary~~

After the discussion between the Secretary of State and Sir Edward Grigg on Tuesday, May 7th, I was directed to examine the difficulties and the various possibilities for action. I am sorry to have been so long, but the difficulties are considerable, and the various possibilities are none of them easy.

Sir E. Grigg pointed out that there were two new factors in the case:-

(i) a strong attempt was being made in Kenya to represent the ineffectiveness of the audit arrangements.

(ii) Major Grogan in his election speeches had definitely referred to this question of the over-issue of salary to the Governor.

Therefore, the Editor needed protection, and there was every reason to fear that Sir E. Grigg's political position in the country might be very greatly weakened by a decision in any adverse to him.

We have not been able to check the reference to Major Grogan. In the last copy of the local newspaper which we received it contains a speech by him which refers to the audit but does not mention this particular case. When later papers come, we may find something more definite.

My first difficulty is the gaps which still remain in our information. I do not wish in any way to seem to be building up a case against the Governor, or I should suggest that we should telegraph for further information. On the other hand

many, if we do not do so, there is just the chance that, after the matter has been settled in some way, further facts may emerge which will show up the Colonial Office as rather too easy-going a custodian of public money.

The money was issued some time in October 1925, and formed the subject of a letter from the Treasury to the Secretariat dated the 15th of October, 1925. We do not know what was in it, and it may have questioned the correctness of the issue.

The Secretariat reply was dated the 16th of January, 1926. We have not got it, but we know that it contained a passage

"the question has been referred by H.E. to the Secretary of State for the Colonies".

We must assume, I think, that it contained nothing else relevant to our problem, but we cannot be sure.

The interval between these dates can, I think, be reasonably accounted for by the fact that the Supplementary Estimate covering the excess on the whole vote was in preparation.

"The question" was <u>not</u> referred to the Secretary of State - if the word relates to the correctness of the actual issue of salary.

The next stage is the audit query of 27th July, 1926, which was passed by the Treasurer to the Secretariat on the 19th of July. The Secretariat returned it on the 27th of October explaining that the query on its receipt was forwarded to the Private Secretary who had minuted on the 6th of August suggesting that it would save time if the query were referred direct to the Director of Colonial Audit to settle with the Colonial Office. A further delay between August and October was accounted for by the fact that the Secretariat file had been detained in Government House.

The presumption is that between the 16th of January, 1926, and the following August, if not October, the Governor had contemplated writing to the Secretary of State about it, but had found some difficulty.

In passing the papers to the Acting Director of Colonial Audit here, the Acting Auditor observed that he did not see why the query could not be dealt with locally, but in view of the arrangement said to have been made by the Auditor, he sent on the query as perhaps there were papers on record in the Colonial Office which would dispose of it.

That was in November 1926, and in August 1927, the Acting Director of Colonial Audit, unfortunately without any reference to the Colonial Office, replied referring the Acting Auditor to the Secretariat letter of the 16th of January as being apparently the authority for the payment. The Acting Auditor was to verify this authority which, as I have pointed out, was not an authority at all.

Sir E. Grigg said on Tuesday that it was not until he got home that he realised there was anything at stake except the regularisation of the excess on the vote. It was on that account that he

he had regarded the Auditor's subsequent activity (in his report on the audit of the Account for 1927) as excess of zeal? I am afraid, however, that I cannot understand how the Governor could fail to realise that a point acutely affecting himself was still at issue. [illegible] that in August 1927 [illegible] to be referred to the Secretary of State if the Supplementary [illegible] had approved [illegible] would be [illegible] overlook [illegible] that the arrangement [illegible] in it were based on express terms on an assumption as to the date of commencing salary.

As I say, I do not wish to press these points, but I think it [illegible] essential to bring them to notice. If the Governor, in his [illegible] pre-occupations, [illegible] himself into a false position, [illegible] that if [illegible]

[illegible]

(i) to [illegible] should refund the [illegible] 4½ months full salary [illegible] for the voyage or say [illegible] salary;

(ii) to [illegible] the [illegible] suggestive [illegible]

(iii) [illegible] on the basis of his [illegible]

on public grounds before taking up his duties, and, adopting what has been done in civil service cases, to grant an allowance equal to half salary for the period of detention, say 2½ months half salary;

(iv) he another course of reconstructing the position, to allow the same emoluments as if he had gone out by a reasonably early boat after his appointment was approved. If there had been a boat, say, on the 1st of July which he had taken, he would have got half salary during the voyage and full salary from the date of arrival. The result of this would be to add full pay for a period of some ten or eleven weeks to what he should by regulation have received, - say 5 months half salary.

[illegible] courses is elected, it [illegible] to say that the attitude of [illegible] various [illegible] has been perfectly [illegible] in the only [illegible] Governor [illegible] from [illegible] this [illegible] in [illegible] the [illegible] must by [illegible] recognition.

[illegible] (i) [illegible] from all points of view [illegible] (ii) [illegible] (iii) [illegible] (iv) [illegible]

criticism [illegible] effectively as it can be countered. Sir E. Grigg does not accept that view, although the actual loss of the money does not worry him, but I feel that any other course will give Major Grogan fuel for a very long run.

Course (ii). I can see no way of explaining [illegible] a way which would [illegible] Sir E. Grigg [illegible] that he should [illegible] whole [illegible] by actual [illegible] at the [illegible] of State [illegible] his [illegible] the [illegible] mentary [illegible] also of [illegible] [illegible] fore [illegible] matter [illegible] I consider to be entirely [illegible] [illegible] of our own [illegible] but [illegible] criticism [illegible]

[illegible] been course [illegible] (iv) [illegible] reject (iv) [illegible] not the solution [illegible] have [illegible] to any [illegible] if the question of compensation for delayed departure had been considered before he sailed there was ample precedent for (iii), especially during war time.

As regards (iii), I have, without success, made further efforts to find evidence as to the circumstances of the postponement of Sir E. Grigg's departure. There were discussions with Ministers, and I was present at one discussion of an appreciation (in the military sense) of the East African position which Sir E. Grigg had prepared. That discussion, I am clear, took place in the Secretary of State's room at the House of Commons, and was, therefore, before the House rose. My impression is that the last portion of the delay was simply in order that Lady Grigg and the child should escape the heat of the Red Sea.

[illegible] I think Lady [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

I am really very doubtful whether there was [illegible] delay caused at the instance of the Secretary of State or the Colonial [illegible] it is dangerous to [illegible] there was such a [illegible] the same time [illegible] lack of official [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Sir E. Grigg was [illegible] and was diffident [illegible] for an allowance at the time, why on [illegible] he not put the point to the Secretary of State [illegible] as the over-issue of salary was brought to his notice [illegible] not know what we can reply.

W. B. 14.5.27

I agree generally except [illegible]

Not [redacted] feel quite as much difficulty as Mr. Bottomley does as regards the date on which half-salary began, provided that the discussions which took place before Sir E. Grigg's departure did raise important questions of policy. My feeling is that, if I had been asked at the time, I should have advised that the date did not matter much, if half-salary was available & it was decided to allow it. But there seems to be no excuse for allowing full salary before landing.

14.5.29 G.G.

Sir G. Grindle

I should like to be clear on one or two points before I come to a decision. When did Sir H. Coryndon die, and when was Sir E. Grigg in fact selected and ready to go? I know his appointment was announced on May 27th, but he may possibly have been otherwise ready to go the moment it was announced, and if we act on

Mr. Bottomley's No. (III) it might be possible to overlook the difference between May 27th and the possible date of departure, and regard the whole period as admissible for half pay.

Is duty leave full pay leave? If it is I am not sure that Mr. Bottomley's No(IV) is not admissible, justifying full payment from whatever date he might otherwise have landed plus half pay for the voyage. I do not see anything very irregular in the Secretary of State allowing an officer kept back for office reasons from claiming the extension of his leave as duty leave, and, if that is permissible, it might be defensible on first entry. I suppose the extra payments to O.A.G. during this period do not preclude this solution?

How far is the matter urgent? My present idea is on receipt of your observations on above, to write to Sir E. Grigg and tell him what my conclusion is but give him a chance of replying before finally deciding.

21. 5. 29

Mr. Amery.

I have discussed with Mr. Bottomley. The answers to your questions are:-

(a) Sir H. Coryndon died 10th February 1925

(b) We have nothing on record in the Department to show how or when Sir E. Grigg's name first came up.

(c)

(c) Duty Leave is full pay leave. But I must point out that a man cannot have leave before he takes up an appointment. It is not a question of leave, but of granting an allowance for a period during which he was detained before sailing to take up his appointment, on the ground that in the recollection of the S. of S. he was kept here for purposes of discussion.

(d) The payments to the [illegible] affect the matter either way.

(e) It seems desirable that [illegible] should be settled before Sir E. Grigg [illegible]. His date of departure now lies between him and his doctor but will probably be some time in June.

On the merits, if you are satisfied that Sir E. Grigg is entitled to a "detention" allowance, I do not see why it should not begin from 27th May. It must not begin a day before, because Sir E. Grigg was presumably sitting and voting in Parliament up to that date. Parliament adjourned on the 26th May to [illegible] June and the writ was ordered on the 10th June. His commission was signed on [illegible] June.

As regards the rate of detention allowance the rate is for you to settle [illegible] the limits provided by the regulations, [illegible] of course, to the money being available. The regulation then and now in force is clear that a Governor can only draw half salary up to the date he lands. The regulation ran as follows in the 1925 edition:-

Section 108

Section 108. "On appointment to a Government half salary when available and when permitted by law will be allowed as a general rule from the date of embarkation from England or a Colony. An officer succeeding to the administration or the provisional [illegible] Imperial Government will be entitled to draw half or full salary, as the case may be, in respect of the [illegible] he assumes the administration [illegible] whom he succeeds will not be entitled to any payment for that day, except the half salary granted in cases of officers on leave." The words "as a general rule" are not meant to cover payment of more than half salary in any case. The second sentence of the regulation makes the rule clear as between full and half salary.

We know of no case in which it has been suggested that this regulation should not be followed. I think these are the rules which you will need to have before you when deciding the case. But perhaps before your decision it finally to so it might be safer for you to know whether in the letter [illegible] the Treasurer of the 18th October [illegible] which the matter was first raised. [illegible]

[illegible] 22.5.26

[illegible] amount

JM 26

A paragraph giving the regulation above and of the precedents where officers have been detained on appointment [illegible]

(c) Duty Leave is full pay leave. But I must point out that a man cannot have leave before he takes up an appointment. It is not a question of leave, but of granting an allowance for a period during which he was detained before sailing to take up his appointment, on the ground that in the recollection of the S. of S. he was kept here for purposes of discussion.

(d) The payments to the [illegible] affect the matter either way.

(e) It seems desirable that [illegible] should be settled before Sir G. Grigg [illegible]. His date of departure now lies between him and his doctor but will probably be some time in June.

On the merits, if you are satisfied that Sir G. Grigg is entitled to a detention allowance, I do not see why it should not begin from 27th May. It must not begin a day before, because Sir G. Grigg was presumably sitting and voting in Parliament up to that date. Parliament adjourned on the 26th May to 9th June and the writ was ordered on the 10th June. His commission was signed on [illegible] June.

As regards the rate of detention allowance, the rule is for you to settle within the limits provided by the regulations, [illegible] of course, to the money being available. The regulation then and now in force is clear that a Governor can only draw half salary up to the date he lands. The regulation ran as follows in the 1925 edition:-

Section 108

Section 108. "On appointment to a Governorship half salary when available and when permitted by law will be allowed as a general rule from the date of embarkation from England or a Colony. An officer succeeding to the administration or the provisional [illegible] Provincial Government will be entitled to draw half salary, as the case may be, in respect of the [illegible] he assumes the administration [illegible] whom he succeeds will not be entitled to any payment for that day except [illegible] half salary [illegible] in cases of [illegible] on leave. The words 'as a general rule' are not meant to cover payment of more than half salary in any case. The second sentence of the regulation makes the rule clear as between full and half salary.

We know of no case in which it has been suggested that this regulation should not be followed. I think these are the rules which you will need to have before you when deciding the case. But perhaps before your decision is finally [illegible] it might be safer for you to know whether in the letter [illegible] the Treasurer of the 15th October [illegible] was first raised.

[illegible]

A [illegible] of the regulation above [illegible] of the precedents where officers have been declared on appointment leads to the conclusion that Sir G. Grigg should have received half pay [illegible]

As for the concerning date that might reasonably be May 27th, his formal appointment was some time after he had informally accepted and [illegible] dropped his other work. We can say in our despatch that in all the circumstances it was not unnatural for him to assume that the sanctioning of the Supplementary Estimate was confirmation by the Secretary of State of the payment in question, and after this length of time the Secretary of State does not feel justified in pressing for the refund [illegible] a matter of fact, understood the [illegible] voluntarily offered [illegible]

10.

Copy also reg'd on 15764/29.

Exemption from Customs Duties.

Extract from a letter from Sir R. Grigg to Sir C. Bottomley, dated 22nd April, 1930.

The papers as to Customs exemption are in order with a view to the question of a similar concession to the Resident Zanzibar.

We know from other papers that in January also Lord Lugard has asked exemption from Customs duty. Good conduct [illegible] the [illegible] effect [illegible] the [illegible] on the 20th [illegible] As [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] not be allowed [illegible] papers.

The point here is the letter of Sir R. Grigg undertaking to refund [illegible]

of the withdrawal clause; & I
presume that the embodiment
might receive no [illegible]

J. H. Allen

29/9/30

Yes. Unless you prefer
to say anything to Sir S. Gigg
in reply, this extract
can be put by.

A. C. Parkinson
30.9.30

Sir S. Gillett

We shall [illegible] notify, [illegible]
[illegible] any
[illegible] of the
[illegible] exception clause
[illegible] interpretation,
[illegible] Gigg took a highly [illegible]
[illegible] view, meant to [illegible]
[illegible] interpretation. If there
[illegible] the clause
(in any sense) was [illegible] from
both points of view.

I think circumstances [illegible]
[illegible] to reply.

[illegible]
30.9.30.

[illegible]

16

Extract from a letter from Sir Edward Grigg,
Government House, Kenya, to Sir Cecil Bottomley,
Colonial Office, Downing Street, S.W.1.

Dated 22.4.3[illegible].

* * *

You will have seen that I have refused to benefit under the clause governing Government House Stores in the new Tariff Ordinance. There were two reasons, the first that I have been (and am [illegible] still) [illegible] subject [illegible] in [illegible] be [illegible] ruled I [illegible] and but [illegible] thought it easier [illegible] involves no [illegible] of any [illegible] it [illegible] a permanent financial sacrifice, and there [illegible] on that score.

EXTRACT FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL DEBATES DATED 5TH NOVEMBER, 1929.

AUDITOR'S REPORT.

THE HON. CONWAY HARVEY asked:

With the hon. the Colonial Secretary be pleased to explain why formal sanction of the Secretary of State to an item of expenditure incurred in October, 1923, as specified in paragraph 44, 1927 Auditor's Report, was only received on 6th June, 1929?

