

*Answers.*—To the above questions answers have been received as follows:—(1.) From Ross and Glendining, 63, Finsbury Pavement, E.C., London: Q. 1. Undoubtedly. Q. 2. We believe an increase of 15 per cent. a moderate estimate.—(2.) From W. Weddell and Co., 16, St. Helen's Place, London: Q. 1. Certainly. Q. 2. Yes; 15 per cent. increase is a reasonable estimate.—(3.) From Mr. John Beaumont, 138, Leadenhall Street: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. No; with charges lowered to 3s. per word, I think 50 per cent. more probable.—(4.) From Mr. James Huddart, 22, Billiter Street, E.C.: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. Yes; look at the development of cable traffic across the Atlantic by reason of reduced charges. I think 15 per cent. reasonable.—(5.) From Sargood, Butler, Nichol, and Ewen, 11, Bunhill Row: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. Yes.—(6.) From Sargood, Son, and Ewen, 11, Bunhill Row: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. Yes.—(7.) From Shaw, Savill, and Albion Company, 34, Leadenhall Street: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. 15 per cent. annual increase might reasonably be expected.—(8.) From McLean Brothers and Rigg, 1, Fenchurch Avenue, E.C.: Q. 1. Certainly. Q. 2. We should think considerably more.—(9.) From James McEwan and Co., 27, Lombard Street, E.C.: Q. 1. Yes, certainly. Q. 2. I think it would not be unreasonable.—(10.) From the Bank of Australasia, 4, Threadneedle Street: Q. 1. As the business has increased largely of late years, it would be unreasonable to suppose that it would not continue to do so if the rates were reduced. Q. 2. As the rate of increase has for some years past been largely in excess of 15 per cent., the opinion may fairly be held that the latter figure would not be an excessive estimate.—(11.) From Grimwade, Ridley, and Co., 82, Bishopsgate Street: Q. 1. Our experience has been that reductions in cost of telegraphing has resulted in increased use of cables. Q. 2. We should not consider this an unreasonable increase to look for.—(12.) From J. E. Nathan, 7, Fenchurch Street: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. Yes, I think this very reasonable.—(13.) From Sir Julius Vogel, Hillenden, East Molesey: Q. 1. Most decidedly. Q. 2. The annual increase of traffic would be very large, but not at a uniform rate. During the first five years it would, in my opinion, more than double, or an increase of more than 15 per cent. per annum for those years. The normal increase subsequently would probably be at a less rate.—(14.) From Turnbull, Martin, and Co., 112, Fenchurch Street: Q. 1. Certain. Q. 2. No.—(15.) From W. Lund, 3, East India Avenue: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. I should consider 15 per cent. increase very reasonable.—(16.) From Loughland, Mackay, and Baker, 50, Lime Street: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. No.—(17.) From S. Hoffnung and Co., 102, Fore Street, E.C.: Q. 1. Yes, but not in proportion to the reduction in cost. Q. 2. Yes.—(18.) From Colonial Consignment and Distribution Company (E. Montague Wilson): Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. 15 per cent. increase not unreasonable; but it must be remembered that the last two years have shown exceptional traffic with West Australia, which is not so active at present.—(19.) From Nathaniel Cork, managing director, Commercial Banking Company, of Sydney: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. Since the last reduction in rate the number of messages to and from the bank has increased 63·2 per cent., and the volume has increased by a far larger percentage, so that a further increase of 15 per cent. consequent upon a reduction of 40 per cent. in the tariff might very reasonably be expected.—(20.) From Milburn and Co., Billiter Avenue: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. No.—(21.) From Sir Edwin Dawes, 23, Great Winchester Street: Q. 1. Yes, judging by past experience. Q. 2. No, considering the increasing vitality of trade with Australasia and the internal development of colonial resources.—(22.) From Gray, Dawes, and Co., 23, Great Winchester Street: Q. 1. Yes, judging by past experience. Q. 2. No.—(23.) From the Australian Joint-stock Bank, 2, King William Street: Q. 1. Yes. Q. 2. No.—(24.) From Gilbert J. McCaul and Co., 27, Walbrook Street: Q. 1. Certainly. Q. 2. Safe to reckon on 15 per cent. increase.—(25.) From Richard Maxwell, 15, Moorgate Street: Q. 1. Undoubtedly. Q. 2. Not unreasonable.—(26.) From McIlwraith, McEacharn, and Co., 3 and 4, Lime Street Square, E.C.: Q. 1. Perfectly reasonable. Q. 2. Not at all.—(27.) From Joseph Gould, Christchurch, New Zealand: Q. 1. Yes, certainly, it would increase. Q. 2. I think 15 per cent. per annum a moderate estimate of the probable increase.

*SECOND.—The Probable Traffic of the Pacific Cable and its Effect on the Commerce of the Empire as a Whole.*

*Questions.*—(4.) Would the Pacific cable be likely to obtain a fair share of the total telegraph business between Australasia and the United Kingdom? (5.) Would it be reasonable to count on the Pacific cable obtaining one-half of the total business between Australasia and the United Kingdom? (6.) If you think the Pacific cable would not obtain as much as one-half of the total business, please state what proportion of the whole might, in your opinion, fall to its share. (7.) Can it reasonably be expected that the establishment of the Pacific cable as proposed would assist in developing trade and telegraphic communication between the Australasian Colonies and Canada, the United States and other parts of America, and as a whole be of material advantage to the commerce of the Empire?

