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The New Zealand Government and the Native War.

THE memorandum prepared by the New-Zealand Government, and which contains their reply to the English address to Governor Grey,

This address, which will be found in the Appendix, was signed by members of the Aborigines' Protection Society, and by Lord Chichester and many other influential persons who are not connected with the Society, but who sympathized with this particular object.

is a document of far too grave importance to be dismissed without full consideration and necessarily lengthened comment. It must be accepted as the Ministerial defence of the policy to which Mr. Whittaker and his colleagues have committed themselves, and & by which they must stand or fall. By its statements the British public are to judge whether, and to what extent, the natives now in arms have been the aggressors in the present war; and what just necessity, if any, has arisen to make the proposed sweeping confiscation of native lands a measure of public policy. We have no desire to shrink from a discussion of this nature, whether reference be had to particular facts or to general principles. All that we ask is that one class of facts shall not be taken to the exclusion of another; that both sides of this grave controversy shall be fairly submitted to the national judgment; and that the obligations of Great Britain as a Christian-Power shall not be eliminated from the discussion. At the outset it must be remembered that the original settlement of New Zealand was based upon principles exceptional in the modern history of colonization; that our position in those islands is determined by the express provisions of a treaty which the highest legal authorities have declared to be as valid as any treaty entered into between two European states.

The opinion of the late Dr. Phillimore is emphatic on this point, and is set forth with that judicial clearness and impartiality for which this eminent lawyer was distinguished.

and that a compact of this nature involves the performance of mutual and equally binding duties. Having undertaken the colonization of New Zealand on such terms, it is not for us to repudiate the agreement on the ground of inconvenience or self-interest; and if it can be shewn that by any laches on our part, by any dereliction of our self-imposed duty, discontent has been fomented, and evils of a serious character have sprung into existence, it is not for us to turn round upon the natives, and to hold them accountable for the fruits of our own misconduct. To teach them that we may break a treaty but they must not; and that while one day we may treat them as aliens, the next we may, if it suits our pleasure, brand them as rebels; is a line of policy, which, on the lowest ground of expediency, must be as fatal to the welfare of any state, as it is manifestly dishonourable to civilized men. Yet this is what we have practically done. By the treaty of Waitangi we not only guaranteed to the Maories the possession of their lands, but promised to impart to them all the rights of British subjects. Instead of doing this, we have systematically treated them as a foreign people, who were at liberty to govern themselves as they pleased; to declare war and to make peace one with another; and generally to exercise all the rights which appertain to a separate and independent community. If the treaty had been observed in both the spirit and the letter, the natives would have been regarded as a part of the body politic; they would have been invested, as far as was practicable, with all the rights of British subjects; and the constitution which secured to
the colonists the privileges of self-government, would have admitted them to a share of the common privileges. But caste prejudices and false notions of expediency prevailed. The natives were excluded from the General Assembly, and from the enjoyment of the franchise, and no attempt was made to prepare the way for the exercise, on their part, of these functions. The result was, that as the natives became more imitative, and, at the same time, more civilized, they endeavoured to develop among themselves those institutions which it should have been our care to provide for them, and to base upon a loyal foundation. The Aborigines' Protection Society may take credit to itself for having, at the time, urged upon the Government the performance of these duties, and for having pointed out that the only sure means of averting future disension and war, was to be found in a measure which provided for the political amalgamation of the two races. That appeal was unheeded, and no steps were taken to give adequate effect to the principle we laid down until it was too late, and irreparable mischief was done. The time for action had arrived when the king movement was in its infancy. In the hands of statesmen that movement might have been made as plastic as clay, instead of which it was allowed to assume any shape into which the energetic spirits of the Maori race thought fit to mould it, and the result was, that what might have been a source of good, became fruitful of evil.

The non-fulfilment of that clause of the treaty which professedly gave to the natives the status of British subjects was the more mischievous, because another provision of the same treaty, which secured to the Government a pre-emptive right in the sale of native lands was rigidly enforced; so that at last the Maoris came to view the British Government simply in the light of land buyers and monopolists, whose chief desire was to diminish the number of Maori proprietors, and to aggrandize the settlers. This conviction, which was strengthened by the proceedings of the officials connected with the land-purchasing department, and by the ludicrous prices which the Government gave the native owners (for millions of acres were bought at a farthing and a halfpenny per acre) gave birth to those land leagues, which, even in this land of combinations and trades-unions, have been regarded in the light of treasonable organizations. Mr. Buddie, the Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in New Zealand, who cannot be suspected of leaning against the Government, has given lucid and emphatic testimony on this point. In his pamphlet on the Maori king movement, he says:—

"In 1849 the Ngatiapa, whose territory lies between Whanganui and Otaki, sold to the Government a tract of land, reaching from Wangaihu to Rangitake, and containing about 400,000 acres, for the sum of 2500l. This transaction caused no little excitement among the tribes along the western coast, from New Plymouth to Wellington. Some wished to follow the example of Ngatiapa, but numbers declaimed against the small amount received for the land, and contrasting it with the high prices which had been paid by natives for allotments near Wellington, opposed further sales. Hona of Waitotara, and Karipa of Taumaha, proposed to sell a fine block, lying between Putea and Manawapou, but many who possessed no claim in the block raised an outcry against the proposal. In May 1849 the entire tribe met at Turangarere on the occasion of the opening of a new church. The subject of land sales was introduced at that meeting, and warmly discussed. It was proposed that no person or family should sell land within the boundary of the Ngatiruanui territory without the general consent of the tribe. This proposal was approved by many, but the meeting was not unanimous. Many asserted their right to do as they pleased with their own; and Hona and Karipa persisted in their determination to sell. The opposition was prompted by various motives: some opposed from patriotic feelings, declaring it to be their wish that the land they had received from their ancestors should be by them handed down to their children. Some of the thoughtful men spoke of the invariable results of colonization, and argued that a Pakeha's town would bring immorality and disorganization among them; that their young women would be debauched, and their young men tempted to drunkenness. How much it is to be regretted that our European settlements, composed as they are of professedly Christian people, should furnish savage tribes with such arguments as these!

"Others were influenced by exaggerated ideas of the value of native land, derived from the increased value of lands improved by English labour and capital, and argued that to sell land was to enrich the Pakeha and impoverish themselves. And numbers opposed the sale from barbaric pride. Dwelling on these large tracts of land, they felt they could maintain individually a degree of self-respect, importance, and independence, that would be lost when they came to mingle with the better-informed and civilized Europeans: that, in fact, if they parted with their land, they would soon be made to feel their inferiority, and must become 'the Pakeha's slave. These opponents pushed their views, and sought to make it 'Te Tikanga o te Iwi,' (the law of the tribe,) that no individual or family should alienate land without the consent of the whole tribe. To make the law popular and binding, they determined on a more general meeting, and to invite all the tribes along the coast to join them in this measure.

"The meeting was held in 1854: about 1000 persons attended, and the following measures were resolved upon:

"1st. That from this time forward no more land shall be alienated to Europeans without the general consent of this confederation.
"2d. That in reference to the Ngatiruanui and Taranaki tribes, the boundaries of the Pakeha shall be Kai Iwi on the south side, and a place within a short distance of New Plymouth on the north.

"3d. That no European magistrate shall have jurisdiction within native boundaries, but all disputes shall be settled by the runanga.

"To give solemnity to the proceedings, and to confirm the bond into which they entered with each other, they buried a New Testament in the earth, and raised a cairn of stones on the spot; and to reassert and perpetuate their determination, parties have been appointed to beat the boundaries at certain periods."

We have given this extract at 60 much length because Mr. Buddle is an authority whose statements will not be seriously questioned by the colonial party. Taking the version which he gives of the origin of the land leagues, it will be seen that they owed their existence primarily to the low prices fixed for the land under the Government monopoly, and to the fear, that if the natives parted with their ownership of the soil, they would be reduced to a condition of dependence and slavery. Mr. Buddle, it is true, speaks of the influence exerted by what he calls "barbaric pride;" but the feeling which leads men to desire to preserve intact the inheritance of their fathers is not peculiar to barbarous, or semi-civilized, tribes: it prevails in all countries where the law of self-preservation (to say nothing of dignity and self-respect) exercises its legitimate influence over the motives and actions of mankind.

The king movement, both in its origin and development, no doubt brought into play passions of a very mixed nature. It would exhibit little knowledge of human character on our part if we imputed to the natives only a high and patriotic purpose. Like all other communities, they are subject to many errors and imperfections. Many may have joined the king movement to gratify a revengeful or ambitious impulse; some because it gave hope of the ultimate establishment of an independent sovereignty; and others because it might lead to an open and warlike rupture with a Government whose friendship they feared even worse than its hatred. To claim for the entire body of Maories who were parties to this enterprise a perfect single-mindedness of purpose, an absolute freedom from all selfish or personal ends, would be as absurd as to claim for our own nation the same supremely, virtuous attributes. But, making full allowance for all the unruly and reactionary elements which were at work in the agitation, enough of good remains to justify the assertion, that the natives, in setting up a Maori king, were making a step in advance. The necessities of their improved social life rendered it needful that their institutions should be reorganized, and some kind of central authority called into existence. William Thompson, the Waikato chief, who, if he did not actually found the movement, yet gave it vitality, said: "I want order and laws. A king could give us these better than "the Governor." In a document which he handed to the king after his election, he expressed the object still more clearly: "The laws for the king are these. The power he is to exercise over men and land is the power of protecting them against quarrels, wars, and murders; a power to extend to all the chiefs and all councils of all the tribes. Second, every man is to live upon his own land, and the king is to defend him against all aggressions against his "land or person." "Christianity, love, and law," says Mr. Buddle, "are the principles that professedly form the basis of the new kingdom." One of their first acts was to order the erection of several places of worship. They inculcated peace and union among themselves, and "peacemakers were sent out to visit contending tribes, and heal existing differences." They proclaimed the supremacy of law. "All disputes and all offences were to be settled by appeal to law." They gave liberally of their means to establish the new kingdom. They purchased a printing-press; and, writing in 1860, Mr. Buddle remarked that perhaps there more educating agency at work in the Waikato district at the "present time, than has existed at any former period." Such were the leading features of one of the most remarkable movements in which a native race, striving to work out for itself a higher destiny, has ever engaged.

That this is no ideal picture is proved by the testimony of many impartial witnesses. Mr. Gorst, who, as Commissioner of the Waikato district, had peculiar opportunities of observation, gives ample proof of the ability and moderation of many of the native leaders, and more especially of the high and even patriotic motives by which William Thoupson (Wiremu Tamihana) was animated. "Of the king's council," he says, "I feel bound to speak in the very highest terms. In all questions which I have heard discussed by them, they have argued with calmness and good temper, keeping steadily to the point at issue, and facing all the difficulties. They usually came to a joint decision. Calm in discussion, the strongest opposition never provoked personal rudeness. It would have been impossible to get together a body of Maories with whom the Government could have more advantageously consulted upon the management of the native race. If the king's council had only possessed power equal to their wisdom and moderation, the present war would never have arisen. But that wise resolutions should but seldom be carried into practical effect is a weakness that appears naturally inherent in all public bodies at the antipodes."

The king was only a puppet. He possessed no power to enforce his own decisions. If he had been simply left alone, the movement, so far as his mock sovereignty was supposed to be subversive of the Queen's authority, would, in time, have utterly collapsed. But the elements of good which the agitation had brought to the surface would have remained. Able men of the stamp of Tamihana and Rewi, who endeavoured, through the figment of a king, to give strength and unity to the Maori people, would have tried
methods less likely to wound the loyal susceptibilities of the settlers of Auckland. Mr. Gorst, than whom no more competent or trustworthy authority could be cited, distinctly affirms, that, at the time the war broke out, the leaders of the king movement admitted that their scheme had proved a failure. The king's name was one which would have alarmed no one but colonists who hoped to fatten on rich contracts at the expense of the national exchequer, and to acquire the rich lands of Waikato by denouncing its inhabitants, without distinction of tribe or class, as hatchers of treason. Mr. Gorst is careful to point out the vital difference between the partisans of the Maori king and those who endeavoured to preserve and perpetuate the Maori nationality. The one party was much less numerous than the other; but both have been involved in one common fate.

It has been the fashion with the Colonial Government and the anti-native party in the colony to deal with the Maories on two wholly antagonistic principles. As we have before remarked, they were, at one time, a race having a separate existence from their European neighbours; at liberty to govern themselves according to their own semi-civilized customs; to declare war and to make peace, as they pleased; to exercise, in short, all the functions of an independent nation. But when the light of Christianity so far ’dawned upon them as to make them conscious of the evils of intertribal warfare; and when, owing to the neglect of the Government, they endeavoured to create those institutions which might, in some measure, supply the deficiencies of which their more enlightened chiefs had become painfully sensible, then the New-Zealand public suddenly awaken, not to a sense of their own unfulfilled duties, but to the fealty which the natives owe to their foreign rulers. These remarks apply with peculiar force to the Waikato country. The Waikatos, who are suddenly discovered to be rebels who may be killed off like vermin (as indeed they have been designated), were never instructed in any of the duties of loyalty before the date of their king movement. "So absolutely was Waikato neglected," says Mr. Gorst, "that Mr. Ashwell stated, before a Committee of the House of Representatives, that during nineteen years before the 'king movement,' he could not remember more than three or four visits to the Waikato by officials. The Maories have been told that the Queen was a hedge around the island to keep off the French, Americans, and other nations, who would have treated them with less humanity than ourselves. To this kind of sovereignty they never had, and have not at the present lime, the slightest objection. But sovereignty or government, in the sense of a government strong enough to put down robbery w and murder, and increase the common happiness by infusing obedience to laws for the common good, was a thing unknown to the natives of New Zealand when they signed the treaty of Waitangi and unknown to loyal and disloyal alike at the present day. It was not that the Maori race did not present scope for the efforts of a paternal sovereign. For years after the treaty, tribal wars were so common, that Tamihana describes them as 'a river of blood' flowing through the land. But to really govern the natives would have been costly. The revenues of the colony were required to pay for the government and improvement of the European race; the Imperial treasury had no funds to spare; and it was therefore thought most economical and prudent not to attempt to govern at all, to abstain strictly from interference in purely native affairs, and merely to purchase, by presents and pensions, the goodwill of the principal chiefs."

Mr. Buddle, in an address which he delivered in Auckland, in March last, mentioned a fact which shews how completely the natives were left to manage their own affairs. He said that "he was in the Waikato long after the sovereignty of the Queen was declared. A murder took place, one Maori killing another Maori. On hearing this, he sent notice to the Government of the murder, and received in reply from the Protectorate Office, that the Government had nothing to do with Maori law, and that the Maories must carry out their own law on the offender. Now he thought, when our Government took possession of the country, they ought to have enforced British law, and he believed that at that time it should have been done, and it could have been done effectually." Governor Browne himself admitted that populous native districts had never been visited by an officer of the Government; and Sir George Grey, writing in 1861, stated, that while, ten years previously, he had deeply felt the imponance, nay, to use his own phrase, the urgent necessity, of introducing municipal institutions among the natives, nothing had been done up to that time to give practical effect to his suggestion. Colonel Browne, in a moment of candour, confessed that "the Government is, and always has been, unable to perform its duty for want of a sufficient number of agents, trained and qualified for the service required of them." Whose fault was this, if it was not the fault of the Government itself? And while it is no part of our object, in making these strictures, to attempt to apportion the blame equitably, to determine to what extent the Imperial Government was responsible, and how far the local authorities were in fault,—it is manifestly impossible to weigh the conduct of the rebellious natives in a just and righteous balance, unless a knowledge of official shortcomings is first obtained.

We now pass on to a brief review of the principal statements contained in the memorandum addressed to the Governor by the present Government of New Zealand, and signed by the Hon. William Fox, the Colonial Secretary. In doing so, we cannot refrain from making one or two observations of a somewhat personal character, which we should gladly avoid if it were possible to do so with a due regard to justice. Mr. Fox, in his able but (as we shall show) disingenuous reply, prudently abstains from all allusion to the Taranaki war, and the connection which undoubtedly existed between that sanguinary struggle and the present war with the Waikato
tribes. It is not difficult to discover the cause of that strange omission. Mr. Fox, four years ago, entertained very different views of native policy from those which he now advocates. In language at once eloquent and convincing, he denounced the attempt to wrest the Waitara from its rightful owners as an outrage upon law and morality. He was then at the head of the peace party—the champion of the spoliated Maori against colonial aggression. We are loth to believe that the change which has come o'er the spirit of his dream is to be attributed to the circumstance of his having exchanged the cold shade of opposition for the substantial advantages of place and power; but the fact that the minister who at that time fought so stoutly for justice and restitution is now urging on a policy of confiscation more ruthless than any of which his former opponents ever dreamed, is an example of political inconsistency as painful as it is suggestive.

Mr. Fox begins by stating, that at the outset of the war the general body of the rebels "entertained the firm conviction that they could drive the Europeans out of the island;" and he further declares that "they commenced by a desperate attack upon Auckland, the seat of Government." No assertion more monstrous or more unfounded was ever made in a public document, or vouched for by a responsible signature. Mr. Fox in not content with concealing the all-important fact, that the first overt act of war was committed by the British troops; but he must needs charge the natives with having made an attack upon the seat of Government,—a statement which does not contain in it one tittle of truth. A valued correspondent, who is a member of the House of Representatives, and who, for nearly a quarter of a century, has had an intimate personal acquaintance with the natives in every part of the island, writes:—"I have known all the principal Waikato chiefs for years. Many of them are old and sincere friends; and I assure you that it is untrue to say that they ever intended to attack Auckland." The New Zealander, a journal which deserves the thanks of every friend of truth for the bold and manly course it has pursued on this question in the face of an overwhelming amount of obloquy, thus aptly comments on Mr. Fox's extraordinary statements:—"This is news to us. We were not, until now, aware that the seat of Government had ever been attacked at all; and no citizen of Auckland that we have met "with is cognizant of the occurrence. On this subject we must await some further revelation."

What Mr. Fox probably means is that the country in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital was ravaged by the Maories, and by his subsequent remarks on the subject he would leave it to be inferred that they began the war, and began it by carrying fire and the sword into the heart of the settled districts of the province. This suggestion is as untrue as the allegation that Auckland had been attacked. "Now," again to quote The New Zealander, what was the actual sequence of events? In the "week ending Saturday, July 11th, 1863, upwards of one hundred Maories were expelled from their dwellings, being included in the European territory, and within the next three days a still greater number. On Sunday, July 12th, Colonel Murray ordered away the natives settled at Kirikiri, who asked and obtained leave to remain till Monday. On Thursday, July 16th, the old invalid chief Isaac and his father, with twenty-one other persons, young and old, were apprehended; and all these, at a later date, were liberated without any charge having been brought against them. But still all this did not amount to an act of war. The first overt act of hostility, as it was considered by the Maories, and as it was known in Auckland that it would be considered, occurred on one of the before-mentioned days, viz. Sunday, the 12th of July. On the morning of that day the British troops crossed the Maungatawhiri creek, the boundary between the European and Maori territories. It happens to be within our own knowledge, that immediately on this step being known in the city of Auckland, a gentleman resident there despatched an urgent message to certain friends resident between Auckland and Waikato, assuring them that the crossing of the Maungatawhira would be accepted by the Waikatos as a declaration of war, and enforcing the necessity of immediate removal to the city. This advice was taken, and was probably the means of saving life. The invasion of the Waikato territory commenced on Sunday, the 12th of July, and on Friday, the 17th, took place the three following events:—On that day occurred the first engagement of the war, the battle of Koheroa, when our troops attacked and took a native position. On the same day, an attack was made by the Maories on a military escort. And, on the same day, at Shepherd's Bush was perpetrated the murder—"we term it, and as most of the natives acknowledge it—of Mr. Meredith and his son, who were set upon when unarmed, and cruelly put to death. Such was the actual sequence of events, as may be found in the file of New-Zealand newspapers, or in the columns of that convenient summary, the New-Zealand Examiner, published monthly in London.

It is clear from this well-authenticated statements of facts and dates, that the army had not only been put in motion, but the Waikato territory and actually been invaded before the first shot was fired by the Maories, or the first settler murdered by the straggling bands which are always let loose at the outbreak of every war, and for whose lawless acts of vengeance it is unfair to make an entire people responsible. But Mr. Fox is conveniently silent with regard to certain events which preceded even the invasion of Waikato, and probably provoked the outrages upon the outlying settlers of which he complains. We refer to the cruel and unprovoked deportation or the natives who inhabited the Maori villages in the neighbourhood of Auckland; and who, as Mr. Gorst assures us, were largely composed of "the old and the infirm." They were not only driven from their homes, but when they had sought refuge at a place called Kirikiri, an order was received from the Governor 10
make them prisoners. The expulsion of these poor people against whom no crime was alleged save the crime of being related to the Waikatos, took place on Sunday, the 12th of July, a day on which Christians are supposed to be employed in acts of devotion or deeds of mercy which ill accord with the barbarity which that Sabbath morning saw consummated in New Zealand. A correspondent thus describes the scene:—"If you refer to Mr. Sewell's pamphlet" he writes, "you will see that the Government proclamation was printed and dated 9th July. On Saturday the 11th it was sent round the different settlemenis. There was not time for the oath of allegiance to be taken. On Sunday, old and young, the widow and orphan, were driven from their peaceful homes, and had to fly to the woods. There they were followed by armed men and troops. Their houses and settlements were soon pillaged of every thing. Their neat little church at Ihumata, within a few days, had its sashes, door-bells, communion-table, &c. stolen, and even the floor was torn up for the sake of the timber. Soon their beautiful settlement became a wreck, every thing moveable being taken. Can we wonder at some few Maories taking revenge. Among those they shot were some who had robbed them. But beyond Maungatawari, where the troops crossed the Waikato, there have been no murders, and several settlers have resided in the interior to this date (June 1st, 1864). All down the Waikato, the Thames, Coromandel, (where many Europeans are digging, and an extensive timber trade is going on,) and all down the East Coast, not one settler has been robbed by the natives, and here they might all have been cut off. The natives have acted on the defensive all along; and when we leave off fighting they do the same."

All this, be it observed, took place several days before the perpetration of the first act of reprisal, timely warning having been given by the natives themselves to the Europeans who had settled in the Waikato country, and who were allowed to remove their goods without molestation. But Mr. Fox is perfectly silent on this subject. Surely outrage and violence, when committed by Christian Englishmen, are as much deserving of reprobation as similar acts when committed by men who have scarcely begun to emerge from an civilized state. "Early in the struggle," says Mr. Fox, "Thompson, who may be regarded as the leader of the rebel party, announced in writing, under his own hand, his determination to carry the war to the "utmost extremity, not even sparing unarmed persons." It is to be regretted that the Colonial Secretary did not give the text of this document, so that we might judge of its exact impart and meaning. We presume the honourable gentleman alludes to William Thompson's letter to Archdeacon Brown of Tauranga, which was not a missive threatening the massacre of unarmed persons, but one of simple warning. In a letter to the Governor, dated the 1st of August 1863, he says:—"On this very day I came to Waikato with all my tribe. I have a word to say to you about my letter to Minister Brown. A warning from me to you to bring to the town the defenceless, lest they be killed at their farms in the country. But you are well acquainted with the customs of the Maori race." Thompson would surely never have given this thoughtful warning to the exposed settlers if he had been anxious to carry the war to "the last extremity." There is something absolutely disingenuous in this studied mise-presentation of what was really a chivalric act, especially when we are assured, on good authority, that no settlers' property has been destroyed at Tauranga, the settlement at which Archdeacon Brown resides, and that many of the settlers continue to live at that place, their vessels still trading along the coast as though no such calamity as war had desolated the country. But this calumny is only in keeping with the systematic conduct of the Government towards William Thompson. He is a man, who, if he were a leader of a European people, would be exalted to the skies as a patriot; but who, being a simple New-Zealand Chief, is only deemed worthy of being made food for powder or for slander. It is true that he is called the "rebel leader," but it is not the less true that he advocated peace up to the last moment. When he visited Auckland, seven years ago, he was received with studied coldness, and refused an interview with the Governor, although his influence as the chief of one of the most powerful of the Waikato tribes, and his extraordinary capacity both as a statesman and an orator (the reader need not fear that either word is misapplied), rendered it manifestly desirable that his goodwill should be conciliated, and his offers of service accepted. He upheld the king movement solely with a view to preserve and elevate his own race. Again and again he interposed to prevent his countrymen from provoking a collision with the colonial authorities. Again and again did he risk his influence in order to prevent war. He opposed every attempt made by his great rival, Rewi, to induce the Waikatos to espouse the quarrel of William King at Taranaki, although he knew (as we now know on the authority of Governor Grey himself) that that quarrel was a just one. He went to Taranaki in person; and, at the risk of his life, endeavoured to persuade the tribes who were at war with us to lay down their arms. His mission was so far successful, that to him belongs the credit of having terminated hostilities which might otherwise have been indefinitely prolonged. Yet war was proclaimed against him equally with the natives who had rendered active assistance to the Taranaki insurgents. No distinction was drawn between him and the chiefs who, against his remon-strances, had taken part in the Waitara contest. He committed no act of war; and while it is true he has received the title of "the King maker"—the New-Zealand Warwick, he has established a still better claim to the designation of a peace maker. As we have seen, Mr. Fox has made the absurd statement that the Waikatos attacked Auckland. If William Thompson had ever entertained any such design, no one knows better than the Colonial Secretary, that when,
during the Taranaki war, Auckland was denuded of troops, the way to the capital lay open to him, and that he had but to give the signal to ensure its destruction. But he did not give that signal, because he did not want war. Yet Mr. Fox can write of him as though he had always been our remorseless foe, as vindictive and unspARING to defenceless settlers as to the soldiers arrayed against him in battle.

All must deplore the atrocities which have been committed during the progress of this war. It is the curse of every war that the innocent suffer with, and sometimes for, the guilty; that non-combatants are often exposed to greater peril than those who fight behind entrenchments, or throw live shells into their enemy's works. We admit, and admit with deep sorrow, that some settlers have been murdered, and that much of their property in the outlying districts has been destroyed.

Not the least of the many unhappy results of this war is the reactionary influence it has exercised on that portion of the natives who have been gradually led back to the practice of many of their old superstitious and barbarous rites. Still we believe that this has been the case only with a small number of the Maories, and that the great body of them have acted in the spirit of the proclamation issued by the Tauranga chiefs:—

"March, 28, 1864: Portriwhi District of Tauranga.—To the Colonel—Friend, salutations to you The end of that. Friend, do you give heed to our laws for the fight. Rule 1. If wounded or whole, and the butt of the musket or hilt of the sword be turned to me (he) will be saved. Rule 2. If any Pakeha, being a soldier by name, shall be travelling unarmed, and meets me, he will be captured and handed over to the directors of the law. Rule 3. The soldier who flies being carried away by his fears, and goes to the house of the priest with his gun (even though carrying arms) will be saved. I will not go there. Rule 4. The unarmed Pakehas, women, and children, will be spared. The end. These are binding laws Tauranga. By TERE PUIMAUNKA, WI KOTIRO, PENI AMPOU, KETETI, PATERIKI."

But it is to the credit of William Thompson that he gave timely notice to the Europeans settlers in the Waikato country to leave for a place of safety; and that the New-Zealand chiefs have, with a few exceptions, set their faces against the mutilation of the dead, and other barbarous practices, in which their native predecessors in warfare were wont to indulge. Much has been said about the murders to which we have referred; but although it is not the fashion to apply the epithet of murder to any of the usages' of so-called civilized warfare, we may well doubt whether, in the sight of morality, these false distinctions can be maintained. For example, "Vindex," in writing to the Morning Star, gives the following quotation from a private letter:—

"Auckland, N. Z.,

"My dear—,

We have had another fight: twenty on our side killed and forty wounded: Captain Ring, 18th Regiment, dead, and another Captain just dying. 1500 British surrounded 250 Maories and forty women and children in an entrenched pah. General Cameron attempted to take it by storm, but was repulsed again and again. He then had recourse to sap, and, after three days' working, blew up the pah. The brave Maori defenders, in a most gallant manner, cut their way through our lines, and escaped, though not without leaving 100 killed, including all the women and children. Credat Judæus! This was truly a most gallant affair on the part of the natives, equal to the famous charge of the 600 at Balaklava. Before General Cameron blew up the place he offered to give them their lives if they would surrender. 'No,' every Maori said: 'we prefer death to slavery, and will fight for ever! for ever! for ever!' Honour to the brave! All the women and children were, it is said, blown up in the pah.

"On the 20th of February the troops surrounded and set fire to some native huts or wharries, and when the poor Maories, who had gone inside for protection, ran out imploring for mercy, they were all shot dead like dogs by the colonial assailants. Since that affair the natives appear to have dispersed; but no doubt they will soon turn up when and where least expected. The troops are shortly to go into quarters for the winter, at fixed stations, and orders have been given by the commissariat for six hundred thousand feet of sawn timber for building huts."

Truly, the shooting down of women and children, the setting fire to native huts, and the refusing of quarter to the inmates when they rushed out, "imploring for mercy," are episodes of the war with which the British public, who are expected to pay the cost of the slaughter, and to be enthusiastic in supporting the colonial cause, should be made acquainted, no less than with those other, but not darker horrors, which have excited the humane indignation of Mr. Fox and his colleagues.

Governor Grey's despatch on this affair is as follows:—

"Government House, Auckland,

"April 21, 1864."
"My Lord Duke,—Adverting to my despatch No 55. of this day's date, transmitting the official despatches relating to an attack upon the entrenched position at Orakau, I have the honour to enclose a nominal return of the native prisoners under treatment for wounds received in the action. Unfortunately, it appears from this return that nearly one-forth of the number are females.

I have, &c, "G.G.

The following is the list of the women:—

- Piririri, gunshot, both hips, died 4th April.
- Maiata, gunshot, right foot.
- Harriet, gunshot, left elbow.
- Mali, gunshot, left arm, cheit.
- Hica, gunshot, chest.
- Katai, gunshot, right thigh.

(Signed) "Wm. J. SPENCER, Assistant-Surgeon, 18th R.I."

It is unnecessary to give the list of the men who were wounded in this engagement.

But there is another question connected with the war, upon which Mr. Fox does not touch, but which certainly deserves some consideration at the hands of the taxpayers of Great Britain. We allude to the means by which the natives have been able to accumulate those munitions of war, without which they could not have risen in arms, or waged a long and desperate struggle. The mischief was done by the relaxation, in 1857, of the ordinance prohibiting the sale of arms and gunpowder to the natives—a proceeding which was strongly resisted at the time by the Acting-Governor, General Wynyard, and by Bishop Selwyn and the principal Missionaries. But love of profit overcame all sense of prudence; and, in a moment of weakness, Governor Browne yielded to the pressure which was brought to bear upon him by Mr. Richmond's Ministry. Both the character of this measure and its disastrous effects are well described in a pamphlet recently published, and the writer of which, we may remark, is a gentleman who does not write from hearsay, but from a personal knowledge of the facts which he details. That gentleman says:—

"The plea forearming the Maories, set up by the Colonial Councillors of Governor Browne, and used in his despatches to the Secretary of State, as well as afterwards advanced by the supporters of colonial misrule in the Imperial Parliament, was, 'that the natives were enabled to smuggle from the vessels along the coast any amount of arms and gunpowder:' it was therefore expedient to make such traffic lawful, so that all the merchants and settlers in the colony might derive the benefit of the "trade thereby. The consequence of such unwise policy was, that almost unlimited supplies of guns, rifles, and gunpowder, were imported and sold to the Maories, who, in fact, scarcely ever spent their money in purchasing any thing else from 1857 till the declaration of the war in February 1860, a period of about three years, during which time many of the chiefs, in the Waikato and elsewhere, built large magazines, and hoarded up the armaments which have since been turned against the troops and colonists. It was quite a common thing to see canoes laden with thirty or forty barrels of powder leaving Auckland An order from the resident magistrate had only to be obtained for the sale and shipment, but these orders from a servant of the Colonial Government were treated quite as a matter of course, and were commonly signed in blank, and filled up by a clerk when required, either for a barrel or a ton of gunpowder, or for one gun or a case of rifles. The latter were invariably imported and sold under the designation of fowling-pieces, guns, or musket's, the sale of rifles being prohibited by Governor Gore Browne and his ministry.

Supposing that the reasons advanced for this wholesale arming of the aborigines had even been valid, because, occasionally, a few barrels of powder and a few old muskets were smuggled along the coast, common-sense dictates that the right course would have been to make the restrictions more stringent than those of Sir George Grey, and the punishment much greater in the event of infringements; but this method the Governor and the same Councillors neglected to adopt until the latter end of 1860, long after they had committed themselves to a war with the natives by the forcible seizure of 600 acres of land, before they had completed the purchase thereof; these acts become, therefore, the best commentaries on the former conduct of those who are morally responsible for such fearful results; and the proof of the difficulties in smuggling 'any quantity of arms and gunpowder along the coast, since the restrictions were reimposed, is evinced by the difficulties the Maories now have in obtaining additional supplies, one having, it is said, recently offered 600 sovereigns for 300 boxes of percussion caps.' And by later accounts, a Maori woman offered a sovereign for a few brass eyelet-holes, by filling the centre of which with phosphorus, scrapped off lucifer-matches, the natives find them available for use in lieu of percussion cap?, thus proving their cleverness as well as the extremities to which they are at present reduced for munitions of war."

No more striking proof could be given of the fact, that to the suicidal policy of the colonists themselves is the ability of the Maories to carry on war mainly due; and, like many other facts which might be cited, it justifies the inference, that so long as the expenses of their wars are paid by a credulous public at home, they
will continue reckless of the consequences which might flow from their selfish acts, and regardful only of their own mercenary gains. Money could be made by selling arms to the natives; and so hucksters trafficked with them in the dangerous weapons, heedless of all warning and remonstrance. Money too is now made out of the huge contracts which war brings in its train, and so, to a class at least, war has its bright and tempting side. It is true it is now being carried on under the mask of patriotism, and professedly to vindicate the outraged majesty of the law; but the same lust for gold is really instigating its prosecution to the bitter end.

But Mr. Fox tells us that no considerable body of the natives have made "the slightest overtures of peace." Let The New Zealander again furnish the reply to this astounding statement:

"Compare the sweeping declaration of the Memorandum with, for example, the following. In the lately issued Blue Book, the Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, we find the subjoined letters. We take the official translations:

"Ngaruawahia,

O Friend, O Governor,—

Salutation! This is to say to you, the fight has been fought, and some are dead, some alive. Restore to us Waikato. Let it suffice for you, the men who are dead. Return to ua those who live. Enough From your friend,

"PENE PUKAWHAU
"From all the Chiefs of Waikato."
"To the foregoing 'small overture of peace,' the following was the reply [the Italics are ours]:—

"Auckland,

"Pene Pukawhau,—

"Your letter has arrived, and the matter has been carefully considered This is the reply to you, and also to all the people of Ngaruawahia.

The Governor will hold in communication with you while you continue in arms; but give up all your guns, your powder, and all your arms to the Governor: then only will a way of communication he open for you: at present there is none. That is the word. From your friend,

"W. Fox."
"Before this reply of Mr. Fox reached its destination, the anxious chiefs renewed their solicitation as follows:—

"Ngaruawahia,

"O Friend, O Governor,

"Salutations! O Friend, we are awaiting the reply to our letter. Can it have reached you or not? These are the words of that letter: Restore the Waikato men; suffice for you the dead. Enough.

"From the Chiefs of Waikato.
"From PENE PUKAWHAU."
"To this reiterated appeal the following answer was vouchsafed:—

"Government House,

"O all you Chiefs of Waikato,"O Pene Pukewhau,—

"Your letter of the 2nd December has readied me. Sons, my words to you are these. The General must go uninterrupted to Ngaruawahia; the flag of the Queen must be hoisted there. Then I will talk to you."
"(Signed)
G. GREY, Governor"

"Do these letters comprise no overture of peace, not even 'the smallest from a leading tribe'? Was it the opinion of Mr. Fox when he wrote the foregoing letter? Was it the opinion of His Excellency the Governor when he promised to talk to the Waikato chiefs, after Ngaruawahia should have been taken? But the Colonial Ministers are honourable men, and they do declare to us—or rather, they declare to the Earl of CHICHESTER and the other gentlemen of the Aborigines' Protection Society,—the 'regret' which they feel in having to 'state, that down to this date,' the 5th of May 1864, 'the rebels have not as a body, nor have any leading tribes, made the smallest overture of peace.' Such is the ministerial declaration officially signed by the Honourable 'W. Fox.'"

"It is a well-known fact," says Mr. Fox, "that in their intertribal wars, the natives universally regard any overtures of peace as a sign that the party who makes it is beaten, and that it is an acknowledgment of defeat." This does not explain why the letter of the Waikato chiefs was only met by a declaration that Ngaruawahia must be captured before any overtures could be listened to; or why Bishop Selwyn's and Mr. George Graham's offer to act as mediators was refused. Still less does it justify a Christian Government in coolly electing to act in accordance with the usages of a semi-civilized race, and in deliberately putting aside every generous and magnanimous impulse. What better is the civilization which we make it our boast that we have established in New Zealand, than the barbarism which it is designed to supplant, if the Christian rulers of the colony have not the courage to act in accordance with its humanizing ideas? The truth is, that when they wish to punish the natives, or to hold them up to public reprobation, they stigmatize their customs as barbarous; but when it suits their convenience, they make the existence, or rather, in this case, the alleged existence of those customs the pretext for acting upon precisely the same principles. But while Mr. Fox has sought for a precedent in the barbarous practices of uncivilized tribes, unfortunately for his argument, the precedent is rather the other way. For example, when the famous New-Zealand warrior, Hongi Hike, conquered the Waikato country, he was the first to offer terms of peace; and he gave up to his vanquished foes the very territories which he had subdued. And when the Waikatos, in their turn, conquered Taranaki, they were the first to make overtures of peace, and they, too, abstained from retaking the lands which they had acquired by the power of their arms. Again, the New-Zealand Ministry, in vindicating the confiscation of the Maori lands, aver that "it is a custom which has been always recognised by the Maories themselves."

In an able article on this subject, the New Zealander says:—"Confiscation is not customary among the natives of New Zealand, never having been recognised by Maori law. The New Zealanders, in the darkest days of their heathenism, evinced a high appreciation of natural justice, and their moral perceptions on this head have been sharpened by their acceptance of Christianity. It is admitted that certain lands, accidentally, as it were, occasionally fell into the hands of conquerors, but their title thereto was never acknowledged while an individual member of the vanquished tribe remained alive. The conquerors, in taking possession of the deserted territory, were looked upon as unlicensed squatters, nor did they consider their title valid during the lifetime of any individual man, woman, or child, of the original owners of the soil. In land transactions with the native tribes, this law seems to have been almost always respected by Europeans, and, when ignored, the Maories insisted that the violation of their ancient statute, by force of arms; hence the native feuds, to prevent which risings a number of leading chiefs instituted the system gene rally known as the 'Land League.' As for fighting for the mere acquisition of land, no one dared to avow such a motive, as he would have been looked upon as a common robber. Their boundary lines were well defined, for any encroachment upon which they would fight to the death; but to raise an army for the ostensible purpose of confiscation was, in no era of New Zealand history, so far as we can learn, ever attempted by the Maori tribes."

Herein Mr. Fox confounds two things which essentially differ. The natives, in their inter-tribal wars, have unquestionably recognised the right of confiscation; but they have never done so as regards the lands of rebels. Archdeacon Hadfield puts the matter so clearly, in a private letter, that we cannot do better than quote his words. He says:—"Confiscation is the act of the sovereign power in reference to the property of its rebellious subjects. Now I have no hesitation in saying that no Maori ruler ever so acted in regard to the property of their own people; that confiscation of the property of any so called rebels was unknown to Maori custom."

"It is possible that (through a confusion of ideas very common with our colonial statesmen) Mr. Fox is referring to the annexation of the lands of conquered enemies. But if so, it seems a strange mistake of Mr. Fox to make, inasmuch as he, on assuming office, brought prominently forward, as an essential part of his policy, that the Maories were not to be treated as foreign enemies, but as rebels.

"It is true that Maories did annex portions of the territory of opposing tribes whenever victory gave them an opportunity of so doing; but it is equally true that the conquered tribe did not acquiesce in the spoliation, but considered itself bound in honour to recover its lost possessions whenever an opportunity offered. It is true, as
stated by Mr. Fox, that such acquired possessions have frequently been purchased by the Government; but the Government had no alternative but to acknowledge rights to property as they found them when the treaty of Waitangi was made. This, however, is hardly an adequate statement of the case, for in almost every instance with which I am acquainted, compensation has been given to the injured owner. There can be no doubt that the confiscation policy has driven numbers into rebellion who otherwise would have kept aloof from war. It will also lay the foundation of future troubles: outrages will be perpetually committed on any occupants of the confiscated lands. Nothing could have been more unhorse than an imitation of Maori proceedings in former wars. Imitations are proverbially bad. Rangireata, whom Mr. Fox cites as an authority, once said that he was the undisputed owner of some conquered lands, for—he had eaten the original occupants. If Mr. Fox were prepared to follow his example in this also, future occupants of the Waikato and other confiscated districts might reside in security on their acquisitions. You will gather from what I say that I condemn in the most unqualified terms the the whole plan of confiscation. The bitterest enemy of the Government could not have suggested a policy more detrimental and more pregnant with evil for the future."

It is unnecessary to follow Mr. Fox through the specious arguments by which he endeavours to prove that the complete defeat of the Maories in the field, coupled with the confiscation of a portion of their lands, as "a material guarantee," is necessary to insure their submission. If such a policy is persisted in, it can only lead to the extermination of the entire race; and this is a result from which we hope Mr. Fox would shrink, however gratifying it might be to some of his supporters. Mr. Fox dilates upon the danger with which the rebellion has menaced the very existence of the colony; but the justice of his cause cannot be proved by any considerations of this kind. In considering what punishment should be inflicted upon the rebels, regard must he had to the origin of the war. Who provoked the natives to embark in a struggle which has cost them far more than it has or will cost the colony? Mr. Fox's only hope for the future of the race is in compelling them to acknowledge "the supremacy of law," and not only to convince them that they have made a mistake, but to make them bear its consequences. He forgets that no effort was made to teach them "the supremacy of law," until the lesson was too late to be efficacious; that they had been uniformly treated, not as subjects, but as a virtually independent people; that the treaty which imparted to them all the rights of British subjects, has been practically regarded as so much waste paper, except that provision of it which confered upon the Government the privileges of land-buying monopolists. His whole argument for confiscation is based upon the assumption, that as every other method, save war, had been previously tried by the dominant race, in their efforts to win the obedience and to promote the elevation of the Maories, there is now no alternative but to administer to them the severest chastisement which Armstrong guns and Enfield rifles can inflict, and to add thereto the loss of their lands. He entirely overlooks the fact that the other plan has never been tried; that the natives have only been British subjects in name; and that their ideas of the intentions of the Government towards them have been not unnaturally derived from the shameless columns of the anti-aboriginal portion of the press, and the unscrupulous speeches of the annexation party in the General Assembly. To his eye the native is simply a rebel deserving of condign punishment, and that punishment must assume the form of confiscation; not, of course, because the settlers want the land but because the Maories will only respect a peace which is accompanied by "a material guarantee." It is worthy of remark, that when Governor Grey made peace with the natives of the Bay of Islands in 1846, he did not confiscate their lands, and the result has been that they have remained our steadfast friends to this hour, and have sold all their waste lands to the Government at the rate of sixpence an acre. When the war in the province of Wellington was brought to a termination, the same enlightened Governor abstained from that policy of confiscation which Mr. Fox so highly enlogises, and the natives have from that time to the present exhibited an unbroken loyalty; and they also (perhaps unwisely) have sold immense districts of their lands for a few pence per acre. When Mr. Fox urges that confiscation is necessary to ensure submission, he strangely overlooks these indisputable and most suggestive facts in the history of the colony. The truth is, that confiscation is persisted in, because the colonists want the land but because the Maories will only respect a peace which is accompanied by "a material guarantee," is necessary to insure their submission. If such a policy is persisted in, it can only lead to the complete defeat of the Maories in the field, coupled with the confiscation of a portion of their lands, as "a material guarantee," is necessary to insure their submission. If such a policy is persisted in, it can only lead to
however, has fortunately saved his country from the awful guilt and dishonour of such a crime. If, in addition, he will give a new assurance to the natives that their ownership of the soil, as secured by the treaty of Waitangi, will be scrupulously maintained; if he will detach the Government from the undignified and mischievous business of land-buying, and give his sanction to a well considered plan for the establishment of municipal institutions in the native districts, and the representation of the Maories in the General Assembly, he will do much to avert from a noble race the doom with which it is threatened. But we can not hope for the adoption or the success of any policy of the kind, until the colonial Government is deprived of the management of native affairs, and the Governor, in attempting a just settlement of the native difficulty, is no longer liable to be thwarted by the selfish intrigues or the fluctuating opinions of the local Parliament.

Signed on behalf of the Committee of the Aborigines' Protection Society,

R. N. Fowler, M.A., Chairman.
Thomas Hodgkin, M.D., Secretaries.
F. W. Chesson, Secretaries.

November, 1864.

Appendix.

Address to the Governor,

To his Excellency Sir GEORGE GREY, K.C.B., Governor of New Zealand.

SIR,—The unhappy war which is now raging in New Zealand between the Maories and their English rulers has excited the most deep and painful interest in this country. It was generally hoped that the contest which recently took place in the province of Taranaki would have been the last of those painful collisions which have proved as inimical to the best interests of the colony as they have been disastrous to the native race. This hope was confirmed by the spirit with which your Excellency entered upon the duties of your high office, and especially by the persevering efforts you made to establish a system of self-government in the native districts. We cannot express to you with what profound regret we have witnessed the failure of those wise and beneficent measures, and how deeply we sympathize with you in the peculiarly trying position in which you are now placed.

The justice which has ever been the great characteristic of your Excellency's administration of native affairs is a pledge to the world that the war which is now being waged will be limited to the one object of restoring British supremacy in the disturbed districts, and of achieving an honourable and, if possible, a lasting peace. Occupying as you do a position at once so difficult and so responsible, we would not venture to offer any suggestions of our own, did we not feel that Englishmen, even at so great a distance, ought not to regard the momentous events now transpiring in New Zealand with indifference or even with silence.

We would therefore express our earnest hope that your Excellency will avail yourself of the first favourable opportunity which may present itself of endeavours to terminate the war by negotiation, and especially that you will listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms may make. This course will, we are sure, so commend itself to your sense of humanity and Christian feeling that we should scarcely presume to urge it upon your consideration, did we not feel that your hands might be strengthened by this expression of our opinion—an opinion which we believe to be shared by the great body of the British people.

We have, however, been alarmed by the pertinacity with which in some quarters it has been proposed to confiscate the lands of all contumacious and rebellious natives. As has been truly observed, such a policy as this would shut the door to any possible settlement of the difficulty, except by the sword; in other words, it would lead to the extermination of a people who value their property in the soil even more than their existence, and who, despite their faults, are worthy of a better fate. We can conceive of no surer means of adding fuel to the flame of war—of extending the area of disaffection—and of making the natives fight with the madness of despair, than a policy of confiscation. It could not fail to produce in New Zealand the same bitter fruits of which it has yielded so plentiful a harvest in other countries where the strife of races has been perpetuated through successive generations, and that, too, with a relentlessness and a cruelty which have made mankind blush for the species.

We therefore pray, that in the hour of victory your Excellency will temper justice with mercy, and give to the world another bright example of forbearance and magnanimity. By such means, and such means only, may we hope to see the Maori race saved from extinction, and the dominion of our beloved Queen firmly established over every portion of the islands of New Zealand.
With great respect, we have the honour to be, Sir, Your Excellency's faithful servants,
(Signed) Chichester;
Ebury, P.C., Moor Park, Rickmansworth;
Walter C. Trevelyan, Bart;
John Hesketh Lethbridge, Bart;
Wilfrid Lawson, Bart;
S. Gurney, M.P.;
W. E. Forster, M-P.;
Thomas Barnes, M.P.;
Henry Pease, M.P.;
Thomas Bazley, M.P.;
William Williams, M.P.;
P. A. Taylor, M.P.;
Edward Baines, M.P.;
E. A. Leatham, M.P.;
John Brady, M.P.;
Samuel Morley;
Thomas Fowell Buxton;
T. Perronnet Thompson, Lieutenant-General;
Edward Miall;
R. N. Fowler, Treasurer of the Aborigines' Protection Society;
Samuel Lucas;
Thomas Guthrie, D.D., Edinburgh;
Thomas Binney;
Charles J. Hadfield, Colonel;
William Howitt;
Henry Salwey, Colonel;
J. E. Cairnes, Professor of Jurisprudence, &c. Queen's University, Ireland;
F. W. Newman, late Professor at University College, London;
Newman Hall, L.L.B.;
J. Humffreys Parry, Serjeant-at-Law;
Samuel Stott, Mayor of Rochdale;
Leone Levi, Professor of Commerce and Commercial Law, King's College, London;
Charles Sturge;
Henry Christy;
Joseph Pease, Darlington;
George Thompson;
David Thomas, D-D.;
Henry Richard;
John Nichol, B.A. Oxon;
Duncan M'Laren, Newington House, Edinburgh;
Edward Smith, Sheffield;
Frederick Baines. Leeds;
Benjamin Scott, F.R.A.S.;
Edmond Beales, M.A., Lincoln's Inn;
Edmund Sturge, Birmingham;
John Lee, L.L.D., Hartwell;
Jabez Burns, D.D.;
Joseph Cooper, Lloyd's;
John Cropper, Liverpool;
John Hodgkin, Lewes;
Henry Vincent;
Washington Wilks;
L. A. Chamerovzow;
George Gilfillan, Dundee;
John Cassell;
Arthur Trevelyan, J.P.M Teinholm Tranent, N.B.;
Government House, Auckland, 

April 7, 1864.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th of January, transmitting me an address which had been very numerously and influentially signed, in which a hope was expressed that I would avail myself of the first favourable opportunity which presented itself of endeavouring to terminate by negotiation the war unhappily existing in New Zealand, and especially that I would listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms may make.

Your letter, and the address which it encloses, shall be forwarded to my responsible advisers for their consideration; but in the mean time I can have no hesitation in saying that the wishes and instructions of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle impose on me as a duty that which is entirely in consonance with my own feelings and with yours, viz. that I should instantly listen to any reasonable overtures that the natives in arms may make, and that I should avail myself of any opportunity that offers of obtaining permanent peace for this colony. I am quite confident that general public opinion in this country will support me in taking this course, and would expect me to do so.

With regard to the confiscation of portions of the lands of the natives now in arms, this point has to be considered—that mercy requires that future contests between the two races should, in as far as practicable, be prevented, and that there are many tribes in New Zealand who have taken no part in the present lamentable conflicts, yet who might hereafter be led into similar acts; whilst nothing would more certainly lead to the extermination of the native race than a series of contests such as that which is now being carried on. The object of the local Government, therefore, has been to secure to that numerous part of the native population who have taken no active share in the present war the whole of their landed possessions, and also by laws passed expressly for this object to give to the lands held by such natives a value greater than they have previously had for their owners, by, in all respects, giving them equal rights in their landed possessions with those enjoyed by their European fellow-subjects, the intention in this respect being to show that the rights of peaceable citizens, of whatever race, are carefully respected, and to give the natives so valuable a stake in the country that they are not likely hereafter to hazard it lightly.

On the other hand, it was thought necessary by an example to show that those who rose in arms against their fellow-subjects of another race suffered such a punishment for doing so as might deter others from embarking in a similar career. It is therefore proposed to deprive such persons of a considerable portion of their landed properties, and to provide for the future safety of the colony by occupying such lands with an European population.

But even in the case of these persons it is intended that sufficient lands shall be reserved for themselves and their descendants, to be held on the same tenure as lands are henceforth to be secured to the rest of the native population.

That these measures will be carried out in a spirit of liberal generosity and of mercy I earnestly hope, and will do my best to ensure: and in my efforts for this end I believe that I shall be supported by a large majority in
this colony.

You will much oblige me by returning this answer to those noblemen and gentlemen who signed the address which you forwarded to me.

I have, &c,
(Signed) G. GREY.
F.W. CHESSON, Esq.

Letter From the Hon. William Fox.

New Zealand Colonial Secretary's Office, Auckland,

4th May 1864.

MY LORD,—The letter which you and other noblemen and gentlemen connected with the Aborigines' Society addressed to His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B., Governor of this colony, in January last, has been referred by His Excellency to his responsible advisers.

They have submitted their opinions upon it to His Excellency in the form of an official memorandum, of which, at His Excellency's suggestion, they have now the honour to forward a copy to you; and of which His Excellency will forward one to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

As the letter in which your Lordship and the other subscribers impugned the policy of confiscation, which the New-Zealand Government has adopted, was published by you, at the date of its transmission to the colony in the "London Times" and other newspapers, I venture respectfully to express a hope that you will give similar publicity to the enclosed memorandum.

I have the honor to be, MY LORD,
Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

WILLIAM FOX, Colonial Secretary.

The Right Honourable Earl Chichester, 22, Grosvenor Place, London, S.W.

Memorandum for his Excellency the Governor.

1. MINISTERS have received a copy of the letter addressed to His Excellency the Governor by Lord Chichester, and several other gentlemen connected with the "Aborigines' Protection Society" in London, relative to the "war which is now raging in New Zealand between the Maoris and their English rulers," on which they beg to make the following remarks:—

2. The only two points in the letter which appear to call for any remark are—First, the hope expressed that His Excellency the Governor "would avail himself of the first favourable opportunity of endeavouring to terminate the war by negociation, and especially that he would listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms might make;" and secondly, a protest against the confiscation of the lands of the rebel tribes.

3. With regard to the first of these points, Ministers regret to state, that, down to this date, the rebels have not as a body, nor have any leading tribes, made he smallest overture of peace. At the commencement of the present unhappy struggle, they appear to have entertained a firm conviction that they could drive the Europeans out of this island, and they commenced by a desperate attack upon Auckland, the seat of Government. Early in the struggle, Thompson, who may be regarded as the leader of the rebel party, announced in writing, under his own hand, his determination to carry the war to the utmost extremity, not even sparing unarmed persons. Acting in this spirit, the Maoris threw themselves into the heart of the settled districts of the Province of Auckland, murdering and destroying the settlers within seventeen miles of the town, cutting down the Government flagstaff at the Manukau, the western harbour of the city of Auckland itself, and driving from their farms and homesteads a tolerably dense population of agricultural settlers over the space of some twenty miles square. So sudden was their onslaught, and so completely did they succeed in getting possession of the country close round Auckland, that it was not till after the fall of Rangiriri—five months at least after the commencement of the struggle—that they were driven back, and routed out of the wooded ranges, to such an
extent that even the city and immediate suburbs of Auckland could be considered safe. Since that period they have been driven, or escaped from, one stronghold after another, till they have been compelled to evacuate the whole of Waikato proper: they have retreated before our troops to a distance of 120 miles from Auckland, and their main body is understood to be broken into two or three sections, the principal of which appears to have descended upon Tauranga, in the Bay of Plenty, where, with the resident rebels of that district, they are again defying the British troops, and throwing up aggressive works within a distance of three miles of our posts. During all this time they have not, as a body, shewn the smallest symptom of any desire to terminate the war, nor have they made any overtures of peace. On the contrary, they continue to make the most strenuous efforts to recruit their forces by enlistment among the East-Coast tribes, whom they encourage to join them by the most monstrous falsehoods, which are circulated by express authority of Thompson and the other leaders, and by means of which they have hitherto succeeded in deluding considerable numbers into the belief that the rebellion has been successful, and that they have only to join it to see the final establishment in triumph of the Maori king. (See Appendix A.)

It is a well-known fact, that, in their intertribal wars, the natives invariably regard any overtures of peace as a sign that the party who makes it is beaten; that it is an acknowledgment of defeat. It is a matter, therefore, of the utmost delicacy to initiate such negociations, as nothing could be more fatal to the prospect of actual peace than that the rebels should be able to announce to the distant or non-committed tribes that we had placed ourselves in that position. Such tentative efforts in that direction as the Government has thought it prudent to make, have at once been seized on by Thompson as indications of weakness, and he has on various occasions encouraged his followers (and no doubt it has operated to keep them in arms) by assurances that “the Governor and General are now suing for peace.” The time, however, has now arrived when, by the fall of Maungatautari, the last of the fortified strongholds of Waikato, the conquest of that district and its inhabitants is practically complete, though the latter may no doubt still carry the war into other parts of the island, as they are doing at Tauranga. Still the event referred to seemed to ministers to afford a fair opportunity for making a general announcement of the terms on which the rebellion might be terminated, by the issue, by His Excellency the Governor, of a proclamation; and ministers have accordingly advised His Excellency to issue one, the terms of which have been settled by them after much earnest thought and discussion.

While such has been the action of the Government in reference to the rebels as a body, the door has never been closed against such individuals as might be desirous of laying down their arms, or returning to their allegiance without any personal punishment whatever. Numerous efforts have been made by the Government to induce them to do so. On the 16th of December last, immediately after the capture of Ngaurawahia (the king’s palace), a document was sent to the rebels, in which their principal chiefs were invited to visit the Governor, in order that they might learn the future intentions of the Government towards them; and they were distinctly assured, under the hand of the Governor, that if the rebels would give up their arms, they would not be made prisoners, nor be in any way molested in their persons, for any part they might have taken in the present or any former war. On the 6th of January last, the Colonial Secretary issued instructions to the resident magistrates as to the course to be pursued towards rebels who might surrender, and an abstract of these instructions was circulated, and has been kept before the eyes of the natives in every part of the island. The terms have been generally admitted, at least by those not actually engaged in hostilities, as extremely fair, and a very considerable number of rebels have actually come in under the terms offered, given up their arms, and signed a declaration of allegiance.

On the 30th of March last, immediately previous to the evacuation of Maungatautari, William Nero, a friendly chief of the highest rank, closely related to the leading rebels, informed the Colonial Secretary, personally and by letter, that he had reason to believe that the rebels were desirous of making peace, but were deterred by the fear that their leaders would be hung; and he suggested that he might be allowed to proceed to the rebel camp in order to disabuse their minds of this supposition. The Colonial Secretary at once acquiesced in the proposal. (See Correspondence, Appendix B.) Nero proceeded on his mission, but entirely failed, not even an interview being granted with the leading chiefs. Two or three men of rank, whom he persuaded to come in and sign a declaration that in two days they would bring in all their tribe, left again on the following day under pretence that they would return with all those people, amounting to some 200 souls. They did not, however, even return themselves, but very adroitly contrived to thrust upon us some sixty or seventy women, children, and decrepit old men, who were a burden on their commissariat, and an impediment to their movements. This was all that was gained on our side by this well-intentioned, but certainly not very successful attempt to remove what was believed by some to be the only obstacle to the restoration of peace. It should be observed, also, that, during these negociations, Thompson, by letter addressed to Nero, affected a great desire to see peace restored. Yet, at the very moment he was writing such letter, he appears to have been organizing a new campaign.

Ministers repeat that, in their opinion, the very greatest caution ought to be exercised in pressing the natives
to come to terms. Everyone who knows the Maori must know, that, even in the ordinary business of life, any
exhibition of anxiety to get him to do anything is the certain way to make him hang back from doing it; his
mind, cunning and suspicious beyond that of most races, inferring at once that such anxiety is a sign of
weakness on the part of him who shews it, and that, by standing out, he can obtain his own terms, however
extravagant or unreasonable. On the other hand, ministers have entire faith in the natural results of an actual
defeat of the rebel armies enforced with prudence, with firmness, with mercy; and in such broad general
principles as may operate, not on the mind of one individual here and there, but on the feelings and sentiments
of the entire nation, both that part which has been engaged in active hostilities, and that which has not.

And it must be borne in mind that this latter portion of the native community is to be considered in what is
done, equally with the actual rebel. It would be of little benefit to patch up peace in Waikato, if rebellion were
by that to be encouraged in Cook's Straits or at Ahuriri. Waikato has been, and is, the head of the rebellion, and
the neck of it must be broken there. If a final, permanent, and complete subjugation of Waikato is effected, this
will, in all human probability, be the last instance which will occur of any combined resistance to British
authority and British law. If, in our anxiety to spare the erring Maori race, we press and persuade them to come
to terms before they are really convinced of our superiority, and before we have taken those material guarantees
for the future which it is contemplated to take, we shall to a certainty have, at some future day, to repeat the
lesson which we are now endeavouring to teach. If the present struggle should be terminated without
completely convincing the natives all throughout New Zealand of the folly of trying their strength against the
Europeans, and without a sufficient material guarantee being taken, new outbreaks wilt undoubtedly occur from
time to time, which can only end in chronic hostility of the race, and wars of extermination. The only hope of
saving a remnant of the Maori race is the termination of the present struggle by their full acknowledgment of
their mistake, their full acceptance of its consequences, and submission to the supremacy of law: it will not be
done by treaties of peace which might leave the impression that they are an independent people, or at liberty in
any future imaginary casus belli to take up the sword.

In concluding this part of their remarks, ministers would observe that no time has yet been allowed for the
results of the late campaign to bear their natural fruit It is only three weeks since the final blow was struck in
Waikato, by the capture of Orakau, and evacuation of Maungatautari. The mind of the rebel cannot yet have
fully realized to itself the magnitude of the defeat and its consequences; at all events it does not appear to have
done so. A little patience on our side may, and there is little doubt will, enable us to reap the fruits of the late
costly military operations, while, as already hinted, undue pressure brought to bear on the Natives to induce
them to come to terms, or undue anxiety exhibited on our part to escape the prolongation of the war, will
probably have exactly the reverse effect to that which is intended.

One thing must be borne in mind. This is not a war between two independent nations, living in separate
territory, perhaps hundreds of miles apart. When this rebellion is put down, we have to govern the Maori, to
re-instate him in our community, to live with him, to come under numerous mutual responsibilities, social and
political. A war simply between independent nations involves no such consequences, and may be terminated on
a very different basis; while its termination may be brought about by negotiations which would be very
unsuitable means by which to terminate a struggle of the sort which exists in this Colony.

4. As regards the question of the confiscation of Maori lands, against which a protest is raised, ministers
beg to make the following observations:—

In the first place, it is a custom which has been always recognised by the Maoris themselves. In their wars,
a conquered tribe not only forfeited its lands, but the vanquished survivors were reduced to a tributary position,
and large numbers to personal slavery. The Government of New Zealand has always recognised such a title as
valid. The Waikatos themselves were paid by Governor Hobson, for such a proprietary right over the district of
Taranaki; and a very large proportion, if not an actual majority of the purchases of land from the Maoris in
various parts of the island have been made on the basis of a recognition of this right of conquest. There is
therefore nothing in the course proposed abhorrent to the moral sense, or previous habits of thought, of the
Maori race (See Appendix C.)

In the second place, they never do consider themselves conquered unless their lands are taken. In previous
wars between the British Government and the Maoris, which were not followed by confiscation, friendly
Maoris have expressed their surprise at our moderation. "What is the good," they have said, "of taking the man?
You should have taken his land, then that work would have been finished."

In the third place, when the struggle began, the Maoris openly avowed their intention of taking the land and
farms of the Europeans, when they should have driven us into the sea. It was not uncommon, even before the
war commenced, for some of the more insolent to come to a settler's house, and, after looking the place over, to
say, "Ah, this house will suit me very well, that room will do for my wife, that shall be my bed: wait a little; by
and bye you will see." An instance of this is within the personal knowledge of a Minister. The feeling was
general among the tribes which engaged in, or sympathized with the king movement, after it assumed an
aggressive character, hostile towards the European occupation of the country.

Fourthly The chief object of the Government is, however, neither punishment nor retaliation, but simply to provide a material guarantee against the recurrence of those uprisings against the authority of law, and the legitimate progress of colonization, which are certain to occur if the rebel is allowed to retain his lands after involving the Colony in so much peril, disaster, and loss. The Natives are fond of war, as almost their only source of excitement. The practice of incessant hostilities with each other for centuries, has become a second nature; and though circumstances have to a great extent suspended the operation of their military impulses for some few years, they have neither lost their skill in fighting nor their taste for it. If they can have the excitement and many advantages of a summer's campaign when it pleases them, with liberty to retain their lands when it is over, without suffering any losses except their wretched dwellings and a season's crops, while the colony is nearly broken down by the losses and cost of the war, they will not easily be deterred from renewing hostilities. Mere defeats in the field will not deter them. There must be some more substantial and material guarantee. The guarantee which the Government has proposed is to introduce colonists, chiefly direct from Great Britain, into those districts now sparsely inhabited by the rebels, and from which they make their inroads into the settled districts. It is only on the lands of the rebels, at least in Waikato, that population can be so established. But it is not, and never has been, proposed to leave them without an ample quantity of land for their use and occupation. A quantity, much larger per head than the average occupation of Europeans in this island is proposed to be set apart for them, on a graduated scale, according to rank and other circumstances. These lands would no longer be held under the pernicious system of tribal right, but as individualized properties under the security to each proprietor of a Crown grant. Ministers believe that nothing has been, or can be more pernicious to the native race than the possession of large territories under tribal title, which they neither use, know how to use, nor can be induced to use. It has, in the opinion of Ministers, been the principal cause of the slow progress, and, in some respects (particularly their physical condition), of the actual retrogression and decay of the race. And though, while the Maoris acknowledge the supremacy of a protecting Government, and professed submission to law, it was just to respect those semi-feudal proprietary rights which they declined to surrender, yet now that they have abandoned their allegiance, renounced all submission to law, and staked their all against our all, there seems no longer any reason for respecting privileges which are believed to be equally injurious to their moral, social, and political condition. In the present state of this colony, it is not a question to be argued by reference to the rights of the Maori in times past, when, as an independent people, they were recognised as competent to surrender or retain whatever power or property they might please. It can scarcely be held, that after the events of the last year, the rebel Maori is entitled to take this position. On the other hand, the struggle has become one for the bare existence of the Colony, which, though now apparently secured for the time by the result of the late campaign, but still only held by military posts, it is no less the duty of the Government to take such precaution as may prevent its being again imperilled. The deliberate and almost unanimous opinion of both Houses of Assembly determined the course of action in this matter which forms the basis of the policy of the ministry in reference to the confiscation of the lands of those who have been engaged in the rebellion. The deliberate opinion of ministers is, that to terminate the present insurrection without confiscation of the lands of the rebels, making of course ample provision for their future, would be to surrender every advantage that has been gained, and practically to announce that British rule over the Maori race must cease, and the Northern island be abandoned as a safe place of residence for Her Majesty's European subjects.

WILLIAM FOX, Col.-Sec.

Auckland,

5th May 1864.

APPENDIX A.

Extract from a Letter from the Bishop of Waiapu, dated Turanga (Poverty Bay), April 15th, 1864.

The Reports which are conveyed are of the most absurd character, such as you have had instances of in other quarters; that the losses sustained by the soldiers are something enormous; that the Queen will not send any more soldiers; that England is at war with America and Russia, and other parts of the world; that the soldiers have been driven out of Rangiriri and Meremere; that Auckland is nearly depopulated, and that the Natives of the coast have only to go there and take possession. The latest accounts which arrived while I was at Waiapu spoke of 150 of Ngatiwhakaue being killed, and the coast natives were invited to go and finish the rest,
and drive away the soldiers from Maketu and Tauranga. It was to little purpose that I explained the onward
inarch of troops to Awamutu and Maungatautari: my story was all English and one-sided. I pressed upon their
attention the assurance of the Governor, that the lands of the Natives who remain quiet will not be interfered
with but that those who go to fight will lose their land. Those who are gone to Waikato have held out threats
against all who remain at home; that, on their return from destroying the "Pakehas," they will serve them in like
manner, because they would not join with them."

Extract from a private Letter from a Missionary on the East Coast.

"The most absurdly exaggerated reports are in circulation about our losses at Waikato. When the poor
"Avon" (Steam transport on the river) was injured, she had on board 1000 men, all of whom perished! The
General must have more lives than a cat. He was killed at Waikato, and 20l. taken out of each of his boots. He
went in disguise as a minister to one of the pas (I think Paterangi). The bell was rung, and he took his station in
the pulpit, but counted each person as he entered. As the karakia (Church service) was proceeding, a Maori
noticed some part of the uniform under the surplice; the alarm was given, and the unfortunate General was
despatched. There are several other stories of the same character flying about, which are all implicitly
believed."

Extract from a Letter written by W. Thompson to Natives on the East Coast, professing to
report the engagement at Rangiaohia. (The actual loss to the Natives was above 100, and only
one horse is said to have been killed on our side.)

"Those tribes then went on, and came to close quarters, the one with the bayonet, the other with the
tomahawk. Twenty of the Pakehas fell. It was a hand to hand fight. Then came the cavalry. They now came
upon our party. I called out 'fire'. One volley was fired, and every horse was killed; not one escaped. There was
an end- Ngatiraukawa lost three. Urewera two, Tuwharetoa two, and Rangwewehi one.

"These were all our dead: as for the Pakehas, they had the bed (of death) to themselves.
"The General has proposed to make peace. It is ended.
"From Wi TAMEHAUA,"

Extract from a private Letter from Cook's Straits.

"A man from Rangiaohia (Waikato) has come here. . . .He has damaged his cause by exaggerated
statements. Among others, that 1500 soldiers were killed at Bangiaohia, and that Bishop Sehvyn was now
second in commaud, and rode about with a sword at his side."

APPENDIX B.

Correspondence between W. Nero and Mr. Fox.

"Auckland

30th March, 1864.

"O, friend! O, Mr. Fox! This is the cause of my thoughts which caused me to speak of our going to Wm.
Thompson and the chiefs of Waikato, namely, their desire to come towards life (meaning to leave off fighting),
also to give up their guns, cartouche-boxes, and other munitions of war. The only reason for delaying (carrying
into execution) these thoughts is, fear lest, after having given up their weapons, Wm. Thompson and Matutaera
should be seized and hung. That is their fear.

"Therefore I reflected, and said, Let me be let to go to inspect these words, that I may see the truth of their
words, or the falsity. If I see that it is true (as stated), I will let you know.

"Enough from your friend,
(Signed) "Wi NERO."

"To Mr. Fox.
"Auckland,

31st March 1864.

"FRIEND WM. NERO,—I have read your letter in which you say that the road to life for Wm. Thompson and
the chiefs of Waikato is stopped because they are afraid if they give up their weapons Wm. Thompson and Matutaera will be hung, and you ask that you may be allowed to go to tell them whether this thought is true or false.

Friend William, great is your love for Waikato, to save those men from destruction. This is good. The Government also desires that they should not perish. But that thought of theirs is wrong altogether. The word of the Government is that *all will be spared* if they lay down their arms and agree to live under the Queen's law. Their land will be gone to the Queen, but they will be allowed *enough to live on well*: a Crown grant will be for each. This word is for Matutaera, for Tarapipipi, for all Waikato: *none are excepted but the murderers*. Let not these men, then, be afraid. But let them be quick in giving up their arms, for otherwise the General will not be held in; he will go on till the arms of the rebels are laid down.

"This is a true word. Now if you like to go, go. If you will not go, that also is well. This is that your love for Waikato may save the lives of those men, of Matutaera, of Thompson, and the others.

From you loving friend,

"(Signed) Te Pakiha
William Fox."

**APPENDIX C.**

The custom of confiscation, from a variety of causes, is a fixed one among the Natives, and has been practised for centuries in every part of the colony. When Captain Fitzroy failed to take the Wairau plains after the massacre of 1843, Rangihaeata, the principal actor on that occasion, said, "He paukena te Pakeha,"—the Governor is soft: he is a pumpkin.

W. F.

**Mr. Cardwell's Despatch.**

*Copy of Despatch from the Right Honourable Edward Cardwell to His Excellency Sir George Grey.*

Colonial Secretary's Office, Auckland, 27th June 1864.

The following Despatch from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies is published for general information.

WM. FOX.

"Downing-street, 26th April 1864.

"Sir,—Her Majesty's Government have had under their consideration three Acts passed by the Legislature of New Zealand in order to give effect to the views of your advisers with reference to the native war, viz—

"No. 8.—An Act to enable the Governor to establish Settlements for Colonization in the Northern Island of New Zealand.

"No. 11.—An Act for raising a Load of three millions sterling for the public service of the colony of New Zealand.

"No. 12.—An Act to appropriate certain sums to be raised under the New-Zealand Loan Act, 1863 (the last mentioned Act) and to provide for there-payment of certain portions thereof.

"The most important of these Acts is that which stands first on the list.

"It declares in effect, that if, in the opinion of the Colonial Government, any considerable number of the members of any native community have been or shall hereafter be in rebellion, the Colonial Government may declare any district within which such community may hold property to be a district for the purpose of this Act, and may at any time thereafter confiscate within that district such lands as they may from time to time consider requisite for purposes of settlement, whether those lands be the property (of loyal or disloyal natives or of colonists.

"Compensation is to be given, according to the judgment of a Court, to persons (or I presume to tribes or communities) who are to be dispossessed without having been engaged in rebellion.

"These Courts are not only empowered to refuse, but are positively disabled from giving compensation to
any person who shall have aided, assisted, or comforted any rebel, or who (whether engaged in rebellion or not) shall have refused to give up his arms on being required to do so by proclamation.

"The law is a permanent law, applicable not only to the present conjuncture, but to any case in which the Colonial Government shall hereafter 'be satisfied' that any considerable number of any native community in any part of the island shall have been in rebellion since the first of January 1863.

"I learn from the memorandum which accompanies this Act, that the power of the Assembly to pass it has been questioned in New Zealand, and I have thought it right to submit it, together with one which has also been passed by the Colonial Legislature for the suppression of the rebellion, to the law officers of the Crown, for their opinion. That opinion I cannot receive in time to communicate with you by this mail; but I need not leave you in ignorance of the views which I entertain upon the policy embodied in this important law, or of the opinion of Her Majesty's Government in respect to the measures which ought to be taken, as soon as decisive success in arms shall enable you to take them, for the pacification and settlement of the Northern Island. It appears that of the land thus about to be acquired, part is to be granted in lots, varying from 50 to 400 acres, to the members of the colonial force recently raised, numbering, I understand, about 4000 persons, and part is to be occupied by settlers, who are to be introduced from Europe at the expense of the colony, and are to hold their lands on a species of military tenure. It is supposed that the whole number of settlers, including the above mentioned colonial force, will amount to about 20,000.

"A scheme of this kind was submitted to the Duke of Newcastle, in your despatch No. 109, of the 29th of August last. Your Ministry then proposed the introduction of 5000 men, who were to hold fifty-acre farms upon military tenure, on land to be taken from insurgent natives Your despatch implied that you approved the principle of this scheme, and you stated that you had sanctioned it to the extent of raising 2000 men for active service.

"The Duke of Newcastle adopted your views, but not without a very serious caution as to the danger and delicacy of applying them. He indicated the difficulty of preventing the injustice, and the hazard of exciting the apprehension of the natives; he pointed out to the local Government the responsibility which they would incur of providing against these evident risks; and he added, that if the determination of your Government should have the effect of extending and intensifying the spirit of disaffection, and of thus enlarging the sphere or prolonging the period of military operations, these consequences would be viewed by Her Majesty a Government with the gravest concern and reprehension. I need scarcely observe that the Act now forwarded, taken in combination with the scheme proposed by your Government, exhibits a rapid expansion of the principles in which the Duke of Newcastle acquiesced with so much reserve.

"The number of settlers, and consequently the immediate amount of confiscation, is quadrupled; the compulsory power of acquiring land within a proclaimed district is, by the terms of the Act, applied alike to the loyal and the disloyal; the right of compensation is jealously limited, and is denied even to the most loyal native if he refused to surrender his accustomed right of carrying arms; and these powers are not to be exercised exceptionally and to meet the present emergency, or by regularly constituted courts of justice, but are permanently embodied in the law of New Zealand; and to form a standing qualification of the treaty of Waitangi.

"This being the nature of the law, I proceed to consider some very grave objections which may be urged against it.

"It renders permanently insecure the tenure of native property throughout the islands, and is thus calculated to alarm our friends. It makes no difference between the leaders and contrivers of rebellion, and their unwilling agents or allies, and is thus calculated to drive to despair those who are but half our enemies. The proceedings by which unlimited confiscation of property is to take place may be secret, without argument and without appeal. And the provision for compensation is as rigidly confined as the provision for punishment is flexible and unlimited.

"I concur with your advisers in thinking it impossible to apply to the Maories the maxims of English law in all their application to the details of civilized life. It is necessary to take into account the anomalous position which they occupy on one hand, as having acknowledged the Queen's sovereignty, and thus become liable to the obligations and entitled to the rights of British subjects, and on the other hand, as having been allowed to retain their tribal organization and native usages, and as thus occupying in a great measure the position of independent communities. Viewed in the former capacity, they have, by levying war against the Queen, rendered themselves punishable by death and confiscation of property. These penalties, however, can only be inflicted according to the rules, and under the protection of the Criminal Law. Viewed in the latter capacity, they would be at the mercy of their conquerors, to whom all public property would at once be transferred, private property remaining under the protection of international custom. Remembering the difficulty of determining what is private and what public property among the Maories, it seems to follow, that in the interest of all parties the rights of the Maori insurgents must be dealt with by methods not prescribed in any law-book,
but arising out of the exceptional circumstances of a most anomalous case.

"It is therefore doubly necessary that those who administer in the name of the Queen's Government of irresistible power, should weigh dispassionately the claims which the insurgent Maories have on our consideration. In the absence of those legal safeguards which furnish the ordinary protection of the vanquished, the Imperial and Colonial Governments are bound so to adjust their proceedings to the laws of natural equity, and to the expectations which the natives have been encouraged or allowed to form, as to impress the whole Maori race at this critical moment with the conviction that their European rulers are just, as well as severe, and are desirous of using the present opportunity, not for their oppression, but for the permanent well-being of all the inhabitants of New Zealand.

"I recognise the necessity of inflicting a salutary penalty upon the authors of a war which was commenced by a treacherous and sanguinary outrage, and attended by so many circumstances justly entailing upon the guilty portion of the natives measures of condign punishment. But I hold in the first place, that in the apportionment of this punishment, those who have actively promoted or violently prosecuted this war should be carefully distinguished from those who by circumstances, connexion, or sense of honour, or other natural temptation, have been unwillingly drawn into it, and still more pointedly from those who have on the whole adhered to the British cause. Even in the case of the most culpable tribes the punishment should be such as to inflict present humiliation and inconvenience rather than a recurring sense of injury, and should leave them with a conviction, that their punishment, if severe, has not exceeded the limits of justice, and also with the assurance that for the future, they have nothing to fear, but every thing to hope from the Colonial Government. With this view, the punishment, however exemplary, should be inflicted once for all, and those who may have suffered from it, should be led to feel that they may engage in the fruits of industry on the lands which remain to them, with the same security from disturbance which is enjoyed by their most favoured fellow-subjects. And I should hold it as a great misfortune if the punishment were so allotted as to destroy those germs of order and prosperity which have been so singularly developed in some of the Waikato tribes.

"I do not dispute the right of the Colonial Government to obtain from the punishment of the insurgent natives some aid in defraying the expenses of the war; or, in other words, of including in the contemplated cession or forfeiture of lands to be disposed of by sale, as well as lands to be devoted to the purposes of military settlement. But these expenses have been mainly borne by this country, which has therefore a right to require that the cession or confiscation of territory shall not be carried further than may be consistent with the permanent pacification of the island and the honour of the English name. I must now invite your attention to some difficulties to which such a scheme would appear to be liable if carried into effect too suddenly and on too great a scale.

"I think it may be generally, said that there is not much modern experience of a successful military settlement. In the present case, it can scarcely be hoped that the 20,000 persons whom it is proposed to place upon the land will be entirely of the most desirable class; and notwithstanding the intention expressed by your Ministers to provide for the introduction of married settlers with their families, it is to be expected that there will be a great preponderance of males amongst them, a circumstance which is always productive of many causes of strife in such a state of society. If the settlements should be scattered at a distance from any natural centre, and in the heart of a disaffected country, they might prove unequal to their own defence, and their protection would be extremely expensive, while it would hardly be possible for the colony to abandon the territories which it had occupied. Lastly, as the immigrants would be without special experience or capital, bound to a distasteful military tenure, and perhaps exposed to the hostility of the natives, it is to be feared that they would have to undergo much hardship, and would be soon attracted from their farms by the high wages of Australia, or the still nearer gold-fields of Otago.

"I am strengthened in these apprehensions by observing that the difficulty of enforcing military service upon colonists has pressed itself on the notice of yourself and the New-Zealand representatives. In your despatch of the 24th of July 1862, you express your fear that labourers and artisans could not be induced to remain in the colony if liable to militia service. And a somewhat similar anticipation is expressed in the memorial addressed to Her Majesty by the Houses of Representatives, and mentioned in your despatch of the 6th of October 1862.

"This is a matter which more properly belongs to your own advisers on the spot, responsible as they now are for the conduct of native affairs; and I do not urge these objections for the purpose of discouraging within moderate and practical limits a scheme from which you expect the best results, but only trust, in order to ensure success, these limits may be carefully considered in the first instance.

"I shall have occasion to recur to the subject of lands taken for sale in considering the proposal for a guaranteed loan.

"Considering that the defence of the colony is at present effected by an Imperial force, I should perhaps have been justified in recommending the dis-allowance of an Act couched in such sweeping terms, capable
therefore of great abuse—unless its practical operation were restrained by a strong and resolute hand—and calculated, if abused, to frustrate its own objects and to prolong instead of terminate war. But not having received from you any expression of your disapproval, and being most unwilling to take any course which would weaken your hands in the moment of your military success, Her Majesty's Government have decided that the Act shall for the present remain in operation.

"They are led to this conclusion, not merely by a desire to sustain the authority of the local Government, but also, in no small degree, by observing that no confiscation can take effect without your personal concurrence, and by the reliance which they so justly place on your sagacity, firmness, and experience, and your long-recognised regard, as well for the interests of the colonists as for the fair rights and expectations of the native race.

"I have therefore to convey to you the following instructions, as embodying the decisions of Her Majesty's Government.

"It is in their opinion very much to be desired that the proposed appropriation of land should take the form of a cession imposed by yourself and General Cameron upon the conquered tribes, and made by them to the representatives of the Queen as a condition on which Her Majesty's clemency is extended to them. The advantages of such a settlement (in which, however, I need hardly say the position of the Maoris as defeated rebels should be unequivocally exhibited) are too manifest to need explanation.

"But if this should be found impossible, you are at liberty, subject to the following reservations, to give your concurrence in bringing the law into operation.

"A measure should be at once submitted to the legislature to limit the duration of the Act to a definite period, not exceeding, I think, two years from its original enactment, a period long enough to allow for the necessary inquiries respecting the extent, situation, and justice of the forfeiture, yet short enough to relieve the conquered party from any protracted suspense, and to assure those who have adhered to us that there is no intention of suspending in their case the ordinary principles of law.

"The aggregate extent of the forfeiture should be at once made known, and their exact position as soon as possible.

"A Commission should be constituted for the special purpose of inquiring what lands may properly be forfeited. The members of this Commission should not be removable with the Ministry, and should be so chosen as to guarantee a fair and careful consideration of the matters brought before them.

"It should be clearly understood that your own concurrence in any forfeiture is not to be considered as a mere ministerial act, but that it will be withheld unless you are personally satisfied that the confiscation is just and moderate.

"And here I must observe, that if, in the settlement of the forfeited districts, all the land which is capable of remunerative cultivation should be assigned to colonists, and the original owner—the Maori—be driven back to the forest and morass, the sense of injustice, combined with the pressure of want, would convert the native population into a desperate banditti, taking refuge in the solitudes of the interior from the pursuit of the police or military, and descending when opportunity might occur into the cultivated plain to destroy the peaceful fruits of industry. I rely on your wisdom and justice to avert a danger so serious in its bearing on the interests of the European, not less than of the native race.

"Turning to that part of the law which authorizes the dispossession of persons who have not been involved in the recent rebellion, I have to observe that although Her Majesty's Government admit with regret that the tribal nature of the native tenure will sometimes render it unavoidable that innocent persons should be deprived of their lands, they consider that land should not be appropriated against the will of the owners merely because it is in the same district with rebel property, and may be conveniently used for purposes of settlement, but only in cases where loyal or neutral natives are unfortunate enough to be joint owners with persons concerned in the rebellion, or because it is absolutely required for some purpose of defence or communication, or on some similar grounds of necessity. But every such case of supposed necessity should be examined with the greatest care, and admitted with the greatest caution and reserve.

"The compensation to be given to persons thus dispossessed is properly, by the Act itself, made the subject of inquiry in an open Court But the 5th section of the Act ought to be so modified that the powers of the Court may not be limited in any manner which would prevent its doing complete justice to the claims of every innocent person, or extending reasonable consideration to those whose guilt was of a less heinous character; a class which, in the varying temper of the New-Zealand tribes, is probably large. I trust that in accepting; any cession, or authorizing confirmation of any forfeiture of land, you will retain in your own hands ample power of doing substantial justice to every class of claimant for restitution or compensation.

"Finally, when you have taken all the powers and received all the cessions which you think necessary for the satisfactory pacification of the islands, you will do well to accompany these measures of justice and severity by the announcement of a general amnesty, from which those only should be excepted who have been
concerned in the murders of unoffending settlers, or other like of Fences of a heinous and strictly exceptional character. In order to mark as much as possible the discriminating character of British justice, the exception from the amnesty should not be couched in general terms, but should recite one by one the specific outrages which remain unpardoned.

"Subject to these cautions and conditions, and in full confidence that you will act on the general principles which I have before laid down (and in which I anticipate your cordial concurrence), Her Majesty's Government are prepared to leave in your hands the power with which you have been entrusted by the Legislature of the colony.

"In the despatch in which you have transmitted to me these measures, you have expressed, in terms with which I entirely agree, your own appreciation of a generous policy, and of its beneficial consequences when adopted on former occasions in New Zealand. You give at the same time your reasons, the justice of which I am not prepared to dispute, for determining that the circumstances of the present case justly and necessarily call for measures of severity, such as have not been adopted at the close of former wars; but you accompany these reasons with the expression of your opinion that this severity ought not to be carried too far. I recognise also with satisfaction the statement of your Ministers on the occasion of their first submitting to you their views upon for-feiture and military settlement. They said they felt assured that as this would be the first, so it would be the last occasion on which an aboriginal inhabitant of New Zealand would be deprived of land against his will.

"I trust that on their part there will be no unwillingness to co-operate with you in confining the measures of severity, to which it may be necessary to have recourse, within those just limits to which I have referred.

"I now turn to the Act which authorizes a loan of 3,000,000?, for which it is desired to obtain the guarantee of the British Parliament. I observe that of the total sum it is proposed to raise, 1,000,000?, is allotted to the expenses of the war, 200,000?, to the repayment of a debt to the Imperial Government, which has probably doubled since that time, 200,000? to the compensation of the Taranaki settlers, and the rest, in the main, in the settlement of the country. The bulk of it appears to be appropriated to the plan of military settlement to which I have already adverted.

"Her Majesty's Government recognise as exceptional the expenses occasioned to the colony by the native war. And they are not unwilling to entertain the question of extending the guarantee of the 500,000?., which they have already conditionally promised to submit to Parliament, to such a further sum as will cover the increased debt of the colony to the Imperial Exchequer, and so much of these military expenses, including 200,000? for compensation to the Taranaki settlers, as may properly be defrayed, not out of current revenue of the colony, but by loan.

"But the same reasons do not, in their judgment, apply to the settlement of the country, which, whether successful or not as a measure of defence, is mainly a matter of colonial interest. Inasmuch as its success is calculated to add to the wealth and population of the colony. To a purpose of this kind the Imperial credit is not generally applicable; and Her Majesty's Government do not consider that the land which it is proposed to acquire under the Settlement Act is of any such definite value as materially to add to the security on which the guarantee of Parliament could be given. The omission of this sum will reduce the whole loan within much narrower limits, and I will consider and write you on a future occasion how far the revenue of New Zealand, pledged by the terms of the Act, and the considerations to which I have referred, may justify Her Majesty's Government in increasing the proposal they have promised to make to Parliament. Under any circumstances, the sum will doubtless appear to Parliament larger than it has hitherto been usual to guarantee to a colony of the size and resources of New Zealand, and could only be proposed by the Government with any prospect of success in connexion with the peculiar circumstances of the present loan, and in the, well-founded hope of a final pacification and settlement.

"I must now call attention to the importance of reducing, as rapidly as possible, after the conclusion of the troubles, the large force now maintained in New Zealand, and I confidently expect to receive from you such information as may enable me to communicate to the Secretary of State for War the possibility of a great reduction in the number of men, and consequently in the estimate for the year 1865-66. I must also remind you, that for the great expense which this country has already incurred in putting down the present insurrection, the Home Government only calls upon the colony for that almost nominal contribution which it has already engaged to pay.

"The arrangement at present in force respecting the amount of the military contribution, and the proportion of it which is to be returned to the colony, to be employed for the benefit of the natives, will terminate with the close of the present year. In consenting to guarantee a large loan for the colony, the Imperial Government will feel it necessary to require, that if, at the close of that period, the colony should continue to require the assistance of the mother-country, a much more adequate contribution shall be made to the Imperial exchequer. I am, however, unable at this moment to convey to you any definite decision on this part of the subject. It is
under the consideration of the Government, and I shall take an early opportunity of addressing you again upon it.

"I conclude by expressing an earnest hope that the operation in which General Cameron has been engaged may already have terminated the war; and shall rejoice when I am able to congratulate you on having succeeded by the wisdom of your own measures and those of your Government, by the skill of that distinguished commander, and by the valour of the Queen's troops and seamen, and of the colonial forces engaged in the conflict, in restoring the blessings of order and good government to the country entrusted to your care.

I have, &c,
"EDWARD CARDWELL,"
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Preface.

UPON the publication of my Remarks on the Taranaki Question, a large body of "Notes," challenging the accuracy of many of the statements therein made, were published "for the New Zealand Government." Seeing that these "Notes" avowedly expressed the views of the local authorities, it appeared to me that they ought not to pass without notice. But the publication of these official "Notes" was followed shortly after by a Notification in the New Zealand Gazette (25 Jan. 1861) deprecating public criticism on the conduct and policy of the Government, in the following terms:—

"The Governor fully recognises the right of every British subject freely to discuss, criticise, and censure the acts of the Government, and, when the danger now threatening has passed away, he does not desire to see that right restricted.

"There are, however, occasions when the unrestrained use of such a right becomes manifestly dangerous to the community, and he feels it his duty to state that such an occasion now exists in this Colony"

As a copy of this official Notification has been specially addressed to me by the direction of His Excellency the Governor, I understand it to be the desire of the New Zealand Government that their "Notes" shall not be made the subject of public criticism. In deference, therefore, to their wish, I abstain for the present from giving publicity within the Colony to the following pages.

The Remarks on the Government' Notes 'and on Mr. Richmond's 'Memorandum' have been made as brief as possible. Those statements only have been commented on, which appeared likely to mislead the reader as to some material point. Many minor assertions and inferences, which I believe to be incorrect and unsound, have been passed over; either in the belief that their irrelevancy to the main question will be observed by a careful reader, or from an apprehension that the length and complexity of our Colonial documents may render them unreadable at home. Of course I pass over those assertions, as to which the evidence set forth in my original remarks appears to me to have anticipated and negatived all that is now urged in the Notes' and in the "Memorandum." I refer particularly to the statements made in the latter documents as to the nature and grounds of the present quarrel, as to the alleged connection of that quarrel, in its origin, with some land-league or with the Waikato King movement, as to the cession by Waikato, &c. I wish to avoid any repetition of what has been already said. In some cases the point relied on by the Government recurs in several Notes or in several passages of the Memorandum; in such cases I have noticed the point in connection with that passage, in which it seemed to be most prominent. I believe there is no assertion or argument concerning the substance of the question, either in the Notes or in the Memorandum, which is not directly met in these Remarks.

I adopt the references as I find them in the Notes, that is to say, "page 27" means the Note headed "page 27," and referring to the 27th page of the "Taranaki Question."
Remarks on Notes Published for the New Zealand Government.

These references are made to the pages of the London edition of "The Taranaki Question," by Sir W. Martin,

PAGE 5. NOTE 2.

Mr. Busby's statement is cited as if it were entirely opposed to mine. In reality, the only difference between us is as to the origin of the rules: a question upon which it is unnecessary to enter.

To shew this I set out the whole paragraph, of which only the first sentence is cited in the Note:—

"I have no hesitation in saying" that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, as established by a singular concurrence of the best evidence, are not rules of native origin. That they have been 'generally accepted and acted upon by the natives' in the later periods of their dealings in respect to lands, I do not dispute; but they are natural and necessary deductions from the proceeding's to which our own countrymen had recourse, in order to obtain an equitable title to the lands which they purchased from the natives. It is not more than twenty-five or thirty years since the natives first began to look upon land as an object of exchangeable value."—(Mr. Busby, page 7.)

In page 8, Mr. Busby again carries back the existence of those rules to a time previous to the foundation of the colony.

"In fine, the result of my experience during the seven years in which I held office, was a conviction that the natives had no idea of property in land, such as exists in the minds of the people where it has been the subject of legislation. And that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, were not rules established by natives, but suggested by the precautions adopted by our own countrymen in order to obtain a title which could not be justly disputed."

These admissions are quite sufficient. Indeed there is no real contradiction between Mr. Busby and myself as to the existence of rights of property among the natives. The difference is in the sense given to the word "right." Mr. Busby uses the word in the legal sense, as that which has a corresponding remedy, and is supported by some law.

He says in page 5:—

"In these remarks we have only to do with the rights of property, as they are necessarily understood by jurists and statesmen, implying corresponding obligations to respect such rights. In this sense I do not hesitate to say that, so far as we can trace their history, there is no evidence of the New Zealanders ever having possessed any rights, with the exception of those which were created by the Treaty of Waitangi. Of what use is it, practically, for a man to say I possess a right to my property, when there is no law to define the obligations which are created by such a right; or government with power to administer the law, supposing it to have existed? New Zealand was,? in an emphatic sense, a country without a law and without a prince."

I use the term for that which was acknowledged and warranted by custom, though there was no law in our sense to uphold it.

I subjoin a passage from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell in the House of Representatives, 3rd of August, 1860:—

"We know how at the great original migration of the occupants of the first canoes took possession of the land; we know how it became subdivided as the tribes increased, and the hapu branched off from the iwi; we know how particular and distinct titles arose as land was subdued by cultivation, as hunting grounds were claimed for catching the rat, as weirs were erected in the streams, or as numberless other special acts of ownership were exercised; we know how these distinct titles still merged in the tribal title, and did not destroy it: these are customs universally recognized, lying (as I said) at the foundation of native tenure throughout the islands."—(New Zealander, Aug, 8th, 1860.)
It may be well to say that I have never intended to uphold the tribal or communal right as a good thing in itself. I assert it only as a fact which now exists and which has existed from time immemorial. It was the only way in which the tribal form of society could be kept up. For to alienate land to a stranger, was to alienate to one who might any day become an enemy. The whole tribe therefore was interested in the matter for the sake of its own independence. It was something like what we call an Alien Law. Afterwards when the Pakeha came, it acquired a new meaning, but one of scarcely less practical importance to them. It is a question of great moment to them, whether a single man or a few men may, without the consent of their fellows, introduce into the midst of their cultivations an ineligible neighbour whose cattle may range over their unfenced land, or who in a variety of other was may injure or annoy the rest of the community. Nor would the social evil be less. Such a principle would be fertile of quarrels. It would offer an opportunity to every ill-disposed man to gratify private resentment, and to embroil his tribe with the Pakeha. In this very case there are indications of something of this kind.

It is for the interest of both races that individual rights should be substituted for the right of the Community, as far as possible. But this can only be effected by rational means, not by mere force.

**Page 6, Note 1, and Page 7, Note 2.**

It is asserted in this Note that when the captives and the persons who had voluntarily migrated to other places began to return to Taranaki, those families, which remained in the new places where they had settled, were never admitted to exercise authority over those who returned, in the disposal by the latter of their own land. It is also asserted, that for the last eighteen years it has been acknowledged amongst themselves that even a family of four people were free to dispose of or to retain their property. In page 7, Note 2, this is asserted broadly as applying to the whole tribe. It is said to have been an acknowledged usage among the *Ngati awa* that their separate families had separate rights of alienation.

It is believed that these assertions are incapable of proof. They are directly contradictory to Mr. McLean's statement, 17th December, 1844, (*Taranaki Question*, page 19,) and also to Mr. McLean's practice. For, upon the principle now alleged, the visits to Queen Charlotte Sound and "Wellington were unnecessary.

So extraordinary an exception to the general rule should have been properly proved, before force was resorted to.

**Page 13, Note 1.**

It is believed that the practice of the Land Claim Commissioners was the following:—They travelled throughout the country, investigating each claim on the spot. The persons whose names appeared on each Deed as sellers were examined; and the boundaries of the land were then publicly pointed out. If this was done without opposition, it was assumed that the Community at large assented. The Note itself states, that there were cases where the tribe or *hapu* did object.

**Page 14, Note 2.**

Thinking it not unlikely that the word "Community" would be objected to as novel, I fell back upon the terms ordinarily employed, and used the words "tribe" and "tribal" in the ordinary way, as opposed, to "individual." It would no doubt tend to clearness to use the word "Community" throughout, to indicate the separate societies into which the Maori population is broken up.

**Page 15, Note 2.**

The assertion here referred to is made on the authority of the following; statement made by Mr. Forsaith, (formerly of the Native Department,) in his place in the House of Representatives, on the 9th August, 1860:—"Now it was a well-known fact, that W. King and that section of the *Ngatiawa* tribe whom he represented were never dispossessed by the Waikatos. As a proof of this, he would mention a fact which his honourable friend the Member for the Wallace County would confirm. About the year 1842, Te Pakaru, a Waikato Chief who had taken part in the invasion of Taranaki, proceeded to the Waitara for the purpose of taking possession, and had actually commenced felling timber for the purpose of preparing ground for cultivation. William King, who had not then returned from Waikanae to the home of his fathers, sent a deputation to *pana* Te Pakard, i. e. to warn him off. Te Pakaru, conscious that his position was not tenable, gave up the attempt, and returned to Waikato."—(*New Zealander*, August 15, 1860.)
Sir George Grey opposed for a time the return of William King and his party to the Waitara, seeing the complication that would arise out of such return. When he found that they were bent upon doing that which they had the clearest right to do, he assented to that which he could not prevent. No doubt he desired to prevent their settling on the South bank of the Waitara. Whether William King made any promise, and if so, what were the circumstances and terms of the promise, I know not.

But it should be remembered that the blame (whatever it may be) of disregarding Governor Grey's wishes is not to be confined to William King. Teira returned with William King and settled also on the South bank. This Note refers to the Note on page 92. In the latter we find a statement, proceeding from persons who must have been acquainted with the facts, that "W. Kingi being the head Chief of all Waitara, "on both sides of it, it was for himself to choose and "to say on which side he was to reside."

I had heard of such a permission as is here alleged, but the extent or terms of it I did not know, and do not know even now. At every "point the same defect makes itself apparent, the lack of a proper investigation of the facts of the case. The point intended to be noticed is this, that William King was driven off land which he was actually occupying at the time.

The first sentence of this Note misstates my proposition under the form of admitting it. The proposition in the Note is, that the Native cultivators and occupiers of the block could make a title without the consent of the whole tribe. Advantage is taken of the ambiguity of the word "tribe," here, as commonly used to indicate that Community or Society of which the cultivators and occupiers were members. My real meaning is put out of doubt by the next sentence of the text, in which the Government view is expressed in other words, viz.:—"That "if Teira's right existed at all, it was of necessity "an absolute right and that it was the purpose "of the Government to disregard all claims but "those of the individual holders."

In this Note a passage is set forth which purports to be a part of Governor Fitzroy's speech of 3rd Aug. 1844. It is produced in order to explain away the natural meaning of the words used by himself in his official statement to the Home Government. In fact, the passage set forth is no part of that speech. It is taken from a sort of Leading Article in the Maori Gazette, published at Auckland, 2nd September, 1844. In the same number of the Gazette (pp. 46-47) the speech itself is set forth. Then follows a brief notice of other speakers; then another address without a name, to the absentee owners, urging them to go to the nearest teacher or protector, to register their names and claims to land, so that, if they should not be disposed to sell, and their masters should be willing to manumit them, they might return to their own places.

In page 48 commences the before-mentioned Leading Article, reviewing and commending the Governor's proceedings at Taranaki, contrasting the English and French modes of Colonization, and ending by enlarging on divers passages of Scripture. From this Article the words cited in the Note are translated. They appear to apply to the Town Block which Governor Fitzroy insisted on retaining, whilst he was content to recall the settlers from other parts of the District. When a block is to be ceded, of course the marking out of individual holdings becomes necessary in order that the payment may be apportioned. But before it comes to this stage of the business, the Community must have already assented to the Cession. The contrast which runs throughout the words of Governor Fitzroy and the comments thereon, is not a contrast between the individual right and that of the Community, but a contrast between the rights of the owners on the spot and those of the absentees.

The source of the whole difficulty which Governor Fitzroy found at Taranaki was this: the persons who were on the spot at the time of the arrival of the New Zealand Company's agent, desiring to secure the presence and protection of the Pakeha had sold a tract of land without the assent of the absentee owners. This fact furnishes the key to all that Governor Fitzroy said. He expressed his desire to avoid the recurrence of such an evil, and all his suggestions pointed that way.

I have thought it necessary to explain this document, to guard against misconception. But in fact Governor Fitzroy's remarks did not apply to the Waitara at all. It is admitted that the people of that district had nothing to do with the sale to the New Zealand Company. (T. Q. p. 20.)

The connection of the argument in the text is missed in the Note. It is therefore necessary to restate it briefly. The letter to William King cited in page 26, and Mr. McLean's notice in page 28, both expressed the new principle quite plainly. Mr. McLean says, "You know that every man has a "right (of doing as he pleases) with his portion, and no man may interfere to prevent his exercise of this right as respects his portions, for the
thought respecting his own is with himself." These declarations were made to a man, with whom the Government had been long dealing as with one whose consent was necessary to the alienation of land at the Waitara. The new declaration forced him to assert his right in the letter set forth in page 33, and to state the ground of his right, namely, that the land belonged to the whole Community.

I notice that in the third column in this Note, the beginning only of the above sentence of Mr. McLean is given, and the conclusion of the very same sentence (distinguished above by Italics) is omitted.

PAGE 27.

The important subject of the feuds referred to in this Note is reserved for consideration in connection with the Note on page 90.

The ambiguity of the word "tribe" has been admitted. I did not intend to assert that William King is the Chief of the whole tribe of the Ngati awa. He is certainly the Chief of that section of the Ngati awa to which the Waitara belongs.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I subjoin an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell, in the House of Representatives, 3rd August, 1860:—"Towards the end of 1889, Colonel Wakefield (the Company's agent) arrived in New Zealand, and among other places went to Waikanae, where Wiremu Kingi, even at that time an intelligent and enterprising man, took great interest in the Colonel's proceedings, and accompanied him in the ship Tory on a visit to the Ngati awa Chiefs of Queen Charlotte Sound, to buy land. It was on that occasion that Wiremu Kingi signed the deed of which so much has been said; but for my part I never attached much importance to his signature except as it may be held to bar his individual right. About this time the Ngapuhi and Waikato tribes determined on manumitting their slaves taken in war, and almost simultaneously with the introduction of European Settlers into Taranaki, numbers of the Ngati awa captives returned to their ancient location; while those who belonged to the first migration followed their example, and also began to come up from the South in small detached parties. Wiremu Kingi and his father remained at Waikanae, but according to Maori law were equally entitled to reclaim their old possessions at Taranaki when they should return. I need not remind the House of the disputes which immediately followed the return of the Ngati awa, in the first years of the settlement, nor how they and the English settlers contested the possession of the soil; still less need I remind them that in 1844 Mr. Spain, the Queen's Commissioner for investigating and determining titles to land, held his Court at Taranaki, and decided that the Company was entitled to a grant of 60,000 acres: or that Governor Fitzroy disallowed that decision, on the ground of its setting aside the claims of unreturned captives and absentee. I do not believe that Governor Fitzroy meant absolutely to annul the Company's purchase; I think it is clear he intended that compensation should be given to the absenteeees as they came in, not that they should have all the land back. But whatever he may have thought, there was never a doubt on my mind that the natives understood his decision practically to be a recognition of their ownership and a giving back of the land"—(New Zealander, 8th August, 1860.)

Another circumstance should be noticed. Various points are relied on from time to time in support of the Government case: at one time the Waikato Invasion; at another, the Cession to Governor Hobson; at another, Governor Grey's policy; and so forth. Each of these taken singly, supposing it to have the effect ascribed to it, would set aside Teira's title as much as William King's: yet, in some way or other out of the combination or conflict of all, Teira emerges as "rightful owner," as "undisputed owner," whilst the rights of the Community and of the Chief have been lost. The result of this view is that Teira reappears with a title not worse, nor just as good, but far better than it would have been if none of these adverse circumstances had existed. For he is now conceived to possess a power of alienation, even without the consent of the Community to which he belongs.

It was not sufficiently considered how little the arbitrary severance, made by the Government theory, between the rights of the individual holder and those of the Community and the Chief, could be expected to commend itself to the people of the Waitara. The Waikato invasion is the point from which Mr. McLean dates the alleged-change in the Rules of Tenure at Taranaki, the commencement of the exceptional state of things in that district. If the individual holders were not affected by all that had passed from the Waikato invasion downwards, how could the Community and the Chief regard themselves as deprived of their old rights by those same events?

PAGE 31.

Surely it is not meant that all publications are to be condemned, except those which approve of the course taken by the Government. In a Dependency, it is possible that the policy pursued by the Government of the Dependency may tend to counteract, or even to defeat, the policy of the Imperial Government. If that is deliberately believed to be the case, is every man to be censured who expresses that belief, with due caution and
regard to circumstances?

The Debates in the House of Representatives in August, 1860, made it notorious throughout the country that there was a great difference of opinion amongst the Colonists themselves as to the proceedings of the Government. I believe that notoriety to have had a most wholesome effect in checking the spread of the war. The Natives were thereby encouraged to believe that what was done at the Waitara was not the doing of the Pakeha as a race, and would not be approved by the Queen.

My remarks on the Taranaki Question were put forth in the beginning of December, after hostilities had continued for nine months.

As to the declarations of the Governor referred to in this Note, it is to be remarked that, with the Natives, words weigh little against deeds.

It does not yet appear whether the assurance conveyed to the Bishop of New Zealand respecting the "lawful rights of Chief and Tribe 3 has ever been circulated amongst the leading Native Chiefs.

PAGES 34, 35, 36.

There can be no doubt as to the duty of a citizen to communicate to the Government information which he may derive from any private source, respecting matters which seriously affect the public interest or public peace. I do not enter into the circumstances here referred to. The reasons for Archdeacon Hadfield's conduct have already been publicly explained by himself.

One thing however should be said. It is a most unfortunate state of things when a Government allows itself to depend on such sources of information, and omits to take the proper means of obtaining information for itself. And in this particular case, it should in fairness be asked, whether the assertion of right and the expression of determination to hold the Waitara, contained in these letters to Archdeacon Hadfield, had not been already conveyed directly to the Governor by W. King?

There appears to be a misconception as to the object for which these letters are cited. That object is not to prove any specific facts; but to shew the; general facts that there were claims, and what was the nature of those claims. By the aid of the private documents, the writer gropes his way to some notion of the state of things. He endeavours to ascertain, as well as he can, what the Government ought to have ascertained fully and accurately. Had a proper inquiry been instituted by the Government, the use of all these letters would have been superseded.

The consideration of this object will explain the omission of the letter of July 27. That letter indicates nothing as to the special nature of the claim made by William King; whilst it contains a story about Mr. Parris, which I could only regard as unfounded or greatly exaggerated and distorted. At the same time I had experience enough of rumours in this land, to find no difficulty in believing that such reports had reached William King and had been credited by him.

PAGES 38, 39, 40.

The second letter appears to me to prove nothing more than that the writer foresaw, what others ought to have foreseen, namely, that the employment of soldiers would end in bloodshed.

A remark towards the end of the Note makes it necessary for me to add, that when these letters came to my hands, the time had long passed when they could have been of any practical use to the Government.

PAGE 49, NOTE 2.

It was never intended to be alleged that William King is the Chief of the whole Ngati awa tribe. He is certainly the chief of the Community to which the Waitara belongs.

PAGE 51.

What is meant is, that plain issues are raised even upon these documents. Those issues would have been raised more plainly still, if a proper inquiry had been instituted by the Government.

PAGE 55.

No complaint is made against the Land Purchase Department; nor any question raised as to its efficiency, whilst kept within the bounds of its proper functions. If there is no dispute between buyer’ and seller, there is nothing to decide. What is maintained is this, that when a dispute exists, the decision of the Land Purchase Department (in this particular case the decision of Mr. Parris) is not sufficient. It is not sufficient to bind the
rights of the Queen's subjects, or to justify the use of military force against the Queen's subjects.

With a view to remove a misconception which seems to prevail at Home, I notice an important statement in this Note, by which it appears that nearly 30,000,000 acres of land have already been acquired for the Crown in this Colony. The British population is estimated at between 60 and 70,000.

PAGE 60.

It is by no means the case, that "the accusations of not instituting a proper investigation, after all, resolve themselves into the charge that no investigation was made at Waikanae." The case of Waikanae was dwelt on because it was an admitted fact that no investigation did take place there. The cases of Queen Charlotte's Sound and Wellington were passed over more lightly, for want of information; and that reason was expressly given. It is now clear that the very gravest doubts exist as to the assent of the Natives at Queen Charlotte's Sound. Mr. McLean himself, on his examination before the House of Representatives, produced a letter, dated April 10, 1859, written to him by one of those Natives. The letter stated that the names of certain persons had been signed without their authority, and intimated that the transaction, if it went on, would issue in fighting. (See Mr. McLean's Evidence, Pap. E. No. 4, page 23.)

PAGE 64.

If any reasonable doubt could remain as to the meaning of the words used by Wi Tako, it would be removed by the following fact.

A short time back, when the excitement arose "about the native man found dead near Patu mahoe, some of the people on the Waikato river notified their intention of visiting the spot, and there making inquiry for themselves as to the cause of the death. Ihaka of Pukaki (between Auckland and Waikato) resisted their interference. In the course of a discussion on this subject, which took place at Pukaki, Ihaka twice used the words "No matou tenei he;" the very phrase of Wi Tako. They were taken down at the time by a gentleman thoroughly acquainted with the Maori language. Nothing certainly could be farther from Ihaka's meaning than to charge himself and his people with any wrong or fault in the matter. All that he meant was, that the thing which had gone wrong was his own affair, and that their neighbours ought not to meddle with it.

It is to be regretted that the original words of Paora's speech, referred to in this Note, are not given.

PAGE 67, NOTE 2.

The admission here made of the desirableness of the establishment of some tribunal for settling questions of Native tenure and custom, is so far satisfactory. The difficulties in the way of doing this appears to be over-estimated. All would depend on the constitution of the Court, and on the order and course of our proceedings with a view to the establishment of it. For the creation of a Court for determining land questions is not the first point to be aimed at. This subject will be discussed more fully in connection with Note, page 90.

What the reasons were which induced the Legislature of the Colony to agree to the Declaration in Section 8, I do not know. That they had nothing to do with the point here suggested (namely, that the territorial rights of the Natives stand upon Treaty, and therefore that questions between the Government and the Natives belong to the Governor and not to any Court) is shown by the words of the Declaration itself which apply, not to questions between the Government and the Natives, or between English Colonists and the Natives, but to questions "affecting the Title or right of occupancy of the Aboriginal Natives, as amongst themselves." The point here referred to as to the Treaty and its consequences, will be more fully considered below in reference to Mr. Richmond's Memorandum.

As to Lord Carnarvon's Despatch, is it intended to be inferred that, whereas the British Government was not to be expected to support by military force the decision of the Governor in Council, under the Native Territorial Rights Bill, that Government was to be expected to support by military force the result of Mr. Parris’ inquiry? His Lordship's Despatch should rather have suggested, that the full and proper investigation, which we claim as due of right to the Native subjects of the Crown, was no less needed for the protection of the English Colonists and of the tax-paying public of England.

PAGE 83.

In this Note it is said that the order of things, which the Governor disturbed, was the desperate feud then prevailing at New Plymouth.

It should be remembered that there was no feud-subsisting between William King and Teira. We learn from Mr. Parris that after this offer for sale Teira associated with William King the same as before, but never let the
subject rest." He states also that "they never had recourse to harsh measures after the public offer of the land to
His Excellency the Governor, but on the contrary tried to work upon Teira by acts of kindness." (E. No. 3 A. p.
2.)

Mr. Parris is here speaking of peaceful relations subsisting between William King and Teira before the
negotiations for peace between the Taranaki tribes began, that is to say, whilst the feud was still subsisting
between William King and other parties. Then came the negotiations which brought the feud to an end. Peace
had continued for about half a year when the Governor made the military demonstration at the Waitara.

PAGE 87.

In this Note it is asserted that "nearly twelve months of patient investigation "were expended on this case.
Now Teira's offer was made on the 8th day of March, 1859, and the first instalment was paid on the 29th
November, 1859. The whole investigation then lay between those two dates. We are also told that Mr. Parris'
"inquiry was prolonged till the close of the year 1859; not from any doubt that existed as to the title, but in the
hope that the opposing party might be brought to reason." (Pap. E, No. 3, p. 21.)

A portion of time then, which we have no means of defining; is to be interposed between the time when all
doubt had ceased as to the title, and the 29th of November. Moreover, Mr. Parris himself states that his inquiry
was intermitted for two months, lest he should interfere with the negotiations for peace then pending between
the Tribes. (Pap. E, No. 3A, p. 2.) What portion of the residue was actually employed on this particular
business, it is impossible to ascertain, as there are no Minutes of his proceedings.

Yet in the Despatch to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 28th of June, 1800, it is stated that "nine
months were occupied by persons constantly engaged in carefully considering and investigating this particular
title." And now we are told that "nearly twelve months of patient investigation" were spent upon it.

I notice this, not because the matter in itself is of great moment; for the value of an investigation depends
much more on the nature and method of it than on the length of time employed; but as on instance of a
looseness of statement much to be regretted in official documents.

PAGE 88.

This Note furnishes a remarkable instance of a practical fallacy which pervades these Notes. These
so-called "rules" and "decisions" were in fact merely plans of proceeding or schemes of policy. They might be
very beneficial, if they could be carried out, but they had no binding effect or authority whatever. To induce
the Natives to yield up tracts of land and accept compensation for them, was in many cases very proper; and
Mr. Clarke and the officers of his department often had influence enough with the Natives to obtain their assent.
But no one was bound by those transactions, except the persons who were actually parties to them.

What is here called Governor Grey's decision was no decision at all in any proper sense. Governor Grey
found himself in the midst of those difficulties which followed upon that act of Governor Fitzroy, which has
been expressly admitted by the present Governor to have been both just and politic. (Parl. Pap. July, 1860, p.
177.)

Governor Grey did not directly impugn the proceeding of his predecessor, but he felt the practical
inconveniences which followed upon it. To escape them, he attempted an intermediate and singular policy. The
titles of the returned owners were not to be acknowledged in words by the Government, but their claims were to
be bought, if they were disposed to sell, at a rate not exceeding 1s 6d an acre.

It is idle to quote this policy of Governor Grey as an authority or precedent for the present proceedings.
That policy has been entirely abandoned by the present Governor. The titles of the individual cultivators, which
Governor Grey would not directly acknowledge, have been in this very transaction (not to go further back) fully
acknowledged by the present Government. Teira and his companions have been recognized as "rightful
owners" as "undisputed owners." (E. No. 3, p. 22.) And as to the price, have the present sellers received no
more than Is 6d an acre?.

PAGE 90.

This Note opens a subject of the utmost importance, and one which needs a fuller discussion. It is most true
that feuds productive of many crimes raged among the tribes in the neighbourhood of New Plymouth, for five
years, from August, 1854, till July, 1859, peace being finally made in September, 1859.

Here, and elsewhere in these Notes, it seems to be taken as a consequence of that state of things, that the
proceedings of the Government at the Waitara were justified. It is implied that there was something’ in those
proceedings tending to put an end to that state of things: or else, that with a people capable of such crimes, all
legal and rational modes of dealing were out of the question. Therefore I do not content myself with saying
(what indeed would be a sufficient answer to this Note) namely, that these feuds and crimes and our inability to prevent or punish them, furnish no reason why a full and proper inquiry should not have been made into Teira's title to sell; such an inquiry being demanded at once by justice to the Natives, and by due regard to the interests of our own people in the Colony and in England.

These feuds commenced when Rawiri Waiaua, encouraged by the local Land Purchase Commissioner, attempted to sell a piece of land in violation, as it appears, of the tribal right. (T. Q. p. 139.) The result of this was the crime described in page 115. The Government did not interfere to punish that crime, or to suppress, by military force, the atrocities which followed it. It was apprehended that interference on our part would lead to a war of which the limits, the cost, and the effects, could not be estimated. It was seen also that it would be extremely difficult to prevent our motives from being misunderstood. Many feuds and private wars in different parts of the country had passed without notice. If we interfered in this case, it was likely to be thought that we did so, not so much on account of the crime which Katatore Had committed as on account of the land which Rawiri desired to sell. So the Government confined itself to protecting the settlers, and endeavouring by such means as were practicable to check or mitigate those feuds.

The difficulty of the case became still greater when Katatore was murdered. That crime was committed on the Queen's land, on a public road within the settlement. It was a murder of revenge, not directly connected with any piece of land. Still the Government refrained from interfering, beyond issuing a Proclamation in the following month, February, 1858. That Proclamation was not in such general terms as stated in this Note, that is to say, "warning all the Natives that this anarchy would no longer be tolerated." It only warned them against assembling with arms within the boundaries of a certain district. The Proclamation was accompanied by an official comment in the Maori Messenger, which, after explaining the reasons of our non-interference proceeded thus:—

"While indulging; this hope, we are startled by the news of another and more frightful murder. Blood is spilt on land which the Queen has granted. This cannot be allowed to pass in silence. The Governor has therefore spoken his word. He still says, 'I shall not interfere. Both parties are doing wrong, but it is not my present intention to employ force against either while they keep outside the limits of the English settlement, but I will allow neither to come armed within these limits, I will not permit fighting in my presence'" I do not know whether this limited proclamation has been, as is alleged in the Note, openly violated.'

The effect of this state of things on the Natives may be gathered from the following letter:—

March 4, 1858,

Waitara.

To Riwai, Kiripata, Wiremu Tamihana, Apa, Ture, Wiri, Tei, and Hohepa, to you all, Greeting to you. My friends, my fathers, listen. Here we are involved in warfare, that is to say, in grievous, murderous, cannibal, bloodthirsty calamity—in this very grievous calamity. Listen. You are probably imagining that we are going blindly to work. It is not so, but we are proceeding on a clear course, "What makes it clear is this, that as far as regards the reference to the Governor, that has been done. As for murder, we have no intention of murdering. We leave murder to Ihaia and Nikorima. Our Chiefs will act in broad daylight, and indeed they are acting now in broad daylight. As regards the reference to the Governor, that has been made by the Chiefs. You have already heard that Waitere (Katatore) was killed on the ninth day of the month of January. We had to wait till February for the Governor's answer. The answer came, that the Governor could take no steps in the matter, but let there be another murder, then the Governor would consent. Hence our Chiefs concluded that the course taken by the Governor was wrong, because, this is Ihaia's second murder. The words of the former Governor are not attended to now, for steps were taken in the case of the quarrel with Rangihaeata at the Hutt—on that occasion, promptly. In the case of this murder no steps are taken. As he was killed in the midst of the settlers, so now should any man belonging to Ihaia be found in the house of a settler in the town he will be killed there, because this is not as it should be. And now all the pas are surrounded, Te Karaka, Pukerito, and Otehetehe. The pa which we attacked was Pukerito, we got close under the outworks. Those of our party who were killed in the attack on the pa, were Hehe Nga nohoanga, Tamati Tuainane, and Te One. These were from Waitara. Tamati Takua from Wai***, Maihi from Tapuirau, Heta from te Kawau. These were killed. Of the people of the place Eruini Mangania, Hakaraia Repo, Te Kawhaki Haenga were wounded. Wi Te One mihi was killed in the light at Te Ika moana. He was shot by Te Kepa Hanawerangia.

