

No. 27.

The SUPERINTENDENT, Pacific Cable Station, Doubtless Bay, to the ACCOUNTANT, General Post Office, Wellington.

SIR,—

The Pacific Cable Station, Doubtless Bay, 10th June, 1907.

I have just received the following service telegram from Mr. Milward: "Referring to the proportions to be credited to different Administrations in cases of interruptions on the Auckland—Doubtless Bay or Sydney—Southport wires, the Commonwealth Administration has ruled that, if an interruption takes place before the transmission of a message commences, the higher rate payable for transmission by a more costly route must be collected. This means that on international messages diverted by New Zealand Administration *via* Extension cable and Australian land-lines to Southport, the Board must lose the Extension Company's charge of threepence and Australian rate of fivepence; and on messages diverted by Sydney *via* Extension Company's cable and New Zealand land-lines to Doubtless Bay, the Board will lose the Extension Company's rate of threepence and the New Zealand rate of one penny. Should diversion be necessary before definite instructions are received from London, settlement on the above lines may be made. The *pro rata* settlement for the first twenty-four hours on messages diverted by Norfolk Island (either Australian messages *via* Doubtless Bay or New Zealand messages *via* Southport) still applies, as such diversions can only take place whilst the messages are in course of transmission."

I have, &c.,

C. H. HERTSLET, Superintendent.

The Accountant, General Post Office, Wellington.

[P.C. Diver. 07/54.]

No. 28.

The ACCOUNTANT, General Post Office, Wellington, to the SUPERINTENDENT, Pacific Cable Station, Doubtless Bay.

(Telegram.)

Wellington, 18th June, 1907.

YOURS dated 10th instant: Under what regulations does Commonwealth rule that this Administration has no power to divert cable messages during interruption at *pro rata* rates? Seeing that the *pro rata* rates lately agreed upon were fixed at the instance of Commonwealth and our accounts have been rendered on their basis, the position now assumed by them is inconsistent. If your Board is accepting the loss—presumably after strong protests—under the new revision it would be better to advise a rate for messages routed Extension and Southport.

[P.C. Diver. 07/54.]

No. 29.

The SUPERINTENDENT, Pacific Cable Station, Doubtless Bay, to the ACCOUNTANT, General Post Office, Wellington.

(Telegram.)

Doubtless Bay, 18th June, 1907.

THE matter was arranged by Mr. Milward, who is now on "Iris" between Suva and Fanning. I cannot say for certain, but presume under Regulation 42, paragraphs 1 and 2. See Regulation 76, paragraph 5, also Berne's ruling, 29th May, 1905. [Enclosure 2 in No. 2, F.-8, 1906.]

[P.C. Diver. 07/54.]

No. 30.

The MANAGER IN AUSTRALASIA, Eastern Extension Company, Melbourne, to the SECRETARY, General Post Office, Wellington.

The Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company (Limited),
Melbourne, 21st June, 1907.

SIR,—

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter [No. 24, F.-8, 1907] of the 13th instant, replying to mine of the 26th April last [No. 21, F.-8, 1907], respecting the charges to be made for the transit over my company's New Zealand cables of diverted telegrams.

I note that your Administration differs from the views put forward in my letter, and that I appear to construe the Convention regulations in order to obtain for senders "*via* Eastern" an advantage denied to senders "*via* Pacific."

By the operation of the Convention regulations a small advantage certainly exists as mentioned by you, but this appears to be unavoidable. When the company's cables to Sydney are interrupted, messages for Europe marked "*via* Eastern" can reach that route *via* the Pacific cable to Southport without disturbing the message accounts at all. Your own Administration decided that our cables to Australia were regarded by your Department as merely local ones and not forming an integral part of the company's system, by diverting all unrouted messages to China, South Africa, &c., *via* the Pacific cable to Southport, and advertising the route in your Postal Guide as "*via* Direct." I have questioned this action, but your Department construed the Convention otherwise and I said no more on the subject; although I still consider it very unfair, as "*via* Pacific" is not the "*direct*" route for messages to those places.

On the other hand, with any part of the Pacific cable route interrupted between Auckland and Norfolk Island, messages can only reach the Pacific route by way of Australia, and to go this way the transit rates of my company and the Commonwealth, amounting to 8d. per word additional, are incurred.