

B

EST. 1850
SECRETARY

1st October 1850

TE.

2

CONFIDENTIAL
DESPATCHES
TO SECRETARY
OF STATE FROM
GOVERNOR
13 November
1877 to
20 April 1893

29



G.H.S.F.D
10 June 1891

Confidential

My Lord,

adverting to my Despatch no 81 of 3rd June it is requisite that I should write to your Lordship confidentially on the subject of that communication, the more so that the Land question in British Honduras was the rock on which I split - and where, if I had let the matter alone I should not have incurred the hostility of the Belize Estate and Produce Company and ~~other~~ influential land owners, who were able through members of Parliament and others in England to represent matters to your Lordship that they virtually gained their point.

I do not shrink the fact that in this Colony the Falklands Island Company occupying a similar position to The Belize Estate & Produce Co: and some of the other large sheep farmers here are not desirous of having a survey and I must expect from them every opposition - but the community are anxious that there should be one for the reasons stated in my Despatch

no 81 of 3rd June 1891
Sovereign

It is not impossible therefore that your Lordships may be called upon to receive a deputation not very early concluded to that which waited upon you in the month of May last year, but I hope that before your Lordship arrives at any decision you will call upon me for the fullest information as I fear that this last question has already become a burning one - I do not wish your Lordship to think that this matter is of my instigation, indeed I trust that I shall be exonerated from the charge of stirring up "dirty water"

It is not a case of leaving well alone, for a very strong feeling had already set in before my arrival against these large sheep farmers euphemistically termed "monopolists," not because they lease large areas but because it is believed, and not groundlessly in my opinion, that they are farming over far larger areas than they are entitled to under the present leases -

I am writing this not only for the reason before stated but because there are several points on which I should be glad of your Lordships instruction. 1. Is it intended that the lots as marked on the chart & referred to in ordinance Reg of 1890 are to be considered

of the acreage named therein and what grants are to issue without a survey?

2. In renewing the leases about to fall in, is it desirable to state in such lease that rent shall be paid upon all acreage found on Survey or otherwise in excess of that mentioned, or a rebate given if less than mentioned in the lease; and if so should such rent or rebate be retrospective?
3. Would your Lordship sanction new leases in all cases being issued after survey, for a term of 21 years notwithstanding some leases were still unexpired?

The reason for suggesting this is - that instead of as at present a lessee holding several leases of different tenures all could be comprised in one lease - thus much trouble and inconvenience would be saved to all concerned.

4. Would your Lordship be prepared, in the event of a survey, that such survey should be undertaken on the understanding that "mountains & ponds" not already included in the acreage stated

in a lease should not thereafter be included, conditional on $\frac{1}{2}$ being given up together with all other land in excess of that mentioned in the lease, arrears of rent also not being demanded. Therefore -

I believe on a basis of this kind the land question might be settled without friction, as there would be half to $\frac{2}{3}$ of a million acres available for meeting the wants of those who desire to farm on a small scale.

Incluse a sketch that already people are seeking land elsewhere this will prove most prejudicial to a small colony such as this but unless some steps be at once taken a considerable number may be looked for.

I am not anxious of becoming a sort of scapegoat in the land question so seek your lordships instructions and I need scarcely add whether consistent or otherwise will my own ideas I shall carry them out faithfully & unhesitatingly.

I have etc

Yd Roger Tuckf. Folkestone

Confidential

G. H. S. F.)

17 November 1891

My Lord

In my despatch No 162 of 13 Nov
I informed your Lordship of my having
accepted Miss Weston's resignation.

2 Her conduct was ~~so~~ but
to say such that it was openly
commented on & would have prevented her
being reemployed in the capacity of
nurse & midwife -

3. Thinking with my Council
that it was desirable she should leave
Stanley as soon as possible to avoid
further scandal I sanctioned the payment
of £29 the cost of a 2^o class passage to
England though under her contract
she was not entitled to the same -

4. She left the colony by the
mail of 29 October -

5. Praying that your
Lordship will approve of my action

I have the

S^o Roger Gurney Goldworthy

Confidential Mr. Ford

8.15. J.S.

15 June 1892

I have the honor to forward for yr consideration a list of all the cases which have been brought before the Magistrate's Supreme Court on which the Government has been the prosecuting party. 2. I have felt it my duty to speak to Mr. Ronkidge on what appears to me the total inadequacy of the sentence to the offence of crime committed - but as my remonstrances have failed to have any effect and as such sentences are in my opinion likely to bring the administration of justice into disrepute, if not contempt I feel bound to lay the matter before U. in the hope that the confirmation of my views from one who has had a legal training may have more effect than remonstrance from myself.

3. Mr. Ronkidge has never, I believe, till his arrival in this Colony acted as a J.P. or administered justice in any capacity from the Bench.

This may account in a measure for the inadequacy of some of the sentences. I have personally had many years experience as a J.P. and for some four year acted as a Magistrate and Judge of small causes, but in all my experience whether acting alone or with other Justices, I have never seen grave offences so lightly punished.

The Right Honorable
Lord Knutsford.

I have etc
(sgd) Roger Duckett Oldknow
Governor

Confidential

Hyford

8.15.79.

25 June 1892

I have the honor to forward a letter addressed by Mr. Ronkidge to you in respect of an invitation from myself for any remarks on my copy of the 15th instant to you in which I expressed the hope that you would be fit to endorse the views expressed by me that the sentence passed by Mr. Ronkidge in his dual capacity of Judge and Magistrate was inadequate.