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Provision to cover the expenditure in question was included in the Third Supplementary Estimates, 1925, the period which the payment covered being stated in the usual form of a note appended to that Head in the Estimates. These were duly approved by the Secretary of State in the form passed by Legislative Council.

In the following year the Auditor, when examining these votes, asked whether the item had received the specific sanction of the Secretary of State and His Excellency directed that the query should be addressed to the Colonial Office. The question thus became the subject of correspondence between the Auditor and the Director of Colonial Audit and was subsequently referred to the Secretary of State who, after examination, confirmed his previous sanction in a despatch dated 6th of June, 1929.

F.15442/1929 Kenya

To be dated 6. June & forwarded with his dummy signature

Mr. Allen 5/6
Mr. Parkinson 6/6/29
Mr. Bottomley 6.6.29 f.o.
Mr. Bottomley.
Sir E. Harding.
Sir J. Shuckburgh.
Sir G. Grindle.
Sir C. Davis.
Sir S. Wilson.
Mr. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lovat.
Mr. Amery.

DRAFT.

KENYA

No. 424

O.A.G.

Downing Street,

6th June, 1929.

C
R 6-JUN
D 6

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to the despatches noted in the margin regarding the payment to Sir Edward Grigg of the full salary of the office of Governor as from the 27th May, 1925.

2. The amount payable in respect of the period [illegible] prior [illegible] ment would prop[illegible] half salary from [illegible] 1925, to the date of embarkation with half salary thereafter for the period of the voyage under

Sol.

Gov.No.475 30th Nov.1928.
O.A.G. No.711 17th Dec.1928.

Station: BURY ST EDMUNDS, L.N.E.R.
Telegraph Office: SICKLESMERE.
Telephone: BURY ST EDMUNDS 75.

7a.

RUSHBROOK HALL,
BURY ST EDMUNDS,
SUFFOLK.

4. 5. 29.

Dear Bottomley,

Your letter of the 2nd on the subject given I saw the Secretary of State last week and arranged to see him on this matter on Tuesday morning next 7th. I have written to the Private Secretary asking him to let me know what time

with suit the S of S.

Your letter puts a view of the matter quite different from that put to me by the Permanent Under secretary when I saw him on the subject in January. It is difficult to deal with a Query which changes form so completely from one dis-

cussion to another. I think that I had better not attempt to write upon it officially until I know exactly what the Secretary of State requires of me. I presume the S of S will have you with him on Tuesday. If not, I will ask him to send for you. Yours sincerely,

Edward Grey

X15442/28 Kenya.

Mr. Eastwood 26/4

Mr. Parkinson 28.4.28

Mr.

Mr. Bottomley 29.4.28

Sir E. Harding

Sir J. Shuckburgh

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Lord Lloyd

Mr. Amery

For Mr. Bottomley's signature

DRAFT

14. Col. Gov.
K.C.M.G., K.C.

[illegible] period from the [illegible]

[illegible] tion of your [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] ival in [illegible]

[illegible] disclose [illegible]

[illegible] suggested that the reply should invite

Supplementary Estimates.

The question which the Auditor has raised is the authority for this issue of public money, and until this point can be definitely cleared up, it is, I fear, impossible to reply to the Kenya despatches. Since our discussion the papers have again been referred to the Secretary of State who has minuted that he has no recollection of the reasons for the delay in your departure in 1925, and careful search in the papers has revealed nothing ~~whatever~~ as to the period during which you stayed in this country being regarded as leave of absence on duty. Perhaps you would kindly let me have a written statement giving your recollection of what passed at the time, which I can put before the Secretary of State,

with

[illegible],

with whom you will, ~~I gather,~~ wish to discuss the matter personally. In the meantime I am afraid that we shall have to defer the preparation of a reply to the despatches from Kenya.

(Sgd.) W. ELIOT GRINNELL-MILNE.

Overpayment of Salary to the Governor.

Sir Edward Grigg referred to this matter in his discussion with Mr. Ormsby Gore and Mr. Bott[illegible] on the 16th April. He said he had no [illegible] of any discussion [illegible] 20, [illegible] on the [illegible] salary. He said the [illegible] he should proceed to [illegible] year, [illegible] that he was despair[illegible] discussions with the [illegible] in view of the [illegible] specially, [illegible] in this [illegible] assured as [illegible] Sir Edward Grigg [illegible] in the [illegible] which, [illegible] the [illegible] Colonial Office [illegible] the [illegible] matter [illegible] Colonial [illegible] Sir Edward Grigg thereupon referred the matter to the Secretary of State at the end of November last. It was then that the Colonial Office learnt of the payment for the

regarded as cleared by the approval given by the Secretary of State to the Supplementary Estimates providing for the payment.

(sd) H.T.Allen,

17.4.13.

Mr.

Mr. Abell 22.3.29

Mr.

Mr. Bromley. 22 3 29

Sir R. Harcourt

Sir P. Chamberlain

Sir G. Grindle.

Sir C. Davis.

Sir S. Wilson.

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Lord Lovat.

Mr. Amery. Comments

DRAFT.

Foreign & A.T. Dutton.

cf. Adm. & Ag. Trade & Dependencies Office

Cockspur Street,

S.W.

15642/1 Amery 32

For his observations

C.O.

Mar 1929

Dear Dutton

The S of S. has under his consideration the question of salary drawn by Sir Edward Grigg prior to embarkation for Kenya in 1925 & during the voyage.

As you know, the rule is that Colonial Governors do not draw pay until the date of embarkation & only half pay on the

2C

MEMORANDUM A

Overpayments to Governor prior to assumption of Administration.

Sir Edward Grigg's appointment as Gov[illegible] was notified to Kenya by telegr[illegible] He embarked from Marseilles on [illegible] September 1[illegible] and assumed administration on the [illegible]

Colonial Regulation 10[illegible] was then in force [illegible] "Government half salary [illegible] "by law will be all[illegible] from the date "of embarkation [illegible] "succeeding [illegible] the previous "administration [illegible] Government will be "entitled to dra[illegible] or half salary as the case may "be, in respect [illegible] day on which he [illegible] the "administration. [illegible] officer who [illegible] will be "be entitled [illegible] "half [illegible]

12509/25

the 10th of July 19[illegible] State's decision as to the revis[illegible] "As regards the emoluments [illegible] Acting Governor, no change will [illegible] present tenure in the acting appoi[illegible]

Under the Colonial Regulation [illegible] and the local rules as to date of embarkation, Sir Edward Grigg was therefore only eligible for half salary from the 9th September 1925 and for full salary from the 2nd October, 1925.

It now appears that in October 1925 a

voucher

15 [illegible] 2/4 [illegible]

Mr.

Mr. Acl 22.3.29

Mr.

Mr. Holmwood 22.3.29

Sir H. Harding

Sir J. Shuckburgh

Sir G. Grindle

Sir C. Dodds

Sir S. Wilson

Sir [illegible]

Lord Stamfordham

Mr. Wynn Parry

DRAFT.

Sir H. Harding

Sir Hor. S. of State

& Dependencies office

Lock office Secret.

Sir Hor Secretary's signature

C.O.

Mar 1929

My Dear Sutton,

The King has seen the letter of the Secretary of State for Colonies in 1925 & during the voyage. As you know, the rule is that Colonial Governors do not draw pay until the date of embarkation & only half pay on the

[illegible]; but it is understood that full
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
The salary was issued to Sir Edward
Grigg (Kenya) from the 27th May 1925,
the date on wh. his appt. as
Governor was officially notified
to the Colony, although he did
not sail until [illegible] September.

The Sept. Ms. also states the
Dept. to state the exact arts.
under which salary was
issued contrary the regulations.
This, however, would be
probably this info., which is
not [illegible] given in many of
the corresp. wh. they have
to now have. [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] waiting upon [illegible]
whether you can fill me, in [illegible] info.

Mr.
Mr.
Mr.
Mr. Bottomley.
Sir E. Harding.
Sir J. Shuckburgh.
Sir G. Grindle.
Sir C. Davis.
Sir S. Wilson.
Mr. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lonsdale.
Mr. Amery.

DRAFT.

27.

how it came about that
the Treasury in Kenya
issued the voucher for
salary [illegible] for an
27 days in the 30 dept.
1925.

Yours sincerely,

voucher was issued for the payment to Sir Edward Grigg of £1,560, being salary at the full rate of £4,500 a year for the period 27th May to 30th September 1925, i.e., he was overpaid to the extent of (a) full salary for the period 27th May to 8th September 1925 inclusive, and (b) half salary for the period 9th September to 30th September 1925, [illegible] Presumably [illegible] later overpaid half [illegible] these over- [illegible] approved by [illegible] to the [illegible] required [illegible] when [illegible] 1926 [illegible] the District Treasurer [illegible] to the Secretariat [illegible] 15th [illegible] The Secretariat replied on the [illegible] we not [illegible] material [illegible] from the minute [illegible] department [illegible] (flagged) the [illegible] and as a result of the [illegible] from [illegible] Governor's Private Secretary [illegible] who, [illegible] enclosed [illegible] a reply that [illegible] examined in the [illegible] minute from Mr. Harding [illegible] the D.C.A. is [illegible] supposing that due authority for the payment was contained in the Colonial Secretary's letter of the 18th January 1926, (already referred to) then no further proceedings were necessary, but that the Auditor should verify whether that letter did

contain

contain the due authority.

The Governor states that he regarded this reply as settling the question of authority. His version of it, in paragraph 2 of the Governor's despatch in No. 1 in this file, seems ed obscure. The D.C.A. was asked about it and replied in his minute from which the quotation above was taken. Subsequently, however, the despatch from the O.A.G. No.2, was received correcting the earlier version. In paragraph 2 of that despatch it is stated: "The authority mentioned is a Secretariat letter, (not a Supplementary Estimate) and stated: 'the question has been referred by His Excellency to the Secretary of State for the Colonies' ".

Although that Secretariat letter was dated the 18th January, 1926, the matter was referred to the Secretary of State for the first time, next three years later.

Also, it is not clear how the Secretariat letter of the 18th January 1926 authorised a "payment" made ~~at~~ some months earlier without the necessary approval of the Secretary of State.

The suggestion that the authority was a Supplementary Estimate (i.e., the 3rd Supplementary Estimates 1925) appears now to be abandoned. But in case it may be revived some explanation on this point may usefully be recorded. In the first instance it may be pointed out that as the Governor had already drawn the money, provision had to be made for any consequent excess on the vote, but such provision could not be regarded as in itself covering authority, since the payment was outside the regulations and therefore required the approval of

the

contain the due authority.

The Governor states that he regarded this reply as settling the question of authority. His version of it, in paragraph 2 of the Governor's despatch in No. 1 in this file, seems obscure. The D.C.A. was asked about it and replied in his minute from which the quotation above was taken. Subsequently, however, the despatch from the O.A.G. No.2, was received correcting the earlier version. In paragraph 2 of that despatch it is stated: "The authority mentioned is a Secretariat letter, (not a Supplementary Estimate) and stated: 'The question has been referred by His Excellency to the Secretary of State for the Colonies' ".

Although that Secretariat letter was dated the 18th January, 1926, the matter was referred to the Secretary of State for the first time, three years later.

Also, it is not clear how the Secretariat letter of the 18th January 1926 authorised a "payment" made some months earlier without the necessary approval of the Secretary of State.

The suggestion that the authority was a Supplementary Estimate (i.e., the 3rd Supplementary Estimates 1925) appears now to be abandoned. But in case it may be revived some explanation on this point may usefully be recorded. In the first instance it may be pointed out that as the Governor had already drawn the money, provision had to be made for any consequent excess on the vote, but such provision could not be regarded as in itself covering authority, since the payment was outside the regulations and therefore required the approval of

the

the Secretary of State.

[illegible] ferred to [illegible] these [illegible] allowances payable to His Excellency the Governor, namely, salary at £4,500 per annum in place of £4,[illegible] per annum and duty allowances at £2,500 per annum in place of £1,500 (and assuming that the increased rates will be drawn from His Excellency's date of appointment), [redacted] an excess of £225 is anticipated."

The submission of the Supplementary Estimates to Council was delayed, various alterations were necessary and the provision referred to was increased from £2[illegible] to £2[illegible], the following explanation being given:-

Personal Emoluments, [illegible]

"In view of the revised scale of salary and duty allowances payable to His Excellency the Governor, the Secretary of State [illegible] payment to the Acting Governor [illegible] duty allowances at the new rates [illegible] Excellency's appointment [illegible] to cover the balance [illegible] who has drawn the [illegible]

[illegible] altered rates [illegible]

The despatch forwarding the Supplementary Estimates was received on the 22nd January, 1936, but

but the enclosures were omitted and were not received until the 18th February, 1926. Therefore, when the alleged authority of the 18th January 1926 was given the Secretary of State had not even received the Supplementary Estimates themselves.

[illegible] was, however, a further complication which [illegible] bearing on the provision in the Supplementary Estimates.

50427/1925 [illegible] E. Grigg asked in private letters and [illegible] that Sir E. Denham, then Admin[illegible] should be given some hon[illegible] the Governor, and [illegible] Secretary of [illegible] 12th November [illegible] January 1926. Since [illegible]

789/26

789/26

[illegible] patch [illegible] minuted, "The new [illegible] of the period from the 27[illegible] [illegible] as being the date of the notification of Sir E. Grigg's appointment. As Sir E. Grigg did not draw salary for a long time afterwards this is only one more instance of the want of logic which gives Mr. Denham extra money" because Government House was vacant & death and not by leave

but I am not prepared to suggest that we should resist. The full amount has already been voted by the Council so that we (once more) cannot object without incurring all the odium." It may also be noted that in his private letter to Mr. Bottomley of the 31st January, attached to 789/26, Sir E. Denham argued that "The acting officer could get the increase from the date when the officer for whom he was acting was drawing at the enhanced rate". In the letter Mr. Bottomley underlined the word "drawing" and put the word "no" in the margin.

It is clear, therefore, that at the time there was no idea here that Sir E. Griggs had already drawn full pay from the 29th May 1925, and this fact was not referred to either in his semi-official letter or in his despatches. It will, however, be seen that the explanations furnished with the Supplementary Estimates also omitted to make any mention of this fact. The reasons for the excess were stated to be (a) the revised scales of salary of the Governor (b) the payment to the Officer Administering the Government. As a matter of fact as the actual excess proved to be only £335., neither of these payments would in themselves have caused an excess if the Governor had not been overpaid.

It is true that the first quotation at two pages back above contains the phrase "and assuming that the increased rates will be drawn from His Excellency's date of appointment". As it stands that phrase was all right and could only be interpreted as date of embarkation. They subsequently amended in red inserting the date as 29th May 1925. This date was

was ~~already~~ also all right if regarded as indicating that the revised rates came into force from that date in order to make provision for the [illegible] payment in the [illegible] [illegible] The [illegible] affect [illegible] Governor's [illegible] regulation [illegible] and [illegible] local [illegible] it was at least [illegible]. In this connection it may be [illegible] to the [illegible] presumably have to [illegible]

[illegible]

there

there were several opportunities for making the fact known to the Secretary of State but advantage was taken of none of them. and the position is that the overpayments to the Governor remain irregular, since they are not covered by the specific approval of the Secretary of State.

