

shortly secure for the Australasian Colonies that freedom from Imperial restrictions on their fiscal relations with each other which the conciliatory policy of Her Majesty's Government has already conceded to the Colonies of British North America.

Colonial Secretary's Office, 11th September, 1871.

J. M. WILSON.

NEW ZEALAND.

Enclosure 6 in No. 58.

Governor Sir G. F. BOWEN to the Earl of KIMBERLEY.

(No. 117.)
MY LORD,—

Government House, Wellington, New Zealand,
9th December, 1871.

At the request of my Responsible Advisers, I have the honor to transmit herewith a Ministerial Minute by Mr. Fox, covering a Memorandum by Mr. Vogel, the Colonial Treasurer, on the subjects treated of in your Lordship's Circular Despatch of the 13th July, 1871.

I have, &c.,
G. F. BOWEN.

Sub-Enclosure 1 to Enclosure 6 in No. 58.

MEMORANDUM for His Excellency.

MINISTERS present to His Excellency, for transmission to the Secretary of State, the attached Memorandum by the Colonial Treasurer on the Despatch from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State on the subject of Intercolonial Reciprocity.

The Memorandum represents the views of Ministers.

Wellington, 8th December, 1871.

WILLIAM FOX.

Sub-Enclosure 2 to Enclosure 6 in No. 58.

MEMORANDUM on a Circular Despatch from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies on Intercolonial Reciprocity.

THE Colonial Treasurer has carefully studied the Circular Despatch, dated the 13th July, 1871, from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Governor Sir George Ferguson Bowen, on the subject of Intercolonial Reciprocity. He recognizes the consideration which has induced his Lordship to set forth at length the views of Her Majesty's Government on the subject; but he is unable to discover in those views reasons for withdrawing the recommendation already given, that the Colonies should be at liberty to make reciprocal tariff arrangements. The Despatch was brought under the notice of the Assembly, and the special attention of the House of Representatives was called to it; but no Member expressed a wish that the subject should be reconsidered.

The Secretary of State does not, in his Despatch, mention that the position of New Zealand differs from that of the neighbouring Colonies. He treats of them collectively: but there is reason to believe, from previous communications, that his Lordship is aware that there is no law which prohibits the New Zealand Assembly imposing differential duties. Although such a prohibition is contained in the Constitution Acts of the Australian Colonies, it does not find place in the New Zealand Constitution Act, the provisions in that Act being confined to a prohibition against passing any law infringing treaty arrangements between Great Britain and Foreign Powers. Probably Lord Kimberley did not think it necessary to refer to the distinction; because, evidently, as long as New Zealand alone possesses the power to impose differential duties, she cannot enter into reciprocal arrangements with her neighbours. Still it is important to remember she has the power, both because she might find it convenient to use it outside the Australian group, as the British American Colonies have used a similar power, and also because it may fairly be claimed that the power possessed by New Zealand ought without delay to be granted to the Australian Colonies, including Tasmania.

There are some incidental passages in Lord Kimberley's Despatch, which, if grouped, might lead his Lordship to reconsider the views he has expressed.

1. There are allusions to the absence of any urgent need of dealing with the matter.
2. Throughout the Despatch, it is contended that the proposal of reciprocity is made in the interests of protection.
3. The desire is indicated to encourage a Customs Union.
4. The admission is made, that an Act similar to the measure the Colony desires to pass, was one of the first Acts of the Legislature of the newly-constituted Dominion of Canada in its opening Session: "that it was passed in the expectation that at no distant date the "other Possessions of Her Majesty in North America would become part of the Dominion;" and that "the assent of Her Majesty's Government to a measure passed in "circumstances so peculiar and exceptional, cannot form a precedent of universal and "necessary application."

These four references, taken in connection, are unusually suggestive. The Act passed by the Legislature of the Dominion, to which Lord Kimberley refers, was, in respect to the clauses permitting reciprocity, similar to the Act of 1866, passed before the Dominion was constituted; and that, again, was copied from a former Act. In these Acts, clearly the provision was made from a genuine desire to