

CLOSER UNION IN EAST AFRICA

Vol. I.—REPORT
TOGETHER WITH THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE COMMITTEE

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be Printed
6th October, 1931*

LONDON:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
To be purchased directly from H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses:
Adastral House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2; 120, George Street, Edinburgh;
York Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff;
15, Donegall Square West, Belfast;
or through any Bookseller

1931

Price 1s. 6d. net.

REFERENCE.

ORDER OF LORDS.

Mercurii, 12° Novembris, 1930.

Resolved, That it is desirable that a Joint Committee of both Houses be appointed to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa (Cmd. 3234 and Cmd. 3378), together with the statement of the conclusions of His Majesty's Government (Cmd. 3574), and to report thereon (The Lord Passfield): After debate, *agreed to*: Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Commons to communicate this Resolution, and to desire their concurrence.

Die Martis, 18° Novembris, 1930.

Message from the Commons that they concur in the resolution of this House communicated to them on Wednesday last, viz.: That it is desirable that a Joint Committee of both Houses be appointed to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., and to report thereon.

• *Die Jovis, 20° Novembris, 1930.*

Moved, That a Committee of ten Lords be appointed to join with a Committee of the House of Commons to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., and to report thereon (The Lord Passfield).

The Lords following were named of the Committee—

E. Onslow.	L. Phillimore.
V. Mersey.	L. Lugard.
L. Stanley of Alderley. (<i>L. Sheffield.</i>)	L. Passfield.
L. Lamington.	L. Dickinson.
L. Cranworth.	L. Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Ordered, That such Committee have power to agree with the Committee of the House of Commons in the appointment of a Chairman.

Then a message was ordered to be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint them therewith, and to request them to appoint ten Members of that House to be joined with the said Committee.

Die Martis, 25° Novembris, 1930.

Message from the Commons to acquaint this House that they have appointed a Committee of Ten Members to join with the

Committee appointed by this House, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of the 20th instant, to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., and to report thereon, and a Message ordered to be sent to the House of Commons to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A. on *Thursday, the 4th of December next, at half-past Eleven o'clock.*

Die Jovis, 27^o Novembris, 1930.

Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Committee appointed by them to join with a Committee of this House to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships in Committee Room A. on *Thursday, the 4th of December next, at half-past Eleven o'clock*, as proposed by this House.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[*Wednesday, 12th November, 1930*] :—Message from *The Lords*,—That they communicate that they have come to the following Resolution, viz. : “ That it is desirable that a Joint Committee of both Houses be appointed to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa [Cmd. 3234 and Cmd. 3378], together with the Statement of the conclusions of His Majesty’s Government [Cmd. 3574], and to report thereon.”

[*Thursday, 13th November, 1930*] :—*Ordered*, That the Lords Message [12th November], communicating the Resolution, “ That it is desirable that a Joint Committee of both Houses be appointed to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa [Cmd. 3234 and Cmd. 3378], together with the Statement of the conclusions of His Majesty’s Government [Cmd. 3574], and to report thereon,” be now considered.—(*Mr. Kennedy.*)

Lords Message *considered* accordingly.

Resolved, That this House doth concur with the Lords in the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Kennedy.*)

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

[*Thursday, 20th November, 1930*] :—Message from the Lords,—That they have appointed a Committee consisting of Ten Lords to join with a Committee of the Commons to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., and to report thereon, and request the Commons to appoint an equal number of their Members to be joined with said Lords.

[*Friday, 21st November, 1930*] :—*Ordered*, That the Lords Message [20th November] relating to the appointment of a Committee on Closer Union in East Africa be now considered.—(*Mr. Hayes.*)

Lords Message *considered* accordingly.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Ten Members be appointed to join with a Committee appointed by the Lords as a Select Committee to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa [Cmd. 3234 and Cmd. 3378], together with the Statement of the conclusions of His Majesty’s Government [Cmd. 3574].—(*Mr. Hayes.*)

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Committee *nominated* of,—Sir John Sandeman Allen, Mr. Amery, Mr. Buxton, Sir Robert Hamilton, Mr. James Hudson, Mr. Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Parkinson, Dr. Shiels, Lord Stanley, and Mr. Wellock.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Hayes.*)

[*Wednesday, 26th November, 1930*] :—Message from *The Lords*,—That they propose that the Joint Committee appointed to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa, &c., and to report thereon do meet in Committee Room A on Thursday, 4th December, at half-past Eleven o'clock.

Lords Message *considered* :—

Ordered, That the Committee appointed by this House do meet the Lords Committee as proposed by their Lordships.—(*Mr. Kennedy.*)

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE—(House of Lords), Volume I, page i	
" " (House of Commons) ,, ,, 1v	
TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE REPORT ... ,, vii	
REPORT Volume I, page 1	
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ,, ,, 47	
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE See Volume II	
APPENDICES See Volume III	

The cost of printing and publishing this Volume is estimated by the Stationery Office at	£	s.	d.
	100	0	0
The cost of preparing for publication the Shorthand Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee was	559	11	1
The cost of duplicating Memoranda, etc. is estimated by the Stationery Office at	130	0	0
The cost of other incidental Typing for the Committee was	45	12	8
The cost of repayment of Witnesses expenses was ...	3,147	1	11
Total ...	3,982	5	8

[NOTE.—It is not yet possible to estimate the cost of printing Volumes II and III, viz., the Minutes of Evidence and Appendices.]

REPORT FROM THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

CONTENTS.

<i>Para.</i>	INTRODUCTORY.							<i>Page.</i>
	<i>Geographical Picture.</i>							
1.	Geography of the territories	1
2.	The economic aspect	1
3.	Area and population	2
4.	Racial divisions	2
	<i>Historical.</i>							
5.	Early impacts	2
6.	The partitioning of East Africa	3
7.	Indian immigration and trading	3
	<i>European Settlement.</i>							
8.	The Highland areas	4
9.	Encouragement of European colonisation	4
10.	Importance of agriculture	4
	<i>The Existing Forms of Government.</i>							
11.	The Governor and the Executive and Legislative Councils	4
12.	Native political and social institutions	5
13.	Conditions prior to British occupation	6
	<i>The Importance of the East African Problem.</i>							
14.	Interest focussed on East Africa	6
THE PROBLEM OF CLOSER UNION.								
	<i>Historical Survey of Proposals.</i>							
15.	Degree of union contemplated in the mandate for Tanganyika	6
16.	The terms of the mandate	7
17.	The duration of the mandate	8
18.	The Ormsby Gore Commission of 1924	8
19.	The 1927 White Paper	9
20.	Decision to send out another Commission	10
21.	The Hilton Young Commission and Sir Samuel Wilson's visit	10
22.	Sir Samuel Wilson's report	10
23.	The "Conclusions" of 1930	11
24.	The proposals put forward...	11
25.	Proposals to be submitted to a Joint Committee	12

<i>Para.</i>		<i>Page</i>
<i>Appointment of the Joint Committee.</i>		
26.	The terms of reference	12
27.	The "Memorandum on Native Policy" of 1930	12
28.	Evidence before the Committee	12
29.	Memoranda received	13
30.	Relevance of evidence	13
31.	Wide interpretation of terms of reference	13
32.	Committee's desire to remove feeling of uncertainty	13
33.	No definition of ultimate objectives	13
<i>Closer Union or Co-operation,</i>		
34.	Arguments against political and constitutional closer union	14
35.	Proposal for the union of Kenya and Uganda	14
36.	The control of the basin of Lake Victoria	14
37.	Objections to the union of Kenya and Uganda	14
38.	Arguments in favour of economic co-operation	16
<i>Transport.</i>		
39.	Unity of transport policy	16
40.	New construction and development	17
41.	Administration	17
42.	The Tanganyika railways	18
43.	The office of High Commissioner of Transport	18
44.	The proposed Adviser on Transport	18
45.	A Central Road Board	19
46.	Enquiry into railway rates	19
<i>Customs.</i>		
47.	Unification of the customs departments proposed	19
48.	Customs policy a matter for the Governors' Conference	19
<i>Scientific Services.</i>		
49.	The scientific aspect	20
50.	Local and routine research	20
51.	Scheme for co-ordination	21
52.	"Long range" research	21
<i>Recommendations as to the Governors' Conference.</i>		
53.	The meetings of the Conference	21
54.	The Conference secretariat	22
55.	Unofficial meetings prior to Governors' Conference	22
56.	The problem of liaison	22
57.	Native policy	23

<i>Para.</i>	GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING WHITE SETTLEMENT.	<i>Page.</i>
58.	Conditions of white settlement	23
59.	Benefit to natives	24
60.	Future prospects	24
61.	Relations between natives and non-natives	25

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF NATIVE POLICY.

62.	The meaning of "native policy"	25
63.	The essential unity of African problems	25
64.	Previous statements of policy	26

The Principle of Trusteeship.

65.	Statement of the trust	26
66.	Some misunderstandings	27
67.	The Committee's view	28
68.	Objections to the memorandum of 1930	28
69.	Fear of a change of policy	28
70.	The various statements must be read as a whole	29
71.	Agreement on general definition of policy	30
72.	Answer to objections	30
73.	The Committee's view	31
74.	Adequate security for all communities	31
75.	Authority of the Crown	31

The Place of the African in the Body Politic.

76.	The problem of a "mixed state"	32
77.	The understanding of the native mind	33
78.	Development through native councils	34
79.	Devolution a practical necessity	35
80.	The growth of district and provincial native councils	35
81.	A central native council	35
82.	The de-tribalised native	35

THE PROBLEMS OF KENYA.

83.	Proposals for administrative separation	36
84.	Arguments in favour	36
85.	Arguments against	37
86.	The Committee's view	37
87.	Proposal for strengthening native administration without territorial division	38
88.	Composition of Legislative Council in Kenya	38
89.	Historical	39
90.	European objective	39
91.	Aquiescence of Arab community	39
92.	Indian attitude	39
93.	Government White Papers regarding common roll	40
94.	Conflicting views on the Indian Franchise	40
95.	Unofficial representation on the Legislative Council	41
96.	Advisory capacity of unofficial members of Council	41
97.	Representation of diverse interests should be adequate	41

<i>Para.</i>		<i>Page</i>
98.	Unofficial majority	41
99.	The de-tribalised natives	41
100.	Decision regarding common roll	42
101.	Native representation on the Legislative Council	42
102.	Encouragement of native councils in Kenya	43
103.	Devolution of responsibility	43
104.	A means for the expression of grievances	43
105.	Taxation, land and other questions	43
106.	Forced labour	44
107.	The language question	45
108.	Shortage of administrative staff in native areas	45
109.	Native education	46
110.	Necessity for facilitating work of native administration	46

REPORT

The Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the House of Lords to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa (Cmd. 3234 and Cmd. 3378), together with the statement of the conclusions of His Majesty's Government (Cmd. 3574) have agreed to the following Report:—

INTRODUCTORY.

Geographical Picture.

1. Between latitude 18° south and 4° north there is a continuous belt of Central and East African territory for which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is responsible. The total area is roughly 1,000,000 square miles and the total population about 14,000,000. For administrative purposes this area is divided into six units—the Protectorates of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland in the south; the Mandated Territory of Tanganyika and the Protectorate of Zanzibar (which consists of the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba) in the centre, and Kenya and the Protectorate of Uganda in the North. Kenya is a colony with the exception of the coastal strip which constitutes the Kenya Protectorate, and which is leased from the Sultan of Zanzibar. The area includes the whole or parts of the three great lakes of East and Central Africa, of which the largest, Lake Victoria, approximately of the same size as Scotland, is surrounded by Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika; the second, Lake Tanganyika, is in part the boundary between Tanganyika Territory and Northern Rhodesia, while the third, Lake Nyasa, is touched by the Nyasaland Protectorate and by Tanganyika Territory.

Geography
of the terri-
tories.

2. Economically, all these territories are in the main dependent upon ports of the East Coast of Africa—Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland on the port of Beira in Portuguese East Africa; Tanganyika Territory upon Dar-es-Salaam and Tanga, and in part upon Mombasa; Kenya and Uganda wholly upon Mombasa. The railways of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland are at present connected with the South African system and not with the northern systems. In Tanganyika there is a central railway connecting the port of Dar-es-Salaam with both Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria. A railway runs near the northern frontier of Tanganyika from Tanga to Arusha, which is not connected with the central railways, but is connected by a branch from Kahe to Voi with the main Kenya-Uganda Railway. The main Kenya-Uganda Railway runs from

The econ-
omic aspect.

Mombasa to Kampala, the commercial capital of Uganda, and has various branch lines in both Kenya and Uganda.

Area and
population.

3. The area with which the Committee are directly concerned is that covered by the three northern territories of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika. Geographically speaking this area falls into three main sections: the coastal strip, the broad belt of elevated but still tropical country, interspersed with patches of still higher temperate country, which makes up the greater part of Tanganyika and Kenya, and the Lake Victoria basin which includes considerable portions of Tanganyika and Kenya as well as most of Uganda. The political boundaries between the three territories do not correspond to any significant physiographical or ethnographical divisions, but are purely the result of recent historical accident. Kenya embraces an area of approximately 225,000 square miles, with a population, according to recent estimates, of 17,000 Europeans, 45,000 Indians, 12,000 Arabs, and 3,000,000 Africans. Uganda covers an area of 94,000 square miles with an estimated population of 2,000 Europeans, 14,000 Indians and 3,500,000 Africans. Tanganyika Territory consists of 374,000 square miles with a population of approximately 8,000 Europeans, 25,000 Indians, 7,000 Arabs and 4,800,000 Africans. There is a significant concentration of native population in the Lake Victoria basin. One-third of the total population of Tanganyika Territory resides in the three north-western provinces of Bukoba, Mwanza and Tabora. The area lying to the north-west of the Lake is occupied by the Kingdom of Buganda with an approximate population of 900,000, east of which is a dense population in the Eastern Province of the Uganda Protectorate, while the most populous area of Kenya Colony is in the adjoining Nyanza Province, which borders the Lake on the north-east.

Racial
divisions.