It is clear that [illegible] Governor [illegible] cannot be [illegible] that [illegible] State's covering authority is to be given [illegible] only be given as an [illegible] case, [illegible] in paragraph [illegible] the Governor's [illegible]

[illegible]

treatin[illegible]

purpose [illegible]

[illegible] an [illegible]

[illegible] or

[illegible] out at [illegible]

[illegible] allowance

and [illegible] only I have not [illegible] found any suggestion that he knew it from the 2[illegible] May 1925 making a still further overpayment. The full amount

amount of that allowance was provided in the Railway Estimates for 1926.

The Order in Council setting up the ~~Municipal~~ Transfer Administration and providing for the appointment of High Commissioner, did not come into operation until the 3rd of February 1926. If Sir E. Grigg did not draw ~~on~~ any allowance as High Commissioner prior to the 3rd February 1926, it is a matter for consideration whether that allowance could not be given retrospective effect to the date on which he embarked for Kenya and, in that case, the allowance due between the date of embarkation and the 3rd February 1926 be treated as a set-off against the overpayment from Colony Funds.

Half rate, of course for the period of the voyage only

The Director of Colonial Audit.

May we have your observations on Paragraph 2 of this Despatch. It is quite unintelligible to me as it stands, since (1) it fails to distinguish between provi[illegible] for [illegible]ment [illegible]

[illegible] your [illegible] given in the De[illegible] [illegible] any [illegible] to se[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible] as you will [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] 1945 [illegible] Dire[illegible] Treasur[illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] the Colonial [illegible] 1925 [illegible] Acting Auditor [illegible] Minister's Private Secretary [illegible] reply of the D.C.A. [illegible] was right in supposing that due authority for the payment was contained in the Colonial Secretary's letter S/M/23265/34 of 18th January 1926, then no further proceedings were

The Director of Colonial Audit.

May we have your observations on Paragraph 2 of this Despatch. It is quite unintelligible to me as it stands, since (1) it fails to distinguish between provi[illegible] for [illegible]

[illegible] your [illegible] the [illegible] in the De[illegible] any [illegible] to [illegible] sentence [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1[illegible] of the [illegible] as you [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] 19[illegible] [illegible] Dir[illegible] Treasur[illegible] [illegible] Bat[illegible] the Colonial [illegible] January 19[illegible] [illegible] Acting Auditor [illegible] Private Secretary [illegible] reply of the D.C.A. [illegible] was right in supposing that due authority for the payment was contained in the Colonial Secretary's letter S/M/23265/34 of 18th January 1926, then no further proceedings were

I find however that the statement of Unforeseen Expenditure for the Quarter ended 31st December 1925 showed as the second item:-

"H.E.the Governor - Personal Emoluments

"Sanctioned Expenditure £8138.----

"Expenditure up to 31st December 1925 ..... £8473.6.71

Expenditure incurred during the quarter ended [illegible] 1924 ..... £335.6.71

[illegible] £335.6.71

[illegible] ---

[illegible] Report

[illegible]

[illegible] 1923 was approved by the [illegible] July 1923 [illegible] nothing to imply [illegible] "H.E.the Governor [illegible] cash [illegible] was due to Sir E.Grigg Navy [illegible] of Kenya before he left [illegible] Governorship.

when I get out 1924

22 J. Harding 11/1/29 DCA

KENYA.

Query No: 1018 of 1925.

----oOo----

From

The Audit Office.

Dated: 7th July, 1926.

To

The District Treasurer, Nairobi.

--------oOo--------

October, 1925. Nairobi District Treasury Cash Account. Voucher No.1431 for Shs.31,200.67. H.E. the Governor. Personal Emoluments. To salary of H.E. the Governor Sir Edward F.N.Grigg from the 27th of May to the 30th of September 1925 @ £4,500 per annum.

His Excellency only arrived in Kenya on the 2nd of October.

Will you please submit copies of the papers relating to this appointment confirming the payment made.

(Sgd) H.N.LEE.

for Auditor.

----oOo----

Hon: Ag: Col: Secretary,

Forwarded for favour of necessary action - in this connection please see my letter No.GR/25/3 of 15th October 1925 and your reply (No.S/E.23265/24 dated the 18th January 1926).

(Sgd) J.H.STUART.

19.8.26. District Treasurer.

----oOo----

District Treasurer, E.23265/26.

This Query at the time of receipt was forwarded to the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor. Secretariat file was detained at Government House and has only just been returned.

I quote the following minute by the Private Secretary datedthe 5th August for your information:-

"I have spoken to the Auditor and have suggested that it would save time if the Query were referred

referred direct to the Director of Colonial Audit to settle with the Colonial Office. He has agreed to the suggestion". Intd. E.A.T.D.

The query is returned herewith.

(Sgd) G.M.[illegible]

27.10.26 Ag.Col.Secretary.

---oOo---

[illegible] Secretariat letter No. [illegible] of 6th October, 1926, a copy of which is sent herewith.

(Sgd) [illegible]

District Treasurer, [illegible]

---oOo---

Sir,

Refer attached letter [illegible] you will [illegible] the Director of Colonial Audit on the subject.

(Sgd) [illegible]

20.11.26.

---oOo---

P.O.A.,

Please see attached minute from Col. Sec. I am not aware of any arrangement [illegible] with the Pay Secretary to H.E. and do not [illegible] this can be dealt with locally. In view [illegible] the [illegible] made by the Auditor I [illegible] the [illegible] there are papers on record on the [illegible] available to you which will [illegible].

[illegible]

---oOo---

Auditor,

From the minute of the [illegible] Treasurer, Nairobi, dated the 19th July, 1926, it appears that the authority for the payment of this salary from the

27th

Memorandum B.

B. Governor's salary.

Sir Robert Coryndon's emoluments were

	£
Salary	4,000
Duty allowance	1,500
Allowance as High Commissioner for Zanzibar	500
	6,000

In February, 1925, the Unofficial Members of the Legislative Council passed a resolution re-
12509/25 commending that the post of the Governor of Kenya should command a salary of £6,000 per annum, and an entertainment allowance of £2,500 per annum, i.e. a total of £8,500.

~~In a letter dated the 7th of July, Sir E. Grigg was informed that he would receive the following emoluments:~~

	£
~~Salary~~	~~4,500~~
~~Duty allowance~~	~~2,500~~
~~High Commissioner for Transport~~	~~1,000~~
	~~8,000~~

12509/25 In a despatch of the 3rd of June, 1925, the O.A.G. was informed that the emoluments would be

	£
Salary	4,500
Duty allowance	2,000
High Commissioner for Transport	500
	7,000

12509/25 The O.A.G. was informed by a telegram of the 25th June, 1925 that no action should be taken on this despatch, Sir E. Grigg having asked that the matter

should

should be reconsidered; and Sir E. Grigg was subsequently informed on the 7th of July that the S. of S. had on reconsideration decided that the emoluments should be

	£
Salary	4,500
Duty allowance	2,500
High Commissioner for Transport	1,000
	8,000 plus local allowance

12609/25

This decision was communicated to the G.A.G. in the despatch of the 16th of July in which it was stated that the S. of S. had discussed the matter with Sir E. Grigg, and in view of the importance of maintaining the relation between the actual salary of the post and the salaries of other Colonial Governors, he (Sir E. Grigg) is prepared, in the first instance, to endeavour to maintain the Government House as it should be maintained, and as the Colony has shown that it desires it to be maintained, on the emoluments mentioned. The S. of S. added, however, that he would be prepared to reconsider these arrangements later if it is found by the Governor and his advisers after careful trial to be inadequate to the expenses of the position.

Sir E. Grigg arrived in the Colony on the 2nd October 1925, and in his despatch of the 29th of December forwarding the Estimates for 1926, he reported that an increase in the Governor's salary by £500 (i.e. from £4,500 to £5,000) making the total emoluments £8,000 had been

7K 7/26

moved by Lord Delamere, seconded by Capt. Conay, and passed without a division, the only dissentients being two Indian Members who objected to any change being made in the amounts avowed by the S. of S. A resolution to the same effect had been embodied at the request of the Unofficial Members in the Report of the Select Committee on the Estimates. The Governor added that the matter, being one which concerned himself, no comment was of course made by him, and he had included the item in the Estimates for consideration of and decision by the S. of S. The increase was covered by the general approval of the Estimates, no comment on the point being made.

Memorandum C.

[illegible]

KENYA.

No. 711

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
KENYA.

17th December, 1928.

Sir,

I have the honour to invite your attention to an error of reference in the second paragraph of Sir Edward Grigg's despatch No.675 of the 30th November, relative to the payment of full salary to him for the period the 27th May, 1925, to 30th September, 1925. The Director of Colonial Audit's minute which is quoted in that paragraph reads as under:-

> "From the minute of the District Treasurer, Nairobi, dated the 19th July, 1926, it appears that the authority for the payment of his salary from the 27th May to the 30th September, 1925, is given in S.E. 27365/34 dated the 18th January 1926. Subject verification of authority E.F.P.F."

2. The authority mentioned was a Secretariat letter (not a Supplementary Estimate) and stated:

> "The question has been referred by His Excellency to the Secretary of State for the Colonies."

3. The matter is one which will no doubt be discussed during Sir Edward Grigg's visit to England and a copy of this despatch has accordingly been addressed to His Excellency the Governor's Private Secretary

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LIEUTENANT COLONEL L.C.M.S.AMERY, P.C., M.P.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET, LONDON S.W.

Secretary at the Trade and Information Office in London.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

ACTING GOVERNOR

47

KENYA.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
KENYA.

2th Nov. 1928.

[illegible]

[illegible] out that [illegible] when [illegible] available and when permitted by law will be allowed as a general rule from the date of embarkation from England. In my case I embarked at Marseilles on the 10th September, 1925.

2. The question of authority for this payment was raised by the then Auditor in July, 1926, and referred on my instructions to the Director of Colonial Audit, as it seemed undesirable to settle the matter locally. The Director of Colonial Audit in a minute dated 9th August, 1927, replied that the authority was given in Supplementary [illegible] 23265/34 dated 18th January, 1926, and added, "subject to verification of authority, N.F.P. ." The present Auditor General [illegible] it necessary [illegible]

[illegible]

ary...

Cons 8 II 24

[illegible] M.P.
[illegible] OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET,
LONDON.

authority, which I had taken to be settled by the reply of the Director of Colonial Audit. With regard, however, to the propriety of the payment, I desire to submit that Colonial Regulation No. 108, while applying not unfairly to officers in the Colonial Service who are in any case, pending their embarkation for their new post, drawing the pay of their previous one, cannot fairly be applied to officers appointed from outside the service. In my case I gave up all other emoluments within a short time of my appointment and long before my departure for the Colony, and I was engaged upon continuous and heavy preparatory work with yourself and your office during the whole of that period.

4. I would add that although, as you remember, I accepted the appointment on the understanding that the fixed salary would cover all reasonable expenditure in connection with the post, I have not found this possible in practice [illegible] the heavy reimbursements on account of outfit, [illegible] and other charges which I make annually from my salary to Government. I would therefore like to raise the question of these payments, which amount to a total sum of approximately £2,000 per annum, when I arrive in England. At the same time I should be glad of an opportunity to raise the question of a subsistence allowance while in England on duty. As you will remember, I was asked semi-officially not to press my claim when in England on the ground that there was no precedent for it. I do not think your office could have been aware at the time that my predecessor while on duty in England in exactly similar circumstances in 1923 drew a subsistence allowance of Sh.63/- per diem. I may add that all my officers when they are in England on

duty....

49
END

duty invariably draw a subsistence allowance, and that owing to the fact that I have heavy expenses to meet in the Colony during my absence from it, I am in fact further penalised by coming home on duty.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

Thomas King.

GOVERNOR.

Sum of £5,000 has been inserted in 1929 Estimates to provide staff and travelling expense accounts of inspectors and supervisors to handle Stephanodores coffee pests and requests authority to incur expenditure and take the steps, prior to general approval of the Estimates.

The Stephanodores bug is the same as the coffee berry borer. It appears from pages 211 to 213 of the Agricultural Department's Report for 1927 that he is common in Uganda, but he has until recently never been recorded in Kenya, and it was hoped that, owing to the high mountainous country which [illegible] separates the coffee growing [illegible] Kenya and Uganda, and the [illegible] soil and adverse [illegible] conditions [illegible] he would [illegible] Fresh [illegible]

[illegible] director [illegible]

[illegible] Chamber [illegible] and that is [illegible] attention [illegible] were taking immediate steps to institute control measures [illegible] consultation with the Coffee Consulting Committee.

No special provision appears in the Draft Estimates for the Agricultural Department, so presumably this amount of £5,000 was inserted after consideration of the Estimates in Select Committee. This appears the more probable, as we know from a recent telegram that considerable alterations have been made in the Estimates in Committee.

approve as on off-the-record [illegible]
[illegible] 31/12/28

We shall no doubt get further details with the Govt. when the Enclosure of informing the S. B. C. can be considered.

J. Miller 30/12/28

W.A.S. 31.12.28

Secy of Treasury 4.1.29

To Gov tel (1 ans'd) 1 Jan. 1929.

DESTROYED UNDER STATUTE

E.A. TRADE & INFORMATION OFFICE, 5 APRIL 29. Forwards copy Minutes of a Meeting of the Coffee Planters Union of Kenya and East Africa and submits explanations of some of the Items.

? Jointly.

(This is a "polygraph" letter sent in a kind of circular)

G. Gordon

1.4.29

Mr Creasey
Mr Stockdale
Mr Ormsby Gore
} To see

of return

J. Miller 1/4

A. Hall

Seen. Has any further data been received indicating the steps being taken against the coffee berry borer. If not, I think this should be called for as that the S. B. C. may consider then & consider whether other measures are desirable & necessary

L. A. Stockdale 12/4/29

Dispatch 16.4.29

The following passage occurs in the Report of the Select Committee on the Estimates :-

"The Director of Agriculture outlined the proposals he has in hand for concerted action with coffee planters in respect of stephenodores. The Director proposed the temporary appointment of a number of inspectors and supervisors to deal with this pest during the first three months of 1929. The Committee recommends insertion in the Estimates under the head Agricultural Department, Extraordinary of a one-line vote of £5,000, to enable the Director to give effect to his proposals".

The vote appears as Head 22A Item 4 of the Estimates, as passed. I also attach a copy of the Rules published in the Gazette of the 27th of December.

Draft telegram herewith for consideration.

G. Gordon

But I doubt if it is either necessary or desirable to burden the S.B.C.

J. Miller 22.4.29

Draft approved.

Acting 30.4.29

To Gov. tel. 6/5 ans'd - 22nd April 29

DESTROYED UNDER STATUTE

Seen Creasey 6.5.29

No reply to hand.

? wait a week pl.

Noted

Yes.

