

1891.
NEW ZEALAND.

DESPATCHES

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE GOVERNOR OF NEW ZEALAND.

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by command of His Excellency.

No. 1.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 19th November, 1889.

I have the honour to transmit to you, for publication in the colony under your government, a copy of a declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Government of the French Republic, signed at Paris on the 23rd October, 1889, with reference to the disposal of the proceeds of wrecks on their respective coasts.

I have to call your attention to Article VI. of the declaration, from which you will observe that, if it is desired that the stipulations of the declaration should be made applicable to the colony under your government, notice to that effect must be given by Her Britannic Majesty's representative to the French Republic within one year from the 23rd October, the date of the signature of the declaration.

I have therefore to request that you will be good enough to acquaint me as soon as possible of the wishes of your Government in the matter.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

[For enclosure see *New Zealand Gazette*, 6th November, 1890.]

No. 2.

(Circular.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 31st March, 1890.

The question has been asked in the House of Lords whether Her Majesty's Government are in possession of information regarding the most recent means adopted in the colonies and in foreign countries for the transport of civilian sick and injured by organized ambulance corps or otherwise. The information is desired for the purpose of considering the question in relation to this country, which is at present dependent on voluntary efforts alone. It seems that the object of the inquiry may be best answered by ascertaining what is the practice in the principal cities in foreign countries and in the chief colonies.

I have accordingly to request that you will favour me with a full report as to the system pursued in Wellington.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 21st April, 1890.

With reference to the discussion on the subject at the Colonial Conference (pp. 374–383 of Vol. 1 of proceedings of the Conference, with copy of which you have been furnished), I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a memorial from the associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, and of a letter from the Board of Trade, on the subject of establishing a uniform procedure throughout the Empire in the matter of patents, trade-marks, and designs.

I shall be glad to be informed (1) whether your Government are in favour of a system by which a patent issued and a design or trade-mark registered in one part of Her Majesty's dominions shall have in every other part of Her Majesty's dominions in which the fact of its issue or registration has been recorded the same protection as if it had been issued or registered in such other parts; (2) whether your Government would be prepared to notify to the Imperial Government and to all other colonial Governments the patents issued and designs and trade-marks registered in the colony under your Government, and to record without charge the patents, designs, and trade-marks notified to them by the Imperial and other colonial Governments.

In connection with this subject, I would call your attention to the circular despatches from this office of the 29th October, 1883, and the 18th April, 1884. New Zealand and Queensland are the only colonies which, after due legislation, have applied for and obtained an Order of Her Majesty in Council under section 104 of "The Patents, Designs, and Trade-marks Act, 1883."

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure No. 1.

IMPERIAL PROTECTION FOR PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE-MARKS.

To the Right Hon. Lord Knutsford, G.C.M.G., Secretary of State for the Colonies. The humble Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom sheweth,—

1. That much inconvenience is at the present time caused to traders having interests in patents, designs, and trade-marks by the necessity which exists for separate grants and registrations of such patents, designs, and trade-marks in the United Kingdom, and in the various colonies and dependencies of the Empire.

2. That in many instances, especially with regard to trade-marks, conditions are laid down in the colonies which preclude the attainment by traders there of the privileges which in respect of the same premises they have been able to obtain in the United Kingdom.

3. That a desire exists in the colonies for a scheme of Imperial protection of patents, designs, and trade-marks upon application made in the applicant's place of origin, and that such desire was pointedly expressed at the Colonial Conference, held at the Foreign Office in 1887, by the representatives of the colonies.

4. That the association are fully aware of the practical difficulties which stand in the way of the realisation of a scheme of Imperial protection for patents, designs, and trade-marks; but they believe that these difficulties in no way affect the principle of such a scheme, but relate only to its details, and are, moreover, such as by mutual concessions between the colonies and the Mother-country may be readily removed.

5. That any difficulties which at present exist to the realisation of a scheme of Imperial protection of patents, designs, and trade-marks must of necessity be increased by lapse of time, inasmuch as interests adverse to those of existing patentees and owners of registered designs and trade-marks may grow up in the various colonies and dependencies of the Empire, until they in themselves create a formidable obstacle to the realisation of the project the subject of this memorial. And for this reason it is the opinion of the associated Chambers of Commerce that it is a matter of great regret that no steps have been taken in this direction since the subject was mooted at the Colonial Conference in 1887, and it appears to the association that the matter is one of urgency, which should be taken in hand without any further delay.

6. And, lastly, the association is of opinion that the realisation of a scheme of this description, whereby the Mother-country and her colonies and dependencies will be welded together for a practical purpose—namely, the protection of their common interest in industrial property of great value and importance—would be, if only a partial, yet at the same time a most practical, realisation of the general aspirations of men of all parties in the Empire in the direction of Imperial federation.

Given under the common seal of this association the 1st day of January, 1890.

1, Great College Street, Westminster, S.W.

EDWARD S. HILL, President.

Enclosure No. 2.

BOARD OF TRADE TO COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,— Board of Trade (Railway Department), London, S.W., 15th March, 1890.

Referring to your letter of the 23rd January last, on the question of the adoption of a uniform system in the granting and registration of patents, designs, and trade-marks throughout the British Empire, and requesting that Lord Knutsford may receive any remarks this department may have to offer, I am directed by the Board of Trade to request that the following reply may be laid before his Lordship.

While fully admitting the advantages of similarity in the provisions of the patents, &c., laws, and the procedure thereunder, the Board are disposed to think that the difficulties in the way of the proposals set forth in the evidence in the blue-book referred to are considerable, and that the criticism on the statements made by Mr. Deakin merit careful attention.

A difficulty in addition to those already advanced arises from the fact that, if the Empire were constituted a single area for the purposes of the protection of patents, &c., by virtue of one application to run throughout, it would be requisite for a record to be kept not only in the state of first application but in each of the other states. Unless the authorities of these states are prepared to keep such record without charge it would be necessary for applicants to pay fees to cover such expenses, whether they desired protection throughout the area or in a part thereof.

The existing State patent fees for such a general protection would probably not be far short of £200, and, presuming some reduction in the same were effected, would, no doubt, still represent a prohibitive tax on inventors.

On the other hand, the Board are disposed to think it might be found practicable to adopt common forms for applications and procedure up to the sealing of a patent, or the registration of a trade-mark, without combining the existing separate areas, thus leaving it optional to applicants to apply for protection in as many parts of the Empire as they either might desire or could afford to pay fees for. This object the Imperial Government have already been striving to attain, but, as yet, the Board understand, with no large measure of success.

It appears to the Board of Trade that what inventors and trade-mark owners really require is not so much uniformity in legislation as relief from the burden and expense of the employment of agents in the making of applications in each of the colonies. This raises the question whether the Governments throughout the Empire would undertake this duty, and whether it would be limited, as mentioned in Mr. Deakin's proposal, to merely notifying applications to other parts of the Empire.

Presuming the Governments accepted the duty, the limitation to mere notification could only be adopted on a remodelling of the patent laws on the basis of requiring a simple deposit of documents, the validity of which would remain for the determination of the various judicial tribunals.

At present, it may be added that the particulars required by the Patent Acts render the services of an agent in the locality indispensable, and such difficulty would probably in some degree remain, even if a simplification of the laws were brought about.

Prior to ascertaining the views of the various colonial Governments, the Board of Trade do not consider it would be useful for this department to specify the precise points on which an amendment of the law is required to facilitate the obtaining of patent and trade-mark protection throughout the Empire.

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

I have, &c.,

COURTENAY BOYLE.

No. 4.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 22nd April, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you, for publication in the colony under your government, a copy of an Order of Her Majesty the Queen in Council, dated the 21st March, 1890, giving effect to the Convention between Her Majesty and the United States of America with respect to the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals, signed at Washington on the 12th July, 1889, the ratifications of which were exchanged at London on the 11th March, 1890.

It will be observed that the Convention came into operation on the 4th instant, in conformity with Article IX.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

[For enclosure see *New Zealand Gazette*, 26th June, 1890.]

No. 5.

(Circular.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 25th April, 1890.

