explain that I have since written to the Government Printer asking whether I, or any person acting on my behalf, gave instructions to print upon the paper the words "By authority," and have received from the Government Printer this written answer: "I received no direction to attach the words 'By authority.' They were put there by the printer as a merely mechanical act."

I need scarcely assure your Lordship that I should have been most willing to have placed these simple facts at the disposal of His Excellency the Governor had I been requested to do so, or had I been asked for any explanation; and I cannot refrain from respectfully submitting to your Lordship that His Excellency, by accepting and adopting the *ex parte* statements of persons publicly well known to be bitterly hostile to me, and not affording me any opportunity of commenting upon or explaining those statements, has inflicted upon me a cruel wrong and grievous injury. It is with deep regret, my Lord, that I so write; but I feel that I have no alternative, in view of the statement in His Excellency's letter of the 4th July, that he had "already communicated the facts, and similar expressions of regret, to the Secretary of State," and in view of the further fact that this letter, which does me so much injustice, will be bound up amongst the permanent public records of this colony.

In order that your Lordship may be in possession of all the facts bearing upon this subject—which have been very fully debated in Parliament—I forward for your Lordship's information the official documents detailed at foot hereof. I have, &c.,

GEORGE FISHER.

The Right Hon. Lord Knutsford, Secretary of State for the Colonies.

LIST OF OFFICIAL AND OTHER DOCUMENTS FORWARDED WITH THE FOREGOING LETTER.

(1.) PARLIAMENTARY Paper H.–19, 1889.—Correspondence relating to the convict Gasparini. (2.) *Hansard*, No. 1, p. 40.—Motion for Address to His Excellency the Governor for production of correspondence. (3.) *Hansard*, No. 4, p. 187.—Discussion in reference to my retirement from the Ministry, showing the feeling existing between Sir Harry Atkinson and myself at the time His Excellency's letter was written. (4.) *Hansard*, No. 6, p. 309.—Mr. Fisher announced to the House that the correspondence was printed for the convenience of His Excellency Sir Wm. Jervois. (5.) Letter to *Evening Post* (attached) of 11th July, to show that from the beginning the Premier was aware that the correspondence was in print. (6.) *Hansard*, No. 7, p. 395.—Statement to House by Premier as a reply to foregoing letter in *Evening Post*. Mr. Fisher's rejoinder. (7.) *Hansard*, No. 8, p. 484.—Sir George Grey calls attention in Parliament to His Excellency's letter of 4th July. (8.) *Hansard*, No. 8, p. 521.—Mr. Fisher announced to Parliament that he had discovered the printed papers sent to the Premier at New Plymouth, the existence of which the Premier in Parliament emphatically denied. (9.) Letter to *Evening Post* of 20th July, 1889—Referring to same subject. (10.) Article from *Evening Post* of 9th August, 1889, commenting on this matter. (11.) *Hansard*, No. 10, p. 615.—Discussion initiated by Sir George Grey on the subject of His Excellency's letter of 4th July, 1889, to the French Vice-Consul. (12.) Comment of *Catholic Times* on the Gasparini correspondence. (13.) Comment of *Rangitikei Advocate* on the Gasparini correspondence.

---

No. 5.

[Extract from the *Evening Post*, Thursday, 11th July, 1889.]

THE GASPARINI CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,— 10th July, 1889.

Many statements connected with the printing of this correspondence greatly surprised me. In the first place, I now learn that on the 7th March the Premier received a letter from the French Vice-Consul asking that the correspondence should not be published, "pending the consideration of the question by the metropolitan competent authorities." A little strange, is it not, that I was never made aware of the existence of such a letter, for I was a Minister of the Crown for a month after the date of that letter? Secondly, I regard it as a rather cool proposition that the French Vice-Consul, who made a serious charge which I had scattered to the four winds of heaven, should, on the eve of departing from the colony, leave behind him a last request that my vindication should never see the light of day! These, however, are points of secondary importance. The point of first importance is this: In the letter of His Excellency the Governor (Lord Onslow), which is now attached to the correspondence, is contained this statement: "It appears that the papers in question have been printed without the knowledge or sanction of the Officer Administering the Government, and apparently on the authority only of Mr. Fisher, at that time Minister of Education, without consulting his colleagues." Of course, it is an anachronism to speak of the Officer Administering the Government in connection with the matter, for the correspondence was conducted wholly through the medium of Sir Wm. Jervois, and not during his absence. But upon whose authority were the papers printed? Upon the authority of the Premier? For it was he who suggested that the correspondence should be sent to the Governor in print. And when it was sent to His Excellency in print, he asked (after necessary corrections and emendations) for ten complete copies of the correspondence, in print, to be forwarded to the Home Government. Now, sir, I ask, quite courteously, does it not appear that His Excellency has been misled into making the statement that "the papers in question have been printed by Mr. Fisher, without consulting his colleagues?" As a proof that the Premier has all along been cognisant of the fact that the correspondence was in print, I take from my letter-book this copy of a letter, which, as it relates wholly to the Gasparini correspondence, I make no apology for publishing. It was addressed to the Premier, who was at the time on a short visit to New Plymouth. "27th September, 1888.—My Dear Major,—I send you printed copies of the memorandum. When I read the draft to you on Sunday evening you generally approved of it. The two portions which you disapproved I expunged. . . . . In the beginning I am called on to make an explanation in the