I cannot tell all. Enough.
It seeing that the letter from the Governor, referred to above, has not yet been printed.

Now what view of the Queen's Sovereignty could the Natives acquire under these circumstances? I do not censure the Government, but I ask for a fair consideration of the facts. Instead of throwing the whole blame upon the Natives, let us rather look upon that state of things as the common calamity of both races. Let us not keep back the fact that in the origin of these evils we also had a share, and that they were aggravated by injudicious acts and by violent language on the part of some of our own people. No greater misfortune could have befallen the Natives than to see that the Government was powerless, and so to be driven back into their old barbarism. It would have been the greatest blessing for both races, if it had been possible from the beginning to follow up and punish every act of bloodshed. The manifest benefit, flowing from the action of the Queen's Sovereignty, would have reconciled the Natives to the action of that Sovereignty in other ways. But every consideration which had made it unwise and inexpedient to interfere against crime, made it still more unwise and inexpedient to interfere in a question of land.

The feuds at last wore themselves out and peace was made. A few months after that, the Colonial Government employed military force at the Waitara. The power which had not protected life or property, came forward to take possession of land. What I assert is, that no course could have been more unfortunate than this, no course less likely to effect the great object of establishing practically the Queen's Sovereignty throughout this island. We did not interfere even when we should have been sure of a strong body of allies; when the instinctive sense of justice and retribution for crime would have been in our favour, on the spot and throughout the island. When the feuds and crimes had ceased, we began to employ military force, and that in a case wholly unconnected with crime. So we did all in our power to confirm the evil notion, already widely spread among the Natives, that we care for nothing but to get their land.

We often hear strong language used about what is called a defiance of the Queen's Sovereignty. It were better for both races if we set ourselves dispassionately to consider what we have done towards commending that Sovereignty, towards showing the value and benefit of it. In what light must the case appear to them? The Queen's power has not saved their lives or property, but it takes possession of their land. It appears to them not as a protector but as an invader; not as a stayer of bloodshed, but as itself a shedder of blood. We have taken the course which tends not to advance, but to hinder, our great object. We have begun at the wrong end.

I do not mean to say that the Queen's Sovereignty could be imposed wholly from without, even by a Government regarded with confidence by the Native population. We must act on the principle, which has been of late so often enunciated and so often forgotten, that the Natives are to be governed through themselves; but we can only effect our great object by proceeding in the right order. We must invert the whole course of our proceedings. We must begin by suppressing bloodshed and crime, and so advance in minor matters. The next Native Conference will furnish an opening for our efforts towards securing that great end.

Our present mode of proceeding provokes resistance. Let us proceed in the proper order, and we shall find support in all parts of the country.

We boast of our superiority, and especially of our skill in government. Let us prove our skill, by commending rather than discrediting the object we have in view. The Natives have been repelled from that to which they ought to have been attracted by the strongest sense of their own interest.

Many and very intelligent men amongst them are now drawn towards the King party most unwillingly. They know and say, that the chiefs of that party possess neither the knowledge nor the means needed for elevating their race, and rescuing them from the evils of their present condition. Yet they turn to them as a protection against a power, which they fear and cannot trust.

When the present evils shall have ceased, and confidence shall have been restored by a fair investigation of their grievances, and by an earnest practical effort to provide for them the institutions, and secure the social benefits, they so greatly need and desire, the combination which is now opposed to our authority will disappear like a mist, and the Native race will regard the Sovereignty of the Queen as a boon and a privilege.

Remarks on Mr. Richmond's Memorandum.

Paragraph 6.

In the four propositions here stated as conveying the substance of my remarks, there are some inaccuracies. In the first, Mr. Richmond speaks of "the territory of the Ngati awa in Taranaki," and of the right of "the whole tribe; "I have intended all along to speak of the community to which the Waitara belongs, and of the communal
right. In the second, William King is described as "principal Chief of the Ngati awa" I regard him, not as chief of the whole tribe, but as chief of the Waitara. In proposition four, it is given as my opinion that the Governor was not justified in taking possession "without the Judgment of a Court of Law." What I maintain is, that the Governor was not justified in taking possession without the decision of some competent and independent tribunal.

Par. 9.

The assertions here made cannot be admitted. The quarrel is in its origin and nature a land quarrel. To the Maories, it is not even now a question of Sovereignty in Mr. Richmond's sense. I believe there are very few (if any) amongst them, who think it possible or desirable to overthrow the Queen's Sovereignty and to establish one of their own. To them it is an intensely practical matter. The people of the Waitara resisted because they saw the soldiers take possession of the land. That which draws others into the quarrel is the belief that if the present proceeding of the Government shall succeed, the like will be attempted elsewhere, and they will have no security for their lands or their lives. There can be no clear understanding of the present state of affairs unless we distinguish between two things which are often confounded in official papers, the British Government and the Colonial Government. Even yet the "great mass of the Native population is disposed to trust to the justice of the British Government, but I fear there are few who are disposed to trust to the justice of the present Colonial Government.

Par. 21, 22, 23, 24.

It is here asserted that "Mr. Spain's Award was a solemn judicial determination," and also that "Governor Fitzroy had no authority to reverse Mr. Spain's determination."

Mr. Spain's powers were such as he received under his Commission from Her Majesty and under the "Land Claims Ordinances" of the Colony. It is plain that the Commission by itself could not give him power conclusively to bind persons and lands; the Legislature only could give such power. Now the powers which the Legislature really did give, were only such powers as were requisite for a proper investigation. The result of the inquiry was to be reported to the Governor. Mr. Spain made no such claim for himself as is now made for him. In his Despatch to Governor Fitzroy, 12th June, 1844, he says, "I delivered my judgment in the presence of a considerable number of Natives, as well as Europeans; but wherein I have most carefully explained that the same is subject to confirmation by your Excellency, and cannot be carried into effect without your approval" (E. No. 2, p. 8.) Accordingly Governor Fitzroy, acting on the advice of the officer who was then responsible for Native Affairs, refused to confirm it.

Respecting Governor Fitzroy's disallowance of Mr. Spain's award, it may be well to notice that the present Governor has recorded his opinion in the clearest terms (Desp. Nov. 19, 1855):—

"Mr. Commissioner Spain was sent to enquire into these claims, and with certain exceptions declared in favour of the New Zealand Company's purchase. His decision was, however, overruled by Governor Fitzroy, who required all lands to be returned to the Natives, except those in which it could be proved that the whole of the owners had been, or were, willing to sell them.

"This just decision, which also proved to be a very politic one, prevented the New Zealand Company from fulfilling its engagements with the Settlers, and caused great dissatisfaction and in some cases distress." (Parl. Pap. July, 1860, p. 177.)

Mr. Richmond remarks that my citation in italics (T. Q. p. 17) is not the whole of the sentence? which is quite correct. But it is the whole of that which concerns the people of the Waitara and the present question. The only claimants with whom "Governor Fitzroy had to do, were the persons concerned in the sale of 1840. The people of the Waitara had nothing to do with that sale. (T. Q. p. 19.)

It is also said that "Governor Fitzroy never contemplated and never admitted the assertion of the tribal claim." It is true that nothing is said here about the tribal claim. The reason is, that the question which Governor Fitzroy had to settle, was not a question between individuals and the community, but between residents and absentee.

Par. 24.

Of this so-called Address of Governor Fitzroy I have spoken above (p. 10). The four passages here thrown together, as if they were all parts of that Address, are taken from three distinct documents: the first and second from the Address; the third from the Notice to the Absentees; the fourth from what I have called the Leading Article in the Maori Gazette of 2nd September, 1844.

The drift of the third passage is obscured by r. Richmond's departure from the translation (itself defective)
put forth by the Government in the Appendix to the Memorandum, page 24. The words "men of Taranaki," meaning; the absentees, have become "men at Taranaki."

Before leaving this subject of Governor Fitzroy's alleged plans and words, I will state again briefly the fallacy which pervades Mr. Richmond's reasoning on this subject.

Governor Fitzroy had before his mind two classes of people: 1st, those who had been parties to the sale to the New Zealand Company's agent in 1840; and 2ndly, those who had not been parties to that sale. To this latter class belong the people of the Waitara.

As to the former class, he insisted on certain terms. Their act had led the Pakeha to form a settlement. The Governor therefore was not content to abandon that settlement. The Pakeha must retain all that really belonged to the sellers. The absentees should do what they pleased, either keep or sell.

As to the latter class, the Governor recognized their claims in all their integrity. Mr. Bell has told us (above p. 13) bow the Natives understood that.

The fallacy of Mr. Richmond's argument is this, that he treats the terms insisted on in reference to the first class, as being the measure and limit of the rights recognized as belonging to the second class

PAR. 32.

What is called by Mr. Richmond the first Counter-proposition, and which is here taken to have been established, runs counter, not to what I have really maintained, but to what I am assumed to have maintained. My proposition as to the rule of Native Tenure is, that the individual holder, is a member of a Community, and that the consent of the Community is necessary to the alienation of the land; and that in every purchase it is one of the matters of fact to be ascertained, what the Community is in that particular case. This proposition, so far from being; disproved, is in fact admitted in express terms in Mr. Richmond's last paragraph; where Mr. McLean is cited as saying, u The whole of the purchases previously made at Taranaki had been effected on the same principle as the present one from Te Teira, namely, that of acquiring' the land from the different chans and subdivisions of clans which came in from time to time to offer it." Mr. McLean admits the rule; but there is nothing to shew that in this particular case that rule was carried out. There is nothing to shew that the right of the Community was ever investigated at all. Nor is there any way of reconciling the rule so admitted by Mr. McLean with the direct and express denial, on the part of the Government, of everything but the individual right, throughout the proceedings at the Waitara.

Here I leave the question of the exception alleged to exist at Taranaki, and the novel assertions that have been made on the subject since the proceedings at the Waitara. Those assertions have been directly denied by a number of members of the Ngati awa. In reference to Mr. McLean's statements before the House of Representatives (Q. 58, 59) they say, "We, of this Ngati awa, now hear for the first time of those modes of proceeding;" ______ "we have never heard of this custom all these years. We now hear of it for the first time in this answer." (New Zealand Spectator, Jan. 2, 1881.) See above, p. 7.

I now notice the stages by which men have advanced to the new theory.

In 1858, Mr. Charles Brown, one of the oldest settlers in the Province of Taranaki, was elected Superintendent, the first under the Constitution Act. Whilst a candidate for the office, he put forward his views on the Land question in the following words:—"I look forward with hope that the time is not far distant when the Government will buy no land and have none to sell, and that its office will then be confined to extinguishing the collective titles of tribes, and giving individual titles, available for sale." (Taranaki Herald, 18 May, 1853.)

In accordance with this view, Mr. Superintendent Brown addressed to the Colonial Secretary the following letter, dated 6th March, 1854:

"Sir,—A recent purchase having been effected by Mr. Commissioner McLean of a tract of land in this Province, I beg to draw the attention of his Excellency the Officer administering the Government, to the peculiar features of this purchase, as bearing in the most important manner on the relations of the two races.

"Mr. McLean did me the honour to request my opinion on the offer of the land in question, at what he considered a high price, and in which it was proposed to exclude all but a few pah reserves, securing to the Natives the pre-emptive right of purchase of 2000 acres at 10s per acre, each Native to purchase separately and possess a separate Crown Title for his property.

"As an opportunity of introducing a principle so beneficial to the Native race, breaking up the common rights which cripple their individual energies, and giving them separate rights with Crown Titles, might not occur for a long time, I expressed the opinion, which I hope will meet with the approval of his Excellency, that the introduction of such a principle was worth attaining at any cost, whether as regarded the Province individually, or its benefit as an illustration to the whole Native race. I have no hesitation in anticipating that the adoption of the principle by any Native tribe, will convert the members of it into settlers and citizens fully as valuable as the European population." (Southern Cross, Nov. 2, 1860.)
In another letter to the Colonial Secretary, dated 26th September, 1860, Mr. Brown stated that the plan proposed in 1854 had been carried out, and that "the owners of these individual holdings are the most loyal, peaceable, and industrious Natives in the Province, as well as the best neighbours the settlers in the district could wish for." It will be seen that Mr. Brown had no notion of any difference, as to the communal right, between Taranaki and other parts of the island.

Thus Mr. Brown sought to effect a good object by fair and reasonable means. This was the first stage.

The second stage was when the Provincial Council at Taranaki presented their Memorial to both Houses of Assembly in 1858, urging "that the Government should compel an equitable division of such common land among the respective claimants, on the petition of a certain proportion of them." The third stage was when the Government, instead or seeking to remove by proper means the difficulty presented by the communal right, assumed it to have been removed, and denied or ignored every right except that of the individual holder.

PAR. 38.

As to the assertions in the former part of this. Paragraph, I leave them to be judged of according to the evidence. As to the last assertion, the explanation is given in the text, p. 4, Par. 4.

PAR. 40 To 67.

In conformity with the principles stated in the outset, I refrain from entering minutely into these paragraphs relating to the "points in dispute" between the Government and the Native claimants. They contain many statements which I believe to be incorrect, to be supported by very infirm evidence, and to be capable of being impugned by better evidence, but I avoid raising minor and immaterial issues which, after all, we are not in a position to decide. Our complaint and grievance is this: that these points cannot be ascertained until the Government shall do in the end, what it ought to have done in the beginning, that is to say, institute a proper inquiry into the facts of the case.

PAR. 70, 71.

Every one knows with how much caution it is necessary to regard statements made after the fact by persons concerned in justifying; what has been done. The statements here cited from Mr. McLean are no exception to the general rule. I do not wish to examine them narrowly. I only ask that the strong assertions here made be compared with the evidence set forth in my text. Beyond this I confine myself to three particular points: 1st, Mr. McLean here justifies the proceedings of Mr. Parris in the most unqualified language, in the face of the fact that Mr. Parris had not obeyed the express instructions of Mr. McLean himself, which required him to visit the absentee claimants personally; 2nd, the numerous and frivolous claims made by persons who seek to share in the purchase money—which claims are themselves the produce and effect of the secret system of land purchasing—are urged as reasons against the employment of that open and legitimate mode of inquiry, which would prevent or destroy them: 3rd, the grave doubts affecting the transaction at Queen Charlotte's Sound are passed over without notice.

PAR. 73 To 83.

Here, on the subject of the "Investigation," the same course is taken by Mr. Richmond as before, with reference to the "Points in dispute." Scraps and fragments of doubtful assertions and unsifted evidence are produced by Mr. Richmond, and we are asked to accept them as a substitute for that proper inquiry which was demanded by every consideration of justice and expediency. Unproved allegations and uncertain inferences cannot be allowed to take its place. The defect of inquiry can only be supplied by a proper inquiry hereafter. The web, which Mr. Richmond has woven, is too weak to bear the weight of a civil war.

One passage only I think it necessary to notice: It is as follows (Par. 82); "Where unrepresented claimants are known, or believed, to exist, the Government makes inquiry on the spot; as was done in the present case at Queen Charlotte's Sound, and at Wellington. But where (as in the case of the Waikanae Natives) there is no reason to believe in the existence of valid claims, no local investigation is instituted. The Waikanae claimants (for whom the Rev. Riwai te Ahu acts as Secretary) ought to have come forward. They admit that they were aware of the negotiation at the time when the first instalment was paid in November, 1859."

On the contrary, there was very good reason to believe in the existence of valid claims at Waikanae. It was notorious that people closely connected with the Waitara were still at Waikanae. At a distance of 200 miles, they received no notice at all from the Commissioner of his proceedings. They hear of them for the first time, when the inquiry was concluded and the first instalment paid. This mode of dealing with absent owners is now
justified; a Native Minister regards it as sufficient. If this be sufficient, what can be insufficient? Do we shew our superiority and our civilization by this contemptuous disregard of common justice?

**Par. 98.**

Here is the main proposition on which Mr. Richmond relies: "In law, as well as in fact, their territorial rights and obligations are not subject to the interpretation of our Courts. These rights stand upon Treaty, of which the Crown itself is, rightfully, the sole interpreter." The practical consequence is drawn in Par. 121: "If the Governor had jurisdiction, he was justified in asserting it in the only practicable mode, viz., by force; in other words the Governor being of right, sole judge of questions respecting Native Territorial rights, was justified in enforcing Ms jurisdiction in the only practicable mode, viz., by military occupation."

I have argued that the people of the Waitara, being subjects of the Crown, have not been dealt with as subjects of the Crown. Mr. Richmond answers by saying, they are not subjects of the Crown; they have had all they are entitled to.

The fallacy of Mr. Richmond's argument is obvious. A Treaty in the ordinary sense is a compact between two independent nations, independent before the Treaty was made, and independent after it was made. Such a Treaty is not within the jurisdiction of the Courts of either nation. For an independent nation cannot be bound by the decision: of the Courts of another nation. Disputes therefore between independent nations, respecting the meaning; of a Treaty, must be decided by force or by arbitration. Of late even Sovereign powers have inclined to the latter mode. But the Treaty of Waitangi is of a different kind. The parties thereto were independent before, but not after. It is an express article of the Treaty that one party shall thereby become subject to the other; that the Maories shall become subject to the Queen, and shall receive the protection due to subjects. "Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her Royal protection, and imparts to them all the rights and privileges of British Subjects."

It may not be easy to find an exact counterpart to the Treaty of Waitangi: but there is a considerable analogy between it and the Charters and other instruments, by which Princes at various times have granted rights and franchises to their people. Whether the rights of the subject have been, as in Europe for the most part, doled out by Charters wrung from unwilling hands, or given freely and at once, as in this case, makes no difference as to the nature and effect of the compact: the only difference is one of degree, and not of kind. Now in such cases it has not been left to the Prince to put his own construction upon the Charter; but the franchises of the people have been expounded and maintained by tribunals independent of the Prince.

It is not meant, that the whole complex body of English Law was at once to be applied to the Natives; but it is meant, that the plain and fundamental principles of English Law became applicable at once; that the Natives became at once entitled to the essential rights of British subjects. Amongst those rights surely are the following:—that life shall not be taken without a fair trial; that land shall not be taken without a fair trial. "The rights and privileges of British subjects" must mean at any rate the opposite to despotism. The proceedings of the Government at the Waitara were pure despotism.

Mr. Richmond has entirely overlooked the consequences of his theory; namely, that if the Treaty of Waitangi be (as his argument assumes it to be) a Treaty in the ordinary sense, then the right of interpreting and enforcing the Treaty must belong: not to one party, but to both equally; that the Natives are at liberty to resort to force in support of their view, as much as the Governor in support of his; and that they cannot be charged with rebellion, if they do so.

However little the theoretical value of Mr. Rich- mond's doctrine may be, it is a significant and remarkable fact that such a doctrine is put forth. It is remarkable as bearing on the position, which I have maintained, that the Natives at the Waitara, being British subjects, have not been treated as British subjects. Had it been possible to shew that they have been treated as British subjects, Mr. Richmond would hardly have had recourse to a doctrine which denies them to be British subjects at all, which repudiates the assurances given by word and deed in a vast variety of ways during twenty years, and which puts the Natives in the same position in which they would have stood, had the Treaty never been made. It should be noticed also, what that is which is now clothed with the name and dignity of "the Crown." "The Crown itself (says Mr. Richmond) is the sole interpreter of the Treaty." (Par. 98.) It might be inferred then to be the duty of the Governor to provide for the Crown the means of interpreting, to ascertain all the facts, to submit them to the Home Government, and to act upon their decision. But Mr. Richmond requires nothing of the kind. In Par. 121 he applies the general principle to the particular case of the Waitara, and attempts thereby to justify the proceedings of the Government in this particular question. This enables us to understand what Mr. Richmond means, when he says that the Crown is the sole interpreter of the Treaty. The Crown then, in Mr. Richmond's sense, does not mean the Queen or the Government of England. They had never authorized, they did not understand, they had no means of understanding, what the Colonial Government was doing at the Waitara. That which Mr. Richmond calls by the
name of "the Crown "is in fact the Governor of the Colony, acting in a manner vitally concerning the interests of the Natives and the honour of the Crown, without any special authority or instruction from the Crown, with the concurrence and on the advice of persons who represent neither the Natives nor the Crown. Let us reduce the general proposition a little further. The Governor judging in this particular case is simply and in fact Mr. Parris. The largeness of the general proposition narrows itself down practically to these dimensions. The majesty of the Royal word and the largeness of the national undertaking issue in the decision of an Assistant Land Purchase Commissioner.

In May, 1857, the present Ministers recorded their opinion on the policy to be pursued in Native matters: they said, "As to the ultimate end to which the British Government in these Islands is bound to shape its Native policy, there can be no difference of opinion. Successive Governors have promised, in the name of the British Crown, that the Colonists and the Maories should form but one people, under one equal law; and no effort must be spared to redeem this pledge." (T. Q. p. 108.) In December, 1860, a theory is boldly put forward by one of those Ministers which, if England were capable of adopting it, would render the fulfilment of those promises absolutely and forever impossible: a theory according to which the Native population must submit to the aliens on their own soil; to bear the pressure of our dominion, but not to receive the protection of the Law or the privileges of English subjects. Thus, whilst professing to aim at raising and preserving this race, and bringing them into a peaceful union with ourselves, we uphold and prescribe a course of action which must provoke them to the most determined resistance to our authority, and can only end in the failure of our undertaking, in discredit to ourselves, and in ruin to them.

PAR. 100.

I agree with Mr. Richmond that "at the present moment the desideratum is to bring the Maories within the pale of the law." My complaint is, that the Colonial Government have been proceeded as to render the object more difficult of attainment than it was before. (See above, pp. 29-30.)

PAR. 103.

The Land Claims Courts were not cited by me "as instances of the satisfactory working of a jurisdiction over Native Territorial Rights." They have no such jurisdiction. They were referred to as shewing that the Colonial Legislature had again and again created Courts of Inquiry possessing powers and means for ascertaining facts, which Mr. Parris did not possess.

PAR. 107 TO 110.

In these paragraphs Mr. Richmond dwells on the difficulty of bringing dishonest or contumacious debtors of the Native race within the reach of our Civil Courts. The existence of such a class of persons furnishes no evidence against the disposition of the large majority to obey law. Few nations would be content to have defendants in actions of debt set up as their "representative men." Amongst the Maories, as elsewhere., the general character of the people may be more fairly estimated from the large majority who fulfil their contract without legal compulsion than from the minority, against whom the process of the Courts is resorted to.

PAR. 138.

I have asserted that the persons invited to the Kohimarama Conference were, with few exceptions, such as were known to be friendly to the Government. When Mr. Dillon Bell urged in the House of Representatives (August 17, 1860), the necessity of carefully considering the nature and constitution of the Conference proposed for 1861, he said that the Conference just held could not be regarded as of a representative character, for only those chiefs had been invited who were known to be friendly. No member questioned that statement. Mr. Richmond said it would be the object of the Government to give to the next Conference as much of a representative character as possible.

Though I cite Mr. Bell as asserting the same thing, my knowledge of the fact is derived from independent sources.

PAR. 141.

The purpose of the last 50 pages of the pamphlet was not solely, as Mr. Richmond suggests, "to enforce the necessity of a just and honest policy." The chief purpose was to shew, what have been the fruits of the existing mode of managing Native Affairs. Nominally, Native Affairs are committed to a Governor responsible to the
Crown. But in fact, the Governor possesses no substantial power and cannot obtain such power, except upon such terms as may be imposed by persons who represent neither the Crown nor the Natives. He may propose plans, but he can do little beyond that. There is, under existing circumstances, no security for the establishment of any complete and consistent plan for solving the Native difficulty, much less for steadily carrying out such a plan for a reasonable length of time.

The last Session has shewn us, that there are among the Colonists men capable of taking a just and comprehensive view of the relations of the two races. But thought and labour were stimulated by the war. The same amount of interest and exertion cannot be expected under ordinary circumstances.

My purpose was to shew that the existing system of management has issued in alternate fits of neglect and of intimidation, of non-government and of misgovernment; and thereby to suggest that the same mode of management, if continued, will only lead to a recurrence of the same deplorable results.

**THE END**

Handwritten letter to Mr. Collie


Upon the publication of my Remarks on the Taranaki Question, a large body of "Notes" challenging the accuracy of many of the statements therein made, were published "for the New Zealand Government." Seeing that these "Notes" avowedly expressed the views of the local authorities, it appeared to me that they ought not to pass without notice. But the publication of these official "Notes" was followed shortly after by a Notification in the New Zealand Gazette (25 Jan. 1861) deprecating public criticism on the conduct and policy of the Government, in the following terms:

"The Governor fully recognises the right of every British subject freely to discuss, criticise, and censure the acts of the Government, and, when the danger now threatening has passed away, he does not desire to see that right restricted."

"There are, however, occasions when the unrestrained use of such a right becomes manifestly dangerous to the community, and he feels it his duty to state that such an occasion now exists in this Colony."

As a copy of this official Notification has been specially addressed to me by the direction of His Excellency the Governor, I understand it to be the desire of the New Zealand Government that their "Notes" shall not be made the subject of public criticism. In deference, therefore, to their wish, I abstain for the present from giving publicity within the Colony to the following pages.

The following Remarks on the Government' Notes' and on Mr. Richmond's 'Memorandum' have been made as brief as possible. Those statements only have been commented on, which appeared likely to mislead the reader as to some material point. Many minor assertions and inferences, which I believe to be incorrect and unsound, have been passed over; either in the belief that their irrelevancy to the main question will be observed by a careful reader, or from an apprehension that the length and complexity of our Colonial documents may render them unreadable at home. Of course I pass over those assertions, as to which the evidence set forth in my original remarks appears to me to have anticipated and negativized all that is now urged in the 'Notes' and in the 'Memorandum.' I refer particularly to the statements made in the latter documents as to the nature and grounds of the present quarrel, as to the alleged connection of that quarrel, in its origin, with some land-league or with the Waikato King movement, as to the cession by Waikato, & Sec. I wish to avoid any repetition of what has been already said. In some cases the point relied on by the Government recurs in several Notes or in several passages of the Memorandum; in such cases I have noticed the point in connection with that passage, in which it seemed to be most prominent. I believe there is no assertion or argument concerning the substance of the question, either in the Notes or in the Memorandum, which is not directly met in these Remarks.

I adopt the references as. I find them in the Notes, that is to say, "page 28" means, the Note headed "page 28," and referring to the 28th page of the "Taranaki Question."

W. M.

Taurarua,
Erratum,

Page 2 line 16, for "in property" read "of property,"

Remarks on Notes Published for the New Zealand Government.

Page 1. Note 2.

Mr. Busby’s statement is cited as if it were entirely opposed to mine. In reality, the only difference between us is as to the origin of the rules: a question upon which it is unnecessary to enter.

To shew this I set out the whole paragraph, of which only the first sentence is cited in the Note:—

"I have no hesitation in saying that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, as established by a singular concurrence of the best evidence, are not rules of native origin. That they have been ‘generally accepted and acted upon by the natives in the later periods of their dealings in respect to lands, I do not dispute; but they are the natural and necessary deductions from the proceedings to which our own countrymen ban recourse, in order to obtain an equitable title to the lands which they purchased from the natives. It is not more than twenty-five or thirty years since the natives first began to look upon land as an object of exchangeable value."

(Mr. Busby, page 7.)

In page 8, Mr. Busby again carries back the existence of those rules to a time previous to the foundation of the colony:

"In fine, the result of my experience during the seven years in which I held office, was a conviction that the natives had no idea of property in land, such as exists in the minds of people where it has been the subject of legislation. And that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, were not rules established by natives, but suggested by the precautions adopted by our own countrymen in order to obtain a title which could not be justly disputed."

These admissions are quite sufficient. Indeed there is no real contradiction between Mr. Busby and myself as to the existence of rights in property amongst the natives. The difference is in the sense given to the word "right." Mr. Busby uses the word in the legal sense, as that which has a corresponding remedy, and is supported by some law.

He says in page 5:—

"In these remarks we have only to do with the rights of property, as they are necessarily understood by jurists and statesmen, implying corresponding obligations to respect such rights. In this sense I do not hesitate to say that, so far as we can trace their history, there is no evidence of the New Zealanders ever having possessed any rights, with the exception of those which were created by the Treaty of Waitangi. Of what use is it, practically, for a man to say I possess a right to my property, when there is no laic to define the obligations which are created by such a right, or government with power to administer the law, supposing it to have existed? New Zealand was, in an emphatic sense, a country without a law and without a prince."

I use the term for that which was acknowledged and warranted by custom, though there was no law in our sense to uphold it.

I subjoin a passage from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell in the House of Representatives, 3rd of August, 1860:—

"We know how at the great original migration the occupants of the first canoes took possession of the land; we know how it became subdivided as the tribes increased, and the hapu branched off from the iwi; we know how particular and distinct titles arose as land was subdued by cultivation, as hunting-grounds were claimed for catching the rat, as weirs were erected in the streams, or as numberless other special acts of ownership were exercised; we know how these distinct titles still merged in the tribal title, and did not destroy it: these are customs universally recognized, lying (as I said) at the foundation of native tenure throughout the islands." (New Zealander, Aug. 8, 1860.)

It may be well to say that I have never intended to uphold the tribal or communal right as a good thing in itself. I assert it only as a fact which now exists, and which has existed from time immemorial. It was the only
way in which the tribal form of society could be kept up. For to alienate land to a stranger, was to alienate to one who might any day become an enemy. The whole tribe therefore was interested in the matter for the sake of its own independence. It was something like what we call an Alien Law. Afterwards when the Pakeha came, it acquired a new meaning, but one of scarcely less practical importance to them. It is a question of great moment to them, whether a single man or a few men may, without the consent of their fellows, introduce into the midst of their cultivations an ineligible neighbour whose cattle may range over their unfenced land, or who in a variety of other ways may injure or annoy the rest of the community. Nor would the social evil be less. Such a principle would be fertile of quarrels. It would offer an opportunity to every ill disposed man to gratify private resentment, and to embroil his tribe with the Pakeha. In this very case there are indications of something of this kind.

It is for the interest of both races that individual rights should be substituted for the right of the Community, as far as possible. But this can only be effected by rational means, not by mere force.

**Page 2, Note 1, and Page 3, Note 2.**

It is asserted in this Note that when the captives and the persons who had voluntarily migrated to other places began to return to Taranaki, those families which remained in the new places where they had settled, were never admitted to exercise authority over those who returned, in the disposal by the latter of their own land. It is also asserted, that for the last eighteen years it has been acknowledged amongst themselves that even a family of three or four people were free to dispose of or to retain their property. In page 3, Note 2, this is asserted broadly as applying to the whole tribe. It is said to have been an acknowledged usage among the Ngati awa that their separate families had separate rights of alienation.

It is believed that these assertions are incapable of proof. They are directly contradictory to Mr. McLean's statement, 17th December, 1844, (Taranaki Question, page 16,) and also to Mr. McLean's practice. For, upon the principle now alleged, the visits to Queen Charlotte Sound and Wellington were unnecessary.

So extraordinary an exception to the general rule should have been properly proved, before force was resorted to.

**Page 9.**

It is believed that the practice of the Land Claim Commissioners was the following:—They travelled throughout the country, investigating each claim on the spot. The persons whose names appeared on each Deed as sellers, were examined; and the boundaries of the land were then publicly pointed out. If this was done without opposition, it was assumed that the Community at large assented. The Note itself states, that there were cases where the tribe or hapu did object.

**Page 10, Note 2.**

Thinking it not unlikely that the word "Community" would be objected to as novel, I fell back upon the terms ordinarily employed, and used the words "tribe" and "tribal" in the ordinary way, as opposed to "individual." It would no doubt tend to clearness to use the word "Community" throughout, to indicate the separate societies into which the Maori population is broken up.

**Page 12, Notes 2.**

The assertion here referred to is made on the authority of the following statement made by Mr Forsaith, (formerly of the Native Department,) in his place in the House of Representatives, on the 9th August, 1860:—"Now it was a well-known fact, that W. King and that section of the Ngati awa tribe whom he represented were never dispossessed by the Waikatos. As a proof of this, he would mention a fact which his honourable friend the Member for the Wallace County would confirm. About the year 1842, Te Pakaru, a Waikato Chief who had taken part in the invasion of Taranaki, proceeded to the Waitara for the purpose of hiking possession, and bad actually commenced felling timber fur the purpose of preparing ground for cultivation. William King, who had not then returned from Waikanae to the home of his fathers, sent a deputation to pana Te Pakaru, i. e. to warn him off. Te Pakaru, conscious that his position was not tenable, gave up the attempt, and returned to Waikato." (New Zealander, August 15, 1860.)

**Page 14, Note 1.**

Sir George Grey opposed for a time the return of William King and his party to the Waitara, seeing the
complication that would arise out of such return. When he found that they were bent upon doing that which they had the clearest right to do, he assented to that which he could not prevent. No doubt he desired to prevent their settling on the South bank of the Waitara. Whether William King made any promise, and if so, what were the circumstances and terms of the promise, I know not.

But it should be remembered that the blame (whatever it may be) of disregarding Governor Grey's wishes is not to be confined to William King. Teira returned with William King and settled also on the South bank.

This Note refers to the Note on page 84. In the latter we find a statement, proceeding from persons who must have been acquainted with the facts, that "W. Kingi being the head Chief of all Waitara, on both sides of it, it was for himself to choose and to say on which side he was to reside."

PAGE 16.

I had heard of such a permission as is here alleged, but the extent or terms of it I did not know, and do not know even now. At every point the same defect makes itself apparent, the lack of a proper investigation of the facts of the case. The point intended to be noticed is this, that William King was driven off land which he was actually occupying at the time.

PAGE 22.

The first sentence of this Note mis-states my proposition under the form of admitting it. The proposition in the Note is, that the Native cultivators and occupiers of the block could make a title without the consent of the whole tribe. Advantage is taken of the ambiguity of the word "tribe," here, as commonly, used to indicate that Community or Society of which the cultivators and occupiers were members. My real meaning is put out of doubt by the next sentence of the text, in which the Government view is expressed in other words, viz:—"That if Teira's right existed at all, it was of necessity an absolute right, and "that it was the purpose of the Government to disregard all claims but those of the individual holders."

In this Note a passage is set forth which purports to be a part of Governor Fitzroy's speech of 3rd Aug. 1844. It is produced in order to explain away the natural meaning of the words used by himself in his official statement to the Home Government. In fact, the passage set forth is no part of that speech. It is taken from a sort of Leading Article in the Maori Gazette, published at Auckland, 2nd September, 1841. In the same number of the Gazette (pp. 46-47) the speech itself is set forth. Then follows a brief notice of other speakers; then another address without a name, to the absentee owners, urging them to go to the nearest teacher or protector, to register their names and claims to land, so that, if they should not be disposed to sell, and their masters should be willing to manumit them, they might return to their own places.

In page 48 commences the before-mentioned Leading Article, reviewing and commending the Governor's proceedings at Taranaki, contrasting the English and French modes of Colonization, and ending by enlarging on divers passages of Scripture. From this Article the words cited in the Mote are translated. They appear to apply to the Town Block which Governor Fitzroy insisted on retaining, whilst he was content to recal the settlers from other parts of the District. When a block is to be ceded, of course the marking out of individual holdings becomes necessary in order that the payment may be apportioned. But before it comes to this stage of the business, the Community must have already assented to the Cession. The contrast which runs throughout the words of Governor Fitzroy and the comments thereon, is not a contrast between the individual right and that of the Community, but a contrast between the rights of the owners on the spot and those of the absentee owners.

The source of the whole difficulty which Governor Fitzroy found at Taranaki was this: the persons who were on the spot at the time of the arrival of the New Zealand Company's agent, desiring to secure the presence and protection of the Pakeha, had sold a tract of land without the assent of the absentee owners. This fact furnishes the key to all that Governor Fitzroy said. He expressed his desire to avoid the recurrence of such an evil, and all his suggestions pointed that way.

I have thought it necessary to explain this document, to guard against misconception. But in fact Governor Fitzroy's remarks did not apply to the Waitara at all. It is admitted that the people of that district had nothing to do with the sale to the New Zealand Company. (T. Q. p. 16.)

The connection of the argument in the text is missed in the Note. It is therefore necessary to re-state it briefly. The letter to William King cited in page 23, and Mr. McLean's notice in page 24, both expressed the new principle quite plainly. Mr. McLean says "You know that every man has a right (of doing as he pleases) with his portion, and no man may interfere to prevent his exercise of this right as respects his portions, for the thought respecting his own is with himself." These declarations were made to a man, with whom the Government had been long dealing as with one whose consent was necessary to the alienation of land at the Waitara. The new declaration forced him to assert his right in the letter set forth in pp. 29-30, and to state the
ground of his right, namely, that the land belonged to the whole Community.

I notice that in the third column in this Note, the beginning only of the above sentence of Mr. McLean is given, and the conclusion of the very same sentence (distinguished above by Italics) is omitted.

PAGE 24.

The important subject of the feuds referred to in this Note is reserved for consideration in connection with the Note on page 82.

The ambiguity of the word "tribe" has been admitted. I did not intend to assert that William King is the Chief of the whole tribe of the Ngati awa. He is certainly the Chief of that section of the Ngati awa to which the Waitara belongs.

Before leaving, this branch of the subject, I subjoin an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell, in the House of Representatives, 3rd August, 1860:—"Towards the end of 1839, Colonel Wakefield (the Company's agent) arrived in New Zealand and among other places went to Waikanae, where Wiremu Kingi, even at that time an intelligent and enterprising man, took great interest in the Colonel's proceedings, and accompanied him in the ship Tory on a visit to the Ngati awa Chiefs of Queen Charlotte Sound, to buy land. It was on that occasion that Wiremu Kingi signed the deed of which so much has been said; but for my part I never attached much importance to his signature except as it may he held to bar his individual right. About this time the Ngapuhi and Waikato tribes determined on manumitting their slaves taken in war, and almost simultaneously with the introduction of European Settlers into Taranaki, numbers of the Ngati awa captives returned to their ancient location; while those who belonged to the first migration followed their example, and also began to come up from the South in small detached parties. Wiremu Kingi and his father remained at Waikanae, but according to Maori law were equally entitled to reclaim their old possessions at Taranaki when they say should return. I need not remind the House of the disputes which immediately followed the return of the Ngati awa, in the first years of the settlement, nor how they and the English settlers contested the possession of the soil: still less need I remind them that in 1844 Mr. Spain, the Queen's Commissioner for investigating and determining titles to land, held his Court at Taranaki, and decided that the Company was entitled to a grant of 60,000 acres: or that Governor Fitzroy disallowed that decision, on the ground of its setting aside the claims of unreturned captives and absentees. I do not believe that Governor Fitzroy meant absolutely to annul the Company's purchase; I think it is clear he intended that compensation should be given to the absentees as they came in, not that they should have all the land back. But whatever he may have thought, there was never a doubt on my mind that the natives understood his decision practically to be a recognition of their ownership and a giving back of the land." (New Zealander, 8th August, 1860.)

Another circumstance should be noticed. Various points are relied on from time to time, in support of the Government case: at one time the Waikato Invasion; at another, the Cession to Governor Hobson; at another, Governor Grey's policy; and so forth. Each of these taken singly, supposing it to have the effect ascribed to it, would set aside Teira's title as much as William King's: yet in some way or other out of the combination or conflict of all, Teira emerges as "rightful owner," as "undisputed owner," whilst the rights of the Community and of the Chief have been lost. The result of this view is that Teira reappears with a title not worse, nor just as good, but far better than it would have been if none of these adverse circumstances had existed. For he is now conceived to possess a power of alienation, even without the consent of the Community to which he belongs.

It was not sufficiently considered how little the arbitrary severance, made by the Government theory, between the rights of the individual holder and those of the Community and the Chief, could be expected to commend itself to the people of the Waitara. The Waikato invasion is the point from which Mr. McLean dates the alleged change in the Rules of Tenure at Taranaki, the commencement of the exceptional state of things in that district. If the individual holders were not affected by all that had passed from the Waikato invasion downwards, how could the Community and the Chief regard themselves as deprived of their old rights by those same events?

PAGE 28.

Surely it is not meant that all publications are to be condemned, except those which approve of the course taken by the Government. In a Dependency, it is possible that the policy pursued by the Government of the Dependency may tend to counteract, or even to defeat, the policy of the Imperial Government. If that is deliberately believed to be the case, is every man to be censured who expresses that belief, with due caution and regard to circumstances?

The Debates in the House of Representatives in August, 1860, made it notorious throughout the country that there was a great difference of opinion amongst the Colonists themselves as to the proceedings of the
Government. I believe that notoriety to have had a most wholesome effect in checking the spread of the war. The Natives were thereby encouraged to believe that what was done at the Waitara was not the doing of the Pakeha as a race, and would not be approved by the Queen.

My remarks on the Taranaki Question were put forth in the beginning of December, after hostilities had continued for nine months.

As to the declarations of the Governor referred to in this Note, it is to be remarked that, with the Natives, words weigh little against deeds.

It does not yet appear whether the assurance conveyed to the Bishop of New Zealand respecting the "lawful rights of Chief and Tribe" has ever been circulated amongst the leading Native Chiefs.

**Pages 30, 31, 32.**

There can be no doubt as to the duty of a citizen to communicate to the Government information which he may derive from any private source, respecting matters which seriously affect the public interest or public peace. I do not enter into the circumstances here referred to. The reasons for Archdeacon Hadfield's conduct have already been publicly explained by himself.

One thing however should be said. It is a most unfortunate state of things when a Government allows itself to depend on such sources of information, and omits to take the proper means of obtaining information for itself. And in this particular case, it should in fairness be asked, whether the assertion of right and the expression of determination to hold the Waitara, contained in these letters to Archdeacon Hadfield, had not been already conveyed directly to the Governor by W. King.

There appears to be a misconception as to the object for which these letters are cited. That object is not to prove any specific facts; but to shew the general fact that there were claims, and what was the nature of those claims. By the aid of private documents, the writer gropes his way to some notion of the state of things. He endeavours to ascertain, as well as he can, what the Government ought to have ascertained fully and accurately. Had a proper inquiry been instituted by the Government, the use of all these letters would have been superseded.

The consideration of this object will explain the omission of the letter of July 27. That letter indicates nothing as to the special nature of the claim made by William King; whilst it contains a story about Mr. Parris, which I could only regard as unfounded or greatly exaggerated and distorted. At the same time I have had experience enough of rumours in this land, to find no difficulty in believing that such reports had reached William King and had been credited by him.

**Pages 34, 35.**

The second letter appears to me to prove nothing more than that the writer foresaw, what others ought to have foreseen, namely, that the employment of soldiers would end in bloodshed.

A remark towards the end of the Note makes it necessary for me to add, that when these letters came to my hands, the time had long passed when they could have been of any practical use to the Government.

**Page 42, Note 9.**

It was never intended to be alleged that William King is the Chief of the whole Ngatiawa tribe. He is certainly the chief of the Community to which the Waitara belongs.

**Page 44.**

What is meant is, that plain issues are raised even upon these documents. Those issues would have been raised more plainly still, if a proper inquiry had been instituted by the Government.

**Pages 47, 48.**

No complaint is made against the Land Purchase Department; nor any question raised as to its efficiency, whilst kept within the bounds of its proper functions. If there is no dispute between buyer and seller, there is nothing to decide. What is maintained is this, that when a dispute exists, the decision of the Land Purchase Department (in this particular case the decision of Mr. Parris) is not sufficient. It is not sufficient to bind the rights of the Queen's subjects, or to justify the use of military force against the Queen's subjects.

With a view to remove a misconception which seems to prevail at Home, I notice an important statement in this Note, by which it appears that nearly 30,000,000 acres of land have already been acquired for the Crown in
this Colony. The British population is estimated at between 60 and 70,000.

**Page 50, Note 2**

It is by no means the case, that "the accusations of not instituting a proper investigation, after all, resolve themselves into the charge that no investigation was made at Waikanae." The case of Waikanae was dwelt on, because it was an admitted fact that no investigation did take place there. The cases of Queen Charlotte's Sound and Wellington were passed over more lightly, for want of information; and that reason was expressly given. It is now clear that the very gravest doubts exist as to the assent of the Natives at Queen Charlotte's Sound. Mr. McLean himself, on his examination before the House of Representatives, produced a letter, dated April 10, 1859, written to him by one of those Natives. The letter stated that the names of certain persons had been signed without their authority, and intimated that the transaction, if it went on, would issue in fighting. (See Mr. McLean's Evidence, Pap. E. No. 4, page 23.)

**Page 56.**

If any reasonable doubt could remain as to the meaning of the words used by Wi Tako, it would be removed by the following fact.

A short time back, when the excitement arose about the native man found dead near Patu mahoe, some of the people on the Waikato river notified their intention of visiting the spot, and there making inquiry for themselves as to the cause of the death. Ihaka of Pukaki (between Auckland and the Waikato) resisted their interference. In the course of a discussion on this subject, which took place at Pukaki, Ihaka twice used the words "No matou tenet he; the very phrase of Wi Tako. They were taken down at the time by a gentleman thoroughly acquainted with the Maori language. Nothing certainly could be farther from Ihaka's meaning than to charge himself and his people with any wrong or fault in the matter. All that he meant was, that the thing which had gone wrong was their own affair, and that their neighbours ought not to meddle with it.

It is to be regretted that the original words of Paora's speech, referred to in this Note, are not given.

**Page 59, Note 2.**

The admission here made of the desirableness of the establishment of some tribunal for settling questions of Native tenure and custom, is so far satisfactory. The difficulties in the way of doing this appear to be over estimated. All would depend on the constitution of the Court, and on the order and course of our proceedings with a view to the establishment of it. For the creation of a Court for determining land questions is not the first point to be aimed at. This subject will be discussed more fully in connection with Note, page 82.

What the reasons were which induced the Legislature of the Colony to agree to the Declaration in Section 8, I do not know. That they had nothing to do with the point here suggested (namely, that the territorial rights of the Natives stand upon Treaty, and therefore that questions between the Government and the Natives belong to the Governor and not to any Court) is shown by the words of the Declaration itself; which apply, not to questions between the Government and the Natives, or between English Colonists and the Natives, but to questions "affecting the Title or right of occupancy of the Aboriginal Natives, as amongst themselves" The point here referred to as to the Treaty and its consequences, will be more fully considered below in reference to Mr. Richmond's Memorandum.

As to Lord Carnarvon's Despatch, is it intended to be inferred that, whereas the British Government was not to be expected to support by military force the decisions of the Governor in Council, under the Native Territorial Rights Bill, that Government was to be expected to support by military force the result of Mr Parris' inquiry? His Lordship's Despatch should rather have suggested, that the full and proper investigation, which we claim as due of right to the Native subjects of the Crown, was no less needed for the protection of the English Colonists and of the tax-paying public of England.

**Page 75.**

In this Note it is said that the order of things, which the Governor disturbed, was the desperate feud then prevailing at New Plymouth.

It should be remembered that there was no feud subsisting between William King and Teira. We learn from Mr. Parris that "after this offer for sale Teira associated with William King the same as before, but never let the subject rest." He states also that "they never had recourse to harsh measures after the public offer of the land to His Excellency the Governor, but on the contrary tried to work upon Teira by acts of kindness." (E. No. 3A. p. 2.)
Mr. Parris is here speaking of peaceful relations subsisting between William King and Teira before the negotiations for peace between the Taranaki tribes began, that is to say, whilst the feud was still subsisting between William King and other parties. Then came the negotiations which brought the feud to an end. Peace had continued for about half a year when the Governor made the military demonstration at the Waitara.

**Page 80, Note 1.**

In this Note it is asserted that "nearly twelve months of patient investigation" were expended on this case. Now Teira's offer was made on the 8th day of March, 1859, and the first instalment was paid on the 29th November, 1859. The whole investigation then lay between those two dates. We are also told that Mr. Parris' "inquiry was prolonged till the close of the year 1859; not from any doubt that existed as to the title, but in the hope that the opposing party might be brought to reason." (Pap. E, No. 3, p. 21)

A portion of time then, which we have no means of defining, is to be interposed between the time when all doubt had ceased as to the title, and the 29th of November. Moreover, Mr. Parris himself states that his inquiry was intermitted for two months, lest he should interfere with the negotiations for peace then pending between the Tribes. (Pap. E, No. 3A, p. 2.) What portion of the residue was actually employed on this particular business, it is impossible to ascertain, as there are no Minutes of his proceedings.

Yet in the Despatch to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 28th of June, 1860, it is stated that "nine months were occupied by persons constantly engaged in carefully considering and investigating this particular title." And now we are told that "nearly twelve months of patient investigation" were spent upon it.

I notice this, not because the matter in itself is of great moment; for the value of an investigation depends much more on the nature and method of it than on the length of time employed; but as an instance of a looseness of statement much to be regretted in official documents.

**Page 80, Note 2.**

This Note furnishes a remarkable instance of a practical fallacy which pervades these Notes. These so-called "rules" and "decisions" were in fact merely plans of proceeding or schemes of policy. They might be very beneficial, if they could be carried out, but they had no binding effect or authority whatever. To induce the Natives to yield up tracts of land and accept compensation for them, was in many cases very proper; and Mr Clarke and the officers of his department often had influence enough with the Natives to obtain their assent. But no one was bound by those transactions, except the persons who were actually parties to them.

What is here called Governor Grey's decision was no decision at all in any proper sense. Governor Grey found himself in the midst of those difficulties which followed upon that act of Governor Fitzroy, which has been expressly admitted by the present Governor to have been both just and politic. (Parl. Pap. July, 1860, p. 177.)

Governor Grey did not directly impugn the proceeding of his predecessor, but he felt the practical inconveniences which followed upon it. To escape them, he attempted an intermediate and singular policy. The titles of the returned owners were not to be acknowledged in words by the Government, but their claims were to be bought, if they were disposed to sell, at a rate not exceeding 1s. 6d. an acre.

It is idle to quote this policy of Governor Grey as an authority or precedent for the present proceedings. That policy has been entirely abandoned by the present Governor. The titles of the individual cultivators, which Governor Grey would not directly acknowledge, have been in this very transaction (not to go further back) fully acknowledged by the present Government. Teira and his companions have been recognized as "rightful owners," as "undisputed owners." (E. No. 3, p. 22.) And as to the price, have the present sellers received no more than Is. 6d. an acre?

**Page 82.**

This Note opens a subject of the utmost importance, and one which needs a fuller discussion. It is most true that feuds productive of many crimes raged among the tribes in the neighbourhood of New Plymouth, for five years, from August, 1854, till July, 1859, peace being finally made in September, 1859.

Here, and elsewhere in these Notes, it seems to be taken as a consequence of that state of things, that the proceedings of the Government at the Waitara were justified. It is implied that there was something in those proceedings tending to put an end to that state of things: or else, that with a people capable of such crimes, all legal and rational modes of dealing were out of the question. Therefore I do not content myself with saying (what indeed would be a sufficient answer to this Note) namely, that those feuds and crimes and our inability to prevent or punish them, furnish no reason why a full and proper inquiry should not have been made into Teira's title to sell; such an inquiry being demanded at once by justice to the Natives, and by due regard to the interests
of our own people in the Colony and in England.

These feuds commenced when Rawiri Waiaua, encouraged by the local Land Purchase Commissioner, attempted to sell a piece of land in violation as it appears, of the tribal right. (T. Q. p. 132.) The result of this was the crime described in page 108. The Government did not interfere to punish that crime, or to suppress, by military force, the atrocities which followed it. It was apprehended that interference on our part would lead to a war of which the limits, the cost, and the effects, could not be estimated. It was seen also that it would be extremely difficult to prevent our motives from being misunderstood. Many feuds and private wars in different parts of the country had passed without notice. If we interfered” in this case, it was likely to be thought that we did so, not so much on account of the crime which Katatore had committed as on account of the land which Rawiri desired to sell. So the Government confined itself to protecting the settlers, and endeavouring by such means as were practicable to check or mitigate those feuds.

The difficulty of the case became still greater when Katatore was murdered. That crime was committed on the Queen's land, on a public road within the settlement. It was a murder of revenge, not directly connected with any piece of land. Still the Government refrained from interfering, beyond issuing a Proclamation in the following month, February, 1858. That Proclamation was not in such general terms as are stated in this Note, that is to say, "warning ill! the Natives that this anarchy would no longer be tolerated." It only warned them against assembling with arms within the boundaries of a certain district. The Proclamation was accompanied by an official comment in the Maori Messenger; which, after explaining the reasons of our non-interference, proceeded thus—

"While indulging this hope, we are startled by the news of another and more frightful murder. Blood is spilt on land which the Queen has granted. This cannot be allowed to pass in silence. The Governor has therefore spoken his word. He still says, 'I shall not interfere. Both parties are doing wrong, but it is not my present intention to employ force against either while they keep outside the limits of the English settlement, but I will allow neither to come armed within these limits, I will not permit fighting in my presence.'"

I do not know whether this limited proclamation has been, as is alleged in the Note, 'openly violated.'

The effect of this state of things on the Natives may be gathered from the following letter—

March 4, 1858, Waitara. For this translation I am indebted to the same gentlemen as before. The Maori text is given below.

To Wiwi, Kiripata, Wiremu Tamihana, Apa, Ture, Wiri, Tei, and Hohepa, to you all, Greeting to you. My friends, my fathers, listen. Here we are involved in warfare, that is to say in grievous, murderous, cannibal, bloodthirsty calamity in this very grievous calamity. Listen. You are probably imagining that we are going blindly to work. It is not so, but we are proceeding on a clear course. What makes it clear is this, that as far as regards the reference to the Governor, that has been done. As for murder, we have no intention of murdering. We leave murder to Ihaia and Nikorima. Our Chiefs will act in broad daylight, and indeed they are acting now in broad daylight. As regards the reference to the Governor, that has been made by the Chiefs. You have already heard that Waitere (Katatore) was killed on the ninth day of the month of January. We had to wait till February for the Governor's answer. The answer came, that the Governor could take no steps in the matter, but let there be another murder, then the Governor would consent. Hence our Chiefs concluded that the course taken by the Governor was wrong, because, this is Ihaia's second murder. The words of the former Governor are not attended to now, for steps were taken in the case of the quarrel with Rangihaeata at the Hutt—on that occasion, promptly In the case of this murder no steps are taken. As was killed in the midst of the settlers, so now should any man belonging to Ihaia be found in the house of a settler in the town he will be killed there, because this is not as it should be. And now all the pas are surrounded, Te Karaka, Pukerito, and Otehetehe. The pa which we attacked was Pukerito, we got close under the outworks. Those of our party who were killed in the attack on the pa, were Hehe Nga nohoanga, Tamati Tuainane, and Te One. These were from Waitara. Tamati Takua from Wai***, Maihi from Taputirau, Heta from te Kawau. These were killed. Of the people of the place F.ruini Mangania, Hakaraia Jtepo, Te Kawhaki Haenga were wounded. Wi Te One mihi was killed in the fight at Te Ika moana. He was shot by Te Kepa Hanawerangia.

I cannot tell all. Enough.
From RITATONA TE IWA.

It seems that the letter from the Governor, referred to above, has not yet been printed.

Now what view of the Queen's Sovereignty could the Natives acquire under these circumstances? I do not censure the Government, but I ask for a fair consideration of the facts. Instead of throwing the whole blame upon the Natives, let us rather look upon that state of things as the common calamity of both races. Let us not
keep back the fact that in the origin of these evils we also had a share, and that they were aggravated by injudicious acts and by violent language on the part of some of our own people. No greater misfortune could have befallen the Natives than to see that the Government was powerless, and so to be driven back into their old barbarism. It would have been the greatest blessing for both races, if it had been possible from the beginning to follow up and punish every act of bloodshed. The manifest benefit, flowing from the action of the Queen's Sovereignty, would have reconciled the Natives to the action of that Sovereignty in other ways. But every consideration which had made it unwise and inexpedient to interfere against crime, made it still more unwise and inexpedient to interfere in a question of land.

The feuds at last wore themselves out and peace was made. A few months after that, the Colonial Government employed military force at the Waitara. The power which had not protected life or property, came forward to take possession of land. What I assert is, that no course could have been more unfortunate than this, no course less likely to effect the great object of establishing practically the Queen's Sovereignty throughout this island. We did not interfere even when we should have been sure of a strong body of allies; when the instinctive sense of justice and retribution for crime would have been in our favour, on the spot and throughout the island. When the feuds and crimes had ceased, we began to employ military force, and that in a case wholly unconnected with crime. So we did all in our power to confirm the evil notion, already widely spread among the Natives, that we care for nothing but to get their land.

We often hear strong language used about what is called a defiance of the Queen's Sovereignty. It were better for both races if we set ourselves dispassionately to consider what we have done towards commending that Sovereignty, towards showing the value and benefit of it. In what light must the case appear to them? The Queen's power has not saved their lives or property, but it takes possession of their land. It appears to them not as a protector but as an invader; not as a stayer of bloodshed, but as itself a shedder of blood. We have taken the course which tends not to advance, but to hinder, our great object. "We have begun at the wrong end."

I do not mean to say that the Queen's Sovereignty could be imposed wholly from without, even by a Government regarded with confidence by the Native population. We must act on the principle, which has been of late so often enunciated and so often forgotten, that the Natives are to be governed through themselves; but we can only effect our great object by proceeding in the right order. We must invert the whole course of our proceedings. We must begin by suppressing bloodshed and crime, and so advance to minor matters. The next Native Conference will furnish an opening for our efforts towards securing that great end.

Our present mode of proceeding provokes resistance. Let us proceed in the proper order, and we shall find support in all parts of the country.

We boast of our superiority, and especially of our skill in government. Let us prove our skill, by commending rather than discrediting the object we have in view. The Natives have been repelled from that to which they ought to have been attracted by the strongest sense of their own interest.

Many and very intelligent men amongst them are now drawn towards the King party most unwillingly. They know and say, that the chiefs of that party possess neither the knowledge nor the means needed for elevating their race, and rescuing them from the evils of their present condition. Yet they turn to them as a protection against a power, which they fear and cannot trust.

When the present evils shall have ceased, and confidence shall have been restored by a fair investigation of their grievances, and by an earnest practical effort to provide for them the institutions, and secure the social benefits, they so greatly need and desire, the combination which is now opposed to our authority will disappear like a mist, and the Native race will regard the Sovereignty of the Queen as a boon and a privilege.

Remarks On Mr Richmond's Memorandum.

PARAGRAPH 6.

In the four propositions here stated as conveying the substance of my remarks, there are some inaccuracies. In the first, Mr. Richmond speaks of "the territory of the Ngati awa in Taranaki", and of the right of "the whole tribe"; I have intended all along to speak of the community to which the Waitara belongs and of the communal right. In the second, William King is described as "principal Chief of the Ngati awa." I regard him, not as chief of the whole tribe, but as chief of the Waitara. In proposition four, it is given as my opinion that the Governor was not justified in taking possession "without the Judgment of a Court of Law," What I maintain is, that the Governor was not justified in taking possession without the decision of some competent and independent tribunal.
PAR. 9.

The assertions here made cannot be admitted. The quarrel is in its origin and nature a land quarrel. To the Maories, it is not even now a question of Sovereignty in Mr. Richmond's sense. I believe there are very few (if any) amongst them, who think it possible or desirable to overthrow the Queen's Sovereignty and to establish one of their own. To them it is an intensely practical matter. The people of the Waitara resisted because they saw the soldiers take possession of the land. That which draws others into the quarrel is the belief that if the present proceeding of the Government shall succeed, the like will be attempted elsewhere, and they will have no security for their lands or their lives. There can be no clear understanding of the present state of affairs unless we distinguish between two things which are often confounded in official papers, the British Government and the Colonial Government. Even yet the great mass of the Native population is disposed to trust to the justice of the British Government, but I fear there are few who are disposed to trust to the justice of the present Colonial Government.

PAR. 21, 22, 23, 24.

It is here asserted that "Mr. Spain's Award was a solemn judicial determination," and also that 'Governor Fitzroy had no authority to reverse Mr. Spain's determination."

Mr. Spain's powers were such as he received under his Commission from Her Majesty and under the "Land Claims Ordinances" of the Colony. It is plain that the Commission by itself could not give him power conclusively to bind persons and lands; the Legislature only could give such power. Now the powers which the Legislature really did give, were only such powers as were requisite for a proper investigation. The result of the inquiry was to be reported to the Governor. Mr. Spain made no such claim for himself as is now made for him. In his Despatch to Governor Fitzroy, 12th June, 1844, he says "I delivered my judgment in the presence of a considerable number of Natives, as well as Europeans; but wherein I have most carefully explained that the same is subject to confirmation by your Excellency, and cannot be carried into effect without your approval." (E. No. 2. p. 8.) Accordingly Governor Fitzroy, acting on the advice of the officer who was then responsible for Native Affairs, refused to confirm it.

Respecting Governor Fitzroy's disallowance of Mr. Spain's award, it may be well to notice that the present Governor has recorded, his opinion in the clearest terms (Desp. Nov. 19, 1855)—

"Mr. Commissioner Spain was sent to enquire into these claims, and with certain exceptions declared in favour of the New Zealand Company's purchase. His decision was, however, overruled by Governor Fitzroy, who required all lands to be returned to the Natives, except those in which it could be proved that the whole of the owners had been, or were, willing to sell them.

This just decision, which also proved to be a very politic one, prevented the New Zealand Company from fulfilling its engagements with the Settlers, and caused great dissatisfaction and in some cases distress." (Part. Pap. July, 1860, p. 177.)

Mr. Richmond remarks that my citation in italics (T. Q. p. 14) is not the whole of the sentence: which is quite correct. Rut it is the whole of that which concerns the people of the Waitara and the present question. The only claimants with whom Governor Fitzroy had to do, were the persons concerned in the sale of 1840. The people of the Waitara had nothing to do with that sale. (T. Q. p. 16.)

It is also said that "Governor Fitzroy never contemplated and never admitted the assertion of the tribal claim." It is true that nothing is said hereabout the tribal claim. The reason is, that the question which Governor Fitzroy had to settle, was not a question between individuals and the community, but between residents and absentees.

PAR. 24.

Of this so-called Address of Governor Fitzroy I have spoken above (p. 8). The four passages here thrown together, as if they were all parts of that Address, are taken from three distinct documents: the first and second from the Address; the third from the Notice to the Absentees; the fourth from what I have called the Leading Article in the Maori Gazette of 2nd September, 1844.

The drift of the third passage is obscured by Mr. Richmond's departure from the translation (itself defective) put forth by the Government in the Appendix to the Memorandum, page 24. The words "men of Taranaki," meaning the absentees, have become "men at Taranaki."

Before leaving this subject of Governor Fitzroy's alleged plans and words, I will state again briefly the fallacy which pervades Mr. Richmond's reasoning on this subject.

Governor Fitzroy had before his mind two classes of people: 1st, those who had been parties to the sale to
the New Zealand Company's agent in 1840; and 2ndly, those who had not been parties to that sale. To this latter class belong the people of the Waitara.

As to the former class, he insisted on certain terms. Their act had led the Pakeha to form a settlement. The Governor therefore was not content to abandon that settlement. The Pakeha must retain all that really belonged to the sellers. The absentees should do what they pleased, either keep or sell.

As to the latter class, the Governor recognized their claims in all their integrity. Mr. Bell has told us (above p. 12) how the Natives understood that.

The fallacy of Mr. Richmond's argument is this, that he treats the terms insisted on in reference to the first class, as being the measure and limit of the rights recognized as belonging to the second class.

PAR. 32.

What is called by Mr. Richmond the first Counter-proposition, and which is here taken to have been established, runs counter, not to what I have really maintained, but to what I am assumed to have maintained. My proposition as to the rule of Native Tenure is, that the individual holder is a member of a Community, and that the consent of the Community is necessary to the alienation of the land; and that in every purchase it is one of the matters of fact to be ascertained, what the Community is in that particular case. This proposition, so far from being disproved, is in fact admitted in express terms in Mr. Richmond's last paragraph; where Mr. McLean is cited as saying "The whole of the purchases previously made at Taranaki had been effected on the same principle as the present one from Te Teira, namely, that of acquiring the land from the different clans and sub-divisions of clans which came in from time to time to offer it." Mr. McLean admits the rule; but there is nothing to show that in this particular case that rule was carried out. There is nothing to show that the right of the Community was ever investigated at all. Nor is there any way of reconciling the rule so admitted by Mr. McLean with the direct and express denial, on the part of the Government, of everything but the individual right, throughout the proceedings at the Waitara.

Here I leave the question of the exception alleged to exist at Taranaki, and the novel assertions that have been made on the subject since the proceedings at the Waitara. Those assertions have been directly denied by a number of members of the Ngati awa. In reference to Mr. McLean's statements before the House of Representatives, (Q. 58, 59,) they say "We, of this Ngati awa, now hear for the first time of those modes of proceeding;"——"we have never heard of this custom all these years. We now hear of it for the first time in this answer." (New Zealand Spectator, Jan. 2, 1861.) See above, p. 5.

I now notice the stages by which men have advanced to the new theory.

In 1853, Mr. Charles Brown, one of the oldest settlers in the Province of Taranaki, was elected Superintendent, the first under the Constitution Act. Whilst a candidate for the office, he put forward his views on the Land question, in the following words—"I look forward with hope that the time is not far distant; when the Government will buy no land and have none to sell, and that its office will then be confined to extinguishing the collective titles of tribes, and giving individual titles, available for sale." (Taranaki Herald, 18 May, 1853.)

In accordance with this view, Mr. Superintendent Brown addressed to the Colonial Secretary the following letter, dated 6th March, 1854—"SIR, A recent purchase having been effected by Mr. Commissioner McLean of a tract of land in this Province, I beg to draw the attention of his Excellency the Officer administering the Government, to the peculiar features of this purchase, is bearing in the most important manner on the relations of the two races. Mr. McLean did me the honour to request my opinion on the offer of the land in question, at what he considered a high price, and in which it was proposed to exclude all but a few pah reserves, securing to the Natives the pre-emptive right of purchase of 2000 acres at 10s. per acre, each Native to purchase separately and possess a separate Crown Title for his property.

As an opportunity of introducing a principle so beneficial to the Native race, breaking up the common rights which cripple their individual energies, and giving them separate rights with Crown Titles, might not occur for a long time, I expressed the opinion which I hope will meet with the approval of his Excellency, that the introduction of such a principle, was worth attaining at any cost, whether as regarded the, Province individually, or its benefit as an illustration to the whole Native, race. I have no hesitation in anticipating that the adoption of the principle by any Native tribe, will convert the members of it into settlers and citizens fully as valuable as the European population." (Southern Cross, Nov. 2 1860.)

In another letter to the Colonial Secretary, dated 26th September, 1860, Mr. Brown stated that the plan proposed in 1854 had been carried out, and that "the owners of these individual holdings are the most loyal, peaceable, and industrious Natives in the Province, as well as the best neighbours the settlers in the district could wish for." It will be seen that Mr. Brown had no notion of any difference, as to the communal right, between Taranaki and other parts of the island.
Thus Mr. Brown sought to effect a good object by fair and reasonable means. This was the first stage. The second stage was when the Provincial Council at Taranaki presented their Memorial to both Houses of Assembly in 1858, urging "that the Government should compel an equitable division of such common land among the respective claimants, on the petition of a certain proportion of them." The third stage was when the Government, instead of seeking to remove by proper means the difficulty presented by the communal right, assumed it to have been removed, and denied or ignored every right except that of the individual holder.

Par. 38.

As to the assertions in the former part of this Paragraph, I leave them to be judged of according to the evidence. As to the last assertion, the explanation is given in the text, p. 4, Par. 4.

Par. 40 to 67.

In conformity with the principles stated in the outset, I refrain from entering minutely into these paragraphs relating to the "points in dispute" between the Government and the Native claimants. They contain many statements which I believe to be incorrect, to be supported by very infirm evidence, and to be capable of being impugned by better evidence, but I avoid raising minor and immaterial issues which, after all, we are not in a position to decide. Our complaint and grievance is this: that these points cannot be ascertained until the Government shall do in the end, what it ought to have done in the beginning, that is to say, institute a proper inquiry into the facts of the case.

Par. 70, 71.

Every one knows with how much caution it is necessary to regard statements made after the fact by persons concerned in justifying what has been done. The statements here cited from Mr. McLean are no exception to the general rule. I do not wish to examine them narrowly. I only ask that the strong assertions here made be compared with the evidence set forth in my text. Beyond this I confine myself to three particular points: 1st, Mr. McLean here justifies the proceedings of Mr. Parris in the most unqualified language, in the face of the fact that Mr. Parris had not obeyed the express instructions of Mr. McLean himself, which required him to visit the absentee claimants personally; 2nd, the numerous and frivolous claims made by persons who seek to share in the purchase money—which claims are themselves the product and effect of the secret system of land purchasing—are urged as reasons against the employment of that open and legitimate mode of inquiry, which would prevent or destroy them; 3rd, the grave doubts affecting the transaction at Queen Charlotte's Sound are passed over without notice.

Par. 73 to 83.

Here on the subject of the "Investigation," the same course is taken by Mr. Richmond as before, with reference to the "Points in dispute." Scraps and fragments of doubtful assertions and unsifted evidence are produced by Mr. Richmond, and we are asked to accept them as a substitute for that proper inquiry which was demanded by every consideration of justice and expediency. Unproved allegations and uncertain inferences cannot be allowed to take its place. The defect of inquiry can only be supplied by a proper inquiry hereafter. The web, which Mr. Richmond has woven, is too weak to bear the weight of a civil war.

One passage only I think it necessary to notice: It is as follows (Par. 82); "Where unrepresented claimants are known, or believed, to exist, the Government makes inquiry on the spot; as was done in the present case at Queen Charlotte's Sound, and at Wellington. But where as in the case of the Waikanae Natives) there is no reason to believe in the existence of valid claims, no local investigation is instituted. The Waikanae claimants (for whom the Rev. Riwai te Ahu acts as Secretary) ought.to have come forward. They admit that they were aware of the negotiation at the time when the first instalment was paid in November, 1859."

On the contrary, there was very good reason to believe in the existence of valid claims at Waikanae. It was notorious that people closely connected with the Waitara were still at Waikanae. At a distance of 200 miles, they received no notice at all from the Commissioner of his proceedings. They hear of them for the first time, when the inquiry was concluded and the first instalment paid. This mode of dealing with absent owners is now justified; a Native Minister regards it as sufficient. If this be sufficient, what can be insufficient? Do we shew our superiority and our civilization by this contemptuous disregard of common justice?

Par. 98.
Here is the main proposition on which Mr. Richmond relies: "In law, as well as in fact, their territorial rights and obligations are not subject to the interpretation of our Courts. These rights stand upon Treaty, of which the Crown itself is, rightfully, the sole interpreter." The practical consequence is drawn in Par. 121: "If the Governor had jurisdiction, he was justified in asserting it in the only practicable mode, viz., by force; in other words the Governor being of right sole judge of questions respecting Native Territorial rights, was justified in enforcing his jurisdiction in the only practicable mode, viz., by military occupation."

I have argued that the people of the Waitara, being subjects of the Crown, have not been dealt with as subjects of the Crown. Mr. Richmond answers by saying, they are not subjects of the Crown; they have had all they are entitled to.

The fallacy of Mr. Richmond's argument is obvious. A Treaty in the ordinary sense is a compact between two independent nations, independent before the Treaty was made, and independent after it was made. Such a Treaty is not within the jurisdiction of the Courts of either nation. For an independent nation cannot be bound by the decision of the Courts of another nation. Disputes therefore between independent nations, respecting the meaning of a Treaty, must be decided by force or by arbitration. Of late even Sovereign powers have inclined to the latter mode. But the Treaty of Waitangi is of a different kind. The parties thereto were independent before, but not after. It is an express article of the Treaty that one party shall there by become subject to the other; that the Maories shall become subject to the Queen, and shall receive the protection due to subjects. "Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her Royal protection, and imparts to them all the rights and privileges of British Subjects."

It may not be easy to find an exact counterpart to the Treaty of Waitangi: but there is a considerable analogy between it and the Charters and other instruments, by which Princes at various times have granted rights and franchises to their people. Whether the rights of the subject have been, as in Europe for the most part, doled out by Charters wrung from unwilling hands, or given freely and at once, as in this case, makes no difference as to the nature and effect of the compact: the only difference is one of degree, and not of kind. Now in such cases it has not been left to the Prince to put his own construction upon the Charter; but the franchises of the people have been expounded and maintained by tribunals independent of the Prince.

It is not meant, that the whole complex body of English Law was at once to be applied to the Natives; but it is meant, that the plain and fundamental principles of English Law became applicable at once; that the Natives became at once entitled to the essential rights of British subjects. Amongst those rights surely are the following—that life shall not be taken without a fair trial; that land shall not be taken without a fair trial. "The rights and privileges of British subjects" must mean at any rate the opposite to despotism. The proceedings of the Government at the Waitara were pure despotism.

Mr. Richmond has entirely overlooked the consequences of his theory; namely, that if the Treaty of Waitangi be (as his argument assumes it to be) a Treaty in the ordinary sense, then the right of interpreting and enforcing the Treaty must belong not to one party, but to both equally; that the Natives are at liberty to resort to force in support of their view, as much as the Governor in support of his; and that they cannot be charged with rebellion, if they do so.

However little the theoretical value of Mr. Richmond's doctrine may be, it is a significant and remarkable fact that such a doctrine is put forth. It is remarkable as bearing on the position, which I have maintained, that the Natives at the Waitara, being British subjects, have not been treated as British subjects. Had it been possible to shew that they have been treated as British subjects, Mr. Richmond would hardly have had recourse to a doctrine which denies them to be British subjects at all, which repudiates the assurances given by word and deed in a vast variety of ways during twenty years, and which puts the Natives in the same position in which they would have stood, had the Treaty never been made. It should be noticed also, what that is which is now clothed with the name and dignity of "the Crown." "The Crown itself (says Mr. Richmond) is the sole interpreter of the Treaty." (Par. 98.) It might be inferred then to be the duty of the Governor to provide for the Crown the means of interpreting, to ascertain all the facts, to submit them to the Home Government, and to act upon their decision. But Mr. Richmond requires nothing of the kind. In Par. 121 he applies the general principle to the particular case of the Waitara, and attempts thereby to justify the proceedings of the Government in this particular question. This enables us to understand what Mr. Richmond means, when he says that the Crown is the sole interpreter of the Treaty. The Crown then, in Mr. Richmond's sense, does not mean the Queen or the Government of England. They had never authorized, they did not understand, they had no means of understanding, what the Colonial Government was doing at the Waitara, That which Mr. Richmond calls by the name of "the Crown" is in fact the Governor of the Colony, acting in a matter vitally general character of the people may be more fairly estimated from the large majority who fulfil their contracts without legal compulsion than from the minority, against whom the process of the Courts is resorted to.
I have asserted that the persons invited to the Kohimarama Conference were, with few exceptions, such as were known to be friendly to the Government. When Mr. Dillon Bell urged in the House of Representatives (August 17, 1860), the necessity of carefully considering the nature and constitution of the Conference proposed for 1861, he said that the Conference just held could not be regarded as of a representative character, for only those chiefs had been invited who were known to be friendly. No member questioned that statement. Mr. Richmond said it would be the object of the Government to give to the next Conference as much of a representative character as possible.

Though I cite Mr. Bell as asserting the same thing, my knowledge of the fact is derived from independent sources.

The purpose of the last 50 pages of the pamphlet was not solely, as Mr. Richmond suggests, "to enforce the necessity of a just and honest policy." The chief purpose was to shew, what have been the fruits of the existing mode of managing Native Affairs. Nominally, Native Affairs are committed to a Governor responsible to the Crown. But, in fact, the Governor possesses no substantial power, and cannot obtain such power except upon such terms as may be imposed by persons, who represent neither the Crown nor the Natives. He may propose plans, but he can do little beyond that. There is under existing circumstances no security for the establishment of any complete and consistent plan for solving the Native difficulty, much less for steadily carrying out such anian for a reasonable length of time.

The last Session has shewn us, that there are among the Colonists men capable of taking a just and comprehensive view of the relations of the two races. But thought and labour were stimulated by the war. The same amount of interest and exertion cannot be expected under ordinary circumstances.

My purpose was to shew that the existing system of management has issued in alternate fits of neglect and of intimidation, of non-government and of misgovernment; and thereby to suggest that the same mode of management, if continued, will only lead to a recurrence of the same deplorable results.

Original Text of the letter cited above p. 25.

Waitara.

E Riwi, e Kiripats, e Wiremu Tamihans, e Apa, e Ture, e Wiri, e Tei, e Hohepa; e koutou katoa, tena ra koutou katoa, e aku hoa, e aku papa. Whakarongo mai. Tenei matou kei runga i te pakanga, ara, i te mate kina, i te mate kohuru, i te mate i otaina i ngaau, i te mate inumia nga toto, i tenei mate kina noa iho. Whakarongo mai, tena pea koutou te ki mai na, tenei te mahia nei i runga i te pohehe, kaore, kei te mahia i runga i te marama. Ko te marama ra tenei, ko te mahi ki te Kawana, kua oti; ko te mahi kohuru kaore i whakaaro me kohuru, Erangi ma Ihaia ma Nikorima te kohuru, ma nga rangatira o maua me awatea. Koia tenei e malia nci i te awatea. Ko te mahi ki a te Kawana i mahia ano e nga rangatira. Kua rongo mai iami koutou ki te marama i mate ai ate Waitere, ko Hanuere i te 9 o nga ra tae noa ki a l'epuere e tatari ana ki te kupu a te Kawana. Ko te taenga mai o tana kupu, kaore he tikanga a te Kawana, engari kia kotahi ake kohuru i tei, hei reira ka whakae ai a te Kawana. No konei ka whakaaro nga rangatira o maua, ka he nga tikanga a te Kawana, no te mea ka rua nga kohuru a Ihaia. Ko nga kupu a te Kawana o mua, inaiane ki kaore e whakarangona ana kupu. Ina hpki, he tikanga ano i te whawhai kiata Uangihaeata i Heretaunga, i hohehe i reira: i tenei kohuru kaore he tikanga. Ko te mea i patua ki waenga nui o nga Pakhe, ko tenei ka kitea ki roto i te whare Pakhe i tei i tei kourangi tanga o Ihaia ka patau ano kia kohuru, no te mea kua he. Ko tenei kua karapotta katoa nga pa, a te Karaka a Pukeni a Otehehe. Ko te pa i whakaekea emaua ko Pukeni, taea rawatia a raro iho o te pekerangi. Ko o maua i mate i te whakaenga o te pa, ko Hehe Nga nohoanga, ko Tamati Tuainane, ko te One, no Waitara enei; ko Tamati Takua no Wai***, ko Maihi no Tapuiraup, ko Heta no te Kawau, i mate rawa enei. No te tanga whenua, ko Erini Manganui, ko Hakaraia Repo, ko te Kawhaki Haenga', nga mea i tu ora. Ko Wi Te Onemihi, no te parkura i te lka moana ia i mate ai. Na te Kepa Hana Werangia i pupuhi.

Ekore e taea te korero atu. He Oti.

NA RITATONA TE IWA.

Remarks on Notes,
Remarks on Notes Published for the New Zealand Government.

These references are made to the pages of the London edition of "The Taranaki Question," by Sir W. Martin.

**PAGE 5. NOTE 2.**

Mr. Busby's statement is cited as if it were entirely opposed to mine. In reality, the only difference between us is as to the origin of the rules: a question upon which it is unnecessary to enter.

To shew this I set out the whole paragraph, of which only the first sentence is cited in the Note:—

"I have no hesitation in saying that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, as established by a singular concurrence of the best evidence, are not rules of native origin. That they have been generally accepted and acted upon by the natives in the later periods of their dealings in rested to lands, I do not dispute; but they are natural and necessary deductions from the proceedings to which our own countrymen had recourse, in order to obtain an equitable title to the lands which they purchased from the natives. It is not more than twenty-five or thirty years since the native first began to look upon land as an object of exchangeable value."—(Mr. Busby, page 7.)

In page 8, Mr. Busby again carries back the existence of those rules to a time previous to the foundation of the colony.

"In fine, the result of my experience during the seven years in which I held office, was a conviction that the natives had no idea of property in land, such as exists in the minds of the people where it has been the subject of legislation. And that the rules which Sir W. Martin lays down, were not rules established by natives, but suggested by the precautions adopted by our own countrymen in order to obtain a title which could not be justly disputed."

These admissions are quite sufficient. Indeed there is no real contradiction between Mr. Busby and myself as to the existence of rights of property among the natives. The difference is in the sense given to the word "right." Mr. Busby uses the word in the legal sense, as that which has a corresponding remedy, and is supported by some law.

He says in page 5:—

"In these remarks we have only to do with the rights of property, as they are necessarily understood by jurists and statesmen, implying corresponding obligations to respect such rights. In this sense I do not hesitate to say that, so far as we can trace their history, there is no evidence of the New Zealanders ever having possessed any rights, with the exception of those which were created by the Treaty of Waitangi. Of what use is it, practically, for a man to say I possess a right to my property, when there is no law to define the obligations which are created by such a right or government with power to administer the law, supposing it to have existed? New Zealand was, in an emphatic sense, a country without a law and without a prince."

I use the term for that which was acknowledged and warranted by custom, though there was no law in our sense to uphold it.

I subjoin a passage from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell in the House of Representatives, 3rd of August, 1860:—

"We know how at the great original migration the occupants of the first canoes took possession of the land; we know how it became subdivided as the tribes increased, and the hapu branched off from the iwi; we know how particular and distinct titles arose as land was subdued by cultivation, as hunting grounds were claimed for catching the rat, as weirs were erected in the streams, or as numberless other special acts of ownership were exercised; we know how these distinct titles still merged in the tribal title, and did not destroy it: these are
It may be well to say that I have never intended to uphold the tribal or communal right as a good thing in itself. I assert it only as a fact which now exists and which has existed from time immemorial. It was the only way in which the tribal form of society could be kept up. For to alienate land to a stranger, was to alienate to one who might any day become an enemy. The whole tribe therefore was interested in the matter for the sake of its own independence. It was something like what we call an Alien Law. Afterwards when the Pakeha came, it acquired a new meaning, but one of scarcely less practical importance to them. It is a question of great moment to them, whether a single man or a few men may, without the consent of their fellows, introduce into the midst of their cultivations an ineligible neighbour whose cattle may range over their unfenced land, or who in a variety of other ways may injure or annoy the rest of the community. Nor would the social evil be less. Such a principle would be fertile of quarrels. It would offer an opportunity to every ill-disposed man to gratify private resentment, and to embroil his tribe with the Pakeha. In this very case there are indications of something of this kind.

It is for the interest of both races that individual rights should be substituted for the right of the Community, as far as possible. But this can only be effected by rational means, not by mere force.

**PAGE 6, NOTE 1, AND PAGE 7, NOTE 2.**

It is asserted in this Note that when the captives and the persons who had voluntarily migrated to other places began to return to Taranaki, those families which remained in the new places where they had settled, were never admitted to exercise authority over those who returned, in the disposal by the latter of their own land. It is also asserted, that for the last eighteen years it has been acknowledged amongst themselves that even a family of four people were free to dispose of or to retain their property. In page 7, Note 2, this is asserted broadly as applying to the whole tribe. It is said to have been an acknowledged usage among the Ngati awa that their separate families had separate rights of alienation.

It is believed that these assertions are incapable of proof. They are directly contradictory to M. McLean's statement, 17th December, 1844, (Taenaki Question, page 19,) and also to Mr. McLean's: practice. For, upon the principle now alleged, the visits to Queen Charlotte Sound and Wellington we unnecessary.

So extraordinary an exception to the general rule should have been properly proved, before fore was resorted to.

**PAGE 13, NOTE 1.**

It is believed that the practice of the Land Claim Commissioners was the following:—They travelled throughout the country, investigating each claim on the spot. The persons whose names appeared on each Deed as sellers were examined; and the boundaries of the land were then publicly pointed at. If this was done without opposition, it was assumed that the Community at large assented. The Note itself states, that there were eases where the tribe or hapu did object.

**PAGE 14, NOTE 2.**

Thinking it not unlikely that the word "Community" would be objected to as novel, I fell back upon the terms ordinarily employed, and used the words "tribe" and "tribal" in the ordinary way, as opposed to "individual." It would no doubt tend to clearness to use the word "Community" throughout, to indicate the separate societies into which the Maori population is broken up.

**PAGE 15, NOTE 2.**

The assertion here referred to is made on the authority of the following statement made by Mr. Forsaith, (formerly of the Native Department,) in his place in the House of Representatives, on the 9th August, 1860:—"Now it was a well-known fact, that W. King and that section of the Ngati awa, tribe whom he represented were never dispossessed by the Waikatos. As a proof of this, he would mention a fact which his honourable friend the Member for the Wallace County would confirm. About the year 1842, Te Pakaru, a Wai kato Chief who had taken part in the invasion of "Taranaki, proceeded to the Waitara for the purpose of taking possession, and had actually commenced felling timber for the purpose of preparing ground for cultivation. William King, who had not then returned from Waikanae to the home of his fathers, sent a deputation to pana Te Pakaru, i.e. to warn him off. Te Pakaru, conscious that his position was not tenable, gave up the attempt, and returned to Waikato."—(New Zealander, August 15, 1860.)
Sir George Grey opposed for a time the return of William King; and his party to the Waitara, seeing the complication that would arise out of such return. When he found that they were bent upon doing that which they had the clearest right to do, he assented to that which he could not prevent. No doubt he desired to prevent their settling on the South bank of the Waitara. Whether William King made any promise, and if so, what were the circumstances and terms of the promise, I know not.

But it should be remembered that the blame (whatever it may be) of disregarding Governor Grey's wishes is not to be confined to William King. Teira returned with William King and settled also on the South bank. This Note refers to the Note on page 92. In the latter we find a statement, proceeding from persons who must have been acquainted with the facts, that W. Kingi being the head Chief of all Waitara, on both sides of it, it was for himself to choose and to say on which side he was to reside."

I had heard of such a permission as is here alleged, but the extent or terms of it I did not know, and do not know even now. At every point the same defect makes itself apparent, the lack of a proper investigation of the facts of the case. The point intended to be noticed is this, that William King was driven off land which he was actually occupying at the time.

The first sentence of this Note misstates my proposition under the form of admitting it. The proposition in the Note is, that the Native cultivators and occupiers of the block could make a title without the consent of the whole tribe. Advantage is taken of the ambiguity of the word "tribe," here, as commonly used to indicate that Community or Society of which the cultivators and occupiers were members. My real meaning is put out of doubt by the next sentence of the text, in which the Government view is expressed in other words, viz.:—"That if Teira's right existed at all, it was of necessity an absolute right," and that it was the purpose "of the Government to disregard all claims but those of the individual holders."

In this Note a passage is set forth which purports to be a part of Governor Fitzroy's speech of 3rd Aug. 1844. It is produced in order to explain away the natural meaning of the words used by himself in his official statement to the Home Government. In fact, the passage set forth is no part of that speech. It is taken from a sort of Leading Article in the Maori Gazette, published at Auckland 2nd September, 1844. In the same number o the Gazette (pp. 46-47) the speech itself is set forth. Then follows a brief notice of other speakers; then another address without a name, to the absentee owners, urging them to go to the nearest teacher or protector, to register their names and claims to land, so that, if they should not be disposed to sell and their masters should be willing to manumit hem, they might return to their own places.

In page 48 commences the before-mentioned Leading Article, reviewing and commending the Governor's proceedings at Taranaki, contrasting the English and French modes of Colonization and ending by enlarging on divers passages of Scripture. From this Article the words cited in the Note are translated. They appear to apply to the Town Block which Governor Fitzroy insisted on retailing, whilst he was content to recall the settlers from other parts of the District. When a block is to be ceded, of course the marking out of individual holdings becomes necessary in order that the payment may be apportioned. But before it comes to this stage of the business, the Community must have already assented to the Cession. The contrast which runs throughout the words of Governor Fitzroy and the comments thereon, is not a contrast between the individual right and that of the Community, but a contrast between the rights of the owners on the spot and those of the absentees.

The source of the whole difficulty which Governor Fitzroy found at Taranaki was this: the persons who were on the spot at the time of the arrival of the New Zealand Company's agent, desiring to secure the presence and protection of the Pakeha, had sold a tract of land without the assent of the absentee owners. This fact furnishes the key to all that Governor Fitzroy said. He expressed his desire to avoid the recurrence of such an evil, and all his suggestions pointed that way.

I have thought it necessary to explain this document, to guard against misconception. But in fact Governor Fitzroy's remarks did not apply to the Waitara at all. It is admitted that the people of that district had nothing to do with the sale to the New Zealand Company. (T. Q.p. 20.)

The connection of the argument in the text is missed in the Note. It is therefore necessary to restate it briefly. The letter to William King cited in page 26, and Mr. McLean's notice in page 28, both expressed the new principle quite plainly. Mr. McLean says, You know that every man has a "right (of doing as he pleases) with his portion, "and, no man may interfere to prevent his exercise of this right as respects his portions, for the
thought respecting his own is with himself." These declarations were made to a man, with whom the Government had been long dealing as with one whose consent was necessary to the alienation of land at the Waitara. The new declaration forced him to assert his right in the letter set forth in page 33, and to state the ground of his right, namely, that the land belonged to the whole Community.

I notice that in the third column in this Note, the beginning only of the above sentence of Mr McLean is given, and the conclusion of the very same sentence (distinguished above by Italics) is omitted.

PAGE 27.

The important subject of the feuds referred to in this Note is reserved for consideration in connection with the Note on page 90.

The ambiguity of the word "tribe" has been admitted. I did not intend to assert that William King is the Chief of the whole tribe of the Ngati awa. He is certainly the Chief of that section of the Ngati awa to which the Waitara belongs.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, subjoin an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Dillon Bell, in the House of Representative, 3rd August, 1860—"Towards the end of 1839, Glonel Wakefield (the Company's agent) arrived in New Zealand, and among other places went to Waikanae, where Wiremu Kingi, even at that time an intelligent and enterprising man, took great interest in the Colonel's proceedings, and accompanied him in the ship Tory on a visit to the Ngati awa Chiefs "of Queen Charlotte Sound, to buy land. It was on that occasion that Wiremu Kingi sighed the deed of which so much has been said; but for my "part I never attached much importance to his signature except as it may be held to bar his individual right. About this time the Ngapuhi and "Waikato tribes determined on manumitting their "slaves taken in war, and almost simultaneously "with the introduction of European Settlers into Taranaki, numbers of the Ngati awa captives returned to their ancient location; while those who "belonged to the first migration followed their "example, and also began to come up from the South in small detached parties. Wiremu Kingi and his father remained at Waikanae, but according to Maori law were equally entitled to reclaim "their old possessions at Taranaki when they should return. I need not remind the House of the disputes which immediately followed the return of the Ngati awa, in the first years of the settlement, nor how they and the English settlers contested the possession of the soil; still less need I remind them that in 1844 Mr. Spain, the Queen's Commissioner for investigating and determining titles to land, held his Court at Taranaki, and decided that the Company was entitled to a grant of 60,000 acres: or that Governor Fitzroy disallowed that decision, on the ground of its setting aside "the claims of unreturned captives and absentees. I do not believe that Governor Fitzroy meant absolutely to annul the Company's purchase; I think it is clear he intended that compensation should be given to the absentees as they came in, not that they should have all the land back. But whatever he may have thought, there was never a doubt on "my mind that the natives understood his decision "practically to be a recognition of their ownership "and a giving back of the land"—(New Zealander, 8th August, 1860.)

Another circumstance should be noticed. Various points are relied on from time to time in support of the Government case: at one time the Waikato Invasion; at another, the Cession to Governor Hobson; at another, Governor Grey's policy; and so forth. Each of these taken singly, supposing it to have the effect ascribed to it, would set aside Teira's title as much as William King's: yet, in some way or other out of the combination or conflict of all, Teira emerges as rightful owner," as undisputed owner," whilst the rights of the Community and of the Chief have been lost. The result of this view is that Teira reappears with a title not worse, nor just as good, but far better than it would have been if none of these adverse circumstances had existed. For he is now conceived to possess a power of alienation, even without the consent of the Community to which he belongs.

It was not sufficiently considered how little the arbitrary severance, made by the Government theory, between the rights of the individual holder and those of the Community and the Chief, could be expected to commend itself to the people of the Waitara. The Waikato invasion is the point from which Mr. McLean dates the alleged change in the Rules of Tenure at Taranaki, the commencement of the exceptional state of things in that district. If the individual holders were not affected by all that had passed from the Waikato invasion downwards, how could the Community and the Chief regard themselves as deprived of their old rights by those same events?

PAGE 31.

Surely it is not meant that all publications are to be condemned, except those which approve of the course taken by the Government. In a Dependency, it is possible that the policy pursued by the Government of the Dependency may tend to counteract, or even to defeat, the policy of the Imperial Government. If that is deliberately believed to be the case, is every man to be censured who expresses that belief, with due caution and
regard to circumstances?

The Debates in the House of Representatives in August, 1860, made it notorious throughout the country that there was a great difference of opinion amongst the Colonists themselves as to the proceedings of the Government. I believe that notoriety to have had a most wholesome effect in checking the spread of the war. The Natives were thereby encouraged to believe that what was done at the Waitara was not the doing of the Pakeha as a race, and would not be approved by the Queen.

My remarks on the Taranaki Question were put forth in the beginning; of December, after hostilities had continued for nine months.

As to the declarations of the Governor refered to in this Note, it is to be remarked that, with the Natives, words weigh little against deeds.

It does not yet appear whether the assurance conveyed to the Bishop of New Zealand respecting the lawful rights of Chief and Tribe has ever been circulated amongst the leading Native Chiefs.

**Pages 34, 35, 36.**

There can be no doubt as to the duty of a citizen to communicate to the Government information which he may derive from any private source, respecting matters which seriously affect the public interest or public peace. I do not enter into the circumstances here referred to. The reasons for Archdeacon Hadfield's conduct have already been publicly explained by himself.

One thing however should be said. It is a most unfortunate state of things when a Government allows itself to depend on such sources of information, and omits to take the proper means of obtaining information for itself. And in this particular case, it should in fairness be asked, whether the assertion of right and the expression of determination to hold the Waitara, contained in these letters to Archdeacon Hadfield, had not been already conveyed directly to the Governor by W. King?

There appears to be a misconception as to the object for which these letters are cited. That object is not to prove any specific facts; but to shew the general facts that there were claims, and what was the nature of those claims. By the aid of the private documents, the writer gropes his way to some notion of the state of things. He endeavours to ascertain, as well as he can, what the Government ought to have ascertained fully and accurately. Had a proper inquiry been instituted by the Govern merit, the use of all these letters would have been superseded.

The consideration of this object will explain the omission of the letter of July 27. That letter indicates nothing as to the special nature of the claim made by “William King; whilst it contains a story about Mr. Parris, which I could only regard as unfounded or greatly exaggerated and distorted. At the same time I had experience enough of rumours in this land, to find no difficulty in believing that such reports had reached William King and had been credited by him.

**Pages 38, 39, 40.**

The second letter appears to me to prove nothing more than that the writer foresaw, what others ought to have foreseen, namely, that the employment of soldiers would end in bloodshed.

A remark towards the end of the Note makes it necessary for me to add, that when these letters came to my hands, the time had long passed when they could have been of any practical use to the Government.

**Pages 49, Note 2.**

It was never intended to be alleged that William King is the Chief of the whole Ngati awa tribe. He is certainly the chief of the Community to which the Waitara belongs.

**Page 51.**

What is meant is, that plain issues are raised even upon these documents. Those issues would have been raised more plainly still, if a proper inquiry had been instituted by the Government.

**Page 55.**

No complaint is made against the Land Purchase Department; nor any question raised as to its efficiency, whilst kept within the bounds of its proper functions. If there is no dispute between buyer and seller, there is nothing to decide. What is maintained is this, that when a dispute exists, the decision of the Land Purchase Department (in this particular case the decision of Mr. Parris) is not sufficient. It is not sufficient to bind the
rights of the Queen's subjects, or to justify the use of military force against the Queen's subjects.

With a view to remove a misconception which seems to "prevail at Home, I notice an important statement in this Note, by which it appears that nearly 30,000,000 acres of land have already been acquired for the Crown in this Colony. The British population is estimated at between 60 and 70,000.

PAGE 60.

It is by no means the case, that the accusations of not instituting" a proper investigation, after all, resolve themselves into the charge that no investigation was made at Waikanae." The case of Waikanae was dwelt on because it was an admitted fact that no investigation did take place there. The cases of Queen Charlotte's Sound and Wellington were passed over more lightly, for want of information; and that reason was expressly given. It is now clear that the very gravest doubts exist as to the assent of the Natives at Queen Charlotte's Sound. Mr. McLean himself, on his examination before the House of Representatives, produced a letter, dated April 10, 1859, written to him by one of those Natives. The letter stated that the names of certain persons had been signed without their authority, and intimated that the transaction, if it went on, would issue in fighting. (See Mr. McLean's Evidence, Pap. E. No. 4, page 23.)

PAGE 64

If any reasonable doubt could remain as to the meaning of the words used by Wi Tako, it would be removed by the following fact.

A short time back, when the excitement arose about the native man found dead near Patu mahoe, some of the people on the Waikato river notified their intention of visiting the spot, and there making inquiry for themselves as to the cause of the death. Ihaka of Pukaki (between Auckland and Waikato) resisted their interference. In the course of a discussion on this subject, which took place at Pukaki, Ihaka twice used the words No matou tenei he," the very phrase of Wi Tako. They were taken down at the time by a gentleman thoroughly acquainted with the Maori language. Nothing certainly could be farther from Ihaka's meaning than to charge himself and his people with any wrong or fault in the matter. All that he meant was, that the thing which had gone wrong was his own affair, and that their neighbours ought not to meddle with it.

It is to be regretted that the original words of Paora's speech, referred to in this Note, are not given,

PAGE 67, NOTE 2.

The admission here made of the desirableness of the establishment of some tribunal for settling questions of Native tenure and custom, is so far satisfactory. The difficulties in the way of doing this appears to be over-estimated. All would depend on the constitution of the Court, and on the order and course of our proceedings with a view to the establishment of it. For the creation of a Court for determining land questions is not the first point to be aimed at. This subject will be discussed more fully in connection with Note, page 90.

What the reasons were which induced The Legislature of the Colony to agree to the Declaration in Section 8, I do not know. That they had nothing to do with the point here suggested (namely, that the territorial rights of the Natives stand upon Treaty, and therefore that questions between the Government and the Natives belong to the Governor and not to any Court) is shown by the words of the Declaration itself; which apply, not to questions between the Government and the Natives, or between English Colonists and the Natives, but to questions affecting the Title or right of occupancy of the Aboriginal Natives, as amongst themselves." The point here referred to as to the Treaty and its consequences, will be more fully considered below in reference to Mr. Richmond's Memorandum.

As to Lord Carnarvon's Despatch, is it intended to be inferred that, whereas the British Government was not to be expected to support by military force the decision of the Governor in Council, under the Native Territorial Rights Bill, that Government was to be expected to support by military force the result of Mr. Parris' inquiry? His Lordship's Despatch should rather have suggested, that the full and proper investigation, which we claim as due of right to the Native subjects of the Crown, was no less needed for the protection of the English Colonists and of the tax-paying public of England.

PAGE 83.

In this Note it is said that the order of things, which the Governor disturbed, was the desperate feud then prevailing at New Plymouth.

It should be remembered that there was no feud subsisting between William King and Teira. We learn from Mr. Parris that after this offer for sale Teira associated with William King the same as before, but never let the
subject rest." He states also that they never had recourse to harsh measures after the public offer of the land to His Excellency the Governor, but on the contrary tried to work upon Teira by acts of kindness." (E. No. 3 A. p. 2.)

Mr. Parris is here speaking of peaceful relations subsisting between William King and Teira before the negotiations for peace between the Taranaki tribes began, that is to say, whilst the feud was still subsisting between William King and other parties. Then came the negotiations which brought the feud to an end. Peace had continued for about half a year when the Governor made the military demonstration at the Waitara.

PAGE 87.

In this Note it is asserted that nearly twelve months of patient investigation were expended on this case. Now Teira's offer was made on the 8th day of March, 1859, and the first instalment was paid on the 29th November, 1859. The whole investigation then lay between those two dates. We are also told that Mr. Parris' inquiry was prolonged till the close of the year 1859; not from any doubt that existed as to the title, but in the hope that the opposing party might be brought to reason." (Pap. E, No. 3, p. 21.)

A portion of time then, which we have no means of defining, is to be interposed between the time when all doubt had ceased as to the title, and the 29th of November. Moreover, Mr. Parris himself states that his inquiry was intermitted for two months, lest he should interfere with the negotiations for peace then pending between the Tribes. (Pap. E, No. 3a, p. 2.) What portion of the residue was actually employed on this particular business, it is impossible to ascertain, as there are no Minutes of his proceeding's.

Yet in the Despatch to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 28th of June, 18(10, it is stated that nine months were occupied by persons constantly engaged in carefully considering and investigating this particular title." And now we are told that "nearly twelve months of patient investigation" were spent upon it.

I notice this, not because the matter in itself is of great moment; for the value of an investigation depends much more on the nature and method of it than on the length of time employed; but as an instance of a looseness of statement much to be regretted in official documents.

PAGE 88.

This Note furnishes a remarkable instance of a practical fallacy which pervades these Notes. These so-called "rules" and "decisions" were in fact merely plans of proceeding or schemes of policy. They might be very beneficial, if they could be carried out, but they had no binding effect or authority whatever. To induce the Natives to yield up tracts of land and accept compensation for them, was in many cases very proper; and Mr. Clarke and the officers of his department often had influence enough with the Natives to obtain their assent. But no one was bound by those transactions, except the persons who were actually parties to them.

What is here called Governor Grey's decision was no decision at all in any proper sense. Governor Grey found himself in the midst of those difficulties which followed upon that act of Governor Fitaroy, which has been expressly admitted by the present Governor to have been both just and politic, (part. Pap. July, 1860, p. 177.)

Governor Grey did not directly impugn the proceeding of his predecessor, but he felt the practical inconveniences which followed upon it. To escape them, he attempted an intermediate and singular policy. The titles of the returned owners were not to be acknowledged in words by the Government, but their claims were to be bought, if they were disposed to sell, at a rate not exceeding 1s 6d an acre.

It is idle to quote this policy of Governor Grey as an authority or precedent for the present proceedings. That policy has been entirely abandoned by the present Governor. The titles of the individual cultivators, which Governor Grey would not directly acknowledge, have been in this very transaction (not to go further back) fully acknowledged by the present Government. Teira and his companions have been recognized as rightful owners," as undisputed owners." (E. No. 3, p. 22.) And as to the price, have the present sellers received no more than 1s 6d an acre?

PAGE 90.

This Note opens a subject of the utmost importance, and one which needs a fuller discussion. It is most true that feuds productive of many crimes raged among the tribes in the neighbourhood of New Plymouth, for five years, from August, 1854, till July, 1859, peace being finally made in September, 1859.

Here, and elsewhere in these Notes, it seems to be taken as a consequence of that state of things, that the proceedings of the Government at the Waitara were justified. It is implied that there was something in those proceedings tending to put an end to that state of things: or else, that with a people capable of such crimes, all legal and rational modes of dealing were out of the question. Therefore I do not content myself with saying
(what indeed would be a sufficient answer to this Note) namely, that these feuds and crimes and our inability to prevent or punish them, furnish no reason why a full and proper inquiry should not have been made into Teira's title to sell; such an inquiry being demanded at once by justice to the Natives, and by due regard to the interests of our own feuds in the Colony and in England.

These feuds commenced when Rawiri Waiaua, encouraged by the local Land Purchase Commissioner, attempted to sell a piece of land in violation, as it appears, of the tribal right. (T. Q.p. 139.) The result of this was the crime described in page 115. The Government did not interfere to punish that crime, or to suppress, by military force, the atrocities which followed it. It was apprehended that interference on our part would lead to a war of which the limits, the cost, and the effects, could not be estimated. It was seen also that it would be extremely difficult to prevent our motives from being misunderstood. Many feuds and private wars in different parts of the country had passed without notice. If we interfered in this case, it was likely to be thought that we did so, not so much on account of the crime which Katatore had committed as on account of the land which Rawiri desired to sell. So the Government confined itself to protecting the settlers, and endeavouring by such means as were practicable to check or mitigate those feuds.

The difficulty of the case became still greater when Katatore was murdered. That crime was committed on the Queen's land, on a public road within the settlement. It was a murder of revenge, not directly connected with any piece of land. Still the Government refrained from interfering, beyond issuing a Proclamation in the following month, February, 1858. That Proclamation was not in such general terms as stated in this Note, that is to say," warning all the Natives that this anarchy would no longer he tolerated." It only warned them against assembling with arms within the boundaries of a certain district. The Proclamation was accompanied by an official comment in the Maori Messenger, which, after explaining; the reasons of our non-interference, proceeded thus:—

"While indulging this hope, we are startled by the news of another and more frightful murder Blood is split on land which the Queen "has granted. This cannot be allowed to pass in silence. The Governor has therefore spoken his word. He still says, 'I shall not interfere. Both parties are doing wrong, but it is not my present intention to employ force against either while they keep outside the limits of the English settlement, but I will allow neither to come armed within these limits, I will not permit fighting in my presence." I do not know whether this limited proclamation has been, as is alleged in the Note, 'openly violated.'

The effect of this state of things on the Natives may be gathered from the following letter:—

"Waitara.
For this translation I am indebted to the same gentlemen as before.

March 4, 1858,

To Riwai, Kiripata, Wiremu Tamihana, Apa, Ture, Wiri, Tei, and Hohepa, to you all, Greeting to you, My friends, my fathers, listen. Here we are involved in warfare, that is to say, in grievous, murderous, cannibal, bloodthirsty calamity—in this very grievous calamity. Listen. You are probably imagining that we are going blindly to work. It is not so, but we are proceeding on a clear course. What makes it clear is this, that as far as regards the reference to the Governor, that has been done. As for murder, we have no intention of murdering. We leave murder to Ihaia and Nikorima. Our Chiefs will act in broad daylight, and indeed they are acting now in broad daylight. As regards the reference to the Governor, that has been made by the Chiefs. You have already heard that Waitere (Katatore) was killed on the ninth day of the month of January. We had to wait till February for the Governor's answer. The answer came, that the Governor could take no steps in the matter, but let there be another murder, then the Governor would consent. Hence our Chiefs concluded that the course taken by the Governor was wrong, because, this is Ihaia's second murder. The words of the former Governor are not attended to now, for steps were taken in the case of the quarrel with Rangihaeata at the Hutt—on that occasion, promptly. In the case of this murder no steps are taken. As he was killed in the midst of the settlers, so now should any man belonging to Ihaia he found in the house of a settler in the town he will be killed there, because this is not as it should be. And now all the pas are surrounded, Te Karaka, Pukerito, and Otehetehe. The pa which we attacked was Pukerito, we got close under the outworks. Those of our party who were killed in the attack on the pa, were Hehe Nga nohoanga, Tamati Tuainane, and Te One. These were from Waitara. Tamati Takua from War***, Maihi from Tapuirau, Heta from te Kawau. These were killed. Of the people of the place Eruini Mangania, Hakaraia Repo, Te Kawhaki Haenga were wounded. Wi Te One mihi was killed in the fight at Te Ika moana. He was shot by Te Kepa Hanawerangia.

I cannot tell all. Enough.
It seems that the letter from the Governor, referred to above, has not yet been printed.

Now what view of the Queen's Sovereignty could the Natives acquire under these circumstance? I do not censure the Government, but I ask for a fair consideration of the facts. Instead of throwing the whole blame upon the Natives, let us rather look upon that state of things as the common calamity of both races. Let us not keep back the fact that in the origin of these evils we also had a share, and that they were aggravated by injudicious acts and by violent language on the part of some of our own people. No greater misfortune could have befallen the Natives than to see that the Government was powerless, and so to be driven back into their old barbarism. It would have been the greatest blessing for both races, if it had been possible from the beginning to follow up and punish every act of bloodshed. The manifest benefit, flowing from the action of the Queen's Sovereignty, would have reconciled the Natives to the action of that Sovereignty in other ways. But every consideration which had made it unwise and inexpedient to interfere against crime, made it still more unwise and inexpedient to interfere in a question of land.

The feuds at last wore themselves out and peace was made. A few months after that, the Colonial Government employed military force at the Waitara. The power which had not protected life or property, came forward to take possession of land. What I assert is, that no coarse could have been more un fortunate than this, no course less likely to effect the great object of establishing practically the Queen's Sovereignty throughout this island. We did not interfere even when we should have been sure of a strong body of allies; when the instinctive sense of justice and retribution for crime would have been in our favour, on the spot and throughout the island. When the feuds and crimes had ceased, we began to employ military force, and that in a case wholly inconnected with crime. So we did all in our power to confirm the evil notion, already widely spread among the Natives, that we care for nothing but to get their land.

We often hear strong language used about what is called a defiance of the Queen's Sovereignty. It were better for both races if we set ourselves dispassionately to consider what we hate done towards commending that Sovereignty, towards showing the value and benefit of it. In what light must the case appear to them? The Queen's power has not saved their lives or property, but it takes possession of their land. It appears to them not as a protector but as an invader; not as a stayer of bloodshed, but as itself a shedder of blood. We have taken the course which tends not to advance, but to hinder, our great object. We have begun at the wrong end.

I do not mean to say that the Queen's Sovereignty could be imposed wholly from without, even by a Government regarded with confidence by the Native population. We must act oh the principle, which has been of late so often enunciated and so often forgotten, that the Natives are to be governed through themselves; but we can only effect our great object by proceeding in the right order. We must invert the whole course of our proceedings. We must begin by suppressing bloodshed and crime, and so ad- vance in minor, matters. The next Native Conference will furnish an opening for our efforts towards securing that great end.

Our present mode of proceeding provokes resistance. Let us proceed in the proper order, and we shall find support in all parts of the country.

We boast of our superiority, and especially of our skill in government. Let us prove our skill, by commending rather than discrediting the object we have in view. The Natives have been repelled from that to which they ought to have been attracted by the strongest sense of their own interest.

Many and very intelligent men amongst them are now drawn towards the King party most unwillingly. They know and say, that the chiefs of that party possess neither the knowledge nor the means needed for elevating their race, and rescuing them from the evils of their present condition. Yet they turn to them as a protection against a power, which they fear and cannot trust.

When the present evils shall have ceased, and confidence shall have been restored by a fair investigation of their grievances, and by an earnest practical effort to provide for them the institutions, and secure the social benefits, they so greatly need and desire, the combination which is now opposed to our authority will disappear like a mist, and the Native race will regard the Sovereignty of the Queen as a boon and a privilege.

THE END.

The New Zealand War.
The Second Year of one of England's Little Wars.
By Octavius Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapihi, New Zealand.
Williams and Norgate, Edinburgh, London 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden And 20, South Frederick Street, 1861

I have been induced by the perusal of Professor Harold Browne's Pamphlet to send to England a few further remarks on the origin of the Taranaki war. I have directed particular attention to some of his misstatements—all that are important: I have necessarily omitted to notice many others. I have reprinted some letters previously
published in the Colony, because they contain information that appears to be much required in England. I reproduce them in their original form, partly from want of time to recast them, and partly to shew that I have fearlessly stated my opinions here knowing that they could not be refuted. I have also given some notes by Sir William Martin, late Chief Justice of the Colony, which I consider very valuable. I would direct attention to the letters from certain Ngatiawa natives, as well as to a speech and a letter from a Chief, Renata, residing on the East Coast many miles from Taranaki. I have felt obliged to vindicate myself from certain charges brought against me for not communicating to the Governor letters which I had received from W. King. But I have refrained from any allusion to the Governor's calumnious imputations against me in reference to the origin of a Petition for his recall, which was sent to Her Majesty the Queen by the Maories of this place and its vicinity, having written officially to the Secretary of State for the Colonies contradicting and refuting his statements.

O. H.

Otaki,

April 4, 1861.

One of England's Little Wars.

The silence of the local press as to the real merits of the Taranaki war induced me to send home to England in May, 1860, a few remarks on that subject, which were published in the form of a letter to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The letter on its return was reprinted by the local press, and became widely circulated through the Colony. Nobody here has been rash enough to attempt a refutation of a single statement contained in it. But what nobody has ventured to do here, Professor Harold Browne has not shrunk from doing in England. A little knowledge will sometimes deter from rashness, when absolute ignorance only tends to engender boldness. As Mr. Fox's pamphlet, "The War in New Zealand," published in London, and Sir William Martin's "Taranaki Question," have confirmed every statement of importance contained in my letter, besides establishing in the clearest way the illegality of the Governor's proceedings at Taranaki, it will be necessary that some only of the numerous misstatements occurring in Prof. Browne's pamphlet should be noticed.

It is almost needless to say that I see no reason to recall or modify any expression contained in the letter which has called forth such unqualified condemnation from Prof. Browne. I am charged with having pronounced severe and undeserved censures on Colonel Browne's conduct; and with having left no stone unturned to effect his ruin and disgrace. I was not aware of any prejudice likely to warp my judgment or incapacitate me for the duty I had undertaken, when I directed public attention to what I then considered, and still believe to be, an act of flagrant injustice—an act absolutely illegal and wholly indefensible. I am charged with allowing zeal and intemperance to blind me to principles and facts which under other circumstances could not have been overlooked; but what these principles and facts are, does not appear. I am quite unable to surmise on what grounds charges of zeal and intemperance are advanced: no right is advocated on behalf of the aborigines, but that of being dealt with on the commonest principles of justice: no charge has been brought against the Governor that has not been proved to be strictly true, namely, that he has acted unjustly and illegally; and that nothing could have been more impolitic than his proceedings, whether the interests and well-being of the colonists, or whether the enormous expenditure as well as great discredit they would entail on the mother country, were taken into consideration. I have no faith in soft words and disguised censure conveyed in circumlocutions: I believe that great crimes ought to be called by their proper names; and that the interests of truth and justice ought to be paramount to every other motive. Surely at a time when sycophants and flatterers abound, a little toleration may be shewn to the few who are bold enough openly and plainly to denounce oppression and spoliation, although committed by a British Governor. It might have been supposed that the heavily taxed people of England, placed by circumstances entirely at the mercy of the Colonial Office, would have been slow to blame an independent man daring to speak out and warn them, while there was yet time, against persevering in a course which could lead to no satisfactory result; but was certain to involve very heavy expenditure. I at least shall feel it to be a source of lasting satisfaction that I was the first to perceive and, in spite of the remonstrances of timid friends to expose, the iniquity perpetrated at Waitara. But it is a source of still greater satisfaction that all the positions of importance maintained by me at a very early stage of the proceedings are now confirmed by so high an authority as that of Sir W. Martin, in a pamphlet entitled "The Taranaki Question."
As this pamphlet was written after all the papers considered important to the establishment of their ease, were laid by the Government before the Colonial Parliament; and as all these have been fully answered in it, to go again over the same ground would be superfluous. What is now proposed is to direct attention to some circumstances connected with the subject which seem to have escaped general notice, and likewise to expose some of the numerous inaccuracies into which Prof. Browne, while amiably intent on defending his brother's conduct, has fallen.

A large part of the Ngatiawa tribe, with William King and his father at their head, left Waitara about the year 1827, for the purpose of residing in Cook's Strait. They were not induced to take this step by any actual or anticipated pressure from Waikato, as appears evident from the fact that an important section of the tribe remained behind. W. King, and that portion of the tribe who acknowledged him as their chief, after his father's death, returned to Waitara in the year 1848, to re-occupy the lands inherited from their ancestors, which they had left in 1827. Now the question arises—Had anything occurred during the interval of these two dates to bar their return and occupation of those lands with unaltered and unimpaired rights? Governor Browne and his supporters answer this question in the affirmative; they say that Waikato conquered the country and thereby became the owners of the land; that the New Zealand Company purchased the land from certain persons resident at Taranaki, and others dwelling in Cook's Strait; and that Governor Sir George Grey forbade their return to Waitara, Nothing else has hitherto been advanced against the right of W. King and his tribe to return to the full enjoyment of all their rights to land at Waitara.

It is admitted on all sides that about the year 1830 Waikato completely defeated that portion of the Ngatiawa who remained at Waitara, and defended Pukerangiora. The Waikato were, however, very shortly afterwards repulsed by another section of the Ngatiawa led by Te Puni and others, near the Sugar Loaf Islands in the vicinity of New Plymouth. Waikato never took possession of Waitara, or cultivated any portion of it. This is vaguely denied by Mr. M'Lean and others; but until they can mention the names of the persons who did take possession and cultivate, as well as point out the particular portions of land asserted to have been cultivated by them, and specify the time when such occupation took place, their mere denial of notorious facts is not to the purpose. I was myself at Taranaki in February, 1840, that is, before the British Government was established in New Zealand, but though engaged in learning everything connected with the place and its inhabitants, I never heard of any Waikato occupation of the country. There really ought to be no doubt as to a matter of fact such as this.

Mr. Clark's report, written June 29, 1844, after inquiries made on the spot, concludes his investigation thus—"I believe a small party of them (Waikato) attempted to occupy land on the Waitara, but met with so much opposition from the original claimants, that they were compelled to retire. * * * I believe they never took possession of or exercised acts of ownership upon the land generally." (Papers E, no., p.11.) This opinion is important as having been given more than sixteen years ago, by a person born in New Zealand, and thoroughly acquainted with the language, and moreover by one who was the son of Mr. Protector Clark, who had advised Governor Hobson to purchase the Waikato claim.

But there is an aspect of this question which seems to have escaped notice, it is this—that even if Waikato had taken possession of, and cultivated, the land after their triumph over a subordinate portion of the Ngatiawa tribe, such possession could in no way whatever have affected the rights of W. King and that portion of the tribe absent in Cook's Strait. That a forcible entry had been made upon their territory during their absence could not affect their rights. Maori law or custom on this subject is clear and distinct. It is not pretended that any capitation took place, or that any terms were made at the capture of Pukerangiora, which could be construed into a cession of territory. And if a more general view of the subject is taken, nothing is clearer than the principle that a forcible and temporary occupation does not, as such, give any right whatever to the territory of a foreign nation or tribe. Vattel is distinct on this subject. He says,—"It must however be confessed, that between nations, the rights of usurpation, and prescription are often more difficult in their application, so far as they are founded on a presumption drawn from long silence. Nobody is ignorant how dangerous it commonly is for a weak state even to limit a claim to the possessions of a powerful monarch. In such a case, therefore, it is not easy to deduce from long silence a legal presumption of abandonment." And again, when speaking on the same subject—"The case is different with a possession of only a few years continuance, during which the party whose rights are invaded may, from prudential reasons, find it expedient to keep silence, without at the same time affording room to accuse him of suffering things to become uncertain, and of renewing quarrels without end." (Book ii. ch. 11.) The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that the rights of W. King and his tribe to their ancient territory at Waitara were in no degree whatever affected by the Waikato invasion that occurred during their absence; and that, according to Vattel, those rights would not necessarily have been impaired, even had the Waikato held possession, which they never did.

It follows also that Governor Hobson's purchase of the whole territory, now constituting the Taranaki...
Province, from two Waikato chiefs, could not impair or invalidate the rights of W. King and his tribe to their land at Waitara. The object of the transaction having been to prevent any interference on the part of Waikato in Taranaki land questions. Mr. Richmond unwarily admits this: "This deed was relied upon as, at all events, precluding the interference of Waikato in the Taranaki question." (Papers E, No. 3, p. 33.)

The nest statement made by the Governor and his supporters is, that the New Zealand Company purchased the Waitara from certain persons residing at Taranaki. It appears that a deed of cession was executed at Taranaki, on the 15th Feb. 1840. Mr. Commissioner Spain's award of 60,000 acres was grounded on this deed. Governor Fitzroy reversed the Commissioner's decision. Governor Sir G. Grey censured Governor Fitzroy's reversal, but tacitly acquiesced in it. Governor Browne himself formally recorded his opinion in a dispatch, dated Nov. 1855, that Governor Fitzroy's reversal of the Commissioner's decision was "just and very politic."

