

1900.

NEW ZEALAND.

DUTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM ON IMPORTED WINE.

(CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR CANADA, THE AGENTS-GENERAL FOR THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.)

No. 1.

Westminster Chambers, 13, Victoria Street, London, S.W.,

3rd May, 1899.

SIR,—

I beg to transmit a copy of joint letter which the High Commissioner for Canada and the Agents-General addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the subject of the proposed increased duties on imported wines, and a copy of Mr. Chamberlain's reply.

I have, &c.,

The Right Hon. the Premier, Wellington.

W. P. REEVES.

Enclosure 1 in No. 1.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada, 17, Victoria Street, London, S.W.,

26th April, 1899.

SIR,—

We have the honour to inform you that, in accordance with the suggestion you were good enough to make when Lord Strathcona saw you some days ago, we asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to grant us an interview, and waited upon him yesterday, when we placed before him the views of the wine-producing colonies in reference to the proposed increase in the duties.

(2.) All the self-governing colonies were represented on the occasion, except Queensland and Tasmania. The Agents-General of these colonies were unavoidably absent from town, but they attended our preliminary meetings, and their names are appended to this letter.

(3.) While all the colonies are not directly concerned in the production of wine, they are all interested in the development of the trade of the outlying parts of the Empire with the Mother-country, and this feeling will serve to explain the interest the colonial Governments are evincing in the matter.

(4.) The Governments of the colonies especially and immediately concerned—New South Wales, Victoria, the Cape of Good Hope, and South Australia—regard with alarm the proposed increase in the wine duties, and have specially requested their representatives to place their views officially before Her Majesty's Government. Others of the colonies may sooner or later enter upon the wine industry, and are therefore much interested in the general question. Canada, for instance, manufactures annually a large quantity of wine, much of which is consumed locally at present; but the development of the export business is looked upon, however, as one of the probabilities of the near future in the Dominion.

(5.) Knowing as we do the great interest Her Majesty's Government has shown in the expansion of the colonies, and in the development of their resources, we feel that we may rely upon its sympathetic consideration of the facts we submitted to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach to illustrate the serious effect the increased wine duties will have upon a colonial industry which has attained its present position in the face of many difficulties, and whose very existence is, we believe, jeopardized by the proposals now before Parliament.

(6.) It may not perhaps be within your knowledge that, as compared with other countries, the British colonies in their wine industry labour under many serious disadvantages. They are much further away from the British markets; freights are three times higher; oak staves have to be imported from England, increasing the cost of the casks; large stocks have to be maintained owing to the distance from the sources of supply; and the wine, after the voyage, has to be stored for a longer time before use. Thus the capital invested cannot be turned over so rapidly as in the case of foreign wines. All these things naturally tend to add to the expense, and to reduce the profits of the industry, and we think they are deserving of careful consideration.

(7.) The cheaper foreign wines, with which colonial wines come into competition, are known under the names of the districts from which they come. In these wines there is a wide range of prices and qualities. They may be increased in price as the result of the duty, but it will still be possible for a purchaser to buy a somewhat similar article to that to which he has been accustomed

at the same price. On the other hand, colonial wines are known by certain brands. Their quality must be maintained or the trade will be injured. If the new duty is imposed it must be added to the price at which they are sold—a circumstance that is sure to affect their sales, as, indeed, experience has already shown.

(8.) We desire to emphasize the fact that the colonial wine trade is still a small one relatively, although of much importance to the colonies, as giving employment to considerable capital and labour. For many years the industry was stationary, but latterly it has made more progress, as the result of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition in 1886, and of the increased favour with which the excellent qualities of the wines has caused them to be regarded. We hope and believe, if colonial wines are allowed to enter without being burdened with the increased duty, that the trade will develop, as it is capable of very great expansion under favourable conditions. The experience in other branches of colonial trade justifies this statement being made. But if the additional duty is imposed it is feared by those most competent to judge that the existing trade will not be maintained, and certainly cannot be expected to expand.

