It is thought that the particulars furnished the London Office sufficiently demonstrated the unreasonableness of the request made by that office. The discussion on the subject seems to have arisen because of an apparent misapprehension on the part of the London Office, which appears to think that some particular portion of the Colonial share of postage on parcels exchanged with the United Kingdom is allocated for the sea service; but such is not the case, and it must be obvious that (the Orient and P. and O. Companies having two years since abandoned their special charges for the sea transit of parcels) there is no need to allocate any portion of the postage receipts to cover charges which no longer exist.

The London Office has not made, *nor is it entitled to make, any claim for the sea transit of parcels sent from the Colonies addressed to the United Kingdom*, and, as the arrangement made is that the Colonies are to receive the *same share of postage* on parcels exchanged with foreign countries *viâ* the United Kingdom as on parcels exchanged direct with the United Kingdom, and in view of the other strong reasons herein given, it seems sufficiently clear that the London Office has no good claim to the credit asked for; *and it is still thought that the request made should not be acceded to.*

To sum up the matter, on parcels for Foreign Countries *viâ* the United Kingdom, the London Office receives *its full share of postage at the rates agreed upon, in addition to the onward postage from the United Kingdom to destination*, and it would seem clear that the London Office has no good claim for any further payment.

Were the claim of the London Office admitted, the *Colonies* would receive (after the first lb.) only 2*d*. per lb., whilst the United Kingdom would receive 4*d*. per lb., instead of each receiving as at present, 3*d*. per lb.

We recommend that the foregoing statement be communicated to the London Post Office, Queensland dissenting, that Colony having already made the necessary charge on parcels in order to meet London demands.

No. 55.—"The practicability or otherwise of introducing the 'Value payable,' or 'Cash' on delivery of Parcels System into the Australasian Colonies."

It is thought that there would be strong protests from country storekeepers and others were this system introduced; indeed, when the parcel post was brought into operation there were numerous complaints that people in the country found it cheaper to obtain their goods from the city by parcel post than to (as formerly) patronise their local storekeepers, who suffered in consequence. Were the "value payable," post inaugurated, it is obvious that the grievance would be intensified. Moreover, were the system to apply, as in India, only between Money Order Offices, it would not be available for use by people in remote districts, by whom it would be most appreciated. Under these circumstances it is thought that it would not be desirable at the present time to bring the system mentioned into operation in the Australasian Colonies.

No. 56.—"Rates of Commission on Money Orders from the Australasian Colonies to the United Kingdom, Cape Colony, &c."

We recommend that the rates of commission charged on Money Orders for the United Kingdom, British Possessions, and Foreign Countries, in all the Colonies as in New South Wales and Queensland, be 6*d*. for each pound or fraction of a pound.

No. 57.—"Reduction in rate of commission to paying country on Money Orders exchanged between Australasian Colonies and Singapore."

The rate of commission has now been reduced from one per cent. to half of one per cent. by all the Colonies.

No. 58.—"Treatment of Money Order Advices missent to other Colonies."

We advise that in the event of Money Order Advice being inadvertently sent to the wrong Colony, that Colony should forward the Advice without delay to the Head Office of the Colony on which the Money Order was drawn, so that the payee may at once receive payment; at the same time, the issuing Colony should be informed of the action taken and requested to deduct the amount of such Advice from the next Account.

No. 59.—"Practice of forwarding Money Order Advices, with and without lists, between Colonies."

We advise that Tasmania correspond by letter with the Colonies concerned.

No. 60.—"Telegraph Money Orders to New Zealand and Tasmania."—"Omission of signature from Advices, and Cable Company's charges."

At the 1896 (Sydney) Conference, the following recommendation by Permanent Heads of Departments was adopted, viz.:—"We recommend that the proposal of New Zealand to introduce the Telegraph Money Order system between that Colony and Australia and Tasmania be agreed to. Our experience of the system which is now in force between the Australian