

No. 67.

The Hon. Sir J. VOGEL to the AGENT-GENERAL.

SIR,—

London, 7th April, 1875.

I have just learned, with great surprise, that a number of emigrants for Taranaki, Nelson, and Westland are being sent to Wellington.

2. Nothing is more clear than that such a mode of forwarding emigrants is opposed to the instructions sent to you from the colony; and, in addition, it is one which is calculated to be very costly.

3. I believe I communicated to you, after my arrival in Europe, asking you not to make any fresh arrangements for shipping without consulting me; and I understood that you had meanwhile made arrangements for your ordinary necessities only. I have been so much occupied, and so unwell, since I arrived in London, that I have not been able to go into the matter with you as I should desire; but, at the same time, I have been under the impression that you were not making any but ordinarily necessary shipping arrangements, and that you were not departing from your instructions.

4. I have several times spoken to you about Taranaki, and have expressed the desire that emigrants for that province should be sent out direct.

5. I write this letter in order to place on record the fact that the information as to the intended despatch of these emigrants, which I have received from Mr. Carter, has been to me wholly a surprise.

I have, &c.,

The Agent-General for New Zealand.

JULIUS VOGEL.

No. 68.

The Hon. Sir J. VOGEL to the AGENT-GENERAL.

7, Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.,

9th April, 1875.

SIR,—

I have delayed acknowledging the copy, which you sent me, of your letter of November 25th, 1874, on the subject of Mr. Cashel Hoey, until the Minister for Immigration, to whom the original was addressed, has requested me to deal with the matter to which it refers. It is desirable to place on record a reply to your letter.

2. I have not the papers before me, but I have no difficulty in explaining from memory the facts which seem to cause you so much anxiety.

3. The principle laid down in the Colonial Secretary's letter of 2nd August had reference to the appointment of a Private Secretary. You speak of the officer as "Confidential Secretary." If that was the term used, it was meant to designate only a Private Secretary. The Government would still, I believe, be of opinion that you should select the officer. In the subsequent telegrams which you quote, the Government understood the reference to be to a Private Secretary: in one of them, indeed, the words are expressly used.

4. It seems, by your letter, that when you telegraphed on the 20th February, you had Mr. Cashel Hoey's appointment in view, but merely asked permission to give £600 for salary of secretary. I must express the opinion that it would have been better then that you had stated your intention. I presume you are not unaware of the controversy which Mr. Hoey's appointment to the Victorian Agency caused in the colony of Victoria.

5. The reply sent you on the 2nd April was considered by the Cabinet. The condition that the appointment was to be temporary was imposed because the Government thought it probable that extensive alterations would be found desirable in your department, and did not wish new permanent engagements made. It was even then thought that, if it was decided to provide you with an officer to fill a position analogous to that of Under Secretary, a Private Secretary might be unnecessary.

6. The reply to your subsequent telegram about Mr. Cashel Hoey was considered by the Government. I may observe that I do not agree with you that it released you from the previous instruction concerning a month's notice. You complain that the reply said nothing about Mr. Hoey. The omission was not accidental. The Government did not wish to recall your freedom to choose your own Private Secretary, subject to the conditions already laid down. I may, however, observe that Ministers did take into consideration whether they should prohibit Mr. Hoey's appointment, but came to the conclusion that it was unnecessary to do so, because you stated he required a salary of £600 a year, and they thought that the refusal to allow anything like that salary was sufficient. The reason why they were inclined to stop Mr. Hoey's appointment was, because they believed that that gentleman sought a much more permanent and influential appointment than they were prepared to sanction. Mr. Hoey, though nominally Private Secretary to the Victorian Agency, held an appointment more in the nature of Acting Agent-General. Mr. Childers was not able to give his whole time to the office, and Sir J. McCulloch only accepted the appointment temporarily. Your own letter bears out this view. Private Secretaries do not receive special votes of thanks from Governments; and you point to qualifications beyond those required by a Private Secretary. Although the Government were willing, under the conditions named, you should select your own Private Secretary, they were, of course, not inclined to waive the responsibility of appointing an officer who would possess, or be likely to assume, much larger powers than they considered attached to a Private Secretary's office. In their opinion, Mr. Hoey's want of knowledge of New Zealand disqualified him from exercising, in the New Zealand Agency, the powers he exercised in the Victorian Agency.

7. My telegram to you from Melbourne was caused by my noticing in the papers of that city a telegraphic report about Mr. Hoey's engagement. As you had not advised it, I thought it might be a rumour, and I telegraphed that which was really my opinion—that with Mr. Kennaway's aid you would not require Mr. Hoey's.

8. So much by way of explaining the circumstances to which your letter refers. I may add, that though I do not concur in the claims which you seem to consider Mr. Hoey possesses, I am willing that he should continue to hold the position of Private Secretary until the Government have considered