

GPO Box 1404,  
Suva, Fiji.

10th December, 1975.

*San Hing*

I enclose a copy of a letter which I received yesterday from Ing, Assistant Treasury Solicitor, dated the 28th November. (It bore a Fiji stamp and must have been sent through the UK High Commissioner here in Fiji; but you will appreciate that it took no fewer than 12 days, whereas if it had been posted to me direct, it would have taken only some 4 days. I will draw this to Ing's attention when I reply to him. I will also send you a copy of my letter).

2. It was very helpful of him to send me a copy of his letter to you of the 27th November, and, with one exception, which links up with that in the third paragraph of the enclosed letter, I have no comments to make.

3. The point concerns the fourth paragraph of Ing's letter to you, where he proposes that the financial arrangements which concern you should be made through Richard Sands. I do not know who the latter is, but guess that he may be a member of the UK High Commission in Canberra. Is that correct?

4. In the third paragraph of his letter to me, you will observe that Ing wishes to know my financial requirements. When we discussed this in Canberra, I said that mine were likely to be a good deal more modest than your's; on the other hand, I think I am right in saying that you thought that it would be rather invidious for us to seek, and receive, different fees. Let me make it quite clear at the outset that I fully recognize that you are justified in demanding a higher fee than I can justify, and that, if you did receive a higher fee, it would in absolutely no way upset me. (It would also show what a very high-powered expert you are in comparison to me - even if I am more "mentally agile" which is totally untrue!).

5. But, without knowing more of the background to the preliminary arrangements which you propose to make with Sands, and your views on the differential fees, it is difficult for me to decide what reply I should return to Ing at this juncture.

*in stage*

6. On the basis of earnings alone, I calculate that I might lose, say, £20 (20 pounds) a day. But then, to that I should certainly wish to add an amount (which I cannot at present specify) for, for example, watchman for my house, servant's wages, winter clothing, and for other out of pocket expenses, e.g. (tips, though not on the scale you did in the Phillipines!), newspapers, transport, e.g. en route, and so on. I am writing this letter in a great hurry and so cannot possibly hope to ensure that all such expenses are covered. But, in any case, the fee representing such expenses on my part, you will see, must come to a good deal less than your's, unless you feel they should be the same. Will you let me have your views as soon as possible please? ~~Maybe you would feel that it would be best to ask Sands to deal with the fees for both of us?~~

7. The fees would presumably be paid from the date of our departure from where we live until the date of return. I mention this since I think it would be only reasonable at some stage to warn Ing (or Sands?) of our probable route home, where we propose to stop, and how long we propose to take over the journey. I mention this especially since I think it would hardly be fair, in respect of the return journey, to make an open-ended commitment vis à vis H.M. Treasury. What I mean is that you might decide to spend several weeks in South Africa and Mauritius, which I am sure you would agree would be unreasonable. I think therefore that a time limit should also be suggested for the return journey, though not the route to be taken. This would, of course, affect the duration of time that the fee



was paid.

8. Another point has just occurred to me in connexion with determining the fee payable and that is whether it should include an element for expertise ?

9. Another point which has occurred to me is this; I think it would make more sense if the UK High Commission in Canberra booked air passages, and reserved hotel accommodation at ~~the~~ stops, for both of us - you from Canberra to London, and me from Nadi to London, but with open return tickets. This will probably save a lot of correspondence between us later on. I think we agree on the route - Nadi, Honolulu, San Francisco or Los Angeles, Florida, London - 3 days at each stop, though only one night for me at Nadi since I would fly over and join you there for the third night, unless you would like me to come over for all three days, for discussions. As for San Francisco or Los Angeles, it is a choice of airline from Honolulu - Qantas to San Francisco or Air New Zealand from Honolulu to Los Angeles. I have no preference. Plenty of US planes from either, on to Miami. From Miami there is a daily Jumbo service of British Airways to London, which we ought to use because of Neil! It makes sense for the UK HC in Canberra to book the passages as the UK Government will have to pay for them anyway.

10. Another thought; the eighth paragraph of Ing's letter to you mentions the 21 ~~day~~ reservation limit at the Royal Commonwealth Society; true, he does not suggest that we should stay longer than that, but it might be as well to make it quite clear to him as to what the maximum time you desire to spend away from Canberra should be. I don't want them to "do a Turpin" on us for weeks on end.

11. You may possibly have written to me anent Ing's letter to you - or you may not. To avoid getting the wires crossed, I will do nothing till I hear from you, though if you have already written, I will then hastily reply thereto. In great haste; love to Honor;

*In Paddy*