



Extract from letter T & M 71/948/NDI of 20 January 1976
from Mr N D Ing, Treasury Solicitor's Office to Miss Josselyn,
FCO

"Thank you for having sent me a copy of Professor Maude's letter of 3rd January to Richard Sands of the British High Commission at Canberra.

Professor Maude's letter, which I note is written on behalf also of his wife and of Mr P D Macdonald, sets out the financial arrangements which are considered necessary for their forthcoming visit to this country in connection with the royalty action. I have spoken to those concerned in my department and am pleased to say that these proposals are agreed, subject to the following points, which are put forward with a view to confirmation and clarification, in connection with my own records, and not by way of disagreement with Professor Maude's proposals (and also, as regards "subsistence", by way of elaboration).

(a) As regards (1) of Professor Maude's letter, it is assumed that the tickets purchased will cover the whole of the chosen routes and that the "stop-overs" will be achieved by way of a breaking of the journey, rather than by the booking of separate tickets from one stop to the next; certainly the assumption which I have made seems to follow from the way in which Professor Maude has expressed the matter.

(b) As regards (3) and (5) of Professor Maude's letter: as Professor Maude and Mr Macdonald will by now be aware, I have provisionally retained accommodation for three weeks from Monday 16th February at the Royal Commonwealth Society, Northumberland Avenue, WC2. I have arranged for the accounts of Professor and Mrs Maude and Mr Macdonald at the Society to be sent direct to me for settlement. This will of course take care of the cost of their accommodation as such - and, while breakfast is not included in the overnight charge, I imagine that the visitors will wish to sign for the cost of their breakfasts and for the amounts concerned to be included in their accounts. Apart from the sundries dealt with in (5), there remain the two main daily meals other than breakfast. It would be possible for these to be taken generally at the Society and for the cost again to be included in the accounts. However, it occurred to me that this might leave the visitors too little flexibility in their arrangements and I therefore suggest that there should be an additional allowance (per person) of £5 per day, during the stay in London, to provide for the cost of luncheon and an evening meal. (This arrangement would in no way prevent the taking of those meals at the Society when desired, as it is entirely usual for residents, as well as other members, to pay for some of their meals in cash if they wish.) It is thought that such an allowance would be realistic for its purpose but, if this should prove not to be the case, its amount could be reviewed at any time. (Owing to currency differences, it would probably be too cumbersome to apply this additional allowance to main meals taken while travelling - including "stop-



"stop-overs" - so these can be dealt with on an "as taken" basis.)

(c) As regards (4) of Professor Maude's letter, it is assumed, in view of the opening words of the first paragraph on page 2 of the letter, that the allowance is a maximum of £100 per person.

(d) In the first paragraph on page 2 of his letter, Professor Maude has referred to a possible entitlement to "the usual witness fees (if any)". There are no specific fees payable as a matter of general custom to witnesses in proceedings such as the present; each case has to be considered on its own circumstances. Certainly this would have been an important issue if no question had arisen of the payment of an allowance designed to compensate for loss of income. However, as such an allowance is to be paid - and as it is clearly understood that my department will be responsible also for all matters of subsistence - it is not thought that the payment of further fees would arise in the present case. It is emphasised 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.

(e) In the penultimate paragraph of his letter, Professor Maude has confirmed that any expenses incurred as a result of a voluntary extension of his and Mrs Maude's stay would be his responsibility. It may be that this statement was intended to relate also to Mr Macdonald who, I understand, may wish to extend his stay in England to visit close relatives. In any event, I feel sure that Mr Macdonald would agree that it would be reasonable for this principle to apply in his case too - although, bearing in mind what is said about the dangers of burglary during his absence, my department would be willing to continue to meet the expenses, as stated, of maintaining the watchman at Mr Macdonald's home during even an extended voluntary absence of two or three weeks!"