2. The occasion when I first mentioned the subject to Mr. Ronkidge was when the steward of the government Schooner "Stadasah" was merely fined 20/- and costs for having concealed in his cabin wrecked goods supposed to be a portion of the "Stadasah's" cargo - when I saw that such a punishment was an inducement to repeat the offence.

3. The punishment however which had previously called forth comment throughout the colony was that of 6 months imprisonment without hard labour inflicted on Foster the chief mate of a vessel who, when in the guard room cells, deliberately fired at Chief Constable Hurst and wounded him in the groin, so that for some days it was doubtful if he would survive - this man Foster had previously fired through an old disused keyhole into the guard room in which several men were sitting. The subsequent treatment by Mr. Ronkidge of this man in fact was severely commented upon.

4. The next case calling for attention was that of A. Halliday for harbouring 2 prisoners who had escaped from jail. Halliday had been discharged from his post as Acting Warden a short time before for being drunk on duty, and the fact of the 2 prisoners going to his house, where they had all been drinking together when found, pointed to an understanding between the prisoners and Halliday - for this serious offence Halliday was fined 20/- and costs - and being drunk was put on the prohibition list for 12 months - the latter was no part of the punishment for the serious offence of harbouring prisoners. The two prisoners were punished by simply a fortnight's confinement within the gaol instead of being allowed to work out of doors. I had again to tell Mr. Routhedge in his capacity of magistrate that discipline could not be maintained in the gaol if for serious offences so slight a punishment was inflicted.

5. Again in dealing with a police constable so grave an offence as leaving a vessel when on duty as Custom House Officer and being found drunk on shore was punished by a fine of one day's pay. It certainly was the first complaint against the man which had been brought before the magistrate, but such an offence as leaving the vessel when smuggling might in his absence have been carried on to any extent, should not have been thus dealt with. There are other minor matters I might mention of a similar character but the foregoing will be sufficient to form an opinion upon

6. As Y.L will see from the tenor of Mr Ronkidge's letter that he considers the Governor has no right to draw the Magistrate's attention to what he believes may consider inadequate punishment, in other words, it appears to me that did Mr Ronkidge hold only the appointment of Magistrate and Judge, he might give the usual allowed sentences and the Governor, according to his contention, could not take any cognizance of them.

7. I have never directly or indirectly interfered with Mr Ronkidge when any case was pending before him but I conceive that it is the duty of the Governor to speak now especially when he finds that cases other than treason prosecutions are not so leniently dealt with.

The Right Honourable
Lord Knutsford Esq

I have etc
(2d) Roger Duckett Oldworthy
Governor

Confidential

G.W.S. 22

18 July 1892

My dear,

In perusing the despatches which have emanated from successive Governors to your Lordship and predecessors I must confess to the very attend views which toward the latter part of his Government Governor Kerr seems to have entertained as disclosed in the correspondence and which I think it is only right to draw attention to having you to find some solution to the question.

2. Governors Callaghan and myself appear to have been of one mind on the land question, at all events Governor Kerr up to 1885 entertained similar views. Subsequent to this date not by degrees but quite suddenly Governor Kerr made a volte face, - previously he had been an advocate for small farmers as opposed to the land being in the hands of a few individuals farming over large areas - he had represented the Falkland Islands Company as monopolists not only in respect of land but as a trading body, and the correspondence shows how he played off Messrs Dian & Co against the Company until the Falkland Islands Company and Messrs Dian amalgamated in 1888.

3. In confirmation of what I state and for the complete change of Governor Kerr's policy in respect of the land I must refer you to the correspondence prior and subsequent to 1885 but especially to No. 81 of September 1883 which states that when accurate surveys of the stations are made there will be sufficient to recoup the Government. This despatch it must be remembered was written after the passing of Ordinance No. 22

Govr Kerr's
daughter
married a
farmer

W.W.

1882, by which Ordinance Sir Greville Kerr states in his despatch No. 23 of 1 March 1886, "fixity of tenure" was provided by Section 2. "Fixity of tenure" I maintain referred only to that land which on survey the lessees would be found to be entitled to according to the acreage mentioned in their leases, and not for anything in excess. This despatch clearly shows that Greville Kerr did not contemplate that the introduction of the Land Ordinance 1882 prevented the leases being dependent upon a survey.

4. On the 11 March 1885 in the Lordship despatch No. 11 Lord Derby wrote as follows:—
 "I concur with you that as soon as funds can be provided it will be desirable to commence a proper survey of the Island with a view more especially to determine the true extent of the Crown lands held under leases."

The matter should be brought up in connection with the Estimates for 1886."

A copy of what took place in Executive Council on 12 Nov 1885 when the Estimates were being discussed is enclosed for your information. In January a survey was urged by Greville Kerr, in November of the same year apparently there was no desire in Greville Kerr's part for one, and from that date the subject was not mentioned by Greville Kerr. What the reason, or what the cause for such a change of front may well baffle.

