

G. H. S. S. I.

36.

1<sup>st</sup> April 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward for your Lordship's information a letter received by me from the Bishop of the Falkland Islands asking that your Lordship would sanction the title of Deane being conferred by his Lordship upon the Rev. Doctor Brandon Colonial Chaplain. and I beg to recommend that assent should be given to the same unless there appears to your Lordship any grounds for objecting of which personally I am not aware.—

Enclosed is a copy of the constitutions under which the affairs of Christ Church, which was duly consecrated on the 21<sup>st</sup> February, will be controlled and conducted.—

I have etc

S<sup>r</sup> Roger Tuck R<sup>g</sup> Goldworthy.

The Right Hon<sup>ble</sup>

Lord Knepp Esq<sup>r</sup>.

to etc

98

G. H. S. F. D.

37.

1<sup>st</sup> April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to inform you that the two gun carriages for the brass 6 pounder guns which I asked might be obtained from the Colony from the War Department, have arrived.-

2 They are standing gun carriages and though useful for mounting guns on are useless if it is intended to fire the guns, nor are the guns thus mounted of any use for purposes of instruction to the Volunteers as I intended they should be known the guns & carriages form an ornament in the Government House grounds where they are placed

3 Whilst on this subject I would draw your Lordships attention to my Dispatch No 79 of 19<sup>th</sup> June replied to by that of your Lordship of 5<sup>th</sup> September - Since the receipt of the latter I have not had any information as to how far the Imperial government would go in respect to the issue of arms, accoutrements, ammunition &c to the Volunteers and as I consider it would be a pity to throw cold water on a scheme which would afford, in the event of war, a small body of Volunteers rifles & artillery as an auxiliary to any force of regulars I beg again to draw your Lordships attention to the matter -

Throughout

22

Throughout the Colony a force of some hundred or more volunteers could be obtained. In Stanley there are some 80 who have put down their names & a few of these have attended some drills when Her 'Cleopatra' was here.

4. The senior naval officer Capt. Daus has most readily offered any assistance from the Men of War in organising and drilling the volunteers who he considers would be a valuable auxiliary.

5. I propose that the force should be subdivided as follows - 20 artillery - 60 rifles & 20 as mounted rifles - the men here are capital horsemen who would serve as scouts along the coast and by signals, to be adopted, quickly give notice of the approach or movements of any hostile fleet.

6. The artillery men whilst learning heavy gun drill should also have two light field pieces in the drill of which they could be exercised.

7. Harbours here are plentiful and the light guns would be most useful in preventing an landing from the boats of a hostile force from the South or South East near Port Harcourt. If act they could be moved wherever required to oppose a raid.

I have etc

5. Roger G. F. Goldsworthy.

38

G. H. S. J. D.

2<sup>o</sup> April 1892.

My Dow.

ans by N<sup>o</sup> 43 of 1892

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's Dispatch No 14 of 6 Feb replying to mine of 7<sup>th</sup> December and regret that the order is ultra vires in respect of the penalty imposed.—

I would however ask your Lordship whether in view of Sec 3 of Ordinance 4 1870 had a penalty of £10 been imposed such a penalty would have been illegal— I ask this as Judge Routledge is of opinion that the mistake was made in not fixing it at £10 under that ordinance—

I think that the legal adviser of the Crown here is in somewhat an exceptional position as he has not the benefit of consulting with others who are compelled by their legal training to assist him— might I therefore request that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown be asked on the points detailed in the accompanying memorandum which has been forwarded me by Judge Routledge

I have etc

as Roger Tucke Goldworthy.

G. H. S. T. D.

39.

219. W. SN

2<sup>nd</sup> April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's Despatch N<sup>o</sup>9 of 30<sup>th</sup> January directing me to bring in an ordinance to amend Ordinance N<sup>o</sup> 5 of 1891 entitled "an ordinance to consolidate & amend the laws relating to customs duties and trade".

2. I have deferred doing so until your Lordship has perused the accompanying memo of Judge Routledge from which it would appear that the three ordinances referred to in the second para of your Despatch are repealed by the Consolidated Ordinance N<sup>o</sup> 5 of 1891.—

3. It certainly was the intention to make similar exceptions to those contained in the repealed ordinances but there was oversight as your Lordship will observe from Judge Routledge's memo the necessary addition to the schedule was not included.

4. Pending therefore your Lordship's wishes I shall not introduce further legislation but when dealing with import whilst executing the duty it will be on the understanding that it will be returned when the law has been amended.

I have etc

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger G. F. G. G. Lowes-Worthy.

40.

G. H. S. J. D.

2<sup>nd</sup> April 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith  
6 copies of an ordinance entitled "An ordinance  
to provide for the holding of Conventions of Inquiry  
which has been amended in accordance with  
the instructions contained in your Lordships  
dispatch N° 67 of the 30<sup>th</sup> October and which passed  
the Legislative Council -

Trusting that the ordinance may  
obtain Her Majestys gracious confirmation  
and allowance

I have &c

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Suckf<sup>d</sup> Jobe worthy.

G. H. S. S. D.

44.

4<sup>th</sup> April 1892

My Lord.

I have the honor to forward herewith  
6 copies of an Ordinance relating an ordinance  
to amend the Brewers licensing ordinance 1891  
which has been amended in accordance with  
the instructions contained in your Lordship's  
Despatch No 88 of 18<sup>th</sup> December and which passed  
the Legislative Council -

Praying that the ordinance  
may obtain N. M's previous conference  
and allowance

I have etc

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Tuck<sup>d</sup> Jollsworthy

For Despatches 42 to 46 see pages 108 to 118

G.H. S. & D

46.

April 1892

Cancelled

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith  
for transmission to the Board of Trade an account  
current with supporting vouchers for advances  
made by this Government on account of  
distressed British Seamen for the quarter ended  
31<sup>st</sup> March -

307. 16. 8 I have drawn the bill of exchange  
quoted in the margin in repayment of the amount  
advanced

I have the

D<sup>r</sup> Roger Gurney Goldworthy.

For Despatches Nos 42 to 46 see page 108 to 118.-

G. H. S. S. D.

April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith

a copy of the memorandum of

the subject which was this day

signed by the Right Honorable

and others in my office

in accordance with your directions

and I hope you will be pleased

to accept my very cordial regards

Yours very truly

John G. M.

48.

Q. H. S. J. I.

7<sup>th</sup> April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith  
6 copies of an ordinance entitled "an  
ordinance to make further provision for the  
Colony of the Falkland Islands for the year  
1890" also 6 copies of an ordinance entitled  
an ordinance to make further provision for  
the colony of the Falkland Islands for the year 1891.  
Trusting that the ordinances may  
obtain Her Majesty's gracious confirmation &  
allowance

I have etc

J<sup>d</sup> Roger Tuckf<sup>d</sup> Goldworthy.

The Right Honorable

Sir Hesketh Bell.

etc etc etc

G. H. S. G. D.

49.

8<sup>th</sup> April 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith  
a return of appointments made during the  
quarter ended 31<sup>st</sup> March

I have re

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Gwyff<sup>o</sup> Folbworth

The Right Honourable

Lord Knebworth Genl.

re re re

50.

G. H. P. d. J

8 April 1892

My Lord,

I regret ~~not~~ having reported  
by the last mail the arrival of the Russian  
man of war "Djigyt" under command of  
Captain Fockerschau -

2. The "Djigyt" took on board  
Coal, Water and Bread and after a stay  
of 3 days proceeded on her passage to  
Petersburg at which place Captain Fockerschau  
had to arrive by April -

I have the

S<sup>t</sup> Honor Flockfield Goldworthy

42.

G. H. S. G. J.

14<sup>th</sup> April 1892.

My Lord,

I fear that I somewhat misapprehended the tenor of the instructions contained in your despatch N<sup>o</sup>. 7 of <sup>January</sup> December and to which mine N<sup>o</sup>. 33 of 1<sup>st</sup> March was the reply - I thought that the particulars of the dates when the leases were granted together with the areas where they stood and a statement showing their boundaries and acreage supplied the information sought - and it had been previously forwarded - I see no objection that copies of the leases themselves are required and these I now forward - they include those which have expired and for which occupation licences, under your Lordships instructions, have been issued -

2. In connection with the land you I beg earnestly to draw your Lordships attention to the large withdrawals of money in the past 2 years from the Savings Bank -

3. These withdrawals I regret to say are owing to the fact that a considerable number of people are investing their money in land in Patagonia & in Terra del Fuego - It is much to be deplored that they cannot under the present conditions of things obtain land here

here - owing to those at present holding land under lease faring over a larger area of land than the acreage named in their leases - the result being all enclosures here -

4. It is urged I am aware by those farming large areas that small farmers are not desirable - if by small farmers is meant a class similar to the "Cockatoos" farmer of Western Australia I quite concur - but I maintain that 10,000 acres would give a man a good living and enable him to educate and bring up a family in comfort

5. Look for instance my Lord, at Lively Island ruled by the Company to Mr Cobb a brother of the managing director. It is said to be about 12,500 acres and on it are between 9,000 and 10,000 sheep besides cattle and horses - I grant that the land at Lively is better than the average and Mr Cobb on the income which he makes out of it is able to support a family and live like a gentleman - Why not then a man not of an equal station in life on a 10,000 acre farm where habits and ideas are not so expensive and who looks forward to nothing better than to make the Falkland Islands his home

6. I should not refer to Mr Cobb's brother for whom I have a personal esteem were it not to bring more forcibly to Mr Cobb the Co managing Director the fact that

a farm of 12000 acres is not too small for  
a near relation to make a living out of.  
Since the foregoing was written  
I have received your Lordship's Despatch No. 25  
of 12<sup>th</sup> March with the opinion of the law adviser  
of the Crown on the Land question.

I have &c

Sd Roger Tuckfield Goldworthy

The Right Honourable

Lord Newbrough Esq.

He He He

G. H. S. G. I.

5<sup>th</sup> April 1892

A.G.

My Lord.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordships Despatches N<sup>o</sup>s 8 & 18/Jan & 10 of 2<sup>nd</sup> February with enclosures from the Foreign Office and also from the Admiralty stating that the Senior Naval Officer on the S<sup>E</sup> American coast had been instructed "to afford such protection to the Seal Fisheries at the Falkland Islands as is compatible with the other duties of the Station"—

2. I am glad to find from the Foreign Office letter of the 6<sup>th</sup> Jan "that Her Majesty's representatives at Santiago and Buenos Aires will be instructed to furnish a report on the present regulations of the Chilean & Argentine governments with regard to the seal industry—

3. Except the ordinance fixing a close season from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 1<sup>st</sup> April I cannot find any ordinances or proclamations dealing with this important question, here—

4. It is true that since 1861 licenses to kill Seal have been granted, vid license, but I cannot find any law by which the issue of such licenses is justified. Enclosed is an opinion of Mr. Mason Bonaparte Q.C. which appears to me to state that every lease holder

(though holding his lease for pastoral purposes  
only vide sic of Land ordinance 1871) has the  
right to kill or destroy any seal within  
the boundaries of his lease <sup>so long as</sup> they being feral animals.

5. There is left in the hands of  
each leaseholder the power to help to destroy  
an important public adversary by virtue of  
his pastoral lease - I cannot believe that such  
a contention is sound or if it be so from  
the defective state of any existing law or rather  
owing to their not being any restrictive legislation  
the sooner steps are taken to introduce legislation  
the better -

6. In the earlier years of the Colony  
the mainland of the East and West Falklands  
abounded with seal rookeries now they are  
conspicuous by their absence - The seals too  
are the only ones left and as they are becoming  
yearly less numerous till within a very unapproachable  
distance of time they will be totally extinct -

7. What I venture to recommend  
is immediate legislation to protect the seals for  
such period as may in the opinion of those  
conversant with the subject be necessary to使  
the seals to recuperate as was done in the case  
of the Penguins which are now over twice my num-

8. If there be any existing rights  
compensation should be given though any such  
rights must be small indeed when on the face

114

Jason Bleaud one of the best 200 Ringers the  
successor of the late Capt Haeseler on behalf  
of the wife where asking for a renewal, writes  
as follows " I would undertake to destroy the  
whole of the seal fishery for the next ten years  
in less than a day" - True that he somewhat  
contradicts himself in the next para of his letter  
still it is certain that if something be not done  
and that immediately the seal fisheries of the  
Falklands will be a thing of the past. But I  
must add that any regulation will be useless  
if the naval authorities only give the  
same perfunctory protection in the future  
as in the past

I have etc

-  
Dr Roger Suckling (old worthy)

G. N. S. J. O

44

5 April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward 6 copies of an ordinance which passed the Legislative Council by three official to two unofficial votes.

2 Messrs. Gellon & Baillou have forwarded their reasons (vide enclosure) for opposing the ordinance.

3. My object in introducing the Bill is to be gathered from clauses 1 & 2 which prohibit not only the auctioneer but any person pecuniarily interested in the Commission to run directly or indirectly making a bid.-

4. The custom was in the past for the leading firms here to have one of their servants take out an auctioneers license. Once times the license was paid for by the firm - on occasions by the Clerk - but in all cases a share in the Commission received by the auctioneer vary from  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{2}{3}$  (it is the latter now) has been taken by the firm whose clerk the auctioneer was or is -

5. On the very first sale of any major big that of the "Sabino" the auctioneer sold to a firm whose servant he is - the same sort of thing has occurred in the past and I think that if the F. D. Co or any other firm situated, would only look at the matter for they would recognise that an ordinance of the nature

nature excepted them from any charge  
of collusion.-

6. This word was not used by myself  
but by Mr. Felton in Council in reference to  
a suggestion made by myself that the Government  
might appoint under Sec 3 of the ordinance  
in order to save any difficulty, an auctioneer  
temporarily.

7. Surely if Mr. Felton thought that  
such an accusation might possibly be  
brought against the Government, had much  
more then against an individual or Co  
whose served the auctioneer is - and  
therefore I think that the Committee should  
look upon this as a remedial measure  
and in their own behalf which will save  
them from any such charge as that which  
Mr. Felton considered might be levelled against  
the Government under circumstances not at all  
similar on a par with existing ones.-

8. I have not attended to the Bill  
in consequence of the two members of Council  
being opposed and in order that your Lordships  
might express your views - but when I state that  
Mr. Baillou is the manager here of the S. J. Co  
who reap  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the profit of the auctioneer  
who is likewise a salaried servant of their own  
and

112

and that Mr. Fellow held a similar position when Storekeeper to Mr. & Son before the Tally amalgamated his business with that of the Co the reason of the opposition is not far to seek -

9. It is in my opinion mercenary legislation and will tend to prevent results not favourable to those who are sometimes (two) their crooked bidders & buyers at the same time

Observe

to Roger Tuckf<sup>d</sup>. Folkeworthy

The Right Honourable

Lord Macclesfield Esqur

He He He

G. H. S. F. D

45.

6<sup>th</sup> April 1892

my dear,

I have the honor to acknowledge  
the receipt of your Lordships Circular Despatch  
of the 21<sup>st</sup> January 1892 with Enclosures—

In reply I have to inform Your  
Lordship that having submitted the same to  
my Executive Council it is of opinion  
that His Colony should cordially adopt the  
Suggestion of the Post Master General which  
must greatly facilitate lead to further  
postal improvement throughout the colony.

I have the  
D<sup>r</sup> R. G. F. G. Worthy.

The Right Honorable  
Sir Duncford G. C. B.  
to the re

L. W. S. & C.

46.

6 April 1892

My dear,

I have the honor to forward you  
a statement showing detailed payments and  
receipts and savings on the Estimates for the year  
1891

I have etc

as Roger Gurney Goldworthy

The Right Honourable

Lord Newbold Etc.

cc s m

51.

G. N. S. S. D

9<sup>th</sup> April, 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward  
herewith the oil & store returns from Cape  
Pembroke lighthouse for transmission to the  
Board of Trade -

I would venture to point out  
that all queries are addressed to the  
Colonial Secretary direct and would suggest  
that these returns should be forwarded direct  
to the Assistant Lee Harbour Dept Board of Trade  
in a similar manner as the accounts are  
forwarded direct to the Audit Department.

I have the

2<sup>d</sup> Roger Tuckfield Goldsworthy:

The Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford Cllng.

He - - - - - He - - - - -

G. H. S. S. D

62.

12<sup>th</sup> April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch N° 25 of 12<sup>th</sup> March giving the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown on the Land question.

I submitted the same to the Executive Council who with the exception of the Colonial Secretary were of opinion with myself that before taking action thereon I should await your Lordships perusal of the copies of the various leases which are forwarded by the mail.

The delay will not make any difference and it may be that some of the two millions acres given away may be recovered.

There will be a mail leaving here on the 20<sup>th</sup> when I shall reply more fully to the Despatch in question.

I have the

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Tuck<sup>y</sup> Goldworthy

The Right Honorable

Lord Kentsford G. C. B.

to to to

53.

~~85  
133~~

G. H. P. S. I

12<sup>th</sup> April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward  
herewith additional signatures from the W  
Falkland, to be added to the address forwarded  
in my Despatch N° 32 of the 16<sup>th</sup> February

I have &amp;c

S<sup>r</sup> Roger Gurney Goldworthy.