But the particular point to be noticed in connection with this deed is, that W. King, and that portion of the tribe which migrated to Cook's Strait in 1827, were not parties to it; and consequently that their rights to any lands purported to be alienated by that deed were in no respect whatever impaired by it. It would be wasting words to make any further allusion to this deed. It is also evident, that neither Mr. Spain's award nor Governor Fitzroy's reversal of that award have anything whatever to do with W. King, whose territorial rights, whatever they may have been, were not affected by the deed to which these had reference. Before leaving this subject, it may be advisable to allude to another deed, dated Nov. 8, 1839, which purports to convey both sides of Cook's Strait to the New Zealand Company, and to which W. King's signature is affixed. It might be sufficient to say that no award was ever made by Mr. Commissioner Spain, or any other Commissioner under this deed; and that no land was ever even formally claimed under it in the Commissioner's Court. But the most complete proof of its absolute inapplicability to the point now at issue, appears on the face of the deed itself, the whole of the Waitara district, and a considerable portion of the land both to the north and south being excluded from it. (Papers E, No. 2, p. 2.)

Sir G. Grey's so-called prohibition of W. King's return to Waitara, amounts to very little. If, as has been now shewn, W. King's rights at Waitara remained in tact, the Governor could have had no right to issue such a prohibition. The truth however is that Sir G. Grey never did more than express a wish that W. King and his tribe would remain at Waikanae. This request was acquiesced in from July, 1847, till April, 1848, when they left Waikanae for Waitara without remonstrance or opposition of any kind being offered by the Government to their departure; the only question raised having been as to the removal of their arms and ammunition, which were absolutely requisite for their protection.

It appears, therefore, that nothing whatever occurred during the interval between W. King's departure from Waitara in 1827 and his return to that place in 1848 to affect his rights at Waitara, or those of that portion of the tribe who acknowledged him as their head, and accompanied him in his movements.

It may have appeared quite superfluous to have entered into an examination of the claims resting on the Waikato invasion of Waitara, and of those founded on the New Zealand Company's deeds, when the right of the Ngatiawa to reoccupy and possess their property at Waitara has been practically admitted by the Government, not only by leaving them unmolested there, but by repeatedly entering into negotiations with various members of the tribe, and W. King in particular, for the purchase of particular lands there. But the reason for examining into their alleged claims is to prevent a false impression being produced by an attempt made to place the rights of W. King on a different basis from that on which the settlers—Teira and others, are assumed to rest theirs. The distinction drawn by the Government is, that the Waikato invasion and the New Zealand Company's purchases effaced the tribal right, leaving individual or private rights unimpaired. To those unacquainted with native tenure of property this might appear important: I need hardly say that it is absurd and untenable. It is obvious that these claims set up by the Government, if valid would have affected the whole tribe and all the individuals thereof—that in whatever sense it affected W. King's rights, it equally affected those of the sellers. It is clear that if the purchases on which these claims rested were valid they covered the individual as well as the tribal rights; but if they were invalid, as has been sufficiently shewn, they were worthless.

There is a view of this subject that has been entirely overlooked, but on which I have laid particular stress from the very beginning of this controversy. In my letter referred to above any allusion to Tribal right was altogether omitted, not because any doubt was entertained on the subject; but simply because it appeared that the whole controversy might be greatly narrowed by avoiding any reference to it.

Appendix K.

Allowing, for the sake of argument, that the purchases made by the Government from the Waikato chiefs, and by the New Zealand Company from certain natives, were as valid and important as they are asserted to have been, the individual or private rights to property in the disputed land at "Waitara, contended for by W. King, Te Patu-kakariki and others now resisting armed trespassers acting under the Governor's orders, must be equally good and valid with those of Teira and the other sellers, which have been acknowledged by the Government as being indisputably so. It will naturally be asked how the Government escapes from this
difficulty. It endeavours to escape from it by denying the indi-vidual or private rights of W. King, Te Patukakariki and others to their properties within the boundaries of the disputed block of land, and positively refusing any investigation of these. The point really at issue, and being contended for by those now in arms against the Government, is,—Have W. King, Te Patukakariki and others any land within the disputed block? They and a hundred other claimants affirm that they have. The Government contents itself with denying this and refusing any investigation.

The Government documents contain innumerable repetitions of the assertion, that W. King and those acting with him have never made any claim to the disputed land. It is presumed that some meaning is intended to be conveyed by these reiterated assertions; but it is difficult to imagine what it can be. The assumption that a number of men may be forcibly ejected from land which they have inherited from remote ancestors, and which they are actually occupying, unless they send in claims to such land at the bidding of a Deputy land purchase Commissioner, is so absurd and unreasonable that it cannot deserve serious refutation. But it may be safely predicted that such an arbitrary process of confiscation, if authorized by the Home Government) will require a larger portion of the British army to enforce it than may be expected, for Maories will never submit to such an act of spoliation.

It has been asserted that W. King never advanced any claim to land at Waitara, except in his capacity as head of an "anti-land-selling-league."

Appendix B. J.

Mr. McLean, the author of this assertion, fixes 1853-4 as the date when this so-called league originated. Now official documents prove that W. King has informed every Governor that he was the Chief of Waitara and that he would not sell the land there. He says, in a letter quoted by Mr. Richmond in his speech given in the New Zealander, Aug. 8.—" My word is not a new word, it is an old one: Governor Hobson [in 1840], Governor Fitzroy, and Governor Grey have all heard it, and now that you have come, O Governor Browne, I send the same word to you, that I have sent to the Governors to hold back my land, &c." Mr. Richmond himself allowed, in April 1860, that "King's stand is really taken upon his position as Chief."—(Mem. E. no. 3, p. 34.) But the truth is that no such "anti-land selling-league" has ever existed in the colony.

Appendix A. B.

The assertion of its existence is one of those "acknowledged lies" by which the Home Government has been misled and its action paralysed.

It will probably be inferred from the constant reference to claims that some Court formally investigated the respective titles of claimants to the land at Waitara. No such investigation ever took place.

Mr. Parris allows that he failed in his attempt to make even a preliminary inquiry. "I spent this day and many others with them endeavouring to induce them to meet Teira's party, and discuss quietly and deliberately, the claims to the block of land, but they never would consent to do it; I therefore was obliged to get information from other natives (and strange to say some who are now opposing the Government, Hapurona and others), to compare with the representations of the selling party, and the information which I obtained fully corroborated the statement of the selling party." (Further Papers, E, no. 3 i. p. 3) The truth is, Mr. Parris had no authority to compel the attendance of witnesses; this alone would shew the true nature of the whole proceeding.

This is notorious here in New Zealand. Let Mr. Fox describe the so-called investigation: "Sub-commissioner Parris tells him (the Governor), in two letters of three lines each, that he is proceeding with the investigation of Teira's title—at last announces that he has paid an instalment of the purchase money; but not a particle of evidence as to the right of Teira to sell, and not a dry official report of actual sale is furnished till five months after war is commenced." (Fox, p. 43.) Such are the opinions entertained here as to the nature of the pretended investigation. Professor Browne, while residing at Cambridge, seems to have arrived at a different conclusion. He says—"The next step in this matter was a direction of the Governor to Mr. McLean, the chief land commissioner, to investigate carefully Teira's title to the land. Nine months were occupied in the enquiry, every available proof was had recourse to."

The second question is, "Did the Governor do rightly in submitting the question of title to Mr. M'Lean, Chief Land-Purchase Commissioner?" (P. 23.) This question seems very unmeaning, it being an acknowledged fact that the consideration of title was never submitted to Mr. M'Lean till more than four months after the war began.

"Surely then when the Governor had com- mitted the decision of the claims to the chief land commissioner, when he, with the aid of his deputy commissioner, had for eight or nine months patiently investigated the question, &c." (P. 24). "The chief commissioner, having the Queen's special authority for the purpose, and having for twenty years performed the office, is desired to investigate the title. After eight or nine months patient enquiry, he reports that Teira's title is undoubted."

This sentence is curious. The Chief Commissioner has no special authority from the Queen. Professor Browne assumes that Mr. M'Lean holds the same office as that held by Mr. Spain, and is commissioned "to
investigate and determine titles and claims to lands in New Zealand." (Page S3.) In this assumption he is quite wrong. Again, Mr. McLean has not held his office anything like twenty years. So far from spending eight or nine months in patient enquiry, he was absent the whole time, as has been shewn, from Taranaki, having been chiefly engaged on the opposite side of the island, near Napier. He never reported that" Teira's title was undoubted," or indeed made any report at all on the subject until July, 1860, four or five months after the war began. This sentence, containing this extraordinary accumulation of blunders, occurs in the last page of the pamphlet.

(P. 46). It will hardly be necessary to inform those who have even a superficial acquaintance with this controversy that Mr. McLean, the chief commissioner, never once even visited the Province of Taranaki during the twelve months that intervened between the offer of the land made by Teira to the Governor, in March, 1859, and March, 1860, after hostilities had actually commenced. Indeed Professor Browne, who states that he has carefully studied the debates on this question, ought to have noticed what was reported in the Native Minister's speech of August 3: "The Chief-commissioner was to have concluded the purchase of the land at Waitara, but, unfortunately, was prevented by serious illness, * * * they deeply regretted that they had not been able to benefit by his great influence at Taranaki." (Southern Cross, Aug. 7, 1860.) The truth is there was no investigation

Appendix C.

of the titles, I will not say of claimants but, of the persons actually in possession of the land at Waitara, from which they were forcibly expelled by the former. There was not only no investigation, but not even the formal decision of any Land-purchase-commissioner. There was nothing but the sic volo sic jubeo of Colonel Browne, which his subordinate, Mr. Parris, though he had himself once described the transaction as "a treacherous and dishonourable conspiracy

The whole of thin "conspiracy," by means of which Mr. Richmond first got rid of the old New Zealand Company's purchasers, and then involved the country in a war to uphold an illegal purchase from a man that was not the proprietor, is exposed in a memorial that will he presented to the two Houses of Assembly, from Augustus Abraham, Esq., Barrister-at-law.

to expel W. King from the Waitara," subsequently lent himself to obey.

The Government has now abandoned the original ground on which it defended the war. Prof. Browne will perhaps be surprised to find himself among the heretics. Mr. Richmond's Memorandum lately published in answer to Sir W. Martin's "Taranaki Question," contains the following words:—" The opening proposition that 'the present is a land quarrel' has a tendency to mislead. The question raised in the original dispute with W. King was one of authority and jurisdiction, not a question of title to a particular piece of land." (p. 2.) Prof. Browne took the same view of it as Sir W. Martin, his opening proposition being—"The quarrel now unhappily existing between the Government and some of the natives originated in a dispute concerning the sale of about 600 acres of land." All the "acknowledged lies" about an "investigation" and a "decision" as to the rights of the persons expelled from Waitara, which Prof. Browne seems to have believed and relied on, are now thrown to the winds; the Government now no longer ventures to defend them. Mr. Richmond now boldly says—"The Governor being of right sole judge of questions respecting Native Territorial right, was justified in enforcing his jurisdiction in the only practicable mode, viz. by military occupation." (p. 2.) After these admissions from Mr. Richmond, the Native Minister, it is to be hoped that no friends of the Governor will again venture to defend the untenable position that there ever was any investigation of the titles by which the owners of the disputed land at Waitara occupied it, or any decision of a land-commissioner, or even any ground whatever for supposing that the ejected persons were not the real owners of the land.

The inquiry still remains as to what was the real motive that induced the Governor to begin this war. It is clear that when he indignantly repudiated the suggestion made to him by the Taranaki Provincial Council, that he might by an irregular and dishonest course obtain the Waitara, he was not prepared for the step he subsequently took: be did not then see what he afterwards saw, that it was "essentially necessary for the consolidation of the Province, as well as for the use of the settlers." (E, no 3, p. 3.) There is no doubt that what has been aptly described in the House of Representatives as "sinister influence," was brought to bear on him.

Professor Browne says, that I "reproached the Governor for not acting without consultation with his Ministers." (P. 34.) There is not a word of truth in this. On the contrary, it is well known here that I have for several years predicted the disasters that would follow from allowing an individual Governor to act on his mere impulse or caprice; and have pointed out nearly five years ago in an official letter, in reply to one from the Governor, the a priori absurdity of supposing that two races so thoroughly intermixed as the Pakeha and the Maori could be successfully governed, not only on two different systems, but by two distinct authorities. I even alluded to this fact in my letter to the Southern Cross, on which the Professor has commented, but which he seems to have read very carelessly. The "sinister influence" was brought irregularly to bear on the Governor.

Nor can there be any doubt that a prejudice against W. King had been created in his mind, for he had
spoke of him in an official dispatch as "an infamous character." A meeting was arranged, at which the Governor should be present (March, 1859); and at which a low-bred man, Teira,

Professor Browne says, "As regards birth, it is proved by their respective pedigrees that Teira's is superior to King's, for his descent is strictly in the male line, whilst King's is from the marriage of a female with an unknown, adventurer. The pedigrees are given in the Maori Messenger." (Page 40.) That any one should have been such a gobe mouche as to believe the ridiculous hocus-pocus here referred to amazes me. It is however satisfactory to find that the amiable Professor does not adopt Mr. Richmond's views about "beastly communism." Hear what a disinterested Maori Chief says about the pedigree:—"Sir, what about his genealogy P This is the second proof he has given you (against himself)—his theft first, and now his genealogy. By these you may know him. W. King would never give his genealogy, because it is known throughout the island; it is not recounted. This is a thing for a common man to do who never was heard of before—for an obscure thief. You must know that this is a thing done by the lower orders." (See App. N.)

son of Tamati Rara, the descendant of a slave, belonging to the Taranaki tribe, who was known to have a grudge against W. King, should be put up to insult him in the Governor's presence, by offering to sell Waitara, which it was known that Chief would not part with. The Governor was advised to accept this offer. The Chief told the Governor briefly in firm but respectful language that he would not sell it. "Listen, Governor. Notwithstanding Teira's offer, I will not permit the sale of Waitara to the Pakeha. Waitara is in my hands, I will not give it up; I will not, I will not, I will not. I have spoken." (E, no. 3, p. 20.) The native report by Tipene Ngaruna is—"Listen, Governor. I will not give my land Waitara to you, never, never, never."

Appendix D.

It is now well known here that from that time offended pride and dignity sought for satisfaction. The Governor returned to Auckland heavy and displeased because of the word which W. King had spoken to him; for he had said, I will not give thee the inheritance of my fathers. In the same month, March 29, 1859, he wrote to the Secretary of State—"W. King then rose, and while asserting no claim to it, said he would never permit the land to be sold; then waving his hand to his people, he and they left the meeting with some want of courtesy to myself." He had even then, nearly twelve months before the war actually began, determined on hostilities against W. King; for he says in the same dispatch,—"I have, however, little fear that W. King will venture to maintain his assumed right; but have made every preparation to enforce obedience should he presume to do so. Copies of the instructions I have given to both the Civil and Military authorities are herewith enclosed." I presume nobody will have the audacity to assert that there had been either any investigation of what the Governor thinks proper to call "an assumed right," or any "decision "even by a land-purchase commissioner at this time, when it appears that the Governor had already made up his mind on the subject, and had determined on the use of military force. Any defence of Governor Browne's conduct in plunging this colony into an unjust and disastrous war, must always be a hopeless task. I attended all the debates in the House of Representatives in reference to the origin of the war. Mr. Dillon Bell, the most ingenious, though not the most cautious, of the Governor's supporters, could find nothing on which he could rest his case, until at length the truth unawares escaped him, and he confessed that the Governor could not brook the humiliation inflicted on him by W. King. The language he used made an impression on my mind, being somewhat below the level of even colonial parliamentary talk. He said if the Governor, after promising Teira that he would take his land, had allowed himself to be deterred from doing so by W. King's opposition, he must have returned to Auckland "like a dog with his tail between his legs."

Mr. Bell:—"He believed that the question of Teira's title was altogether foreign to the cause of the war; and the justification due to the Governor in attempting to make a settlement. If Xing had come at the invitation of his Excellency when he went to Taranaki, would that have saved the war P He had expressed a great many of his views and opinions as to the first cause of the war: he had told the House that he would not advise a declaration of war; he would yield to no one in his attachment to the race, for he held many of them in the highest esteem. Would honourable members have advised the Governor, after the insult offered to him, to have come back with his tail between his legs?" (Southern Cross, Aug. 12, 1860.) There will be observed a difference between this and the report in the New Zealander. The truth is, Mr. Bell is a good writer, but a bad speaker. Professor Browne will perhaps learn from this why it is that there are so many "uncontradicted statements" in the New Zealander's reports.

Mr. Richmond also, writing to Mr. Parris, says that "the Governor feels it is impossible for himself, as Her Majesty's Representative, to withdraw from the position he has deliberately assumed in this affair." (E, no. 3, p. 11). Nothing, then, can be clearer than that this war has been brought about by the offended pride of Governor Browne.

I have been censured for charging Colonel Browne with an act of "flagrant injustice," and "folly closely bordering on insanity," I did bring against him both these charges; but I said nothing of motives. I now reluctantly give my deliberate and matured opinion that he was actuated by a motive quite unworthy of a man
holding a high official position. Were anything more wanted in order to establish this conviction than the language which has been adverted to, it would be the fact that though the Governor had been in the constant habit of consulting such persons as Sir W. Martin, the late Chief Justice, Mr. Swainson, the late Attorney-General, and the Bishop of New Zealand, on matters affecting Maori policy and affairs, and had actually recommended them to the Secretary of State as members of a permanent Council, being in his opinion the most highly competent persons for the purpose of advising him on such matters; and that they were all, at the time when he resolved on war, at Auckland, he was so conscious of doing wrong, so ashamed of his proceedings, and so certain that what he proposed would be disapproved of and discouraged, that he never said a word to any one of them on the subject. If the Home Government, notwithstanding the experience gained during former disturbances, and Sir George Grey's successful government of the Colony, which recommended him to the important post he has since so ably filled at the Cape, will continue to trifle with this Colony, and imagine that a man of Colonel Browne's mental and moral stature is capable of grappling with the difficulties its government presents, of course the British people must be content to pay for such inconceivable folly. Had the warning I gave in August last been heeded, and had either a new Governor, or a commission of inquiry been sent to the Colony, probably no less than a million sterling might have been saved to the heavily taxed people of England. But it was deemed necessary by the Colonial Office to supply in the first place a salvo to the pride of a little Colonial Governor. For of what account is a million of money, of what account are hundreds of human lives, of what account are the sufferings of thousands of ruined colonists, when the dignity of a Colonial Governor is at stake?

I now advert to certain charges brought against me of having withheld from the Governor information contained in three letters from W. King, written to me in 1859, in reference to the disputed land at Waitara. The first of these I received in July; I replied to it saying that I felt quite sure the Governor would do nothing unjust. His second letter was written in the same month. It expressed satisfaction with my reply to the former letter, and ended by saying that the writer remembered his promise to pay me a visit here. There was nothing whatever in these two letters to create alarm: the suspicion which had existed in his mind seemed to have been partly removed. I received the third letter towards the end of December. In this the writer inquired of me, whether I knew anything about "the Governor's new plan" for obtaining land. He asserted a claim on his own behalf, and on that of other members of his tribe, to the land said to belong to Teira, for which £100 had been paid. He mentioned his suspicion that "the Governor was seeking ground for a quarrel." He added,—"If the Governor should come to where you are do you say a word to him." My reasons for not communicating this letter to the Governor were.—1. That I did not believe, after the very positive assurance the Governor had himself given me in the previous May, that he had either any plan for confiscating native lands or any such intention whatever.——2. That as his letters contained no description of the disputed land I could not have offered any opinion in reference to it.——3. That, however I may have subsequently been convinced to the contrary, I did not credit W. King's assertion that the Governor was seeking ground of quarrel against him.——4. That the Governor, who was in the Middle Island at the time, was expected at Wellington, where I should have seen him. As soon as I was attacked by Mr. Dillon Bell, (who made his attack on me before he had even read the letters), for not forwarding these letters, I vindicated myself from the charges brought against me by him in two letters which immediately appeared in the 'Southern Cross' at Auckland. After reading these letters, Mr. Bell told Mr. Carleton, the Chairman of Committees, that he should never have used the language he did, had he known the real merits of the case. So far as I was able to gather the opinions of intelligent members of the House of Representatives, Mr. Bell's attack on me was considered a gross attempt to draw off attention to the real culprits—the Governor and his ministers, as well as to damage me with the House, and throw suspicion on any information I might give. I certainly never expected to hear any more on the subject, unless it were in illustration of the base unworthy tricks to which men will resort for party purposes. I consequently never wrote a word upon the subject to my friends in England. I confess, therefore, that I learnt with no little surprise that Professor Browne had stooped to rake up and circulate again this contemptible charge made by Mr. Bell, of which I certainly imagined he was himself heartily ashamed.

As this subject has been brought prominently forward, it may be worth while to ascertain its real value. It is not altogether a personal question: an inquiry into its merits may throw light on collateral subjects. But I am met at the outset with a difficulty, because W. King's letters are described in diametrically opposite terms by the Government. Mr. Bell and those who agree with him, characterize the letters as documents that might have prevented war had they been in the Governor's hands; a view of them repeated by Professor Browne, who goes so far as to charge me with having "suppressed letters tending to peace." But Mr. Richmond, the Native Minister, who, whatever may be thought of his honesty,* is by far the most intelligent man of the party, describes them as injuring W. King.

Appendix .G. H. I.

He thought the three letters of W. King produced
by Mr. Forsaith really confirmed the case of the Ministry; for they shewed that King had no claim to make even in private." And again: "The Hon. Member concluded by expressing his conviction that "W". King's letters had fortified the case of the Governor against him." It appears to me that these gentlemen ought to come to some agreement among themselves as to the real value and importance of the letters, before they bring such serious charges against me.

But there is another aspect of this question that can hardly be silently passed over, it is this: that the letters contain no claim to the Waitara not put forth in even stronger language in W. King's own letter to the Governor of April, 1859.

Appendix E.

Sir William Martin alludes to this:—" It should in fairness be asked, whether the assertion of right and the expression of determination to hold the Waitara, contained in these letters to Archdeacon Hadfield, had not been already conveyed to the Governor by W. King." And if this be so, of which there can be no doubt, what can be thought of Mr. Bell's attempt to cast aspersions upon my character, so readily repeated by the Governor, and again re-echoed by his brother the grave Cambridge Professor, even after a public refutation of Mr. Bell's assertion had been made by the Bishop of Wellington.

Appendix O.

It may also be asked whether the Governor has attached the least weight to those letters since their publication. Has he abated one jot of his positive and dogged assertions as to Teira's absolute right to the disputed land? Then what is this attack on me, either on his part or on that of his Ministers, but a hypocritical attempt to screen their own iniquitous conduct; for, let it be observed, the charge brought against me was, that the war might have been stopped by a knowledge of the contents of these letters; and surely no remissness of mine ought to have prejudiced W. King's rights. Sir W. Martin notices another point, he says, "It is a most unfortunate state of things when a Government allows itself to depend on such sources of information, and omits to take the proper means of obtaining information for itself." How was I, residing two hundred miles from Taranaki, to suppose that the officer commissioned with the duty of investigating the claims to the disputed land at Waitara would keep the Governor in absolute ignorance of the merits of the case; or that the Governor would refuse to attend to the remonstrance of any native, much less of a chief of the first rank who had always been distinguished for his loyalty to the Crown, unless such remonstrance was supported by some private recommendation? I was not at the time in question so fully convinced, as I have been since I attended to the debates on the war in the House of Representatives, and read the official despatches and memoranda in reference to it, of the contempt in which the Governor and his Ministers held the Maoris, as painfully shewn in the (Native Offenders' Bill'.

The Governor states that he had requested me to write to him on any matters connected with native affairs occurring in my district that I might consider important. I complied with his request. At the same time I always carefully avoided giving advice either to the Government or the natives about any transactions in reference to the purchase of land.

Professor Browne says: "If he had come forward, as both parties had requested him, and had acted the part of a mediator, it is not in the highest degree probable that much might have been done to prevent the outbreak t" (P. 34.) That the Governor ever once mentioned W. King's name, or Waitara, or Taranaki to me, or ever requested me to mediate in any dispute, is so absolutely false, that as no reference whatever is gives in support of the allegation, I am compelled to say that the passage I have cited is to mo wholly unaccountable,

I knew that the Native Secretary, Mr. McLean and his subordinates in the land-purchase department, to whose guidance the Governor had implicitly resigned himself, would certainly resent and run counter to any recommendation or advice proceeding from me on such subjects. I had for some years been endeavouring to open the eyes of the Government to their mischievous proceedings.

Appendix F.

Still I consulted the Bishop of Wellington in January, soon after receiving W. King's letter of December, who advised me to wait, promising to co-operate with me in bringing this and other matters of a similar kind of which he had recently become cognizant, under the notice of the Governor when the General Assembly should meet at Wellington, which was expected in the following month or in March at latest.

The Governor has also laid much stress on a casual expression occurring in a note of mine, to the effect that I would inform him of anything likely to occasion alarm to the settlers (the remark was made in reference to a false alarm that had just been raised near Wellington), or to the Government: I was of course alluding to my own neighbourhood and the Province in which I resided. I must candidly confess myself unable to see the application of this to the Waitara question. There was nothing whatever to excite alarm in W. King's letters. I knew him well: I was quite certain that he was the last man in New Zealand to injure a settler, either in his person or his property; or show any hostility to the Government. He however was alarmed: he stated his suspicions as to the Governor's intentions towards himself. I did not write to the Governor, having nothing to
say to him; but I wrote to W. King, endeavouring to allay his suspicions and restore his confidence in the Governor. I never for one moment suspected that the Governor was going to violate the Treaty of Waitangi—set law at defiance—and illegally employ Her Majesty's troops against unoffending men, merely for the purpose of gratifying his own feelings of pride.

The 'Southern Cross,' (Aug. 7), said—"The Archdeacon, like ourselves, placed a blind confidence in the Governor's promise not to buy any land the title of which was in dispute; and knowing of his own knowledge the points of the dispute, would as soon have expected to see His Excellency walking on his head as waging war about the particular piece of land in question." I have already noticed the fact that there were persons at Auckland quite competent and willing to advise the Governor, but that he purposely withheld from them all knowledge of the coup-de-main he was contemplating. It further appears from his own words that he valued private communications on this subject very lightly: he says—"Private letters are full of surmises and alarms, and talk of a war of races; but I do not put faith in them." (Disp. Feb. 22, 1860.) The following points may now be considered established:—

- That I had no wish to withhold W. King's letters.
- That W. King's letters contained no claim to Waitara that was not more strongly expressed in his letter to the Governor of April, 1859.
- That in the opinion of the Native Minister the letters of W. King "fortified the case of the Government against him."
- That I had no reason whatever for supposing that any information I could have given on the Waitara question could have been of use.
- That the Governor declined to ask advice from competent persons in immediate communication with himself.
- That he treated the private advice given him with contempt.
- That his possession of the letters did not induce the Governor to alter his conduct towards W. King, though the letters were withheld by no fault of the latter.
- That the admission, that though W. King's letter to the Governor in April, 1859, had been disregarded, one forward through me would have been attended to, is derogatory to the Government.
- That the attempt to throw blame on me was only to draw off attention from the Governor's illegal and unjustifiable proceedings, and to weaken the force of my censure of these.

Notes By Sir William Martin.

The Debates in the House of Representatives, in August, 1860, made it notorious throughout the country, that there was a great difference of opinion amongst the Colonists themselves, as to the proceedings of the Government. I believe that notoriety to have had a most wholesome effect in checking the spread of the war. The Natives were thereby encouraged to believe that what was done at the Waitara was not the doing of the Pakeha as a race, and would not be approved by the Queen.

There can be no clear understanding of the present state of affairs, unless we distinguish between two things which are confounded in official papers, the British Government, and the Colonial Government. Even yet the great mass of the Native population is disposed to trust to the justice of the British Government, but I fear there are few who are disposed to trust to the justice of the present Colonial Government.

Every one knows with how much caution it is necessary to regard statements made after the fact by persons concerned in justifying what has been done. The statements here cited from Mr. McLean, are no exception to the general rule. I do not wish to examine them narrowly. I only ask that the strong assertions here made be compared with the evidence set forth in my text. Beyond this, I confine myself to three particular points. 1st, Mr. McLean here justifies the proceedings of Mr. Parris in the most unqualified language, in the face of the fact that Mr. Parris had not obeyed the express injunctions of Mr. McLean himself, which required him to visit the absentee claimants personally: 2nd, the numerous and frivolous claims made by persons who seek to share in the purchase money—which claims are themselves the product and effect of the secret system of land purchasing—are urged as reasons against the employment of that open and legitimate mode of inquiry, which would prevent or destroy them: 3rd, the grave doubts affecting the transaction at Queen Charlotte's Sound are passed over without notice.

Here, on the subject of the "Investigation," the same course is taken by Mr. Richmond as before, with reference to the "points in dispute." Scraps and fragments of doubtful assertions, and unsifted evidence are produced by Mr. Richmond, and we are asked to accept them as a substitute for that proper inquiry which was demanded by every consideration of justice and expediency. Unproved allegations and uncertain inferences cannot be allowed to take its place. The defect of inquiry can only be supplied by a proper inquiry hereafter.
The web, which Mr. Richmond has woven, is too weak to bear the weight of a civil war. One passage only I think it necessary to notice: It is as follows (Par. 82); "Where unrepresented claimants are known, or believed, to exist, the Government makes inquiry on the spot; as was done in the present case at Queen Charlotte's Sound, and at "Wellington. But where (as in the case of the Waikanae Natives) there is no reason to believe in the existence of valid claims, no local investigation is instituted. The Waikanae claimants (for whom the Rev. Riwai te Ahu acts as Secretary) ought to have come forward. They admit that they were aware of the negotiation at the time when the first instalment was paid in November, 1859." On the contrary, there was very good reason to believe in the existence of valid claims at Waikanae. It was notorious that people closely connected with the Waitara were still at Waikanae. At a distance of 200 miles, they received no notice at all from the Commissioner of his proceedings. They hear of them for the first time, when the inquiry was concluded, and the first instalment paid. This mode of dealing with absent owners is now justified: a Native Minister regards it as sufficient. If this be sufficient, what can be insufficient? Do we shew our superiority and our civilization by this contemptuous disregard of common justice?

I have asserted that the persons invited to the Kohimarama Conference were, with few exceptions, such as were known to be friendly to the Government. When Mr. Dillon Bell urged in the House of Representatives (August 17, 1860), the necessity of carefully considering the nature and constitution of the Conference proposed for 1861, he said that the Conference just held could not be regarded as of a representative character, for only those chiefs had been invited who were known to be friendly. No member questioned that statement. Mr. Richmond said it would be the object of the Government to give to the next Conference as much of a representative character as possible. Though I cite Mr. Bell as asserting the same thing, my knowledge of the fact is derived from independent sources.

Here is the main proposition on which Mr. Richmond relies: "In law, as well as in fact, their territorial rights and obligations are not subject to the interpretation of our Courts. These stand upon treaty, of which the Crown itself is rightfully the sole interpreter." The practical consequence is drawn in Par. 121: "If the Governor had jurisdiction, he was justified in asserting it in the only practicable mode, viz. by force; in other words, the Governor being of right sole judge of questions respecting Native Territorial rights, was justified in enforcing his jurisdiction in the only practicable mode, viz. by military occupation."

I have argued that the people of the Waitara, being subjects of the Crown, have not been dealt with as subjects of the Crown. Mr. Richmond answers by saying, they are not subjects of the Crown; they have had all they are entitled to.

The fallacy of Mr. Richmond's argument is obvious. A treaty in the ordinary sense is a compact between two independent nations, independent before the Treaty was made, and independent after it was made. Such a Treaty is not within the jurisdiction of the Courts of either nation. For an independent nation cannot be bound by the decision of the Courts of another nation. Disputes therefore between independent nations, respecting the meaning of a Treaty, must be decided by force or arbitration. Of late even Sovereign powers have inclined to the latter mode. But the Treaty of Waitangi is of a different kind. The parties thereto were independent before, but not after. It is an express article of the Treaty that one party shall thereby become subject to the other; that the Maories shall become subject to the Queen, and shall receive the protection due to subjects. "Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her Royal protection, and imparts to them all the rights and privileges of British subjects."

It may not be easy to find an exact counterpart to the Treaty of Waitangi; but there is a considerable analogy between it and the Charters and other instruments, by which Princes at various times have granted rights and franchises to their people. Whether the rights of the subject have been, as in Europe for the most part, doled out by Charters wrung from unwilling hands, or given freely and at once, as in this case, makes no difference as to the nature and effect of the compact; the only difference is one of degree, and not of kind. Now in such cases it has not been left to the Charter: but the franchises of the people have been expounded and maintained by tribunals independent of the Prince.

It is not meant that the whole complex body of English law was at once to be applied to the natives; but it is meant, that the plain and fundamental principles of English law became applicable at once: that the natives became at once entitled to the essential rights of British subjects. Amongst those rights surely are the following:—that life shall not be taken without a fair trial; that land shall not be taken without a fair trial. "The rights and privileges of British subjects" mean at any rate the opposite to despotism. The proceedings of the Government at Waitara were pure despotism. Mr. Richmond has entirely overlooked the consequences of his theory; namely, that if the Treaty of Waitangi be (as his argument assumes it to be) a Treaty in the ordinary sense, then the right of interpreting and enforcing the Treaty must belong, not to one party, but to both equally; that the natives are at liberty to resort to force in support of their view, as much as the Governor in support of his; and that they cannot be charged with rebellion if they do so.

However little the theoretical value of Mr. Richmond's doctrine may be, it is a significant and remarkable
fact that such a doctrine is put forth. It is remarkable as bearing on the position, which I have maintained, that
the natives at the Waitara, being British subjects, have not been treated as British subjects. Had it been possible
to shew that they have been treated as British subjects, Mr. Richmond would hardly have had recourse to a
doctrine which denies them to be British subjects at all, which repudiates the assurances given by word and
deed in a vast variety of ways during twenty years, and which puts the natives in the same position in which
they would have stood had the Treaty never been made. It should be noticed also, what that is which is now
clothed with the name and dignity of "the Crown." "The Crown itself (says Mr. Richmond) is the sole
interpreter of the Treaty." (Par. 98.) It might be inferred then to be the duty of the Governor to provide for the
Crown the means of interpreting, to ascertain all the facts, to submit them to the Home Government, and to act
upon their decision. But Mr. Richmond requires nothing of the kind. In Par. 121 he applies the general principle
to the particular case of the "Waitara, and attempts thereby to justify the proceedings of the Government in this
particular question. This enables us to understand what Mr. Richmond means, when he says that the Crown is
the sole interpreter of the treaty. The Crown then, in Mr. Richmond's sense, does not mean the Queen or the
Government of England. They had never authorized, they did not understand, they had no means of
understanding, what the Colonial Government was doing at the Waitara. That which Mr, Richmond calls by the
name of "the Crown," is, in fact, the Governor of the Colony, acting in a matter vitally concerning the interests
of the Natives and the honour of the Crown, without any special authority or instruction from the Crown, with
the concurrence, and on the advice of persons who represent neither the Natives nor the Crown. Let us reduce
the general proposition a little further. The Governor, judging in this particular case, is simply and in fact Mr.
Parris. The largeness of the general proposition narrows itself down practically to these dimensions. The
majesty of the Royal word and the largeness of the national undertaking issue in the decision of an Assistant
Land Purchase Commissioner.

In May, 1857, the present Ministers recorded their opinion on the policy to be pursued in native matters:
they said, "As to the ultimate end to which the British Government in these islands is bound to shape its native
policy, there can be no difference of opinion. Successive Governors have promised, in the name of the British
Crown, that the Colonists and the Maories should form but one people, under one equal law, and no effort must
be spared to redeem this pledge." (T. Q. p. 100.) In December, 1860, a theory is boldly put forward by one of
those ministers, which, if England were capable of adopting it, would render the fulfilment of those promises
absolutely and for ever impossible; a theory according to which the native population must submit to be aliens
on their own soil; to bear the pressure of our dominion, but not to receive the protection of the law or the
privileges of English subjects. Thus, while professing to aim at raising and preserving this race, and bringing
them into a peaceful union with ourselves, we uphold and prescribe a course of action which must provoke
them to the most determined resistance to our authority, and can only end in the failure of our undertaking, in
discredit to ourselves, and in ruin to them.

Miscellaneous Notes on Professor Browne's Pamphlet, &c.

Professor Browne speaks of the war as "at first unboundedly popular." At first nobody knew anything about
the cause of the war: the now "acknowledged lies "were believed to be facts. But Mr. Fitzherbert, one of the
most eloquent and courageous members of the House of Representatives, explained what the popularity of the
war meant. He said, "What we mean by war is a good market for our fat oxen and fat sheep—plenty of
commissariat expenditure." Such a war, so long as it does not come too close, is very likely to be popular. What
would be the state of Europe now if nations could go to war, not only without incurring expenditure, but
actually derive pecuniary profit from it. It is not many years ago that Mr. Gladstone pointed out that a great
check on war would be to increase taxation instead of raising loans, that the immediate pressure might restrain
warlike feelings. What would he have said to a 'paying' war. But as a matter of fact it is a libel on the settlers to
say that war with the Maories is or was popular. The Governor's Ministers would have exhibited a sorry figure
in the House of Representatives, if the question of deciding on the merits of the war had been left to the
members of the Northern Island—the only persons who knew anything about it. I myself heard Mr.
Moor-house, the Superintendent of Canterbury, in his speech describe the debate on the war as "a debate wholly
uninteresting to him as a member for Canterbury."

The following is one of the strangest and most instructive parts of this controversy. Archdeacon Hadfield
writes to the Duke of Newcastle: "With regard to Teira's right to sell, which is so positively asserted, and on the
supposed validity of which a war has been commenced at Tarauaki, can I expect to be believed in England,
when I assert, as I do unequivocally, that Teira's father, Tamati Rara, through whom alone the son could lay
claim to any land, as inherited by him from his ancestors, is still alive and opposed its alienation. He refused to sell, and co-operated with W. King up to the very commencement of hostilities. I feel that nothing I could add to this fact, would tend to strengthen the assertion I make, that the claim set up on behalf of Teira to alienate the whole block of land is altogether untenable." Now compare with this 'unequivocal' and triumphant assertion not only the fact that Tamati's name is affixed to letters of Teira's, urging the Governor to complete the purchase, but also with the following undeniably statement of the Colonial Prime Minister: 'There had been rumours that Teira's father, Tamati Rara, was fighting on King's side; the fact being that Tamati Rara had assisted to cut the boundary lines for the surveyor of the very block in dispute. Tamati Rara's only objection to the proceedings of the Governor was, that they had not at once given him a gun to enable him to fight on the Government side. They had received letters from him, not declaring that the lands should not be sold, not desiring that the survey should be stopped, or the military occupation of the land be abandoned, but asking for a gun to fight for them."

This note surprises me. Professor Browne must be a very loose thinker if he imagines that the extract given from Mr. Stafford's speech contradicts one particle of my assertion. If indeed he had remembered what he had himself written at page 15 of his pamphlet, he would have seen that Mr. Stafford referred to a survey made subsequent to the military occupation of the land, for he there informs us that only one Maori, Henri Potaka, assisted at the one attempted before the war began. How many survey lines he may have assisted in cutting after the commencement of hostilities, or in what other manner he may have shewn his zeal with a view to excuse his tardy conversion, in no way affects my statement, that Teira acted against his wishes, and that he opposed the alienation of the land up to the very commencement of hostilities. Nor does the alleged fact that Tamati's name is affixed to letters of Teira's, urging the Governor to complete the purchase, at all invalidate my assertion. I am certain that T. Rara cannot write his name. But it will be seen by a reference to documents (E. no. 2, p. 3 and 4), that when natives do not write their own names, they affix a cross. Sometimes a note is made by the writer that he is authorized to write the names affixed. I have no doubt that T. Rara's name was forged by his son, and affixed to the letters in question without his leave or consent. Perhaps Professor Browne will learn that a less "triumphant" tone is more becoming in one who writes on a subject of which he absolutely knows nothing.

See Appendix G.

I had written, "What are the loyal natives to think of a Governor, who, without the least provocation, singles out this chief, distinguished through a long course of years for his loyalty to Her Majesty's Government, and friendship to the English, for a hostile attack?" Professor Browne observes, "It is scarcely worth while to notice the perversion in this statement, as though the Governor had attacked King, whereas King first defied and then attacked the Governor." I pass over the vague word "defied," as incapable by any kind of interpretation of being forced into a 'casus belli.' But the assertion that W. King attacked the Governor is so gross—so reckless—so absolutely destitute of a particle of evidence to support it, that I am unable to conceive how Professor Browne could have been guilty of it. He does indeed refer in a note to some rhetorical language of Mr. Dillon Bell's: but, in the first place, Mr. Bell is no authority on this subject; and even if he were, his assertion does not bear out Professor Browne's assertion: He does not say that W, King "attacked the Governor." Mr. Bell says that W. King "made war on the Governor, by erecting armed pas, by performing war dances, by refusing the safe conduct, and rejecting the merciful summons that was sent him." Which of these particulars was intended to be considered as the "attack on the Governor," I am unable to surmise. There is no such thing as an armed pa in New Zealand. The pas alluded to by Mr. Bell were indefensible, and were evacuated within a few hours after troops were moved on to the land, and without a shot being fired. I cannot conceive that a so-called wardance, or the refusal of a safe conduct, or a merciful summons, can either in law or common sense be considered as an attack upon the Governor. And this loose, foolish language of Mr. Bell's, is the only ground Professor Browne seems to have for his charge of 'perversion' brought against me. There can be no room for doubt how the war began. A proclamation of martial law was made on the 25th of January. An attempt to survey the land was made on the 20th of February, and was resisted, but "no violence was offered." (Governor's Dispatch, Feb. 27, 1860.) On the 22nd of February, martial law was proclaimed. On the 1st of March, W. King was requested to come and meet the Governor, but refused. On the 5th of the same month, the military took possession of the disputed land, and W. King's pas and houses were burnt. On the 13th and 14th the land was surveyed on the night of the 15th a pa was built on it: on the 17th the pa was cannonaded.

It is to be observed that the official Maori version of the Proclamation of Martial Law was a declaration of war on all the natives of the Province of Taranaki, including even the Ngatiruanui. Upon this Professor Browne remarks—"It has been replied, that, whatever effect it may have had on other natives, King was too well informed for it to have so affected him. He bad, on a former occasion, been living in a district where martial law was proclaimed, and fully understood its meaning." (P. 16.) It is remarkable what different conclusions are drawn from the same facts, according to people's prejudices. The inference I should have drawn would have
been, that as W. King perceived a wide difference in the wording of this proclamation, from that of the former one with which he had been acquainted, he concluded that something different was intended by it.

Professor Browne says, "As to the so-called coup-de-main, is it strange in any country that, when a mob resists and overawes the civil authority, the executive should call in the aid of the military? Could any one suppose that the Governor would yield as soon as the police was overpowered?" As I have already shewn, Professor Browne knows nothing at all about the subject on which he has presumed to write. No mob resisted the civil authority. A trespass was rightfully and lawfully resisted without violence—as is acknowledged by the Governor—by men on their own land. There was no civil authority resisted: no police overpowered. And let it be remembered, that this illegal coup-de-main was agreed upon nearly a month before the lawful interruption of the illegal trespass authorised by the Governor.

IV. It is necessary to notice an exception which has been taken to my explanation of W. King's reported saying that the land belong to Teira and his party. I attributed the apparent difficulty to a misunderstanding of W. King's language. My reason for this was that, as it was notorious that he had land within the block, which the Government has since admitted, and that I knew that his son had land within it, which I had myself seen, and of which W. King could not possibly have been ignorant, such a construction of his language as would not only make him tell a deliberate lie, but tell one for the sake of injuring himself and his son was inadmissible. Professor Browne says—" No doubt Maori language, like Maori ideas of property, is vague and indefinite." There is no more vagueness in Maori than in any other language to those who understand it. My difficulty has arisen not from any obscurity about the Maori, but from its absence. If "W. King's Maori words had been reported, there could have been no difficulty in knowing what he meant. The inaccurate translations officially given of the Proclamation of Martial Law, of Wi Takō's letter, and of India's letter, have destroyed my faith in official translations. The conversation alluded to, as reported by Mr. Parris, I consider absolutely worthless. It is simply absurd to ground upon the doubtful version of an alleged conversation the assertion that "W. King made no proprietary claim." What astonishes me is that Englishmen should have such "vague ideas of property," as to think that it may be confiscated on such vague assertions.

V. Professor Browne says, that "King's party was thoroughly organized." There is not a particle of proof advanced in support of this. Mr. Richmond makes the same assertion:—King's preparations for armed resistance, long before the commencement of hostilities, are undeniable. He did not need to accumulate warlike stores, having always been well provided with arms and ammunition. But he prepared his pa in the bush, so that he might be ready for hostilities at any moment-ready, as he threateningly said to Mr. Parris, 'to go to the mountains.' I beg leave to deny what Mr. Richmond says is "undeniable," and must continue to do so until some proof is brought to establish his assertion. W. King's arms and ammunition became a necessity when the former officially informed him that he would afford no protection to life outside the English boundary: they had been accumulated in order to protect himself against the "friendly natives," as the murderers of Katatore, Ihia, and Tamati are called, and not for hostilities against the Government. He had not prepared a pa in the bush in order to be ready for hostilities. On turning to Mr. Richmond's reference to ascertain his authority for the so-called threatening language attributed to W. King, I find it is his opponent Teira with two others. I call particular attention to this, as a specimen of the loose way in which Mr. Richmond writes on an important subject. No doubt the English reader would suppose that references thus made without any comment, were made to evidence given on oath. But I have another charge to bring against Mr. Richmond; the words ascribed to "W. King are never used as a threat: all that they could convey (it is by no means an uncommon expression) is—' If I give up Waitara to you, and all my cultivable land is thus ceded, where shall I go and reside, can I live on the mountains?' It is absolutely impossible to find any other construction in these words. Mr. Richmond's ignorance of Maori is hardly a valid excuse for such a perversion.

VI. An attempt is now being made to justify the war on the ground that the King-movement must soon have required one. Nothing in the past conduct of the Government leads me at least to place much reliance on this assumed foresight as to a coming necessity. There is certainly no official document bearing date before the commencement of the war to indicate that they possessed it. But so far was the suppression of the King-movement from having been the object of the war, that, as I last year pointed out, the Government committed the extreme folly of attacking a loyal Chief, wholly disconnected from that movement, when it was becoming apparent to all persons moderately acquainted with Maori affairs, and possessing the least sagacity, that the movement had become too important to be any longer either neglected or trifled with. But there are positive proofs in existence to shew that at the time the war was begun the Government had no intention of extending it beyond the Waitara land question. It is hardly necessary to mention that the Governor gave positive instructions to the officer in command to confine his hostile operations to the disputed block of land at "Waitara; and that he cautioned him against any attack on Waikato natives (those more immediately connected with the King-party). At the time the war commenced no proclamation or official notice had ever been issued expressing disapprobation of the movement, or cautioning natives against it. In the answer presented by a
friendly tribe, Ngatiukatua, to the Governor's speech at the Conference, aid officially published in the *Maori Gazette*, are these remarkable words:—" Hearken to us! The fault is your own. Sometime ago we informed you of its commencement, and that Potatau was set up as King. You answered that you did not believe in it, and that it was mere child's play; but that if all this island were to acknowledge it (the Maori King), then you would believe in it. *** Your fault is this: had you extinguished it (the King-movement) some time back, it would have disappeared ere this." There is something very humiliating in seeing how vastly superior these so-called savages were in foresight to the British Governor. Their scarcely concealed sneer at his statesmanlike sagacity in saying that he would believe in it when he saw it is instructive.

The war is even defended on more general ground; namely, that a war between the two races must have taken place sooner or later. This appears so silly that it is not very easy to imagine the mental state in which it could have originated, aid may perhaps be thought incredible in England. It is of abut the same value as would be the defence of a man charged with committing murder, who should say—It is true I killed he deceased, but in any case he must have died some day or other. Even this hardly equals the absurdity of the defence set up for an unjustifiable war, because, though it be true that every ran will die, there is nothing whatever to prove that war must necessarily have taken place in New Zealand. On the country, nothing but the grossest injustice could have forced a reluctant people to take up arms; even now, a year after the commencement of hostilities, very few have done so. A Government worthy of the name might have easily ascertained the causes of the irritating grievances of which the Maoris complained. But even these grievances, whatever they were, did not occasion the war, and might easily have been removed—A few years more of peace and conciliation would have resulted in such a large increase of the English population, and such a thorough fusion of the interests of the two races, as must have actually precluded the possibility of a war of races. War is so great an evil that no mere future probability of its necessity can justify it. A system deliberately pursued by a government with its own subjects which must necessarily lead to war, bears its own condemnation on the face of it.

VII. "In the assembly of Maori Chiefs, gathered from all parts of the island, after the principal Land-Commissioner made a statement, the Chiefs debated the questions among themselves. At the conclusion a series of propositions were moved and seconded by different Chiefs, and carried by a majority of 107 to 3, the dissentient 3 being relations of W. King: The most important were:—' That this Conference having heard explained the circumstances which led to the war at Taranaki, is of opinion that the Governor was justified in the course taken by him; that W. King provoked the quarrel, and that the proceedings of the latter are wholly indefensible.' "(p. 18.) I regret to he obliged to contradict the writer. There was no such resolution carried by such a division as he asserts. The resolution was put to the Assembly but was not carried—no division took place on it. The Rev. Robert Burrows wrote to the *Southern Cross* (Aug. 24), "It will be seen by reference to my 'memoranda' that a majority were in favour of Res. II. and that therefore it was carried—not so Res. III. which is indeed the Resolution of the series. Mr. Clark (a Government officer) allows that' some confusion did arise, but not from opposition to the Resolution.' He does not deny, however, that when the meeting was called upon to ap! prove of that Resolution by a show of hands the *majority did not put up their hands*, and that no better success attended a second effort. Whilst therefore Res. II. was passed because a majority *did* hold up their hands in favour of it, Res. III. was *not* passed because a majority *did not* hold up their hands. "What took place after the Chairman had ‘declared the Conference closed/ I am not prepared to say.’ What took place after the closing of the Conference is now very well known. Underhand means were used to obtain the signatures of those who had been members of the Conference to a document which embodied the objectionable resolution. Several of those who signed this, which they regarded as a complimentary address to the Governor, did so because they expected to receive payment for their attendance at the Conference so soon as this document was signed, they having heard that £3000 had been voted by the General Assembly to cover the expenses of the members. This reason for affixing their names to that paper after the Conference was finally closed has been assigned to me by several members. It is well known that there was great dissatisfaction and discontent expressed when they found themselves disappointed, more especially as they well knew that the Members of the House of Representatives are paid. It is said that the dissentient three were W. King's relations. This is not true. By tracing back the pedigree five or six generations, it may be shewn that they are connected with him; but the same process will shew that they are more nearly connected with Teira, so that Professor Browne's argument will gain little by this. It would have been more to the purpose to say that they, being the only members of the Ngatiawa present at the Conference were the only persons in a position to give an opinion on the subject. One of these men, on hearing this objection, observed—" Does not the Governor's *brother* see that the same objection may be raised against his defence of his brother.' The truth is the members of the Conference were hastily got together at a time and under circumstances when the leading chiefs could not leave their people, and consisted principally of inferior men, many of whom were paid agents of the Government. I allude more especially to those from the southern parts of the Island.

VIII. "All this shoke's one faith in the extreme simplicity of the case, as stated by Archdeacon Hadfield and
those who aide with him." (P. 36.) Professor Browne seems to argue that there must be some uncertainty as to Maori tenure of land, because many Maori speakers at the great Waikato Meeting, as well as at the Auckland Conference, were unable to arrive at a decision as to the respective titles of W. King and Teira. He fails to perceive that their difficulty, whatever it may have been, did not arise from any doubts as to Maori tenure, but was occasioned by the entire absence of facts on which to ground a decision, no investigation having ever taken place. I have already given my opinion as to what weight should be attached to the opinions of the Laud-Purchase Commissioner's partizans, who formed a majority of the Conference. But allowing that there may be many various opinions given as to Maori tenure, this fact should scarcely have been deemed conclusive against the "extreme simplicity" of my view of it. Professor Browne must be well aware that to ninety-nine men out of a hundred a bundle of facts is nothing more than a bundle of facts, but that there are a few men who by careful and patient analysis can arrive at very simple laws underlying these facts. His error is analogous to that fallen into by many persons, that because Maoris cannot explain the grammar of their own language (which, of course, no Maori can) therefore it is not reducible to any fixed grammatical rules, and is devoid of any clear and definite meaning. I am told that Mr. McLean differs from me as to Maori tenure. He has himself denied this. (Appendix to Mr. Richmond's Mem. on Taranaki Question.) But however that may be, his mind is incapable of the process I have just alluded to. On the other hand it may be observed that the views on this subject maintained by Sir W. Martin, late Chief Justice of New Zealand, are identical with mine. ("Taranaki Question.")

IX. Professor Browne seems to think it is a sufficient answer to my statement to quote some scraps from what he calls "authentic documents;" which authentic documents generally turn out to be extracts from Mr. Bell's reports of his own speeches, or it may be extracts from Mr. Stafford's speeches, or portions of Mr. McLean's statements. He seems to have no suspicion whatever that he is overlooking the most obvious rules which should guide men in estimating the respective value of conflicting evidence. In the first place, all the persons just alluded to are paid officers of the Government. As Mr. Stafford knows nothing of Maori matters, it is hardly worth while to attend to any of his statements. Mr. Bell knows very little more than Mr. Stafford; but it is always quite certain that he will take the Government side in any dispute; he is a personification of red-tape. I pass on, therefore, to Mr. McLean. He is the head of the Land-Purchase Department. He comes forward to defend the proceedings of his own department. What I maintain is, that according to the ordinary rules for estimating the value of testimony, his evidence ought to be received with caution as that of a witness under the influence of an undoubted bias and considerable pressure. Mr. Fox says, "He was considered as merely the mouth-piece of the Governor to lay a one-sided statement before the House." Mr. McLean has been convicted of the grossest misstatements as to facts, some of which appear to have been made wilfully.

See Appendix.

But even if he were an independent and trustworthy witness, he cannot justly occupy so high a position as his injudicious friends would place him in, Mr. Fox says again—"Some of his replies, on cross-examination, exhibited a degree of ignorance on common subjects both startling and suggestive." If the truth must be told, it is, that Mr. McLean is an ignorant, uneducated man. He was once employed at Waihike by Patene Puhata, a native chief, as a goatherd, where he acquired some knowledge of the Maori language, which, with considerable patience and tact, has made him a useful agent in Maori matters.

It would be absurd to expect from him any information as to Maori tenure of land. As an illustration of what I mean, his answer to a question (49) in his examination is given—"What do you mean by Tribal right? I suppose it means the right of a tribe." Mr. McLean never lived among that section of the Ngatiawa tribe which includes W. King, Teira, &c.

See Appendix L.

I need only say that I lived many years in the midst of them; that I learnt from them twenty years ago their laws and customs as to tenure of land; and that I have recently written on the questions now engaging attention in this Colony, at great personal inconvenience, and with the certainty of incurring much obloquy, because I deemed it right to defend truth against error, and expose injustice and oppression.

Professor Browne says, "Mr. McLean is represented on all sides as a man of singular knowledge and experience in questions of native title and rights. Within the last twenty years he has investigated the title to, and conducted the negotiations for the Bale of, from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 of acres, and in no important respect has the validity of these purchases ever been disputed."

Appendix N.

(p. 23.) With regard to the alleged fact of these purchases not having been disputed, see Appendix. But the statement is a gross and unjustifiable exaggeration. It is well known that the greater part of the land referred to is in the Middle Island, where there are very few natives, and consequently little difficulty in effecting purchases. But the greater part of these were made by Mr. Kettle, Mr. Kemp, and others, Mr. McLean having had little or nothing to do with them.

Notwithstanding the observations I have thought it necessary to make, it is only doing justice to Mr.
McLean to say that I believe he never would have advised the Governor to adopt the course he did at Waitara, had he been consulted on the subject.

Appendix.

A.

To the Editor of the Southern Cross.

Sir,—I shall feel obliged by your inserting in the columns of your paper the following observations:—

I cannot refrain from expressing my utter astonishment at seeing in an Auckland paper, lent me by a neighbour, certain statements, made by the Native Secretary and the Chief Land Commissioner, many of them seriously reflecting upon the reputation and loyalty of the natives of Otaki and their Missionary.

I constantly read erroneous opinions put forth in the local journals in reference to Native matters, which have passed unnoticed, and I do not think I can fairly be accused of "rushing into print:" but when I consider the circumstances under which those statements were made, by a person who is looked upon as an authority, I feel myself called upon to offer a few remarks upon facts with most of which I was personally acquainted, having resided for eight years in the Otaki district, in connection with Archdeacon Hadfield, prior to my appointment to this coast.

I have no intention of accusing the Native Secretary of wilfully misleading the public, but he has most certainly been misinformed upon some of these points. I have often admired his great amount of patience and perseverance with the natives in the purchase of land, but that serious errors have been committed, cannot, I think, be fairly denied.

There are many points in the Native Secretary's statement which appear to me exceedingly incorrect, but I confine myself to the following. I quote his own words:—

"I first heard of this League as having originated at Otaki. The natives of that place assured me that they had good advice on the subject, and were determined not to dispose of any more land to the Government."

In order to show how far advice given to the natives at Otaki had proved injurious, I will state that when the Rangitikei country was offered for sale to the Government by the Ngatiapa great excitement prevailed, and both Rangihaaean and Te Rauparaha (whose rage at the time was witnessed by the Commissioner) were determined to prevent the sale. The former of these had previously burnt down a raupo house which was built by Te Hokeke and party, on the south side of the river, for Dr. Best, to whom they had engaged to lease that portion of the land; and it was only through the influence of the Otaki natives, "acting upon good advice," who also asserted a claim, that these two chiefs, together with others, withdrew their opposition; and their old enemies, whom they looked upon in the light of slaves, were allowed to sell the land and keep the whole of the payment. The Commissioner himself expressed his gratification at such honourable and generous conduct.

In consequence of the behaviour of the Ngatiapa, after the sale of the Rangitikei block, who, notwithstanding the handsome manner in which they had been treated, threatened to sell even the land occupied by some of the Ngatiraukawa, the Otaki, and Manawatu natives (principally Ngatiraukawa) entered into an agreement not to sell any more land within certain boundaries, over which they had an undoubted control according to native custom. This agreement was, however, cancelled in I8.12, in consequence of some of the natives on the Manawatu River wishing to sell a portion of their land; and it was arranged that they should be left free to do as they pleased. The "good advice" which is said to have led to such serious consequences, we are no doubt to infer was given by Archdeacon Hadfield; but I must remind the Commissioner that that gentleman was at the time in Wellington, where he had been almost entirely confined, nearly four years, to what was considered to be his death-bed. I was never aware of the natives having any advice in favour of such a scheme, although they were decidedly recommended to give it up.

Again, the Native Secretary says:—

"This League kept gaining ground for some years till a general meeting took place in the Ngatiruanui country, where the natives pledged themselves, not only that they should sell no more land, but that they would take the life of any one who attempted to do so."

The meeting at Manawapou, in the Ngatiruanui district, had no connection whatever with the agreement entered into at Otakian and Manawatu, which had been cancelled two years before. At Manawapou it was proposed to form a Land League, which was rejected; and it was decided that each tribe should be left to its own affairs. What 19 called the Land League at Waitara was entirely of a local character, and, in accordance with this decision, having no connection whatever with the Ngatiruanui. Parotene Te Koparn, in advocating the League at Manawapou, produced a hatchet, which was offered to the Southern Chiefs, and was placed before them for their acceptance, as a pledge that they would unite in supporting the League. There were stated to have
been about 500 natives present, but not one of them received the hatchet, and it was returned to its owner!

Also—
"It was also resolved at this meeting of the natives that they should entirely repossess themselves of land already alienated by them, and drive the European settlers into the sea."

This most startling assertion is positively contradicted by one of the principal Chiefs, who was present; the only one who has since been within my reach. I never heard such an idea breathed before. Having seen a number of (he natives on their return from the meeting, I feel convinced that such a scheme would most certainly have come to my ears had it ever been entertained. If such a resolution had been passed, why was it not acted upon? Nearly seven years have elapsed without the least interference with the Europeans.

Further—
"The subsequent murders, involving the deaths of Rawiri and Rata-tore, and various others that have taken place at Taranaki, have been the result of the League and the confederacy of Manawapou: and there is very little doubt that the settlement at Taranaki has been, since the formation of this Land League, in a very perilous position. It has been stated that this has arisen in some measure from the defective system of acquiring land."

My opinion upon these matters differs widely from that of the Commissioner. I have no hesitation in saying that the evils here spoken of have, to a very great extent, arisen from injudicious purchase, or attempts to purchase, of disputed lands. One of Rawiri Waiaua's own relatives told me that he could not justify his conduct; that Katatore had used every means in his power to prevent the sale of the land in question, to which he had an undoubted right; and that he repeatedly remonstrated and protested, both to the white man and to the Maori, without effect, and that he was driven to take up arms in defence of his property! An unhappy position for a British subject to be placed in.

Again he says—
"The venerable gentleman who was examined previous to myself has endeavoured to convey an impression that land purchases at the South have produced dissatisfaction."

There can be no doubt as to the land purchases having of late caused very great dissatisfaction at the South. The "tikanga hou," or new policy of the Government—purchasing lands from individuals without the sanction of the rest of the tribe, has much perplexed the natives of this district. I have repeatedly met with the assertion (in spite of all that could be said to the contrary) that the Government were trying to provoke a quarrel with them, in order that they might have some pretext for depriving them of their lands; and when they heard of the disturbance of Taranaki they considered that their predictions were being fulfilled. They see a wide difference between the repeated assurance of the Commissioner in former years, ratified by the pledge given them by the Governor, during his last visit to Napier—that no land would be purchased except from those tribes who were free to sell—and the way in which it has latterly been acted up to; and say that the Government have broken faith with them. They are now kept quiet under the assurance that no act of injustice can be intended by the Home Government, and that existing errors will in time be rectified.

He continues—
"The purchases to which he probably refers, those at Rangitiikei and the Middle Island, were carefully conducted; I am prepared to uphold the purchases between Otaki and Whangaroa as having been. Required from the true and rightful owners."

Most of the old purchases made in the Wellington and Ahuriri Provinces, I am willing to support; they do great credit to the Commissioner; and it is much to be lamented that a system which gave such universal satisfaction was ever deviated from.

Further—
"It was perhaps the misfortune of some of these owners that they did not belong to the same denomination as the Venerable Archdeacon, and this in a great measure (at least it appears so to me) forms, in his estimation, a barrier to their claims."

The insinuation that Archdeacon Hadfield could lower himself to do or say anything to the prejudice of persons of a different denomination to his own, I should have considered beneath the Native Secretary. I do not admit that any of the tribes alluded to are entirely Wesleyans, although they are in some cases intermixed with our people; and with them we were always on most friendly terms.

I lastly quote as follows:—
"Reference has been made to land being at one time bought from the conquered, and at another from the conquerors."

Taking this quotation with the next preceding, I am at a loss to know what the Commissioner means. Does he complain of the conquered Ngatiapa, among whom there are many Wesleyans, being allowed to keep the whole of the purchase money for Rangitiikei, besides having an interest in the land retained by the Ngatiraukawa? Or does he suppose that it is denominational prejudice which induces the Archdeacon to sympathise with the conquered Ngatirivia of Te Honere, Pelorus River (part of whom were "Wesleyans"),
because they were not consulted in the sale of their land; they, in his opinion, holding a similar position in the Middle Island to that of the Ngaliapa in the Northern (Te Rauparaha and Rangihacata, with their people, being conquerors in both places); the only difference was that the Otaki natives had no interest in the latter case? The Ngatiruia did, however, I am informed, receive some trifling compensation from the Commissioner, after a fruitless attempt to retain possession.

In conclusion, I would remark, that during the eight years I was in immediate connection with the Archdeacon—sometimes acting for, sometimes with him, I never once, that I can recollect, heard of his attempting to dissuade any Maori from selling land, although he did remonstrate with the purchaser when the transaction was likely to lead to a disturbance. This appears most unfairly to have been interpreted into an opposition on his part to the sale of land.

Yours, &c.,

SAML WILLIAMS.

Te Auti, Hawke's Bay,

September 7th, 1860.

B.

New Zealand Spectator, Nov. 3.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator. Otaki,

Oct. 20.

SIR,—Will you allow me to offer a few comments on a passage occurring in Mr. M'Lean's evidence given in the House of Representatives. It is this—"I believe that most of the difficulties and opposition which has been met with in pursuing this purchase have originated entirely with the anti-land-selling-league. This league I first head of as having commenced at Otaki. The natives of that place assure me that they had very good advice on the subject, and that the; had resolved not to dispose of any more land to the Government. This league kept gaining ground for some years, until a general meeting took place in the Ngatiruanui country, where the natives pledged them selves not only to sell no more land, but to take the life of any one who should attempt to do so. This meeting took place about seven years ago It was also resolved at this meeting of natives that they should entirely repossess themselves of lands already alienated by them, and drive the European settlers into the sea. The subsequent murders, involving the deaths of Rawiri, Katatore, and others that have taken place at Taranaki, have been the result of that league and the confederacy at Manawapou, and there is very little doubt that the settlement of New Plymouth, since the formation of this land league, has been in a very perilous position." In reference to this language used by Mr. M'Lean, the Rev. Samuel Williams, who perhaps is as competent as any one to give an opinion on this subject, thus writes in a letter addressed to the Southern Cross, and republished by you, Sir, in your issue of October 6th:—"I cannot refrain from expressing my utter astonishment at seeing certain statements made by the Native Secretary—statements made by one who is looked upon as an authority." He may well express astonishment at such statements made by one who is not only looked upon as an authority, but who is actually the governing head of the Native Department, whoever may be its ostensible one. The remarks contained in Mr. Williams' letter in reference to Mr. M'Lean's assertions are so clear and definite, and so thoroughly refute them, that it seems superfluous to add anything to them. But there are some points raised by Mr. M'Lean that compel me to offer a few further comments on his allegations.

Mr. M'Lean asserts that most of the difficulties and opposition which have been met with in purchasing Waitara originated entirely with the Anti-Land-Selling-League. It is unfortunate that Mr. M'Lean did not afford more information about this league, to which such powerful influence is attributed. He says, indeed, that he first heard of this league as having commenced at Otaki. He avoids committing himself by saying positively that it did originate at Otaki. But, assuming that he meant this to be inferred from his language (if he did not, it fails in the object for which it was advanced, namely, in connecting ne with the movement), I must treat the insinuation as though it were an asser- lion of a fact. Still he makes no attempt to trace it in its development from this its assumed cradle. He, however, goes on immediately to say, that this league kept gaining ground for some years,
until at a general meeting it attained what certainly looks like considerable maturity at Manawapou; and that the resolutions adopted by the meeting were—"not to sell any more land"—"to take the life of any one who should attempt to do so"—"to repossess lands already alienated"—"to drive the European settlers into the sea." He very coolly adds—"This meeting took place about seven years ago." Now a few questions naturally suggesting themselves in reference to this league, which openly resolved on taking such serious steps as those just enumerated, are—Where are all the Chief Commissioner's reports about this league? What course did the Government, when Mr. M'Lean reported to it the existence of this league, and the resolutions agreed upon at the meeting in question, adopt? What steps did Governor Wynyard, and subsequently Governor Browne, take in reference to it? What measures, during these seven years, since it attained the alarming maturity which it is said to have reached at the Manawapou meeting, have been introduced into the General Assembly, in order to check, if not to crush it? Were Sir George Grey's regulations for preventing the sale of fire-arms and ammunition made more stringent with a view of averting or lessening the threatened danger? Was the British Government distinctly informed of all these particulars before it guaranteed the loan for the purchase of native lands—and, before the 58th Regiment was withdrawn? And, lastly, was any investigation recommended by the Chief Commissioner for the purpose of ascertaining the causes which led to the formation of this league? Such, I say, are some of the inquiries which might be expected. But to leave such inquiries, which I very much fear would receive no satisfactory replies, I feel more inclined to ask—Does any one believe that such a league ever existed? Did the Chief Commissioner, when he made the statements as to the existence of this league and the resolutions adopted by it, believe them—believe that there was a word of truth in them? If he did, then all I can say is, that he is fairly entitled, like his native acquaintance just before alluded to in his evidence, to claim connection with 

_Haweoa o te Marama_ (The Man in the Moon).

What I now assert, and until proof is adduced to the contrary by those who can show where this imaginary league exists, must continue to assert, is, that there is no such league, and that there never has been any such league; that the whole story is an invention, a fabrication, an imposition; that it either is a fiction, or the Government is chargeable with gross negligence for never having taken steps to put down a conspiracy having objects so clearly avowed and so dangerous as Mr. M'Lean states them to have been seven years ago. But I am quite sure that no proof can be adduced to the contrary. It may be suggested that I am ignorant of the subject. But, until the questions I have asked above are satisfactorily answered, there is such a _prima facie_ appearance of incredibility about it, that the charge of ignorance is hardly worth refuting. But Mr. M'Lean is debarred from making such an objection, because he has stated his belief that the league commenced at Otaki, in which case no one would he more likely than Mr. Williams and myself to have some knowledge of this league; but we both assert it to be a fiction.

The Native Minister made use of language in the House very similar to that used by Mr. M'Lean. And during the whole of the debates on the origin of the Waitara hostilities, it was really amusing to notice how every speaker on the Ministerial side of the House, when all arguments in defence of either the justice or necessity of the war seemed to fail, immediately had recourse to the land-league. William King was called a land-leaguer (I think Mr. Richmond invented the term), and this invariably produced a "Hear, hear." This was considered an unanswerable argument, on the principle, I presume, of _omne ignotum pro terrific._ This imaginary league did more service on the Government side of the House than all the other fictions invented for the occasion put together, such as Teira's chieftainship—William King's armed resistance to the survey—or his refusal to meet the Governor before war was officially declared. The general ignorance displayed on the subject by the Native Minister and his supporters may account for, though it does not justify, the use made of this bugbear. But Mr. M'Leau cannot be excused in the same way. I must repeat, that the language contained in the passage cited above from his statement deliberately made before the Committee of the House, is the most barefaced and shameless fabrication that I ever knew to be officially made.

I shall probably be asked whether there was not such a land-league at Otaki many years ago, and whether this league did not keep gaining ground for some years until a general meeting took place in the Ngatiruanui country seven years ago. The answer has been given by Mr. Williams; "The Otaki and Manawatu natives (principally Ngatiraukawa) entered into an agreement not to sell any more land within certain boundaries, over which they had an undoubted control according to native custom. This agreement was, however, cancelled in 1852." It would simply be an absurd and unwarrantable abuse of language to call this local agreement made for the prevention of the further sale of land—until some internal differences and disputes had been adjusted, a league. But this agreement, made for a temporary purpose, and which terminated in 1852, is the only agreement of the kind that has ever existed here. To assert, therefore, as Mr. M'Lean does, that this local, temporary agreement, which he calls a league, and which actually ceased in 1852, "kept gaining ground for some years until a general meeting took place in the Ngatiruanui country," where the murderous resolutions already referred to are said to have been agreed upon, and that it ultimately developed itself in an anti-land-selling-league which occasioned most of the difficulties and opposition which were encountered in
the attempted purchase of Waitara, is to state what is absolutely false. Mr. Williams confirms my statement; he says—"The meeting at Manawapou, in the Ngatiruanui district, had no connection whatever with the agreement entered into at Otaki and Manawatu, which had been cancelled two years before."

I have already denied that any such resolutions as those mentioned by Mr. M’Lean were adopted at the Manawapou meeting. The attempt made at that meeting to get up a land-league utterly failed; and failed, let it be observed, through the advice of the few natives who attended from Otaki and its neighbourhood. The decision arrived at was that stated by Mr. Williams—"that each tribe should be left to manage its own affairs"—the very opposite of an anti-land-selling-league. Mr. Williams likewise correctly says—"what is called the land-league at Waitara was entirely of a local character." It was in fact a mere temporary agreement among members of the same tribe, the actual owners of the one particular district, not to sell any more land. I have distinctly stated in my evidence (42) what the cause of Rawiri Waiaua's death was. Until my statements made on that occasion are refuted, I must decline to attribute his death, and the deaths of those persons who shared his fate, to an imaginary cause.

There may still be objections raised by persons little acquainted with this subject. It may he asked—how comes all this talk about a land-league if no league exists? Is it possible there can be all this smoke without any fire to cause it? A very few words will suffice to answer this. I believe there has been, during the last ten years, no general disinclination on the part of the natives to dispose of their lands. Purchases of several extensive districts have been made. But it will hardly be denied by any one competent to give an opinion on the subject, that very great dissatisfaction has existed (which has during the last few years increased), with the mode in which transactions have been carried on by the land-commissioners in reference to the purchase of land. Quarrels have been fomented, and, as in the case of Tarnnaki when Rawiri was killed, and in the disturbances at Ahuriri, many lives were lost. The result has been the formation, from time to time, of separate and independent agreements in various tribes, for protesting against, and peaceably resisting, the mischievous proceedings of the land-commissioners. But I positively deny the existence of any combination, or confederacy, or league, between any two distinct tribes.

If I am asked why the Ngatiruanui, if no league existed, went to William King's assistance, I shall be prepared to answer this question when I am told why they came to his assistance when he was attacked at Waikanaein 1839.

In these observations, which I have found it necessary to make, I have abstained from all allusion to the King-movement, which notoriously originated with Waikato, and with which it is admitted William King, prior to February, had no connection whatever.

I consider this letter as a supplement to Mr. William's letter, which ought to be carefully read.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Octavius Hadfield.

C.

New Zealand Spectator, Oct. 10, 1860.

Sir,—I wish to make a few remarks on a passage contained in a Despatch of the Governor's (June 28th), commenting on a letter to the Duke of Newcastle, to which the Bishop of Wellington's name and mine were attached. It is as follows:—

"The Bishop states that the Head of the Department did not investigate the title; but his statement is inaccurate, as your Grace may see by Mr. M'Lean's report, forwarded in my Despatch No. 63, of 27th June last, in which the subject is incidentally mentioned."

I think a careful consideration of the documents published since the letter was written will remove all doubts as to the fact asserted—that Mr. M'Lean did not investigate William King's title to the disputed land at Waitara, and that the statement contained in the letter it not accurate, but that the Governor's own assertion is open to the charge of inaccuracy. When I signed the letter containing the allegation in question, I well knew what the Governor himself ought to have known when he contradicted it in an official despatch, that Mr. M'Lean not only had not investigated William King's title, but that he had not even been at Taranaki for nearly twelve months before he went:here in March last, after hostilities had commenced. I believe this fact cannot be refuted. Still these are times of much credulity: a kind of clairvoyance may be attributed to Mr. M'Lean. There are, I believe, people who even now suppose that the Chief Commissioner investigated William King's claim to
the disputed land at Waitara. I shall not be at all surprised to see, after the lapse of a few months—perhaps only weeks—the same assertion again made, even in official despatches, notwithstanding the acknowledged fact that he was actually absent from the Province of Taranaki during the whole period I have mentioned above.

But my knowledge of the fact, that the Chief Commissioner do not investigate William King's title to the land in dispute, did not rest on mere report or hearsay; on the contrary, I had it on the best possible authority, that of Mr. M'Lean himself. On the 10th of March last Mr. M'Lean called on me. During the conversation that arose in reference to Taranaki, he told me very distinctly, that though he was surprised that William King had not spoken more strongly at the meeting that took place on the 12th March, 1859, he had by no means made up his mind that Teira's title was a valid one; and that he had, in consequence of this doubt, advised the Governor and Mr. Parris to use very great caution if they proceeded with the negotiation. He added that he had subsequently made some inquiries as to the title of the disputed land at Queen Charlotte's Sound and at Wellington (these inquiries, let it be observed, were made among Teira's friends and those favourable to the sale); but that he had made none at Waitara. I will not say that he expressed surprise that no reference had been made to him before the important step taken by the Governor was resolved on; but his language undoubtedly implied as much, when he attributed the absence of any such reference to him, to the probable wish of the Governor to avoid giving unnecessary anxiety or trouble during his illness.

I certainly considered this conclusive as to the fact stated in the letter, that the Chief Commissioner had not investigated William King's claim. Probably the Governor may attach a different meaning to the word "investigate" from that which it conveys to me—especially when used in reference to a native's title to land. But however that may be, in no other hypothesis can I account for his assertion, that the statement contained in his letter, namely, that Mr. M'Lean did not investigate William King's claim, is "inaccurate." I was not aware that Mr. M'Lean had ever disguised his opinion on this subject. Matene Te "Whiwhi, described by Mr. Richmond as that "influential and excellent chief," was taken by Mr. M'Lean in March last to Taranaki. On his return he told me, what he told others here, that Mr. M'Lean bad expressed his regret that the Governor should have taken such a hasty and premature step, as the forcible ejection of William King from Woitara, without further investigation,

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed)
OCTAVIUS HADFELD.

D.

Statement respecting the Proceedings at Waitara, by Tipene Ngaruna.

In the course of September, 1858, I arrived at Waitara. I stayed there during three months of 1858, and three months of 1859. Teira commenced the sale of Waitara. I did not see Tamati Bam joining in what Teira was doing. The only word of his that I observed, was to keep possession of the land. In the year 1851), our meeting assembled at Te Kuikui, concerning Teira's proceedings. Wiremu Kingi stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara. Wiremu Patukakariki (Ngawaka) stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara. Tamati Baru stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara. In the same strain spoke the many. Teira stood up, and had no supporter; he was alone.

The second meeting was at Werohia. Wiremu Kingi stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara. Wiremu Patukakariki (Ngawaka) stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara. Tamati Raru stood up and spoke for retaining possession of Waitara; and in the same strain spoke the many. Teira stood up, and had no supporter; he was alone.

The third was the great meeting at Waitoki, in the town. Teira stood up and spoke for disposing of Waitara. He had no supporter; he was alone. Wiremu Patukakariki (Ngawaka) stood up and said: "Governor, Waitara shall not be yielded up to you. It will not be good that you should take the pillow from under my head, because my, pillow is a pillow that belonged to my ancestors." Paora Karewastood up and said, "Listen, Governor, X will not give Waitara to you. It will not be good that you should drag from under the me bed-matting of my ancestors. If I were to drag the bed from under you, you would be angry." Teira gave his parawai to the Governor as a pledge for the Bale of "Waitara. Wiremu Kingi stood up and said: "listen, Governor. I will never give my land at Waitara to you—never. This is all I have to say."

On the occasion of our talk at Hurirapa, Teira spoke, and sail that his lands outside the boundary should be given in exchange for the lands of the many, which were within the block that was being sold by him. The many said: "Tour lands outside the boundary will not be an equivalent for ours, because our lands, which are within
the land which is being sold by you, Teira, are far greater."

When the chain was laid (upon the land), Tamati Saru did not join in laying down the chain, nor did he consent.

TIPENE NGARUNA.

E.

Wiremu Kingi to the Governor.

(Pap. E. No. 3. p. 6.) Waitara,

25th April, 1859.

FRIEND,—Salutations to you. Your letter has reached me about Te Teira's and Te Retimana's thoughts. I will not agree to our bedroom being sold (I mean Waitara here), for this bed belongs to the whole of us; and do not you be in haste to give the money. Do you hearken to my word. If you give the money secretly, you will get no land for it. You may insist, but I will never agree to it. Do not suppose that this is nonsense on my part; no, it is true, for it is an old word; and now I have no new proposal to make, either as regards selling or anything else. All I have to say to you, O Governor, is, that none of this land will be given to you, never, never, not till I die.

I have heard it said that I am to be imprisoned because of this land. I am very sad because of this word. Why is it? You should remember that the Maories and Pakehas are living quietly upon their pieces of land, and therefore do not you disturb them. Do not say also that there is no one so bad as myself.

There is another word to you, O Governor. The land will never, never be given to you, not till death. Do not be anxious for men's thoughts. This is all I have to say to you.

From your loving friend,

WIREMU KINGI WHITI.

F.

To the Editor of the 27ew Zealand Spectator.

Otaki,

February 28, 1861.

SIR,—I shall feel obliged by your insertion in your columns of a letter I addressed to the Governor nearly five years ago. My object for desiring its publication is to shew that the opinions I have recently advocated are not new ones. It will be observed, that I called attention to the suspicious combination among the chiefs that subsequently resulted in the King-party;—that I discouraged any attempts to raise or increase their influence, advising on the contrary the impartial enforcement of law;—and that I pointed out even then what would inevitably be the result of the reckless proceedings of the Land Purchase Department. It will be observed that the letter was written in reply to one received from the Governor asking for my "opinion of the present state of feeling among the natives towards the Europeans and the Queen's Government."

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

[Copy.]

Otaki,

April 18, 1856.

SIR,—In accordance with the wish expressed in your communication of the 9th March, I have the honour to
offer a few remarks on the present state of feeling on the part of the authorities towards the Queen's Government and the settlers.

I must premise the observations which I am about to make, by saying that I have not of late years kept myself so thoroughly informed of the proceedings of the natives throughout the country as I did formerly, and consequently that my remarks will apply more especially to those in this part of the country.

1. There is at present no hostile feeling towards either Europeans or the Queen's Government, as such, in this part of the country, there appears to be no inclination to provoke war or create a disturbance.

2. There is, however, a certain kind of restlessness among some of the chiefs and leading men, which has manifested itself within the last three or four years by efforts to get up meetings in various places. And I now understand that there is a secret intention of assembling, if possible, most of the leading chiefs of the centre and southern parts of this Island, in the ensuing summer, for the purpose of raising the authority of the chiefs. The very vagueness of the object renders the movement worthy of notice, as it implies some feeling of dissatisfaction apart from any special grievance.

3. It is worthy of notice, in attempting to estimate the present feeling of the Native population, that there are many young men who are grown up in a state of ignorance, being neither under the influence of religion nor under subjection to law, and who would be quite ready to take part in any disturbance which might, on the occasion of any accident, arise; and that a large number of natives who have been all their lives accustomed to take an active share in the management of the business of their respective tribes, and who have even been accustomed to deliberate and decide on such momentous subjects as the Declaration of war or the establishment of peace, are now in a great measure left without any opportunity of employing their active minds. Should, any untoward event unfortunately lead to war, it would be much more serious in its consequences than the former disturbances. The communication between the distant tribes has become much more frequent of late years: there would be more unanimity of purpose than ever there was before; there would be more unity of action.

4. The only permanent grievance is that connected with the purchase of land. There is no disinclination on the part of the aborigines to alienate their lands. But there will be innumerable difficulties in dealing with this subject until some clearly defined principle of ownership is laid down—such a principle as shall be assented to by the natives as well as by the Government, and which shall form the basis of negotiations for the purchase of land. There appears to have been and native absence of any intelligible principle at to the ownership of land a the part of those commissioned to make purchases from the natives in this part of the country; a consequence of this has been that sometimes the claim to ownership of those in possession, at other time that of those who were formerly owners, but who have been either conquered or expelled, is set up, as the Commissioners may imagine that the one party or the other is more disposed to sell. There is nothing more likely than this to lessen their respect for law, or to lead to disaffection towards the Government.

I will now offer a few suggestions on the future treatment of the native race by the Government;—

1. The primary object of the Government should be to make the whole of the native population amenable to law. Until law is respected it can scarcely be said that the Government is firmly established in the country. If courts, presided over by discreet magistrates, to be assisted by native assessors, were established in various parts of the country, natives of all ranks would become familiarized with law and accustomed to submit to it. Unless such a habit be speedily acquired, no account of military force likely to be maintained in the country will assure permanent tranquillity.

2. It appears to be highly important, notwithstanding a very general opinion to the contrary, that the Government should do nothing towards establishing the influence of the chiefs, but should rather endeavour to lessen this by every legitimate means, especially by raising the position of inferior men through the equal action of law.

3. It is absolutely necessary, if the peace of the country is to be preserved, that all transactions with natives in reference to the purchase of land should be entered on with the greatest caution and care, ad that these should be entrusted to those only in whom the Government has perfect confidence, and who are directly amenable to the General Government.

4. It would be advisable that the Government should show its good will towards the native race by encouraging the spread of education, by the employment of natives as much as possible on public works, by giving assistance to efforts made by themselves to advance in civilization.

5. Great care should be taken that the military force in the country should not be so divided and scattered as to be rendered really ineffective on every point, and besides expose the Government to insult at headquarters, which would greatly lower its prestige, and encourage any disaffected persons to insubordination or rebellion.

In conclusion, I will merely add that I am strongly of opinion that Government ought by no means to relax its efforts, either to promote civilization or to establish law throughout the land. It may fairly be anticipated that the joint action of religion, law, and civilization, will lead these people to happiness, peace, and prosperity.
I remain, &c. &c,
(Signed)
OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

G.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator.

Otaki, Jan. 31, 1861.

SIR,—At page 11 of Mr. Richmond's "Memorandum," in reply to Sir W. Martin's Taranaki Question, I find the following words:—"Tipene's assertions about Tamati Ram (Teira's father) are ridiculous falsehoods. Ram has throughout been one of the principal sellers, his son Teira being merely the spokesman of the party. With his own hands he helped to cut the boundary line of the block; he has, through-oat the war, borne arms against King; and his is the first signature to the Deed of Cession." As I made, in my published letter of May last, assertions somewhat similar to Tipene's, I think it as well to examine the value of Mr. Richmond's summary mode of disposing of them by calling them "ridiculous falsehoods." My own statement was, that Tamati Raru "refused to sell, and co-operated with William King in opposing his own son up to the very commencement of hostilities." Tipene's assertions are, that on two occasions when the proposed sale of Waitara was discussed. Ram protested against his son's proceedings; that on no public occasion was he ever known to speak in support of them; and that when the survey was attempted, he took no part in it. Now let it be observed how Mr. Richmond meets these assertions. He begins by saying that they are "ridiculous falsehoods." Well, this sort of answer—never very convincing—when coming from Mr Richmond, is worthless. He proceeds to say that Raru has throughout been one of the principal sellers; but this is just the point to be proved by Mr. Richmond, not to be asserted in opposition to Tipene. The latter professes to have been a witness to what he relates, and to Lave actually heard what he vouches for—that Ram opposed, but never assented to the sale-Mr. Richmond, on the contrary, does not even profess to have any personal knowledge of the matter. Mr Richmond's assertion is no refutation of Tipene's statements. Mr Richmond continues—"With his own hands he helped to cut the boundary line of the lock." Now, then, it will, perhaps, be said, he must be right, for he enters into particulars; he says Raru did it "with his own hands." It is extremely painful to be obliged to expose a gross attempt at deception in aberson occupying Mr Richmond's public position. Will it be believed that Mr. Richmond is now referring to a different survey, one made in March, after the military occupation of Waitara; whereas he very well knew, that the survey spoken of by Tipene—the survey—the notorious survey—the only one which tested the wishes of those who desired, am those who refused, to sell, was the one attempted on the 20th February. That Mr. Richmond could have had no doubt as to which survey was intended, is clear from the circumstance that Taupahi, who put the name to Tipene'a paper, for the purpose of corroborating this one fact of which he was cognisant, actually alludes to it as "the survey of harris." I must characterise this as a lamentable rather than a "ridiculous falsehood. Mr. Richmond goes on to say—"His is the first signature to the Deed of Cession." This will, of course, have appeared conclusive to many persons. And it will now be assumed that I can have nothing further to say on behalf of Tipene or myself. But, stop; it is Mr. Richmond who makes this assertion. We have already seen how important it is to be gifted with the facility of ignoring a month—what an advantage may be gained in a State Paper to be read in England, by confounding what occurred in March with what took place in February. The first inquiry then is—when was the Deed of Cession signed? I anticipate the answer, "Of course," it will be said, "before the publication of martial law, and before the military occupation of the land conveyed by the Deed." I need now do no more than direct attention to the fact, extorted from Mr Richmond in the House of Representatives, during a debate on the 9th August, namely, that the Deed of Cession was not executed at the time the survey alluded to was made, nor, in fact, till some time after actual hostilities had taken place. The statement will be found in a report of Mr. Fox's speech of that any, Mr. Richmond having interrupted him in order to make it. It will be scarcely necessary to add, that the denial by Tipene, an actual witness, of Raru's participation in the sale of Waitara, prior to the survey of the 20th February, is in no degree whatever invalidated or affected by Mr. Richmond's false assertions to the contrary; or that Raru's signature, placed at the head of those attached to the Deed of Cession, and obtained after the war began, proves how necessary the Government perceived the sanction of his name to be, in order to give validity to the purchase of even that small portion of the block described by Teira in his letter to the Governor as "only sufficient for three or four tents to stand upon," but which he had professed to cede, when it appeared more than probable that their irregular
proceedings would be eventually dragged to light. It will hardly be thought necessary to account for the motives that subsequently induced a father, when he found that, hostilities having commenced and neutrality being impossible he was obliged to make his election, to determine in siding with his disobedient son.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

H.

H. NEW ZEALAND SPECTATOR, Feb. 6, 1861.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator. Otaki, January 29, 1861.

Sir,—I must request your permission to notice in your columns some allusions to myself contained in Mr. Richmond's reply to Sir W. Martin's Pamphlet—The Taranaki Question.

At page 15 are the following words:—" Speaking of the official statement which the Governor had caused to be circulated immediately on the breaking out of hostilities the Archdeacon says:—' I deny the truth of all the statements. I am prepared to prove their falsity here [in New Zealand] where evidence can be obtained.' "I regret to be obliged to say that this assertion of Mr. Richmond is absolutely false; I never said what he attributes to me. Nor would it have occurred to me to say that I denied all the statements contained in the official document referred to, such, for instance, as this:—"The Governor has said that he will not allow land to be bought, the title to which is disputed," I selected four propositions from the official document, the truth of which I denied. The words I used were theses "It is stated that the land belonged to Teira and a few other persons, who were the real owners, and who sold it to the Government;—that Teira's title to the land was 'carefully investigated, and found to be good;'—that William King and those who acted with him had no title to it;—that 'William King never pretended to deny Teira's right of property, but insisted on his own right to put a veto on all sales at Waitara.' I deny the truth of all the statements; I am prepared to prove their falsity here, where evidence can be obtained."

Mr. Richmond proceeds:—" Upon the General Assembly being finally summoned for despatch of business, on the 31st July last, Archdeacon Hadfield came up from Wellington. The House of Representatives being made aware of the strong views which he entertained on the subject of the Waitara purchase, examined him at the bar of their House. Considering that on the 29th May he had committed himself to a public pledge that he was 'prepared to prove the falsity of all the statements,' his evidence at the bar in August, when he had had so much time to complete his case, should have been clear, definite, and conclusive." Mr. Richmond seems to have a peculiar logic of his own, which is not likely to find much acceptance with thinkers accustomed to the ordinary modes of reasoning. If I understand him, his argument is this,—that as I pledged myself in May, here, where evidence can be obtained, to prove that certain statements were false, therefore my own evidence in August ought to have been clear, definite, and conclusive. This sort of reasoning may be very satisfactory, and apparently is quite conclusive to Mr. Richmond; but it puts me in mind of Coleridge's ridicule of similar logic: "The watchman cries, 'half-past three o'clock;' therefore the great Cham of Tartary has a carbuncle on his nose." What I pledged myself to do was to prove here, where evidence can be obtained, that the four propositions extracted from the official document alluded to, were false. What I promised in May I was quite ready to perform in August. Whose fault was that evidence was not taken as to the cause and origin of the war? Was there any reluctance to obtain such evidence on the part of those members of the House whose opinions on these subjects were supposed to agree with mine? Who moved for a Committee of Inquiry? It can hardly be needful to answer these questions, or tell Mr. Richmond that it was the Ministry, who, having first professed to desire an investigation, voted against the motion for inquiry. In the Southern Cross, Aug. 14, I see these words, "They select Archdeacon Hadfield to give secondary evidence, but insist on precluding him from bringing up those who could give direct evidence to the same effect." Mr. Richmond—the Native Minister—the Member for New Plymouth—was very well aware of the weakness of their cause; and he knew that I could bring witnesses—witnesses, let it be remembered, some of whom were then in Auckland, and who are still available when the proper opportunity occurs,—to expose the injustice of their proceedings. What object Mr. Richmond expected to obtain by making a false assertion that was sure to be refuted, or by drawing a false inference that was certain to be exposed, I am unable to conjecture. But this much is clear, that a cause
It is difficult to imagine with what object a long extract from a despatch of the Governor's, commenting on my evidence given before a Committee of the House of Representatives, is introduced by Mr. Richmond into an attempt at a reply to Sir W. Martin's pamphlet; it appears to he introduced apropos of nothing. But as it has been brought forward, it cannot be allowed to pass without comment. Do the Governor and Mr. Richmond mean to insinuate that my evidence given on that occasion strengthened the Government side of the question? Are they prepared to deny that my evidence damaged their cause with the House? Will they deny that Mr. Stafford, after having given notice of a motion approving the war policy of the Ministers, was subsequently obliged to modify the terms of his motion (nothing whatever having occurred in the interval but Mr. M'Lean's evidence and mine) because he found that his own supporters, after hearing that evidence, declined to support his original motion, and that he was taunted with this in the House? If so, if this was the effect produced on the House by the evidence, of what use can it be to detach a few passages from the body of the evidence, and represent these as inconclusive? Or what can be intended by a verbal criticism (indicated by italics) of words that were not mine? My examination lasted four hours and a half. I was more than once cautioned by the Chairman that I spoke too rapidly for the reporters. About one-fourth part of what I said was taken down and committed to print. I make no complaint of the general drift of the printed evidence; I have no doubt that much actually uttered would have appeared in print to be mere surplusage; but when stress is laid on particular words and expressions, I must distinctly protest against the inferences intended to be drawn from these. I will explain what I mean. The Governor's despatch, as quoted by Mr. Richmond, contains the following words:—"When asked what proof he has of a certain native (Hamere) having a claim, he says, 'An old man who resided at Waitara forty years, pointed out to me when I was at Waikanae [150 miles away] portions of the land which belonged to William King.' I presume that the Governor, by giving in italics the words "when I was at Waikanae," intended to convey that I told a lie; or, at least, that I was so ignorant of the whole question that I did not know where Waitara or Waikanae were situated. His language may have produced this effect in England. But Mr. Richmond cannot expect the same result here. A map of Waitara had been frequently alluded to in the House; and whether I expressly referred to it or not, while giving the answer attributed to me, I think I may safely say that no member of the House misunderstood me, or imagined for a moment that either the old man or I pretended to clairvoyance. I had previously stated in my evidence (19) that it was "three years since I had been on the land" in dispute at Waitara, and could not therefore have intended to mislead the House into believing that I had been there since the war began. But, notwithstanding the italics, perhaps the object was to call attention to the apparent discrepancy between the question and the answer, the former having reference to Hamere (Hamuera Ngaia), and the latter to William King. I now extract from the printed evidence the two questions in full, as this will afford me an opportunity of showing what I have already alluded to; I mean the absurdity of verbal criticism in a matter of this kind:—

"81. Has William King ever made a proprietary claim? I hear that he made a proprietary claim to a portion of the block. It would be impossible for me to say what it is, as I understand that the boundaries of the block are undefined. I have heard that about sixty acres, on the south bank, had been left out as belonging to William King. It is utterly impossible for me to state, without the boundaries being defined, what portion of his claim is within the block and what without it. His son has a claim within the block."

"82. What proof have you that Hamuera Ngaia has a claim on the block? I before stated that I am unable to produce all the evidence which I have had, but I may state to the Committee that an old man who resided at Waitara forty years, pointed out to me, when I was at Waikanae, portions of the land which belonged to William King. Several other natives confirmed that statement." It will be observed that the second question evidently has reference to the preceding answer. I bad there spoken of having heard that sixty acres had been excluded from the original block, as belonging to William King, since the land was purchased and the war commenced,—this having been done, it will be observed, to non-suit William King. Having ascertained this, I referred to his son's claim, and stated that he held property, derived from his uncle Hamuera Ngaia, which could not have been excluded because it was intermixed with portions of Ram's land. Then it was that I was asked what proof I had that Hamuera Ngaia had owned land in the block, and that the answer referred to was given. But no mention is made in the printed evidence of what I had said about Eruera, William King's son, having inherited the property from his uncle, Hamuera Ngaia, which led to the latter name being mentioned. It is perhaps just as well that I have noticed this particular question, otherwise from the wording of the question and my answer to it, an inference might be drawn that I was ignorant of the fact that H. Ngaia had been dead for nine years.

The Governor's despatch, as cited by Mr. Richmond, proceeds:—"When he is asked if he knows the position of the land in dispute, he says, * I do not know the precise boundary line.* 'If it was not the Governor's object to deceive and mislead by giving this extract from my answer, and to convey the impression that I was ignorant of what I ought to have known, I am unable to suggest what his motive was. The question, with my
answer, was as follows:—"Do you know the position of the block of land in dispute at Waitara? The only difficulty I have in answering that question arises from my never having seen the official survey boundaries. It has been described as a block of land containing about 600 acres, situated on the south bank of the Waitara; this land I have seen and been over; but I do not know the precise boundary line of the Government. It is three years since I was on the land." I really see nothing in this answer to be ashamed of. But why does Mr. Richmond, of all people, cite this passage? How was it possible for me to define precisely the position of a block of land, concerning which Mr. Richmond had stated a few days before, in answer to Mr. Fox, that one of the boundary lines was still undefined? Certainly, Mr. Richmond turned very pale, looked very confused, and hung down his head, when he made that statement; but still I did not at the time suspect his veracity. But in the report of a speech delivered by Dr. Featherston at a numerously attended public meeting in Wellington in November last, I find these words:—"The Government further declared that for the purpose of excluding such lands, they had refrained from fixing the internal boundary of the block, thus admitting that they really did not know what lands they had bought; and yet—will you believe it!—when the map was laid on the table the inland boundary was found to he cut." And now it comes to this: that I am sneered at by Mr. Richmond (for what else can be meant by the quotation?) as a mere gobe mouche, because I gave credit to a statement officially made by him, a minister of the Crown, in his place in the House of Representatives.

A detailed explanation of all the detached scraps of my evidence collected by the Governor in his despatch, and now given to the public by Mr. Richmond, would be too great a tax on the patience of your readers; I will make an extract, and offer a few further remarks on its contents.—"When asked whether he is acquainted with the details of the negotiations for land in the New Plymouth district, he says, 'I could not say that I was acquainted with the details.' When asked of whom the Bell Block was bought, he says, 'Principally, I believe, from returned slaves from Waikato; so I have been informed.' Of whom the Hua Block? 'I do not know.' Of whom the Taururutangi? 'I do not know.' When asked whether Wiremu Kingi received any payment for the Belt Block, he says, 'I do not know whether he did or not.' When asked the territorial boundary of the four hapus of which he says Wiremu Kingi is the head, he says, 'I am not acquainted with the boundaries. I have never professed to be acquainted with the boundaries.' "What inducement could I have been supposed to have had for wasting my time on acquiring a knowledge of the "details" of negotiations for land at New Plymouth having no connection whatever with Waitara? Does either the Governor or Mr. Richmond intend to deny that the Bell Block was bought from returned slaves from Waikato? At page 7 of this very "Memorandum" I find that the Governor himself says of the Bell Block—"The land was bought from the chief Rawiri Waiaua and a part of the Puketapu;" but does any one deny that Rawiri Waiaua was a returned Waikato slave?—thai he was carried away into slavery when the Mikotahi Pa fell? If so he only exposes his own ignorance. Again—what had the "Hua Block" or the "Taururutangi" or the "Bell Block" or "the territorial Boundary,"—not subdivisional boundaries—of the "four hapus" to do with the question at issue—whether Teira and a few others acting with him were the only owners of the 600 acres, which they professed to sell to the Government, and which everybody knew had no connection whatever with the territorial boundary of the "four hapus"? I could proceed with the rest in the same way, and expose more fully than I have yet done the miserable quibbling contained in the document under consideration; but what I have now said will suffice on this subject. For my part I am quite content to let the value of the evidence rest on, firstly, the fact mentioned above, that is, the effect produced on the Committee at the time it was given; and secondly on this, that with all the pains taken by the Governor and Mr. Richmond to invalidate and misrepresent my words and meaning, I do not find that the misstatement of a single fact is alleged against me; certainly none is proved.

I have already directed your attention to the fallacy pervading the whole paragraph of the "Memorandum" on which I have been commenting, namely—that because I had pledged myself to establish a case, if allowed to bring witnesses, I was therefore hound to establish it on my own. The last question and answer at the close of my examination were—"Do you believe that if you were permitted to summon witnesses from the South, you could substantiate by direct evidence the statements you made before the Committee, where requiring direct confirmation? Yes, I think I could substantiate every one of the statements I have made relating to the Natives at Waitara. I am quite sure I could substantiate all of them." But this was just what the Government refused to permit. I was prepared to give evidence on native tenure of land. I was equally prepared to state the relative positions of William King and Teira in the tribe. I was prepared to state that Teira and those who acted with him were only subordinate members of their own sub-tribe or hapu, Patukakariki, who has all along acted with W. King, being its chief. These and many other points I was ready to give evidence upon. But I did not profess to know the boundaries of each claimant's property; nor could I fairly have been expected to do so. It is quite possible that the best lawyer in England, well versed in every work of note upon real property beginning even with Coke upon Littleton, may not be acquainted with the actual boundaries of any single estate in the kingdom: and it is quite certain that with the clearest case, he would break down, if precluded from bringing up his witnesses.
At page 14 Mr. Richmond says—"Perhaps the most important circumstance is, that the sellers have exclusively occupied the block since their return from the South in 1848, with the exception only of the site of King's pa. This fact of the exclusive occupation of the block is not disputed by Archdeacon Hadfield." I have before remarked that it is quite impossible for any ordinary mortal even to guess at Mr. Richmond's mode of reasoning. Suppose Mr. Richmond should have thought proper to assert that Waitara is in the Moon (it would be but little more absurd than many of his assertions), and then all this a fact; is it to be said, because I never disputed such an assertion, of which I had never heard, that I admit the fact? But if Mr. Richmond means that I have ever admitted the fact asserted by him, hat "the sellers have exclusively occupied the block since their return" I must inform him that his assertion is untrue. Nor is it likely that I should have made such an admission, when my own published letter of May last, cited from an official statement published at New Plymouth on the 20th of March the following passage:—"King's followers have, however, encroached with their cultivations upon the South side of the river: and these encroachments have been, for a long time, a source of continual discussion." It appears, therefore, that the Government itself did not venture to deny what was a notorious fact. I myself had no personal knowledge of these recent cultivations, and therefore declined to give evidence upon the subject. The Government however must lose the benefit of this imaginary" most important circumstance."

At page 16 there is a remarkable passage which I feel compelled to notice. In allusion to the Waikanae claimants Mr. Richmond says of me—"Mr. Parris also privately applied to him through Archdeacon Govett, of New Plymouth, requesting him to use his influence to procure the withdrawal of King's opposition. The Archdeacon replied—'That he would not advise natives to sell their land; that b was not pleased with anything the Government had done for the natives, and that the Government would find that a large party of the natives at Otaki would espouse William King's cause.' The natives of Waikanae, which is close to Otaki, were therefore, it is evident, full; aware of what was going on, long before the commencement of hostilities, and ought to have come forward." I must premise the remarks I am going to make by saying that the passage printed in inverted commas in the 'Memorandum,' and purporting to be an extract from letter of mine to Archdeacon Govett, is not a verbatim extract from that letter. In September, 1859, my friend Archdeacon Govett, at M Parris's request, wrote to me in the following words:—"I write a he to ask whether you would try and use your influence with William King, to induce him to give up some of his land at Waitara, say, on the south bank of the river. There is a very strong feeling against him not only on the part of the Europeans, but also of a large number of he natives, on account of Ids obstinacy. Te Teira and his relations, we are said to be the rightful owners of the main part of the land, have offered it to the Governor; and he has accepted the offer, and is determined to bring the matter to a conclusion. If William King could be induced to yield, the Governor would he willing to make most liberal allowances j if he persists in holding his land great quarrelling and fighting mill most probably ensue." I need hardly say, that while I fully appreciated Archdeacon Govett's motives in acceding to Mr. Parris's request, and delivering his message to me, I felt indignant that an officer of the Government should have asked me to use any influence that I, as a clergyman, might have in reference to a contemplated negotiation about land. I therefore immediately replied, that I certainly would not advise William King, or any other native, in reference to his land. I here take the opportunity of noticing an insinuation, if not a statement, publicly made by Mr. Commissioner M'Lean, that I have advised natives not to sell (heir land to the Government. I now state most distinctly and unequivocally, that I have never, since New Zealand became a British colony, either directly or indirectly advised, or in any way endeavoured to influence, any native, or party of natives, not to sell their lands to the Government; and that Mr. M'Lean's statement is a falsehood, and one, I regret to say, which the many opportunities that have occurred for explanation, render wholly inexcusable. It is frequently said that I have great influence with natives. Whatever the amount of my influence with them may be, it is in a great measure traceable to my systematic and rigid abstinence, during a long course of years, from any interference with their affairs or proceedings where no religious or moral consideration was involved. Whenever, therefore, I have interfered, the natives have been convinced that some such principle was involved. An instance in point was my effective resistance of the Maori King movement in this district in May last, which the Government had made no effort to check. I then enforced only one single principle, namely, that a treaty made twenty years ago is not now open to reconsideration. If this movement should, after this long interval, recover strength, it will have been occasioned by the infatuated folly of the General Government. But to return from this slight digression. That I ever stated in writing, or in any other way, what is now attributed to me—that "I was not pleased with anything the Government had done for the natives," is absolutely false. On the other hand, I have no doubt whatever that I distinctly stated, that under the circumstances contemplated by the Government, "a large party of the natives of Otaki would espouse William King's cause;" though these were not the words I used. I wrote to the Governor himself to the same effect in March last, as I have already proved by publishing extracts from my letter, but by no means limited my prediction to the natives of this district. I might leave this subject were it not that a curious piece of information has now been unwittingly given to the public.
Innumerable hard words about the "guilt of blood" have been uttered against me by the Government, because I am said to have withheld my opinion of the probable consequences of a coup-de-main, at Waitara, supposed only to require "a couple of volleys," to enable it to effect its object. It is now confessed by the Government, that Mr. Parris applied to me in September, 1859, through Archdeacon Govett, in reference to the compulsory purchase of some portion of Waitara, and that I then conveyed to him my opinion that the contemplated step would bring on a general war, for that is evidently implied in my answer. That not the slightest weight was attached to my warning has since been proved by facts. What weight would have been given to it at a subsequent and maturer stage of the proceedings, may not be difficult to conjecture. Here, then, to apply Mr. Richmond's own words to himself, is "an engineer hoisted with his own petard."

I refrain from further comments on Mr. Richmond's peculiar logic. It really seems very silly to say in an official paper, that because I thought the natives of Otaki would take a certain view of an event still future, of which at the time they had never heard, "therefore it is evident" that the natives of Waikanae, "which is close to Otaki," ought to have brought forward their claims to a block of land, about the contemplated purchase of which they knew nothing.

I abstain for the present from any general notice of this "Memorandum." I deliberately pronounce my opinion, formed from a tolerable acquaintance with the facts touched on, that it contains the most barefaced and disgraceful misstatements and misrepresentations that I ever saw. I can say nothing more condemnatory of a State Paper. I conclude with one word of advice to any one who, having read Sir W. Martin's pamphlet, thinks that its facts or arguments are in any way impugned or affected by this reply, that is—Read it again. I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

OCTAVIUS HADFIEKD.

I.

New Zealand Spectator, March 6, 1861.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator. Otaki,  

February 7, 1861.

SIR,—I wish to offer a few remarks on the following passage from Mr. Richmond's "Memorandum," page 16:—

"Riwai names in his letter of 23rd June, three specific claims, one on behalf of Te Patukakariki, who, being on the spot, never claimed for himself. Another on behalf of King himself, whose cultivation within the block, he says is called Te Porepore. A third on behalf of King's two children. The cultivations which belonged to their mothers, are, he says, at Hurirapa, the pa which was burnt by the soldiers; and another at Oropa on the south of their old pas. As regards the cultivations of King himself, Riwai is directly contradicted be the evidence above cited, which establishes that neither Kingi nor any of his people have had cultivations on the block. Nor is it at all likely that if he had been entitled to cultivate on the block in right of his wives or children, he would have omitted to do so, were it merely for the purpose of asserting his title. Riwai's passionate inaccuracy is shewn in his statement that Hurirapa was burnt by the soldiers. Hurirapa was not burnt. No pa was burnt by the soldiers. In the same spirit he scoffingly denies the fact that W. Kingi have leave to place his pa on the block: 'How, then, can it be said that they gave W. Kingi leave to settle on the block, when he came from Waikanae? A fine saying, indeed! No. Each man knew that cultivation of his own ancestor. Was it they who gave W. Kingi leave to cultivate Te Porepore, when he went from Waikanae? Was it they who gave his children leave to cultivate at Te Hurirapa (Teira's pa), when they went from Waikanae, which cultivations have been taken from them by the soldiers?" The statements implied in these questions are, as have already been seen, absolutely contradicted by the officers charged with the investigations, and are inconsistent with the proved facts of the case. Sir W. Martin may have good ground for his expressed belief in the Rev. Riwai Te Ahu's general honesty of character, but it is evident that in the present case, his (the Deacon's) statements show strong passion and slender information."

Allow me to say that there has been no "evidence cited" that contradicts any statements by the Rev. Riwai Te Ahu, as to Kingi's cultivations within the disputed block. Mr. Richmond asserts that the evidence cited "establishes that neither Kingi, nor any of his people, have had cultivations on the block;" but this is contradicted by an official statement, published at New Plymouth on the 20th of March last, which says,—"Kingi's followers have, however, encroached with their cultivations upon the south side of the river; and these
encroachments have been, for a long time, a source of continual dissension." But even if the fact asserted by Mr. Richmond were established, which it is not, Riwai Te Ahu's inaccuracy would not be proved: he says nothing about recent "cultivations;" he speaks of mara (translated in the version of his letter printed in my evidence given before the House of Representatives, "portions of land")—fields—former cultivations, as is clear from his saying,—fields of their "mothers" and their "ancestors." Mr. Richmond's inference, therefore, is worthless, being founded upon a blunder of his own.

Any inference drawn from Mr. Richmond's conjectures, as expressed in such words as—" nor is it at all likely, &c," I must leave to those who think that a charge of inaccuracy can be substantiated by such a trashy mode of reasoning as this.

Mr. Richmond contradicts Riwai Te Ahu, and says that "Hurirapa pa was not burnt." I am requested to forward to you a statement made by Wi Tako in reference to this disputed point: "April 6, 1861. This was when I arrived at Waitara. I saw that W. King's pas were all destroyed by fire. The names of these pas are Werohia, Te Hurirapa, and Kuikui: not a whare remained; all were burnt. One whare remained; it was a building for meetings; it was outside Te Hurirapa pa. We were two hours there. I went on hoard the steamer; we sailed to Waitohi. This is all. From Wi Tako."

Aperira 6, 1860. Ko toku taenga mai tenei ki Waitara, ka kite au i nga pa o Wiremu King. kua wera katoa i te ahi; nga ingoa o ana pa nei—ko Werehia, ko te Hurirapa, ko te Kuikui. Kuore he whare i toe, pau katoa i te ahi, kota te whare i toe—he whare hui, i wah o te pa o te Hurirapa. Erua haora e nohoana maiou i reira, ka eke au ki runga ki te Teira. ka rere matou ki Waitohi. Re oti (Signed) NA WITAKO.

This statement of Wi Tako's appears perfectly conclusive as to the point at issue.

Mr. Richmond's assertion that "no pa was burnt by the soldiers," is a mere evasive quibble. The pas referred to by Wi Tako and Riwai Te Ahu, were burnt by native allies, hearing arms under the authority of the officer in command of the soldiers, and acting under his protection. Most men would be ashamed of such a transparent attempt to evade an awkward fact.

Mr. Richmond says,—" He scoffingly denies the fact that W. King had leave to place his pa on the block." He does not say one word about it. He certainly would have denied it, if any allusion had been made by him to the subject, because he knew, as I know, that the assumed fact is an absurd falsehood. No question was ever raised as to W. King's right to settle on the "block;" the only one was that explained by me in my published letter of May, namely,—" whether his pa should stand a few chains nearer the water side than it would have stood, had it been erected on his own land on the same side of the river."

It will hardly satisfy any impartial person, to be told that Riwai Te Ahu's statements are "inaccurate," and that he possesses only "slender information," because they have "been absolutely contradicted by the officers charged with the investigation." Why! these are the very persons whose whole conduct and proceedings in reference to the Waitara purchase have been impugned. Anything more absurd, except on the hypothesis of the absolute infallibility of these officials, can scarcely be conceived; and, if that is the assumption, it might as well have been broadly asserted from the beginning. What "the proved facts of the case "are, or where they are to be found, would, I fear, juzzle Mr. Richmond to show.

It will be seen that not a single statement made by the lev. Riwai Te Ahu has been in any degree invalidated by Mr. Richmond's rash counter statements.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator.

Otaki, February 26, 1861.

SIR,—"You will oblige me by publishing the enclosed litter, being the copy of one addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

J.
Otaki, Wellington, New Zealand,  
February 25, 1861.

MY LORD DUKE,—I request to be allowed to draw your Grace's attention to some very serious charges brought against me in an official document contained in certain "Miscellaneous Papers "forming part of an Appendix to a Memorandum by Mr. Richmond, on Sir W. Martin's "Taranaki Question." The document referred to is—"Copy of a letter from the Chief-Land-Purchase Commissioner to the Governor," dated 1st December, 1860; and purports to be a reply to a letter of mine published in the New Zealand Spectator of the 12th October, 1860.

I forbear to trouble your Grace with any remarks on Mr. Donald M1 Lean's contradictions of my statements. What' I wish to bring under your Grace's notice is the following passage;—

" And now I shall briefly advert to some observations which appear in Archdeacon Hadfield's evidence before the House of Representatives in the last Session. (Ans. to Q. 44), ' I was absent from the Colony about twelve months, and on my return I found that the [King] movement had made rapid strides in the South. The progress of the King movement is to be attributed, in my opinion, to the action of the Land Purchase Department in the South part of this Island.' In making an assertion of this description the Venerable Archdeacon should have had the candour to avow that the "anti-land-Selling-league"—which eventually merged into the King party—was really a project of his own, and was recommended by him to the natives as early as the years 1848 and 1849. The natives have openly stated at their meetings, on the subject of land-selling, that they had been instructed by the Archdeacon not to alienate any portion of their territory to the Government. Mr. Had-field seems to find it very convenient to conceal the part which he took in influencing the minds of the natives, and very adroitly to endeavour to impute to the Land Purchase Department the blame due to his own acts. I apprehend it would require a measure of more than the Archdeacon's ingenuity—great as it may be—to defend his efforts to embarrass the Government in their operations with the natives, and by his advice and counsel to lead them on to their own destruction."

In reference to this extract, I beg leave to make the following observations:—

- I have no doubt whatever that the opinion I gave in my evidence before the House of Representatives as to the King movement is correct. I shall be prepared to prove its truth whenever an opportunity is afforded me of adducing evidence in support of it.
- I have proved in a letter published in the New Zealand Spectator, November 3, 1860, that there never has been any "anti-land-selling-league "in New Zealand.
- I have never had any project whatever as to an "anti-land-selling-league "; nor have I ever recommended anything of the kind to any native.
- During the whole of the year 1848 I was ill and confined to my bed, at the house of a friend in Wellington, and had no communication with natives. It was not till near the end of the year 1849 that I recovered and returned to this place: but the subject of land was never once mentioned, there being at that time no negotiation for the purchase of any land in my district.
- Before I had seen the charges on which I am now commenting, I had said in a letter published in the New Zealand Spectator of the 6th inst., "I here take the opportunity of noticing an insinuation, if not a statement, publicly made by Mr. Commissioner M'Lean, that I have advised natives not to sell their lands to the Government. I now state most distinctly and unequivocally—that I have never since New Zealand became a British colony, either directly or indirectly advised, or in any way endeavoured to influence any native, or party of natives, not to sell their land to the Government: and that Mr. M'Lean's statement is a falsehood, and one, I regret to say, which the many opportunities which have occurred for explanation render wholly inexcusable." As Mr. M'Lean gives no information as to who "the natives" are, and when and where they made the statements imputed to them, I can add nothing more on this head.
- Your Grace will not expect that I should condescend to reply to the calumnious and malignant insinuations contained in the latter portion of the extract from Mr. M'Lean's letter. But what the effect of my advice and counsel has really been among those natives over whom I may be supposed to have any influence h pointed out in a letter addressed by me to the Southern Cross, August 24, 1860, when a similar attack was made on me by the Native Minister. 'It is twenty years since I first went to reside at Waikanae and Otaki. During the whole of my residence in the district there has been profound peace. No Englishman or Maori has ever been murdered. No collision has ever taken place among the natives themselves. No outrage his ever been committed on the person or property of an Englishman. During the
last twelve years—when low first began to be enforced—there has never been an attempt to prevent the 
execution of a warrant issued by the Resident Magistrate of Wellington, though placed in the hinds of 
only a single constable. I boldly challenge any one to point to a single instance of disloyalty on the part of 
any of the natives of my district, or of any act which has the slightest tendency to produce disloyalty, until 
the month of May last, when after the Taranaki war began, a colour from the Maori King was sent from 
Waikato, and an attempt was made to erect it."

I should not have troubled your Grace with this letter were it not that peculiar circumstances, which it is 
unnecessary for m to explain, render it unadvisable that I should at present take legal proceedings against Mr. 
Commissioner M'Lean,

I have the honour to be, 
Your Grace's most obedient servant, 
OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.

The Right Honourable the Duke of Newcastle.

K.

From certain Members of the Ngatiawa Tribe to the Superintendent of the 
Province of Wellington.

Waikanae, 

    July 29, 1860.

MR. SUPERINTENDENT,—Greeting to you. These are our words: hear them, that you may declare them 
openly in the presence of the Governor.

We hare portions of land also at Waitara within the piece of land which was wrongly sold by Teira to the 
Governor; we, as well as those who have been driven off that piece of land. It belonged to all our ancestors. We 
ever heard from the old men who have lately died, that that land belonged only to Ngatituaho and Ngatihinga, 
or to the ancestors of Teira and his companions, whose pedigree has been lately set forth, or to his father, and 
that by them it was given to our ancestors and to our fathers as to dependents, who should raise food for the 
ancestors of Teira and his companions, or for his father and the fathers of his companions.

Nor is it land that has lately been discovered by Teira, or by his father or by his companions, that we should 
be mistaken in what we say about it, or that it should be right to make strong assertions with reference to that 
land in order to justify their making no account of us and those who have been forcibly driven off it No. It is 
old land that belonged to our ancestors.

Now we have heard the defence of Parris' wrong doing with reference to our portions of land there, which 
says, "A long time was allowed to elapse, and nothing was said about the land: Parris, the Land Commissioner 
of Taranaki, carefully inquired that he might find out who were the owners of the land which was offered to 
him. Parris searched, and at length he found them out."

These words were intended to excite everybody's admiration, that it might be thought that he really had 
searched. Listen. We were all the time living at Waikauae; one of us at Otaki. Now Parris never came to make 
inquiries of us as to whether we had land there or not; nor did any assistant of his in that work come to inquire; 
nor did he write any letter of inquiry; nor did he, in the course of that year, print in the newspaper his inquiries 
as to the owners of that land, None, none at all.

Off goes one of the land purchasers to make inquiries of some people of Arapawa, passing over us without 
inquiry.

We did not hear of it until the time when Teira received the money. Still we felt no apprehension of losing 
our lands, because we were continually hearing of the strong declaration of Wiremu Kingi, that he would keep 
our lands for us. For he is our chief, a protecting shade for our lands.

The second time was when they went to survey it.

The third time was when the soldiers were sent to take it. How could we get a word in? When the trouble 
had become serious, then Parris goes and prints in the newspaper that he has made inquiry.