5. Again therefore, I would ask you to peruse Greville Kerr's despatch No. 82 of 1883

therin he states "I am not in favour of the price of land being reduced and must recommending, of the land now to be sold, sales at the upset price of 4/-, urges that in the event of the Falkland Islands Company carrying out their threat of selection, the price should be raised to 8/- per acre. Up to 1885 Mr. Mortimer had persistently opposed the grantation of land into the hands of the Company, he subsequently reversed his policy, this was after his visit to England in 1886. Immediately prior to this, at least in 1885, on the Falkland Islands Company applying to purchase their foreshore, Messrs. Dran's right to a similar concession being granted was brought forward by Governor Kerr (vide despatch No. 54 of 15th April 1885). This completed, on October 20th 1885 the purchase by Mr. Anson² Governor Kerr's son-in-law of the half share of 100,000 acres, less 14,000 transferred, was concluded — the money being advanced by Mr. George Dran.

6. In 1886 Mortimer returned from England and in 1888 the opposition of Messrs. Dran & Co to the Falkland Islands Company was ended by a fusion of their respective interests; from that date matters were made easy for the Falkland Islands Company, concessions were made which had previously been strongly opposed by Mortimer — for instance in respect of the Darwin and other reserves. (vide despatches No. 53 of 17 June 1880, 112 of 18 August 1882, and 82nd 21 September 1883)

7. A climax was put to the whole in 1890, when it was suggested by Governor Kerr in his despatch No. 113 of 12 September 1890 that

that land said of him to be "utterly valueless
land" should be sold for 3/- per acre, does
not for a moment conceive that the Falkland
Islands Company would offer 3/- per acre
for "utterly valueless land" when in 1883
they had offered only 2/- for land presumed
to be good, and for which Governor Kerr had
suggested that not less than 4/- should
be taken - it should be borne in mind too
that this "utterly valueless land" had good
water frontage to each section, and contained
two government reservoirs which had for
many years been let at a yearly rental.
They bring revenue for a township -
As a matter of fact the Falkland Islands
Company had only track and trail after
McDoran joined them.

The Right Honorable
Lord Knuckfield C.M.G.

I have etc
(sgd) John Duckett
Governor

Confidential

My Lord,

G.H.S.J.D.

16 August 1892

I have the honor in reply to Yrs. Confidential despatch of 21 May last requesting to be furnished with a confidential report of the conclusions arrived at by the Senior Naval Officer on the S.E. Coast of America Station to suggest that the Conf. correspondence addressed by Capt Musgrave R.N. to the Admiralty on the subject of a Naval port should be as far from that Department

No. 10. p 283b
1891

2. That I did not presume that on a matter of such importance whether regard imperially or colonially, Yrs. would have been communicated with by the Admiralty, I would on this have communicated with Yrs. on the subject.

3. In the interview which I had with Capt Musgrave in Montevideo in July last year he unhesitatingly gave his opinion, as I think will be gathered from his letter p 283b 1891, in favour of Port Edgar, situated on the E. coast of the W. Falkland, as a Naval Station. At the same time I elicited from him that temporarily, whilst the necessary preparations were being made at that port to render it suitable as regards accommodation for Naval stores, coal, etc., and whilst providing defences essential to an important Naval Depot, Port Stanley could be utilized, but that he did not consider, looking to the size of the Harbour, it could afford sufficient accommodation for the vessels which might have to seek shelter from an enemy's cruisers.

4. Your lordship will observe that, looking to the Admiralty requirements, the available ports are

are reduced, in order of merit in Capt Musgrave's opinion, to Port Howard, Port Stanley, and Port Egmont. The views however of Captain Lang, Capt Musgrave's successor, do not coincide with those of his predecessor. The former being distinctly in favour of Port Stanley, which in his opinion would be sufficiently large for vessels seeking protection in time of war, with the vessels moored stem and stern.

This too was the view taken by Admiral Kennedy, formerly on the S. American Station, in a conversation I had with him at the Admiralty in March 1891.

5. Against this plan of mooring there might be this objection, that in the event of fire on board any one vessel, it would probably mean the destruction of a very large proportion of those in Harbour. This might arise from purely accidental circumstances or from the shells of the enemy fired from sea over the lowlying beach East of Whalebone Lick. This fact Captain Lang is also quite alive to, but considers that our own cruisers would prevent an enemy getting sufficiently near to shell the ships in Harbour — one must trust however to the fact that by a wise use our cruisers might be decoyed away by one part of the enemy's fleet, whilst the others temporarily absent would return and fire the harbour.

6. Eventualities of this nature must be considered ~~while~~ more consonant to offer an opinion than myself, and there can be no doubt that Major Smith, in his report,

12 April 1881 to the then Capt. General of Artillery
 General Gallyay R.E., had guarded against any
 entrance by an enemy first by submarine mines
 between Arrow & the Point as also between
 Ray and Engineer Points, in addition to the
 batteries suggested in his report.

Now there is one question deserving of
 consideration. Was the scheme of Major Smith
 based upon the supposition that the harbour
 would have to be defended, irrespective of H.M.
 Ships of war? It would, I think, appear so from
 the fact that 2350 men of the various branches,
 Infantry, Artillery, and Engineers are stated
 to be required for the protection of the harbour
 and against a landing. Now Captain Lang
 does not consider that any enemy could in force
 attack a fortified naval station such as Stanley
 would be; firstly, he says, from whence could
 the enemy get the necessary supply of coal.
 Secondly, that, looking to the relative
 maritime superiority, except a large force
 (and here again the coal question would
 be a not unimportant factor), were detailed
 the British Squadron in these quarters augmented
 as it would be, would be more than sufficient
 to cope with any Squadron so detached.