(9.) There is a growing feeling in all the colonies in favour of closer commercial relations with the Mother-country. It has already found expression in Canada. In three of the Australasian Colonies it certainly is more than a possibility of the near future, and the same remark may be made of other parts of the Empire. By far the largest proportion of the imports of the colonies comes from the Mother-country. This is the consequence of the energetic development of their resources and industries, which we venture to think has deservedly attracted much attention. The more the colonies prosper the greater will their commerce become, and there is no doubt that the expansion of inter-Imperial trade is a subject the importance of which is recognised by Her Majesty's subjects in all parts of the world.

(10.) The additional duties on colonial wines is a small matter, so far as Imperial revenue is concerned, as admittedly, on the basis of the present trade, they would only yield about £20,000 out of the revenue of £420,000 expected to be realised altogether. On the other hand, the question is one of great moment to the colonies. If the increased duties are maintained, it will affect the employment of thousands of persons, jeopardize the future of a promising industry, and certainly cause much disappointment.

(11.) We venture to suggest, therefore, that colonial wines should be exempted from the operation of the additional duties. Such a decision would be received with much gratification, satisfaction, and pleasure in the colonies, and would, we believe, be very popular also in the United Kingdom, as tending to strengthen the bonds which unite the different parts of the Empire—the feeling in favour of which appears to be as strong in the United Kingdom as it is among those of Her Majesty's subjects in the Dominion and in the colonies we have the honour to represent.

(12.) In conclusion, we desire to express our appreciation of the reception Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was good enough to accord to our representations, and, through you, to commend the suggestion we have submitted, as earnestly and as strongly as we can, to the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government. We venture also to express the hope that we may have the benefit of your influence and support in the matter, to which the Governments especially concerned attach much importance.

We are, &c.,

STRATHCONA, High Commissioner for Canada.
JULIAN SALOMONS, Agent-General for New South Wales.
D. TENNANT, Agent-General for the Cape of Good Hope.
ANDREW CLARKE, Agent-General for Victoria.
JOHN A. COCKBURN, Agent-General for South Australia.
W. P. REEVES, Agent-General for New Zealand.
WALTER PEACE, Agent-General for Natal.
E. H. WITTENOOM, Agent-General for Western Australia.
HORACE TOZER, Agent-General for Queensland.
P. FYSH, Agent-General for Tasmania.

The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Enclosure 2 in No. 1.

MY LORD,—

Downing Street, 1st May, 1899.

I am directed by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain to acknowledge the receipt of the letter of the 26th ultimo, signed by your Lordship and by the Agents-General of the Australasian and South African Colonies, representing that the proposed increase in the duties on wines imported into this country will have an injurious effect on the wine industry in the colonies, and suggesting that colonial wines should be exempted from the operation of the additional duties.

Mr. Chamberlain is fully alive to the considerations that you bring before him on behalf of the Governments which you represent, and has the fullest sympathy with any effort for the furtherance of colonial industries, and for the extension of commercial intercourse between the colonies and the Mother-country. But, while he is prepared to forward your letter to the Treasury, for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners, he feels bound to point out to you that there seems much force in the argument that so important a departure from the fiscal policy of this country as the differential duty you suggest would scarcely be justified by the sole object of encouraging a particular industry, which has grown rapidly on the basis of equal duties.

It must not be forgotten, moreover, that the colonies principally affected levy a much higher duty on wine than the increased duty now proposed to be levied in this country, and also, by means of highly protective tariffs, discourage the consumption of British goods.

The High Commissioner for Canada.

I am, &c.,

H. BERTRAM COX.

No. 2.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada, 17, Victoria Street,
5th May, 1899.

SIR,—

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Cox's letter of the 1st instant, in reply to the joint communication addressed to you on the 26th ultimo, respecting the proposed increase in the duties on wines imported into the United Kingdom, which we consider will have a very injurious effect on the wine industry in the colonies.

Mr. Cox states that you are fully alive to the considerations we ventured to submit on behalf of the Governments we represent, and that you have the fullest sympathy with any effort for the furtherance of colonial industries, and for the expansion of commercial intercourse between the colonies and the Mother-country.

It is scarcely necessary to observe that these statements have given us the liveliest satisfaction, and have stimulated the hope we entertain that we may rely upon your valuable support in securing favourable consideration for the request we placed before Her Majesty's Government—that colonial wines might not be burdened with the additional duties.