4. There is little homogeneity of race among the native populations of Eastern Africa. In both Kenya and Uganda there are, in addition to various Bantu tribes, a number of quite different racial strains grouped generically under the two terms, Nilotic and Hamitic. The Committee were given to understand that in Kenya alone there are five distinct linguistic groups, each having little or nothing in common with the other. In Tanganyika Territory the vast bulk of the population are Bantu, but there is an intrusion of Hamitic Masai near the Kenya frontier of the Territory.

Historical.

Early
impacts.

5. For many centuries the native populations of East Africa have been subjected to the impact of non-African races from without. The main impact before the coming of the Europeans was that of the Arab colonisation dating from before 1200 A.D. In the 16th and 17th centuries there was a period of Portuguese rule which in its turn again gave way to that of the Arabs, the last

survival of which remains in the Sultanate of Zanzibar. It was due to this Arab impact and the penetration of East and Central Africa by Arab caravans that Kiswahili, a coastal Bantu dialect enriched with many Arabic words, became the language of trade and inter-tribal communication throughout a large part of the area. There had also been an old-established trade between the African coast and the Persian Gulf and the Western Coast of India carried on by Indian merchants. It was a Hindu who piloted Vasco da Gama across the Indian Ocean. When the Sultan of Zanzibar established his influence on the coast in the early part of the nineteenth century Indian trading houses in Zanzibar opened branches at the various ports and thus began the Indian settlements on the coast.

6. Before the partition of Africa during the last quarter of the nineteenth century Great Britain exercised a predominant influence at Zanzibar, the British Missions had been established in Uganda and Nyasaland. After the Berlin Conference of 1885 Germany appeared on the scene and entered into negotiation with Zanzibar for the acquisition of German East Africa. By the Treaty of 1890 the boundary was fixed between the British and German spheres, and a British protectorate was declared over the Kingdom of Buganda in 1894. A Charter was granted to the Imperial British East Africa Company in 1889 and surrendered in 1895, when a British Commissioner was appointed. As a result of the Great War, what was formerly German East Africa was divided between Great Britain and Belgium as mandatories; the portion allocated to Great Britain is now known as Tanganyika Territory, the mandate for which was conferred upon His Majesty by the Supreme Council of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and was finally approved as to its terms by the Council of the League of Nations in 1922. Meanwhile in 1920 the former East Africa Protectorate was annexed as a Colony under the name of Kenya, with the exception of the ten mile wide coast strip which became the Kenya Protectorate. It will thus be seen that the European impact upon Eastern Africa is very recent and the advance made both in economic development and progress of the indigenous population can be claimed as remarkable considering the short period of effective occupation coupled with the fact that Eastern Africa was one of the theatres of conflict in the War. There can be no doubt that turbulence and unrest have been succeeded by comparative peace and security since the British occupation.

The partitioning of East Africa.

7. With the establishment of British administration, increasing numbers of Indians arrived from India for the purpose of carrying on trade and commerce and as employees of European enterprise, particularly the construction of the Uganda Railway. Since that

Indian immigration and trading.

date the Indians have played a large part in the general trade of the territories in which they have invested considerable capital. They also play an important part in extending trade as small shopkeepers scattered about the native areas.

European Settlement.

The
Highland
areas.

8. In contra-distinction to the corresponding British dependencies in West Africa there are in different parts of East Africa considerable areas of high land of which the largest and most compact block is in Kenya Colony. In Tanganyika Territory this highland area is slightly smaller and more diffused, the most notable areas being those round Mounts Kilimanjaro and Meru in the north-east, and in the districts of Iringa and Tukuyu in the south-west. The Uganda Protectorate consists for the most part of an undulating trough which descends from the northern shores of Lake Victoria, 3,700 feet above sea level, northward to the Sudan frontier. This trough is flanked by the Kenya highlands on the east and by the mountains which rise on the western side of the Western Rift Valley along the Congo border; there is a small highland area suitable for European residence in the extreme west.

Encourage-
ment of
European
colonisa-
tion.

9. European settlement in East Africa dates from the completion of the Uganda Railway in the early years of the present century. Considerable areas of the highlands of Kenya being found to be either unoccupied or sparsely occupied by indigenous inhabitants, the policy of European colonisation of the highlands was encouraged by the British Government before the War. After the War a considerable effort was made to increase European settlement in Kenya by a scheme for settling ex-soldiers on the land. There are to-day approximately 2,000 separate European owners of agricultural estates in Kenya.

Importance
of agricul-
ture.

10. The whole area is essentially dependent for all economic progress upon agricultural and pastoral industries. Comparatively few mineral deposits likely to attract enterprise on any considerable scale have been discovered, and the economic advance of all races must to a large extent depend upon the success of agricultural crops and stock raising. As regards the latter, the areas suitable for cattle are limited, either by low rainfall, as in large parts of Kenya Colony, or still more important, by the prevalence of the tsetse-fly, particularly in Tanganyika Territory and parts of Uganda.

The Existing Forms of Government.

The Govern-
or and the
Executive
and
Legislative
Council.

11. Each of the three Territories is administered by a Governor who is the representative of the Crown as well as the Head of the Executive. The Governors are assisted by Executive Councils which are, with the exception of that for Kenya, entirely official in composition, and by Legislative Councils. In each of the Legislative Councils there is an official majority. In addition to the

Official Members provision is made, in Kenya, for eighteen Unofficial Members; in Tanganyika there are now ten Unofficial Members, and in Uganda three Unofficial Members. In the two latter Territories the Unofficial Members are nominated by the Governor without restriction as to race. In Kenya, on the other hand, the principle of election was introduced after the War, and there are now eleven members elected by British subjects of European origin or descent on an adult suffrage basis, and five Indian Members and one Arab Member* elected on a similar basis by the Indian and Arab communities respectively, except that the franchise for the Arabs does not extend to women. In addition there is one Unofficial Member nominated by the Governor specifically to represent African interests—in practice this Member has hitherto been a Missionary.

12. The overwhelming mass of the African inhabitants of Eastern Africa are still organised in tribal groups of varying size and complexity. Of recent years special efforts have been made by the British Administrations to utilise the varying indigenous social structures for administrative purposes, and, in effect, to develop native self-government, not according to any one pattern but according to the traditional organisations of the various African peoples. In the Kingdom of Buganda, now part of the Uganda Protectorate, the British Government found in existence a long established native polity, and they entered into Treaty relations with the Baganda and two other tribes with somewhat similar institutions, the Treaties embodying definite recognition of the existing constitutional structure. The Uganda Agreement of 1900 is always referred to by the people of Buganda as their Charter of Rights. In the administration of their own affairs the Baganda are governed by His Highness the Kabaka, who acts through his native Ministers and the Lukiko, or native Parliament, consisting of the principal Chiefs. In Tanganyika Territory are to be found for the most part more typical Bantu organisations under chieftainships of varying size and power. The Arab impact had done much to break down the tribal organisation on the coast, which had been still further affected by the German system of appointing official "Akidas" or headmen who were frequently Swahilis, but even there it has been possible in some cases to reconstruct the original organisation traditional among the people. In the more populated north-western area it has been found possible to build upon the African idea of chieftainship larger units of native administration by the voluntary association of the chieftainship areas under paramount chiefs. In Kenya almost without exception the indigenous structure was more primitive and less developed; there was little corresponding even to the chieftainships of Tanganyika, still less to the kingdoms or principalities in the Uganda Protectorate. In some cases there was little

Native political and social institutions.

* There is in addition one nominated Arab member.

organisation higher than the native village with its elders. Where native councils had existed they had largely ceased to function, and the recreation of these, and the creation of new ones, is a direct undertaking of the British Administration, initiated in the first instance by Sir Robert Coryndon less than ten years ago.

Conditions
prior to
British
occupation.

13. As already indicated, prior to the partition of Africa each of these territories had been the scene of continual bloodshed. Uganda, under the despotism of Mtesa, and later in consequence of the religious and political rivalries of opposing factions; Kenya, owing to the raids of the Masai, until they were decimated by famine following on the outbreak of rinderpest in 1892; and Tanganyika from the raids of the slave-trading Arabs. The latter territory had also suffered from being the scene of operations throughout the whole period of the Great War.

Importance of the East African Problem.

Interest
focussed on
East Africa.

14. This brief outline picture of East Africa would not be complete without some reference to the importance of the problems which arise in connection with its future. The Committee have to envisage not only the future of some millions of Africans of very diverse racial origin, capacity and development, but to consider the consequences of the residence in their midst of the non-African elements of the population, both European and Asiatic. It is impossible to isolate East Africa and not take into account its connection with other parts of Africa, and even with Europe and India. Moreover Tanganyika Territory is the largest and most populous Mandated Territory, and British administration of that Territory is now subject to annual review by the League of Nations at Geneva through its Permanent Mandates Commission. The mixture of races in East Africa not only raises all those problems of race relations upon which so much thought is concentrated in the modern world, but is also coming to be regarded as a test case of Imperial statesmanship in harmonising the separate interests of British subjects or protected persons of different races in the framework of the Empire as a whole. The action of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom must inevitably be watched very closely by His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa and the Government of Southern Rhodesia as well as by the Government of India.

THE PROBLEM OF CLOSER UNION.

Historical Survey of Proposals.

Degree of
union con-
templated
in the
mandate.

15. A glance at the map provides sufficient grounds for a *prima facie* case for intimate co-operation, if not actual closer union, between the three Territories which all abut upon Lake Victoria in the interior and upon a comparatively short strip of coast. The

acceptance of the mandate by His Majesty for the eastern and larger part of what was formerly German East Africa, in 1922, brought this question of co-operation or closer union into the sphere of practical politics, so much so that in the actual terms of the mandate for Tanganyika Territory an article was inserted in the following terms:—

“ The Mandatory shall be authorised to constitute the territory into a customs, fiscal and administrative union or federation with the adjacent territories under his own sovereignty or control, provided always that the measures adopted to that end do not infringe the provisions of this mandate.”

The movement to give effect to the provisions of this article came in the first place from the commercial communities trading or established in East Africa who were attracted by the advantages of a systematic development of the railways and harbours based on the natural economic unity of the whole area and not on artificial political boundaries, as well as by those of internal free trade and uniform customs and commercial legislation. To those motives was added the growth among residents in East Africa generally of the conception of a united East Africa, not uninfluenced by the desire to put a definite end to the uncertainty regarding the future of the mandate which, however unwarranted, still appears to exist in some quarters. Certain witnesses stated that many of those who favoured closer union did so in the anticipation that it would be a step towards a unified government which would develop in due course into responsible government. In this country, too, there has been a widespread feeling that the kindred problems of this great block of territory, differing inherently from those both of South and of West Africa, might with advantage be treated on more uniform lines and on the basis of a common conception as to the respective functions and relations of the different communities established in it.

16. It is clear from a study of the actual terms of the mandate which is the basic document governing any constitution affecting the future of the Tanganyika Territory, that no amendment of the terms of the mandate, however small or however great, can be made without the concurrence of the Council of the League of Nations. The “ acceptance ” by His Majesty of the mandate for the Tanganyika Territory is recited and embodied in the actual mandate, and any transfer of authority by His Majesty to another Power is clearly an amendment of the existing mandate requiring the assent of the Powers represented on the Council of the League. But, over and above this fact it must be borne in mind that Germany renounced all her rights over her former colonies in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers under Article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles and that it was from the Principal Allied and Associated Powers that His Majesty

The terms
of the
mandate.

received the mandate for the Tanganyika Territory. The grant was absolute and contained no power of revocation. Hence any alteration of mandatory would require the assent not only of the existing mandatory and the proposed mandatory but also of the Council of the League of Nations; possibly the assent of the Powers from whom His Majesty received the mandate would also be required; and in any event the rights of the United States of America *vis-à-vis* His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom would have to be considered in view of the Convention signed in London on the 10th February, 1925, respecting the rights of the Governments of the two countries and their respective nationals in the former German colony of East Africa. The Committee recite this statement of the position in order to make it clear that the mandate cannot be taken away from His Majesty without his consent nor can His Majesty alter the mandate or surrender it to another mandatory by any unilateral act.

The duration of the mandate.

17. Discussions have also arisen regarding the duration of the mandate. In the mandate itself there is no time limit, nor any clause making provision for its termination, but it is implicit in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations that there can only be a termination of the mandate when the people of the mandated territory "not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world" are in a position to stand alone.

The Committee hope that this recital will put a stop to those doubts and misapprehensions, both in East Africa and elsewhere, regarding the effective permanence of His Majesty's title to and mandatory responsibility for Tanganyika Territory. The Committee would, however, like to emphasise in this connection the obligation upon His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to carry out the mandate, both in the letter and in the spirit—an obligation which it has always fully recognised.

The Ormsby-Gore Commission of 1924.

18. Since the War, East Africa has been visited by a number of Commissions of Enquiry initiated by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. The first of these was appointed in July, 1924. It was set up as a result of the East African Committee which sat in London under the chairmanship of Lord Southborough. Their terms of reference included consideration of :—

Cmd. 2387 (1025) p. 3.

"Measures to be taken to accelerate the general economic development of the British East African Dependencies and the means of securing closer co-ordination of policy on such important matters as transportation, cotton-growing, and the control of human, animal and plant diseases."

The survey of this Commission embraced Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Zanzibar, in addition to the three territories which

the Committee are primarily considering. Their chief recommendations affecting closer union were :—

(i) A loan guaranteed by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to an amount of £10,000,000 sterling for transport development in East Africa to be considered on the basis of the needs of East Africa as a whole.

(ii) A proposal for the holding of a series of conferences of the five Governors and the British Resident at Zanzibar, to discuss and prepare projects for closer co-operation in any field where co-operation or co-ordination seemed desirable.

(iii) The Commission favoured the dual policy of increasing the quantity and quality of production on native lands *pari passu* with the development of European cultivation and the "sincere acceptance" by officials, unofficials and natives of this dual policy as the first necessary step to that stability of economic conditions without which real progress could not be maintained.

