

you refer to, you entirely failed to bring home to me the assurances you now mention. On the contrary, I then distinctly understood that you regarded the naval defence of New Zealand as a matter of secondary consideration.

You will, no doubt, remember my mentioning to you, when in conference at Government House, Melbourne, on the 18th ult., that you would probably be reminded by the New Zealand Government as to the necessity for regarding New Zealand in your naval arrangements for defence. Your reply was, "No doubt I shall when you get back there," or words to that effect.

It is scarcely necessary, however, for me to remark that my observation referred entirely to views which I felt would be—and, as a matter of fact, have been—entertained, quite independently, by the Government of New Zealand.

You will, I trust, pardon me if I venture to bring to your notice that New Zealand is a constitutionally governed country, and that it is not in my power to dictate to my Responsible Ministers the views which they should hold.

Rear-Admiral Tryon, C.B.

I have, &c.,

WM. F. D. JERVOIS.

## F.

SIR,—

H.M.S. "Nelson," at Sydney, 22nd May, 1885.

With reference to your letter of the 30th April, which Lord Augustus Loftus handed to me last evening on his return to Sydney, I confess, had your Excellency not pointed out in a letter to him the exception you took to my telegram of the 20th ultimo, and had also suggested certain alterations in it, I should not have found myself in a position to reply to your letter.

2. While I am unable to accept the wording you suggest for my telegram, because, in the first place, it was very carefully considered before it was sent, and because, after eliminating the words you propose should be omitted and inserting those you suggest should be added, and reading it as a whole, it no longer conveys what I intended.

3. The words you suggest, however, seem to indicate that it is possible we have attached different meanings to the term "naval defence."

4. I considered naval defence was the subject of consideration when we together at Sydney had before us the chart of the Western Pacific and of New Zealand, when the plans, especially of Lyttelton, Dunedin, Wellington, and Auckland, were before us, on some of which you were good enough to point out the proposed positions for batteries to meet a naval attack; and when I referred briefly to the lines of trade and commerce, I did not understand you differed from my observations.

5. I then noted some of the points to which you drew attention, and referred to the matter again when at Melbourne. I also considered that naval defence was being considered when you visited my flagship at Melbourne with the view of seeing some torpedo appliances which I recommended for adoption; also when you showed me a draft telegram which you proposed to send to your Ministers, inviting my observations.

6. I considered defence against naval attack was alone the subject of my memorandum dated the 17th March last, which was written at your urgency to have something from me to take back. It was written during the brief time that elapsed between your request and your leaving Melbourne.

7. At each interview I gathered that it would give you and those in New Zealand much satisfaction if I detached one or two ships there. On each occasion I was asked, "But what am I to tell my Ministers, or what am I to say when I get back?" My reply, now oft repeated, was, "Tell them New Zealand will not be forgotten." On one occasion I explained that ships might not even be in sight, yet might be best fulfilling the object I had at heart quite as much as any man; and I only regretted I could not meet your wishes, because I considered it would be wrong to do what you suggested at that time.

8. With reference to the second paragraph of your letter, the Conference at Government House, Melbourne, was called for the purpose of considering what Victoria was providing for local defence. A reference to the *précis* of the proceedings will show that the Conference confined itself to the subject for which it was called.

9. Personally you consulted me in the room as to a telegram you proposed to send your Ministers on what I call naval defence. Subsequently you made some casual remarks as to New Zealand of a tenor similar to what had been discussed between us before. I naturally made some observation to turn the conversation, as it could only have been attended with inconvenience to have discussed New Zealand matters before whoever happened to be near, and there was no one present acquainted with the subject.

10. I will now but briefly refer to the second sentence in the first paragraph of your letter of the 30th, and I will only do so so far as to say that the impression on my mind is that the first and primary object of the visit you made to my flagship was with a view to discuss the naval defence of New Zealand, and, with few incidental exceptions, the conversation we held was limited to that subject, which necessarily had to, and did, absorb so much of my attention.

11. For my part I rejoiced at the accidents which enabled me to learn, on the occasions referred to, something from your Excellency of your views and of the resources of New Zealand; and so soon as I was able to do so I gave practical proof of the importance I attached to what I gathered from you, by offering that assistance which I learnt from you was required.

12. Your Excellency will, I am sure, understand that I considered your telegram of the 24th April to be in its entirety from yourself alone: it was very specially indorsed by your Excellency. I considered, when I received it, that it was a remarkable telegram, and, knowing it would be confirmed by cipher as sent, I sent a copy of it in writing, requesting to be informed whether it was correctly rendered, and I have been so informed.