

In reply, I have the honor to direct you to inform Messrs. Brogden and Sons that the Government is of opinion that they are not entitled to the relief they ask, nor to any relief whatever.

It is quite true that, in accordance with the requirements of the colony, the Government directed you, in October last, to grant free passages to emigrants. In taking this step they did not recognize that it gave any claim to people who had previously paid their own passages or given undertakings to do so. If such an obligation was involved, probably some 200,000 people might have made claims for the repayment of their passage money to the colony. But instead of this claim arising, the free passages were given by the authority bestowed on the Government by the representatives of the people of the colony, in Parliament. It was for the benefit of the colony and its people that the free passages were and are given, and whenever it seems desirable to adopt another system the colony has the right to do so, without the fear of ill-defined claims for compensation. In short, New Zealand will promote immigration from time to time, as it is found desirable, without admitting that any changes of system involve claims for compensation on account of previous arrangements.

The case of Messrs. Brogden and Sons is indeed not so strong as that of any persons resident in the colony who may have paid their own passages out, or that of their servants or employés. It is to be presumed that, on account of the large contracts they have charge of, the adoption of free immigration has been a great boon to Messrs. Brogden and Sons; indeed it would not be difficult to show that it has enabled them to economise expenditure. In respect to the immigration contract, it was arranged after much negotiation; and, to say the least, the colony would have had the right to feel disappointed, if, with the large contracts they received, free from the competition of public tendering, they had not imported labourers to carry them out.

In considering the amounts they were to be paid, Messrs. Brogden and Sons frequently referred to the expenses they might have to incur in importing labour, and the prices fixed included heavy margins for contingencies. Results since have shown conclusively, that if submitted to public tender the contracts made with Messrs. Brogden and Sons could have been let at cheaper rates. In employing Messrs. Brogden and Sons, the idea was that they could introduce to the colony something new. A London firm, Messrs. Clarke and Co., obtained a contract for the construction of a railway in Tasmania: they at once introduced labour to carry out their contract, without there being, I believe I am justified in saying, any clause in their contract requiring them to do so.

If Messrs. Brogden and Sons were unfortunate in their selection of men who disowned their liabilities, or if they advanced too largely, or failed to offer the highest rates of wages, and so led the men at their own risk to break any contract they had entered into, these are all matters between Messrs. Brogden and Sons and those with whom they arranged. The Government cannot think of interfering. Messrs. Brogden and Sons have the remedies, and their employés the rights, the laws of the colony afford, and to them they must be left.

You are at liberty to communicate to Messrs. Brogden and Sons any portion of this letter.

I abstain from replying to Messrs. Brogden and Sons' remarks about the railway corps on the Waikato extension, except to observe that their complaint on the subject is unwarranted, and has been fully investigated in the Colony. As to the general complaint about inducing responsible persons to incur large outlay, &c., I have only to observe, that Messrs. Brogden and Sons have received great consideration in New Zealand; they have had contracts given to them at exceptionally high prices, whilst, on the other hand, they have not carried them out with despatch.

The Agent-General for New Zealand, London.

I have, &c.,
JULIUS VOGEL.

No. 14.

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

(No. 195.)

SIR,—

Immigration Office, Wellington, 4th July, 1874.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1214, of 4th May ultimo, with enclosures, respecting a request by Mr. Wm. W. U'Ren that a grant of land, under "The Immigrants Land Act, 1873," may be made to relatives of his, although they have not complied with the terms of that Act, and indeed could not, as they were unaware of the existence of the Act when they left England.

In reply, I have to state, that to depart from the precise provisions of the Act would be to establish a very inconvenient precedent, and that, therefore, I do not feel at liberty to comply with Mr. U'Ren's request.

The Agent-General for New Zealand, London.

I have, &c.,
JULIUS VOGEL.

No. 15.

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

(No. 196.)

SIR,—

Immigration Office, Wellington, 4th July, 1874.

I have the honor to forward herewith copy of an agreement entered into by the Secretary for Crown Lands with Mr. G. V. Stewart, by which it has been concluded to set apart, for the purpose of a special settlement of farmers with capital, the Kati Kati Block, at Tauranga, comprising 10,000 acres or thereabouts.

I desire to call your particular attention to those conditions of the agreement which require to be fulfilled by Mr. Stewart in Great Britain,—and especially clause 4, which provides for the issue by yourself of a certificate to each of the emigrants selected by Mr. Stewart, that he is an eligible person