Indeed he further states that an enemy
 would not be so rash as to act so far away
 from his base, or in other words I presume,
 any place whence supplies may be drawn
 and where the most important would be coal
 which would require to be constantly replenished.
 The effective strength of a stran squadron
 depending in a great measure on its coal -

8. To dismiss for a moment - of what use would a fleet of steamers be off the Falklands without the motor power to enable it to pursue a foe, as the case might be? None whatever, it would simply fall a prey to a numerically far inferior force with a proper supply of coal.

9. It must not be forgotten that, in the Argentine Republic, coal fields have recently been discovered which may materially alter the outlook for ourselves. I forward for your information extracts from the Buenos Aires Standard of June 20 last which will show that not so far from the Eastern seaboard, indeed so close to the sea littoral as Chufat, coal in workable quantities has been discovered, and in the event of war it will be necessary to guard against the Argentine Government aiding the enemy.

Now, will it not be necessary, looking to the annual protest the British first receive from that of Argentina against our occupation of the Falklands, in view of hostilities with any foreign power, to safeguard our own interests and prevent any coalition by blockading these ports. - This is an eventuality that must not be overlooked: and one which I pointed out to Capt Lang, and which he himself recognized.

10. There is one circumstance to which I would draw attention and it is this, should not the enemy be first encountered at the entrance to Port William, say by batteries at York & Gateway Points, both admirably situated, both points being of

rocky formation, and affording sufficient room for the erection of suitable works.

11. I trust that I may not be deemed presumptuous in suggesting that the further away from the Harbour, the attack of an enemy can be met, the better, and I think that in view of this, Salthay and Yorke Points should not be lost sight of - a converging fire from these points aided by submarine mines as suggested in Major Smith's report would be a most effective barrier, and if supported by batteries not necessarily so heavily armed as proposed by Major Smith, at Engineer and Hay Points, the safety of the inner Harbour from entrance by an enemy's fleet would be ensured.

12. On the land side Stoker's Point, Sapper's Hill and the lines with a 2 gun battery on the high ridge 139 feet, Ruby Fairy Point would effectively protect the Harbour from any land attack. The lines should be on the narrowest part of a neck of land computed at 500 yards probably a little more.

13. Good sites for barracks can be found on or about the positions marked on the map,

*below and South
of the ridge west
of Ruby Point
and to the east
of Engineer Point.*

14. Such a scheme as that I have ventured to sketch out would involve a considerably less outlay in regard to armament than that proposed by Major Smith, whilst the expenditure on batteries and barracks would be considerably less, a far smaller number of men being required for manning the batteries.

15. Though there is some hard ground, or "camp" as it is called here, over which an enemy might advance from the North or South, the

the difficulty of landing and bringing guns into play under fire would be immense, and the guns so landed would necessarily be inferior in calibre and range to those of our own opposed to them.

16. It therefore would, I think, be expedient looking to the heavy expense and the comparatively cheap scheme suggested by Capt Lang to ascertain whether a media via might not be adopted, for, whilst thinking that so expensive a scheme of fortification is unnecessary in view of our own fleet not being omitted, and this is a most important factor - still I consider that to guard against eventualities, such as I have described, taking place, some safeguards against an attack on the land side must be adopted, and this Captain Lang has not sufficiently guarded against.

17. The "diles" are in any case considered a sine qua non, and undoubtedly would be of the greatest importance, but I venture to think that a far less expensive scheme would meet all the requirements of the place assuming as Capt Lang does that British Squadron, even withdrawn for a time, will not for any lengthened period be far distant.

18. On reference to the Confidential Test of 17 M.Ships, I find that cruisers of the second class as for instance the "Sirius", the senior Naval Officer's ship on the S.E. Coast America Station, does not carry any gun of greater power than the 6 inch, and I don't think

think that any enemy's vessels of heavier armament would be detached so far away - so it is not likely that we should have to provide against attack by them. A heavy expenditure would thus be saved as in place of 10 inch guns as recommended by Major Smith, possibly 4.7 inch guns would be sufficient supplemented by one or two 6 inch or 7 inch guns. The saving would be larger as I find that every 7 inch gun costs £3600, whilst that of a 4.7 inch is only £650 - the batteries I also infer would be cheaper in a corresponding ratio, Major Smith having provided against attack by vessels of a very heavy calibre.

19. I forwarded last mail a sketch map showing the positions where Captain Lane proposed the batteries should be placed, but I am not quite sure as to the number of guns, but think my memory serves me correctly, and that it is as stated on the map.

20. Whilst touching on the Defence question I am not overestimating the number of volunteers whose services could be utilized when I say that at least 100 to 120 could be relied upon. Without any incentive such as a threatened attack, in absolute time of peace about 60 have already been sworn in in Stanley and for the past 3 months have regularly drilled twice a week, - as mounted scouts and signalmen would be most invaluable with our extended coastline, whilst others could act as artillery or riflemen.

21. Uniform and arms have not even been issued and yet drilling as they do under most

most unfavourable circumstances without the opportunity being afforded of appearing to the best advantage. They have readily come forward.

22. In the outstations many of those who put their names down (vide my despatch No. 77 of 21 June) are now located, and as they come in from time to time will be sworn in and go through a course of drill.