Your general expression of opinion, we observe, however, is qualified by certain statements which, we desire respectfully to submit, are, in our judgment, open to argument. For instance, we cannot admit that the colonial wine industry has grown rapidly on the basis of equal duties. The industry has been in existence for many years, and has not progressed as rapidly as might have been expected, in consequence of the disadvantages under which it has laboured in competition with cheap foreign wines—among others, the equal duties you refer to. And just at a time when further expansion seemed possible, owing to the wines having become popular, and to the extension of the vineyards of Australasia and South Africa, the whole trade is likely to be jeopardized by further duties being imposed which, like the old duties, will weigh more heavily upon colonial than upon foreign wines, for the reasons stated in our previous letter, and at our interview with your colleague, the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

We would point out that no question of economics or fiscal policy appears to be involved, for the reason that wine, similar to that upon which the duties are levied, is not made in the United Kingdom. It may be, as you state, that the colonies principally affected levy a higher duty on wine than the increased duty now proposed in the United Kingdom, but we desire to urge that the wines in question come from foreign countries, and not from the United Kingdom, which is in no sense prejudiced, and that there is no parallel between the two cases.

You conclude by the remark that the colonies principally affected, by means of highly protective tariffs, discourage the consumption of British goods. In this connection it is only necessary to state that, while the total imports of the Australasian Colonies in 1896 were valued at about £63,000,000, no less than £56,000,000 came from the United Kingdom and British possessions—£25,000,000 from the former, and £31,000,000 from the latter—and only about £7,000,000 from foreign countries. The total imports into the Cape were £18,000,000, the proportion from the United Kingdom (£13,000,000) and from British possessions (£811,000) amounting to nearly £14,000,000. (Colonial Office List, 1898.) These figures indicate no discouragement to the importation and consumption of British goods, and we venture to think that, considering the population of the outlying parts of the Empire, there are no other communities in the world which can compare with them as markets for the manufactures of the United Kingdom.

In our former letter we referred to the favourable feeling that has been shown in Canada in the direction of encouraging importations from the Mother-country, and to the fact that the same sentiment is a matter of policy with three of the Australasian Governments. In addition, you now have before you the telegram from the Premier of New South Wales, on behalf of the Australasian Governments, in which he recalls to your recollection the favourable dispositions of the colonial Premiers towards making differences in favour of British goods in future, and to the feelings now prevailing, which, under federation, would, it is hoped, bear practical proof in that part of the world.

In conclusion, we again venture most earnestly to commend the matter to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, in the hope that they will not discourage the development of an industry which, though relatively small at the present time, is capable of great expansion under favourable conditions in the future, and, as already stated, now gives employment to considerable capital and labour. Such a decision, as we have already mentioned, would, we feel sure, give much satisfaction at Home and in the colonies, and be calculated to encourage and stimulate the sentiment which we believe now prevails universally among Her Majesty's subjects in favour of closer bonds of union between the different parts of the Empire.

We are, &c.,

STRATHCONA, High Commissioner for Canada.
JULIAN SALOMONS, Agent-General for New South Wales.
D. TENNANT, Agent-General for the Cape of Good Hope.
ANDREW CLARKE, Agent-General for Victoria.
J. A. COCKBURN, Agent-General for South Australia.
W. P. REEVES, Agent-General for New Zealand.
WALTER PEACE, Agent-General for Natal.
E. H. WITTENOOM, Agent-General for Western Australia.
HORACE TOZER, Agent-General for Queensland.
P. FYSH, Agent-General for Tasmania.

The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

No. 3.

SIR,—

Colonial Office, Downing Street, 6th May, 1899.

With reference to the joint letter from the High Commissioner for Canada and the Agents-General of the 26th ultimo, respecting the increase in the duty on wines imported into this country, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain to transmit to you for your observations, and for communication to the Government of New Zealand, copy of a letter (4th May, 1899) from Messrs. Burgoyne and Co., who claim to be by far the largest importers of Australian wines, expressing their opinion that the increased duty will be beneficial rather than injurious to the trade in these wines.