We ask this question. What are we, peaceable persons who are not joining in the fighting, to do when our 
lands are wrongly taken away by the Governor? Where shall we seek a way by which we may get our lands 
restored to us? Shall we seek it from the Queen, or from whom? We imagined that it was for the law to rectify 
wrongs. Up to this time our hearts keep anxiously inquiring. We will say no more.
From us, members of Ngatiawa, and owners of that lard at Waitara.

Hohepa Ngapaki, x.
Kiripata Pake.
Patihana Tikara.
Epiha Paikau Tupaki, x
Pinarepe Te Neke, x,
Henare Te Marau, x
Paora Matua Awaka
Hutana Awatea.
Wiperahaua Putiki.
Teretiu Tapakama.
Riwai Te Ahu.

L.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator.

Waikanae, November 23, 1860.

FRIEND,—Will you print our letter in your paper.

When we read Mr. M'Lean's false answer to the following questions put to him we were very sad; we were sad because, though he knew nothing about our claims to that land at Waiters, or the connections of the various tribes and their chiefs, he nevertheless gave evidence at random on these subjects. But we will point out the errors of his answers, that all the Pakehas may understand, and that they may not ignorantly condemn William King and his tribe. These are all the answers that we have in Maori—from the New Zealand Spectator, October 6, 1860.

1. The Hon. Mr. Richmond—Had the Ngatitahu and Ngatinga aright to the disputed block, independent of the hapus of the Ngatiawa?—Yes; decidedly. We say—It is quite false to assert that it belongs to these tribes alone, we now hear for the first time from Mr. M'Lean that it belongs to these tribes alone.

2. Do the sellers, including Ropoama and his people at Queen Charlotte's Sound, properly represent these two hapus?—They do. We say—This is false, some of those men are not real members of those tribes, some are slaves from Totorewa and from Ngaitahu; the principal men of those tribes are those (at Waitara) who are being trampled upon, Patukakariki and others.

3. After the inquiry you have made do you know of any outstanding claim?—I have referred to one man who may have a claim, that is Patukakariki, though I do not know that he has. We say—This answer is intended to deceive. He did not make proper inquiries of the people to whom the land belonged; but he is quite right to confess his ignorance, for he is only talking at random about what he knows nothing in denying Patukakariki's and our claims to that land.

4. Do you believe that any considerable claim can be outstanding?—I do not. We say—This is false. We, who are connected with that land, say that there are persons who have real claims, that is, to the lands cultivated by their ancestors and parents; he has no right to deny their claims.

5. As to Te Patukakariki, did he oppose Teira's offer?—No, he never did. We say—He did (see .15), and everybody has heard that the Government survey was resisted by women. Now, some of those women were Patukakarika's wife and his two daughters. "What more could they do to shew that they opposed the sale?"

6. Has he ever made a claim?—He never, to my knowledge, made a claim to that particular block. We say—He did strongly assert a claim to that block of land, both he and his nephew, Paora Karewa. lie (Mr. M'Lean) heard it with his own ears on the day that Teira gave his parawai to the Governor; but he had determined not to

7. Do you think he possibly has a chum to any extent I—I think he may possibly have a claim to a small extent. We say—He has a claim; he has several pieces within the block. All the pieces held by individuals within the block, whether by those who have been driven off it, or by us, or by those who sold it, are equally small; each person may have two, or one, or four, as the case may be.

8. Do you consider that Riwai Te Ahu has a valid claim to any part of the block?—I do not consider that he has. We say—He has a just claim. Mr. M'Lean could know nothing justifying his denial of it; he is stating what
is false when he denies the claim; it was his desire to have the land that made him say this.

39. Suppose that Patukakariki's claim is a good one, is he bound to prefer it? and if he does not, what law

38. Is not Patukakariki the head of the hapu to which Te Teira belongs? If he is not, who is?—I never

37. Was a copy delivered to Patukakariki?—The letter was addressed to William King, Patukakariki, and

36. How was that letter published and circulated?—It was not published at all; it was written by me to the

35. Believing that Patukakariki has possibly a claim to the disputed block, why have you not endeavoured

34. In investigating Riwai Te Ahu's claim, was he present, and had he the opportunity of examining the

33. Mr. Fox—You have stated that Riwai Te Ahu had no claim. How can you be sure of this if you have

32. We say—That the land purchaser refused to listen, and that chiefs who opposed sales did not always think proper to enforce their claims.

31. We say—The father of Te Patukakariki was the principal chief of those (two) tribes; his name was Karewa; he is

30. We say—The principal chief of these hapus died some years ago. Ropoaina, at Queen Charlotte's Sound, represents them.

29. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

28. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

27. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

26. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

25. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

24. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

23. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

22. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

21. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

20. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

19. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

18. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

17. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

16. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

15. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

14. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

13. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

12. We say—The land purchaser refused to sell Waitara; why then write? Why should they pay any attention to his letter?

11. Has any similar interference by the chief been recognised in Taranaki, either in favour of King or of any other?—Never in connection with any of the purchases made there. We say—That the land purchaser refused to listen, and that chiefs who opposed sales did not always think proper to enforce their claims.

10. Under the peculiar circumstances of the Taranaki case, had King in your opinion any right to interfere with the sale by another hapu of their lands?—Decidedly he had not. We say—It is only this land-jobber who would venture to deny William King's right to withhold the land: we say that he had a clear right to withhold the land, for it did not belong to those hapus alone, or to other tribes, or other ancestors. Was it his animosity to William King that made him say this?

9. Has King ever made a claim of proprietary right?—William King has never made such a claim, to my knowledge. We say—This is quite false. Mr. M'Lean would not listen to what he said, in the same way that he would not listen to what Patukakariki said (Question 6).

8. Has any similar interference by the chief been recognised in Taranaki, either in favour of King or of any other?—Never in connection with any of the purchases made there. We say—That the land purchaser refused to listen, and that chiefs who opposed sales did not always think proper to enforce their claims.

7. Under the peculiar circumstances of the Taranaki case, had King in your opinion any right to interfere with the sale by another hapu of their lands?—Decidedly he had not. We say—It is only this land-jobber who would venture to deny William King's right to withhold the land: we say that he had a clear right to withhold the land, for it did not belong to those hapus alone, or to other tribes, or other ancestors. Was it his animosity to William King that made him say this?

6. Has any similar interference by the chief been recognised in Taranaki, either in favour of King or of any other?—Never in connection with any of the purchases made there. We say—That the land purchaser refused to listen, and that chiefs who opposed sales did not always think proper to enforce their claims.
his title adduced, which universal custom recognises as the manner in which he should prefer his claims, We say—Mr. Pox is quite right; he is only inquiring of the person who professes to know all about it. If they did not wish to sell their land, why should they go, more especially when what they had said on previous occasions had not been attended to?

46. You have heard of the eleven claims mentioned by the claimants as existing at Otaki: have you investigated them?—I have not investigated those claim, with the exception of the one to which I have referred in answering a previous question. We say—Take not of his prevarication. Listen: that is a different piece of land about which he had spoken; it is at Waiongana, about five or six miles distant, in the block offered by Katatore before his death. See at question 33, what was said about that land. But this, about which he was questioned, is the land now being fought about at Waitara. Having nothing to say, he said what was false, it being quite impossible for him to prove that our claims at Waitara are not good and valid.

48. Did you ever hear of a meeting at which Te Teira offered to give up to the parties opposing the sale some lands belonging to him outside the block in exchange for the lauds he was offering to the Government?—I did not hear of a meeting at which any proposal of that nature was made in reference to the land he was offering to the Government. I am aware that there was a meeting at which there was some discussion about the accommodation of their claims. This was a considerable time pr or to the purchase. We say—See how clever he is at quibbling. Teira did make that offer; we heard it from Tipene Ngaruna, who was present at the meeting at Waitara.

58. What are the rules of alienation in the Ngatiawa tribe?—In the Ngatiawa a family of three or four people has been regarded as empowered to dispose of its common property We say—We of this Ngatiawa, now hear for the first time of this mode of proceeding (in alienating land), but perhaps he is in an underhand way laying down a new rule for this Ngatiawa, or does he mean for Ngatiawa at Tauranga (of whom we know nothing).

59. Have they long enjoyed this right?—It has been so for the last eighteen years. We say—Vie have never heard of this custom all these years. We now hear it for the first time in this answer.

64. Did not Patukakariki protest repeatedly, three or four times, at public meetings against the sale of the disputed block?—Never against the sale of the block in question; but he has protested against the sale of other land. We say—What other portion of Waitara was ever sold by any natives to any other land purchaser, that he should have had an opportunity of objecting? No, it was that same block of land which they are fighting about. What Mr. M'Lean says is quite false, that "he has protested against the sale of other land."

65. Has he claims within the block?—I have stated, lie may have chums; he has never proved any title. We say—See, he merely conjectures, from utter ignorance of the facts. We positively assert that he has land there.

66. Do you believe he has claims?—It is altogether conjectural; it is probable he may have a claim within the block. We say—if he does not know, why does he venture to give evidence about that land, and thus expose his ignorance?

75. Mr. Bell: In the evidence of Archdeacon Hadfield, he says that Te Teira is not a Chief at all, but a "tutua:" is that your opinion as to his position in the tribe?—Certainly uot. We say—Archdeacon Hadfield was quite right. He lived five years with us in our pa at "Waikanae; he was therefore well able to "know who were Chiefs, and who were men of no rank at oil; but this person, who contradicts another, has never lived among us, that he should know who are Chiefs and who are not,

79. Mr. Domett: Did you advise the Governor that the title of the sellers of Te Teira's block was good, before the purchase of the block was made?—I advised the Governor to accept the offer, and proceed with the purchase of the block, because it appeared to me that Te Teira had an unquestionable title. We say—He had a claim to his own little piece of land scattered among those of all of us. It is very wrong to doggedly persist, without any ground for his assertion, in saying that our pieces of land belong to Teira only.

80. Mr. Fox: "When did you give that advice to his Excellency?—In March, 1859. We say—Exactly so; then U is he who has misled the Governor.

81. Had the title at that time been fully investigated?—The offer was made publicly, which was the first and best evidence you could get of title, and a more minute investigation into the titles of the various claimants was afterwards instituted. We say—That afforded no evidence for a decision; the greater part of that Assembly were Puketapu natives and natives from the town, and he would not listen to Patukakariki, and Paora Karewa, and William King, when they openly protested against the sale that day in the presence of the Governor, when Teira gave his parawai; perhaps he thought that they had no right to interfere, or, which is more probable, he had determined in his own mind that if they refused their assent the soldiers should take the land.

84. Was a contemporaneous, or nearly contemporaneous, notice of the meeting of March, 1859, at which Teira's block was offered, published in the Maori Messenger?—A notice of that meeting was published in the Maori Messenger. We say—There was do mention of Teira's having offered land for sale in the Maori Messenger. Ngamotu, Taranaki, March 8, 1859, and Auckland, March 31, 1859. The account of the meeting to
which he alludes was in these two Kareres.

95. Mr. Richmond: Archdeacon Hadfield has stated that Ropoama refused to come up to the meeting at Kohimarama, because he disapproved of the transactions, falsely alleging illness as an excuse; was this the case?—It was certainly not so; he was scarcely able to stand. I sent a boat for him. He expressed himself willing to come, but he was really so unwell that he might have died at sea. In fact, I could not think of bringing him. In the short interview which I had with him on board the steamer, he again expressed his intention of selling his claims to the Government. We say—What Archdeacon Hadfield said is quite correct; we heard it from the natives who came across from Queen Charlotte's Sound. Illness was not the reason why he and Hone Tuhata remained. No; they staid on account of the Governor's proceedings against William King. Notice the fact that not even one of those people went to Kohimarama.

We conclude by saying that Mr. M'Lean had better leave off telling untruths about William King's land.

From us,
(Signed)
HERUNI TE TUPEOTU.
EPIHOI.
HOHEPA NGAPAKI.
HENERE TE MARAU.
TAMATI TE HAWE.
RAWIRI NGAWAKA.
WIPERAHAMA PUTIKI.
WIREMU TAMIHANA TE NEKE.
PAORA MATUAWAKA.
KIRIPATA PAKE.
TIPENE NGARUNA.
HUTANA AWATEA.
TERETIU TAMAKA.
HONE TAMAKA.
RIWAI TE AHU.

M.

Meeting at the Pa Whakaairo.

January, 1861.

On the 7th November a Maori meeting was held at Te Pa Wha-kaairo, which was called by nearly all the Native Chiefs at Ahuriri; about 200 natives were present, some of whom had come from Te Waipukuran, Te Aute, Eparaima, and Waimarama, The Superintendent of the Province, with Messrs. Alexander, Colenso, and G. Cooper, were specially invited by the natives, and several other settlers attended. The meeting lasted until it was nearly dark; during the day an excellent plain dinner was prepared by the natives for their guests, consisting of geese, pork, crayfish, and sausage rolls, ale, beer, ginger beer, milk, and tea. The principal speaker on the part of the natives was the Chief RANATA, who was understood to act as spokesman and to express the opinions of the natives of Ahuriri and the East Coast. The following translation of Renata's speech is different from, but more correct and intelligible than, the one given is the Hawke's Bay Herald of December 8th:—

From the Pa Whakaairo,
November 7th, 1860.

This is the day on which the Ngati-Kahungunu tribe and the Englishmen of Napier was held. The mouthpiece of the councils of Te Pa Whakaairo, of Tanenuiarangi, of Waipukuran, of Te Aute, Eparaima, and Waimarama, The Superin- tendent of the Province, with Messrs. Alexander, Colenso, and G. Cooper, were specially invited by the natives, and several other settlers attended. The meeting lasted until it was nearly dark; during the day an excellent plain dinner was prepared by the natives for their guests, consisting of geese, pork, crayfish, and sausage rolls, ale, beer, ginger beer, milk, and tea. The principal speaker on the part of the natives was the Chief RANATA, who was understood to act as spokesman and to express the opinions of the natives of Ahuriri and the East Coast. The following translation of Renata's speech is different from, but more correct and intelligible than, the one given is the Hawke's Bay Herald of December 8th:—

From the Pa Whakaairo,
November 7th, 1860.

This is the day on which the Ngati-Kahungunu tribe and the Englishmen of Napier was held. The mouthpiece of the councils of Te Pa Whakaairo, of Tanenuiarangi, of Waipukuran, of Matahiwi, of Te Timu, of Pakowhai, of Te Pakipaki, of Potaka, of Te Hauke, of Te Aute, of Waipaoa, of Te Waipukurau, of Eparaima, of Porangahau, of Tautane, of Te Takapau, of Tikokino, is Renata Tamakihiku-rangi; he spoke as their representative to the English.

The occasion of this meeting is, that we Maoris are grieved at the war that is going on at Taranaki between the Governor and William King. We were talking to you some months back at the meeting that was held here,
and we then said, "The Governor is in the wrong." We fully expected that he would listen to the remonstrances of us natives and some of you English; but not so, he is determined to carry on the war with W. King. He goes on gathering soldiers from one land after another, even as far as from England, in order to destroy those brethren of ours. That made us think of going to Taranaki. Just as you are all English, though one is a Bishop, another a minister, one is a Governor, and another a soldier, and another a settler; so we (Natives) are all one; Maori is my name: though one man builds houses, and another provides food, and another makes canoes, and some (thanks to you!) are fighting now. My name is like the Church of God, of which the Scripture says, "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." The Church of God is one name, like ours. Therefore, I said, let me also go to my own people, who are being fed by thee (O Governor) with indigestible food. But if you will agree to some way of settling our dispute, and go to Taranaki to discuss and investigate the quarrel between the Governor and W. King, then it will be all right. If it is thereby found that W. King is in the wrong, then let all of us, English and Maoris, combine to oblige him to give up his present course of action; but if it is found that Te Teira is in the wrong, then the Governor must give up his determination to fight. We Maoris are depending on the fair fame of your noble race, as your name is known as a people quietly establishing laws, a people judging peacefully. We were carefully taught by former Governors "not to fight, but to go to law;" but now that we are under this Governor, law is cast aside, and hard food is flung at us. Doubtless, for petty matters, such as a basket of potatoes, a bushel of wheat, and a pig, there is law—but the great matters, such as land and the life of a man, are not decided by law. And then we remember that his newspapers tell us that he is a kind father, and the Queen a gracious mother to us. But look a little further! Behold, powder and shot are the food that my father and mother are feeding those children of theirs with; and ships are sailing here with more of the same food. Therefore, Mr. Superintendent Fitzgerald, I shall go to Taranaki to sympathise with my brethren that are being fed with this indigestible food. For I was like the nestlings of the Tui (or parent bird): the dam goes to seek food, and when she brings it the young open their mouths wide to receive their food. But now I cannot feel any affection towards that mother of mine; nevertheless, if she will look hither at the wrongs done to me by this Governor that is feeding me with guns, powder, and shot, and if she will recall him, and give me another Governor to feed me with digestible food, that is with Councils, Law, Love, and good principles, it will be well again. At the very commencement of the dispute, our Maori King proposed to the Governor that they two should investigate the quarrel between him and W. King, that they should meet at Waiuku (near Auckland) and look into the matter, talk it over, and decide it by the rules of law; off goes the Governor, arrives at Taranaki, opens fire upon W. King. Therefore, we Maoris saw clearly that the Governor was in the wrong—because he would not submit to have the case judged by law. Then the Maori King said, well then, the Maoris will inquire into it. Waikato goes to look at the case; and it is declared, that if it be truly found that W. King is in the wrong, then the land shall be given up—but if it is truly found that the Governor is in the wrong, then let sympathy be shewn to W. King. When Waikato got to Taranaki, it was found that the Governor was entirely in the wrong; and, accordingly, they joined in the war at Taranaki.

But it is not necessary to go to Taranaki to see the Governor's course is wrong. No: we have seen it here at Ahuriri in the way in which his officials buy land—a very different system prevailed formerly from what is the practice now.

The plan formerly, was to assemble all the people, chiefs and serfs, old men and old women, women and children, in the presence of the Commissioner, so that the conveyance of the land to the Queen might be open and straightforward. The first block so purchased was that at Waipuktirau—rightly done; and then Ahuriri, rightly done. Those were the lands the sale of which to the Queen was clear and unobjectionable. We fancied that such was to be the universal rule of purchase—but afterwards it went wrong. The wrong was this, that the Commissioner bought of one person by himself. This was the case in the purchase of the blocks at Cape Kidnappers, at Aorangi, and at Okawa, at Tariotehanawa, at Umuopua, at Tautaue, at Aropaoanui. You have got possession of those lands, but by an unfair purchase made by your Commissioners; and thence arose our quarrels amongst ourselves. Afterwards we quietly gave up these lands to you, as a proof of our love to the Queen, but we said at the time, put a stop to this practice now.

Now, perhaps you will say that the natives of this island are seeking a quarrel with the English. Not so, for if we were desirous of quarrelling, we should have encouraged the Wanganui plan for killing the English, and
that of Tipa for destroying Raglan. But I refused to have anything to do with it; and the councils of the Maori King, who have rebuked you openly to your face, rejected the plan.—(I will not listen to any excuses for the Governor, but do you listen to what I say about our all going to Taranaki, and there investigating this quarrel. Then my ears will listen to what you say. Dost thou not (O Governor) see the open dealings of thy enemies, whom thou art so determined to fight with? I will not be like your *Lickplates* that met at Kohimarama. My words will be frank and open, although that Conference of yours has acted differently.) This weapon was sent to me by Ngatiraukawa, as a sign of destruction for Wellington. I refused to have anything to do with it. The meaning of this weapon was, that if, on the occasion of raising the King’s flag, the men who hold with the Governor and the military attacked the King’s men and the flag (then Wellington was to be destroyed). And so again Wanganui did wrong, this was the wrong:—A native living there went and fetched some wood-work from the graves, and burned it in a cooking oven, and then called the fire in his oven by the names of the Maori King and his chief men, Porokoru, Tamihana, Wetini, Epiha, Eewi, and all the chiefs of Waikato; this he did in the hope that the men of Wanganui would be excited to turn against the English there and kill them. And this was the act of those very men who went to the Governor’s Conference at Kohimarama. That man had said the name of his child was Te Mutu-mutu (that is, have done with these English), and the name of another was Pakau (strike, strike, strike). But the Mauri King forbade it, and so did all our councils. Now this is another instance:—Tipa is the name of a man who shaved his head, and the hair of his dog-skin mat; and this he did that his people might kill the English at Raglan. The King forbade it, and so did we who openly rebuke you to your face. And so did a great part of Ngatiraukawa, who openly rebuke you to your face, as I do now; but you turn and find fault with the Otaki Petition, that openly rebuked you. You turn and get up some delusive talk at the Conference that you called together to tell you a parcel of lies at Auckland. However, I do not intend to have anything to do with attacking the towns. This is my word, that has been decided by the King, "all towns are to be as Parininihi" (a steep cliff near Taranaki)—it is enough to fight at Taranaki alone, the place which the Governor’s sword has smitten. But if the Governor shall ascend any of these cliffs (that is, if he attacks any other Maories), then we shall fight there as our brethren are now fighting at Taranaki. Here is another fault of the Governor’s, namely, his writing in his newspaper to all the chiefs of this island, that they should assemble at Taranaki to put to death the men that committed the murders (at Omata); and he does not see that he has a murder of his own on his hands; for, behold, he has taken to himself Ihaia Kirikumara as a bosom friend. I know that it is said, Katatore was a murderer. Not so; his was an open act, for he forbade his land being sold (by Rawiri) to the English. Rawiri persisted in selling it. Katatore said to the English and to Rawiri, Leave alone my land. Rawiri still persisted; then Katatore said to Rawiri, "You still persist; here is a gun for you; let us fight." Rawiri still persisted in marking out the boundary of Katatore’s land; he would not listen. Then guns were fired off, not directed at him, but merely fired into the air and on the ground. It was supposed that he would "be frightened, and leave off. Not so. Then Katatore fired at Rawiri and killed him. This was not a murder, but open dealing. That teas a murder which Ihaia committed, and which he called revenge. Not so; that was revenge which Arama Ka raka openly did in the face of day. He and Katatore fought fairly in the open day, and at the end peace was made. But this act of Ihaia’s, in assassinating Katatore, was no revenge—it was murder—it was a base murder of his and the Governor’s (i.e., the Governor made it his own by making such friends with Ihaia).

Now, with regard to that man, Te Teira: he is called a Chief—not so—he is a nobody. For I know that man; he is a man of low rank. William King is the only great man of that tribe; his name alone is known by the people here. For doubtleess the name of his father was Retetawhangawhanga, from whom came Te *Rangi* take (William King). His name, the name of the Chiefman, ascends to *heaven*, just as my name, Taniakihiku *rangi* ends in *heaven*. But Te Teira’s name is Manuka, mere scrub (that grovels on the earth). Now, not a single piece of land here (Ahuriri) that has been sold to the English, was transferred by a mere serf, but by the Chiefs only; and the community consented that the land should be sold to the English—by Te Moaua-Nui, by Tarcha, by Te Hapuku, by Pahara, by Tawhara, by Hineirangia, by each Chief was our land conveyed to the Queen.

This is another grievance. The Governor will not let us buy powder, even to shoot birds with. This is not a fair course of his; my rule is, that if my enemy has no weapon, I fling him one, that our fight may be equal. But are you not ashamed, O Governor, at my defenceless hand 1 Stay, cast away your guns, and powder and shot, and let us fight with our fists only—and if you don’t like that, give it over, have done with it for ever, and rather let us return to the law courts. What is the good of killing men on a wrongful cause? It is a bad business. If you are determined to fight, we shall all of us do wrong incessantly. It is wrong, for you are desirous that the natives should be destroyed by you. It is wrong, for you and this English people of yours are always vaunting yourselves against us. No doubt it is quite true you English are a noble race, and we Maoris are a wretched set. It is quite true. But had we not better leave that consideration to the God that made us. God made you to be a good and Mr-skinned people—God made us to be “bad and black,” as you say. If this is meant to be a taunt of yours to us, it is not to your credit. There are many English that vaunt themselves in this way—but with God is the thought for that matter. And so again, if you are determined to fight, it cannot he helped—with God lies the
issue between us, between you and us. But our desire is that we should agree together, both English and Maoris, to put down this war. Enough—I have no more to say.

N.

Renata's Reply to the Superintendent of Hawke's Bay.

New Zealand Spectator, March 23, 1861. Pawhakairo,

MR FITZGERALD

Sir,—I have received the report of our speeches made here at the Pawhakairo when we mutually gave expression to our opinions, and which have now been published by you in a newspaper We all recognise mine as correct (i.e. the report), but yours are not these that have been sent to me; these are newly made up by you. It was not I alone who observed that your speech was incorrectly reported; the whole of us agree that it is wrong, all those who heard our speeches. These are not your words as heard by the meeting they have been manufactured anew by you. Had you spoken thus when here, you would have been answered by me according to the tenor of your words. Perhaps our friends in other places may suppose that this is a correct report of your speech as delivered here, instead of which it has been made anew by you at Ahuriri. Sir, it comes to me in a new shape, and I must give you a new answer.

Now then, I will answer your speech.

In reply to what you say about your grief for the war at Taranaki. If you felt genuine sorrow you would have been at Taranaki before this; your grief would have led you thither to put stop to the war; then your word would have been heard beforehand in favour of stopping the evil; then you and I would have had nothing to discuss. I told you that the cause of our meeting was grief for the war at Taranaki, and proposed to go there and put a stop to it, to which you replied—that you could not influence the Governor. Then I thought, Eh! you are not sorry, your grief does not reach up to mine, since you oppose my proposal that we should go to Taranaki to enquire into the war. Although the Governor has the direction of the Jaws, b will not submit (his conduct) to investigation; and you also oppose it; this is my reason for concluding, Eh! it is only I who feel any sorrow. This is your sort of sorrow. You wish that the Maoris only should be killed.

You say "Fighting is not a good thing." This is the answer. Truly fighting is not a correct thing, and nothing but the badness of your cause has prevented you from trying to stop it, so that I might know that you were free from the fault of the Governor. This was why we said in your presence, Eh! we are grieved because of the evil going on at Taranaki; but you would not agree to accompany me thither to discuss it.

You say, "Shall we permit evil to prevail?" This is my answer—Is it the Maori who permits evil to prevail? It was proposed to the Governor that an investigation should be had. This is what Te Wherowhero said about the failure of the meeting at Waiuku to discuss the Waitara question. The old man was vexed at the Governor avoiding a quiet discussion and investigation, and he said——"Uenuku, the man-eater, used to be my god; but when the clergyman came to this land, I was told to put away my god, for the Pakeha God was the true one, Jehovah, the preserver of man, the Creator of heaven and earth. When I accepted your God, I thought all wrongs were to be made the subject of investigation, great wrongs as well as little ones. When it came to this affair, I alone was left to worship his God, whilst he, the Governor, went off to pick up my cast away god, Uenuku, the cannibal. And now the Governor, the supporter of Jehovah, has stepped forward and carried off Uenuku the cannibal to Taranaki as his god for the destruction of man."

Sir, was this evil caused by me—by the Maori, that I should be spoken to by you in that fashion! Why, that is your evil, the Governor's, and you had better yourself stop that evil. The Maori knows perfectly well that it was you who allowed it to prevail, since you did not hasten to put an end to it. If I were the instructor of both of us, I should have said, investigate that the war may be stopped, so that the man may be saved for after days.

You say, "Can chastisement be laid aside?" My reply is, Sir, what is the chastisement alluded to by you? Do you mean bloodshed? Do you mean shooting men down with guns? What part of the children do you mean to leave alive to feel your chastisement? What I have always heard described as chastisement was this, to teach with love. My idea of chastisement is investigation, that the child may survive to listen to your instructions in after days. Those weapons of yours are not good things for teaching with; your teacher is a very bad kind of one, your children will run away. What would be right would be to agree to an investigation, that the evil might be put down, and man suffered to live.

This is one of your words, "It (the war) is being used as a medicine." This is my reply. Sir, this medicine
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that you speak of is killing people, then physicking them. Sir, your medicine is the same as that used by the European shepherds to physic our dogs with. This is the kind of physic that you use, and the dogs die. The medicine for mankind is investigation; this is the kind of physic prescribed by the law of God and of the Queen. Sir, do you not hold in awe the life-blood supplied alike to us all by the Creator?

You say, "It is better as it is with us at Ahuriri here, where we dwell together and eat together."

This is my reply: Sir, do you mean to say that dwelling peaceably together has only existed at Ahuriri? How was it at Taranaki in your opinion? Why, they had the same manner of dwelling together, of land purchasing, of bartering in trade, of brotherhood with the Maori, just the same. There was the same Mr. M'Lean, the same Governor, and all the same relationships subsisting between the Pakeha and the Maori. Sir, eating together is also a good thing. What William King himself said was, that we should sit down in peace and eat together; but the Governor would persist. And who speaks against commerce? Has anybody been killed by commerce? You say, "It has been seen already in bygone years how great a regard the Governor has for the Maories."

This is the answer: Sir, that is the very thing that William King was pleased with, the great regard of the Governor in bygone years; and he thought from that that he was not a bad man, but friendly disposed. Eh! but when he requested him to leave his land alone, be (the Governor) did not pay any attention to his wish. Sir, this proved to us that the regard of the Governor, to which you allude, is a sneaking regard for the land.

Sir, in time of the former Governor, the crimes of the Maoris were the greatest; and the Governor pursued the crime of the Maori to punish it. But with this Governor, it is quite clear to us that the evil is of his making alone. He is a Governor in your estimation; he is nothing but a common Pakeha in ours. For, had he been really a Governor, he would not have listened to the persuasions of evil. The greatness of his regard (for the Maori) would have been able to keep him out of war.

You say: The Governor went all the way to Taranaki that he might himself see them both (W. Kingi and Te Teira) and hear what they both had to say.

This is my answer: Sir, that is a piece of your own invention. "Who is to be deceived by it? Why, he sent for William King to go and talk with him, after the soldiers had arrived. Why should be go there to put himself in danger of the soldiers? The good opportunity had been lost which was indicated by our great man for investigating the dispute according to law; the Governor had disregarded the wish of Potatau that they should meet and talk it over in accordance with the law. The first thing he hears is, Eh! the Governor has arrived at Taranaki, and is thundering forth with cannons and rockets. A person might suppose from the way you talk that the dispute was investigated by the Governor. Sir, what have you to do with mis-statements? You say, "The Governor was aware that William King was an obstinate"

This is the answer: Sir, wherein did you discover the obduracy of William King? Is his land a proper thing to call him obstinate about? When he takes something of yours, you can then talk of his obstinacy, Sir, this is what Potatau said of him, "William King is not fl deaf man; his ears are always open to hear both Pakeha and Maori. They have no hair (to obstruct them); but when Ihaia murdered his friends, then it grew; and when Te Teira and the Governor took the land, the hair grew all over every part of his ears. It did not grow out from inside; it was thrust in from without."

You say, "When we arrived (at Auckland) we met together (General Assembly) and discussed this matter with many other questions." This is my reply—Sir, had your meeting been one of inquiry you would have discovered a means of putting a stop to the war at Taranaki. Instead of which your seeking was like that of a man in search of a missing horse, lie searches the whole country around in vain; he is not found. He returns home; and behold there is the animal all the time! Had it been a seeking indeed the Governor's assembly of Maori Chiefs would first have taken place; afterwards the Taranaki war.

You say, he said, "I shall not allow it (the land) to be sold, having said which Wm. King arose and walked out of the room." Sir, I beg you to know that this is the Maori's most emphatic mode of denial: to say his say, get up and go, that it may be known that he will never consent.

You say, "As for this matter it was most carefully investigated when I was in the House of Representatives at Auckland; how careful was the inquiry of that Assembly! its diligent research, its careful and penetrating questions. Nothing could equal it! it was greater than I can tell."

This is my answer: Sir, what were you looking for when you were at Auckland? Were you seeking to find the wrong of the Taranaki war? or were you trying to find out a way of justifying the Governor's proceedings? or was it to find an excuse for persisting in the Taranaki war? This would have been a great thing for you to do to investigate the matter, but you did not accomplish it; yet there were a great many Pakehas assembled at that gathering. But if you are seeking, let us go to Taranaki and seek there; we shall not be long before we find something.

You say, "For Governors were sent to punish evil doers and to praise those who do well." This is the answer: Sir, the word of Scripture is right, but you misapply it altogether in this instance. It is the Governor...
who is in fault. Sir, your word is wrong. The chastiser having himself given cause of offence, is he to go out and punish others for it? Rather let crime come of itself, and then let punishment follow; and when men see that which is good, they will praise it. Sir, why did not the Governor, the chastiser, hang up Ihaia by the neck, that murderer whom he has taken to be his dear friend? Your quotation is misplaced.

You say, "Do not suppose that it is only we Pakehas who think the Governor right in what he has done at Taranaki. No, there are great numbers of Maoris who say the same thing."

This is my reply: Sir. I have told you those fellows were lick-plates, and you still report their words to me. Listen to me: it was not I who condemned them; it was themselves, in their own assembly at Kohimarama. When a great number of them had been dunning the Governor for money, one among them stood up and said they were attempting to impose upon the Governor. That Maori's name was Parakaia, of Otaki. This is the way they spoke when their vessel called in at Ahuriri. One of them said they had been disappointed about money, as they fancied the £3000 voted for their meeting was to be divided amongst them. Another one said they had been scheming to get a way opened by which to buy some gunpowder but as to the question of wrong, they had seen well enough that the Governor was in the wrong. In what you have written you make them out to support the Governor. So we have two opposite opinions from the same men. So much for two faces under a hood, with their two contrary sayings. Don't again quote those lick-plates to me; one a' whose faults was their not saying plainly to the Governor's face. "You are wrong in what you are doing at Taranaki." Sir, they were no a wise assembly. Look here. Mr. M'Lean himself, the author of the evil, stands there himself to investigate it. Why did not the Maoris lay: It will not do for the defendant to be a judge in his own case?

This is what you say about the Pakehas (opposition members) who find fault with the Governor: "Those Pakehas are not good people. They are chattering, growling, grumbling Pakehas, aye, bad Pakehas." This is the reply: Sir, what is the crime of those Pakehas? Is it (the war) a work of such small dimensions that you turn aside after the Pakehas 1 Did they go and teach Win. King? It was he who pointed it out to himself (his position); it was not taught him. The evil was notoriously self-evident, and that it was that showed it to Wm. King. Sir, had he been urged on by a Pakeha instead of by his own feelings, the war would probably have been over. A person acting under the instigation of another does not hold out very long; he soon gives in. This is the Pakeha's teaching, that fighting with guns is bad; it is better to fight with words, and with the pen. This war is of Maori (i.e. W. King was not put up to it by Pakehas) origin, the effect of his anger about his land being taken; be talked for a long time, but his words were unheeded.

You say, "Let Wm. King lay down his arms;" yon also speak of not making peace, and about (W. King) submitting to the law.

This is the answer: Sir, shall I then lay down the shield, and leave the weapon free to strike me 1 No, let the weapon be put down, and the shield will follow it. Is this fault the man's (W. King's) that he should put an end to it; it is the Governor's own, and he must put a stop to it. Who is the innocent man having charge of the laws 7 For the Governor himself has done wrong, the keeper of the laws. The Maori will obey the law; if it be properly administered he will always obey. It was the Governor himself who established the law of fighting at Taranaki. The Maori only defended himself.

You quote this passage from Scripture: "A kingdom divided against itself cannot stand; and if a city or a house be divided against itself it cannot stand."

Sir, Did I, the Maori, turn round upon you to fight? I rather think it was you who turned upon your neighbour, William King. I did not go to your land to set up my Utile King. But it was my wrongs unredressed by you that induced me to set about to work out an idea of my own; that is, "Waikato, the tribe who set it going. Sir, this is the way by which this pain, this sorrow, this bitter grief, which causes such pain to so many people."

This is the answer: Sir, who caused the pain? I take it to have been the Governor. Very different were the land purchasing arrangements of former days. There was to be an assemblage, and when they had all consented, then the land should pass. All the Maoris beard this from the Governor. But now they hear, Eh! this plan of buying is changed, and land is now to be sold by a single individual. Sir, this is the way by which this pain, this
trouble, has come upon us; it was through double-dealing that this trouble came. Had the old way continued, we should not have gone wrong; but since it has been abandoned, and attention has been paid to a single individual, difficulties

You say, "That man must let down his bristles, and pay obeisance to his Sovereign the Queen."

This is the answer: Sir, what then is the Maori doing? The Maori is yielding obedience. For many years he has been listening to that teaching of the Queen's. But the Governor has made it all go wrong. Your word is not clear. Perhaps you think he is not a man, that you say be should not raise his bristles when his land is taken from him? If your laud were taken by a Maori, would your bristles not rise? Give him back his land, and then if we see his bristles still sticking up, I will admit that you are right. You quote from the Scripture that children should honour their parents; quote to the Governor the other portion of the same passage, "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath."

You say, "Probably by lengthening, by dragging out (the war), this island will be filled with soldiers and fighting men." This is my answer: Sir, you have no right to say this to me. Had I (i.e. the Maori) begun this war, you might with justice have applied those words to me. But seeing it was the Governor, if you had said this to the Governor, to him who began the work at Taranaki, it would have been right. Not to me. Sir, all these (evils) are of our doing. First, there was the wish to take our lands, and now is the accomplishment of it. For the cause (of the war) was but a small matter, and you have gone on importing Pakehas from other lands to fight with the Maoris. The nest thing will be, you will hide your error under the cloak of the Waikatos having gone to Taranaki to ward off tie weapon raised by you against William King, whereas your opposition was made in order that you might get the land.

For had it not then been asserted that the Maori King had any power (or sovereignty); they were still in search of a rule of action. By and by you will conceal the Governor's fault under this covering (King movement) since you seem determined on war. Sir, the Maori did not look upon war as his avocation; it was you who taught it him, and lie stood erect to ward off your weapon, because of your stealing the Maori's land. Sir, is thieving, indeed, then a legitimate occupation? It has been said to be a wicked one—it must be that only you who taught it him, and lie stood erect to ward off your weapon, because of your stealing the Maori's land.

You say, "that by fighting and division, the Maori King will be established in Waikato" (i.e. that the Waikatos think that by fighting, Ac.)

This is my answer: Sir, can't you perceive that the Governor commenced that quarrel with his son Wm. King? He (W. K.) was an opponent of my little king.

All that Waikato desired was to have an investigation; and for a long time, as far as talking could accomplish, they intervened between the combatants, and for a long time, whilst the Governor was quarrelling with his son, the Waikato were strenuously smothering their feelings of sympathy. But when at length the war became permanent, then they arose to shield him (W. K.) from the weapon of him who was placed over him. Ought they to have given him up to darkness (death)? This is my custom—if my chief is gently punishing his children, they are left to settle their own differences; but if I see him lift a deadly weapon then I get up to interfere. If be thereupon turns round upon and kills me, it cannot be helped. That is a good kind of death in my—the Maori's—estimation.

Sir, did I set up my King in secret? As I view it, Waikato wished that his authority should emanate from the Governor. And then it was that we tried to do the best we could for ourselves. When it was seen that evil was partly put down by the runanga; and the stupid drunkards became men once more, then the work (the King movement) became general. And then I hear that the Governor, who found fault with our runanga, has himself called another Maori runanga, to screen himself that his fault might be hidden.

But is this (King movement) indeed (o cause a division between us? No, it will be caused by secret purchases of land, the thing which has been going on for years.

Is he a veritable King in your eyes? Sir, cease to cite this as a cause of quarrelling. For behold, the Treaty of Waiting! has been broken. It was said that the Treaty was to protect the Maoris from foreign invasion. But those bad nations never came to attack us; the blow fell from you, the nation who made that same treaty. Sir, it is you alone who have broken your numerous promises. You say, "The Maories are not able to fight against the Queen of England and prevail against her." This is my answer. Sir, you know perfectly well that the Maori will be beaten. What will save me will be my not attempting to instruct you. It is only you who teach me; and then there are both me and your doctrine for you to kill. Sir, I have not strength to fight with you, but the law (of right) is strong, and you cannot kill it. Though it be said that this war is for sovereignty, the fault of the Governor can never be concealed by that. Who is the Maori that is such a fool as to be mistaken about the sovereignty or supremacy of the Queen of England? Or who will throw himself away in fighting for such a cause? No, it is for the land; for land has been the prime cause of war amongst the Maoris from time immemorial down to the arrival of the Pakehas in this island of ours. The Maori will not be daunted by his weakness, by his inferiority, or the smallness of his tribe. He sees his land going, and will he sit still I No, but
he will take himself off to resist.

It is not a fight for life, (i.e. we fight without caring for our lives, that being a secondary consideration to a Maori, as is proved by their carrying on the war against hopeless odds at Taranaki); my surviving or dying is a thing to be determined there (in fighting) as you may see them now, being killed at Taranaki. The Queen's sovereignty has been acknowledged long ago. Had it been a fight for supremacy, probably every man in this island would have been up in arms. But in the present case the fighting is confined to the land which is being taken possession of. There is a letter of Wm. King's lying here, in which he says that if his land is evacuated be will put a stop to the fighting. This is my answer to what you say about the Maori being starved for want of money. Why did you say this? Am I making light of your money, of your food, of your clothing? I am always buying them, and I am also building churches, and mills, and wooden houses. You had better confine yourself to the subject of the land improperly purchased by the Commissioners. You speak of the Maori improperly buying guns and powder. In reply I say, Well, what would you have? When you are setting us quarrelling amongst ourselves about our land improperly bought, and you leave us alone to fight it out. It is partly to arm ourselves against each other that we buy these things. We do not buy them to be turned against you. For where were we to find a cause, since we heard the Governor saying that he could not be the aggressor. Look for yourself—the earth has long been shaken by you, and yet the Maori has nowhere commenced fighting, through the instrumentality of my little king who kept them down, as I have already shewn you. As to what you say about your Pakehas having no powder, cease to humbug me. Do you then feed your children upon nothing but lead? do you not add a little powder as a relish 1 By what kind of air then was it (the lead) propelled? You say, "It is quite evident yourselves are the cause of the faulty purchasing. It lies neither with the Governor, nor with his Commissioners, but with the Maori." This is my answer. Are not you ashamed to put your sins upon my shoulders? when he who committed the fault has himself acknowledged it are you to deny it? Mr. M'Lean said to us, "This fault is mine, tie purchaser's; I will pay you for it"—and he paid us £1300 for than mistake. Other mistakes are likewise paid for.

This was not a subject that we intended discussing but your having desired it, obliged us to allude to it. But it will probably be just the reverse at Taranaki; he (Mr. M'Lean) will not be able to admit an error there, lest the news of it should spread far and wide, and reach the ears of everybody. Sir, listen whilst I tell you of the last errors of Mr. M'Lean after he bad wiped out his former ones, the mistakes that were made subsequently; viz., Omarutairi and Ngapaeruru—these are what I am going quietly to tell you about. Omarutairi was a piece of land held by the owners as a reserve for themselves, he greater part of their possessions being already alienated. When Mr M'Lean went to Te Aute it was reported that this land was sold. The owners went straight off and said, "Mr. M'Lean, don't buy that land, Sir." They remained three days repeating this, and then went away; and afterwards the money was secretly paid to two people. As to Ngapaeruru, this land was for sale; but by reason of the faulty purchase, you did not obtain it. This was the fault. Two men came to sell this land by stealth to Mr. M'Lean. The owners heard of it, and wrote a letter to Mr. M'Lean not to pay any money to those men. When they reached Mr. M'Lean, one of us saw them there—Karaitiana Takumoana—who suspected that they must have come to sell the land secretly, Karaitiana put Mr. M'Lean on his guard, who replied, "You are right, for I have got a letter from Paora Tamaihotua." Karaitiana read the letter, and then said to Mr. M'Lean, "This letter is correct. Don't you give any money for the land to these men, but pay your money into the hands of the tribe on the spot, that the land may pass with a clear title to you." Mr. M'Lean consented to this, but as soon is Karaitiana was gone, he paid £400 as the price of Ngapaeruru, Thrt was the fault in the case of those two men, and these wrongs prove b us those which have been committed by Mr. M'Lean and his assistants at Taranaki. It is the same Mr. M'Lean and the same system of purchase. You say, "For you have tied up the land. It was free former!"—aye, free from the days of your ancestors."

This is the answer. Sir, our land is free, but it is now being enslaved, inasmuch as it is being sold for money. In olden times it was not sold, but if we had a man in captivity, that was what we sold. Sir, you should have reflected that the land was free, and therefore had an investigation as a preliminary step before proceeding to purchase. This is a suitable reply to your childish Baying. You appear to suppose that by getting hold of a single individual you can gain an advantage over him. Hereafter, whenever the majority consent to a sale it shall take place. Let us have no more blundering. All our troubles have arisen from faulty working, and on this account it was that the door of land selling was shut. But when the system of buying is amended, the door will be opened that sales may be conducted on a, regular plan.

An expression of ours is quoted by you—"That no man will be allowed to sell his land although it should be his exclusive property." This is my reply—That expression is (quoted) both correctly and inincorrectly. It was settled so, in consequence of your bad system of purchasing—for we had lost numbers through this same land purchasing. Whenever the Government shall have laid down some equitable system of land purchase, and when calm is once more restored, then the tribes who are for selling will sell their lands under a properly regulated system.
But the word (as quoted by yon) is not exactly correct, for it was determined by Waikato that if the laud turned out to be the individual property of Te Teira, it should be given up to the Governor. Instead of which it was a land of complicated claims, the property of the whole tribe, the site of pas and of cultivations; and besides that, W. King and his tribe were in occupation of it.

You say—"Yes, indeed, friend Renata, for this very reason, the stoppage of sales, was the system of purchasing altered in later times." This is my answer. Do you tell me that because I withhold my land, you are therefore justified in coming and buying it by stealth? Sir, be cautious how you repeat that word; give it up at once and for ever. At our first meeting at the pa Whakairo here, you said the Governor had only one plan of buying, which had been followed up from the commencement down to the present time; he would never buy in any other manner. Afterwards you tell me that our own internal quarrels had put an end to the system of assembling us together, that all might witness the alienation of the land; but we see that no land was sold at the time of the war; it was sold before the fighting began, and afterwards also, when peace had been made, some land was sold. And who was the cause of this? A man who goes up to Auckland, and there sells the land, and the first thing the owners hear about it is that the land is gone. Others went off to Wellington, and there sold, and the first I heard of it was, that my own place, Okawa, was gone, and several others the same. Did these cases arise from the war 1 You buy in a hurry inside your house, and the first I hear of it, I fl man has passed by with the money, whilst I am continually saying, "Pay your money in the presence of the tribe to whom the land belongs, that you may obtain it with a clear title; "but Mr. M'Lean would not listen.

You told me at our last meeting that the Governor had made a rule that every individual should be free to sell his own bushel of wheat, his potatoes, his corn, and his land as well. We replied to this at the time, "That is right, as applied to the wheat, potatoes, and corn, for they are produced by the labour of his hands; but the land is an inheritance from our ancestors, a father of us all;" and besides all that, how about the rule made by all the Governors who preceded Governor Browne? the rule adopted by the Land Purchase Commissioners, and by the very man, M'Lean himself. "Although a single man should offer laud to me, I will not accept it, but let the majority concur, that the purchase may be right." In those days the laud passed clearly, and everything was carried on peaceably, and with Governor Grey it ceased (i.e. purchases were carried on correctly and peaceably till the end of Sir George Grey's government, and then this system changed), and now you tell me that my withholding my laud from sale has justified you in taking and buying it from any single individual. Not so; it was rather the faulty purchasing that caused the land to be retained lest it should continue to be a road to death for us. Sir, it is not I who have upset your arguments about the Governor's land buying. It was your first assertion that the Governor's system of purchasing would never be changed, by which your subsequent statements have been condemned down to the last of them. Each of your assertions is contradicted by another, and that again by others, so that those very statements carry their own condemnation on the face of them. That is all on that subject.

This is what you say about Te Teira, "Because his genealogy was published last winter," (therefore he is a chief).

This is my reply: Sir, what about his genealogy? This is the second proof that he has given you (against himself), his theft first, and now his genealogy; by these you may know him. W. King would never give his genealogy, because it is known throughout this Island j it is not recounted. That is a thing for the common man to do, who never was heard of before, or for an obscure thief. You must know that this is a thing done by the lower orders.

You say to me, "Lay a firm hold on the regulations of the Government, in order that you may see life and length of days, and prosperity increasing without end."

To which I reply: That is the very thing. Exert yourself to point it out to me, that I may speedily see it. At present I am entirely occupied in looking at your guns, powder, and lead, and at our tribes who are being exterminated by you, through your system of seizing land.

Sir, some of your statements I do not particularly care to notice. Were all true, I should answer all. For this is the only reply to the truth, ". What you say is correct." But now I have occupied months in preparing and digesting a written reply to what you said. That is my difficulty (writing). Had it been an exercise to which I had been accustomed in my youth, I should not have taken long to write an answer to what you have said; or had it been that which I understand properly—an oral discussion, it would not have taken me such a length of time to find a reply. That is all.

From RENATA TAMAKIHUKURANGI,
The spokesman of Ngatikahuhunu.

To Thomas Fitzgerald, Superintendent Napier.

P.S.—Sir, you have omitted to insert the most important topic of our discussion. I had left it for you to insert, as it arose from your answer to my proposal, that we should go to Taranaki to inquire into the cause of
the disturbance. It was proposed in reply to leave it to the Queen to judge between the Governor and Wm. King. You witnessed the general assent of all to that proposal that the Queen should be the judge. Well, does this look in your opinion like a rebellious word in regard to the Queen, that you have left it out of sight, and taken up that word of your own invention about the Maori making war against the Queen? Sir, the Maori does not consider that he is fighting against the Queen. I beg therefore that you will cease to pervert words, And rather consent to our proposal that we should all join in writing a letter to the Governor (to propose) that the war may be stopped, and that it may be left for the Queen to decide in this quarrel; and then let ns write a letter to the Queen (to pray) that she will send a Commissioner (Kai-whakawa) to stand between us, and let us all join together in inquiring into this dispute. Cease (arbitration) by guns, and now let it be left to in quiry, that a remnant of men may be left.

From RENATA.

O.

To the Editor of the New Zealand Spectator.

Bishop's House, Wellington.

Sir,—I trust that you will allow me through your columns to clear Archdeacon Hadfield of a grave charge brought against him by Mr. Dillon Bell, as reported in the New Zealander of August 8th. He is there stated to have said, "I cannot conceive how any man having the interests of the country at heart, or desiring to serve the Maori race, could withhold these letters (W. King's to Archdeacon Hadfield) from the knowledge of the Governor, how a minister of the gospel, the friend and adviser of this chief, when war was raging, even while blood was being shed (loud cheers), could have preferred keeping them secret only to find a paltry triumph in making them known in this House when it was too late (loud cheers)." It is very characteristic of Archdeacon Hadfield, that in his letters to the editor of the Southern Cross, published in your issue of August 22d, he makes no allusion to so grave a charge. With, the independent dignity of an honourable man, conscious of right, and of a character that places him far beyond the reach of such aspersions, he does not even refer to it. But what such a man will not do for himself, another may be allowed to say for him. The Governor was made acquainted with the fact of "William King having written to the Archdeacon as far back as April last; and the reason of his not having been made sooner acquainted with the letter, is given in the following extract from a letter written by me to His Excellency on the 7th of April, the receipt of which the Governor acknowledged.

"I think you have been misled in the matter of Archdeacon Hadfield's conduct about this Taranaki war. He told me some months back that he wished to write to you about the state of the natives at Taranaki, as he had received a letter from W. King; but as I then expected you and the General Assembly to be here in February or March, I recommended his waiting till you came, and talking the matter over. We had no idea of the sudden coup de main your Excellency was planning, and the proclamation of martial law in the province of Taranaki came upon us before we had any opportunity of remonstrance." The public can now judge for itself of the value of Mr. Dillon Bell's language as quoted above.

I am, Sir, &c. &c.

(Signed) C. F. WELLENGTON.

24th August, 1860.

Analysis.
MY LORD,—Your Lordship is probably aware that, there is a dispute pending between the Colonial Office and the Government of New Zealand, relative to the expenses of the late Maori war.

Your name is identified with the successful foundation, upon sound principles, of a settlement of British colonists in New Zealand, and it is therefore natural to appeal to you in a matter which, while it affects most deeply the interests of our own colony, may have an important bearing-on the general system of the Imperial administration of colonies.

It is my desire to recapitulate to your Lordship the circumstances which have led to the present disagreement, and to expound what I may venture to represent as the Colonial view of the rights of the matter.

It is a cause of great concern to us all to feel that at present the general impression throughout England, as represented in Parliament and by the Press, is very unfavourable to New Zealand. And I fear that a much closer attention must be bespoken to rectify such an impression than that which was needed to form it. But I trust at the same time that a statement carefully made on behalf of the colonists will be listened to with the candid hope of arriving" at the truth on the one hand, and on the other, of securing that vindication of the character of the colonists which their kinsmen of the mother country must desire to see made.

The Case Against the Colony.

By whom charge are made.
An article lately published in the 'Times' newspaper conveniently illustrates the injurious impression to which I have alluded, and nowhere else has the general case against the colony been more strongly or more compendiously stated. I therefore adopt it as representing the darkest picture that can be drawn of our shortcomings; and it is certain that the assertions contained in it, be they true or false, do actually raise all the points in the question.

what the charges are.
The line of argument taken by the writer may be summarized thus:—
That the colonists are responsible for the origin of the native disturbances in New Zealand.
That the hostilities which began in the year 1860, and in which a large force of British troops have been employed, were commenced for the purpose of obtaining land for the benefit of the colonists.
That the troops now quartered in the colony are maintained there for the protection of the settlers.
That the settlers, being protected by others, are unwilling; to exert themselves in their own defence, but desire to throw the whole burden of military operations, conducted for their benefit, on the mother country.
That a state of war is encouraged by the colonists for the sake of the expenditure from the Imperial Treasury which attends it.
That so long as Great Britain at its sole expense supplies the colony with troops the same causes will be in operation and similar effects produced, in the constant outbreak of little wars, to be carried on at the expense of British taxpayers.
That with such an association of facts before it, it is the duty of the Imperial Government, in justice both to itself and the colony, to remove its troops as quickly as possible.
I am not aware that any other argument of any force has been employed, or that those which I have stated could be put more fairly.
If the premisses are true the conclusion must be admitted. But they are entirely untrue; the argument cannot be supported for a moment by any one who will consider the facts, and the conclusion, as it is not fairly arrived at, is mischievous.


The first step towards determining who and Distinction between native and colonial Government.
what caused the native war in New Zealand, and whose the conduct conclusion and cost of it ought to be, will be to consider what has been hitherto the machinery of Government in the colony. To do this I shall venture to trouble you with a brief recapitulation of our political history from the date of the Constitution to the
present day. In the course of this recapitulation, I shall shew that the colonists themselves have been entrusted with the administration of their own affairs, and their own affairs only; and that the Imperial Government has distinctly and jealously retained all along’ in its own hands the control of the native population. I shall more especially point out that this has been no mere theoretical distinction, but a most practical division of administrative government. I shall be the more careful in insisting upon this last point, because I am aware that many persons admit the nominal existence of the distinction, while they slight its importance, and avowedly treat an appeal to it by the colonists as an unhandsome recourse to technicality for the evasion of their legitimate responsibilities.

intention and effect of Constitution act.

The Constitution Act of 1853 conferred full powers of local self-government upon the settlers of New Zealand. It contains express provisions for the benefit of the Maori race, and treats them as a people apart from those on whom the rights of self-government were conferred. One provision of the kind, amongst others, reserves to her Majesty the power of declaring at pleasure "native districts," within which the laws and customs of the aborigines shall remain in force, i.e.:—in which the acts of the Legislature shall be inoperative. Further, a property qualification excludes almost every Maori from the franchise. It follows that, though a Maori might qualify himself for the franchise, and though the acts of the Legislature run nominally all over the Colony, practically it was provided that the Maoris should not govern themselves, and intended that they should not be governed by the colonists. Further, by the reservation of a sum of £7000 on the Civil List for native purposes, a separate government of the race was rendered possible.

But this is not all. It will be said that, whatever may have been the intention of the framers of the Constitution, yet, in fact, the whole power of Government was, by consent of the Imperial authorities, assumed and exercised by the colonists. This was by no means the case. All the functions of administration have been carefully reserved and exercised by the Home Government, as I shall proceed to shew.

During a period of more than 18 months after the coming into operation of the New Zealand constitution—a period of the greatest importance in the political history of the colony—Her Majesty's Government left vacant the office of Governor of the Colony. The administration of all affairs, both European and Maori, was conducted by the senior military officer and the permanent officials of the old regime. The colonists asked for the concession of ministerial responsibility for the management of their own affairs: but this concession Colonel Wyn-yard found himself without power to make. Without this, the mere existence of an elective legislative body was not, it must be admitted, real local self-government: and if not self-government by the colonists in their own affairs, how much less a government of the native race, for which there was no necessity to take votes of money, and in whose case even laws solemnly enacted might be set aside at pleasure.

Local self-government established.

From the first session of the General Assembly, in 1856, which followed the arrival of Governor Gore Browne in 1855, dates, the establishment of complete local self-government by the colonists, three years after the passing of the Constitution Act. The crown officials were then replaced by gentlemen possessing the confidence of the legislature. From this time began the practical application of the theory deductible from the Constitution Act—the division of the Government into two branches, one for the administration of European, the other of Maori affairs. As in the mode of creating and carrying: out this distinction lie the main facts of the case now under discussion, I will narrate the circumstances somewhat in detail, appealing almost exclusively to such sources of information as are readily accessible in this country.

A condition imposed by Home Government.

Governor Browne found that the claim for the Government, establishment of responsible government had been admitted by the Home authorities in a despatch from Sir George Grey, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the acting; Governor, dated 8th Dec. 1854, [Parl. Papers, N. Z., 30 March. 1855, p. 39,] in which is disclaimed "any desire to propose terms or to lay down restrictions on your assent to the" measures which may be necessary for that object, except that of which the necessity appears to be fully recognized by the General Assembly, namely, the mating-provision for certain officers who have accepted their offices on the equitable understanding of their permanence., and who may now be liable to removal." Nor in any other despatch is a reservation suggested on the subject of native affairs.

Governor Browne was therefore not compelled to make any exceptions, when entrusting the administration of the affairs of the Colony to his new advisers. But he did make an exception. He had time before the meeting of the Assembly to mature his opinions and obtain a personal knowledge of the circumstances of the Colony, by a tour through the provinces. Thereupon, on the 14th of February, 1856, two months before meeting the Assembly, he wrote a general report of the state
of the Colony, [Parl. Papers, N.Z., July, 1600, pp. 184-7,] and explained his opinions and intended policy on several subjects. After describing the circumstances from which causes of dissatisfaction between the races might at any moment arise, [§ 30-35,] and which would require, as he said, the utmost circumspection and the most careful management, His Excellency added, (§ 37,) "I shall view with apprehension and object to any attempt to alter the provisions of the 78rd Clause of the Constitution Act, or to bring" the powers therein entrusted to the Governor, in any way under the control of the Assembly."

No reply from Colonial Office.

To this first indication of Governor Browne’s policy it is remarkable that the Secretary of State, in a seemingly careful reply to the despatch, [ib. pp. 4G6-8] does not refer by so much as a single word. But soon Her Majesty's Government were asked to be more explicit.

Formal announcement of Governor's plan.

Governor Browne found that different opinions were entertained as to the meaning of that section of the Constitution Act which reserved to Her Majesty certain exclusive powers in native affairs. As he deemed the subject "of great importance, and one which must affect the relations between the Governor and his responsible advisers," he submitted it for the consideration of the Secretary of State in the following-words, on the 19th March 1856, lb. p. 193]:—

"The view I have taken of the relation which ought to exist between myself and my responsible advisers (when they take office) is, that, as these gentlemen are responsible to the Assembly, I should be guided by their advice in all matters under the control of that body, even when I differ from them in opinion. On matters affecting the Queen's prerogative and imperial interests generally, I should receive their advice; but when I differ from them in opinion, I should, if they desire it, submit their views for your consideration, but adhere to my own until your answer is received.

"Among imperial subjects I include all dealings with the native tribes, more especially in the negotiation of purchases of land. My responsible advisers would probably fix the amount to be expended in any one year in the purchase of land; but at that point their interference should cease.

"The Governor alone is responsible to Her Majesty's Government for the tranquillity of the colony, which would be endangered even by the ordinary and inevitable change of opinion consequent on a change of my advisers. It is also necessary to observe, that though I might be judiciously advised by gentlemen who have lived among the natives, and had experience of their habits and feelings, I should also be liable to advice from gentlemen of great influence who have never resided among them, and from others whose known opinions would, if acted on, plunge the country into war or inextricable difficulties.

"If my views are correct, it is evident that the Chief Land Commissioner and his subordinates must take their orders from me alone. My late Despatches will have satisfied you that in all dealings with the natives the utmost caution and the most careful management are necessary; and if the power of interference with them is confided to gentlemen liable to the pressure of public opinion, and whose tenure of office is dependent on the confidence of a public assembly, it will be impossible to foresee the result."

On the meeting of the General Assembly hi the following month (April, 1856), the Governor addressed himself at once to the organisation of an Executive Council, composed of gentlemen responsible to the Legislature. At once he placed in their hands the following; minute, [lb. p. 209], which is identical in terms with the despatch last quoted:—

**MINUTE.**

April 15, 1856.

The view the Governor takes of the relation between himself and his responsible advisers is as follows:—

1st. In all matters under the control of the Assembly, the Governor should be guided by the advice of gentlemen responsible to that body, whether it is or is not in accordance with his own opinion on the subject in question.

2d. On matters affecting the Queen's prerogative and imperial interests generally, the Governor will be happy to receive then* advice, but when he differs from them in opinion he will (if they desire it) submit their views to the consideration of Her Majesty's Secretary of State, adhering to his own until an answer is received.

Among imperial subjects the Governor includes all dealings with the native tribes, more especially in the negotiation of purchases of land.

He will receive and act on the advice of his responsible advisers in reference to the amount of money they
may desire to have expended in any one year in the purchase of land, but beyond this he considers himself bound to act on his own responsibility.

The Governor alone is responsible to Her Majesty for the tranquillity of the Colony, which would be endangered by the ordinary and inevitable change of opinion consequent on a change in his advisers.

It follows as a necessary consequence of these views, that the Chief Land Purchase Commissioner and his subordinates must take their orders from the Governor alone.

Before giving his assent to Acts passed by Provincial Councils and other matters of a legal nature, the Governor will require the annexed certificate from the Colonial Secretary and Attorney-General; and in approving appointments to vacant offices, he will require to be assured that the gentlemen recommended are fit and eligible for their respective situations.

(Signed) THOMAS GORE BROWNE.
(Signed) HENRY SEWELL.
FREDERICK WHITAKER,

MEMORANDUM.

(a) In explanation of paragraph No. 1, the Governor of course reserves to himself the same constitutional rights in relation to his ministers as are in England practically exercised by the Sovereign.

(b) In further explanation of the same paragraph; he intends by the term "matters under the control of the Assembly," all matters whatever relating to the government of the colony not referred to in paragraph No. 2.

(c) In explanation of paragraph No. 2, the Governor refers to Clauses 19, 20, and 21 of the Royal Instructions accompanying his Commission, which oblige him as a general rule to take advice in all matters with his Executive Council. He considers such rule as applying to the subjects referred to in paragraph No. 2, and he will not object (having the Queen's sanction to that effect) to limit the members of the Executive Council to his responsible ministers.

(d) In explanation of the 4th paragraph, the Governor would observe, that he feels no objection to the House of Representatives defining the specific lands to be purchased, it being, however, understood, that it is not to be compulsory on the Governor to make purchases, if in his opinion political reasons render it inexpedient to do so.

Assent of colonists to plan.

The terms of this minute were assented to by the Assembly. The condition required by the Secretary of State was satisfied by the passing; of an Act pensioning-the Crown Officials; and the Governor's conditions were accepted by both Houses and by the Ministry, though not willingly or hopefully.

Approval of Colonial office.

I call attention to the reason given by Governor Browne (in par. 3 of his despatch above quoted) for reserving the control of native matters. This reason is reproduced, as the chief among several, by Mr. Secretary Labouchere, in reply [lb. p. 461]. Her Majesty's Government, when for the first and last time for some years they spoke on the subject, said as follows:—

"After the best consideration which they can give to the subject, Her Majesty's Government approve of the principles by which you propose to conduct yourself in relation to the affairs of the natives, and which they find laid down with sufficient clearness in your Minute of the 15th April last, and the Memorandum annexed. They consider that, notwithstanding all the respect due to the principle of responsible government, the management of native affairs should remain for the present mainly in the hands of a Governor responsible for it to the Crown. They are of opinion that the circumstances which justify this decision are the terms of the Constitution itself, which withhold this subject in great measure (as regards the land dealings) from the control of the Local Legislature, to which the Local Executive is responsible; the still subsisting or apprehended danger in certain parts of New Zealand; the necessity arising from this danger for maintaining in the Colony a large force at the expense of the mother country, a force of which the discipline control, and application must remain in the hands of the Governor, as a servant of the Crown; the large amount of the native contributions to the local revenue (as shown by yourself), while from unavoidable circumstances they remain almost unrepresented in the Legislature; and the fact that the mass of the native population is found in one or two provinces only, while the greater part of the European community, with preponderating influence in the Legislature, has in reality no direct concern with native affairs.

"You are therefore fully authorized to act, until further instructions, on the principles there laid down, and assented to in April last by your responsible advisers. If you should at any time find it in your power to carry into effect the provision, of the Constitution for setting apart native districts, it is plain that a considerable step would be made towards the solution of this difficulty. But this is not a subject on which Her Majesty's
Government feel themselves justified in prescribing any course to you, as your conduct must needs depend on local circumstances."

The main reason thus urged by the Governor and
Reasons for reserving control of natives.

endorsed by the Secretary of State for reserving of the most important functions of Government from the control of the colonists was admitted by the latter to be a sufficient reason, and because of it they submitted to the terms imposed [vide 'Minute of Ministers,' ib. p. 363]. The three parties, therefore—the Secretary of State, the Governor, and the colonists—agreed to the control of native affairs being reserved by the Imperial Government, because that Government held itself responsible for the provision and maintenance of a warlike force, should, as was always possible, the conduct of the natives require the exhibition of force.

I am bound to express my conviction, one in which a great number if not all of the colonists have agreed, both before and since the war, that this reservation was a most unfortunate act, highly injurious to all the three parties to it. The action of the Colonial Ministry has been all along a standing-protest against its adoption and continuance. But this point must be considered separately.

As Mr. Secretary Labouchere had a short time previously (on the 28th November 1855) written a despatch [ib. p. 451] requiring the colonists to provide such additional means as might be needed for their own defence, and repeated this caution in the later despatch first quoted, it seems evident that he contemplated as possible a necessity for employing additional troops against the natives for other objects than the defence of the settlers. If he did, his foresight has been entirely justified.

Plan modified.

Governor Browne's plan of native government was not entirely satisfactory, even at first, to the Legislature. Very quickly it was found that serious inconveniences arose from the erection of a double government in the colony, and from the ignorance in which the Ministry, who were expected to inform the Legislature, were kept of the proceedings of the Governor's advisers and servants in native affairs. A slight change was accordingly made. [See Letters and Memoranda, ib. pp. 360, 364]. The papers respecting native affairs were now ordered to pass through the hands of a Minister, on their way from the Native Secretary to the Governor. But this Secretary was not to be appointed or removable by, or subordinate to, the Ministry, and was to communicate personally with the Governor. Ministers, in fact, were informed of what was being done, and that was all.

At this time, also, the office of Native Secretary was combined with that of Chief Commissioner for the Purchase of Native Lands, and the two departments were more or less amalgamated. This combination was made by His Excellency, owing to the high qualities of Mr. McLean, who previously held the latter office only; but it is certain that it resulted injuriously to the cause of law and order among the Maori race, by presenting the Crown to them chiefly as a bargainer for their land.

That Governor Browne took every step with
Firmness of the Governor.

deliberate reference to the rule which he had laid down, is quite evident from the facts. He had fortified himself with the opinions of a large number of clergymen and others, long resident among the Maoris, to the effect that it was not safe to trust the Government of the race to a changing and indifferent body of men. Indeed, all through the negotiations with the Legislature, as well as in the practical administration of affairs, he exhibited a firmness of purpose, a careful adherence to his plan, and a consistent reliance, in native affairs, on his own opinion and on that of his chosen advisers in preference to that of his responsible Ministers, which contrasts remarkably with his complete acceptance of a constitutional position in all matters relating to the colonists. That Governor Browne planned and carried out most exactly, for several years, this most difficult system of the double government, ought to be a complete refutation of the assertion which has been made, that after all, in the serious matter of going to war, he weakly departed from his principles, and yielded to the solicitations of interested colonists. He listened to the advice of his Executive Council, as he was bound to do, but never deferred to it in native matters. Here he held himself alone responsible, and never sought to throw that responsibility on any other person. He had the firmness which springs from a clear perception of duty.

Plan re-enunciated.

It is desirable, before closing this enquiry as to the theory of native government in New Zealand, to shew that the opinions of Governor Gore Browne and the Home Government did not change during the period which followed the first few years of its practical experiment. After the session held in 1858, the last which took place before the outbreak at Taranaki, occasion arose (to be hereafter noticed) for a fresh enunciation of the principles of government. Governor Browne, in a despatch to the Secretary of State, dated 14th October, 1858, defines his practice as follows—"I admit the right of the Assembly to legislate in the manner it thinks proper, reserving to myself the right of veto, as provided for by the Constitution Act. I retain to myself the executive and administrative part of native affairs, admitting my responsible advisers to full information, and granting them tie right to advise me, but reserving to myself the right to act upon my own judgment, when I differ from
them."—[Parl. Papers, 27 July, 1860, p. 19.] This is the announcement of the constitutional relations between
the Governor and the colonists in native affairs, made by the Representative of Her Majesty's Government in
the colony, after two years' experience of the actual working of those relations; and it must be carefully noted
that no innovations had crept m during the period. Nor did the Imperial Government
And re-confirmed
yet see reason to alter its mind. Lord Car-narvon, writing for the Secretary of State in reply to the Governor, on
the 18th May, 1859, states his conviction to be, not that the colonists had not both the desire and the capacity to
advance the well-being of the natives, but that—" circumstances do not yet justify the Imperial Government in
abdicating the responsibilities which at present rest upon it with regard to that remarkable race."—[lb. p. 171.]
In the same despatch he proceeds:—
"If, indeed, the Imperial Government were prepared to depart from the arrangements already sanctioned,
and to transfer the management of native affairs from the Governor, acting under instructions from this
country, and through a staff of permanent officers, to an officer responsible to the colonists, and changing with
the Government, it might he considered that the system of land purchase from the natives was to be decided
upon by colonial and not Imperial authority. But this view of the subject I am not able to accept. Her Majesty's
Government wish to give the fullest effect to the system of responsible Government, and to leave all questions of
domestic and internal interest to be decided by the Colonial Government; but they cannot, either for the sake of
the colonists or for that of the natives, or for Imperial interests, surrender the control over native affairs, the
administration of which has been, up to the present time, considering the difficulties and intricacies of the
subject, crowned with a very remarkable success, and is paving the way towards that complete civilization and
consolidation of the native race with the English colonists, which Her Majesty's Government, not less than the
local Government, desire to see effected. And whilst Her Majesty's Government feel themselves constrained to
justify to Parliament the large expense which every year is incurred for the maintenance of a military force in
New Zealand for the defence of the colony, and for the better control and regulation of the native race, they
must retain in their hands the administration of those affairs which at any moment may involve the employment
of those troops, and the consequences of an expensive conflict."—[lb. p. 173.]
Importance of foregoing facts.
I have dwelt at length on this period, because here are to be found the main facts which must determine, not
only by whom, but how, the natives of New Zealand were governed for some years before the late war, and
which therefore can alone fix a real responsibility, whether incurred technically or morally, for the outbreak and
its consequences upon anyone.

Practice of Administration in Native Affairs.

Having quoted the repeated enunciations by the
Examples taken from points of difference.
Imperial Government itself of the doctrine of exclusive responsibility in native affairs, I proceed to
illustrate by a few examples the method by which it has carried that doctrine into practice. For that purpose I
shall take cases where the Governor and his responsible advisers differed in opinion: not only because they are
naturally the only cases which have been' worth recording in despatches, but because no number of instances of
agreement of opinion between two powers can place beyond doubt which was the superior, or with which
rested the responsibility of action.
The course which the administration of affairs practically took after 1856 agreed exactly with the special
policy of the Governor. Action or inaction was in his hands "in all matters affecting Imperial interests,
including all dealings with the native tribes, more especially in the negotiation of the purchase of lands." The
system of double government early became irksome to the colonial half of the administration; yet there was no
perceptible personal
Willingness of colonists to cooperate with Governor.
irritation between the Governor and his Ministers, or the party which supported the Ministry in either
branch of the Legislature. There was necessarily some antagonism, but no such conflict as to lead the
Legislature into deliberate acts of obstruction to the Governor's policy, such as no doubt were at any time
within their power. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence of the readiness of both Houses to lend their
assistance in a liberal spirit, if not always as approving-that policy which was beyond their reach, or in a way to
gain his Excellency's cordial approbation.
Grants of money for native purposes.
It has sometimes been asserted that the Government of the natives was in the first instance reserved to the
Crown, and the administration of it subsequently impeded, by the illiberality of the colonists in matters of
supply. I will not go so far as to say that Governor Gore Browne did not encounter any difficulties in this respect, but I will proceed to shew that in the main his needs for purposes connected with the natives were fairly and even generously provided for by the colonists.

I have stated that the sum of £7000 a year had been reserved on the Civil List for native purposes, and was deducted without question from the Colonial revenues. But as early as 1855-1856, I find that an additional sum of £8762. 7s 6d was expended solely for native purposes. A provision for the same purposes for 1856-1857 was granted by the Assembly of £14,872 in all. In 1858, the Legislature voted a permanent yearly grant of £7000, to supplement the Civil List, besides removing various native charges, formerly defrayed from the latter fund, on to the list of ordinary appropriations. These grants were exclusive, of course, of such share of the general expenditure as may represent the benefit derived by the Maori population from the ordinary civil government, from roads, posts, jetties, and other public works and undertakings, provided out of common funds, of which the natives make no little use. It must be added that returns of the land purchase operations shew that of the whole outlay at this time about one-third was expended upon the staff, the members of which had become by the amalgamation of the departments, more or less, for good or evil, representatives of the Imperial Government among the Maoris.

Governor Browne, in 1856, estimated the contributions

of the Maori people towards the general revenues at £51,000 for the ensuing year. For the same year, when it was over, the Colonial Treasurer calculated that those contributions had amounted to a little over £17,000.

These two estimates (for they partake of the same character), can as little be reconciled as other contradictory opinions upon native affairs. The grounds of each estimate are given at full length. At least the colonists did not propose to themselves any gain from the taxation of the native race. The Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Richmond, states as the conclusion of an elaborate calculation, from which he educes the result above mentioned:—"The practical conclusion is, that in those years in which the demand for native produce has brought the Aborigines large profits in the European markets, and in which they have consequently largely availed themselves of the advantages of a civilized state, their contributions to the revenue have constituted a fair, but not it would seem more than a fair equivalent; whilst in years of slack demand, those contributions do not probably exceed the sum returned to them in direct and exclusive governmental benefits." [Parl. Papers, 27 July, 1860, p. 35.]

Legislation for native purposes.

The important session of 1858 is the only one by which the policy of the colonists towards the Aborigines may fairly be judged; for it was the first session after the establishment of a responsible Government, and it was the last that was free from the excitement of civil war. The "native" legislation of 1838 consisted of five acts—for the constitution and regulation of "native districts"—for the administration of justice in those districts—for the support and management of native schools—for the colonization of mixed settlements—and for the recognition of aboriginal title to land in such a manner as to give to individual natives, under conditions, the rights incident to landed property. To all of these but the last the Governor was a consenting party. But the "Native Territorial. Rights Bill," as the last was termed, contained provisions

Difference of opinion.

to which he could not agree. Among other objections and the chief of all was that, not the Governor, but the "Governor in Council," was empowered to act. The Council consisted of the colonial responsible advisers. It is surely most important to notice that this attempt by the colonists to obtain power in the administration of native affairs was promptly resisted by the Governor, as contrary to the principles which had been accepted on both sides. Because also the effect of the hill would be to do away with the pre-emption of the Crown over native lands, and to introduce a system of direct purchase by individuals, it was deemed in the highest degree dangerous to the peace of the country. For other reasons the measure was considered unjust to the Maori. The Governor was not called upon to exercise his right of veto, a provision within the bill itself reserving it for Her Majesty's assent. But a similarly independent course was taken; His Excellency forwarded the bill, and Colonists defeated.

begged the Secretary of State to advise the Queen to refuse her assent to it, which was done. [See Despatches from the Colony, Nos. 1—6, with enclosures; and to the Colony, No. 1; in Parl. Papers, N.Z. 17 July, 1860.] The course taken by Governor Browne arose entirely from his sense of separate responsibility; it would have been impossible under any other system than that of the double Government. It proves both that Imperial Representative carried out the doctrine of exclusive responsibility into practice, and that when any act of the colonists seemed to infringe upon that doctrine he was able to defeat the attempt.

Question not of merit.

The temptation to enter into the merits of the questions at issue in the "Territorial Rights Bill" must be resisted. It is enough for my present purpose to show that a constitutional conflict arose, and that the Imperial
Government defeated the colonists. I think further that a perusal of the Blue Book will show that the contest was one of argument only, temperate and fair; and that the colonists attempted to bring no undue pressure to bear upon the Governor.

Another difference.

Another important example of the same kind is on record. I regret that the Parliamentary Papers which I have been able to consult do not furnish me with all the documents, and that I must therefore refer to the printed papers of the Colonial Assembly, which are not so accessible in this country. But the facts which I wish to recall are too well known to require specific proof, I refer to the policy with which the 'King' movement among the Waikato tribes was treated in its earlier development. [See Report of 'Waikato Committee'—Appendix to Journals, Home of Representatives, N.Z., 1860; pp.

The king movement.

111 to129.] This movement was regarded by the Colonial Ministry of the time as indicating a desire for law and order, that is for a stronger government than then ruled those tribes. The Governor's special advisers in native affairs, on the other hand, considered the movement to be merely one of trifling local and evanescent consequence, originating in the ambition and restlessness of the young men who desired to rival the older chiefs. At a later date, the movement either assumed or was recognised for the first time as possessing the character of a widespread organisation for procuring the absolute independence of the Maori race. But in 1858, though there had been already much reason for studying the symptoms of the movement, politicians had not advanced beyond the first two opinions, between which they were divided—the representatives of the colony on one side, those of the Imperial Government on the other. The Resident Magistrate at the head-quarters of the movement, Mr. Fenton, held the first opinion, and was energetic in his attempts to guide what he thought a movement in favour of law and order to a safe and legitimate result, by bringing English Government within reach of the natives in a shape adapted to their customs. In these efforts he was supported by the Ministry, who tendered their advice to his Excellency

Responsible and irresponsible advice.

accordingly. The Governor however, true to his rule, did not suffer himself to be guided by this advice, even though he might at first approve of it. He sought counsel from the head of the native department, whom he was justified in assuming to have a more exact knowledge of the history, and a more intimate understanding of the designs of the Maori people. He acted upon the opinion entertained by these gentlemen, that Mr. Fenton's policy was alienating the old chiefs, in whom confidence ought to be placed; that to treat the movement as important was to make it so; and that to neglect it was the only safe treatment. Mr. Fenton was therefore recalled from the Waikato: the work that he had begun was undone, and the King Movement was left to itself. It is of no importance for the present argument, whether the colonial policy were right or wrong; possible neither may have been the right one. But every one must confess that no more important question than this could have been presented for solution to those holding the reins of government, even though peace had never afterwards been broken; and that the positive rejection of the advice tendered on the part of the colony on this occasion, and the deliberate undoing of the work of which the Ministry approved, remove from the latter any sort of responsibility for whatever consequences may be traceable to the progress of the King Movement.

Conclusion to be drawn.

It must now be conceded that both in the theory of native government and in the administration of its functions, as well legislative as executive, the Imperial Government has rigidly reserved from the Colony, and to itself, all real power.

Governor's attitude towards his advisers.

It must be admitted also that Governor Browne, during the period preceding the first indications of a Maori outbreak, shewed no want of firmness in his purpose, suffered no departure from established rule, and exhibited no symptoms of weakness before an antagonistic legislature. On the other hand he was on excellent terms with his colonial advisers. And he observed what he took to be the spirit and letter of the Constitution as completely to permit the self-governments of the colonists in their own affairs as he did to prevent their interference in matters relating to the native population. Where, in the latter case he and his advisers differed, as their advice was not put to the test of practice, it is impossible to say that they were more often right than he. And it is as little likely that he was ever induced by jealousy of them to take an opposite view as that he submitted to their view through carelessness. I assert this, not that any words of mine can raise or lower Colonel Gore Browne's character, but because a true view of his relations with his advisers and the colonists is necessary to a proper understanding of the question at issue.
Moral Responsibility for the War.

It is no doubt sufficient for the purpose of fixing
Colonists will not evade responsibility.
on the Imperial Government complete technical responsibility for the late Maori outbreak and its consequences, to have shewn the complete exclusion of the colonists from control over matters affecting the native race; an exclusion not more perfect while New Zealand was a Crown colony than after the rights of self-government were conferred upon its white inhabitants. But the settlers of New Zealand are not so changed by a few years' absence from the mother country as to evade any responsibility that may be morally theirs because they can prove it to be technically another's. They hold fast by the doctrine that a Government is bound to maintain order among1 and to protect those whom it governs, and to provide any force that may be required for these purposes. Yet they will not shelter themselves under that doctrine if they have themselves caused or contributed to a breach of the peace which requires force to repress it or if they have been the means of inducing; the governing" power to take steps which have brought about a mischievous result; or even if without their consent or interference any act involving the employment of force has been done either solely or chiefly for their benefit If the colonists have been partly a cause of the disturbances in. New Zealand, it is certain that they are proportionately responsible for the consequences; but the burden of proof that this was so lies now with the other side. The common notion that the colonists are answerable because the affair happened in the colony cannot be sustained.

How responsibility might be divided.
If the New Zealand war has been the result of bad government of the natives, it is only one of many excuses for those whose duty it was to govern well to say that the colonists by their acts made government difficult. If it be argued that the Government was overborne by a pressure from without, and so urged into a mistaken policy, that at most is but an attempt to divide the responsibility. If, again, an injudicious anxiety on the part of the Government to benefit the colonists be put forward as a main cause of the war, the suggestion only imputes blame to those who so little understood what was the best way of performing their peculiar duty. Now the charge against the colonists of complicity in the war takes one or other of these three forms, or is compounded of them in various proportions. Yet it can be shewn that neither as a body nor through their representatives have the colonists taken such a part in bringing about the native disturbances as can cast upon them a real responsibility for the consequences. To shew this it is not necessary to go into any minute detail or to examine any doubtful evidence on the subject. The case of the colonists in this respect, as is the former, rests on broad facts and obvious inferences.

In the year 1853 the Maori tribes were perfectly
State of natives in 1853.
peaceful throughout the colony. In 1860 the war began. All the progressive symptoms of disaffection as well as its more immediate causes are to be sought for during the intervening period. At the end of the former year, Governor Sir George Grey left the colony. His policy towards then natives may be called distinctively one of conciliation, but was not unaccompanied by the operations of active government. Resident magistrates were administering justice in native districts. Arms and warlike stores were denied to the aborigines. Land purchase operations were conducted with great caution. Maori land was offered to Government more freely than funds could be provided for the purchase. And the tribes were in a singular state of peace among themselves. [See Parl Papers, N. Z., July 1860, p. 28.]

Carelessness of Government.
At this time, as before stated, the Colonial Office left shew Zealand without a Governor for eighteen months; and then Governor Gore Browne was appointed. Throughout the seven years which ended with the war, the Papers laid before Parliament shew that no advice as to dealings with the natives was offered by Her Majesty's Government. There are certain formal despatches expressing a simple approval of the Governor's acts and views as detailed by himself. And there are parts of two despatches, already quoted, commanding him to reserve all control over native affairs to the. Crown. But the Colonial Office took no part of this control on itself, and left the government of the natives, which it deemed so delicate and important a duty, to the unassisted discretion of its representative in the colony. The task was thrown upon the Governor, but surely all responsibility was not so got rid of.

A new policy.
Before Governor Browne's time, serious difficulties had already arisen. Governor Grey's processes of conciliation and government had been discontinued together. Hostilities had sprung up between two parties of natives near Taranaki, and they had been dealt with after a new policy which may be distinctively called one of non-interference. One example among many may be quoted. Katatore quarrelled with Rawiri, killed him, and
was left to the vengeance of the murdered man's friends. (See below, p. 39). The two men were intimate with
the Europeans, and justice might easily have been done. But it had come to be deemed no part of the duty of the
Government to do justice between native and native. For the origin of this policy see Acting-Governor
Wynyard's despatches, 2nd November, 1854, and 5th February, 1855. [Papers, March, 1860, pp. 58, 71]. This
policy, and the departmental staff which transacted native affairs, were Governor Browne's inheritance. The
amalgamation of the native governing department with that of land purchase, which took place in 185G, has
been already mentioned. Government was less efficiently conducted and land purchases were less satisfactorily
effected after this step. Promises of hospitals, schools, further payments out of the proceeds of land sales, and
other advantages, which had been made to natives when they ceded their land, were forgotten or disregarded.
At the same time the restrictions on the disposal of arms and ammunition were relaxed. The natives became

Its consequences.

almost absolved from control. Dislike to a Government which appeared to them a mere bargainer for their
property, joined to a deep-rooted jealousy of European advancement into their territory, roused many to oppose
any further cession of lands. At the same time the want of any governing and restraining power from without
moved many thoughtful men among them to attempt the constitution of some authority over themselves from
within. The two objects harmonized, and were allied to a thoroughly natural desire for the independence of the
race. Though many who aimed at more practical objects were far from desiring to overthrow the Queen's
nominal sovereignty within their borders, many others of the ambitious and reckless classes urged on the
agitation towards this end. The Land League first, and then the (King' movement, were the result. This was the
movement the treatment of which by the Government has been already described. It was left alone, in the hope
that it would die out, but it spread and grew and soon bore plentiful fruit.

Irritation of natives not against settlers.

It was at this time, if at all, that the settlers could be charged with stirring up discontent among the natives,
making Government difficult, and so contributing to the coming outbreak. But it is remarkable that no feeling
of hostility was ever manifested by the natives towards the colonists. The two races continued on the most
friendly terms privately, and even in spite of exceptional though frequent, annoyances from individual Maoris,
which the law was unable to punish, the settlers in outlying districts remained guiltless of any misconduct. It
cannot be maintained, therefore, for an instant, that the settlers irritated the natives and provoked them to a
breach of the peace. But if it be said that Government was rendered difficult by false reports, inconsiderate
suggestions, and comments injurious to the authorities circulating through the press, these cannot be altogether
denied, though their influence may be doubted. The difficulty is one which constantly besets a free
Government, and is the price which it pays for at least an equivalent support and sympathy from its more
thoughtful subjects.

It must be remembered that the agitation called
Agitation against Government.

the King movement was attended by no violence, by no exhibition of forcible resistance to constituted
authority, nor even by the display of any such intention. It was confined to the strong tribes in the Waikato
district, in the interior of the island. The natives in other districts were either still submissive to the
Government, or were influenced similarly with the "Waikato tribes without their organization. The latter state
of feeling prevailed in the province of Taranaki, where for several years the peace of the country had been
broken by feuds between a minority of natives desirous of selling, and a majority whose object was to prevent
sales of land to the Government.

Early in the year 1859 Governor Browne visited Taranaki. What happened there is described in a
Parliamentary Blue Book entitled "Papers relating to the recent Disturbances in New Zealand," presented by
command, March, 1861, from which I shall quote.

The Governor, finding the settlers at Taranaki
Taranaki Governor and settlers.

very desirous for more land, assured them of his earnest desire to meet their views, when he could
extinguish the native title to land satisfactorily, and without compromising the neutrality which he had
determined to observe in all native quarrels, [p. 1.] No language could be calmer on one side or more cautious
on the other than that which is recorded as having passed between them. There is no evidence that the settlers
were as yet unduly urgent upon the Governor, or that he gave way in any degree to solicitations from without.
Governor and natives.

The Governor after meeting" the settlers had an interview with the natives; and here we approach the
immediate origin of the war. It is necessary to observe carefully what the opinions and intentions recorded at
the time were, for subsequent explanations of motives may be thought open to suspicion as influenced by the
event.

Land negotiations.
The Governor says in his despatch of March 29, 1859, (pp. 1, 2) as follows:—

"After this a chief, named Teira, offered some land for sale, which he and his relatives desired to dispose of to the Government, and which, as being situated at the mouth of the Waitara river, on the south bank, will be a valuable acquisition to the province. He pressed for an immediate answer, and I replied that if he could give a satisfactory title I would accept his offer. Another chief rose to object, but when, asked if he had any claim to the land, admitted that he had not. William King then rose, and while asserting no claim to it, said he would never permit that land to be sold; then, waving his hand to his people, he and they left the meeting with some want of courtesy to myself.

"Since then progress has been made in ascertaining Teira's right to dispose of the land (of which there seems to be little doubt), and, if proved, the purchase will be completed. Should this be the case it will probably lead to the acquisition of all the land south of the Waitara river, which is essentially necessary for the consolidation of the province, as well as for the use of the settlers.

"It is also most important to vindicate our right to purchase from those who have both the right and the desire to sell.

"The right to sell land belonging to themselves without interference on the part of other chiefs (not having a claim to share in it) is fully admitted by Maori custom; any recognition of such a power as that assumed by William King would therefore be unjust to both races, because it would be the means of keeping millions of acres waste and out of cultivation. I have, however, little fear that William King will venture to resort to violence to maintain his assumed right; but I have made every preparation to enforce obedience should he presume to do so. Copies of the instructions I have given to both the civil and military authorities are herewith enclosed.

"I found the settlers extremely anxious that favour should be shown to Ihaiah, the chief with whom William King is at feud, and who has always been a firm friend to the English. His quarrel with King is chiefly because the latter has some claim on the land which he desires to sell, and which King will neither yield nor sell.

"I have, however, declared my firm determination to remain entirely neutral in this and all other Native feuds, and to purchase no land without the consent of all who have a claim on it."

Governor's declaration.

And that portion of his address to the natives (enclosed in the despatch) which bears on the subject was as follows:—

"The Governor then said, he had but two subjects on which he desired to speak particularly to the tribes living near Taranaki, and they were,—First, in reference to criminal offences; second, in reference to land. He wished these subjects to be considered separately, and as having no sort of reference to each other. He observed that the tribes in the vicinity of Taranaki have greater advantages than most others, as they are much intermixed with the Pakeha, and ought to profit by their intercourse with them. If they chose to live peaceably and cultivate their lands they would grow rich and multiply, instead of which they were constantly at war with each other, and their numbers were decreasing. Their disputes were almost always about matters of little or no importance, or about land which was not worth quarrelling for. The Governor then said that he had been in New Zealand when Katatore slew Rawiri, he would have had him arrested and brought before the Judge, and, if the Judge had sentenced him to be hanged, he would have caused him to be hanged; that he had not thought proper to arrest Ihaiah, because though the murders to which he was a party were horrible and disgraceful, yet they admitted of some extenuation, inasmuch as they were committed in retribution for the murder of Rawiri. All this, however, now belongs to the past; but, for the future, he had determined that every man (whether he be Maori or Pakeha) who may commit any violence or outrage within the European boundaries shall be arrested and taken before the Judge, and the sentence of the Judge, whatever it may be, shall be carried into effect. He was determined that the peace of the settlers should no longer be disturbed by evil-doers, and that those Maoris who are not content to live in peace among the Pakehas had better go elsewhere. Id reference to the second subject, the Governor said he thought the Maoris would be wise to sell the land they cannot use themselves, as it would make what they could use more valuable than the whole; but that he never would consent to buy land without an undisputed title. He would not permit any one to interfere in the sale of land unless he owned part of it; and, on the other hand, he would buy no man's land without his consent,"

[pp. 3, 4.]

Governor Browne evidently had the circumstances of the then late native feud in that district strongly impressed on his mind at the time of this address. These circumstances are sufficiently remarkable to be briefly mentioned; the more so, that they illustrate the case that was just about to arise.

In the time of Acting-Governor Wynyard, a piece
Lesson taught by previous case.

of land at Taranaki bad been offered to the Land Purchase Department by a native named Rawiri and his friends. Preliminaries being arranged, and it being known that another part of natives would oppose the sale, the
Government officer did not undertake the survey, but sent the fellers themselves to lay out the block. "When the survey party went about their work, the opposing natives, headed by their chief Katatore, fired upon them and killed Rawiri. The Government refused to interfere. A bitter feud sprang up between the two parties, lasting several years; during which among other atrocities, Ihaia, the friend of deceased Kawiri, plotted and effected the death of the murderer Katatore. [Parl. Papers, July, 1860, pp. 41,72, et seq.]

Governor's intentions.
The Governor as we have seen expressed his views upon Teira's offer at once. He placed first on record an opinion on the point whether the land was worth purchasing at a price for general purposes: secondly, a desire that as much land as possible should be removed from being the subject of native quarrels: and thirdly, a determination that, if Teira should prove the real owner, no self-constituted authority should interfere to rob him of his right to sell and receive the value. Therefore the investigation was ordered to proceed.

Investigation of land title.
With the nature of the investigation and the decision arrived at I have no concern, further than that the colonists, from the Ministry downwards, had nothing to say to it; they could not control the officers of the department nor interfere in any way with their work. The decision was to be arrived at on the responsibility of the Imperial Government alone, and therefore the enquiry was left in the hands of its own officers. The investigation was completed by January 1860, and resulted in favour of Teira's claim.

Approval of Home Government—silence of settlers.
By this time the intentions of the Governor had been submitted to and approved of by the Secretary of State (p. 259). The settlers had made no demonstration whatever. If they wanted the land they had at least self-control enough to leave the Governor and the department to the execution of their duties. If it be asserted that any pressure was "brought by the settlers to have the title to the land at the Waitara declared good for purchasing;", the assertion is not true.
The Governor then, satisfied of Teira's right,
Preparation for force; and reason.
paid part of the purchase money and ordered a survey (p. 5). Even at that time he so far expected opposition as to prepare for the display of force. It is most important to note that in this very first mention of force the Governor gives his reason for proposing to employ it. He says—"Though always ready to consider every reasonable objection, I am not the less determined to enforce Her Majesty's right to deal with her own subjects without hindrance from any one not having a legitimate interest in the transaction." The desirability of obtaining a good bit of land, which was a good reason amongst others for entering upon the negotiation, was no reason, actual or professed, for the employment of force. Governor Browne henceforth stated his motive to be the assertion of Her Majesty's authority. The bit of land might be the occasion but it was not to be the cause of war.

Having satisfied himself of the correctness of Approval of Colonial Ministry.
Teira's title to the land, and believing that the right to sell would be opposed by the chief, Wiremu Kingi, Governor Browne consulted the Executive Council, which included the members of the Colonial Ministry. The minutes of the meeting are on record (p. 6,) and shew that the views of the Governor were fully concurred in by the Council. The determination was taken to survey the land to support the survey by a military force if necessary; to hold the land in the same way and in the event of serious opposition to call out the militia and volunteers, and to proclaim martial law in the district.

Their reasons for supporting the war.
It is not necessary to explain the concurrence of the Ministry in this determination. The facts speak for themselves. The Governor had in his own person, a year previously, taken the first steps in the matter, foreseeing-the issue which had now come about. He now took the opinion of his Council, as he was bound to do, and it agreed with his own. There is no doubt about what his own opinion had been all along and there is as little doubt that had his own opinion been otherwise, and had his Council recommended this course, e meromotu, he would have been as little induced to give way to them as he had been on all former occasions. This was one of many instances, no doubt, of unanimity in opinion. In the present instance it was clearly arrived at by the acquiescence of the Ministry and not by any yielding of the Governor. Whether the determination thus taken was the wisest possible, or an error of judgment on both sides, does not alter their relative positions in any degree. There is no evidence that the Colonial ministry did more than adopt the Governor's plan. They cordially supported his Excellency in asserting the Queen's authority; hoping that the question of sovereignty might be deter-mined once for all, and order restored and maintained to the ultimate advantage (f both races. That I am not imagining motives for the Ministry

Statement by Colonial Treasurer.
is shewn by the following passages from Mr. C. W. Richmond's minute of May 35, 186(, the whole of
which is worth reading:

"The insinuation that the war is one of aggrandisement, that it is undertaken for the sake of acquiring territory, is quite untrue. The proceedings which hive led to it were under the immediate superintendence am" control of the Governor. His Excellency will confirm the statement that those proceedings were not, at any stage, urged upon him, or so much as suggested to him, by Ms responsible Ministers. Nor was there, previously to the commencement of the war, any manifestation of public feeling on the subject of the dispute between the Governor and Wm. King. It would be absurd to suppose that his Excellency could be actuated by the motive imputed. And it must appear almost equally improbable, to any person who calmly reflects on the matter, that the colonists, or their representatives, should willingly incur the risks and submit to the sacrifices of a Maori war for the sake of a few hundreds of acres in the least important province of New Zealand. Other motives must be sought for to explain the general support which his Excellency has received in the colony upon the present occasion." * * * *

"On behalf of their fellow settlers, his Excellency's Ministers would represent to Her Majesty's Imperial Government, that the grand desire of the British colonists in respect to the natives is, not the appropriation of the native territory, still less the destruction of the race, but it is to see the Maori people rendered amenable, in their dealings with the settlers, to British law. The restless instinct of progress, the love of wealth, the hatred of race, are all no doubt motives at work in the country, and against the indulgence or the excess of these strong passions the Government is bound to be upon its guard. But stronger, and more universal, and more inevitable than all these feelings, is the desire which animates the public mind, that all the inhabitants of New Zealand should be subjected, in their mutual dealings, to the control of one equal law. This is a natural and praiseworthy desire, and, if duly regulated, must be conducive to the good as much of the natives as of the colonists," * * * *

"It is because the decisive action of his Excellency the Governor appears to the colonists adapted ultimately to secure this great and happy result, that they are not merely reconciled to the heavy present sacrifices it entails upon them, but prepared to give the Imperial Government their most active support in suppressing the existing rebellion. His Excellency's responsible Ministers concur in this general opinion and determination, and now express their expectation that his Excellency's policy, though beset with, unavoidable and accumulated difficulty, will be recognized and supported as neither unwise nor unjust, nor likely to prove disastrous to either race, but that it will be seen to have been, on the contrary, dictated by a due regard to the welfare of New Zealand and the dignity of the Crown, and of necessity to have been in strict accordance with those just principles which have hitherto regulated the conduct of the British Government in these islands."

[pp. 52, 53.]

Beginning and progress of war.

The rest of the story may be briefly told. On the 20th of February, 1860, the survey of Teira's land was attempted by a small unarmed party, under the orders of the District Land Purchase Commissioner, but was put a stop to by a crowd of Kingi's people. The Governor himself came to Taranaki in consequence, He warned Kingi and all the natives not to attempt to oppose his orders. He finally determined to carry the survey by a military force, and on the 5th of March troops were moved down to the spot from the town of New Plymouth. The next day a small pa (fortification of palisades) was erected by the opposing natives, and some carts carrying; supplies were stopped by them on the road. But on summons the pa was evacuated, and the carts were allowed to pass. The survey was completed, and the boundaries marked out. On the night of the 15th of March, another pa was erected by the insurgents on the purchased land, and the survey sticks pulled up and burnt. On the 17th a summons was sent to the occupants of the new pa, but it was not listened to. Fire was accordingly opened by the troops, and on the 18th the pa was evacuated by the insurgents (pp.21, 22). This was the actual beginning of the war. Kingi obtained reinforcements, and so did the troops; the fighting; went on with little advantage, if any, on the side of the military. Further reinforcements quickly came over from Australia, and Kingi sought and obtained the help of the powerful Waikato tribes, by joining the King movement and handing over the land in dispute to be dealt with by the Maori Confederation. The war now became a national contest, and soon there was scarcely a district in the island where the natives could be relied upon as certain to remain friendly. The consequences exist to this day.

Home Government approve of the war.

The proceedings of Governor Browne in going to war and in prosecuting" it were approved or by the Secretary of State. [See Despatches, 23, May 1860 26, June 1860 26 Sept. 1860. and 27 Nov., 1860, amongst others.] The policy of the war and the conduct of the Governor have never been objected to: but the expense was condemned as soon as it was felt.

Conclusions to be drawn.

Summing up the results obtained, I assert:—First, that the colonists are not technically responsible for the war and its consequences.
Because the Imperial Government reserved to itself the management of native affairs.

Because the Governor strictly carried into practice the exclusion of the Colonists from the control of the native race.

Because the war was commenced by the Governor in person on behalf of the Imperial Government: and the only share in it taken by the Colonial Government was one of loyal and subsequent co-operation.

Secondly, That the Colonists are not morally responsible for the war and its consequences.

Because their plans for the better government of the natives were rejected.

Because they in no way provoked the war, or induced a breach of the peace leading to it.

Because they brought no pressure to bear upon the Governor in the matter.

Because the war was not begun for their sole or special benefit.

The Minor Charges Against the Colonists.

Having now refuted at length the fundamental charge brought against the Colonists of New Zealand of having brought about the war, the subsidiary accusations against them may be more easily disposed of.

As the war was not begun for the special benefit of the colony.

the Colonists still less was it meant for their defence. In fact there was no danger to defend them against: there was no such prospect of invasion as is commonly supposed to attend settlers on the frontiers of savage tribes. What the settlers did feel was the want of power in the law to punish individual native offenders who acted from time to time as evil disposed persons among even civilized nations will act where the law cannot reach them. A policeman and a magistrate were all the force wanted to repress the sort of crime that was committed in the place.

The Government nevertheless would have been blamable had they counted upon this good disposition of the natives as sufficient protection for the country. A small force had been maintained accordingly at Taranaki and at each of the chief settlements in the North Island; but it was never made use of. And even before Taranaki was furnished with a regular force, the settlers were required to organize themselves as volunteers and were rendered liable to be called out as militia. When the war began, the volunteers and militia of Taranaki were at once called out for active service. Some who have spoken of the colonists with a sneer may perhaps be surprised into a compliment when they learn that these settlers—the whole active male population of the province—flew to arms at the call, and fought side by side with the Queen’s troops, not for the defence of their property or their families, but for the support of Her Majesty’s authority. Compelled to abandon their homes in the country, to send their women and children away to another province, to serve in the field and in garrison along with but as subservient to the troops of the line, they behaved gallantly through-out, endured danger and hardship willingly, even after their whole property had been sacrificed, and spilled their blood freely with no prospect of better reward than to be turned adrift paupers into the wilderness when the war should end. I cannot resist the temptation to quote here the words of an independent eye-witness. Captain Cracroft, R.N., who, being in command of Her Majesty’s ship “Niger” throughout the war, distinguished himself by leading the attack on the Waireka pa., one of the few successes of the British arms during the campaign. In an address to a body of English volunteers, after his return from the Colony, the newspapers report that—

"Captain Cracroft, R.N., said he could not express to them the pleasure he felt in meeting the Volunteers of England, and this was the first time he had had that honour. He had met Volunteers elsewhere, for wherever the English flag was planted there the noble spirit that had actuated the Volunteers of England was found to exist. There was now no colony which owned England for its parent with out its Volunteers—It had been his privilege to see them brought into action on a late occasion in New Zealand, and when he said they were the first in the field, and the first to face the enemy, and had shown the way to the Regulars and the Militia, he felt he need say no more—that he could award them no higher praise. When called upon they were in their places, as those before him would be, should their hour of trial ever arrive. He (Captain Cracroft) had been brought side by side with the Volunteers in New Zealand, and had found as much honour and bravery among them as among his own men, who regarded them as brothers, and would have done anything for them."

It is absolutely true not only that the New Zealand Consequence to the settlers.

war was not for the defence or the special benefit of the settlers, but that it converted the settlement where it was carried on into a battle-field held by the enemy; and brought upon that the colonists, who for twenty years had been struggling to build up their fortunes there, the total destruction of their hard-earned property.
Whatever annoyance might have been anticipated from the lawless character of individual natives, it is certain that nothing short of the declaration of war could have brought such a catastrophe as this upon the settlement. Nor can it be urged that the colonists of Taranaki entered upon the war without foreseeing its consequences. Before its declaration, but expecting it, they had already removed their families from the country to the town; and when they applauded and supported with all their vigour Governor Browne's attempt to maintain the Queen's sovereignty, they had already made up their minds to the coming sacrifice. [Parl. Papers, March, 1861, pp. 8-10.] Three weeks before the first shot was fired the settlers had left their homes, and presented themselves for enrolment as militia and volunteers.

Defence of Auckland.

In Auckland the settlers were charged with the entire defence of the town and settlement. They mustered in great strength, and were quickly available for active service in the field. But throughout the campaign, though the war raged in a neighbouring province, and the ranks of the rebels were recruited from the borders of Auckland, the citizen forces were never called upon to strike a single blow. With remarkable forbearance, the insurgents, savages though they were, and engaged in a bloody and desperate struggle with the Government, left unhurt the persons and property even of the outlying settlers who were all the time completely at their mercy. Only in Taranaki, the authorised battle-field, where martial law (the 'law of fighting' as it was translated to them) had been proclaimed, did the natives think themselves privileged to pillage and kill.

and other Provinces.

The settlements of Napier, Wellington, and Wanganui, on the eastern and southern shores of the North Island, were similarly exposed to danger, similarly defended, and in the same manner left unattacked. Though it would have been madness to calculate on such immunity, yet the result proves the truth of the feeling often expressed by the natives that their hostility was against the Government and not against the settlers. Even the most savage and dastardly of the tribes slewed this feeling._ [See amongst other passages. Parl. Papers, March 1861,p.14.]

As soon as the pressure of probable danger ceased,

Present condition of colonial forces.

the movement for self-defence naturally lapsed into that state which it has assumed in other countries under similar conditions. Its vitality would be aroused at the first note of warning, and in real danger it would resume at least its first appearance of vigour. But a whole population in a colony, as elsewhere, cannot always remain under arms. The smallness of their numbers, and the difficulty of mustering any force of consequence at a central point, hinder their general employment as an offensive force. Readiness on the part of the New Zealand colonists to enrol and train themselves cannot be questioned. And with the case of Taranaki as evidence, their willingness and ability to fight even for other purposes than self-defence is well established. It is absurd therefore to assert that the settlers wish to shirk the duty of defending themselves.

So far from the settlers demanding the help of

on which side obligation lies.

the British troops tor their purposes, it is the fact that they gave their assistance to the Imperial Government in the furtherance of its objects. And the Government, having" got their help, would not let it go. Their houses might burn, their families might starve or go into exile, all they were worth in the world might be swept away before their eyes; but they were soldiers of the Crown and might not stir. They were not permitted to take measures for defending their property: they were prevented from disposing of the produce of their lands while it was still removable; and down to the date of the latest news from the colony, they have even been forbidden to go upon their own lands, for fear of embarrassing the Imperial military policy! By which side then is a debt due to the other for assistance rendered during the war?

The use of British troops.

To the assertion that troops are now quartered in New Zealand and maintained there at the expense of the British tax-payer, for the protection of the settlers, the reply is simple. In time of peace their protection is not wanted j and in time of war the troops, judging from the past, are otherwise fully employed. A slender garrison is all that can be alleged to have ever been even intended for defensive purposes.

The war not yet ended.

It will probably be asked, why then are the troops kept there, since now the war is over? First, because the exhibition of force is needed for the restoration of government among the natives by pacific measures, of which I shall say more hereafter; secondly, because the war begun in 1800 is not yet ended. The practical result of the first campaign is that the rebels took possession of the lands of the Crown and the settlers, and still hold them. Even supposing that it is not thought convenient to punish the rebels, the Imperial Government at least knows that they cannot be permitted to maintain a claim to possession by conquest of part of her Majesty's dominions. As it has been put in the colony i—if the war were for the assertion of her Majesty's sovereignty, it has weakened her authority: if it were for the acquisition of land, land has instead been surrendered. The war will
not be at an end till the obvious loss sustained in both these respects shall have been retrieved. The Ngatiruanui tribe hold the district of Tataraimaka, in the province of Taranaki, by right, as they say, of conquest from the Crown, effected in 1860. It is impossible that the Imperial Government can allow this to continue until the natives die off the land. And though the Governor may devise means for recovering the territory without appealing to arms, the greater probability is that the force which must be employed in some shape for ejecting the rebel occupants will light up the flame of war afresh throughout the island. While I write, the problem is very probably in course of solution; solved it must be sooner or later; and if the result should prove to be a recourse to arms on both sides, it must not be called a fresh war, but a renewal and direct consequence of the former. These are the reasons why a force is quartered and maintained in the colony.

Expense borne by the colony.

To the assertion that the colony desires to throw the whole burden of the war upon the mother country; I reply that New Zealand has undertaken a separate war liability of about £660,000; besides an annual payment of about 825,000 for the troops to be employed, and a further annual sum of £35,000 for pacific means of restoring-order. These amounts are exclusive of appropriations for self-defence. In proportion to population (one hundred thousand to thirty millions), the corresponding charges upon Great Britain would be about two hundred millions of debt, and fifteen millions of annual grants from revenue. Reference will be made presently to the condition which the Legislature of the colony has attached to these large grants.

War no advantage to settlers.

Of the assertion that a state of war is encouraged by the colonists for the sake of the expenditure from the Imperial Treasury which accompanies it, I will not speak with the indignation it deserves-Such a calumny is easily uttered, and is generally hard of disproof. It is commonly repeated without consideration, and comes to be believed on no evidence of facts, but merely because it is probable. Whoever utters such a charge against the people of New Zealand shews not only a want of charity towards the absent but an ignorance of plain facts. The war, I have shewn, was most warmly supported by those who had everything to lose by it, and who undertook to lose all, even to life itself. It was also strongly approved of, from its commencement to the present time, by the great majority of the settlers in the Middle Island, who had nothing to gain by land purchases, and derived as little benefit from commissariat expenditure in the north as if they had been in Australia. The settlers of Auckland, Wellington, and Napier, to whom done it could be imputed that they profited by a was which did not touch themselves, furnished the whole strength of what was called the "peace party" which vehemently opposed Governor Browne's fighting policy. In the foremost ranks of this party were the leading members of the commercial class. Those, therefore, against whom a primā facie charge might perhaps be said to lie are an insignificant minority.

In the addresses to the Governor from the people.

opinion of colonists

of the Northern Island, [pp. 5357], it is observable that a state of war is declared to be extremely prejudicial to the material interests of the colony. This feeling has, so far as I can judge, strengthened with the progress of the war. A true explanation of the views of the colonists is to be found, not in the suggestion contained in the charge now made against them, but more probable in one exactly its opposite.

The British public may there for be quite satisfied

Meaning of colonial support of war.

that little wars will not be excited by their fellow subjects in New Zealand, for any gain to accrue to them from fighting. If the colonists found again supporting the prosecution of a war within their borders, it will be because they feel as Englishmen, that a timely exhibition of strength is sometimes necessary for upholding the right and punishing the wrong.

Imperial Policy Towards The Colony.

Object of Maori protection.

It may be said, if the war was not for the benefit of the colonists, it was certainly not for that of the English people, and the taxpayers of the three kingdoms should therefore not be more heavily taxed to carry it on. This is a very natural observation to make, but the time to make it has gone by for the present.

The philosophy of English statesmen and the philanthropy of the people were early enlisted on behalf of the Maori race. England had become ashamed of those pages in her history which describe the destruction of the aborigines in those countries where her earlier colonies have been planted; and she determined to save the Maori race from a similar fate. The Maori was a fit subject for the attempt. Missionaries had been very successful in Christianizing the race, and a readiness to adopt the habits of civilization had long been perceived among them. The work of preserving and elevating a savage race demanded the resources of a powerful nation and the careful observance of a plan. Haphazard intercourse with white men would spoil the race rather than
improve it. A small body of colonists might succeed in gradually killing off the aborigines, as had often been
done before, but not in administering a strong government among them. Such was the accepted doctrine at the
foundation of New Zealand as a colony. Influenced by these views, the British nation, through its government,
deliberately accepted the protectorship of the Maori people, confirmed them by treaty in the enjoyment of their
existing rights; and undertook so to govern the colony that the two races should grow up together for the benefit
of each other. This noble policy has always enlisted the intelligent approval of the colonists, though at times the
wisdom of the methods adopted for carrying the intention into effect has been doubted by them. They would
have been willing at one

Willingness of colonists to work out policy.
time to take upon themselves, without any hesitation, the duty of governing the native tribes, in the hope of
carrying out the same policy with closer attention and greater success. Though they never in terms offered to do
so, the Imperial Government having always treated the surrender of its protectorate as an impossibility, yet the
impatience of the settlers under the system of double government which has been described would doubtless
have led them to accept the duty, had it been tendered to them while its performance seemed within their
power. But the protectorate was jealously

Offer to transfer powers.
maintained, and no offer to abandon it was even hinted till last year, two years after the outbreak of war. The
transfer of power was then tendered in a despatch from the Secretary of State, dated May 26, 1862, [Parl
Papers, N.Z., August, 1862, p. 79.] in a way which was not deemed satisfactory by the colony. The Duke of
Newcastle said to the Governor in this despatch (p. 80), "I am ready to sanction the important step you have
taken in placing the management of the natives under the control of the Assembly." He did so, both because he
thought the Governor's views correct, and because "the endeavour to keep the management of the natives under
the control of the Home Government has failed."

Misapprehension by colonial office.

If the Secretary of State supposed, as he appears to have done, that his 'readiness to sanction' this important
step settled the matter be was mistaken. It is clear that such a step, intended as it was to shift the responsibility
of native government from the Home Government to the Colonial Assembly, required the acquiescence of the
latter body to render it complete. It is not possible, even in the small matters of private life, for one man to ease
himself of a duty by transferring it to another without the latter's consent. No doubt his Grace misapprehended
the meaning of the Governor's despatch to which he was replying [ib. p. 27], and finding that the separate
native Department in the colony had been done away with, and the agency of the Colonial Ministry employed
in its place, assumed that the colony had already acquiesced in an entire change of plan. But this was not the
case. The Crown was of course at liberty to perform its own work through and by whom it might choose; but all
its servants are not necessarily 'Responsible Ministers.' Sir George Grey found the better to transact native
affairs through the ordinary heads of departments than through a separate staff. He did this because he agreed
with his colonial advisers, who, acting upon a resolution of the Legislature, pointed out the difficulties of a
double government in the colony [Ib. p. 3.] But it did no; follow that the two sets of affairs were to be
conducted on the same terms. It would have been idle, indeed,

Complete change of plan not possible.
to think of such a thing. To have brought Sir George Grey from the Cape of Good Hope to an inferior
Government, because he was the most able Governor of aborigines the British Empire could produce, and then
to make him merely a constitutional ruler, leaving the colonial representatives to direct and be responsible for
all native as they were for all colonial affairs, would have been an extravagant mockery. It is only necessary to
suppose the case of a difference on an important question between the Governor and advisers having the
support of a strong party in Parliament; or that of a hostile vote in the Assembly against a Ministry supported
by the Governor. If the Assembly was to be responsible for the consequences, the Governor must give way.
Nobody except Sir George Grey himself would have ventured to recommend a plan treating so lightly the
Governor selected for a special emergency. The suggestion of a responsible government in native affairs was at
the time not feasible. His Excellency's colonial advisers could not undertake their part in such a scheme; and
even had they done so temporarily, the Assembly when it met could not and would not have sanctioned the
arrangement. The plan will be possible when the Governor can consent to follow whatever policy in native
affairs may be approved of by any set of advisers in whom the Legislature of the time may have confidence.
This has been the bugbear in the way of Responsible Government in native affairs hitherto. It will be well for
the Imperial Government to assure itself that in this way only will complete responsibility for the management
of the New Zealand aborigines be fixed upon the colony.

Probable mistake of H.M. Government.

The Secretary of State, then, seems to have forgotten that the acquiescence of the colony in a transfer of
duties and responsibilities was necessary, and that it had not been obtained. It seems, indeed, very like the truth
that the Colonial Office had come in the course of years to forget that the Governor was the representative of
the Crown, and to look upon him only as the chief and mouthpiece of the colonists. In New Zealand native
affairs, as has been shewn, the Governor was only the former, and not the latter at all. This supposed erroneous
view would account for the absence which has been noticed of any instructions to the Governor on matters of
policy; for the belief which has grown up in colonial responsibility for the war; and for the assumption just now
mentioned of an acquiescence on the part of the colony in the Governor's proposals. And though the words of
the Secretary of State acknowledging failure, quoted above, seem to oppose this view, they may bear a different
meaning.

In the same despatch, the Duke of Newcastle
Despatch from Secretary of State.
claims prompt payment of colonial contributions to military expenditure arising out of the war; throws all
past and future expense for militia and volunteers upon the colony; condemns the New Zealand Government for
"ignorance of the obligation under which the colonists themselves lie to exert themselves in their own defence,
and to submit to those sacrifices which are necessary from persons whose lives and property are in danger;"
calls for the imposition of additional taxes: announces, "though not an immediate, yet a speedy and
considerable diminution of the force now employed;" and consents finally, as a concession, "in consideration of
the present difficulties of the colony," to remit from the colonial contribution to the forces, for three years and
no more, about one-half the cost of restoring the machinery of Government among the natives by pacific
measures,—to an amount not exceeding £25,000 a year.

The colonists had been somewhat prepared for
Previous despatch of same kind.
language such as this. About fifteen months before, in the session of 1861, when the Governor had
determined that the proper course to restore order and assert the Queen's sovereignty was to attack the head
quarters of the King movement in Waikato, he was compelled to tell the Assembly that unless the colony would
undertake some additional liability, demanded by the Imperial Government, he could not employ the forces in
July, 1860, seems to have been the first and chief instruction to the Governor to take a step such as this.
[Appendix to Journals, House of Rep. N. Z. E. No. 3 b., 1861, pp. 6, 7.] The occasion was too serious to
hesitate; refusal would have thrown the blame of inaction on the colony; and the Assembly then undertook to
furnish men and means, to the extent of the resources of the colony. [Journals, &c, 1861, p. 47.] The fulfilment
of this pledge was never exacted, for the threatened invasion of the Waikato country was suspended from other
causes; but the colonists had felt for the first time the horns of the dilemma—to submit to a hard bargain, or to
be condemned as indifferent to the welfare of their country.

Colonists' opinions on despatch.

Nevertheless the terms of the Duke's dispatch of May 26, 1862, grated harshly on the ears of the Colonial
representatives, who at the time of its arrival were assembled in session. On further consideration the
propositions contained in it were universally condemned. If the acknowledgment of failure in the words already
quoted really meant that the Imperial policy had broken down, and that the attempts to govern the natives had
failed;

See Note at the end.

if it was admitted that the misgovernment of the aborigines had resulted in war, or if it was maintained that
the government had been rightly conducted up to the outbreak, but that the war was a mistake; in either case the
Duke ought at least to have acknowledged the large assistance already given by the colony both in men and
means, and to have admitted the sacrifices which the settlers had undergone. Had the colonists been met in this
spirit, they might have been content not to urge their opinion that their revenues and their property and the lives
of many of their number had been sacrificed to Imperial mistakes. They would have been satisfied as citizens of
the Empire to take a share of that liability which they contended was one resting on the Empire at large; and,
remembering their approval of the war from its beginning, they would not have disputed the amount to be
contributed by them, as that share, up to the limit of their estimated resources. But to be told that all that had
been done was in their defence, when their protection alone had never brought a single soldier into action; that
they did not exert themselves for their own protection, when they had lot only been ready to do this if
necessary, but bad actually fought from loyal sentiment as though they had been paid soldiers of the Crown;
that they ought to make sacrifices to save their property, when the act of the Government alone had swept away
much of that property, and might at any time cause the destruction of all that remained in the North Island; to
be told these things was to be grossly insulted. I regret that I have not at my command a milder expression to
describe the fact. That these insults should be the introduction to a plan to leave on the colony the task of
governing the native population who were still for the most part in a state of determined rebellion—a task
involving, as a recent resolution of the House of Commons told them, the cost of repressing all
disturbance—and that the whole should be accompanied by an intimation that the troops would shortly be withdrawn while the prospects of further war were still imminent, left the colonists in such a state of blank amazement, as might have been that of the Israelites when ordered to make bricks without straw. The subject occupied many long days of debate, and called forth every variety of opinion. It seemed at last hopeless to leave the answer to a despatch so full of misconceptions to be conveyed in a mere formal reply; and it was resolved accordingly to embody a statement of the case in the form of an address to the Queen. This remonstrance, as it may properly be called, has been recently published. I quote it at length in an appendix to this letter.