With reference to my circular despatch of the 19th September last, I A.—2, 1890, No. 31 have the honour to transmit to you a copy of a regulation drawn up by the Board

of Trade relative to the return of cancelled certificates of competency as masters, mates, or engineers in the mercantile marine, or the issue of new certificates in their stead. This regulation applies only to the United Kingdom, but the Board of Trade have suggested that, as it is desirable that the practice in British possessions abroad should not differ from that of the Board, a similar regulation should be adopted in the colony under your Government.

I transmit also a copy of the Order in Council of the 19th August, 1889, relative to colonial certificates of competency, and of instructions issued under it by the Board of Trade to superintendents of mercantile marine offices.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure.

REGULATION concerning Cancelled Certificates of Competency as Masters, Mates, or Engineers in the Mercantile Marine.

PERSONS who once held certificates of competency as masters, mates, or engineers in the mercantile marine, but who from any cause have had them cancelled, shall, as a rule, be re-examined before they are again allowed to hold a certificate of the same grade, and upon their passing the examination a new certificate shall be issued to them and the old one destroyed.

In those exceptional cases where re-examination is dispensed with the original certificate shall be returned.

No. 6.

(New Zealand, No. 19.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 25th April, 1890.

A.-1, 1890, No. 43

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch No. 12, of the 31st January last, enclosing a communication from Major Kemp, taking occasion of the jubilee of New Zealand as a fitting opportunity to express his wish that the union of New Zealand to Great Britain as at present existing should be confirmed for ever.

Your Lordship will be so good as to inform Major Kemp that his communication has been laid before the Queen, who was pleased to receive it very graciously, and was much gratified by the loyal sentiments by which it was prompted.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

No. 7.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 29th April, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of an address, presented by the House of Commons to the Queen, praying for a return to be laid before Parliament giving certain information as to taxation on land and taxation of buildings in European countries, in the United States of America, and in British colonies; and I have to request that you will obtain and transmit to me, at your earliest convenience, as full and accurate information as possible upon this subject as regards the colony under your government, in order that it may be laid before Parliament with the return as regards foreign countries to be prepared by the Foreign Office.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Tuesday, 1st April, 1890.

RESOLVED, That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a return showing,—

1. Taxation on land: (a) The percentage on the annual value which the rate levied amounts to; (b) the total amount raised, the total for local and national purposes being stated separately; (c) the percentage which the amount raised by taxation of land bears to the total taxation.

2. Taxation of buildings: (a) The percentage on the annual value which the rate levied amounts to; (b) the total amount raised, the totals for local and national purposes being stated separately; (c) the percentage which the amount raised by taxation of buildings bears to the total taxation.

Ordered, That the said address be presented to Her Majesty by such members of this House as are of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

No. 8.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 30th April, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit herewith, for the information of your Government, copies of a memorandum, prepared in the Home Office for the information of Magistrates and Police authorities in England, as to procedure in extradition cases, and cases under "The Fugitive Offenders Act, 1881." The memorandum is based on circulars which have been issued from time to time by that department, and, as regards the Fugitive Offenders Act, on instructions to the police issued shortly after the Act came into force. To this has been added information on various points on which inquiries are frequently made of the Home Office by police and prosecutors.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

[Enclosure filed in Police Department, Government Buildings, Wellington.]

No. 9.

(New Zealand, No. 21.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 7th May, 1890.

I am directed by the Secretary of State to transmit to you, for communication to your Government, with reference to Lord Knutsford's circular despatch of the 8th of February, 1888, the document specified in the annexed schedule, on the subject of Imperial commissions for officers of colonial local forces.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

[Enclosure in *New Zealand Gazette*, 3rd July, 1890.]

No. 10.

(New Zealand, No. 23.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 14th May, 1890.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to inform you, A.-1, 1890, No. 46 with reference to your Despatch No. 17, of the 22nd of March, that the Queen's *exequatur*, empowering Mr. Jacques Felix de Lostalot Bachoné to act as French Vice-Consul at Wellington, received Her Majesty's signature on the 8th instant, and that the notification of Her Majesty's approval of this appointment appeared in the *Gazette* of the 9th instant.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 11.

(New Zealand, No. 24.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 16th May, 1890.

In reply to your Despatch No. 18, of the 24th of March, respecting the A.-1, 1890, No. 47 suitability of Point Elizabeth as a coaling-station, I have the honour to transmit to you, for communication to your Lordship's Government, a copy of a letter from the Admiralty on the subject.

Your Lordship will no doubt inform Mr. Guinness of the purport of the Admiralty letter.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure.

ADMIRALTY to COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Admiralty, 12th May, 1890.

With reference to your letter of the 6th instant, forwarding copy of a despatch from the Governor of New Zealand, with its enclosures, respecting the natural advantages of Point Elizabeth, near Greymouth, as a coaling-station and harbour, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to request that you will state to Lord Knutsford that the plan forwarded shows that a harbour could be made by artificial works, but until this is accomplished my Lords are of opinion that it would be premature to consider its suitability as a coaling-station.

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

I have, &c.,

EVAN MACGREGOR.

No. 12.

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 20th May, 1890.

I have the honour to inform you that the Queen has, on my recommendation, been graciously pleased to give directions for the appointment of Dr. Morgan Stanislaus Grace, Member of the Legislative Council of the Colony of New Zealand and Surgeon-General of the local military forces, to be a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 13.

(New Zealand, No. 28.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 29th May, 1890.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to acquaint you that an application has been received from the Portuguese Minister at this Court for the issue of an *exequatur* to Mr. John Duncan as Consul for Portugal at Wellington.

As this gentleman appears to be resident in the colony under your government, at Wellington, I am to request you to report whether you are aware or not of any objection to his appointment; and, if not, you will recognise him provisionally in that capacity until the arrival of the *exequatur*.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 14.

(New Zealand, No. 29.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 4th June, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you, for communication to your Ministers, an extract of a letter from the Foreign Office, enclosing a despatch from Sir E. Monson respecting the reduction desired by the Greek Government of the duties levied on dried currants in the Australian Colonies.

I should be glad to learn what reply your Government wish to be returned to the Greek Government.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure No. 1.

EXTRACT from a Letter from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, dated 9th May, 1890.

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit to you, to be laid before Lord Knutsford, and for such action as his Lordship may see fit to take in the matter, a copy of a despatch from Sir Edward Monson reporting that the Greek Government is desirous of obtaining from the Governments of the Australian Colonies a reduction of the duties imposed by them upon dried currants.

Enclosure No. 2.

Sir E. MONSON to the MARQUIS of SALISBURY.

MY LORD,—

Athens, 30th April, 1890.

Mr. Tricoupi is very anxious to obtain from the Governments of the Australian Colonies a reduction of the duties imposed by them upon dried currants, and has instructed M. Gennadins to place himself in communication with the Agents of those colonies in London with the view of entering into negotiations for that object.

His Excellency told me yesterday that he had been astonished to find that the consumption of this fruit is proportionately nearly as great in Australia as in the Mother-country; and, as the duty seems to average nearly three times the amount formerly imposed in Great Britain, he is of opinion that an immense stimulus would be given to the trade by a reduction of the duty.

I promised to bring the matter officially to the notice of Her Majesty's Government.

I have, &c.,

The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., &c.

EDMUND MONSON.

No. 15.

(New Zealand, No. 31.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 21st June, 1890.

I am directed by the Secretary of State to transmit to you for the information of your Government the documents specified in the annexed Schedule, on the subject of the appeal case of the Shaw-Savill and Albion Company *versus* the Timaru Harbour Board.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure.

JUDGMENT of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the appeal of the Shaw-Savill and Albion Company (Limited) *versus* the Timaru Harbour Board, from the Supreme Court of New Zealand (Canterbury District); delivered 30th April, 1890, by the Lord Chancellor.

Present: The Lord Chancellor, Lord Bramwell, Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir Richard Couch.

This is an appeal by a company carrying on business as shipowners against a judgment of the Court of Appeal of New Zealand, whereby judgment was entered for the defendants, the Timaru Harbour Board.

The plaintiff company owned a vessel called the "Lyttelton," and on the 12th June, 1886, while under the conduct and management of a person named Storm, the "Lyttelton" was sunk, as was alleged, by want of due care by Storm, who was a licensed pilot, and also was the Deputy Harbour-master of the harbour of Timaru.