Minute S.C. 6/5/29 on file

A. Forster 6.5.1929

recd. the comprehensive report promised in
No 5 but in the meantime desires to
invite attention to the matter in
para 4 of the Bureau's letter (No 7/
1 copy of to the Bureau of
[illegible]

31/5/[illegible]

and ask for the observations of the local
agricultural authorities on these suggestions

[illegible]

App [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] copies [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] all [illegible]

3.6.29

To Gov [illegible]

C. N. Dale (S.O.) 1st June 1929
Under cable received as to Kenya Legislature voting
£9,000 [illegible] engagement Entomologist and
cost of Biological [illegible] to cope Mealy Bug menace

~~Attention Int~~
19/6/29

Ack
20.6.29

Colony. Telegram. 25 June 1920.

Requests telegraphic approval of official
Warrant to cover urgent expenditure of £7500
for measures to control coffee berry bug

? appr. as in Off. Ltr.

Communicate to our Offr
& advise

G. Lambrick
25/6/20

If there is an outbreak of an insect pest which threatens the staple crop of a Colony, obviously the Govt must take steps to cope with it. But there is nothing here to show that the Kenya Govt appreciate the desirability of cutting down outlay esp. to meet an emergency of this kind. The financial position of Kenya is not such that £500 or £1000 can be drawn lightly from surplus balances, even though £500 of it is for capital expenditure.

I have read this Tel. by phone to Mr. Macdell. He endorses very well advise

5

on the measures wh. the Govt are adopting, in the absence of full info. on the subject.

The trouble is that the ants protect the mealie bug against the ladybirds, wh. otherwise wd. be able to keep them down. Owing to a mistake, perhaps, arrangement on the part of Nature, the bugs secrete a sweet fluid wh. the ants like & so the ants take on the job of defending them against ladybirds. Possibly, however, with a sufficient number of ladybirds, the bugs despite the ants could be effectively attacked.

I asked Mr Greenhalt whether £7500 was not a very large sum to pay for 1 insectarium. He spoke as if it is difficult to be definite without more info.

The E.A.S. is just constructing a new insectary at Farnham Royal. It, what I gather is to be, a superior type at a cost of £1000. Other methods such as gauze wire wd. presumably cost more in Kenya than here; so it may be that these insectaries are of very large size.

I think that we might

Telegraph as no very alternative [illegible]

A.W. Parkinson
27.6.29

I am not at all easy regarding the [illegible] of insect pests of coffee in Kenya. I have in mind the collapse of coffee in Ceylon from leaf disease, as it is probable that we may have been [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] agricultural method [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]

(Coffee [illegible] Kenya) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

one [illegible]

method [illegible]

permanent [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

there is [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] coffee [illegible] [illegible]

it [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

to see the practice [illegible]

[illegible] 28.6.29

[illegible]

remarks on the efficiency
of natural biological control of the
pest.

Stockdale Dec. [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] particular I would like him to [illegible]
[illegible] the probability of [illegible]
[illegible] introduction of parasites
[illegible] enemies of insects
[illegible] and is undoubtedly
[illegible] speed of the early
[illegible] the many of [illegible] enemies
[illegible] It is possible that
climatic conditions may be less responsible
for the scarcity of predators in similar conditions
may possibly account success with entirely
second introduced parasites. At the same time
the introduction of foreign species, if not
without danger, a policy of such
introduction should only be contemplated

If one is certain that an improvement of
the conditions will be effected thereby, on the
other hand the introduction of parasites has
been most effective in a number of instances
& it is now generally admitted that the
method of biological control is always worth
consideration. There is little possibility of
the scale being in danger & it is possible that
the [illegible] may have little information about
[illegible] of similar species of scale insects
[illegible]. It is a line of inquiry on
[illegible] should however be sought
[illegible] it is not hopeful as to the [illegible]
[illegible] in finding a [illegible]
[illegible] It is possible that [illegible]
[illegible] parasites may [illegible] the scale.
This is a really [illegible] If it [illegible]
necessary it will [illegible] easily
[illegible]

[illegible] Stockdale

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

To D.I.B.E. — Cons — 16 AUG 1929

(w/copy of 14)

16. Imperial Bureau of Entomology. ....16th Sept:29.

Submits comments on No. 13. States that it is desirable that consn. should be given to the introduction of parasites and predators from other countries.

For the obvious reason
J.H. Allen
22/9/29

I would suggest that the Govt. of Kenya be asked that the question of the increase of mealy bug on coffee in Kenya is viewed with some concern & that the I.B.E. has been asked as to the probability of success in the breeding of indigenous predators of general distribution and that this reply has been as follows:-

It might be noted that the views of the Bureau authorities may be given some consideration: the story & the desirability of introducing parasites & predators from other countries investigated

J.H. Stockdale
23/9/29

In your minute of the 27th of June, 1929, you record a conversation with Dr. Marshall regarding the cost of the insectaries, and this matter was taken up in the telegram to the Governor of the 24th June (No.14) which pointed out that in the

the absence of detailed information, no definite opinion on this question of cost could be expressed although it appeared to be high. The Governor dealt with the point in par.4 of No.14 which was sent to the Imperial Bureau of Entomology for observations, although the letter (No.15) to the Bureau did not mention this point specifically as suggested by Mr. Seel in his minute of the 7th of August, 1929, on No.14.

The Bureau in this reply do not take the point, and I suppose they would have done if they had seen anything to criticise. I, therefore, assume that it is not necessary to pursue it.

? Proceed as proposed by Mr. Stockdale.

Seel

J.H. Allen
7/10/29

W.J. Stockdale

We could certainly write to Kenya, as you suggest: but I rather incline, if by see no objn., to wait now for Dr. Marshall's return. He may — almost certainly — well have discussed bionomics of mealy bug in Kenya, and it will be more convenient to know what he has suggested. Said out there before we communicate views on point to I.B.E.

A.E. Parkinson
9.10.29

W.J. Stockdale is away. We will wait on

suggested in my minute.

[illegible]

Recirc. at end of October.

A.C.C.P.
11.10.29

17. TO A HOLM, ESQ. FROM MR STOCKDALE. 31/8/29.
(See last para. as to Amani programme for coffee.)

No 17 attached to this file on Mr Creasy's [illegible]
instructi[illegible]

[illegible] 832
Enc. [illegible] copies of [illegible]
[illegible] Offi[illegible]
on th[illegible] progress and res[illegible]
campa[illegible] which will be
wi[illegible] full advantag[illegible]
Direc[illegible] of the I.B.E.

Parkinson

[illegible] for the matter [illegible] the full [illegible] campaign [illegible] duplicate [illegible] to I.B.E. [illegible] [illegible]

C.A.C. Cliffe

I've noted the file [illegible] Recirc. end of Oct. in any case. [illegible] him also to write [illegible] letter [illegible] to the I.B.E. on [illegible] mealy bug [illegible]

J.O.S. Allen
7/10/29

I think it will be better to defer action on No. 18 as well as No. 16 for Dr Marshall's return.

Recirc. in 2 months.
[illegible]

[illegible]

Mr Allen

[illegible] for [illegible] after speaking to Mr Parkinson.

C.A.C. Cliffe
14.12.29

A.C.C.P.
16.12.29

19 To I.B.E. (w/c Mr Marshall) [illegible]
20 Dr Marshall ([illegible]) [illegible]

X 5301/29

C. O.

Mr. Cliffe 14/11/29

Mr. Allen 14/11

Mr. Robinson

Mr. Bottomley.

Sir J. Shuckburgh.

Sir G. Grindle

Parl. U.S. of A.

Parl. U.S. of B.

Secretary of State.

(answered 1 on 159924)

30

Scope of Instructions

18 December 1929

My dear Marshall,

With reference to your letter of the 5th ult. I enclose a copy of the letter which I addressed to the Colonial Office on the 14th ult. in reply to theirs of the 5th ult. on the subject of the proposed Conference.

I gathered from the Colonial Office that the Government, in the light of the Conference, would be prepared to send the Governor of the Straits Settlements, but that he is not expected to be accompanied by any other representative.

Yours sincerely

almost entirely have
destroyed the whole
mealy-bug question
with the local authorities.
While you were here
if desired ~~[illegible]~~ the letter
to enable you when
[illegible] again ~~[illegible]~~ anything
to the Colony Govt. Is
there anything you would
like me to have done that
which you said or heard
in Kenya, before we do so?

We are ~~also~~ sending
you officially for your
claims a despatch for
Kenya containing a full
report on the progress and
results of the present
mealy-bug campaign. This ~~which~~
[illegible] from speaking
~~for [illegible]~~ when

Yours sincerely

and is there anything you
would wish to add to Hearle's
letter?

I do not know that
Brittain, if he accepts
the offer now being
made to him, will
take up such a
point as the breeding
of indigenous predators
against the mealy
bug?

[illegible]

[illegible] A. D. C. BARKINSON

X (330 1/29)
KENYA

19

C. O.

Mr. Chiffe 16 xii 29
Mr. Allen 14/12
Mr. Fakenwalle
Mr. Bottomley.
Sir J. Shuckburgh.
Sir G. Grindle.
Permt. U.S. of S.
Parly. U.S. of S.
Secretary of State.

16 DEC 29
17

DRAFT. ~~[illegible]~~

18 December 1929

The Director,
Imp. Bureau of Entomology,

Sir,

With reference to the letter from this Department of the 4th June, I am to transmit to you ~~for your information~~ the enclosed copy of a despatch with enclosures from the Gov. of Kenya regarding the incidence of coffee pests (Stephanoderes and Stephanoscelis) and the measures taken against them.

Note 32
for Gov. for K.
Enclosures

(2)

C. O.

X 15301/29
KENYA
19

Mr. Clyde 16 Oct 29
Mr. Allen 14/12
Mr. Pakenham
Mr. Bottomley.
Sir J. Shuckburgh.
Sir G. Grindle.
Permt. U.S. of S.
Parly. U.S. of S.
Secretary of State.

DRAFT. ~~Despatch~~

18 December 1929

The Director,
Imp. Bureau of Entomology

Sir,

With reference to the letter from Mr. Dyke of the 19th June, I am to transmit to you ~~for your information~~ the enclosed copy of a despatch with enclosures from the Gov. of Kenya regarding the incidence of coffee pests (Stephanoderes and Sophronica) and the measures taken against them.

(2)

Nov 32
Gov to be informed
(Nov 18)
for Entomologist

KENYA.
No. 632.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
KENYA.

8th October, 1929.

My Lord,

I have the honour to refer to Your Lordship's despatch No. 450 of the 15th June last requesting the observations of my advisers on suggestions made by the Director of the Imperial Bureau of Entomology in regard to the incidence of coffee pests (Stephanoderes and Sophronica) and the measures taken against them.

The Director of Agriculture states that, while [illegible] that the pest Stephanoderes hampers its [illegible] in Kenya, it is not considered that its increase is due [illegible] to the [illegible] of coffee culture. It has not been found [illegible] plant other than coffee and the beetles have not been found infesting wild coffee. There is no record [illegible] of the pest in the Colony prior to 19[illegible] [illegible] of coffee has been extended in many directions during the past fifteen years and coffee has been growing for a longer period in the areas where the pest was first noticed and where it has been found on practically every farm.

[illegible] advisers consider it probable that one of the primary causes of the increase in numbers of this pest has been the method employed in reaping the crop, by which over-ripe berries are allowed to remain on the trees —

TO.
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD PASSFIELD, P.C.
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET,
LONDON....S.W.

trees and on the ground, forming an ideal breeding-place for the beetle. The question of the influence of shade on the increase of Stephanoderes has not been fully examined but it would appear to have little or no influence except where a deciduous type of shade tree is used, when the fallen leaves of the shade tree render the collection of all the ripe berries difficult.

No. 4

4. I enclose, as requested in Mr. Amery's telegram of the 22nd April, copies of two comprehensive reports prepared by the Senior Coffee Officer and the Entomologist of the Department of Agriculture respectively on the progress and results of the present campaign. It is considered desirable to continue the campaign next year, since it is probable that local infestations are still in existence. If the campaign were remitted, planters would probably return to their usual methods of picking the crop in accordance with which fallen berries would be left lying on the ground and conditions favourable to the multiplication of the pest would be reproduced.

5. Full advantage will be taken of the visit of the Director of the Bureau to discuss with him the matter of incidence and control of these pests.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servant,

Edward Grigg

GOVERNOR.

of the proposed rules, was placed before the Select Committee on the Estimates, and this amount was placed on the Estimates for 1929 and passed.

The Rules were gazetted and came into operation on January 1st, 1929.

For the administration of the Rules, it was necessary to carry out a systematic inspection of all Coffee Plantations in the Colony, and for this purpose a field staff was engaged, consisting of 3 Temporary Inspectors at [illegible] per month, and 13 [illegible] Assistant Inspectors at £20 per month (see [illegible]).

The Officers received a short course of instruction at the Scott Agricultural Laboratories, consisting of the identification of pests and diseases, the application of the [illegible] and the procedure to be adopted in making inspections [illegible] Stephanoderes was the main object of the [illegible], the opportunity was taken of making a general [illegible] of all the more common diseases and pests occurring on plantations, together with notes on cultural conditions. The [illegible] Inspectors were placed in charge [illegible] the Nyanza Province, and the Uasin Gishu [illegible] respectively, with instructions to [illegible] the work of the Assistant Inspectors [illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible] September 6th, 1928, a circular was addressed to the [illegible] of all the District Associations, explaining [illegible] plan of the Grading required under Rule 9, and [illegible] that each Association should assist by preparing a list of suggested groups to cover the area served by the Association, and to suggest dates for the stripping of the terminating Crop for such groups.

With few exceptions, the response to this appeal was lamentably poor, and it fell to Officers of the Department to group the bulk of the coffee plantations in the Colony.

The groups thus prepared, and their appropriate Terminating Dates, were circulated and published, and after some readjustment have proved reasonably satisfactory.

RESULTS OF CAMPAIGN.

An analysis of the reports of the inspections of every Coffee plantation in the Colony shows that Stephanodarea was confirmed on farms in various districts, as shown in Table I.

The movement of coffee from all farms found to be infected was stopped until such coffee had been treated, either by immersion in water for 96 hours or by treating in a mechanical dryer. The object of such control was to diminish the risk of infection being spread over the country to fresh districts.

As a result of complaints received from several Coffee Planters, an experiment was carried out to determine the effect of such water treatment on the quality of the product.

Samples of (1) Green Immature coffee.
(2) Mature Mbuni
(3) Hulled coffee

were treated with water for four days, changing the water at varying periods. After treatment the samples were dried and Nos.1 and 2 hulled for examination. It was found that there was a tendency to a change to a dull brownish colour. Beans which were very immature turned completely black, those slightly more mature went brown, while almost fully developed beans lost their greenish grey colour and became dull brownish grey.

All the samples had a "grassy" aroma, and it was found that coffee hulled before treatment acquired a most objectionable aroma, which would seriously affect the liquoring properties. The strength of this taint depended on the length of time the water had been allowed to remain stagnant, and was least noticeable in the sample which had received fresh water each day.