*Answers.*—To these questions replies have been received as follows:—(1.) From Ross and Glendining, 63, Finsbury Pavement, E.C.: Q. 4. We believe so. Q. 5. We believe this would happen in a short time. Q. 7. We have no doubt of it, and would use the cable ourselves if laid to a much greater extent than we use the existing cables.—(2.) From W. Weddell and Co., 16, St. Helen's Place: Q. 4. Yes, if as efficiently worked as the Eastern Telegraph Company. Q. 5. Yes. Q. 7. Most certainly.—(3.) From John Beaumont, 138, Leadenhall Street: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. More, if the Pacific cable did not mutilate as much as existing cables. Q. 7. Yes.—(4.) From James Huddart, 22, Billiter Street, E.C.: Q. 4. Without doubt. Q. 5. I think so. It would be the policy of merchants to keep it alive. Q. 7. As certain as gravitation.—(5.) From Sargood, Butler, Nichol, and Ewen, 11, Bunhill Row: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. Yes, provided the charges were equal. Q. 7. Yes, it could not fail to be of material advantage.—(6.) From Sargood, Son, and Ewen, 11, Bunhill Row: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. Yes. Q. 7. Yes.—(7.) From Shaw, Savill, and Albion Company, 34, Leadenhall Street: Q. 4 and Q. 5. Yes, the extent of this would entirely depend upon how the business was conducted. Q. 7. Yes.—(8.) From McLean Brothers and Rigg, 1, Fenchurch Avenue, E.C.: Q. 4. It largely depends on the mode of business. Q. 5. Should scarcely think so, but the former answer somewhat governs this. Q. 7. Yes.—(9.) From James McEwan and Co., 27, Lombard Street: Q. 4. This would depend on the rates charged. Q. 5. I doubt it unless the new line was more accurately worked than the present. Q. 6. I cannot form an opinion. Q. 7. I think so.—(10.) From the Bank of Australasia, 4, Threadneedle Street: Q. 4. If the service should be as well performed. Q. 5. No means of judging. Q. 7. On the principle that two routes are better than one, a material advantage should accrue.—(11.) From Grimwade, Ridley, and Co., 82, Bishopsgate Street: Qs. 4, 5, 6, and 7. In our opinion, if the new proposed route is cheaper than existing routes it would naturally command support from all needing to cable; possibly increased facilities of inter-communication may benefit commerce. One thing is certain, that it will increase the work that has to be done on this side.—(12.) From J. E. Nathan, 7, Fenchurch Street: Q. 4. Most decidedly. Q. 5. Yes. Q. 7. Yes, certainly, and decidedly of very great advantage.—(13.) From Sir Julius Vogel, Hillenden, East Molesey (letter appended): Q. 4. See answer 6. Q. 5. Certainly not with one cable only. Q. 6. If the Eastern companies charge the same, I do not think the Pacific route will obtain more than a quarter to a third of the traffic, so long as the system comprises only one cable. The proportion will be liable to considerable decrease if the cable is interrupted frequently or for lengthened periods. The Governments may assist traffic by their own business, and by giving the route preference for unmarked messages. It would not be safe to calculate on more than (if so much as) a third. See my covering letter (appended). Q. 7. Most certainly, yes.—(14.) From Turnbull, Martin, and Co., 112, Fenchurch Street: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. Yes. Q. 7. Yes. I am connected with companies paying considerably over £2,000 a year in telegraphing to Australasian Colonies.—(15.) From W. Lund, 3, East India Avenue: Q. 4. Yes, if the messages were delivered speedily and accurately. Q. 5. Yes; probably more. Q. 7. I consider it would be of very material advantage to the commerce of the Empire.—(16.) From Loughland, Mackay, and Baker, 50, Lime Street: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. Yes, in time. Q. 7. Most certainly; we come to this conclusion after fifty years' experience of Australian trade.—(17.) From S. Hoffnung and Co., 102, Fore Street, E.C.: Q. 4. Yes. Q. 5. Certainly not at first. An established company will retain a large proportion of a trade or business in spite of opposition. Q. 7. Yes.—(18.) From the Colonial Consignment and Distribution Company (E. Montague Wilson): Qs. 4, 5, and 6. A fair share, but probably not for some time half the business if the existing company works at same tariff. Q. 7. Undoubtedly.—(19.) From Nathaniel Cork, for Commercial Banking Company of Sydney: Q. 4. Yes, provided the messages between London and the colonies received each day at 4 p.m. are delivered by 10 a.m. at either end. Q. 5. Certainly yes, if the above condition can be relied on. Q. 7. Means of communication with the Pacific is much needed. There can be no doubt that a cable between Australia and British North America would lead to a large business between the two. Australia would take American timber and wheat. America would import coal, wool, and fruit.—(20.) From William Milburn and Co., Billiter Avenue: Q. 4. On equal