Effect was given to these recommendations by the passing of the Palestine and East Africa Loans Act, 1926, and the holding of the first Governors Conference at Nairobi in 1926, at which the application of the dual policy was one of the subjects discussed.

19. In 1927 it so happened that several of the East African Governors were simultaneously in London and discussion between them and the then Secretary of State led to the issue of the White Paper entitled "Future Policy in Eastern Africa." On page 5 of this document the following policy was laid down :—

The 1927
White
Paper.
Cmd. 2904.

"The dual policy in regard to economic development should have its counterpart in the political evolution of the Territories. Every year we are providing more educational facilities for the natives, and although in some places it may be many years before the native can take a direct part in the central legislatures, his place in the body politic must be provided for, and steps taken to create the machinery whereby native self-government, at first purely local, and later over larger areas, can be developed. These considerations point in two principal directions. First, an investigation as to how closer union and co-operation between the Territories may be most effectively secured, and, secondly, whether it is possible to provide for increasing association of the immigrant communities in the responsibilities of government, and, at the same time, for the creation of more effective machinery for native representation. It may be found that it is necessary to proceed in these matters by successive stages. While the ultimate possibility of federation of all the six Territories concerned should be borne in mind, closer union may prove, on examination,

to be practicable, in the first instance, only between Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika, leaving it open to Zanzibar, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia to come into any new structure as and when the development of communications permits."

Decision to send out another Commission.

20. The document concludes with the announcement of the decision to send out a further Commission of Enquiry, and a Commission proceeded accordingly to East Africa under the chairmanship of the Right Honourable Sir Edward Hilton Young, M.P., in December, 1927.

Cmd. 3234.

The Report of this Commission was presented to Parliament early in 1929. The Commission recommended a series of steps towards an ultimate close form of union under a single Governor General. They suggested as a preliminary step to be "undertaken immediately" the appointment of a High Commissioner for Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika with executive powers, his special functions being:—

(a) To inaugurate enquiries and joint discussions on questions of native policy:

(b) To promote unified control of certain services of common interest and to settle on a fair basis any immediate cases of dispute or difference:

(c) To discuss locally and work out arrangements for extensive modifications proposed in the constitution of Kenya Colony.

The Hilton Young Commission and Sir Samuel Wilson's visit.

21. The Chairman of the Hilton Young Commission differed on certain points from the Majority Report, and it was manifest that the Report raised many far-reaching issues upon which consultation with the various interests in East Africa had not been possible during the tour of the Commissioners. Accordingly the then Secretary of State for the Colonies requested Sir Samuel Wilson, Permanent Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, to visit East Africa in April, 1929, with the following terms of reference:—

Cmd. 3378, p. 5.

"You are to proceed to East Africa in order to discuss the recommendations of the Hilton Young Commission for the closer union of Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda (and such possible modifications of these proposals for effecting the object in view as may appear desirable) with the governments concerned, and also with any bodies or individuals representing the various interests and communities affected, with a view to seeing how far it may be possible to find a basis of general agreement. You are to ascertain on what lines a scheme for closer union would be administratively workable and otherwise acceptable, and to report the outcome of your consultations".

Sir Samuel Wilson's report.

22. The recommendations of Sir Samuel Wilson, limited as they were—by these specific terms of reference, were submitted to the

Secretary of State in July, 1929, and presented to Parliament in the following September. The main features of Sir Samuel Wilson's recommendations were :—

(i) The appointment of a High Commissioner exercising complete control, legislative and administrative, over certain defined economic services, such as transport, customs, defence and research, assisted by a Central Council with legislative powers in so far as these transferred subjects were concerned, and in addition by a special advisory board on communications and customs: all other matters including native policy to be left to the local Governors and legislatures as at present.

(ii) A re-arrangement of the Kenya Legislative Council by the addition of nominated unofficial members thus creating an unofficial though not an elected majority, the High Commissioner being given special powers of veto and certification.

23. Finally, in June, 1930, Lord Passfield, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, issued a "Statement of the Conclusions of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom as regards Closer Union in East Africa."

The "Conclusions" of 1930. Cmd 3574.

24. These conclusions embody a proposal that "A High Commissioner should be appointed to supervise Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda". The High Commissioner would have two distinct functions :—

The proposals put forward.

(a) As chief adviser to the Secretary of State on native and other policy under Royal Instructions covering a series of 13 heads.

(b) As an executive officer, under Order-in-Council, to administer and legislate in respect of certain transferred services of all three Territories, namely :—

(i) Railway and other transport.

(ii) Ports and harbours.

(iii) Customs.

(iv) Defence.

(v) Posts, telegraphs and telephones.

(vi) Extradition.

(vii) Central research.

(viii) The Trade and Information Office of the Eastern African Dependencies in London.

(ix) Any other matter which shall be placed under the authority of the High Commissioner, by any amending Order-in-Council.

In regard to his functions under (b), he would be assisted by a Legislative Council consisting of three officials of his own staff and

Cmd. 3574,
p. 7.

twenty-one nominated members, namely, seven for each of the three territories. Further, it is stated that, the "goal of constitutional evolution in Kenya, as elsewhere, is admittedly responsible government by a Ministry representing an electorate in which every section of the population finds an effective and adequate voice"; but since this cannot be attained for a long time the most promising line of development for the African population may well lie not in any direct participation in the Legislative Council but in the increasing importance to be given to the native councils; meanwhile the constitution of the Legislative Council for Kenya should remain substantially unchanged; that "His Majesty's Government are of the opinion that the establishment of a common roll is the object to be aimed at and attained, with an equal franchise of a civilisation or education character open to all races", and that an enquiry should be undertaken by the proposed High Commissioner, when appointed, as to what is the most practicable action to be taken in this direction in the immediate future.

p. 8.

Proposals
of be sub-
mitted to a
Joint Com-
mittee.

Cmd. 3573.

25. The issue of this document was accompanied by a statement that in order that these proposals should receive the fullest consideration they should be submitted to a Joint Committee which the two Houses of Parliament would be invited to appoint in order to enable those who were specially interested in the matter to express their views. A memorandum on native policy was issued simultaneously which the Governors were directed to bring into force immediately.

Appointment of the Joint Committee.

The terms
of reference.

26. Accordingly on November 12th, 1930, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies moved in the House of Lords to appoint a Joint Committee of both Houses to consider the Reports on Closer Union in East Africa (by the Hilton Young Commission and Sir Samuel Wilson), together with the statement of the conclusions of His Majesty's Government and to report thereon. This motion was subsequently agreed to by the House of Commons.

The
"Memo-
randum on
Native
Policy" of
1930.

27. In concluding the debate on November 12th the Secretary of State said:—

"I would only like to say, incidentally, that the Memorandum on Native Policy (Cmd. 3573) will necessarily be before the Joint Committee. It is actually referred to in the Memorandum on Closer Union. It is actually founded on the Hilton Young Report, which was definitely referred to the Joint Committee".

Evidence
before the
Committee.

28. The Committee have enquired fully into the matters referred to them. Oral evidence has been heard from 51 witnesses including the late Governors of Kenya and Tanganyika and the Chief

Secretary of Uganda. They also received oral evidence from specially appointed delegates representing the European communities both settler and commercial in East Africa, from selected natives from each of the three territories and from members of the Indian communities in Kenya and Uganda and the Arab community in Kenya. In addition to these witnesses who were invited from East Africa to give evidence before the Committee, many individuals conversant with different aspects of the East African problem gave oral evidence.

29. In addition, the Committee have received a very large number of written memoranda. Many of the writers would no doubt have wished to supplement these memoranda by oral evidence, but in the interests of despatch the Committee found it necessary to curtail the number of witnesses whom they heard.

Memoranda received.

30. It is true that much of the evidence heard was not strictly relevant to the terms of reference. At the same time to have rigidly restricted it would have prevented the outspoken opinion of witnesses, and this the Committee were most anxious to obtain.

Relevance of evidence.

31. In fact, so wide an issue has been raised, more particularly by the Report of the Hilton Young Commission, and so far-reaching are the problems involved in any question of closer union which entails constitutional changes, that this report cannot avoid dealing with certain matters that would be excluded by any rigid or very strict interpretation of the terms of reference to the specific subject of closer union.

Wide interpretation of terms of reference.

32. The Committee feel that the setting up for the first time of a Joint Committee, composed of persons of all parties in the State and both Houses of Parliament, to examine in London the problems of East Africa has afforded a unique opportunity of endeavouring to reach some conclusions which will lead to continuity of policy in that part of the Empire, whatever may be the changes of government at home. There can be little doubt that the rapid succession of a number of Commissions of Enquiry and Government White Papers has resulted in a feeling of uncertainty among various sections of the community in East Africa. Wherever possible it has been the endeavour of the Committee to be as explicit as circumstances permit, with a view to removing this feeling of uncertainty, and it is their hope that, at any rate so far as closer union is concerned, any fresh approach to the problem in the future will be made with a clear perception of the results of the present examination.

Committee's desire to remove feeling of uncertainty.

33. The Committee, while they are impressed with the importance of giving the fullest weight to any concrete proposition which they have had before them, are none the less averse from attempting in any manner to define "ultimate objectives", which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty in countries where so

No definition of ultimate objectives.

much is as yet in an experimental stage. They have therefore confined themselves as far as possible to the consideration of existing facts and conditions as presented to them in the evidence, and with the probable trend of events that might naturally be expected.

Closer Union or Co-operation.

Arguments
against
political
and con-
stitutional
closer
union.

34. Early in their enquiry it became evident that neither the proposals of the Hilton Young Commission nor those in Sir Samuel Wilson's report nor yet the conclusions of His Majesty's Government have at present any substantial measure of support either from the Governments of the territories concerned or from the communities affected. In fact, there has undoubtedly been a certain reaction against the whole idea of closer union in East Africa. Witnesses, almost without exception, expressed the view that the time for giving effect to any far-reaching scheme in East Africa was inopportune on financial grounds. Like other parts of the world, East Africa is passing through a time of serious financial and economic depression and anything that would add to the overhead expenses of government is viewed with strong disfavour. The only estimate placed before the Committee regarding the nett increased cost of the new machinery of government contemplated by the conclusions of His Majesty's Government, amounted to some £34,000 a year, after certain possible savings and adjustments had been taken into consideration. Nor can it be safely assumed that this sum represents fully the additional cost which would fall upon the East African Dependencies in the future. In addition to the financial objection which it is to be hoped may be only of a temporary character, there are other objections felt at present which time and future development may nevertheless diminish. Among these temporary causes must be included a very definite reluctance, expressed by the native witnesses from Tanganyika and Uganda, to be more intimately associated with Kenya as they know of it by hearsay to-day. Further there was strong objection on the part of all the native witnesses to the establishment of any authority which would come between the representatives of the Crown in the several East African Dependencies and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. Another objection is that the present stage of economic development, particularly in regard to communications, is such that it still imposes serious obstacles to the effective operation of any new authority with executive functions throughout the whole of so large an area. Above all, although there is discernable, particularly among certain elements of the European community in each territory, some growing East African consciousness, the vast majority of all communities are still primarily and mainly interested in the affairs of their particular territories. This is especially

true of the native populations whose horizon is, for the most part, still confined to their separate tribal affairs. All these circumstances combined make it clear to the Committee that this is not the time for taking any far-reaching step in the direction of formal union. In fact, they consider that for a considerable time to come the progress and development of East Africa as a whole can best be assured by each of the three territories continuing to develop upon its own lines, lines which they consider to be still experimental. It is of no use ignoring the fact that there is considerable diversity between the central and significant features of each of these territories, and that the evolution which has taken place in the last thirty years and is still taking place to-day, is not on identical lines.

35. The Committee have carefully considered a proposal for the amalgamation or quasi-federation of Kenya and Uganda. Substantial arguments can be advanced in support of some such amalgamation. The administration of an interior country which has no sea port of its own and is dependent on a railway running through an intermediate territory under a separate government must necessarily afford continual grounds for misunderstanding and friction both as to railway rates and customs tariffs, which might be decreased were the territories combined under a single control.

Proposal for
the union
of Kenya
and
Uganda.

36. A further suggestion was for the creation of an unified control of the whole Lake Basin to be secured by some re-arrangement of existing boundaries. In regard to transport it has been pointed out that the lake represents a great and elastic loop line 600 miles in circumference, but that its effective development is hampered by the divided control of its shores. The control of sleeping sickness, plague, rinderpest, etc. ; the development of the fishing industry and the prosecution of fishery research ; the collection of agricultural and meteorological statistics are for the same reason rendered far more difficult. It was pointed out that on more than one occasion the boundaries between Uganda and Kenya have already been altered.

The control
of the basin
of Lake
Victoria.

37. The general objections already advanced against a closer union of the three territories apply to alternative proposals for partial union, or re-arrangement. Both European settlers and Chambers of Commerce have expressed themselves as adverse to the making of any constitutional changes at the present moment of economic difficulty. The European witnesses from Uganda, both official and unofficial, consider that any union with Kenya would be most unpopular, and the native evidence was very hostile to it. The special position of the Kingdom of Buganda under the Uganda

Objections
to the
union of
Kenya and
Uganda.

agreement, the advanced political development of many of the Uganda tribes, and the absence of a settled white community comparable to that of Kenya make the whole administrative problem of Uganda very different from that of Kenya.

Arguments
in favour of
economic co-
operation.

38. There is a very real field for co-operation and co-ordination which can be effected in the economic and scientific services without political or constitutional union involving the creation of a super-structure over the three Governors and Legislatures. The fact that the Committee do not see their way to recommend the creation of a High Commissioner with or without a Legislative Council common to the three territories makes it all the more incumbent upon them to explore means for ensuring such co-operation and co-ordination in these services as is clearly desirable. These economic services are in the main :—

- (i) Transport.
- (ii) Customs duties and customs administration.
- (iii) Scientific and technical services.
- (iv) Posts and telegraphs.

To these may be added law, particularly commercial law, and defence. In regard to which, effective unification is now practically complete as the result of steps taken during the last year. As to posts and telegraphs, those of Kenya and Uganda are already amalgamated, and there appears to be no immediate necessity for extending this amalgamation to include the system which serves the territory of Tanganyika. The Committee agree, however, that the closest practicable co-ordination is desirable. There remain the three important categories of transport, customs and scientific services.