The Right Honourable

Lord Knutsford Q.C. M.P.

&amp;c &amp;c &amp;c

## Herodotus

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
36	1 <sup>st</sup> April	Enclosing letter from the Bishop & Dean	1
37	.	Volunteers	
38	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Sistermper	1
39	.	Customs & Revenue	1
40.	.	Commission of Inquiry or Revenue	6
41	4 <sup>th</sup>	Brewers ordinance	6
42	4 <sup>th</sup>	Land	
43	5 <sup>th</sup>	Seals	
44.	5 <sup>th</sup>	Auctioneers license	
45.	6 <sup>th</sup>	Re postal arrangement	
46	.	Excise & Outlandish	
47	.	Survey of Chest	
48	7 <sup>th</sup>	Supplementary Ord '90 & '91	
49	8 <sup>th</sup>	app dury year to 3 <sup>rd</sup> March	
50	8 <sup>th</sup>	arrival of Russian War	
51	9 <sup>th</sup>	Oil & Store Return	
52	12 <sup>th</sup>	Act Dept 25 of 12 <sup>th</sup> March add other signatures	
53	13 <sup>th</sup>		

G. N. S. S. O.

54

13<sup>th</sup> April 1792

My Lord,

In my Despatch N<sup>o</sup>. 52 of 12<sup>th</sup> April I acknowledged the receipt of that of your Lordships N<sup>o</sup>. 25 of 12<sup>th</sup> March on the said question -

<sup>2</sup> At the risk of being thought presumptuous I desire to draw your Lordships attention to the following -

In your Lordships Despatch N<sup>o</sup>. 7 of the 6<sup>th</sup> January I was requested to send copies of all the leases now existing and of those which had been given I assumed the government of the Colony - I naturally presumed that these were required to enable the law officers of the Crown to advise your Lordship on the said question as I gathered from a previous Despatch (N<sup>o</sup>. 64 of 26<sup>th</sup> Sept/91) that there were not any copies of these leases in the Colonial Office -

<sup>3</sup> Now I respectfully submit that to enable the law officers to arrive at a decision in respect of the leases, which vary considerably in detail, that they should have had them before them not merely those only which possibly were supplied by the manager of the F. I. Co - whose leases are more carefully drawn up and in whose case greater exactness was exercised in respect to the boundaries than was generally observed - this being doubtless

Be.

<sup>own</sup> to the Company realising that at some time or other a survey would take place and naturally enough they were anxious that every thing should be in order and probably took counsel's opinion upon the respective leases &c having such large interests at stake.

But what with regard to the others? is it contended that the lessee is under his lease able to come down upon the lessor for more than the acreage of the land mentioned therein - (each section by law is supposed to contain only 6,000 acres &c see 10 of Ordinance 4 of 1871) and that he can insist upon the lessor giving him the same acreage on renewal without any increased rental though a survey shows that instead of 6,000 it be 10,000 acres or more? Is the lessor (the Government exbarred from correcting by Survey (viz see 21 of Ord 4 of 1871) an error into which a Governor or Surveyor may have fallen - more especially when the whole I contend is subject to Survey and that "more or less" only means ~~and~~ quantity somewhat approximate say 10% of the quantity of land less - or if on the other hand the lessee is able (as apparently he is by the Law Officers opinion) to take advantage of any error made, it is to be hoped in ignorance by a Governor or the officer responsible to him viz the Surveyor General.

is it to be concluded that the principle of  
caveat emptor is not to be applied to the lessee?

5. In other words if the lessors are  
able to take advantage of any mistake on the  
part of the Government, which they apparently  
are able to do (they as applicants for the lease of  
the land were better cognizant of the acreage  
than the Government which leased it) are they  
then supposing the Surveyor general were in  
collusion with them, are they to benefit to  
the exclusion of the Government or if it be shown  
that the Surveyor general in the interests, not of  
the Government but of the lessees had overreached  
himself and that the lease was void in law, is  
the Government to be prevented from claiming  
that such lease is invalid? - or, on the other hand  
cannot the Government fairly claim to be  
allowed to say - let both sides stand or fall  
by the lease - we never intended to give you so  
extended an acreage. A section by clause 11  
of Ord 4 of 1871 is limited to 6000 acres or as near  
as may be -

If the Government through its servant  
has given you more it has been wrong - but if  
claim against us in this respect we say  
that through an ignorant or dishonest servant  
we have not given you any valid lease -  
So it, my Lord, I ask fair trial half  
the area of the Colony should have been  
given

given away without any consideration.

6. how ever condition has not been complied with in many leases - in Sec 12 of Ordinance 4 of 1871 it is stated "such leases" shall contain a clause &c" but in the following leases this condition has not been observed again with respect to bearing a section. In Sec 10 it reads "each section shall consist of 600" acres or as near as may be" Surely this cannot be construed into meaning 10 or more thousand acres in fact these very words "as near as may be" favor in my opinion the proper interpretation of the term "more or less".

7. I am aware that it is contended by some that Sec 31 excepts the lessee from being bound by any survey and it would appear that the Crown Lawyers are not dissimilar in their opinion - but surely my Lord the the intention of the legislature must not be lost sight of in that this clause was merely inserted in order that leases might be granted without a preliminary survey of the land and that was doubtless done because every successive Secretary of State had been opposed to a survey on the ground of expense - Look too at the latter part of Clause 21 does not the word "subsequently" at a later time, seem to point to the intention to have a survey at some future time or otherwise how could

the boundaries be subsequently made by the Surveyor general and if so must not the Surveyor general have seen that such sections and their boundaries were in accordance with the conditions contained in clauses 10.17 and 4.18?

8 Again I would ask if Lordships is it intended upon the opinion of the Law officers of the Crown who I venture to assert had not the leases before them, to give up over 2,000,000 acres of land valued at £400,000 i.e. at the upset price of 1/- per acre without raising the question under clause 12 which says "Such lease shall contain a clause that every dispute as to boundary of any station or section shall be settled by arbitration in the usual way at the expence of the parties interested"— It is no small matter, my Lord, that this large sum should be lost to the Colony and I earnestly urge your Lordships to appoint a commission to inquire into the whole land question, before surrender what I cannot help considering are the former rights.—

9 Hitherto it has not been thought advisable to raise questions as to how far lessees have complied in all respects with the conditions of their leases but if they have the time has now arrived when an enquiry should be made as to how far this has been

been done or not & if not then the land  
should revert to the Crown -

10. The interests of the Colony at  
large should not be made subservient to the  
wishes of a few who amongst them well have  
obtained from the laches of the government  
and I regret to think in some cases through  
misrepresentation with the concurrence of  
government officials, leases with apparently  
fixure of tenure or freeholds of land to the  
value of some £400,000 - divided among  
some 27 sheep farmers for which no compensation  
has been or now or hereafter can be exacted  
according to the opinion expressed by the law  
officers of the Crown -

11. With regard to para 4 of P<sup>r</sup>  
Despatch in which your Lordship direct  
me to consider with my Executive Council  
and report whether it is expedient that any  
portion of the land comprised in any of  
the expired leases should be put up for  
sale under Sec 2 of Ordg of 1882 - I have to  
ask for information on the following points  
1. Whether the late lessee could claim  
the right to purchase under Ordg of  
1890 and thus prevent its being put up  
for sale

2. If reserved for sale is the section

Section to be put up for sale as stated in the  
expired lease or at the acreage which the ~~section~~  
may on Survey be found to contain (I submit  
that after recent experience land should not  
be put up for sale without a Survey)

3. Whether if put up Government  
has to buy it (the upset price not having been  
bid) the land can be looked upon as "sold" within  
the meaning of clause 3 of <sup>nd</sup> 19 of 1882 or if not will  
it be compulsory on the Government to release  
it to the original lessee -

4. If compulsory to re-lease to  
the original lessee must it be on the same  
~~conditions~~ + rental only as before or can rental  
be demanded on the acreage as found on Survey

12. With reference to Paras 3 & 6 and  
to the decision arrived at by the Law Officer  
in the case of a lease in which the boundaries  
were not completely defined but were stated  
as extending for a specified distance from  
a given point and to the extracts of letter  
from the F. D. Co. maintaining that "as every  
station as marked on the official chart is  
bounded by some other station the lessors  
can in no case have encroached on unlet  
Crown Land" - In reply I beg to point out  
that boundaries as stated in the lease and as  
drawn on the official chart differ - If taken  
the official chart there be found as in ~~less~~  
Sections 44, 48, 67 and others that a more ~~wide~~  
<sup>broad</sup>

13

boundary has been given there stated in the lease it is clear that if not corrected the mistake to this extent would be perpetuated throughout the chart - This a Survey would correct -

13 Now in Bowens case to which I referred in my Despatch (N<sup>o</sup> 33 of 1<sup>st</sup> March) that Gentleman farms to the foot of the Wickham Heights - and that the S. I. Co must be aware of this as the chart which they kindly sent me on coming out to the Colony shows the station as extending right up to the <sup>North</sup> side of the hills - neither by the boundaries as contained in his lease or as indicated on the official chart was he entitled to this extra 900 acres or thereabouts -

14 Again in respect to N<sup>o</sup> 70 copy of which as it appears in the lease book I enclose since it will be observed are drawn through portion of the original lease to which Governor D'Arcey's signature is appended - the correction on the margin is in a different hand writing altogether and unsigned & undated and gives 16 miles as the boundary as against 11 in the original - The former would take the station up to Shepherds Brook - the latter to the S.E. corner of Bodie Peak Station all these are cases which show the necessity of a Survey -

Now.

how it is stated in Mr Coulsons letter of 16<sup>th</sup> April  
Lieutenant Parsons R.M. offered to survey 9710 acres for £60 the expense of ascertaining existing boundaries should not be very large - As I said in a previous part of my Despatch in my opinion it would be best to appoint a Land Commission any way something should be done to prevent so severe a loss to the colony -

15<sup>th</sup> As instructed I will inform the memorialists whose petition accompanied my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 118 of 19<sup>th</sup> August last when you receive your Lordships reply to my cablegram forwarded on the 12<sup>th</sup> April

I have etc  
S<sup>r</sup> Roger G. Fobsworthy

The Right Honourable  
Lord Knutsford Q.C.M.D.

He      He      He

133

G. H. S. S. I.  
13<sup>th</sup> April

55.

My Lord,

I have the honor to transmit  
to your lordship a letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> April  
from Mr. Fraser the Colonial Treasurer  
addressed to myself and I would ask your  
lordship to obtain H. Majestys gracious sanction,  
under clause III<sup>rd</sup> of the Royal Instructions to  
allow Dr. Hamilton the Colonial Surgeon during  
his tenure of office, to ~~also~~ take precedence  
in Executive Council next after the Colonial  
Secretary -

I have much pleasure in  
bearing testimony to the ready assistance  
& cordial cooperation which Dr. Hamilton has  
always given me in Council -

I have etc

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Guppy<sup>rd</sup> Goldsworthy.

G. H. P. S. D

56

14<sup>th</sup> April 1892

my Lord,

Referring to my despatch N<sup>o</sup>. 44 of 5<sup>th</sup> April I have the honor to forward copy of a minute addressed by myself to Mr. Routledge the Colonial Secretary in his capacity of legal adviser on a point of law and I should be glad to know if Mr. Routledge's opinion is correct.

It recommended the alteration of clause 2 in the Draft ordinance but I must admit that I think that the amendment is an improvement and obviates the difficulty referred to in the concluding portion of Mr. Routledge's minute and which might have arisen <sup>should</sup> in the West Falklands.

I have etc

Yours very truly  
R. Roger P. G. Goldsmith

The Right Honorable

Lord Merton of Clun.

etc etc etc

57

G. N. S. J.

121

14<sup>th</sup> April 1892

my dear,

I have the honor to acknowledge  
the receipt of your Lordships Despatch No 18 of  
1<sup>st</sup> March conveying to me Her Majestys most  
gracious reply to my telegram tendering the  
sympathy of the inhabitants to Her Majesty  
and the Prince & Princess of Wales on the occasion  
of the death of HRH the Duke of Clarence -

I have caused the same to be  
communicated to the inhabitants

I have re

Y<sup>r</sup> Roger Tuck<sup>d</sup> Goldsworthy

58.

G R S. D

My Dow.

16<sup>th</sup> April 1892

I have the honor to acknowledge  
the receipt of the despatches noted below

I have re

to Roger Tuckey Goldworthy

N<sup>o</sup> 16 of 20<sup>th</sup> February to N<sup>o</sup> 27 of 12<sup>th</sup> March

general 29<sup>th</sup> Feb.

No. 59.

G. H. S. F. I.

15 April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to request that you will cause to be laid before the Board of Trade the accompanying letter dated April 4<sup>th</sup> which I have received from the lighthouse keeper at Cape Pembroke

2. Mr. Broom having served for 15 years without increase of salary, it may be within the powers of the Board of Trade to take his request into its favourable consideration

3. Mr. Broom has I believe on all occasions given satisfaction to his superiors and an increase of his salary would be a great assistance to him in providing for the education of his children. It must be borne in mind that being so far from Stanley, he cannot avail himself of the Government School to which to send his children

My Very Honorable

Lord Kilkenny, G.C.M.G.

I have etc

(yours truly) Roger Duckfield Goldsworthy

No. 67

G.W.S.J.J.  
15 April 1872.

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 20 of 7 March, and to thank you will convey the thanks of the Colony & the Lord Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury and to the War Office for their ready compliance with the request contained in my despatch No. 77 of 10 June 1871.

2. I have not been able formally to bring the matter before the Legislative Council, and therefore the necessary sum of £100 has not been voted by that body, but I know that individually the unofficial members are prepared to vote the sum.

3. It appears to me however that as the Police Force is not to be run up to its full strength that a Drill Instructor might be appointed who would draw £70 per annum from the force, and kept (£10 per annum), the balance being made up by a special vote.

4. Whilst at first the duties of Sergeant Instructor might be somewhat heavy - afterward his duties as Drill Instructor could not possibly occupy his whole time and attention - I therefore submit the suggestion for Your Lordships consideration and, if approved, I should be glad if you would send out a competent non-commissioned officer who would hold the appointment of Sergeant under the Constable and Sheriff (Mr. Hare).

5. I concluded that although my application is acknowledged only, the accoutrements will be provided. See here to any obsolete patterns of sabre guards, the Colony will be glad to be supplied with them.

The Right Honourable

I have etc

Lord Knutsford Q.C.M.Q.

(sgd) Roger Tuckfield Gold

G.W.S.J.

16 April 1892

No. 61

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch no. 21 of 8 March and to state that I have conveived to Messrs Kinder & D'Almeida a renewal of their leases on the terms and conditions specified in my despatch no. 8 of the 7<sup>th</sup> January,

I shall take steps to carry out Your Lordship's views in connection with the fencing of the common pasture land which I am glad to find is approved of

The Right Honorable

I have etc

Lord Hawksford Esqrs

(Ld) Roger Juckfield Goldworthy

G.W.S.J.

18 April 1892

No. 62

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch no. 28 of 12 March with reference to legalising the excesses upon the vote for the year 1890 and beg to refer you to my despatch no. 48 of 7 April forwarded Supplementary Appropriation advance no. 1 of 1892

The Right Honorable

I have etc

Lord Hawksford Esqrs

(Ld) Roger Juckfield Goldworthy

No. 63

G.H.S. F.I.  
8 April 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch marked 'General' of the 29 February transmitting to me Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom erecting the Settlements in the Falkland Islands and their Dependencies into a Colony, and constituting the office of Governor and Commander-in-chief thereof, and providing for the government of the Colony — also instructions under the Royal Sign Manual and Seal, and a Commission re-appointing me, Governor and Commander-in-Chief.

<sup>also the Royal Seal</sup> I have the honor to inform you that I was duly sworn in as such by Judge Routhedge to whom and to the other members of the Executive and Legislative Councils the customary oaths were subsequently administered.

The Right Honorable

I have etc

Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

(sgd) Roger Buckfield Goddard

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April 1892

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
574	13 <sup>th</sup> Ap.	I and	3.
55	-	W. Fraser re S. seawards	1
56	14 <sup>th</sup>	Auctions on	2
57	-	ack Desp 15.	
58	-	" despatches	
59	15 <sup>th</sup>	Letter from Lighthouse Kape	1
60	-	Volunteers	
61	16 <sup>th</sup>	Re Juncy, Comms &c	
62	18 <sup>th</sup>	Supplementary ord.	
63	-	Erecting Falkland into Settlement	

G. H. S. F. D

64.

20<sup>th</sup> April, 1892

My Lord.

I have the honor to accordance  
with your Despatch N° 68 of 14<sup>th</sup> November  
to forward for your Lordships information  
a report which I have received from the  
Senior Naval officer regarding the Hulls in  
Stanley Harbour and from which your  
Lordship will see, as stated in my Despatch  
N° 130 of 15<sup>th</sup> September, that Hulls which are grounded  
such as the "Snow Queen" &c do tend to silt up  
the Harbor -

With regards to Hulls moored which  
Capt Day considers "do not interfere with the"  
"navigation of the small amount of shipping"  
"entering the port" the complaints come  
from masters of small schooner trading  
round the islands, who state that the "Great  
Britain" which is moored is in the fair way  
of all boats having to tack up the Harbor -

I have re

J<sup>d</sup> Roger Gurnell Goldworthy.