In the case of mature mbuni, the fruity aroma was

absent, and was replaced by a slightly unclean aroma, in all the samples except that which had received fresh water each day. The taint decreases noticeably if the coffee, after hulling, is exposed to air for a short period.

Although [illegible] much [illegible] is [illegible]

[illegible] go to office [illegible]

[illegible] still be seen from [illegible]

[illegible] infected by [illegible] Jolik, and Kalmady while [illegible] distributed in all district.

The response on the part of [illegible] the [illegible] Rules has on the whole been excellent, but the Rules governing the movement of Coffee have caused considerable

controversy.

Planters and traders have not cooperated with the Department as much as might be desired, and in certain cases there has been deliberate obstruction.

It is fully realised that rules such as these, to be properly complied with entail a certain amount of extra trouble and expenditure to the planter and the trader, but coffee is not and need not be a fair weather crop only, and crops [illegible] must withstand certain setbacks such as these.

A point which has come to the fore very noticeably is [illegible] value [illegible] a bye-product by a number of [illegible], who appear to be prepared to risk a serious loss [illegible] by taking no steps to combat a [illegible] of Stephanoderes, rather than so [illegible] in any way impaired. Such a short sighted policy is certainly not worthy of Kenya's leading industry.

Tables 1, (and Tables 1, 2 & 3), consist of an analyses of the reports [illegible] by Inspectors. Certain districts were not as fully inspected as could be desired, but on the whole the results give an indication of the distribution of diseases and pests in the Colony and to a certain extent their relative importance in different areas.

It is of interest to note that the Entomologist has not [illegible] the finding of parasites attacking either Stephanoderes or Sophronica sp. It is suggested that parasites from Uganda might be introduced and distributed on some of the worst infected plantations in Kenya.

It would appear that there is more damage being caused to coffee beans by the larvae of the Sophronica beetle than by Stephanoderes. Broken beans which are often mixed with the shell of Elephant beans have been found to be the result of Sophronica damage. In the past one has never been able to determine the cause of these broken (shell-like) beans which

are usually found in the grade known as "Triage" and which must not be confused with Elephant beans, which have been separated by the pressure of the huller.

In a district such as Ruiru, where the loss caused by Mealy Bug is paramount, it is considered that the control of Mealy Bug should take first place. Banding therefore would be allowed to take precedence to stripping and cleaning, although the latter must in no way be neglected.

Certain irregularities and points in the Rules which became evident during the progress of the Campaign were brought up for revision and amended Rules came into force on April 22nd, 1929.

These amendments apply to the rules governing the movement of coffee, and have been framed to give effect to a resolution passed at a meeting of Coffee Traders held on the 30th. January, 1929.

A further outcome of the Campaign is the fact that the Department has been enabled to compile a complete list of coffee plantations in the Colony, and a new system of recording inspections has been evolved, so that in future the spread or movements of disease will be easily as[illegible] and the work of the coffee section rendered more [illegible] organisation.

There are a number of coffee planters who in [illegible] have criticised the action of the Department in this Campaign and who are doing so even more stridently now that Mealy Bug has returned in an epidemic form in certain areas, and there are others who, although approving the Campaign at first, when the money was voted to be spent on the Industry, have now, with the advent of the Mealy Bug, turned to recrimination. However, prevention is better than cure and selfish criticism of a destructive nature is always abortive.

For the safe guarding of the industry it is essential that the control of all pests and diseases become compulsory.

Taking into consideration the actual and potential

losses caused by diseases and pests and the menace of neglected and abandoned plantations, it is also urged as a [illegible] necessity that systematic inspections be continued and [illegible] pointed. Such inspectors are [illegible]

[illegible]

treatment of injury [illegible] is it is provided that the [illegible]

[illegible]

(Sgd) A.D.le Poer Trench

SENIOR COFFEE OFFICER.

August 1929.

APPENDIX I.

TEMPORARY STAFF ENGAGED FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

Inspectors in charge of :

Kikuyu-Ukamba ...	Mr.H.Meinsmith Jones
Nyanza	Mr.R.Finch
Uasin Gishu-Trans Nzoia..	Mr.M.Godley

Assistant Inspectors operating in :

Nyeri-Kangari ...	Capt.H.E.Fitzgerald
Nakuru-Lenanga, Donyo Sabuk, Machakos. ...	Mr.T.H.G.Somerville
Thika	Mr.T.L.McClelland
Y[illegible]	Mr.P.B.Robson
Limoru, Upper Kiambu ...	Mr.H.Borman
Nairobi, Sgong, Kabete, Kiboyu	Mr.H.L.Bolton
Nakuru, etc.	Mr.P.S.Beckett
Koru, Kaimosi ...	Mr.G.H.R[illegible]
Sotik, Fort Ternan, Lumbwa, Kericho	Major R.[illegible]
M[illegible]on. Kiminini ...	Mr.R.G.[illegible]
Soy, [illegible] Bridge, Cherangani	Lt.Comdr [illegible]
Turbo -Kipkarren ...	Mr.M.T.Shelly

DISTRICT	No. of plantations	FUNGOID DISEASES: Leaf Disease	Brown Blight	Coffee Berry Disease	Leaf Spot Disease	Root Disease	Anthracnose	INSECT PESTS: SCALES: Green Scale	Brown Scale	Waxy Scale	West Indian Red Scale	Asterolecanium	Black Scale	Pulvinaria Pallida	Ishnaspis Longiostris	MEALY BUG: Pilococcus	Other species	Root Mealy Bug	Icerya Microcircolata	LEAF EATING BEETLES: Systates	Congoa Dentum	LEAF EATING CATERPILLARS: Metarranthis Lideresmii	Parasa Vivida	Earworm	Odites argiloma	STEM BORERS: White	Black	Yellow Headed	Tip Boring Moth	BEAN BORERS: Stephanoderes	Larva of Sophronica sp.	C.B. Moth or Butterfly	Antestia	Thrips	Cutworm	Aphis
KIKUYU-UKAMBA																																				
Nanyuki	7	1							1																						1	2	1		1	
Nyeri	45	10	10		16		4	21	6						1					2	5		1				1					6	6	7	4	18
Maragua	14	6	9					1																								1	11		1	
Ithanga-Makuyu	49	46	3					33	7	2		15	1			3	1				1			1		13	4	2			2	17	31	19	2	
Donyo Sabuk	9	9						8				3				3										1	3					2	4	5		
Thika	52	24	46					26	1	1	3	5				44	1			5	1		29			1	3	1	4	18	4	18	8	13	6	
Ruiru	48	36	47			1		41	12	14	1	2				46												1		31	24	41	19	35	5	
Kiambu	80	7	30		13	2		47	11	3						31		1			28		39					1		8	34	71	19	12	7	
Upper Kiambu	18	9	12		5			15	5	2						9				6	1		5					1		4	12	8	12	4		
Limoru	32	3	1					22		2						13				18	2										3	1	2			
Kabete-Kikuyu	30	1	13					22	1	2						11				1	1		1				1		1		2	19	4	2	4	
Kairobi	10							1																							2	1				
Ngong-Dagoretti	19		3			2		19						1		1					1						1				6	11	4		1	
Machakos	9	2	2					7	1							2																1	3	4	1	
Voi-Taveta	5	3	3					2														1				1	1	2				2	1			
TOTAL	425	157	279		34	5	4	265	45	26	4	25	1	1	1	188	4	2		30	38	1	75	1		16	15	10	1	61	94	201	127	119	44	
KYANZI																																				
Makueni	30	3	12		1	1		4	1	1							1				1							1			1				5	
Kongei	6		1														1																			
Sabukia	8		3					2														1									2	4	14			
Senghor	62	49	34	5				5	3	3																							8			
Eldama Ravine	7																3					3											8			
Lumbwa	11	7	10	1	2			1									7					7					1			5	3	4	1			
Sotik	24	20	14	11	1			11	3	1							4		1		1	6								4						
Kericho	15	8	8	10													3																			
Kisii	15	15	1		2												1					2														
Fort Ternan	10	7	9	2																												14				
Kisumu	1	1																												7	1	4				
Koru	15	15	7																			1			1	1										
Kaimosi	20	13	18	15				1	8								14		1		2	20			1	1	1	1		17	7	30	40		32	1
TOTAL	222	144	117	44	6	1		24	15	5																						5	4			
BASIN GISHU-TRANS NZOIA																						1														
Kitoret	9	4	5	2	4			5	2	3												3									4	10		19	1	
Turbo	28	24	4	10	4			4	4	4		2									1	2										11		11	4	
Kipkarren	31	20	5		5	1		8	2	3		1										2						2			2	3		4		
Soy	14	9	9	2	8			2	2								1					1				1		1			1	11		2		
Hoey's Bridge	32	18	23	3	24	1		9	2	1							3				1											7	1	11		
Cherangani	39	11	27	3	23			21	3								3				2											5	3	3	2	
Kitale	18	7	12	4	12			7	1								1															19	3	3	9	
Kimisini	35	24	34	2	18			3	1	1							1				1											25	4	3	4	
Elgon	45	22	41	5	33			9	2												1										7	94	49	75	25	
TOTAL	251	139	158	31	131	2		68	19	12		3					9				6	9				1	3	3								
GRAND TOTAL	898	440	454	75	171	8	4	357	79	43	4	28	1	1	1	188	29	2	1	30	46	50	75	1	1	18	19	14	1	78	106	325	216	201	72	10

CONTROL OF STEPHANODERES.

[illegible] permanent inspectors [illegible]

[illegible] for these purposes [illegible] inspectors in the field.

In [illegible]

[illegible]

In order to arrive at [illegible] idea of the [illegible] of beans damaged by each and all of the borers, the inspectors [illegible] standard-sized samples, from the [illegible] the bushes, from the drying [illegible]

[illegible] the perc[illegible] [illegible] appendix [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible] probably exceeds [illegible]

[illegible] of the crop.

[illegible] by six feet high [illegible] number for each farm, the name of the owner and shows, in colour, the distribution of the borers. It is intended

to continue this map to include all coffee pests.

The insects known to bore in the coffee berries in the Colony are :-

1. Stephanoderes hampei, Ferr., (Scolytidae)
2. Sophronica ventralis, Auriv., (Cerambycidae)
3. Thliptoceras octoguttale, Hald., (Pyralidae)
4. Eucosma nereidope, Meyr., (Eucosmidae)
5. Deudorya lorisoma, Hew., (Lycaenidae)

Stephanoderes hampei, Ferr.

No case has been received of Stephanoderes attacking green, ripening or ripe berries. In all cases damage had been done to what is known locally as 'huni' coffee. By huni kaf is meant dry coffee which has not been pulped and fermented.

The first definite record of this borer in Kenya was from a plantation situated in the eastern Kiambu area some twelve miles from Nairobi, in April 1928. My determination was corroborated by the Imperial Bureau of Entomology.

At the present stage of the survey this pest seems to be confined to more or less definite areas and to have been present in these areas for some time, although, on the other hand, no samples of coffee beans showing Stephanoderes damage had been received either from planters or factories previous to April, 1928.

Several of the infested areas are widely separated, e.g. Kaimosi and Kuiru, with uninfested areas between; some areas show a fairly high percentage of infestation while in others the percentage is small.

The outbreak, at the present stage of our investigation cannot be explained by introduction from outside sources and it would appear that Stephanoderes is indigenous to this part of Africa although it has not yet been recorded from any other plant than coffee nor has it been found attacking the indigenous wild coffee of the Nandi country.

to continue this map to include all coffee pests.

The insects known to occur in the coffee berries in the Colony are :-

1. Stephanoderes hampei, Ferr., (Scolytidae)
2. Sophronica ventralis, Auriv., (Cerambycidae)
3. Thliptoceras octoguttale, Feld., (Pyralidae)
4. Eucosma nereidope, Meyr., (Eucosmidae)
5. Deudorya lorisoma, Hew., (Lycaenidae)

Stephanoderes hampei, Ferr.

No case has been received of Stephanoderes attacking green, ripening or ripe berries. In all cases damage had been done to what is known locally as 'buni' coffee. By buni kaf is meant dry coffee which has not been pulped and fermented.

The first definite record of this borer in Kenya was from a plantation situated in the eastern Kiambu area some twelve miles from Nairobi, in April 1928. My determination was corroborated by the Imperial Bureau of Entomology.

At the present stage of the survey this pest seems to be confined to more or less definite areas and to have been present in these areas for some time, although, on the other hand, no samples of coffee beans showing Stephanoderes damage had been received either from planters or factories previous to April, 1928.

Several of the infested areas are widely separated, e.g. Kaimosi and Ruiru, with uninfested areas between; some areas show a fairly high percentage of infestation while in others the percentage is small.

The outbreak, at the present stage of our investigation cannot be explained by introduction from outside sources and it would appear that Stephanoderes is indigenous to this part of Africa although it has not yet been recorded from any other plant than coffee nor has it been found attacking the indigenous wild coffee of the Nandi country.

Those districts from which no specimens of damage, due to this pest, were received during the campaign are :- Nairobi, Ngong, Dagoretti, Kabete, Trans Nzoia, Solai, Songhor, Muhoroni, Koru, Nyeri, Nanyuki.

Those districts from which Stephanoderes damaged beans were received are :- Kiambu, Ruiru, Thika, Makuyu, Kaimosi, Kericho, Sotik.

The percentage of infection in these districts was :-

Kiambu	0.7 %
Ruiru	1.5 %
Thika	1.1 %
Makuyu	0.07 %
Kaimosi	8.2 %
Sotik, Kericho	7.8 %

Points to be considered in future work :-

1. A more detailed search for indigenous host plants.
2. Seeing that Kaimosi and [illegible] the heaviest rainfall, is the percentage [illegible] in these districts high owing to the [illegible] on the development of the [illegible] entirely to the difficulty [illegible] clean-up under the conditions [illegible]
3. What effects the better harvesting methods recommended by the Senior Coffee Officer, if properly carried out, will have in reducing the loss in the affected areas.
4. The treatment of infested material and its movement.
5. Further investigation into the factors responsible for the 1929 outbreak.
6. The effect of shade on the incidence of the pest. The only effect which has been noticed so far is that, in plantations in which a shade tree of the Sesbania type is used, the fallen leaves by covering the fallen berries make it more difficult to have a thorough clean-up.

[illegible] Kiolis, Auriv.

[illegible] is [illegible] widely distributed than [illegible] for more less, [illegible] also.

[illegible]

[illegible] that [illegible] of [illegible] for [illegible] districts was :-

Nairobi, [illegible] Dagoretti	
Kiambu	
Upper Kiambu [illegible]	
Ruiru	
Thika	1.3 %
Makuyu, Fort Hall, Ithanga	1.8 %
Tana Nzoia	2.1 %
Tximosi	0.1 %
Kericho, Sotik, Fort Tarham	1.7%

[illegible] Mycosphaerella coffeicola, Zeld.