The cause was tried before Mr. Justice Richmond and a special jury, and a verdict was found for the plaintiffs both for the value of the ship (£14,000) and for the value of the cargo (£17,000). Leave was reserved at the trial to enter a verdict for the defendants in lieu thereof upon various points of law.

The majority of the Court of Appeal, on the ground that no sufficient notice of action, as required by a local statute, had been given by the plaintiffs, entered judgment for the defendants, and this appeal is brought against that order of the New Zealand Court of Appeal.

With respect to the question of fact involved in this appeal, their Lordships are of opinion that no ground has been shown for disturbing the verdict of the jury. They are of opinion that the loss of the vessel was due to the mismanagement and want of skill of the person then acting as pilot, and that the management of the tug did not in any material degree contribute to the catastrophe which happened.

In this view of the facts they are confirmed by the opinion of the nautical assessors.

The next question raised on the appeal is the validity of the notice of action, and this in turn depends upon the proof of agency in the person by whom, in fact, the notice of action was given.

That question was a question of fact, and, if no arrangement had been arrived at by the parties, must have been submitted to the jury. By consent, that question was withdrawn from the consideration of the jury and left for the determination of the Court.

It is not necessary for their Lordships to express any opinion upon this part of the case, inasmuch as the serious and important ground upon which the case was argued depended on the competency, in point of law, of the Timaru Harbour Board, as constituted by statute, to enter into pilotage contracts, or in their corporate capacity to employ a person as pilot for the conduct and management of a particular vessel.

Now the ambit of the Harbour Board's powers is prescribed by statute. That for their own purposes they might employ a pilot for the purpose of moving vessels which neglected the orders of the Harbourmaster in his capacity of administering the shipping in and about the harbour may be true enough. But their sole duty, as constituted by statute, in respect of pilots was to license pilots, between whom and themselves the only relation which the law contemplated as existing was that they should be under their supervision and under their jurisdiction for the purpose of being

duly licensed; but once licensed the pilot had to make his own bargain with the shipowner, and would incur in that contract of pilotage only his own personal liability for the due performance of his duty. The statute and the rules made under it seem carefully worded, so as to exclude the notion that the Harbour Board in its corporate capacity is acting as pilot for the vessels frequenting the harbour, and their Lordships are of opinion that what is not permitted to the Harbour Board under the statute is prohibited; they are not therefore authorised to pledge public funds for the purpose of entering into private engagements, and cannot be held responsible for the default of their Harbourmaster, who, in fact, was acting as pilot for the vessel not in the view their Lordships take of the facts as Harbourmaster, but as pilot engaged by the parties themselves, and who was only himself personally liable for acting in the capacity of pilot, though he happened to fill the character of Deputy Harbourmaster at the same time.

The facts of the case are peculiar in this respect: that the transaction in question was out of the ordinary course of duty in more aspects than one. It would be intelligible that the Harbour Board should with their own tug and Harbourmaster aid vessels entering or departing from the harbour, having taken care that both their Harbourmaster and the appliances at his command were sufficient for the purpose of effecting the object desired. In this case, the tug-boat (by which the Harbour Board were in the habit of assisting vessels as they did) was out of repair; the parties, at their own risk, appear to have employed a steam tug not the property of or habitually under the command of the Harbourmaster. And, when it is remembered that the accident itself happened partly by reason of the inappropriateness of the steam-tug employed for the purpose, it is not an unimportant topic for consideration that even the ordinary practice of the Harbour Board, whether authorised or not by law, was not the practice in following which this accident happened, but the error of the pilot in attempting to conduct an operation by a vessel not used by the Harbour Board, and inappropriate for the purposes for which it was selected by the parties now complaining.

Their Lordships, however, are of opinion that, even had the misfortune happened in the use of the steam-tug according to the ordinary practice, and by the person who, as a matter of fact, was the Harbourmaster, the Harbour Board had no authority to enter into such a contract, as they were not entitled by statute themselves to become pilots, but only to license others for that vocation.

Their Lordships will, therefore, humbly advise Her Majesty that this appeal should be dismissed, and that the judgment of the Court of Appeal of New Zealand should be varied by entering judgment for the defendants, and that the appellants pay the costs of the suit and of this appeal.

No. 16.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 27th June, 1890.

H.-10, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you, for communication to your Government, copies of a memorandum which has been prepared by the Colonial Defence Committee at my request, and that of the Secretary of State for War, on the reports recently drawn up by Major-General Edwards in regard to the defences of the Australasian Colonies.

It will be seen that, except in regard to a few matters relating to individual colonies, the Colonial Defence Committee concur generally in Major-General Edwards's recommendations. As to the broad principles which should guide the Australasian Colonies in fixing the standard of their defences, however, the Committee, with full knowledge of the resources of other Powers, are unable to accept the point of view from which the inspecting officer appears to regard the military requirements of this portion of the Empire.

It is of the utmost importance that clear and definite views as to the nature of these requirements should be arrived at. Failing this, no proper scale of defence can be laid down, and expenditure wasteful, because misdirected, is inevitable.

In recommending this memorandum to the careful consideration of your Government, I desire to point out that the Colonial Defence Committee is specially charged with considering the larger questions of Imperial defence, that its chairman is the Inspector-General of Fortifications, and that the Directors of Naval and Military Intelligence, as well as officers representing the departments of the Adjutant-General and of the Director of Artillery, are members. The Committee has thus at its disposal all the available information in regard to the strength and resources of foreign Powers, and its views therefore will naturally have due weight with the Australasian Colonies.

While as regards purely local matters the colonial Governments will doubtless be disposed to accept the opinions of the commandants of their forces, who are their military advisers upon the spot, I may point out that these officers were selected in regard to their qualifications for the purposes of special duty

only; and that, however able they may be, they have neither the knowledge nor the experience necessary to qualify them to deal with the larger questions of Imperial defence, for the consideration of which the Colonial Defence Committee was formed.

I am led to make the above remarks by the perusal of a paper recently drawn up by the commandant of the Queensland Forces, in which it is stated that he sees "no serious difficulty to an enemy in landing twenty or thirty thousand men on the coast of Queensland."

If this opinion were sound it is evident that the standard of defence of the Australasian Colonies would require to be raised to an extent which could not be contemplated; but it cannot be accepted, inasmuch as it is inconsistent with experience based upon a knowledge of the resources of other Powers, and of the possibilities of naval warfare.

If the general aspect of the military position of the Australasian Colonies, as clearly laid down by the Colonial Defence Committee, is rightly understood, it will be seen that the main requirements are (1) moderate local defences, and (2) an organization which will enable those defences to be available at short notice.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure.

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES.— (REPORTS BY MAJOR-GENERAL J. BEVAN EDWARDS, C.B.)

REMARKS by COLONIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

THE Colonial Defence Committee have had under consideration the Reports of Major-General J. B. Edwards, C. B., on the Military Forces and Defence of the Australasian Colonies, which have been referred to them by the Secretaries of State for War and the Colonies. While, for reasons which will be stated, they are unable to agree in some of the recommendations embodied in these reports, they are impressed by the ability displayed, and the care which has been bestowed upon them.

Before proceeding to consider the recommendations of the Inspecting Officer in the case of the individual colonies, the Committee desire to reassert the general principles which should guide these colonies in adjusting the standard of their defences. It is essential that such principles should be constantly borne in mind, since the absence of a definite basis of policy necessarily leads to wasteful expenditure.

The general requirements of defence which present themselves to the Australasian Colonies depend solely upon the probable nature and strength of the attack. No country can be provided against every remote contingency which may be suggested, and reasonable probabilities, rather than possibilities, form the ultimate basis of the war preparations of every great Power.

The Colonial Defence Committee have in various memoranda expressed their views as to the conditions of probable attack in Australasian waters, and these views have been embodied in Colonial Office circular despatch of the 14th January, 1890.

It may be useful, however, to recapitulate these conditions.

On account of their geographical position, and of the now considerable population in all these colonies except Western Australia, there is no British territory so little liable to aggression as that of Australasia. In view of the armed forces maintained, and the strong spirit which animates them, territorial aggression, except on a large scale, is out of the question. To endeavour to place small bodies of troops on shore would be to court disaster, with consequent injury to the prestige of any Power which attempted such a policy. Any force destined for aggression, even if safely landed, must be of a strength sufficient to conquer and hold either an important strategic point or a considerable portion of territory, under the certain condition of losing its communications by sea.