Transport.

Unity of
transport
policy.

39. It is clear that in modern colonial administration questions of railways, main roads, ports and harbours and lake transport are essentially one, and there must be effective co-ordination and some degree of central supervision over all these different forms of transport services. Equally, it is clear that economic considerations should govern policy in regard to them without rigid regard to historical frontiers or political interests. These matters play, of course, a prominent part in the economic development of any territory or group of territories and therefore it is not always easy to separate transportation policy from political policy, and so intimately do questions of new construction, railway rates and the like, enter into the economic interests of various communities that the political element cannot be eliminated altogether, even though it be rightly subjected to the economic.

40. Transport policy in East Africa must be considered under two different heads or aspects. The first is new construction and development, and the second administration or management. As regards the former, it is desirable that, whether ports and harbours or railways and main road construction are being dealt with, new developments should be considered in their bearing upon East Africa as a whole, rather than as questions of purely local concern. These new constructions involve for the most part the raising of public loans with or without a guarantee by His Majesty's Government, and accordingly any project must necessarily be referred to the Secretary of State, who should be provided with the necessary advice to enable him to judge of the comparative urgency and desirability of the work, in regard both to cost and to labour supply, and of its effect on existing communications. It is clearly advisable that anything in the nature of uneconomic competition should be guarded against, and that any new expenditure should be considered in the light of the common interests of all the territories. In this matter it is to be hoped that the machinery of the Governors' Conference and the general control of the Secretary of State, together with the appointment of an Adviser on Transport as recommended in paragraph 44 may sufficiently overcome the natural tendency of individual governments to look at these questions from the point of view of their purely local interests.

New construction and development.

41. As regards administration, transport in Kenya and Uganda is at present unified under the provisions of the Kenya and Uganda (Transport) Orders-in-Council of 1925 and 1927. Summarised briefly, these provide for a High Commissioner for Transport, who is the Officer Administering the Government of Kenya, assisted, as regards railways, by a Railway Advisory Council consisting of an equal number of official and nominated unofficial representatives of each of the two territories, and as regards maritime ports, by a Harbour Advisory Board, containing members appointed both by the Governments and by Chambers of Commerce. The Railway Advisory Council sits either in Kenya or Uganda under the chairmanship of the senior official member of the territory in which the session takes place. There is a single General Manager for the whole transportation system. The annual estimates and all questions of general policy in connection with the administration, control, working or management of the services, including railway rates are decided by the High Commissioner with the assistance of the two councils. Any legislation required is effected through the legislatures of Kenya and Uganda, and the annual estimates are submitted to the Legislative Councils of the two territories, which may by resolution approve or disapprove them or propose modifications. The ultimate authority for sanction of the estimates is the Secretary of State.

Administration.

The
Tanganyika
railways.

42. As regards Tanganyika Territory the railways and a steamer on Lake Tanganyika are the property of the Mandated Territory. They are administered under the Governor by a General Manager whose headquarters are at Dar-es-Salaam. There is no Railway Advisory Council for Tanganyika; but there are separate Port and Harbour Advisory Committees with official and unofficial members for both Dar-es-Salaam and Tanga.

Questions affecting the mutual interests of the transportation systems in Kenya and Uganda on the one hand and in Tanganyika on the other have on occasion been discussed by the two General Managers direct, and have been brought up at meetings of the Governors' Conference. But, the Committee are not satisfied that transport problems have always been regarded by either of the two groups from the point of view of the economic needs of East Africa as a whole.

The office
of High
Commissioner
of
Transport.

43. It has been pointed out to the Committee that the position of the Governor of Kenya as High Commissioner for Transport in Uganda as well as in Kenya is at least theoretically anomalous, and in practice at times difficult. In the absence of an impartial external authority the Committee would suggest that this High Commissionership for Transport in Kenya and Uganda might be held alternately by the Governors of Kenya and Uganda for such fixed periods as convenience may dictate.

The
proposed
Adviser on
Transport.

44. While executive responsibility should remain with the High Commissioner for Transport in Kenya and Uganda and, in Tanganyika, with the Governor of Tanganyika Territory, they recommend the creation of a new post of Adviser on Transport for all three Territories. This officer—who should have high technical qualifications and wide experience—should be adviser to the Governors' Conference and attend all meetings when any matters affecting transport are under discussion. Further he should investigate any transport matter on which he was instructed by the Governors' Conference to report. He should have full authority to submit advice in connection with railways, harbours, lake steamers, main roads, air routes and air ports throughout the three territories, not merely as regards all new projects and developments but also as regards existing administration. He should be summoned to attend and be entitled to take part in, but without a vote, the deliberations of the Kenya-Uganda Railway Advisory Council and of all Port and Harbour Advisory Committees or other bodies dealing with questions of Transport that come within his sphere. The Committee, in that connection, are of opinion that a Railway Advisory Council should be established in Tanganyika Territory. In the event of any questions as to competition or lack of co-ordination arising in any part of the whole field of transport, it would be the

duty of the Adviser on Transport to take the matter up, with a view to its solution, either by discussing it with the competent authorities or by means of joint meetings of the councils concerned, or ultimately by the Governors' Conference.

45. The Committee also suggest for consideration the creation of a Central Road Board for each of the three territories, with provision for joint meetings as may be required.

A Central Road Board.

46. In the course of the evidence submitted to the Committee on the existing administration and co-ordination of transport services a good many witnesses raised questions as to railway rates. The Committee are not satisfied that the present rates are in all cases fair as between different commodities, different territories, or different communities. Further, it would appear that the net losses in operating some of the existing branch lines call for a searching investigation as affecting these questions; and still more the question of any further construction. It has not been possible for the Committee to investigate these matters thoroughly, but they are of opinion that a *prima facie* case has been made out for a fresh impartial enquiry on the spot into these questions of railway rates and railway finance throughout East Africa, and for a report thereon to be prepared for the Governors' Conference. Such an enquiry, which might be one of the first tasks of the Adviser on Transport, must be a comprehensive nature, and should take into account the interests of the different classes of users of the transport systems throughout the area, with a view to maintaining a fairly-adjusted balance between different classes of producers, traders and consumers in all three territories.

Enquiry into railway rates.

Customs.

47. There is at present a customs union throughout Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika. This provides for internal free trade between the three territories and purports to impose a uniform customs tariff at the ports of entry. There are, however, two separate customs departments, one for Kenya and Uganda and one for Tanganyika. In the past, commercial communities in East Africa have complained of variation in administration and in the interpretation of customs law between the two departments, and Uganda has complained of protective duties. It is obviously desirable that such differences should be avoided and that effective steps should be taken by the Governors' Conference to ensure that there is no longer any ground for such complaints.

Unification of the customs departments proposed.

48. But the question of customs policy in East Africa, as elsewhere, gives rise to problems which have a political as well as an economic bearing. Controversy is liable to arise where a common tariff is designed to have a protective as well as a revenue objective. The European settlers in Kenya, in endeavouring to establish new

Customs policy a matter for the Governors' Conference.

crops and industries in their colony, are anxious to retain the East African home market for certain products, both on account of that market in itself, and also as a basis for developing an export of those particular products beyond the requirements of the home market. It so happens that Tanganyika and Uganda are less interested in the production of these articles, though it is possible that these territories may also wish in course of time to foster the East African consumption of some of their products. In the absence of a common legislative authority the difficulties which may arise can only be settled by mutual give and take after discussion at the Governors' Conference.

Scientific Services.

The scientific aspect.

49. If there is one field of great economic importance to the future of East Africa as a whole, it is the effective co-ordination of scientific and technical research. In these three territories there is a series of scientific problems, particularly in regard to human, animal and plant diseases, which are in fact common, and, in some cases, peculiar to the three territories; and overlapping or duplication of effort is clearly wasteful. The Committee have heard evidence from the Economic Advisory Council on this most important matter, and a scheme for better co-ordination has been laid before them.

Local and routine research.

50. Research work may be divided roughly into two categories, the one dealing with work of a local nature and conducted exclusively on behalf of an individual territory; the other with "long-range" problems involving highly specialised intensive and costly programmes of research of common interest to the East African territories as a whole. In regard to the first category, adequate laboratory facilities for each of the main scientific departments should be available in each territory; but much unnecessary overlapping of work can be prevented if to some degree the principle of differentiation of function is applied. To put this work under some formal co-ordinating authority, would merely be to create an artificial boundary in a field where no boundaries should exist. It has been suggested that the ends desired could best be obtained by the formation of joint advisory committees for each group of subjects, composed of the scientific heads of the appropriate departments in each territory. While fully maintaining the right of scientific workers to communicate on scientific matters directly and freely with their colleagues in other parts of the world, the channel of communication in matters not of a strictly scientific nature, e.g., an application for grants from outside bodies, should

be from the joint advisory committees through the secretariat of the Governors' Conference or other co-ordinating authority.

51. The Committee concur in this suggestion and they feel satisfied that the regular meeting of these joint committees should secure the necessary co-ordination of research in all the East African territories and that by free discussions between the scientific heads of the different territories many of the difficulties of the past would be obviated. The Committee agree that it would be generally beneficial if, from time to time, the appropriate scientific adviser to the Colonial Office were deputed to preside over these meetings, and that adequate steps should be taken to ensure that the public be kept well informed of the results of the deliberations and that some unofficals be invited, as occasion offers, to attend the discussions.

Scheme for co-ordination.

52. Research work such as would fall into the second category cannot be successfully prosecuted by each territory individually. In agriculture for instance, fundamental research of a "long-range" character can best be carried out at a central research institute and such research work has already been commenced at the East African Agricultural Research Station at Amani. In the case of animal health it is felt that facilities for work of this character should be available at one of the existing laboratories, and Kabete already offers distinct advantages towards this objective. Although the Committee recognise that the establishment of specially equipped central research institutions may, for certain subjects, be an ideal at which to aim, they do not consider that, at the present time, it would be desirable to create any more permanent stations of this type. They are impressed, however, with the suggestion that some common fund should be established and built up by contributions both from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and from the different territories concerned. In this way adequate financial resources might be made available to meet demands, when they arise, for the support of central research institutions when created and for an intensive attack on particular problems.

"Long-range" research.

Recommendations as to the Governors' Conference.

53. The Committee recommend that the machinery of the Governors' Conference should be increasingly utilised for the purpose of ensuring continuous and effective co-operation and co-ordination, not only of the particular economic services already referred to but in regard to all matters of common interest to East Africa. They are of opinion that the Governors of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika should meet regularly in conference,

The meetings of the Conference.

not less often than twice a year, and that the Conference should be regarded as in permanent session, so that an intermediate meeting could be held at any time if so required by one of the Governors. They are also of opinion that periodical extraordinary conferences should be held to which the Governors of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland and the British Resident at Zanzibar should be invited. The Conference should take place in the capitals of the three dependencies in turn, unless special circumstances arise which would make this difficult in any particular instance; and that whoever is His Majesty's Representative in the territory where the Conference is being held should preside over it.

The Conference secretariat.

54. The Conference should have its own secretariat, which would be that not only for the Governors' Conference, but also for all official inter-territorial conferences of a technical, scientific or advisory character, and it would be the duty of the secretariat to maintain continuity between sessions. The expenses should be divided in proportions to be determined between the three territories mainly concerned.

Unofficial meetings prior to Governor's Conference.

55. It may be found useful for chambers of commerce and other unofficial organisations to hold meetings from time to time to discuss questions where co-operation or co-ordination appears to be necessary. Such a practice would give unofficial bodies an opportunity of bringing matters to the attention of the Governors' Conference and enable the latter to appreciate unofficial opinion before considering questions which affect various interests. Such meetings should be entirely unofficial. The Committee recommend that the proposals which the suggested meetings see fit to submit to the Governors' Conference should be given the widest publicity before the latter takes place, so that all those affected by them may have ample opportunity of studying and expressing their views upon them.

The problem of liaison.

56. It was suggested to the Committee that, in the event of the proposals for a High Commissioner in East Africa being abandoned, it would be desirable to strengthen the effective liaison between East Africa and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. One of these suggestions was a proposal that an officer appointed by the Secretary of State should be sent out from England to preside over the Governors' Conference. The Committee see constitutional difficulties in a proposal which would, in effect, place an officer over the King's Representatives in East Africa, as this would tend to diminish the authority and prestige of Governors, and they think there is considerable weight in this objection. Further, the Committee envisage more frequent and regular sessions of the Conference and in view of the fact that it still takes approximately one month to travel from London to any

of the East African capitals, it would be extremely difficult to ensure the attendance of such an officer if he were at the same time to maintain close contact with the Colonial Office, although a rapid improvement of the air service would naturally facilitate such visits. The Committee are, however, of opinion that it would be advantageous if sessions of the Governors' Conference could, whenever desirable, be attended by an officer sent out from this country. This officer need not always be the same individual. The Committee consider that his selection should be entirely in the hands of the Colonial Office. They attach considerable importance to regular visits of the kind suggested and they trust that no financial or administrative difficulties will be allowed to stand in the way of this proposal. At the same time the Committee do not wish in any way to detract from the value of recent developments whereby junior officers in the Colonial Office have been interchanged for tours of duty with officers of the Colonial Service.

57. Before concluding this section of the report dealing specifically with the issues raised under the heading Closer Union, it must be recalled that both in the Hilton Young Report and in the Conclusions of His Majesty's Government the appointment of a High Commissioner for East Africa was advocated not merely to control the common services but also to play a considerable role in the development of native policy. While not recommending the proposal for the High Commissioner it must not be thought that the Committee have lost sight of the desirability of securing, even amid the admitted complexity and diversity of native institutions and administration in the East African Dependencies, close contact and regular examination as between the various experiments in native development in different parts of East and Central Africa. While the underlying principles of native policy and inter-racial relations are of supreme importance to the future progress and welfare of East Africa, it may be found that application must vary according to historical circumstances and according to the degree of progress achieved by the various sections of the native communities. Hence the Committee attach the utmost importance to the machinery of the Governors' Conference being used, and also to the proposals for a closer liaison with the Colonial Office, in maintaining a continuous review of developments of this character.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING WHITE SETTLEMENT.