I am, &c.,

The Agent-General for New Zealand.

H. BERTRAM COX.

Enclosure in No. 3.

LETTER FROM MESSRS. P. B. BURGOWNE AND CO., RELATING TO THE PROPOSED INCREASE OF WINE DUTIES AS AFFECTING AUSTRALIAN WINES.

5, Dowgate Hill, Cannon Street, London, E.C., 3rd May, 1899.

OBJECTIONS, on legislative grounds, have been raised in the Press by many important people against preferential duties for Australian wines. We trust, Sir, you will allow us through your columns to state our views.

We introduced Australian wines to the English public, and have annually during twenty-eight years paid more duty on such wines than all the rest of the trade together. Our views have been withheld, pending the decision of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in deference to the wish of the trade expressed to our Mr. Burgoyne, who, presiding at a committee of its members, found himself in a minority. That committee has now been dissolved, and last night's debate in the House practically settles the question. The thanks of the wine-growing interests are, in our opinion, due to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach for not conceding preferential duties to Australian wines. Such preference would have ruined the industry; his decision has saved it. The Australian wine industry is no weakling that requires nursing; it needs no molly-coddling or leading strings. There is a force behind it which is fast raising it to the level of the foremost wine countries of the world. The competition they supply is invigorating and healthful, and the Australian wine-growers, amongst whom we are numbered, should compete, and are competing without favour, on equal terms with other countries and on the merits alone of their wines. The effect of the impost will be to raise a barrier to the importation of common wines generally, which have long been bringing the trade into disrepute. Now they will not be worth the duty. In the case of Australian wine the incidence of the tax will put distributors and growers alike on their mettle, and a still better article will be supplied, and the industry be advanced a step towards a higher standard. We do not think it will limit the consumption of Australian wines, but, on the contrary, judging by our own business, it appears to have given the trade an extraordinary impetus, in spite of the natural disturbance which a change of prices brings about. There has been no covering up or inclusion of the extra tax in the cost of Australian wine, so that the public know the change has not been made at the expense of quality. Consumers, after all, must bear the tax and the extras connected with it. Complaints are very few, and we are all settling down to the inevitable. Will any one tell us that preferential duties helped the Cape wines? Between 1853 and 1860, while the duty on wines from foreign countries was about 5s. 9d. a gallon, it was only about half the amount on wines from the Cape, and after 1860, when the duties were again altered, there was still a preference, though small, in their favour. Where are they now, or the business it was supposed to foster? Last year's imports from the Cape were under 7,000 gallons. The preferential rates, we are told by the largest importers of those days, opened the door to the rubbish which has brought about this result.

Therefore, Sir, we cordially approve of the decision of the Government in declining to concede preferential duties to Australian wines. Such favour would have been in the highest degree enervating and destructive.

P. B. BURGOWNE AND CO.

No. 4.

MY LORD,—

Colonial Office, Downing Street, S.W., 9th May, 1899.

I am directed by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain to acknowledge the receipt of the further letter of the 5th instant, signed by your Lordship and the Agents-General of the Australasian and South African Colonies, on the subject of the increase in the wine duties, and to state that he has caused a copy of it to be communicated to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury for their consideration.

(2.) I am to observe, however, that, in stating that the colonial wine industry had grown up rapidly under the system of equal duties, Mr. Chamberlain was referring to the fact that the import of colonial wines into this country had grown from some 20,000 gallons in 1882 to some 720,000 gallons in 1897.

(3.) I am to add, in reference to the sixth paragraph of your letter, that it must be remembered that this country is also the principal market for colonial produce, and the figures given by you as to the imports of British produce into Australasia should be read with the figures of the exports of Australasian produce to the United Kingdom.

I am, &c.,

The High Commissioner for Canada.

H. BERTRAM COX.

No. 5.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada, 17, Victoria Street, London, S.W.,

SIR,—

10th May, 1899.

We have the honour to acknowledge Mr. Cox's letter of the 9th instant, on the subject of the increase in the wine duties.