Field operations on Australasian territory would require a large expeditionary force of all arms, fully equipped; and the idea of attempting such operations with the small landing force available even from a strong squadron of cruisers may be altogether dismissed.

It is evident that transport for a large expeditionary force could not be prepared in any of the advanced bases of any Power without the fact being known, when a corresponding redistribution, if necessary, of the British navy would be made.

Such an expedition, whether despatched from an advanced base or from Europe, could not hope to reach its destination until the British navy had been definitely worsted. Even then the difficulties and the risks would be so considerable that, in view of other enterprises of a more hopeful nature, it is almost inconceivable that the attempt would be made. History affords no parallel of such difficulties successfully overcome.

Attack upon the Australian littoral thus reduces itself to raids by an enemy's cruisers based upon his defended ports. Such raids might be undertaken to obtain coal, which might be urgently required, or with the object of attempting to extort an indemnity under threat of bombardment. Coal, if on shore, could not be seized, even in a port possessing no coast defences, without landing

men, and, in view of the small crews carried by cruisers, this proceeding would be extremely dangerous in face of armed and organized resistance. It is inconceivable that any Australasian town would consent to pay blackmail, which the British race have not submitted to for upwards of a thousand years. Moreover, in view of the difficulty of obtaining fresh supplies of ammunition, and the fact that the expenditure of the whole of the shell carried by a squadron of cruisers would fail to work serious destruction upon any large town, and that such a proceeding would inevitably provoke severe reprisals, it is in the last degree improbable that a bombardment would be attempted.

As regards liability to cruiser raids, the primary factors are the distance of the bases and the relative naval strength of possible enemies to that of the British squadron in Australasian waters strengthened by the aid of the funds provided by all the colonies except Queensland.

The nearest French port is Nouméa, distant about 780 miles from Brisbane, 1,100 miles from Sydney, and 1,100 miles from Auckland. The next in point of distance is Saigon, 3,700 miles from Brisbane and 4,800 miles from Auckland. The other bases of France, Réunion and Diego Suarez, are distant respectively 3,400 and 4,300 miles from Perth.

Nouméa does not, however, possess the qualifications of a base, and the position of the French in New Caledonia in the event of war would be necessarily precarious. Defence rather than aggression would be their probable object. Saigon falls within the scope of the British China Squadron, and could not be made use of as a base till that squadron had been defeated. Réunion and Diego Suarez are too far away to serve as bases without intermediate links which do not exist.

Vladivostock, the only possible base of any other great Power, 4,900 miles from Brisbane, is closed by ice during from three to four months in the year, and the line of action therefrom passes through waters defended by the British China Squadron.

Finally, although raids are not absolutely barred by the presence in the waters of a superior force, the risks they entail are thus greatly increased, and the temptation to undertake them is definitely lessened. The naval force of Great Britain is far superior in Australasian waters to that of any other Power or combination of Powers, and its strength can, if it were necessary, be increased more rapidly than that of any other Power.

The above conditions appear to the Colonial Defence Committee to supply a solid basis upon which the standard of the armaments of the Australasian Colonies may safely rest; but, although they have been set forth at various times, there has been an evident tendency to ignore them, as was pointed out in the Colonial Defence Committee's remarks on Major-General Schaw's Report on the Defences of New South Wales. It is unfortunate that these principles have not been more widely grasped, since their realisation would unquestionably have prevented the great exaggeration of danger and the erroneous conception of what is really to be apprehended, which have from time to time been manifested.

Unobstructed routes for the transport of their products are of vital importance to the Australasian Colonies, and the most probable danger lies neither in territorial aggression nor, so long as efficient land forces are maintained, in raids upon colonial ports, but in the loss of mercantile ships in the neighbourhood of the ports. One of the principal results of the large supersession of sailing-vessels by steamers for the purposes of the mercantile marine is that ordinary peace routes need not be adhered to in ocean passages, so that the capture of vessels on the high seas becomes largely a matter of chance, and the performance of the "Alabama" could not now be repeated. On the other hand, this new condition increases the danger to trade at points of necessary convergence, and in the vicinity of ports.

Defence against dangers of this nature can only be provided by naval means.

With these considerations before them, the Colonial Defence Committee are unable to concur with Major-General Edwards in his expression of opinion that it is necessary to contemplate the concentration of a force of "30,000 or 40,000 men" for defence against territorial aggression. This appears to be a contingency so excessively improbable that it need not be taken into account as one of the requirements of Australasian defence.

The military preparations of these colonies should, in the opinion of the Committee, be based on other grounds. Australia and New Zealand possess an enormous coast-line, with numerous points against which such raids as have been referred to might possibly be directed. In the absence of any organized force on shore, even a small number of men landed for a short time would be able to inflict grave damage. To meet these requirements, it appears to be essential to provide an adequate force well organized and capable of being rapidly mobilised, since it is at the outset of war that the probability of a raid is greatest. So soon as the command of the sea in this quarter of the world has been fought for, or conceded without fighting by an enemy, the probability will diminish.

In the event of a great war, the military resources of the Empire will be heavily taxed, and the responsibility for land defence must necessarily rest with the colonies which have willingly accepted it. As it would be of great importance to dislocate the industrial machinery as little as possible, reliefs of garrisons and posts would doubtless be required, entailing the maintenance of a higher total strength than would be necessary in the case of a standing army.

In carrying out the military defence of the coast-line, occasions may evidently arise where a transference of troops from one colony to another may be desirable. The Committee, therefore, consider that assimilation of organization, as urged by the Royal Commission in 1882, is of great importance. The defence of Continental Australia, including Tasmania, cannot be satisfactorily dealt with in piecemeal fashion; and by adopting a common system, and providing for the easy transference of troops from one colony to another, a definite gain of strength would be obtained. From this point of view, as well as in a commercial aspect, the assimilation of railway-gauge, which Major-General Edwards has urged, appears highly desirable.

Finally, the Colonial Defence Committee desire to point out that the rôle which the Australian Colonies will probably play in the event of war is not likely to be limited to the passive defence of

ports little liable to attack. These colonies will doubtless desire that solid guarantees for future security should be taken, and it is evidently essential to success in this sense that their land forces should be organized on a common basis so as to be capable of being brought together for concerted action. The possibility of being able to take a vigorous offensive at the outset of war against points which might subsequently prove menacing would be a strategic advantage of the first importance.

For the above reasons the Colonial Defence Committee, while differing from the line of argument followed by Major-General Edwards, concur generally in the strength of the forces he lays down.

As regards the standard of coast armaments, the conditions above laid down supply a definite basis. For the purpose of dealing with the class of vessels which alone will be found in Australasian waters, the 6-inch gun will amply suffice, and by its great handiness and speed of fire will prove more effective than the heavier natures. The cost of armaments and emplacements rapidly rises as calibres increase, and by restricting the size of their guns in future the colonies will secure economy, efficiency, and simplicity at the same time.

The most important question with which the colonies have to deal is that of organization, and the Colonial Defence Committee concur with Major-General Edwards in considering that the brigade unit is most suitable. They are, however, of opinion that the population basis cannot well be adopted as fixing the relative strength of the forces of individual colonies, and that, as regards New South Wales and Victoria, it will suffice for present requirements if each of those colonies furnishes two brigades.

The basis of the organization should be a nucleus of permanent troops and a "partially-paid" force, capable of expansion, and it appears most desirable that the conditions of service and training, and, if it can be arranged, the rates of pay, should be common to all the colonies, and that the same general standard of efficiency should be maintained. The principle of a small cadre battalion proposed by Major-General Edwards appears sound; but the Colonial Defence Committee are unable to regard the rifle companies as at present fulfilling the conditions of a reserve; for, while it is undoubtedly most desirable to encourage proficiency in rifle-shooting by means of these companies, they appear in some cases to be only private associations assisted by the Colonial Governments, and not under a general obligation to serve in the ranks in case of need. It would be a doubtful expedient to flood the small battalions with untrained men at the outset of war, and rifle companies can only be looked upon as a practicable reserve on condition of receiving some drill and training, possessing uniforms, and being accustomed to discipline.