If H. S. F. I.

2<sup>nd</sup> May 1892

65

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordships Despatch N° 27 of the 12<sup>th</sup> March with enclosures from Messrs Cobb & Spearing & all you complaining that masters of vessels or the crewmen have to pay 10/- per diem for the services of a customs house officer under Sec 3 of the Customs Ord. N° 5 of 1891.

2. I enclose for your Lordships information a memo from the Treasurer & collector of customs and I entirely endorse everything he says - more especially the para in which he most forcibly remarks - If their views were "acted upon that they should pay duty as per manifest alone there would be no need of customs office at all" -

3. Does Mr Cobb concur that payment of duty on cargo which appears in the manifest as dutiable is sufficient to secure against any attempt to defraud the revenue - perhaps a perusal of the following letter from Governor Kerr Despatch N° 109 of 12<sup>th</sup> November 1884 may tend to do away with any such contention - "It is exceedingly difficult" writes Governor Kerr "to prevent "or detect frauds &c &c &c" -

4. Again it was only the other day that a copy for Mr Cobbs brother, the F.D. Co acting as agents, supposed not to contain any undesirable for

Co.

was found on being opened by the customs officer (Moore) to contain wine - appended is his statement - If these people "whom" Socers had "marks" might be supposed to be above suspicion." Then act what may not others do.

5. If too the P. I. Co are so anxious it be looked upon as above suspicion why permit their agent to engage as master of one of their ships - man immediately after his being found <sup>to</sup> be ~~to~~ <sup>for</sup> unlawfully concealing wrecked goods -

6. Facts such as these show the absolute necessity of customs officers having the opportunity of inspecting goods dutiable or otherwise - were it not so only necessary to pay according to the manifest whilst the supposed non-dutiable goods might contain dutiable articles which would if duly paid afford a small revenue to the Colony -

7. Where practicable and the cargo can be easily got at as in the case of the "Jellicoe" - a certain number of cases, belonging to the cargo said not to be dutiable, for the outfit was brought on deck & inspected - this done there was nothing necessary to have an officer on board - otherwise in my opinion, it is imperative where a vessel goes the round of the East & West Falklands and discharges cargo at places which are not ports of entry and where the services of a customs officer other than the servant of the importer himself could not be

65 of 92

be obtained, that an officer should accompany the vessel.

8. With regard to Messrs Spearing & Waldron say I would remark that their vessel the "Cross Owen" which arrived here with goods for various ports had as has been the custom, a customs officer sent from Stanley, for whom no charge was made, at considerable expense to the government to accompany this vessel to the various ports which were not parts of entry - but the daily expense did not fall upon Messrs Spearing & Waldron as the vessel was chartered as the master informed me to convey & discharge the cargo at 20 weeks per ton. That the services of the customs officer would fall upon him as port owner of the vessel.

9. Touching the "Kingist" that vessel having come out in ballast it was necessary to do more than rummage her and this was done by the Assistant Collector Dr. Young - To shew that doubt existed in the minds of some that possibly spirits, which next forenoon got into their hands getting hold of, might be on board, I have to mention that two J. P's especially drew my attention to this vessel and asked me to have her thoroughly examined on her arrival.

10. I do not say that Messrs Spearing & Waldron would knowingly permit smuggling but as your Lordship must be well aware officers even on board merchantmen are not always so particular -

11. If your Lordship after my explanation directs that customs officers are not take placed on board

105

board & vessels proceeding to out port. The ports of the Colony might as well be declared free - this would do away with any remuneration for Customs officers, which would probably meet no Cobb views, but the <sup>Imperial</sup> Customs Revenue amounting £3000 annually would have to be made up by some other mode of taxation.

12. In conclusion I would respectfully urge that all representations should be made either by the S. J. Court here or else entirely by the managing Director at home so that as Governor should not be subjected to a trial in the Falkland from Mr. Baillou's bombardment as home from the Company.

I have etc

S<sup>r</sup> Roger Gurney Goldsworthy.

The Right Honble

D<sup>r</sup> Hume Fox Gleag

etc etc

G. H. S. F. J

66.

3<sup>rd</sup> May 1892

My Lord:

Referring to my Despatch No 574 of 13<sup>th</sup> April and to the questions asked in Para 11 sub head 3 as to whether, if the Country lands be bought in by Government (the upset price not being bid) the lands can be leased out.

2. I now beg to draw attention to Sec 7 not 4 of 1871 from which it would appear that "Country land if not sold when put up to auction shall afterwards be open to selection and purchase at the upset price - Provided that the Governor may withdraw any such lands from selection and again subject them to public auction and so from time to time till the land be sold - also to Sec 2 of Ordinance Q of 1882 which runs as follows "pro always that in the case of a new lease expiring by effluxion of time the new lease (if any) to be granted under this ordinance of all or any of the lands comprised therein shall be granted to the former lessor if he shall have given notice in writing to

3. Now what I desire to draw attention to is this that whereas in the former it was provided (ceteris paribus I presume) that the original lessor should have priority of claim over others applying for the lease see 20. - In 1882 or eleven years afterwards two sections No 16 & 20 (ord 4 of 1891) were repealed and a new section introduced giving increased advantages to the lessor

145

as much as there is no "priority of claim" but the new lease (if any) must go to the former lessee surely. This was an ordinance introduced for the individual lessee at the expense not only of the community but of the interests of the Colony -

4 Under the ordinance of 1871 it was evidently the intention of the government after the old lease had expired to allow the land to be put up to competition, though it gave the original lessee priority of claim rightly too I think over others were equal bids were made - Ord 9 of 1882 however prevents any one other than the original lessee having a chance of obtaining the land.

5 Wherein too consists the inequality referred to in the preamble of Ord 9 of 1882.

b. Certainly it was strange that Governor Callaghan a barrister should not have thought it necessary to introduce such a healing ordinance which by Governor Kerr is deemed necessary, some 11 years afterwards - but we neither of the ordinances do I glean that it was intended to grant the leases on the same conditions as formerly - it is not spoken of as a renewal of an old lease but the granting of a new lease. Vide clause 2 <sup>Section</sup> Ord 9 of 1882. Section 6 of this same ordinance also recites that this ordinance may be cited as the Land ordinance 1882 and shall be read with and form part of the Land Ord 1871 - Now in Sec 12 of this latter ordinance it says "the Governor shall have power to make such at

at his discretion to insert in every lease to be granted by him on behalf of the Crown, such reservations, conditions and restrictions as may seem expedient. Such lease shall contain a clause &c. Not a word here that it must be on the same conditions; on the contrary it is I think, clear ~~at~~ least to my apprehension that in "every lease" consequently in this is included any "new lease"; the Governor has power to make "reservations, conditions and restrictions" how then ~~and~~ debarred from inserting in any new lease conditions relating to Survey &c? Under what now existing Ordinance I would ask, are new leases to be granted? if not under that of 1871 and the amending Ordinances of 1872 and 1882 then under what? If under these has not the Governor the power to add "subject to immediate survey" and to the conditions of Sec 3 with regard to the acreage of a section i.e. 6000 ac. There is no "as near as may be" in this section as may be convenient - as in previous Proclamations & Ordinances this section are the words 6000 acres of land - we can be clearer than this. -

7. What right shall I have as Governor to give a lease of a section which I know contains 10, or 12,000 acres - I cannot go beyond the law and therefore I cannot issue a new lease till the existing law be altered - unless <sup>any</sup> construction is clearly shown to be wrong -

8. I have had various correspondence going back as far as 1845 - and it apparently was the aim of those desirous of acquiring land so to deprive

49

the character of it that the C.O and responsible  
governors really seemed to have acquired the belief  
that 6 acres of land were requisite to feed one sheep  
from what I have gathered from various sheep farmers  
and seen for myself. This is not so - In some places  
it does not take 2 acres per sheep and the average  
certainly may be taken as 3 acres per sheep -  
yet upon representations made by applicants for land  
land has been leased or sold for comparatively nothing  
speaking, little - the result being that the whole  
acreage of the East & West Falklands with the surrounding  
islands some 4,159,969 acres exclusive of S. Georgia  
are in the hands of some 27 sheep farmers - whilst their  
grants and leases shew only 2,367,594 the difference  
between which ~~not~~ <sup>now</sup> any consideration has been  
or is being ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> - may I not fairly be said  
that the Government has through misrepresentation  
been induced to part with land - and if so is it  
too late so to act in the interests of the Colony  
as will conserve to it that which ~~the present~~ <sup>we</sup>  
have, in my humble opinion, no right to what more -  
Is it too late for the Government so to act I ask as well  
prevent nearly the whole community of the Falklands  
from looking upon the Government as unfaithful  
custodians of the land entrusted to them by the  
Crown -

9. Much has been said of the uphill work  
and the privations which the early settlers underwent

and

and this is construed as a reason for undue  
consideration being shown to them - surely my Lord  
whilst letting this have due weight will the Government  
though I scarcely know where in opening of new  
country anything else can be expected, get on the other  
hand the counteracting advantage which the early  
settlers had over more recent comers should not be lost  
sight of - Then the Falklands treated well wild cattle  
the hides of which were more than sufficient to  
maintain a man seeing that every hide there  
realized £1 to 3/- a piece - There were other natural  
resources to which a man could turn to find  
means to enable him to stock & fence his farm  
I allude to the seal & penguin fisheries the  
former all but extinct through their indiscriminate  
slaughter - seal skins I may say realized £3 a piece  
whilst penguin oil sold for 7½ per gallon on the spot being  
6 birds to the gallon -

10. At the time of writing I have by me  
a letter from a man now unconnected with the Colony  
who left it being unable to obtain land and settled in  
Patagonia he writes "as regards the farmers having advanced  
the theory that the present leases have borne the burden of  
heat of the day and worked up their farms to prosperity  
I have to say that very many of these farmers were stocked  
with wild cattle the proceeds of the hides of which realize  
more money - I have myself shipped in one year  
from Port Howard Farm over 2,000 hides. In the  
Schooner Fairy in one trip in the year that I was up  
in the Shallow Bay farm about 1600 hides were taken off -

"In the year 1871 the principal part of the cargo of the "Dobson" lost in Tamar Pass was hides - Your Excellency will please bear in mind that hides in those days were of much greater value than hides in the Falklands in the present day - grown of tremendous size and thickness -

*Confidential*

11. Enclose (A) which I have caused Mr Coulson to draw up will shew your Lordship pretty well the condition of the farmer here. Mr Coulson though holding but a subordinate position from the fact of his accompanying Surveyor General Bailey on many occasions and from his long residence in the Colony, is the most reliable authority here from whom to get information in respect to the land -

12. With regard to a survey a fair idea might be obtained of the areas of the respective sections - simply by measurement on the chart I forward with this Despatch - but a survey would not be expensive if instead of each section being measured separately the boundaries of the land held by the various lessees were only taken - for instance in the Falklands preserving the boundaries of the land held by Mr Greenfield & the Wickham Heights were surveyed the entire boundaries of the land held by Messrs Greenfields Pittaluya, Cameros, Ronner, Fenton, F. D. Co (in respect of their land N of Lafonia for which a special grant is held) and Capt Packe would be ascertained, the rest being almost entirely bounded by the coast line except as follows 6½ miles between messrs Fenton & Capt Packe, 5¾ boundary line between F. D. Co and Capt Packe, 5 miles boundary line between

between Government Land and Captain Pasteur whilst 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  miles of boundary would give the households here by means Greenhills, Robon, Pitaleya, 84 arp. limits or in other words a survey of M<sup>t</sup> Greenhills and 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  miles would give the entire boundaries of the East Falklands North of Lafonia.—

13. Now with regard to the West Falklands the Boundary lines of the various households do not exceed one hundred miles - were these surveyed it would not be a difficult matter to compute the area from the Nautical Chart of the Colony - the other boundaries being the entire coast line - The boundaries once surveyed there could not be any cause for dispute - and if the instructions contained in your Lordships Dispatch No 25 of the 12<sup>th</sup> March are final - it would be better simply to grant new leases of the various stations as I do now there have so many leases of sections (the leases of which fall in at different periods) which go to make up the station - I have not touch on the islands adjacent to the East or West Falklands an approximation to their area could easily be obtained from the chart - and as the islands are not subdivided there can be no dispute about boundaries.—

14. The cost of a survey such as I have described would be small - and the excess of acreage over the amount stated in the lease

lease or leases would be ascertained —

15. Looking to the severe comments made by the then S of State on the amalgamation ordinance and to its subsequent disallowance and likewise to the fact that the introduction of ordinances 1 of 1879 and 9 of 1882 became necessary to render valid certain leases owing to doubts having arisen as to their validity - added to this the fact that any act now done by me in respect to the leases which your Lordship has directed are to be renewed, may prevent for the further term of 21 years any rectification of existing errors I have deemed it advisable as stated in my Despatch No 524 of 13<sup>th</sup> April to defer any action till your Lordship has seen the terms of the various leases now existing or which have recently expired -

16. By this opportunity I forward draft lease drawn up by Judge Roulstone which I have the honor to submit for the signature of your pleasure therein —

I have &c

S<sup>d</sup> Roger F<sup>r</sup> G<sup>r</sup> Goldworthy.

G. H. R. S. D.

64.

13<sup>th</sup> May 1892

to	date
29	of 18 March
30	" 2 <sup>nd</sup> April
31	" "

My Son,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the despatch noted in the margin

I have etc

Dr Roger Duckett, Glastonbury

The Right Honourable  
Sir Knutsford G. C. M.

+e sc ke

G. H. S. F. J

68.

17 May 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's Dispatch No 29 of the 18<sup>th</sup> March enclosing a letter from the Board of Trade with reference to certain omissions in the quarterly oil & store account-

2. In reply I enclose a memorandum from the Colonial Secretary to the effect that the errors have been rectified and will refer you to the last para of Mr. Trewoon's letter I need scarcely say that this Government will always render every possible assistance to the Board of Trade in the administration of Cape Pembroke lighthouse.

I have the

O<sup>fficer</sup> Roger Parkes Glosworthy

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Rec'd 25/June 1892.  
Ack'd 5 August 1892.

Scraps

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of May 1892

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
64	20 <sup>th</sup> ap	Report from Denio naval office	Page 139
65.	2 <sup>nd</sup> May	Customs	140
66	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2nd	" 144
67	7 <sup>th</sup>	air despatch	
68	17 <sup>th</sup>	answer to Bd Trade	
69	.	Faccim	1874.

G. H. P. F. I.

69.

17<sup>th</sup> May 1892

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your circular Despatch of 19<sup>th</sup> Feb 1892 enclosing letter from the Local Government Board as to the supply of Vaccine Lymph.

2. In view of the opinion expressed in the accompanying memo by the Col Surgeon and of the impracticability of establishing any local centre for the distribution of lymph in this Colony, I trust that the supply from the London Vaccine Establishment may not be discontinued.

I have &c

As Roger Tuck. Goldworthy.

The Right Honourable

Lord Knebworth G.C.M.G.

He He He

No. 70. My Lord.

223.

G.H.S.J.

17 March 1892

I have the honor to report that at the request of the Bishop of the Falkland Islands I have sanctioned the appointment of Revd Edwin C. Aspinall to be Assistant Minister of the Falkland Islands as from the 1<sup>st</sup> March subject to the conditions mentioned in Your Lordship's despatch No. 11 of 10 March 1891 2. I have further granted 6 months leave of absence, but the question of salary if any, during that period is contingent on Your Lordship's instructions

3. Prior to the acceptance of the appointment it was understood that Mr Aspinall would shortly apply for leave to enable him to get married but it was on the understanding that it must be without salary unless your Lordship saw fit to order otherwise

I have etc,

(sgd) Roger Duckett Goldworthy  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford C.M.G.

G.H.S.J.

No. 71

My Lord,

15 June 1892

A

I have the honor to submit to Your Lordship's consideration a Bill which has been drafted by Judge Roulledge at my request

2. Shortly after my arrival in the Colony representations were made to me by the Colonial Chaplain that the Burial Board as constituted under Ordinance No. 6 of 1888 did not work satisfactorily

3. In Judge Roulledge's minute of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 1892 the causes are explained. 4. After a conference with the clergy of the several denominations and some of the laity the printed draft ordinance herein enclosed was submitted to the Legislative Council and was left in Committee pending the arrival of Bishop Stirling to carry out certain legal formalities in connection with the Trusteeship

5. On his arrival however Bishop Stirling in view of the manner in which, without his being consulted, Ordinance No. 6 of 1888 had been introduced and passed, curtailing as he considered the powers previously vested in him, and of the further proposed legislation, expressed his wish to resign the Trusteeship, at the same time stating that his absence from the Falklands for the greater portion of each year would preclude him from acting on any Board - the outcome being the draft amendment and now submitted for Your Lordship's consideration. 6. As I am given to understand by Judge Roulledge there is no local legislation adopting the Imperial Trustees Act 1850 hitherto, and he has advised me before introducing this draft and a bill to the Council to submit the same to Your Lordship. I have etc.

S.A. S. I. I.

