

PRESS STATEMENT ON WITHDRAWAL OF SECURITY FOR COUNTY STATE OFFICERS

- The Council of Governors strongly condemns the recent withdrawal of security officers attached to two Governors. We are aware that neither of the affected officers received formal communication prior to withdrawal of the said officers from the County premises and official residences.
- 2. Article 260 of the Constitution includes the Office of the Governor as a state office, and subsequently, Governors must before assuming the State office, take and subscribe to the oath of office, which serve as an affirmation to the entire public that the respective individual has been given the responsibility to serve constituents and in the discharge of his or her duties, is entitled to certain benefits. This has been reiterated in Section 30 of the County Governments Act.
- 3. In light of the above, the Salaries and Remuneration Commission under Article 230 (4) (a) of the Constitution, set security as one of the benefits accruing to State Officers serving in the County Government vide the Gazette Notice No. 2888 of 1st March 2013.
- 4. The Office of the Inspector-General should therefore have followed formal procedures if they had reasonable grounds for withdrawing security for H.E. Hassan Joho and H.E. Amason Kingi. The callous manner in which the withdrawal of the officers has been undertaken reveals elements of bad faith and abuse of power. The Coast Police Commander has, until now, failed to provide satisfactory justification for the abrupt action taken by his office, and why the same was never communicated at all to any of the Governors.

5. Our Constitution is very elaborate in Chapter Six on Leadership and Integrity that State authority must be exercised with respect, honor, dignity and such authority must promote public confidence in the integrity of the office and is given with the sole aim that the officer serves the people, rather than rule them. Clearly, this has been ignored and blatantly violated. State power must not be exercised to serve the interests of particular individuals or for the preservation of political patronage. Indeed if we take this route as a nation, we must be ready to be labeled as a country quickly slipping into anarchy and a banana republic.

6. Every public officer has a duty to make decisions that are not influenced by nepotism, favoritism and other improper motives. The withdrawal of the security personnel for the Governors demonstrates a clear conflict between discharge of public duties and fulfillment of personal interests, whether directly or indirectly. The Inspector-General must take action in this matter, and seek to formally communicate to the affected Governors and immediately replace the officers. The actions witnessed must not be repeated ever again.

Signed

H.E. Peter Munya

Chairman, Council of Governors