

No. 2.

MEMORANDUM No. 200, 1873, for the AGENT-GENERAL.

IN reply to your letter No. 509, of date 11th July last, with reference to Messrs. Birch, Seaton, and Farnall, I have again to observe that in the recommendation made to you by the Government of the day, that you should avail yourself of the services of these gentlemen in the capacity of immigration agents, there does not appear to have been any intention whatsoever that they should be in any sense independent of your instructions.

In pursuance of this view, immediately on the receipt of your telegram to the effect that these gentlemen were "costly and useless," I took occasion to remind you that under such circumstances the power of dispensing with their services rested entirely with yourself.

G. MAURICE O'ROKKE.

Immigration Office, Wellington, N.Z., 29th September, 1873.

No. 3.

MEMORANDUM No. 204, 1873, for the AGENT-GENERAL.

REFERRING to my Memorandum No. 196, 1873, of the 22nd instant, I have to request that you will forward me a copy of your instructions to local emigration agents, relative to emigrants nominated in the Colony.

G. MAURICE O'ROKKE.

Immigration Office, Wellington, N.Z., 29th September, 1873.

No. 4.

MEMORANDUM No. 206, 1873, for the AGENT-GENERAL.

WITH reference to your letter No. 480, dated 11th July, 1873, upon the subject of German and Scandinavian emigration, wherein you state that the contractors for the supply of emigrants had intimated to you that it was quite out of their power to carry out the provisions of the contract, and that you had entered into arrangements with another firm, I must remark that the information afforded is exceedingly meagre; and I shall be glad if you will explain why steps were not taken to enforce the original contract, and what are the terms and conditions of the "arrangements with another firm."

G. MAURICE O'ROKKE.

Immigration Office, Wellington, N.Z., 29th September, 1873.

No. 5.

MEMORANDUM No. 213A, 1873, for the AGENT-GENERAL.

IN your letter of 13th June (No. 423, 1873), commenting on my complaints of 12th April (No. 65, 1873) in respect to the suffering and discomfort that had to be endured by emigrants under the contract with Messrs. Shaw, Savill, and Co., you contradict me in the following terms:—"I beg respectfully to point out that this statement is not borne out by the reports of your own local Immigration Commissioners."

I cannot understand how you could feel yourself justified in making use of that language, seeing that the same mail that took my Memorandum to you also conveyed you intelligence of the convictions of the captains of the "Glenlora" and "Forfarshire" for breaches of the Passengers Act, and the report of the Commissioners on the "Glenlora" and "Charlotte Gladstone."

The following extracts from the reports of the Commissioners will, I think, satisfy you of the incorrectness of your assertion quoted above.

Extract from Commissioners' Report on "Glenlora":—

"Very serious and apparently well-founded complaints were made by the married people, that the preserved milk, sago, and other articles which are especially provided under the terms of the contract for the use of the young children, were not supplied excepting for a short time after leaving England, and since revictualling at the Mauritius. That those articles had been short served was acknowledged by the captain and purser, but was attempted to be accounted for by the assertion that the surgeon-superintendent, at the commencement of the voyage, had ordered a larger quantity of these articles to be served out than the contract allowance. We are, however, of opinion that there is not sufficient evidence of this to account for the subsequent deficiency.

"We are unable to recommend the payment of the usual gratuity to Captain Culbert; and as the matron was dismissed from her post by the surgeon-superintendent in the early part of the voyage, as being unfitted for its duties, we are unable to recommend any gratuity in her case also. In this case, it appears to us that as no sufficient reason is alleged for depriving the single women of the use of the bathroom, the only conclusion to be drawn is, that it was taken away for the convenience of the chief cabin passengers. We consider that the bathroom to be provided for the single women should be kept for their exclusive use; and that no circumstances can justify their being deprived of so necessary a provision for their health and cleanliness, and that prohibition of its use involves a breach of the contract with Messrs. Shaw, Savill, and Co. We are also of opinion that the failure of necessary provision four days before the arrival of the 'Glenlora' in port is not sufficiently accounted for by the additional demand made on the stores for the supply of the crew from the 'Der Fuchs,' and that the captain of the 'Glenlora' and her agents were not justified in allowing the ship to leave the Mauritius with so slender a provision against the contingency of a lengthy voyage.

"Mr. A. F. Halcombe,—The single women per ship 'Glenlora,' whose names are appended, wish me to inform you that on the 22nd January, 1873, they were told that they could no longer use the