152

No. 72 My Lord,

15 June 1892

I have the honor to forward herewith the last Regulations which were passed in Executive Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> May last. 2. The principal alteration made has been in appointing Visiting Justices in rotation for the trial of offences by prisoners against discipline etc - vide clause 4.

3. The necessity of this appeared to me obvious looking to the fact of Mr. Routhledge, the Judge and Magistrate holding likewise the appointment of Colonial Secretary. 4. For instance, were not such a provision made, the life & soul speak of a prisoner from the moment of entering the Police Magistrate's Court would be in the hands of one man, as hitherto all offences committed by prisoners in gaol had or been brought before the Police Magistrate - this I am sure was never contemplated. 5. Of course offences which cannot be dealt with summarily, and which have to be dealt with in a higher court will as heretofore go before the Police Magistrate - clause 8 deals with this. 6. With regard to other matters the regulations speak for themselves.

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Duckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

No. 73 My Lord,

S.A. S. I. I.

15 June 1892

I have the honor to forward herewith for Your Lordship's information a statement from the Colonial Treasurer showing the total Receipt and Payments of this Colony for the Quarter ending 31 March 1892

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Duckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

No. 74 My Lord

S.A. S. I. I.

15 June 1892

I have the honor to report for Your Lordship's information that Mr. Wickham Spearman has ceased to act as my Private Secretary as from 26<sup>th</sup> ultimo

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Duckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

160  
S.H.S.J.J.

No: 75 N.Y.C.

15 June 1892

I have the honor to inform you that Capt. J. Campbell, first Pilot and Master of the Mail Schooner "Isaacsah," has received three apprentices under the following circumstances.

2. On the 3rd May, A.D. 1891 and Customs Officer S. Wilmer was sent to Port William to board the "Inveresk" in order to seal hatches, and, while on board, two apprentices belonging to the vessel took his boat, the Government Schooner's dingy, and went ashore for the purpose of shooting. On their landing the boat was considerably damaged.
3. The Master of the "Inveresk" had the boat repaired by the ship's carpenter to the extent of nailing a piece of lead over the broken part of the starboard-stake, and the repairs were passed as satisfactory by Capt. Campbell. On my visiting the dockyard however I found that the repairs were by no means properly carried out, and the enclosed correspondence, Enclosure A, ensued between the Colonial Secretary and the Master of the "Inveresk".
4. Subsequent to this correspondence I instructed the Harbour Master to take proceedings against the apprentices with the result that they were ordered to pay 30/- the cost of the repairs, but the costs of the prosecution, 29½/- were lost to the Government. A report of the proceedings in the Police Magistrate's Court is enclosed, Enclosure B.
5. Capt. Campbell was immediately interdicted from duty pending an Inquiry into his conduct in passing the boat as satisfactorily repaired, whereupon he tendered his resignation, Enclosure C, which I declined to accept pending the result of the Inquiry, a report of which is attached, Enclosure D.
6. As the action of Customs Officer S. Wilmer had been animadverted upon by the Magistrate, Mr. Donkidge, and the costs of the prosecution given against the Government, I thought it better that I should take the opinion of the members of the Executive Council as to the mode in which the matter should be dealt with in view of the replies given by Capt. Campbell to the Queries given in the course of the Inquiry by the Harbour Master and Collector of Customs, Mr. Dace, the decision being that "Capt. Campbell should pay expenses incidental to prosecution, 29½/- and to send in a written apology for his conduct since Interdiction, failing the, to be suspended and the whole matter and all attendant circumstances to be referred to Executive Council."

F  
7. At first Capt Campbell refused to pay the expenses incurred ultimately or the Collector of Customs informing him that charges had been framed against him. Enclosure 8, and that it would be better for him to comply with the Governor's decision and tender his resignation rather than to run the risk of dismissal - he assented and sent in his resignation, Enclosure 9 which I have accepted.

8. The Assistant Pilot Mr Wilmer has entirely exonerated from blame by the Head of his Department, (whose opinion should have been asked in Court), and in his decision I thoroughly concurred.

9. The Next Pilot will act as Pilot, and I do not purpose filling that officer's place. In his absence in command of the government Schooner "Stadessah", should a vessel arrive requiring the services of a Pilot, there are 2 or 3 persons here who have acted as Pilot on similar occasions who would bring the vessel in - a considerable saving will thus be effected.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford Esq M.P.

I have etc  
(sgd) Sir J. D. Goldsworthy  
Governor

No: 76

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward for Your Lordship's information herewith the Report of a Surprise Board of Survey, held on the Treasury Fleet on the 14<sup>th</sup> instant.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford Esq M.P.

I have etc  
(sgd) Sir J. D. Goldsworthy  
Governor

No. 77.

My Lord

I have the honor to request that You will give instruction to have forwarded to me a draft ordinance for the Volunteers - the more simple its provisions, the better - in order that I may introduce it into the Colony.

2. It would not be advisable on first starting to have drastic regulations, as it would possibly bring about a collapse of the movement, on the other hand some legislation is required to secure authoritative recognition of the movement, and to allow the capitation grants for officinants, the number of such

S. N. S. J. J.

21 June 1872

every Volunteer must undergo annually before an, such  
capitation grant can be claimed, and power to make rules and  
regulations for the better securing and maintaining the discipline &  
discipline of the force.

3. The volunteers should have the privilege of nominating  
their own officers subject to the approval of the Governor for the time  
being - and I now submit for Your Lordship's approval the  
names of those who have been temporarily appointed by me,  
and who, at a meeting of the volunteers, were chosen by ballot.

4. The number of officers is above the proportion as compared  
with the rank and file who have already taken the oath of  
allegiance before me, who number 41, but many who will  
hereafter join are absent on the out-stations & could not  
do so, but will doubtless hereafter.

5. The principal man is Mr. Rouse who originally founded  
the rifle association, the members of which have on all  
occasions defeated the rifle teams opposed to them of Mr. Sheepshanks  
Mr. and Mr. Fraser formerly in the army and who did good  
service during the Zulu War, and new Colonial Treasurer,  
received equal votes for the command, but, looking to the nature of  
the force, I considered it more creditable after consulting Mr.  
Fraser, to appoint Mr. Rouse who is in general business here  
to the first place.

6. The other officers occupy various positions, and are held  
in estimation by their fellow citizens and their hearts are  
in the movement.

I have etc  
(sgd) Roger Suckling Oldworth,  
Governor

Right Honorable  
Sir Knutsford GCMG

No: 78

1st Post

Arbord.

I have the honor to forward 2 copies of the Blue Book  
of this Army for 1891, together with the Report of the Colonial  
Secretary thereon

I have etc  
(sgd) Roger Suckling Oldworth  
Governor

Puglenton

Sir Knutsford GCMG

G.H.S.D.J.

21 June 1892

No. 79 My Lord,

8 A.S.T.

163

21 June 1892

I have the honor to request that Instructions may be given to  
the Agents to transfer £500 of the £2000 set apart for Jetties & Harbour  
Improvements to the funds in their hands to the credit of the Colony, as  
considerable disbursements have been made out here amounting to  
present time to about £200. (In de 4th despatch No 48 of 27 Aug)

2. I do not propose at any rate for the present to exceed the sum  
of £500 on Jetties accommodation and Harbour Improvements.

3. It would be desirable that the Agents should also be instructed  
to invest a sum of £500 on account of the Savings Bank Fund

I have etc

(17) Roger Duckett  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford

No. 80. My Lord,

8 A.S.T.

21 June 1892

I have the honor in reply to your Circular despatch of 5 Dec 1891  
enclosing the Report of the Committee and to enquire into the compilation  
of Import and Export Statistics to inform you that the principal  
importers have expressed their willingness to carry out the suggestions  
made therein pending the same being assured by the requisite  
legislation.

2. It will be necessary to amend the Customs Ordinance No.  
of 1891 in respect to certain forms contained in the Schedule to  
same, but I shall not introduce an amending ordinance until  
I receive your Lordship's reply to my despatch No. 39 of 2 April  
in respect to other proposed amendments as it would be  
unadvisable to cumber the Statute Book with so many amendments  
advances. 3. Meanwhile the information obtained from  
the importers will be in accordance with the suggestions of the  
Committee and will appear in any future statistics of Imports  
and Exports.

I have etc

(18) Roger Duckett  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford Esq.

No. 81.

8 A.S.T.

22 June 1892

Acts and Desps 32 of 4 April to 47 of 21 May 1892; 1st of 21  
May 1892, 25 Apr., 11 May, 20 May; Account of 22 April  
Circulars 13 Apr., 16 April, 19 April

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Rec'd 30 July.

Ack'd 5 Aug:

S.S "Denderah"

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of June 1892

No of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
70	17 May	Appt of Rev <sup>d</sup> E.C. Aspinall as Auct Minister and grant of leave.	nil
71	15 June	Draft Cemetery ordinance	3.
72	" "	Post Regulations	7.
73	" "	Financial Return, March &	1.
75	" "	Resignation of J. Campbell, Govt Pilot	6
76	" "	Surprise Chest Survey	1
74	" "	Private Secretary, W. Spearman	nil
77	21 "	Volunteers	1
78	" "	Blue Book 1891	3
79	" "	Expenditure on Jetties & Harbour	nil
80	" "	Customs Statistics	nil
81	22 "	Ack'd Despatches	nil
82	25 "	Certificate of W.W. Warding	1

W.W. Warding

(Govt. Agent for Falkland Islands)

W.S. F.J.

23 June 1892

No. 82 My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of 22 April marked "Accounts", and have much pleasure in returning its enclosure duly signed

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Tuckf<sup>t</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford S.C.M.G.

W.S. F.J.

No. 83

My Lord,

11 July 1892

I have the honor to forward to Your Lordship herewith the Report of the Quarterly Survey on the Treasury Account for the Quarter ending 30 June 1892

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Tuckf<sup>t</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford S.C.M.G.

W.S. F.J.

No. 84

My Lord,

11 July 1892

I have the honor to forward to Your Lordship herewith the Minutes of the Executive and Legislative Councils of this Colony for the half-year ending 30 June 1892.

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Tuckf<sup>t</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford S.C.M.G.

W.S. F.J.

No. 85

My Lord,

11 July 1892

I have the honor to forward to Your Lordship herewith the Return of changes in office etc for the Quarter ending 30 June 1892

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Tuckf<sup>t</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford S.C.M.G.

W.S. F.J.

No. 86

My Lord

11 July 1892

I have the honor to forward to Your Lordship herewith for transmission to the Board of Trade the Meteorological Register for the half-year ending 30 June 1892, and the Cape Town Store Oil & Stores account for the Quarter ending 30 June 1892

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Tuckf<sup>t</sup> Goldsworthy

Right Honorable

Lord Knutsford S.C.M.G.

G.W.S. J.J.

No. 87 Mr. Ford,

11 July 1892

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of yr. despatch No. 122 of 11 May inclosures applying to mine No. 125 of 5 Sep' 1891 informing me that the Minister had brought the subject matter of the despatch in question before the American Government, and that the British Minister at Washington having enquired into the matter "does not consider that the U.S. Govt. should interfere further in the matter". Further I note yr. instruc. that I should reprimand Mr. Wilmer for not stating the fact that he had received £ 22. 11 for compensation for detention aboard his vessel during his passage from Montevideo to the Falkland Islands.

2. The blame I would willingly take upon myself did I consider that Mr. Wilmer's application was one for "detention or passage"; so far as he was personally concerned, but a perusal of his letter will show that his claim is based on "great distress of mind caused by my wife and family", which appears to me altogether abs. any remuneration for services rendered, detention or passage.

3. Mr. Wilmer did report that he had received cost of passage and 72/- per diem from June 15<sup>th</sup> to July 18<sup>th</sup>, and the blame, if any must rest upon myself for not informing yr. of the same, when claim quite outside it, was discussed.

I have etc,

(sgd) Roger Jackfield G.D. Worthy  
GovernorThe Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

G.W.S. J.J.

No. 88 Mr. Ford.

11 July 1892

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of yr. despatch Nos. 33 & 40 of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 30 April respectively, - the latter enclosing a letter from Mr. Cobb, the Managing Director of the Falkland Islands Company, electing as Agent for Messrs. Brunel and Blake to take a renewal of the old lease of the land which they are entitled to purchase under the arrangement made last year.

2. Mr. Cobb is correct as to the sum of £ 368 having been paid on the 5<sup>th</sup> February to the Colonial Government for an Occupation Lease.

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Jackfield G.D. Worthy  
GovernorThe Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

S.H.S. F. I.

16<sup>o</sup>  
No. 89.

My Lord,

11 July 1892.

I have the honor to ack. the rec'd of your despatch no. 26  
of 2 March 1892 transmitting extract from a letter from Mr Dran in  
respect to Dyke Island - and I beg submit the following remarks.

2. The license which was granted to Mr Dran in 1868 is  
worded as in Schedule A, and your lordship will observe in the  
concluding portion the word, "including Dyke Island & containing  
70 400 acres." - "West Island and Tusac Island in Port  
Stephens, and Isle Island in Port Stephens are included in this  
license". 3. In neither the first nor the second lease, Schedule  
B, is any mention made of these Islands, but in the latter lease  
which was taken out under the Amalgamation ordinance is an  
additional clause stating that Bird Island at a rental of £15  
is added to Port Stephens Station on account of Penguin oil brought  
in demand for dressing sheep infected with scab.

4. I desire to draw your Lordship's attention to the fact that  
where adjacent Islands are included in a lease of any station they  
are invariably mentioned, and here for where not mentioned I  
think it must be assumed that they were not intended to be  
included, and though undoubtedly in the license Dyke Island  
with others was mentioned, the very fact of their being omitted  
from the leases points to its not being considered desirable to  
grant them for a term of years - a license to occupy running  
for only a year in contradistinction to a lease which ran  
then as now for 21 years.

5. Mr Dran's letter of 23 February may be read in more way than  
one - if he means it to be understood that Colonel D'Arcy visited  
Dyke Island in 1874 "and saw that we had possession of it,"  
had stocked it, built a woolshed and fenced it right across at  
"considerable expense", he misleads us. Port Stephens was  
settled, not Dyke Island which was not stocked about upon  
until 1882. 6. As regards Bird Island this is mentioned only  
in the second lease and was specially granted at a rental of £15  
per ann., not £10, on account of the penguin cookeries, the  
penguin oil brought in demand for dressing scabby sheep.  
Bird Island is essentially useless for pastoral purposes, I write  
from personal knowledge.

7. Mr Dran is either being inaccurate or by his statements unfortunately  
gives wrong impressions to his readers, - he writes "from the

earliest times all sales and leases of Crown land on the mainland carried with them the detached island immediately adjacent therewith the sandbanks - Does he intend me to understand that by Island is attached to the mainland by sandbank - Such is not the case - it is distant in its narrowest part ~~near~~<sup>only one-fourth</sup> a mile - in its broadest nearly 2 miles, the channel averaging 16 to 18 fathoms not feet in depth - How "Shepherds and dogs can introduce sheep under these circumstances I cannot well understand.

8 Mr Dren too is incorrect in assuming that leases from the earlier times were qualified in using the islands adjacent to their stations. In no single case have the leases of Crown land carried with them the right to the adjacent islands without application for the same & insertion in the lease at a given rental.

9 Rose Island lying close off Rosslyn Station was applied for by the lessee before using, copy of letter in regard to application enclosed. Enclosure C, Tanning Island off the entrance to Saalalon was rented to the lessee of No 23 Tanning Head lease in 1884, for which he had to pay rental as from 13<sup>th</sup> June 1870, so that it might be rendered concurrently with that lease. The same with Split Island, Dry and Passage Islands are rented to the South American Mission through their station at Kepul Island is rent free.

10 There are but small islands varying from 200 to 500 acres where as Dyke Island is 5000 acres, the marketable rental of the would be £40 to £50 per annum. I am unable to say whether previous Governors were aware that Dyke Island was occupied by Mr Dren without any demands for rent being made, or that the fact that the Island in question was not mentioned in either of his leases of Port Stephens station was or was not known to my predecessors; I maintain this, that if farmers are to benefit by the sale of some two million acres more or less in not having to pay rent thereon, then the losses of the Government, then where a large proprietor has undertaken the trouble to see that his leases are drawn up in accordance with his application, or a reason assigned for the omission of an part of the land he desired to acquire on lease, the fault lies in him, it should be taken that the omission was intentional on the part of the Government, That a man of business habits from his youth for 20 years has allowed such a discrepancy between his license to lease to erect without making any enquiry points to a fact on his part that such omission was not unintended. Mr Dren's letter however is desirous and very misleading, and I repeat to you

of written with that object.

11. I should add in conclusion that in going through the lease book my attention was drawn to the fact that Mr. Dran occupied Dyke Island when it was not mentioned in his lease, hence my communication with his son on the subject.

12. The conclusion here is in my opinion but one point in Mr. Dran's favour, and that is that the same acreage is mentioned both in leases and leases - but the importance which might otherwise be attached to this is lessened when it is borne in mind how little attention seems to have been paid when computing the acreage of estates generally, the lessee in, I think I may say, every instance paying rental on much less land than a survey would shew.