I should add that many of the present Volunteers are old soldiers, whilst others have been connected with Volunteer corps in England.

23. Iptbwn decided at an early period to make Stanley a Naval Station having the formation of a depot for coal, ammunition, stores, etc. I would suggest that some drotolet class of ship should be fitted and sent out as a coal hulk and store ship. Even now I think it is important that a supply of coal for the fleet should always be ready here, as exorbitant prices are charged locally; for instance when Capt Lang visited Stanley the D.L.C. asked 65/- for coal which very coal was purchased by them from the "Sabine", a vessel which put in here for distress, for 22½ per ton.

On the threat however that the men of war on the station would not be allowed to coal at Stanley, the price was eventually reduced to 55/- - the accompanying is a memo. which I sent to Captain Lang respecting the accommodation which might temporarily be afforded for stores and coal.

24. Captain Lang and myself also discussed the question of barrack accommodation. There would no difficulty in adapting the old barracks (recently repaired throughout) for any working party of Engineers which might be sent out. At present they are occupied by the Colonial Surgeon, the Schoolmaster and his family - whilst the Websterine is used as an Infant School - an allowance could be made to the Colonial Surgeon in lieu of quarters, whilst a new School which is really a necessity in the Colony might be built for the accommodation of the 3 Government Schools (boys, girls, and infants).

25. The building recently used as fort officers, and which was formerly the Governor's residence, might easily be made available for the Senior Naval Officer or other officers whom it might be necessary to employ on shore.

26. The Colonial Govt should readily give assistance to further the establishment of a Naval Depot here in its own interests, apart from all Imperial considerations. It would be the making of Stanley both from a social and pecuniary point of view, as, with the Fleet here and a considerable military force, those who now shirk visiting the Falklands owing to its lack of society, accommodation for visitors etc, would repair to it from the places adjacent to it, such as Buenos Ayres and Montevideo to enjoy the invigorating air of these latitudes. Capital would be introduced, and other stores, hotels etc would be started, and in place of Stanley being, as it is, a one-horse place.

place with everything monopolised by one Company, at whose mercy the people are - it would become a thriving town with as keen competition in business as exists elsewhere.

27. I think I may take the credit of St Lucia becoming a Naval Station sooner than it might otherwise have done, by obtaining the sanction of the then Secy of State to the expenditure of a considerable sum of money in Harbour improvements, and I do trust that you may see your way, by offering every assistance to the Admiralty, to obtaining the commencement of the long talked of Naval Station here.

28. Looking to the trade routes from Australia and N. Ireland, and that to and from the W. Coast of S. America to all parts of the world via Cape Town, it seems to me that no better place could be selected than the Falklands for a Harbour of refuge or a base from which our fleet could act in the event of war, which will surely come upon us and find us totally unprepared in this part of the world if the Admiralty do not carry out their long contemplated plans for the defence of Stanley.

29. I feel assured too that were a dry dock constructed here, as I presume would be necessary were this to become a Naval Station, thousands & thousands of pounds would be saved to Lloyd's and other marine insurance companies, and many a vessel such as the "Great Britain" would be still

still on the mercantile navy list instead of occupying the ignominious position of a bulk in Stanley Harbour

30. Whilst on this subject might it not be as well to ascertain whether or not Lloyd and other insurance companies would not contribute in their own interests to the maintenance and upkeep of such a dock which could be recouped to them by a small extra premium on all vessels trading via Cape Horn. At the present moment there are no less than 1 English and 3 American Vessels giving a total of 6159 tons register in here for repairs. The Captain of one of these vessels the "Old Kensington" told me that he calculated that he would not get out of the H Co's hands under £7000 or £8000

31. trusting that the suggestions I have made may be of use to your lordship

I have etc

(yours) Roger Duckett Goldworthy
Premier

The Right Honourable
Lord Clarendon Gen^r
etc etc etc.

Falkland Islands
Confidential.

Government House.
Stanley 17 November 1892.

My Lord,

I have the honour to enclose a certificate which I have this day received from the Colonial Surgeon and in view I have to request your Lordship to permit me to come to England on sick leave by the mail leaving this on

in March. I shall thus avoid the winter here and shall not arrive in England till April when the spring will have set in. The certificate itself is not a long one but read in conjunction with a letter written to me in the early part of September last your lordship will gather that I have not suffered inconsiderably during my stay.

2. By that time I trust everything will have been arranged in connection with the Land Question or that a Commission will then be enquiring into and taking evidence on this important question.

3. The present Colonial Secretary who would in the ordinary course succeed to the government has so identified himself with the Sheep farmers and being in opposition to the government, i.e. myself and my other advisers in Executive Council on this question considering as he does that the farmers are entitled to all they hold I fear that there would be small chance of the interests of the government versus the farmers being considered.

4. I would recommend in view of the foregoing that some one should be sent out to act in my absence and would suggest that he might in conjunction with

with the offices who must be appointed
to survey the land reserved for sale be
joint Commissioners to enquire into the
land question meanwhile till the
result of their report were known all
matters should remain in statu quo.

The Rt Honble

The Marquis of Ripon
^{KG}
Downing Street.

I have &c.

(Signed) Roger Pech Goldsworthy,
Governor.

Falkland Islands.
Confidential.