Address to the Queen.

The main points in the reply of the colonists are—a disclaimer of responsibility for the past; a statement of the reasons which render it impossible for the colony alone to take up the government of the natives at the present crisis; a remonstrance against the seeming intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to withdraw from engagements to which they are honourably bound; a recapitulation of the losses and sufferings which have been entailed upon the colonists by no misconduct or imprudence of their own; an undertaking to carry on the government of the natives, if it be offered to them under possible conditions; and a consent to hear the burden of expense under any circumstances, to the extent of their means.

This remonstrance has been read as if it were a mere evasion of responsibility. It would undoubtedly appear to be mainly so to any one possessed with the belief that the colonists have been the authors of all Maori troubles. But whoever is willing to listen to and examine into the real facts must acknowledge that the New Zealand settlers, who had innocently suffered as individuals, and were willing to drain their public resources to pay a debt which they had no share in incurring, were fully justified in drawing the line there, and refusing to acknowledge a liability of indefinite amount in the future.

Future Prospects.

The following circumstances—that the colonists already pay taxes, in the shape of Customs duties alone, to the amount of about £4 per head, being double the rate of contribution from all sources to the revenue by the population of the United Kingdom; that a comparison of probable cost with produce puts the idea of the direct taxation of 100,000 people scattered over a large territory quite out of the question, even if their actual taxation through the Customs were not already heavy enough; that a few thousand adult males in detached settlements round a coast more extensive than that of England cannot provide a combined force to move on the offensive against a central enemy; that the Maori people are intelligent active and courageous in war, and their country peculiarly impenetrable; that the interests of a colony are urgently opposed to unremunerative war, from the mere fact that its prosperity depends upon its power not only to retain a population not yet firmly rooted in its territory but to attract others from abroad;—these circumstances are worth stating, though they may not bear directly upon the present argument. The question is not so much what the colony can do, as what it ought to do. Yet two considerations are suggested by these facts which it is important to notice.

Probable policy of Colonial Government.

First, what would the colony do if left without assistance in the management of native affairs? I am sure that the colonists of New Zealand would not swerve from the doctrine which teaches humanity to the inferior race and a recognition of the rights of aborigines. They would endeavour to the best of their ability to civilize and elevate and preserve the race by judicious measures of government. They would restrain and punish members of their own body who should attempt to injure their Maori neighbours. In short, all that intelligence and philanthropy might prompt they would try to do. Many indications already suffice to prove that this is not an empty boast. But they could not exhibit to the natives the other equally necessary side of government, the strong arm of the law, the power to restrain as well as to encourage, to punish as well as to reward. For a generation yet to come there will be no means in the colony adequate to such a purpose. A policy upheld by no force, and a force which upholds no true policy, are equally impotent for the redemption of the savage. Justice there, as elsewhere, needs the sword as well as the balance. Against turbulence, anarchy, or overt rebellion within the Maori border, the Government would be helpless. A timid, temporizing, cajoling and procrastinating policy must be employed in any such crisis. Could it succeed in preserving elevating and civilizing the race? Certainly not. On the other hand it is evident that an attempt to maintain such a system of government among the white population must fail. The policy, though begun in the best spirit, would in the very probable event supposed break down utterly. No body of settlers would endure long the pains and penalties of a partial law, not
receiving any advantages from it in the shape of protection; which if the law failed for many years to give them
would be sought in some other way. Against the urgency of this feeling no Government could continue to carry
on a confessedly futile policy. In short, Government without force to back it would be thoroughly unreal; and
the attempt which would doubtless be made to establish it on the basis of an enlightened policy would result in
the subversion of government and policy together; And the case supposed is already in existence. Anarchy and
lawlessness prevail among the interior tribes. The consequences which might follow the unaided efforts of the
colonists under favourable circumstances must follow any such efforts if now begun.

Possible plan for managing natives.
Secondly, on what terms could the colonists carry on an efficient Government? Very easily and very
profitably for themselves, if they were careless of British engagements to the aborigines, or of any end but their
own interests. To declare the wide and fertile lands of the natives the property of the State, to invite an army of
determined men, to pay them in the soil they should conquer, and to reduce the surviving natives to the
occupation of no more territory than they could use, would be a very cheap and most effectual plan for
pacifying the country and opening it to the influences of civilization and good government. The end might even
be achieved without much cruelty or bloodshed; though, from the character of the natives and their country, it is
more probable that the Joss of life would be great on both sides. New Zealand is not too large for such an
experiment. There are plenty of men in Europe and elsewhere who would be glad enough to serve in the New
Zealand army on such terms, even though the best settlers of to-day should quit the country in disgust. Nothing
forbids the attempt but British honour, involved in the promise that has been pledged in solemn treaty by the
Superior to the inferior race.

The alternatives of principle before the Imperial
Alternative for Home Government.

Government are perfectly plain. Either such force as a great nation only can supply must be maintained to
support a system of real government among the aborigines until it be fairly established; or, if that force is to be
saved, treaty obligations must be cast off, and a less honorable if simpler process adopted.
If the latter alternative be preferred, the colony
Colony not to bear reproach of breach of faith.

has a right to demand that the shame of repudiating obligations, breaking promises, and abandoning a
philanthropic undertaking for the sake of economy shall be borne by the English nation itself through its
Government; and that the disgraceful task shall not be left to be performed, unwillingly and under the pressure
of adversity, by the colony.
The alternatives of principle before the Imperial

First step maybe taken now most conveniently.

First step in practical economy.

England complains that the government of the New Zealand natives has cost such and such sums of
money—"a very appreciable item," says the Duke of Newcastle, "among those which fix on the British
tax-payer the burden of an income-tax." The burden is sought to be thrown upon the settlers in the colony. But
they are not the body in whose government this money has been spent. The rule is that the subjects of a
Government should pay its expenses. In this case those subjects are the Maori people. Let them be called on for
the cost. If they have not money, as they have not, let their land, which is the only equivalent, be taken. And
then it will be known for the future that consideration for aborigines is no longer to stand in the way of a proper
adjustment of the burden of expenditure.

Financial Questions.

Bill against the colony.
Besides the very important question between the mother country and the colony of the future government
of the natives, there is the question of payment for what has been and is being done in the colony in
consequence of the outbreak of war.

What the colony has to set down as the cost of the war to itself may be stated in round numbers as
follows:—
The total amount is that which the colony calls
Liberal offer to pay.
its war liability up to the middle of last year. If the settlers were altogether responsible for the war, the
above account shows that they have already been severely punished. If they are, or, the other hand, not at all
responsible, their offer to take on themselves this liability is generous in the extreme. Perhaps it would have
shewn more worldly wisdom to promise much and pay nothing than to pay and remonstrate as they have done.
The former course could not have brought upon them greater discredit than the latter has by some perversion
been made to bring.
The only condition which the colony attaches to its promise to pay what the Imperial Government demands, a sum of about £200,000 out of the amount above stated, is that it shall not be obliged to go into the money market to raise a loan in its own name. It is willing to offer its revenues as security, and to charge them with the payment of interest and principal. The Imperial Government may make use of this offer instead of adding to the burden of the British tax-payer. But if it does, it must relieve the colony of that difference of interest which exists between an Imperial and a Colonial debt.

In other words the colony requests that the Imperial Government will guarantee the requisite loan, and so save to the colony one-third of the amount of interest each year. It is but a little matter to ask assistance which can be so easily rendered when the colony is endeavouring on its own side to do all that it can do without considering whether it might not avoid the claim. As the settlers of New Zealand call the war an Imperial one, they, not forgetting that they are a part of the Empire, have shown their willingness to bear at least their share of the cost and loss; and in the same way they ask for their share of the benefit of common citizenship.

**Conclusion.**

Three courses open.

The Imperial Government have now three courses practically open to them, one of which they must follow. They may retain the management of New Zealand native affairs in their own hands, supplying the force required to retrieve past failures and to give effect to their administration in future, and depending on the liberality of the colonists for the continuance of a contribution from them to the extent of their means. Or they may insist upon abandoning a work, which in their hands has got into a state of serious entanglement, to the colonists, adhering to the terms last pro-pounded by the Secretary of State, and so alienating the colonists and dooming the aborigines to anarchy and degradation. Or they may effect an honourable transfer of their troublesome duty, offering as the basis of an arrangement with the colonists efficient aid for a term of years in money if not in men.

That I may not be misunderstood I distinctly assert that the colonists would now as ever undertake the labour and responsibility of native affairs, confident in being able to conduct them satisfactorily, if only the expense seemed to be within their means. But if the Imperial Government prefer to follow the first named course, the colonists will be content while an able Governor remains in the colony, if he be supported and not thwarted from home, that the execution of his plans may he rendered possible. The gist of their demand is reasonable: that the Imperial Government should see the colony through the great trouble which has been brought upon them, and should render the natives thoroughly subdued and obedient before handing over the liabilities of government to the colonists. And (hey declare that the policy of the Secretary of State if adhered to will force them into either a breach of faith to the natives or a military expenditure beyond their means.

I have now endeavoured so to narrate the history of the relations between the mother country and its colony of New Zealand in native affairs as to render the case of the colonists intelligible; to prove the falsity of the charges commonly brought against them; and to indicate generally the course which events must take for the future. I need not say that the broad question of Imperial and Colonial relations, in reference to external defence and such other matters as concern the colony proper, has not been touched upon, and is of at all affected by the subject under notice. But I venture to observe that many considerations which I have pointed out in the case of New Zealand affect also the Cape of Good Hope and any other colonies of Great Britain where an aboriginal race exists in any strength, and where expense is involved by an enlightened regard for their interests. Excluding this class of case, the British colonies as a whole hardly cost the mother country so much money in proportion to their value as to render necessary an entire change of plan for their management.

It may be proper to add that I was personally a close spectator and attentive observer of the events which I have tried to narrate, but a participator in them only to a very small extent. As a colonist of the Southern Island, I have been able to speak freely about native affairs without fearing to be accused of interested motives. And being permitted to be on terms of personal friendship with Colonel Gore Browne, for whom I have always entertained a sincere respect and esteem, there has been nothing further from my desire than to make him a scapegoat for the absolution of the colonists.
I am, my Lord,
Your Lordship's very faithful servant,
Crosbie Ward.

LONDON,

April, 1863.

**Note, page 63.**

The Duke of Newcastle's words are: "I cannot disguise from myself that the endeavour to keep the management of the natives under the control of the Home Government has failed." [*Parl. Papers, N. Z. Affairs, August 1862, p. 80.*] The first and most obvious meaning of this sentence, when read along with the context, is a confession that the government of the natives by the Imperial authorities has been unsuccessful. But the words bear another construction, and may mean that the Home Government has been prevented from reserving to itself, as it desired, the exclusive control of the natives. If this be the meaning the words were intended to bear, allusion is probably made to the only circumstance which can be construed into an obstacle placed by the colonists in the way of the Crown's free action. In the session of the Imperial Parliament, held in 1860, a bill was brought in by the Government "For the better Government of the Native Inhabitants of New Zealand, and for facilitating the purchase of Native Lands." This bill passed through the House of Lords. But some colonists, who then happened to be in England, expressed great indignation at the suggestion of such a measure. The Constitution Act had established an independent Legislature for New Zealand, and it was not competent for the Imperial Parliament also to legislate. Nor was it necessary to do so. If the Colonial Legislature passed measures of which the Crown did not approve, it was within the power of the Crown to disallow them. And if measures which the Crown desired were not passed, the Crown was perfectly at liberty to act in native matters without them. The Constitution Act was widely constructed for the purpose. A despatch from the Colonial Office instructing the Governor, or at most an Order in Council, would have been quite as good as an Act of Parliament; but instruction to the Governor was the one thing which for some reason was never given. To pass an Act of Parliament where there was no jurisdiction, for the purpose of empowering the Crown to determine through what servants or in what way it should do its own work (which was the effect of the measure) was at once an error and an absurdity. The measure was withdrawn in the House of Commons, the Secretary of State for the Colonies being absent from the country at the time. When the result was known in the colony the opposition given at home to the bill was approved of; but a measure of a similar character was brought into the General Assembly and passed, as was the legitimate course. This bill was however deemed to restrict as well as to define the power of the Crown, and was not assented to by her Majesty. There may be other instances in which the Imperial Government conceives itself to have been thwarted; but the only one of consequence is the opposition on constitutional grounds to the Native Government Bill of 1860; and this took place after the war began. The question of responsibility for the war is therefore not affected by it.

**Appendix.**

Address of the House of Representatives. AUGUST, 1862. (SEE PAGE 64.)

To The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,—

"We, your Majesty's loyal subjects, the House of Representatives of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, in all faithfulness and zeal to your Majesty's service, desire humbly to lay before your Majesty the difficulties under which this colony is labouring, and the dangers with which it is threatened.

From despatches recently received from your Majesty's Secretary of State, especially from a despatch dated the 26th of May, 1862, and laid before us by his Excellency Governor Sir George Grey, we have learnt that your Majesty's Government, recognising "that the endeavour to keep the management of the natives under the control of the Home Government has failed," has resolved to sanction the important step taken by his Excellency "in placing the management of the natives under the control of the General Assembly of the Colony," subject to several conditions which are fully stated in the despatch referred to.

We desire humbly to represent to your Majesty that the proposal of his Excellency was made without obtaining the assent of the General Assembly to accept the responsibility thereby imposed upon it; and although the Legislature might, under other circumstances, be willing to accept that responsibility, the present condition of the colony forbids such a course. Our duty to the inhabitants of both races within these islands, a due regard
for the honour of your Majesty's throne and for the interests of humanity, alike compel us, with the deepest respect, to decline to undertake the task imposed upon us, under conditions which were never contemplated by your Majesty's representative, and which render it impossible for us honourably or successfully to fulfil that task.

We recognize the difficulty of the attempt to govern two races within the same territory by means of separate Governments responsible to different authorities, between whose respective jurisdictions no definite line can be drawn, and whose administration must often conflict. But we deem it necessary humbly to represent to your Majesty that the duty of educating, civilising, and governing the aboriginal inhabitants of these islands is one which does not, and has never hitherto been supposed solely to belong to, and therefore ought not to be wholly charged upon the European inhabitants of the colony. And we would further humbly submit that the task is one which it is impossible the colony can, by its unaided efforts, rightly perform. At the same time no efforts will be spared on our part, by cordial co-operation with your Majesty's Government, to put an end to the prejudicial effects which have hitherto attended a divided Administration.

We are compelled humbly to represent to your Majesty that the liability which attaches to the Home Government in respect to the native race is greatly increased by the fact that from the first settlement of the colony the government of the natives has been in the hands of your Majesty's representatives, under the orders of successive Secretaries of State. An absolute control over all legislation affecting the natives, and over the administration of laws relating to them, has been strictly observed by your Majesty's Government; and the settlers, as a body, seemed to have been viewed as objects of suspicion and distrust, to preserve the natives from whom it was necessary to pass peculiar enactments and to establish especial protectorates.

In respectfully declining, therefore, to accept the proposal of your Majesty's Government, we do so, not as shrinking from labours or burdens which we ought rightly to undertake, but because, along with a desire on the part of your Majesty's Government to confer an apparent political boon on the colony, we seem to discover, in the despatches to which we have referred, the intention to withdraw from engagements to which the British nation is honourably bound, and to transfer to the colony liabilities and burdens which belong properly to the empire.

Had the natives been in real allegiance to your Majesty, or in a state of peace and prosperity, the transfer of authority to govern them, together with all the liabilities attending such a transfer, might have been accepted by us with thankfulness for the confidence reposed in us, and with a reasonable anticipation of good results. But the allegiance of the natives as a body has never been more than nominal; and it is proposed to make the transfer at a time when a large section of the race have endeavoured to establish a separate nationality and to set up a king, and have raised bands of armed men to maintain his authority. It is to be made when, many other tribes are alienated and disaffected, and at the close of a war which has failed to convince the natives of the superiority of your Majesty's arms, but which has reduced to a mere garrison one British settlement, where the insurgent natives at this moment hold possession, avowedly by right of conquest, of one of the principal agricultural districts, which had been occupied under grants from your Majesty, and cultivated for years, by peaceful and industrious settlers. It is to be made, in short, at a time when its duties must entail upon the colony expenses which it is not in a condition to bear, and dangers it cannot successfully contend against without the aid of a considerable military force; for we humbly submit to your Majesty's consideration that it is hardly to be expected that the colonists, if left at an early date to their own resources, without powerful military aid, would, in the event of future collisions with the natives, be able to exercise that self-restraint which is the privilege of the strong; and that any war which might arise would degenerate into a guerilla warfare, and become a life and death struggle of races; and if peace should happily be preserved, it might not he prudent or humane for the colony to attempt by its own limited means to establish and maintain your Majesty's authority in the whole of those districts where the native race predominates. It might be driven in its weakness to abandon the show, where it could not possess the reality, of control, and to leave the bulk of the Maori race to virtual and even avowed independence.

We have read with great concern the opinion expressed by your Majesty's Secretary of State, that his Grace can see "no adequate apprehension on the part of the New Zealand Government of the obligation under which the colonists themselves lie to exert themselves in their own defence, and to submit to those sacrifices which are necessary from persons whose lives and properties are in danger." Had the dangers, losses, and sacrifices of the colonists arisen from their own misconduct or imprudence, the imputation thus cast upon them would have been less intolerable; but when the fact is admitted that the settlers have not been the authors of the wars in New Zealand, although immeasurably the severest sufferers by them, we humbly submit that such a charge ought not to have come from the authority under which those sufferings have arisen.

But we are further bound to state, with deep respect, to your Majesty, that the imputation tints oozing on the colony by his Grace the Duke of Newcastle is undeserved. The taxation imposed upon the colonists by the recent war alone amounts to more than half a million sterling—a charge exceeding £5 per bead "upon the whole
European population of both islands; and very nearly the whole male inhabitants of Taranaki from 16 years of age and upwards have been engaged for two years and a half in full military service. We humbly submit to your Majesty that it would have been ruinous and impracticable to exact any large amount of compulsory service and raise a considerable moveable army from among the settlers scattered over the whole colony. The neighbourhood of the plains of Australia, and of the rich gold fields of Victoria and New Zealand, would have effectually prevented such a scheme, which would have resulted simply in depopulating the northern island of this colony. It would, moreover, have been impossible that any large part of this, as of any civilized community, should have remained long under arms without public bankruptcy, unless stayed by pecuniary assistance from without. But the population of the colony were at all times ready if called upon by the military commanders for active support in their own districts; and the conduct of the Volunteers and Militia of Taranaki will, on inquiry, prove to your Majesty that the settlers, though untrained, were as able to serve as they were willing to risk themselves in support of your Majesty's sovereignty-The two corps, whose services have not been fortunate enough to meet with recognition, took an active part in the most successful operations of the late war, and never shrank from the post of honour and danger.

We deem, it our duty to your Majesty humbly to record the conviction, which has been forced upon us by experience, that it will ever be found impossible to sustain, or even to elicit, the full military ardour of a community under a system which places your Majesty's local forces in a position of marked inferiority to the regular army, not only in the performance of military duties, but also in the distribution of honours and rewards due to meritorious service.

And we would humbly express this further conviction, that in a country in which the maintenance of your Majesty's Government and the enforcement of its policy requires the presence, and may require the active help of the military power, it is essential that the Government directing that policy should be armed with the entire control of that military. Great calamities have already fallen upon this colony; wars have been needlessly prolonged, lives lost, and treasure squandered, solely from that want of some local authority having power to remove inefficient and incompetent commanders, and to intrust the execution of military operations to men capable of conducting them to a successful issue. We cannot but feel, therefore, that any proposal to get rid of the divided responsibility hitherto existing in the colony, and to unite the Government under a single administration, is a proposal in name rather than in fact, unless the control of the military force be intrusted to your Majesty's representative in the colony.

We humbly trust that, upon a consideration of the above views and statements, it may appear to your Majesty that a complete examination ought to be made into the respective obligations of the mother country and the colony with reference to the native race, in order to an equitable apportionment of those obligations; and that your Majesty will be pleased to direct a full inquiry into the condition and prospects of the colony, and a reconsideration of the announced intentions of your Majesty's Government.

A sense of the gravity of the duty which it is proposed to transfer wholly to us, without material aid, has induced us thus earnestly, but with deep respect, to appeal to your Majesty. We have always been and ever shall remain ready to take as large a share as our means will allow of the burden of that duty; and we will gladly aid your Majesty's Government by relieving them from the anxious task of guiding the affairs of this your Majesty's remotest dependency, if the power is given and the help continued to us that will make our efforts hopeful; and we humbly pray that the youngest of your Majesty's colonics may not be left to struggle unaided amid political and financial difficulties too great for its strength; but that your Majesty may be pleased to deal with us as an integral part of the empire to which we are proud to belong, and as one where peculiar troubles and dangers demand peculiarly liberal consideration.

The New-Zealand Government and the Maori War of 1863-1864,
With Especial Reference to the Confiscation of Native Lands,
And the Colonial Ministry's Defence of Their War Policy.
By William Tweedie, Published for the Aborines' Protection Society 335 Strand. 1864
Price, Out Shilling.

Note.

[The Aborigines' Protection Society was founded by the late Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, and for a period of nearly twenty-eight years the Society has been unceasing in its efforts to elevate the social and political condition of the native inhabitants of the British colonies, and to defend them against injustice and oppression. Subscriptions in support (if its objects will be thankfully received by the Treasurer, R. N. Fowi.er, Esq., 50 Cornhill.]
The New Zealand Government and the Native War.

The memorandum prepared by the New-Zealand Government, and which contains their reply to the English address to Governor Grey,

This address, which will be found in the Appendix, was signed by members of the Aborigines' Protection Society, and by Lord Chichester and many other influential persons who are not connected with the Society, but who sympathized with this particular object.

is a document of far too grave importance to be dismissed without full consideration and necessarily lengthened comment. It must be accepted as the Ministerial defence of the policy to which Mr. Whittaker and his colleagues have committed themselves, and by which they must stand or fall. By its statements the British public are to judge whether, and to what extent, the natives new in arms have been the aggressors in the present war; and what just necessity, if any, has arisen to make the proposed sweeping confiscation of native lands a measure of public policy. We have no desire to shrink from a discussion of this nature, whether reference be had to particular facts or to general principles. All that we ask is that one class of facts shall not be taken to the exclusion of another; that both sides of this grave controversy shall be tally submitted to the national judgment; and that the obligations of Great Britain as a Christian Power shall not be eliminated from the discussion. At the outset it must be remembered that the original settlement of New Zealand was based upon principles exceptional in the modern history of colonization; that our position in those islands is determined by the express provisions of a treaty which the highest legal authorities have declared to have valid as any treaty entered into between two European states;

The opinion of the late Dr. Phillimore is emphatic on this point and is set forth with that judicial clearness and impartiality for which this eminent lawyer was distinguished.

and that a compact, of this nature involves the performance of manual and equally binding duties. Having undertaken the colonization of New Zealand on such terms, it is not for us to repudiate the agreement on the ground of inconvenience or self-interest; and if it can be shewn that by any laches on our part, by any delinquency of our self-imposed duty, discontent has been fomented, and evils of a serious character have sprung into existence, it is no for us to turn round upon the natives, and to hold them accountable for the fruits of our own misconduct. To teach them that we may break a treaty but they must not; and that while one day we may treat them as aliens, the next we may, if it suits our pleasure, brand them as rebels; is a line of policy, which, on the lowest ground of expediency, must be as fatal to the welfare of any state, as it is manifestly dishonourable to civilized men. Yet this is what we have practically done. By the treaty of Waitangi we not only guaranteed to the Maories the possession of their lands, but promised to impart to them all the rights of British subjects. Instead of doing this, we have systematically treated them as a foreign people, who were at liberty to govern themselves as they pleased; to declare war and to make peace one with another; and generally to exercise all the rights which appertain to a separate and independent community. If the treaty had been observed in both the spirit and the letter, the natives would have been regarded as a part of the body politic; they would have been invested, as far as was practicable, with all the rights of British subjects; and the constitution which secured to the colonists the privileges of self-government, would have admitted them to a share of the common privileges.

But caste prejudices and false notions of expediency prevailed. The natives were excluded from the General Assembly, and from the enjoyment of the franchise, and no attempt was made to prepare the way for the exercise, on their part, of these functions. The result was, that as the natives became more imitative, and, at the same time, more civilized, they endeavoured to develop among themselves those institutions which it should have been our care to provide for them, and to base upon a loyal foundation. The Aborigines' Protection Society may take credit to itself for having, at the time, urged upon the Government the performance of these duties, and for having pointed out that the only sure means of averting future dissension and war, was to be found in a measure which provided for the political amalgamation of the two races. That appeal was unheeded, and no steps were taken to give adequate effect to the principle we laid down until it was too late, and irreparable mischief was done. The time for action had arrived when the king movement was in its infancy. In the hands of statesmen that movement might have been made as plastic as clay, instead of which it was allowed to assume any shape into which the energetic spirits of the Maori race thought fit to mould it, and the result was, that what might have been a source of good, became fruitful of evil.

The non-fulfilment of that clause of the treaty which professedly gave to the natives the status of British subjects was the more mischievous, because another provision of the same treaty, which secured to the Government a pre-emptive right in the sale of native lands, was rigidly enforced; so that at last, the Maories
came to view the British Government simply in the light of land buyers and monopolists, whose chief desire was to diminish the number of Maori proprietors, and to aggrandize the settlers. This conviction, which was strengthened by the proceedings of the officials connected with the land-purchasing department, and by the ludicrous prices which the Government gave the native owners (for millions of acres were bought at a farthing and a halfpenny per acre) gave birth to those land leagues, which, even in this land of combinations and trades-unions, have been regarded in the light of treasonable organizations. Mr. Buddle,

The Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in New-Zealand.

who cannot be suspected of leaning against the Government, has given lucid and emphatic testimony on this point. In his pamphlet on the Maori king movement, he says:—

"In 1849 the Ngatinpa, whose territory lies between Whanganui and Otaki, sold to the Government a tract of land, reaching from Wangaihu to Rangitake, and containing about 400,000 acres, for the sum of 2500l. This transaction caused no little excitement among the tribes along the western coast, from New Plymouth to Wellington. Some wished to follow the example of Ngutiapia, but numbers declined against the small amount received for the land, and contrasting it with the high prices which had been paid by natives for allotments near Wellington, opposed further Bales. Hona of Waitotara, and Karipa of Taumaha, proposed to sell a line block, lying between Putea and Manawapou, but many who possessed no claim in the block raised an outcry against the proposal. In May 1849 the entire tribe met at Turangarere on the occasion of the opening of a new church. The subject of land sales was introduced at that meeting, and warmly discussed. It was proposed that no person or family should sell land within the boundary of the Ngaturuanui territory without the general consent of the tribe. This proposal was approved by many, but the meeting was not unanimous. Many asserted their right to do as they pleased with their own; and Hona and Karipa persisted in their determination to sell. The opposition was prompted by various motives: some opposed from patriotic feelings, declaring it to be their wish that the land they had received from their ancestors should be by them handed down to their children. Some of the thoughtful men spoke of the invariable results of colonization and argued that a Pakeha's town would bring immorality and disorganization among them; that their young women would be debauched, and their young men tempted to drunkenness. How much it is to be regretted that, our European settlements, composed as they are of professedly Christian people, should furnish savage tribes with such arguments as these!

"Others were influenced by exaggerated ideas of the value of native land, derived from the increased value of lands improved by English labour and capital, and argued that to sell land was to enrich the Pakeha and impoverish themselves. And numbers opposed the sale from barbaric pride. Dwelling on these large tracts of land, they felt they could maintain individually a degree of self-respect, importance, and independence, that would be lost when they came to mingle with the better-informed and civilized Europeans; that, in fact, if they parted with their land, they would soon be made to feel their inferiority, and must become the Pakeha's slave. These opponents pushed their views, and sought to make it 'Te Tikanga o te Iwi,' (the law of the tribe,) (that no individual or family should alienate land without the consent of the whole tribe. To make the law popular and binding, they determined on a more general meeting, and to invite all the tribes along the coast to join them in this measure.

"The meeting was held in 1854: about 1000 persons attended, and the following measures were resolved upon:

"1st. That from this time forward no more land shall be alienated to Europeans without the general consent of this confederation.

"2d. That in reference to the Ngatiruanui and Tarauaki tribes, the boundaries of the Pakeha shall be Kai Iwi on the south side, and a place within a short distance of New Plymouth on the north.

"3d. That no European magistrate shall have jurisdiction within native boundaries, but all disputes shall be settled by the runanga.

"To give solemnity to the proceedings, and to confirm the bond into which they entered with each other, they buried a New Testament in the earth, and raised a cairn of stones on the spot; and to reassert and perpetuate their deremination, parties have been appointed to beat the boundaries at certain periods."

We have given this extract at so much length because Mr. Huddle is an authority whose statements will not be seriously questioned by the colonial party. Taking the version which he gives of the origin of the land leagues, it will be seen that they owed their existence primarily to the low prices fixed for the land under the Government monopoly, and to the fear, that if the natives parted with their ownership of the soil, they would be reduced to a condition of dependence and slavery. Mr. Buddle, it is true, speaks of the influence exerted by what he calls "barbaric pride;" but the feeling which leads men to desire to preserve intact the inheritance of their fathers is not peculiar to barbarous, or semi-civilized, tribes: it prevails in all countries where the law of self-preservation (to say nothing of dignity and self-respect) exercises its legitimate influence over the motives and actions of mankind.

The king movement, both in its origin and development, no doubt brought into play passions of a very
mixed nature. It would exhibit little knowledge of human character on our part if we imputed to the natives only a high and patriotic purpose. Like all other communities, they are subject to many errors and imperfections. Many may have joined the king movement to gratify a revengeful or ambitious impulse; some because it gave hope of the ultimate establishment of an independent sovereignty; and others because it might lead to an open and warlike rupture with a Government whose friendship they feared even worse than its hatred. To claim for the entire body of Maories who were parties to this enterprise a perfect single-mindedness of purpose, an absolute freedom from all selfish or personal ends, would be as absurd as to claim for our own nation the same supremely virtuous attributes. But, making full allowance for all the unruly and reactionary elements which were at work in the agitation, enough of good remains to justify the assertion, that the natives, in setting up a Maori king, were making a step in advance. The necessities of their improved social life rendered it needful that their institutions should be reorganized, and some kind of central authority culled into existence. William Thompson, the Waikato chief, who, if he did not actually found the movement, yet gave it vitality, said: "I want order and laws. A king could give us these better than "the Governor." In a document which he handed to the king after his election, be expressed the object still more clearly: "The "laws for the king are these. The power he is to exercise over en "and land is the power of protecting them against quarrels, wars, "and murders; a power to extend to all the chiefs and all councils "of all the tribes. Second, every man is "to live upon his own land, "and the king is to defend him against all aggressions against his "land or person." "Christianity, love, and law," says Mr. Buddle, "are the principles that professedly form the basis of the "new kingdom." One of their first acts was to order the erection of several places of worship. They inculcated peace and union among themselves, and "peacemakers were sent out to visit contending tribes, and heal existing difference." They proclaimed the supremacy of law. "All disputes and all offences were to be "settled by appeal to law." They gave liberally of their means to establish the new kingdom. They purchased a printing-press; and, writing in 1860, Mr. Buddle remarked that "perhaps there "is more educating agency at work in the Waikato "district at the "present time, than has existed at any former period." Such were the leading features of one of the most remarkable movement in which a native race, striving to work out for itself a higher destiny, has ever engaged.

That this is no ideal picture is proved by the testimony of many impartial witnesses. Mr. Gorst, who, as Commissioner of the "Waikato district, had peculiar opportunities of observation, gives ample proof of the ability and moderation of many of the native leaders, and more especially of the high and even patriotic motives by which William Thompson (Wiremu Tamihana) was animated. "Of the king's council," he says, "I feel bound to speak in the 'very highest terms. In all questions which I have heard discussed "by them, they have argued with calmness and good temper, keeping steadily to the point at issue, and facing all the difficulties. "They usually came to a joint decision, Calm in discussion, the "strongest opposition never provoked personal rudeness. It would "have been impossible to get together a body of Maories with "whom the Government could "have more advantageously consulted "upon the management of the native race. If the king's council "had only possessed power equal to their wisdom and moderation, the present war would never have arisen. But that wise resolutions should but seldom be Carried into practical effect is a weakness "that appears naturally inherent in all public bodies at the antipodes." The king was only a puppet. He possessed no power to enforce his own decisions. If he had been simply left alone, the movement, so far as his mock sovereignty was supposed to be subversive of the Queen's authority, would, in time, have utterly collapsed. But the elements of good which the agitation had brought to the surface would have remained. Able men of the stamp of Tamihana and Rewi, who endeavoured, through the figment of a king, to give strength and unity to the Maori people, would have tried methods less likely to wound the loyal susceptibilities of the settlers of Auckland. Mr. Gorst, than whom no more competent or trustworthy authority could be cited, distinctly affirms, that, at the time the war broke out, the leaders of the king movement admitted that their scheme had proved a failure. The king's name was one which would have alarmed no one but colonists who hoped to fatten on rich contracts at the expense of the national exchequer, and to acquire the rich lands of Waikato by denouncing its inhabitants, without distinction of tribe or class, as hatchers of treason. Mr. Gorst is careful to point out the vital difference between the partisans of the Maori king and those who endeavoured to preserve and perpetuate the Maori nationality. The one party was much less numerous than the other; but both have been involved in one common fate.

It has been the fashion with the Colonial Government and the anti-native party in the colony to deal with the Maories on two wholly antagonistic principles. As we have before remarked, they were, at one time, a race having a separate existence from their European neighbours; at liberty to govern themselves according to their own semi-civilized customs; to declare war and to make peace, as they pleased; to exercise, in short, all the functions of an independent nation. But when the light of Christianity so far dawned upon them as fo make them conscious of the evils of intertribal warfare; and when, owing to the neglect of the Government, they endeavoured to create those institutions which might, in some measure, supply the deficiencies of which their more enlightened chiefs had become painfully sensible, then the New-Zealand public suddenly awaken, not to a
sense of their own unfulfilled duties, but to the fealty which the natives owe to their foreign rulers. These remarks apply with peculiar force to the Waikato country. The Waikatos, who are suddenly discovered to be rebels who may be killed off like vermin (as indeed they have been designated), were never instructed in any of the duties of loyalty before the date of their king movement. "So absolutely was Waikato neglected," says Mr. Gorst, "that Mr. Ashwell stated, "before a Committee of the House of Representatives, that during nineteen years before the 'king movement,' he could not remember "more than three or four visits to the Waikato by officials. The Maories have been told that the Queen was a hedge around he "island to keep off the French, Americana, and other nations, who "would have treated them with less humanity than ourselves. To "this kind of sovereignty they never had, and have not at the resent time, the slightest objection. But sovereignty or government, "in the sense of a government, strong enough to put down robbery "and murder, and increase the common happiness by influing "obedience to laws for the common good, was a thing unknown to "the natives of New Zealand when they signed the treaty of Vaitangi and unknown to loyal and disloyal alike at the present lay. "It was not that, the Maori race did not present scope for the efforts "of a paternal sovereign. For years after the treaty, tribal vars "were so common, that Tumihuna describes them as 'a river of "blood' flowing through the land. But to really govern the "natives would have been costly. The revenues of the colony were "required to pay for the government and improvement of the European race; the Imperial treasury had no funds to spare; and it "was therefore thought most economical and prudent not to "attempt to govern at all, to abstain strictly from interfererce in "purely native affairs, and merely to purchase, by present and "pensions, the goodwill of the principal chiefs." Mr. Buddle, in an address which he delivered in Auckland, in March last, mentioned a fact which shews how completely the: natives were left to in manage their own affairs. He said that "he was in the Waikato long "after the sovereignty of the Queen was declared. A murder "took place, one Maori killing mother Maori. On hearing this, "he sent notice to the Government of the murder, and received "in reply from the Protectorate Office, that the Government had "nothing to do with Maori law, and that the Maories must curry "out their own law on the offender. Now he thought, when our "Government took possession of the country, they ought to have "enforced British law, and he believed that at that time it should "have been done, and it could have been done effectually." Governor Browne himself admitted that populous native districts had never been visited by an officer of the Government; and Sir George Grey, writing in 1861, stated, that while, ten years previously, he had deeply felt the impartment, nay, to use his own phrase, "the urgent necessity," of introducing municipal institutions among the natives, nothing had been done up to that time to give practical effect to his suggestion. Colonel Browne, in a moment of candour, confessed that "the Government is, and "always has been, unable to perform its duty for want of a sufficient "number of agents, trained and qualified for the service required "of them." Whose fault was this, if it was not the fault of the Government itself? And while it is no part of our object, in making these stricutures, to attempt to apportion the blame equitably, to determine to what extent the Imperial Government was responsible, and how far the local authorities were in fault,—it is manifestly impossible to weigh the conduct of the rebellious natives in a just, and righteous balance, unless a knowledge of official shortcomings is first obtained.

We now pass on to a brief review of the principal statements contained in the memorandum addressed to the Governor by the present Government of New Zealand, and signed by the Hon. William Fox, the Colonial Secretary. In doing so, we cannot refrain from making one or two observations of a somewhat personal character, which we should gladly avoid if it were possible to do so with a due regard to justice. Mr. Fox, in his able but (as we shall show) disingenuous reply, prudently abstains from all allusion to the Taranaki war, and the connection which undoubtedly existed between that sanguinary struggle and the present war with the Waikato tribes, it is not difficult to discover the cause of that strange omission. Mr. Fox, four years ago, entertained very different views of native policy from those which he now advocates. In language at once eloquent and convincing, he denounced the attempt to wrest the Waiters from its rightful owners as an outrage upon law and morality. He was then at the head of the peace party—the champion of the spoliated Maori against colonial aggression. We are both to believe that the change which has come o'er the spirit of his dream is to he attributed to the circumstance of his having exchanged the cold shade of opposition for the substantial advantages of place and power; but the fact that the minister who at that time fought so stoutly for justice and restitution is now urging on a policy of confiscation more ruthless than any of which his former opponents ever dreamed, is an example of political inconsistency as painful as it is suggestive.

Mr. Fox begins by stating, that at the outset of the war the general body of the rebels "entertained the firm conviction that "they could drive the Europeans out of the island;" and he further declares 'that "they commenced by a desperate attack upon "Auckland, the seat of Government." No assertion more monstrous or more unfounded was ever made in a public document, or vouched for by a responsible signature. Mr. Fox is not content with concealing the all-important fact, that the first overt act of war was committed by the British troops; but he must needs charge the natives with having made an attack upon the seat of Government,—a statement which does not contain in it one title of truth. A valued correspondent, who is a member of the House
of Representatives, and who, for nearly a quarter of a century, has had an intimate personal acquaintance with the natives in every part of the island, writes:—"I have known all the "principal Waikato chiefs for years. Many of them are old and "sincere friends; and I assure you that it is untrue to say that they "ever intended to attack Auckland." The New Zealander, a journal which deserves the thanks of every friend of truth for the bold and manly course it has pursued on this question in the face of an overwhelming amount of obloquy, thus aptly comments on Mr. Fox's extraordinary statements:—"This is news to us. We "were not, until now, aware that the seat of Government hadever "been attacked at all; and no citizen of Auckland that we have met "with is cognizant of the occurrence. On this subject we must "await some further revelation."

What Mr. Fox probably means is, that the country it the immediate neighbourhood of the capital was ravaged by the Maories, and by his subsequent remarks on the subject he would leave it to he inferred that they began the war, and began it by currying fire and the sword into the heart of the settled districts of the province. This suggestion is as untrue as the allegation that Auckland had been attacked. "Now," again to quote The New Zealander, "what was the actual sequence of events? In the "week ending Saturday, July 11th, 1863, upwards of one hundred "Maories were expelled from their dwellings, being included in "the European territory, and within the next three days a still "greater number. On Sunday, July 12th, Colonel Murray "ordered away the natives settled at Kirikiri, who asked and "obtained leave to remain till Monday. On Thursday, July 16th, "the old invalid chief Isaac and his father, with twenty-one other "persons, young and old, were apprehended; and all these, at a "later date, were liberated without any charge having been "brought against them. But still all this did not amount to an "act of war. The first overt act of hostility, as it was considered "by the Maories, and as it was known in Auckland that it would "be considered, occurred on one of the before-mentioned days, "viz. Sunday, the 12th of July. On the morning of that day the "British troops crossed the Manugatawhiri creek, the boundary "between the European and Maori territories. It happens to be "within our own knowledge, that immediately on this step being "known in the city of Auckland, a gentleman resident there "despatched an urgent, message to certain friends resident between "Auckland and Waikato, assuring them that the crossing of the "Muungatawhira would be accepted by the Waikatos as a declaration of war, and enforcing the necessity of immediate removal to "the city. This advice was taken, and was probably the means "of saving life. The invasion of the Waikato territory commenced on Sunday, the 12th of July, and on Friday, the 17th, "took place the three following events:—On that day occurred "the first engagement, of the war, the battle of Koheroa, when our "troops attacked and took a native position. On the same day, "an attack was made by the Maories on a military escort. And, "on the same day, at Shepherd's Bush was perpetrated the "murder—as we term it, and as most of the natives acknowledge "it—of Mr. Meredith and his son, who were set upon when "unarmed, and cruelly put to death. Such was the actual "sequence of events, as may he found in the file of New-Zealand "newspapers, or in the columns of that convenient summary, the "New-Zealand Examiner, published monthly in London."

It is clear from this well-authenticated statements of facts and dates, that the army had not only been put in motion, but the Waikato territory had actually been invaded before the first shot was fired by the Maories, or the first settler murdered by the straggling bands which are always let loose at the outbreak of every war, and for whose lawless acts of vengeance it is unfair to make an entire people responsible. But Mr. Fox is conveniently silent with regard to certain events which preceded even the invasion of Waikato, and probably provoked the outrages upon the outlying settlers of which he complains. We refer to the cruel and unprovoked deportation of the natives who inhabited the Maori villages in the neighbourhood of Auckland; and who, as Mr. Gorst assures us, were largely composed of "the old and the infirm." They were not only driven from their homes, but when they had sought refuse at a place called Kirikiri, an order was received from the Governor to make them prisoners. The expulsion of these poor people against whom no crime was alleged save the crime of being related to the Waikatos, took place on Sunday, the 12th of July, a day on which Christiana are supposed to be employed in acts of devotion or deeds of mercy which ill accord with the barbarity which that Sabbath morning saw consummated in New Zealand. A correspondent thus describes the scene:—"If "you refer to Mr. Sewell's pamphlet he writes, "you will see that "the Government proclamation was printed and dated 9th July. "Now Saturday the 11th it was sent round the different settlements. "There was not time for the oath of allegiance to be taken. On "Sunday, old and young, the widow and orphan, were driven from "their peaceful homes, and had to fly to the woods. There they "were followed by armed men and troops. Their houses and "settlements were soon pillaged of everything. Their neat little "church at Ihumata, within a few days, had its sashes, door-bells, "communion-table, &c. stolen, and oven the floor was torn up for "the sake of the timber. Soon their beautiful settlement became a "wreck, everything moveable being taken. Can we wonder at "some few Maories taking revenge. Among those they shot were "some who had robbed them. But beyond Maungatawari, where "the troops crossed the Waikato, there have been no murders, "and several settlers have resided in the interior to this date (June "1st, 1864), All down the Waikato, the Thames, Coromandel, "(where many Europeans are digging, and an extensive timber "trade is going on,) and all down the East Coast, not one settler has "been
robbed by the natives, and here they might all have been cut "off. The natives have acted on the defensive all along; and when "we leave off fighting they do the same."

All this, be it observed, took place several days before the perpetration of the first act of reprisal, timely warning having been given by the natives themselves to the Europeans who had settled in the Waikato country, and who were allowed to remove their goods without molestation. But Mr. Fox is perfectly silent on this subject. Surely outrage and violence, when committed by Christian Englishmen, are as much deserving of reprobation as similar acts when committed by men who have scarcely begin to emerge from an uncivilized state.

"Early in the struggle," says Mr. Fox, "Thompson, who may "be regarded as the leader of the rebel party, announced in writing, "under his own hand, his determination to carry the war of the "utmost extremity, not even sparing unarmed persons." He is to be regretted that the Colonial Secretary did not give the text of this document, so that we might judge of its exact import and meaning. We presume the honourable gentleman alludes to William Thompson's letter to Archdeacon Brown of Tauranga, which was not a missive threatening the massacre of unarmed persons, but one of simple warning. In a letter to the Governor, dated 1st of August 1863, he says:—"On this very day I came to "Waikato with all my tribe. I have a word to say to you "about my letter to Minister Brown. A warning from me "to you to bring to the town the defenceless, lest they be killed "at their farms in the country. But you are well acquainted "with the customs of the Maori race." Thompson would surely never have given this thoughtful warning to the exposed settlers if he had been anxious to carry the war to "the last extremity. "There is something absolutely disingenuous in this studied misrepresentation of what was really a chivalric act, especially when we are assured, on good authority, that no settlers' property has been destroyed at Tauranga, the settlement at which Archdeacon Brown resides, and that many of the settlers continue to live at that place, their vessels still trading along the coast as bough no such calamity as war had desolated the country. But this calumny is only in keeping with the systematic conduct of the Government towards William Thompson. He is a man, who, if he were a leader of a European people, would be exalted to the skies as a patriot.; but who, being a simple New Zealand Chief, is only deemed worthy of being made food for powder or for slander. It is true that he is called the "rebel leader," but it is not the less true that he advocated peace up to the last moment. When he visited Auckland, seven years ago, he was received with studied coldness, and refused an interview with the Governor, although his influence as the chief of one of the most powerful of the Waikato tribes, and his extraordinary capacity both as a statesman and an orator (the reader need not fear that either word is misapplied), rendered it manifestly desirable that, his goodwill should be conciliated, and his offers of service accepted. He upheld the king movement solely with a view to preserve and elevate his own race. Again and again he interposed to prevent his countrymen from provoking a collision with the colonial authorities. Again and again did he risk his influence in order to prevent war. He opposed every attempt made by his great rival, Rewi, to induce the Waikatos to espouse the quarrel of William King at Taranaki, although he knew (as we now know on the authority of Governor Grey himself) that that quarrel was a just one. He went to Taranaki in person; and, at the risk of his life, endeavoured to persuade the tribes who were at war with us to lay down their arms. His mission was so far successful, that to him belongs the credit of having terminated hostilities which might otherwise have been indefinitely prolonged. Yet war was proclaimed against him equally with the natives rives who had rendered active assistance to the Taranaki insurgents, No distinction was drawn between him and the chiefs who, against his remonstrances, had taken part in the Waitara contest. He committed no act of war; and while it is true he has received the title of "the King maker"—the New-Zealand Warwick, he has established a still better claim to the designation of a peace maker. As we have seen, Mr. Fox has made the absurd statement that the Waikatos attacked Auckland, If William Thompson had ever entertained any such design, no one knows better than the Colonial Secretary, that when, during the Taranaki war, Auckland was demuded of troops, the way to the capital lay open to him, and that he had but to give the signal to ensure its destruction. But he did not give that signal, because he did not want war. Yet Mr. Fox can write of him as though he had always been our remorseless foe, as vindictive and unsparing to defenceless settlers as to the soldiers arrayed against him in battle.

All must deplore the atrocities which have been committed during the progress of this war. It is the curse of every war that the innocent suffer with, and sometimes for, the guilty; that non-combatants are often exposed to greater peril than those who fight behind entrenchments, or throw live shells into their enemy's works. We-admit, and admit with deep sorrow, that soma settlers have been murdered, and that, much of their property in the outlying districts has been destroyed.

Not the least of the many unhappy results of this war is the reactionary influence it has exercised on that portion of the natives who have been gradually led back to the practice of many of their old superstitious and barbarous rites. Still we believe that this has been the case only with a small number of the Maories, and that the great body of them have acted in the spirit of the proclamation issued by the Tauranga chiefs;

"March, 28, 1864; Portriwhi District of Tauranga.—To the Colonel-Friend, salutations to you The end of
that. Friend, do you give heed to our laws for the fight Rule 1. If wounded or whole, and the but at of the musket
or hilt of the sword be turned to me (he) will be saved. Rule 2. If any Pakeha being a soldier by name, shall be
travelling unarmed, and meets me, he will be captured and handed over to the directors of the law. Rule 3. The
soldier who flies being carried away by his fears, and goes to the house of the priest with his gun (even though
carrying arms) will be saved. I will not go there. Rule 4. The unarmed Pakehas, women, and children, will be
spared. The end. These are binding laws Tauraaga. By TEREAA PURMAUNKA, WI KOTIRO, PENI AMPOU, KETETI,
PATERIKI."

But it is to the credit of William Thompson that he gave timely notice to the Europeans settlers in the Waikato
country to leave for a place of safety; and that the New-Zealand chiefs have, with a few exception, set their
faces against the mutilation of the dead, and other barbarous practices, in which their native predecessors in
warfare were wont to indulge. Much has been said about the murders to which we have referred; but although it
is not the fashion to apply the epithet of murder to any of the usages of so-called civilized warfare, we may well
doubt whether, in the sight of morality, these false distinctions can he maintained. For example, "Vindex," in
writing to the Morning Star, gives the following quotation from a private letter:—

"Auckland, N. Z.,

April 8, 1864.

"My dear—, We have had another fight: twenty on our side "killed and forty wounded: Captain Ring, 18th
Regiment, dead, "and another Captain just dying. 1500 British surrounded 250 "Maories and forty women and
children in an entrenched pah. "General Cameron attempted to take it by storm, but was repulsed "again and
again. He then had recourse to sap, and, after three "days' working, blew up the pah. The brave Maori
defenders, in "a most gallant manner, cut their way through our lines, and "escaped, though not without
leaving 100 killed, including all "the women and children. Credat Judoeus! This was truly a "most gallant
affair on the part of the natives, equal to the "famous charge of the 600 at Balaklava. Before General Cameron
"blew up the place he offered to give them their lives if they "would surrender. 'No,' every Maori said: 'we
prefer death "to slavery, and will fight for ever! for ever! for ever!' "Honour to the brave! All the women and
children were, it is "said, blown up in the pah.

"On the 20th of February the troops surrounded and set fire to some native huts or wharries, and when the
poor Maoies, "who had gone inside for protection, ran out imploring for "mercy, they were all shot dead like
dogs by the colonial assailants. Since that affair the natives appear to have dispersed; "but no doubt they will
soon turn up when and where least "expected. The troops are shortly to go into quarters for the "winter, at
fixed stations, and orders have been given by the "commissariat for six hundred thousand feet of sawn timber
for "building huts."

Truly, the shooting down of women and children, the setting fire to native huts, and the refusing of quarter
to the inmates when they rushed out, "imploring for mercy," are episodes of the war with which the British
public, who are expected to pay the cost of the slaughter, and to be enthusiastic in supporting the colonial
cause, should be made acquainted, no less than with those other, but not darker horrors, which have excited the
humane indignation of Mr. Fox and his colleagues.

Governor Grey's despatch on this affair is as follows:—

"Government House, Auckland, April 21, 1864.

"My Lord Duke,—Adverting to my despatch No 55. of this day's date, transmitting the official despatches
relating to an attack upon the entrenched position at Orakan, I have the honour to enclose a nominal return of
the native prisoners under treatment for wounds received in the action. Unfortunately, it appears from this
return that nearly one-fourth of the number are females.

"I have, &c.,

"G. GREY."

The following is the list of the women;—

- Piririri, gunshot, both hips, died 4th April.
- Maiata, gunshot, right foot.
- Harriet, gunshot, left elbow.
- Mali, gunshot, left arm, chest.
- Hica, gunshot, chest.
- Katai, gunshot, right thigh.

(Signed) "WM. J. SPENCER, Assistant Surgeon, 18th R.I." It is unnecessary to give the list of the men who
were wounded in this engagement.

But there is another question conceded with the war, upon which Mr. Fox does not touch, but which certainly deserves some consideration at the hands of the taxpayers of Great Britain. We allude to the means by which the natives have been able to accumulate those munitions of war, without which they could not have risen in arms, or waged a long and desperate struggle. The mischief was done by the relaxation, in 1857, of the ordinance prohibiting the sale of arms and gunpowder to the natives—a proceeding which was strongly resisted at the time by the Acting Governor, General Wynyard, and by Bishop Selwyn and the principal Missionaries. But love of profit overcame all sense of prudence; and, in a moment of weakness, Governor Browne yielded to the pressure which was brought to bear upon him by Mr. Richmond's Ministry. Both the character of this measure and its disastrous effects are well described in a pamphlet recently published, and the writer of which, we may remark, is a gentleman who does not write from hearsay, but from a personal knowledge of the facts which he details. That gentleman says:—

"The plea for arming the Maories, set up by the Colonial Councillors of Governor Browne, and used in his despatches to the "Secretary of State, as well as afterwards advanced by the supporters of colonial misrule In the Imperial Parliament, was,"" that the natives were enabled to smuggle from the vessels along"' the coast any amount of arms and gunpowder: ' it was therefore expedient to make, such traffic lawful, so that all the merchants and settlers in the colony might derive the benefit of the "trade thereby. The consequence of such unwise policy was, "that almost unlimited supplies of guns, rifles, and gunpowder, "were imported and sold to the Maories, who, in fact, scarcely ever spent their money in purchasing anything else from 1857 "till the declaration of the war in February 1860, a period of about three years, during which time many of the chiefs, not the "Waikato and elsewhere, built large magazines, and hoarded up "the armaments, which have since been turned against the troops "and colonists. It was quite a common thing to see canoes "laden with thirty or forty barrels of powder leaving Auckland "An order from the resident magistrate had only to be obtained "for the sale and shipment, but these orders from a servant if the "Colonial Government were treated quite as a matter of course, "and were commonly signed in blank, and filled up by a clerk "when required, either for a barrel or a "ton of gun powder, or for "one gun or a case of rifles. The latter were invariably imported "and sold under the designation of fowling-pieces, guns, or muskets, the sale of rifles being prohibited by Governor Gore "Browne and his ministry."

"Supposing that, I he reasons advanced for this wholesale arming "of the aborigines had even been valid, because, occasionally, a "few barrels of powder and a few old muskets were smuggled "along the coast, common-sense dictates that the right course "would have been to make the restrictions more stringent than "those of Sir George Grey, and the punishment much greater in "the event of infringements; but this method the Governor and "the same Councillors neglected to adopt until the latter and of "1860, long after they had committed themselves to a war will the "natives by the forcible seizure of 600 acres of land, before they "had completed, the purchase thereof: these acts become, therefore, the best commentaries on the former conduct of those who "are morally responsible for such fearful results; and the proof "of the difficulties in smuggling 'any quantity of arms and gun' powder along the coast, since the restrictions were reimposed, "is evinced by the difficulties the Maories now have in obtaining "additional supplies, one having, it is said, recently offered 600"sovereigns for 300 boxes of percussion caps.' And by later "accounts, a Maori woman offered it sovereign for a few brass "eyelet-holes, by filling the centre of which with phosphorus, "scraped off lucifer-matches, the natives find them available for "use in lieu of percussion caps, thus proving their cleverness as " well as the extremities to which they are at present reduced for "munitions of war."

No more striking proof could be given of the fact, that to the suicidal policy of the colonists themselves is the ability of the Maories to carry on war mainly due; and, like many other facts which might be cited, it justifies the inference, that so long as the expenses of their wars are paid by a credulous public at home, they will continue reckless of the consequences which might flow from their selfish acts, and regardful only of their own mercenary gains. Money could be made by selling arms to the natives; and so hucksters trafficked with them in the dangerous weapons, heedless of all warning and remonstrance. Money too is now made out of the huge contracts which war brings in its train, and so, to a class at least, war has its bright and tempting side. It is true it is now being carried on under the mask of patriotism, and professedly to vindicate the outraged majesty of the law; but the same lust for gold is really instigating its prosecution to the bitter end.

But Mr. Fox tells us that no considerable body of the natives have made "the slightest overtures of peace." Let The New Zealander again furnish the reply to this astounding statement:—

"Compare the sweeping declaration of the Memorandum with, for "example, the following. In the lately issued Blue Book, the "Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, we find "the subjoined letters. We take the official translations:—

"Ngaruawahia,
Nov. 25, 1863,

"O Friend, O Governor,—

"Salutation! This is to say to you, the light has been fought, and some are dead, some alive. Restore to us Waikato. Let it suffice for you, the men who are dead. Return to us those who live. Enough From your friend,

"PENE PUKEWAHU.

"From all the Chiefs of Waikato."

"To the foregoing 'small overture of peace,' the following was "the reply [the Italics are ours]:—

"Auckland, November 30, 1863.

"Pene Pukawhau,—

"Your letter has armed, and the matter has been carefully considered This in the reply to you, and also to all the people of Ngaruawahia.

The Governor will hold no communication with you which you continue in arms: but give up fill your guns, your powder, and all your arms to the Governor: then only will a way of communication he open for you: at present there is none. That is the word. From your friend,

"W. Fox."

"Before this reply of Mr. Fox reached its destination, the anxious "chiefs renewed their solicitation as follows:—

"Ngaruawahia. December 2nd, 1863.

"O Friend, O Governor,

"Salutations! O Friend, we are awaiting the reply to our letter. Can it have reached you or not? These are the words of that letter: Restore the Waikato men; suffice for you the dead. Enough.

"From the Chiefs of Waikato.
"From PENE PUKEWAHU."

"To this reiterated appeal the following answer was vouchsafed:—"

Government House, 6th December 1863.

"O all you Chiefs of Waikato,
"O Pene Pukewhau,—

"Your letter of the 2nd December has reached me. Sons, my words to you are these. The General must go uninterrupted to Ngaruawahia; the flag of the Queen must be hoisted there. Then I will talk to you.

"(Signed) G. GREY, GOVERNOR."

"Do these letters comprise no overture of peace, not even 'the smallest,' from a leading tribe? Was such the opinion of Mr. "Fox when he wrote the foregoing letter? Was it the opinion of His Excellency the Governor when he promised to talk to the Waikato chiefs, after Ngaruawahia should have been taken? But the "Colonial Ministers are honourable men, and they do declare to us "—or rather, they declare to the Earl of CHICHESTER and the other "gentlemen of the Aborigines' Protection Society,—the 'regret' "which they feel in having to 'state, that down to this date,' the '3th of May 1864, 'the rebels have not as a body, nor have any "leading tribes, made the smallest overture of peace.' Such is the "ministerial declaration officially signed by the Honourable W. "Fox."

"It is a well-known fact," says Mr. Fox, "that in their intertribal wars, the natives universally regard any
The whole plan of confiscation. The bitterest enemy of the Government could not have might reside in security on their acquisitions. You will gather from "what I say that I condemn in the most prepared to follow his example in this also, future occupants of the Waikato and other confiscated districts have eaten the undisputed owner of some conquered lands, for—he had imitations are proverbially bad. Rangiheata, whom Mr. Fox cites as an authority, "once said that he was the confiscated lands. Nothing could have been more unwise than an imitation "of so doing; but it is equally true that the conquered tribe did "not acquiesce in the spoliation, as to were, occasionally fell into the hands of conquerors, but their title there to was never acknowledged while an individual member of the vanquished tribe remained alive. The conquerors, in taking possession of the deserted territory, were looked upon as unli censed squatters, nor did they consider their title valid during the lifetime of any individual man, woman, or child, of the original owners of the soil. In land transactions with the native tribes, this law seems to have been almost always respected by Europeans, and, when ignored, the Maories resented this violation of their ancient statute, by force of arms; hence the native feuds, to prevent which risings a number of leading chiefs instituted the system generally known as the 'Land League.' ...... As for fighting for the mere acquisition of land, no one dared to avow such a motive, as he would have been looked upon as a common robber. Their boundary lines were well defined, for any encroachment upon which they would fight to the death; but to raise an army for the ostensible purpose of confiscation was, in no era of New Zealand history, so far as we can learn, ever attempted by the Maories themselves."

In an able article on this subject. the. New Zealander says;—" Confiscation is not customary among the natives of New Zealand, never having been recognised by Maori law. The New Zealanders, in the darkest days of their heathenim, evinced a high appreciation of natural justice, and their moral perceptions on this head have been sharpened by their acceptance of Christianity. It is admitted that certain lands, accidentally, as it were, occasionally fell into the hands of conquerors, but their title there to was never acknowledged while an individual member of the vanquished tribe remained alive. The conquerors, in taking possession of the deserted territory, were looked upon as unli censed squatters, nor did they consider their title valid during the lifetime of any individual man, woman, or child, of the original owners of the soil. In land transactions with the native tribes, this law seems to have been almost always respected by Europeans, and, when ignored, the Maories resented this violation of their ancient statute, by force of arms; hence the native feuds, to prevent which risings a number of leading chiefs instituted the system generally known as the 'Land League.' ...... As for fighting for the mere acquisition of land, no one dared to avow such a motive, as he would have been looked upon as a common robber. Their boundary lines were well defined, for any encroachment upon which they would fight to the death; but to raise an army for the ostensible purpose of confiscation was, in no era of New Zealand history, so far as we can learn, ever attempted by the Maories themselves."

Herein Mr. Fox confounds two things which essentially differ. The natives, in their inter-tribal wars, have unquestioningly recognised the right of confiscation; but they have never done so as regards the lands of rebels. Archdeacon Hadfield puts the matter so clearly, in a private letter, that we cannot do better than quote his words. He says;—" Confiscation "is the act of the sovereign power in reference to the property "of its rebellious subjects. Now I have no hesitation in saying if "that no Maori ruler ever so acted in regard to the property of "their own people; that confiscation of the property of any so-called rebels was unknown to Maori custom. "It is possible that (through a confusion of ideas very common with our colonial statesmen) Mr. Fox is referring to the "annexation of the lands of conquered enemies. But if so, it "seems a strange mistake of Mr. Fox to make, inasmuch as he, "on assuming office, brought prominently forward, as an essential "part of his policy, that the Maories were not to be treated as "foreign enemies, but as rebels. "It is true that Maories did annex portions of the territory "of opposing tribes whenever victory gave them an opportunity "of so doing; but it is equally true that the conquered tribe did "not acquiesce in the spoliation, but considered itself bound in "honour to recover its lost possessions whenever an opportunity "offered. It is true, as stated by Mr. Fox, that such acquired "possessions have frequently been purchased by the Government; "but the Government had no alternative but to acknowledge rights "to property as they found them when the treaty of Waitangi was "made. This, however, is hardly an adequate statement of the "case, for in almost every instance with which I am acquainted, "compensation been given to the injured owner. There can," be no doubt that the confiscation policy has driven numbers into "rebellion who otherwise would have kept, aloof from war. It "will also lay the foundation of future troubles: outrages will be "perpetually committed on any occupants of the confiscated lands. Nothing could have been more unwise than an imitation "of Maori proceedings in former wars. Imitations are proverbially bad. Rangiheata, whom Mr. Fox cites as an authority, "once said that he was the undisputed owner of some conquered "lands, for—he had eaten the original occupants. If Mr. Fox "were prepared to follow his example in this also, future occupants of the Waikato and other confiscated districts might reside in security on their acquisitions. You will gather from "what I say that I condemn in the most unqualified terms the "the whole plan of confiscation. The bitterest enemy of the Government could not have
suggested a policy more detrimental "and more pregnant with evil for the future."

It is unnecessary to follow Mr. Fox through the specious arguments by which be endeavours to prove that the complete defeat of the Maories in the field, coupled with the confiscation of a portion of their lands, us "a material guarantee," is necessary to insure their submission. If such a policy is persisted in, it can only lead to the extermination of the entire race; and this is a result from which we hope Mr. Fox would shrink, however gratifying it might be to some of his supporters. Mr. Fox dilates upon the danger with which the rebellion has menaced the very existence of the colony; but the justice of his cause cannot be proved by any considerations of this kind. In considering what punishment should be inflicted upon the rebels, regard must he had to the origin of the war. Who provoked the natives to embark in a struggle which has cost them far more than it has or will cost the colony? Mr. Fox's only hope for the future of the race is in compelling them to acknowledge "the supremacy of law," and not only to convince them that they have made a mistake, but to make them bear its consequences. He forgets that no effort was made to teach them "the supremacy of law," until the lesson was too late to be efficacious; that they had been uniformly treated, not as subjects, but as a virtually independent people; that the treaty which imparted to them all the rights of British subjects, has been practically regarded as so much waste paper, except that provision of it which conferred upon the Government the privileges of land-buying monopolists. His whole argument for confiscation is lased upon the assumption, that, as every other method, save war, had been previously tried by the dominant race, in their efforts to was the obedience and to promote the elevation of the Maories, there is now no alternative but to administer to them the severest chastisement which Armstrong guns and Enfield rifles can inflict, and to add thereto the loss of their lands. He entirely overlooks the fact that the other plan has never been tried; that the natives have only been British subjects in name; and that their ideas of the intentions of the Government towards them have been not unnaturally derived from the shameless columns of the anti-aboriginal portion of the press, and the unscrupulous speeches of the annexation party in the General Assembly. To his eye the native is simply a rebel deserving of condign punishment, and that punishment must assume the form of confiscation; not, of course, because the settlers want the land but because the will only respect, a peace which is accompanied by "a material guarantee." It is worthy of remark, that when Governor Grey made peace with the natives of the Bay of Islands in 1846, he did not confiscate their lands, and the result has been that they have remained our stedfast friends to this hour, and have sold all their waste lands to the Government at the rate of sixpence an acre. When the war in the province of Wellington was brought to a termination, the same enlightened Governor abstained from that policy of confiscation which Mr. Fox so highly eulogises, and the natives have from that time to the present exhibited an unbroken loyalty; and they also (perhaps unwisely) have sold immense districts of their lands for a few pence per acre. When Mr. Fox urges that, confiscation is necessary to ensure submission, he strangely overlooked these indisputable and most suggestive facts in the history of the colony. The truth is, that confiscation is persisted in, because the colonists want the land, and they would rather that the last. Maori should cease to exist, than forego their insatiable cupidity. But Waikato has been conquered, and the rebels have been driven to the East Coast. Why, therefore, should not Mr. Fox and his colleagues be satisfied with having accomplished what they did in the chief object of the war? Why hunt the Maori like a beast of prey to his last place of refuge? True, terms of peace were offered at Ngaruaahia; but were the unfortunate indices likely to confide in the assurance that their personal liberty would be respected, while their unfortunate counymen, who had previously been made prisoners of war at Rangiriri, were kept in close confinement in a hulk at Auckland, and so retained against the remonstrances of the Governor? The truth is, that the war is, on our side, a contest for the acquisition of land, and that the object of the contractors and land speculators of the northern province is to carry it on until the Waikatos are so completely conquered or exterminated, that the work of spoliation may be accomplished without endangering the future peace of the colony.

It is certain that if the New-Zealand ministry had been permitted to carry out the Confiscation Act in all its cruel severity, nothing short of the total extirpation of the Maori race would have ensued. Mr. Cardwell, however, has fortunately saved his country from the awful guilt and dishonour of such a crime. If, in addition, he will give a new assurance to the natives that their ownership of the soil, as secured by the treaty of Waitangi, will he scrupulously maintained; if he will detach the Government from the Undignified and mischievous business of land-buying, and give his sanction to a well considered plan for the establishment of municipal institutions in the native districts, and the representation of the Maories in the General Assembly, he will do much to avert from a noble race the doom with which it is threatened. But we can not hope for the adoption or the success of any policy of the kind, until the colonial Government is deprived of the management of native affairs, and the Governor, in attempting a just settlement of the native difficulty, is no longer liable to be thwarted by the selfish intrigues or the fluctuating opinions of the local Parliament.

Signed on behalf of the Committee of the Aborigines' Protection Society,
R. N. Fowler, M.A., Chairman.
Appendix.

Address to the Governor.

To his Excellency Sir GEORGE GREY, K.C.B., Governor of New Zealand.

SIR,—The unhappy war which is now raging in New Zealand between the Maories and their English rulers has excited the most deep and painful interest in this country. It was generally hoped that the contest which recently took place in the province of Taranaki would have been the last of those painful collisions which have proved as inimical to the best interests of the colony as they have been disastrous to the native race. This hope was confirmed by the spirit with which Year Excellency entered upon the duties of your high office, and especially by the persevering efforts you made to establish a system of self-government in the native districts. We cannot express to you with what profound regret we have witnessed the failure of those wise and beneficent measures, and how deeply we sympathize with you in the peculiarly trying position in which you are now placed.

The justice which has ever been the great characteristic of your Excellency's administration of native affairs is a pledge to the world that the war which is now being waged will be limited to the one object of restoring British supremacy in the disturbed districts, and of achieving an honourable and, if possible, a lasting peace. Occupying as you do a position at once so difficult and so responsible, we would not venture to offer any suggestions of our own, did we not feel that Englishmen, even at so great a distance, ought not to regard the momentous events now transpiring in New Zealand with indifference or even with silence.

We would therefore express our earnest hope that your Excellency will avail yourself of the first favourable opportunity which may present itself of endeavouring to terminate the war by negotiation, and especially that you will listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms may make. This course, we are sure, so commend itself to your sense of humanity and Christian feeling that we should scarcely presume to urge it upon your consideration, did we not feel that your hands might be strengthened, by this expression of our opinion—an opinion which we believe to be shared by the great body of the British people.

We have, however, been alarmed by the pertinacity with which in some quarters it has been proposed to confiscate the lands of all contumacious and rebellious natives. As has been truly observed, such a policy as this would shut the door to any possible settlement of the difficulty, except by the sword; in other words, it would lead to the extermination of a people who value their property in the soil even more than their existence, and who, despite their faults, are worthy of a better fate. We can conceive of no surer means of adding fuel to the flame of war—of extending the area of disaffection—and of making the natives fight with the means of despair, than a policy of confiscation. It could not fail to produce in New Zealand the same bitter fruits of which it has yielded so plentiful a harvest in other countries where the strife of races has been perpetuated through successive generations, and that, too, with a relentlessness and a cruelty which have made mankind blush for the species.

We therefore pray, that in the hour of victory your Excellency will temper Justice with mercy, and give to the world another bright example of forbearance and magnanimity. By such means, and such means only, may we hope to see the Maori race saved extinction, and the dominion of our beloved Queen firmly established river every portion of the islands of New Zealand.

With great respect, we have the honour to be, SIR,
Your Excellency's faithful servant*,
(Signed) Chichester;
Ebury, P.C., Moor Park, Rickmansworth;
Walter C. Trevelyan, Bart.;
John Hesketh Lethbridge, Bart.;
Wilfrid Lawson, Bart.;
S. Gurney, M.P.;
W. E. Forster, M.P.;
Thomas Barnes, M.P.;
Henry Pease, M.P.;
Thomas Bazley, M.P.;
Williams, Williams, M.P.;
P. A. Taylor, M.P.;
Edward Baines, M.P.;
E. A. Leatham, M.P.;
John Brady, M.P.;
Samuel Morley;
Thomas Fowell Buxton;
T. Perronnet Thompson, Lieutenant-General;
Edward Miall;
R. N. Fowler, Treasurer of the Aborigines' Protection Society;
Samuel Lucas;
Thomas Guthrie, D.D., Edinburgh;
Thomas Binney;
Charles J. Hadfield, Colonel;
William Howitt;
Henry Salwey, Colonel;
J. E. Cairnes, Professor of Jurisprudence, &c, Queen's University, Ireland;
F. W. Newman, late Professor at University College, London;
Newman Hall, L.L.B.;
J. Humffreys Parry, Serjeant-at-Law;
Samuel Stott, Mayor of Rochdale;
Leone Levi, Professor of Commerce and Commercial Law, King's College, London;
Charles Sturge;
Henry Christy;
Joseph Pease, Darlington;
George Thompson;
David Thomas, D.D.;
Henry Richard;
John Nichol, B.A. Oxon;
Duncan M'Laren, Newington House, Edinburgh:
Edward Smith, Sheffield;
Frederick Baines, Leeds;
Benjamin Scott, F.R.A.S.;
Edmond Beales, M.A., Lincoln's Inn;
Edmund Sturge, Birmingham;
John Lee, L.L.D., Hartwell;
Jabez Burns, D.D;
Joseph Cooper, Lloy'd's;
John Cropper, Liverpool;
John Hodgkin, Lewes;
Henry Vincent; Washington Wilks;
L. A. Chamerovzow;
George Gilfillan, Dundee;
John Cassell;
Arthur Trevelyan,
J.P., Teinholm Tranent, N.B.;
J. J. Colman, Norwich;
Richard Smith, 7, Highbury Crescent;
F. W. Chesson, Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society;
A. K. Isbister, M.A.;
John Epps, M.D.;
Joseph Cowen jun., New-castle-on Tyne;
John Mayfield, 300, Holborn;
Francis E. Fox, Tottenham;
The Governor's Reply.

Government House, Auckland, April 7, 1864.

SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th of January, transmitting me an address which had been very numerously and influentially signed, in which a hope was expressed that I would avail myself of the first favourable opportunity which presented itself of endeavouring to terminate by negotiation the war unhappily existing in New Zealand, and especially that I would listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms may make.

Your letter, and the address which it encloses, shall be forwarded to my responsible advisers for their consideration; but in the mean time I can have no hesitation in saying that the wishes and instructions of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle impose on me as a duty that which is entirely in consonance with my own feelings and with yours, viz that I should instantly listen to any reasonable overtures that the natives in arms may make, and Hint I should avail myself of any opportunity that offers of obtaining; permanent peace for this Colony. I am quite confident that general public opinion in this country will support me in taking this course, and would expect me to do so.

With regard to the confiscation of portions of the lands of the natives now in arms, this point is to be considered—that mercy requires that future contests between the two races should, in so far as practicable, be prevented, and that there are many tribes in New Zealand who have taken no part in the present lamentable conflicts, yet who might hereafter be led into similar acts; whilst nothing would more certainly lead to the extermination of the native race than a series of contests such as that which is now being carried on. The object of the local Government, therefore, has been to secure to that numerous part of the native population who have taken no active share in the present war the whole of their landed possessions, and also by laws passed expressly for this object to give to the lands held by such natives a value greater than they have previously had for their owners, by, in all respects, giving them equal rights in their landed possessions with those enjoyed by their European fellow-subjects, the intention in this respect being to show that the rights of peaceable citizens, of whatever race, are carefully respected, and to give the natives so valuable a stake in the country that they are not likely hereafter to hazard it lightly.

On the other hand, it was thought necessary by an example to show that those who rose in arms against their fellow-subjects of another race suffered such a punishment for doing so as might deter others from embarking in a similar career. It is therefore proposed to deprive such persons of a considerable portion of their landed properties, and to provide for the future safety of the colony by occupying such lands with an European population.

But even in the case of these persons it is intended that sufficient lands shall be reserved for themselves and their descendants, to be held on the same tenure as lands are henceforth to be secured to the rest of the native population.

That these measures will be carried out in a spirit of liberal generosity and of mercy I earnestly hope, and will do my best to ensure: and in my efforts for this end I believe that I shall be supported by a large majority in this colony.

You will much oblige me by returning this answer to those noblemen and gentlemen who signed the address which you forwarded to me.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) G. GREY.
F. W. CHESSON, Esq.
Letter from the Hon. William Fox.

New Zealand Colonial Secretary's Office, Auckland,

4th May 1864.

MY LORD,—The letter which you and other noblemen and gentlemen connected with the Aborigines' Society addressed to His Excellency Sir George Grey, H.C.E, Governor of this colony, in January last, has been referred by His Excellency to his responsible advisers.

They have submitted their opinions upon it to His Excellency in the form of an official memorandum, of which, at His Excellency's suggestion, they have now the honour to forward a copy to you; and of which His Excellency will forward one to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

As the letter in which your Lordship and the other subscribers impugned the policy of confiscation, which the New-Zealand Government has adopted, was published by you, at the date of its transmission to the colony in the "London Times" and other newspapers, I venture respectfully to express a hope that you will give similar publicity to the enclosed memorandum.

I have the honor to be, MY LORD,
Your Lordship's most obedient servant
WILLIAM FOX,
Colonial Secretary.

The Right Honourable Earl Chichester,
22, Grosvenor Place, London, S.W.

Memorandum for His Excellency the Governor.

1. MINISTERS have received a copy of the letter addressed to His Excellency the Governor by Lord Chichester, and several other gentlemen connected with the "Aborigines' Protection Society" in London, relative to the "war which is now raging in New Zealand between the Maoris and their English rulers," on which they beg to make the following remarks:—

2. The only two points in the letter which appear to call for any remark are,—First, the hope expressed that His Excellency the Governor "would avail himself of the first favourable opportunity of endeavouring to terminate the war by negotiation, and especially that he would listen to any overtures of peace which any of the natives who have taken up arms might make;" and secondly, a protest against the confiscation of the lands of the rebel tribes.

3. With regard to the first of these points, Ministers regret to state, that, down to this date, the rebels have not as a body, nor have any leading tribe, made the smallest overture of peace. At the commencement of the present unhappy struggle, they appear to have entertained a firm conviction that they could drive the Europeans out of this island, and they commenced by; desperate attack upon Auckland, the seat of Government. Early in the struggle, Thompson, who may be regarded as the leader of the rebel party, announced in writing, under his own hand, his determination to carry the war to the utmost extremity, not even sparing unarmed persons. Acting in this spirit, the Maoris threw themselves into the heart of the settled districts of the Province of Auckland, murdering and destroying the settlers within seventeen miles of the town, cutting down the Government flagstaff at the Manukau, the western harbour of the city of Auckland itself, and driving from their farms and home-steads a tolerably dense population of agricultural settlers over the space of some twenty miles square. So sudden was their onslaught, and so completely did they succeed in getting possession of the country close round Auckland, that it was not till after the fall of Rangiriri—five months at least after the commencement of the struggle—that they were driven back, and routed out of the wooded ranges, to such an extent that even the city and immediate suburbs of Auckland could be considered safe. Since that period they have been driven, or escaped from, one stronghold after another, till they have been compelled to evacuate the whole of Waikato proper: they have retreated before our troops to a distance of 120 miles from Auckland, and their main body is understood to be broken into two or three sections, the principal of which appears to have descended upon Tauranga, in the Bay of Plenty, where, with the resident rebels of that district, they are again defying the British troops, and throwing up aggressive works within a distance of three miles of our posts. During all this time they have not, as a body, shewn the smallest symptom of any desire to terminate the war, nor have they made any
of the entire nation, both that part which has been engaged in active hostilities, and that which has not.

principles as may operate, not on the mind of one individual here and there, but on the feelings and sentiments
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more interview being granted with the leading chiefs. Two or three men of rank, whom he persuaded to come

in the proposal; and ministers have accordingly advised His Excellency to issue one, the terms

of which have been settled by them after much earnest thought and discussion.

While such has been the action of the Government in reference to the rebels as a body, the door has never

been closed against such individuals as might be desirous of laying down their arms, or returning to their

allegiance without any personal punishment whatever. Numerous efforts have been made by the Government to

induce them to do so. On the 16th of December last immediately after the capture of Ngaruawahia (the king’s

palace), a document was sent to the rebels, in which their principal chiefs were invited to visit the Governor, in

order that they might learn the future intentions of the Government towards them; and they were distinctly

assured, under the hand of the Governor, that if the rebels would give up their arms, they would not be made

prisoners, nor be in any way molested in their persons, for any part they might have taken in the present or any

former war. On the 6th of January last, the Colonial Secretary issued instructions to the resident magistrates as

to the course to be pursued towards rebels who might surrender, and an abstract of these instructions was

circulated, and has been kept before the eyes of the natives in every part of the island. The terms have been

generally admitted, at least by those not actually engaged in hostilities, as extremely fair, and a very

considerable number of rebels have actually come in under the terms offered, given up their arms, and signed a

declaration of allegiance.

On the 30th of March last, immediately previous to the evacuation of Maungatautari, William Nero, a

friendly chief of the highest rank, closely related to the leading rebels, informed the Colonial Secretary,

personally and by letter, that he had reason to believe that the rebels were desirous of making peace, but were
deterred by the fear that their leaders would be hung; and he suggested that he might be allowed to proceed to
the rebel camp in order to disabuse their minds of this supposition. The Colonial Secretary at once acquiesced
in the proposal. (See Correspondence, Appendix B.) Nero proceeded on his mission, but entirely failed, not

even an interview being granted with the leading chiefs. Two or three men of rank, whom he persuaded to come

in and sign a declaration that in two days they would bring in all their tribe, left again on the following day

under pretence that they would return with all those people, amounting to some 200 souls. They did not,

however, even return themselves, but very adroitly contrived to thrust upon us some sixty or seventy women,

children, and decrepit old men, who were a burden on their commissariat, and an impediment to their

movements. This was all that was gained on our side by this well—intentioned, but certainly not very

successful attempt to remove what was believed by some to be the only obstale to the restoration of peace. It

should be observed, also, that, during these negociations, Thompson, by letter addressed to Nero, affected a great
desire to see peacere stored. Yet, at the very moment he was writing such letter, he appears to have been

organizing a new campaign.

Ministers repeat that, in their opinion, the very greatest caution ought to be exercised in pressing the natives
to come to terms. Every one who shows the Maori must know, that, even in the ordinary business of life, any
exibition of anxiety to get him to do any thing is the certain way to make him long back from doing it; his
mind, cunning and suspiscious beyond that of most races, inferring at once that such anxiety is a sign of
weakness on the part of him who shews it, and that, by standing out, he can obtain his own terms, however
extravagant or unreasonable. On the other hand, ministers have entire faith in the natural results of an actual
defeat of the rebel armies enforced with prudence, with firmness, with mercy; and in such broad general
principles as may operate, not on the mind of one individual here and there, but on the feelings and sentiments
of the entire nation, both that part which has been engaged in active hostilities, and that which has not.
And it must be borne in mind that this latter portion of the native community is to be considered in what is done, equally with the actual rebel. It would be of little benefit to patch up peace in Waikato, if rebellion were by that to be encouraged in Cook's Straits or at Ahuriri. Waikato has been, and is, the head of the rebellion, and the neck of it must be broken three. If a final, permanent, and complete subjugation of Waikato is effected, this will, in all human probability, be the last instance which will occur of any combined resistance to British authority and British law. If, in our anxiety to spare the erring Maori race, we press and persuade them to come to terms before they are really convinced of our superiority, and before we have taken those material guarantees for the future which it is contemplated to take, we shall to a certainty have, at some future day, to repeat the lesson which we are now endeavouring to teach. If the present struggle should be terminated without completely convincing the natives all throughout New Zealand of the folly of trying their strength against the Europeans, and without a sufficient material guarantee being taken, new outbreaks will undoubtedly occur from time to time, which can only end in chronic hostility of the race, and wars of extermination. The only hope of saving a remnant of the Maori race is the termination of the present struggle by their full acknowledgment of their mistake, their full acceptance of its consequences, and submission to the supremacy of law: it will not be done by treaties of peace which might leave the impression that they are an independent people, or at liberty in any future imaginary casus belli to take up the sword.

In concluding this part of their remarks, ministers would observe that no time has yet been allowed for the results of the late campaign to bear their natural fruit. It is only three weeks since the final blow was struck in Waikato, by the capture of Orakau, and evacuation of Maungatautari. The mind of the rebel cannot yet have fully realized to itself the magnitude of the defeat and its consequences; at all events it does not appear to have done so. A little patience on our side may, and there is little doubt will, enable us to reap the fruits of the late costly military operations, while, as already hinted, undue pressure brought to bear on the Natives to induce them to come to terms, or undue anxiety exhibited on our part to escape the prolongation of the war, will probably have exactly the reverse effect to that which is intended.

One thing must be borne in mind. This is not a war between two independent nations, living in separate territory, perhaps hundreds of miles apart. When this rebellion is put down, we have to govern the Maori, to reinstate him in our community, to live with him, to come under numerous mutual responsibilities, social and political. A war simply between independent nations involves no such consequences, and may be terminated on a very different basis; while its termination may be brought about by negotiations which would be very unsuitable means by which to terminate a struggle of the sort which exists in this Colony.

4. As regards the question of the confiscation of Maori lands, against which a protest is raised, ministers beg to make the following observations:—

In the first place, it is a custom which has been always recognised by the Maoris themselves. In their wars, a conquered tribe not only forfeited its lands, but the vanquished survivors were reduced to a tributary position, and large numbers to personal slavery. The Government of New Zealand has always recognised such a title as valid. The Waikatos themselves were paid by Governor Hobson, for such a proprietary right over the district of Taranaki; and a very large proportion, if not an actual majority of the purchases of land from the Maoris in various parts of the island have been made on the basis of a recognition of this right of conquest. There is therefore nothing in the course proposed abhorrent to the moral sense, or previous habits of thought, of the Maori race (See Appendix C.)

In the second place, they never do consider themselves conquered unless their lands are taken. In previous wars between the British Government and the Maoris, which were not followed by confiscation, friendly Maoris have expressed their surprise at our moderation. "What is the good," they have said, "of taking the man? You should have taken his land, then that work would have been finished."

In the third place, when the struggle began, the Maoris openly avowed their intention of taking the land and farms of the Europeans, when they should have driven us into the sea. It was not uncommon, even before the war commenced, for some of the more insolent to come to a settler's house, and, after looking the place over, to say, "Ah, this house will suit me very well, that room will do for my wife, that shall be my bed: wait a little: by and bye you will see." An instance of this is within the personal knowledge of a Minister. The feeling was general among the tribes which engaged in, or sympathized with the king movement, after it assumed an aggressive character, hostile towards the European occupation of the country.

Fourthly. The chief object of the Government is, however, neither punishment nor retaliation, but simply to provide a material guarantee against the recurrence of those uprisings against the authority of law, and the legitimate progress of colonization, which are certain to occur if the rebel is allowed to retain his lands after involving the Colony in so much peril, disaster, and loss. The Natives are fond of war, as almost their only source of excitement. The practice of incessant hostilities with each other for centuries, has become a second nature; and though circumstances have to a great extent suspended the operation of their military impulses for some few years, they have neither lost their skill in fighting nor their taste for it. If they can have the excitement
and many advantages of a summer's campaign when it pleases them, with liberty to retain their lands when it is
over, without suffering any losses except their wretched dwellings and a season's crops, while the colony is
nearly broken down by the losses and cost of the war, they will not easily be deterred from renewing hostilities.
Mere defeats in the field will not deter them. There must be some more substantial and material guarantee. The
guarantee which the Government has proposed is to introduce colonists, chiefly direct from Great Britain, into
those districts now sparsely inhabited by the rebels, and from which they make their inroads into the settled
districts. It is only on the lands of the rebels, at least in Waikato, that population can be so established. But it is
not, and never has been, proposed to leave them without an ample quantity of land for their use and occupation.
A quantity, much larger per head than the average occupation of Europeans in this island is proposed to be set
apart for them, on a graduated scale, according to rank and other circumstances. These lands would no longer
be held under the pernicious system of tribal right, but as individualized properties under the security to each
proprietor of a Crown grant. Ministers believe that nothing has been, or can be more pernicious to the native
race than the possession of large territories under tribal title, which they neither use, know how to use, nor can
be induced to use. It has, in the opinion of Ministers, been the principal cause of the slow progress, and, in
some respects (particularly their physical condition), of the actual retrogression and decay of the race. And
though, while the Maoris acknowledge the supremacy of a protecting Government, and professed sub—mission
to law, it was just to respect those semi—feudal proprietary rights which they declined to surrender, yet now
that they have abandoned their allegiance, renounced all submission to law, and staked their all against our all,
there seems no longer any reason for respecting privileges which are believed to be equally injurious to their
moral, social, and political condition. In the present state of this colony, it is not a question to be argued by
reference to the rights of the Maori in times past, when, as an independent people, they were recognised as
competent to surrender or retain whatever power or property they might please. It can scarcely be held, that
after the events of the last year, the rebel Maori is entitled to take this position. On the other hand, the struggle
has become one for the bare existence of the Colony, which, though now apparently secured for the time by the
result of the late campaign, but still only held by military posts, it is no less the duty of the Government to take
such precaution as may prevent its being again imperilled. The deliberate and almost unanimous opinion of
both Houses of Assembly determined the course of action in this matter which forms the basis of the policy of
the ministry in reference to the confiscation of the lands of those who have been engaged in the rebellion. The
deliberate opinion of ministers is, that to terminate the present insurrection without confiscation of the lands of
the rebels, making of course ample provision for their future, would be to surrender every advantage that has
been gained, and practically to announce that British rule over the Maori race must cease, and the Northern
island be abandoned as a safe place of residence for Her Majesty's European subjects.

WILLIAM FOX,

Auckland,

5th May 1864.

Col.—Sec.

APPENDIX A.

Extract from a Letter from the Bishop of Waiapu, dated Turanga (Poverty Bay), April 15th, 1864.

"The Reports which are conveyed are of the most absurd character, such as you have had instances of in
other quarters; that the losses sustained by the soldiers are something enormous; that the Queen will not send
any more soldiers; that England is at war with America and Russia, and other parts of the world; that the
soldiers have been driven out of Rangiriri and Meremere; that Auckland is nearly depopulated, and that the
Natives of the coast have only to go there and take possession. The latest accounts which arrived while I was at
Waiapu spoke of 150 of Ngatiwhakaue being killed, and the coast natives were invited to go and finish the rest,
and drive away the soldiers from Maketu and Tauranga. It was to little purpose that I explained the onward
march of troops to A wamutu and Maungatautari: my story was all English and one—sided. I pressed upon
their attention the assurance of the Governor, that the lands of the Natives who remain quiet will not be
interfered with but that those who go to fight will lose their land. Those who are gone to Waikato have held out
threats against all who remain at home; that, on their return from destroying the "Pakehas," they will serve
them in like manner, because they would not join with them."

Extract from a private Letter from a Missionary on the East Coast.

"The most absurdly exaggerated reports are in circulation about our losses at Waikato. When the poor
"Avon" (Steam transport on the river) was injured, she had on board 1000 men, all of whom perished! The
General must have more lives than a cat. He was killed at Waikato, and 207. taken out of each of his boots. He went in disguise as a minister to one of the pas (I think Paterangi). The bell was rung, and he took his station in the pulpit, but counted each person as he entered. As the karakia (Church service) was proceeding, a Maori noticed some part of the uniform under the surplice; the alarm was given, and the unfortunate General was despatched. There are several other stories of the same character flying about, which are all implicitly believed."

Extract from a Letter written by W. Thompson to Natives on the East Coast, professing to report the engagement at Rangiaohia. (The actual loss to the Natives was above 100, and only one horse is said to have been killed on our side.)

"Those tribes then went on, and came to close quarters, the one with the bayonet, the other with the tomahawk. Twenty of the Pakehas fell. It was a hand to hand fight. Then came the cavalry. They now came upon our party. I called out 'fire.' One volley was fired, and every horse was killed; not one escaped. There was an end—Ngatiraukawa lost three, Urewera two, Tuwharetoa two, and Rangwewehi one.

"These were all our dead: as for the Pakehas, they had the bed (of death) to themselves.

"The General has proposed to make peace. It is ended.

"From Wi TAMEHAUA."

Extract from a private Letter from Cook's Straits.

"A man from Rangiaohia (Waikato) has come here He has damaged his cause by exaggerated statements. Among others, that 1500 soldiers were killed at Rangiaohia, and that Bishop Selwyn was now second in command, and rode about with a sword at his side."

APPENDIX B.
Correspondence between W. Nero and Mr. Fox.

"Auckland, 30th March, 1864.

"O, friend! O, Mr. Pox! This is the cause of my thoughts which caused me to speak of our going to Wm. Thompson and the chiefs of Waikato, namely, their desire to come towards life (meaning to leave off fighting), also to give up their guns, cartouche-boxes, and other munitions of war. The only reason for delaying (carrying into execution) these thoughts is, fear lest, after having given up their weapons, Wm. Thompson and Matutaera should be seized and hung. That is their fear.

"Therefore I reflected, and said, Let me be let to go to tell them whether this thought is true or false. If I see that it is true (as stated). I will let you know.

"Enough from your friend,
"To Mr. Fox. (Signed)
"Wi Nero."

"Auckland, 31st March 1864.

"FRIEND WM. NERO,—I have read your letter in which you say that the road to life for Wm. Thompson and the chiefs of Waikato is stopped because they are afraid if they give up their weapons Wm. Thompson and Matutaera will be hung, and you ask that you may be allowed to go to tell them whether this thought is true or false.

"Friend William, great is your love for Waikato, to save those men from destruction. This is good. The Government also desires that they should not perish. But that thought of theirs is wrong altogether. The word of the Government is that all will be spared if they lay down their arms and agree to live under the Queen's law. Their land will be gone to the Queen, but they will be allowed enough to live on well a Crown grant will be for each. This word is for Matutaera for Tarapipipi for all Waikato none are expected but the murderers. Let not these men, then, be afraid. But let them be quick in giving up their arms, for otherwise the General will not be held in; he will go on till the arms of the rebels are laid down.

"This is a true word. Now if you like to go, go. If you will not go, that also is well. This is that your love for Waikato may save the lives of those men, of Matutaera, of Thompson, and the others.
APPENDIX C.

The custom of confiscation, from a variety of causes, is a fixed one among the Natives, and has been practised for centuries in every part of the colony. When Captain Fitzroy failed to take the Wairau plains after the massacre of 1843, Rangiahetia, the principal actor on that occasion, said, "He paukena te Pakeha,"—the Governor is soft: he is a pumpkin.

W. F.

Mr. Cardwell's Despatch.

*Copy of Despatch from the Right Honourable Edward Cardwell to His Excellency Sir George Grey.*

Colonial Secretary's Office, Auckland, 27th June 1864.

The following Despatch from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies is published for general information.

WM. FOX.

"Downing-street, 26th April 1864.

"SIR,—Her Majesty's Government have had under their consideration three Acts passed by the Legislature of New Zealand in order to give effect to the views of your advisers with reference to the native war, viz—

"No. 8.—An Act to enable the Governor to establish Settlements for Colonization in the Northern Island of New Zealand.

"No. 11.—An Act for raising a Loan of three millions sterling for the public service of the colony of New Zealand.

"No. 12.—An Act to appropriate certain sums to be raised under the New—Zealand Loan Act, 1863 (the last mentioned Act) and to provide for the repayment of certain portions thereof.

"The most important of these Acts is that which stands first on the list.

"It declares in effect, that if, in the opinion of the Colonial Government, any considerable number of the members of any native community have been or shall hereafter be in rebellion, the Colonial Government may declare any district within which such community may hold property to be a district for the purpose of this Act, and may at any time thereafter confiscate within that district such lands as they may from time to time consider requisite for purposes of settlement, whether those lands be the property of loyal or disloyal natives or of colonists.

"Compensation is to be given, according to the judgment of a Court, to persons (or I presume to tribes or communities) who are to be dispossessed without having been engaged in rebellion.

"These Courts are not only empowered to refuse, but are positively disabled from giving compensation to any person who shall have aided, assisted, or comforted any rebel, or who (whether engaged in rebellion or not) shall have refused to give up his arms on being required to do so by proclamation.

"The law is a permanent law, applicable not only to the present conjuncture, but to any case in which the Colonial Government shall hereafter 'be satisfied' that any considerable number of any native community in any part of the island shall have been in rebellion since the first of January 1863.

"I learn from the memorandum which accompanies this Act, that the power of the Assembly to pass it has been questioned in New Zealand, and I have thought it right to submit it, together with one which has also been passed by the Colonial Legislature for the suppression of the rebellion, to the law officers of the Crown, for their opinion. That opinion I cannot receive in time to communicate with you by this mail; but I need not leave you in ignorance of the views which I entertain upon the policy embodied in this important law, or of the opinion of Her Majesty's Government in respect to the measures which ought to be taken, as soon as decisive success in arms shall enable you to take them, for the pacification and settlement of the Northern Island. It
appears that of the land thus about to be acquired, part is to be granted in lots, varying from 50 to 400 acres, to the members of the colonial force recently raised, numbering, I understand, about 4000 persons, and part is to be occupied by settlers, who are to be introduced from Europe at the expense of the colony, and are to hold their lands on a species of military tenure. It is supposed that the whole number of settlers, including the above mentioned colonial force, will amount to about 20,000.

“A scheme of this kind was submitted to the Duke of Newcastle, in your despatch No. 109, of the 29th of August last. Your Ministry then proposed the introduction of 5000 men, who were to hold fifty—acre farms upon military tenure, on land to be taken from insurgent natives Your despatch implied that you approved the principle of this scheme, and you stated that you had sanctioned it to the extent of raising 2000 men for active service.

“The Duke of Newcastle adopted your views, but not without a very serious caution as to the danger and delicacy of applying them. He indicated the difficulty of preventing the injustice, and the hazard of exciting the apprehension of the natives; he pointed out to the local Government the responsibility which they would incur of providing against these evident risks; and he added, that if the determination of your Government should have the effect of extending and intensifying the spirit of disaffection, and of thus enlarging the sphere or prolonging the period of military operations, these consequences would be viewed by Her Majesty's Government with the gravest concern and reprehension. I need scarcely observe that the Act now forwarded, taken in combination with the scheme proposed by your Government, exhibits a rapid expansion of the principles in which the Duke of Newcastle acquiesced with so much reserve.

“The number of settlers, and consequently the immediate amount of confiscation, is quadrupled; the compulsory power of acquiring land within a proclaimed district is, by the terms of the Act, applied alike to the loyal and the disloyal; the right of compensation is jealously limited, and is denied even to the most loyal native if he refused to surrender his accustomed right of carrying arms; and these powers are not to be exercised exceptionally and to meet the present emergency, or by regularly constituted courts of justice, but are permanently embodied in the law of New Zealand; and to form a standing qualification of the treaty of Waitangi.

“This being the nature of the law, I proceed to consider some very grave objections which may be urged against it.

“It renders permanently insecure the tenure of native property throughout the islands, and is thus calculated to alarm our friends. It makes no difference between the leaders and contrivers of rebellion, and their unwilling agents or allies, and is thus calculated to drive to despair those who are but half our enemies. The proceedings by which unlimited confiscation of property is to take place may be secret, without argument and without appeal. And the provision for compensation is as rigidly confined as the provision for punishment is flexible and unlimited.

“I concur with your advisers in thinking it impossible to apply to the Maories the maxims of English law in all their application to the details of civilized life. It is necessary to take into account the anomalous position which they occupy on one hand, as having acknowledged the Queen's sovereignty, and thus become liable to the obligations and entitled to the rights of British subjects, and on the other hand, as having been allowed to retain their tribal organization and native usages, and as thus occupying in a great measure the position of independent communities, Viewed in the former capacity, they have, by levying war against the Queen, rendered themselves punishable by death and confiscation of property. These penalties, however, can only be inflicted according to the rules, and under the protection of the Criminal Law. Viewed in the latter capacity, they would be at the mercy of their conquerors, to whom all public property would at once be transferred, private property remaining under the protection of international custom. Remembering the difficulty of determining what is private and what public property among the Maories, it seems to follow, that in the interest of all parties the rights of the Maori insurgents must be dealt with by methods not prescribed in any law—book, but arising out of the exceptional circumstances of a most anomalous case.

“It is therefore doubly necessary that those who administer in the name of the Queen's Government of irresistible power, should weigh dispassionately the claims which the insurgent Maories have on our consideration. In the absence of those legal safeguards which furnish the ordinary protection of the vanquished, the Imperial and Colonial Governments are bound so to adjust their proceedings to the laws of natural equity, and to the expectations which the natives have been encouraged or allowed to form, as to impress the whole Maori race at this critical moment with the conviction that their European rulers are just, as well as severe, and are desirous of using the present opportunity, not for their oppression, but for the permanent well—being of all the inhabitants of New Zealand.

“I recognise the necessity of inflicting a salutary penalty upon the authors of a war which was commenced by a treacherous and sanguinary outrage, and attended by so many circumstances justly entailing upon the guilty portion of the natives measures of condign punishment. But I hold in the first place, that in the
apportionment of this punishment, those who have actively promoted or violently prosecuted this war should be carefully distinguished from those who by circumstances, connexion, or sense of honour, or other natural temptation, have been unwillingly drawn into it, and still more pointedly from those who have on the whole adhered to the British cause. Even in the case of the most culpable tribes the punishment should be such as to inflict present humiliation and inconvenience rather than a recurring sense of injury, and should leave them with a conviction, that their punishment, if severe, has not exceeded the limits of justice, and also with the assurance that for the future they have nothing to fear, but every thing to hope from the Colonial Government. With this view, the punishment, however exemplary, should be inflicted once for all, and those who may have suffered from it, should be led to feel that they may engage in the fruits of industry on the lands which remain to them, with the same security from disturbance which is enjoyed by their most favoured fellow—subjects. And I should hold it as a great misfortune if the punishment were so allotted as to destroy those germs of order and prosperity which have been so singularly developed in some of the Waikato tribes.

"I do not dispute the right of the Colonial Government to obtain from the punishment of the insurgent natives some aid in defraying the expenses of the war; or, in other words, of including in the contemplated cession or forfeiture of lands to be disposed of by sale, as well as lands to be devoted to the purposes of military settlement. But these expenses have been mainly borne by this country, which has therefore a right to require that the cession or confiscation of territory shall not be carried further than may be consistent with the permanent pacification of the island and the honour of the English name. I must now invite your attention to some difficulties to which such a scheme would appear to be liable if carried into effect too suddenly and on too great a scale.

"I think it may be generally said that there is not much modern experience of a successful military settlement. In the present case, it can scarcely be hoped that the 20,000 persons whom it is proposed to place upon the land will be entirely of the most desirable class; and notwithstanding the intention expressed by your Ministers to provide for the introduction of married settlers with their families, it is to be expected that there will be a great preponderance of males amongst them, a circumstance which is always productive of many causes of strife in such a state of society. If the settlements should be scattered at a distance from any natural centre, and in the heart of a disaffected country, they might prove unequal to their own defence, and their protection would be extremely expensive, while it would hardly be possible for the colony to abandon the territories which it had occupied. Lastly, as the immigrants would be without special experience or capital, bound to a distasteful military tenure, and perhaps exposed to the hostility of the natives, it is to be feared that they would have to undergo much hardship, and would be soon attracted from their farms by the high wages of Australia, or the still nearer gold—fields of Otago.

"I am strengthened in these apprehensions by observing that the difficulty of enforcing military service upon colonists has pressed itself on the notice of yourself and the New-Zealand representatives. In your despatch of the 24th of July 1862, you express your fear that labourers and artisans could not be induced to remain in the colony if liable to militia service. And a somewhat similar anticipation is expressed in the memorial addressed to Her Majesty by the Houses of Representatives, and mentioned in your despatch of the 6th of October 1862.

"This is a matter which more properly belongs to your own advisers on the spot, responsible as they now are for the conduct of native affairs; and I do not urge these objections for the purpose of discouraging within moderate and practical limits a scheme from which you expect the best results, but only trust, in order to ensure success, these limits may be carefully considered in the first instance.

"I shall have occasion to recur to the subject of lands taken for sale in considering the proposal for a guaranteed loan.

"Considering that the defence of the colony is at present effected by an Imperial force, I should perhaps have been justified in recommending the disallowance of an Act couched in such sweeping terms, capable therefore of great abuse—unless its practical operation were restrained by a strong and resolute hand—and calculated, if abused, to frustrate its own objects and to prolong instead of terminate war. But not having received from you any expression of your disapproval, and being most unwilling to take any course which would weaken your hands in the moment of your military success, Her Majesty's Government have decided that the Act shall for the present remain in operation.

"They are led to this conclusion, not merely by a desire to sustain the authority of the local Government, but also, in no small degree, by observing that no confiscation can take effect without your personal concurrence, and by the reliance which they so justly place on your sagacity, firmness, and experience, and your long-recognised regard, as well for the interests of the colonists as for the fair rights and expectations of the native race.

"I have therefore to convey to you the following instructions, as embodying the decisions of Her Majesty's Government.
"It is in their opinion very much to be desired that the proposed appropriation of land should take the form of a cession imposed by yourself and General Cameron upon the conquered tribes, and made by them to the representatives of the Queen as a condition on which Her Majesty's clemency is extended to them. The advantages of such a settlement (in which, however, I need hardly say the position of the Maoris as defeated rebels should be unequivocally exhibited) are too manifest to need explanation.

"But if this should be found impossible, you are at liberty, subject to the following reservations, to give your concurrence in bringing the law into operation.

"A measure should be at once submitted to the legislature to limit the duration of the Act to a definite period, not exceeding, I think, two years from its original enactment, a period long enough to allow for the necessary inquiries respecting the extent, situation, and justice of the forfeiture yet short enough to relieve the conquered party from any protracted suspended, and to assure those who have adhered to us that there is no intention of suspending in their case the ordinary principles of law.

"The aggregate extent of the forfeiture should be at once made known, and their exact position as soon as possible.

"A Commission should be constituted for the special purpose of inquiring what lands may properly be forfeited. The members of this Commission should not be removable with the Ministry, and should be so chosen as to guarantee a fair and careful consideration of the matters brought before them.

"It should be clearly understood that your own concurrence in any or forfeiture is not to be considered as a mere ministerial act, but that it will be withheld unless you are personally satisfied that the confiscation is just and moderate.

"And here I must observe, that if, in the settlement of the forfeited districts, all the land which is capable of remunerative cultivation should be signed to colonists, and the original owner—the Maori—be driven back to the of rest and morass, the sense of injustice, combined with the pressure of want, would convert the native population into a desperate banditti, taking refuge in the solitudes of the interior from the pursuit of the police or military, and descending when opportunity might occur into the cultivated plain to destroy the peaceful fruits of industry. I rely on your wisdom and justice to avert a danger so serious in its bearing on the interests of the European, not less than of the native race.

"Turning to that part of the law which authorizes the dispossession of persons who have not been involved in the recent rebellion, I have to observe that although Her Majesty's Government admit with regret that the tribal nature of the native tenure will sometimes render it unavoidable that innocent persons should be deprived of their lands, they consider that land should not be appropriated against the will of the owners merely because it is in the same district with rebel property, and may be conveniently used for purposes of settlement, but only in cases where loyal or neutral natives are unfortunate enough to be joint owners with persons concerned in the rebellion, or because it is absolutely required for some purpose of defence or communication, or on some similar grounds of necessity. But every such case of supposed necessity should be examined with the greatest care, and admitted with the greatest caution and reserve.

"The compensation to be given to persons thus dispossessed is properly, by the Act itself, made the subject of inquiry in an open Court. But the 5th section of the Act ought to be so modified that the powers of the Court may not be limited in any manner which would prevent its doing complete justice to the claims of every innocent person, or extending reasonable consideration to those whose guilt was of a less heinous character; a class which, in the varying temper of the New-Zealand tribes, is probably large. I trust that in accepting any cession, or authorizing confirmation of any forfeiture of land, you will retain in your own hands ample power of doing substantial justice to every class of claimant for restitution or compensation.

"Finally, when you have taken all the powers and received all the cessions which you think necessary for the satisfactory pacification of the islands, you will do well to accompany these measures of justice and severity by the announcement of a general amnesty, from which those only should be excepted who have been concerned in the murders of unoffending settlers, or other like offences of a heinous and strictly exceptional character. In order to mark as much as possible the discriminating character of British justice, the exception from the amnesty should not be couched in general terms, but should recite one by one the specific outrages which remain unpardoned.

"Subject to these cautions and conditions, and in full confidence that you will act on the general principles which I have before laid down (and in which I anticipate your cordial concurrence), Her Majesty's Government are prepared to leave in your hands the power with which you have been entrusted by the Legislature of the colony.

"In the despatch in which you have transmitted to me these measures, you have expressed, in terms with which I entirely agree, your own appreciation of a generous policy, and of its beneficial consequences when adopted on former occasions in New Zealand. You give at the same time your reasons, the justice of which I am not prepared to dispute, for determining that the circumstances of the present case justly and necessarily call for
measures of severity, such as have not been adopted at the close of former wars; but you accompany these reasons with the expression of your opinion that this severity ought not to be carried too far. I recognise also with satisfaction the statement of your Ministers on the occasion of their first submitting to you their views upon forfeiture and military settlement. They said they felt assured that as this would be the first, so it would be the last occasion on which an aboriginal inhabitant of New Zealand would be deprived of land against his will.

"I trust that on their part there will be no unwillingness to cooperate with you in confining the measures of severity, to which it may be necessary to have recourse, within those just limits to which I have referred.

"I now turn to the Act which authorizes a loan of 3,000,000l., for which it is desired to obtain the guarantee of the British Parliament. I observe that of the total sum it is proposed to raise, 1,000,000l. is allotted to the expenses of the war, 200,000l. to the repayment of a debt to the Imperial Government, which has probably doubled since that time, 200,000l. to the compensation of the Taranaki settlers, and the rest, in the main, in the settlement of the country. The bulk of it appears to be appropriated to the plan of military settlement to which I have already adverted.

"Her Majesty's Government recognise as exceptional the expenses occasioned to the colony by the native war. And they are not unwilling to entertain the question of extending the guarantee of the 500,000l., which they have already conditionally promised to submit to Parliament, to such a further sum as will cover the increased debt of the colony to the Imperial Exchequer, and so much of these military expenses, including 200,000l. for compensation to the Taranaki settlers, as may properly be defrayed, not out of current revenue of the colony, but by loan.

"But the same reasons do not, in their judgment, apply to the settlement of the country, which, whether successful or not as a measure of defence, as mainly a matter of colonial interest, inasmuch as its success is calculated to and to the wealth and population of the colony. To a purpose of this kind the Imperial credit is not generally applicable; and Her Majesty's Government do not consider that the land which it is proposed to acquire under the Settlement Act is of any such definite value as materially to add to the security on which the guarantee of Parliament could be given The omission of this sum with reduce the whole loan within much narrower limits, and I will consider and write you on a future occasion how far the revenue of New Zealand, pledged by the terms of the Act, and the considerations to which I have referred, may justify Her Majesty's Government in increasing the proposal they have promised of make to Parliament. Under any circumstances, the sum will doubtless appear to Parliament larger than it has hitherto been usual to guarantee to a colony of the size and resources of New Zealand, and could only be proposed by the Government with any prospect of success in connexion with the peculiar circumstances of the present loan, and in the well-founded hope of a final pacification and settlement.

"I must now call attention to the importance of reducing, as rapidly is possible, after the conclusion of the troubles, the large force now maintained in New Zealand, and I confidently expect to receive from you such information as may enable me to communicate to the Secretary of State for War the possibility of a great reduction in the number of men, and consequently in the estimate for the year 1865—66. I must also remind you, that for the great expense which this country has already incurred in putting down the present insurrection, the Home Government only calls upon the colony for that almost nominal contribution which it has already engaged to pay.

"The arrangement at present in force respecting the amount of the military contribution, and the proportion of it which is to be returned to the colony, to be employed for the benefit of the natives, will terminate with the close of the present year. In consenting to guarantee a large loan for the colony the Imperial Government will feel it necessary to require, that if, at the else of that period, the colony should continue to require the assistance of the mother—country, a much more adequate contribution shall be made to the Imperial exchequer. I am, however, unable at this moment to convey to you any definite decision on this part of the subject. It is under the consideration of the Government, and I shall take an early opportunity of addressing you again upon it.

"I conclude by expressing an earnest hope that the operation in which General Cameron has been engaged may already have terminated the war; and shall rejoice when I am able to congratulate you on having succeeded by the wisdom of your own measures and those of your Government, by the skill of that distinguished commander, and by the valour of the Queen's troops and seamen, and of the colonial forces engaged in the conflict, in restoring the blessings of order and good government to the country entrusted to your care.

"I have, &c.,

"Edward Cardwell."
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To the Maories of New Zealand.

FRIENDS,—

Some of the true English friends of the Maories wish that Abraham Pungatara and William Pou may, on their return to their country, carry back words of kindness and useful counsel to their brethren.

Their English friends are grieved at the cruel war in which so many Maories and Englishmen have been killed; in which so many good and valuable things have been destroyed; and, more than all, at the black and gloomy future which it may bring to all the Maori people.

Living so far off, their English friends do not know, and will not pretend to say, who are quite right, and who are most to blame; but they believe that many of their English countrymen have treated the Maories very badly, and not as Christians ought to do. This does not make it right for Maories to do like them. It would not be good, even if they were able, to drive away all their enemies—the bad whites.

Their English friends wish William Pou and Abraham Pungatara, when they are safely returned to New Zealand, very plainly to tell their countrymen what they have seen in England, how many people there are here, and what strength they have, so that it must be quite impossible for the Maories to conquer, even if they gained victories and killed many whites. Perhaps the Maories read in their Bibles that God helped the Israelites to gain battles against their stronger enemies, but they must not deceive themselves by expecting to gain battles in the same way. Those Israelites lived in Old Testament times. The Saviour of the world had not come, and the whole truth was not made known. We cannot read that Jesus Christ told his disciples to fight, or that they ever did so. The Maories must not, on this account, give up hope, and say that all is lost; for God still gives the best help to those who truly obey and really trust Him.

Your English friends will now tell you a little of what they think that you should do for your safety and good.

First,—Be as peaceable, and as much of one mind, amongst yourselves, as you can be. Unless you do so you will break to pieces like a glass bottle dashed on the stones, which cannot be mended.

Secondly,—Do nothing which your enemies can truly say is wrong, and breaking the laws. If you do, they will say that you must be punished, and they may never think that they have punished you enough.

Thirdly,—If wrong be done to you never revenge it. Try, with the best temper, and the greatest perseverance, to get your right,

according to law, and with the help of the best whites who are your friends, and they, if you choose them properly, will not mislead you.

Fourthly,—Truly, Queen Victoria and many Englishmen are your friends, and you have friends in New Zealand, for some colonists are good; but you must not think it quite enough to have friends and to do no wrong. Remember the bad and idle servant, who put his lord's money in the ground. You have life, and strength, and land, and minds, which, like the land, require to be cultivated, and many other things which are the talents your Lord has given you to use, and, if you do not use them, you will surely be the losers.

When Victoria was made Queen of New Zealand, as well as Queen of England, many Englishmen came to your country and bought much land with little money, because land then was cheap. They set to work and made themselves rich and bought more land, and many Englishmen came and did the same. So many Englishmen could not live together without laws and without head men to guide and judge them. The lands where the Englishmen lived were divided and marked out for different rulers, like the land of Canaan, which the Israelites took from the people who were there before them, and divided amongst their several tribes; but the Englishmen did not wish to destroy the Maories, as the Israelites were told to do to the Canaanites, but they took no trouble to help you to have the useful English laws where the Maories live. Perhaps they thought it best and kindest to leave you alone to please yourselves, but this was not right. You saw that the Englishmen's rule was good for them, and you tried to do like them, and desired a king, which made the colonists greatly displeased, because it looked like opposition to Queen Victoria and her Government. It may be that you meant no such thing, yet it helped to set the people against you.

It is good news which has come to England that the war is ended, and that you have given up fighting. You must now get Bishop Selwyn, Sir William Martin, Archdeacon Hadfield, and your other true English friends, to help you to make a just and honest peace with the colonists in their different provinces, under the sanction and support of the Governor, Sir George Grey, who acts for the Queen in all the islands, and whose office it is to maintain the law throughout the native districts and the European provinces. When you are thus relieved from the sufferings and dangers of war, you must lose no time to have the Maori tribes of New Zealand placed under the same laws as the Pakeha's provinces. They need not be joined to Auckland or Canterbury, or any other
province, but form one or more like them, where Maories and Englishmen may be governed alike; and live alike. In bringing this about you are happy in having such a man as Sir William Martin near you. He is your true friend, and is a wise lawyer. With his help you may have such laws that Maories and colonists may live and work well together, neither being above the other.

Fifthly,—Instead of the tribes having their lands in common, every man must have his own piece for himself and his family to use, which nobody should have the right to interfere with. Its boundaries should be clearly marked, that no one should meddle with it; but to prevent his being robbed by selfish and dishonest persons he should be unable to dispose of it, and this rule should be made quite strong and safe. Even the letting or leasing of land should be discouraged and never sanctioned without caution and registration. Colonists, out of New Zealand, have had lands let to them by natives, and then the Colonists have kept possession and driven the natives away. It will be quite right to keep some of the land as common property, in every native district, which may be turned to great advantage for public and private purposes.

Sixthly,—It is awful to see that the Maories are becoming fewer and fewer every year, whilst the Colonists are year after year becoming more numerous. Many English children are born in New Zealand, and many grown up men and women go there in ships, but the Maories raise up few young people, and the strong men are killed in war, and leave very few to fill their places.

Your chiefs and all your people, your men and your women, must think very much of this state of things, which must come to an end. It will be of little use to have good laws and to look to the Queen and the Governor to protect you and love you, because you do not break the laws, and because you keep the peace, and are good neighbours, if you are wasting away all the time. The laws of a country and good magistrates may keep neighbours in order, but the people cannot prosper and do well if the families do not keep themselves in good order.

Seventhly,—All the family good which your friends desire and pray for you must grow out of beginning well. Then let every family have its own separate house with separate rooms in it. You cannot know what it is to be a private orderly family, unless you attend to this advice. It will be quite right to encourage marriages. Every man and every woman should be married, but every marriage is not a right and good marriage; therefore the man and the wife, and the children, are not happy and prosperous. The man and the woman should first know their own minds, and feel sure that they can love each other and make each other happy, and that they can well provide for themselves and their children, if they have any. They may then ask God to bless their marriage and help them to keep their promises to each other, and to bring up children who may be a blessing to their parents and to their countrymen. The young people who ought to marry may consult their wiser and older friends. They ought to do so, but the older people ought not to make objections and difficulties, when there is no true and good reason for doing so. They ought in every way to help a proper marriage, and promote the happiness of the new family, but not meddle with its doings in any other way, unless there is something quite wrong to be altered, and then let them give advice in the most gracious and pleasant manner.

Eighthly,—The future of the Maori people is to be placed, under the blessing of God, in the young people, and in those who are yet to be born. You must therefore look well to the bringing up of children. Their bodies must be sufficiently fed with the right sort of food, and also protected by the right sort of clean clothing. As soon as possible, attend to their minds, teaching them to be truthful and honest, obedient to their parents, to love God and to fear to offend him by doing any thing which they know to be wrong, and which, when done, makes them unhappy, though no one may know it but themselves. Strive in an especial manner to keep them pure and chaste, as they must grow up surrounded by many opposite temptations. Be quite as careful about the training and bringing up of the girls as of the boys. As they grow up and become mothers they will have to form the future men. They are much exposed to temptation, and the good or the ruin of the Maories may spring from them.

Ninthly,—Those who would be really Christians, and also good and useful Maories, should obey the command of our Saviour, and be wise as serpents as well as harmless as doves. It is very necessary that you should be wise, for those who would do you the most injury have plenty of the wisdom of this world. If you and your children know as much as they, they will not find it so easy to deceive and injure you. You and your children should become well acquainted with the English language, spoken, printed, and written, and with English books and newspapers. There is so little printed in the Maori language that you cannot know enough by reading that only. If you know English well, you will not only know what the Colonists say and do as well as yourselves, but you may print your own thoughts, and the good counsel which you wish to give to your relatives and friends at a distance from you.

Tenthly,—You should learn to print for yourselves, and it will not cost much to have a printing press through your friends in England. All such useful things may be had if you earn money and take care of it, never spending it or giving it away for that which is not good or of no use. Never buy or receive, use or sell,
gunpowder, spirits, or tobacco, which are tools of the wicked one. The rule may be almost general.

Eleventh.—Cultivating the ground in order to produce the best crops, and rearing live stock of the most desirable kinds, is good for your health and that of your families; and by so using the ground yourselves you will be taking away temptation from those who seek to injure you. Some of your people should live for a time with Colonists to learn useful arts.