13. Personally, I am I may say almost unknown to Mr. Dran, a large shareholder in the Falkland Islands Company, and I have not the slightest interest in his getting the land or otherwise except that I conceive that in this and other cases a Commission of Enquiry would best settle matters - one of two things is necessary in regard to the land question; either an ordinance legalizing all existing leases, and thus avoiding the suggestion even that a Governor should act contrary to the existing law, which I certainly would not do; or, that the interests of the inhabitants of the colony should be considered as opposed to a very small minority, and such legislation be introduced as to give effect to what I conceive was the intention of the legislature whatever different construction has been put upon it by the law officers of the Crown.

14. With what object was a survey strongly recommended by Governor Callaghan and Governor Kerr, and approved (less duly) in his despatch No. 11 of 1 March 1885 in answer to Governor Kerr's despatch No. 19 of 2 January, if the outcome could only be the solidifying of any existing claim the lessees or others may have and proving of no advantage to the Government.

Right Honorable  
Lord Lansdowne G.C.M.G.

I have etc

(4d) Roger Duckett Goldsworthy  
Governor

Should your lordship concur that Mr. Dran has not made good his claim to the island, he should be called upon to pay the rent for the period during which he used the island - and looking to the numerous applicants for land, and those already owned by Mr. Dran and his sons, I would advise that he be asked the highest bidder.

(4d) RTG

G.H.S. J.J.

(20)

No: 90.

Mr. hood,

11 July 1892

In reply to Your Lordship's despatch no: 35 of 18 April, I have the honor to inform you that subsequent to the decision in the Executive Council on the subject of the Poor Saving Bank, the Colonial Chaplain withdrew his application and requested that the matter might not be proceeded with.

I have etc.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford GCMG

(sgd) Roger Buxley Goldsworthy  
Governor

No: 91.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford GCMG

G.H.S. J.J.

16 July 1892

Acknowledges 1st of 24 May, and desps 18 of 27 June to 51 of 16 June 1892

(sgd) Roger Buxley Goldsworthy  
Governor.

No: 92. Mr. hood

18 July 1892

I have the honor to request that the Commandant may be instructed to have the accompanying requisition for clothing for the Volunteers carried out. 2. It is not intended that the cost shall fall upon the colony but upon the Volunteers themselves who have asked me to procure the clothing in this manner as being more economical when securing uniformity in make and material.

3. I do not know whether H. L could obtain the sanction of the War Office for the clothing to be made in the Army Clothing Department Grosvenor Road S.W. of 30, this would be the most satisfactory if not, I would ask that the clothing should be made by some wholesale house such as Messrs Cook, Son & Co, of St Paul's Churchyard.

I have etc

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford GCMG

(sgd) Roger Buxley Goldsworthy  
Governor

No: 93

Mr. hood

G.H.S. J.J.

18 July 1892

In view of th despatch no: 25 of 12 March 1892 in which you in par: 4.1. the question of reserving portions of the land contained in any of the expired leases and request me to report thereon, I have the honor to point out that before I am in a position to give the full information it will be necessary to know exactly the position

Government in connection with the reserves as also in regard to the land it may be proposed to reserve. 2 I would therefore ask the following questions in respect to the reserves generally, and each land as under H.L.'s instructions I may reserve, - a list of the former I forward for your information - these as far as I can ascertain have been leased for long periods

- (i) The reserves not having been advertised as ceasing the leases, are they still to be considered as such
  - (ii) Is the Government bound by the conditions in respect to these reserves, embodied in section 2 of the Land ordinance 1897? (iii). In the event of my reserving land from the leases just expired and which are now held under occupation leases (vide part II of H.L. despatch No 64 of 26 Sept 1891), is the section so reserved to be put up to auction at the average mentioned in the lease, 6000 acres, or at its acreage as shown by measurement on the chart.
  - (iv) If land leased as one section is known to contain the acreage of 2 sections - should the land be put up as 1 section of 6000 acres or be subdivided and sold as 2 sections of 6000 acres each (this, I presume, will in a measure depend on the answer to the foregoing).
  - (v) Can the lessee claim to purchase at the reduced rate of 3/- per acre and thus have an advantage over other bidders or will the upset price be in his case 4/- per acre
  - (vi) If too the area of a section stated in the lease as 6000 acres be found to be 12000, is the rental to be diminished by £20 or £40; it being borne in mind that the portion for which the lessee still has rental is in all probability far in excess of the area stated in the lease.
3. Again as in my despatch No 524 of 3 April strongly urge that a Land Commission be appointed, and if it be found that there have been leases or abatements, let legislation be introduced which shall replace in the hands of the State the excess land which has been leased to some 27 sheep farmers without payment, to the detriment of the rest of the Colony.

4. Surely, Mr. Hord, a Government which does not hesitate to deal with freeholders in Ireland - and introduce most drastic measures (and rightly too) should not hesitate to intervene and introduce legislation when 27 broadholding sheep farmers have

Received 25 August, 1892.

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

S. S "Mones"

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of July 1892

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
83	11 July	Quarterly Chest Survey	1
84	" "	Minutes of the anterior & present Councils	2
85	" "	Changes in Office etc	1
86	" "	Cape Pembroke Lighthouse accounts	
87	" "	Pilot Welmers claim agst F.M.C.L.	nil
88	" "	Messrs. Holmeted Blake's leave	nil
89	" "	Messrs. Drans' claim to Dyer Island	3
90	" "	Berry Savings Bank	nil
91	16	Ack <sup>c</sup> g of C.O. Despatches	
92	18	Supplying of Volunteer equipment	3
93	" "	Government Receivers	1

of the folly of the Government prompted and filled their purses  
up to the "no-end" principle in respect of a considerable  
portion of the land leased to them.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

I have etc  
(sd) Roger Duckfield Goldworthy  
Governor

G.T.S. T. J.

No. 94 My Lord,

11 August 1892

I have the honor to submit for Y<sup>r</sup> approval the accompanying  
amended scale of fees payable to the Colonial Surgeon for attendance on  
private patients. Under the old scale everyone paid alike -  
a person's income not being taken into consideration.

I beg to annex to whom I submitted the old scale for review are  
Mr Sanguineti, late Acting Colonial Secretary, Mr Dalton M.A.C.,  
and Mr Tere Pack. The fees are certainly not excessive and are  
compare favourably with those charged by medical practitioners in other  
Colonies. The new scale was approved in Executive Council and came  
into operation on the 1<sup>st</sup> proximo. I have etc,

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

(sd) Roger Duckfield Goldworthy  
Governor

G.O. Stanley

No. 95 My Lord,

11 August 1892

With reference to Y<sup>r</sup> despatch No. 1 of 1 January 1892 relative  
the appointment of Mr Turner as Foreman of Works for a period of  
years I did not deem it desirable to act upon it as I feared  
it was not improbable that I should have to dispense with his  
services as though a good workman himself he was scarcely  
competent to take charge of the Works department, added to  
which his deafness was a great drawback. 2. In however entailing  
any action on my part by sending in his resignation, subsequently,  
expressed his readiness to continue but I have not thought it due  
to renew the engagement; there will thus be a saving of £190 annu-  
ally which would have been his salary. This sum was not chargeable  
under the fixed establishment, but was payable from the Public  
Vote.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford G.C.M.G.

I have etc  
(sd) Roger Duckfield Goldworthy  
Governor

G.W.S. F.I.

11 August 1892

No. 96. My Lord,

I have the honor to forward by request of Mr Smith a copy of res<sup>o</sup>l<sup>t</sup> adopted at 2 public meetings in respect to the mail service between England and this Colony.

2. As I understood through Mr Schlotfeldt, the Agent of the Hamor Company, that a fresh contract had been made with that Company I so informed Mr Smith as I thought it useless sending on the resolutions - but as I was not in a position officially to verify the Agent's statement, Mr Smith on behalf of himself and his co-signatories again requested that they might go forward.

3. I now therefore enclose them for Y.L. perusal, and at the same time must say that it is placing a Governor in a somewhat false position to keep him in the dark on an important question of this nature when as in this case the Agent of the Hamor Company and the Manager of the Falkland Islands Company were cognizant of the conditions of the contract a copy of which was kindly supplied to me by Mr Schlotfeldt.

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Duck<sup>y</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable  
Lord Thurlford & C.M.G.

G.W.S. F.I.

11 August 1892

No. 97.

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward herewith for Y.L. information 6 copies of returns giving particulars of Crown lands leased and of those sold under Ordinance No. 9 of 1890 and also of Island whether leased or otherwise.

I have etc

(sgd) Roger Duck<sup>y</sup> Goldsworthy  
Governor

Right Honorable  
Lord Thurlford & C.M.G.

G.W.S. F.I.

16 August 1892

No. 98. My Lord

I have the honor to request that Y.L. will be good enough to make the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to instruct the Senior Naval Officer on the S.E. Coast of America to grant me a passage for a man of war to South Georgia which it is my desire to visit.

2. There are some eight people here who are anxious to ascertain its capabilities for farming and who have applied to me to know on what terms the island would be leased. From the Captain of an American steamer I heard that the land is not inferior to that in New

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Received 15 September 1892  
SS "Karnak"

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of August 1892

No of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
94	11 Aug.	Medical fees	6
95	" "	Resignation of W Turner, Surveyor of Works	nil
96	" "	Memorial reppg Mail Service	2
97	" "	Returns showing leases of Cr. Land	6.

M. Wardrig  
Acting Private Secretary

order for him  
despatched  
No. 27 10<sup>th</sup> Ned  
1887.

136

islands - but until I have seen it for myself and have heard  
opinion of some practical sheep farmer as to the nature of the pasturage,  
water supply, etc., it would be impossible for me to recommend Your  
Lordship to approve of any application for leasing the whole or any  
portion of the land, the area of which is computed at 1000 <sup>sq miles</sup>.

3. I would also ask that a representative of those who have  
applied to me may be given a passage to South Georgia and back.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford SC MP

I have etc  
(sgd) Roger Duckett Goldsworthy  
Governor

G.M.S. T. I.

16 August 1892

No. 99 My Lord,

I have the honor to enclose a cutting from the "Southern Times"  
published at Buenos Ayres, which may deserve the attention of  
Foreign Office in view of the claim annually made by the Argentine Govt.  
to the Falkland Islands. 2. Should any concession have been  
made, the terms of the same will probably define what are "Argentine  
waters" in the opinion of that Government. 3. That the concession  
properly fishing adjacent to the Falklands <sup>is</sup> is clear from the enclosed  
portion of the cutting as her state that the fishing station is to be  
in this Colony.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford SC MP

I have etc  
(sgd) Roger Duckett Goldsworthy  
Governor

G.M.S. T. I.

20 August 1892

No. 101.

Ack<sup>t</sup> rec'd of Despatches 52 V 22 June to 60 11<sup>th</sup> July. General  
8 June, Accounts 17 June

I have etc  
(sgd) Roger Duckett Goldsworthy  
Governor

The Right Honorable  
Lord Knutsford SC MP

G.M.S. T. I.

No. 100 My Lord,

16 August 1892

I have the honor to inform you that it is proposed to erect a  
Stanley a building to be utilized as a swimming bath and the  
promoters have applied to me for the grant of a site according to  
sketch attached.

2. I am of opinion that such a project of course  
would be great public benefit, and would therefore

102

grant of the site at a peppercorn rent, on condition that if the land be utilized for any purpose other than that stated, except with the consent of the Governor in Council, it shall revert to the Crown with all the buildings thereon.

3. I may add that the Executive Council are unanimous in supporting this recommendation, and that the plans have been submitted to and approved by me.

The Right Honorable  
Lord Hankford GCMG,

I have etc  
(Sd) Roger Taft Goldsworthy  
Governor

No 102.

Government House, Stanley.  
Falkland Islands.

20 August 1892

Acknowledgment of Dps 52 - 60. 22 $\frac{6}{92}$  to 13 $\frac{2}{92}$  Accts 17 $\frac{6}{92}$   
Gen 8 $\frac{6}{92}$ . Circulars 30 $\frac{5}{92}$ , 31 $\frac{5}{92}$ , 15 $\frac{6}{92}$  Libs 15 $\frac{6}{92}$ , 10 $\frac{6}{92}$ , 28 $\frac{6}{92}$ , 4 $\frac{7}{92}$ .

(Sd) Roger Taft Goldsworthy.  
Governor.

No 103.

Government House, Stanley.  
Falkland Islands.

24 August 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to transmit herewith,  
<sup>Ordinance V. 1892  
Supplement</sup> for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon,  
a full and duly authenticated copy of Ordinance  
No 5 of 1892 being an Ordinance "to provide for the  
"prevention of the spreading of any contagious"  
or infectious disorders amongst dogs or other  
"animals within the Colony of the Falkland  
"Islands".

2. This Ordinance has  
been passed in conformity with the instructions  
contained in your Lordship's despatch No 43  
of 20<sup>th</sup> May last.

3 August

~~order in Council  
In Duplicate~~

The Rt Honorable  
Lord Knutsford Q.C.  
Downing Street.

3. Another outbreak of disease  
has necessitated the issue of a further order  
in Council, a copy of which is enclosed.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) Roger T. Goldswor  
Governor

Falkland Islands.

No 104.

Government House,  
Stanley, Falkland Islands  
24 August, 1872.

My Lord,

*Ordinance No. 1872  
In duplicate*  
I have the honour to transmit herewith, for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure theron, a full and duly authenticated copy of ordinance No. 6 of 1876 being an ordinance "to amend the Administration of Justice Ordinance, 1876."

2. The effect of this ordinance is to legalize the payment of notarial fee into the Colonial Treasury as instructed by your lordship's despatch No. of the

The Rt Honorable

Lord Knutsford  
Q.C.  
Downing Street.

I have, &c.

(Signed) Roger T. Goldswor  
Governor.

No 105.

Government House,  
Stanley, Falkland Islands  
24 August, 1872.

My Lord,

*W.C. Francis  
22 Augt 1872*  
I have the honour to forward an application from Mr Charles A. Francis, Colonial Treasurer, &c. of this colony applying for the appointment

Commandant of the Cyprus Constabulary

2. I have every reason to be satisfied with Mr Fraser's performance of his duties during the short period of his service here.

the R<sup>t</sup> Hon<sup>ble</sup>.  
Lord Knutsford, G.C.M.G.  
Downing Street.

I have &c  
Signed) Roger T Goldsworthy  
governor.

Falkland Islands.  
No 106.

Government House,  
Stanley, Falkland Islands  
26 August, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to report that Mr C.W. Hill, Government Clerk, arrived here by this mail and has taken up his duties in succession to Mr W.A. Harding who leaves to-day for England.

the R<sup>t</sup> Hon<sup>ble</sup>.  
Lord Knutsford, G.C.M.G.  
Downing Street.

I have &c.  
(Signed) Roger T Goldsworthy  
Governor.

Falkland Islands.  
No 107.

Government House, Stanley.  
9 September, 1892.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Colonial Office despatch No 55 of the 6<sup>th</sup> July forwarding a copy of correspondence with Mr Dean in respect to Dyke Island.

2. I have amended the acreage in the grant in accordance with your instructions; the explanation of the

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Received October, 1892.

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of August 1892

No of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
98	16 August	Island of South Georgia	one
99	-	Fisher Concession in Argentine Republic	one
100	-	Syndicate and Swimming Bath	one
101	20.	Act <sup>t</sup> of CO Despatches	nil
102.	-	Act <sup>t</sup> of Despatches.	.
103	24	Ordinance V of 1892.	Two.
104	" "	Ordinance VI of 1892 -	Two.
105	" "	Mr Fraser's applic <sup>a</sup> for a transfer	One.
106	26	U.S. Ship's arrival & At. Madrigal's departure	

discrepancy between the grant and that upon which Mr. Dean paid, is afforded in the Colonial Secretary's letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> August last enclosed herein.

3. Upon a receipt given by the then Treasurer, Lord Knutsford seems to have concluded that Mr. Dean was entitled to Dyke Island. I submit that had the receipt in question been referred to me the facts subjoined would materially have affected Lord Knutsford's decision.

4. The whole correspondence with Lord Knutsford's instructions, was read by me to the Executive Council, the result being as in the enclosed extract of the minutes thereof. I have made enquiries and cannot find that it was ever customary to give receipts such as that given by Mr. Collins to Mr. Dean, the origin of which I return herewith, retaining a copy of the official record of which none can be found in the office.

It will be in the knowledge of the Colonial Office officials that Mr. Collins in the year 1881 a year after the date of the receipt referred to, was tried and convicted of embezzlement and sentenced to seven years penal servitude.

At that time and for a considerable period anterior thereto, indeed at the very time that this receipt was given, Mr. Collins was heavily in debt to Messrs. Dean and Co., of whom their representative here, Mr. G. Dean (now deceased), and to whom the receipt in question was given, was the defendant in the "action" Brock and others v. G.M. Dean "tried in the Supreme Court on the 23 May 1879. A perusal of the evidence does not point to a high standard of honor and uprightness on the part of the litigants."

