

Enclosure No. 1.

The PREMIER of NEW ZEALAND to the PREMIERS of NEW SOUTH WALES, QUEENSLAND, TASMANIA, VICTORIA, and WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

SIR,—

Premier's Office, Wellington, 15th February, 1892.

In a despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, dated 12th December, 1891, received by His Excellency the Governor, is enclosed copy of a despatch addressed to the Governors of New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria, and Western Australia, on the subject of the exercise of the prerogative of mercy under the Royal Instructions, in which it appears that Her Majesty's Government is prepared, should it be thought desirable, to submit to Her Majesty the question of the substitution for the corresponding clause in the present Instructions to Governors, of a clause similar to that contained in the Canadian Royal Instructions.

Lord Knutsford having intimated that it is desirable to secure uniformity of action upon this important question. I trust you will be able to convey to His Lordship a similar expression of satisfaction to that expressed by the South Australian Government, and which is felt by this Government, that the Royal Instructions may be amended by an instruction that, in exercising the prerogative of mercy in capital cases, Governors are to act upon the advice of their responsible Ministers.

I have, &c.,

J. BALLANCE.

Enclosure No. 2.

The PREMIER of TASMANIA to the PREMIER of NEW ZEALAND.

SIR,—

Premier's Office, Hobart, 5th March, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ultimo on the subject of the contemplated amendment of the Royal Instructions to Governors of the Australian Colonies in regard to the prerogative of mercy.

This Government cordially approves of the proposed alteration in the Instructions as being most desirable for securing uniformity of practice with respect to so important a question, and also as more fully recognising the principles of responsible government.

I have, &c.,

P. O. FYSH.

The Hon. the Premier, New Zealand.

Enclosure No. 3.

The PREMIER of WESTERN AUSTRALIA to the PREMIER of NEW ZEALAND.

SIR,—

Premier's Office, Perth, 10th March, 1892.

In reply to your letter of the 15th February, with reference to the question of the exercise of the prerogative of mercy under the Royal Instructions by the Australasian Governors, I beg to inform you that this Government has expressed its view to Lord Knutsford that a clause similar to that contained in the Canadian Royal Instructions should be substituted for the corresponding clause in the present Instructions to Governors of the Australasian Colonies.

I have, &c.,

JOHN FORREST.

The Hon. the Premier of New Zealand.

Enclosure No. 4.

The PREMIER of QUEENSLAND to the PREMIER of NEW ZEALAND.

SIR,—

Chief Secretary's Office, Brisbane, 12th March, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 15th ultimo, in which, referring to the question of the substitution for the corresponding clause in the present Instructions to Governors of a clause similar to that contained in the Canadian Royal Instructions, you express your hope that the views of this Government may be favourable to the proposal.

I have pleasure in being able to state that I have informed His Excellency Sir Henry Norman that this Government would regard the substitution suggested with satisfaction.

I have, &c.,

S. W. GRIFFITH.

The Hon. J. Ballance, Wellington, New Zealand.

Enclosure No. 5.

The PREMIER of VICTORIA to the PREMIER of NEW ZEALAND.

(No. 1137.)

SIR,—

Premier's Department, Melbourne, 25th March, 1892.

Your letter of the 15th ultimo, respecting the exercise of the prerogative of mercy under the Royal Instructions, was replied to by my telegram of the 2nd instant, as follows—viz.: "Melbourne, 2nd March, 1892.—Entirely agree with your letter of the 15th instant respecting Royal Instructions. May I ask whether you have addressed the other Australian Governments in the same sense?"

I duly received your telegram of the same day, informing me that the other Australian Governments had been similarly addressed, except South Australia, which had already expressed concurrence.