Government House,

Stanley 16 January 1893

My Lord,

I have received from Mr. Baillie, the
Manager of the Falkland Islands Company through
the Colonial Secretary the enclosed correspondence
A, to which a letter marked B signed by the Clerk
of Council was the reply from the Governor in
Council.

2. Much unnecessary annoyance
to myself as Governor would have been saved had
the Colonial Secretary declined as he should have
done to place before myself as Governor com-^m
munications couched in disrespectful terms.
Reference to the Colonial Secretary's minute
of 11 January 1893 discloses no anxiety on the
part of that office to assist the Governor by
his advice and it was not until my minute
of 12 January 1893 was placed in his hands that
a response showing what injury might in his
opinion accrue to the public interests, not
evidenced in any way in his first minute,
was forthcoming arruning that "whereby
"doing so a sort of general paralysis of certain
branches

branches of the service must prevail" was at the outset the view he took of the matter. What, my Lord, can be thought of an Officer who knowing the stake at issue would quietly sit down and write a minute such as that of 11 January.

3. In the first place, my Lord, as your Lordship is aware, the duty of a Colonial Secretary when sending papers to the Governor is to point out the course of action which in his opinion should be adopted, this was not done but viewing the possible results (vide his minute of 14 January, 93), as the Colonial Secretary did, it was his duty to have at once conferred personally with the Governor and if necessary advised a meeting of the Executive Council being summoned to consider what steps should be adopted at what he considered a serious juncture of affairs. But, my Lord, I maintain the Colonial Secretary's action is deserving of greater censure in that he had previously a knowledge (vide the minute of Executive Council marked D) that an insult of this nature would be offered to myself as Governor and neither informed myself or his colleagues in Executive Council. For such conduct there can be no excuse it is an identification of himself with the rioting Justice, or in other words with the sheep farmers, but, such action on W. Ponting's part I am not surprised. With his fellow officials

officials he has held little or no intercourse
and so marked was his constant association
with Mr. Baillie and those in opposition
that it called forth from me the letter a copy
of which I enclose (marked E) to which
enclosure (F) was his reply.

4. It would, my Lord, doubtless be difficult to prove direct collusion
with the Company but morally I am as
certain as I write these words that he is
neither more nor less than the Company's
legal adviser. The opposition given by
him throughout on the Land question, the
same on the Auctioneer's licensing
Ordinance, because it affected the Falkland
Islands Company, the manner in which in
and out of Council he has, if I may so term
it, held a brief for that Company, so clear
indeed to my mind that I challenged him
in Executive Council with being rather
Counsel for the Company than legal
adviser to the Government; his letting
such a remark before his colleagues pass
without any disclaimer or remonstrance
all to my mind point to Mr. Routledge
being in antagonism to the Government.

5. True' he agreed to and
concurred in the opinion arrived at in
Council as to the action to be taken in
connection with the resignation of the
justices and why if he had a hand
in it, as I honestly believe he had,
he could not have admitted it except
on pain of dismissal from the
service

service. If he had not a hand in it his action on receipt of Mr. Baillou's letter points if not to disloyalty to perfect indifference as to how the Govt might be affected thereby. So much for Mr. Rontledge's conduct.

6. It has also come to my knowledge that Mr. Felton, a member of the Legislative Council, when first the land question was taken ^{up} by me said we do as they did in British Honduras (i.e. when I was Governor) and resign. The resignation of these justices is merely a repetition of the line adopted in British Honduras to culminate it is hoped by them in a similar way. But I trust my Lord that a policy of concession will not be adopted here as there, but that a Governor who has endeavoured to protect the interests of the Crown against the powerful influence of a corporation at home backed by their chieftain, the farmers out here, will receive from you, my Lord, that support which he has a right to expect in struggling to obtain for the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands in general a Commission of enquiry as to how some two and a quarter million acres of land have virtually been alienated without any consideration being shewn therefor. Land, my Lord, valued at some £450,000 divided between some 27 individuals and to which

the inhabitants put forth a claim, not a claim to lease without payment as at present but to lease at the ordinary price failing this or at least to have set apart therefrom for sale under section 2 of Ordinance 9 of 1882 some portion of that large area of land but which the farmers refuse to yield.

By the Law under which they claim to hold the land or lease (and the Law Officers of the Crown have confirmed their right thereto) by that same law also my Lord, are they bound and especially by the section above referred to by which the Governor can legally can reserve for sale. There should therefore be no weakness, no uncertainty on the part of the Government, the farmers should be told you have appealed to Casar to Casar shall ition go; or in other words, you have appealed to the law, by the law to which you have appealed shall your claims be decided. But as they desire to have all that the law gives them but decline to surrender that which the Government is entitled to take under that very law. There must be no half measure my Lord, let the Falkland Islands Company who have been the main inciters of the farmers to their line of action be clearly given to understand that the Falklands are not alone for them