It is, therefore, for serious consideration whether a real reserve could not be formed of men who have passed through the ranks of the partially-paid forces, and might receive a small retaining fee;* or whether the organization of the rifle companies could be placed on a partially military basis.

The amalgamation of the artillery and submarine mining services appears desirable in principle, if difficulties arising from differences in rates of pay, &c., can be overcome; but "Australian Coast Corps" would seem a more desirable designation than "Fortress Corps" in the case of a portion of the Empire where fortresses are not required and could not under any circumstances be maintained.

The Colonial Defence Committee consider that all the mounted forces should be organised and trained as mounted infantry. Cavalry, in the European sense, are not required to meet the probable conditions under which any Australian force would be employed.

The general assimilation of uniform, as proposed by Major-General Edwards, is most desirable, and a service-dress should be adopted. The decision as to pattern is a matter for joint consideration; but the Colonial Defence Committee agree with Major-General Edwards in deprecating the choice of red as the colour. The adoption of smokeless powder, which will certainly shortly take place, renders it more than ever necessary that troops should not be clothed in a dress of conspicuous colour.

The provision of a joint Colonial Military College would be a great advantage, as pointed out by the Royal Commission of 1882. Such an institution would promote uniformity of training, and would serve to focus problems of colonial defence, and lead discussion into proper channels.

Turning to the specific recommendations made by Major-General Edwards in regard to individual colonies, the Colonial Defence Committee desire to offer a few remarks in certain cases.

New Zealand.

The Colonial Defence Committee have dealt with the defence of New Zealand in their remarks of the 10th April, 1888, upon Major-General Schaw's report. While generally concurring in Major-General Edwards's recommendations, they deprecate the transference of more than half the naval artillery to the rifle companies. The naval artillery appears, judging from its numbers, to be a popular force in the colony, and any reduction should be very gradual. It would be advisable to introduce the partially-paid system, as calculated to give a higher standard of efficiency than is provided by a purely Volunteer force. On account of the distance (1,200 miles) which separates New Zealand from continental Australia, the Colonial Defence Committee consider that the defence of New Zealand must be dealt with independently, and they doubt whether any advantage would be gained by amalgamating the Permanent Artillery and Submarine Mining Force of this colony with those of the remaining colonies. They are of opinion that it is desirable to provide a better infantry weapon than the Snider, but they consider that a total stand of 8,000, in place of the 16,000 recommended, would amply suffice.

* Such a reserve has already been established in Victoria, but does not at present appear to be entirely successful.

The Colonial Defence Committee purposely refrain from marking this memorandum as "Confidential." Major-General Edwards's reports have been made public and widely discussed. They consider that their remarks, which refer to large questions of principle rather than to details of defence, should receive equal publicity.

16th May, 1890.

G. S. CLARKE,
Secretary, Colonial Defence Committee.

N.B.—Those parts of the memorandum which relate exclusively to other colonies are not published.

No. 17.

(New Zealand—General.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 30th June, 1890.

A.—1, 1891, No. 39

With reference to your Lordship's Despatch No. 5, of the 15th January, I have the honour to acquaint your Lordship that the desire of your Government to be excluded from the operation of the treaty of commerce with Mexico has been duly communicated to Her Majesty's representative in Mexico, with instructions to give formal notice to the Mexican Government.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

No. 18.

(New Zealand, No. 33.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 9th July, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you for the information of your Government a copy of a letter from the Treasury setting forth the grounds upon which Her Majesty's Government are unable to join in the proposed guarantee to the cable companies in connection with the reduction in the telegraphic rates between Australia and England.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure.

The TREASURY to the COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Treasury Chambers, 5th July, 1890.

I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to request that you will inform the Secretary of State that since the date of the meeting between His Lordship (with the Financial Secretary to the Treasury) and the Agents-General for the Australian Colonies, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has had further personal communications with the Agents-General, and has received through the Financial Secretary additional explanation from them with regard to the proposal that the Imperial Government should join with the Australian Colonies in the payment of the subsidies now and for some years past paid to the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company in respect of the Australian cables, and also in sharing with them the guarantee to the company of half the loss of revenue that may accrue from the proposed reduction of the cable rates between Australia and the United Kingdom.

The Agents-General have very fully explained and have ably supported the views of their Governments in making the proposal, and my Lords are far from wishing to seem to controvert or to doubt the sufficiency of the arguments which have governed the action of the Australian Colonies in granting a subsidy in the past to the company in respect to the duplication of its Java-Australian cable, and in now proposing to guarantee the company against a certain proportion of the loss under the contemplated reduction of rates. On the contrary, they both fully sympathize with the object of the subsidy, and they recognise in the highest degree the nature and extent of the sacrifices which the Australian Colonies are prepared to make in the future with a view to developing and facilitating telegraphic communication.

The readiness, too, with which those colonies have accepted, at the risk of considerable loss of revenue, and with some disturbance of their postal system, the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for a reduction of the postal rates, affords an additional reason, if any were required, for the most favourable consideration of any proposal emanating from them in cognate matters.

My Lords have, however, felt very strongly that there are considerations less applicable to the Australian Governments which must be allowed a preponderating influence in determining the decision of the Imperial Government on any question of subsidies to a telegraph cable company. Up to the present time the action of Her Majesty's Government in affording assistance to schemes for the establishment of telegraphic communication with Her Majesty's possessions has been limited to the grant of such subsidies as would secure the laying and maintenance of submarine cables, which except for such assistance would not have been laid or maintained, to foreign and colonial dependencies where telegraphic communication has been deemed essential for political or strategical reasons, and the aid given has been strictly limited to a fixed amount and to a limited term of years.

By these means, within the last twenty years telegraphic communication has been obtained with the South African Colonies, with the West Coast of Africa, and with Bermuda. In the two former cases no doubt the assistance afforded by Her Majesty's Government for political or military and naval reasons has proved to be of the greatest benefit to commercial and general interests. Such benefit has, however, been incidental to and has in no way determined the decision of Her Majesty's Government in affording the assistance required for the laying and maintaining of the cables, and in no case has Her Majesty's Government imposed any restriction, except incidentally, on the rates to be charged for non-official telegrams.

The proposal now put forward departs essentially from the spirit of the policy heretofore followed. The saving that might accrue under it on the charge for official telegrams is too slight to counterbalance the other objections to it.

Under the proposal Her Majesty's Government would substitute for a policy with well-defined and entirely defensible objects, and with definite and limited charges on the Exchequer, a system under which no finality could be guaranteed as regards the claims that might be put forward, either in the particular instance or in similar cases elsewhere, and of which the objects are at least open to discussion.

The Australian Colonies have only to consider the particular case of the Australian cables, and the proposal covers the whole of their extra Australasian cable communications, but the Secretary of State will see that the adoption by Her Majesty's Government of the principle of guaranteeing companies against loss caused by reduction of rates could not fail to lead to similar claims from every other English dependency desirous of reducing the cost of telegraphic communication. Not only is the number of cases very large in which such claims might be made, but in all probability reductions of rates thus obtained would in time be considered insufficient, and additional demands might be made in each case for still further developing and facilitating cable communication by assisting the companies to extend the reductions.

It is not contested that the essential objects that have been considered by the Imperial Government in the past to justify State assistance to cable companies are already obtained. The cables are in existence, and there is no doubt as to their being maintained, a substantial dividend being derived from working them.

My Lords are unwilling to establish a precedent for the grant of State assistance in excess of the amount necessary for securing objects which the State may properly aid in order to secure a benefit which will primarily fall to a limited class.

It appears to them that such a precedent could not fail to be invoked with a view to its extension not only to other cases of cable companies, but also to objects in which State intervention and assistance is alien to the spirit of the commercial policy of this country.

It is scarcely necessary to consider minor objections to the proposal. My Lords will only refer to the probable effect upon the question of possible competition if a subsidy be now granted to the only company owning cables to Australia. Assuming that competition is desirable, it would seem very doubtful whether the proposal of the Australian Colonies would not place the Eastern Extension Company in such a position as to render competition a practical impossibility.