Colletotrichum, the Coffee Berry Moth [illegible] Great damage is caused by the Colony [illegible] [illegible]

Nairobi, Ngong, Dagoretti	1.5 %

Kiambu	3.1 %
Upper Kiambu & Limuru	2.2 %
Kairu	1.8 %
Thika	1.5 %
Makuyu, Fort Hall, Ithanga	1.5 %
Trans Nzoia	35.0 %
Kaimosi	0.6 %
Kericho, Sotik, Fort Ternan	0.8 %

At present the damage done by Eucosma nereidope, Meyr. and Lyudoryx lerisema, Hew., is very small.

(Sgd) Thos. J. Anderson

6.2.29.

NAIROBI. NGONG. NAGORETI. DISTRICT.

16 Samples were examined; 12 of these were of sufficient size to justify a count. The following are the figures:

	Beans Examined	No Insect Damage	Stephanoderes Damage	Sophronica Damage	Thliptoceras Damage
No. 238	880	839	-	41	-
No.239	1,831	1,804	-	27	-
No.240	1,166	1,144	-	22	-
No.242	239	194	-	45	-
No.243	220	141	-	79	-
No.311	405	264	-	141	-
No.312	676	486	-	190	-
No.313	644	544	-	[illegible]	2
No.333	2,299	1,058	-	[illegible]	112
No.334	521	413	-	[illegible]	61
No.338	428	292	-	[illegible]	[illegible]
No.339	1,841	1,784	-	50	7
No.148	987	901	-	72	15
	12,137	9,854	-	2,094	89

12,137 Beans examined

9,854 showed no insect damage

- showed Stephanoderes

2,094 showed Sophronica

89 [illegible]

[illegible] DISTRICT

[illegible] samples were examined. [illegible] of these were of [illegible]

No. [illegible]

No. [illegible]

20

15

10

36

7

8

31

15

40

36

17

7

35

26

41

6

17

15

34

25

14

38

7

0

16,44

16,161

118

826 shows

520 shows

217 shows

34,241

No. 253

No. 273

No. 274

No. 286

No. 303

No. 303

No. 304

No. [illegible]

16,442

The percentage of infection in the different [illegible]

UPPER KYAMBU AND THIKA DISTRICTS.

19 Samples were examined; 16 of these were of sufficient size to justify a count. The following are the figures :

	Beans Examined	No Insect Damage	Stephanoderes Damage	Sophronica Damage	Thliptoceras Damage	Butterfly Damage
No.237	70	1,155	2	7	6	–
No.234	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	83	–	2
No.235	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	14	3	–
No.257	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	101	–	–
No.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	10	88	–
No.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	84	23	–
[illegible]	[illegible]	502	[illegible]	10	–	–
[illegible]	84[illegible]	791	[illegible]	100	–	–
[illegible]	297	345	[illegible]	50	4	–
[illegible]	207	246	[illegible]	11	–	–
[illegible]	1,043	1,[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	61	–
[illegible]	326	2[illegible]	[illegible]	14	–	–
[illegible]	548	406	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	–
[illegible]	729	6[illegible]	[illegible]	4	[illegible]	–
4	462	2[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	–	–
33	1,268	1,[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40	–
	11,901	10,734	[illegible]	885	277	2

11,901 Beans examined.

10,734 showed no insect damage ...	90.1%
3 showed Stephanoderes damage..	0.[illegible]%
885 showed Sophronica damage ...	7.4%
277 showed Thliptoceras damage...	2.3%
2 showed Butterfly damage ...	0.01%

RUTAU DISTRICT

45 Samples were examined; 38 of these were of sufficient size to justify a count. The following are the figures:

	Beans Examined	No Insect Damage	Stephanoderes Damage	Sophronica Damage	Thiptoceras Damage
No.51	1,280	1,240	15	-	25
No.52	1,975	1,900	35	20	20
No.54	982	972	10	-	-
No.58	320	309	11	-	-
No.67	832	681	-	151	-
No.81	2,152	2,004	8	140	-
No.120	1,140	1,008	40	-	92
No.121	460	426	21	53	-
No.143	2,800	2,740	40	10	10
No.147	730	700	-	-	30
No.167	874	865	9	-	-
No.168	879	846	17	2	14
No.190	1,105	1,040	37	11	18
No.194	994	964	13	7	-
No.196	994	962	10	11	11
No.214	759	710	-	47	2
No.215	1,158	1,100	5	-	55
No.270	1,204	1,142	17	46	3
No.271	1,271	1,132	6	129	4
No.287	1,290	1,142	-	100	48
No.306	977	820	57	100	-
No.309	1,084	1,024	28	19	12
No.310	1,358	1,188	84	86	-
No.314	1,014	866	10	50	29
No.315	959	880	20	50	-
No.317	848	698	15	21	114
No.318	703	628	5	10	60
No.343,344	5,028	4,718	-	250	60
No.345	1,252	1,208	3	41	-
No.340	1,202	998	17	167	20
No.341	944	863	1	80	-
	38,679	35,774	525	1,583	696

38,679 Beans were examined.

35,774 showed no insect damage 92.4%

525 showed Stephanoderes damage [illegible]

1,583 showed Sophronica [illegible]

[illegible] 1.5%

[illegible] were examined:

15,716 beans examined

13,[illegible] showed no insect damage [illegible]%

10 showed Stephanitrem damage .07%

[illegible] showed Sphenoptera damage 1.4%

[illegible] showed [illegible] damage [illegible]%

KAIMOSI DISTRICT

15 samples were examined: 7 of these were of sufficient size to justify a count. The following are the figures :

	Beans Examined	No Insect Damage.	Stephanoderes Damage.	Sophronica Damage.	Thliptoceras Damage.
No.69	1,841	1,700	141	-	-
No.71	895	870	25	-	-
No.122	2,840	2,680	100	-	60
No.197	1,828	1,804	19	-	5
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	623	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	8	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	15		3
[illegible]	11,298	[illegible]	[illegible]		68

11,289 Beans examined

10,271 showed no insect damage	90.9%
931 showed Stephanoderes damage	8.2%
19 showed Sophronica damage	0.1%
68 showed Thliptoceras damage	0.6%

[illegible] DISTRICT
[illegible] KIGALE, GUERANGANI.

[illegible]

[illegible]	62.7%
[illegible]	2.1%
[illegible] damage	[illegible]

[illegible] DISTRICTS.

12 samples examined; all too small [illegible] Stephanoderes, [illegible] Sophronica and Thliptoceras.

[illegible] DISTRICT

[illegible] received: No insect damage to beans.

NYERI, NANYUKI DISTRICT

28 samples examined; all too small to make counts; No Stephanoderes, chiefly Moth and Butterfly.

KERICHO, SOTIK, LUMBWA, & FORT HALL TERRAN DISTRICTS.

29 Samples were examined; 14 of these were of sufficient size to justify a count. The following are the figures :

	Beans Examined	No Insect Damage	Stephanoderes Damage	Sophronica Damage	Thliptoceras Damage
No.1	5,498	5,473	24	1	-
No.24	2,890	2,620	210	60	-
No.154	580	530	50	-	-
No.276	120	112	8	-	-
No.277	850	774	7[illegible]	-	-
No.278	320	260	60	-	-
No.279	680	620	60	[illegible]	[illegible]
No.283	1,280	1,200	24	16	-
No.292	182	140	12	26	-
No.300	472	458	[illegible]	30	-
No.330	885	368	[illegible]	-	-
No.347	166	66	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
No.350	150	10	[illegible]	42	60
No.367	271	214	[illegible]	24	[illegible]
Total	13,900	12,445	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

13,900 Beans examined

12,445 showed no insect damage [illegible].5%

1,096 showed Stephanoderes damage [illegible].8%

246 [illegible] 1.7%

[illegible] damage [illegible] .8%

[illegible] Thliptoceras damage


66
165
19
246
13
205
3,910
68
113
119

COPY.

8, Richmond Terrace,

London, S.W.1.

31st August, 1929.

File CR/C.

Dear Holm,

In reply to your letter Coff/34 of August 7th addressed to me personally, I have to inform you that the earliest employment of scientific officers by planting bodies in the Colonies was probably that in Ceylon when the Planters Association made contributions for the engagement by the Government of Ceylon of Professor Marshall Ward for the investigation of coffee leaf disease, and subsequently when the Planters Association of Ceylon engaged, out of their own funds, Mr. J. B. Carruthers as Mycologist to investigate cacao diseases. After the period of agreement Mr. Carruthers was absorbed into the Government staff as Government Mycologist. It was then thought that research work could not be successfully controlled by such an unofficial body as a Planters Association. The first organized scheme for experimental investigation and research concerned with a single crop was possibly that of the British Guiana Sugar Planters Scheme and the Froghopper investigation in Trinidad. The British Guiana scheme was possibly the first which was constituted by a legislative enactment but, as its work did not prove to be satisfactory and was very considerably modified, it is unnecessary for me to forward to you copies of the legislation which was passed in connexion with it.

The Enactment No.8 of 1925 passed by the Federated Malay States to provide for the establishment of a Rubber Research

Alex. Holm, Esq., C.B.E.

under the Customs Ordinance and Regulations framed under Ordinance No.14 of 1926, amending the main Diseases of Plants Ordinance No.3 of 1913. The Director of Agriculture is the [illegible] of the Coconut Committee and its scientific officers [illegible] and considered to be Government Officers [illegible] Committee.

[illegible] nds at the [illegible] on is run [illegible] and has [illegible] the [illegible] Malaya [illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] Tea Research [illegible]

[illegible] to of Ceylon [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

institutes [illegible]

officers [illegible]

No.3.

A circulation officers of [illegible] Department of Agr[illegible] was made as to [illegible] able what a pessimistic light [illegible] the worth [illegible] and carry with them [illegible] this [illegible] was incorporat- [illegible] ed in so [illegible] the institutes to the Ceylon [illegible] for the Tea [illegible] Research Institute Association - the [illegible] similar percentage of the [illegible]

I enclose, for your in[illegible]

Ordinances above referred to [illegible] copies of the reports of the institutes [illegible] secured by direct application to [illegible] concerned [illegible] the case of [illegible]

[illegible] Agriculture [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible] fill the needs of the [illegible] industries

industries for research, and it was agreed that separate organizations for the three main plantation industries were required. It was decided that these industries should be encouraged to meet the cost of this special research work, and a general basis of 50:50 contribution by the industry and by the Government was decided upon. The tea industry was, however, especially prosperous at the time and was desirous of as little Government control as possible. It therefore decided to find all the funds required for its Research Institute. In the case of rubber a 50:50 basis h been effective since 1913, but will terminate when the Ordinance constituting the S heme on a legal basis is passed as it is thought that the rubber industry has now realized the value of specialized research and can find the funds required for those research requirements which are additions to those already provided by Government. The Coconut Rese Scheme has been framed on a 50:50 basis, which is subject t reconsideration at the end of twelve years. The fu a of the Coconut Committe. i Fiji are provided for five yearly periods, subject to renewal or amendment every five years. The re ew for the second five years was agreed upon at th end of last year.

Just as it has been found in this country that the creation of scientific research stations for special subje has the best promise for efficiency and progress, there is every prospect for similar progress to be made from resear in the tropics when concentration is made upon individual This has been the policy in Java and certainly has much t commend it. It has also been provided in India for cot tea and lac. For Indian conditions the Royal Commission not recommend the extension of the policy except for jute

when

industries for Research, and it was agreed that separate organizations for the three main plantation industries were required. It was decided that these industries should be encouraged to meet the cost of this special research work, and a general basis of 50:50 contribution by the industry and by the Government was decided upon. The tea industry was, however, especially prosperous at the time and was desirous of as little Government control as possible. It therefore decided to find all the funds required for its Research Institute. In the case of rubber a 50:50 basis has been effective since 1913, but will terminate when the Ordinance constituting the Scheme on a legal basis is passed, as it is thought that the rubber industry has now realized the value of specialized research and can find the funds required for those research requirements which are additional to those already provided by Government. The Coconut Research Scheme has been framed on a 50:50 basis, which is subject to reconsideration at the end of twelve years. The funds of the Coconut Committee in Fiji are provided for five yearly periods, subject to renewal or amendment every five years. The renewal for the second five years was agreed upon at the end of last year.

Just as it has been found in this country that the creation of scientific research stations for special subjects has the best promise for efficiency and progress, there is every prospect for similar progress to be made from research in the tropics when concentration is made upon individual crops. This has been the policy in Java and certainly has much to commend it. It has also been provided in India for cotton, tea and lac. For Indian conditions the Royal Commission did not recommend the extension of the policy except for jute, and

when

when one has visited India one realises th[illegible]
ask for special crop Ins[illegible]
etc. was rightly not su[illegible]
by crops should not [illegible]
[illegible] be arranged at [illegible]
[illegible] on indiv[illegible]
[illegible] opinion, b[illegible]
the work which [illegible]
the Government [illegible]
be allowed to [illegible]
allowed to be [illegible] by the [illegible]
Government that its establishment [illegible]
curtailing its programme or of shirking [illegible]
The closest co-operation between the [illegible]
Research Station and the Government Department [illegible]
is necessary, and the fullest exchange [illegible]
and information between the scientific workers [illegible]
and overlapping must be avoided. It should not be over-
looked, I think, that a Government Department of Agriculture
in a Colony must be recognised as responsible for advisory
work in connexion with an industry and for reasonable pest
and disease control work, which must be carried on [illegible] r
legislative enactments for which the Government must [illegible]
responsible through its officers pro[illegible]
No industry can take [illegible]
Government has a [illegible]
[illegible] Acts [illegible]
in [illegible]

[illegible] frequently [illegible]
[illegible] question for research. These view[illegible]
[illegible] ing that sharpest when the re[illegible]

constituted was to draw up a programme of research work which was required for the industry and to secure a common agreement as to which would be continued or undertaken by the Department of Agriculture's Scientific officers and which should be [illegible] by the Institute. All pest and disease control [illegible] to the Department of Agriculture and, in [illegible] the existing [illegible] the Department concentrated on soil erosion [illegible] cover-crops [illegible] the Institute [illegible] agreements and [illegible] with these [illegible] advisory [illegible] to come to [illegible] deals with [illegible] occasionally [illegible] regard to [illegible] series [illegible] part of Agriculture [illegible] on [illegible] to their own [illegible] the latter were [illegible] point, however, [illegible] tactfully [illegible] that was [illegible] [illegible] Government [illegible] and if [illegible] the advice of the Institute [illegible] it was in the interest of the Colony [illegible] responsible to the Government for the [illegible] of the industry and through that industry to the welfare of the colony, and no work of the Institute could stand in the way. Should circumstances arise which necessitated action called for in view of the above responsibility. This attitude was recognised and well understood.

In

In Malaya, no such division of labour, as instanced above, was decided upon, and the result has been confusion. The position has been cleared up since Tempany arrived in Malaya as Director of Agriculture. He took the line that his Department was responsible for pest and disease control and for advisory work amongst the small holders. We discussed this at considerable length before he went out to Malaya and, ultimately, in conference with those in the City interested in Malayan rubber. A working arrangement has now been arrived at by Tempany with the Institute on these lines with satisfaction to both sets of officers.