9 of 1890

for them, that they must respect Law
and order as much as the poorest
citizen nor think that exceptional
privileges are on all occasions to
be accorded to them. What my Lord
is the result of successive govern-
ments conceding so much in the past
eventuating in a Special Ordinance
I refer to that of 1890 being introduced
in the first instance solely for the
benefit of the Falkland Islands
Company and which only by the
threatened opposition of Mr. Fenton
(one of the unofficial members)
thereto, Mr. Cobb, the Manager of the
Falkland Island Company being
the other, was modified by the
insertion of section 3 which gave similar
privileges to all farmers, the answer
to my query is that it has made the
Company almost paramount.
That Ordinance was introduced by
Governor Kerr without the Executive
Council having been consulted for
which reason when it was before the
Legislative Council both the Colonial
Surgeon and Colonial Chaplain
recalled their votes against it and
protested. Had that clause not been
inserted at Mr. Fenton's request I
might almost say dictation the
Ordinance would only have passed
by the Governor using his casting
vote. "For" the Ordinance would
have

have been The Governor, the Colonial Secretary Mr Cobb (a very interested party) "against" The Colonial Surgeon, Colonel Chapman M. Elton. Such, my Lord, is the history of that Adinance which gave 97,128 acres of land without a survey at the reduced rate of 3/- per acre. At the very least it must be $\frac{1}{2}$ more as the area has been calculated at 640 acres to a nautical mile. But I trust, my Lord, looking to the open opposition to Imperial Interests, I allude to the attitude assumed here and at home towards the Volunteer movement by the Company's representatives, for Mr Cobb has written out that he is opposed to it and I was myself told by Mr Baillon, the Company's local agent, when asking why he did not give support to it that his chiefs were opposed to it, to the disinclination to the formation of any naval dépôt, it being considered that a defenceless town would be a greater protection to the interests of the Falkland Islands Company and regarding this selfish policy on the part of that Company, I must ask, my Lord is it not true that Imperial and Colonial interests must take the first place - a policy of concession to this company and the former means, excuse the phrase, moral cowardice

Volunteers

Cowardice, it is like a man constantly putting off to the evil day which sooner or later must come upon him, when the issue must be tried. Every concession gives increased power to the Company, now is the time my Lord, when you have the people & right on your side but by further delay the government loses power whilst the Company gains in a corresponding ratio. A policy of the kind I propose which I conceive to be a policy of protection to the best interests of the people I am prepared to carry out but a policy which gives into the rapacious maws of the farmers land without payment whilst not compelling them to adjust that which they can reswallow on payment if they so desire is a suicidal one in a Crown or other Colony. I am prepared to put up with any amount of calumny and abuse in carrying out what I believe to be for the true interests of the Colony but I am not ready to remain in nomine a Governor whilst the Company and their clientele are de facto the Governing body supported by the influence they have hitherto been able to bring to bear against the fair and legitimate demands of the people.

The Right Honorable
The Marquis of Ripon K.G. I have &
Signed, Roger Tuckfield Goldsmith

Government House, Stanley,
2 February, 1873.

My Lord,

I have the honour, in connection with my confidential despatch of 16 January, to forward copies of proceedings in Executive Council from which your lordship will be better able to judge of the line of conduct pursued by Mr. Routledge.

1. Mr. Routledge was previously aware of the proposed resignation of the Justices but never informed me.

2. I though ordered by me in Council not to submit letters which were not couched in respectful terms he notwithstanding such intimation forwarded letters far more disrespectful in their tone than those forwarded through Mr. Baillon.

3. That when Mr. Routledge, as Colonial Secretary received the letters of resignation he by his own admission said to the Governor "Here's a pretty how do" the Justices have resigned thereby leading his brother member of Executive Council to suppose that it came as a matter of surprise whilst he had been previously well aware of the proposed action of the Justices and had failed to communicate the same to me as Governor.

4. That as a reason for not obeying my instructions, namely to return all disrespectful letters to the writers Mr. Routledge stated that in his opinion they were not "disrespectful" when he had been a party to and

and approv'd of the letter dated 10 January
addressed by the Clerk to Council to Mr. Baillon
and was aware that previous correspondence
of a less objectionable character had been
considered by the Council of whom he was
one "unconscientious and disrespectful";
he being also aware that his conduct had
been commented upon by me in Council
for having submitted the original cor-
respondence for the very reason that it
was "disrespectful" to myself as the
Majesty's representative.

2. Dr. Routledge's intimate
relations with Mr. Baillon and the farmers,
his studiously keeping himself apart from
his brother officials combined with his
persistent opposition to myself and the
other members of the Council on the land
question and indeed upon all questions
connected with the farmers taken in
conjunction with his own statement (vide
copy of letter attached) that he knew
before his arrival more about the land
question than any one in the colony lead
me to think that prior to his departure
from England his several interviews with
Mr. Cobb had not been without effect in
influencing his mind, the result being
that he has unswervingly shewn a strong
bias in favour of the farmers and to such
an extent that I affirm ~~most~~ ^{most} unhesitatingly
that to him in a great measure is at-
tributable the present position of affairs.

3. I cannot look upon

D. Hamilton
February 10th
Filed in enclosure file

the doubt expressed by Mr Routledge in his comments on the land question (vide his letter of 12 November forwarded in despatch No 127 of 15 November 1892) but as evidencing mala fides towards the government because having the impression that it was doubtful whether a question might not arise under section 2 of Ordinance 9 of 1882 as to how far the acceptance of rent for the current year and in addition the lapse of 6 months since the date of Lord Kruksford's despatch of the 22 March last was received from a claim to the leaseholder, by implication, of a renewal of his lease accepted by the government having allowed the 6 months to pass without intimating to the leaseholder any intention of reserving for sale any part of the Station or section leased.

Why did he not before the expiration of the six months confide to me his doubts and leave it to my discretion to act as I might deem advisable, no; he did not do this but when too late (if his contention be right which I do not myself think it is) draws attention to the matter.