Twelfth, and lastly,—When you find that you are getting on well, that the Almighty blesses your labours, and you are pleased with the knowledge you acquire, do not let these things make you proud, puffed up, and uncivil and haughty; but be gentle to all men, Maories and Colonists, slow to anger, and humble, or meek, remembering the words of our Saviour, that the meek shall inherit the earth, and that the Scripture also tells us that the meek the Lord will guide in judgment.

Your English friends believe that many Maories—know already what is here written, but it may shew their good will and affection to put you in mind of them.

They bid you Farewell, and finish by saying, If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

From us,
Your loving Friends,
S. Gurney.
R. N. Fowler.
Thomas Hodgkin, M.D.
F. W. Chesson.

London,
Nov. 1864.

(To the Maories of New Zealand) Ki Nga Maori O Niu Tireni.

E Hoa Ma,
Ko te hiahia tenei a matou a nga hoa aroha, i Ingarani nei, o nga Maori, kia tukua atu, ma Wiremu Pou raua ko Aperahama Pungatara e kawe atu a matou kupu aroha, kupu ako, ki o raua hoa Maori, i a raua ka hoki nei ki to raua whenua tupu.

Tau iho te pouri ki nga Pakeha hoa aroha o to Maori, ki te whawhai nanakia e hinga mai nei te tini o te Maori o te pakeha—he whawhai maumau tangata, maumau taonga—ko te mea ia i tino pouritia ai ko te kino pea o te tukunga iho ki nga iwi Maori.

Kei tawhiti noa mai nei maori nga hoa aroha Inirihoi o te Maori e noho ana, e kore matou a hui te mohio, kowai i tika, kowai i he, ko to matou ia e whakaaro nei ko etahi o nga pakeha kina i whakatupu kina ki te Maori, kihai i rite ki ra te Karaitiana tikanga. Heoi, ahakoa i pera, c kore e tika kia utua atu e te Maori he kino mo te kino. Ahakoa e kaha ana pea te Maori ki te pei i o ratou hoa riri i nga pakeha kina, heoi ekore e pai te pera.

Te hiahia a nga hoa aroha Ingirihi o te Maori, kia tino korerotia katoatia ki a ratou, e Wiremu Pou, raua ko Aperahama Pungatara, ki te tae ora atu raua ki Nui Tiren, nga mea katoa i kite ai raua i Ingarani nei—te mano tino i te tangata, me to ratou kaha; ki kia huihui ai te Maori, ahakoa e riro to papa i a ratou i etalii wha—whaitanga, ahakoa e tini te Pakeha e hinga i a ratou, heoi, kei te roanga iho ko te Maori e nga kohatu, e whakaaro e pera ratou te awhinatia e riro tonu ai te papa i a ratou i roto i nga whawhaitanga. No nga takiwa onamata, o te Kawenata Tawhito, te iwi o Iharaira. Kahore ano kia tae mai i reira, te Kai Wha—kaora o te Ao, kahore ano kia tino puaki mai nga tikanga katoa a te Atua. Kahoro he kupu a te Karaiti ki ana Akonga e, me whawhai ratou, kahore ano hoki tato i rongo noa i whawhai nga Akonga a te Karaiti. Heoi, ahakoa tenei, kia rei i poui te ngakau o te Maori, kaua e koe i he maumau whakaaaro, te te mea e mau tonu ana iniai e ia a te Atua awhina i te hunga o pono ana te rongo ki ana tikanga, e pono ana te o to te ngakau ki a ia.

Tenei etahi kupu whakatupato mo koutou, na o koutou hoa aroha Ingirihi, hei ora hei pai mo koutou.

Tuatahi—Kia ata noho, kia ngakau tahi ki tetahi ki tetahi o koutou. Ki te kore koutou e pera ka moti noa iho koutou, ka rite ki te ipu pounamu e akina ana ki te kohatu, te taea te hanga hou.
Tuarau—Kia tupato kei māhi he koutou, kei takahia te Ture, e tika ai he take whakaheanga mo koutou e o koutou hoa riri. Kei whai take hoki e kai ai ratou me wliakawhiu koutou, a unakia iho pea te whakawhiunga.

Tuatoru—Ki te whai take pakanga, he he no te tangata ki a koutou, kaua e utua ki te kino. Me ata tohe, me ata rapu marire i runga i te ngakau riri e pehia ana, kia whakatikaia ta koutou ki ta te Ture tikanga, me whai atu ki nga pakeha tino pai, e aroha nei ki te Maori, hei hoa awhina, a ki te tika ta koutou whirihirihiri i te pakeha whakapono, ekore koutou e nukaia e ratou.

Tuawa—He tino pono tenei, kia rongo mai, e tino aroha ana a Kuini Wikitoria, me te tokomaha o nga Pakeha o Ingarani ki a koutou, e arohangia ana hoki koutou e etahi o ena i Nui Tiren, he hunga pai etahi o nga Pakeha i heke atu na ki Nui Tiren, heoi, kei whakaaro koutou heoi ano ma koutou ko te whai hoa aroha, ko te ata noho, a heoi ano: kahore—Engari, kia mahara ki te pono—nga kino, pongonga mangere, i huna ra i nga moni a tona Ariki ki te oneone. He ora te tika whaou, he kaha; he whenua o koutou, he ngakau, he hinengaro mahara o koutou, me māhi te hinengaro, me para me te oneone e mahia ana, tena atu ano hoki he māha nga mea kei a koutou, he taranata ena mei a hoatu e to koutou Ariki kia mahia e koutou, a ki te kore e mahia tikatia e koutou, mo koutou ano te he.

I te takiwa i an whakangāuitia a i Wireki a Kuini Wikitoria he Kuini mo Ingarani mo Nui Tiren hoki, he tini te Pakeha i heke atu ki to koutou whenua, a he nui te whenua i hokona e ratou, he iti nga moni i utua ai ta mea he iti te utu mo te whenua i tera takiwa. Tahuri ana ratou ki te māhi kua tina haere o ratou taonga, na, kei te hoko oneone ano mo ratou, kīte ana te nuinga atu o te ratou. Kei ka o te ngau ano hoki ratou. Ekorē a tau te noho huihui o te tino i te Pakeha e runga i te tikanga ture—kore, me te kore tangata hei whakatikatika, hei whakawa i a ratou. Na konei hoki i wehe—wehea ai i rititia a iha whenua e nga nohoia ana e nga Ingirihia, kia nohoia i e ka iho tohutohu, e ka iai tohutohu pera me te whenua o Kanaana i tangohia ra e Iharaira i nga iwi i rokohanga atu e ratou e noho ana i heira, wehewehe ake mo i a hapu, mo i a hapu, o ratou; heoi, kahore he hiahiha o aua Ingirihia kia whakangaromia o nga whenua, kia perataia ana te a Te Atua i ako an ka ratou. Kei noa nga whenua e Kanaana, kotahi ia ta te Pakeha, mangere ana i te tuku atu i nga Ture pai a te Pakeha ki roto ki nga Kaanga Maori mahia. Ka te ratou nei whakaaro pea he tohu aroha no ratou, te waiho noa iho i a koutou i kona mahia noa ai i a koutou koutou paei i a koutou, heoi, he whakawhena he te tana.

Titaro ana koutou he pai mo te Pakeha te Ture, na kei te hiahia hoki koutou kia rite ki a ratou, tu ana ko ta koutou Kingi, riri ana te Heke Pakeha ka hua he tutu ki a Kuini Wikitoria ki te Kawanatanga ano hoki. He hanga noa iho pea u a koutou nei, heoi ko tetahi take tera i kino ai te hanga Pakeha ki a koutou. He rongo pai tenei kua tae nei e, kua mutu te whawhawhai, kua whakaae koutou kia hohia te rongo. Haere koutou ki a Pihopa Herewini, ki a te Matenga, (Sir William Martin) ki a te Harawira, minita, (Archdeacon Hadfield) ki era atu o a koutou hoa pono pakeha, hei hoa mo koutou ki te whakamaunui i te rongo ki nga Pakeha Pakeha na i o ratou tini wahi e noho i, me tongo atu kia wha—kawaietia kia whakauaugia e te Kaawa, e Ta Hori Kerei, he mea whakarite hoki i a na te Kuini mo nga motu katoa o Nui Tiren, hei whakapumapua i te Ture ki nga Kaanga Maori, ki nga Kaanga Pakeha. Ano ka pahemo mai koutou i roto i nga mamae i nga mate o te takiwa pakanga, kei tureiti koutou—hohoronui tonu te tango i nga Ture Pakeha hei Ture mo nga tini Hapu Maori. Haunga te huhihi ngatahi ki tera i Akarana i Katepere ranei, i era atu Kaanga ranei, engari me whakarite to te Maori ki o era Kaanga, kia tika ai te noho huhihi o te Maori o te Pakeha kotahi tonu Ture mo tetahi, me tetahi, me nga whare whai ruma, me nga kai, me nga kakahu, aha, aha. Na, he pai rawa a te Matenga (Sir William Martin) hei Kai tohutohu mo ratou. He tanga tino aroha iai ki a koutou he Roia mohio rawa hoki. Mana koutou e whakako ki nga Ture pai e tau ai te noho talii, me te mahi tahi o te Maori o te Heke Pakeha, kaua tetahi e hira ake i tetahi.

Tuarima—Me whakakore te tikanga pupuri a hapu i nga whenua, me motuhake te piili o ia ianga, o ia tangata, mona akei, hei wahi mo koutou te tana whaihine ko a raua tamariki, kaua hoki te tangata ke e pokenaio mai. Kia tino marama nga rohe kei poka—noatai e te tangata; heoi, me ruri, me tuhitahi, hei whenua tuku iho ki ona uri, kei taea e hokina noa atu i a, he mea kei nukaia ia e te hunga tinihanga, tahae, me whakapumapua hei ture mau tonu tenei. Na, ko te reti, ko te ritia, ko te ritia nga whenua e kia whine, engari ki te perata i kia mo, kia tupato, me whai tuhitahi Roia kia tika ai. Kua kia tenui hoki ki etahi whenua, haunga i Nui Tiren, retia ana nga whenua e nga iwi Maori ki nga Heke Pakeha, ta—nohia ake mo ratou te whenua, pea ia te hunga noa. He tika rawa kia motuia kei tahaia whai wahi o te whenua te kia tana mo nga whai wahi mea Raio, me huihui te kia tana mo nga whai wahi, me aha e huihui, me huihui.

Tuaono—E aue ana matou ki te ngaro haere o te Maori, e iti haere ana te tokomaha i tenei tau, i tenei tau, ko te Heke Pakeha ia, huri ake he tau, me te tini haere. He nui te tamariki Pakeha e whanau ana ki Nui Tiren, he nui te tane, te whain te whaina koumataua e ake atu ana i runga i te kaipuke, he iti i ake a tamariki Maori e tae ano ki te kaumatua tanga, ko nga tanga mahi mariorihi e hinga ana i te parekura, kore noa iho he whakakapi mo ratou.

Tena kei te nui pea te whakaaro a nga Rangatir Maori, a nga tane, a nga wahine, a te iwi katoa, ki taua mea nei, na me wha—4a kaaro he tikanga e mutu ai. Mo he mea kei te ngaro haere koutou, he aha te pai kia whai Ture pai, kia whakaaro ma kou ma ki te Kuini raui ko te Kawana hei tikai, hei aroha i a koutou, i a koutou e ata
noho ana, e rongo ana ki te Ture, e whakahoa pai ana ki nga Pakeha. Kia rongo mai, He pai nga Ture, he pai nga Kai whakawha hei pehi mo
te hunga tutu, heoi, e kore e kake ki te nui te iwi, ki te kore e pai te whakatupu ake nga tangata o ia whare o ia whare.

Tuawhitu—Na ko nga pai e hiahiatia ana, e inoitia ana mo koutou e nga hoa aroha, ma te mea kia pai te pukenga ake, ka whirrihi ai koutou. He mea tika kia tuku nga tane, nga wahine, ki te marena. Me marena katoa ratou. Heoi, e kitea ana te marenatanga o etahi kihai i pai; na reira kore ake he tatutanga ngakau, kore ake e kake ki te nui, ki te pai, te tane hei hoa e nga tamariki. Na, me ata whakaro marire i he timatanga te tano raau ko te wahine, kua tino aroha, kua tino ngakau nui ranei raau ki a raua, e mau tonu ranei to raau pai a mate noa, a tena ranei kei hea he rawa mo ratou ko a raua tamariki ki te whai uri raau. Ki te mea e pono ana te aroha o te tetai o te tetai, katalahi ka kia tika ioi ki te Atua kia manaakitia to raau marenatanga, kia pono aoi ta raau whakae ki a raau; ki whakatupuriria tikatia a i whai awhi tamariki hei whakahari mo nga matua hea pai mo te iwi Maori.

Ko nga taitamariki, taitamahine, kua tika kia marenatia, me ata korero ki nga matua ki nga hoa kaumautia ki te hunga whakaro tika. Ae, e tika ana kia pera, heoi, kaua ano hoki nga matua, nga kaumautaa e pakeke hufua kore. Ma te take tika ano ka pai ai. Me he mea, he marena tika te marena, kaua e araia, tukua, wha—kapumautia te ora te pai o te hunga marena hou, ma te he anake katalahi ka whai kupu atu, ara, i runga i te aroha te hunga, te aroha i te whare.

Tuawaru—Na, kei nga taitamaki, kei ratou te taura uri o muri nei he whakaraotanga mo te Maori i nga taima e haere ake nei, ara—ki te manaakitia ratou e te Atua, mo reira hoki, kia tupato, kia mohio, kia pai te whakatupu ake i nga tamariki. Kia papai nga kai e whangaia ai o ratou tinana, kia pai, kia ma nga kakahu. Timata kau te mohio, tahuri ki te whakaako i o ratou hinengaro, akona kia pono te kupu, kaua he koreror leka, te tahahe ranei, kia rongo ko nga matua, akona kia aroha ki te Atua, kia wehi i nga mea e riri ai ia, e tau ai hoki te mamae ki o ratou ngakau, ahakoa i mahia humatia i te tangata. Tiakina ratou i nga maha kino i nga moe tehara, i nga whakawainga e karapotia ai ratou. Kia rite tahi ano ki to nga tamariki tane te pai o te whakatupu ake, o te tiaki i nga kotiro. Ka kaumautaa ratou, ka marena, ka whanau tama, ka riro ko ratou hei whakatupuriria kia pai nga tangata mo amua. He tini nga whakawaia e karapotia ai ratou, ma te mea kia pia nga whaea, ka tupu ake he pai mo nga Maori—ma te mea tino ranei he whaeae kino nga whaea ka tupu ake hoki ki maha hanga nga maori.

Tuaiwa—Ko koutou e mea ana hei Karaitiana pono koutou, hei Maori pai e hua ana i te hunga paua, kia rongo ko te Ture a te tao tatu Kai—whakaroa ara, "kia rite ki te nakahi te mahara, kia rite ki nga kukupa te kino kore." He pai kia mohio, kia tupato koutou, hei nui hoki te mohio maori o te hunga e tupa ai te kore i te koutou. Kie te whihihi koutou ko a koutou tamariki ki te mohio—nga e kore koutou e taa te nuka e ratou. Kia hohoro koutou ko a koutou tamariki te ako i te reo Pakeha, kia mohio ai koutou ki te korero, ki te tuhihi, ki te titoi pukapuka reo pakeha, i nga Nuiepea Pakeha ano hoki. He korekore nga pukapuka e taia ana ki te reo Maori, e kore e hohoro koutou te whihihi ki nga tini ma—tauranga ki era anake. Engari ki te tino mohio koutou ki te Reo Pakeha, ka mohio koutou ki nga korero ki nga mahi a nga Heke Pakeha, ae, ka taea ano hoki kia whakaro te perereh i koutou ko te reo Pakeha, me nga kupu aki ko i koutou huaanga i noho ano i tawhititahi.

Kotahi tekau—Me ako e koutou te mahi te tahi ma nga pukapuka ma koutou, e kore e tino nui te utu o te perehi, ma nga hoa Pakeha i Ingarani nei e uta atu ki te hiahia koutou. He tini te taonga pai c riro i a koutou, ki te uaua koutou ko te mohio moni ma.koutou, ka rongoai ai, hei hoko i nga taonga pai, kaua e rukea noatia atu, ma maumario ranei ki nga hangahanga noa iho. Kaua e hoko ranei e tango noa mai ranei, hei mahi hei hoko ranei ma koutou te paura, te waiipo, te tupeka, he ore rei na te wairua kino. Hei ture horapa ki te katoa tenei.

Tekau—Hei mahi he, he mahi ora mo te tinana, te mahi ngak whanga whanga, kaua, aha, aha, ka mahia pcratia te whenua e kore e hiahia ihe mai te tangata tini—hanganga. He mea pai kia noho etahi o koutou ki nga Pakeha, ako ai i nga tino mahi Pakeha.

Teka-rara—To ko wliakingatanga—Ki te rite i a koutou e tenei tenei, ki te tau ki a koutou te manaakititanga a te Atua, ki te koe te ngakau i te maturanga kua nui heare; hei whakakake te ngakau, hei whakapemahepeha, hei hikaka, engari kia ngawari ki nga tanga katoa, ki a koutou whaha—maori, ki nga Heke Pakeha, kia aweke ki te riri, kia whakai, kia humarie, te ma mara ano ki te kupu a to tato Kai—whakora kia i ai e, "ma te hunga ngakau marie e noho te Whenua," e ki ano ano hoki nga Kapaiputere, ma Ihowa e whakatika te haere o to hunga marie.

E mohio ana matou o koutou tango aho aroha Ingirihiki he tokomalia nga tanga Maori kua mohio noa ake ki enei mea, heoi e aroha, he putanga kohia tenei i whakamaharaitia atu ai.

Heio ano Hei kona ra, hei kupu whakamutunga tenei, "Ki te matau koutou ki enei mea ka koa ki te meatia e koutou."
A GREAT wrong is being perpetrated in New Zealand. The legislature of that colony have, by large
majorities, passed a Bill, confiscating native lands in the disturbed districts to the extent of several millions of
acres. There is a feeling in the colony that this measure is, in the highest degree, vindictive and even dangerous;
but for the present all sense of prudence and of justice has been overwhelmed by an anti—aboriginal torrent of
hatred and rapacity. That Governor Grey and Mr. Fox should have yielded to these influences is greatly to be
deplored; but the duty of those who regard a policy of confiscation as cruelly revengeful in itself, and as likely
to lead to a war still more sanguinary than that which appears to be on the eve of terminating, is not the less
plain because these eminent men have given the weight of their authority to a measure of spoliation. On the
contrary, there is the more need that the friends of justice in England should emphatically protest against both
the principle and the details of the Bill, and use all their influence to induce the Government to withhold from it
the Royal assent. The Memorial which the Aborigines' Protection Society has addressed to the Duke of
Newcastle will show the specific grounds upon which the Imperial veto is solicited. The report of the debate on
the second reading in the Legislative Council, which is printed word for word as it was published in the New
Zealander, will furnish the reader with ample proof of the fact that the Bill was opposed by gentlemen of high
authority in the colony, whose speeches, we may add, contain arguments so incontrovertible that neither
ministers nor their supporters appear to have attempted anything worthy the name of a reply. We conclude with
the expression of an earnest hope that this attempt to despoil the native tribes of lands which are necessary to
their very existence, may be defeated, and that Great Britain, in the greatness of her strength, will temper justice
with mercy.

The Confiscation Act.

An Act to enable the Governor to establish Settlements for Colonization in the Northern Island of New
Zealand.

WHEREAS the Northern Island of the Colony of New Zealand has, from time to time, been subject to
insurrections amongst the evil disposed persons of the native race, to the great injury, alarm, and intimidation of
Her Majesty's peaceable subjects of both races, and involving great losses of life and expenditure of money in
their suppression: And whereas many outrages upon lives and property have recently been committed, and such
outrages are still threatened and of almost daily occurrences: And whereas a large number of the inhabitants of
several districts of the Colon have entered into combinations, and taken up arms with the object of attempting
the extermination or expulsion of the European settlers, and are now engaged in open rebellion against Her
Majesty's authority: And whereas it is necessary that some adequate provision should be made for the
permanent protection and security of the well disposed inhabitants of both races, for the prevention of future
rebellion, and for the establishment and maintenance of Her Majesty's authority, and of law and order
throughout the Colony: And whereas the best and most effectual means of attaining those ends would be by the
introduction of a sufficient number of settlers able to protect themselves and to preserve the peace of the
country: And whereas there are large tracts of land, lying unoccupied, useless, and unproductive, which may be
made available for the introduction and location of such settlers, with benefit to themselves and with manifest
advantage to the Colony:
Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the
authority of the same, as follows:—

• The short Title of this Act shall be "The New Zealand Settlements Act, 1863."
• It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council, from time to time, to set apart eligible sites for settlements
for colonization, and the boundaries of such settlements to define and vary.
• For the purposes of such settlements the Governor in Council may from time to time reserve or take any
land in the Northern Island of the Colony, in respect of which no Certificate of title under "The Native
Lands Act, 1862," nor any Crown Grant shall have been issued, and any such Land shall be deemed to be
Crown Land freed and discharged from all Title, Interest, or Claim of any person whomsoever, as soon as
the Governor in Council shall have declared that such Land is subject to the Provisions thereof.
• Compensation shall be granted to all persons who shall have any title, interest, or claim to any land taken
under this Act, provided always that no compensation shall be granted to any of the persons following,
that is to say, to any person—
  • Who shall have been engaged in levying or making war, or carrying arms against Her Majesty the Queen,
or Her Majesty's forces in New Zealand, or—
  • Who shall have adhered to, aided, assisted, or comforted any such persons as aforesaid, or—
  • Who shall have counselled, advised, induced, enticed, persuaded, or conspired with any other person to
make or levy war against Her Majesty, or to carry arms against Her Majesty's forces in New Zealand, or
to join with or assist any such persons as are before mentioned in Sub—Sections (1.) and (2.), or—
  • Who in furtherance or in execution of the designs of any such persons as aforesaid, shall have been either
as principal or accessory concerned in any outrage against person or property.
• Compensation shall be granted according to the nature of the title, interest, or claim of the person
requiring compensation, and according to the value thereof at the time of the passing of this Act: Provided
always, that no claim shall be entertained unless the same shall have been preferred in writing to the
Colonial Secretary by the claimant, if residing in the Colony within six months, and if not residing in the
Colony, then within eighteen months after the land, in respect of which the claim is made, has been
proclaimed under Section 3, as required for the purposes of this Act.
• For the purpose of determining claims for compensation under this Act, there shall be established Courts,
to be called "Compensation Courts."
• It shall be lawful for the Governor, from time to time, by Letters Patent under the Public Seal of the
Colony, to appoint Judges of such Courts, and at any time by warrant under his hand to remove any such
Judge.
• Any Judge, before proceeding to act, shall take and subscribe before a Judge of the Supreme Court an
oath that he will faithfully perform the duties of his Office.
• Every Compensation Court shall be held before one such Judge, whose jurisdiction shall extend over a
district to be specified in the Letters Patent by which he is appointed.
• Every Judge shall have the power, as near as circumstances will permit, of compelling the attendance of,
and examining witnesses, and of regulating the proceedings of his Court, as a Resident Magistrate in New
Zealand has in reference to a cause of complaint, over which he has summary jurisdiction; and also power
to make rules for the conduct of the business of his Court.
• It shall be the duty of the Colonial Secretary to transmit every claim under this Act which shall be
received by him, to the Judge of a Court competent to hear the same, and it shall be the duty of such
Judge to hear the claim and determine the right of the claimant to compensation, and the amount of
compensation to which he is entitled.
• The Judge shall grant to every claimant whom he shall determine to be entitled to compensation a
certificate, specifying the amount thereof, and describing the Land in respect of which the same is
granted, and the nature of the claimant's title, interest, or claim therein.
• Such certificate shall entitle the person in whose favour the same was granted, to receive from the
Colonial Treasurer the amount named in such certificate as payable to him.
• On part of the Land, subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor shall cause to be laid out a
sufficient number of Towns and Farms around, or as near as conveniently may be to the same, to give full
effect to the provisions of the several contracts heretofore or hereafter to be entered into by or on behalf of
the Government of New Zealand with certain persons for the granting of land to them respectively in
return for Military Service on the terms in and subject to the conditions of the said Contracts respectively
expressed, and the several persons who shall have been enrolled under the said contracts respectively,
shall be entitled to such Town and Farm Sections in conformity with the provisions of the said Contracts:
Provided always that it shall be lawful for the Governor with the consent in writing of any person entitled
under such contracts to vary the conditions thereof as regards such person, as the Governor in Council
may think fit.

- After setting apart sufficient land for all the persons who shall be entitled thereto under the said contracts, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to cause Towns to be surveyed and laid out, and also Suburban and Rural allotments.

- All such Towns, Suburban, and Rural Land shall be let, sold, occupied, and disposed of for such prices, in such manner, and for such purposes, upon such terms, and subject to such regulations as the Governor in Council shall, from time to time, prescribe for that purpose.

- Money to arise from the sale and disposal of any Land under this Act shall be disposed of as the Governor in Council shall, from time to time, direct, for all or any of the following purposes—
  - in defraying the expenses incident to the formation and laying out of Settlements, including the payment of any compensation which shall be payable under this Act.
  - in repaying such portion of the expenses of the rebellion as shall be hereafter fixed by the General Assembly.
  - in the construction of Roads, Bridges, Docks, Quays, Landing Places, Wharves, Piers, Public Buildings, or other Public Works within or in connection with Settlements formed under this Act, and in repayment of any Loans advanced for any such purpose.
  - in establishing, endowing, and maintaining Public Schools and other institutions.
  - in promoting emigration from other places for the purpose of securing the efficient colonization of the said Settlements.

Provided always that all such money shall for the purposes of "The New Zealand Loan Act, 1856," be deemed and taken to he revenue arising from the disposal of Waste Lands of the Crown in the Colony of New Zealand, and shall be chargeable with the sum of money borrowed or raised under the authority of the said Act, and with interest thereon.

- This Act shall not come into operation until Her Majesty's pleasure shall have been taken thereon, and the same shall have been confirmed by Her Majesty with the advice of the Privy Council, and a proclamation of such confirmation having been given shall have been made by the Governor of the Colony.

General Assembly.

Legislative Council. Monday, Nov. 16.

Mr. WHITAKER said that he had before pointed out that there were two things we had to endeavour to secure—the suppression of rebellion and the permanent peace of the country. We might drive away our foes from any particular place, but as soon as we are gone they would return. They must not be allowed to keep their land and their plunder, lest we should have frequent rebellions. This state of things would be bad for both Europeans and Maoris. We required such a population as would be a safeguard against such occurrences for the future. The first principle of the Bill now before the Council was to give Government the power to take land wherever it was a state necessity that they should have it. Mr. Whitaker then read an extract from the opinion of Dr. Phillimore and Mr. Woolmer, as published by the "Aborigines Protection Society," and proceeded to state that this opinion, given in answer to a question relating especially to the natives of New Zealand, put the matter in a very clear light, and quite confirmed the principle of this Bill. Another principle of the Bill was, that those who were engaged in rebellion were not entitled to compensation for the land taken from them. There were people who said that the Maories were not subjects of Her Majesty: he believed that they were as much so as himself. The learned member proceeded to read a passage from Blackstone to prove the punishment due to rebels and traitors, and contended that that passage proved the principle of the Bill. He said that if they were not rebels they had broken the treaty of Waitangi, and as they had broken it, it could not be held to be longer binding on us. He concluded by moving the third reading of the Bill.

The Hon. Mr. SWAINSON believed that the Bill before the Council formed part of the ministerial scheme of policy for putting an end to the present disturbances, and for the permanent pacification of the country. He would not now enter into the origin or history of the outbreak, but would content himself with dealing with the fact as he found it, that, rightly or wrongly, we were engaged in a trial of strength with a portion of the native race, and he had no hesitation in declaring that it was not only necessary for ourselves, but absolutely essential to the future welfare of the natives themselves, that we should teach them unmistakably that we are the stronger; in expressing his earnest hope that this should be so completely and conclusively shown, that we may never again be cursed with another Maori war; and in promising his cordial support to any measure that might seem reasonably calculated to promote so desirable an object. The Attorney-General had endeavoured to maintain the principle of the Bill on the authority he had just cited to the Council; but he (Mr. Swainson) would explain the grounds on which he had arrived at an opposite conclusion. On undertaking the colonization of the
country, some twenty—five years ago, the British Government had placed itself in loco parentis to the native race. In doing so they had made themselves responsible for their civilization and good government. If, then, the British Government could only or could best govern and control them and save them from themselves by planting military settlements in commanding positions on native lands, he believed not only that it would be competent for the British Government, in the absence of any treaty obligations to the contrary, but that it would be their duty to occupy such positions by military posts. And if the Bill before the Council had authorized the Government to establish military settlements in the disturbed districts of Waikato and Taranaki on the land of natives proved before a competent tribunal to be in rebellion against, and to repudiate the sovereignty of the Queen, he should have been prepared to give it his support. But it contained two fatal objections. It authorized the Government to take the land of Her Majesty's native subjects who were not in rebellion, but who were living quietly and in peace, and to sell the surplus not required for the sites of the proposed military settlements. Such being the scope and object of the Bill, he contended that even the Crown itself could not agree to it without a violation of the public faith; that the General Assembly had no power to pass it; and that, if passed, it should at all events contain a clause reserving it for the consideration of the Crown. By the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi, "the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, extensive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession." And he maintained that the Crown itself, in the face of this treaty, could not, consistently with honour and good faith, seize the land of peaceable Maori subjects without their consent. But however that might be, the General Assembly had no legal power to pass the Bill; in the first place, because they had no power to set aside a treaty which had been entered into by the Crown; and because no power was given to them by the Constitution Act to dispose of native lands. In the words of the Act, "the General Assembly may make laws for regulating the sale, letting, disposal, and occupation of the waste lands of the Crown in New Zealand; and all lands wherein the title of natives shall be extinguished as hereinafter mentioned, &c., shall be deemed and taken to be waste lands of the Crown, within the meaning of the Act." It was fairly to be inferred, therefore, that it was not intended by the Constitution Act that the Assembly should have power to make laws for seizing, occupying, and disposing of lands guaranteed to the natives under treaty by the Crown. But if they still proceeded to pass the Bill, it ought to contain a proviso delaying its operation until the law received the confirmation of the Crown; for it is an express instruction issued to the Governor by the Crown, under the authority of the Constitution Act, that, except in case of great emergency, he shall reserve for the signification of the Queen's pleasure, "any Bill, the provisions of which shall appear inconsistent with obligations imposed upon us by treaty." And it was impossible for any one to deny that the Bill to enable the Governor to establish settlements for colonization in the Northern Island of New Zealand was inconsistent with the treaty of Waitangi. Such were some of the legal and constitutional objections he had to urge against the Bill. On the question of its policy he would say but little. The Bill must be read by the light of other measures, and by the light of the Ministerial statements, by which they had been explained. They had been told that, by means of three millions sterling, past and future military expenditure might be met—thousands of settlers might be located in the districts—light—houses might be erected—telegraphic communication might be established —and all debts and liabilities, to the amount of half a million, might be paid off and discharged. They had been told on official authority, that the Ministerial eye had been cast over the map of the Northern Island; that, in the districts of the Waikato, the Thames, Taranaki, and Whanganui, several millions of acres of native land were to be found; that, after locating some twenty thousand settlers upon them, a million and a half of acres would remain; and that in course of time, this land, at the rate of two pounds an acre, would realize the sum of three millions sterling. It would seem, therefore, that the Ministerial scheme of native policy needed these three Bills for its completion—the Bill for raising a loan of three millions; the Bill now before the Council to authorise the Government to seize, occupy, and sell the land; and the Coercion Bill, to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, and to establish Martial Law. On the policy of the Ministerial scheme he could not better express his opinion than in the language made use of by the Duke of Newcastle in almost his latest despatch: "With a large proportion of the native population, either already in arms, or prepared to take them up in defence of their supposed rights, and most especially of rights to land, policy, not less than justice, requires that the course of the Government should be regulated with a view to the expectations which the Maories have been allowed to base on the Treaty of Waitangi, and the apprehensions which they have been led to entertain respecting the observance of that treaty." "I cannot doubt," adds the Duke, "that the proposed appropriation of land, if effected against the will of the owner, and justified on principles, which, whether technically correct or not, are alike contrary to the principles of English or native law, would be considered as a violation of native rights, would be resisted on the spot, and would provoke throughout the island warm resentment and general distrust of British good faith." With regard to the statements contained in the preamble of the Bill, he (Mr. Swainson) would content himself with this observation, that it was certainly a most painful
and humiliating observation to have to make, that, after the many conflicting and contradictory statements which, in the course of the last few years, had been placed before the public in the most formal official documents, and on the highest official authority, we could arrive at no other conclusion than that the most authoritative statements must be received with caution, and that they could only be acted upon safely after satisfactory proof. When the time should come that the Waikato evils were thoroughly inquired into, it would probably be found, that while some of the natives were in actual rebellion against the Queen's sovereign authority, others had taken up arms, not in rebellion against the Crown, but in defence of supposed rights, or to avenge some real or imaginary injury they may have suffered at our hands. But whatever the policy of the Ministry might be, he would seriously entreat them to carry it into operation with due discrimination. That instead of falling into the error of their predecessors, and acting before inquiring, he trusted they would first inquire and then act, and so carefully, that it should not be in the power of some future Government some two or three years hence to proclaim to the world that we had made a mistake; that we had punished the unoffending and taken possession of the wrong land; and that circumstances had transpired which rendered it expedient that it should be restored to its aboriginal native owners. Whatever the merits or demerits of the Ministerial policy might be, it would be admitted on all sides that the exercise of the highest statesmanship was needed to rescue the Colony from its present difficulties. It would require small statesmanship to take military possession of the land; it would require small statesmanship to fill the country with armed men: the really great work they had to do, was to regain the lost confidence of a whole race, and to win from them a willing submission to our rule; and he believed that the highest triumph of New—Zealand statesmanship would be achieved when the Government, whoever they might be, could safely act upon and frankly accept the wise maxim of a late lamented English statesman, "That a policy which required the continual presence of a large force, carries its condemnation in its face." Not that he (Mr. Swainson) underrated the value of physical force. Without power, Government was impossible, and there could not even be justice without power. He believed that, from the outset of our colonizing opera—tions in New Zealand, the British Government had mistakenly failed to impress the natives with an adequate notion of our overwhelming power, and that we had thereby unintentionally hurried them on almost to their destruction; and he feared that, after impressing them with a delusive notion of our real power, it would be difficult to persuade them that the conceit of their own strength will certainly destroy them; that law is their only safeguard; and that it is only as loyal subjects of the Queen that they can count on continuing in the undisturbed possession of their lands. If he could make himself heard by the whole native race, he would earnestly warn them, if they would remain an unconquered people and continue to be recognised as the rightful owners of the soil, that instead of trusting to their own mistaken strength to main—tain them in possession of their lands, and instead of rising in rebellion against our authority in the vain hope of maintaining a separate nationality, they should hold fast to the treaty of Waitangi, and to the rights and privileges guaranteed to them as subjects of the Crown.

The Hon. Dr. POLLEN would not oppose the second reading of the Bill; but lest he should be supposed, by his giving a silent vote, to approve of all the objects of it, he would trouble the Council with a few observations. It had long been seen that the only practical solution of the native difficulty was to be found in the judicious settlement of the province with well—selected immigrants; and the name of the honourable mover was, so long as seven years ago, honourably connected with the first step taken to carry out this policy. In this Bill he saw—and it was the only element that recommended it to his approval—that this policy was intended to be extensively carried out, not peacefully now, but yet in such manner as he admitted was rendered necessary by the altered circumstances of the times. He admitted that it was necessary for the public safety that we should establish military settlements. The public necessity had created a right to take land for the purposes of public defence; but he (Dr. P.) maintained that this right should be strictly limited by the necessity which had created it; that not an acre more than was required for the settlements should be taken forcibly for that purpose; and that we should not attempt, with the sort of power which this Act will confer, to confiscate the whole land of the native people. The Bill went beyond the necessity; it was, in fact, a Bill for the confiscation of the native lands of the province, the object being veiled by a specious form of words. It appeared that, lest there should be a doubt that this was the ultimate end and object of the policy meant to be carried out, the Hon. Colonial Treasurer, in another place, had distinctly enunciated the fact. In the report of the Colonial Treasurer's speech on moving the second reading of the Loan Bill, he found the following:—"1,250,000 acres of land will altogether be required. If we take the total area of land in the rebel districts, it will be found that it amounts to 8½ million acres, and we have obtained information from persons well acquainted with the districts and the quality of the land, that one half of it will be available for settlement; therefore we have for settlement 4,250,000 acres. If we deduct from that the quantity required for the location of European settlers and natives, there will be a balance of three millions for sale, reserve, and for the preservation of the territory of those loyal natives who may not be desirous of disposing of their lands. I said there was a balance of 3,000,000 of acres, and supposing we set apart 500,000 acres for roads and reserves, and 1,000,000 for land that may be retained by
the loyal natives, it will still leave 1,500,000 for sale. Of course it would not be desirable, if it were even possible, to dispose of this land at once; but by bringing it into the market judiciously, it appears to us that 1,500,000 acres economically dealt with and properly sold will realize at the very least £2 per acre, and, £3,000,000 will be obtained at the time these arrangements are completed." The obvious meaning of which was that it was the deliberate policy of the Government to confiscate all the lands held by tribes which were actually in rebellion, or had been previously in rebellion, to give the owners a portion of them; and after making other provisions, to reserve a large balance of these lands for sale. This was a part of the scheme, to which he had an insurmountable objection. If this, indeed, be the Government policy, he (Dr. P.) must say, that politically it was immoral, and, as a financial project, utterly delusive and unsound. Allusion had twice already been made to—day to the treaty of Waitangi, and to the rights which the natives had acquired under it. He (Dr. P.) was present at the meeting at Waitangi on the 6th of February 1840, when the treaty was proposed, and he was an attentive and anxious listener to all that passed. He heard Her Majesty's representative arguing, explaining, and promising to the natives, pledging the faith of the Queen and of the British people to the due observance of it; giving, upon the honour of an English gentleman, the broadest interpretation of the words in which the treaty was couched; and he could assure the Council that, definite and clear as the terms of that treaty appeared to us now, they bear about the same relation to the picture which it was made to present to the eyes of the natives on that day as the skeleton does to the living and breathing human body. The ink was scarcely dry on that treaty before the suspicions, which had been temporarily allayed by the promises of the Governor, were awakened with redoubled force; and he need scarcely remind the Council that from that time to this every action of ours affecting the natives had presented itself to their eyes, and had been capable of that interpretation, as shewing that our object and business in this colony was to obtain possession of the lands of the natives recte si possumus, si non quocunque modo. Before we talked of the duties of the native to us in this colony, we ought to be able to shew that some of the duties which the Crown undertook to discharge to the native people had been so discharged. He asked any one to point out in the statutes of this colony, or on the records of the native administration, any of those measures which might fairly be said to have fulfilled those obligations which devolved upon the Crown at that time. It was true we had had legislation, but it had been nominal, and without beneficial, practical result. The best attempt was made in 1858, when his hon friend the mover was Attorney—General; but before those Acts could be brought into operation, we had, in pursuance, as it must have appeared to the natives, of that policy which was always ours, attempted by force of arms at Waitara, to upset the tribal right which we had pledged ourselves to respect. Last session, the rights of the natives had been still further recognised in the Native Lands Act; but before it came into operation we were again at war with the natives, and now the Assembly were about to legislate in respect to native lands, to give power to take these lands by force, and to abrogate, as it will appear to them, the treaty of 1840. Then, as he had said, the policy was financially unsound. They were invited to spend three millions, with the assurance that they would certainly recoup that expenditure by the "judicious" re—sale of the surplus land at £2 per acre: before we could sell land at that price you must be able to give a quiet and secure title. Now there was a native proverb, "first the man, then the land," which expressed, he thought, a determination to die man by man upon their land before they would give it up: that was the native point of honour. But successful settlement meant peaceful settlement. Not many furrows would be turned in Waikato, if the ploughman must take his life in his hand into the field, and work with his rifle and cross—belts slung upon his shoulders. If any attempt at such wholesale confiscation as appears to be contemplated were made, the effect would be to increase the exasperation already existing in the native mind, and it would need for its success the extermination of the race. The soundness of the financial policy of confiscation may be tested by a very simple calculation, the elements of which are at hand. We could determine, approximately at least, the cost of the work of extermination: we may be said to have been at war for three years; we have spent—including the Imperial charges—perhaps five million pounds during that period; we have killed 150 or 200 natives. How much, at that rate, will it cost to kill 10,000? This policy of confiscation is immoral, and cannot be made profitable financially; unfortunately it is a popular policy; but here in this Council, where honourable gentlemen are safe from the storms of the hustings, calm and dispassionate consideration might at least be expected to be given to such a subject as this. He had, however, ceased to hope for that at present; and when he remembered how, upon a recent occasion, when a question affecting the life, the liberty, and the property of the people was under consideration, the expression of honest indignation had been met, he could not expect that any thing he could then say would arrest or alter the downward current of events. He (Dr. Pollen) had hopes, however, that the statesmen of England would stand between us and the natives, and, if need be, prevent the wrong which might be inflicted under the powers which this Bill proposes to give; he had hopes, also, that the administration of the law would be better than the law itself, and that in carrying it out the gentlemen who were charged with a trust so important would forget that a particular course was popular, and would be guided only by the dictates of justice, good faith, and public honour.
The hon. Mr. Stokes felt constrained to offer a few observations on the native policy of the Ministry, as indicated by the measures before the Council. The Bill which had been passed provided for the suppression of the rebellion by the summary punishment of those engaged in it, and of those who in any way assisted or abetted the rebels. The Bill now under their consideration had for its object the prevention of any future rebellion by the confiscation of the lands belonging to the rebel tribes, and their permanent occupation by settlers on a military tenure. He felt bound to ask himself whether these measures were likely to effect the object sought to be obtained, and what would be the probable result of these measures. Undoubtedly the object sought to be obtained, that which is or ought to be the sincere desire of every colonist, is the speedy termination of present hostilities, and the establishment of peace on such terms as would remove all apprehension of future disturbances, and preserve the native race inhabiting these islands from ruin and probable extinction. This he believed to be the end proposed, the object to be obtained, the consummation devoutly to be wished. But would this be the result of these measures? He found among the papers laid before the Council the following plan proposed by the late Ministry, which was substantially that now sought to be carried out:—

"The plan, briefly stated, is to make the Waikato river, from the sea on the west coast to its southern bend in the middle of the island, a temporary line of defence, by placing armed steamers on the river, and by establishing posts on its northern bank. Then, from the head of the river, to establish a line of fortified posts, extending to the Hauraki Gulf—the intervals to be defended by cavalry—the Gulf and its shores to be looked after by another steamer. Next, to throw forward military posts from the central bend of the river up to the Paetai and Ngarua—wahia, taking permanent possession of these places, the latter of which will be the point where one steamer will usually be stationed. At the same time, to clear out all hostile natives at present residing between the Auckland isthmus and the line of the river and fortified posts above mentioned, which together cross the island. Lastly, to confiscate the lands of the hostile natives, part of which lands will be given away and settled on military tenure, to provide for the future security of the districts nearer Auckland, and the remainder sold to defray the expenses of the war."

And this plan received the approval of the Governor, who promised to carry it out vigorously. He (Mr. S.) very much feared if this measure were vigorously carried out—if so large an area were seized, containing the best lands in the Waikato country—the effect would be to drive some thousands of armed natives from their lands as outcasts and wanderers into the interior, to be dependent on the bounty of inland tribes, or as marauders on the southern provinces of this island, to obtain a precarious existence by predatory habits. But will this be peace, will this be a state of things we could look forward to with any satisfaction? It was true that Auckland, defended by a British army as large as that which quelled the Indian mutiny of 150,000 armed and disciplined Sepoys, would be in a state of security, but what would be the state of the southern provinces, what would be the condition of the natives? He very much feared that unless these measures were carried out with great, forbearance,—unless these extensive and extraordinary powers were exercised with the utmost moderation,—the effect would be to render the natives now in rebellion reckless and desperate, and only change the scene of hostilities.

"It is well to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous To use it as a giant"

And if we wish to obtain lasting peace we must, as his learned friend had observed, endeavour to secure the confidence of the natives, and not to enforce their submission by such stringent measures as were calculated to leave all hope behind. The Bill now before them was much modified and improved from the original draft circulated in the Council; and he could only express his earnest hope, that if these powers were entrusted to the Ministry they would take the earliest opportunity of convincing the natives that they had every thing to hope from a willing obedience, and that even to those who, by some, were considered desperate, justice would be tempered by mercy. (Hear, hear).

The Hon. Captain Salmon would vote for this Bill. The Government often took lands from Europeans, why should they not do so from the Maories. He thought that a want of sufficient firmness with the Maories had been me chief cause of the war: they had had their own way far too much.

The Hon. Mr. Whitaker replied that the Government scheme was intended to embrace the whole of the island, the southern as well as the northern parts. To his hon friend (Mr. Swaison) he would reply, that in practice, if not in theory, we had the power of dealing with the native question. It had been dealt with nearly every session, and Bills on that subject had been sent home and approved of. The land taken from the natives was only to be employed in the suppression of rebellion, and placing military settlers on the land. It was a mistake to suppose that any part of the proceeds of that land was to be appropriated to recoup the three million loan. It was a mistake, too, to imagine that Maories would die sooner than give up their land. It was a recognised principle of theirs, that men who were conquered in war lost their land. We must teach the natives that obedience to the law is essential to their well-being.

The Hon. Dr. Pollen proved, by reference to a paper, that he was correct as to what he stated the Colonial Treasurer to have said.
On the motion for the second reading being put, the Council divided, when there appeared—

The bill was then read a second time, and the Council went into Committee. Some considerable discussion ensued in Committee on the various clauses, but only very slight alterations were made.

When the Council resumed, the Bill was reported, with some small amendments, and the third reading was made an order of the day for Tuesday.

**Memorial to the Duke of Newcastle.**

To His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, K.G., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary for the Colonies.

YOUR memorialists regard with the utmost alarm the passage through the Legislature of New Zealand of a Bill confiscating all the lands of rebellious natives, and authorizing the Government to take possession of the lands of loyal natives upon the payment of compensation. As a part of the same scheme, a Bill has been passed empowering the Colonial Government to raise a loan of three millions sterling, to be repaid by the sale of the confiscated territory.

Your memorialists believe that, for its sweeping and indiscriminate character, this measure stands without a parallel in the history of modern legislation; that if it be enforced it will inflict an indelible blot upon the British name; and that, in the language of an honourable gentleman who opposed it, "its inevitable effect will be to drive the natives of the north island into a state of hopeless despair and rebellion."

That your memorialists have not exaggerated the scope and object of the Bill is proved by the following extract from the Colonial Treasurer's speech, delivered on the second reading of the Loan Bill—

"If we take the total area of land in the rebel districts, it will be found that it amounts to eight and a half million acres, and we have obtained information from persons well acquainted with the districts and the quality of the land, that one half of it will be available for settlement; therefore we have for settlement 4,250,000 acres. If we deduct from that the quantity required for the location of European settlers and natives, there will be a balance of three millions for sale, reserves, and for the preservation of the territory of those loyal natives who may not be desirous of disposing of their lands. I said there was a balance of 3,000,000 of acres, and supposing we set apart 500,000 acres for roads and reserves, and 1,000,000 for land that may be retained by the loyal natives, it will still leave 1,500,000 for sale. Of course it would not be desirable, if it were even possible, to dispose of this land at once; but by bringing it into the market judiciously, it appears to us that 1,500,000 acres economically dealt with and properly sold, will realize, at the very least, 21. per acre, and 3,000,000l. will be obtained at the time these arrangements are completed."

It is but too obvious from this explanatory statement, as well as from the terms of the Bill itself, that nothing short of the absolute confiscation of all the lands owned by the rebel tribes is contem- plated by the New-Zealand Government, and that this policy has received the deliberate sanction of the General Assembly.

Your memorialists would remark that no kind of grace is offered to natives who may be willing at once to lay down their arms; that there is no attempt to define the various degrees of guilt, and to apportion the punishment equitably; and that there is a total absence of that clemency which ought ever to be exhibited by a civilized nation in its dealings with a subject race.

There is grave reason to fear that the Confiscation Bill will have an effect the very opposite of that which its supporters anticipate. The many thousands of natives whom it will render homeless wanderers, will scarcely allow themselves to be driven forth without an effort to avert their doom; and against the estimated pro—ceeds of the sale of confiscated territory must be set the probable cost of another war, into which it is more than likely many now loyal tribes will be drawn, from a natural feeling of sympathy with their outcast brethren. In expressing their fear that a policy of confiscation will lead to the indefinite prolongation of hostilities, and the ultimate extermination of the whole of the Maori race inhabiting the north island, your memorialists do but echo the opinion of men of high position in both Houses of the New-Zealand Assembly.

Your memorialists protest against that portion of the Bill which empowers the Government to take the lands of loyal natives (even upon the principle of compensation) as being contrary to the express terms of the treaty of Waitangi, whereby "the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and properties, which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession." Loyal natives having been guilty of no offence against the law, any attempt to forcibly deprive them of their lands is manifestly a violation of the treaty, and an act of usurpation.

Your memorialists would remark, as an additional reason why lenity should be shown to the natives, that while they have been guilty of acts of war, which none of their friends desire to justify or palliate, there has been much in the conduct of the colonists and in the acts of the Colonial Government towards them, especially
in connection with the late unfortunate land war in Taranaki, to excite the alarm and arouse the passions of a suspicious and semi—civilized people. The natives, moreover, are entirely unrepresented in the New-Zealand Legislature; and although the treaty of Waitangi nominally invested them with all the rights of British subjects they have been practically treated as a separate and an alien race.

In conclusion, your memorialists humbly pray your Grace to advise Her Majesty to withhold the royal assent from the Bill confiscating the native lands in the disturbed districts of New Zealand.

Signed on behalf of the Committee of the Aborigines' Protection Society,

SAMUEL GURNEY, M.P., President.
R. N. FOWLER, Treasurer.
F. W. CHESSON, Secretary.


Give Votes and Representation to the Natives.

The New-Zealand Colonist of the 13th October publishes the following weighty remarks of Mr. Fitzgerald of Christchurch to his constituents. The high authority of the honourable gentleman would, at any time, entitle his opinion to great consideration, but, at the present moment, his suggestion acquires peculiar value and importance:—

"I wish to say a few words on the subject of the resolutions I moved in the House of Representatives last session, and which I intend to move again and again, so long as I shall be a member of that House, until I obtain their recognition. You are aware of the nature of those resolutions; you know that they declared all the inhabitants of these islands to be equally subjects of Her Majesty, and equally entitled to all the rights and privileges of British subjects: and especially they proposed to give the natives a share in the legislature and government of the Colony. No doubt some of you think that this is an impracticable dream. I think I can show that it is far otherwise. Do you think I am so foolish as to suppose that the giving a native a vote will solve every difficulty in his government? Are you the better for having votes? Is there any mysterious power, in going up to the hustings and giving a vote for a candidate, which makes you better men? No; but it is the feeling of all that the power of voting implies. The vote is the symbol of the great truth that, you are each of you a part of the government under which you live, that you are not living under laws imposed on you from without and maintained by external force, but under laws to which you have given your free consent, and therefore cheerfully obey. "(After a reference to the institution of juries, he said:)—Do you tell me that the Maories are unfitted to enjoy these institutions? I tell you they are quite as fit as your ancestors were when these institutions were first invented. You make a great mistake if you think that these noble rights and privileges have sprung out of your civilization. They, are not the result of your liberty—but the cause. If then these are the schemes of a dreamer, I reply, all I ask is, that you shall apply to others the same privileges of government which have made you great. What I aimed at was this, that if you could once get the natives to feel that they were a part and parcel of yourselves, to feel that they were making laws as well as you, to acquire an interest and confidence in your government, you would find every difficulty in the way of carrying the law into force vanish away—your magistrates, your roads, your ports would rapidly extend throughout the country."

Origin of the New Zealand War; and Who are Responsible for the Payment of all Expenses Arising Therefrom.

By Veritas.
"Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum."
Printed for Private Circulation
Stranoeways and Walden, Printers London Castle St. Leicester Sq.

The New Zealand War.

As the Anglo-Saxon race is now thoroughly involved in an expensive war against the aborigines in New Zealand, and the English Government have been lately asked to sanction the "Suppression of Rebellion Act,"
and the "Confiscation of "Native Lands Act," recently passed by the local legislature at Auckland, I deem it right to print the following observations, which are the result of personal knowledge and experience, after a long residence in that colony.

The European population, or settlers, about ten years ago, being ambitious of obtaining self-government, got up constant local agitations, and afterwards importuned the mother-country for that novel system of legislation which they chose to designate "responsible government in its integrity." The Imperial Government, I presume, heartily sickened by these pertinacious demands, was induced at last to sanction the appeals. Whether this measure was wise for any colony, much less one so young, with comparatively small and widely scattered communities, while the warlike aborigines were so numerous, is a matter of doubt, if not for grave regret. Sir George Grey was Governor during the period, viz. 1853, and disapproved the demands of the clamorous settlers; hence arose the hatred towards him of a strong political party; and before they attained their end His Excellency returned to England, not, however, without leaving many indubitable proofs of his foresight and wisdom, one of the principal instances of which was his enactment prohibiting the sale of arms and gunpowder to the natives, except in very small quantities for sporting purposes, and with great restrictions. The late Major-General Wynyard, C.B., became acting Governor during Sir George Grey's absence, and strictly adhered to his policy until he was obliged to inaugurate the new system called "Responsible Government" (May 1854), prior to his being relieved by Governor Gore Browne from England, in September 1855.

The natives were so astonished at the new form of government that they were quite incapable of reconciling it with the Supremacy of the Queen, who prior to this they had been accustomed to consider ruled the colony through Her representative the Governor. They became still more confounded with the election of the Six Superintendents of the various provinces, and of a Colonial Minister, who seemed to possess, and in reality exercised, the entire control of the Local Legislature, besides quite usurping all the power of patronage in the country. The Maoris used contemptuously to designate the Superintendents "Hickapenny"

Meaning "Sixpenny."

Governors. Observing that they were elected by, and called representatives of, the white population in the houses of Local Parliament, the acute natives therefore very naturally conceived the idea of elevating some representative of themselves or of their own interests in the government of the country, which they daily saw, by the large sales of land, to be rapidly passing from their hands. Hence arose the idea of creating a Maori King, which, unfortunately for themselves, was a misnomer; though, had the term been altered to that of a native "Minister," an "Attorney General," or "Superintendent," there would have been no more rebellion in their primitive demands than (as they had so often opportunities of observing) there was in the constant agitations of the democratic body, the chosen "representatives" of the colonists themselves, who enabled the aborigines, by the wholesale supplies of arms and ammunition, to endeavour to obtain their wishes by physical force, instead of the casuistic arguments and sophistry requisite to fit them for coping with the ministerial representatives of the civilized European races, by whom they saw that they were dispossessed of nearly the whole of their country.

His Excellency, Colonel Gore Browne, immediately after his arrival, gave (if not the reins of government) at least such satisfaction to the newly-elected representatives of the colonists, that they at once increased his salary to £1000 per annum more than that of his predecessor, Sir George Grey.

Mr. R. C. Richmond, from Taranaki, was created Colonial Treasurer; Mr. Stafford, from Nelson, Colonial Secretary; and Mr. Whitaker, of Auckland, Colonial Attorney-General. These three gentlemen were chosen representatives of the colonists in the Executive Council of the Governor, and in June 1857.

Between 25th of June, 1857, and 31st of March, 1858, a period of only nine months, there were sold to the natives, by sanction of the colonial councillors, viz., Messrs. Whitaker, Richmond, and Stafford, 7849 pounds of gunpowder, and 752 double and single barrelled guns, in addition to the vast quantities sold clandestinely. These supplies increased monthly and yearly till after the declaration of war at Taranaki in 1860, the merchants and traders in the colony making, all the while, very large profits by this most lucrative traffic.

pressed by their party supporters (wealthy land-jobbers and settlers), deemed it prudent to urge on his Excellency Colonel Gore Browne the advisability of relaxing the ordinance which prohibited the sale of arms and gunpowder to the aborigines. This relaxing, as it was designated, proved afterwards to be quite equivalent to a removal of that very important law.

The late Major-General R. H. Wynyard, C.B., then in command of the forces in New Zealand, and ex officio a member of the Executive Council, was so astounded at the suicidal proposition of the Colonial Ministers just named, that he officially protested against it, and did all in his power to dissuade Governor Browne from being led into this enormous error, but without success; and as his Excellency was nominally the sole ruler in all matters connected with the natives, General Wynyard obtained permission to withdraw his presence from the Executive Council during the time that very impolitic measure was discussed, but left an official memorandum of his individual opposition. Bishop Selwyn, Archdeacons Kissling, and Brown, and
Maunsell of the Waikato district, each at the time endeavoured to dissuade his Excellency

One of the most powerful friendly Native Chiefs (Tamati Waka) likewise waited upon the Governor for the
same purpose.

from entertaining such an extraordinary proposition of the Colonial Ministry, but to no purpose. After the
withdrawal from the Council Chamber of the Officer commanding the Forces, Governor Browne allowed his
ministry to induce him to render nugatory the Arms Ordinance of Sir George Grey.

The writer was informed by General Wynyard, that on the same day that he withdrew from the Council,
one of the Ministry met him in the street, and jocosely twitted him by saying, "Well, we got on very well
without you."

General Wynyard made an official report to the Horse Guards and War Office on the subject on the 4th
September, 1857, and again on the 7th January, 1858;

No doubt these important documents can easily be produced if necessary.

he had previously reported to the home authorities as far back as August, 1854, the disturbed state of the native
mind, and a tendency to revolt, provoked through European agency. Had this officer's urgent suggestions been
attended to by the colonial advisers of the Governor, the late disastrous war at Taranaki, costing a million
sterling, and the present one, which will amount to at least five or six millions, would undoubtedly have been
avoided.

The plea for arming the Maoris set up by the colonial councillors of Governor Browne, and used in his
dispatches to the Secretary of State, as well as afterwards advanced by the supporters of colonial misuse in the
Imperial Parliament, was, "that the natives were enabled to smuggle from the vessels along the coast any
amount of arms and gunpowder;" it was therefore expedient to make such traffic lawful, so that all the
merchants and settlers in the colony might derive the benefit of the trade thereby. The consequence of such
unwise policy was that almost unlimited supplies of guns, rifles, and gunpowder, were imported and sold to the
Maories, who, in fact, scarcely ever spent their money in purchasing anything else from 1857 till the declaration
of the war in February, 1860, a period of about three years, during which time many of the chiefs, in the
Waikato and elsewhere, built large magazines, and hoarded up the armaments which have since been turned
against the troops and colonists. It was quite a common thing to see canoes laden with thirty or forty barrels of
powder leaving Auckland; an order from the resident magistrate had only to be obtained for the sale and
shipment, but these orders from a servant of the Colonial Government were treated quite as a matter of course,
and were commonly signed in blank, and filled up by a clerk when required, either for a barrel or a ton of
gunpowder,

The clerk to the magistrate informed the writer of the above fact.

The writer knows that the large military magazines were used to store many thousands of barrels of
gunpowder, which were almost exclusively imported for, and sold to, the aborigines by the merchants and
traders in Auckland and other parts of New Zealand. One of these worthies informed him, that he alone cleared
£800, by selling guns within a very short time after the relaxing of the "Arms Ordinance," and that it was the
finest thing for the colony, because if it now only took two regiments to keep the natives in order, it would very
shortly require four; and we, the colonists, should get the advantage of the military expenditure. He, likewise
mentioned, that if the Government were fools enough to allow the sale of arms and ammunition to the natives,
why should he not, as well as other traders, make a profit by it? The individual who thus expressed himself is,
both in the colony and in England, one of the staunchest and most unscrupulous supporters of the Whitaker,
Richmond, and Stafford war party.

or for one gun, or a case of rifles. The latter were invariably imported and sold under the designation of
fowling-pieces, guns, or muskets, the sale of rifles being prohibited by Governor Gore Browne and his
ministry.

Supposing that the reasons advanced for this wholesale arming of the aborigines had even been valid,
because, occasionally, a few barrels of powder and a few old muskets were smuggled along the coast, common
sense dictates that the right course would have been to make the restrictions more stringent than those of Sir
George Grey, and the punishment much greater in the event of infringements; but this method the Governor and
the same councillors neglected to adopt until the latter end of 1860, long after they had committed themselves
to a war with the natives by the forcible seizure of 600 acres of land, before they had completed the purchase
thereof of these acts become, therefore, the best commentaries on the former conduct of those who are morally
responsible for such fearful results; and the proof of the difficulties in smuggling "any quantity of arms and
gunpowder along the coast, since the restrictions were re-imposed, is evinced by the difficulties the Maoris
now have in obtaining additional supplies, one having, it is said, recently offered 600 sovereigns for 300 boxes
of percussion caps." And by later accounts a Maori woman offered a sovereign for a few brass eyelet-holes, by
filling the centre of which with phosphorus, scraped off lucifer-matches, the natives find them available for use
in lieu of percussion caps, thus proving their cleverness as well as the extremities to which they are at present
reduced for munitions of war.

The "Daily Southern Cross" newspaper published at Auckland as recently as the 30th July, 1863, states as follows:—

"Before the commencement of the war at Taranaki, in 1860, scores of Europeans were engaged in the profitable trafficking of arms and ammunition to the Maoris, WITH the full KNOWLEDGE that they would be used against men of their own race.

"War begun, and Government
offered a large reward of £300 for the conviction of offenders, but were afraid to prosecute them or interfere with the MAORI purchasers, when information was given by gentlemen residing in the districts where the trade was carried on in a wholesale manner, but contented itself with prosecuting some starving wretch entrapped by the Detective Police Department of Auckland:"

After England has had to pay so many millions of money for the war, consequent upon the arming of the natives, and the illegal seizure of their lands, through the instrumentality, and by special advice, of the colonial representatives, it now transpires that a bloody and costly war, and ruined settlements, have all proceeded from "a mistake" which was not remedied early enough to prevent subsequent evils, the extent of which cannot now he calculated; and the present Governor, Sir George Grey, found himself obliged, in June 1863, to issue a proclamation giving back the said 600 acres to the rightful native owners of the Waitera block at Taranaki. It has since been ascertained that Sir George Grey was unable to give up the Waitera land till after the murders of Lieutenant Tragett's detachment, owing to the Governor being obliged first to obtain the sanction of his colonial responsible ministry, who were in Auckland.

At the present time, the most important question to be considered is, who are responsible for the payment of the war now in progress, produced originally and throughout by acts, brought about by the advice and consent of the colonial councillors, who were the elect of the European population. No one for a moment can suppose that Governor Browne would have acted all through in the way he did, EXCEPT with the advice and consent of his Colonial Ministry.

There can be no doubt, also, that the poorer classes of settlers, especially at Taranaki, or those not long in the colony, are innocent of participation in the plots or plans which have been the means of ruining their prospects and properties; the real delinquents are the wealthy settlers, political adventurers, and land-jobbers, WHOSE MORE POWERFUL INFLUENCE IN THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT of the colony supported a party which has avowedly, for many years past, advocated a war of extermination of the aborigines, to produce which they have done everything in their power to encourage, under the pretence and cloak of maintaining the Queen's supremacy, and for the sake of the enormous military expenditure, as well as the acquisition of lands in the Northern Island, which they for so many years have been coveting, intending, all the while, that Great Britain shall pay the cost of their well-matured plans,

Or that the native lands shall be confiscated for the purpose.

which are represented by them as entirely consequent upon the acts of the Governor appointed by the Queen. As the mother-country has given the settlers in New Zealand the government of that colony, and their representatives persuaded the Governor, appointed by the Crown, to commit such a series of mistakes, which they endorsed by their signatures, it is but just that the expenses of the last and present war should be borne by the colony, and not made a tax upon the British public.

Mr. Richmond (the Colonial Treasurer from Taranaki) mentioned in one of his last speeches (session 1861) in the House of Representatives, in support of the policy pursued by his party, that, "for four years prior the Government had indubitable evidence of hostile intentions on the part of the natives against the Europeans;
"or, as this gentleman was so fond of saying, "against the Queen's Supremacy:" yet, with such knowledge, in the year 1857 he advised Governor Browne to relax or remove the restriction on the wholesale supply of Arms and Gun-powder to "the warlike and savage race" Mr. Stafford, the Colonial Secretary, in opposition to the Fox party, stated in one of his last speeches (1861), that those who advocated peace with the natives "were cowards, knaves, and slaves;" and, more recently in England, one of the Colonial Ministerial Representatives, Mr. Crosbie Ward, openly advocated sending to Australia for Europeans to aid in defending the colonists from the aborigines, and to reward such hirelings with grants of land from the confiscated territories. Nothing was more common than to hear both settlers and members of the Colonial Houses of Representatives freely advising their "Declaration of Independence" and sending to America and Australia for adventurers to protect themselves from the aborigines, if England would not send British troops at their solicitation. Queere: Who are, in truth, most deserving of the term "Rebels," the natives or such colonists? Captain Sir Everard Home, R.N., many years ago, officially reported that a military force was more requisite to check the rebellion of Europeans than of the natives in New Zealand.

I am not a great admirer of savages, nor of colonial politicians, unless it be for the cunning and impudent
courage they each display to obtain a selfish end. As, however, the former approach nearer to barbarism, there is the greater excuse to be made in charity for their delinquencies. When the British public pay their money to enter the territories of the shareholders of the Zoological Gardens, they at least rely and expect that the managing directors will not bid their keepers open the dens of all the *ferm naturce*, so that the carnivora shall rush upon and devour the innocent adventurers. In the same manner, I hold that the settlers in New Zealand, having the election of their own directors in the Executive Council of the Governors, are, in common justice and equity, responsible for their acts; therefore the colonists are both legally and morally responsible for the payment of all injuries produced through the instrumentality and cupidity of their influence in the government of a country peopled with a semibarbarian race.

The position of the present Governor, Sir George Grey, surrounded by political adventurers, who represent the so-called "responsible government" (*qucere, irresponsible*), is anything but enviable; and it is very unfortunate that his exigencies have obliged him to acknowledge a Colonial Attorney-General who has all along been one of the "hangerson"and supporters of the Richmond and Stafford war party: this legal adviser held the same situation under Governor Gore Browne, when, with his colleagues, Messrs. Stafford and Richmond, he counselled the relaxing of the restrictions on the sale of arms and gunpowder to the aborigines. The same attorney is now the elected chief law adviser of the local legislature, and has advocated the recent "Rebellion Act," and the Act for confiscating the lands of the natives, by which it is proposed (if the English Government sanction it) to defray the loan of three millions sterling towards the expenses of the war, which he and his colleagues, by their advice and influence over Governor Gore Browne, were mainly instrumental in originating in the year 1860.

It appears that Mr. Whitaker, the present Attorney-General of the colonists, introduced and carried, in the New Zealand Parliament (at their last session), the two "Acts" above referred to, against the earnest opposition of Mr. Swainson, formerly *Her Majesty's Attorney-General for the Colony*, and against all the arguments used by the minority of "Honourable Gentlemen" who are the elected representatives of the settlers in their Houses of legislation. The present New Zealand Executive Council is composed of the "Attorney-General," the "Colonial Secretary," the "Native Minister," and the "Treasurer;" the *three former* are lawyers, and the latter is said to be a land-surveyor and house-builder. The Attorney-General, Mr. Whitaker, is a solicitor, well known in connexion with the "Barrier Island," and "Kawau" copper-mining speculations; he owns also a vast tract of land, called the Peako Block, situated on the delta of the Thames and Waikato rivers, which land was purchased for some paltry amount per acre, many years ago, and though said to be rich in itself, was *valueless in the market so long as the Waikato territories remained in possession of the aborigines.*

His Excellency Sir George Grey was solicited to give up the government of the Cape of Good Hope, in order to return to New Zealand, in 1861, to endeavour to repair some of the evils which had arisen during his interregnum. He has, however, at present, the co-operation of a skilful and courageous general, with, at least, ten thousand troops at his disposal, which have therefore, now, very nearly completed the realization of a well-arranged systematic colonial plot. It is, notwithstanding, very doubtful, even now, with so large a force, whether the vanquished territory, in the interior of a country where there are no roads, and consisting principally of forests and swamps, can safely be maintained against a race whose chief strength lies in ambush. It will, consequently, perhaps, be more politic, as well as humane, to cut off supplies of every description by a rigid blockade, and after the establishment of a chain of outposts, compel the so-called "rebels" to act on the offensive, which they are not very apt to do in the comparatively open country—such as would be cleared and in possession of the Europeans. But the cost of this occupation at present amounts to about *three millions sterling per annum*. Surely the British House of Commons will not sanction this vast military expenditure to be continued at the expense of the Imperial Treasury, and to be paid out of the pockets of the British taxpayers!

By information lately received from a gentleman in one of the New Zealand banks it appears, that the military expenditure from the military chest in that colony is 10,000l. a-day, or *three millions six hundred and fifty thousand pounds per annum*, the expenses of the Land Transport alone amount to one thousand pounds a-day, owing chiefly to the great distance of the seat of war from Auckland, its base of operation, and the hay and forage for the horses having, it seems, to be imported even from England.

If a rigid blockade was maintained, and the natives find that they are unable to obtain the comforts of civilized life by communications with Europeans, they will, in all probability, be more induced to sue for peace, particularly when the excitement of constant skirmishing against the military raids ceases; and then, hereafter, it may in truth be said that the Anglo-Saxon race has not, at least in New Zealand, been the means of entirely extirpating from the face of the earth the aboriginal inhabitants of the antipodes.
June, 1864.

Notes on the Maories of New Zealand,
With Suggestions for Their Pacification and Preservation.
By Colonel Sir James E. Alexander,
Printed and Published for the Aborines' Protection Society And Sold By London W. Tweedie, 337 Strand. 1865

The following Notes were presented in the form of a paper to the Geographical and Ethnological Section of the British Association for the Promotion of Science at its last meeting held at Bath.

At that meeting one of the Secretaries of the Aborigines' Protection Society had the pleasure of meeting Sir James E. Alexander, the author of the paper, and well knowing and appreciating its value, he had great satisfaction in securing it for that Society.

Sir James E. Alexander has never been connected with the Aborigines' Protection Society; and this circumstance in itself gives increased value to the Notes which are here offered, not only to the members of the Legislature, but to the British public, most opportunely at a critical period, when the existence of the New Zealand race is at stake, with the chances against it, in the hands of the British. Yes; it adds incalculable value to the evidence afforded by Sir James Alexander that he is a soldier, and probably one than whom the British army does not boast of a better, and not a member of the Aborigines' Protection Society, or of a Missionary Society, or even a frequenter of Exeter Hall; seeing that, were he either of these, he would be of a class to whom the antiaboriginal English, whether colonized or at home, have a special aversion.

Sir James E. Alexander is, notwithstanding, a firstrate Aborigines' Protector. It was he who, nearly thirty years ago, when serving in South Africa, noticed and recorded the sanguinary deeds of the Boers who emigrated from British territory and British rule, to enjoy the felicity of slave-holding and slave-making. His short but stirring narrative was sent by Sir John Herschell, whose presence then gladdened the Cape, to his friend, Dr. Hodgkin, and thus, without any Missionary intervention, the facts became known in England.

And now, after the lapse of nearly thirty years, still a soldier, and still blending the love of justice and mercy, and also respect for the brave but unfortunate, with the love of arms, Sir James again comes forward the advocate of the oppressed.

May his Notes be read by many, and find their way to kindred hearts.

Notes Maories of New Zealand,

With Suggestions For Their Pacification And Preservation.


In the year 1860 I was required to take a regiment to New Zealand, to assist in the war which had recently broken out in that distant and valuable dependency of the British Crown.

Though a voyage of 10,000 miles was before us, I was glad to have the opportunity of visiting our Australian possessions, and of being again actively engaged in the service of the country.

From books I had learned that the Maories were a fine, athletic and warlike race, and living in a country suited, from its climate, for energetic enterprise. I was in hopes that, after a short, and perhaps sharp conflict, peace would be restored, and that a noble race of brown men, children of the same Almighty Creator as ourselves, would be converted from foes into useful allies and fast friends, that is, If justice and humanity held sway in our councils.

A part of the regiment (the 14th) was engaged in the war of 1860-1861, and did good service. There was a cessation of hostilities in April 1861, and the troops went to military road-making.

Being in New Zealand two years I had a good deal of intercourse with the natives, especially when in command of the outposts on the Waikato river, established friendly relations with them, and studied their habits and their language. No more fighting being anticipated, a very able Governor (Sir George Grey) being at the head of affairs, I returned home in the beginning of

A great mistake bad been made at the termination of the conflict in 1861, from which it was imagined by some that possibly difficulties might arise, but not to the extent of occasioning such a serious war as has
prevailed in 1863-1864.

The block of land called the Tataramika, south of New Plymouth (the chief and only town in Taranaki, west coast), had been acquired by purchase some years ago. It had been cultivated by settlers, but who had fled and abandoned it in 1860, going for safety into New Plymouth. General Sir Duncan Cameron proposed to occupy it with a detachment in 1861, to prevent the natives squatting on it. However, the Governor, Colonel Gore Browne and his counsellors, did not think this was necessary.

Sir George Grey did not approve of the acquisition of the mouth of the Waitara, north of New Plymouth, from one man (Teira, of the tribe of Ngatiawa), and said it should be given up to the natives again. Its assumption had been the chief cause of the war of 1860; but a delay took place in giving it back, and in the mean time troops were sent to take possession of the Tataramika, and a redoubt was constructed there. The natives gave due warning, as is their custom (and in this their chivalry is to be commended), that they would go to war again, they not believing in the surrender of the Waitara block of land, and seeing the Tataramika occupied by a detachment of the 57th regiment This was, unfortunately, disregarded, and small escorts of half a dozen men passed between the redoubt and New Plymouth. Then the natives, as was their custom, laid an ambush and, cut off one of these small escorts, and two fine young officers, who happened accidentally to join it on the road. Then began a series of combats, fierce, bloody, and expensive. Our people also contrived ambuscades, and successfully; and since June 1863 till the southern winter mouth of June 1864 war has raged in New Zealand—in the Taranaki, on the Waikato and Waipa rivers, and, latterly, at Wanganui on the south coast, and Tauranga on the east, and attended there with very heavy loss of valuable officers. We lately heard of another fight, with a loss to the natives of 200 men, and casualties among our own men also. This was the success at Te Ranga, a dashing affair. Colonel Greer commanding.

The native determination and heroic contempt of death is shewn in the following extract of a private letter from New Zealand, dated 6th July 1864—

"A most successful fight has taken place at Tanranga. This was most opportune in many respects, taking place within a mile or two of the scene of our previous disaster at the Gate Pa, and achieved by the very troops who suffered the repulse on that occasion, over natives from the same part of the country. The circumstances attending the two fights were, however, widely different. In the one case there was a pa, in the other the enemy had barely time to construct one long, shallow line of rifle pits before they were attacked, and the ground was like a race-course. The results were most satisfactory (124 of the enemy buried by us), and attained under circumstances so peculiarly favourable to our troops. The natives, as indeed they always do, behaved splendidly. They, without a single exception, scorned to run, but retired steadily and slowly; not in the smallest degree demoralized by any feeling of being worsted, but deliberately retreated from the field, though shot down by scores, with the sang froid of the finest troops in the world. Many of them turned round, folded their arms on their chests, bowed their heads, and received their death wound without uttering a syllable!"

A sober and industrious man who goes from this country to a distant colony, determined to conquer an independence for himself, which he cannot always hope for here, in the midst of so much competition, ought to meet with every encouragement, provided he shews no disposition to infringe on aboriginal rights, or try to deprive the natives unjustly of lands derived from their ancestors. There are many of our settlers most excellent and worthy men, who would not desire to acquire land except by Government grant, or by fair purchase from the owners wishing to part with it. But there is another class of settlers I saw, whose text is, "We can make a better use of the land than the natives can, and we should have it" To this I replied that I was quite surprised to see the extent of the native cultivations about the Waikato, for instance, ploughs, harrows, and flour mills, used by the natives; canoes of large size for the transport of produce on the rivers and schooners along the coasts, the natives did make a good use of their lands, were prosperous, and raising great quantities of wheat for sale; and were quiet, and their thoughts turned to gain and to the arts of civilized life, till another most unfortunate mistake was made in 1857—the withdrawal of the prohibition of the sale of arms and ammunition to the natives. Sir George Grey had disallowed this dangerous trade when he had formerly been Governor of New Zealand; but those who came after him, instigated by dealers who were keen for profit, from whatever source it might come, induced the Governor to sanction the trade in warlike stores: a most fatal error; and it was continued from 1857 till the beginning of the war of 1860. The then Commander of the forces, the Bishop, and even a Maori chief, protested against the sale of warlike stores to the natives, who, in the first nine months of the traffic, supplied themselves with 7849 pounds of powder and 742 single and double-barrelled guns. "This," says the London Review, "was on the principle of giving another man a stick wherewith to break one's own head."

When I was acting Governor on one occasion at Auckland, a report was brought to me that a man from the interior had offered 300 sovereigns for 600 boxes of copper caps. He did not get these, but it shewed the value the natives put on these "munitions of war"—10s. a box; the usual price of which is ls. 6d.

The natives, now that the trade in arms, &c, was open, turned their attention from raising grain for sale to
the purchase of gum and powder. Then they began to feel the pressure of poverty, and became desperate and dangerous. Hungry men usually are so. They saw, also, emigrants flocking to New Zealand, many of whom boasted that the whole of the country would soon be theirs. The suspicion of the natives was roused; they lost confidence in the honour of the Government when land was bought for 6d an acre from the natives and resold to the white settlers for 10s., particularly, also, when the movement began for the acquisition of the Waitara, and the first act of war ensued. A European of the bad sort add to me one day, "We want more land, Sir." I replied, "You have already more than you can use." "We want the rich land on the Waikato," said he, "and I'll tell you how we'll get it You send your soldiers to make roads through the Maori land: they will come and fight you: you will beat them, and we will get the land for nothing." A most iniquitous proceeding.

Of late years the Maories began to dislike our people for a peculiar reason, the scarcity of women. Some years ago the natives did not care to take trouble in rearing female children: they wanted men for fighting among themselves. Women became scarce. Fierce conflicts have been seen on the beach at Auckland, one tribe trying to get possession of a particular female from another tribe, who was nearly pulled in pieces between them. White traders and others enticed their women by bribes, and took them away. This caused great irritation. And there is another cause: haughtiness of manner evinced towards natives, and an arrogant assumption of superiority over the brown man, is at once observed, and dislike is thus reciprocated. Some of our people can, and do, behave in a proper and kindly manner to those *alio catentes sole* "bronzed with another sun," and have their reward in mutual goodwill; but I have with great vexation observed among some Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Englishmen, Americans, &c, that every dark man is viewed merely as a "nigger," and as an individual far below the white man in the scale of humanity. The dark races are particularly sensible of this, and note it at once.

Therefore, also, in the apportioning the lands in New Zealand, it seemed to me to have been a great error to have intermixed native and European lands, as I saw in the Taranaki for instance, there were trouble and disputes from this, trespass of cattle and pigs occasioned quarrels; whilst, also, when the inhabitants of neighbouring Maori pas fell out the Europeans took one side or another, and helped their friends to ammunition to fight it out, that is, for a consideration, or stood by and appeared to the natives to enjoy seeing them destroy each other.

In the course of the present war the term rebels, as generally applied to the Maories, is quite a misnomer. Rebels are those who have turned from their allegiance to their acknowledged sovereign, and taken up arms in a struggle for independence. Now some of the tribes may have considered themselves British subjects, say those north of Auckland, but certainly not the proud Waikatos, Ngatimaniapotos, Ngatiruanuis, &c who have been so actively engaged against us. Insurgents would be a better term than rebels. After the natives bad acquired a certain degree of knowledge from education, they found out that divisions among themselves were hastening their decay. Tarapipi, or, as he is usually called, William Thompson, and other clever leaders, thought that to unite the Maories, for law and order, under one head, was best. They therefore chose an old and renowned warrior as their king, Te Whero Whero, of the Waikatos, and his son Matuteira succeeded him. A land league was also formed to try and prevent the wholesale transfer of native lands to the white man; but the king movement and the land league are looked on by some of our people as mortal offences, when the Scotch, supporting their kings and warring against the English in the days of Bruce and Wallace, are considered in history as using noble efforts to avoid conquest and subjugation.

Some maintain that it is wise to destroy, by every means, native cultivations during war; to burn wharrees, or huts, break up canoes, and to carry fire as well as sword into an enemy's country. I am quite of a different opinion, after having, during a forty years' service in the four quarters of the world, seen much of the miseries of war. If we were required to war for ever—become demons in short—then fire and sword would be our motto; but, as Christian soldiers, our desire surely should be to conquer peace as quickly as possible, and then endeavour to be friends and comrades with those with whom we were lately engaged in morial combat. I have seen the huts of Caffres burnt during war at the Cape. I did not know at that time the wretchedness this occasioned to the poor women and children, the exasperation to the men. I know all this now. So, instead of destroying native crops, if I could not secure them, I would leave them alone. Securing grain, potatoes, &c, might induce the owners to sue for peace, in the hopes of recovering their precious food. Turning soldiers loose into fields to destroy, with sword and sickle, Indian corn and other crops, is quite unworthy of the noble profession of arms, and of the nation to which we have the honour to belong. If our own stacks were burnt by an invader, we should entertain the most bitter feelings of animosity towards him, and thirst for revenge.

It was on an expedition to lay waste native cultivations that Captain Lloyd lately lost, his life, his men got scattered, were "rushed "(as it is called), the leader and five others fell, and were decapitated. It is the duty of officers and soldiers to obey orders, and ask no questions regarding any undertaking required of them; and our soldiers, under the able leadership of Sir Duncan Cameron, a very accomplished officer, have generally acquitted themselves with great credit. The navy also have shewn great zeal and energy under Sir William Wiseman and other leaders.
I mentioned that I had charge of the outposts on the Waikato for some months. I had with me about 800 men, and though our camp was on British ground, we had Maori cultivations right and left of us. We were at peace at the time, in 1862, and I was careful, as was my duty, that the natives and their property should be respected in every possible way. I had a daily market at seven in the morning, and we exchanged money for pigs, poultry, peaches, melons, potatoes, &c. I had two visits from the influential chief Wirema Nero (William Naylor); and after entertaining him one day, and he having seen our state of preparedness against surprise, said, "I wish to tell you something. There is now peace between the Pakeha (white man) and the Maori; but there is a totara tree growing on the banks of the Mangatawhiri Creek down there: if you let your soldiers cut it down, and they make a bridge of it, and go over into Maori land, there will be war." I said, "There was no intention of cutting down the totara tree; there had been enough war, already; no occasion for any more; and I trusted that the Iakeha and the Maori would be united for their mutual good. There was plenty of land for both people." But the totara tree has since been cut down, and our troops have gone, not only across the Mangatawhiri Creek, but the Queen's flag has flown on the Maori king's place at Ngaruawania, and far beyond it, up the the Waipa River. Desperate fighting has taken place at Rangiriri: my successor was killed at the head of the regiment; and at Orakau 400 Maories defended themselves for two days, subsisting on raw potatoes, and without water; and on the third day, in the afternoon, in broad daylight, burst out through our people, leading some of their women by the hand, and 100 fell in the pah and in the swamp. Then, some tribes, taking the opportunity to wipe off old scores, have engaged each other—Englishmen being present—and thus added to the great bloodshed of the year.

It would be lamentable if the natives were encouraged to kill and slay each other. Surely humanity dictates that we should endeavour to reconcile their differences, and thus become ourselves respected as mediators. "When Sir George Grey arrived for the second time to assume the reins of government, two tribes were at war in the north. He went there, took up a position between the rival pahs, and soon made peace between them. This was the proper, the wise, the Christian course.

It was urged by the Aborigines' Protection 'Society, in an address to Sir George Grey, that peace should be made immediately the Maories desired it. In the memorandum by the New-Zealand Ministers, in reply to that address, it was stated that the rebels (as they are called) had not, as a body, nor had any leading tribes among them, made the smallest overture for peace; but surely what follows, dated from the Maori king's place, meant peace:—

"Ngaruawahia,

"Nov. 25, 1863.

"O Friend I O Governor!—Salutations! This is to say to you the fight has been fought, and some are dead, some alive. Restore to us Waikato. Let it suffice for you the men who are dead. Return to us those who live. Enough! Prom your friend,

"PENE PUKAHDHAU.

"From all the Chiefs of Waikato."

The answer was," The Queen's flag must be hoisted by the general at Ngarua-wahia." It was eventually hoisted there, but still the war went on.,

Sir George Grey wished to divide the country into districts, with Commissioners resident among the Maories to keep order and administer justice. I do not think the Maories are prepared for this yet, and their pride would revolt against it If the chiefs of tribes are shewn due consideration by our Government, they would be looked up to also by their own people, and have influence for good, and thus might induce them to cultivate the arts of peace. There is little fear of a grand combination against us of all the tribes; and, in fact, the destruction of life has been so great these last twelve months, besides the fine men who felt in the war of 1860-1861, that I lament to say a noble race of warriors is rapidly disappearing, and who might have been made of the greatest use to us in defending New Zealand from foreign foes, and even serving in our armies in the East. The Maories make excellent sailors in whale-ships, and are strong, bold, and active.

A correspondent thus wrote to me lately, under date of the 11th May, from Auckland, New Zealand:—

"We have now come to the eleventh month of the war, and though the suc- cess has been great in carrying out the lawyers' plan for the occupation of the land, very little has yet been done for the establishment of the Queen's supremacy, or of the authority of British law. In fact, interested motives have been allowed to prevail, and all higher considerations have fallen to the ground. The Queen's name is never mentioned. A proclamation, which the Governor never saw, signed "Na ti Pokehu," "By the Fox," is all that the Maori people have ever seen to invite them to peace. The tenor of this document was repulsive: all were called upon to lay down their
arms, but were candidly told that this would not blot out (mutu) their offences, but that the disposal of their
land would rest with the Governor (meaning the Government), and that at the end of the war, it would be
settled what should be done with all who had committed murder or theft. Now as the Decalogue has been
well-nigh abrogated on both sides, ambushes practised by both parties, and looting, this is both iniquitous
and unwise; iniquitous, because we have stolen more from the Maories than they from us by licence of war;
and unwise, because it is contrary to the nature of an amnesty to leave the bulk of the people anxious for the
future.”

Another aborigines' protectionist, in England, writes:—

"New Zealand is, in my mind, what England was when invaded by the Romans; and I feel all the sympathy
for Maories that our ancestors excited in their efforts to repel the invaders. The Maories, too, remind one of the
Britons, of whom Tacitus! says, that though docile to learn, and willing to yield obedience, they resisted
compulsion."

To conclude. We cannot believe that either confiscation or extermination is intended for the Maories by any
right-thinking person in this country, and that the Colonial Minister desires a speedy end of these bloody and
most expensive hostilities in New Zealand. When conferences take place with this view, large maps might be
prepared, shewing to the natives proposed boundaries of land, and ample in extent, for agricultural and pastoral
purposes, and with mountain, forest, and river. In round numbers, the Europeans in New Zealand are now over
200,000, the natives, say, 50,000 souls. And as the Maories are fond of trading, let markets be everywhere
established, and judicious Missionaries and teachers be encouraged and protected.

Thus we may have hope for the pacification and preservation of the remnant of the Maori race.

I annex the following letter from a successful settler, Mr. Farmer, who for seventeen years employed
Maories to cultivate for him, and who worked well for regular wages:—

"I regret that circumstances have so long prevented my writing to you upon Maori matters; and as I cannot
now lay my hands upon documents upon which all my calculations were made, I fear that I can only give a very
imperfect outline of the plan which I proposed to the New-Zealand Government for the benefit of the Maories.
My proposal was to establish agricultural institutions in the centre of populous Maori districts, for the purpose
of instructing the natives in industrial pursuits, including the breeding and general management of stock. Such
institutions would be of incalculable benefit to the Maories, as well as to the general prosperity of the colony,
and would be self-supporting after a few years’ outlay.

"I made an offer to the New-Zealand Government to undertake the management of such an institution in
October 1862, as an experiment, but, for the reasons which I have already mentioned to you, the offer was not
accepted. (The local Ministers had not submitted it to Sir George Grey, though they spoke well of it.)

"Maories have, upon several occasions, offered me a present of a valuable piece of land, upon condition
that I would settle amongst them, and instruct them in practical agriculture and the management of stock,
thereby shewing their anxiety to get instruction. I believe that after the settlement of the present war the scheme
which I proposed would be accepted by the natives generally, as one of the greatest benefits which had ever
been offered to them by our Government Unless the Maories are encouraged, assisted, and paid for their work,
while receiving instruction, I do not believe that they, by themselves, will ever make any effort to improve their
present unsatisfactory condition."

By our future policy in New Zealand no doubt former errors will be corrected, and peace and prosperity, it
is earnestly hoped, will prevail in the Britain of the south.

Westerton, Bridge of Allan, N. B.

October 16, 1864.

The suggestions quoted by Sir James E. Alexander at the close of this paper are doubtless good in
themselves; but it must be observed that the New Zealanders have not rejected civilization, as asserted by the
Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, but have copied our agriculture and purchased and used our
improved implements, raising crops and rearing cattle for the colonial market. They are shewn, by official
returns, to have furnished their share to the revenue, besides the very large amount wrested from them through
the want of fair dealing in the land purchases and sales.

They need instruction, guidance, and good example in their social relations. They need more especially a
correct knowledge of their own position and of the rights belonging to it—rights which have been forced upon
them, together with penalties which they have suffered, but rights, be it remembered, of which they have not
felt the benefit, or been taught either the privileges or the proper mode of seeking them. Let these be taught
them, together with the general and availing knowledge of the English language, and not merely will more be
done for the preservation and benefit of the Maories than has yet been attempted, but the best interests of the colony also will be better served than by protracted war, new loans, and extensive confiscation. At the same time, the eyes of the English at home must be opened to the fatal error of placing the natives, nominally British subjects like themselves, but wholly unrepresented, at the mercy of a Colonial Ministry, of a different race, and swayed by conflicting interests and hostile feelings.

The Revolt in New Zealand.
A Series of Letters Addressed to the Reg. George Townshend Fox,
By William Fox, M.H.R.,
Late Colonial Secretary, New Zealand.
Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday London Fleet Street.
Price Sispence.

Preface.

I HAVE published the following letters at the request of my brother, and I hope that they may be instrumental in imparting correct ideas to some persons concerning the merits of the much-lamented war in New Zealand. I think the facts contained in them will do much towards removing the unjust obloquy under which the colonists have fallen.

At the same time our fellow-countrymen residing in New Zealand should make large allowances for erroneous impressions in reference to transactions taking place at so great a distance from home.

1. The great majority of people in this country have no connexion with New Zealand, and no other means of obtaining information than what the public press affords. A considerable part of the English community, both in Parliament and out of it, make the Times newspaper their text-book, and take their impression of passing events exclusively from what they read in that periodical. Hence the statements made by the military colonel, probably form the staple of many persons' knowledge of the New-Zealand war.

2. In the next place, however, I would remark, that the English mind has been deeply impressed by a very strong conviction of the injustice of the first New-Zealand war, into which Governor Browne hurried this country, by steps as impolitic as they were unjust. The robbing of the Natives of a tract of land was the original cause of the first breach between them and the authorities of New Zealand.

That question has already been thoroughly sifted. No one has censured the transactions to which it gave rise more severely than the author of the following letters; and it is now an acknowledged fact that the land, which was the original hone of contention, was taken from the Natives in defiance of law, that the pretended owner could give no legal title to it, and that an act of more shameful spoliation was never committed.

This is a source of great humiliation and grief to all in this country who take an interest in the welfare of the native tribes of New Zealand. We have been grieved to think that the natives should have been driven into rebellion by an act of British injustice, and that a civilized Christian nation should have set so bad an example to a race just emerging from barbarism, and, under the genial influence of Christianity, beginning to give the brightest promise of future progress.

3. I am willing to admit that many persons in this country have not drawn a sufficiently broad line of distinction between the merits of the first war and the second. The first was simply the result of British injustice driving an injured race into rebellion, in order to get redress, which the administrators of the law refused them; and I may add that the parties who are responsible for that shameful transaction, which has cost our country so much blood and treasure, have laid themselves open to the charge of very unworthy motives, such as a shameful greed for land, and a disposition to act on the tyrannical principle that might makes right.

The second war, however, is happily not obnoxious to the same censure as the first, and the following letters will clearly shew that the New-Zealand Government are free from the great crime of which their predecessors were guilty, and that the present war is one purely defensive, and could not be avoided. Sir George Grey, when he set foot in New Zealand, came in for a very bad inheritance, and whatever blunders he may have committed, it is clear that he could not avoid the recent rebellion, and is not to be held answerable for it.

Admitting these facts, however, our New-Zealand colonists must not be surprised if feelings of English sympathy should still go out towards the natives. For; since it is an established fact that they were goaded into the first rebellion by British injustice, is it surprising that a half-civilized race, who have had little or no political experience, and who probably retain much of that suspicious temperament common to savages, should so thoroughly have lost confidence in the Pakeha as to abandon themselves to unwise measures? If our Hampdens and our Pym's were driven by the habitual falsehood of the first Charles to take up arms in self-defence, need we wonder that a race undisciplined, unaccustomed to forbearance and self-control, should
lose confidence in British rule and British honesty, after such a transaction as that of the Waitara?

Very great allowance, therefore, must be made for the present posture of the Maori, and the feelings by which he is influenced towards the British Government.

4. A further question of a more practical kind, however, is the course which the Colonial Government ought to pursue towards the Natives in rebellion.

Abhorrent as war is to the Christian mind, and fearful as the consequences are which it entails, yet there are occasions when it becomes a stern necessity; and if so, under what circumstances more so than when the peace of a country is disturbed by the wilful rebellion of a portion of its inhabitants? The colony of New Zealand is so circumstanced at the present time, that it has no choice between abandoning the country entirely, and suppressing the unhappy rebellion of the Natives. When once the sword is drawn, the truest benevolence consists in decisive measures and a speedy suppression. Great complaints are uttered in New Zealand against the present Governor for his undecided shill-I-shall-I course of policy which has protracted the war and given encouragement to the Natives to persevere in their rebellion, whilst the complainants contend that a more vigorous prosecution of the war would long since have suppressed the rebels. The merits of this complaint I pretend not to discuss.

5. The complaint, however, which the colonists make concerning their countrymen at home is, that we have brought general and sweeping charges against them of enmity to the native race, of a desire to possess themselves of their land, of an unscrupulous disregard of the means employed, and of a studied purpose to drive them into rebellion, in order to their destruction. If such charges had been confined to the individuals responsible for having goaded the Natives into the first war, they might probably have been justified by the facts; but it is hardly fair to hold the entire people answerable for the acts of a Governor and his ministers. Even Acts of Parliament, passed by both Houses, are a very imperfect representation of the public mind amongst ourselves at home, much more those transactions which have never passed through that ordeal. Thousands amongst ourselves would indignantly repudiate the charge of being held answerable for the guilt of our Chinese wars, and of many other acts of Government; and in like manner, though there may be, as doubtless there are, in. New Zealand as amongst ourselves at home, some greedy unprincipled persons, who would set all moral restraint at defiance, yet it certainly appears unjust to hold the colonists as a body answerable for the unhappy wars which have moistened the soil of New Zealand with so much precious blood.

It is much to be desired, that, during the present session of Parliament, the question of the New-Zealand war may be thoroughly sifted, and such measures may be taken as shall ensure prompt action and the adoption of the course best calculated to hasten on a speedy and permanent peace, whether that course involve a change of Governor, or merely of policy.

G. T. Fox.

Durham,

10th March 1865.

Letter I.

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND,

MY DEAR GEORGE,—

I have your letter of the 19th September, and am glad to find that you still "believe that the acts of the New-Zealand Government are just and humane—punishment of murderers, confiscation of rebel territory, but pardon of vanquished foes, and a settlement of land to each of them." You give in this sentence a correct summary of the policy of the Government of which I have been a member for the last thirteen months, and which has just resigned, because Governor Grey, acting, or rather professing to act, on instructions given by the Colonial Office in England, has backed out of the policy which he endorsed a year ago, and is now endeavouring to patch up a hollow peace on terms which afford no prospect of permanence or stability.

You say that our actions have been misinterpreted by some good people at home, and you enclose me a note from your friend, the Rev. Mr. Tait, of Rugby, which, though couched in language most kind and
respectful myself, shews that he participates in the belief that his fellow-countrymen in the colony have been more or guilty in this matter. You may be sure that we have been deeply grieved, and that our indignation has been greatly roused, by the cruel and false aspersions which have been cast upon us in Parliament and by portions of the English press, and more particularly by what I can call nothing else than the shameless libels which have been circulated in letters received at home from military and naval officers in the colony. The friends of these writers, speaking on their authority, do not hesitate to describe the attempt which we have made to defend ourselves against an unprovoked assault by a savage and warlike enemy, as "a reckless and unrighteous war, carried on for the benefit of sordid persons, and waged with cruelty and injustice." These are the words of a colonel in Her Majesty's service, in a letter addressed to the "Times" in which he sums up the contents of letters received from officers in the colony; and they are a mild specimen of charges which have been made against us in Parliament, and in the columns of the leading London papers. Had the persons who have made each charges been better informed, they would have known that the war was commenced by the Natives, after months of preparation and organization, and that the hostilities on our side were the deliberate act of the Governor, Sir George Grey, in his capacity of representative of the Imperial Government; that not a soldier nor sailor could have been employed but by his order; that active operations could not have continued an hour without his permission; that he has reported to the Home Government that the war was forced upon him as one of self-defence, and that it must be persisted in till those who commenced it have been fully subjugated and made obedient to law. All this is ignored by those who have brought such cruel charges against the colonists, although they have within their reach Parliamentary papers, and other sources of information, containing ample proof of these facts.

If there were any truth in the statements which have been referred to, I should, as a New-Zealand colonist, be ashamed ever again to shew my face in England. I know that my friends will not believe, of me personally the charges which have been brought against the colonists as a body; but must either believe them of me, or refuse to believe them of the colonists as a body; for I have been in this matter, in my political and official capacity of Colonial Secretary, "a representative, man," and as fully committed to the policy which has been denounced as any man in the colony. I feel, therefore, that it is desirable to give you the means of refuting these aspersions on the colonists, of whom I am one, in order that the many friends whose good opinion I value may understand and appreciate the merits of the case, and have before them proof that this war was forced upon us as one of self-defence, and that we have had no other object in engaging in it than the security of our lives and property, and the future peaceful occupation of the country, under just and equal laws, by the two races to which Providence has given it as a common heritage.

I shall throw my statements into the shape of a few letters, in which I shall endeavour to give you the leading facts of the case, abstaining from any discursive or debateable matter, which might prevent your following the thread of what is really a very simple and intelligible translation. So let this go for Letter I.

From your affectionate brother,
William Fox.

Letter II.

You know I was one of those who thought that Governor Browne was wrong in entering upon the Taranaki war of 1860. I thought, and still think, that the title to the land which he agreed to purchase (the purchase has never been completed to this day) was bad; and that, even if it had been good, it would have been wiser to have abstained from buying a paltry 600 acres, under circumstances which necessarily involved us in hostilities with the native race. It was that "beginning of strife" which "is as the letting out of water" If the Governor's object were to assert the Queen's supremacy, as he afterwards said it was he could not have selected a worse cause of quarrel than one tainted with a land dispute. When, therefore, by the intervention of William Thompson (whom the readers of New-Zealand papers will sometimes find called by that name, sometimes Tarapipipi, Waharoa, or Tamehana,) a truce was arranged in 1861, I felt, in common with a large section of the colonists, that opportunities ought to be afforded for the natives to retreat from the position in which they had placed themselves by an appeal to arms, and that no effort should be spared to remove the cause of quarrel by a pacific adjustment of the Waitara dispute. When, therefore, by the intervention of William Thompson (whom the readers of New-Zealand papers will sometimes find called by that name, sometimes Tarapipipi, Waharoa, or Tamehana,) a truce was arranged in 1861, I felt, in common with a large section of the colonists, that opportunities ought to be afforded for the natives to retreat from the position in which they had placed themselves by an appeal to arms, and that no effort should be spared to remove the cause of quarrel by a pacific adjustment of the Waitara dispute. All the hostile feelings of the Maori race towards the Government centred for the time in that one point; and I felt certain that it was of no use to attempt to regain their confidence, or to restore proper relations between them and the Queen's Government, till that casus belli should be disposed of in such a way as might convince them of our determination to do what was just and right.

At this time there were two parties in the Colonial Parliament—the "Vigorous prosecution" party, consisting chiefly of Middle-Island men, who knew little of the Natives, and had comparatively little stake in
the struggle—and the "Peace party," consisting chiefly of Northern-Island men, who lived in neighbourly proximity to the Natives, and whose lives and properties were immediately involved in the issue. A few days before the recall of Governor Browne was announced, the former party was defeated by a narrow majority, and I found myself in the position of Colonial Secretary, and one of the responsible advisers of the Governor. So when Governor Grey arrived in the colony, a few weeks later, avowedly as the representative of a pacific mission, the time seemed to have come when we might reasonably hope that we should be able to bring the then existing difficulties to a satisfactory and peaceful solution.

I was not, however, one of those who believed that Sir George Grey carried an enchanter's wand, and that he had only to shew himself on the shores of New Zealand to cause revolt to sheath her sword. If Sir George Grey entertained that opinion himself he was soon undeceived. The haughty chiefs of Waikato, who had taken "Waitara" into their own hands, held themselves aloof, and intimated that if the Governor wished to communicate with them he must visit them in their own country; thus paying homage to the King whom they had set up in opposition to our Queen. He declined to go, and confined himself to Auckland, waiting for some favourable omen. At length a friendly chief of Lower Waikato (a district which had not joined itself to the King party) invited him to a great feast, at which it was anticipated many of the leading chiefs of the King party would be present, and an opening be afforded for negociations on the subject of our disturbed relations. The Governor accepted the invitation, and I accompanied him. There was a considerable gathering of friendly natives, and a small party of Kingites from the upper river; but among the latter scarcely any man of note, certainly none of the great leaders of the party. Two inferior men, who professed to be delegates, argued with the Governor for some hours, at public gatherings, on the subject of Kingism and Maori independence. On the whole they had the best of the argument, and the Governor failed to convince them of their error, or to revive in their breasts any feelings of confidence towards the Queen's Government. After two or three days spent in this way the Governor returned to Auckland, a good deal chagrined at his reception, and without having seen any of the leading chiefs of the "King party."

Deeply impressed as I was with the conviction, that before any good could be done "Waitara" must be disposed of, I proposed to the Governor before he left the river that I should go on to Upper Waikato, a hundred miles higher up, see Thompson and the leading chiefs of the King party face to face, and propose to them without circumlocution a reference of the Waitara question to arbitration before a tribunal of two Europeans and four Maories, three appointed by the Governor and three by William Thompson. His Excellency assented, and I went on my mission. Thompson was unfortunately absent, and though I sent three special messengers to him during a fortnight that I remained in Upper Waikato, they failed to find him, and he did not return till after I had left for Auckland. I found, however, nearly the whole of the other leading chiefs of the Waikato section of the King party, including King Matahaere Rewi, and William King of Waitara, Governor Browne's opponent. They met me in a public assembly at which I proposed to them to refer the Waitara question to arbitration in the manner above mentioned. They replied, that at the time when the truce had been made between Governor Browne and William Thompson, Waitara had been placed in the hands of the latter, and that it rested with him to decide whether the proposal should be accepted or not. Thompson not arriving after several days' delay, I was compelled to return to Auckland, but wrote to him informing him of my object in visiting the district, and repeating the proposal I had made to the other chiefs to refer "Waitara" to arbitration.

How Thompson met the proposal I will relate in my next letter.

W. F.,

Letter III.

I SAID in my last that Thompson was absent from Waikato when I was there. The day I left he returned. I confess I am uncharitable enough to believe that he did not choose to meet me. If he had really wished it, a meeting could easily have been arranged after his return. About a month after my return to Auckland I received the following letter from him in reply to that which I had left for him in Waikato.

Tamahere,

January 21, 1862.

To Mr. Fox, the Mediator between the Maori and the Paakeha,
FRIEND,

Salutations to you. I did not see your letter. I had passed on to Hauraki on the 22nd December. On the 25th...
I reached Kauaeranga, and on the Saturday your letter passed on to Warekawa. On the Wednesday I reached Piako, and on the Friday I arrived at Peria. I there saw a letter from Te Paama (Mr. Palmer), saying that you were staying at Tamahere, waiting for me. On the Saturday I started for Tamahere. It was a very bad day, and I did not reach Tamahere. I passed the Sunday at Maungakawa, and started for Tamahere at six o'clock. Piripi came, and I asked him where Mr. Fox was. Piripi said, "He has returned to the town." "When did he return?" "This day." Enough; my annoyance was great at not having seen you. I reached Ngaraawahia at eleven, and went to Mr. Ashwell's. Mr. Ashwell said to me, "Your friend Mr. Fox has returned: the cause of his coming was to have some men appointed for Waitara, and also to have some discreet and intelligent Pakehas to investigate the Waitara case." Friend, your korero is very just, and would have been very good some time ago, while the fighting was going on. The object of making peace was that the fighting might cease; that the plans for Waitara might be deliberated upon, so as to ascertain if Governor Browne was right, and Te Eangitake wrong; for it was impossible to see who was in error while the war continued. I therefore said to the General, "Let your soldiers go, that the Maories may return to their own places: let the law have the care of Waitara; let a good man from the Queen investigate the case, that is, some person sent by the Duke of Newcastle to suppress the troubles in this land." This, oh friend, was my plan. At present I do not quite understand the doings of our friend (Sir George) Grey; I am not quite sure whether his thoughts are good or evil. Perhaps after some time I may know his thoughts. Your plan is good, very good, and very just (or proper). This is the only thing that stops it. I do not know the thoughts of the Governor; we might waste time investigating, and afterwards there would be fighting at some other part. For instance, I am acquainted at the present time with some of the Governor's plans. I am very suspicious. A man named Perereka, of Patumahoe, who went to Taranaki, writes to me to say that the Governor has demanded payment for his having gone to Taranaki to fight. That is part of what I know: another thing is the persisting in stationing soldiers at Te la. These are the things that perplex me, I shall not now consent to Waitara being investigated. When the Governor ceases to plan, and when his thoughts and his works are good, then will I consent. As it is, O Friend, you and I will make arrangements by-and-by. Let me look about me at the present time. Perhaps there are other works of the Governor's which are hidden from my eyes, which will perhaps be seen after a while. Hence my caution. It would be waste (work) for you and I to arrange when there may be war again.

From your Friend,
Wi Tamehana Te Waharoa.

I was greatly disappointed when I read this letter. I had read too many Maori letters to entertain any doubt as to its real meaning. It was clear that Thompson was playing his friends false, and that he was not desirous of removing the great stumbling-block in the way of re-establishing friendly relations between the Natives and the Government.

I determined, however, not to abandon the attempt. The Hawkes Bay Natives, a numerous and influential tribe, sympathizers with the King movement, but not committed to it, had, immediately on the appointment of Governor Grey, written to him, urging the investigation of Waitara, and expressing their desire to take part in it. Shortly after my receiving Thompson's letter it was arranged that the Governor and myself should visit the Hawkes Bay Natives, as well as several intervening tribes in the interior and on the East Coast. His Excellency did not carry out his intentions, but I did; and, after visiting Taupo, I met a very large gathering of Natives at Hawkes Bay. I told them of the proposal I had made to Thompson and how it had been received. They expressed great surprise, took up the subject with much warmth and earnestness, and undertook to communicate with him upon it. Within two days after my interview with them their principal chiefs wrote him the following letter:

Matahiwi, March 6th, 1862.

FRIEND,

Salutations to you, and to all our dead there and here. The Governor's friend, Mr. Fox, came to us on the 4th day of March, to bring us the Governor's korero [word]. He came and said what he had to say. We listened, and then answered him. Potatou's word, at the commencement of the wrong at Waitara, was, that it should be investigated; that word which you spoke at Taranaki, that Waitara should be left for the law to investigate. That word was also spoken by us here. It was that word which gave strength to our Pakeha friends. That was the bravest word in all our talk: it went bravely to England, and won the battle there, and this is the result—the coming of Governor Grey. This was the word which we spoke to the Governor's friend"—namely, the delay in
the investigation of the Waitara. Mr. Fox then said that it was you who caused the delay, in not giving a
decided consent to the Governor and him to the investigation of Waitara. It was ascertained from your letter
that you still seemed to object to the investigation. This put our thoughts out altogether, and we sought for a
word in reply, and said, "Perhaps it was a mistake of the Pakeha's who translated your letter." We write,
therefore, that you may fully explain it to us, that we may know; for it is not well to make fools of us, and of our
Pakeha friends who have taken part with us, by objecting to the investigation which was publicly called for by
us. Answer our letter quickly, so that when the Governor comes our talk to him may be clear. Enough.

From your loving friends,

Karaitiana,
Renata,
Noa,
And from all the Runanga.

To Tamehana Te Waharoa.

A copy of the foregoing letter having been forwarded to me by a Mend in Waikato, I wrote to the Hawkes
Bay Natives as follows:—

Mr. Fox To Karaitiana And Others.
Auckland,

3rd, 1862.

Friends,

After I spoke to you at Matahiwi on the 3rd March, I went to Port Nicholson, to Nelson, to Rangitikei, and
to Taranaki. That is the reason I was so long in returning here to Auckland. When I got here I saw the Copy of
the letter that you wrote to Tamehana Te Waharoa about the investigation of the wrong at the Waitara. Tour
words to Tamehana are good. By-and-by we shall see what answer he will give you.

You say in your letter to Tamehana, "Perhaps it was a mistake of the Pakehas who translated your letter."
No, my friends, there was no mistake. I send you with this a copy of Tamehana's letter to me. There you will see
his words written, "I will not now consent to Waitara being investigated."

The word of Tamehana formerly to the Governor was, "Let the soldiers go, that the law may have the care
of Waitara. Let a good man come from the Queen to investigate the case." Now when the Queen has sent out
Governor Grey for that work, and he says, "Let there be six judges, three named by the Maori and three by the
Pakeha," Tamehana answers, "I will not consent to Waitara being investigated." How, then, is the law to have
the care of Waitara, if it is not to be investigated?

Now what are the reasons which Tamehana gives why he will not consent? First he says he does not know
whether the thoughts of the Governor are good or evil. What reason is this? Tamehana said formerly, "Let the
Queen send out a man to investigate." The Queen has sent one, and now Tamehana says, "I do not consent, for
I do not know whether that man's thoughts are good or evil." My friends, if Tamehana really wished that wrong
to be made clear, would these be his words?

Then again, Tamehana says "we might waste time in investigating; perhaps afterwards there might be
fighting at some other part." My friends, if there are more wrongs between the Pakeha and the Maori, besides
the Waitara, is that a reason why the Waitara should not be enquired into? It is this wrong not being enquired
into which has caused the past fighting at Taranaki; that was your word, the word of Renata, and the others.
Let this wrong be first removed by enquiry; then, if there are other wrongs, let them be enquired into also. But
this is the first, the root of the evil.

If Tamehana were very sick, and the doctor were to offer him medicine to cure that sickness, perhaps he
would say to the doctor, "No, I will not consent to take your medicine, for by-and-by I may be ill again in some
other part." Would these be the words of a wise man? Should he not rather say to the doctor, "I will take the
medicine now which shall cure my sickness: if I am ill by-and-by in some other part, I will take more medicine
then, to cure that other illness also." These would be the words of a man who wished to be cured. He would not
be thinking whether, at a future time, he might not be ill in some other part.

Now all the Pakehas [Europeans] who are in favour of peace are grieved at the answer of Tamehana.
When the war was going on, those Pakehas said, "Let the war be stopped, that the matter may be enquired into,
that we may see whose the wrong is, whether of William Kingi, or of Te Teira." Then Tamehana agreed with
the General, and with Governor Browne, that the fighting should cease, and all the people, both Pakeha and
Maori, waited to see that matter settled by the law. But Tamehana now says, "I will not consent, lest by-and-by
there be fighting about something else, in some other part."

We Pakehas say, therefore, "Now it is Tamehana who stops the road of peace." As you say, "he makes fools
of the Maories and Pakehas who have taken part with them, by objecting to the investigation which was
publicly called for by us both." But your thoughts, Karaitiana, Renata, and the other chiefs of Hawkes Bay;
are good about the "matter; and the earnest desire of the Governor and the Pakehas is to see this evil of the
Waitara enquired into.

When Tamehana answers your letter, let me know what he says, and write me your thoughts also.

I am yours, &c.,

William Fox.

Their reply to me was as follows:—

Omahu,

July 30th, 1862.

FRIEND,

Salutation to you. The cause of our not sending a letter to you is, our letter not having been answered by
Thompson. We shall not, therefore, write to you. Another word. We heard that it was not written by the hand of
Tamehana: the letter was another man's. The Waikatos disapprove of our proposal to investigate Waitara. They
say that we are not fit to investigate that wrong at the Waitara. We did not make any reply to that disapproval
of theirs. Our reply shall be to take it at once to Waikato, there to be heard.

There we can listen and be listened to. If the talk is the same as the talk in Tamehana's letter which you
have written to us, we shall condemn talk of this description.

Friend! We still hold to our word, which you have heard, namely, that Waitara be investigated: our word is
still the same.

We are going to Waikato to hear the news. "We shall write to you again from there.

From Renata.
From Karaitiana.
To Mr. Fox.

It seems from this that the interference of the Hawkes Bay Natives had been rejected, and that in very
contemptuous terms. Thompson did not even answer their letter himself. They did not, however, let the matter
drop, nor get angry at the manner in which they were treated. They carried out their intention of going to
Waikato by attending the great Peria meeting, on the borders of that district, in October 1863, which was
summoned by William Thompson for a general discussion on the prospects of the King party. They did not,
however, succeed in inducing Thompson to agree to the investigation of Waitara. Bishop Selwyn, who was
present, also failed in an attempt he made to attain the same end, and he was treated with scant courtesy and a
very curt reply.

I think it will be generally admitted, that up to this point the Government had acted in a most candid and
liberal manner. We were not met by Thompson in the same spirit. It was asserted by the natives on all sides,
that during the period referred to a word from Thompson would have settled the Waitara dispute. His behaviour
in reference to the transaction was a great disappointment to myself and others, who had looked to him as our
right hand in the adjustment of this difficulty. The conclusion which his conduct forced upon us was, either that
he is a double-minded man, or that he has not the courage (and few uncivilized men have) to act up to his own
convictions when opposed to the opinions of the majority of his people.

Letter IV.

In July 1862 I resigned the Colonial Secretaryship, and ceased to have anything to do with the
Government. The ground of my doing so was this:—"When Governor Grey arrived in the colony, he arranged
to carry on the Government on the principle of responsible Government. When the Assembly met, in July 1862,
it disapproved of this, contending that as the difficulties under which we laboured with the Natives had grown
up during the period when the Imperial Government exercised absolute control, they ought to be adjusted by it, and on its responsibility, before the colony assumed the burden on its own account: the "burden" meaning the liability for the consequences of misgovernment and the cost of suppressing future revolts. I never believed in the probability of the Imperial Government either keeping us out or getting us out of native difficulties; and refused to hold an office which would amount to no more than a mere clerkship or secretaryship under the Governor. So he got a new Ministry; and, during the ensuing year, the Governor was himself the sole actor, and solely responsible for the policy adopted in reference to the Natives. At the end of the year the Home Government insisted that, whether we liked it or not, the colony should take the responsibility Of governing the Natives. But before this function was re-imposed upon us, the murders at Taranaki and the outbreak in Waikato had occurred. Since the revolt the Colonial Office has again retraced its steps, and is now endeavouring to establish a system of divided responsibility, in which the Governor is partly responsible and his Ministers partly. I need scarcely say that this ingenious system can only end in deadlocks and utter misgovernment, and has induced me to resign a second, time the Colonial Secretariery, which I had re-asserted when responsible government was bestowed upon us by the Duke of Newcastle, in 1863. This digression is necessary to enable you to understand how fully Governor Grey was responsible for the events which occurred between August 1862 and November 1863, and how little the colonists or the Colonial Government had to do with the matter.

After the failure of all negotiations with "Waikato, the Governor seems to have made up his mind that, as far as Waitara was concerned, it was no use making any further attempts in that direction. He therefore went down to Taranaki, close to which town Waitara is. He did not attempt to institute any public or judicial enquiry; but, through official and other channels, he got at some facts which appear to have been new to him (though well known to the House of Representatives two years before), and he availed himself of these as a ground for deciding to give up "Waitara, thus setting aside the purchase by Governor Browne, and negativing the title of the Natives who had undertaken; to sell it to him.

But there was a complication in the matter, and as it was made the pretext by the natives for a renewal of hostilities, it requires particular notice.

About fifteen miles south of the town of Taranaki, or New Plymouth, lies the district of Tataraimaka. This district had been purchased during Sir George Grey's previous administration, in 1848 or 1849. There had never been a shadow of a doubt as to the validity of the purchase; and it had been occupied by European settlers for ten years, holding under Crown grants. During the Taranaki war of 1860-1861 the settlers were driven from this district by the insurgent Natives, and their homes utterly ravaged and destroyed. At the end of that war the Natives retained possession of the district, claiming it by right of conquest. When Governor Grey went to Taranaki he had, according to the plans he had decided on, to do two things,—to give up Waitara, and to retake Tataraimaka. Had he given up Waitara first, it is more than probable that no opposition would have been made to his taking Tataraimaka. But by one of those important errors which are apt to befal those who "diplomatize" too much, he, for some unexplained reason, reversed the process: without ever giving a hint of his intention to give up Waitara, he sent soldiers to occupy Tataraimaka, which they did, by building a redoubt and taking up their quarters in it. As a matter of policy this was no doubt a great blunder; but it did not give the Natives any right to do what they immediately did. Tataraimaka was not theirs; it had only come into their possession by an act of rebellion; and whether Waitara were given up or not, they had no right to Tataraimaka. Besides which they were not personally interested in the Waitara dispute, belonging to different tribes from that whose claims Governor Browne had ignored.

The Natives did not offer any opposition to the soldiers when they took possession; but they immediately wrote to the chiefs of Waikato, who, you will understand, lived some 200 miles away, and had no personal interest in either Tataraimaka or Waitara. The Waikatos replied by directing them immediately to commence hostilities; and they sent emissaries into every part of the country, urging a general rising and extermination of the Europeans. I was away at this time in the Rangitikei district, fully 300 miles from Waikato, and 150 miles from Taranaki. One of these deputations passed within half-a-dozen miles of my house, on its road down the coast. The leader was an old man of between seventy and eighty years of age, who travelled the long distance from Waikato and back on foot, and over a very rugged country. He exhorted the natives in Cook's Straits to "sweep their yard," meaning thereby, to drive out the Europeans; advice that was responded to by one of the local Natives in these words:—"My plan is to fight across the boundary, in the midst of the Europeans, and to drive them into the sea, in order that they may disappear from this island." Fortunately for us more prudent councils prevailed, and our immediate neighbours determined to watch the progress of events in the north before they should commit themselves.

At Taranaki, however, no time was lost in responding to the war cry which had gone forth from Waikato. On the 4th of May an ambuscade party attacked a small escort conveying some carts between New Plymouth and that place, and killed Lieut. Tragett, Dr. Hope, and seven or eight rank and file. This they did avowedly in obedience to the orders they had received from Waikato, and from this event dates the war in which we have
been engaged ever since. How the field of operations became changed from Taranaki to Waikato, and how we got engaged in hostilities with the tribes of that district, I must reserve for another letter.

Letter V.

