

77 Arthur Circle, Forrest,  
A.C.T. 2603, Australia,  
30th January, 1976.

Mr Richard Sands,  
British High Commission,  
CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2600.

Dear Mr Sands,

Ocean Island Phosphates: Royalty Action

Thank you for letters 375/1 of the 23rd and 28th January conveying the Treasury Solicitor's replies to my letter of the 3rd on the subject of the financial arrangements necessitated by the proposed visits of my wife and myself to London in connexion with the above action.

- (1) As regards (a) of Mr Ing's letter of the 20 January to Miss Josselyn, I agree that, if feasible, the through route open-ended return tickets should cover the whole of the chosen routes and that the stop-overs should constitute breaks in the journey, i.e. that a series of separate tickets need not be booked from one stop to the next. I take it that you have ascertained that this procedure is acceptable to British Airways, or whoever is handling the booking of the tickets and the accommodation at the **stop-overs**.
- (2) Should British Airways, or other agency, wish to know our intended return route from London to Australia I should be grateful if you would inform them that we hope to travel via South Africa and the direct **Indian** Ocean route to Perth, and thence to Canberra.
- (3) I am grateful to Mr Ing for his kindness in arranging our accommodation in London, as stated at (b) of his letter under reference. Mr Macdonald (and others) have queried whether it is possible to lunch and dine in London for £5 a day at present inflated costs (I have no idea myself) but in view of Mr Ing's undertaking to review the proposed allowance of £5 the point does not arise. We would prefer to take our meals at the Royal Commonwealth Society but, as Mr Ing suggests, this may not always prove possible or convenient. Meals en route can, as he states, be recovered on an 'as taken' basis, whenever they are not included in the charge for accommodation.

- (4) As regards (c) of Mr Ing's letter I have discovered that, as I have absolutely no warm suits, the £100 allowed for warm clothing will be quite inadequate at today's prices. The only suit obtainable in Canberra is priced at \$268 (say £134) which would leave me in the red without allowing for any other article of clothing.
- (5) My wife, however, has volunteered to try and make do without purchasing any clothing and I suggest that the £200 should be regarded as available for either the use of my wife or myself. I have a pair of reasonably thick trousers and can purchase a coat here for \$80 (say £50). I would propose to land in these, but as they would presumably not be considered suitable for wearing in Court I suggest that I should visit Moss Brothers the day after my arrival and endeavour to hire a suit, or suits, from them to last for the duration of my stay.
- (6) Friends have, however, advised me that while Moss Brothers have formal clothes required for weddings, receptions and the like it is doubtful if they hire out dark suits for more ordinary wear. In that event I may have to purchase a suit at Marks and Spencer, which apparently stocks the best bargains. Should this get wet or otherwise meet with a mishap I shall have nothing else and will not, accordingly, be in a position to attend Court. I have no overcoat, but my wife thinks that I may be able to survive in a lined raincoat.
- (7) I should like to emphasize that I am not unmindful of the paramount need for economy. But at the same time one must take into account the fact that if I have to appear in too incongruous a garb in Court it will not only effectively destroy my personal morale but can hardly redound to the credit of the British Government, while if my wife and I have to wear clothes in which we suffer from a cold to which we are unaccustomed we shall inevitably get ill, which could nullify the whole object of bringing us to London.
- (8) I hope, therefore, that if with the utmost economy consonant with decency we are unable to procure sufficient clothes to enable us to appear in public and maintain our health the Government will see its way to paying for any necessary expense incurred in excess of £200, subject to each article being approved (if required in advance of purchase). I should like to add that I have endeavoured to borrow clothes from friends; but unfortunately I am not their size. I assume that the suitcase which I have had to buy for \$33 (say £20) is a legitimate charge against the

£100, which leaves me with £30 unexpended after purchasing the coat.

(9) The only other point which requires clarification appears to be (7) in my letter of the 3rd January. Here it has been apparently assumed that my request for cover against medical and hospital expenses referred merely to accidents. This was emphatically not the case and I regret that my perhaps ambiguous wording should have given rise to such a misunderstanding. At our age it is clearly essential for us to be covered against medical and hospital expenses incurred for any reason whatsoever. I had been under the impression that this necessity had been mentioned to Mr Price when our journey was first mooted and that he had considered that it would occasion no difficulty. I could, however, have misunderstood him.

(10) My wife agrees with me that we could not very well leave Canberra unless this condition can be met. But as such contingencies are, I understand, readily insurable against in Australia at reasonable rates I am presuming, unless informed to the contrary, that you will be taking out an insurance policy to cover us against all medical and hospital expenses whether incurred through an accident or for any other reason. Perhaps you will be so kind as to let us have this policy before our departure, as hospitals, particularly in the United States, will often not admit patients unless payment of their expenses is guaranteed; and it will be necessary, furthermore, for us to send particulars of our personal accident insurance for forwarding to our next-of-kin.

It would seem unnecessary to dilate further on minor worries concerning possible contingencies which will, in all probability, never arise, since I am very reassured by Mr Ing's statement that: 'if the present arrangements should in fact prove inadequate to meet the expenses of the visit, they would have to be reviewed so that the object of duly meeting these expenses could be achieved'. Having always been treated fairly, and even generously, by the representatives of the British Crown in the past I feel sanguine that I can safely rely on the same treatment continuing in my retirement.

I am also assuming that, as requested, you will endeavour to get British Airways, or failing them any other travel agency, to book and pay for our return tickets, and our accommodation and board at stop-overs, in advance.

It should be sufficient, therefore, if you would be so kind as to pay me, as an advance in travellers' cheques, the sum of £210 for incidental expenses, calculated at 7 days daily allowance at £5 each, as agreed in your (b), and 7 days at £20, as agreed in your (d). If accommodation and board are not booked in advance we shall need an additional sum to cover these expenses.

I note that you would like to obtain Mr Macdonald's acceptance of the conditions as set out in your two letters and will therefore forward copies of the correspondence to him in Fiji as soon as I have made them. It may, however, be a week or so before a reply is received.

Yours sincerely,

H.E. Maude.