182

5. If Mr. Dean is able to produce similar receipts in the interests of other farmers for whom he acted as agent, and at the time in question the majority were his clientele, the evidence as to the bona fides of this transaction will be more conclusive than at present, but if not, I would ask why did Mr. Collins give an exceptional receipt. Surely one that carried Port Stephens station would have been sufficient without entering into details; if, however, the details of the land acquired compulsorily had been given on other occasions and in respect of those for whom Messrs. Dean were agents / it must be borne in mind that I speak of the West Falklands where several sections of land were taken up and the whole represented as station so and so containing so many thousand acres), then my contention that Mr. Collins acted differently on this occasion to others would break down, but if not, I contend that the receipt in question was obtained by collusion between Mr. Collins and Mr. G. Dean. Again, where did Mr. Collins get his information? As Dyke Island was not included in the lease it could not have been from that. whence then did he get it, except from Mr. G. Dean, the gentleman who did not hesitate to mutilate an agreement and thus attempt to defraud his employees, for it must be borne in mind that there is not any attempt to refute the evidence of Mr. Enoch who swore as follows "When I asked Andrew Bell if he had defaced the agreement it being in his possession he said no Captain Williams was present and all the three others. Andrew Bell said that Mr. Dean did it with his own hand on board the Orissa and that if he Mr. Dean denied it, he, Bell, had witnesses to prove that he had done so."

What follows "the Court was adjourned for luncheon, on return Mr. Dean said he withdrew from defending the case stating that having seen the letter (B) from Mr. Bell the gentleman of which he admitted he would withdraw from defending the case."

Judgment for the plaintiff for £63-5 each being the amount claimed by each of them and costs which amounted in all to £7.

6. Surely a man innocent of so grave a charge as that of mutilating or defacing an agreement to which he was a party would have left no stone unturned to prove his innocence, but it is enough for me to say what I have done to show that Mr. Dean was not above doing that which it is my contention he did - namely, induce Mr. Collins by the power he held over him to include Dyke Island in his receipt which Island though mentioned in the licence was intentionally omitted in the first lease and the amending one.

7. I cannot help referring to a remark made by Mr. Routledge, my legal adviser, it may tell for or against my argument: - namely, that "it is just the sort of receipt a business man would demand". Admitting this, I ask, would a business man for 21 years have carelessly abstained from raising the question of Dyke Island? nay, more, would he not have seen that his first lease was in accordance with the terms of the licence or, assuming that he had forgotten thus to do so, would not have been more careful when the amended lease for 21 years was being issued.

185

8. In paragraph 12 of my despatch h<sup>o</sup>: 89 of "A" July I cited as being in Messrs Dean and Company's favour the fact that the annual acreage of Port Stephens station remained the same notwithstanding that Dyke Island was not mentioned in either lease. Referring however to the lease in question there is an addendum I find to the second stating that Bird Island "is included in this lease" though no addition is made to the acreage therein.

Thus it would seem that whether land was added or subtracted the nominal acreage remained unchanged -

9. Again when the matter of the payment of the compulsory purchase money was before Mr Collins surely Mr Collins must have looked at the lease and if so where was Dyke Island? Then if it had been a mere oversight why did not Mr Dean or Mr Collins bring the omission before the Governor. They did not do so, or if they did the omission was not rectified, showing that the then Governor was of the same opinion as myself that Dyke Island was not intended to be included; the next best thing and one apparently as good in the eyes of the Colonial Office authorities done by Mr Q. Dean was to get a receipt for land compulsorily purchased on Dyke Island from the Treasurer. Now I would ask under what authority could Mr Collins or any other Treasurer fix the localities where the land purchased under Section 3 of Ordinance 6 of 1870 was to be acquired. Could the Colonial Treasurer ipse dixit settle the question which rested solely with the Governor and Colonial Surveyor? But it would appear so, but I hesitate to

think after what I have written regarding known relations existing between mess<sup>r</sup> Dean and Collis, the character far removed from rectitude which these gentlemen held, that either Lord Knutsford or yourself would permit Dyke Island to be included in a lease to mess<sup>r</sup> Dean and Company.

10. Such matters as these, the irregularities which have been committed in connection with land, the manner in which enquiry has been buried, surveys staved off, and everything done to secure to themselves land to which I maintain many no right, it is this knowledge, I say, which has raised a general demand, and rightly too, I think that a Commission should be appointed to investigate the land question and that until this be done no fresh leases should issue.

11. In conclusion they append a few questions which might be addressed with advantage to Mess<sup>r</sup> Dean & Co.

The R<sup>t</sup> Honble.

The Secrat<sup>r</sup> of State  
for the Colonies.

I have etc.  
(Signed) Roger Lupton  
Governor.

P.S. I have not described the blocks of land in the grant as I thought it necessary to acquaint you with the foregoing facts prior to doing so. It does not appear that the proper course has ever been adopted by Mess<sup>r</sup> Dean & Co. regarding the selection and purchase of the blocks of land. The accompanying enclosed is a copy of the course usually followed in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance.

(S<sup>t</sup> L<sup>t</sup>) R.L.G.

186

List of questions.  
(Referred to in Paragraph 11.)

1. In what year was Dwyke Island stocked?  
(By this is not meant the merely locating a few rams without ewes from which to breed. I have authoritative information that it was not till 1882 and that the conditions of the lease were not fulfilled)
2. When were the buildings erected? (It was at the same time as above)
3. How was it that Mr. Collins' receipt was overlooked? (It points to a fault on the part of Messrs. Dean and Co. that it was not en râle which it turns out to be the case).
4. Can Messrs. Dean and Co. produce any approval by the Surveyor General or consent of Governor as laid down in Section 3 of the "Amalgamation ordinance" (under which Port Stephens was leased) of the selection of the blocks of land in the localities mentioned in the receipt given by Mr. Collins?
5. What was the indebtedness of Mr. Collins to the firm at that time?

Government House,  
Stanley, Falkland Islands.  
12 September, 1892.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Lord Knutsford's despatch No 54 of 4<sup>th</sup> July with enclosures relative to the Auctioneers Amendment Ordinance and which I have caused to be published fearing that the public would be strengthened in the idea, already existing, that the Board of Directors of the Falkland Islands Company have only to move the Colonial Office in any matter to gain their point.

2. I forward for your perusal certified copies of the license granted to Mr King by Governor Keor in 1891 and of that granted by myself in 1892, which will sufficiently demonstrate the incorrectness of Mr Cobb's statement in his letter of the 31<sup>st</sup> May to the Colonial Office as follows "it is not a fact that the "Storekeeper of the Company is himself "licensed as an auctioneers nor is it true "that the Company are, &c, &c". Mr Cobb is too apt to make assertions which unfortunately cannot be rebutted by evidence for a period of three <sup>to four</sup> months; meanwhile by thus throwing dust into the eyes of the authorities at the Colonial Office his object has been gained.

3. With regard to the 2½ per cent duty which Mr Cobb desired to see abolished, the fact that it has been in existence for 40 years to use Mr Cobb's own words "is surely an argument in favour of leaving well alone". besides which there

was not any evidence except Mr. Cobb's assertion that this duty "has for years been the subject of complaint as an unjust and unreasonable impost."

The Right Honorable  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.

I have, &c,  
Signed Roger Taft Goldsworth  
Governor.

Falkland Islands.  
h<sup>o</sup> 109.

Government House, Stanley,  
Falkland Islands.

13 September, 1892.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward a copy of an amended gaol regulation, for your afformation which was passed by the Governor in Council on the 7<sup>th</sup> instant.

2. The clause dealing with corporal punishment which appeared in the former amended regulations of 17<sup>th</sup> August 1886 was accidentally omitted to be inserted in the Gaol Regulations of May, 1886 forwarded to you in my despatch h<sup>o</sup> 72 of 15 June last.

The Right Honorable  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.

I have, &c,  
Signed Roger Taft Goldsworth  
Governor.

Falkland Islands.  
h<sup>o</sup> 110.

173/  
1239

Government House, Stanley,  
Falkland Islands.

15 September, 1892.

Sir,

Referring to my despatch h<sup>o</sup> 107 of the instant I have the honours to enclose, for your information, certified copy of a letter of 19 August 1885 from the then Colonial Secretary (Mr. Brooks) to his Excellency the Governor.

agent for a Mr. de Clement from which it will be gathered that Governor Kerr in respect to the endorsement by the Acting Colonial Secretary Mr. Collins in the copy of the lease in the lease book in respect to a transfer of land by Mr. J. de Clement to Messrs Pache Brothers stated that it was "irregular and of no effect, the governor not having been applied to".

2. I draw attention to what is designated as an "irregular and informal entry" as shewing the manner in which Mr. Collins appears to have lent himself on more than one occasion to "irregular" proceedings (vide my despatch h<sup>o</sup> 107 of 9 September) and curiously enough in connection with land transactions in which Mr. G.M. Dean's name on each occasion transpires.

It will be noted in the Colonial Secretary's letter that he says - "It (the application) does not set out that the Governor has been applied to" as far as I can see neither in Section 6 of the "amalgamation Ordinance" under which Chartres Station was leased nor in subsequent ordinances dealing with transfers is there any condition imposed that the Governor should be applied to, the only condition being that notice should be given to the Colonial Secretary though I presume it is understood that that officer would only act subject to the Governor's approval.

3. If the transaction was then "irregular and of no effect" in Governor Kerr's opinion how much more then would he have considered the receipt given by Mr. Collins, when Treasurer, defining the

localities of blocks of land acquired by compulsory purchase, when it is distinctly in the various ordinances stated that they should be "determined by the Surveyor General "by the consent of the governor".

The opinion expressed by Governor Kerr is that of a governor referred to by Mr Cobb in his letter to the Colonial Office dated 16 May, 1882 as "practised in the law" and was likewise held by his predecessor Governor Callaghan who was a Barrister. I merely refer to this as Mr Cobb, who has been constituted champion of the farmer's interest, seems to consider that a governor without a legal training is incompetent to take a common sense view of a question.

The Rt Honble  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.

I have &c.  
Signed, Roger Tuck Goldsworthy  
Governor.

Answer.  
Government House,  
Stanley.  
15 September, 1892

Sir,  
I have the honour to forward, for your information a statement showing the receipts and expenditure for the year ended 30 June, 1892.

The Rt Honble.  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.

I have &c.  
Signed, Roger Tuck Goldsworthy  
Governor.

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Received 24 October, 1892.

131

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 1892.

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
107.	9 September 1892.	Leave of Dyke Island. Further facts relating to the grant of to Mr. Dean	Seven. Two.
108.	12 "	Auctioneers' licenses. Correspondence respecting that issued to Mr. F. King has been published.	Two.
109.	13 "	Amended Gaol Regulation.	One.
110.	15 "	Land leases. Receipts given by Mr. Collins (late Treasurer) in the past irregularly.	One.
111.	15 "	Receipts and Payments for quarter ended 30 June, 1892.	One.
112.	16 "	Acknowledgment of receipt of despatches on 16 September, 1892.	

Government House,

Stanley.

3 October, 1892.

Sir:

I have the honour to transmit herewith, to be forwarded to the Audit Department, the report of the survey of the Colonial Chest for the quarter ended the 30<sup>th</sup> September last and a certificate of quarterly survey containing a statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Colony during the same period.

The R<sup>t</sup> Honble.  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
H. H. K.

I have the  
Seal of R.M. Routledge  
for the Governor.

S/14.

Sir,

259 W/H

Government House, Stanley.

ans by 30 1892

I have the honour to forward for your approval the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the 1893 -

*Estimates 1893.*

2. The Estimated Revenue amounts to £ 10,581-3-1 against £ 11,960 for this year or a decrease of £ 1,378-16-11, this is caused to the extent of £ 1181, by the expiration of the Land and Tenement Tax whilst the increased rental from Government property will not meet the deficiency, the increase under that head being only estimated at £ 435-3-1. The only other item calling for remarks will be found under the head of Post Office, the revenue from which owing to the sea transit rates being only paid once in three years will show a falling off.

3. The estimated expenditure amounts to £ 10,242-7-4 against £ 9914-8-8 the approved estimate for 1892. The difference is explained as follows:-

, Pensions

1. Pensions. The name of Mr Brooks, late Colonial Secretary appears for the first time a sum of £130 being inserted to meet the payment of his pension. Increase  
130 - 0 - 0.
2. Governor. His vote is £25 less than for this year. "Forage and corn for Horses" having been placed under the head of Public Works? 25.
3. Colonial Secretary's Department. The salary of the Colonial Treasurer has been increased under authority of Colonial Office Despatch 79 of 12.<sup>th</sup> December 1891 from £300 to £350. The Government Clerk's salary shows an increase of £4-9-9 that officer being entitled to an increment at the rate of £10 per annum from July next.
4. Fuel and light. There is a decrease of £10 under this head.
5. Type for printing office shows an increase of £20 required to replace worn type. 64-9-9
6. Customs Department. Remains unaltered.
7. Audit Department. Provision has been made for Savings Bank (Audit) local, £ 4 - 4 - 0. There is a decrease of £6 for auditing Colonial accounts, the amount being fixed at £30 (vide Colonial Office despatch General of 2 August). 1.16
8. Port and Marine Department. It has been found necessary to provide for extra pilotage when the pilot is absent or there is an influx of vessels as recently occurred after a heavy gale. £30 has therefore been put on the Estimates. 128

Brought forward.

for an Assistant Pilot. (Allowance)

Under the head of Boatmen's wages "appears a decrease off £20, the cord of the mail schooner "Hadassah" being available where formerly men had to be hired. The £20 will provide for even occasions only required when the "Hadassah" is absent on mail service.

Looking to the thorough repairs and refit of the Government Schooners "Hadassah & Victoria" and to the boats of the Harbour Master a reduction off £50 has been made on this vote.

40.

7. Legal Department. Coroner's "inquest fees" there is a reduction of £4-0-0 on this vote.

4.

8. Police. An Instructor of volunteers (vide Colonial Office despatch 20 of 7 March, 1892) has been provided for under this head of service, it being proposed to utilise his services as Sergeant of Police and Custom House Officer when not employed as Instructor.

"Police Constables" a reduction of £70 has been made by reducing the number by one.

"Clothing." This was over estimated this year. A sum of £75 has been provided and will be sufficient with the clothing on hand.

15.

9. Prisons "Extra Wards" £25 has been voted. This sum may or may not be required, it being dependent on the prisoners working outside the gaol.

Increase	Decrease
194.9.9	26.16.0

194.9.9 85.16.0

Brought forward -  
Clothing, Bedding and Utensils. The supply  
on hand has allowed of a reduction of  
£ 10.

"Subsistence of Prisoners". A reduction of  
£ 10 has been made on this vote. 5.

10. Medical Department. Fees. There is a  
slight alteration under this head, the  
fee being £ 1-1-0. and the total  
estimated at £ 4-4-0 instead of £ 5.

"Cost of Medicines". There is a reduction  
of £ 5. 5:14.0

11. Education: Fees (Schoolmasters).  
Increase £ 5-0-0 based upon attendance.  
Fees (Schoolmistresses) £ 5. based  
upon attendance.

"Fuel". Increase of £ 2. last year's vote  
being found to be insufficient.

"School materials". Increase of £ 5 to  
provide prizes for children. 17.0.0

12. Ecclesiastical. "Fees": No vote is  
taken under this head as all fees  
are paid to the Chaplain himself  
(vide Ordinance 1 of 1858)

13. Transport. Passages of government  
employees. Except for unforeseen  
circumstances it was thought that  
£ 100 would be sufficient showing  
a saving of £ 34 on last year's  
estimate.

"Conveyance of stores". Audit Office  
every h. 2 March past 1891 direct  
that charges for freight should be  
placed under this head. 16.0.0

14. Miscellaneous. "Expenses unfor-  
seen". An extra £ 25 has been  
placed to this vote last year  
proving insufficient.

"Telegrams". Last year's vote being

Brought forward.

Increase	Decrease
232-9-9	103-10-0

being insufficient.

"Cutting and Rickling peat." The vote has been increased £10 to enable constables to be provided with peat (vide Colonial Office Despatch No 4 of 13 January 1872). £0.0.0.

15. Post office. Under "Other charges" a sum of £20 has been inserted for Bureau International, Postal Stores. £0.20.0.0.

16. Mail Schooners. Assistant Pilot (vide Port and Harbour)

"Insurance". At the time of framing the Estimates for last year the exact sum was not known, hence the difference of £9-1-1.

"Provisioning". An increase of £20 is shown being somewhat under-estimated for last year.

"Washing". New item.

£2-1-1.

17. Public works. "Maintenance and Repairs, &c" Under this head is included instalment and interest on expenses for pricing for the commonage. It will be seen that there is a corresponding receipt on revenue side under head of Rentment Tax which has been raised to pay off the loan from revenue.

Maintenance and repairs of public buildings &c. This vote has been doubled, a large amount of painting being necessary and in order to complete certain work for which the grant from surplus funds has not sufficed.

"Forage for cart horses" (vide Governor's Establishment) increase of £5 for cost of Hay &c.

292-9-9 115-11-1

Furniture: It is thought though much is still required that £150 will suffice saving £100.

Brought forward 292.99 15.  
150.

253

18. Interest (Savings Bank). Payments. The number of deposits being necessarily fluctuating and many people leaving for Patagonia &c causes the estimated decrease of £ 150.

19. Drawbacks and Refunds. The amount taken is estimated on an average of three years.

150.