(2.) There is no dispute as to the expansion of the trade in colonial wines from some 20,000 gallons in 1882 to some 720,000 gallons in 1897. The quantity, however, imported from the colonies is still less than 4 per cent. of the total importation into this country, and there is reason to believe that, under favourable conditions, the trade would have advanced to much larger proportions than it has now attained.

(3.) The figures relating to the imports of British produce into Australasia and the Cape were given in consequence of your remark that the colonies principally affected by the increase in the wine duties discourage, by highly protective tariffs, the consumption of British goods. You express the opinion that the figures given of the imports of British produce into Australasia should be read with the figures of the exports of Australasian produce to the United Kingdom. We therefore beg to state that, according to the Colonial Office List, Australasia exported in 1896 nearly £25,000,000 of goods from the United Kingdom, £31,000,000 from British possessions, and £7,000,000 from foreign countries. On the other hand, the exports from Australasia to the United Kingdom were £9,000,000, to British possessions £28,000,000, and to foreign countries £8,900,000. These figures seem to emphasize the conclusions set forth in our previous letter.

We are, &c.,

STRATHCONA, High Commissioner for Canada.

JULIAN SALOMONS, Agent-General for New South Wales.

D. TENNANT, Agent-General for the Cape of Good Hope.

ANDREW CLARKE, Agent-General for Victoria.

W. P. REEVES, Agent-General for New Zealand.

JOHN A. COCKBURN, Agent-General for South Australia.

WALTER PEACE, Agent-General for Natal.

E. H. WITTENOOM, Agent-General for Western Australia.

HORACE TOZER, Agent-General for Queensland.

P. O. FYSH, Agent-General for Tasmania.

No. 6.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada, 17, Victoria Street, London, S.W.,

SIR,—

10th May, 1899.

We beg to acknowledge your letter of the 6th instant, respecting the increase in the duties on wines imported into this country, and transmitting a copy of a letter from Messrs. Burgoyne and Co.

It will be observed from the enclosed memorandum from Mr. Burney Young, the commercial agent of the Government of South Australia, that up to the time of our interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and our subsequent communication with you, the Australian wine trade held (and we think, with the exception perhaps of Messrs. Burgoyne, still hold) very strong opinions as to the prejudicial effect the new duties are likely to have upon the important industry with which they are connected.

In addition to what Mr. Burney Young has stated, we think it right to quote the following letter, dated 24th ultimo, which the High Commissioner received from Mr. J. Gambier, the manager of the firm of Messrs. Burgoyne and Co., and honorary secretary to the Australian Wine Trade Committee:—

“The Chancellor of the Exchequer has kindly consented (we learn through Sir Howard Vincent) to receive members of the trade interested in colonial wines respecting the new tariff. My committee, having already placed their interests unreservedly in the hands of the Agents-General, who are, we understand, to be introduced by you to the Chancellor of the Exchequer tomorrow, feel that such proposed interview may now probably be considered unnecessary. I am desired to ask you to be so good as to convey to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the high appreciation expressed by my committee of his kindness in proposing the interview, and to state that, should he wish to see any members of the trade, my committee hold themselves at his disposal.”

Messrs. Burgoyne and Co. make some reference to the decrease in the importation of Cape wines. There is, however, no parallel between the circumstances of thirty or forty years ago and those which exist now. The wine produced in the Cape at the present time is largely consumed in South Africa, and exported to various European countries where the conditions are more favourable than in the United Kingdom. The Government of the colony have, however, been making strenuous efforts to promote viticulture, but it is claimed that the development of the trade with the United Kingdom in recent years has been prejudiced by the duties that have been charged, and that its expansion will be still further retarded by any increase such as that proposed.

We do not propose to attempt to explain the circumstances or motives that have led to the present action of Messrs. Burgoyne and Co. The representations made by us have been the expression of the views of the various colonial Governments interested, and have been confirmed by official communications received from Australia and the Cape since the publication of Messrs

Burgoyne and Co.'s letter. We venture to hope, therefore, that they will have the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

We are, &c.,

STRATHCONA, High Commissioner for Canada.
 JULIAN SALOMONS, Agent-General for New South Wales.
 D. TENNANT, Agent-General for the Cape of Good Hope.
 ANDREW CLARKE, Agent-General for Victoria.
 W. P. REEVES, Agent-General for New Zealand.
 JOHN A. COCKBURN, Agent-General for South Australia.
 WALTER PEACE, Agent-General for Natal.
 E. H. WITTENOOM, Agent-General for Western Australia.
 HORACE TOZER, Agent-General for Queensland.
 P. O. FYSH, Agent-General for Tasmania.