Upon a most careful review, therefore, of the whole subject, and in spite of their strong appreciation of the spirit in which the Australian Colonies have made the proposal now under consideration, my Lords feel with regret that they are precluded from giving that adhesion to the proposal which they would gladly have given if they had not been limited by consideration of general policy, the importance of which they are confident the Australian Colonies will readily appreciate.

I am, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

W. L. JACKSON.

No. 19.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 31st July, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you a copy of an extract of the proceedings, as reported in the *Times*, in the House of Lords on the question raised by the Earl of Meath as to Sunday labour in the ports of the colonies; and I request that you will be good enough to inform me—(1) Whether any, and if any what, legislation exists in the colony under your government prohibiting Sunday labour, either generally or in respect of any particular branch or branches of labour; (2) whether there is, in fact, any labour on Sundays in the docks or on the wharves of the ports of the colony under your Government; and (3) whether such Sunday labour is practically stopped by rules or regulations of public bodies or by combination of workmen against it.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

Enclosure.

[Extract from the *Times*, 26th July, 1890.]

SUNDAY LABOUR AT HONGKONG AND SINGAPORE.

THE Earl of MEATH asked Her Majesty's Government whether their attention had been called to the following remarks made by Admiral His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh at the annual

meeting of Missions to Seamen Society, held at the Mansion House on the 28th April: "The report also complains that in some ports abroad, and in Crown colonies, especially Hongkong and Singapore, the crews are compelled to do unnecessary work in transshipping cargoes on Sundays, which causes much discontent and discomfort to the men, and puts a stop to all religious observances, whereas in the Australian and self-governing colonies such unnecessary working of cargoes is rigidly forbidden. I understand that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has called the attention of some colonial Governors to this grievance of seamen;" and whether the practice complained of had been prohibited, so that the men might enjoy their Sunday rest in port in common with other of Her Majesty's subjects. He said he would argue this question not on the religious ground, but on the ground that every working-man had a right to one day's rest in the week. He did not see why a seaman should be obliged to work on Sunday if he went to one of our Crown colonies, while he would not have to do so if he went to Australia, where Sunday labour was forbidden, because the working-men had votes and could make their influence felt. He could not say that Her Majesty's Government were not responsible for the state of things existing in the Crown colonies. The people there had no votes, and consequently it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to see that no injustice was done to the working-classes. He was not one of those who thought that work should under no circumstances be done on the Sunday, but he was of opinion that great necessity should be shown before work was carried out on that day. Unless some satisfactory reply were given to his question he should move next session for papers on the subject.

Lord KNUTSFORD said his attention had been called to the remarks of the Duke of Edinburgh to which the noble earl had referred, but the question had been brought under his notice last year, when he received a letter from the Rev. Mr. Bowyer, and he communicated the contents of that letter to the Governors of Hongkong and the Straits Settlements. The Governor of Hongkong expressed his desire to see Sunday labour diminished at the port, but, after full inquiry into the subject and consideration of the difficulties of compulsory legislation, he came to the conclusion that such compulsory legislation on the Sunday labour question was not desirable, and, although he (Lord Knutsford) was not prepared to assent to all the Governor's reasons in support of that decision, he regretted to say that he was obliged to concur in the decision itself. The same decision was arrived at by the Governor of the Straits Settlements, who expressed himself very warmly in sympathy with the desire of those who wished to see Sunday labour diminished. He had himself taken steps towards diminishing Sunday labour, because in all Government contracts a provision was now inserted that work under those contracts should not be carried on on Sunday, except in very urgent cases and under special authority. But after communicating with the Chamber of Commerce, the leading merchants, and the unofficial members of the Council, the Governor of the Straits Settlements came to the conclusion arrived at by the Governor of Hongkong, that compulsory legislation was not desirable. The answers that were received by him from the Chamber of Commerce and the leading merchants were certainly not of an encouraging nature. He consulted both the Governors when they were in England, in order to ascertain whether any compromise could be effected, but he regretted to say that he found no compromise was possible. He was distinctly opposed to compulsory legislation on this point—viz., forcing against the views of the unofficial members legislation by an official vote. The case of Australia, which had been referred to, was very different. In the first place, as in other colonies where there was a Customhouse, Sunday labour could be prevented indirectly by closing the Customhouse, but in Hongkong and Singapore Customhouses did not exist. He was not aware that in Australia any Act prohibiting Sunday labour was in force. The working-men themselves had declined to work on Sunday, and indirectly secured for themselves freedom from work on that day; but he was not aware that there was any direct legislation on the point. He did not think anything could be done in this particular branch of labour unless it could be obtained by the voluntary unanimity upon the subject of the members of the Chamber of Commerce and the leading merchants in the colonies and of the leading merchants here who had partners or agents in the colonies. In that way pressure might be put on local Legislatures, and ultimately some measure might be introduced which would put an end to Sunday labour. But at present he did not think there was that feeling in the colony which would justify compulsory legislation.

The Earl of HARROWBY said that he did not see why legislation on this subject should be possible in Australia and not in the Crown colonies. He would suggest to his right honourable friend that he should address inquiries to the Governors of all the colonies, Crown and self-governing, as to the existing practice. The feeling among the seamen was rising very high on the question of Sunday labour.

Lord KNUTSFORD said that he should have great pleasure in adopting the suggestion of the noble earl.

The subject then dropped.

No. 20.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 16th August, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit, for the information of the colony under your government, a copy of a letter from the organizing committee of the projected International Congress on Hygiene and Demography which it is contemplated to hold in London in 1891, together with a preliminary statement issued by the committee.

I have, &c.

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HYGIENE AND DEMOGRAPHY, LONDON, 1891.—President, H.R.H.
the Prince of Wales, K.G.

MY LORD,—

6th August, 1890.

We beg to direct your Lordship's attention to the important arrangement which has recently been concluded for holding the seventh International Congress of Hygiene and Demography in London in 1891, under the presidency of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales.

Your Lordship will doubtless be aware that the former congresses have been held biennially in some of the chief continental cities, the last being held in Vienna under the auspices of his late Imperial Highness Prince Rudolph, the Crown Prince of Austria, who opened the Congress in person.

The next Congress will be the first Congress which has met in Great Britain, and we entertain the confident assurance that it will be your Lordship's desire that that Congress should in all its circumstances be worthy of the great nation which stands foremost in the promotion and practical application of hygienic science and statistical research.

The learned and scientific societies of Great Britain and Ireland have already nominated as delegates a number of gentlemen of the highest distinction as hygienists and statisticians.

Taking into consideration that the Congress will be attended by the representatives of numerous Councils and Corporations engaged in sanitary administration, and by members of several professions, we are led to anticipate that London will be visited by not fewer persons than at the time of the Medical Congress in 1881.

The deliberations of the Congress will be specially directed to the consideration of subjects concerning the public health; and in the section of demography, which will be assisted by a special committee appointed by the Royal Statistical Society, the life conditions of civilised communities will be considered in their various industrial, social, and domestic relations, from statistical points of view. It is obvious that such a conference of official and professional authorities and scientists will necessarily be of the highest value in promoting hygiene and cognate sciences, and generally advancing the welfare not only of all classes of our fellow-countrymen, but of humanity at large.

We therefore venture to express the hope, should the objects and arrangements of the Congress described have met with your approval, your Lordship will allow us to communicate through the Colonial Office with the Colonial Governments, inviting them to nominate delegates and to take part in the deliberations of the Congress, and thus to insure that the sanitary condition of every one of Her Majesty's colonies shall be adequately represented at the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography which will be held in London in 1891.

We have, &c.,

DOUGLAS GALTON,
Chairman of Organizing Committee.
W. H. CORFIELD,
SHIRLEY F. MURPHY. } Hon. Secretaries.

The Right Hon. Lord Knutsford, Secretary of State for the Colonies.

No. 21.

(New Zealand—General.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 12th August, 1890.

With reference to your Lordship's Despatch No. 26, of the 24th May, A.-1, 1891, No. 1. I have the honour to state to your Lordship, for the information of your Government, that the notification of the accession of the colony under your government to the declaration with France respecting the disposal of the proceeds of wrecks, of the 23rd October last, has been formally made to the French Government, and notified in the *Journal Officiel*, under date 1st August, 1890.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

No. 22.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 25th August, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit herewith, for publication in the colony under your government, a copy of "The Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (53 and 54 Vict., c. 37), to which I think it right to draw your attention, as some of its provisions bear upon colonial matters.