48

Totals £ 593.99 265.11

4. I should add that the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Adm<sup>stn</sup> opposed the vote of £ 466.15.<sup>11</sup> for "Mail Schoones" (Vote 16) on the ground that the upkeep of the schoones for mail service was heavier than was warranted there being local schooners which could be subsidised and perform the service at a lesser cost. A comparison of the actual expenditure on the Government Schooner however with that which would have to be expended on her (for it is absolutely necessary that the Government should have a boat here) and for the services of a local schooner shows that the present arrangement for this service is the most economical one, the "Hadassah" making two trips a month against one trip that would be made by a schooner subsidised for £300 which subsidy prior to the "Hadassah" undertaking the service it was proposed to increase to £ 600.

The R<sup>H</sup> Mr.  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
150  
K. re. re.

I have seen,  
(Signed) Ross P. Goldsmith  
Governor

Government House, Stanley.  
10 October, 1892.

Sir:

I have the honour to enclose herewith copies of an Ordinance entitled an Ordinance "to raise a sum of money by a tax on tenements in Stanley and to provide for the application thereof and of other local taxes for the proposed Local Improvements." which was submitted to the Legislative Council and passed through its various stages:-

2. The object of the Bill is to apply certain funds raised locally for the sole purpose of local improvements, such as roads and bridges, drainage, lighting, &c; hitherto all expenses have been borne by general revenue without any regard as to whether the sum raised locally was sufficient or otherwise to meet local expenditure. By this Ordinance local improvements will be dependent upon the amount raised in Stanley from the sources enumerated in Section 2. The disbursement of the money as voted in Council will be as heretofore in the hands of the Governor.

3. Dr. Baillon the only unofficial member present though he expressed himself in favor of local taxation refrained from voting as he thought it would have been better to have raised local revenue from some other source than the tenement tax since people might look upon it as "a breach of faith". The object of the tenement tax is entirely different from that provided for in Ordinance No 14 of 1882 which expires by effusion of time on the 31 December next which was raised for the purposes of general

revenue whereas this tax is now imposed to pay  
for the expenses of fencing in the commonage -  
debt due by the local to general revenue - and  
will only remain in force for five years by which  
time the debt will be discharged. I had therefore  
more especially as I have not received any  
representation against it, no hesitation in  
re-introducing it so far as regards Stanley.

The Right Honble.

The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
" Downing Street.

I have, &c,

(Signed) Roger Tuck Goldsworthy  
Governor.

H. 2/116.

Government House,  
Stanley.

10 October, 1892.

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit herewith  
for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure  
thereon, a full and duly authenticated  
copy of Ordinance H. 2/116 of 1892 being an  
Ordinance entitled "An Ordinance to provide for the  
Service of the Colony of the Falkland Islands for  
the year 1893" and to which I have given my  
assent.

2. The draft estimates of  
Expenditure for 1893 showing how the total  
of the various heads are made up accompa-  
nying despatch H. 2/114 of to-day's date.

The Right Honble.

The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
" Downing Street.

I have, &c,

(Signed) Roger Tuck Goldsworthy  
Governor.

200  
217.

Government House,  
Stanley, 12 October 1872.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose herewith copy of a correspondence which has taken place with the local manager of the Falkland Islands Company here regarding the mode to be adopted in forwarding home communications on public affairs here intended for submission to the Secretary of State.

2. With regard to the subject matter of the correspondence I need only say I have based my action on the lines contained in my despatch h<sup>o</sup>. 52 of the 12<sup>th</sup> April last.

To Right Honorable  
the Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
Downing Street.

I have &c.  
(Signed) Roger Tuck Goldsmith.  
Governor.

218.

P 349 Book 2<sup>2</sup>

Government House.  
Stanley, 12 October 1872.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose for your information copy of a resolution passed by the Legislative Council voting, with your approval, the sum of £500 from the special fund for jetties and harbour improvements for the making and completing certain roads in Stanley which have remained unfinished owing to want of funds.

2. As by Ordinance ~~VI of 1872~~<sup>3</sup> the cost of local improvements will in future have to be met by the inhabitants I think before making them dependent on their own efforts that it is only fair that roads,

261

re, should be put into an ordinary state  
repair.

of 1891 I beg to refer you to my  
despatch No 6, of 8 May<sup>1891</sup> and to Lord Knobell's  
W.H. reply thereto No 48 of 27 August. Of the £6,000  
originally belonging to the special fund  
a sum of about £250 has only been expended  
though £500 in all has been set apart for  
improvements on the harbour and completion  
of a sea wall.

The Rt Honble  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
cc m m

I have re,  
*(Signed) Roger Tuckfield*  
Governor.

1892.

Government House,  
Stanley.  
13 October, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge  
the receipt of your lordship's Circular despatch  
of the 1<sup>st</sup> informing me that Her Majesty  
had been pleased to entrust to your care,  
one of the Secretaries of State, the seals of the  
Colonial Office.

The Rt Honble.  
The Secretary of State  
for the Colonies.  
Downing Street.

I have re,  
*(Signed) Roger Tuckfield*  
Governor.

1892.

Government House,  
Stanley, 14 October 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to forward  
your lordship herewith the Return of

in office for the quarter ended the 30<sup>th</sup> September last.

R. G. Troubridge,  
Secretary of State  
for the Colonies

I have re.  
(Signed) Roger Tuckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor.

Colonial Office  
No 121.

Government House,  
Stanley.  
24 October, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's despatch No 7 of the 7<sup>th</sup> ultimo in which you wished to be informed of the steps taken by the Commission appointed to inquire into all matters relating to the disease in sheep called scab.

2. I have the honour to enclose a copy of the report of the Commission with my reply thereto.

3. I do not fully concur in the conclusions arrived at by the Commission but I fear that it will be useless to deal further in the matter until the land question is decided, fencing being a most important factor.

R. G. Troubridge,  
Marquis of Ripon,  
Downing Street.

I have re.  
(Signed) Roger Tuckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor.

Colonial Office  
No 122.

Government House,  
Stanley.  
25 October, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's despatch No 7 of the 7<sup>th</sup> September with regard to "the delay and difficulty in obtaining supplies of Inussac from the Colonial Government".

Captain

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Received 28 November 1892

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of October, 1892.

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
113.	3 October	Survey of Colonial Chest September Quarter. Forward report of.	Two.
114.	10 "	Draft Estimates for 1893 with observations.	One.
115.	" "	Ordinance VII of 1892 Local Taxation Act.	One.
116.	" "	Ordinance VIII of 1892 Appropriation Act.	One.
117.	12 "	Correspondence of local manager Falkland Islands Company on public affairs. As to his action in sending home direct.	One.
118.	" "	Public works. Resolution of Leg. Co. voting £500 from sea walls and jetties fund to the repairs of Roads &c. in Stanley.	One.
119.	13 "	Secretary of State for the Colonies. Ack's report of app't of the Marquis of Ripon as	
120	14	Quarterly Return Sept.	One

2 Captain Pache has Pearson  
Burut and Elephant Islands in the immediate  
vicinity of his stations besides other islands in  
Kepp Lagoon and Island Harbours from which to obtain  
abundant supplies of Tussac, any way I fail to  
see how the Government has anything to do with  
the matter.

I have re.

(Signed) Roger Tuckf? Goldsworthy

No 123.

Govt House, Stanley

26 October, 1872

My Lord,

In reply to the Right Honourable R.H. Meade's  
despatch No 64 of 13<sup>th</sup> August last I have the  
honour to forward, for your lordship's information,  
a copy of a letter by the Collector of Customs on the  
complaint of the Kosmos Company that their ss  
"Perapis" had been detained an unusual time  
in Stanley last May.

I have re.

(Signed) Roger Tuckf? Goldsworthy  
Governor

124

Government House, Stan  
5 November, 1872

My Lord,

In reply to the Honourable R.H. Meades' despatch No 73 of the 9<sup>th</sup> September last I have the honour to forward, for transmission to the Board of Trade, a letter received from Mr Broom, light-keeper here, stating that the cost of his son's passage to England amounted to £25. Mr Broom is unable to furnish vouchers but a declaration to the accuracy of his statement will be forthcoming.

subjoined on his letter above mentioned.

R<sup>t</sup> Honble.  
Marquis of Ripon  
Downing Street.

I have no.  
(Signed) Roger Thelliford Worth,  
Governor.

2125.

Government House, Stanley.  
10 November, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Honourable R. H. Mead's despatch d<sup>o</sup> 70 of the 27<sup>th</sup> August last and to report as follows relative to the renewal to the widow of the late W<sup>r</sup> Hansen of the lease of the Carcass and Jason Islands.

2. In November 1891 Mr. Blake, as sole executor of the late W<sup>r</sup> Hansen, brought W<sup>r</sup> Hansen's case to the notice of the Government and asked that when the present lease expired in September 1893 a renewal of the lease for Carcass Island alone might be made to W<sup>r</sup> Hansen for grazing purposes.

3. Mr. Blake petitioned for the renewal of the Carcass Island alone knowing as he admits himself that His Excellency Governor Kerr had given W<sup>r</sup> Hansen to understand that on the expiration of the present lease, a copy of which is enclosed, it would not be renewed. Mr. Blake based his application on the fact that W<sup>r</sup> Hansen lacked educational training and never realized that his leases were not granted on the same lines as those held by other lessees and that if the lease were not renewed a very heavy loss would fall on the present occupant as the sheds, fencing &c. would

lapse to the government leaving Mrs Hansen  
and her children absolutely without means  
support.

4. In reply Mr Blake was informed on 14 December 1891, with the advice of the Executive Council, that if the lease of the Carcass and Jason Islands were then surrendered a fresh lease for 21 years for the Carcass Island would be granted to Mrs Hansen on condition that 100 acres of land with suitable water frontage and a good harbour be reserved for the use of the lessee of the Jason Islands on which such lessee would have liberty to erect buildings and that the same condition as existed in the present lease would hold good under which the Government would not be liable at the expiration to make compensation for the cost of improvements.

5. Mr Blake in answer to this communication expressed it as his impression, when he sent in his first application, that, in any case, the present lease would run on to its expiration in September 1893 and continued by applying not only for the renewal of the lease of the Carcass but also of the Grand and Steep Islands, two Islands of the Jason group. In the understanding that Mrs Hansen relinquished all right to the seal fishery.

6. On the 23 January last Mr Blake was informed that as the conditions offered in December 1891 had not been accepted before the receipt by me of a cablegram from the Colonial Office directing me not to issue any new leases pending further consideration of the question of the renewal of our leases.

representatives of Mr Hansen must remain in abeyance pending such instructions.

7. Mr Cobb, as Managing Director of the Falkland Islands Company, now asks your lordship to renew the leases not only of Carcass Island but of all the Jason Islands and of the sealing license.

8. The matter of the seal fishery is dealt with in Lord Knutsford's despatch No. 58 of 9<sup>th</sup> July and I am awaiting your lordship's pleasure on that subject.

9. As regards the renewal of the land lease with the foregoing facts before your lordship I think it will be admitted that Mr Hansen has been treated even with liberality and I cannot recommend that any prospect of any further grant be held out to Mr Hansen than that already offered to her last year and in which the Executive Council concurred.

R. Elton  
Barque's Office  
Lion Street.

I have, &c.  
Signed, Roger Pack Goldsworthy  
governor.

No. 126.

Government House,  
Stanley, 14 hours 09<sup>th</sup>.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Lord Knutsford's despatch No. 65 of 13 August with respect to the circumstances attending Captain Campbell's resignation in which Lord Knutsford states that Captain Campbell's conduct did not call for such severe treatment as interdiction and

205

directing that the sum of 29/-, the costs of procuring the apprentices should be repaid to Captain Campbell and that he should have the opportunity of withdrawing his resignation and then be reinstated in his office.

2. In my despatch of the 15 June I did not think it necessary to enlarge upon Captain Campbell's conduct which resulted in his interdiction but the fact of his being called upon to make an apology after the hearing of his case in Executive Council was sufficient. I deemed to show that besides his action in respect to the boat his conduct had been such as to justify an apology being demanded before accepting the resignation he had at the outset tendered.

3. As regards the interdiction I beg to refer your lordship to paragraph 88 of the Colonial Office regulations which appears to me to justify the course I adopted. Here it is distinctly laid down "If in any case it is true (as parenthetically stated *exempli gratiae*) that the custody of public money is now in my Lord, what were the circumstances? The fact of my not having stated them fully will at least show that I had no desire to make matters worse for Captain Campbell. They were these -

On 3 May  
Captain Campbell as Pilot had to bring from Port William into the inner harbour (Port Stanley) the Inveresk an iron vessel of 1296 tons which unfortunately whilst in his charge he put aground where she remained from the

Under instructions from myself Mr. Wilmer, Assistant Pilot, went to the Government Schooner "Hadassah" on to see if he could render any assistance. The statement of what then took place

append. On Mr. Winkles return, as your lordship will observe, he reported the "Haddassis" boat as having been taken by two of the ship's apprentices and seriously damaged. The pilot Captain Campbell, had not instructed him to take any action against the apprentices in accordance with Section 24 of the Summary Jurisdiction Ordinance No 11 of 1853 nor did Captain Campbell take any steps to have the boat properly repaired at the expense of the ship. He contented himself with seeing that the ship's carpenter nailed a bit of lead over the broken portion. It was in this condition I found it lying in the dockyard quite unfit for use and had I not accidentally made inquiries of the Colonial Secretary who reported that he understood the boat had been repaired and gone to see for myself knowing that Captain Campbell was not altogether reliable it is more than probable that it would have been repaired with other boats undergoing repairs at the Government expense.

On Captain Campbell's return to Stanley he reported himself at Government House but when spoken to on the subject of the boat sat doggedly silent and would not afford me the slightest information though I told him there would have to be an enquiry as it seemed to me that having got the Inveresk ashore he had played into the Captain's hands and not demanded as he should have done that the cost of the repairs should be paid for by the apprentices but had contented himself with seeing a bit of lead nailed over the part stove in.

Not considering that an officer who could act thus in respect to Government property was reliable I interdicted him pending the

result of the enquiry.

To this interdiction Lord Knutsford took except I would ask my Lord whether an official who con-  
act as did Captain Campbell should have remain-  
on duty until so grave a suspicion as concerning  
the master of the Inveresk to save the latter expense  
and thereby throwing the cost of repairs on the Gov-  
ernment until such suspicion I say should have  
been removed by the result of an enquiry  
I submit my Lord with all deference to Lord  
Knutsford that the course I adopted was  
justified by every precedent of the service.

4. It is evident that Lord Knutsford  
conceived that Captain Campbell's retirement  
was forced upon him - rather is it not to be  
assumed that he tendered his resignation  
on the 1<sup>st</sup> June thinking that by so doing  
all enquiry would be staved off. This  
resignation I refused to accept and I should  
have been most culpable had I done so  
in view of his manner at Government House  
in not affording me the slightest expla-  
tion. Captain Campbell simply was setting  
the Government at defiance, not only did  
he vacate the Government quarters but had  
the insolence to send a MS voice to govern-  
ment House to apply for his appointment  
informing his voice he had left.

5. I cannot conceive that Lord  
Knutsford would have put such a slight on  
the Executive Council had matters not been  
more clearly represented to him or had not  
given a more detailed account of the  
actual circumstances. Consider, my Lord,  
that the Governor in Executive Council was  
forming the Court of Appeal here, and  
it was quasi-judicial on this occasion  
and not only by Lord Knutsford.

21

would a slight be cast upon myself but also on the members of the Council, whilst it could not but be prejudicial to the best interests of the service to re-instate an official who had shewn himself so unreliable.

6. It was Captain Campbell's own wish to resign, he was not asked to do so, and the only question was how could the Government be recouped for the expenses incurred through Captain Campbell's mala fides towards it. He was told to pay the sum and tender an apology. Having refused he was told if he did not do so proceedings would be taken for his suspension. Ultimately he changed his mind and apologised. It was an open secret that he did not intend to remain in the service before ever he was interdicted and there was no threat held over his head. The money was kept back by the Treasurer. When I saw him again after he had apologised, I said, I am glad you have come to your senses, when he asked me when he could go and it was only by his express wish that instead of giving three months notice I accepted his resignation as from the 31<sup>st</sup> May.

7. I should add that the Colonial Secretary whilst endorsing the Colonial Treasurer's letter did not agree with myself and the rest of the Council in referring this matter back as he stated, as will be seen from the enclosed copy of the minutes of the proceedings of the Executive Council attached, that if my objection were not sustained by your Lordship damages would lie against the Council for not at once carrying out the instructions conveyed in Lord Knutsford's despatch. I am happy to think that neither the Colonial Treasurer or Colonial Surgeon were influenced

*Colonial Treasurer  
10 May 1873*

*Council Minutes G.*

by the remarks with reference to an action legal against the government which it appears to have been beside the question at issue, which simply was a whether or not Lord Knutsford had not given his decision under a misapprehension and which in their opinion and mine reflected upon myself in the first instance and myself and them in the second. The money retained has been handed over to Captain Campbell.

The Right Honorable.

The Marquis of Ripon K.G.  
Downing Street

I have, &c,  
(Signed) Roger Duckfield Goldsworthy  
Governor.