58. The presence of a settled white community in East Africa raises problems fundamental to the Committee's whole inquiry. The question how far, and subject to what conditions, we, as a nation, are justified in encouraging the settlement of our own people in a country already inhabited by a native population is one which must be fairly faced. To deny that justification in general terms would

lead to the conclusion that the North American and Australian continents should have been strictly reserved for the aboriginal populations. To affirm it without qualification would involve the denial of any rights or fair opportunities for development of whole categories of fellow human beings on the ground of their present weakness or relative inefficiency, and would mean the repudiation of the whole doctrine of trusteeship upon which the Empire is professedly based. The principle of trusteeship implies not only the avoidance of direct injustice to the natives as individuals but also the more positive obligation to afford to the natives, as a race, both time and opportunity to develop their latent capacities and play such part as they may eventually prove capable of playing in the ultimate destiny of the country. Every opportunity for advancement should moreover be afforded to such natives as may reach a higher level than is common to their race.

Benefit to natives.

59. In the case of East Africa there can be no doubt, as has already been mentioned in this report, that the introduction of European rule, as distinct from European settlement, has been of great benefit to the native people. The influx of European settlement at the beginning of the century was encouraged by Government in order to promote the development of areas which, partly owing to their relatively colder climate and partly owing to Masai devastation, were largely unoccupied or in very sparse or irregular occupation. The subsequent expansion of European settlement may have led to some transactions of doubtful fairness, and has necessitated effective measures to protect against all future alienation sufficient land to provide for present and prospective native requirements. At the same time it would be difficult to find any other instance of a white population settling in a native country with so little disturbance of the original population. Nor, after making all allowance for a tendency on the part of the settler community to influence the construction of railways or the framing of tariffs and of taxation generally in a direction primarily favourable to the development of areas and industries in which they have been interested, can it be denied that the natives as a whole have benefited from the presence of the settler community.

Future prospects.

60. European settlement in the tropics of East Africa is, of course, an experiment little more than a quarter of a century old, and its success cannot yet be considered as definitely established. In the course of the evidence an interesting analysis of the economic basis on which white settlement has hitherto rested was submitted to the Committee, the general conclusion of which was that white settlement has not been really self-supporting but only made possible by a very considerable measure of direct and indirect financial assistance, and that the tendency of the future would be to eliminate the farmer settler in favour of the plantation manager. This view and its implications were opposed by a considerable body

of evidence. When allowance is made for the severe set-back which the young settler community suffered owing to the war, and for the difficult economic conditions of the post-war period, the progress made so far certainly compares not unfavourably with that of other countries at the same stage in their history. On the other hand, even when the initial stage of taking root has been overcome, the possibilities of any large expansion would seem to be precluded by the limited area of the temperate highlands as well as by the narrowly restricted sphere of occupations which the white man is prepared to take up. In the meantime the Committee consider that the figures and arguments submitted to them merit serious consideration before any policy of further intensive white settlement is adopted.

61. Nor is it possible to leave out of account the effect of native development both in limiting the supply of wage labour upon which white development depends and in creating a formidable competitor to that development. It is considerations of this kind which emphasize the importance of securing that the development of both races shall be complementary to each other, and the responsibility of His Majesty's Government both in holding the scales even and in endeavouring to foster a similar sense of responsibility in the settler community by enlisting their interest and co-operation in the problems of native administration. Subject to these considerations and to the general principles laid down in their report, the Committee wish to affirm their belief in the value of white settlement as an important element in the progress of East Africa, and their hopes for its future success.

Relations between natives and non-natives.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF NATIVE POLICY.

62. The phrase "native policy" has been used rather loosely to express on the one hand objectives in native development and administration, and, on the other, inter-racial relations. It may not be easy to separate these two conceptions into clearly watertight compartments, but the essential distinction between the two aspects of the same problem must always be borne in mind.

The meaning of "native policy".

63. Apart from the discussion of measures which might be adopted immediately or in the near future to secure greater co-ordination, it is of primary importance that the general principles governing these two aspects of native policy should be clearly set out. For, in spite of the wide diversity of methods of administration existing and necessary during the present experimental stage, there are fundamental principles which are applicable to the three territories as a whole and indeed have a bearing upon native policy

The essential unity of African problems.'

over a far wider area. The Report of the Hilton Young Commission alludes to this essential unity of African problems :—

Cmd. 3234,
p. 9.

“ It is not safe to allow policy in Kenya to be framed regardless of what is being done in Tanganyika and Uganda. It should be framed for Eastern Africa as a whole. But more than this, policy for Eastern Africa should be framed with regard to experience and policy in all other territories of Africa.”

p. 33.

“ Speaking generally, the problems which the native peoples present to the administration are throughout the three territories broadly the same.”

Previous
statements
of policy.
Cmd. 1922,
Cmd. 2904,
Cmd. 3573.

64. The main lines of policy have been officially laid down in Government statements from time to time. The most important of them are the Duke of Devonshire's White Paper of 1923, Mr. Amery's White Paper of 1927 and Lord Passfield's "Memorandum on Native Policy in East Africa" of 1930. These declarations form the broad basis upon which the co-ordination of native policy should proceed in so far as co-ordination is desirable. The Committee consider that this broad basis should be made generally known to all the various communities in the territories concerned, and that, wherever it may be necessary, steps should be taken to bring the administration into harmony with these principles. This is not to say that there are not matters which require elaboration and upon which further comments cannot usefully be made, particularly with regard to political development. Indeed, the memorandum of 1930 evidently contemplates that this Committee will consider the subject of native political development, for in regard to this matter it lays down that :—

Cmd. 3573,
p. 6.

“ His Majesty's Government do not think it desirable to anticipate the conclusions which they may reach after they have received the Committee's Report.”

Cmd. 2387.
Cmd. 3234.

The Committee desire specifically to draw attention to the very full discussions of these problems, which are to be found in the Reports of the Ormsby Gore Commission, 1925 (Ch. III), and the Hilton Young Commission, 1929 (Ch. III). The subjects there dealt with are the principle of trusteeship, the conflicts between native and non-native interests, the dual policy, political development and, coming to more specific points, the relations of natives and non-natives in respect of land, taxation, government services, labour, education, native administration and political institutions.

The Principle of Trusteeship.

Statement
of the
trust.

65. His Majesty's Government have laid it down that the principle underlying the mandates is no less unassailable in Kenya and

Uganda than in Tanganyika. This principle is expressed in the terms of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations :—

“ To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.”

To this may be added the statement of the Hilton Young Commission that :—

“ The standards of administration so imposed are no higher than those which His Majesty’s Government have imposed on themselves. In regard to the other territories in Eastern and Central Africa, the declarations of His Majesty’s Government, to which reference will be made in the following chapter, have made it clear that the fundamental principles of policy laid down for both the British dependencies and the mandated area are the same.”

Cmd. 3234,
p. 34.

66. Some misunderstanding has arisen through the interpretation of the following two declarations of His Majesty’s Government. The first occurs in the 1923 White Paper and the second in that of 1927.

Some
misunder-
standings.

(i) “ But in the administration of Kenya His Majesty’s Government regard themselves as exercising a trust on behalf of the African population, and they are unable to delegate or share this trust, the object of which may be defined as the protection and advancement of the native races.”

Cmd. 1922,
p. 9.

(ii) “ At the same time they wish to place on record their view that, while these responsibilities of trusteeship must for some considerable time rest mainly on the agents of the Imperial Government, they desire to associate more closely in this high and honourable task those who, as colonists or residents, have identified their interests with the prosperity of the country.”

Cmd. 2904,
p. 7.

The Committee consider, however, that the declaration of 1927 does not alter the principle laid down in that of 1923, but rather expands it. They are of the opinion that there never has been any intention to go back on the declaration of 1927, and that successive Governments have recognised the wisdom of enlisting the advice and help of the non-native communities in the carrying out of their trust without, however, divesting themselves in any way of their full responsibility. They hold that a trustee, in the execution of his trust, may wisely call in those who are capable

of assisting him in its execution. While the responsibility of a trust must rest in the trustee, yet in its execution he would be well advised to invite assistance from those qualified by their position and knowledge to give it.

The Committee's view.

67. The Committee are of opinion that the trusteeship of natives must remain the function of His Majesty's Government, but that the assistance of the non-native communities in carrying out this obligation should be encouraged to an increasing extent. In setting up machinery for the detailed administration of the trust, the Government should avail itself to the full of the local knowledge and experience of the unofficial elements. For a government to create an official class cut off from the commercial or settler class, and paying no attention to their views would, in the view of the Committee, be to neglect a most valuable adjunct of government. Further association in the responsibility of trusteeship is, however, not necessarily synonymous with increased political control in native affairs. Even if in the strict sense therefore, the trusteeship for native races should be the sole responsibility of His Majesty's Government, in a wider sense the obligation to advance the interests of those races lies on every person of a race more advanced in civilisation. Every settler, every merchant, the Indian or Arab as well as the white trader, every missionary, every visitor even, shares the obligation to help the native races to advance in civilisation.

Objections to the memorandum of 1930.

Cmd. 3573.

68. With the basic idea of Trusteeship established the Committee pass to the consideration of inter-racial relationships. Briefly, the problem is to determine the place of the African population in a "mixed state". The various Government pronouncements since 1923 on this matter have given rise to some misunderstanding. Objections have been raised in particular to the memorandum of 1930. These objections, when analysed, proved to be general in character, no particular propositions being singled out for criticism. The suggestion was that by affirming a positive native policy, it was implied that this alone of the problems of government was deserving of attention. The use of the word "paramount" and the fact that it was capable of two different interpretations formed the main ground for uneasiness. This view of the White Paper was supported by the evidence of the European community, and in the memorandum of the Associated Producers in East Africa, who emphasised the apparent lack of impartiality, and urged that the average man's conception of good government is that it should devote itself to the good of the community as a whole.

Fear of a change of policy.

69. Much of the misunderstanding clearly arose not so much from the actual proposals of Government as from a suspicion shown by many of the witnesses from Kenya that in the application of

established principles some new interpretation had been given in the "Conclusions" of 1930 to the statements of policy which had been enunciated by His Majesty's Government in 1923. A fear was expressed that the "Conclusions" of 1930 were preliminary to a change in policy, whereby the equality of opportunity for all races which they held to be the guiding principle of the dual policy was to be abandoned and that in future less consideration was to be given to the economic advancement of the European population, and that their fate was to be largely subordinated to the special interests of the African. The terms used in the first instance in the Government declaration of 1923 on "Indians in Kenya", namely, that

"Primarily Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African natives must be paramount, and that if and when those interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail",

seemed to be interpreted as excluding the European population in the Kenya highlands from their fair share of Government assistance and support.

70. The declaration of 1923 appears at the time to have been accepted without any minute examination. In 1927, however, the Hilton Young Commission found that it was giving rise to considerable misgiving in the minds of the British community, and since the publication of the conclusions in 1930 it has been examined with anxious care by those who represent the settlers' interests. The Committee desire to point out that the declaration of 1923 must be discussed as a whole, and not treated as though the sentence quoted above were the only operative part. By itself this sentence would, in the Committee's opinion, justify the fear of the white settlers that a weighting of the scales of justice against them was possible. It must, however, be noted that the declaration in its subsequent paragraphs profoundly qualified this broad statement of native rights in the following sentence:—

"Obviously, the interests of the other communities, European, Indian, or Arab, must severally be safeguarded. Whatever the circumstances in which members of these communities have entered Kenya, there will be no drastic action or reversal of measures already introduced such as may have been contemplated in some quarters, the result of which might be to destroy or impair the existing interests of those who have already settled in Kenya".

The Committee would further point out that the White Paper of 1930, in quoting the declaration of 1923, gives equal prominence to this qualification, and they consider that the native policy of

Cmd. 3574.

Cmd. 1922,
p. 9.

The various
statements
must be
read as a
whole.

His Majesty's Government should be founded not on the first statement alone but on the whole.

Agreement
on general
definition
of policy.
Cmd. 1922,
p. 9.

71. There will be few to dispute the general definition of policy contained in a later sentence of the declaration which lays down that :—

“it is the mission of Great Britain to work continuously for the training and education of the Africans towards a higher intellectual moral and economic level than that which they had reached when the Crown assumed the responsibility for the administration of this territory”.

The evidence the Committee have heard from the representatives of the settlers makes it clear that in principle they are prepared to admit that a very special obligation lies on the Government of Kenya to safeguard and promote the interests of the natives. The administration should in its daily acts, and more especially in the framing of its policy, give the most careful consideration to the question of the possible effect such policy will have on native interests. In its land policy, for example, it should consider not merely the present requirements of the native races, but should keep prominently before it the future needs of a population that is likely to grow with the improved conditions that settled government brings in its train. It is certain that the native population will be, for many years to come, a people engaged in agriculture and pastoral pursuits, and for the Government of Kenya not to frame its policy so as to provide for an increase of native population would be to neglect a duty which, from the very nature of the case, is imposed on it. It is a matter of words whether this is described as a paramount duty, as a paramount right of the native population, or as an obligation which should under no circumstances be neglected.

Answer to
objections.

72. It was pointed out, in reply to the objections referred to, that the memorandum of 1930, as its title shows, deals with native policy in particular; and that it was in no way inconsistent with a strict application of the “dual policy,” namely, the complementary development of native and non-native communities. The memorandum itself deals with this matter in the following terms :—

Cmd. 3573,
p. 5.

“This aspect of the question is discussed at length in the Report of the Commission on Closer Union, where the view is expressed that ‘paramountcy’ of native interests is to be interpreted in the sense that the creation and preservation of a field for the full development of native life is a first charge on any territory, and that the Government having created this field in the establishment of an organised governmental administration of the modern type has the duty to devote its energies to assisting the natives to make the best possible use of the opportunities open to them. This obligation, which is plainly involved in the trusteeship, must be regarded as in no way

incompatible with the common duty of any Government to promote the development of the resources of its territory and the prosperity of its inhabitants, including the immigrant communities within it. His Majesty's Government adopt this interpretation as a general statement of a matter in which a more precise definition is difficult of achievement".

