

As Sir David Monro seems, from his letter, unwilling to accept a seat in the Council under the immediate nomination of Her Majesty, there will be no objection on the part of Ministers to recommend to His Excellency that Sir David should be nominated to a seat in the usual manner, though Ministers regret that Sir David Monro should not be sensible that the course proposed by them would confer upon him greater honor.

The only precedent in the matter, arising in New Zealand, which Ministers had before them, was the case of Sir Charles Clifford, who was twice elected Speaker of the House of Representatives. On his retirement Sir Charles received merely an address; but as he proposed to leave the Colony, the question as to a seat in the Legislative Council did not occur in his case.

Ministers concur in the opinion of Sir David Monro as to the estimation in which he is held in New Zealand. But they regret that he should have allowed personal or party feelings to betray him into troubling the Secretary of State for the Colonies with particulars of no Imperial interest. The questions involved are either party or personal; with neither is it likely that the Secretary of State would desire to interfere.

Sir David Monro's letter was probably written under feelings of irritation, and Ministers would suggest that, having regard to the high position which he has held in the Colony, it would be a considerate course for the Secretary of State to allow him to withdraw his letter.

Sir David Monro, writing from Nelson, states that he has forwarded to the Secretary of State an extract from a local paper giving a summary of the proceedings of the Legislature relating to the subject of his letter. Sir David does not, however, name the paper from which the extract was obtained, nor has he forwarded to His Excellency the extract with the copy of his letter; Ministers are therefore unable to state how far that extract may fairly be considered to convey an impartial summary of the proceedings of the House of Representatives on this subject.

Wellington, 17th November, 1871.

W. GISBORNE,
Colonial Secretary.

No. 25.

COPY of a DESPATCH from Governor Sir G. F. BOWEN, G.C.M.G., to the
Right Hon. the Earl of KIMBERLEY.

(No. 108.)

Government House, Wellington,

MY LORD,—

New Zealand, 19th November, 1871.

Adverting to my Despatch No. 101, of the 25th October ultimo, and to the previous correspondence connected with the case *Regina v. Barton*, I am now requested to forward copies of the "Report of the Select Committee on the Working and Management of the Electric Telegraph Department," and to solicit your Lordship's attention to this Parliamentary Paper.

*Vide Appendix
to Journals of
H. of R., H. No.
8.*

2. The Committee was appointed by the House of Representatives, at an early period of the recent Session, in consequence of the charges that had been made in certain quarters against the management of the Electric Telegraph in New Zealand. It will be seen that after a long and searching inquiry, and after the examination of numerous witnesses, "the Committee have arrived at the following conclusions, founded upon the evidence taken:—

"(1.) That the Telegraph Department has been fairly and honestly conducted, and has been eminently worthy of public confidence.

"(2.) That the accusations have been founded entirely on misconceptions and inferences drawn from supposed occurrences which are proved not to have taken place.

"(3.) That the principal accuser of the Government and the Telegraph Department (Mr. Barton) should have continued to use the Press in reiterating the charges, even after evidence was in his possession which should have disabused his mind, shows, in the opinion of the Committee, that his mind was warped by previous antagonism to the Commissioner of Telegraphs, and that the whole of his accusations and beliefs—although by the peculiar circumstances of the case they may have been justified in the first instance—were not justifiable after the evidence which explained away his misapprehensions was in his possession. The Committee desire to record their opinion that the evidence of one witness (Mr. Hart) is an example of the most reckless and wicked conduct; and that unfounded reports such as those spread by that witness have caused great uneasiness in the public mind as to the integrity of the Telegraph Department, and entailed unnecessary expense on the public.

"The Committee, notwithstanding the expense incurred in conducting the inquiry, believe that good has resulted from it, through its having established the integrity of the Telegraph Department."