The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Enclosure in No. 6.

Memorandum.—Messrs. P. B. Burgoyne and Co. and the Wine Duties.

35, Walbrook, E.C., 9th May, 1899.

WITH reference to Messrs. Burgoyne and Co.'s letter to the public Press on the question of the new duties as affecting Australian wines, I may say at once that the views expressed by these gentlemen are diametrically opposite to those held by all the other firms interested in the Australian wine trade in London, as well as those of the vine-growers in South Australia, as evidenced by the following cable published in the *Times* and other papers to-day as a result of a meeting held in Adelaide yesterday (the 8th instant) to consider the question of the increased duties: "Vine-growers unite in representing injury to trade if increase of duty enforced."

It is difficult to understand the attitude assumed by Messrs. Burgoyne in view of the following facts:—

(1.) At a meeting of those chiefly interested in the Australian wine trade held on the 14th April to consider the new duties, Messrs. Burgoyne and Co. were represented, and the following resolution was unanimously passed: "That the Chancellor of the Exchequer be requested to receive at his earliest convenience a deputation of those interested in the production and distribution of colonial wine, that they may have the opportunity of laying before him the grounds upon which they would respectfully ask Her Majesty's Government to refrain from levying the proposed increased duty upon wines produced within the British Empire, which would, in their opinion, be calculated to do great injury to a growing inter-British trade."

Mr. Gambier, manager to Messrs. Burgoyne and Co., was appointed honorary secretary to the committee formed to further the objects in view.

(2.) On the 17th another meeting of the Australian wine trade was held at Messrs. P. B. Burgoyne and Co.'s offices, Mr. Burgoyne himself presiding (*vide* report of meeting in the *Times* of the 18th April), when the following resolution was passed, stamped "P. B. Burgoyne and Co.," and forwarded to the Agents-General: "At a meeting of the representatives of the Australian wine trade held on the 17th instant at 5, Dowgate Hill, it was unanimously resolved to invite the Agents-General for the Colonies to represent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the proposed increase of duties on wines would be prejudicial to the wine industry of the colonies, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to them with copies of letters from Sir Howard Vincent and Mr. Chamberlain.—P. B. BURGUYNE AND Co., 5, Dowgate Hill, E.C."

(3.) A third meeting was held the next day (the 18th April), Mr. Burgoyne again presiding, in which he assisted in framing the views of the trade which were submitted in the form of a memorandum to the Agents-General for the Colonies for the express purpose of the interview arranged for them with the Chancellor of the Exchequer to set before him the reasons for the desired exemptions of colonial wines from the new duties. The memorandum was signed "J. Gambier, Hon. Sec. to the Committee of the Representatives of the Australian Wine Trade." Mr. Gambier is the manager of the firm of P. B. Burgoyne and Co.

In view of the foregoing, it is but right to attach the following advertisements issued by P. B. Burgoyne and Co., which are specimens of a number which have appeared in the public Press:—

(a.) An advertisement in "Ridley's Wine and Spirit Trade Circular" of the 12th April, 1899, stating that Messrs. Burgoyne's duty-paid stock of Australian wine consisted on that date of over 5,000 hhd's. (*i.e.*, over 300,000 gallons, as Australian hogsheads contain 60 gallons each).

(b.) An advertisement from the "Wine Trade Review" of the 15th April of a similar tenor.

(c.) An advertisement in the *Daily Graphic* of the 3rd May (dated 17th April) notifying that the following additions are made to the retail prices of their wines: 3s. per dozen on Imperial quarts, 2s. per dozen on bottles, and 1s. per dozen on half-bottles.

E. BURNEY YOUNG,
 Commercial Representative, South Australian Government.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,375 copies), £3 12s.