73. In the Committee's view, this principle does not imply that the responsibility of the Government towards European settlers should be disregarded. On the contrary, the fullest security must be given to their legitimate interests. They should have a right to effective representation, and to protection against legislative and administrative policy which would fundamentally change the economic conditions on the basis of which they settled in the country. The principle of paramountcy was intended in 1930 as in 1923 to meet those particular cases which might arise, especially in connection with land and labour questions, in which there might be a definite conflict between the interests of a non-native community and those of the native population. Such cases have been fully and clearly set forth in the Report of the Hilton Young Commission :—

The Committee's view.

"It is in practice almost inevitable that the advent of European civilisation should create, if not a conflict, at least a duality of interests between the Europeans and the natives". (Page 19.)

Cmd. 3234, p. 19.

" . . . it is useless to ignore the fact that this contact (with white civilization) raises practical problems of the greatest difficulty, and that the two communities, in pursuit of what they regard as their particular or immediate interests, may frequently find themselves at variance." (Pages 36 and 37.)

pp. 36 and 37.

The Committee consider that the matter may be summed up briefly by saying that the doctrine of paramountcy means no more than that the interests of the overwhelming majority of the indigenous population should not be subordinated to those of a minority belonging to another race, however important in itself.

74. The Committee would observe in this connection that while any discrimination, by means of subsidies or other privileges, customs duties, railway rates, or otherwise, designed to favour unduly any one community is of necessity open to serious criticism, at the same time it is most important to give adequate security to those Europeans and other non-natives who have settled in the country, and who have made a permanent home there, often under very difficult and trying conditions.

Adequate security for all communities.

75. The primary obligation to the native races follows naturally from the acceptance of the principle of trusteeship, and to this certain corollaries must be added. The control of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom must remain unimpaired. The

The authority of the Crown.

conditions in East Africa, where these widely differing communities exist side by side demand the maintenance of an effective power of intervention by the Crown in all matters of both legislation and administration. This power will be exercised by His Majesty's Government acting through the Secretary of State. It is clear that under existing conditions, the principles outlined above can only be effectively operative if the authority of His Majesty's Government remains unimpaired. The diversity of the interests to be co-ordinated and harmonized require a Government impartial and capable of long views. The majority report of the Hilton Young Commission recorded their emphatic opinion that all matters in which racial interests were or appeared to be divergent should be decided by an arbitral authority. That authority exists in the Secretary of State and the Governor acting under his instructions.

The Place of the African in the Body Politic.

The problem of a "mixed state".

76. Having stated the broad principles which taken as a whole, govern the inter-racial relationships of the African and non-African communities, the Committee now turn to the problem of native political development. The solution of this problem necessitates the careful consideration of both aspects of native policy, for any proposed line of political development must be examined not only from the point of view of native administration but also from that of its immediate or ultimate repercussions on the political development of the non-native communities. The papers referred to this Committee and all the evidence taken before them have brought home the necessity, which cannot be evaded or shirked if any good is expected to result from this enquiry, for a clear and unequivocal statement of opinion as to the place which the African races are hereafter to occupy in the body politic of East Africa. The decision reached on this fundamental issue will beyond question affect all parts of tropical Africa, and in the opinion of the Hilton Young Commission the whole of the British Empire. Successive Governments have made the following pronouncements in State Papers laid before Parliament and referred to this Committee directly or by implication as the considered decisions of His Majesty's Government. The White Paper of 1923 stated that—

Cmd. 1922,
p. 18.

“ the primary duty of the Colonial Government is the advancement of the African ”.

Cmd. 2904,
p. 5.

The words used in the White Paper of 1927 were more precise. His Majesty's Government declared that the place (of the native)

“ in the body politic must be provided for and steps taken to create the machinery whereby native self-government at first purely local and later over larger areas can be developed ”

A further declaration of policy included—

“ the Imperial duty of safeguarding the interests and progress of the native population as trustees for their welfare until such time as they can take part more fully in their own Government and in the common affairs of all races inhabiting the territories ”. Cmd. 2904,
p. 7.

The “ Statement of Conclusions ” of 1930 says :—

“ For the native African population, indeed in so far as the tribal organisation is still the basis of its social organisation, the most promising line of development for the near future may well lie, not in any direct participation in the Legislative Council, but in the increasing importance to be given to the Native Councils—an importance to be manifested alike in a continuous widening of their functions, and in a constant communication to these Councils, through the District Commissioners or otherwise, of the various proceedings and proposals of the Executive Government, as well as the enactments of Bills of the Colony’s Legislature.” Cmd. 3574,
p. 7.

Simultaneously with this the Memorandum on Native Policy of 1930 (Para. 7a) describes the process to be followed as :—

“ the development of native social and political institutions on native lines wherever such institutions exist, even in germ, in a form worthy of preservation. The African native thus being trained, by methods and forms of organisation which have a traditional appeal for him, may gradually develop a political consciousness and a desire to take an increasing share first in his tribal affairs and the land reserved for tribal use, and ultimately also in the governance of the territory in which he lives. The means by which this can be achieved is, as pointed out by the Closer Union Commissioners, to make the maximum use of the opportunities of self-government in tribal and local institutions, and increasingly to associate the natives with Government through local native councils ”, Cmd. 3573,
pp. 6 and 7.

to which all proposals seriously or particularly affecting native interests would be referred. The memorandum adds :—

“ His Majesty’s Government consider that at least the way should be kept open to the possibility, at subsequent dates, of the separate administration of particular native areas, outside the limits of any considerable immigrant settlement, should this be deemed advisable.” Cmd. 3573,
p. 7.

77. The fact that native communities, in the words of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations dealing with mandates, are unable “ to stand alone under the strenuous conditions of the The understanding of the native mind.

modern world", implies that the native population must be regarded as the "wards" of the trustee, and appropriate measures for the protection of their interests are required. It implies also that their development should be designed to enable them ultimately to stand by themselves, at least as part of the whole community in the territory. Success in this aim can largely be measured by the degree in which those responsible for government have been enabled to penetrate the native mind and to understand the intricate web of tribal life. Without this understanding it is impossible to achieve a real contact between ruler and ruled, and mutual misunderstandings and suspicion can be the only result. With it, it should be possible to build on existing tribal institutions a structure comprehensible to the native mind and suited to his ability, which will lead the native through the necessary stages of development. A thorough study of the social anthropology of the native races cannot therefore be neglected. A clear knowledge of native systems and habits must form the broad basis upon which are founded not only the day to day actions of the administrative officer but the general policy of the Government. This end can be achieved by two mutually dependent courses of action, the prosecution of direct research and the provision of adequate facilities for the instruction of administrative officers.

The Committee are glad to know that arrangements are made by the Colonial Office for cadets selected for the administrative service in Tropical Africa to receive instruction in anthropology before taking up their duties, and that officers on leave are afforded facilities for taking special courses of instruction in the subject. The Committee also understand that the question of developing this side of the Administrative Officer's work is under consideration.

Develop-
ment
through
native
councils.

78. The main line of development at the present time should be to promote the growth of the structure referred to in the last paragraph; that is to say, of native councils with increasing financial, judicial and executive functions. In this matter variety of experiment is of the greatest value. It must be remembered that except in Uganda the association of natives in their own government is a new experiment in East Africa. The experience has not yet been obtained which would justify the adoption of a general system, if indeed a general system could ever be applicable in more than the broadest outline. Native councils at present are purely local in character. They have been most developed in Tanganyika and Uganda, but even in these territories, with the exception of a few instances such as the Kingdom of Buganda, they give to the tribes only a small part in the control of their political destinies. These native councils are schools in which political experience can be gained, and should be given greater functions and powers as experience shows that they are fit to receive them. It is only by management of their own local

affairs that the meaning of responsibility can be learned by the natives.

79. It should be added that the adoption of such a policy is a practical necessity for good administration at the present time. It is impossible to provide a sufficient number of British administrative officials to conduct the business of the whole country. To attempt to administer without any delegation of powers to the proper native authorities would, as experience has shown, merely result in the secret perpetuation of tribal institutions to meet the daily requirements of community life. Being thus maintained without official recognition or approval, the opportunity, both of guiding their development on progressive lines and of utilising them in the machinery of Government is lost.

Devolution
a practical
necessity.

80. By degrees, it should be possible to extend the scope of such tribal councils as exist, both by adding to their responsibilities and by forming district and provincial councils extending over larger areas. Such extension need not be simultaneous over the whole of East Africa, or even over any single territory. Some tribes show greater adaptability in the exercise of administrative functions than others, and it may well be, for example, that a provincial council will become possible in one part of Kenya, while the education of the native mind in association with functions of government in another part will have proved to be more backward. Native councils, however elementary, should have an assigned portion of the direct tax as their own revenues and a defined share of responsibility. Side by side with a continuous widening, native councils should be kept in touch, through the District Commissioners or otherwise, with the various proceedings and proposals of the Executive Government, as well as, except in cases of urgency, with all projected ordinances or regulations affecting native interests.

The growth
of district
and provin-
cial native
councils.

81. Out of these provincial native councils may well grow in the future a central native council representative of native political opinions and ambitions for the whole of the territory concerned. The Committee consider that no policy that would make this impossible should be adopted.

A central
native
council.

82. If the main line of the political development of the native races is to be through native councils, it is clear that these can only be created where tribal organisation exists. There is, however, a considerable number of more or less "de-tribalised" natives. At present the problem of finding a place for this element of the community arises more particularly in Kenya. Here the Committee are concerned only with the statement of general principles, and it is sufficient to say that the problem is one of considerable importance and that, whatever the political system adopted, the interests of de-tribalised natives must be considered.

The de-
tribalised
native.

THE PROBLEMS OF KENYA.

Proposals
for
administra-
tive separa-
tion.

83. The advantages, dwelt upon in the preceding paragraphs, of utilising the native root stock of tribal organisation and tradition in order to secure a healthy and vigorous development of political responsibility are obvious. This has led many experienced students of the problem to the conclusion that in a country like Kenya, where a European community, with entirely different political traditions and instincts, lives side by side with the natives, the political development of the two communities should remain separated to the furthest possible extent until the native communities can take their full share in the body politic and the governance of the country. Such a division into two separate and parallel systems of government, linked by the arbitral authority of the Crown, was strongly recommended by a number of witnesses, who supported the principle and have submitted proposals with a view to giving it more or less complete effect. The general principles of one such scheme of administration and legislation are given as a footnote.* It provides, briefly, for a demarcation of the settled area which is to remain under the legislative control of the Governor acting with the advice of his Legislative Council, the remainder of the territory being administered by him on his own responsibility with the assistance of a Central Advisory Council.

Arguments
in favour.

84 The case for separation may be summed up as follows. European parliamentary methods are unsuited to tribal Africans. The desired development of the system of native councils and of tribal service would be prejudiced from the outset if the ablest and most ambitious of the younger natives were diverted by the magnet

* The proposal for "administrative separation" may be described as follows.—

The laws enacted by and with the consent of the Legislative Council would operate only in the area or areas assigned for non-native settlement ("settled areas"). On the analogy of the Straits Settlements Colony the blocks of territory need not be co-terminous, and they could at any time be enlarged to meet requirements. For the remainder of the Colony and Protectorate (called the "native areas") the Governor would enact such laws as refer to native affairs—as in the three South African Protectorates, Nigeria, Ashanti, etc.—consulting the native council or councils increasingly as they become more competent. For legislation which intimately affects the interests of the inhabitants of both areas the Governor would have the assistance of a Central Advisory Council consisting of officials and unofficials from both areas. The Governor would be sole judge as in the Government of India Act as to whether or not any matter falls into this category. There would be no decisions by majority vote. The settled areas, in which the laws enacted by the Legislative Council operate, and where there would be no obstacle to the fullest extension of local self-government must, of course, be precisely defined. Except as regards legislation there would be no change. The Civil Service and Judiciary would function as at present. The Chief Native Commissioner would submit to the Governor a separate budget for the native areas. The financial arrangements and other details would be a matter for careful and expert consideration on the spot.

of the Legislative Council. At the same time the English-speaking educated natives, who would be foremost in seeking admission to the Council, would not really be recognised by the tribal communities as representing them. On the other hand, as long as the laws affecting their daily life are made for them by the Legislative Council, Africans will, with the rapid spread of education, increasingly press for representation upon it and eventually claim representation in such proportion to their numbers as would, whether under a common roll or a communal roll, swamp the European element. Separation would, it is urged, provide a means for the expression of the views and wishes of the natives, and with their goodwill would relieve the Legislative Council from the pressure for native representation, and facilitate the extension of wider responsibility to the Europeans within their own area, without in any way curtailing their co-operation with the Government in the general duties of trusteeship or precluding them, through a Central Advisory Council or otherwise, from an effective voice in the general affairs of the country as a whole.

85. To this the objection has been taken that, however advantageous the development of native councils may be as an initial training in citizenship, two parallel systems cannot be continued indefinitely and that the ultimate object to be kept in view should be not two political systems side by side, but one. Given as the guiding principle that the native has the same right to political development as the white man, the aim should be that of equal citizenship for all civilised men of whatever colour. Without attempting to lay down what may be the exact nature of the ultimate development under conditions such as those of East Africa, or suggesting that it must necessarily evolve on the lines of parliamentary sovereignty as known in this country, those who hold this view contend that, as far as they can see at present, a Legislative Council, or some similar institution, affords the best means by which the citizens as a whole can participate in the legislation and administration of the territory as a whole. They would, therefore, neither discourage the natives from looking towards the Legislative Council nor unduly delay their direct representation upon it.

Arguments
against.