The only other point on which I might offer a few comments related to the constitution of the Board of Management. If your industry is held by one class of the community a considerable amount of independence of control can be given, but if there are several classes interested, progress is only likely to be possible if the Chairman is an uninterested party. In Ceylon, we agreed that the Tea industry Board of Management should nominate its own Chairman. The system has worked well because I was entrusted with the full confidence of the Chairmen. We met frequently and discussed matters generally. For Coconuts, I was able to persuade the industry that the Director of Agriculture should be Chairman in order that conflicting interests should be assured of impartial treatment and consideration. I also advised Government that as they were contributing 50% of the funds this should be insisted upon. I held the same view for the Rubber industry in Ceylon. This view was challenged in certain interested quarters, but I am certain that I should have won through if I had remained in Ceylon.

The Chairmanship of an Institute is a matter of some importance and, if you are starting the experiment in Kenya, I would advise that, in the first instance, you stipulate for the Director of Agriculture to be Chairman, if you can spare the time,

and

and that your Department

In your view you sho

served by

in the Economic Planning Institute in Tokyo as a consultant

either on broad questions of procedure or on problems of

difficulty which may arise.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) E. A. STOCKWELL.

Imperial Bureau of Entomology

Head Office at—

Director:
Guy A. K. Marshall, O.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
Assistant Director:
S. A. Neave, D.Sc.

British Museum (Natural History),
Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7.

The Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office,
S.W.1.

16th September 1929.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter [illegible]/29 of the 16th August last on the subject of the campaign against the coffee mealy-bug in Kenya Colony.

2. With regard to the questions raised in paragraph 2, it is a matter difficult to express a definite opinion as to the prospects of success in breeding indigenous predators for [illegible] against the mealy-bug in that colony [illegible] to the [illegible] rather more detailed information than is at present available. It is a fact, however, that the breeding of a ladybird (Cryptolaemus montrouzieri) against the Citrus Mealy-bug [illegible] California has proved a complete commercial success. The breeding of indigenous predators in Kenya might therefore be reasonably expected to give good results provided that it is carried out on a sufficiently large scale and that the predators can be adequately protected from the attacks of ants. Although the breeding of mealy-bug predators in California has, up to the present, been the only means that has been found of dealing satisfactorily with the pest, it has [illegible] the costs of production considerably, and the authorities there have therefore decided to introduce parasites and predators from other countries in the hope of establishing a more complete and less expensive control. It is therefore distinctly desirable that in Kenya Colony consideration should be given, in addition, to the introduction of parasites and predators from other countries.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Acting Director.

13

[illegible]

X 15501/29

Kenya

Mr. Cliffe 10.viii.29
Mr. Seel 12.8.
Mr. Parkinson (away)
Mr. Bottomley.
Sir E. Harding.
Sir J. Shuckburgh.
Sir G. Grindle.
Sir C. Davis.
Sir S. Wilson.
Mr. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lovat.
Mr. Amery.

O D
19 AUG
16.

DRAFT.

The Director

Imp. Bureau of En[illegible]

[illegible]

C.S.W.

16 August 1929

Sir,

I am

letter

of the 12

for

am

[illegible]

campaign against

coffee mealy-bug

Kenya Colony

2. My Lord Pembroke

would be glad [illegible]

[illegible]

could be found.

44 14

KENYA.

No. 425

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
NAIROBI,
KENYA.

15th July, 1929.

My Lord,

No. 12

I have the honour to refer to your Lordship's telegram of the 28th June in which approval was given to the issue of a Special Warrant for the sum of £7,300 in respect of "mealy bug" control measures on the understanding that this expenditure will be met from savings on approved expenditure for the year.

The necessity for this provision arises from the following circumstances. It has been believed that the "mealy bug" pest would be kept under control by natural biological means, provided that the ant repellent introduced and sold by the Department of Agriculture was used effectively. While this method remains effective and is, I understand, the best means at present known of affording protection, recent experience has shown that the reproduction of insects predatory on the pest has not kept pace with the /

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD PASSFIELD, P.C.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET,
LONDON, S.W.

the multiplication of the pest itself. Extensive damage and serious losses have in consequence been suffered on many plantat[illegible] particularly in the Thika, Ruiru and Lower Kiambu districts and there is a danger that, [illegible] that is not kept under control, dama[illegible] extend [illegible] future to wider area[illegible]

[illegible] by [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] Dep[illegible] [illegible] is inadequate to ren[illegible] [illegible] to the progress of the [illegible] protection of its interests [illegible] to a considerable extent the pre[illegible] [illegible] Department [illegible] carried out [illegible] research and [illegible] "nealy [illegible] necessary [illegible] most [illegible] have to [illegible]

[illegible] establi[illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] insect[illegible] [illegible] cost [illegible]

[illegible] to
research work
coffee plantation
capital expenditure
of £7,900.

6. The [illegible]
£1,350 in respect of 1929 [illegible]
an Entomologist, whose appointment
subject of Kew's despatch [illegible]
June, for a Manager [illegible]
Assistant Manager and a Clerk
also made for labour and upkeep
expenses. It is proposed to [illegible]
preliminary [illegible]
the cost of producing [illegible]

Estimates for the current year were under consideration, the question of securing some financial contribution from the coffee industry towards the cost of services provided for it by Government will not be lost sight of. Endeavours to secure such contributions in the past have met with no success, but I understand that the Coffee Planters Union will bring the subject under review again shortly and this matter will no doubt receive the attention of the Agricultural Commission shortly to be appointed.

8. In regard to the matter of savings to cover this expenditure, the financial position has not changed since the despatch of my telegram No. 135 of the 10th May on the subject of 1929 expenditure and I anticipate that the amount now involved will be met from savings on sanctioned Estimates for [illegible] year.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servant,

ACTING GOVERNOR.

KENYA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

REPORT FOR JUNE

1929

x x x x

6. Coffee. Generally speaking, and in spite of the ravages of Mealy Bug, which have now passed their potential peak, the outlook in most Coffee [illegible] remains very good, although in practic[illegible] more and early rain[illegible] taken [illegible]

[illegible] control, the [illegible] to wide[illegible]

[illegible] Authorit[illegible] ins[illegible]

[illegible] The Unio[illegible] insecticide for the [illegible] spray upon the M[illegible] of erection and [illegible] will commence [illegible] amount of damage done by Mealy [illegible] forthcoming crop, [illegible] of a million pounds was [illegible] of the problem of research in the [illegible] present [illegible] and repres[illegible] was passed in favour of the [illegible] Industrial [illegible] upon [illegible] the industries of the [illegible] The proposals under consid[illegible] passed and con[illegible] such an Institute [illegible] Fund [illegible] the [illegible] working [illegible] Union [illegible] industr[illegible] of the world.

x x x x

X. 15501/29 Kenya

12

Mr. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lovat.
Mr. Amery.

DRAFT. Code rd.

Copy of (11) letter to Sir J. B. Cut Ant. KG

Coded & sent 5.0 pm 28 June

28 June Your telegram of 25 June No. 191 has reached us after issue of special instructions for [illegible] medic but control measures on understanding that the expenditure will be met from savings on approved expenditure for the year. Assume that you are

X. 15504/29 Kenya

12

C.O.

Mr. Ormsby-Gore 27.6.29

Mr. Stockdale 27/6/29

Mr.

Mr. Bottomley 28 for action

Sir E. Harding

Sir J. Shuckburgh

Sir G. Grindle

Sir C. Davis

Sir S. Wilson

Mr. Ormsby-Gore

Lord Lovat

Mr. Amery

Answd. No. 14

Coded & sent 5.0 pm 28 June

28 June

Your telegram of 25 June No. 191

I am prepared to approve issue of special warrant for [redacted] but control measures or a waiver undertaking that the expenditure will be met from savings on approved expenditure for the year. I assume that you are

Copy of (11) action to Sir J. Cut

DRAFT. Coded etc.

Governor Kenya

[illegible] that [illegible]
cannot be erected more
cheaply [illegible] be chosen of
detailed info. my advisers
cannot express definite
opinion but from such
[illegible] have been
[illegible]
possible to make it worth
[illegible]

Telegram from the O.A.G. of Kenya to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Dated 25th June, 1929.

(Received Colonial Office 5.53 p.m. 25th June, 1929.)

[illegible] 25th June Recrudescence of coffee mealie bug [illegible] much damage and the first supplementary [illegible] includes the sum [illegible] telegraphic [illegible] urgent expenditure [illegible] the cost of constructing [illegible] predatory ladybirds from [illegible] derived.

52

10.

CHD/KMPH

His Majesty's Eastern African Dependencies

KENYA, UGANDA,
TANGANYIKA, ZANZIBAR.

TRADE & INFORMATION OFFICE.
Royal Mail Building,
Cockspur Street
(ENTRANCE SPRING GARDENS)
London, S.W.1.

NYASALAND
NORTHERN RHODESIA.

TELEGRAMS: KENYA STRAND.
ONLY CABLE MESSAGES REQUIRING THIS
OFFICE TO BE ADDRESSED TO THE
KENYA MINISTRY. QUOTING
FILE.

05096/29

RECEIVED
17 JUN
COL.

[illegible]th June, 192[illegible]

Dear Mr. Bottomley,

I give [illegible] extract which [illegible] received [illegible] from the Colonial Office [illegible] be [illegible] interest to you:

"KENYA SOLDIERS [illegible]
29,250 OVER [illegible]
COST PIGLOGN[illegible]
MENANGE"

Yours [illegible]

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

2. The Director of the Bureau has ~~[illegible]~~ expressed the opinion that the measures adopted appear to be quite adequate and if properly carried out should lead to a material diminution in the pest for the time being. He thinks it however likely that similar [illegible] may have to be taken periodically until it has been [illegible] what [illegible] of Stephanoderes. [illegible] Director states further that there can be little [illegible] the Stephanoderes beetle [illegible] some parts of Kenya [illegible] He [illegible] that the increase [illegible] due to the recent increase in [illegible] only owing to the extension [illegible] cultivation; on the other hand it is possible that certain cultural methods may have produced conditions specially favourable to it. For example, the growing of coffee with or without

shade

shade might well have an important bearing on the incidence of the pest, an aspect of this question which I no doubt already receive attention locally.

4. With regard to the Longicorn beetle, Sophronica [illegible] of a species of this genus [illegible] stored coffee [illegible] in Uganda [illegible] fro[illegible] The [illegible] species is Sophronica [illegible] is [illegible] is known to occur also [illegible] and the Dis[illegible] insect [illegible] probably prove to be the same. He adds that the species is [illegible] mainly inc[illegible] these [illegible] and [illegible] further [illegible] comprehensive report [illegible] your telegram [illegible] May, but in the meantime I would invite your attention

(No.5)

atten

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] Mac Arthur and

you think it desirable that [illegible]

should be taken of his pre[illegible]

Kenya [illegible] when acc[illegible]

him personally.

Imperial Bureau of Entomology

Head Office at—

Director:
Guy A. K. Marshall, C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
Assistant Director:
S. A. Neave, D.Sc.

British Museum (Natural History),
Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7

30th May, 1929.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 15501/29 of the 21st May enclosing copies of correspondence regarding measures that are being taken against certain coffee pests in Kenya, together with a copy of the Rules that have been put into force for this purpose.

2. The measures adopted appear to be quite adequate, and if properly carried out should lead to a material diminution in the pest for the time being.

3. It may be remarked, however, that it is likely that similar action may have to be taken periodically, until it has been ascertained what factor has been responsible for this rather sudden outbreak of Stephanoderes.

4. Until recently it appears to have been assumed that this beetle did not occur in Kenya Colony, but there can be little doubt that it is really indigenous in some parts of the territory. Its increase may be simply due to the recent increase in its food supply owing to the extension of coffee cultivation; on the other hand, it is possible that certain cultural methods may have produced conditions specially favourable to it. For example, the growing of coffee with or without shade might well have an important bearing on the incidence of the pest; but no doubt this aspect of the question is already receiving attention locally.

5. With regard to the Longicorn beetle, Sophronica, we had a

record

record from Mr. A. Hargreaves of [illegible] species [illegible]
[illegible]red coffee berries in Uganda as long [illegible]
[illegible]riously been reported from Kenya [illegible]
[illegible] Coffea venatrix, [illegible]
[illegible] Congo; probably the Kenya [illegible]
same [illegible] species [illegible] only indigenous to [illegible]
not introduced.

I have the honour to

Sir,

Your obedient servant

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] St.

TELEGRAM from the O.A.G. of Kenya to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Dated 9th May.

(Received, Colonial Office, 1.3 p.m., 9th May, 1929).

No. 4

9th May. Your telegram of 22nd April [illegible] Comprehensive report will be sent to [illegible] as possible but operation(s) not yet [illegible] 15 Inspectors were engaged in January and [illegible] training. Every plantation in the [illegible] inspected. Stephanoderes found in 86 plantations [illegible] beetle [illegible] 16. Rule(s) published in Official Gazette of 27th December last page 2002 [illegible] force 1st January. No movement of infected [illegible] allowed unless satisfactory treated by heat [illegible] on water for 2 hours. All strippings and [illegible] have to be destroyed within one month of date [illegible] completion of stripping. Campaign has been [illegible] to cover soja bean boring beetle which is [illegible] damage in "buni" coffee and can be controlled [illegible] measures of Stephanoderes. Stripping now almost completed but four Inspectors being retained to follow up the work.

A.D. 1928.

3. This Order may be cited as the Copyright Mechanical Instruments (Royalties) Order, 1928, and shall apply to contrivances sold on or after the first day of November nineteen hundred and twenty-eight or after the expiration of three months from the date of its confirmation by Parliament, whichever be the later.

Given under the Official Seal of the Board of Trade this Twenty-first day of May Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight.

(L.S.) P. CUNLIFFE-LISTER,
President of the Board of Trade.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 674.

THE DISEASES OF PLANTS PREVENTION ORDINANCE.

Rules.

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon him by section 8 of the Diseases of Plants Prevention Ordinance (Chapter 155 of the Revised Edition), His Excellency the Acting Governor in Council has been pleased to make the following Rules:—

These Rules may be cited as "the Diseases of Plants Prevention (Coffee) Rules, 1928", and shall come into force on the [illegible] day of January, 1929.

In these Rules, unless the context otherwise [illegible]

"Coffee plantation" shall include any land on which coffee bush or coffee plant is growing whether the land is used solely as a coffee plantation or not.

"Director" means the person for the time being holding the office of Director of Agriculture.

"Inspector" means any person appointed by the Director by notice in the Gazette as an inspector for the purposes of these Rules.

MOVEMENT OF COFFEE PLANTS.

3. No person shall move or cause to be moved any coffee plant from any of the administrative districts of Nairobi, Fort Hall and Kiambu (as defined by Proclamation No. 54 of February 25th, 1924), or from that part of the Machakos District known as the Donyo Sabuk area, bounded on the west, north and east by the Athi River and on the south by the line of meridian 1° 45' south, to any other part of the Colony: Provided that nothing in this Rule shall be construed to prohibit the movement of coffee plants within or over the districts mentioned in this Rule, with the following exceptions:—

(a) No coffee plants shall be moved from the administrative districts of Kiambu, Nairobi, or Fort Hall, into the Donyo Sabuk area as defined above.