For the convenience of your Government, I also enclose a copy of an explanatory memorandum by the parliamentary counsel.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

[For enclosure see *New Zealand Gazette*, 15th January, 1891.]

No. 23.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 26th August, 1890.

The Lords Commissioners of the Treasury have desired to be furnished, for the purpose of record, with information as to the law and practice of escheat and the disposal of casual revenues of the Crown in the colonies. In connection therewith, I may refer you to the Imperial Act, 15 and 16 Vict, cap. 39.

As this department is not in every case supplied with information, and in other cases there appears to be some uncertainty, I shall be obliged by your supplying me with the desired information for the colony under your government, with copy of any local Act bearing on the subject.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 24.

(New Zealand, No. 38.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 29th August, 1890.

No. 18.

With reference to my despatch of the 9th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit to you, for the information of your Government, a copy of a letter which I caused to be addressed to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury respecting the wish of the five colonies represented at the Adelaide Postal Conference, that the decision of Her Majesty's Government not to join in the proposed guarantee to the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company in connection with the reduction in the telegraphic rates between Australia and England should be reconsidered, together with a copy of their Lordships' reply.

It will be observed that the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury reluctantly find themselves unable to meet the wishes of the Australian Colonies in this matter.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure No. 1.

COLONIAL OFFICE to TREASURY.

SIR,—

Downing Street, 9th August, 1890.

With reference to your letter of the 5th ultimo, and to previous correspondence respecting reduction in the charges for telegrams between England and Australia, I am directed by Lord Knutsford to transmit to you a copy of a telegram from the Governor of New South Wales on the subject.

I am to request to be informed of the reply which the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury would desire should be returned to this representation.

I am, &c.,

The Secretary to the Treasury.

JOHN BRAMSTON.

Sub-enclosure.

TELEGRAM from the Right Hon. Lord CARRINGTON (New South Wales) to Lord KNUTSFORD.

(Received, 8th August, 1890.)

7th August, 1890.

AFTER careful consideration of the whole subject, the five colonies represented at the late Postal Conference in Adelaide—namely, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and New South Wales—respectfully urge reconsideration of the proposal that England share in the guarantee to Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. In answer to the statement that it would be contrary to the general policy of the Imperial Government, and would open the door to numberless claims of a similar nature, it is pointed out, with confidence, that there can be no similar claim, as no other country is so remotely situated, and at the same time connected with England by commerce of such great magnitude.

Henry Parkes, for New South Wales and colonies.

I am, &c.,

CARRINGTON.

Enclosure No. 2.

TREASURY to COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Treasury Chambers, 22nd August, 1890.

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury your letter of the 9th instant, forwarding a copy of the telegram from the Governor of New South Wales, urging a

reconsideration of their Lordships' decision upon the proposal that the Imperial Government should join with the Australian Colonies in the payment of subsidies to the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, and in sharing with them the guarantee to the company in connection with the reduction of the cable rates between Australia and the United Kingdom. In reply, I am to express their Lordships' regret that after renewed consideration of the subject they find themselves unable to depart from their decision.

I am to request that in conveying this intelligence to the Governor of New South Wales you will assure him of their Lordships' full appreciation of the spirit in which the Australian Colonies have put forward the proposal, and of the reluctance with which their Lordships find themselves unable to meet the wishes of the colonies in this matter.

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

I am, &c.,

R. E. WELBY.

No. 25.

(Circular.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 11th September, 1890.

I have to request that you will cancel the sixth and seventh paragraphs No. 16. of my circular despatch of the 27th June last from the words "I am led to make" to "naval warfare."

The statement there quoted as to the possible landing of twenty or thirty thousand men for hostile purposes was taken from a paper forwarded to me from Queensland, but upon the arrival of my circular despatch in Australia I was informed by telegraph that the figures should have been two or three thousand.

The observation following the quotation must therefore be withdrawn, and I have to express my regret that the remark of the Commandant of the Queensland Forces should have been misrepresented.

The statement as to the respective functions of the Colonial Defence Committee and the commandants of the local forces rests however upon more general reasons, and I would observe, in connection with this matter, that a force of two or three thousand men could be so easily coped with in any settled part of Australia that such a landing would be useless to the enemy and would not be likely to be attempted.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 26.

(New Zealand—General.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 19th September, 1890.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch No. 39, A.-1, 1891, No. 8. of the 22nd July, relative to the cancelled certificates of competency in the mercantile marine, which I caused to be referred for the consideration of the Board of Trade, and to state to you, for the information of your Government, that a reply has now been received stating that "when the Board are of opinion that the justice of the case requires it they can, under section 23 of "The Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862" (25 and 26 Vict., c. 63), "without reference to the length of service, reissue and return any certificate, "or grant a new certificate to a person whose certificate has been cancelled."

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

No. 27.

(New Zealand, No. 41.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 20th September, 1890.

With reference to your Lordship's Despatch No. 34, of the 1st July, A.-1, 1891, No. 5. requesting information as to the manner of marking meat for the purpose of identifying the country of its origin, I have the honour to transmit to you, for communication to your Government, copies of letters, with their respective

3—A. 2.

enclosures, which have been received from the Foreign Office, the Board of Trade, and the Board of Agriculture on the subject.

I have, &c.,
KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure No. 1.

FOREIGN OFFICE to COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Foreign Office, 4th September, 1890.

In reply to your letter of the 21st ultimo, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the accompanying memorandum, as marked in the margin, on the method adopted in France of marking meat imported into that country. This information was asked for by the Governor of New Zealand.

I am, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

T. H. SANDERSON.

Sub-Enclosure.

Paris, 29th August, 1890.

ALL meat imported by land or sea is marked with a red or blue stamp at the Customhouse of entry by agents of the Veterinary Department of the Ministry of Agriculture. The stamp is the guarantee of its fitness for consumption, and is not intended to enable the public to discriminate between Home and foreign meat, though it may help them to do so if the stamp is not removed; but, the object in affixing it being purely sanitary, there is no penalty for removing it, as, when the meat is admitted into a town for consumption, the stamp has already served its purpose in proving to the Octroi authorities that the meat is fit for food.

It is thought at the Ministry for Agriculture that very little, if any, meat finds its way into the country unexamined by the veterinary authorities.

The Veterinary Agent stamps every joint separately, if he thinks it necessary: this point is left to his discretion. There is no mode in practice in France of marking meat with a view to identifying the country of its origin.

Enclosure No. 2.

The BOARD of TRADE to the COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Board of Trade (Railway Department), London, S.W., 13th September, 1890.

Referring to your communication of the 21st ultimo, in respect of the request of the Government of New Zealand to be supplied with information as regards the modes of marking meat for the purpose of identifying the country of its origin, I am directed by the Board of Trade to enclose herewith, for the information of Lord Knutsford, a copy of a memorandum that has been drawn up in the Commercial Department of this office, together with copy of a letter that this Board has received from the Board of Customs in this matter.

I have, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

R. GIFFEN.

Sub-Enclosure 1.

MEMORANDUM respecting the French Laws and Regulations as to the Importation of Meat.

Commercial Department, Board of Trade, 28th August, 1890.

THE French law of March, 1887, which increased the import duties leviable upon live animals and fresh meat, also provided for the establishment of a sanitary inspection at the frontier of all meat killed before entry into France, and that a supplementary tax should be payable by the importer for this service.

A further law was passed in May, 1888, of which the principal provisions were: That importations of fresh meat were only to be permitted through certain Customhouses, to be specified by decree of the President of the Republic; that beef and pork could only be imported in the entire carcase, whole, or cut up in corresponding parts; that the lung was to be left adhering to such parts, and that no scraping of the walls of abdomen or chest was to be allowed. Sirloins and fillets of beef were excepted from this regulation. The tax *de visite* to be levied on account of the inspection was also fixed at one franc per 100 kilos or smaller parcel.

Copies of two French Customhouse circulars bearing upon this matter are sent herewith, and it is requested that they may be returned to the Board of Trade as soon as possible.

Sub-Enclosure 2.

SIR,—

Customhouse, London, 9th September, 1890.