PERSONS in England, in looking at the New-Zealand question, appear generally to get hold of the Waitara dispute and Colonel Browne's war as the root and foundation of the present hostilities. They were, no doubt, very material elements in producing them, and had a direct effect on the growth of that hostile spirit with which ultimately nine-tenths of the Maori population south of Auckland became imbued. But there was another stream of events running parallel to those, which flowed originally from quite another fountain-head. These were the Land league and the King movement; separate at first, but, in the end, merging in one.

The Land league originated in the jealousy of the Waikato and certain other tribes of the progress of the colonists. Afraid that the land would be all overrun by the Europeans, they banded themselves together to oppose all land-selling. The movement was legitimate so long as they refused, every man, or every family, or every tribe, to sell his or their own land. But after a time the movement became aggressive; and, by means which practically amounted to intimidation, they prevented tribes and individuals from selling land which they were willing and even desirous to sell.

The King movement appears to have originated in a desire to establish law and order among themselves, and might, had it been properly directed in its earlier stages, have been turned to good effect. Partly by mismanagement during Governor Browne's administration, partly through the inability of the Natives to guide and control the machinery they had put in motion, it became ultimately little else than a system of antagonism towards the European, the whole aim of which was to keep him at arm's length, and to prescribe the limits within which colonization should advance. Being wanting in the knowledge necessary to enable them to establish effectually the machinery of government, the institutions established under the auspices of the King had no power, and were altogether ineffectual to secure law and order among the Natives themselves. They were sufficient, however, to concentrate the energy of whatever government they had against the European. Anarchy within, and tyranny towards those without, were the practical results of what was probably, in its origin, a well-meant but ill-designed attempt at self-elevation and national independence.

Both these systems—the Land league and Kingism—originated about 1848, during the first administration of Governor Grey; but at that period they made little progress, and had no prominence. That was the time, however, when the guiding hand was wanted, and when, by a judicious system of land courts and self-governing institutions, the feeble attempts of the Natives to struggle out of the confusion of their own social condition, and to annex themselves to ours, might have been carried on to a satisfactory result. It might have been done in the earlier part of Governor Browne's time, and the colonial authorities made the attempt to do it, but were thwarted by the representative of the Imperial Government. It was too late when Governor Grey returned to New Zealand in 1861; and the institutions which he then hastily endeavoured to establish only remain as a monument of good intentions, and perhaps of a not very clear perception of the right method by which to carry them into execution.

When Governor Grey arrived in the colony "Kingism" was a far more threatening difficulty than "Waitara." But Kingism had thoroughly adopted Waitara, and therefore it was that the latter had assumed so great an importance, and loomed on the political horizon far larger than it would have appeared if viewed through the medium of its own merits.

At the date of the renewal of hostilities at Tataraimaka, as recorded above, Kingism had developed these features:—A king, a very young man of no force of character, surrounded by a little mock court, and a body guard of household troops without shoes and with very tight stocks, kept aloof from all vulgar contact, and even from the inspection of Europeans, unless on humiliating terms; a body of 5000 to 10,000 warriors, scattered over the country, but thoroughly organized, and capable of easy combination, to the extent of 2000 or 3000, in any one spot; large accumulated stores of ammunition; large stores of food; a position in the centre of the island from which a descent could be made in a few hours upon any of the European settlements; roads forbidden to be made through the King country; the large rivers barred against steamers, so that nine-tenths of the country was closed against the ordinary means of travel and transport; the Queen's law set at utter defiance, her magistrates treated with, supercilious contempt, her writs torn in pieces and trampelled under foot; finally, Europeans who had married Maori women, and had lived for a quarter of a century among the Natives, both lay and Missionary, ordered out of the country, while their wives and children were taken from them on the plea of relationship to the Maori;—all this was accompanied by an exhibition of the utmost arrogance and self-confidence, and the most overbearing and undisguised contempt for the power of the Queen and the Europeans.
It was practically fast coming to this, that either the turbulent spirit of the King party must be controlled by force, or the colonists must leave the country. I know by experience what it was, for I spent the year 1862-1863, during which the revolt broke out, in a country district, in the midst of a scattered population of colonists, surrounded on three sides by tribes, some of which had openly committed themselves to the King party, and all of whom (with one insignificant exception) were notoriously in sympathy with it. At any time during that year a word from Waikato might have let loose upon us the excited passions of our neighbours; or more remote tribes might, by crossing a range of hills, or floating down our river, have invaded our district, and carried devastation into the midst of a peaceful population, as they had done at Taranaki, and were doing at Auckland. Though our district had taken the disease in a very mild form, and though friendly relations with our neighbours of the Maori race, of many years' standing, had created a feeling of confidence in them which the event proved to be well founded, yet we saw enough of Kingism in its new development to convince us how dangerous an element it had become, and how certainly, unless it were crushed, it must destroy the results of twenty years' colonization, and most, or the greater part of the population in ruin.

Letter VI.

To go back to my relation of events. Very shortly after the outbreak at Taranaki on May 4th, 1863, the Governor returned to Auckland. Here he was soon made aware of an alarming state of affairs, which threw the Taranaki outbreak into the shade, and compelled him to recall General Cameron, and to concentrate nearly all his forces in the neighbourhood of Auckland, which was threatened with an immediate attack by the Waikato tribes. Information poured in from all sides that those tribes had ordered the insurrection, and directed the murders at Taranaki, and that they were preparing for an immediate advance upon Auckland. In short, the whole power of the King party was about to try its strength with the British Government. The following extracts from papers laid by the Governor before the Colonial Assembly will shew what was the character of the threatened invasion, and how imminent it became immediately after the outbreak at Taranaki:—

Copy of Despatch from Governor SIR GEORGE GREY, K.C.B., to His Grace the DUKE of NEWCASTLE, Auckland, New Zealand,

July 4th, 1863.

MY LORD DUKE,

I have the honour to transmit copies of the letters named in the margin, which I have received from various persons, warning me of the present intentions of the Natives inhabiting the district which borders the Waikato river, and which adjoins most populous and wealthy part of the province of Auckland. These letters are selected as coming from the most trustworthy sources, but I have received much additional information all to the same purport.

2. It has now been clearly proved that some of the chiefs of Waikato ordered the recent murders at Taranaki, and that, being thus responsible for them, they have determined to support the people who carried out the orders which they issued. For this purpose they are quite prepared to attack this populous district, and even to commit similar murders here......

I have, &c.,

G. Grey.

The Rev. B. Y. ASHWELL to the BISHOP of NEW ZEALAND. Taupiri,

June 30th, 1863.

MY LORD BISHOP,

The Waikato tribes are now engaged I fear in a runanga puku, and that ere long some sudden outbreak will take place...

Numerous messengers are gone through the country to excite, I believe, a general rise. I have told you nearly all I know. Under these circumstances great vigilance is necessary. I wish all the Natives about or in the neighbourhood of Auckland were away.
Copy of Despatch from Governor Sir George Grey, K.C.B., to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, K.G.

Government House, Auckland,

July 11th, 1863

My Lord Duke,

Adverting to my Despatch No. 72, of the 4th July last, upon the subject of a plan laid by some of the Waikato tribes and their adherents to attack the Auckland district, I have now the honour to transmit the documents named in the margin, shewing how completely this plan was matured, and how determined and bloodthirsty were the intentions of some of the most evil-disposed amongst the leaders of the Waikato tribes.

I have, &c.,

G. Grey.

His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, K.G.

July 3rd, 1863.

O______,—

Listen to what I have to say. I have just heard evil news. I will not hide the evil from you, my parents. Hearken. The tribes of this island intend making an attack upon Auckland. This has been decided upon all over the island. All the chiefs of the island have given their consent. An attack will be made: be on your guard, as to Auckland, every day this month. Keep on your guard during July and August. Let all Auckland be on the alert throughout all its boundaries. The cause is sympathy for Taranaki. Friends, Te_____and Te_____, salutations. This is my word to you. Be kind to me, and keep my name carefully concealed. Were it known that I had sent this letter to you, the payment would be myself.

Don't tell______, lest my name should become known. Tell this to the Governor, that all Auckland may be warned, and request him also to keep my name concealed: keep me quite secret. If my name were heard of, this would be my last day. See to it you, that warning is given; but keep my name secret from Pakeha and Maori. Keep my name concealed; but beware of Hauraki, of Kaipara, and of the Ngapuhi.

If nothing happens, still keep my name secret; whether there is good or evil, conceal my name. Pray earnestly to God for me. Enough.

From your loving Son,

From_____.

To TE______.

Raglan,

July 4th, 1863.

Friend, salutations.

Friend______has not yet stayed at Waingaroa (Raglan), because of the disturbed state of Waipa.

O______, listen to what I have to say. Paora Kina and Aporo Tunua have come to Tamehana Tarapipipi to get his consent, and he has consented to an attack upon the In, and even to include the town of Auckland (or he has consented to the people of the In being killed, the slaughter to extend even to the town of Auckland). The letters for the killing of you Pakehas have been sent to all Hauraki. We have here the information. It is not on account of Aporo, but that the King may prevail, and not be altogether done away with.

Friend, these are your men who went to urge war. Enough.

From______. 
Send my letter that the Governor may see it. Raglan,

July 6th, 1863.

FRIEND,

Salutations to you; this is my word to you and Te_____. Be on your guard, all of you. Listen. The minds of New Zealand are rising about Auckland, Otahuhu, Tauranga (Drury), Rama-rama, Pukeahau, Pokeno, Te la, and the Soldiers' pas at Waiuku. This talk is from the chiefs of Manukau. That talk has been arranged at Waikato. With the Ngatimaniapoto at Eangiwhia, at Maungatautari with Te Ori Ori, at Tamahere with Tamehana and the Ngathiaha, at Ngaruawahia, with Matutaeara.

All these tribes are determined upon evil. The men who arranged this are Paora Kina and Aporo, of Ngatitamaoho. This talk is from_____. It was brought by his son_____, and the letter for Tamehana, and the other to hold a meeting_____ is to be sent to arrange an attack upon Auckland, or upon Raglan. The Ngatiteata and Ngatitamaoho are to attack Waiuku. If this communication reaches you, keep_____name secret, and mine also; but let the Governor know of this. This is not on account of Aporo, but lest the King should be humbled. We shall remain in Raglan. Enough,

Memorandum by Mr. FULLOON.

Shortly after the cessation of hostilities at Taranaki, in 1861, the Waikatos organized a plan of operations, in the event of a misunderstanding arising with the Government, as they fully believed at the time that the Government was going to press them for the part that they had taken in the Taranaki war, and also against the King movement.

This opinion was shortly after confirmed, when His Excellency Colonel Gore Browne issued his Manifesto, May 21st, 1861, by which they understood that negotiations would cease on the 31st August, and that war would be declared, and Waikato invaded, on the 1st September 1861.

The plan of operation was, as near as I can remember, for the whole of Waikato to come down in a body to Maramaruia, and proceed up that river to a place called Paparata, in the Tirikohua district, making that place their head-quarters.

From thence parties were to proceed and occupy the following positions, viz.—Maketu (situated behind Drury: to the right of the coal-mines, there is an old war track from Maketu to Paparata), the Razorback, Pukewhau (overlooking Baird's farm), and Tuhimata. The Razorback and Pukewhau have direct and partly independent tracks to the Maketu and Paparata war-paths. The parties at the Razorback and Pukewhau were to destroy the bridges on the Great South Road, and those at Tuhimata were to observe and oppose any military movement that might be made against them.

The party at Maketu (which was to be a strong one) were to maraud the Drury and Papakura districts.

The Ngatipou were to concentrate the whole of their force at Tuakau, and from thence attack the Patumahoe and Waiuku settlers. The Ngatiteata taking no active part.

This was the first plan: afterwards it was altered as to the plan of attack; namely, after the troops had invaded Waikato, the Natives were to assemble at the back of Maketu, and another party were to assemble near Te Whau. The Thames Natives were to meet in the neighbourhood of Taupo, and upon a given day some Natives (living in town for that purpose) would fire Auckland at different points, and, whilst the citizens were extinguishing the conflagration, the assault was to be made both by sea and by land. The Natives fully believed that they could have accomplished their design, and the "Puku o te weke "would have been theirs; and that they could have moved from their rendezvous without its becoming known to the Government.

There were certain houses and persons to have been saved; the dwellings were to be recognised by a white cross upon all the doors, a native to mark the houses on the same night that the towa was to be attacked.

The attack was not to have been confined to Auckland alone. It was to have taken place simultaneously all over the island. It was intended to have been a general war against the Pakeha, and to have taken place upon the 1st September 1861.

It was the news that His Excellency Sir George Grey was coming to succeed Colonel Gore Browne that averted the general rising of the Natives.

By what I have been able to ascertain, the plan Waikato intends to follow out now is the one that I have first described.

At the time that these plans were organized, most of our friends were made acquainted with what was intended, but they did not think it worth their while to inform the Government, and some even promised to assist. I believe Wiremu Nero Te Awaitaia was the only man that acquainted the Government of it, shortly after he was requested to join the conspiracy.

A Mr. Hurst, of H.M. 12th Regiment (lately acting as engineer upon the Great South Road), has been over
all the war-paths that I have mentioned, and has made rough surveys of the country during his rambles.

James Fulloon.

Auckland, 

June 20th, 1863.

Immediately after the commencement of hostilities in Waikato, William Thompson wrote a letter to Archdeacon Brown (by whom he had been educated), from which the following is an extract:—

Otorokai, Matama, 

July 26th, 1863.

To ARCHDEACON BROWK, 

Salutations. Friend, hearken. The reasons are many that induced me to go and view the work between the Waikato and the Governor. 

This is a word of mine to you, to let you know my views. I shall spare neither unarmed people nor property....... 

Father, listen. I have consented to attack the whole of the town. If they prove the strongest, well and good. If the Maoris prove the strongest, this is how it will be: the unarmed people will not be left. Enough. You hear what I say. This turns.

From your son, 
William Thompson Te Waharoa. 

To Archdeacon Brown. 

He afterwards wrote an explanation of the above, as follows:—

Meremere, 

August 22nd, 1863.

To_____. 

Salutation. Your question about my word to Brown, (Archdeacon) of Tauranga, has reached me. My word is quite true as regards the town (Auckland), but not as regards Tauranga. Listen to me: it is my purpose to reach the town. If the Governor gains the day, well. If my battle in the open day fails, how can it be helped? If I gain the, day there will be no swerving from the word which was spoken to Brown. 

O, I shall not fight with the soldiers of the Ia, but I am now assembling (my men): when all are assembled, I shall then attack the town. That part (of my forces) which have gone off to the hills are six hundred in number. The only forces I am now awaiting are (the men of) Ngaiterangi, and Kawhia. They have not yet arrived. These are the forces I am now awaiting. This ends.

This is my plan. 

W. Tamihana. 

August 1st, 1863. 

SIR

On this very day I came to Waikato with all my tribe. I have a word to say to you about my letter to the minister Brown; a warning from me to you, to bring to the town the defenceless, lest they be killed at their farms in the country. But you are well acquainted with the customs of the Maori race. 

The documents above given were, it will be observed, all written previously to the commencement of hostilities in Waikato, except Thompson's letters, which were written within a few days after that event, and are sufficiently clear as to his intentions. Many other similar warnings from friendly natives and Missionaries were received at the same period, all proving beyond it doubt that the threatened advance upon Auckland by the
Waikato tribes was imminent, and that not an hour was to be lost in taking steps to repel it.

Letter VII.

Withina few days after the receipt of the friendly warnings cited in the last letter the Waikato tribes came down in force to attack our outposts, a portion of their force having already been sent round to effect a flank movement, by which they expected to, and did, in fact, turn General Cameron's rear, and got within twenty-five miles of the town of Auckland, where, taking up a position in the wooded ranges, they harassed our escorts, attacked redoubts, cut off stragglers, murdered unarmed settlers, and ravaged the homesteads over twenty miles square of settled country. Such were the events which brought us into conflict with the tribes of Waikato, and forced us into a war of self-defence.

I have passed over many incidents and collateral events, the merits of which have given rise to much discussion, and some of which, no doubt, had the effect of precipitating the struggle, and strengthening the resolve of the insurgents. Many of the acts of Sir George Grey, during the period referred to, cannot be regarded without feelings of regret, nor without admitting that they reflect great discredit on the Government of which he was the representative. The sudden changes of policy and constant vacillation which have marked his whole administration—the great error committed in the occupation of Tataraimaka before he surrendered Waitara—the still greater error of surrendering Waitara after the Oakura-murders—the deceptions practised at Aumutu and Kokekohe, where, under the pretence of founding schools, he made preparations for the erection of ball-proof barracks, and the establishment of political agencies, events which led to the only two exhibitions of physical, force by the Waikato tribes before the general rising—these, and other acts of a similar character, had no doubt the effect of precipitating the revolt. But they afforded no justification for it. The Governor had a right, if he chose, to occupy Tataraimaka, whether he surrendered Waitara or not.; he had a right to surrender Waitara, though it might be liable to be interpreted as an act of weakness, and an invitation to further aggression; the ruses at Aumutu and Kokekohe might be things to be deplored; but none of these events justified the Natives in taking up arms, invading the homesteads of peaceable settlers, and threatening even the capital of the colony with destruction, "not even sparing unarmed people."

I think I can now confidently appeal to the candour of those who may have read my statement, whether this war is a colonists' war, got up by sordid men as a pretext for seizing the lands of the Natives, or whether it was not forced upon the colony under circumstances which leave the aggressors absolutely without justification or excuse. I will now say a few words on the means by which it has been proposed to take security for the future and indemnity for the past; I mean, the confiscation of a portion of the native territory, and its settlement by European colonists, which Governor Grey, in his despatch to the Duke of Newcastle, of August 29th, 1863, declared to be the only plan he could devise for effecting the permanent security of the country, inflicting a punishment upon the aggressors, and deterring other tribes from similar attempts for the future. It was the proposal by Governor Grey to carry out this plan which has afforded a handle for the unjust accusations made against the colony, that it was engaged in a war to wrest land from the Natives. It is a very different thing to propose, as Governor Grey proposed, to take territory from rebels, as a punishment and a guarantee for the future, from waging "a reckless and unrighteous war against a defenceless people, for the purpose of wresting from them their land."

To go at length into the question would occupy much more space than I can afford. I will therefore merely summarize the argument, leaving you to draw your own inferences, and to fill in as your common sense may direct.

1. The Natives were the unprovoked aggressors.
2. On our side a war of defence, of life and death, and for the very existence of colonization in the North island.
3. Unless such events are to be chronic, substantial punishment must be inflicted, and material guarantees taken.
4. The Natives do not care for mere loss of life or destruction of crops. Till thirty years ago their whole existence was spent in hostilities among each other, renewed year by year.
5. They do care for loss of territory.
6. It is consistent with their own customs.
7. They never consider a belligerent defeated till his territory is taken.
8. This revolt will not cost the colony less than at least two millions sterling, probably much more.
9. There is nothing contrary to natural equity, moral law, or Christianity, in requiring those who have inflicted so ruinous an injury upon us to make restitution.
10. Land is the only source from which the Maories can make restitution.
11. The colony has reached a condition of almost absolute bankruptcy in consequence of this revolt.

12. It can be relieved from it by the sale of confiscated territory of the rebels, and in no other way.

13. No real injury will be inflicted on the Natives by taking large territories from them. The tribes whom we hold responsible for this war amount to ten or twelve thousand souls. They own eight or ten million acres; they do not cultivate or use one hundred thousand. If we took half, or a third of their waste lands, I do not think it would be more than a just punishment, and would not do much more after all expenses of survey and settlement, than repay the loss and cost the Natives have inflicted upon us.

14. Great Britain made China pay seven million sterling as the cost of the opium war. Japan, I believe, has been made to pay for the hostilities consequent on Mr. Richardson's murder. Why should not the Maori pay for the ruinous injury inflicted on this colony by his unprovoked act?

15. In expressing my own opinion as to extent, I should state that the Government never proposed to take so large a quantity. 1,600,000 acres was the amount suggested by the late Ministry to the Governor, to be appropriated to military settlement—general colonization—and sale to such an extent as would relieve us of a moderate part of the burden inflicted upon us. My own opinion is that the Natives ought to pay the whole cost of suppressing this rebellion, both Imperial and Colonial. And except as far as their pride would suffer, it could be done without inflicting any actual loss upon them. They do not use the land, and they won't sell it. Except as a matter of national pride and aggrandizement, it has no real value to them beyond the few acres which they actually cultivate. The possession of these large unoccupied territories lies at the foundation of their uncivilized condition, and is one of the greatest barriers existing to their elevation and progress, either individually or as a people.

In conclusion, I must mention one fact which has greatly surprised and grieved the colonists of New Zealand. We have seen exhibited in Parliament, and in the press in England, the utmost sympathy for the Natives who have involved us in this war—the utmost anxiety to reduce to the smallest possible amount the punishment to be inflicted upon them. But we have looked in vain for any expression of sympathy with ourselves. A whole settlement has been blotted out of the map of New Zealand; another district of twenty miles square has been ravaged, and its inhabitants stripped of all they possessed; women and helpless children have been massacred in cold blood; absolute ruin has been inflicted on hundreds of unoffending families; but those who have raised their voices so loud in behalf of the aggressor have nothing to say in behalf of the victim. On the contrary we are denounced "as sordid men, waging, with cruelty and injustice, a reckless and unrighteous war." This is not what we had a right to expect from this "great heart" of the British Nation, We have not deserved it. The colonists of New Zealand are entirely free from the imputations which have been so unjustly cast upon them; and we cannot doubt that, when the facts are better known, the good feeling and good sense of our fellow-countrymen will render us the justice that is our due.

Your affectionate brother,
William Fox.
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"New Zealand's war."

18, Chaloot Crescent, Regent’s Park, London, February 1st, 1865.

To The Editor of the Times,

Sir,—In your excellent Leader of the 24th ultimo on The Case of New Zealand, forwarded to you from the Colony, you observe that you "give it the publicity which is desired, but that you need scarcely be at the pains of remarking how much more evidence will be required before a conclusion can be safely reached."

As an ex-Colonist acquainted for twenty years with our future "Britain of the South," and still taking warm interest in the young fortunes of that beautiful Land, will you permit me to respond, to your invitation and to seek to supply some portion of that "more evidence" which you demand.

Exeter Hall and the Missionary Party—those who, unmindful of Lord Bacon, would "destitute plantations" each and all brought their "Case" before your tribunal, let me beg you now to hear the plain unvarnished tale of a mere private Colonist, of one who never took part in the public life of his Colony, and whose ambition there soared to nothing beyond the Plough and the Golden Fleece.

The Statement called "The Case of New Zealand" I have never seen—indeed I have purposely abstained from consulting it, so that what I have asked permission to place before you, however inferior it might be, might be something unprompted by others, and wholly my own. I am the more tempted, too, to profit by your intimation that more evidence is still needed in "re New Zealand," by the force of the fact of a rather mendacious pamphlet having just been circulated among the Members of your Legislature by the Aborigines Protection Society—circulated in the hope of some Night winning a crushing verdict, there, against a distant body of English Settlers pioneering the way for their Countrymen in the primeval wilderness of our Southern Thule.

New Zealand Colonists suffer in the Mother Country from the hostility of two active sections of your community—the one, the disciples of Professor Goldwin Smith who affect to regard Colonies as costly incumbrances, or at least as Possessions which should entail on the Mother-Country no atom of expense—the other, those Utopian believers in the "Noble Savage" of the Story Books, the extreme Missionary and Aborigines-protecting Party among you here, who have never forgiven Colonisation and Colonists for scattering their cherished design of locking up the noble Islands of New Zealand as a Preserve for Exeter Hall.

The small [unclear: figure placed] here and there in this Letter refer to "confirmatory remarks" standing at the end of the Pamphlet.

(l) The former are partially represented in your Legislature by the Hon. Member for Taunton, Mr. Arthur Mills—the latter, very fitly, by the Hon. Member for Maidstone, Mr. Buxton,—

"Who flays the Colonist, but whose curious mind
Glows with tenderness for 'Black' mankind."

Substantially, and put in the precis form, the principal Allegations injurious to New Zealand Colonists, made by these gentlemen and their followers, are these:—

• That, mainly, it is the Colonist's "greed" of Land, his trampling on the Native's "rights and titles" to Land which has at last goaded the Native into heroic Revolt (Treated of at page 4.)
• That it is the Native's actual "need" and "scarcity" of Land which has contributed to place him in Revolt. (Treated of at page 9.)
That the Colonists have incited the Native to Revolt not only in the hope that his punishment for Revolt, "confiscation," would give them his Lands—but in the further hope that the large imperial Commissariat expenditure caused by Revolt would" fill their tills. (Treated of at page 12.)

That Colonisation has been injurious to the Native; and that the Colonists, in their daily intercourse with him, have treated him as the mere "Black Fellow"—like the weeds of the Country, fit only for extirpation. (Treated of at page 14.)

That it is the Colonists who have had the government and the guidance of the Native; and that it is partly their legislative mismanagement and neglect of the Noble Savage which has now, again, metamorphosed him into the costly rebel. (Treated of at page 18.)

That the Colonists, moved by sordid love of lucre, have suicidally sold to the Maori those Arms and munitions of war which, alone, enable him to withstand and slaughter both her Majesty's gallant Troops, and their own Volunteer and Defense Corps. (Treated of at page 23.)

That bodies of British Emigrants becoming, in the last twenty years, British Colonists in New Zealand, and going forth to their destination with the full privity and sanction of the British Government, have little or no more just claim to require England to aid them in a savage War than Poles would have to require her to march on Warsaw or Danes to require her to protect Holstein. (Treated of at page 26.)

Permit me, Sir, to refute, or comment on, these various Allegations in the order in which they stand; and in dealing with the first—the Allegation that it is the Colonist's "greed" of Land, his "trampling on the Native's rights and titles to Land," which has provoked the War—allow me just to recall to your recollection how and why it was that New Zealand ever came to be colonised by England at all, and on what great, novel, principle her colonisation was commenced and has been carried on.

New Zealand was created a British Colony in the year 1840, and the chief considerations which impelled the Crown to create it a British Colony were these:—the hope that if these wild Cannibal Islands of the distant South were raised to this estate the ferocious intermittent tribal fends between the Natives, threatening the utter self-extermination of the Race, might gradually be made to cease—the necessity of introducing some law and order among the Squatters of Kororareka (2) and the New Zealand Company's Settlers in Cook's Straits—and the desire to prevent France(3) from seizing on a promising naval possession standing before the very doors of Australia, and the germ, too, of a Country capable of expanding into the future mistress of the Oceanic South,—and the Crown was further tempted to give practical effect to these various considerations by the force of the fact that various of the Natives, sick for the time of tribal slaughters and ferocious internecine wars, and anxious to profit by that increased trade and wealth, that increased security of life and property, which they foresaw would follow in the wake of colonisation, had more than once moved the Crown to assume the Sovereignty of the Islands and give them the protection of the British flag.

Lord John Russell had the Colonial Office when New Zealand thus became a member of the Empire, and in those days the Nation was proud of its triumphs in the fields of Colonisation; for its Emigrant-Armies, with weapons of Plough and Axe, had created from the Wilderness a dozen young Englands, and given the State nobler Territories than she had ever secured by the Sword. But the Anglo-Saxon Settlement of New Countries had been ruthless to the Savage: in America, whole Tribes of the Red Indian had disappeared; in Australia, the Aborigenes were fading away; in Tasmania, the Black man was gone. A fresh wild Country had become ours for Settlement, and a strong desire sprang up that here, at least, the like reproaches should be spared us, and that in our colonisation of New Zealand, one of our chiefest cares should be the preservation and elevation of the Native Race.

It was seen that in America and Australia one great cause of the decrease and degradation of the Aborigenes had been the wholesale taking of their wild lands for the Plough and for the Fleece; and, forgetful of the wide difference between the requirements of a semi-nomad people like the Indians and the Australians living mainly by the chase, and those of a stationary people like the Maories, living mainly on rude garden produce and sea fish, it seems, somewhat paradoxally, to have been thought that as ouroustingthe Native from the broad territories of wild land he hunted over and used in America and Australia had led to his extinction, our securing to the Native the broad territories of wild land in New Zealand which he did not hunt over and use must lead to his preservation and increase.

Entering on our colonisation of New Zealand with these ideas, Captain Hobson of the Royal Navy, the first Governor, arrived in the Country with stringent instructions from Lord John Russell to carry these ideas out; and under the "Treaty of Waitangi," the Treaty by which the Native ceded and made over to the Crown the Sovereignty of the Islands, it was virtually agreed on the Dart of the Crown—firstly, That the whole area of New Zealand, an area of nearly eighty millions of acres, as large as that of Great Britain and Ireland, with all that "was on and under it, should be held to be the freehold property of that remnant of the Native Race, some 60,000 men, women and children, which was then left in the Country—secondly, That the Crown in seeking to
acquire any portion of this vast area for the purposes of Colonisation should do so only by the way of "friendly purchase" from the Natives—and thirdly, That, to avoid confusion and to protect the weaker Race from imposition, the Natives, when they felt disposed to sell any portions of their vast unused territories, should do so only to the Crown—(4) which, thus, buying blocks of Wild Land wholesale in the raw state, would survey and classify such Land and then retail it to the actual Settler for the purposes of the Plough and the Fleece.

In its broad, boundless, emphatic, acknowledgment of the Native's right of ownership over every acre of the entire "Wilderness—in its care to protect the Native from the possible trickery of the Land-Shark,(5) and the grasping Speculator, by ordaining that the Native should alienate his Lands only by open public sale to the Queen—this u 'Treaty of Waitangi" was for more liberal, some would say far more Utopian, in its spirit and provisions than the great Treaty made with the Indians by Penn.

The Waitangi Treaty, too, has been no mere paper Treaty. Despite the immense difficulty of ascertaining who among the 60,000 Natives of the North Island were to be regarded as the Owners, or as the nearest approach to Owners, of the wild territories of a Country where twenty hostile Tribes, now advancing conquerors now retreating fugitives, had been waging ferocious Wars with each other for centuries—a Country where titles to Land, to use an expression, were derived or lost through conquest, re-conquest, occupancy, non-occupancy, slavery, accidental spilling of blood, through twenty clashing whims, codes, and customs of barbarism—(6) despite all this, the Crown, acting through its Governors and Local Authorities, ever scrupulously observed both the letter and the spirit of the Treaty; and from 1840, when the regular Colonisation of the Islands first commenced, up to the period of this present Revolt, almost every acre (4) of Land which had been obtained by the Settlers in New Zealand had been obtained for them by the Crown solely and wholly by way of friendly purchase—friendly purchase from such of the more enlightened among the Natives as had wished to realize something from their immense unused wild estates by selling portions of them; and who had been shrewd enough to see that the approach, or extension, of European Settlement caused by their sale of such portions, would bring markets to their doors, enrich them with a lucrative and a civilizing Trade, and quadruple the value of those great tracts of Wilderness which they still would possess.

But that "Exeter Hall and Missionary Party" to which I have referred, while compelled to admit that the "Treaty of Waitangi" has been faithfully maintained by the Crown and the Colonists for a period of nearly a quarter of a century, assert that it was infringed by the Crown and the Colonists in one late, solitary, case, at Taranaki, inasmuch as there, a miserable plot of land was attempted to be taken from the Natives by force, and that it was such attempted "act of force" which provoked the present War. Now, the monstrous History of the "Taranaki Land Question"—familiar in our mouths as Household Words throughout New Zealand—shows that the course which Representative of the Crown had the wisdom and the man-fulness to pursue there, was a course in perfect conformity with the spirit of the Waitangi Treaty—shows that the turbulent Chief there who so impudently resisted the Crown in the matter of the Land had himself sold it, and was himself a trespasser on it—and proves that Governor Gore Browne, in deciding to enforce the Queen's purchased right and title to Waitera, was in no wise moved to do so by the value of the Land, or even fundamentally by the Land at all, but by the righteous necessity of settling the question as to whether Queen Victoria or Te Potatau the First was to rule in New Zealand, and whether the Colony was to be nursed on into a second England, or be abandoned to the Savage and again become a howling Waste.

See further remarks at page

I venture to think, then, Sir, that an impartial weighing of the facts on record in regard to the great principle on which the colonisation of New Zealand was commenced, and has been carried on, will not only show that in our Settlement and Civilisation of the Country we have exhibited no "greed" of Land, no contempt for the Native's rights and titles to Land—but will further show that it might with truth be declared that the whole history of the colonising enterprises of all Nations, from the earliest times down to our own, would afford no single instance where the interests of the weaker Race, in the great matter of the Wild Lands of the new Country, were ever so amply recognized, so practically guarded, by the Colonisers, as those of the Maori have been recognized and guarded in New Zealand.

The Allegation that it is the "Native's need and scarcity of Land" which has contributed to place him in Revolt.

This is an Allegation so extravagant as to border on the ludicrous, and to strike Colonists on the spot with amazement that any extent of remoteness from the actual scene of operations suffered (or enjoyed) by the good people of England could ever have emboldened our Detractors to make it. Of course, the fact of the Native not needing the Land would afford us no shadow of justification were we to attempt to coerce him into parting with the Land. But when we find that it is charged against us here that we are scheming to get from the Poor Native that without which the Poor Native would starve, we may be permitted to show that Land is virtually a "drug" with the Poor Native, and that at the present moment he possesses a four hundred fold greater portion of it than he has ever used, or ever dreamt of using.
The New Zealanders, as before observed, were never a Hunting People; and, that, for the very sufficient reason that there was nothing in the Islands to hunt. For the last twenty years, three-fourths of their daily food and nine-tenths of their produce brought to market, has consisted of potatoes, maize, wheat, kumeras, taro, melons, and fruit, raised by rude cultivation in patches of garden-ground; and of pigs, cows, and poultry, feeding in and around their Pahs. The remaining fourth of their Larder is supplied mainly by fish—their largest villages being on the coast and their inland Settlements all within easy access of some arm of the sea, or lake, or teeming eel weir—and to their plenteous garden produce, their pigs, fowls, and fish, they now and then add, by way of dessert, a bit of stranded whale, a pigeon or wild duck, a luscious grub or two, a truffle, or a handful of Hinau berries—picked up for the most part within gun-shot of their dwelling places. The little clearings which yield them their substantial food and surplus sufficient to bring them sugar, blankets, and tobacco are ever found on the richest soil; and such are the goofy crops they yield that the Maori, the most active of the active in War but rather the lazy sun-basking Maori in peace, finds that a very small amount of field labour expended on a very small field will fill the belly and the pipe, and give him plenty and to spare. Hence it is that his farming and gardening operations are conducted on so singularly small a scale that it has been estimated from certain existing data that the 60,000 Natives of the North Island, where even now they must, I think, possess some 20,000,000 acres of Land, have not much more than 60,000 acres of such vast domain, the four hundredth part of it, under actual cultivation.

It has been thought by some that the ferocious internecine Wars which raged between the New Zealanders before the days of Colonisation were Wars occasioned mainly by their "need of Land" or their desire to extend tribal territory. But a weasel-like appetite for blood, hereditary feuds, adultery, Murder, violations of Tapu, were far more pregnant causes of War than Land. In 1822, when Hongi and his Ngapuhi devastated the Thames and Waikato country it was a raid only to slaughter and enslave. In 1830, when Te Whero Whero and his Waikato, devastated the Taranaki country it was a raid in revenge of murder; and though by Native custom the utter defeat and dispersion of Ngatiawa by Waikato gave the conquerors the whole of the magnificent territory of the conquered they returned to their own district without making a single Settlement in their new acquisition, or ever occupying or using a single acre of it.

The Maori, among his fellows, likes to boast of his ducal possessions. The vast territories of Wild Land handed over to him by the Treaty of Waitangi are of a certain worth to him for the purposes of sale, and give him a certain weight and status in the community far above his merits as a member of it; while he has been taught by bad advisers, and has been shrewd enough to see, that one of the most telling "cries" he could raise to excise his rebeldom and enlist the sympathy of a very powerful party in England in his favour, is the cry that he is being "robbed of his Lands"—robbed of his little all—robbed of that which he must grasp to the last would he not perish from off the Earth.

Doubtless, in these ways, for such purposes, the Maori's broad domains are of a certain value to him—but as to the Allegation that the War is partly attributable to his real need, or use, of Land, there is no atom of foundation for it—the truth, as we have seen, being that at the present moment he is the owner of millions of acres of which he makes no manner of use—and the further truth being that he has so little real want of Land that if the whole of our cultivations, like Taranaki's beautiful farms and gardens, were abandoned to the "Noble Savage" to morrow, he would again play the Dog in the Manger, and in twelve months show us the spectacle of our hard-won Pastures and Corn Fields again dressed in the livery of barbarism, again jungles of weeds and deserts of dock and thistle.

The Allegation that the Colonists have provoked the War partly in the hope that the large Imperial Commissariat Expenditure caused by War would "Fill their Tills," and that the War, generally, is profitable to them. Undoubtedly, the Commissariat Expenditure has brought a large amount of money into circulation, increased the trade of Auckland and of one or two of our other Ports, enhanced the price of cartage, stock, fuel, flour, butter, cheese, and eggs, and put many an extra guinea into our northern Trader's till, and into our northern Farmer's fob. But to hear the language of Messieurs Buxton, Mills & Co., one would almost imagine New Zealand to be some barren rock in the South Pacific where every second Man's chance of a meal depended on his catching a shilling tossed from the Mother Country's Commissariat Chest. ("Now, in many of the natural elements of wealth, New Zealand is a far richer Country than England; and it is but simple truth to say that our "producing classes," such as our Shepherd Princes, our Gold Miners, and others, together with our Merchants and Traders, our Mechanics and Labourers, who thrive by and revolve round our "producing classes," no more count on the profits drawn from England's Commissariat Chest than England's broad-acred Dukes may count on the profits drawn from furze faggots or plantation trimmings. Indeed, not only do the great body of Colonists derive no pecuniary advantages from the War worth a week's cost of War, but, in a pecuniary sense, War is disastrous to them. The great, fundamental, all-inclusive, desideratum in a young emigration field like New Zealand, where the population instead of numbering nearly 400 to the square mile as in England, does not as
yet number 2, the Panacea for almost all its ills, is more People, more men, women and children, more capital and labour. This Panacea we find only in Emigration from the European world, and this auriferous stream of Emigration from the European world which, had golden Peace been preserved in New Zealand, would now be flowing freely to our shores, has been damned up, or diverted from us, solely by this wretched War.

Again, see how War swallows up our infant Revenue half a million a year is the least that the little Army alone which it has made us raise is costing us; and as money, counted by what you can make of it, is twice as valuable in New Zealand as in England, this half million a year is just as sore a loss or burden to the handful of a hundred and forty thousand people in New Zealand, as millions a year, your three years' entire income, would be to your thirty millions of people here.

Then, glance at the large proportion of our scanty band of able-bodied men drawn from plough and axe to take up the rifle—at the utter check to the progress and extension of civilized industries, carried on in mine and field and forest, where you have a savage enemy ever on the pp—at the spectacle our murdered boys, and of our clusters of beautiful Homesteads, hewn from the Wilderness by the toil of years, made blackened ruins in a day! (7)

In truth, I but declare the sentiments of nine-tenths of my late fellow Colonists, when I say that I would gladly have counted down the value of one-third of any amount of property which as a Colonist I might have possessed in the North Island to have insured Peace there for twenty years, and prevented our petted pampered lacquered Savage from again indulging in what is half sport to him, but in what is half death to us, this, his third, costly, causeless, criminal, Revolt,

The Allegation that Colonisation has been injurious to the Native that the Colonists despise and misuse him.

I apprehend you will admit, Sir, that the greatest blessing any Community can possess is "Security of Life and Property;" and that, compared to this. State Church, Free Trade, light Taxation, low Franchise, Courts of Chancery, Courts of Divorce, Competitive Examinations, Lord Mayor's Shows, are but your mere social and political luxuries, your mere leather and prunella of Civilization which you might dispense with, yet live, and life enjoy. Let us, then, in considering whether Colonisation has injured or advantaged the Maori, make the test question, this—has the amount of Security of Life and Property enjoyed by him been greater before Colonisation, or after? The answer is this—in the period of sixty years elapsing between Cook's last visit to the Country and the commencement of our Colonisation of it in 1840 the Native Population decreased nearly one half; and that, mainly, from the ferocious feuds ever raging between the Tribes. In those days, the Maori carried his life in his hand; he lived in daily terror of being killed and eaten, alternated by hopes of some day killing and eating. The state of the Islands in those times was appalling—they were a slaughter house—the Land reeked with blood. I give you three instance of this in the Addenda, I could give you thirty. (8) This was before I Colonisation—after it, the Plough came, bearing the olive branch, and from 1840, when Colonisation first commenced, up to the period of this present Revolt, tribal wars and slaughters virtually ceased, and the "Security of Life and Property" gratuitously enjoyed by the Aboriginal Race in New Zealand has, substantially, been almost as great as that enjoyed by the tax-paying people of the British Isles.(9)

In but two decades, Colonisation has not succeeded in metamorphosing 60,000 warlike Savages into 60,000 peaceful Citizens—it has not turned them into agriculturists, traders, mechanics, artizans; made them breeched Burgesses of Auckland, given them seats in colonial Parliaments, or placed them on the electoral roll. 'Tis not so easy to change the Leopard's spots, and tame the Wild Man. The Savage may everywhere accept the blessings of law and order, but everywhere he loaths the curb of law and order; and despite the elaborate twaddle put forth by Chief Justice Martin, by Aborigenes Protection Societies, by dilettanti Philo-Maories, by foolish Daniels come to judgement, like Mr. Gorst, there has never been a day since the British Flag was planted in New Zealand when the Maori would have received, and conformed to, British Institutions, otherwise than at the point of the bayonet.

Some people from Utopia have escaped to New Zealand; but New Zealand is not Utopia. Colonisation, there, has not yet smoothed the Maori into a tax-paying Householder—it has not even discovered the Philosopher's stone. But, so far in New Zealand, Colonisation has preserved the remnant of the Race it found there from further self extermination—changed the Maori's love of internecine butchery into love for the Settler's silver and gold—extinguished Slavery and cannibalism, and enabled every man of the Race, where such has been his pleasure, to sit in safety under his vine—brought him Markets and enriched him with a Trade which has made him the wealthiest Aboriginal in the world—given him better food, given him the Surgeon and the healing art—opened to him the great Free School formed by and found in a civilised European community planted at his doors—and displayed before his eyes a hundred learnable industries creative of comfort and happiness for Man.

As to the charge that the Colonists in their daily inter-course with the Maori have treated him as the mere "Black Fellow," fit only for extirpation, nothing can be more opposite to the fact. The bearing and conduct of
Race towards Race, as of man towards man, is ruled mainly by the real "estimate" which the one forms of the other, by what the one really thinks of the other. What "estimate," then, have the Colonists formed of the Maori? Here and there among us one is found who, taking the extreme "Missionary" view, regards, the Maori, in respect to the great virtues of innocence and inoffensiveness, as the impeccable Sheep, and who wont see in him one feature of the Wolf. (Here and there, too, we finc a Settler, may ben some Vieux Moustache who has followed Havelock or Clive, who believes the Maori, like every other Black Skin among the Whites, to be only watching for a "Cawnpore." But the judgment the great bulk of the Colonists have: passed on the Maori is this—that, in his present state of semi-barbarism, he is mercenary, artful, and suspicious, shrewd but shallow and capricious, reventful and designing, with no word even in his language signifying gratitude, J and vain, contemptuous, and holding no Race equal to his own; that his religion is but a lacquer-scratched off, revealing the imperious, audacious Savage, with the mind of the precocious child, the passions of the embittered man. But, per contra, we hold that there is good stuff of manhood in the Maori—that, great in War, he may be lazy, but not puny, in Peace—that stimulated by hope of gain he is capable of great, if fitful, exertion—that though a Bully to the weak he is brave before the strong—and that next to the Red Indian, physically and mentally, and with all his faults, he is far the finest Wild Man ever encountered by the Anglo-Saxon in the field of Colonisation.

In this brighter side of his character, too, we have not forgotten the signal military merits of the Maori, the noble addition he would make to the Colony's permanent Defense Force, to the ranks of our Rifle Rangers, our Volunteer Corps. Again, far before Red Deer or any noble game, he imparts a variety, a piquancy, a picturesqueness, to our fields and forests which many of us would sadly miss—while we are pleased to hope that if only he can be pre-served long enough for the trial, preserved, sad to say, against himself and Aborigines Destruction Societies, further civilization will eradicate or soften some of his dark traits, and develope and intensify some of his bright

'Tis clear, I think, Sir, that a Race of which we have ed such an "estimate," though not a Race which, as yet, we can much admire or belove, is assuredly no Race which we can wish to despise or misuse. It has never been despised or misused by us; and with your permission I will close this portion of my subject by hinting to the Pseudo-Philanthropists who accuse us of brutality wards the Maori that if they and the whole of your employing classes here, profiting by the noble words of the late Mr. Justice Talfourd, were to deport themselves to those under them with half that courtesy and Respect which New Zealand Colonists have ever shown towards the New Zealanders it would be all the better for your Poor Men, and none the worse for your Rich.

The Allegation that it is the Colonists who have had the government and the guidance of the Native; and that it is partly their legislative mismanagement or neglect of the Noble Savage which has now, again, metamorphosed him into the costly Rebel.

Here, again, the charge is directly opposite to the fact. From the first day of the colonisation of New Zealand in 1840, up to the present time, your Colonial Office, inspired by your Aborigines Protection Society, and your Exeter Hall, has set apart the Native Race in New Zealand as a peculiar and an exceptional feature of the Country, to be shaped and dealt with only by itself; and it is literally true that, in regard to "legislating for," and "managing" the Maori, the English Settlers in New Zealand have had but little more to do with him than the English Settlers in the Isle of Man. "Certainly, within, the last few years, your Colonial Office, acting through its Governors on the spot, has sought to strengthen its "Native Measures" by passing them through our Colonial Legislature as the acts and ordinances of that body. It has frequently, too, taken counsel with the various Ministerial Executives of our Local Government, and when, and when only, the advice tendered to it by them has been agreeable to it, has taken it. But, substantially, the Native Policy in New Zealand has been almost as much dictated by Downing Street since representative institutions were conferred on the Colony, as it was in the Semi-Bashaw days of Governors Hobson, Shortland, Fitzroy, and in the first days of Governor Grey—days when every edict of your Colonial Minister came to us bearing the "Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas"—while so far from there having been even in these latest times any relaxation in the grip which your Colonial Office, inspired by your Missionary and Aborigines Protection Societies, has kept on "Native Affairs"—so far from its having, at this eleventh hour, listened to the voice of the Colonists therein, it is at this present moment seeking to patch up a false and flimsy peace with the Rebels in utter contempt and defiance of the solemn convictions of nineteen-twentieths of the whole of our colonial community.

Great misconception, too, exists on another point in connection with this "Management of the Maori," for while it is untruthfully asserted that the Colonists have had the management of him, others accuse the Colonists of trifling with the Home Government in the matter, and of not knowing their own minds therein, inasmuch as when, in compliance with the wishes of some of us, your Colonial Office did at last offer to hand the Maori over to the Colonists, they refused, altogether, to take charge of him.

Now, here, the facts are these. Since 1855, when Representative Institutions virtually came into force in New Zealand, certain of our more ambitious public men have undoubtedly, and more than once, moved your Colonial Office to transfer the management of the Native Race to our young colonial Parliament, and to suffer
it to legislate for the Maori as it did for everything else in the Country. But until the "King Movement" troubles were dawning, and the Maori was budding into the Rebel, your Colonial Office, turning deaf ear to all such suggestions, had altogether declined to divest itself of its chosen office of Maori Guardian. When, however, the Native sky was dark, and storms were lowering, the Colonial Office rather altered its tone, and at last virtually assented to the fair-seeming proposition its very interesting, but somewhat fractious ward could, perhaps, be better curbed-in and regulated by a local Legislature on the spot than by an Office in Downing Street fifteen thousand miles away.

I am sure, I may say, that the Colonists did not believe that this "altered tone" proceeded from any selfish or cowardly motive on the part of your Colonial Office—from any desire on the part of the redoubtable British Lion to sneak out of a quarrel he had provoked—they remembered that different Chiefs of this famous Bureau might naturally entertain different Views; and when the late lamented Duke of New-castle virtually offered to turn the Maori over to them they believed he did so only from a desire to do what seemed to him the best for all. But, unfortunately, it did so happen that in the long interval elapsing between the first expressions of any desire on the part of a portion of the Colonists that the Maori should become their Ward, and the offer of the Colonial Office to make him such, the Ward had grown into a Ward so utterly disaffected and unruly as to have become one who might entail on the Colonists expences of chastisement and restraint infinitely beyond the depths of their slender colonial exchequer to defray. Hence, they respectfully declined the metamorphosed Trust—to use a nautical figure, they had asked for the command of a Ship, and at the eleventh hour were offered the command of a Wreck. Your Colonial Office and your Missionary Party had managed, or mismanaged, to rouse our Native Hornets, and the Colonists declined to go, alone, and take the Nests. You, if I remember aright, Sir, were somewhat indignant at the Colonists for this—heroics aside, don't you now) think they were right?

In Downing Street and in the Colony, where the facts are known, it is known that save in the above instance the Colonist has never had even the chance of trying his 'prentice hand at "legislating for" and "managing" the Native. Whether these were functions properly pertaining to the Colonist is quite another question; and one which I and many others should instantly answer in the negative. Bear in mind that when New Zealand became a British Colony in 1840 it was a primeval Wilderness, a fertile Wilderness if you will, but still a Wilderness. Even now, a large portion of it is as little smoothed by art and civilization as Britain was when Caesar chased the woad-stained Warriors along the shores of Kent. In such a Country, in an Emigration Field in such rude state, the few thousand squatters and graziers, farmers and traders, mechanics and labourers, professional men, capitalists, estate-creators and speculators, who make up the body called the New Zealand Colonists and who constitute the little pioneering population of the Country have their hands full of work. — They have to wrest fields from forests, to plant the germs of towns and villages, to lay the foundations of social institutions, to ply a hundred industries necessary to enable them to advance their footing in the Wild Land and make portions of its deserts blossom like the rose. — These, the toils and duties of Anglo-Saxon Emigrants who go forth to subdue the waste have nowhere been more energetically undertaken, nowhere more manfully performed, than by the Colonists in New Zealand. To have asked, to have expected, to have allowed, such handful of willing Workers, to have charged themselves, in addition to their own legitimate labours, with the gigantic task and burden of civilizing and bitting-in to law and order a nation of Savages like the New Zealanders would surely have been as inconsiderate, as exacting, as to have placed the work of the man of forty before the child of four.

The British Colony of New Zealand, as I shall hope to show, is as much the valuable "property" of the millions of the British Nation at-home as of the thousands of the British Nation on the spot. Property, we know, has its duties; and as in the national work of colonising our New Zealand Property there were two great duties, two great and much co-equal tasks, before us—subduing the Wilderness, subduing the Maori—and as the Colonists effectually undertook the one, right and reason demanded that the Mother-Country, operating through a succession of chosen Governors and Administrators on the spot, should effectually undertake the other.

Though, however, the task of civilizing the New Zealander has hitherto been a task properly belonging to the Home Government to perform, and which, after its fashion, it has attempted to perform, the time is undoubtedly approaching when it will become a task which the Home Government might well share with the Colonial. Our first struggle with the wilderness is now pretty well over; we have founded and reduced to working order excellent social and civil institutions for ourselves; while every year adds to our number of well-to-do practical men who can afford to leave flocks and herds, and mines, and farms to attend the duties of legislation.

Despite the smug dictum, too, of a superfine member of your Fourth Estate

The "Saturday Review." The frequency with which this doughty Journal bepommels Colonists would almost suggest the fear that its Colonisation Contributor, one Dies irae, must have been frightened by some rude Colonist—some rough, hirsute, Hotspur Settler from Australia or Now Zealand, angered to see a perfumed Penman who ne'er set squadron in the tented field, nor the division of a battle knows more than a Spinster,
prattling so prettily of "guns and drums and wounds (God save the mark), and of parmaceti and villainous saltpetre." Smart and impudent is on many subjects, when the Saturday Cynic leaves the Tub to perform in that rough field of Colinisation, where is done Lord Bacon's "heroic work" of Colonisation it must, I fear, often remind practical, but irreverent Colonists of the "Dancing Dog at the Fox Hunt"

who asserts that New Zealand Colonists, in common with all Colonists, are sordid "Bagmen," it has been said—need I add we are ready to believe—that not even among the Pilgrim Fathers of Massachusetts or among the Virginian Cavaliers has a better sample of the Anglo-Saxon race ever left your shores than exist in the ranks of the New Zealand Settlers—ininvigorated as they are, or have been, by the blood of your Cliffords, Dillons, Petres, Staffords, Molesworth, Tancreds, Tollemachcs, Cholmondeleys, Congreves, Pierpoints, Vavasours, and Welds.(10) Such a community, so placed, and holding such an "estimate" of the Maori as I have shown it does, could surely help, and would gladly help, the Home Government to civilize the Savage; and I cannot but hope that when the two Parliaments sitting in Westminster and Wellington have, together, administered to the Maori that sole tonic in the pharmacopoeia of legislation which alone can now save him from a saddening end—the steel tonic of a thorough thrashing—they will continue towards him in Peace that "unity of action" which, for his salvation, they commenced towards him in War.

The Allegation that the Colonists, moved by sordid love of lucre, have suicidally sold to the Maori those arms and munitions of war which, alone, enable him to withstand and slaughter both her Majesty's gallant troops, and their own Volunteer and Defense Corps.

Here, at last, in part, there is, I regret to say, a true bill against us—not, though, as to the motive for suffering the sale of arms, but as to the fact thereof. A majority of our colonial legislature in Governor Browne's reign did, most besottedly, rescind a very wise and humane regulation made in Governor Grey's time, prohibiting the sale of arms to the Natives. It should, however, be clearly understood that this besotted act was done with the full approval of your representative, in the person of Governor Browne; and of that high functionary with which he stamped and legalized it. But if your Representative knew no better than to assent to such an ordinance, the majority of our House of Commons ought to have known far better than to pass it.

Their motive, however, in doing so was not that attributed them by Sir John Hay and other justly indignant Members of your House, in the debate on New Zealand affairs last July, in Auckland, possibly, as in London, there may be sordid traders in the ranks of commerce who for an extra £ 10 per cent, would sell their fathers—but if there be, such "ghouls of the till" are far too small and insignificant a body in our northern capital to be capable of exercising the slightest, influence there on the deliberations of our colonial Parliament. The main considerations which impelled the Queen's representative, Governor Browne, and a majority of our legislature to perpetrate the act of legalising the sale of arms to the Maori were these—that Governor Grey's regulations prohibiting such trade had become a dead letter; that the French, Yankee, Bremen, and Australian whalers recruiting in our hundred lone bays, and the Sydney traders plying round our coasts, collecting native produce, had long earned on a brisk trade in supplying the Maori with arms; and that as it was believed to be impracticable to stop or even materially check this contraband trade it would be better to legalize it—better, as it was held to be impossible to prevent the Maori from arming himself, that he should arm himself before our faces than behind our backs.

Undoubtedly, there was some force in these considerations—but had your Representatives and our Ministerial Executive been equal to the occasion—had they remembered that the supplying of the Maori with guns and powder was substantially the same criminal blunder as the supplying of the silly and vicious child with fireworks—they would have taken the most stringent measures to have enforced Governor Grey's regulations—have memorialized the Colonial Office to help them with half-a-dozen small gun-boats as revenue cruisers, have quadrupled the pains and penalties for infringing the law, and justly punished every second breach of it on the part of any Trader by nailing him by the ear to his own door.

Governor Gore Browne, and that working majority in our New Zealand Parliament which had seats in the Legislature during his dynasty, will ever be entitled to the gratitude both of the Mother-Country and of the Colony for the wisdom and manhood they evinced in resisting the monstrous pretensions of our pampered Savage—nor is it too much to say, that had they been premitted to carry out the policy they inaugurated at Taranaki, the Maori Revolt would have been crushed down two years ago, where it began, and both races, long ere this, been again busied in the paths of peace—but their failure to see the vast importance of preventing the further arming of the Native must always remain a blot on their legislative fame, and afford a signal instance of that "blindness to the future"—not wisely given—which at time smites the most astute and far-seeing of men.

It must, however, be remembered that Arms to the Maori means death to Settler as well as to Soldier. Still, after all that can be urged in palliation, this abrogation of Governor Grey's politic prohibition is a thing ever to be regretted by all who take an interest in New Zealand; and, touching it we may truly exclaim,

"Deep are our pangs, but deeper far to feel,
"We nursed the pinion which impelled the steel."
The Allegation that bodies of British Emigrants becoming, in the last twenty years, British Colonist in New Zealand, and going forth to their destination with the full privity and sanction of the British Government, have little or no more just claim to require England to aid them in a savage War than Poles would have to require her to march on Warsaw, or Danes to require her to protect Holstein.

The sweeping Proposition, here put in plain words, strange, almost unnatural, a one as it will seem to many, is, nevertheless, one which is now substantially maintained by those among you here who, rejecting the guidance of the "dry light" of Lord Bacon in the Field of Colonisation, prefer to follow the ignis fatuus of Professor Goldwin Smith.

In refuting it, I would premise my observations by disclaiming any feeling of insensibility as to the assistance which the Mother-Country has lent us in War. With a Moles worth, a Merivale, a Fortescue, at the Colonial Office, the amount of military and financial help which she has given us would have been far greater—with a Mills or a Buxton, "meddling and muddling" there, it would have been far less—therefore are we grateful to Mr. Card-well for his half loaf. But, were we to assent to the Allegation heading these remarks, we should virtually debase ourselves, when in our extremity we knock at the door door of your Horse Guards or Exchequer, to the condition there of your Beggars asking for Alms—whereas we opine we are your Equals there asking for our Rights—a status and position, which, as I will briefly seek to show, we are entitled to claim, and one which, while we remain colonial flesh of your flesh, bone of your bone, we shall assuredly ever determine to maintain.

I assert, then, that the Mother-Country, represented by and acting through the British Government, is bound to help her Colonial Children in New Zealand in such a War as that now raging there, by and from Three great considerations and obligations—the First, the one arising from the circumstances that the various bodies of British Subjects who in the last twenty years have gone forth to New Zealand, and who now constitute the New Zealand Colonists, have left the shores of the Mother-Country to settle among Savages (Savages, too, under the avowed rule and management of the Crown) with the sanction and encouragement of the British Government. The Second, the obligation arising from the Mother-Country's part or chief Ownership of the "national property" of New Zealand;—the Third, the obligation arising from the fact of the New Zealand Colonists being Members of that great Colonial Community of the Empire which puts an immense annual sum into the pockets of the more domestic, stay-at-home portion of your People, and which very largely contributes to England's public revenue and well-being, and to the pay and support of her military and naval establishments.

But, if the "duty" of the British Government to afford aid in War to British Subjects settled in New Zealand was based solely and wholly on the First only of these facts, on the fact that for more than twenty years the British Government has sanctioned and encouraged.

Were it necessary to prove the existence of the Sun at bright noon, a hundred overt acts on the part of the Crown could be instanced to prove that it has "sanctioned and encouraged" the emigration of its Subjects to New Zealand—let one suffice as a sample. The Crown for upwards of twenty years has maintained among its other governmental Departments of State, a Department of State presided over by Authorities officially designated "Her Majesty's Emigration Commissioners." This Department of State, among its other legitimate works, annually issues a most useful and popular Publication, ornate with the Lion and the Unicorn, styled the "Colonisation Circular"—a Publication so cheap and good, and one, which from the fact of its being issued by Authority, and from its being free from that puffing and exaggeration so common in private works on Colonies and Emigration, is so popular as to have become the great "Emigration Guide and Hand-Book for the Nation." Among other pertinent information given in such Emigration Guide Book of the Crown, there has long been a very captivating but very truthful picture presented to the public of the special advantages which New Zealand offers to the Emigrant: its race of Savages much addicted to the tomahawk and the fire-brand is nowhere mentioned: but its fine climate, its high wages, its free grants, its cheap land arc all elated on—and every one who has the slightest familiarity with the annual Emigration Movement of this Country, knows that this "Government Guide-Book" has such weight and currency among our Emigrant-Classes as to exercise a very considerable and a very just influence on them in the great question, as to which of our many Emigration Fields it would be the best to choose.

the Settlement of such Subjects in such Colony that, alone, would be sufficient to fix and fasten such "duty" on the British Government; and all further facts or arguments tending to the same end however weighty and conclusive, might be dismissed as altogether superfluous.

Indeed, the "idea" that an enlightened, powerful, humane, and generally just, Government, such as you have the happiness to live under, would, after having encouraged thousands of its Citizens to plant new homes in one of its distant Territories, afterwards plead that it was not morally and paternally bound to aid such Citizens in making good their footing in such Territory and in protecting themselves from the deadly perils found to be existing there, would be an "idea" so crude and monstrous that no Government of this Country
would for a moment ever seriously entertain it. It would be an "idea" which might tickle dilettanti Political Economists, and one which might be acted on in Lilliput, in Utopia, in Barataria—but there is no smack of civilised humanity about it; and I feel assured I may close this portion of my subject in the conviction that you will agree with me that such an "idea"—the one, in effect, that the Parent, after encouraging the Child to undertake an enterprise for their mutual good, may then hack out and refuse him succour in any pains or perils incurred therein—is an "idea" which will not only never be acted on by any English Government in our time, but one which would be especially revolting to the humane and healthy instincts of the English Nation.

If, however, anything further were needed to show that it is the bounden duty of the Home Government to assist the Colony in this Maori War, it might instantly be found in the irrefragable argument that the duty of protecting, defending, improving Property is a duty devolving on the Owners of it; and in the equally irrefragable argument that the Mother-Country is part, if not chief, Owner of the Colony of New Zealand. Is it not ridiculous to speak of a handful of 80,000 pioneer Emigrants, a smaller number of men than is found in many a single English Town, as being the Owners of a Country containing 80,000,000 acres of Land, a Country nearly as large as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland?

You place a Representative of the Queen in New Zealand—in the veto power lodged with your Colonial office, you possess, and when you please, you exercise the right of shaping the Local Government and the Legislative Acts of New Zealand—you annually draw a large Trade-created Revenue from New Zealand—and you make it a Country to which you encourage your surplus population to go, so that they may leave the more loaves and fishes for such of you as are better fitted to sit by the fire at-home.

Certainly the handful of our enterprising people who have been the first to profit by such encouragement, and who are smoothing the path in New Zealand for following tens of thousands of their fellows, have a great stake and interest in the Country they have settled in. They ought to be, they are part "Owners" of it; and they are chargeable with, and are found faithfully to perform, their share of the duties and obligations arising from such part Ownership. But is it not as palpable as the Sun at bright noon that the Colony of New Zealand, with due regard to Native Rights, is the great Freehold of our whole People—not, the peculiar Possession of any mere portion of our People. Is it not clear that New Zealand is the Common property of the Nation, and that, being such, the duty of protecting and improving it rests on the nation, and not exclusively on any mere fractional part thereof?

The circumstance of the Mother-Country having encouraged her Emigrant-Sons to settle in New Zealand; the circumstance of Mother-Country being part or chief "Owner" of New Zealand, are, either of them, amply sufficient to fix on her the absolute duty of contributing effective aid to her people there, in this emergency of a "Native War." “But if neither of these facts had any existence there would still remain one to be advanced which, in and by itself, should be sufficient to dictate to the Mother Country the same line of action—namely, the fact that New Zealand is an important member of that noble group of her Colonies from which, in the shape of "Trade-Profits," she draws, annually, a princely Revenue.

True, it does follow, either in the case of Communities or of Individuals, that because A pockets a goodly sum every year by and through B, A is therefore bound to recognize the quid pro quo, and to do anything in return for B. Undoubtedly, the thirty millions of people in the British Isles might profit to the extent of half as many pounds sterling a year by the Trade created for them by the six millions of their Countrymen in Colonies, refuse to help such Countrymen with a penny in distress, and yet be guilty of no crime therein, nor perhaps even of any breach of any nameable moral law. But Members of your Legislature like Mr. Arthur Mills, and the Disciples of Professor Goldwin Smith, are content, I think, to waive this point. The gist of their argument that the Mother-Country should expend nothing on Colonists either in Peace or War is this—that Colonists contribute nothing to the Public Revenue of the Parent State, And they leave us to infer that if we could show that we did contribute, adequately, to the Public Revenue of the Parent State the case against us would be dissolved, and that we should establish a right and title to come to the Parent State for help in our emergencies and should never find it refused.

Now, the Hon. Member for Taunton may not be capable of seeing it, but nevertheless it is clear that British Colonies and Colonists do contribute, and that very largely, to the Public Revenue of the parent State. Certainly, your Tax-gatherers dont knock at the Colonist's door—but Colonists put a good deal of that fine wool on Mr. Bull's back which enables his dexterous Shearer, Mr. Gladstone, to clip from him those goodly fleeces with which he crams his capacious Exchequer.

The giving of you a breadth of territory on which, as you boast, the Sun never sets; the relieving of you from that ridicule and contempt ever attaching to Littleness; the conferring on you the prestige (productive of real power) of Bigness, are services rendered you by Colonies and Colonists which virtually put or keep money in your pockets and which indirectly increase your Revenue—but you are debtors to Colonies for something more than this. The forming for you of a Nursery for your A.B. seamen, your right arm in War, the supplying of you with raw material for many of your manufactures, are services rendered you by Colonies and Colonists
which virtually put or keep money in your pockets and increase your Revenue—but you are debtors to Colonies for something more than this. The relieving you of your surplus people, of those who pent up in your home-hive would consume far more honey than they would make—the relieving you of those who, remaining here, would be wrestling with you for the prizes in love, war, journalism, arms, arts, commerce; the relieving you of those who would increase your poor rates, your crime taxes, and fester into revolutionary Pariahs of the State, are services rendered you by Colonies and Colonists which America,(11)

See page 83.

which no foreign Emigration Field could have rendered you, and which put or keep millions a year in your pockets and very materially increase your Revenue—but still are you debtors to Colonies for something more than this. The actual value of such benefits as these conferred by her Colonies on the Mother-Country can no more be shown in figures than can the benefits of the Sun.

But all these items in the account I am content, for the moment, to set aside—content, in showing that Colonists contribute handsomely to your national wealth, and indirectly to your Public Revenue, to trust entirely to certain pregnant "figures" put forth by your Board of Trade.

These prove this—that the amount of Export and Import Trade created for the Mother-Country by her Colonies already amounts to the sum of £40,000,000 a year. Now, I think you will agree with me that on an average of years the profits on this vast Trade reaped by the Mother-Country cannot be less than £10 per cent. If so, here at once is a sum of no less than £4,000,000 per annum put by Colonies and Colonists into the pockets of the people of the Mother-Country; and as this "Colonial Trade" is rapidly increasing, the aggregate 10 per cent, profits of it during the next twenty years may safely be counted at £100,000,000—a sum Which cannot do other than help, to some extent, to create and make up that "national condition of wealth and prosperity among you" which enables your People to pay their Taxes, and a portion of which sum will just as surely find its way into your Exchequer as if it were to be counted out in gold, shipped in some colonial galleon to Southampton, and carried thence to Mr. Gladstone's coffers at the Bank.

The sum which in the last twenty years, and even in those her mere infant days, New Zealand has contributed to these hard cash Colonial "pickings" of Mr. Bull's may have amounted to nearly £3,000,000—a sum, probably, equal to any which he had ever and altogether expended on her when, last year, his Statesmen refused to save her the loss of a few thousands per annum by guaranteeing required Loan!

The Cause of the War.

We have, I think, seen then, Sir, that, with one exception, one of the "Charges" made against the New Zealand Colonists by the Honorable Members for Taunton and Maidstone, and by those political and Exeter Hall sections of your community whom they represent, have the slightest foundation in fact. What they allege to be the "Causes" of the War are not the Causes. The War springs, fundamentally, from the fact that for five and twenty years your Colonial Office, incited by your Utopian Missionary and Aborigines-Protection Societies, has so coaxed and coddled the Maori, so truckled to every "whim" of this vicious, turbulent Child, that he would now fain be Master. With one brilliant exception at the Waitara, the history of the government of New Zealand from the day when your first Governor hoisted the British Flag, down to the exploits of your present Governor and his feather bed for Prisoners of War, is the humiliating history of the civilised Man "kotoing" to the Savage.

Ponder on a few illustrations. At W AIRAU, the Maori slaughters two of your Queen's Magistrates in cold blood—he grants your Missionary-Colonial Office

It was about this time that the Colonial Office, seized with what has been termed its "pious fit," commenced that anti-emigration alliance with Missionary Societies, Aborigines-Protection Societies, and Exeter Hall, which it maintained for so many years, and which proved so disastrous to both races in New Zealand. Indeed, from 1830 up to 1850 ex 55, the Colonial Office received its inspirations from these bodies, and its true designative style and title during this period should have been the Missionary-Colonial Office.—Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South."

Governor an interview therein—His Excellency hopes he wont murder Queen's Magistrates again, shakes hands, and bows himself off—whereupon, the chuckling Maori proclaims His Excellency to the Tribes as "He Paukena, te Pakeha," this Governor is soft—a mere pumpkin. At TARANAKI your Law Officer, specially appointed by the Crown, judicially pronounces, after a solemn investigation in open Court, that the Maori has sold and been fully paid for a certain 50,000 acres of unused, wild land, and will not be paid again—whereupon, the Maori rushes to his arms, threatens to destroy the Settlement, and drive its people into the sea—your Missionary Midas hurries to the spot; and, for the moment, pacifies the Savage by tearing up the "Judgement of the Court" and by giving him back every acre he had sold. At KOROUAREKA, Heké, a shining missionary convert, had waxed strong and saucy by bartering his pigs and slave girls with the lawless whalers
for powder and guns—the Custom House came and crippled this Trade—Heké's ultimatum was "remove your Custom House or I burn down your Town"—instantly, your Governor and his Missionary-Officials

Missionary-Officials.—This term is used to signify, generally, the gentlemen who, as advising amateurs or actually salary-receiving officers, constituted the executive governments of Captains Hobson and Fitzroy. Every missionary was not an official, and every official was not a missionary. But they all echoed and typified the missionary policy of the Colonial Office, and were all deeply imbued with the "missionary spirit." This spirit notoriously ruled the councils of the two first governors. Captain Hobson had been accredited to the missionaries; missionaries framed the Waitangi Treaty; the original draft is in the handwriting of a missionary; and Governor Fitzroy was far more a missionary ruler than even Governor Hobson. Indeed, Capt. Fitzroy's bosom counsellor was a missionary catechist, a gunmaker by trade, who had been turned into what was called "Protector of Aborigines," a Mr. Clark, to whom he once paid the dubious compliment of publicly declaring that he. Mr. Protector Clark, was worth any six of his other officers put together.—Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South."

swept away every Custom House in New Zealand by stroke of pen, and sought to replace the public revenue of an infant Colony just emerging from the "Bush" by a property tax and a tax on rooms of houses! (12) At Wellington, Te Rauparaha, the cannibal Napoleon of Cook's Straits, a wily ruffian who had abetted the murderers of the Queen's Magistrates at Wairau, was taken prisoner in rebel War—Sir George Grey, "on hospitable thoughts intent," was entertaining him at Auckland—but Te Whero Whero, he who afterwards became the first puppet King set up by the present Rebels, invited Sir George to release and give up his prisoner-guest to him—royal invitations are commands—Sir George obeyed. Te Rauparaha visited Te Whero Whero, and then leisurely journeyed home—publishing to the Tribes, en passant, that in this third august Representative of the British Crow, as in the second, there was only a "Paukena"—a sort pumpkin, a figure of straw.

These are specimens, patent to all men, of that more public Policy which your Colonial-Office-and-Missionary Government has ever pursued towards the Maori. To count the more private cases where in the quarter of a century's intercourse between the Races your despotic au- thorities, moved by maudlin tenderness for the Pet of Exeter Hall, have winked at his insolent aggressions, and suffered even their own Magistrate to become his laughing stock,—would be to count the leaves in Spring.

Can we wonder, then, that such a Race as the New Zealanders, so dealt with—a Race, mentally, of turbulent Children so humoured for more than twenty years—should refrain from seeking to gratify any "Whim," any "Caprice," by which they might be possessed?

Long before any King-Movement noise among them had roused your drowsy Colonial-Office Officials at Auckland, close observers of the Maori had seen that a "Whim," a "Caprice," had seized him on which, sooner or later, he would act. The Maori's beau ideal of Colonization is half-a-dozen petty White-Man Settlements dominated by Maori Pahs, where, as Store-keepers, we shall barter guns and powder, blankets and tobacco, sugar and flour, with him for pigs and poultry, firewood and garden stuff, and something else. To him, a Settlement is a Shop; and as our early Settlements in New Zealand were little other than Shops, he welcomed them. By degrees, however, our Settlements grew—every year brought more and more of the White Man's ships—fresh Lands were acquired—axe and plough were heard in the wilderness where, before, no sound had broke the solemn stillness save the Kaka's scream—and the Missionary and the Pakeha Maori.

Pakeha is the Native word for stranger or foreigner, and is the term used by the Maori to designate the Colonist. Pakeha-Maories consist, chiefly, of old Whalers and runaway Sailors, Australian Expinces, Sawyers and Pedling Traders, who have taken Native Concubines and left civilization for the hush: Gentlemen, for the most part, naturally opposed to Colonisation and its accompanying nonsense of Magistrates and Policemen. ever hostile to Colonists and Colonisation, had not failed to remind the Maori that when the White Man's Rat had grown numerous enough in the Land, it had utterly eaten up and annihilated the Rat of the Maori.

With the exception of two or three small lizards, the Native Rat. (Kiore) not larger than the English Water-Rat, is the only indigenous four-footed creature found in New Zealand. This little creature, King-quadrupled of the Country, has been all but annihilated, it is believed, by the Immigrant English Rat, which, like everything else introduced into New Zealand, has taken firm root in the Country, and which banquets on the wild provender of the Bush, rather than on the reaped provender of the Barns, in swarms. The Kiore is now so scarce that though I resided several years in New Zealand and am particularly fond of Natural History, I never succeeded in procuring a specimen.

Not unnaturally perhaps, and prompted by those who should have known better, the inference drawn from these facts by certain of the less enlightened and more suspicious Tribes was that their existence as a Race, as free Wild Men of the Woods, depended mainly on their keeping down these annually increasing numbers of the White Man; and they fancied that the directest mode of doing this would be to prevent him from further widening his territory. Believing this, and contemptuous of mat fainéant Government, that official "wind bag"
at Auckland, of which they had so long made mock, they banded together, and resolved, not only to sell no more Land to the European themselves, but to seek to exercise such a "terrorism" over other Tribes, or sections of Tribes, as should prevent the further sale of Land altogether. (13)

Seeing, however, with the cunning peculiar to their Race, that both among their own People and among such of the White men in "Ingaria" (England) as were represented by Missionary and Aborigines' Protection Societies, they would draw to themselves far more sympathy and support, could they but show that it was not a greedy desire to play the Dog in the Manger about Land, or an oppressive desire to prevent others from doing what they deemed best with their Land, which had induced them to combine, they soon, ostensibly, changed their tactics and their "cry," and impudently professed that it was their civil sufferings, their want of the White Man's Laws and Institutions, the anarchy and confusion reigning among them, which, at the last hour, had induced them to band together and advance to the brink of Revolt. And to give colour to this "after-thought" they changed the name of their cause from that of the "Land-League" to that of the "King-Movement," and sought to hide the trick under the banner of a puppet King.

Certain of your Philo-Maori men in England, certain' of our Philo-Maori men in the Colony—men having a horror of the plain and simple, men ever fumbling for the mare's nest, and believing in nothing save what is complicated, many-sided and hard to be understood—believe, or affect to believe, that this latter cause and motive for his Rebeldom, professed by the Maori, was the true cause. Dont listen to them. We have seen at page 14, that in the great, overriding, matter of Security of Life and Property, and in many of the most substantial fruits of Civilisation, the condition of the Maori, on the eve of his Revolt, was infinitely superior to that which he had ever enjoyed before; and was, indeed, one which would have contrasted not unfavourably with that enjoyed by millions of our People at-home; while if British Institutions and the symbols of civilized citizenship had not reached his Village, it was not because no attempt had been made by the Government to push them so far into the wilderness, but because when they were at his gate he himself would give them no admission.

Though in the present Eebel ranks half the combatants may be there from lust of plunder, and from their innate, weasel-like, appetite for blood, yet the original "Root Troubles" in Taranaki, which in their spread have now extended over the North Island, are wholly and solely attributable to a "Combination" on the part of certain Tribes to prevent, by violence and terrorism, the further advance of the White Man, the further victories of his Civilization, by preventing his further acquisition of Land.

Despite his bell-ringing and chapel-going, his letter-writing and speech-making—despite his twenty years' experience of the White Man's goodness, and of the gifts laid at his feet by Colonisation—the Maori Rebel is Child enough to believe, or to pretend to believe, that it is the Pakeha's sworn design to eat up the Maori just as the Pakeha-Rat ate up the Maori-Rat. Were his most trusted Missionary to tell him that New Zealand is big enough and rich enough to support ten millions of each Race in easy plenty, the Maori Rebel would call him a fool and a liar to his face. He is Animal enough to believe that the license of the Wilderness better than the fullness of the Corn-Field—that he can stay the great wave of Colonisation—that he can dictate to the Colonist "so far and no farther," and confine the White Man's twenty rising Settlements in the New Land to markets for pigs, and to Maori brothels and shops—to duplicates, in fact, of that most popular among the Natives of all our Settlements, Heké's foul stye of Kororareka—Kororareka, the old. "Alsatia" of the Pacific.

Our Future Policy.

There is, I think, ne single instance on record, either in ancient or modern times, among any sort or condition of Men, where the original or semi-barbarous Inhabitant so of a Country to which a superior race has come, have ever bowed to the Institutions of such superior Race until they have felt its supremacy in Arms; and most assuredly the arrogant, pugnacious Maori is the very last of Aboriginal Races who would suffer himself to form an exception to any such historical rule.

If, in dispatching Governor Hobson to create New Zealand a British Colony in 1840, Lord John Russell had backed him up with 5000 Bayonets, the Maori would now have been engaged in making Laws instead of breaking them. The Colonial Office, in its secret chambers, has long known that to effect the civilization of a Race like the New Zealanders. The Soldier with his Enfield was as necessary an instrument as the Settler with his Plough, or the Missionary with his Bell. But, daunted probably by your Peace and Cotton Party, the Colonial Office has kept this knowledge to itself; and, by such a Policy and by such a Bearing towards the Maori as we have seen it has maintained, has sought, for twenty years, to put off an evil, but a necessary and an inevitable, Day.

The whole history of the Maori Race, in common with the history of all aboriginal races, the whole of our five and twenty years' intercourse with them, shows that they reverence physical power and esteem it the only qualification for command. For ten years we attempted to live with them without the presence of Soldier: we
trusted to prayers, to mild persuasion, to missionaries, to missionary-governors. The dirt they made us eat during this humiliating period is revolting to think of—they committed twenty murders rose in two rebellions, and sacked a Settlement. Troops appeared, and for the next ten years the Native hid his arms and turned to the plough, and the Colony twice quadrupled her wealth and population. Half the Troops were withdrawn—Colonial-Office economy threatened to withdraw the other half—the Land League was formed—and at once, the Colony was in a blaze again, and thousands are brought to the verge of ruin.

Redoubled Missionary efforts—cargoes of pictorial Bibles with moving pictures of the Prodigal Son in ragged breeches and cocked hat; redoubled Legislative efforts-admission to local parliament, admission to general parliament, Native council, Native magistrate, Native policemen Native hospital, will each and all prove useless in our efforts to civilize and save the Native, if we do not first prove to him that while we are a just and merciful race we are a strong and a warlike race—a race, if need be, as well able to fight as to work, or trade, or talk, or write.

Here and there among the Natives, some man of intellect may be found who, owing to long intimacy with the Colonist's family who would converse with him on other subjects than his own merits, or salvation, or adult baptism, and the like, has formed a reasonable idea of the strength of the White man; and here and there a Native has visited England and seen and measured for himself Portsmouth, Woolwich and the Guards—yet only to be called a liar on his return. But, except in a burlesque smattering of scriptural knowledge, the New Zealanders, intelligent, astute as they are in many things, are really, even now, little other in many important essentials than they were in the days of Tasman and of Cook; and have no clearer an idea of the real power and resources of that far-off Country which would rule them than savages of Dahomy or barbarians of Bhootan.

The Church Missionaries, who, in consideration of the great sums lavished on them by the public, might have been expected to attempt to do some good in New Zealand by imparting to their converts a little elementary knowledge of things practical, have been too much engrossed in expatiating to the Native on the mysteries of the Trinity, on the errors of Rome, on the heresies of Wesley, on la haute politique, to have had sufficient time or inclination to teach the Native anything that would be terrestrially useful to him; and when missionary teaching has stooped to things mundane, or things homely, it has sought chiefly to make the Black man distrust the White.

One marked characteristic of the Maori race, is their stupid, Chinese-like contempt of any other race. They sneer at Frenchmen as Wee-Wees, make mock of English-men as a people who can work like beaver-rats, but who can run away like rats, and esteem dark-skinned races so little that I have heard them figuratively boast that they could eat an Australian aboriginal for breakfast, and dispose of a negro for supper. Physical force, the might of the strong arm, they respect—this, they think, comes and goes with the Soldier. Moral force, industry, the wealth of the working arm, they covertly despise—this, they think, and this alone, is the poor possession of the Colonist. We are the busy beavers—they, the warlike wolves—and they will be ruled by none of our Beaver laws till we show that we can enforce them with the Lion's teeth and claws.

Terms of Peace.—Confiscation.

Indeed, whether we be moved by a righteous desire to punish the "Rebel Tribes"

It should be distinctly understood that in this War with the New Zealanders we have not to deal with the whole of them. In our colonisation intercourse with the Aboriginal Races from America down to Africa and Australia there have ever been found Tribes or sections of Tribes who, either from the influence of some Chief more enlightened than others of his Order, or from some rude inborn admiration of the Plough, have ever been more willing to welcome Civilization than their fellows, and to this rule there has been no exception in New Zealand. Indeed, from the days of our first acquaintance with the Colony down to the present time the Maori Race, in its bearing and demeanour towards the Colonist, has been divisible into three, and three almost numerically equal, Parties, namely, those who have been more or less hostile to the Colonist, and whose ranks supply the present Rebels—those who have been more or less friendly to the Colonist and who against their fellows have more than once aided him with their arms—and those who, between the two, may be called the Neutrals, and who, in "differences" between the Races carry their strength to that side which may happen to appear to them the strongest.

for this, the third, Maori Revolt—or by a desire to effect the regeneration of the Maori by preparing him for the fruitful reception of British Institutions—or by a desire not to move the mirth of Europe and America by retreating, under cloud of a sham Peace, from a War with a few thousand aggressive Savages—or by a desire to redress the wrongs of the Colonists and to preserve our National Property in New Zealand for the use of the nation—whether our course of action be determined by one, or by other, or by all, of these motives—our first, our only, curative step, now that the Sword is drawn is to use it mercifully, but firmly and effectively. No idle supression of arms patched up by Missionary and Aborigines' Protection Societies, aided by Utopian
Fitzgerald, I think, has been a member of half-a-dozen New Zealand Ministries and scarcely remained as many in our little Australasian Ministries that no man can remember who composed them or how they fell—but Mr. appears to live in a state of chronic hostility to all constituted Authorities. So many, so sudden, are the changes pastoral and pacific character of his wealthy Constituency, Mr. Fitzgerald (like other of our Hibernian friends), Maori is only the Gipsy, is about equal to that of the Sheep Farmers of Cumberland. But, notwithstanding the Canterbury—gentlemen whose knowledge of "Native Matters," dwelling as they do in a region where the "nowhere."—In our young Colonial Legislature he is the Pan, melodious, of the glad Sheep Farmers of Colony Britain ever possessed.

Politically Wakefields, Foxes, Molesworths, Petres, Dillons, Cargills, Cliffords, Godleys—who founded the finest future Maucaulay's "History of New Zealand" among those great Emigrant unidentified script—those Colonists, and as an efficient Promoter of that flower of Settlements, Canterbury, may well find a place in some most, of a particular Island speak the feelings and wishes of the united Colonists of New Zealand instead of a particular Party, and, at the Fitzgerald appearing in your issue of the 25th ultimo.

But, in truth, Sir, "Confiscation" is the alpha and omega of the whole matter—the very key-stone of the arch we would build. The great result to be aimed at in now using our arms against the Maori until complete victory is ours, is not that his Defeat shall be expiatory of past Revolt, but that it shall be deterrent of future Revolt. It is not what we may regard, but what he will regard as his Defeat which will have on him this "deterrent effect." Let the struggle end as it may, if it end by his being left in the mind that he has not been thoroughly vanquished, all our powder will have been burnt in vain.

Now, from the earliest days of our acquaintance with the New Zealanders down to the present time, no idea, no rule, no custom, has been more marked, more common, among them, than that which couples the "Defeat of an Enemy" with the taking, or the right or power of taking, his Land, True it is that, owing to their little need of Land and their immense possessions of it, they very frequently made no use of the territory of a vanquished enemy. But they have ever held, and they still hold, that to be a Conqueror of your enemy you must be a Conqueror of his Acres:—you may use them, you may drive off the old occupants, you may permit them to remain—but, one way or the other, you must show that you are Lord of the Soil. Indeed, so strong and universal among them is this feeling at the present time, that they have frequently been heard to argue that in our first struggle with them under Heke in the North, and in our second struggle with them under Te Rauparaha in the South, we, if not the Oonquered, were at least not the Conquerors, because we took none of their Land.

The number of acres which would be taken from the Rebels, on the principle of taking half their unused territory can, now and here, be only a question for conjecture—place it, however, at 4,000,000. When steady peace had set in, such tract of Land might represent a value of £2,000,000; and in reason and equity, would be a property which ought to be given to the Colony as some compensation for its losses and sufferings by the War—the Colonists, in this mutual work of protecting the National Estate of New Zealand, having suffered far more, both in purse and person, than the Co-owners of such Estate at-home. But, in this vital question of "Confiscation," put the Colonists, if need be, altogether out of court:—keep the Land as a demesne for the Crown, burn it, sink it, do what you will with it—but take it from the Rebels. As has been shown at page 9, Land, beyond a small or moderate quantity, is no more a thing of necessity to the Maori than Opera Box may be to Mr. Buxton—take it from the Rebel to convince him you are his Conquerors, and you enrich him by its loss.

Mr. Fitzgerald's Remedies.

Having thus sought to show that, both by interest and duty, the Mother-Country is bound to give effective aid to the Colony in this War, and glanced at that "Peace" which, as it seems to me, would be the only Peace that could ensure quiet for the future and the mutual good of both Races, I shall ask to be permitted to offer a word or two on certain "Suggestions for the Pacification of New Zealand" put forth in the letter from Mr. Fitzgerald appearing in your issue of the 25th ultimo.

Commenting thereon, you remark that you wish that the person who makes them could be supposed to speak the feelings and wishes of the united Colonists of New Zealand instead of a particular Party, and, at the most, of a particular Island.

Let me thank you, Sir, for these pregnant words.Personally, Mr. Fitzgerald is one of our most popular Colonists, and as an efficient Promoter of that flower of Settlements, Canterbury, may well find a place in some future Maucalay's "History of New Zealand" among those great Emigrant unidentified script—those Wakefields, Foxes, Moles-worths, Petres, Dillons, Cargills, Cliffords, Godleys—who founded the finest Colony Britain ever possessed. Politically, however, Mr. Fitzgerald is, if I may use such a term, "nowhere."—In our young Colonial Legislature he is the Pan, melodious, of the glad Sheep Farmers of Canterbury—gentlemen whose knowledge of "Native Matters," dwelling as they do in a region where the Maori is only the Gipsy, is about equal to that of the Sheep Farmers of Cumberland. But, notwithstanding the pastoral and pacific character of his wealthy Constituency, Mr. Fitzgerald (like other of our Hibernian friends), appears to live in a state of chronic hostility to all constituted Authorities. So many, so sudden, are the changes in our little Australasian Ministries that no man can remember who composed them or how they fell—but Mr. Fitzgerald, I think, has been a member of half-a-dozen New Zealand Ministries and scarcely remained as many
weeks with any one of them. Politically, indeed in these early days, he is rather a man of "crotchets;" and one of his present crotchets is that of his calling himself, and some three others,

This is of course figurative—the New Zealand "Peace Party" consists of more than three members, say thirty—but it is composed of very discordant elements. It is almost too small a thing to divide, but it really is divisible, and that into two or three or more sections. For instance, men like Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Sewell seem to call themselves the "Peace Party" partly because they dub everybody else the "War Party," partly because, like Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, they hold with Peace at any price, and partly because they really believe that the Maori can be civilized and saved by Paper. But other members of the "Peace Party" are found in those old Missionary-officials of early days, mentioned at page 35, men, who in many of their views are the very antipodes of Messrs. Sewell and Fitzgerald; while other and very zealous zealots of the "Peace Party" are found in our Pakeha-Maories alluded to at page 37.

the "Peace Party" of New Zealand—a Party whose belief appears to be that if you keep perpetually firing codes of paper laws at Maori War-Pahs you will, eventually, knock them down.

This butterfly may go. But, if I do him no injustice, Mr. Fitzgerald has become the victim of another delusion which needs nipping in the bud, namely, the delusion that two Colonies in New Zealand would be better than one, six better than two, twelve better than six. For the most part, the Southern Settlements in New Zealand, particularly humane and hearty Nelson, have stuck close to their Northern Sisters in these their days of deuil, and have amply recognized the ties of race and blood. But, of late, the Americanized Australian Diggers who now rule the roast at Otago banded with certain Canterbury Cobdens, also represented by Mr. Fitzgerald, have bethought themselves of two schemes which might bring them great profit, possibly, but no honour. The one, that if they were to leave Auckland and New Plymouth and Hawkes Bay and Wellington, to settle this Native War by themselves, they would keep silver in the purse—the other, that if the North Island could be stripped from the South and reduced to a mere Crown Colony, a mere Missionary Preserve, the auriferous stream of immigration which once flowed so freely to it would flow thither no more, but would be attracted to the "fresh fields and pastures new" of Canterbury, Southland, and Otago—fields where the British Emigrant would not find himself shorn of his civil rights, or be crushed into the Serf of the Savage as, it is pictured, his plight would be in the North.

Now I trust, Sir, that the Mother-Country will never sanction any such base desertion of one group of her children by another as this would be—nor for a moment lend further ear to that spirit of "Provincialism"

In civil matters, we are not Whigs and Tories in New Zealand, but "Centralists" and "Provincialists," that is those who would govern New Zealand by one Parliament, and those who would govern her by many. The six Provincial Councils given to the Colony by the Constitution were given to "Provincialism"—and I am bound to admit that the experience of ten years has proved that they were a most useful feature of the Constitution. But "Provincialism" wants more and more of them; and, now, every little Parish-Settlement in the Colony counting 1000 Settlers aspires to don the Purple, and to be raised to the dignity of a Province, like Auckland, Canterbury, Otago, Wellington, Nelson, and New Plymouth—and when we get about twenty little Provinces, "Provincialism" would parcel them out into little groups of twos and threes, and turn them into half-a-dozen little Coloniest each, possibly, in the end demanding a separate Flag.

among us, so attractive to Mr. Fitzgerald, which has already split New Zealand into a dozen little quasi-Colonies—Provin-cialism which, despite the fable truths of the "Bundle of Sticks," would split her into a dozen more; and which, possibly, by the year 1900, might be calling for an army of yours to suppress the little furies of an antipodal colonial internecine War.

Again, on another and even graver point, I regret to say that Mr. Fitzgerald seems to me to be utterly, and somewhat ostentatiously and flippantly in the wrong. In counselling you to abandon New Zealand, he virtually says, "dont suffer yourselves to be alarmed lest if you withdraw your Troops the Settlers will kill all the Natives" Now, for a man sitting safe behind wool fleeces at Canterbury, where life and property are as secure as in Kent, it may be very grand to talk in this way. But in what, were it any other man, I should call his crass delusion which needs nipping in the bud, namely, the delusion that two Colonies in New Zealand would be divisible, and that into two or three or more sections. For instance, men like Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Sewell seem to call themselves the "Peace Party" partly because they dub everybody else the "War Party," partly because, like Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, they hold with Peace at any price, and partly because they really believe that the Maori can be civilized and saved by Paper. But other members of the "Peace Party" are found in those old Missionary-officials of early days, mentioned at page 35, men, who in many of their views are the very antipodes of Messrs. Sewell and Fitzgerald; while other and very zealous zealots of the "Peace Party" are found in our Pakeha-Maories alluded to at page 37.

the "Peace Party" of New Zealand—a Party whose belief appears to be that if you keep perpetually firing codes of paper laws at Maori War-Pahs you will, eventually, knock them down.

This butterfly may go. But, if I do him no injustice, Mr. Fitzgerald has become the victim of another delusion which needs nipping in the bud, namely, the delusion that two Colonies in New Zealand would be better than one, six better than two, twelve better than six. For the most part, the Southern Settlements in New Zealand, particularly humane and hearty Nelson, have stuck close to their Northern Sisters in these their days of deuil, and have amply recognized the ties of race and blood. But, of late, the Americanized Australian Diggers who now rule the roast at Otago banded with certain Canterbury Cobdens, also represented by Mr. Fitzgerald, have bethought themselves of two schemes which might bring them great profit, possibly, but no honour. The one, that if they were to leave Auckland and New Plymouth and Hawkes Bay and Wellington, to settle this Native War by themselves, they would keep silver in the purse—the other, that if the North Island could be stripped from the South and reduced to a mere Crown Colony, a mere Missionary Preserve, the auriferous stream of immigration which once flowed so freely to it would flow thither no more, but would be attracted to the "fresh fields and pastures new" of Canterbury, Southland, and Otago—fields where the British Emigrant would not find himself shorn of his civil rights, or be crushed into the Serf of the Savage as, it is pictured, his plight would be in the North.

Now I trust, Sir, that the Mother-Country will never sanction any such base desertion of one group of her children by another as this would be—nor for a moment lend further ear to that spirit of "Provincialism"

In civil matters, we are not Whigs and Tories in New Zealand, but "Centralists" and "Provincialists," that is those who would govern New Zealand by one Parliament, and those who would govern her by many. The six Provincial Councils given to the Colony by the Constitution were given to "Provincialism"—and I am bound to admit that the experience of ten years has proved that they were a most useful feature of the Constitution. But "Provincialism" wants more and more of them; and, now, every little Parish-Settlement in the Colony counting 1000 Settlers aspires to don the Purple, and to be raised to the dignity of a Province, like Auckland, Canterbury, Otago, Wellington, Nelson, and New Plymouth—and when we get about twenty little Provinces, "Provincialism" would parcel them out into little groups of twos and threes, and turn them into half-a-dozen little Coloniest each, possibly, in the end demanding a separate Flag.

among us, so attractive to Mr. Fitzgerald, which has already split New Zealand into a dozen little quasi-Colonies—Provin-cialism which, despite the fable truths of the "Bundle of Sticks," would split her into a dozen more; and which, possibly, by the year 1900, might be calling for an army of yours to suppress the little furies of an antipodal colonial internecine War.

Again, on another and even graver point, I regret to say that Mr. Fitzgerald seems to me to be utterly, and somewhat ostentatiously and flippantly in the wrong. In counselling you to abandon New Zealand, he virtually says, "dont suffer yourselves to be alarmed lest if you withdraw your Troops the Settlers will kill all the Natives" Now, for a man sitting safe behind wool fleeces at Canterbury, where life and property are as secure as in Kent, it may be very grand to talk in this way. But in what, were it any other man, I should call his crass complacency, Mr. Fitzgerald appears to be oblivious to the fact that when Settlers of English birth and breeding have their children's throats cut, and the fruits of their toil of years made blackened ruins in a day, they dont take pen and ruler and cast up the cost of revenge before they take it.

Indeed, differing in toto from a comparatively new comer in the Colony like Mr. Fitzgerald, quite a South Island Settler, the great majority of the old residents in the North Island, the men who have lived among the Natives for twenty years, hold that so surely as you withdraw your Troops and retire from this War which you have given them, before you have helped them to win their way out of it by a final Peace, based on some such conditions as have been named, so surely, sooner or later, must War burst out again and become, possibly, a butchery.

The triumphant Maori would everywhere feel that the Victory was his—he would recommence his practice of twenty years of bullying the Weak—the Weak would again bend and bear and forbear—till, at last, some
crowning war-grudge Massacre, such as that of the "King Family" at Wanganui after the last Revolt, would light the spark and drive the Settlers to madness—madness, though, with a method—for, proclaiming the whole of the magnificent North Island "Prize of War," they would, I think, invoke the near and sympathetic aid of Victoria and New South Wales; and, with your leave, possibly without your leave, would do their best, I fear, incited by cruel wrongs, to obliterate the Maori as a Race from the face of the Earth.

Mr. Fitzgerald, too, is, I think, equally unhappy on Sir George Grey. Certainly, many think that a new, and a stormy-weather Pilot is now needed at the helm—but what Sir George did or did not do in Taranaki or Waikato has no real concern with the question of the CAUSES of the WAR, or how best to end it. As to the "Root" of the whole matter, the Root lying at Taranaki, the Taranaki Colonists (the men on the spot) hold that the miserable patch of Land at the Waitara (the ostensible cause of the original quarrel,) was fully and fairly purchased for the Crown of its true Owners by Governor Gore Browne—that the "after evidence," as it is called, got up by the Philo-Maori Attorneys of the Native, was not worth a straw—and that Governor Grey's abandonment of the Waitara was a mere bit of his old "Tract and Treacle "Policy—a mere sop in the pan, most unworthily, most ineffectually, given to conciliate the aggressive Rebels of the Land League.

Permit me to remark that the "Taranaki Land Question," as it has now come to be called throughout Australasia, is fully treated of in the second edition of my little work on New Zealand—a humble publication you once did me the honour to commend. The account there given of the monstrous affair has been freely drawn on by others—most welcome to the Waters, though they dont acknowledge the Stream.

If it had the slightest bearing on the question of the Causes of the War or on our future Policy, it might be shown that Governor Grey's abandonment of Waitara and his reclamations of Tataramaka were, virtually, two distinct and separate transactions with two distinct and separate bodies of Natives; and that the order of priority in which they were undertaken is a matter which had no atom of real influence in determining the future course of the rebel Tribes. But these, and fifty other little points in Sir George's treatment of the case are of no more weight than the colour of his Excellency's coat. The great "Root Truths" to be kept before us, and which we must not allow to be obscured by the little incidents emanating from or surrounding them—incidents dilated on by your various Waitara Natives to Te Teira's sale of his Land was the covert action of that monstrous "Land League" named at respondents, are these—that the opposition of the Waitara Natives to Te Teira's sale of his Land was the covert action of that monstrous "Land League" named at page 38, and depicted in the addenda; and that the giving up of the Waitara to the Natives on any excuse, ground, or plea, whatsoever, was virtual submission to the dictates of such League: virtual recognition of the dethronement of Queen Victoria in New Zealand, and of the commencement of the dynasty of Te Potatau, the First.

**Sir George Grey.**

If I remember aright, Sir, you lately threw out a hint that the prosecution of this unhappy War to a speedy, final end might now be promoted by the recall of Sir George Grey. In a letter lately addressed to the Hon. Member for Taunton, I attempted to picture Sir George as that "pattern Colonial Governor" which, generally, he is held to be. In some of its features, this popular estimate of him is a correct one; but his warmest admirers would now scarcely contend that he is altogether the right man in the right place. He is a Governor who m his former reign in New Zealand was an administrator of that "Tract and Treacle" Policy towards the Maori sketched at page 34. This said that, platonically, he is an admirer of our Maori Beauties, our chaste Susannahs of the Bush, and he seems to "love the Maori Race not wisely but too well." In former days he spared his tattooed friends so often that his tattooed friends scarce credit he will smite them now; and there are not wanting among them, I fear, those who even hint, in Maori Councils under the Greenwood Tree, that the escape of the 200 "Waikatos from Sir George's open cage; at Kawau was an escape winked at by him. Half the Rebels laugh at him, half distrust him, while the friendly Tribes rather stand aloof from a vacillating Ruler of whom they seem to think that, after he had encouraged them to take up arms in the White Man's cause, he might patch up a Peace with the Enemy and leave them to the vengeance of the Foes he had tempted them to provoke.

He has quarrelled, too, a Poruriance with his Fox Ministry, one of the ablest, one of the most enlightened, which the Colony ever possessed; and it is not, perhaps too much to say that nine-tenths of the Colonists, including men of all opinions on the War Question, would now pray for his recall.

The only Governor you ever gave us in New Zealand who read the Maori book aright, and who had the manhood to incur the responsibility of acting up to his convictions, was Governor (Sore Browne, and him you suffered to be deported to Van Dieman's Land by Exeter Hall. The hero of Scinde, flower of the flowering Napiers, is no more—but General Cameron and many a good soldier is to the fore; and, for the day, a quick Man of the Sword, rather than an adroit Despatch Writer, is what New needs more than she has ever done before.

There is, too, Sir, another point closely affecting the speedy final ending of this War which would, I think,
be worthy of your attention. It is this, that if you really mean to aid the North Island Colonists to win such a Peace as shall be permanently beneficial to both races, the "non-content" members of your Legislature might well receive gentle teem with unfounded assertions, debasing the Colonist, exalting the Native. These diatribes, appearing as they do in one or two of the "base exceptions" of our Local Press, are instantly seized on by our Missionary Firebrands, by our Pakeha-Maones and Bush Pedlars who live by the Maori, and are so translated and interpreted to the Natives by these gentry that the Rebel Tribes are made to believe this—that with a very large and powerful body in the great Runanga of England they are suffering Saints, and that if they can only hold out a little longer the Troops will be withdrawn and a Peace offered them placing the Settler under their feet—while the Friendly Tribes are made to fear that if they heartily join the Colonists in crushing out the Rebellion they will not only offend the puppet Maori King but offend the real though distant English Queen.

In this way the Philippics of certain Hon. Members of your Legislature almost reduce you to the absurd position of the pugilist who should hit his adversary with the right, himself with the left; while as to the rabid balderdash put forth by your soi-disant "Aborigines' Protection Societies" and your professional and dilettanti Philanthropists, it is not, perhaps, too much to say that it has already cost the two Races almost a Life a Line. He who asserts that the Mother-Country has no interest in a New Zealand War—who ignores the fact that it was Downing Street's mal-administration, not the Colonists', which has suffered a War to arise—who would recall your Troops, save your money, and leave an insignificant handful of your countrymen in the North Island to their chance of exterminating or of being exterminated, comes before your Public with an "ad captandum" cry, and will find crowds of listeners and troops of friends-among whom, though, you, I think, Sir, will not be found. But he who on the grounds which have been urged, or on any other, seeks to prove that it is not only the interest, but moral duty, of the Mother-Country freely to aid those Emigrant Children whom she has encouraged to act as her Pioneers in New Zealand to win their way out of a War which her has given them, may have "fit audience—but few."

Nevertheless, Sir, I for one, shall continue to hope for the best Despite the colonisation fallacies of Professor Goldwin Smith, reiterated by the Hon. Member for Taunton—despite further vituperation of Colonists by the Hon. Member for Maidstone—despite the ready help which mere South Island Settlers like Messieurs Fitzgerald and Sewell might be willing to lend in the unholy work of seeking to cripple the rival North by process of withdrawing the Troops before a solid Peace is won—despite all this, I shall hope now that you have a little army expensively gathered together on the spot, and before you need it elsewhere, you will use it. I shall hope in your Councils you will remember that it is the deliberately formed belief of the majority of the old North Island Colonists (the men of twenty years' experience of the Maori and his ways) that if you leave them before you have helped them to achieve the task which their slender ranks disable them from achieving by themselves, namely the task of showing the Savage that the Civilized Race is the stronger in arms, War, sooner or later, must again burst out, and become, possibly, a War of annihilation. I shall hope that you will either recall Sir George Grey, or insist on his no longer tampering with the "core" of the disease at Taranaki; and that with equal humanity and sound statesmanship towards both Races, with equal regard to your own interests and honour and ours, you will turn a deaf ear to all tempting pretexts for laying down your arms until the just "conditions"

Stated at page 45.

of a solid Peace have been conquered and obtained.

Such a Policy as this would be welcomed by half the Natives, and would command the support of nine-tenths of the whole of the colonial community. Such a Policy as this, too, might lay the foundations of a state of peace and prosperity under which, in another decade, you might find New Zealand a prominent member of some great "Australasian Federation"—the chosen home of half your finest Emigrants.

Though I have seen many Colonies and Emigration Fields, and merits in all of them, we have none, I think, where that happy "combination" of the great cardinal advantages of fineness of climate, goodness of society, and profitable openings for the employment of capital and labour, is found in so high and perfect a degree as in New Zealand; and there can be no doubt that on the pacification of the Colony, New Zealand, with the higher orders both of the Working Man and the Capitalist Emigrant, will become the most popular and frequented of all our Emigration-Fields.

and a Colony giving you an export and import Trade to the extent of £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 a year—while under such a Policy as this you might reasonably hope to see the Son of the most dreaded of the Anthropophagi of the Antipodes metamorphosed into a peaceful Citizen, possibly into a Legislator.

Once let the Maori be strengthened for the reception of British Institutions by the virtues of the tonic of "subjugation by arms," and almost any medicinally legislative measures which a good New Zealand Governor, working with a New Zealand Ministry of practical Colonists, could prescribe, would be taken by him, and would do him good. But, paradoxical as it may seem to the Hon. Member for Maidstone, I take a very warm interest in the welfare of the Maori, and I would here entreat any authorities whose work, bye and bye, it may
be to "govern the New Zealander," not to govern him too much, and not to fly over his head. For some years to come, a model farm and cottage in every second village, where his women might see the sight of an English housewife, a good beef-prescribing doctor here and there, strong-meat for himself, mutton broth for his baby, would do infinitely more both to civilize and christianize him than Codes of Laws, Essays on the Trinity, perpetual preachings, or refutations of Kafir Colenso.

Further, I would have the Maori ask for Civilization, not Civilization ask for the Maori.—In all British Settlements in the Colony, constitute British Law and Order must be maintained—but in the wilder native districts of the interior, British Laws and Institutions should only be given him, say, where and where only, three-fourths of the male adults of each district had formally pledged themselves to support such Institutions by example, and if need were, by arms.

of your future "Britain of the South."

I am, Sir,

Very respectfully yours,
Charles Hursthouse.

An ex-New Zealand Colonist, and a Colonization-studying Visitor in the Canadas, the United States, Australia, and the Cape.

The news brought us by the mail of yesterday, and your comments thereon, Sir, compel me to offer a few words more.

When the advanced telegram informed us that Mr. WELD had become Premier one might have foretold what the ministerial manifesto would prove to be. Mr. Weld and his Attorney-General, Mr. Sewell (like Mr. Fitzgerald) are exclusively South Island

Compared with the two great Islands, the North and the South, the third is of such insignificant extent as to be a mere Isle of Man appendage. Geographically, we do not define the Mother-Country as Great Britain and Ireland and the Orkneys and the Isle of Wight; but as Great Britain and Ireland. Again, the fashion of speaking of New Zealand as consisting of Three islands, makes the true South Island appear the Middle Island; and thus invests it with certain attributes of centrality and superiority of position to which it has no shadow of real claim.

Settlers; and, partly, I fear, from growing attachment to that pernicious "Provincialism" mentioned at page 50, partly, I fear, from want of firmness in refusing to bow to that "cry" of some of their Constituents denounced at page 49, are Settlers who will not, I think, appear among the Mourners, should the policy they advocate insidiously bring about the dissolution of the present one Colony of New Zealand and the reconstruction, from its ashes, of two.

I heartily agree with Mr. Weld that ROADS are essential to the welfare of New Zealand—they would be The Keys of Peace. But in his cry for "Roads, Roads, Roads" our callow young Premier puts his cart before his horse. To get Roads, we must first be masters of the Land on which, and of the Money with which, to make them. To form a good military 100 mile Road, with village and blockhouse dotted along its course, through the most magnificent, but, by sea, the most inaccessible district I have ever been over in New Zealand, namely, the coast-district from Wanganui through the Ngatiruanui Country to Taranaki, might cost half a million. For such Caesar's causeway, however, the money obstacle might doubtless be overcome—but, in the Natives, there would be found an obstacle a hundred-fold more difficult to overcome. The Road would invade the dominions of the worm-eating" Ngatiruanui, the most savage, lawless, land-leaguing Natives in the whole Country. The Rebel Tribes know what Roads mean as well as we do. They know that a Road through Ngatiruanui means, also, a Road through Waikato, through Ngatimaniopoto, through Taupo, through Tauranga. They would not forget that Mr. "Weld's scheme had published to the whole Native Race that, ere long, the Soldier would disappear, never to return; and the 10,000 or 15,000 of the present Rebels, joined, as under these new circumstances, they soon would be, by thousands of those "Neutrals" described at page 44, would band together to resist Roads like angry wasps resisting violation of their nests.

Indeed, without some miraculous change (no more to be expected, perhaps, than the retrogression of the Sun) should come over the Maori Race, Mr. Weld's pick and spade on his Ngatiruanui Road might have to be plied under the fire of fugitive bands of Bush-hidden Savages numbering at times, perhaps, from 3,000 to 4,000 well-armed Rebels—a force, on the peculiar ground where it would fight, equal to one of 8,000 or 10,000 in the "open," where it could be seen, got at, routed, and pursued.

Now, what Army of Workmen is to be found to make this first Road, and what other Army is to be found to guard the Workmen? Between the ages of 20 and 50, the entire male population of the North Island is not yet more than 18,000,

Mr. Weld may have counted on combatants to be raised in his own Island. But, remembering the feeling growing up among his Constituents, the feeling that the War is no concern of theirs, and looking at the full
employment and rich gains of the South Islanders drawn from their wool and gold fields, Mr. Weld may rest assured that his Ministry will pass no Volunteer or Militia Act which would enable our gallant Taranaki Partizan, Major Atkinson, to get any permanent force of more than a few hundred "South Island Rifles" into the actual Northern field of operations.

and three-fourths of this little body are Labourers, Mechanics, Traders, small Farmers, whose daily labour near their homes is necessary for the maintenance of their families.

The Workers we might find—but even half the Fighters we could not find. Indeed, speaking of Mr. Weld with all possible respect for so truly admirable a Colonist as we are fortunate enough to possess in him,

A Cadet of the fine old Dorsetshire "Lulworth Castle" "Welds, he was one of the first pioneers in New Zealand, and is a good specimen of those intelligent, educated, practical Shepherd Princes of Australasia who are throned on Merino.

Among the various passions of mankind evoked by the Colonisation of New Zealand the "cacoethes scribendi" is not the least remarkable, for from Diffenbach's down to Gorst's some tons of Books have been made or written about the Country, its merits and troubles. Two, and two only, of the number have been contributed by practical, public-life, Colonists, namely by Mr. Fox and Mr. Weld. Mr. Fox's "Six Colonies of New Zealand" despite its Title (a lapsus lingusae of "Provincialism") may be read even now with both pleasure and profit, arising from the lucidity of its style and from the bold good sense almost everywhere displayed; while Mr. Weld's little Work on "Sheep Farming" is a little gem, stamping him a very pleasant and a very practical New Zealand Maro.

I cannot but say that, since the days of a certain Dame who essayed to stop the Atlantic with her Mop, no scheme has been devised by Sanity where "ends" have been more cloud-high above "means" than in this scheme of the Lord of Flocks for stopping; New Zealand's War with a Pick.

Let General Cameron and Major Atkinson march a mixed imperial and colonial force of 3,000 or 4,000 men from Taranaki fifty miles down the open coast to the lovely country around Waimaté, and there effectually defeat the "Worm-Eaters" and their allies on their own ground, and then, and then only, may we look to see the "Core" of the Rebellion cut out, and not only Land, but Native Labour, too, got for Roads.

Mr. Weld's scheme, altogether, indeed, is so crude and strange a one that sober folk might be pardoned if they took it to be a sort of grim joke. Excuses, however, are to be made for Mr. Weld. New Zealand Colonists have been so scourged by the English Press and Parliament for high crimes and misdemeanours of which they are guiltless, that the exasperation among some of them is such that the great question with them, now, is not how to deal with the Maori, the Rebel, but how to get rid of England, the Libeller—of England whose laches, as shown at page 34, gave them this War, yet who is ever abusing them for getting into it + This feeling is particularly strong in the Canterbury Province, one of whose Representatives in our New Zealand House of Commons is Mr. Weld. He lately met his Constituents, when, using that freedom of speech common on the hustings whilst a Man is not a Minister, he seems to have denounced the acts of Downing Street with great vigour, and to have hinted that if He ever came into power he would emancipate New Zealand from Downing Street. A few days after (by stroke of Fortune and the commotions of the times) he was sent for to New Zealand's Windsor: Mr. Fox would have no more to do with Sir George Grey, and Mr. Weld took Mr. Fox's portfolio. He is the last man in the world to eat his words—and thus, the Premier of New Zealand seeks to do what the Hon. Member for Canterbury vowed ought to be done.

He is rather on the horns of a dilemma, though. Indeed if you will imagine Mr. Bright, on the Monday, vowing to the good people of Birmingham that every man shall have a vote, that the three-hooped Pot shall be a made a tenhooped Pot, and that on the Thursday, by some political harlequinade, Mr. Bright found himself in Lord Palmerston's place (banded say with the O'Donoghue), and felt himself bound to issue a ministerial programme providing for Vote by Ballot, for Universal Suffrage, for abandonment of Ireland to her Aborigines, you will have some idea, Sir (allowing for radical differences between men and measures), of those "Cares of State," those "Perils of Place" which already, I fear, begin to blanch the ruddy cheek of our Shepherd Premier of the South.

Mr. Blight's Ministry might last a month—Mr. Weld's may last a month—but, at the first breath of Action, down it goes, like House of Cards.

"Double Government."

Again, not only must I differ from Mr. Weld, both as to his capacity to make Roads before he beats down the Rebellion, but I must differ from him as to the existence in New Zealand of what he calls the "Double Government." There is no such thing in New Zealand—there never has been. A "cry," cried loud enough, may pass for a Truth; and the cry of its being New Zealand's Double Government which is her fundamental evil, has been so loudly cried that many excellent people imagine such a thing exists in New Zealand. But it does not.
What we have now, what we have ever had in New Zealand since Representative Institutions were conferred on us, is not a DOUBLE but a TREBLE Government:—a tripartite body, composed of His Excellency the Governor—the New Zealand Ministry—and, the Downing Street Colonial Office.

The Mother Country, as I have sought to show at page 29, is part, if not chief, OWNER of New Zealand and if the salary of the Governor she sends thither were doubled or trebled,

It would well require the Mother Country to pay the half of a handsome Salary to a first class Governor for such a distant, such an exceptional, Colony as New Zealand. But to secure the priceless advantage of a real Double Government in New Zealand, in the person of an A 1 Governor, emancipated from thrall of Downing Street, New Zealand's infant House of Commons would, I should hope, gladly vote him a salary of £8000 or £10,000 a-year. Probably, some even "non-content member for Canterbury might hazard the introduction of a Bill for keeping the Salary to the old £8000—but, if he did, he would almost merit the fate ordained for "non-contents" by Charondas the Locrian—a Potentate so annoyed by the multiplicity of Bills proposed by his St. Stephen's that he ordained that any member introducing a Bill, and failing to get it passed, should straightway be led out of the House and at once hanged.

so as to enable her to secure for the post some Lawrence, or Canning, or Elgin; and if to such a man, acting for her as he would do from the inestimable vantage ground of being on the spot—seeing, hearing, learning, for himself—she would entrust her interests in her magnificent joint Property of the Colony of New Zealand, all would go well Such a man would be too much the Statesman to flout a young Institution like a New Zealand Ministry—no New Zealand Ministry could desire other than to work harmoniously with such a man—and this, indeed, would be DOUBLE GOVERNMENT.

But, oppressed by tape-tied traditions, you submit to have a third, and a half-blind,

Many years ago in our naval skirmishes with the Americans, on the Canadian Lakes, the Colonial Office, imagining that the Lakes were Salt, carefully encumbered our vessels with "casks" for the stowage of fresh water before leaving port! Doubtless, the Colonial Office is not so blind now—but the ignorance, if ignorance it be, of the real state of things in distant Colonies still manifested by this famous Bureau, might almost make the angels weep.—Mr. Cardwell is perhaps as hard working, as conscientious a Colonial Secretary as we have ever had, and one who knows as much about Colonies as any gentleman who will be likely to succeed him for the next few years, yet Mr. Cardwell's real insight into the true position of New Zealand affairs may be judged of by the following extract from one of his late Despatches to Governor Grey. He is seeking to convince Sir George (who by the by is on the spot) that the Rebels have been generally, and indeed everywhere, defeated; and as an illustration of this hopeful, peace-coming, state of things, he says—"At Taranaki the Insurgents have been driven from their strongholds, and New Plymouth so far relieved from danger that the Colonial Government have thought themselves justified in discontinuing the services of the Militia."

Now, at Taranaki the real state of things, both before and when Mr. Cardwell wrote, was this—The close siege which the Savage had laid to the very village of New Plymouth, for more than a year, had so far been relieved that the Settler's children could play before his door, or on the village green, without fear of being tomahawked. But no real agricultural operations had been resumed, and no Settler could venture two miles from the Church without peril to his life. The Taranaki Militia was enrolled, not to mind the children, but to march into the interior, with her Majesty's troops, in search of the Enemy; and when Sir George Grey's orders came to ground arms and suspend the operations of the War, the Colonial Government very properly disbanded a portion of their Colonial Regiments until the Soldiers should receive fresh orders to march. As to Mr. Cardwell's idea that we had, or have now, got the better of the Rebels, it is simply an utter, a most dangerous, delusion. As straws show the current, just glance, Sir, at the "doings" of our Waikato Prisoners, mentioned in the last pages of this Pamphlet.

body, 20,000 miles away from the scene of action, perpetually " meddling and muddling" in the affairs of your New Zealand Estate—a body, at its whim and pleasure, overriding any measure which the united wisdom of your Steward the Governor, of the Colony's Steward the Premier, and of all the practical men on the Spot, has deliberately pronounced to be the best For the common good!

Sir George Grey is so much an instrument of the Colonial Office, he stands in such abject fear of that famous Bureau, that any illustration of TREBLE GOVERNMENT drawn from his administration must needs want force. But even Sir George's "sayings and doings will furnish proof of the reality of the monstrous evil I ask you to denounce. He who will consult the published Despatches of Governor Grey will see that some year or so ago His Excellency, having at last arrived at the conclusion that the Native Race had long been making game of his "Tract and Treacle" policy, described at page 34, determined to show them that his Soldiers had been sent him for some other purpose than for beating drums, and that "Confiscation" should teach the Ingrates that for this, their third, freak of Revolt, they should be compelled (for the first time) to make some atonement for a crime which though half sport to them was half death for others. This, though a late, was a most wise resolve; and in this, your Representative was in perfect harmony with ours, Here, Sir George Grey and Mr. Fox were
one; and had there been no distant "third" portion of the Governing Body to be consulted all would have gone
smoothly, and measures been taken which, probably, long ere now, would have landed us on the solid platform
of a lasting Peace.

But, unfortunately, Governor Grey had certain Governors in Downing Street to consult—Governors, who,
bowing to Bray of Exeter Hall, wincing at whine of Aborigines Destruction Societies, magnetized by minacious
Maidstone, terrified by Taunton—at once commanded Sir George to pocket his thunder and eat his words. Ever
obedient, Sir George did so—but his doing so very considerably disgusted his Fox Ministry (perhaps it would
have disgusted any Ministry), and eventually drove the Fox Ministry from office.

A better Government for New Zealand than a real DOUBLE GOVERNMENT—a Government composed of a
first class Representative of the Crown (counselled, if you will, not commanded, by quills in Downing Street),
and of a institutional New Zealand Ministry, all practical heads, all on the spot—could not be devised by wit of
man,—a TREBLE GOVERNMENT—a Government where all that is done in the light in New Zealand, may be
undone in the dark at the antipodes—might hoist the angels and kick down Paradise.