(b) Coffee plants may be moved under a permit signed by the Director first obtained and in accordance with any special conditions which may be stated on such permit to any other part of the Colony from the Limuru area, more particularly described as that

[illegible] owners, agents or managers, it shall be sufficient promptly to exhibit such requisition at the post office or post offices normally serving such locality and to publish such requisition in a newspaper circulating in the area, and in the Gazette.

9. The Director may divide each district where coffee is grown into groups and may number such groups. Each group shall embrace plantations of coffee under similar climatic conditions and the Director may place each farm in such group as appears to him suitable.

10. Each separate coffee plantation shall, where practicable, be included in a group and it shall be the duty of the owner of such plantation by ensuring that his plantation is included in its appropriate group.

[illegible] All the coffee of the terminating crop shall be stripped [illegible] trees and such stripping shall be completed not later [illegible] date which may be fixed by the Director for each [illegible] Provided that the Director may vary the date for an [illegible] representations made [illegible] shown therefor and the Director may from [illegible] time to time [illegible] meaning of the words [illegible] terminating crop.

[illegible] date fixed for the completion of [illegible] description including coffee lying [illegible] the factory pulping [illegible] coffee permitted under Rule [illegible] All coffee collected [illegible] disposed of within twenty days of [illegible] such [illegible] change [illegible] that all coffee infected with [illegible] be [illegible] as ordered by the Inspector [illegible] larvae, pupae and viable eggs.

[illegible] description on or near [illegible] and on or near [illegible] shall be collected [illegible] month. Full [illegible] under these Rules on the [illegible] such station, godown, mill or [illegible]

[illegible] shall plant any coffee pulp or other coffee [illegible] coffee plant is growing until such [illegible] length of time as will ensure [illegible] Stephanoderes beetles and the destruction [illegible] at in such refuse.

[illegible] person shall dispose of any coffee for seed purposes [illegible] coffee shall have been inspected and certified as [illegible] pests and diseases by an Inspector authorised in that [illegible] the Director. Each bag or container shall be sealed [illegible] certified as aforesaid.

[illegible] coffee, except coffee intended for direct export or [illegible] purposes, shall be delivered to any place other than a [illegible] licensed for the purpose by the Director.

17. A licensed warehouse shall be subject to inspection at any reasonable time by an Inspector and no such warehouse as aforesaid will be licensed unless it contains facilities for the treatment of coffee and for the destruction of *Stephanoderes* either by fumigation or by heating.

18. If any coffee is found to be infested with *Stephanoderes* in a warehouse the keeper of such warehouse shall forthwith notify the Director of the fact and shall state the name of the owner of the farm from which such coffee was delivered.

19. Any coffee found to be infected with *Stephanoderes* during the period it is in the warehouse shall, together with the bags containing it and any other coffee immediately in contact with it, be immediately effectively treated to the satisfaction of an Inspector for the destruction of living *Stephanoderes* beetles, larvæ, pupæ and viable eggs.

20. On and after July 1st, 1929, all coffee consigned from a plantation shall be bagged in new standard coffee bags. A standard coffee bag means a new twill bag, D.W.C. quality, 2 lb. weight, 40 in. by 28 in., hemmed 8 in. by 5 in.

21. Any person who without lawful excuse obstructs an Inspector in the discharge of his duties under these Rules, or who refuses to carry out the instructions of an Inspector in the discharge of his duties under these Rules, or who otherwise contravenes the provisions of these Rules shall be guilty of an offence [illegible] on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding [illegible] or payment thereof to imprisonment of either [illegible] term not exceeding three months.

[illegible] Plants Regulations, 1925, [illegible] of the Diseases of Plants [illegible] are hereby revoked.

By Command of His Excellency the Acting Governor in Council.

Nairobi,
This 20th day of December, 1928.

[illegible] BARTON,
Ch[illegible] Executive Council.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 675.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DISTRICT COUNCILS) ORDINANCE, 1928.

APPOINTMENTS.

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon him by section 149 of the above Ordinance, His Excellency the Acting Governor has been pleased to appoint the persons hereinafter named to be members of the Standing Departmental Committee for Local Government in Rural Areas:—

The Hon. Conway Harvey.
The Hon. T. J. O'Shea.
Capt. The Hon. E. M. V. Kenealy.
Lt. Col. The Hon. Lord Francis Scott, M.B.E.

By Command of His Excellency the Acting Governor.

Nairobi,
This 18th day of December, 1928.

W. M. LOGAN,
Acting Colonial Secretary's Deputy.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 676.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MUNICIPALITIES) ORDINANCE, 1928.

IN EXERCISE [illegible] powers conferred upon [illegible] Local Government [illegible] 1928, His Excellency [illegible] Acting Governor has been pleased to appoint the following persons members of the Standing Committee established under the provisions of the aforesaid Ordinance:—

The Rt. Hon. Lord Delamere.
The Hon. Capt. H. F. Ward.
The Hon. T. J. O'Shea.
The Hon. Major R. W. B. Robertson-Eustace.

By Command of His Excellency the Acting Governor.

Nairobi,
This 18th day of December, 1928.

W. M. LOGAN,
Acting Colonial Secretary's Deputy.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 677.

THE DETENTION CAMPS ORDINANCE, 1925.

NOTICE.

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon him by section 8 of the Detention Camps Ordinance, 1925, His Excellency the Governor is pleased to declare the Camp at Dagoretti to be a Detention Camp for the purposes of the aforesaid Ordinance, and His Excellency is further pleased to appoint as officer in charge of such detention camp, the District Commissioner, Dagoretti.

By Command of His Excellency the Acting Governor.

Nairobi,
This 18th day of December, 1928.

HUNTON BARTON,
for Acting Colonial Secretary.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 678.

THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ORDINANCE.

GRANT OF POWER TO TRY SUMMARILY.

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon him by section 219 of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance (Chapter 7 of the Revised Edition), His Excellency the Acting Governor has been pleased to empower the persons for the time being holding the office of Resident Magistrate at Nakuru, Kisumu and Eldoret, to try in a summary way within their respective jurisdictions, all or any of the offences referred to in the said section.

By Command of His Excellency the Acting Governor.

Nairobi,
This 17th day of December, 1928.

HUNTON BARTON,
for Acting Colonial Secretary.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 679.

THE NATIVE REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, 1921.
(Chapter 127, *Revised Laws of Kenya*).

NOTICE.

IN EXERCISE of the powers thereunto enabling me, I hereby appoint the undermentioned to be a Registration Officer:—

Mr. H. A. Amin, Resident Commissioner's Office, Mombasa, with effect from 1st January, 1929.

Nairobi,
Dated 17th December, 1928.

C. M. DOBBS,
Acting Chief Native Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE No. 680.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARKS ORDINANCE.
(Cap. 99 of the Revised Edition).
TRADE MARK RENEWED.

Trade Mark Number	Class	Name of Applicant	Class
14/14	12-1914	International Tea Company's Stores, Ltd.	42

Nairobi,
This 14th day of December, 1928.

W. M. BEATINGE,
Registrar of Trade Marks.

61

3

His Majesty's Eastern African Dependencies

TRADE & INFORMATION OFFICE.

KENYA, UGANDA, TANGANYIKA, ZANZIBAR, NYASALAND, NORTHERN RHODESIA

Royal Mail Hotel
Cockspur

TELEPHONE: REGENT 8 [illegible]
ANY COMMUNICATION RESPECTING THIS MATTER SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY QUOTING REF.

CABLES: EAMATTERS, LONDON
TELEGRAMS: EAMATTERS, WESTRAND, LONDON.

5th April, 1929.

Dear Sir,

[illegible]

I attach hereto [illegible] meeting of the Coffee [illegible] East Africa which was held [illegible] January 4th [illegible] and [illegible] of the Report [illegible] of Kenya Advisory Committee [illegible] January which has already been circulated [illegible]

[illegible] one [illegible] which arises follows [illegible]

Item 3. [illegible] moderate [illegible] is usually found, such [illegible] is [illegible] only grown coffee. The legislation referred [illegible] is that contained in the regulations set forth [illegible] Kenya Gazette of [illegible] December.

Item 5. The tentative suggestion [illegible] the President is that Government [illegible] and the Union, combined, should [illegible] agronomists for a period of six months [illegible] their attentions exclusively to [illegible] work [illegible] prize of £5,000 [illegible] an [illegible] have

W. A. Bottomley, Esq., C.M.G., [illegible]
Colonial Office,
London, S.W.1.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COFFEE PLANTERS' UNION OF KENYA AND EAST AFRICA held in the Secretary's Office on Friday January 4th 1929 at 10 a.m.

PRESENT:- Mr. A.E. Bester in the Chair.
Messrs. Grahame Bell, Knight, Welsh and the Secretary.

Capt. Sprott attended during the afternoon when item No. 2 was under discussion.

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Messrs. Kenneth Archer, Patmore and Steele.

1. THE MINUTES of the Previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

2. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING. It was decided that the Annual General Meeting should be held on Monday, January 28th, 1929, at 10 a.m. in the Memorial Hall.

The Agenda was drafted and the Secretary was instructed to have it published in the Press and circulated to all Members.

He was also instructed to issue an invitation to the Hon. Director of Agriculture and Officers of his Department to attend.

3. BUNI MARKET. The Secretary read correspondence from Messrs. Milligan and Co. and Mr. Bergeman, putting forward suggestions in connection with this proposal.

The Chairman informed the Meeting that he understood Government proposed introducing legislation to control the movement of Buni in the Colony.

It was decided to defer discussion until the draft Bills are published.

4. STORAGE OF COFFEE at the Coast. The Secretary read a copy of the draft Permit forwarded by the Director of Agriculture.

The draft was approved.

5. DISEASES & PESTS. (a) Mealy Bug. The Secretary outlined a scheme, which had been suggested by the President, to enable the Scientific Services in connection with this Pest receiving direct financial support from the industry.

It was decided to place this subject on the agenda for the Annual General Meeting and the Secretary was instructed to request the President to put forward his views then.

(b) Cotton Wool for Binding. The Secretary read a letter from the Chief of Customs conveying the information that Cotton

Wool /

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COFFEE PLANTERS' UNION OF KENYA AND EAST AFRICA held in the Secretary's Office on Friday January 4th 1929 at 10 a.m.

PRESENT:- Mr. A.E. Baster in the Chair;
Messrs. Grahame Ball, Knight, Walsh and the Secretary.

Capt. Sprott attended during the afternoon when item No. 2 was under discussion.

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Messrs. Kenneth Archer, Patmore and Steele.

1. THE MINUTES of the Previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

2. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING. It was decided that the Annual General Meeting should be held on Monday, January 28th, 1929, at 10 a.m. in the Memorial Hall.

The Agenda was drafted and the Secretary was instructed to have it published in the Press and circulated to all Members.

He was also instructed to issue an invitation to the Hon. Director of Agriculture and Officers of his Department to attend.

3. BUNI MARKET. The Secretary read correspondence from Messrs. Milligan and Co. and Mr. Bergeman, putting forward suggestions in connection with this proposal.

The Chairman informed the Meeting that he understood Government proposed introducing legislation to control the movement of Buni in the Colony.

It was decided to defer discussion until the draft Bills are published.

4. STORAGE OF COFFEE at the Coast. The Secretary read a copy of the draft Permit forwarded by the Director of Agriculture.

The draft was approved.

5. DISEASES & PESTS. (a) Mealy Bug. The Secretary outlined a scheme, which had been suggested by the President, to enable the Scientific Services in connection with this Pest receiving direct financial support from the industry.

It was decided to place this subject on the agenda for the Annual General Meeting and the Secretary was instructed to request the President to put forward his views then.

(b) Cotton Wool for Binding. The Secretary read a letter from the Chief of Customs conveying the information that Cotton

Wool /

Wool for agricultural purposes will be admitted duty free.

He also read a letter from the General Manager, Kenya & Uganda Railway, stating that he did not see his way [illegible] reducing the freight on this commodity.

Th[illegible] instructed to pursue this matter [illegible] the bulk of cotton wool [illegible] this purpose [illegible] it does [illegible] than many bales baled.

6. [illegible]

10. PRAEDIAL LARCENY. The Secretary read a letter from the Joint East African Board forwarding a copy of a letter from the Nyasaland Planters' Association. He stated that he had replied that recent legislation had improved the position here. His reply was approved.

11. WATER LEGISLATION. The Secretary read a letter fr[illegible] the Director of Public Works in which it was stated that Pla[illegible] are at liberty to offer alternative suggesti[illegible] ing pulp daily 100 yards from [illegible]ry water[illegible] which they thought would ensure [illegible] in their [illegible] that no pollution of rivers would take [illegible] The Secretary was instructed to publish [illegible] rmation in his next General Gazette.

12. [illegible] Secretary read letters and [illegible] Bargoman. Copies of [illegible] ples had been sent [illegible] and the Director of [illegible]

[illegible] ructed to [illegible] ad ask what steps [illegible] the sale of [illegible]

[illegible] let[illegible] from [illegible] Uganda [illegible] n the [illegible] ed in [illegible] th [illegible]

[illegible] morial [illegible] as dates [illegible] and [illegible] these [illegible]

[illegible] FOR KAMUZU. The [illegible] that [illegible] the request of a Member [illegible] this [illegible] ject on the Agenda [illegible] explained that [illegible] ion was that the [illegible] hold [illegible] examinations and [illegible] be approved [illegible] Managers and Assistants.

IT WAS AG[illegible]

That this Council does not [illegible] the [illegible] scheme practicable.

THE COFFEE PLANTERS UNION OF KENYA AND EAST AFRICA.

P.O. Box 381,
NAIROBI.
Kenya Colony.
East Africa.

CM/NY/2/1/1388.

22nd December, 1[illegible]8.

Dear Sirs,

Subject :- Overseas Markets.

Your name has been given us, by the British Consul General of New York, as a firm interested in our Coffee.

From information received from his, and from H.M. Senior Trade Commissioner, Montreal, it is apparent that our product is meeting with increasing favour on your side of the world.

From the bulk of [illegible] evidences received from these Offices it appears that Dealers on your side find that they get better [illegible] by dealing through the London Market than by dire[illegible] dealings with this Colony. Owing to variations of altitude at which our coffee is grown, the liquoring qualities vary in different Districts. Owing to variations in climatic conditions, the quality on the one estate varies from season to season.

[illegible] in London there are experienced [illegible]ters who [illegible] will give a stea[illegible] liquor; one year [illegible] by the mark of one [illegible] the next year from [illegible] of the Colony.

We are [illegible] provide such a service.

This Union is not [illegible] to trade in our product. [illegible] and advisory body. We are, [illegible] do all that we can to put Dealers [illegible] Dealers in Nairobi, several of [illegible] business with your Colony.

Please commend us, if [illegible] any way.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) [illegible]

Secretary.