4. I am not, my Lord, singular in my opinion with respect to Mr Routledge's conduct towards the government, it is endorsed by both the members of my Executive Council, gentlemen of considerable experience in the service, the one having sat for 14 years in Council whilst the others can show a record of service in the army and the colonies of extending over a period of some 20 years and they both concur with me in recommending that Mr Routledge should be at once relieved as his conduct most detrimentally affects the government; whilst the difficulties of my position are considerably increased by the presence in Council

Council of one who has unblushingly allied himself with those who are in opposition to my policy.

The Right Honourable
The Marquis of Ripon, Esq.

K - H. M.

I have re.
(S. 2) Roger Tuck, Goldsmith
Governor.

Government House.

Stanley. 3 February, 1873.

My Lord,

I have nothing further to communicate with regard to the tender of resignation of certain justices. I have as yet only received letters from Messrs. Nichol & Dale both employés of the Falkland Islands Company resigning in accordance with the terms of my letter addressed to Mr. Baillon by whom the letters of November 26 and December 19, inclosures in my confidential despatch of the 16 January were forwarded.

It is not too much to assert that Mr. Baillon the Falkland Islands Company Manager here and who is also a Member of the Legislative Council has been the instigator and prime mover of this unwarrantable attempt to tamper the government in the hope thereby to compel the Governor in Council to pursue a different line of action in respect to the land. I need scarcely say, my Lord, such conduct will have quite the opposite effect as it shows me to what length the former would go to prevent and to Burke

if possible any inquiries into the land question and which they were perfectly aware I was endeavouring to obtain, clearly evidencing notwithstanding the views adopted by the law officers of the Crown under the recent Government, that they, the farmers, have ground for viewing the outcome of a Commission of Enquiry with apprehension.

3. Prior to the receipt of the resignations before mentioned individual resignations had been sent in to the Colonial Secretary by Messrs Packe, G A Cobb, Baillon, Nichol and Felton, but which were returned as couched in disrespectful terms (vide proceedings of Executive Council forwarded in my despatch of yesterday's date marked Confidential).

4. In view of Mr Baillon's action I trust your Lordship will strengthen my hand by directing that he should either apologize for acting as he has done or failing his doing so that he should cease to retain his seat as a Member of the Legislative Council. Mr Kellon, the remaining unofficial member, has but followed his lead in resigning whilst Mr Baillon by forwarding the more objectionable document of the two, namely, that of the West Falklands former, has identified himself therewith, besides leading the opposition to my reserving

Reserving land for sale under section 2
of ordinance q. of 1852 in accordance
with instructions from both Lord
Knutsford and your Lordship.

5. By this mail I am forward-
ing a Memorial from the principal
inhabitants of Stanley. (it has I
understand never been sent beyond
the town) taking exception to the
action of those allied with Mr Baillie.

The Rt Honble.

The Marquis of Ripon,
K. G. C.
Downing Street.

I have the

(Signed) Roger Juckfield Goldsworthy
Governor.

Secret.

Government House,
Stanley, 19 February 1893.

My Lord,

I have the honour to transmit
herewith, in duplicate, the Returns for
1891 and 1892 of the Defence Resources
of this Colony as desired by your Lordship's
Circular despatch marked Confidential
of the 13th December last.

2. I regret that the Returns
for 1891 were not transmitted at an
earlier date.

The Rt Honble.

The Marquis of Ripon,
K. G. C.
Downing Street.

I have the

(Signed) Roger Juckfield Goldsworthy
Governor.

Government House,
Stanley
17th April 1893.

My Lord,

I have the honor to transmit to your lordship the accompanying communication which I have just received, on the eve of his departure from the mail for Sandy Point from Mr. Routledge in a Confidential letter requesting that his letter may be forwarded to your lordship by this mail as it explains certain charges which were made against the Colonial Secretary and which formed part of the proceedings of a meeting of the Executive Council held here on the evening of Saturday the 11th March.

2. Time at present only allows me to say that since my assumption of the Government I have found Mr. Routledge a loyal and conscientious officer and a useful legal adviser; but as paragraph 2 of his letter bears on the subject matter of your lordships Confidential Despatch of the 11th March, I shall take the opportunity of applying to that Despatch by the intermediate homeward bound mail which is expected to leave this Port about the 11th May.

3. Your lordship will observe from

17th April 1893.
Enclosed

from his Gazette of the 9th March
that Governor Goldsworthy issued
a new Commission of the Peace
before his departure.

4. On the request of Governor
Goldsworthy received in a
private letter from Monteblido
I have forwarded to him copies
of the questions put by him to
Mr. Routledge in the "Gazette"
of 11th March (Enclosure 7) and
of Mr. Routledge's replies (Enclosure 8).

I have

(Signed) G.W. Monteblido

Government House,

Sunday, 20th April 1893.

My Lord,

I have the honour to
acknowledge the receipt of Your
Lordship's Circular Confidential
of 6th February transmitting a
printed copy of Confidential lists
of Her Majesty's Ships and Foreign
Vessels of War in Commission and
in Reserve corrected up to the
15th January 1893.

In accordance with Your
Lordship's request the lists previously

Parts I and II
& Part III.

transmitted have been duly
destroyed by me.

Done
16. 4. 93.

Shanke
Signed / G.W. Shanke