

The matter was referred accordingly to the other Colonies, and the following is an extract from the New Zealand reply :—

“This Office quite recognises that the case under review presents probably one of the greatest anomalies possible in the application of the long distance sea rates re-enacted by the Vienna Convention, and fully concurs with you that it should be brought under the special notice of the Union Administrations. In my opinion, however, the object sought would be more readily obtained if no definite rates were proposed. Those suggested by New South Wales would traverse the huge Atlantic and European interests created in and before 1878, compared to which the few hundred pounds involved by the Sydney-New Caledonia question sink into insignificance, and while standing but a remote chance of being accepted, they might aid in compromising Great Britain in connection with the growing agitation for the total abolition of sea rates.

“It is considered not unlikely, however, that the part of the proposal made by Austria-Hungary at the Vienna Conference, but postponed for discussion at Washington, which would fix the sea rates from 300 to 4000 miles at 5 frs. and 50 cts. for letters and other articles respectively, may commend itself to a majority of the Union Administrations, and, if so, Sydney's difficulty would be effectually met, as its payments to France would be reduced to one-third the present rates.”

We recommend that the matter should be brought before the Berne Bureau and London Office, and that the Australasian Delegate at the next Quinquennial Congress be asked to press for an alteration in Sea Transit Rates.

No. 51.—*Consideration of proposed Official Code Vocabulary.*

There seems to be a misapprehension on this subject. The proposed code was not prepared by the Eastern Extension or any Company, but by the Berne Bureau, by direction of the Paris Convention of 1890. It is not intended to come into operation as regards extra-European countries (of which Australasia is one) until it has been confirmed at the next Telegraph Conference in 1896. We are of opinion that it is very desirable to have a carefully prepared code vocabulary, as many of the present private codes contain inconvenient words, and words so nearly alike as to lead to frequent repetitions through an error possibly of a single letter. Not having seen the vocabulary to which objection is taken, we are unable to form an opinion as to its suitability.

No. 52.—*Registration of Code or abbreviated Addresses (Uniformity of Regulations).*

The Wellington Office telegraphed to the Postmaster-General, South Australia, that “in England a separate charge is made for each registration at office of delivery. South Australia and Victoria appear to accept registration for the whole of Colony, charging only one fee. The question is—What rule is observed in other Colonies, as uniformity is desirable?”

Postmaster-General, Adelaide, wrote in reply :—“South Australian practice as follows :—

Persons, firms, &c. in Adelaide or any provincial town can have code address entered in Adelaide, thus—

Phillipson & Co.,
Mount Gambier,

can be entered on Adelaide register, say—
Bonus,
Adelaide.

And we transmit messages on receipt to

Phillipson & Co.,
Mount Gambier,

without any additional charge.

If, however, Phillipson & Co. have offices in several towns, they must register a code to each address. Thus—

Phillipson & Co., Mount Gambier,
Bonus, Adelaide,
Phillipson & Co., Gawler,
Beatrice, Adelaide,
Phillipson & Co., Adelaide,
Burnham, Adelaide,

paying usual fee for each code, or they may register code at each place, in which case the messages would bear proper names of places.

Thus—

Bonus, Mount Gambier
Beatrice, Gawler
Burnham, Adelaide.

The reason why in most cases persons register in Adelaide is because Mount Gambier, Gawler, &c. may not for messages put in at London, or in France, &c., be sufficiently explicit, unless the words ‘South Australia’ are added, which increases the cost.