86. The Committee have weighed the broad arguments on the whole question and have considered various schemes submitted to them. Without pronouncing categorically between them, or prejudging future developments, they feel unable to recommend the adoption, at the present time, of any scheme in preference to the existing system of government, on unitary lines, for the Colony as a whole. At the same time they consider that careful study should be made of the various valuable suggestions which have been laid before the Committee, so that, if at any future date, the adoption of an alternative system of government should be deemed

The Com-
mittee's
view.

desirable, full knowledge of the methods that have been proposed should be available.

Proposal for strengthening native administration without territorial division.

87. The relations between natives and non-natives present more difficult and intricate problems in Kenya than in the other two territories. Although the Committee cannot see their way at this juncture to recommend any of the more drastic schemes, they are not satisfied that the best use is being made of the existing machinery. Consequently they have given their most careful consideration to a proposal which has found considerable support on the grounds that it would tend to improve the present methods of native administration, would evolve no sweeping constitutional change, and would be easy of application at a minimum of expense. Shortly, this proposal is that the administration of all native affairs should be directly under a Chief Native Commissioner who should be an officer of high standing with considerably increased authority. He should be entitled to direct access to the Governor, a member of the Executive Council, also of the Legislative Council, and of its Finance Committee. He should also be charged with the preparation of an annual estimate of the financial requirements of his administration and should have allocated to it such funds as the Governor thinks necessary and desirable. Together with this the Committee recommend that as large a measure as possible of responsibility and of self-government in their domestic affairs should be granted to native communities. There is little doubt that the adoption of this proposal would have an immediate beneficial effect on the general administration of native affairs. The scheme that the Committee now propose has these definite advantages. On the one hand should future circumstances show that political development should remain centred in the Legislative Council the present scheme continues as a self-contained administrative system. Whereas, on the other hand, if circumstances prove that this machinery is insufficient to secure the best political and economic development of the African communities, it lends itself to evolution along the lines of separate administration. It does not, however, solve the problem of native claims to representation in the future. Proposals for an immediate increase in the representation of native interests on the Legislative Council follow later in this report (*vide* para. 101).

Composition of Kenya Legislative Council.

88. The Legislative Council, as the principal forum in which the affairs of the Colony are openly discussed and the only medium by which laws are enacted, must be so composed as to give to every separate race and interest a sense that their special point of view will be considered and safeguarded. The question which confronts the Committee is whether any, and if so, what changes in the composition of the Council are necessary in order to

ensure a sense of security to each community with the knowledge that each has its fair share in the direction of the government of the whole country.

89. The problems arising from the large influx of politically active non-native races into Kenya have been more difficult and have given rise to more acute contests between them and the Government than elsewhere, while to these problems have been added the controversies which have arisen between British and Indians for such political power as is assigned to the non-official elements in the community. It is not necessary to relate in detail the history of the growth of the Legislative Council of Kenya; it will be sufficient to record that in 1920 the Council which had been in the past nominated by the Governor was converted into a partly elected body. An official majority was retained, and still exists, but a profound constitutional change was effected when the right to elect their own representatives was given to the Europeans and Indians—a right subsequently extended to the Arabs. The elected representatives are elected by means of a communal franchise. Both the European and the Indian communities have continuously striven in different ways to bring about changes in the system. Historical.

90. The Europeans have aimed at an unofficial elected majority in the Legislative Council with, as an ultimate objective, the creation of responsible government. European objective.

91. The Arab community have from the first accepted the system, and no problem has arisen as far as they are concerned on this account. Acquiescence of Arab community.

92. The Indians have from its inception rejected the communal franchise and have demanded a common roll, in which their representatives would be prepared to accept qualifications for voting based on an educational and a property standard. They were prepared to agree that these standards should be such as would ensure that the number of Indian electors should not exceed that of the Europeans. Further, they were willing that certain seats should be reserved to the Europeans with a smaller number reserved for Indian representatives. It is at least open to doubt whether these conditions formerly suggested by their representatives would be accepted by the Indian community in future. In any case, so strongly have the leaders of Indian opinion held their view about the common roll that they have persuaded the Indian community to decline the representation which the existing constitution gives them, and, generally speaking, Indian representatives have not been elected to the Legislative Council. In the present year, although the Indian community have elected their five representatives, these are under a pledge to take no Indian attitude.

part in the Council until the common roll is substituted for the existing electoral system.

Government
White
Papers re-
garding
common
roll.
Cmd. 1922,
p. 12.

93. In 1923, in the White Paper, "Indians in Kenya," issued by the Government then in power, the following conclusion was arrived at :

" Having regard to all the circumstances, His Majesty's Government have decided that the interests of all concerned in Kenya will be best served by the adoption of a communal system of representation ".

In 1930, however, the then Government set out their opinion, in their conclusions as follows :—

Cmd. 3574,
p. 8.

" With regard to the franchise for the Legislative Council of Kenya, His Majesty's Government are of the opinion that the establishment of a common roll is the object to be aimed at and attained, with an equal franchise of a civilisation or education character open to all races. They have not, however, sufficient evidence before them either from a political or geographical standpoint to say in what manner this desirable end can be reached. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government propose that an enquiry should be undertaken by the High Commissioner, when appointed, as to what is the most practicable action to be taken in this direction in the immediate future."

Conflicting
views on
the Indian
franchise.

94. The Committee have had much evidence on this question in which the views of the Indian community remain inflexibly opposed to those of the Europeans. The European evidence is insistent on the necessity for maintaining communal representation, holding strongly the view that racial clashes would be more likely to be avoided under that system of election than if appeals had to be made by candidates to electors of different races on a common roll. It is admitted by the advocates of the common roll that as proposed it would involve the creation of an artificial franchise, based on no clear principle except that it should be so drawn as to secure that the Indian vote should not outnumber that of the Europeans. The proposed reservation of seats would allocate power to the two communities not in proportion to their numbers on the electoral roll but in an artificial racial proportion. It neglects and gravely complicates the question which will arise if at any time it is decided to give representation to the vast majority of the Kenya population, namely, the Africans. On the other hand, it was stated by the Indian witnesses that they were above all desirous that all the elected members, including the Europeans, should have to take the Indian point of view into account, and thus represent the Indian, as well as the European, voters. The Indians believed that racial differences would be much lessened if the members of the Legislative Council were thus obliged to take the point of view of all their constituents into account.

95. The unofficial members of the Council are at present returned partly by a franchise on a communal basis, the Europeans being returned for electoral areas, whereas the Indians are on one communal basis for the whole country. The Arabs are represented by one elected and one nominated member. The natives are represented by one European nominated by the Governor.

Unofficial representation on the Legislative Council.

96. The Government has an official majority and the unofficial members sit on the Council in the capacity of advisers who can always be outvoted by the official majority should the Governor see fit to use that majority. It is important to bear in mind, that these elected and nominated unofficials are definitely so elected and nominated in order that the Governor may have on his Council chosen representative advisers of different races and interests. In the case of the natives the difficulty of obtaining representation by any other satisfactory method has necessitated the nomination of someone of another race on their behalf. There is nothing here in the nature of responsible government. The official majority secures that the wishes of the Governor are carried out, and, if necessary, in the final resort, the wishes of the Secretary of State, with whom the ultimate responsibility rests.

Advisory capacity of unofficial members of Council.

97. So long as this system is maintained, the number of representatives of the different communities is of minor importance provided always that the membership is of sufficient strength and competence adequately to express the views of the community which it represents. In this connection the Committee feel that it is open to question whether any increase of the Asiatic representation on the Council might not with advantage be considered.

Representation of diverse interests should be adequate.

98. Different considerations, however, arise directly the question of an unofficial majority is admitted into the discussion. This was suggested with the safeguard, however, of the Governor's veto and power of certification. But it appears to the Committee that, even with the safeguards suggested, an unofficial majority, whatever may be said to the contrary, does morally and in fact become responsible.

Unofficial majority.

99. The problem of the detribalised native has already been referred to (*vide* para. 82). The total number of these natives is not clear from the evidence. In some cases natives who have left their tribal reserves still retain their tribal affiliations and return at intervals to the reserves from which they came in search of employment. Many, even among the squatters, return sufficiently frequently for them to be considered as part of their tribe. Apart from these there is a substantial number, how great or how small the Committee were unable to determine, who have definitely and finally severed their connection with tribal life.

Detribalised natives.

Some squatters, the Committee were informed, were born on European estates, and though they may retain some traditional association with their tribe, are in effect severed from the tribal organisation. In Nairobi there are certain natives, including Somalis, who have made it their permanent home. Clearly some representation in the political system must be found for such completely detribalised natives. It is argued in favour of a common roll that it will be impossible to keep Africans out of the western social and economic system and that a place must be found for them in that system. Those, however, by whom this view has been presented, recognise that the main line of native development for the present must be through native councils, and even they, therefore, would limit the enfranchisement of natives upon a common roll to the settled areas only.

Decision regarding common roll.

100. The Committee have carefully considered the arguments for and against the common roll. While not denying that strong arguments have been brought forward on both sides, they feel that it would be impracticable under present conditions to advocate the adoption of the system of common roll representation in preference to the existing system of election. They would, however, add that, if at some future date changes were made in the constitution, the desirability of introducing the common roll should be re-examined without prejudice; and the decision of the Committee as recorded above should not be allowed to militate against the adoption of the common roll should it later be deemed desirable.

Native representation on the Legislative Council.

101. In addition to the question of the franchise, it is desirable to deal with the question of the representation of natives on the Legislative Council. The Committee have been much impressed by the ability of the Africans who have given evidence before them, and they feel that the time may well come, if the unitary system of government is maintained, when the most suitable representation for the African will be by members of their own community. At the present time the suitable education and experience is lacking on any large scale, and indeed it is doubtful if there are any English speaking natives who would command the confidence of their own tribes. The Committee, therefore, go no further at the moment than to recommend that the nominated representation of native opinion be increased, without prejudice to the power of the Governor at his discretion to nominate for inclusion among them persons of African descent, when he considers suitable representatives are available. The Committee would suggest that it would be desirable for the Governor, in making such nominations, to consider using the machinery of the native councils to obtain representative names for his consideration. They venture to express the hope that a rapid development of native councils will provide the machinery whereby native

representatives may obtain not only the training to fit them to take a useful part in a wider political life, but will also ensure that they have the confidence of their constituents behind them.

102. To improve the present system of native representation and to enable native opinion to have more influence, the Committee have recommended an increase in the status of the Chief Native Commissioner and an augmentation of native representation on the Legislative Council. They were impressed by the evidence tendered in regard to the efficiency of native councils in the territories other than Kenya and they recommend that the further development of these councils in Kenya should be actively fostered on the lines advocated for East Africa generally in preceding paragraphs. (*Vide* paras. 78-81.)

Encouragement of Native Councils in Kenya.

103. The Committee attach special importance, in the case of Kenya, to the handing over, at the earliest practicable moment, of new functions, in proportion to the advance in interest and in capacity made by any particular council. They also look on the question of financial responsibility as one of the highest importance. They suggest that the enquiry into taxation, which is referred to below (*vide* para. 105) should deal with this matter. They have already recommended (para. 87) that a part of the general revenue should be allocated to the department of the Chief Native Commissioner. They further recommend that out of this revenue sums should be allocated to the native councils for specified purposes, such as the payment of the salaries of its local officers, the maintenance and construction of roads, education, etc. Without going too closely into the details of local administration, the Committee feel that every effort should be made to discover and train the more enlightened and capable natives and, whenever the desire is expressed, to consider the possibility of making the appointment of a chairman a matter of local choice, in accordance with the practices of the district, instead of the meeting being presided over by a Government officer.

Devolution of responsibility.

104. The Committee's main object is to provide a means whereby all grievances, of whatever nature they may be, and whatsoever community they may specially affect, can find expression through the recognised governmental machinery. The Committee believe that these proposals would be valuable as a clear sign of the intention of His Majesty's Government to take into account native aspirations, and to give serious attention to the problems of native political development.

A means for the expression of grievances.

105.—(i) The Committee have had much contradictory evidence as to the incidence of taxation, and as to the respective shares of that taxation borne by the African, the Indian and the European communities. They are unable to express any clear view as to how in fact taxation is divided between the various

Taxation, land and other questions.

racés, and they consider that an enquiry into the incidence of taxation under existing circumstances should be held at an early date. Such an enquiry, clearly, cannot be conducted by themselves. The Committee consider that there is sufficient evidence of its need to justify them in recommending that one should be held by an independent authority and without delay. It should include a careful and detailed examination of the financial situation with respect to—

(a) the contribution made to taxation, both direct and indirect, by the different racial communities;

(b) railway freights and import duties, with a view to discovering the extent to which each community benefits or suffers by them;

(c) the amount of money expended in the interests of each community, in particular on natives and non-natives; and

(d) the degree and manner in which financial responsibility should be conferred on the native councils.

(u) In view of the nervousness among the native population as regards the land question, a full and authoritative enquiry should be undertaken immediately into the needs of the Native population, present and prospective, with respect to land within or without the reserves, held either on tribal or on individual tenure. Pending the conclusion of this enquiry, no further alienation of Crown land to non-natives should take place except in exceptional cases with the sanction of the Secretary of State.

(ii) It is not the business of this Committee to offer recommendations as regards the details of administration, but they would urge an early and sympathetic consideration, by the Kenya Government, of native representations in the following matters:—

(a) The Registration Ordinance.

(b) The cultivation by natives of coffee and other export crops.

(c) The hut and poll tax.

(d) The problems arising from the use of cattle as currency.

(e) The development of the educational, agricultural and veterinary services in the reserves.

Forced
labour.

106. While the evidence was conclusive that no forced labour is employed by European settlers, or for the purposes of private enterprise, it is not denied that forced labour is occasionally made use of in all three territories on Government work, and further that on still rarer occasions such labour is unpaid. It is still employed for communal purposes in the native reserves. While not denying that such labour is almost invariably in the interest of the natives themselves, the Committee are of opinion that the

practice is no longer in accordance with the ideas of modern civilisation and should be discontinued. In this connection the Committee note that the International Convention on Forced Labour has been recently ratified by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom without reservation.