I am directed by the Board of Customs to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Giffen's letter of the 2nd instant, K8665, on the subject of a request of the Governor of New Zealand for information respecting the modes of marking meat for the purpose of identifying the country of its origin, and I am to state, in reply, that the law does not require meat to be marked upon importation into this country.

I am, &c.,

The Assistant-Secretary, Railway Department,
Board of Trade.

JOHN COURROUX.

Enclosure No. 3.

BOARD of AGRICULTURE to the COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

3, St. James's Square, London, S.W., 13th September, 1890.

I have submitted to the Board of Agriculture your letter of the 26th ultimo, transmitting a copy of a despatch from the Governor of New Zealand requesting to be supplied with information respecting the modes of marking meat for the purpose of identifying the country of its origin.

In reply, I am directed to state that the Board of Agriculture have caused inquiry to be made into the matter, but are unable to ascertain that there are any modes adopted in this country of marking meat from New Zealand or elsewhere for the purpose of identifying the country of its origin.

The practice of the Jews is to insert a sealed tab or tag, such as is enclosed, into such parts of the carcases as are considered by them to be fit for human food, principally the fore-quarters.

I am, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

G. A. LEACH.

No. 28.

(New Zealand, No. 43.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 3rd October, 1890.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to inform you, A.—1, 1891, No. 2, with reference to your Despatch No. 41, of the 5th August, that the Queen's *exequatur*, empowering Mr. John Duncan to act as Portuguese Consul at Wellington, received Her Majesty's signature on the 29th ultimo, and that the notification of Her Majesty's approval of this appointment appeared in the *Gazette* of the 30th ultimo.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

The Officer Administering the Government of New Zealand.

No. 29.

(New Zealand, No. 44.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 9th October, 1890.

I have the honour to transmit to you, for communication to your Ministers, a copy of a letter from the Admiralty, requesting that the thanks of the Lords Commissioners may be conveyed to the Department of Marine in New Zealand for the assistance rendered by them in connection with the revised edition of the "New Zealand Pilot."

I have, &c.

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure.

The ADMIRALTY to the COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Admiralty, 3rd October, 1890.

I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to request that you will move the Secretary of State to cause their Lordships' thanks to be conveyed to the Marine Department of the Government of New Zealand for their courtesy in furnishing a large amount of useful information in aid of the revised edition of the "New Zealand Pilot," and also for the tracings and particulars relating to the coasts and harbours of that colony, which have been forwarded to this department from time to time.

I am, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

EVAN MACGREGOR.

No. 30.

(New Zealand, No. 48.)

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 31st October, 1890.

I have the honour to request that you will invite the attention of your Ministers to the steps which have been taken, and remain to be taken, in order to give effect to the agreement entered into at the Colonial Conference, held in London in 1887, by the representatives of seven Australian Colonies, for the purpose of providing an additional force to be employed for the protection of the

floating trade in Australian waters. This agreement was, as you are aware, adopted as a schedule to the Australian Naval Force Act, which six out of the seven colonies therein named passed subsequently, with the view of giving effect to it.

In December, 1887, I felt myself justified in informing the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Queensland Bill, there appeared to me no reason why their Lordships should not place on the estimates the sum for which provision should be made by Her Majesty's Government in connection with the arrangement with the colonies.

In this view I received the support of the majority of the colonial Governments, three of which telegraphed through their respective Governors urging the construction of the vessels without delay, while a similar wish was conveyed by the Government of Victoria in a despatch from Sir H. Loch of the 11th of January, 1888.

I have now the honour to transmit to you for communication to your Government a copy of a letter from the Admiralty containing statements of actual and estimated expenditure in the construction of the vessels, on which, under Article VII. of the agreement, the Australian Colonies would pay 5 per cent. up to the limit named, and of the annual estimated cost of maintenance (£137,571), of which the payment by the Australian Colonies is limited to £91,000 per annum.

I trust that your Government will take into consideration, with the other Governments concerned, the question of their liability, calculated on the basis of population, and that, in accordance with their Lordships' wishes, the necessary arrangements may be made for payment before the 31st of March next of the advance of half-subsidy, for which they have taken credit in the estimates for 1890-91.

Looking to the magnitude of the interests which this scheme has been designed to protect, I have not allowed myself to suppose that the Colony of Queensland will continue to maintain its present attitude, or, if this should unfortunately be the case, that the other colonies would desire any reduction of the strength of the additional squadron to be maintained in Australasian waters; and I feel confident that the public spirit of the colonial Governments and Legislatures will induce them to devise in consultation any rearrangement of the incidence of the colonial contributions which may prove necessary in order to enable the scheme agreed upon to be carried out in its integrity and with complete success.

I have, &c.,

KNUTSFORD.

Governor the Right Hon. the Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G., &c.

Enclosure.

The ADMIRALTY to the COLONIAL OFFICE.

SIR,—

Admiralty, 2nd October, 1890.

With reference to previous correspondence, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit for the information of the Secretary of State for the Colonies,—

1. A statement of actual and estimated expenditure in construction of vessels, £850,000, on which the Australian Colonies will pay 5 per cent. up to a limit of £35,000.

2. The annual estimated cost of maintenance, £137,571, the payment by the Australian Colonies being limited to £91,000 per annum.

My Lords desire me to add that, so far as can be seen at present, the five vessels of the "Katoomba" class (late "Pandora" class) will possibly be ready to be commissioned early in December and the "Karakatta" and "Boomerang" (late "Whiting" and "Wizard"), possibly in October. And I am to request that Lord Knutsford will arrange with the various colonies for payment before the end of the financial year of the advance of half-subsidy for which the Admiralty have taken credit in the estimates for 1890-91—namely, Half-year in respect of first cost, £17,500; half-year in respect of maintenance, £45,000: total, £63,000.

I have, &c.,

The Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

EVAN MACGREGOR.

STATEMENTS of Actual and Estimated Expenditure on the building and completing the Australian Defence Ships, and of the Estimated Annual Cost for Maintenance.

Building and Completing.

Name of Vessel.	Actual Expenditure to 31st March, 1890.	Further Expenditure to complete.	Total Expenditure, actual and estimated.
	£	£	£
"Katoomba"	101,602	238,115	850,000
"Mildura"	101,997		
"Wallaroo"	97,903		
"Tauranga"	113,514		
"Ringarooma"	114,259		
"Boomerang"	41,315		
"Karrakatta"	41,295		

NOTE.—The annual payment to be made by the colonies is 5 per cent. on the total cost, but not to exceed £35,000.

Estimated Annual Cost of Maintenance of Australian Defence Ships.

	In Commission.			In Reserve.		
	Three Cruisers.	One Torpedo Gunboat.	Total.	Two Cruisers.	One Torpedo Gunboat.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Wages, &c.	35,247	4,878	40,125	5,622	1,540	7,162
Victualling	11,496	1,551	13,047	1,466	401	1,867
Liability in respect of retired pay, &c., of officers	4,827	735	5,562	1,056	325	1,381
Liability in respect of pensions to men ...	9,894	1,540	11,434	1,582	468	2,050
Maintenance of vessels—						
Hull	6,750	1,000	7,750	1,500	333	1,833
Machinery	7,200	1,280	8,480	1,600	426	2,026
Masts, yards, rigging, and stores ...	3,000	1,000	4,000	666	334	1,000
Guns and warlike stores, including torpedoes	342	24	366
Gun-mountings	1,254	61	1,375	278	20	298
Torpedo-carriages and gear	768	80	848	170	27	197
Consumable stores	4,611	618	5,229	255	105	360
Permanent stores	1,165	216	1,381	28	9	37
Coals	11,700	1,650	13,350	210	38	248
Medicines	420	55	475
Relief of crews	5,070	680	5,750
	103,744	15,368	119,112	14,433	4,026	18,459
						119,112
Total estimated annual cost for maintenance under all heads						137,571

NOTE.—The liabilities of the colonies under these heads is limited to £91,000 per annum.

No. 31.

Telegram from the Secretary of State per Governor, Adelaide.

2nd January, 1891.

POSTAL Convention with France, 1856, unavoidably extended beyond 31st March.

[Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, nil; printing (1,300 copies), £13.]

By Authority: GEORGE DIDSBUY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1891.