P.S. Pending your reply to this despatch I have not offered to Captain Campbell the option of withdrawing his resignation.

Printed A.T.S.

No 127.

Government House,  
Stanley, 15 November,

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches No 74 and 75 of the 10<sup>th</sup> September directing me to give effect to the instructions conveyed in Lord Knutsford despatch No 25 of the 12<sup>th</sup> March whilst replying to certain queries contained in your despatch No 54 of the 13<sup>th</sup> April.

2. Referring to section III of Paragraph 2 I think it might to inform your lordship that there are no surveyors in the Falkland Islands. I am therefore met at the outset by a somewhat formidable difficulty as in reserving land for sale it is not to be put up to auction till surveyed.

3. A further difficult

itself from a perusal of paragraph 6 of your lordship's despatch h<sup>o</sup> 75.  
 Supposing that the Governor in Council reserves for sale station h<sup>o</sup> 1, West Falklands, known as Mangbranch, which on survey is found to contain 15,000 acres and the station itself be found, on survey, as I think it will be, to contain somewhere about 23,000, then am I to understand that the rent for the remaining land, i.e., 8,000 acres, is to be "at the rate of £ 20 per 6,000 acres of the number of acres stated to be comprised in the old lease (i.e. 12,120) minus the number of acres reserved," i.e. 15,000 if this be so the result so to speak will be a minus quantity of 2,980 acres on which rent cannot be charged, may more may not the lessor fairly ask that rental on 2,980 acres at the rate of £ 20 per 6,000 acres should be paid to him?

4. There is a solution to this difficulty by reserving the station itself, said to comprise 12,120 (and this cannot be called excessive out of an acreage amounting to 11,120 leased to Packe Brothers). In this case there would not be any "remainder" to be dealt with except the free holds amounting to      acres though it is not known where they are situated such never having been "determined by the Surveyor General with the consent and approbation of the Governor". It is on reference to this station that your lordship draws my attention in paragraph 7 of despatch h<sup>o</sup> 74 where you remark "There appears to be some mistake. On reperusing my despatch h<sup>o</sup> 33 of the 1<sup>st</sup> March I find that the paragraph would if written as copied into the Letter Book give a wrong idea & cations" was written for Station I and the words "two sections of" were omitted.

The amended paragraph should read "again  
would refer your lordship to section I in the W.  
Falklands it is supposed to comprise two sections  
of 6000 each, in the aggregate they amount to  
some 23,000 acres. It is not difficult then to  
understand how the discrepancy in the total  
acres of the Colony has occurred." I regret  
that I should have caused your lordship to fall  
into the error of supposing that I referred to  
Station 2 (Mount Moody) which I have no reason  
to suppose exhibits so startling a discrepancy  
between the acreage in the lease and what can  
be shown by measurement as I am certain exists  
in Station I. <sup>5.</sup> I recognise the error to which  
your lordship draws my attention in paragraph  
6 of the same despatch. I inadvertently over-  
looked the Proclamation of 1861 at the same time  
a survey would, I think, show that the sections  
instead of being 6,000 are nearer 10,000.

6. With regard to paragraph 8  
your lordship writes "I have been unable to  
understand &c. as the chart shews that h<sup>o</sup> 7  
is bounded by the Wickham Heights and  
adjoins the Falkland Islands Company's estate  
h<sup>o</sup> 75." Certainly the Falkland Islands  
Company coloured chart shews it but in  
the official chart the southern boundary does  
not reach the Wickham Heights, nor by the  
lease is the southern boundary so defined.  
The lease runs thus:- "On the north by  
sections 20, 39 and 3<sup>rd</sup> Coral extending 2  
miles on the East by a line running South  
6 miles on the South by a line running West  
till it cuts Shepherds Brook and from thence  
by the Brook to Port Sasser". Measurement  
will show that the eastern Boundary line  
the Company's chart runs 8 miles not 6  
miles South and as the distance is about  
4 miles to Shepherds Brook there is a

of 4 by 2 miles (political) representing some 6,000 acres not "9,000 or thereabouts" as stated in my despatch. When writing 9,000 I probably had in my mind a triangular piece of land on the East of the Wickham Heights which if the boundaries were indicated on the chart as in the leases would be left unoccupied and with the other would make up the 9,000. My reason for drawing attention to the discrepancies between the chart and leases was whilst shewing the necessity of a survey to rebut by reference to the Falkland Islands Company's own chart the statements contained in Mr Cobbs, then Managing Director, letters of the 18 December 1871 and 1 January 1872 (enclosure in Lord Knutsford's despatch of 16 Jan<sup>n</sup> N<sup>o</sup> 7) as follows "There is none who has through his own mistake assumed a more extended boundary than that to which he is entitled, &c." A misconception into which His Lordship has evidently been led by the imperfect information afforded by the Governor."

7. When writing my despatch of the 13<sup>th</sup> April I was not cognisant of your lordship's views as expressed in paragraph 3 of h<sup>o</sup> 74 of 10 September which renders it still more essential that the official charts should be reliable. There are 3 charts looked upon as records and they are none exactly identical, the boundaries in some cases are faintly marked in pencil though the majority are inked in. What dependence can be placed upon them? for all that is known to the contrary, pencilled lines may have been erased and others substituted! This might not unreasonably be assumed if the lease and chart do not correspond. Whilst accepting as is my duty, your lordship's authoritative opinion permit me to point out that whilst

to the lease is affixed the Governor's signature  
 is not so with the chart. True it may be  
 contended that the Governor would naturally  
 see that the section or station was defined  
 on the chart to which on some leases reference  
 has been made in others not, still I hope your  
 lordship will pardon my observing that it  
 appears to me that the Governor's signature  
 is set aside for what the Surveyor General in  
 his discretion may have defined on the chart.  
 I have carefully examined the charts but  
 to neither of the three is the Surveyor General's  
 signature attached. Very few of the  
 sections or stations have ever been surveyed  
 and the indiscriminate way in which  
 sections of 6,000 acres presumably have been  
 marked on the chart varying in size according  
 to the whim or caprice of the Surveyor.  
 General does not point to the reliability of  
 that gentleman. For instance Section 76  
 was surveyed by Lieut. White R.N. and  
 contains 6000 acres Sections 28, 33, 36 & 66  
 67, 73 & 75 are all rated as 6000, the most  
 casual observer cannot but recognise that  
 most of them far exceeds that acreage. One  
 of the most bitter opponents of a survey  
 Captain Packe, wrote in 1803 (vide enclosure)  
 of 25 September in dispatch No 46 of 7 Octo  
 (1803) "nearly all the boundaries in the  
 Falklands are more or less imaginary the land  
 never having been surveyed, &c."

8. That such a condition of  
 things should have existed (and it still exists)  
 in a Crown Colony settled now for many years  
 is beyond my comprehension, the result  
 being that the whole of the East and West  
 Falklands supposed to contain some 4,500  
 acres have been leased or sold as  
 apparently now in the Law Officers office.

21  
is no remedy. For where a survey to shew what I unhesitatingly affirm it would, viz; a large excess of land over what is stated in the leases, it cannot be taken away or rent demanded therefor.

9. The only way to assist those desirous of obtaining land is to reserve for sale land under Section 2 Ordinance 9 of 1882 giving the purchaser ample time to pay the money say 10 years interest meanwhile being paid at the rate say of 2 1/2 per cent. This suggestion was approved in Council, the Colonial Secretary not dissenting as he considered that it would assist the present lessee in enabling him to purchase the land himself instead of possibly not being able to afford to do so if compelled to pay the purchase money forthwith (vide Colonial Secretary's letter of 12<sup>th</sup> instant.)

*Small Survey  
12 November 1882.*  
*Return  
Memorandum  
Ref:*

10. In the return of lands reserved for sale and shewn on enclosed map your lordship will observe that I have declined to release the lands which were formerly Government reserves pending your lordship's decision as to whether they would come under the conditions contained in Section 2 of Ordinance 9 of 1882. If not, the Government will have a fair amount of land at their disposal to release, sell or do what they like with.

In the case of Mr. Green shield referred to in the memorial of 12 November, he has built upon the reserve a dwelling house, sheds, &c., but I have been given to understand that at the time the reserves were leased that it was on the understanding that they must be given up at any time if required. I hope to send further information on this point by the

man of war "Basilisk" which will take a supplementary mail to Blounte Vido, in a fortnight.

11. If your lordship should decide that the reserves in question are no longer suitable bona fide leased lands I would ask your lordship to direct me to reserve other and good average land of equivalent acreage.

If, for instance, Mr Green shield's is a reserve, to meet the difficulty in his case the land to the extent of say a square mile on which his buildings stand might be leased or sold to him thus any hardship would be done away with and he would still have an outlet to the sea.

12. I must now refer to the question of what is and what is not suburban land as Captain Pache claims that Port Harriet and Kidney Island Stations are ordinary rural lands and not suburban. As I observe from past correspondence that there has been doubts as to the meaning of "within six miles by land of Stanley or any township which hereafter may be proclaimed". Vide section 4 of Ordinance h<sup>o</sup> q<sup>o</sup> of 1882 it is as well that this question should be authoritatively decided. Whether it is meant by this a six mile radius from "observation point" in Stanley or merely any land which can be reached by land without crossing the inner harbours which is at observation point  $\frac{4}{5}$ <sup>ths</sup> of a mile broad. If the former neither come within the 6 miles, if the latter the whole of Kidney Island Station and the larger portion of Port Harriet would become suburban and not come under, I presume section 2 of the Ordinance also referred to.

219

219  
The Marquise forwarded herewith.  
Colonial Secretary  
14 November 1892

13. The enclosure quoted in the  
margin are forwarded herewith. The best  
solution of this burning question of land would  
be by the appointment of a Commission entirely  
unconnected with the Colony. This being the  
opinion of the majority of the Council I have  
forwarded a telegram in the following words:-  
"Executive Council, Colonial Secretary dissenting  
strongly recommend Commission of Enquiry into  
"Question of land."

The Rt Honble  
The Marquis of Ripon K.G.  
Downing street.

I have, &c.  
(Signed) Roger J. Goldworthy.

No 128.

Government House,  
Stanley, 16 November 1892

My Lord,

With reference to my despatch of the 15<sup>th</sup> instant, No 127, I have the honor to transmit herewith, for your lordship's information, a memorial which I have received from certain farmers here relative to the question of retaining certain portions of their land for sale and to submit the following remarks thereon.

Paragraph 1. The Colonial Treasurer and the Colonial Surgeon have replied to this in their letter of the 14<sup>th</sup> November and in the views therein expressed I concur. The preemptive right was never entertained or provided for till Ordinance No 2 of 1882 was introduced by Mr Kerr and this was subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.

Paragraph 2. The small leaseholds submitted to the public have been the suburban lots, leased at a far higher rental than for rural lands (vide Colonial Treasurer and Colonial Surgeon's letter) and until recently for only 2 years. Small wonder then that there were

200

no bidders. The old lessees thought the area  
was only some 3,000 or 4,000 acres were ready  
enough to release even at an increased rent  
where the period was changed from 3 to 7 years  
(vide despatch No 21 of 8 March last).

Paragraph 3. Whatever land had been  
selected I fear that the memorialists would still  
have written "Some of the best available sections".  
The memorialists are perfectly well aware  
that the Government were and are quite prepared  
to take the equivalent elsewhere as will be seen  
from the letter, dated 14 November, addressed  
*Colonial Secretary*  
*14 November 1892*  
by the Colonial Secretary to Mr Greenfield.  
This was the outcome of a meeting of the Executive  
Council held on the morning of the 12<sup>th</sup> November  
prior to the receipt of the Memorial of that  
date which was only received by the Private  
Secretary at 5 p.m. of the 12<sup>th</sup> November to consider  
the replies of the lessees to the letter informing  
them of the selections of land for sale  
made in Council on the 30<sup>th</sup> October and 2<sup>nd</sup>  
November.

Paragraph 4. Paragraph 6 of your  
lordships despatch No 75 of 10 September 1892  
is the best reply I can give to this. I hope  
that the memorialists contention is that  
the land is "to be sold for public purposes"  
and that selling it as is proposed is not  
"for public purposes" and this is borne out  
in the last paragraph of the memorial in  
reply.

Paragraph 5. When the leases were  
granted the conditions were less favourable  
to the farmer than they became under section  
of Ordinance No 9 of 1882, and the lessees we  
and have always been subject to land being  
reserved "for sale or public purposes". I do  
not see that the lessees have any ground  
complaint.

Paragraph 6. What law

22

may have been 'reported' to have said is no proof that it was and even were it so I do not see how any Governor even if he himself were not inclined to act on the powers given him by law can bind his successors to follow his example.

I do not know to which of my advisers the Memorialists can refer, but the Colonial Surgeon has been in the Colony 13 years and a member of the Executive Council for the same period, hence the advisers must be the more recently joined members, the Colonial Secretary and Colonial Treasurer. I scarcely think, however, they can refer to the former of the two in view of his letter of 12 November, enclosed in Despatch No 127 of 16 November. If the Colonial Treasurer and the Colonial Surgeon who throughout have supported me in and out of Council carry no weight because of their want of "practical knowledge" by which I understand experience of the land question, I cannot conceive that the opinion of the Colonial Secretary is of greater value except that he supports the argument of the sheep farmers and has done so ever since his arrival in the Colony.

I am unaware that I am forcing the farmers to pay more than £20 a section, which by the law is supposed to be 6000 acres, but I do regret the fact that apparently the government is powerless to compel lessees of sections containing more than that amount to pay on the surplus land. If to have endeavoured to do this is to be "aggressive and antagonistic" to the sheep farmers then I admit the correctness of the memorialists charge. I have simply endeavoured to conserve the Government interests which however appears to be rendered impossible by the action of some of my pre-

In a large Colony like Western Australia or  
in a Colony somewhat larger than this I have  
had opportunities of studying the land  
question which my predecessors never had for  
the simple reason that there remained less  
land to deal with on his arrival in the Colony  
and what was done I unhesitatingly say was  
not in the interests of the Government but  
that of the sheep farmers.

The Right Honble.

The Marquis of Ripon K.G.  
Downing Street.

I have the  
privilege to sign,  
Roger Tuckfield Esq.

Oct 129.

Government House,  
Stanley 7 November,

My Lord,

I regret to inform your lordship that  
the "Hadassah" got ashore on endeavouring  
pass through the "Narrows" at the entrance of  
this port on the 1<sup>st</sup> instant. Every endeavour  
was made to get her off but owing to the heavy  
winds and seas it was found impossible.

2. Acting on the advice of Captain  
McKechnie of the ship "Old Kensington" now  
in Harbour for repairs I eventually put her  
up to auction as she stood at an upset price  
of £100 at which figure she was sold.

3. I forward the report of a Board  
of Survey as also of the Court of Enquiry from  
which your lordship will gather that the accident  
was unavoidable and that acting Pilot Mr...  
who was in charge is held free from all blame.

4. In view of the loss of the "Hadassah"  
I have given a contract to Captain Rowell for  
carriage of the West Falkland mails and  
similar to that which obtained before

"Hadassah" performing the service.

5. Claims for insurance will be made against the London Insurance Company when the accounts are made up.

Re Rt Honble.  
the Marquis of Ripon  
Downing Street

I have, &c.  
(Signed) Roger Lickf. Goldworthy.

No 130

Government House,  
Stanley, 17 November, 1892.

My Lord,

In reply to your lordship's despatch No 59 of the 13<sup>th</sup> July last I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a report by the Colonial Surgeon stating the difficulties met with in connection with arm to arm vaccination here.

Re Rt Honble.  
the Marquis of Ripon  
Downing Street

I have, &c.  
(Signed) Roger Lickf. Goldworthy.

No 131.

Government House,  
Stanley, 24 November, 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's Circular despatch of 26<sup>th</sup> July last and in reply thereto to inform you that a vote of £20 will be inserted in the Supplementary Estimates for this year as a contribution from this Colony towards furnishing a room in the new offices of the Imperial Institute as a meeting or conference room for the western Crown Colonies.

Re Rt Honble.  
the Marquis of Ripon

I have, &c.  
(Signed) Roger Lickf. Goldworthy.

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

Received 27 December, 1892.

Schedule of Despatches transmitted by the Governor of the Falkland Islands to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1892.

No. of Despatch.	Date of Despatch.	Subject of Despatch.	No. of Enclosures.
121.	24 October.	Eradication of Scab. Reports on the result of the enquiry into.	Two.
122.	25 "	Tussac. Capt <sup>r</sup> Pack <sup>e</sup> s complaint as to delay in receiving supplies.	
123.	26 "	Detection of ss "Serapis". Reports on.	One.
124.	5 November.	Luc Broon. Cost of Son's passage to England.	One.
125.	10 November.	Release of the carcass & iron Island.	One.
126.	14 "	Capt <sup>r</sup> Campbell.	3.
127.	15 "	Land. Portions proposed for sale to Com <sup>m</sup> .	Five.
128.	16 "	Memorial by certain landowners against proposal to sell land.	Two.
129.	17 "	Stranding of the Hadassah mail Schooner. Reports.	Two.
130.	17 "	Arm to arm vaccination.	One.