107. The multiplicity of languages is an obvious source of trouble and the Committee have heard the views of several witnesses on this subject. In Kenya alone there are five distinct language groups, each containing several languages and numerous dialects. There can be no question that some official *lingua franca* must be adopted. But the use of an official language that is neither the mother tongue of the administrative officer nor that of the native with whom he has to deal of necessity brings many minor injustices in its train. Kiswahili has become the commercial *lingua franca* and must be acquired in some degree by all natives who seek employment outside the tribal areas, and for this reason, among others, it is maintained by many competent witnesses that, though as a language it is weak in its powers of expressing European ideas, it is at the moment the only suitable official language. Other witnesses from Kenya and the native witness from Buganda claim that English should be the official language. The obvious difficulty in the way of adopting this latter course at the present time is the very small percentage of Africans who are sufficiently educated to speak it with any fluency and the still smaller number qualified to teach it. Nevertheless the Committee feel the desirability of encouraging a gradual change from Kiswahili to English.

The language question.

108. It is not only in the matter of languages that difficulties arise. The many ethnical and tribal divisions carry in their train a great range of variation in customs and tribal laws. To take one instance, the tribal laws governing land tenure are often extremely intricate and are sometimes imperfectly understood. It is impossible for a district officer, whose service in one district may be less than three years and whose spare time is very limited, to obtain anything like a full insight into these matters. Under the present arrangement administrative officers have to be moved from area to area, often from one language group to another, after a comparatively short time; consequently, although many may acquire a slight knowledge of the vernacular of their districts, few can hope to reach that proficiency which brings a full understanding. The Committee consider that every effort should be made to retain officers as long as possible in one language group and that further inducements should be given to ensure a correct knowledge of the vernacular. The Committee have had evidence that district officers are too much tied to the routine work of their offices, and consequently cannot spend sufficient time going round their districts to obtain that personal touch with natives upon which the proper government of backward races so greatly depends. The

Shortage of administrative staff in native areas.

Committee are well aware that at the present time these territories will have difficulty in finding more money for increasing their administrative staff, but they are of opinion that this matter should be taken into early consideration. They have already expressed an opinion favouring a very considerable advance in the status and powers of the Chief Native Commissioner in Kenya (*vide* para. 87) and they would add that they consider it desirable that he should normally be drawn from the ranks of those who have had experience in East Africa.

Native
education.

109. The Committee were also impressed by the keen desire for increased facilities for education, not only for men but also for women, the needs of the latter being particularly stressed by all the native witnesses without exception.

Necessity
for faci-
tating work
of native
adminis-
tration.

110. The Committee are of opinion that matters such as these to which they have here drawn particular attention, in addition to such other matters as the incidence of taxation, the hut and poll tax, the Registration Ordinance, and the necessity for the anthropological study of native customs to which reference has been made elsewhere (*vide* para. 77), all point in the same direction, namely, the supreme importance to the State as a whole of efficient administration on the native side. In order to secure that efficiency the native side of the Colonial Governments must be adequately staffed and placed in such a position as to ensure not only that its various needs and requirements will be fully appreciated by those entrusted with the duty of its administration, but also that those needs will be met by a sufficient appropriation of funds out of the general revenues of the Colony. In saying this, the Committee do not desire in any way to criticise the work of the administrative officers, for whose efforts and for the results achieved, often with inadequate means and in circumstances of difficulty, they have the highest appreciation.

**LORDS AND MEMBERS PRESENT AND MINUTES OF
PROCEEDINGS AT EACH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE.**

Die Jovis, 4^o Decembris, 1930.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Lord Stanley.
	Mr. W. Wellock.

The Order of Reference is read.

It is moved, That the Lord Stanley of Alderley do take the Chair.

The same is agreed to.

The Course of Proceedings is considered.

It is moved, That the Committee be an open one.

The same is agreed to.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Thursday next at a quarter-past Eleven o'clock.

Die Jovis, 11^o Decembris, 1930.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Thursday last are read.

The Course of Proceedings is again considered.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Sir Samuel Wilson, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., K.B.E. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Tuesday, the 3rd of February next, at Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 3^o Februarii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.		Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.		Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley		Mr. C. R. Buxton.
(Lord Sheffield).		Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.		Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.		Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.		Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.		Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.		Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.		Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Thursday, the 11th of December, last, are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Commander The Right Hon. Sir Edward Hilton Young, G.B.E., D.S.O., D.S.C. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at a quarter-past Eleven o'clock.

Die Jovis, 5^o Februarii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.		Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.		Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley		Mr. C. R. Buxton.
(Lord Sheffield).		Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.		Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.		Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Lugard.		Lord Stanley.
Lord Passfield.		Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Dickinson.		
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.		

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The Course of Proceedings is again considered.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at a quarter-past Eleven o'clock.

Die Jovis, 12^o Februarii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Thursday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Sir William Malkin, K.C.M.G., C.B.E.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned until Monday next, at Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 16^o Februarii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Cranworth.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Passfield.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
	Dr. D. Shiels.
	Lord Stanley.
	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Thursday last are read.

The following witness is re-called and examined, viz.: Sir William Malkin, K.C.M.G., C.B.E.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 17° Februarii, 1931

Present:

Viscount Mersey.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Lugard.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Passfield.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read

The following witness is re-called and examined, viz.: Commander The Right Hon. Sir Edward Hilton Young, C.B.E., D.S.O., D.S.C. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 24° Februarii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Phillimore.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Passfield.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Dickinson.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Lord Stanley.
	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 3^o Martii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord
Sheffield).
Lord Lamington.
Lord Cranworth.
Lord Phillimore.
Lord Lugard.
Lord Passfield.
Lord Dickinson.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Sir Robert Hamilton.
Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Stanley.
Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (re-called), Archdeacon W. E. Owen (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday, the 9th of March next, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 9^o Martii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.
Lord Stanley of Alderley
(Lord Sheffield).
Lord Lamington.
Lord Cranworth.
Lord Phillimore.
Lord Lugard.
Lord Passfield.
Lord Dickinson.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Sir Robert Hamilton.
Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Stanley.
Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witness is re-called and examined, viz.: Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 10° Martii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley
 (Lord Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. J. H. Hudson.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: General W. H. Grey, C.B., C.M.G., Mr. John J. Harris, Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, Sir Charles Bowring (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 17° Martii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley
 (Lord Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Mr. J. H. Hudson.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
 Dr. D. Shiels.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (re-called), Mr. J. H. Oldham (a member of Hilton Young Commission) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

Die Martis, 24^o Martii, 1931.

Present :

Earl of Onslow. Viscount Mersey. Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield). Lord Lamington. Lord Cranworth. Lord Phillimore. Lord Lugard. Lord Passfield. Lord Dickinson.	Sir John Sandeman Allen. Mr. C. R. Buxton. Sir Robert Hamilton. Mr. J. H. Hudson. Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore. Dr. D. Shiels. Lord Stanley. Mr. W. Wellock.
--	---

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz. : Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (re-called), Sir Donald Cameron, K.C.M.G., K.B.E. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 27^o Martii, 1931.

Present :

Earl of Onslow. Viscount Mersey. Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield). Lord Lamington. Lord Phillimore. Lord Lugard. Lord Passfield. Lord Dickinson. Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Sir John Sandeman Allen. Mr. C. R. Buxton. Sir Robert Hamilton. Mr. J. H. Hudson. Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore. Mr. J. A. Parkinson. Dr. D. Shiels. Mr. W. Wellock.
--	--

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witness is re-called and examined, viz. : Sir Donald Cameron, K.C.M.G., K.B.E. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter-past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 30° Martii, 1931.

Present :

Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Passfield.	
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Major Leslie Renton (Uganda Settlers' delegate) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a quarter-past Two o'clock.

Die Martis, 31° Martii, 1931.

Present :

Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Lord Stanley.
Sir John Sandeman Allen.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: The Rev. Canon Harry Leakey, M.A. (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday, the 20th of April next, at a quarter-past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 20° Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Cranworth.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday, the 31st of March last, are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Major W. C. Lead, M.C., Major H. Bown, O.B.E. (Tanganyika Settlers' delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 21° Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Cranworth.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lugard.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Passfield.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Dickinson.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward W. M. Grigg, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C. (re-called), Dr. H. H. Hunter (Uganda Chamber of Commerce) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Mercurii, 22^o Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord
 Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Passfield.

Mr. L. Amery.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Dr. D. Shiels.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Mr. Sydney Herbert Sayer (Tanganyika Chamber of Commerce) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at half past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 24^o Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord
 Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. L. Amery.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Dr. D. Shiels.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Wednesday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Major Sir Edward Humphrey Manisty Leggett (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 27^o Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Lugard.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Passfield.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Dickinson.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Mr. Gerald Verner Maxwell (Native Commissioner, Kenya) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 28^o Aprilis, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Chief Koinange Mbiu, Mr. James Mutua, Mr. Ezekiel Apindi (Kenya Native Delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday, the 1st of May next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 1^o Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Phillimore.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Passfield.	
Lord Dickinson.	
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz. Sheikh Hamed Mohamed Bin Issa, Mbarak Ali Hinawy (Arab Delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 4^o Maii, 1931.

Present.

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Lugard.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Passfield.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Dickinson.	
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Mr. Philip Euen Mitchell (Secretary for Native Affairs, Tanganyika) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 5^o Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen..
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore..
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Chief Makwaia, K.M., Mwami Francis Lwamugira, Mr. Hugh Martin Kayamba (Tanganika Native Delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Three o'clock.

Die Mercurii, 6^o Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are re-called and examined, viz.: Chief Makwaia, K.M., Mwami Francis H. Lwamugira, Mr. Hugh Martin Kayamba (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 8° Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley
 (Lord Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. J. H. Hudson.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
 Dr. D. Shiels.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Wednesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Major William Morse Crowdy (Associated Producers of East Africa), (vide Minutes of Evidence). Doctor L. S. B. Leakey.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 11° Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley
 (Lord Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz.: Mr. William Tyson (Kenya Chamber of Commerce) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 12^o Maii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
(Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Lugard.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Passfield.	Lord Stanley
Lord Dickinson.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Serwano Kulubya, Kosiya K. Labwoni, Yekoniya Zirabamuzale, Samusoni Bazongere, Uganda Native Delegates (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow at Three o'clock.

Die Mercuri, 13^o Maii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley	Sir Robert Hamilton.
(Lord Sheffield).	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Dickinson.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Mr. B. Ashton-Warner (Dep. Prov. Commissioner, Uganda), Mr. C. L. Bruton (Dist. Officer, Uganda) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Lunae, 18^o Maii, 1931.

Present :

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley	Sir Robert Hamilton.
(Lord Sheffield).	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Cranworth.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Phillimore.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. W. Wellock.
Lord Passfield.	
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Wednesday last are read.

The following witness is called in and examined, viz. Lady Eleanor Cole (Kenya Women's Association) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 19^o Maii, 1931.

Present :

Viscount Mersey.	Sir John Sandeman Allen
Lord Stanley of Alderley	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
(Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Lugard.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Passfield.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witness is re-called and examined, viz. : Doctor L. S. B. Leakey.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday, the 5th June next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 5^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield). Lord Lamington. Lord Phillimore. Lord Lugard. Lord Passfield. Lord Dickinson. Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Sir John Sandeman Allen. Mr. L. Amery. Mr. C. R. Buxton. Sir Robert Hamilton. Mr. J. H. Hudson. Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore. Mr. J. A. Parkinson. Lord Stanley. Mr. W. Wellock.
---	--

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Tuesday, the 19th of May last, are read.

The Course of Proceedings is again considered.

Ordered, That no more witnesses shall be requested to attend the Committee other than those who have already been invited.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Monday next at a quarter past Two o'clock. -

Die Lunae, 8^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Viscount Mersey. Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield). Lord Lamington. Lord Cranworth. Lord Phillimore. Lord Lugard. Lord Passfield. Lord Dickinson. Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Sir John Sandeman Allen. Mr. L. Amery. Mr. C. R. Buxton. Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore. Dr. D. Shiels. Lord Stanley. Mr. W. Wellock.
--	---

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: Lord Francis Scott, D.S.O., Captain H. E. Schwartz, Mr. J. F. H. Harper (Kenya Settlers' Delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 9^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. L. Amery.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Lamington.	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Cranworth.	Mr. J. H. Hudson.
Lord Phillimore.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Lugard.	Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
Lord Passfield.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Dickinson.	Lord Stanley.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are re-called and examined, viz.: Lord Francis Scott, D.S.O., Captain H. E. Schwartz, Mr. J. F. H. Harper (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at a quarter past Two o'clock.

Die Mercurii, 10^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.	Sir John Sandeman Allen.
Viscount Mersey.	Mr. C. R. Buxton.
Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord Sheffield).	Sir Robert Hamilton.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
Lord Cranworth.	Dr. D. Shiels.
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.	Lord Stanley.
	Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of yesterday are read.

The following witnesses are re-called and examined, viz.: Lord Francis Scott, D.S.O., Captain H. E. Schwartz, Mr. J. F. H. Harper (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Veneris, 12^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord
 Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Lugard.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Mr. J. A. Parkinson.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair,

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Wednesday last are read.

The following witnesses are called in and examined, viz.: The Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri (India Office), Mr. P. V. Mehd (Uganda Indians' delegate), Mr. V. V. Phadke and Mr. A. B. Patel (Kenya Indians' delegates) (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.

Die Martis, 16^o Junii, 1931.

Present:

Earl of Onslow.
 Viscount Mersey.
 Lord Stanley of Alderley (Lord
 Sheffield).
 Lord Lamington.
 Lord Cranworth.
 Lord Phillimore.
 Lord Passfield.
 Lord Dickinson.
 Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede.

Sir John Sandeman Allen.
 Mr. C. R. Buxton.
 Sir Robert Hamilton.
 Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore.
 Lord Stanley.
 Mr. W. Wellock.

The LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY in the Chair.

The Order of Adjournment is read.

The Proceedings of Friday last are read.

The following witnesses are re-called and examined, viz.: Lord Francis Scott, D.S.O., Captain H. E. Schwartz, Mr. J. F. H. Harper (vide Minutes of Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at a half-past Ten o'clock.