What may be Done with New Zealand.

There are four COURSES now open to you to take in New Zealand. Sir, and the four may almost be defined
in four lines. They are these:—

1.—On the grounds urged at pages from 26 to 32, or on any other, recognize New Zealand as being what
she is—namely, a "National Estate"—a "National Property" which interest, which honour, which duty,
require you to help to develop and to defend. Establish a true DOUBLE GOVERNMENT, Recall Governor Grey,
for the reasons assigned at page 53 (or give him trial of another year;) and vigorously prosecute the "War, hand
in hand with the Colonists, until you have won some such solid Peace as that mentioned at Page 45.

Or,

2.—Divide New Zealand into two Colonies—the North Island with its capital at Auckland, the South Island
with its capital at Christchurch. Repeal the Constitution of the former, and make it a CROWN COLONY. Thrash
the Rebels into complete submission. Give the Colonists half the confiscated Land for helping you, and take the
other half for a Crown Demesne—devoting rents and proceeds to a fund for humanizing and civilizing the
Maori, partly in the manner suggested in the note at page 58. Continue to give North New Zealand a prominent
position in that "Crown Guide Book" for Emigrants described in the note at page 28; and by these means, in
this way, possess yourselves of Crown Colony in the Pacific, fit dower for a Windsor Princess.

Leave the South Island as she is, and let her people take care—that, in another decade or so, the North is not
ahead of her in Revenue, in Population, in Exports.

Or,

3.—Divide New Zealand into two Communities, North Island and South, and then leave them and go your
ways. Let the soft Shepherds of the South pile up the golden fleece, and, under the fig tree, dance to pipe and
tabor The Northern Men, have had a harder training, and can both work and fight. Their number are few; but
they would ask sympathetic blood in Australia

It may be that the North Island Settlers would not go so far as to agree with me, here; but, speaking for
myself as an old North Island Settler, I declare that if, under the adoption of Third Course help could not be
obtained from Australia, and rather than have a sham Peace patched up by the South Islanders, I would join in
petitioning the Mother-Country to allow the North Island Community to place itself under the protection of
France. See Addenda, page 99.

for help—righteously requiting help with righteously confiscated Land. Australia would come at their
prayer; and then, possibly, Exeter Hall might sweat for her Pets. In five years, or in ten, the North Island Men
would federate with their Australian Brethren—may be, even with the emasculate Shepherds of the
South—when, possibly, were the Cloud Compeller, himself, to descend on them, say about the year 85, he
might elect to stay in the Elysium he had found—and, in some half-caste Juno, forget the Peacock and the
Olympian "Square".

Or,

4.—Bowing to Exeter Hall and Manchester, patch up some idle Suspension of Arms—and then, on the
word of foolish Philo-Maories, and of South Island Settlers like the Sewell

It is mortifying to see such a Premier as Mr. Weld may some day make, associated with an
Attorney-General like Mr. Sewell. A Pamphlet lately addressed by this gentleman to Lord Lyttleton, written
with all the art of a Special Pleader, and extensively circulated among members of the Legislature here, has
done more injury to the interests alike of Natives and of North Island Settlers than all the diatribes of Exeter
Hall. Judging him by his Philo-Maori Brief, Mr. Sewell must be a man of that peculiar parchment mind who, in
a raging conflagration, would refuse the Beadle key of Engine House because he had ran for it (if Beadle ever
did run) without his insignia of cocked hat.

and Fitzgerald, shut your eyes and declare you have won a PEACE. Quick, carry away your gallant Red-coat!

Is there not something rather ludicrous in the perpetual pother which a great Nation, boasting to be the strongest on earth, and counting no fewer than 30,000,000 of Citizens, the richest in the world, makes about the particular locality of a few thousand Troops? The entire military expenditure of such Nation, on the whole of her immense Possessions in America, South Africa, and Australasia is, annually, but little more than a million and a half; while, as I have sought to show at page 33, she is drawing an income of no less than four millions a year from these Colonies in "Trade Profits" alone. Again, might it not be urged, that New Zealand is both a Sanatorium and a School of War, and that even in times of Peace a few Regiments stationed in New Zealand, where the men might earn five or six shillings a-day, two or three days in the week, at civil employments, are as well stationed as if they were mewed up in Barracks in Britain, rotting away swilling beer. The Mother Country does not keep on foot more Regiments because of the existence of such a place as New Zealand, and her Army must be somewhere—why not, then, a small portion of it in New Zealand?—a Station nearer than England, to India, to Australia, to China, and Japan.

—find a "Paukena"

See page 35.

Governor for New Zealand—but do no more. Content yourselves with the gains of her Trade—keep whole skin and full purse—and should that redoubtable animal, the British Lion, ever hap to hear from malicious foreigners, or even from whoels of his own, that he once sneaked out of a quarrel, provoked by his own Servitors in Downing Street, let him pooh-pooh the libellous truth, or roar it down.

I have ranked these four COURSES, in what I conceive to be their order of merit

The first, I take it, is the great, imperial, manly, states-man-like, "Baconian" Course—that which would be alike the most permanently beneficial to Mother-Country, to Colonists, to Natives. I trust you will elect to take it. If not, take the Second—if not the Second, take the Third. Don't take the Fourth. Spots on white Scutcheons may be covered, and yet be seen, and this Course would bespot your Scutcheon past all scouring or concealment.

It would be cruel, too, to the North Island Settlers—it would leave the Southerners to hamper them. If the South wants to save her coppers and to wash her hands of the War, let her do it Lukewarm Allies in a camp are best eliminated from it.

No one estimates the advantages New Zealand would secure from UNITY more than my humble self. But if you elect to take Course No. 4—if, virtually, you elect to leave us—leave us DUALITY, rather than leave us with the clogging company of those who would dictate to us the conduct of a Savage War which destroys no homestead, which disturbs no dinner, even, of theirs.

Permit me, in conclusion, Sir, to say that in addressing this Letter to you on the vexed subject of the "New Zealand War" I have been as much actuated by a regard for what I conceive to be the honour and interest of the Mother-Country, and by an earnest wish to benefit the Maori, as by any desire, great as that may be, to benefit the Colonist; while I would observe that should you think I have anywhere used too free a pen you must please attribute it to my "Bush" fashion of calling Black, Black—and possibly, in some slight degree, to my long inhalation of our exhilarating New Zealand air.

I am, Sir,

Very Respectfully Yours,

Charles Hursthouse.

18, Chalcot Crescent, Regent's Park.

February 18th, 1865.

Additional Remarks

Suggested by the Debate on New Zealand affairs of March 11th

In the above debate the following passage occurs in the speech of Mr. Mills:—"One section of the Colonists said, 'We cannot afford to carry out this spirited policy.' But his answer to these persons was—'At your own risk, without inducement from the Government, you have chosen to settle in a colony 12,000 miles from home, and you say that we, who have been fighting your battles for so many years, should defend you for ever, although you have absolute control over your own affairs.'"
Surely, since an English House of Commons first came into existence no statement of six lines can have been made within its walls containing so much of the "Suppresio veri," the "suggestio falsi," as this. Mr. Mills' "spirited policy" is that of sneaking out of a quarrel which, as shown at page 34, is one that the crass folly of Downing Street and Exeter Hall provoked; while, further, he adds that this "spirited policy" (the policy of withdrawing half the troops before the Taranaki "Core" of the rebellion has even been touched, and while the Rebels feel that every where they have been triumphant) is a policy, Credat Judaeus Appella ! advocated by the COLONISTs.

Certainly, a clique of South Island Settlers represented, for the moment, by a South Island Ministry who, as hinted at pages 49 and 58, would be gainers if the North Island were suffered to relapse into a wilderness, does, shame to say, advocate Mr. Mills’ "spirited policy,"—but to assert, or to let it be inferred, that the New Zealand Colonists as a body, or any ten men in the North Island, approve of such a Policy, is a trespass on even parliamentary license, and an insult to common sense. Three successive Minis tries: the "Stafford" Ministry, the "Domett" Ministry, the "Fox" Ministry—true Representatives of the North Island Community, the people who suffer from the War—have, by deeds and words, indignantly protested against Mr. Mills' "spirited policy."

Again, Mr. Mills asserts, that at their own risk, without encouragement from Government, the New Zealand Colonists have chosen to settle in a country 12,000 miles distant. Now, with the mere exception of the New Zealand Company's Pioneer Settlers who, as Mr. Roebuck truly observes, saved New Zealand from becoming a French Possession, standing before the very doors of Australia, the New Zealand Colonists (as shewn at page 28) have been very considerably "encouraged" by the Home Government to plant new Homes in New Zealand.

If the Americans had retreated from their War with the Seminole Indians—a war vastly more arduous than this,—no terms in our vocabulary of derision would have been spared them. You, virtually, are retreating defeated from a War with 5000 Savages, and members of your Legislature and your Colonial Office seek to hide from you the shameful fact under the assertion that the Colonists wish you to retreat.

If, with your troops on the spot, you had refused longer to be hoodwinked by Exeter Hall, and by those sure Destroyers of the Maori Race typified in Mr. Buxton, and had proclaimed to the Native that, hand in hand with the Colonial Regiments, you would use your troops and withdraw not a man till you had secured some such a Peace as that sketched at page 45, you would, in a few months, have closed the Temple of War in New Zealand for ever.

As it is, I sadly fear that it will prove you have done just enough further to incense the "Rebel Tribes," and to show them their superiority in arms;—and just enough to show the "Friendly and Neutral Tribes" (described at page 44) your weakness, and to deter such shrewd observers from adventuring to lend any effective help to that which they fancy is the weaker side.

Indeed, rather than do what your complaisant Colonial Secretary hints to Manchester and Taunton he will do—namely, withdraw half your Force from the fire of a triumphant foe—it would, I think, have been better for your honour and for our interests had you never sent one Redcoat to the Country.

Let us hope, however, that the Blind Goddess will bring us better Fortune than we deserve. Let us further hope, too, that, as one step towards the enlightenment of the British Public as to the real character

See pages 16 and 17.

of the New Zealander, the Daily Telegraph may learn from Mr. Roebuck that, in his present state of barbarism, the Maori's Ossian frothings are quite compatible with the act of mutilating the bodies and parading the heads of gallant Soldiers,

The head of Captain Lloyd, who fell in action the other day at New Plymouth, was hacked off by Mr. Buxton's "Babes of grace," stuck on a pole, and paraded through the Rebel Districts, as Spoil of War and symbol of victory!

and quite compatible with a slumbering but innate, and some-what weasel-like, appetite for blood.

See pages 82 and 83.

Better News.

Since the above remarks were penned, the New Zealand January Mail has arrived, bringing us the Governor's fresh "Proclamation" of December. I am happy to agree with your Wellington Correspondent in thinking that if this "Proclamation" had been issued nine months sooner the War would now have been over—over for ever—and though there is some enfeebling obscurity in the article relating to the " Disarming of the Rebels," yet, even at this eleventh hour, if this Proclamation be honestly carried out—if there be no further talk of withdrawing half your Troops until it be carried out, no further stultification of our efforts by Maidstone and Exeter Hall—a solid Peace will be found near at hand.
Cause of Maori Decrease.

I would observe, too, that your Correspondent boldly points out a certain social cancer ever preying on the Maori Race which the false delicacy, the mistaken humanity, of the thousand and one disquisitions we have had on the "Maori and his Manners," have almost ever concealed or ignored. In the first edition of my little work on New Zealand, treating of the decrease of the New Zealanders despite of all our nursing, I stated that the chief cause of it was the almost promiscuous inter-course of the Sexes before marriage; and intimated that if it had ever been otherwise yet that, in these days, the existence of virgin Maori Brides was perhaps more problematical than the existence of the Maori Moa.

For this misdemeanour of declaring the naked Truth, I had the ill fortune to be denounced by Philo-Maori Pharisees as a Vessel of Wrath, and to become the object of much "file-biting" abuse—but, the able Letter of your Wellington Correspondent, in your issue of to-day, shows I was right in my remarks on "girlhood chastity" among the New Zealanders, and, virtually, almost repeats my very words.

March 16th, 1865.

Addenda.

1. (See page 2.)

NEW ZEALAND A GLEBE FOR EXETER HALL.—The Church Missionary Body in New Zealand, in early days, brought great scandal on their cause by trafficking with the Natives for Land. Indeed, not only did they obtain large estates from their docile Flocks but they wanted a monopoly, and would fain have had no people get estates save themselves. One unctuous instance of this is recorded by Dr. Thompson in his admirable Work on New Zealand, where he relates that in 1835 they drew up a "Deed of Trust" of Lands belonging to the Northern Natives, and tried, but in vain, to get the Colonial Office to have them appointed Trustees for such Lands—Lands, which as they alleged, their Flocks wished them to preserve from the intrigues of those whom they, the missionary party, termed "designing men!" Indeed, any one who will wade through the mass of evidence relating both to the early irregular and the later regular colonisation of New Zealand, and keep an eye on the "sayings and doings" of the Church Missionary Body, will see that it cherished the hope, of regenerating the New Zealanders by "Tracts and Treacle," and of converting the North Island into a huge Glebe for Exeter Hall.

It must not, however, be supposed from this, that the Colonists are at all insensible to the many merits of the present Missionary Body. Excepting, always, firebrand-bigots of the "Hadfield" stamp, who might well be deported from our shores to any great Christian College where the cardinal virtues of meekness and charity are taught, the present Missionary Body in New Zealand, especially the Wesleyan portion of it, is one which no Colonist could wisely wish to see enfeebled or suppressed. Missionaries, when they will only confine themselves to their proper sphere and not "meddle and muddle" in the Colony's political and public matters, are most useful Settlers. I do not imagine that any of them have now the slightest hankering after Land. But, in my view, even if they had there would be nothing blameable in it When an earnest, God-fearing man leads out his family from civilization to the wilderness in the hope of benefiting the Heathen he has aright to acquire some stake in the new Country; and could in no wise employ his leisure better than in adding the Husbandman to the Priest, and in seeking to make some provision for his Olive Branches by creating a little estate by tilling Land. In truth, a good hearty Missionary in each Native Villiage, with half-a-dozen children, who would show our Maori friends that it was not Loud Prayers in the Market Place, but Doing unto others that which they would have others Do unto them, which was the true essence of Christianity, and who would also show them a little "model farm," would be, of all men, the right Man in the right place.

2. (See Page 4.)

THE ALSATIA of the PACIFIC—"Kororareka, a noble harbour in the Bay of Islands, in the midst of a large native population and the missionary stations, and long the favourite rendezvous of the whalers and Sydney traders, had from the first been the chief seat of this irregular colonisation; and a more lawless little Pandemonium than this village-port of Kororareka had grown up to be by 1831 neither old nor new world had, probably, ever seen. The most reputable of its denizens were trading adventurers from a convict colony, while
the bulk of the community consisted of runaway sailors, of "Lags," gaolbirds, and scoundrels of every mark and brand from Sydney and Van Dieman's Land. Its Visitors, too, were fit company for its Residents: convict skippers and ticket-of-leave mates of Sydney traders, with rude embruted crews of whalers and coasting traders, all rushing ashore for a spree, and running ferociously festive "mucks" till they fell. Every second house was a grog-shop, and the population might have been divided into those who sold rum and those who drank it.

Sterne's Uncle Toby relates that our army swore terribly in Flanders; but the common conversation of Kororareka displayed a boldness and originality of figure drawn from the whaler's forecastle and the chain-gang, a malicious heartiness of ribald damning, far beyond the powers of our army in Flanders. Convict training and antecedents, blasphemy and the debauchery of drunkenness, were all intensified, too, by debauchery in women. Bark Helens, aboriginal Messalinas, swarmed in Kororareka. Every resident kept a mistress, every visitor came for one. Native women were as common an article of barter between chiefs and whalers as native pigs; and to the daily fights and quarrels which arose in such a community through rum and whiskey were to be added those which arose through the passion of jealousy and the disputed possession of the slave girl. There was neither magistrate nor policeman at Kororareka, neither law nor order nor gospel; every ruffian, and there were many, did what seemed good to him; and in 1831, this New Zealand Village-Port was the veritable "Alsatia" of the Pacific, dashed with a convict Wapping. This lawless colonisation of the country, too, was spreading, and many of the little whaling stations in Cook's and Foveaux Straits, and on the east coast, were little other than budding Kororarekas promising a full bloom." Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South."

3. (See page 4.)

French Race for New Zealand—" We so nearly lost New Zealand to French that Governor Hobson had but just arrived at the Bay of Islands when a French corvette came in to take possession. Finding the British flag planted in the North Island, the French commander determined to try for the South, and hoist the tricolor at Akaroa. His design, however, was betrayed; when Governor Hobson-who, whatever may have been his faults as a civil administrator, was an able and quick-witted naval officer—hurried off the English sloop to Akaroa. The sloop arrived first, but so little first that she was only saluting the British ensign as the corvette dashed in. The French commander then abandoned the design of seizing New Zealand as a French possession, and landed the nucleus of his pioneer colony at Akaroa—as a friendly French Settlement in British dominions. Akaroa remained a small French Community for many years; numbering at one time some 200 Settlers. Most of them were afterwards removed to the rising French colonies in the Pacific; but Akaroa, when I visited it a few years since, still displayed pleasing traces of its founders in gardens famous for peach, and plum, and pear If France had been a month or two earlier in the field she might have gained a colony worth a hundred Algerias; a colony which would have made her mistress of the Pacific; a colony standing so before the doors of Australia that every wool and gold ship would have had to pass almost within sight of fifty French-New Zealand ports—privateer ports amply large enough for the reception of the James Baines Lightning, Marco Polo, and dozens of sister galleons, and offering unrivalled natural facilities for the building and equipment of frigate and corvette." Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South."

4. (See Page 6.)

The Crown's Pre-emptive Right.—I have no copy of the Treaty at hand, and forget, for the moment, whether this condition of selling only to the Crown was one actually embodied in the Treaty, or one which only grew out of it and became the great "land Law" of the Colony by some quick-following agreement and legislation. For a short period, in Governor Fitzroy's time, the Settlers, under certain restrictions, were allowed to purchase Land direct from the Natives; and under a very recent Act of the Colonial Legislature they may do so now. But this privilege has ever been but very slightly used, inasmuch as the private Settler in attempting to buy of Natives No. 1 has had no security, when once the purchase-money was paid down, that Natives No. 2 would not some day present themselves at his doors and demand, as the real owners of the soil, a second payment. Nine-tenths of the whole of the European lands in New Zealand have been acquired by the Settlers under the operation of the Crown's "pre-emptive right;" and most assuredly, speaking from my own and many of my friends' personal experience of the "sharp practice," to use a mild term, of the Maori, I would rather give the Crown one pound per acre for a thousand acres of land to-morrow than any Native, or Tribe, or section of a Tribe, one shilling.

5. (See page 6.)

"Lard Sharks."—Twenty years ago this was a term rife in Am and New Zealand. Land-Sharks were
mostly found among the speculative Capitalists of Australia, and the Masters of the Australian Whalers and Traders. Some Chief visiting Sydney, or some Native going on board a coasting vessel and wanting a gun, a bag of sugar, blankets, spirits, or tobacco would "sell," to use a term, some block of Land to the Land-Shark—other Natives would sell the same block, or other blocks to the same or other buyers, and in this way, by 1840, rather more Land had been "purchased" in New Zealand than New Zealand had Land to furnish.

6. (See page 7.)

The Maori's Titles to Land. Eating the Owners.—The history of the negotiations carried on during the last twenty years by the Crown Authorities with the New Zealand Natives for the purchase of portions of their wild territories would afford some very remarkable, and some very amusing, illustrations of the "comprehensive views" our Maori friends are capable of taking when the question arising is one relating to their, so called, "rights and titles" to Land. Two or three may be given. In his evidence before our New Zealand House of Commons Committee on "Native Matters," Mr. MacLean, the Chief for twenty years of the Native Land Purchasing Department, a gentleman who in his admirable knowledge of Maori character, language, and customs, is almost a Maori himself, tells us this,—"The principal difficulties which have to be contended with in acquiring land from the Native arise out of the necessity of insisting on proof of such merely asserted claims, and of excluding those who fail to substantiate them from participation in the money paid for the land. I know of instances in which the most frivolous pretences have been used to justify such demands. I have found Natives, after attempting to substantiate an asserted claim to land, and failing to do so for want of a good title, evince a great disappointment at their defeat. On one occasion a Native actually came to me and, with the greatest coolness, asked whether (since he had failed in his first attempt) he could not bring forward a claim to an island in the South Seas from which his ancestors had come 600 years ago. The idea was absurd. I asked him whether he really meant what he said. He replied that he did. I told him he might as well have preferred a claim to a portion of the moon. His reply was that he was descended from Ha'wea o te Mamma. Finding, however, that it was useless to prefer a fictitious claim, he gave the question up. I allude to this circumstance to show that too much attention to merely asserted claims may entail considerable inconvenience, danger, and expense to the country. I do not wish to throw doubts upon any just claims of theirs, and am fully aware that every acre of land in this island, not acquired by the Crown, is their property."

Another illustration is afforded by that excellent Missionary, the Rev. Mr. Taylor, where, in his work on New Zealand he relates this anecdote:—"A gentleman entering my house, knocked his head against a beam and cut his eyebrow, so that blood flowed. The natives present deplored the accident, and said that according to their law, the house would have been forfeited to him; and that as they were of his party, it would have been their duty to have seen it given up to him; as every one present was affected by his blood being shed. In the same way, even if a canoe should be dashed on shore in a storm, and the owner's life endangered, he thereby acquires a title to the spot he is thrown on."

A third illustration of the peculiar fashion by which the Maori claims and acquires his "Title" is afforded by the modus operandi followed by that Band of Ngatiawa Weasels, mentioned in this pamphlet at page 82. I have conversed with a very intelligent old Native who was one of these emigrants to the Chathams. He described the Moriori as being rather smaller and darker than the New Zealanders but still delicate eating; while eels were found in great profusion. Taking the land and eating the owner, is certainly a mode of acquiring a right to the soil far more complete than any practised in Westminster Hall.

7. (See page 13.)

Settler's Blackened Homesteads and Loss of Property.—It has been said that twenty-three Homesteads were blazing in one day in New Plymouth; about 300, altogether, have been burned or destroyed there, and I believe that the loss of property in this little Settlement, where the entire white population does not exceed a few hundreds, has been estimated at considerably over a quarter of a million sterling. I do not, however, at all wish to urge this as any special grievance against the Maori—in the field he has no refinements as to combatants and non-combatants—his "way of war" is to burn and slay all be can.

8. (See page 14.)

Maori Massacres of Former Days.—Instance No. 1. In 1820 Hongi, New Zealand's Napoleon, as he has been called, brought over to England by the Missionaries as a shining specimen of their Converts, was presented at Court, and received from George the Fourth congenial presents of powder and guns. On getting back to New Zealand he found that one of his people had been knocked on the head in some quarel with a neighbour Tribe whose Chief was one Hinaki. Poor Hinaki sued for peace, and offered every reparation—but
he was the Lamb in the fable—the Wolf meant to eat him: there were the new weapons, too, to flesh. In the first battle between them Hinaki was shots when the "converted" Hongi scooped out the eye of the dying man, swallowed it, and then stabbed him in the neck and drank his blood. About 1,000 Natives were slaughtered in this one fight, and about 300 cooked and eaten. On Hongi's triumphant return to the Bay Islands he had twenty captives in his own canoe, whom he had picked out for slaves; but his daughter, who had lost her husband in the fight, with dishevelled locks rushed down to the water's edge as the canoe touched the shore, and seizing the sword presented to her father by George the Fourth's own hand, jumped on board, and smote off several of the poor captives' heads. Twenty more of the wretched Prisoners were killed and eaten; yet the frantic woman, not thinking that the shade of her husband was sufficiently appeased even with this sacrifice, went into the bush with a musket, and there shot herself. The ball, however, only passing through her arm instead of her head, she was still alive when found; but, determined to accompany her husband to the Reinga, she afterwards strangled herself.

Hongi had no sooner finished one expedition than he prepared for another. He quickly assembled a thousand men, and proceeded with them to Mercury Bay, to make war upon the tribes of that district; ordering another army of two thousand more to be raised, and to follow him. Success again attended his arms; and, flushed with victory, be next attacked Kaipara, where he made a great slaughter. In 1822, he again visited the Thames and the Waikato, and ascended the Waipa, where he took several large Pahs; thence he nearly penetrated as for as the Wanganui—in this expedition he slew fifteen hundred of his enemies.

In 1823, he attacked Rotorua, conveying his canoes by water, as far as possible, and then dragging them by a road he had cut through the forest, to the lake. Here again he was victorious, and slew many. He continued every year his hostile raids, first to one part and then to another, always with success. His name spread terror wherever he went. In fact, he became the Napoleon of New Zealand, declaring, when remonstrated with by the missionaries, that he should not desist until he had subjected the entire island to his control, and that as England had but one King, so, likewise, should there only be one in New Zealand.

Instance No. 2. In 1825, a Cook's Strait Native, one Pehi, was killed and eaten by Te Tamai, a Middle Island chief. In revenge of this, Pehi's Tribe bribed the brutal master of one of the Sydney Traders, with a load of flax, to carry them down to Te Tamai's strong' hold, where they landed and stormed the Pah with such terrible slaughter that 500 baskets of human flesh are said to have been carried back to the Schooner, Te Tamai was taken prisoner, carried away to Cook's Straits, and delivered up to Pehi's widow. At first, and for about a fortnight, she behaved so kindly to him that a stranger might have taken them for man and wife rather than for doomed captive and mortal foe. She dressed him in her finest mats, and decked his head with her choicest feathers—then, one day, had him tied to a tree, and while in this position, took a spear, stabbed him in the jugular, placed her mouth to the orifice, and drank his blood warm. has it gushed forth.

Instance No. 3. Some while previous to 1833, a fishing canoe of the Waikatoes was driven ashore at the Waitara, in the beautiful Taranaki Country, when most of the wrecked crew were cruelly murdered and eaten by the Ngatiawa Tribe then dwelling there. In revenge of this, the late Te Whero Whero, alias Te Potatau, a great chief of the Waikato, and the Native who was chosen for the first Maori King by the present Rebels (a potentate, too, with whom I once had the honor of smoking a pipe), made a fell swoop on the Ngatiawa—stormed their fortress at Pukerangiora, pitched over the cliff, tomahawked, and slew some eleven hundred men, women, and children; picked out about two hundred for slaves, and then marched back with many baskets of flesh, leaving Pukerangiora such a shambles that the air, for miles around, was tainted with the odour of putridity. A party of the fugitive Tribe, escaping from this massacre, formed that Band of Ngatiawa Weasels, alluded to at page 82, who afterwards got over to the Chatham Isles and ate up the poor Moriori.

9. (See page 14)

CESSION of TRIBAL WARS and MASSACRES after the commencement of regular COLONISATION in 1840.—In a pamphlet put forth the other day by the so-called Aborigines Protection Society—but whose better style and title would be the "Aborigines Destruction Society"—and which I believe has been widely circulated among Members of the Legislature in the hope of getting a crushing Verdict there against the Colonists in some Debate on New Zealand Affairs—it is virtually asserted, among other fictions, that the Security of Life and Property enjoyed by the Natives in New Zealand has been no greater since England's Colonisation of the Country than it was before. Now, undoubtedly, cases of murder, and even two or three of those graver squabbles among the Tribes, leading to little battles, did occur after 1840—but to any man who has lived in New Zealand, and known it for the last twenty years, the Sun at high noon is not more patent to him than that the Security of life and Property which has been enjoyed by the Natives in New Zealand since the regular colonisation of the Country commenced is as much greater than that enjoyed before as the Security now enjoyed in England is greater than that enjoyed in the days of Norman William and the Scandanavian Vikings.
10. (See page 23.)

SOCIETY.—Whatever may have been the defects of that Wakefield System of Colonisation on which New Zealand was settled the System did at least do this—it drew over a much higher class of emigrants to the Colony than any which had ever left the Mother Country since the Puritan towns of Massachusetts and the Cavalier Settlements of Virginia were founded; and selected its free and assisted-passage emigrants so carefully that almost every mechanic and labourer carried to New Zealand has been a "picked" man. Petres, Staffords, Pierpoints, Molesworths, Clifffords, Dillons, Tancreeds, Tollemefies, Congreves, Welds, Worteleys, Vavasours, Cholmondeleys, scions of many an old English family, have settled in New Zealand. Retired professional men turned agriculturists, 'vieux moustache' of the Line or Indian service, grown cunning in wool; enterprising younger sons who have had the good sense to abandon Regent Street and the life of the clubs; quiet rural families, with broods of sons and daughters, most of them living on and creating their little estates; with a considerable sprinkling of black coats, scarlet coats, government officials, and the mercantile classes, constitute half the present pioneering population of the country. No stranger, I think, would now visit the Colony without being agreeably surprised at the high, if homely, tone of society, and forcibly struck with the steady, industrious character of all orders of the young community. Indeed, for friendliness of feeling, pleasantness of intercourse, intellectual and moral endowments, I should say that the social circles of New Zealand would be found quite equal to those which the emigrant family might have left in England, Crime, too, we must recollect, is all but non-existent; while the republican licence so offensive to the Englishman in Yankee Land, and that "convict taint" which still reveals itself through a large portion of Australia are alike unknown. Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South"

11. (See page 32).

COLONIES relieving the MOTHER COUNTRY from the "STRAIN of surplus POPULATION."—AMERICA, herein, no substitute for COLONIES.—It has been shallowly urged by the Goldwin Smith School, that the vast benefits Colonies confer on the Mother Country in relieving her from that fearful "strain of surplus people," which some millions more of accumulated Population must have subjected her to, would have been just as fully and effectually conferred on her if she had had no Colonies—inasmuch as, in that case, she would have been relieved of the "strain of surplus people" by the United States. But, a familiarity with Emigrants and Emigration shows us that the vast majority of those who in the last forty years have moved from the Mother Country to her Colonies have been those who have chosen British Colonies for their new homes either because they had a fear or horror of democratic institutions, or because they had a dread or dislike of sinking their nationality, and changing their old imperial flag—they have been Emigrants, in fact, who, had there been no British Colonies to go to would, for the most part, have stayed at home.

Again, any argument based on the assumption that it would have been equally beneficial to the Mother Country whether her surplus hordes had found homes in her own Colonies or in the United States, is radically false, and for this reason:—it is mainly the blood and vigour which America has drawn off from Great Britain, during the last half century, which has enabled America to swell into the rude aggressive power she is:—if all British Emigrants who have left our shores in the last half century had spread themselves over our own Emigration Fields in Canada, in Africa, in Australasia, instead of going, for the larger part, to the United states, Jonathan would not now have been thinking of sending in to Mr. Bull a certain heavy bill, headed "Damages per Alabama,"—a bill which may yet have to be discharged in blood.

The Goldwin Smith School assert, too, that in the matter of creating or extending our Over-sea Trade the United States would have done for us all which Colonies have done for us—or, in other words, that we should have had as large an Over-sea Trade without Colonies as with them. But, for the very same reasons why and wherefore the United States could not have relieved the Mother Country from her Strain of People," they could not have created for and supplied her with her Colonial Trade.

Again, not only is it politically better for our Emigrants to be spread over the world as British subjects in British communities, than that they should be concentrated in America, as Citizens of a Foreign Power, but it is economically and industrially better—if we had had no Colonists in Australasia where would our wool and gold have come from?

12. (See page 36.)

HEKÉ BURNING KORORAREKA.—" Honé Heké, a distinguished missionary chief of the Bay of Islands, had long driven a thriving trade amid the lawless colonisers of Kororareka—bartering his pigs, potatoes, peaches, slave-girls, and native produce, with whalers and traders for powder, guns, blankets, knicknacks and tobacco.
The hoisting of the British flag at Kororareka, the introduction of some; law, the imposition of customs duties, had sadly crippled this thriving trade, and driven to other shores many of the fishing freebooters who had long revelled on the beach. With the ships, went Heké's income. His mark to this Waitangi Treaty had created him a British subject—but it had created Customs, stopped the pig trade, and made beauty a drug. The British flag-staff symbolised the Customs, He cut it down. Smitten on the one cheek. Governor Fitzroy turned the other. By stroke of pen he abolished Customs throughout New Zealand; when Heké, at the entreaty of his spiritual advisers, sent a note of apology. But whalers did not instantly come back—they had not heard of Customs sudden death. Heké was impatient; he cut the flag-staff down a second time. Missionary authorities remonstrated and set it up once, this time as they tell us, "sheathed with iron"—but not with majesty. Heke cut it down a third time; then burnt down the town and drove the inhabitants to Auckland. Heké, almost an elder of the church, a chief, as a missionary author tells us, "distinguished for his knowledge of the Scriptures," actually burning down his Queen's towns! slaying and harrying Her Majesty's white subjects Well might the missionary officials of the Privy Council exclaim, "et tu brute!" They offered £100 for his head. Hoké at once replied by offering 1000 acres of land for the governor's head—a high price, but Heke was always a liberal savage. Soldiers were brought over from Sydney; natives, old tribe foes of Heké, delighted to cross tomahawks with him once more, were enlisted as allies, and war burst out. Having long coddled our convert we had now to thrash him."—Hursthouse's New Zealand, the "Britain of the South."

13 (See page 38.)

The Rebel Land League—In May, 1849, the entire tribe met at Turangarere, on the occasion of the opening of a new church. The subject of land sales was introduced at that meeting, and warmly discussed. It was proposed that no person or family should sell land within the boundary of the Ngatiruanui territory without the general consent of the tribe. This proposal was approved by many, but the meeting was not unanimous. Many asserted their right to do as they pleased with their own; and Hona and Karipa persisted in their determination to sell. The opponents to selling pushed their views, and sought to make it "Te Tikanga o te Iwi" (the law of the tribe) that no individual or family should alienate land without the consent of the whole tribe. To make the law popular and binding, they determined on a more general meeting, and to invite all the tribes along the coast to join them in this measure. Tamati Reina, a zealous opponent of land sales, made a tour along the coast from New Plymouth to Wellington, soliciting the co-operation of the principal chiefs. The proposal was that a League be formed that should be both defensive and offensive in its operations, not merely binding its members not to sell, but also prohibiting others from selling, and which should employ any amount of force they might be able to command in carrying out their measures. Tamati met with a favourable reception at Waitara, at Otaki, and from some of the Wellington chiefs. After the usual amount of agitation, a great meeting was summoned to be held at Manawapou, for which extensive preparations were made. A large house was built, said to be the largest ever erected in the country, measuring 120 feet in length by 35 in breadth. Matioi Te Whiwhi, who attended this meeting, named the building "Taiporohenui," a word that is used as a symbol of union. The meeting was held in 1854, about 1000 persons attended, and the following measures were resolved upon:—

"1st. That from this time forward no more land shall be alienated to Europeans without the general consent of the confederation.

"2nd. That in reference to the Ngatiruanui and Taranaki tribes, the boundaries of the pakeha shall be Kai Iwi on the south side, and a place within a short distance of New Plymouth on the north.

"3rd. That no European Magistrate shall have Jurisdiction within native boundaries, but all disputes shall be settled by the Rūnanga.

"To give solemnity to the proceedings, and confirm the bond into which they entered with each other, they buried a New Testament in the earth and raised a cairn of stones on the spot; and to re-assert and perpetuate their determination, parties have been appointed to beat the boundaries at certain periods.

"This was the origin of the notorious Taranaki Land League, which evidently contains the elements of the present King movement, and which has proved so fruitful a source of dissension among the Tribes of that district, caused so much bloodshed, and brought about the present collision between W. King and Sis Excellency the Governor.

"Its fruits soon appeared. But a few months after its formation, land was offered for sale to the Government by a tribe not connected with the League, and Rawiri Waiataua, a Native Assessor, went with his people to cut the boundary. Katatoré one of the most active chiefs in the League, with sixty armed men, met them on the land, and fired at Rawiri's party, killing seven and wounding ten, Rawiri being among the dead. Thus commenced the native war at Taranaki, which has continued from that time to this, and has at length involved the Governor in a conflict with the obstructive party that threatens to be more serious in its results than any of the collisions of
former years."—From the Rev. Thomas Buddle's (Wesleyan Missionary) able Pamphlet on the "King 
Movement."

14. (See Note page 68.)

SELLING HALF NEW ZEALAND to FRANCE.—Among the various schemes and crotchets of Mr. Fitzgerald 
and the Gentlemen of the New Zealand "Peace Party," for the settlement of the Northern Troubles, I almost 
wonder we have not seen one for the sale of the North Island to France. Looking at the order that would 
be taken with our Maori friends under the Tricolor, this, probably, would be a scheme somewhat distasteful to Mr. 
Buxton and Exeter Hall—but it would be one by no means repugnant, I should say, to the advanced views of 
Professor Gold win Smith, and it might prove to be one very acceptable to France.

Compared to the North Island of New Zealand, the cherished Settlements of France in the neighbouring 
Northern Polynesia are mere tropical rocks. France, as has been shown at page 88, originally ran a neck and 
neck race with us for the whole of New Zealand; and would now, perhaps, count Mr. Gladstone down, say, ten 
or twenty millions for half New Zealand.

The North Island Colonists might object to being sold to France—but the matter of what particular Cat such 
small Mice were killed by would be quite beneath "la haute politique" of the Shepherd Princes of the South.

Finis.

GEO WITT, Printer, Earl's Court, Leicester square, London.

Remarks
On the Credit of New Zealand and the Honour of Great Britain.
Addressed "To those who extend their thoughts beyond the present, and who do not consider it inconsistent with prudence 
and philosophy to calculate the future—to those who are of opinion that value exists in reversion, as well as in 
possession—to those who believe that the infancy and youth of States may be feeble and costly, whilst their 
progress and maturity may be largely profitable—to those who think that a balance-sheet does not afford the 
only solution to public questions, and that duty and honour are more enduring, as well as more sacred bonds, 
than mere profit and loss."—Old Reviewer.

Remarks, &c.

The dream of an able speculative politician is about to be realized. The ties which bind England to her 
Colonies, and specially to New Zealand, are to be no longer those of dependence—"the mere political link of 
Sovereignty is alone to remain." We are now to behold "England as retaining the seat of the chief executive 
authority, the prescriptive reverence of her station, the superiority belonging to her vast accumulated wealth, 
and as the Commercial Metropolis of the World; and united, By these Ties Only with a hundred nations,"—no 
longer colonies.

Merivale on Colonization, Vol. II., pages 291 and 293.
Whatever may be the case with the other 99 colonies, it seems clear that the declared policy of the Colonial 
Office in regard to New Zealand, and the consequent proceedings of the responsible government of that colony 
must lead to the establishment of some such state of things.

On the 26th of January, 1865, Mr. Cardwell, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, having to define 
clearly the relations between the . Imperial and Colonial Governments in regard to the control of questions 
affecting peace and war, thus deliberately communicates his views:—
"On my own part I have always declared my determination not to interfere with the principle of social 
self-government, as regards the affairs either of the colonists or of the natives. But self-government means the 
control by any people of their own forces, their own finances, and their own relations of peace and war. It does 
not mean that the right of establishing a policy shall belong to one body, and the duty of providing the means of 
carrying that policy into effect shall be laid upon another."

Despatch to Sir George Grey. New Zealand Papers, 9th Feb., 1865; page 20

On the receipt of this despatch the ministry of New Zealand, anxious to grasp unlimited authority, at once 
accepted the distinction pointed out—determined to send away the British troops, and to wage war with their 
own forces and their own finances, taking care to avail themselves of the troops whilst they were allowed to 
remain (but without payment), merely by way of "moral force," and making use of the Governor's name as a 
becoming form—a mere political link of sovereignty! Hence we find that, on the 2nd September last, the 
Responsible Ministry proclaimed peace throughout the whole of New Zealand, and on the 4th day of the same
month proclaimed martial law at Opotiki and Whakatane, the most densely peopled native districts of the northern island;

New Zealand Gazette, No. 35; 5th September, 1865.

and in order that there may be no mistake about these steps and *the consequences*, in the minds of the British public (creditors of the colony?), Mr. John Morrison, the agent of the New Zealand Government, is instructed to write to the leading London journals,

See Letter, 15th November, 1865.

and to call their special attention to the fact that these proclamations are not only signed by the Governor, "G. Grey," but also countersigned in each case by a responsible minister, "Fred A. Weld," or "J. C. Richmond."

God save the Queen!

That the tribes of New Zealand are *independent communities*, and not British subjects, was long since insisted upon by Mr. Cardwell

Despatch to Sir George Grey, 26th April, 1864.

as being the sole legal warrant for confiscating their lands after defeat. The colonial scheme of confiscation has been carried out on this footing, and at the date of the above proclamations two measures were pending before the General Assembly of the colony for the express purpose of conferring on the natives the status and privileges of British subjects.

It cannot well be disputed, therefore, that the prerogative of declaring war and concluding peace has, in a limited form, been conceded to the responsible Government of the colony; and as any laws now passed by the General Assembly of any colony are valid, although opposed to the instructions of the Governor, so long as they do not offend against any act of the Imperial Parliament extending to the colony, or any order or regulation made there under.

See 28 & 29 Vict, cap. 63.

it appears that the Governor and his ministry, with a majority of the assembly, are left perfectly unfettered, and are armed with powers of the most unlimited character. This state of things may be the legitimate result of "the mere political link of sovereignty!" principle, and many other consequences, probably not quite expected, but which will be alluded to in the sequel, may unavoidably flow from it. One thing, however, is certain, that those who are best acquainted with the financial and social position of New Zealand have a strong conviction that the proceedings now being taken in the colony will inaugurate quite a new regime, which may seriously affect the position of the creditors of New Zealand. The British taxpayer is no longer to be called upon to support a war in New Zealand, but English capitalists may voluntarily lend their money to the New Zealand Government for the purpose.

The sovereignty of the islands thus far, at all events, would seem to be henceforth practically transferred to Lombard Street. Whatever evils result, cannot raise a question of law—honour—or humanity, but simply one of £. s. d. Redress cannot, therefore, be fairly looked for in Downing Street, much less from Her Majesty in Council.

As the war must be carried on by loans, and not out of current revenue, the finance companies and capitalists of England are alone vested with the constitutional check of refusing supplies.

In the interest then of the monied classes, as well as of those to whom these pages are addressed, it is desired to point out, before any further loans are contracted, that the first conditions of any power to make war are absolutely wanting in the present position of the islands of New Zealand, viz., **UNITY OF RESOURCES AND UNITY OF POLICY**.

I.—**Want of Unity of Resources.**

When the colony of Victoria determined to borrow nine millions sterling for the purpose of carrying out great reproductive works (railways and waterworks), it pledged the whole of its revenues, ordinary and territorial, for that purpose. There are some plain people who consider that when New Zealand came into the market to borrow moneys for war expenditure, whether with or without the aid of the British taxes, it ought to have followed this example. When a state or nation engages in war, the whole nation ought surely to assume the responsibility, and all the resources of the entire nation ought to be pledged for its support. The late Duke of Newcastle distinctly called the attention of the Colonial Treasurer to this plain duty so far back as the 26th May, 1862. "It does not appear to occur to him," he says, in his despatch to Sir George Grey, "that the portion of that revenue which is so applied as to relieve municipalities from the necessity of imposing local taxes, might be applied in whole or in part to the more pressing needs of the colony, and that the portion of that revenue which is devoted to public works and colonization may, in times of disaster, and particularly in time of civil war, which is disaster, be directed to the paramount object of averting absolute ruin." This kind of policy did not, however, suit the statesmen (?) of New Zealand, and accordingly the whole territorial revenue of the...
islands has been withheld from the security offered for their government loans, and this entirely in the interest and for the benefit of the settlers of the Southern Island, who have the uninterrupted use and enjoyment of forty-three millions of acres against the ten millions of acres which even now, after the war, form the only demesne lands of the Crown in the possession of the settlers of the Northern Island.

The special benefit to the province of Canterbury may be judged from the fact that the whole of the expenditure voted by the Provincial Council for that province, in 1854, was as follows:—

A very modest and moderate sum, it must be confessed, says the editor of the Canterbury Press, for a population of 30,000 persons in times of great financial depression. See Canterbury Press, October 1st, 1864.

There can be little doubt that it is owing mainly to this circumstance that New Zealand 8 per cent, debentures have been selling in the London market below par,

Crown Agent's Letter to Colonial Treasurer.

whilst Victorian 6 per cents, were readily saleable at 106.

The following table, in which the statistics of New Zealand are compared with those of Victoria, clearly proves that New Zealand, with only one-third of the population of Victoria, has already developed resources which, relatively to the amount of their respective actual debts, afford quite an equal security if the whole resources of the country were pledged for the purpose:—

Comparison of Statistics of New Zealand, 1865, With Statistics of Victoria (Australia), 1863. Live Stock. Exports of Colonial Produce. Demesne Lands. Native Territory. Total Area. Acres under cultivation. Amount realized by Land Sales during year. Total Population exclusive of Military and Natives. Horses. Cattle. GOLD. Value. WOOL. Value. VICTORIA, 1863 55,630,000 NIL 55,680,000 507,798 £ 450,646 574,331 103,328 675,272 7, 115,943 £ 6,520,957 £ 2,049,491 NEW ZEALAND, 1865 53,000,000 20,000,000 73,000,000 1,070,203 506,654 171,931 49,401 249,021 4,945,473 3,000,000+ 1,250,000‡ Shipping. Revenue Colonial Debt. Inwards. Outwards. VICTORIA, 1863 1739 624,061 1782 618,052 £ £ 3,000,000 about £ 8,828,970 £ 8,828,970 £ Nil. NEW ZEALAND, 1865 115§ 419,935 1094 394,665 943,500 Estimated in Financial Statement. 606,830 1,550,330 3,650,000 2,644,000 6,294,000 4,308,268 1,985,732†† * Acres meed. Allowing 20 per cent increase only over export of 1863. Amount under estimated. — See Postscript. ‡ Allocating 50 per cent, increase over export of 1863. § Actual return for 1863. † Actual revenue of 1862, exclusive of Government Scrip and Land-Orders, equal to £13,200. The return of land sales for 1864 is not complete, except as to Southern Island, where the land sales produced £519,940! thus: NELSON MARLBOROUGH CANTERBURY OTAGO SOUTHLAND ¶ This is the total given by the Registrar General's statistics, 1863; but the Colonial Treasurer states the amount at £6,615,500. †† Apportioned thus: General £602,623 Provincial 1,383,109 £1,935,732

But it is not in the present depressed price of New Zealand Government securities that this selfish exceptional policy has worked a wrong to the settlers of New Zealand, both North and South.

When the late Treasurer of New Zealand negotiated the loan of three millions in this country, for the Waikato wax, the British Government offered to guarantee one million, at 4 per cent., if the lands of the colony were charged therewith; but the New Zealand Government refused to sanction this course, and consequently instead of one million sterling being raised, at 4 per cent., only £803,657 were realized by the issue of debentures: the operation, in addition to the increased interest of 1 per cent., inflicting a positive loss of £196,343 on the colony. Again, the war has been carried on since November, 1864, by raising the necessary funds by short loans, at 8 per cent., and the whole three millions loan shall have been expended. The amount required for this purpose, as estimated by Sir George Grey, being simply one million sterling!

See Letter to Mr, Cardwell, 8th April, 1865.

and lastly (concurrently with these operations) to induce the British Government to forego its claim for £40 per head for all British soldiers who, during the year 1865, shall have been in the colony in excess of 5,000 men:

See Sir Frederick Rogers' Despatch to Colonial Treasurer, 26th May, 1864.

and from that date its claim for a like sum for every man in excess of one regiment, viz., 1,000 men.

Now in what way does the "Weld Ministry hope to carry out these operations? Simply (in the same breath that it affects to dispense with British aid) by asking the Home Government to cover with its guarantee a 4 per cent. loan for three millions, thus making with the one million loan at; per cent, and the £650,000 loan, a total
general government debt of nearly five million!

See Financial Statement of Colonial Treasurer, and Sir George Grey's letter,

The question is—will the Home Government consent to give this guarantee—and if it does, will it not, and ought it not to require that the territorial revenue should form part of the security?

The Home Government has refused.—See Postscript.

It will, no doubt, be said that the territorial revenue has been pledged for provincial loans, and that for this reason the guarantee formerly offered could not be accepted, but it clearly appears from the General Registrar's return,

No. 36, Statistics of New Zealand for 1863.

that although on the 31st December, 1863, £2,644,000 had been authorised to be borrowed for the provinces, only £689,750 had been then actually raised. It is possible, also, that nearly a similar amount may have been since raised by the provinces; but, however this may be, any security given to the Home Government can easily be made subject to the actually existing provincial debt, whilst all further borrowing for provincial purposes ought to be entirely stayed, so long as the colony chooses to be at war, or be permitted only, subject to the paramount claims of the general government for all further monies required for this extraordinary expenditure. The colonial ministers will, no doubt, reply, as they already have distinctly intimated, that this proposition being opposed to the interests of the settlers of the Southern Island, is "simply impracticable.""
Auckland and Taranaki, have been experiencing all the miseries of the native war in their own persons, and at their very doors. To them the war has been domestic dissension or civil war, whilst to the South it has been simply a foreign war; and Sir James Mackintosh has clearly pointed out what little effect the latter has on the feelings, habits, and condition of the majority of a nation, to most of whom the worst particulars of the war may be unknown. Indeed, excepting a few military settlers, consisting for the most part of new arrivals from Australia, it may be doubted whether any of the Southern provinces have contributed even a score of original settlers as volunteers, for the aid of their fellow colonists in the North.

As regards contributions in money, the case stands no better—until the amended tariff came into operation about twelve months since, the expenses of the war were scarcely directly felt by the Southern settlers. The Comissariat Chest and the Bank of New Zealand kindly kept the Colonial Treasurer in funds whilst the borrowing process was going on here. When this proved unsuccessful, and the scheme of confiscation failed to repay the expenditure, the Southern members resolved, if possible, to stop the war, and dispense altogether with the assistance of the British forces, provided they could centralize the Government in their own hands at Wellington. "Unity of the colony," and "Reliance on our own resources," are favorite party cries of the Weld ministry.

See Weld's Memorandum and Fitzherbert's Financial Statement, August, 1865.

By the former they clearly mean simple centralization, whilst the latter phrase, despite their protestations to the contrary, means nothing more than reliance on substantial assistance from the Home Government.

The Weld ministry are in truth afraid to touch the territorial revenue lest they lose the support of the Southern members, who boldly avow that the lands of the South are their own inheritance, available solely for the improvement by means of roads, railways, and other local works, of the lands already purchased by themselves and the other settlers in the Southern provinces; and the South, instead of assenting to the idea of an united colony, are prepared to vote, as will presently be seen, for an entire separation of the two islands, if any further taxation for native war is to be resorted to.

The great object of the South, "centralization," has already been carried out. Although possessing from their pastoral occupations more wealth and leisure than any other class of colonists, the Southern settlers complained of the voyage to and from Auckland (the seat of Government) as an insupportable grievance, and, at last, by a majority of one, the rights of the Auckland settlers, like those of the original settlers at Taranaki, were confiscated, and the seat of Government has now been actually removed from Auckland to Wellington. In consequence, Auckland, on the one land, is insisting on entire separation from the South, whilst Otago, in the extreme South, for its own special reasons, is also insisting on separation from the North.

This brings us to our second point—

II.—Want of Unity of Policy.

The policy of the Weld ministry, now that it has been joined by Mr. Fitzgerald, one of the members for Canterbury Province, and who is the proprietor and editor of the Canterbury Press, cannot be mistaken.

The withdrawal of every single soldier of the British forces from New Zealand has been made a sine qua non by this gentleman; not as a saving to the mother country or the colony, but as absolutely essential for the full development of responsible government according to his notions—

"We know well," he says, "that, so long as the army remains in the colony, and the Secretary of State can send to the Governor, ordering him to do this, that, and the other, so long the Governor must be held responsible to the Crown for all that is done under his Government. He ought, in our view, to be little more than an officer of State; and the real meaning of giving Responsible Government to a colony is to make the Governor's position one of State and ceremony rather than of political power."

Canterbury Press, 7th October, 1864.

"If the latter were the case," he says, on another occasion, "what business has the Governor to write letters to the Home Government, charging the Queen's ministers with driving the natives to desperation? Nay, we may go further and say, what business has he to write at all except as he shall be advised by his ministers to write? Did that ministerial responsibility which has been so much talked of really exist, such would be the position of the Governor in the colony. But it does not."

Ibid. 5th October, 1864.

And "Thank God it does not" would be the exclamation of ninety nine out of every hundred colonists, both in the North and South, if the question were put to them; for they recognize in these pretensions nothing less than the triumph of the attempt of the old New Zealand Company, to establish a separate authority, in fact, sovereign power in the Islands of New Zealand, in the hands of an irresponsible clique at Cook's Straits. Let us take—
1.—The Opposition of the North.

It must always be recollected that New Zealand not only consists of several distinct colonies, each having ends and interests almost as separate and well defined as the five colonies of Eastern Australia; but that a broad line of demarcation, in truth, antagonism, exists between the Northern Province, Auckland—formerly known as Province of New Ulster, formed under the auspices of the British Government—and the Southern settlements formed in the Province of New Minister by and through the New Zealand Company. This antagonism had its origin in the very foundation of the colony; for the cession of the sovereignty of New Zealand and the establishment of Auckland as the seat of Government were adopted by the British Government expressly to check the illegal proceedings of the Company (then an association merely) in endeavoring to establish sovereign power at Wellington, to which we have already referred. No sooner were these proceedings checked than the Company and its settlers opposed themselves in every way to the authority of the Government because established in the North, and strove to obtain its removal to Cook's Straits, resorting to every imaginable device to depreciate the great natural advantages of the North as a field for settlement.

When these efforts failed, the Company (then in extremis) strove to obtain a separate proprietary government for the South as the field of European colonization, whilst the North was to be left under the separate Government of the crown. The suggestions for this purpose drawn up by the late Mr. Charles Buller, and forwarded by Viscount Ingestrie on behalf of the New Zealand Company to Lord Stanley, are conclusive as to the injustice and impropriety of establishing a central Government at Wellington, as now sought by the Weld ministry. After pointing out that the proceedings of the Government in the North were based on the missionary system, whilst the settlements of the New Zealand Company were founded on the colonizing principle, the paper proceeds thus:—

"These two systems are essentially antagonistic, for the chief scene of the missionary labors has been the Northern Peninsula of the Northern Island. A great proportion of the native population is there—Auckland is there, with the tribes with which the colonial Government has come in contact.

"The chiefs, whose independence we acknowledged, are entirely included in that district, and there alone can the treaty of Waitangi have any legal force, because there alone can it be asserted that the title of the Crown was founded on cession thereby. On the other hand, this district, from the number of natives, &c. &c., does not present a very attractive field for colonization. It contains, however, the positions most desirable for the purposes of a naval station commanding the Pacific, and is the sole repository of that Kauri timber, which is so valuable to our navy.

"This Northern Peninsula should be made a separate government; whether it could be directly placed under the missionaries we cannot pretend to determine, but at any rate the religious, societies should be assured that it should be kept strictly under their system, and that the missionaries should be allowed to retain their influence over the natives, whose interest should be the main care of the Government.

"The remainder of the Northern Island, and the whole of the Middle and Southern Islands (being in fact the province of New Minister) should be formed into another government, and be the field of European colonization."

Commons Papers, 6th June, 1845; No, 867.

The ingenious attempt thus made to stop all British colonization in the North, by diverting its streams entirely to the South, as might be expected, did not succeed with the present Earl Derby. The Company were, in effect, told that Great Britain did not intend to abdicate the functions it had undertaken, and that it was better that the Company should die decently, and "relieve themselves, the colony, and the Government from the embarrassments consequent upon the then state of their affairs."

This they at length did in 1850, after founding the additional settlements of Otago and Canterbury. But their spirit has evidently survived them, for "the tone of dictation and authority totally subversive of all authority" of which Governor Hobson complained in 1841 has been and is still maintained by the Southern settlers against those in the North, with the addition of arrogance of language which proves its authors to be totally unfitted for the exercise of the power they seek. The feeling of "bitter rivalry and hostility " of which the same Governor then complained as existing between the Government settlement and that founded by the Company has increased a hundred-fold between Auckland and Wellington, whilst a similar feeling is rapidly springing up between Wellington and Otago in the extreme South.

Nor, indeed is this surprising when it is known that the first act of the new native Minister (Mr. Fitzgerald) was to denounce from his place in the Assembly the Southern settlement (Otago, having 49,000 inhabitants,) as a bubble, and the Northern settlement (Auckland, having 42,000 inhabitants,) as rotten at the core!

The Northern settlers are in fact now contending for the very scheme of separation put forth in the above plan of Mr. Charles Buller; but for various other reasons besides the one there mentioned.
First, Because the Southern members, having succeeded in transferring the seat of Government to Wellington, have entirely excluded the North from any representation in the Government, and they are practically deprived of all power and influence in the Assembly; the North having under the Constitution Act 15 members only against 45 Southern members, who are united on all questions affecting the interests of the South as against the North.

Secondly, Because the great bulk of the native population being within the limits of the Northern province, their affairs cannot be administered at a distance of 300 miles by those unacquainted with the natives or their language. The point cannot be better put than in the language of the Wellington settlers themselves to Governor Hobson in 1841, when urging the removal of the seat of Government to the South:

"The settlers are already brought into contact with a native population of probably 20,000 (?) persons. Without the presence of some controlling power, which may challenge the respect and submission of the natives, and may, at the same time, inspire them with confidence that they shall be maintained in the full enjoyment of their lawful rights, it is impossible to assert that the peaceful intercourse hitherto so happily maintained will be permanent. If, from the absence of such a power, any dissension should unfortunately arise, the presence of your Excellency will be imperatively required, but it may then be too late to cure the evils which an early residence in this place might have prevented; deep-seated distrust and enduring hostility might make the place of the kindness and confidence at present existing."

D. No. 78, Appendix 12, Report of New Zealand Company,

If this were true before hostilities broke out, how much more so is it when the colonists have not only to undertake the work of governing the natives but of first subduing them, and reconciling them to their new rule. Again we quote Mr. Fitzgerald, Canterbury Press, 31st October, 1864:—

"This work is yet to do; nay, rather yet to be commenced. It must be commenced under circumstances of far greater difficulty than of old, because the irritation arising out of the war is a new element sorely complicating the question. It must at least be a task of long years, far longer by reason of the war than it need have been."

Thirdly, Because the settlers of the Northern Province have from the earliest times submitted to the policy of the British rule in regard to the natives, whether founded on the missionary or any other principle. Whilst the settlers in the Wellington and Hawkes Bay districts set the law at defiance, and grow rich by leasing large tracts from the natives, contrary to the ordinance, the settlers of Auckland were, in the words of the New Zealand charter,

"Obedient, aiding and assisting to the Governor."

Although confined within the narrowest limits, they devoted them-selves to commerce, and became the merchants of the islands. Until the recent war, all lands acquired in the Province of Auckland were honestly purchased from the natives, not at a fraction of a farthing, but at an average rate of 3s. per acre, paid out of provincial revenues, and this although, being principally forest and fern lands, it was necessary, owing to the cost of clearing, to give them away to induce immigration from England, and it being, further, the policy of the Government gradually to introduce population so as to outnumber the natives.

The return which the Home Government now makes to the settlers of the Northern Province is to withdraw their troops, and to hand them over, together with the natives, to the Government of the Southern settlers, who, as already shewn, are unwilling to submit to any sacrifice to carry out the task they have undertaken.

Fourthly, Because the Northern settlers and the British people have to thank the Southern settlers for the existence of the recent native wars. Under the old system of British Government in the North, call it what you please, peace was maintained, and the most friendly relations existed between the natives and the settlers.

The state of things then existing is thus truthfully described by Mr. Fitzgerald himself:—

"It is when all the tale is told that history will begin to judge. It will then relate how the English came to New Zealand shores, and were warmly welcomed by the savage islanders; how the natives rapidly dropped their savage customs, abandoned cannibalism, in a great measure gave up their wars, took to English habits, adopted our dress, and used our implements of labor and cultivation. It will tell how for thirty years we lived amongst them, with slight exceptions, in perfect peace, not only in our own settlements and under the protection of our armies, but isolated families, women and children, defenceless in the midst of remote tribes, and yet with no sense of wrong or even of danger. It will record the amazing fact, that, setting aside those scenes in which war was recognised as existing by both races, (and the periods of war have been very brief,) there is hardly an instance during all that time of the murder of a European by a native. It may probably be asserted as a fact that, excepting in those few districts, and at those short times in which we were at war with the natives, there have been more white men murdered by white men than by natives. Do the new comers in those Southern Provinces know this startling fact? When they hear the natives spoken of as a savage people, resisting every effort on our parts to bring them under our law, do the ? public here know that without force, without police, without law, numbers of Englishmen have been living in all parts of the native districts, and have been enjoying their hospitality during the past thirty years? If they do not know it, history will not be so misinformed; and it
will further relate that this people, who are described as acting the part of the dog in the manger in respect of their lands, have voluntarily given up to us something like two-thirds of the whole area of these islands for an amount of remuneration so insignificant that the estate may be almost regarded as a gift. All this will be told with fatal accuracy in times to come; and history will then go on to state, that as we poured more and more of our population into the country, a bitter jealousy arose between the two races in respect to the possession of the land.”

Canterbury Press, May 20, 1864

The peaceful state of things here described might have been continued but for the desire of the Southern settlers for the introduction of responsible government; and with responsible government came the attempt of the South to advise and interfere in the management of native affairs, until at last Governor Browne, yielding himself to the influence, back, and guidance of the squatter spirit of the South, which was then dominant in his responsible Ministry, adopted those disgraceful proceedings for the acquisition of land at Waitara, New Plymouth, which at once precipitated the country into hostile conflict with the natives—a war which 20,000 men (10,000 British troops and 10,000 colonial forces), as was then prophesied by Northern settlers, have not been able to bring to an end.

See Postscript.

The South, according to the admission of the Southern settlers themselves, were wholly responsible for these proceedings. Let us hear Mr. Fitzgerald on this point. He had, on a previous occasion (31st October, 1864) asserted that Christ Church, Canterbury, was represented by a gentleman whose idea of all government was the sword and pistol, and that it was to the principles advocated by Mr. Cracroft Wilson that the disgrace and disaster of New Zealand's condition was due. Mr. Wilson, at a subsequent public meeting, denied this statement, when Mr. Fitzgerald thus meets his denial:—

"But it seems Mr. Wilson is beginning to feel that the war is becoming unpopular and that it is prudent to disown it. With an energy of language which, as with most weak men, never becomes vigorous without becoming vulgar, Mr. Wilson asserts that it is 'a lie' to say that the votes of the Southern members caused the war. It is not safe for men with treacherous memories to handle public affairs. Mr. Wilson must have forgotten that in the debates on the Waitara question as to whether the war policy of the Stafford Ministry should be sanctioned by the House or not, a majority of the Northern members were against the Ministers, a majority of the Southern members were for them. He forgets that Mr. Stafford refused a committee of enquiry into the Waitara question, and that the policy of enforcing the Waitara purchase by force of arms was ratified by a majority of the Southern members. It is humiliating to hear any public men denying well known facts; still more humiliating when the facts are such as he not only would have admitted, but would have boasted of two or three years ago."

Canterbury Press, 26th December, 1864.

Again, the same writer says:—

"For our own part, we shall never cease to feel that if the Middle Island, after having forced the North into the war, now even professes to desert her in it, it will be an act of far greater baseness and selfishness than anything of which Auckland has been guilty in working the war to her own advantage."

Ibid. 4th November, 1864.

This is plain speaking, and other members of the Canterbury Province (Messrs. Crosbie "Word, and Moorhouse,) have also borne honest testimony to the same fact.

Fifthly, The future promises to increase these Northern grievances ten fold.

'All chance of representation of the North in the Assembly is to be still further lessened by a Bill now pending in the Assembly, by which five additional members are to be given to Canterbury, six to Otago and two to Southland, that is to say, thirteen more Southern members, without any increase whatever in the Northern Province.

So far as the North is concerned, the short sum of the matter appears to be this, that the Northern settlers say, "We will not have these men to rule over us." In the language of the Times, they remind the Home Government that whatever may be the rights of the natives, "they certainly are British subjects, and that as long as they choose to remain so, the mother country has no right to deprive them of their heritage." They object to the Governor’s position being one of state and ceremony rather than of political power; they have a great contempt for "this miserable parody of constitutional monarchy with party government and cabinet administration," as it is justly designated by Mr. Goldwin Smith. They will not submit to be practically governed by Southern ministers alone, and to be made the subject of a ridiculous experiment, in order that the Weld ministry and other Southerners may be schooled in politics and politeness, however necessary that may be. Listen to Mr. Fitzgerald on this point:—

"But those who have played in the great game of politics know that the soul of all party government lies in the noble ambition of men to carry into action the speculations of their brains; and that place and power are
only valuable as affording opportunity for the gratification of this longing, which is ever keener and purer the greater the mind that feels it. But who would care to devote his intellect and time and labor to the public service, if, no matter how successfully he may have striven in promulgating a view, it is liable to be overthrown and spoiled at any moment by the crotchets and caprices of a power responsible to no one."

November 8th, 1864.

Again:—

"Our second objection to Separation is, that by reducing the size, and with the size the number of interests of the colony, the whole standard of its public life will be lowered, and the tone of its public men dwarfed and stunted; we should be descending towards the Vestry instead of ascending towards the Parliament. Little interests make little minds."

November 4, 1864.

The colonists of the Auckland Province having settled in New Zealand under the auspices of the British Government, and faithfully assisted heretofore in forwarding its objects, conceive that the Home Government had better have allowed the New Zealand Company to establish a separate authority in Wellington in 1840, or have adopted their above-mentioned scheme of 1845, than now abandon the North and direct the settlers there to recognise the sovereignty of the South. They cannot help themselves in what is called a "constitutional mode," having no voice in the Assembly; and if they had, that body cannot pass an Act to alter the Constitution and effect separation without an Act of the British Parliament.

In 1855, before the present war policy was introduced by the South, 1400 men (58th and 65th regiments) for a considerable period were sufficient for the whole of New Zealand; at one time only 360 men being in the province of Auckland. The Northern men now say, Restore peace, and place us in the same position we were in at that period. They still hold to the opinion, formerly the rule in New Zealand, "that the Imperial Government ought to exercise a potent voice and paramount authority in the direction of native affairs;" that the veto by the Imperial authorities on colonial legislation is of some substantial value to the mother country; that the colonizers of New Zealand have conferred a lasting benefit upon Great Britain "by placing her in the most commanding position for exercising a great maritime influence over all the shores and islands of the Pacific Ocean;" that these and other advantages impose corresponding duties, and that, if not of appreciable value, they had better be distinctly given up. The Northern settlers are willing to pay £40 per head for two regiments of British troops rather than trust solely to the volunteer system advocated by the South, although they are of opinion that any payment for the use of British troops must give rise to a conflict of authority, and is utterly unworthy of any power claiming to exercise the functions of sovereignty, especially when the troops are to be used for acquiring by confiscation or otherwise additional territory for the Crown, and the extension of British commerce.

See Postscript

2. OBJECTIONS OF THE SOUTH.

The leading idea of the Weldcum-Fitzgerald ministry is "that the Native Difficulty is the school of New Zealand statesmen," and that the administration of native affairs having been conceded by the Home Government at the request of the South, the South must be responsible for the cost of the experiment, whether the result be peace or long protracted war.

The settlers of the Southern Island utterly repudiate this notion. Their leading members, in the recent debate in the Assembly on the question of separation, distinctly intimated that they should support the Weld government, simply and only because the South had pledged itself to an expenditure of three millions; but that as soon as the balance of £602,623, then unissued, was expended, and any further demands were made, there would be no alternative but separation.

Mr. Crosbie Ward, the proprietor of the Lyttleton Times, and member or Lyttleton, also gave notice that the value of all native land confiscated in the North through the war, ought to be treated as an asset, and charged in account as between North and South! Indeed, a meeting of the Southern members was held, in which it was agreed to resist all further schemes of taxation until the cost of the war had been actually apportioned to the complete satisfaction of the South.

See Postscript.

These proceedings can only have one meaning, viz. that the cost of all farther native wars, necessary or unnecessary, must, so far as the South is concerned, be provided for by confiscation out of Northern lands, and the South to have the power of making war or peace. They can compel the North to fight, whether they will or no; and charge them with all the expenditure. The land fund of the South, in actual possession, is sacred for purposes of local improvement; but the land fund of the North, when acquired, must defray the entire cost of its acquisition. Roads and bridges in that region, whether for Europeans or natives, being entirely unnecessary!
Again, the Provincial Council of the province of Otago, so long back as November, 1864., passed resolutions in which they

condemn the native war, and assert that they have no more direct interest therein than any other province of the British empire; and they further declare "that unless some measures can be taken which shall lead to the early termination of the war, on terms consistent with the honor of the colony, and the safety of the Northern settlement; the province of Otago will endeavor to obtain the concurrence of the other provinces of the Middle Island, in a financial and political separation of the two principal islands of New Zealand."

In the same province also, a league has been formed for the express purpose of effecting the same object, not merely on account of the native difficulty, but because the Middle Island has within itself all the materials necessary for the formation of a distinct and independent colony.

Their manifesto declares—

"That the size of the Middle Island fully justifies the desire to convert it into a distinct colony. The area of the Middle Island, with out including Stewart's Island, is 44,500 square miles, whilst that of the under mentioned colonies is only as follows:—

"But the comparison of the size of New Zealand with other colonies becomes yet stronger when its peculiarly long and narrow shape is taken into consideration. From the northernmost point of the North Island to the southernmost point of the Middle Island the length is 1,100 miles, a longer distance than that between any two points in the neighbouring colonies of New South Wales and Victoria, or between those of Victoria and South Australia. The length and narrowness of New Zealand make its government from any one spot more difficult than that of other colonies possessing many times its area. The Middle Island alone is 430 miles in length from point to point, and it covers a more extensive sea-board than the two colonies of Victoria and New South Wales conjoined. Its isolation should also be considered, as for a similar reason the Home Government consented to Tasmania being separated from New South Wales, although but half the size of the Middle Island, and containing at the time of the separation a population of only 12,643 inhabitants, and a revenue of £6,866 1s. 9d.

"In point of resources, the Middle Island is fully qualified to become a separate colony. A comparison of the position of Port Phillip, since named Victoria, when it was allowed to separate from New South Wales, with that of the Middle Island, will show that the latter is justified in asking for the responsibilities of a separate Government.

Port Phillip, 1844.

Middle Island of New Zealand, 1863.

"The territorial revenue of the Middle Island is excluded in the above tables, because the League would urge, as a fundamental principle, that the land fund should be irrevocably secured to the district in which it is obtained.

"With such resources, with a country possessing such capabilities, an already numerous population, and every probability that, as soon as it ceases to be connected with Maori affairs it will become a favorite field for immigration, the new colony would have a splendid career before it, and would doubtless soon attain to a high position amongst the British colonies."

Conclusion.

The British Government, it is said, only gives up the administration of Native affairs to the Colonists because they cannot be managed with justice from a distance. But surely they ought not to relinquish this duty, unless it is willingly accepted by an united Colony, and unless the Colonial Office is satisfied that the hands to whom it is for the future entrusted are equal to the undertaking. It has been clearly shewn that no such union exists, and that it is a farce for the Weld Ministry to talk about dispensing with the British troops, and making war with Colonial resources.

It is not merely that Mr. Weld's position as Minister is entirely dependent on his leaving the South in the free enjoyment of their territorial revenue, but that the South absolutely refuses to accept the unlimited responsibility of managing native affairs.

Sec Postcript.

According to the best informed, further outbreaks are sure to occur if any attempt is made to carry out the new measures of the Weld Ministry, and if they do occur, what would be the resources of the Colony if the South, in addition to the opposition of the North, refused to vote further supplies. The best commentary on the
present state of things is the fact that, although the responsible ministry have succeeded in gaining absolute power and moulding the Governor to their own purposes, they will not accept the responsibility of directing him to send away all the troops, and that they are pleased to permit him to write letters to the Home authorities requesting assistance in raising monies, for which, although urged to do so by the Duke of Newcastle, they are not willing to pledge all the resources of the Colony. The dispute between Sir George Grey and Sir Duncan Cameron in truth afforded the "Weld Ministry an excellent opportunity, of which they have not been slow to avail themselves.

See Postscript.

The *Times* may say "that a Colonial Governor is not a mere machine to be played upon by a colonial administration, and that it is his duty to use his authority so as to reconcile opposing forces, and to keep the Government of the Dependency placed under his care within the limits of the law,"

*Times*, 17th November, 1865.

But Sir George Grey will say that the executive had its own battles to fight, and that "self-preservation is the first law of nature," besides, being now free from Imperial instructions, he may ask with the unhappy colonists, "Pray what is the Law?"

The plain answer seems to be that the Colonists of New Zealand, unless Parliament interferes, are about to be handed over to a state of anarchy, in the shape of an unworkable constitution, with responsibilities never contemplated, and which the majority are unwilling to accept, and that, whether English or Native, they are to be left to fight out their difficulties as best they can.

"When in 1856 the mere chance of the seat of Government being removed from Auckland to "Wellington was adverted to by Governor Browne, the present Lord Taunton, then at the head of the Colonial Office, immediately suggested that "in such a contingency resort must be had to parliament to give the chief of the executive department in the North sufficient independence of action."

Despatch 10th December, 1856; New Zealand Papers, July, 1861.

How much more is it now necessary that Parliament should be consulted on the whole subject of responsible government in New Zealand, when the North, where the mass of the native population is congregated, is now and has been for the last ten months absolutely left, in a time of war, without any executive establishment or Government at all.

The memorial of the New Zealand Government in 1845, the four Petitions of the Provincial Council of Auckland, of the 29th December, 1853, 18th of May, 1855, 1858, and 1862, together with the memorial or petition of 7,920 adult male inhabitants of the Province, have distinctly brought before the view of the Home Government the opinion of the Northern settlers that the present Constitution "cannot be made productive of good government to any portion of the Colony."

The evil results predicted by them have been more than realized, and, are now threatening to bring about the absolute ruin of the Colony. A full, searching Parliamentary enquiry into the whole of the affairs of New Zealand—civil as well as military—seems to be the only remedy for the present disasters; but if this be refused, because inconsistent with the "mere political link of Sovereignty" theory of Colonial government, and the whole of the British troops are to be withdrawn, the public as well as the colonists, however reluctant, may soon be con-strained to think with Professor Goldwin Smith, that they must look, elsewhere for a solution of their difficulties, and that it is time "this almost invisible filament of political connection should cease to exist."

---

**Postscript.**

The foregoing Pages were in print before the arrival of the New Zealand October Mail. The news confirms many of the views expressed, and may be summed up as follows:—

-Resignation of the Responsible Ministry.—The Weld Ministry, having been defeated, resigned; but, as an effort was about to be made to re-instate them, it cannot be considered as certain that Mr. Stafford, who had been sent for, will succeed m forming a ministry or maintaining his position.

**Mr. Weld sometime back wrote to his friend, Lord Alfred Churchill, to inform us that he was about to commit political suicide, but he did not do so. Mr. Fitzgerald now writes to his friend to say that he is actually dead, but the probabilities are that he will be resuscitated. It is amusing to see how your very aspiring colonist treats the Colonial House of Assembly as a mere platform whereon to disport himself for the benefit of his admiring friends at home!**

**and therefore the text of the foregoing remarks is left unaltered. This event, and the circumstances that led to it, afford however strong evidence that in the next Assembly (the present expires by effluxion of time on the 21st of this December) the separation policy is nearly certain to prevail. The Weld ministry were defeated by**
the champions of provincial interests, who carried a vote that three-eighths of all monies, raised by stamp duties for extraordinary expenditure, should be handed over to the provinces (like the three-eighths of the customs) for local improvements, thus confirming the assertion that the Southern provinces will not submit to further taxation for war purposes alone. It is admitted that Mr. Stafford's supporters are all separationists, and that if he comes into office he must yield to their views.

Self-Reliant Policy—Has proved to be a bubble, as soon as it came to the raising the actual ways and means for carrying it into effect.

Proclamation of Peace.—This measure was distinctly condemned by the Legislative Assembly, although the vote was subsequently rescinded on a threat by ministers of immediate resignation. It was designated by the settlers as a "ridiculous piece of state-craft," and "not worth the paper on which it was printed." Two murderers, included in the amnesty proclaimed, were at the very instant undergoing trial before the Chief Justice at Auckland—they have since been found guilty and sentenced to death.

"New Zealand Herald."

As for the natives, they not merely treated the proclamation with contempt, but actually murdered two persons (one a native, the other a European and government interpreter) entrusted with the distribution of the proclamation in their districts. The new Commander-in-Chief appeared to hesitate about taking steps to avenge these murders, possibly because he considered the honour of Her Majesty to be in no degree at stake—the war being the war of the responsible ministry, and not of the British Empire.

Mr. Fitzgerald has written a letter, for publication in the Times, 20th December, 1865, commenting severely on recent military operations in New Zealand, but as little intended to "detract from the reputation" of General Cameron and the British Army, as it is to depreciate his own services during his late two months tenure of office! No doubt the General and the Army will smile and forgive him—by this time they are quite alive to the style of political warfare common in the colonies, and so graphically described by the late Mr. E. G. Wakefield. "It is a general custom in the colonies," that writer says, "when your antagonist withstands abuse, to hurt him seriously, if you can, and even to do him a mortal injury; either in order to carry your point, or to punish him for having carried his. In every walk of colonial life everybody strikes at his opponent's heart If a governor, or high officer, refuses to comply with the wish of some leading colonists, they instantly try to ruin him by getting him re-called with disgrace: if two officials disagree one of them is very likely to be tripped up and destroyed by the other: if an official, or a colonist, offends the official body, they will hunt him into jail, or out of the colony. Disagreement and rivalry are more tiger-like than disagreement and rivalry in this country."

Mr. Fitzgerald seems to admit that the Proclamation of Peace was a bit of strategy, intended to lull the suspicions—not to say deceive—the natives, as it was calculated to mislead the people of England; and he confirms the pleasing intelligence that the confiscated lands in Waikato and Cook's Straits must be fought for again.

Proclamation of War.—Nothing decisive has been done, but the natives (Hauhaus) have entrenched themselves in three pahs, strongly fortified, and Sir George Grey is invited to reduce them as, he says, he did the Wereroa pah. Meanwhile, our old adversaries in the Waikato, under Rewi, have replied to responsible ministers manifestoes by announcing their intention of re-occupying all the confiscated lands in Waikato as soon as the troops are withdrawn.

New Gold Fields on West Coast of Southern Island—Extend several hundred miles along the coast. The yield of gold during the month of September last, as evidenced by the actual receipts from the banks at Nelson, amounted to 45,568 ounces, value £177,000, "giving an export," says the Nelson Examiner, of October 2nd, "at the rate of £2,124,000 a year, from a district where, ten months ago, there was not in all ten persons to be found. This addition to the already large export from Otago will necessarily increase the area of indirect taxation, and so far assist materially the liquidation of the interest of the war loans; but the gold duty and license fees are items of provincial revenue, and form no part of the general creditors' security.

Home Government Guarantee for New Zealand Loans.—Mr. Cardwell, as was to be expected, absolutely refuses this and any other pecuniary assistance. The Southern people are much excited, surprised, and indignant thereat, just as if it was not the natural consequence of their assumption of absolute authority and demand for the removal of all the troops.

Separation of Auckland Province from Southern Settlements.—On the 5th January, 1865, Governor Grey, on forwarding to the Colonial Office, the Petition of the Provincial Council, and of the Settlers of the Northern Province for Separation, distinctly advises Mr. Cardwell as follows:—" Unless some such arrangement as is thus prayed for is carried out, it will be impossible to bring to a satisfactory termination, the difficulties prevailing in New Zealand."

New Zealand Papers, 6th April, 1865.
and he promises to make a full report upon the question on a future occasion. No such report has ever been made, no doubt because the Weld ministry will not permit it. Mr. Cardwell, in his despatch of the 26th July last, alludes to the Governor's silence on this subject, and then quietly adds that he infers that the Governor now agrees with his ministers in opposing separation, and assures him that the Colonial Government will receive the support of the Imperial Government in maintaining the unity of the Colony! He does not say what kind of support—whether moral support or a veto on any act passed by the Colonial Legislature for effecting the object; but clearly after this novel mode of dealing with petitions it seems useless to forward any complaint or request to the Colonial office through the Governor.

**Withdrawal of Troops, and future Policy of the Colonial Office.**—Mr. Cardwell has now not only directed the removal of the whole of the Queen's troops but, in his despatch of the 26th July last, endorses an opinion expressed by the Weld ministry that the province of Auckland, with its population of about 1,000 adult males, is quite equal to accomplish that which all the British troops and colonial forces, nearly 20,000 men, were scarcely able to effect. Of course he must be aware that these settlers are scattered in isolated settlements along a coast line of more than 200 miles long between Mongonui and Wikato: he expects them to be mobilized—leave their 40 acre farms and families, and be ready for service at the East Cape, or anywhere else in the province for defence, preservation of order, and punishment of native aggressors. It is fair to observe that this despatch was written before Mr. Cardwell had the opportunity of seeing Major-General Cameron, and before the occurrence of the Jamaica massacres. If the Colonial Office now persists in this course of policy, the Northern settlers may perhaps not object, if it is followed to its legitimate results. Perhaps Mr. Cardwell, as soon as Parliament neets, will favor the Colonists and Public with information upon the following points:—

- Are the Northern Settlers to be allowed to govern themselves, or be ruled from the south.
- Are they to recoup themselves for loss of time, cost, charges, and expenses out of the $3½ millions of Native territory in their Province, or to sell their own allotments in the $3½ millions of English territory for the purpose.
- May the Northern Settlers obtain assistance from Australia, or the United States (the Panama line will be very convenient for this purpose), and arrange for their remuneration out of the means placed at their disposal? It will be impossible to invite small farmers and labouring men to come 18,000 miles from England, at a cost of £20 per head, and then ask them to shoulder a brown Bess and subdue the natives, instead of quietly subduing the forest on their 40 acre allotments in lieu of passage money!
- A proposition was suggested by a spirited contractor of Melbourne to put down the Maori insurrection by contract; the contractor to take possession of the country out of which he should drive the Maories. Will the Home Government sanction such a project, involving, as it might, the extermination of the Maories, and cease from meddling with the confiscation or cession of native lands, the location of settlers thereon, and such other proceedings as a self-reliant policy may necessitate?
- Are all the vessels of war to be withdrawn as they were in the early days of Governor Browne's reign, as well as the troops?
- If the great majority of able-bodied single men leave the Auckland Province for the Gold Fields of the South (the military settlers are already on the move), who is to take care of the women and children?
- Is the missionary principle to be resuscitated, and will the British Government join with the South in attempting to restore "the link between the races," which is now "absolutely dissolved," entirely through their past united action?
- Is the petition of the bishops of New Zealand to be relieved of their royal letters patent to be granted, and is any other measure of separation for the colonies in contemplation?

In the meanwhile, the Colonial Office may do well to ponder on the remarks of the New Zealand correspondent of a paper not generally supposed to be very partial to Imperial rule, or government expenditure:—

"It is becoming an alarming question what the end of these things will be. It may be expedient, on some political grounds, for the Imperial authorities to divest themselves of the trouble and annoyance inseparable from the management of native affairs, and insist upon the local authorities assuming all the responsibility and all the cost of restoring order. But let me once more press on your earnest consideration the fact that the Imperial government are not merely shirking a duty which, morally speaking, they cannot throw off, but that they are expecting impossibilities from the colonists. Every month widens the gap between the two races; by the atrocious proceedings of the few, comparatively, of the disaffected natives the voices of the European friends of the loyal Maori are silenced, and, as a whole, the colonists—the governing body—are fast drifting onwards to the period when the words 'Maori' and 'enemy' will be considered synonyms, and when the settlers, driven to desperation, will make no exception in the execution of vengeance. Only the untrammelled intervention of the Imperial Government can avert this. The North Island ought at once to be considered a Crown colony, and governed as such until peace and concord be restored."—Morning Star, 18th December, 1865,
Preface.

The following pages contain matter bearing upon the famous Manawatu purchase which, I trust, may not prove uninteresting to those who are acquainted with the past history of New Zealand.

There are those who think that the Waitara purchase and the Waitara war were a great injustice and a cruel wrong. An open investigation into all the circumstances in connection with the Manawatu purchase, may tend to throw some light upon the question as to who have been "the cause of that long and protracted war, the burdens of which now hang about our necks, to the hindrance of public and private prosperity."

The Reverend, afterwards Archdeacon, Henry "Williams, in 1840, translated the Treaty of Waitangi, "and repeated in the native tongue, sentence by sentence," all Governor Hobson said. He afterwards, requested by Governor Hobson, "fully authorised thereto by Her Majesty's instructions conveyed to him by her principal Secretary of State," obtained the signatures to the Treaty of all the principal chiefs on the North side of Cook's Strait, as far as Whanganui.

As I hold the opinion, in common with many others, that the Treaty of Waitangi has been clearly broken by the Government of this country in their dealings with the Natives for the acquisition of the Manawatu block, and as I am the son of the Rev. Henry Williams above-named, I need offer no apology for now coming forward to assist the Natives "on the north side of Cook's Strait" in standing up for their rights guaranteed to them by the said Treaty.

I bring no charge against the colonists, for whom, as a body, I, in common with Parakaia and many of his countrymen, have a great respect. I believe them to have been misinformed and misled. "When I ask any intelligent Maori the question "who are to blame for the past and the present state of things in New Zealand?" the reply is a ready one—"Ko nga kai mahi o te Kawanatanga." When I am myself asked a similar question, my reply is the same—"the Government and the officers of the Government."

THOMAS C. "WILLIAMS,

A Native of New Zealand. Taita, "Wellington,

July 18, 1867.

"The Magna Charter of the New Zealander, as between himself and the British settler, is the Treaty of Waitangi; a treaty to which the faith and honour of the British Crown were pledged in 1840, and the obligations of which have since been again and again reaffirmed by the representatives of the Crown in the Colony, and by statesmen of all parties in the Imperial Parliament. It is sufficient to refer to the noble stand taken on this point by Lord Derby (then Lord Stanley), when Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

"I repudiate, with the utmost possible earnestness, the doctrine maintained by some that the treaties which we have entered into with these people are to be considered as a mere blind to amuse and deceive ignorant savages. In the name of the Queen I utterly deny that any treaty entered into and ratified by Her Majesty's command was or could have been made in a spirit thus disingenuous, or for a purpose thus unworthy. You will honourably and scrupulously fulfil the conditions of the Treaty of Waitangi."—(Despatch to Sir Geo. Grey, June 13, 1845. Parl. Papers, May, 1846, p. 70. See also Parl. Papers, July 27, 1860, p. 44. Despatches from and to the Colonial Office, &c, passim.)

The second Article of the Treaty is as follows:—
"Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, as long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession. But the chiefs of the united tribes, and the individual chiefs, yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of pre-emption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate, at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them on that behalf."—(Parl. Papers, July, 1840, p. 10.)

**ART. 3.**

"In consideration thereof Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand her Royal protection, and imparts to them all the rights and privileges of British subjects."

The following papers will show who were the persons employed by the British Government to explain to the Natives the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi, to induce them to agree to its conditions, and to attach their signatures to the same:

**Extract from a Despatch from Lieutenant-Governor Hobson to Sir George Gipps.—(Parl. Papers, May 11, 1841, page 8.)**

"Her Majesty's ship 'Herald,' "Bay of Islands,

February 5, 1840.

"The business of the meeting then commenced by my announcing to the chiefs the object of my mission, and the reasons that had induced Her Majesty to appoint me. I explained to them in the fullest manner the effect that might be hoped to result from the measure, and I assured them in the most fervent manner that they might rely implicitly on the good faith of Her Majesty's Government in the transaction. I then read the Treaty, a copy of which I have the honour to enclose. In doing so I dwelt on each Article, and offered a few remarks explanatory of such passages as they might be supposed not to understand. Mr. H. Williams, of the Church Missionary Society, did me the favour to interpret, and repeated, in the Native tongue, sentence by sentence, all I said."

**Extract from a Despatch from Lieutenant-Governor Hobson to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.—(lb. pages 15 and 16.)**

"Government House, Russell, "Bay of Islands,

25th March, 1840.

"I commissioned Captain Symonds, of the British Army, and the following gentlemen of the Church Missionary Society, namely, the Rev. Mr. Henry Williams, Rev. Mr. Brown, Rev. Mr. Maunsell, and Rev. Mr. William Williams, to secure the adherence of the chiefs of their respective districts to the Treaty of Waitangi. For this purpose I furnished to each a signed copy of that treaty, with instructions, the copy of one of which I have the honour to transmit. The districts in which these gentlemen were requested to act comprise the whole of the Northern Island, with the exception of the northern extremity called Kaitaia, to which I despatched Mr. Shortland, the Acting Colonial Secretary, with a suite of two gentlemen of the Government, and the Rev. Mr. Taylor, of the Church Missionary Society, to secure the allegiance of the chiefs in that quarter, who are some of the most powerful in the Island; and I am happy to report to your Lordship that Mr. Shortland succeeded to the fullest extent. * * * * At various periods subsequent to the sailing of the 'Herald,' I received from Captain

"Waimate, March 23, 1840.

REVEREND SIR,—

Availing myself of your kind offer, and fully authorized thereto by Her Majesty's instructions conveyed to me by her Principal Secretary of State, I hereby authorise you to treat with the principal Native chiefs in the southern parts of these Islands for their adherence to the Treaty which was executed at Waitangi on the 6th February, 1840. I have the honour to enclose a copy of the Treaty, which I have signed, and to request you will obtain the signatures thereto of such high chiefs as may be willing to accede to its conditions, first explaining to them its principle and object, which they must clearly understand before you permit them to sign.

(Signed)
W. HOBSON,
"Lieutenant-Governor."
Rev. Henry "Williams,
"Paihia."

Lieutenant-Governor Hobson to Major Bunbury.—(Ib. page 17.)

"Paihia, 25th April, 1840.

Mr. Henry Williams, of the Church Missionary Society (formerly a Lieutenant in the Navy), kindly undertook to treat with the chiefs on the West Coast, and on both sides of Cook's Strait, for which purpose I furnished him with a vessel which I chartered.

(Signed)
W. HOBSON,
"Lieutenant-Governor."
Major Bunbury,
"30th Regiment."

Rev. H. Williams to the Lieutenant-Governor.—(Ib. page 105.)

"Paihia,
11th June, 1840.

"SIR,—

"I have much pleasure in forwarding to your Excellency the Treaty committed to my care for the signature of the chiefs in Cook's Strait.

"On my arrival at Port Nicholson I experienced some opposition from the influence of Europeans at that place, and it was not until after the expiration of ten days that the chiefs were disposed to come forward, when they unanimously signed the Treaty.

"The chiefs of Queen Charlotte's Sound and Rangitoto, in the neighbourhood of Port Hardy, on the south side of the Strait, as also those chiefs on the north side of the Strait with whom I communicated as far as Whanganui, signed the Treaty with much satisfaction, and appeared much gratified that a check was put to the importunities of the Europeans to the purchase of their lands, and that protection was now afforded to them in common with Her Majesty's subjects.

"(Signed)
HENRY WILLIAMS.
"To. Capt. Hobson, R.N."

Major Bunbury to Lieutenant-Governor Hobson.—(Ib. page 109.)

"Her Majesty's ship 'Herald,'

"June 19.—We arrived off the island of Kapiti; several canoes were leaving the Island, and, on my preparing to go on shore, fortunately the first canoe we met had on board the chief Rauparaha I was so anxious to see. He returned on board with me in the ship's boat, his own canoe, one of the most splendid I have yet seen, following. He told me that the Rev. Mr. Williams had been there, and had obtained his signature to the Treaty."

The "Manawatu-Rangitikei Block," the purchase of which we have been repeatedly told by Dr. Featherston is "un fait accompli" is an extensive country, containing some 250,000 acres of mostly fine land, lying between the Manawatu and Rangitikei rivers, in the Province of Wellington. The question to be decided is simply this—Has the block been fairly purchased, or has it not? If fairly purchased, well and good; if not, then the Treaty of Waitangi has been broken.

The plaintiffs in the matter are the Ngatiraukawa non-sellers, who hold possession of, and most of whom are living on, the block. The defendants are His Excellency Sir G. Grey, K.C.B.; the General Assembly, the Ministers, and the Land Purchase Commissioner. The New Zealand and the British public will, I trust, act as the jury.

The case for the defendants was closed when Dr. Featherston on the 14th April, 1866, announced, to the Natives his acceptance of the block;—when, in December, 1866, in spite of the many protests from the non-sellers, together with their repeated requests to the Governor, the Assembly, and the Ministers, that their title to the land might be investigated in a court of justice before completing the purchase, he paid down to the Natives (the money having been supplied to him by the General Government) £25,000 as a discharge in full of all demands on the Government on account of the block; £2,000 to be reserved by the Natives for the non-sellers, and the Government agreeing to set apart certain reserves, according to the usual custom in all large purchases;—and when he announced to his Council in his opening speech on the 26th April, 1867,—"It is satisfactory to me to be able to state that the deed of cession has been duly executed, nearly seventeen hundred claimants have signed it, and that the questions just adverted to have been finally and amicably settled."

Of Dr. Featherston, the Chief Land Commissioner, I may say that since the framing of the New Zealand Constitution Act he has acted in the capacity of Superintendent of the Province of Wellington; that in general politics he is a Provincialist, whilst in Provincial politics he is a Centralist; that he is a gentleman who wept over the Waitara, and who considered it his "chief duty to make the Maori's dying couch as easy and as comfortable as possible;" who stated at Taranaki, when speaking of the Natives, as I was informed by one of
the officers of Her Majesty's 43rd Regiment.—" I have no sympathy whatever with the wretches, and I do not care how soon they are all exterminated," and who, shortly afterwards, at Takapu, represented himself to the six tribes as "their friend—one who had ever advocated what he believed to be their true interests—one in whose justice and integrity they had implicit faith."

Of the Sub-Commissioner, Mr. Walter Buller, I may observe that he is simply a model official; one who is at all times ready and willing to say and do all and everything that he is bid; one who has repeatedly stated that, having undertaken the Manawatu purchase, he was "prepared to go any lengths to ensure its completion."

Of Sir G. Grey, K.C.B., the Assembly, and the Ministers, I may observe that, whilst they may have proved themselves capable of framing laws whereby to bring about and to accomplish the good government of the settlers' cattle and sheep, they have proved themselves wholly incompetent to the task of governing human beings, when those human beings are Maoris. Of each and every of them I fear it must be recorded—"Tekel." Mr. Cox, when moving the address in reply to His Excellency's speech on the 10th of June, said—"He for one was very glad that Native affairs would very shortly disappear from the catalogue of questions of policy brought before the House." Strange, should Mr. Cox's words, though not so intended, prove to have been prophetic!

Of the Native sellers I may say that many of them frankly admit that they took the money offered them and signed the deed of cession, though they had no title to the land, because requested to do so by the Commissioner; that the principal sellers, whilst they shrank away from the law," insisted "upon the sale, avowing their determination to fight if the purchase were not at once carried out; whereas the non-sellers are a quiet and peaceable people, whose" grand desire is to see the Maori people rendered amenable, in their dealings with the settlers, to British law;" and "that all the inhabitants of New Zealand should be subjected, in their mutual dealings, to the control of one common law."

The following appears in the memorandum by Ministers in reply to the Aborigines Protection Society, dated 5th May, 1864, and signed "William Fox:"—

"4. As regards the question of the confiscation of Maori lands, against which a protest is raised, Ministers beg to make the following observations:—

"In the first place, it is a custom which has been always recognized by the Maoris themselves. In their wars, a conquered tribe not only forfeited its lands, but the vanquished survivors were reduced to a tributary position, and large numbers to personal slavery. The Government of New Zealand have always recognized such a title as valid; and a very large proportion, if not an absolute majority, of the purchases of land from the Maoris have been made on the basis of a recognition of this right of conquest."

The following appears in the statement of the proceedings of the Compensation Court, at the sittings held at New Plymouth, "Present: Francis D. Fenton, Esq., Chief Judge John Rogan, Esq., Judge; Home Monro, Esq., Judge:—

"Judgment in case of the non-resident claimants at Okura:—

"We do not think that it can reasonably be maintained that the British Government came to this Colony to improve Maori titles, or to reinstate persons in possession of land from which they had been expelled before 1840, or which they had voluntarily abandoned previously to that time. Having found it absolutely necessary to fix some point of time at which the titles, so far as this Court is concerned, must be regarded as settled, we have decided that that point of time must be the establishment of the British Government in 1840; and all persons who are proved to have been the actual owners or possessors of land at that time must be regarded as the owners or possessors of that land now."

We may imagine Dr. Featherston exclaiming "Is that the law?" "Thyself shall see the Act." In Dr. Featherston's admirable speech, delivered in the House of Representatives, on the 7th of August, 1860, when speaking upon the subject of the Waitara purchase and the Waitara war, is the following:—

"Sir,—I apprehend that there are certain Native titles which are based upon well-known customs, and have certain incidents attached to them which admit of no question—of no possible dispute. First, however, let me remind the House that, by the Treaty of Waitangi, 'the Queen confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lauds and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties, which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their desire to retain the same in their possession.' It follows that whatever rights, especially territorial, the Natives possessed at the time the Treaty was made, the Government is bound to respect and preserve inviolate. Now, there are two titles to land, which are so universally acknowledged that they admit of no dispute, viz., by inheritance and by conquest."

Six years after the delivery of the above excellent speech, Dr. Featherston purchases 250,000 acres of (according to the Wellington Independent) "the finest land in New Zealand," from the conquered. He then tells the conquerors that he is in a position "to make them an award in land to the extent of such claims as are admitted by the sellers." As Dr. Featherston was speaking impartially in August, 1860, but acting partially in
1866 and 1867, the public will agree with me that he must be held bound to the opinions he expressed in his excellent speech delivered in the House of Representatives on 7th August, 1860.

All, therefore, that is necessary to show that "the Government were bound to respect and preserve inviolate" the right of the Ngatiraukawa non-sellers to the "Manawatu and Rangitikei Block" is to prove that they held sole and undisputed possession of the block by right of conquest in 1840, at the time the Treaty of Waitangi was signed; and to show that the Treaty of Waitangi has been wholly disregarded and clearly broken by the Government in their dealings with the Natives for the purchase of the block, it is necessary to prove that the land has been purchased by the Government of, that the deed of cession has been signed by, and that the greater portion of the money has been paid to, men of other tribes, who had been conquered by the Ngatiraukawa and their allies so far back as 1830; who were living in subjection to their conquerors—many of them in actual slavery—in 1840, and who, at the time the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, dare not to have asserted their title to one foot of the block; also to men who laid no claim to the land; whereas the great majority of the real owners have not, up to the present time, signed the deed of cession, nor have they taken one sixpence of the purchase-money, though every effort has been tried to frighten them into submission. That Dr. Featherston, after the Government had expended three millions of Colonial treasure, with a vast amount of "British blood and treasure," inflicting at the same time a vast amount of misery on the Maori race: after the Natives had been expelled from the Waikato and other parts of the Northern Island, and their lands confiscated to the Crown, and all for the purpose of asserting in this land the supremacy of law, with several thousand British troops at the time in New Zealand, shortly after his return from the far-famed expedition through the bush during the West Coast campaign, where, shoulder to shoulder with the Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's forces, he breathed forth unlimited threatenings and slaughter against all and everything that opposed itself—an expedition which struck so much terror into the bosom of the Maoris, causing them to be (as Parakaia hath it in his petition) "nungio noa iho."—" paralyzed with fear,"—at a meeting of the Natives at Takapu, on the 14th April, 1866, acting for and on behalf of Her Majesty, ridiculed alike the idea of settling the various claims to the block by arbitration, by a division of the land, or by trial in the Native Land's Court. That Dr. Featherston, on the 14th April, after ignoring the claims of men who asked that their titles might be investigated according to law, "knowing the responsibility which his decisive answer would entail upon him, had not the slightest hesitation in giving it," and "felt no difficulty in announcing his acceptance of the block," at the hands of men who one and all shrank away alike from "arbitration or investigation in the Land Court," the principal chief of whom, Mr. Governor Hunia, actually boasted that "they (the Ngatiapas) had now plenty of arms and ammunition, and could easily drive off their opponents, and that they would now prefer an appeal to arms to any other course, and almost intimidated that they had, during the West Coast campaign, reserved their ammunition for that purpose."

See Appendix, Dr. Featherston's Report.

That Dr. Featherston, acting in his capacity of Land Purchase Commissioner, paid £25,000 to the Natives in full of all demands for the block (less a small sum set apart for the dissentients); that he has repeatedly told the Natives, through his agent, that "their land is all gone to the Queen," and has publicly announced to his Council the final completion of the purchase. That during the interval between the month of April, 1866, when Dr. Featherston publicly announced to the Natives his acceptance of the block, and the month of December, 1866, when the purchase money was paid, the Ngatiraukawa chiefs, who opposed the sale, paid repeated visits to Wellington, and prayed His Excellency the Governor, the Assembly, and the Ministers, to grant them a fair hearing of their claims in a court of justice, and that, beyond a few of their letters appearing in the Blue Book, their prayers were totally disregarded. On the other hand, a Bill was passed, authorizing the raising of a loan of £30,000 for the purchase of their lands.

I may further add, that it will be seen that the Ngatiraukawa chiefs spared the Ngatiapas when Te Rauparaha desired them to destroy them all; that they, in 1849, restored to Ngatiapa the whole of the country to the north of the Rangitikei River, and that the whole of the purchase money was paid by the Commissioner to the Ngatiapa, it being understood that the Ngatiapas were to abandon any claim they might have felt disposed to set up to the land south of the river, on the score of their having been driven off it; and that a similar arrangement was made with the Rangitane tribe when the land on the other side of the block was restored to them by the Ngatiraukawas in 1858, all the purchase money being paid to Hirawanu, chief of the Rangitaneas. It will be seen that Dr. Featherston got the Manawatu exception clause inserted in the "Native Lands Act" in 1862, because Ihakara presented him with a carved club in 1864.

As it is both law and custom with the Anglo-Saxon to register all titles to land, I cannot do better than here produce the following documents, being the register of the Ngatiraukawa's title to the Rangitikei-Manawatu country. Parakaia thinks it quite as good a title as the Anglo-Saxons can show to many of their possessions; he instances "Poa Hakena" (Australia) and Van Diemen's Land:—

"This is a year of contention about land. 23rd October, 1866. I wish to explain what was the Maori custom
of old.

"The Pakehas take the Maori's land by right of conquest, but trample down my right obtained through conquest, by which these tribes became possessed of this country. Attend, and I will relate the history of these tribes. Te Rauparaha was the first to conquer those people (the original owners). When Whanganui heard, they induced Kangihiwinui, chief of Muaupoko, to murder Raupabaraka (his people). They murdered at Ohau Borne of Ngatitoa, old and young. Ngatitoa then murdered to fight those tribes—Muaupoko and Eangitane—those tribes were vanquished.

"Whanganui then persisted; they all mustered and went to Kapitito fight the Ngatitoa. Ngatitoa conquered those tribes—"Waitotara, Whanganui, Ngatipa, Rangitane, Muaupoko, Ngatikahanunu—great numbers were killed, several hundreds perished in the sea, several hundreds were killed by the hand of man; up to the number of 1,000 (mano) perished in the year 1824. Ngatitoa then turned upon Ngatiapa, conquered them, and cut up Rangitikei and Manawatu, dividing to each man his portion. Those who escaped hid themselves in out-of-the-way places in the year 1824.

"When we of Ngatiraukawa at Maungatautari heard, we came here, Whatanui, Hukiki, and Nepia Taratoa, to see what the land was like, and visit Ngatitoa. We saw that it was good, and returned in 1827. When Ngatiraukawa heard it was a good land, that there were Pakehas, another party came down to see the land, and returned in the year 1829. When the second party returned, Rauparaha instructed them to tell Ngatiraukawa to come down and occupy Kangitikei and Manawatu. We left Maungatautari, Patetere, and Taupo, and came to Kapiti, to the place where there were Pakehas: that is why we migrated to this place, that we might obtain guns and powder. We left in the month of May; in July we arrived at Turakina; there we attacked and defeated the Ngatiapas. We came on to Kangitikei and Oroha; there we also defeated the Ngatiapas. We came on to Manawatu and defeated the Kangitane. We took possession then and there of the land in the year 1830. When we arrived at Otaki we divided the eel ponds; when we reached Waikanae the Ngatiawa were there—the Ngatitoa were at Kapiti; Ngatitoa all mustered at Waikanae to receive our party. Ngatitoa divided our party amongst them, each chief agreeing to act as host to a certain number. Rangihawea received Aperahama Te Ruru and our party as his guests. In the month of August, 1830, each chief set apart a portion of land to their several guests. The whole tribe of Ngatitoa agreed to this; they set apart each man a portion for his friend. After that, the chiefs of our party assembled at Rangatira, on the Island of Kapiti. The chiefs Rauparaha and Rangihawea said Rangitane and Muaupoko must be destroyed, on account of those tribes having murdered Te Hira and Te Poa. Muaupoko murdered them. Paetahi, the father of Mete (chief of Whanganui), was the instigator, he having incited Eangihiwini to murder Te Eauparaha (his people); this was the reason why we were told to destroy Eangitane and Muaupoko. Ngatitoa had given no cause for this; only one woman had been killed in a quarrel about a canoe.

"We went from Otaki to fight with those people. The pa Hotuiti was taken, in the Manawatu country. Rangitane fell. We divided their land amongst us, to each man a portion. Ngatiapa were not interfered with. "We then returned to Otaki. The men of those tribes whom we had enslaved were allowed to call in those who had escaped on former occasions, and we permitted them to dwell in our midst with their several masters. Each pointed out to his master, of Ngatiraukawa, their lands, which were taken possession of accordingly, and our people on their part gave of their goods to the survivors, guns, powder, axes, and hatchets.

"We then attacked "Whanganui, on account of a murder committed by Whanganui. Fifty chiefs and Ruamairo, of Ngatiraukawa, had been murdered. Whanganui were defeated in two battles—one pa was taken (Patikiwharanui). Ngatiapa were with us in that fight. Ngatiraukawa made peace with those tribes in 1831. Turao put a stop to the fighting. Next came parties from Taranaki. Ngatiapa, Eangitane, and Muaupoko were living at that time in our midst, and joined with us in fighting against those tribes. Those tribes, Eangitane and Ngatiraukawa, though living in our midst, were living in subjection, without authority over the land. They cannot refute this. Ngatitoa then attacked and defeated Muaupoko, then dwelling in our midst. They took their pa (Papaitonga), and divided their land amongst themselves in the year 1831.

"Thus those tribes dwelt with us in the olden time. After that came the Gospel. Thus they were spared and became free. Fighting ceased in 1839. Mr. Hadfield was the minister at Otaki, Mr. Mason at Whanganui. In Governor Grey's time Ngatiapa commenced selling; they tried to sell this side, we held it the Government were aware of that in 1848.

"In Governor Browne's time those tribes again tried to sell. Ngatiraukawa was still held this side of the Rangitikei. Governor Grey is aware of that land having been held back at that time in 1858. The Ahuoturanga and the Awahou were fairly sold to Governor Browne. Now we have Dr. Featherston: still the same piece of land. I now, therefore, say let this land be settled by the law, that we may go into the question of old Maori custom and law. In these years that England has taken possession of New Zealand by right of conquest, let me also assert my right, obtained by conquest. We have shown our love for the Queen by having allowed the sale of Rangitikei, of Awahou, and of Ahuoturanga. We now cease this generous alienation of our lands to our
Pakeha friends at this end, as there will not be any left for ourselves if we continue to alienate it all to the
Queen.

"The Government say, 'Give.' Another Governor comes: 'Give, give, give up the land to the Queen.' Is
giving all that I have to do? Have I not a right to withhold? Should I give it all up to others? May I not retain
some for myself?

"(Signed)
PARAKAIA TE POUEPA.

"23rd October, 1866."

Correct translation—
J. N. WILLIAMS.

To Thomas Williams.

DEAR FRIEND,—

Will you publish what I have to say respecting Rangitikei, for the information of the Pakehas. We, the
Ngatiraukawa tribe, held it by our own strength till such times as the law came. Ngatiraukawa are still in
possession of Rangitikei. Do you listen? It was Rauparaha who first conquered the inhabitants of this country;
after that, Ngatiraukawa conquered them. It was Rauparaha's wish to have killed them all—not to let any
escape. Ngatiraukawa saved them from death—made slaves and servants of them. They, the original owners,
were very humble and submissive to Ngatiraukawa, viz., Muaupoko, Rangitane, and Ngatiapa, dwelling in
subjection. Listen! Only when the Gospel came did the original owners begin to hold up their heads and exalt
themselves, and so on till Governor Grey's time, in the year 1848, when Ngatiapa attempted to hand over to
Governor Grey and Mr. M'Lean all the land from Rangitikei to Manawatu. When Ngatiraukawa heard that
Rangitikei was being sold they assembled to stop the sale of this side. They agreed to allow the other side to be
sold, on condition that Ngatiapa should abandon all claim to this side, to which Ngatiapa agreed. Ngatiraukawa
did not receive any of the money payment for the land, though it was through them having given their consent
that the land was sold, and Ngatiapa got the money. Next came Governor Browne. When Hirawanu, of
Rangitane, tried to sell Ahuoturanga, he tried in vain; for Ngatiraukawa would not permit it to be sold, they
alone having authority over all the land—Rangitikei, Oroua, Manawatu, Ahuoturanga, as far as Otaki.
Afterwards Ngatiraukawa, out of love for Hirawanu, chief of Rangitane, returned that land, formerly his, to him.
It was done quietly; at the same time they told him that he must give up all claim to this other side. To this
Hirawanu agreed. When the land was sold no money was paid to Ngatiraukawa. Thus those two blocks of
land—Rangitikei and Ahuotouranga—were quietly and peaceably restored to the original owners by
Ngatiraukawa. We did not fight about it, as other tribes have done: all that Ngatiraukawa cared for was to retain
a portion of the land. It was so in the olden time before the law came, and we are doing the same now that we
are living under the law: for you see that the greater portion of the land we have restored to Ngatiapa and
Raugitane we made them a present of it. This is the smaller portion which we are retaining. These people have
no gratitude (koha) to Ngatiraukawa in return for their kindness to them. As to this last sale by Ngatiapa and
Rangitane, it will never be assented to; never! because the only people living upon the land are of the
Ngatiraukawa tribe, and they alone have any authority over and title to the land.

(Signed)
RAWIRI TE WANUI.

Otaki,

26th June, 1867.

Correct translation—
J. N. WILLIAMS.
DEAR FRIEND,—

The Ngatiapas and Rangitanes had lost all authority over these lands as far as Wairarapa long before the Treaty of Waitangi came in 1840. At the tune the Treaty was signed they had no authority over the land. The Ngatiraukawa quietly handed over the other side of Rangitikei to Ngatiapa for them to sell to Mr. M'Lean, which made that sale complete.

Ahuoturanga also was quietly handed over by Ngatiraukawa to Hirawanu, chief of Rangitane, which made that correct.

This side of Rangitikei was retained by Ngatiraukawa then, and they are still retaining it.

(Signed)
MATENE TE WHIWI.

In support of the above statements, I would refer the reader to letters from the Ven. Archdeacon Hadfield and the Rev. S. Williams, which appear in the Appendix.

Correct translation—

J. N. WILLIAMS.

Here follows the Treaty of Waitangi, the Maori's Crown Grant;

In 1849 the Ngatiapa tribe sold a large extent of country to the north of the Rangitikei river to the Government. It appears from the published statement of the Natives that the Ngatiraukawa waved their claim to the block, stipulating at the same time that the Ngatiapa should abandon any claim they might be disposed to set up to the land south of the river on the ground of their having formerly been driven from it. Some of the Natives say that the Ngatiapa agreed to this; others, that the arrangement was made with Mr. M'Lean, the Land Purchase Commissioner. Mr. Buller, in a letter to the Minister for Native Affairs, dated August 31, 1863, speaking of the question, says—" It appears that when the Ngatiapa, in 1849, surrendered to the Crown the land lying between the Whanganui and Rangitikei rivers, they compromised the conflicting Ngatiraukawa claims (of conquest) by conceding to the latter the right of disposal over the territory lying south of the Rangitikei, with the mutual understanding that as the Ngatiraukawa had received a share of the payments, the Ngatiapa should in like manner participate in the purchase money of this block, whenever the Ngatiraukawa should sell. With the lapse of years the Ngatiapa have come to regard their claim as one of absolute right, in every respect equal to that of the present holders; while the latter, always regarding the latter claim as one of sufferance, are now disposed to ignore it altogether." The following extracts from published documents will show that the whole of the purchase money was paid to the Ngatiapa, confirming the statements of the Ngatiraukawa Natives:—

"Wellington,

August 26, 1851.

"Sir,—

"At a general meeting of the Natives, on the 29th May last, I handed over the third instalment of £500 to the Ngatiapa tribe for the Rangitikei purchase.

"I have, &c,

"(Signed)
DONALD M'LEAN,
"Land Commissioner.
"The Hon. the Colonial Secretary."

"Wellington,
25th June, 1852.

SIR,—

"In continuation of my letter of the 22nd ultimo, respecting the fourth and last instalment of £500 to the Ngatiapa tribe for payment of the Rangitikei district, &c.

"I have, &c.,

"(Signed)

DONALD M'LEAN,
"Land Commissioner.
"The Civil Secretary,

(In support of the above see letters Rev. S. Williams and others.)

In 1858 a large block of land on the other side of the Manawatu-Rangitikei block, called the Ahuoturanga, was sold by the Rangitane tribe to the Government. The whole of the purchase-money was paid to the Hirawanu, chief of Rangitane, who made presents or a portion of the money to certain of the Ngatiraukawa. The following extracts from public documents will confirm a portion of the Natives' statements:—

Mr. Commissioner Serancke to the Chief Commissioner.

"Manawatu, Sept. 27, 1858.

"A numerous meeting of Natives from the Ngatiraukawa, Ngatiteihihi, Ngatiwhakatere, Te Upokoiri, Ngatiapa, Ngati-motuahi, and Rangitane, took place, when the whole of the upper part of the Manawatu was formally returned to Te Hirawanu by the three first-named tribes, All of Ngatiraukawa, they fully consenting to his selling the whole of it to the Government.

"(Signed) WILLIAM N. SERANCKE."

Mr. Commissioner Serancke to the Chief Commissioner, in a letter dated Manawatu, Nov. 12, 1855, speaking of Hirawanu and his people, says—"Who, through accidental circumstances, have been again put in full possession of the lands of their forefathers.

"(Signed) W. N. SERANCKE."

Mr. Commissioner Serancke to the Chief Commissioner.

"Wellington, August 6, 1861.

"In September (27), 1858, I had the honour of reporting to you on the negotiations for the purchase of this
block, I then succeeded in obtaining the consent of all the leading chiefs of the Ngatiraukawa tribe to the sale, and the waiving by them of their claims on it. Immediately their consent was gained, difficulties were thrown in the way of the completion of the purchase by a price per acre being insisted on, and the acreage ascertained. Whether these difficulties were made at the suggestion of the Ngatiraukawas, or by Te Hirawanu himself, in the pride of his heart in becoming the acknowledged and undisputed owner of so much land, I am not prepared to say.

"(Signed)
W. N. SERANCKE."

In 1862 the General Assembly passed the "Native Lands Act." The Manawatu block was excepted from the Act. Dr. Featherston then stated that he was in treaty for the block, which was simply untrue. Dr. Featherston, in a report dated June 30, 1866, states, that when speaking to the Native chief Ihakara of what passed in 1864, he himself said—" Nor was he (Ihakara) perhaps aware that the 'Native Lands Act' expressly excepts from its operation all lands on which purchase deposits have been made by the Government. Now, although no deposit had yet been paid on the Rangitikei-Manawatu block, Ihakara could not deny that virtually it was already in the hands of the Commissioner. Ihakara would remember the meeting at Manawatu, when a formal offer of sale was made by himself and other representative chiefs, and accepted by the Commissioner on behalf of the Crown. He would remember on that occasion giving up to the Commissioner a carved club, in token of the absolute surrender of the land, subject to terms. It was only fair, therefore, to deal with the Rangitikei-Manawatu block as land under sale to the Government, although the final terms had not yet been arranged." The real reason for excepting the block may be found in the following extract from a letter dated—

"Wellington, August 26, 1851.

"There is a fine rich district of land situated between the Rangitikei and the Manawatu, the acquisition of which, in the course of a few years, will be found very desirable."

"I have, &c,

"(Signed) DONALD M'LEAN,
"Land Commissioner."

"The Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
"&c, &c, &c."

In the exception clause we find "Be it enacted that all right of selection by the said Act conferred ("The Land Orders and Scrip Act, 1858") shall be exercisable within the block of land called "The Mauawatu Block," whenever the Native title to the said block shall have been ceded to Her Majesty, and not otherwise or elsewhere, &c" "Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other, properties, which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession." It would appear that the General Assembly of New Zealand not only count but actually dispose of "their chickens before they are hatched," Her Majesty's "guarantee" to the contrary notwithstanding. All the documents published of late by the Government bearing upon the Manawatu question, and emanating from the Land Purchase Commissioner, are evidently intended to show that the "only possible solution of the dispute was an absolute sale of the whole of the land in dispute to the Crown." One may, perhaps, be pardoned for suggesting that any other solution of the dispute might have militated against the requirements of "The Land Orders and Scrip Act, 1858;" if so, then all Dr. Featherston's statements which appear so repeatedly in his reports about the prevention of bloodshed must be taken for so much execrable cant, manufactured in the Native Office, and published by the Minister of the doctrines of that most beauteous establishment.

The following is the exception clause:---

X. Extraordinary Provisions.

"LXXXII And whereas by an Act of the General Assembly of New Zealand intituled 'The Land Orders and
that their Missionaries were always telling them that under the Christian law they were "all one flesh," victors altogether," The Ngatiraukawa chiefs give as the reason for their having been so kind to the Ngatiapas of late, while the latter, always regarding the Ngatiapa claim as one of sufferance, are disposed to ignore it holders Ngatiapa have come to regard their claim as one of absolute right, in every respect equal to that of the present December 31, 1862, which he repeats in his report dated 31st August, 1863:—"With the lapse of years the understanding that it did not interfere with the title to the land. Mr. Buller states, in his report dated disapproving of the arrangement, knowing the leases to be irregular and illegal, allowed the matter to pass, with anxious to conciliate them, wished them to have a portion of the rents; the majority of the chiefs, whilst state; that Nepia Taratoa, who was living on the side of the block nearest the Ngatiapa settlements, being them." The non-sellers state that the leases were drawn out at a time when the country was in a very disturbed block is made a great handle of by the Government. Mr. Fox in his memorandum dated Rangitikei, August 19, 1863, states:—"It is believed that most, if not all, of the leases were originally arranged with Nepia Taratoa, the principal chief of the Ngatirau-kawas, though members of other tribes are also parties to them, or some of them." The non-sellers state that the leases were drawn out at a time when the country was in a very disturbed state; that Nepia Taratoa, who was living on the side of the block nearest the Ngatiapa settlements, being anxious to conciliate them, wished them to have a portion of the rents; the majority of the chiefs, whilst disapproving of the arrangement, knowing the leases to be irregular and illegal, allowed the matter to pass, with the understanding that it did not interfere with the title to the land. Mr. Buller states, in his report dated December 31, 1862, which he repeats in his report dated 31st August, 1863:—"With the lapse of years the Ngatiapa have come to regard their claim as one of absolute right, in every respect equal to that of the present holders; while the latter, always regarding the Ngatiapa claim as one of sufferance, are disposed to ignore it altogether," The Ngatiraukawa chiefs give as the reason for their having been so kind to the Ngatiapas of late, that their Missionaries were always telling them that under the Christian law they were "all one flesh," victors..."
and vanquished alike, and "urged them to act a generous part towards those who had been so harshly treated in past years."

See Appendix, letter from Rev. S. Williams. Ngatiapa now say that Ngatiraukawa should go back to Maungatapu for their land. The Judges of the Native Lands Court ridicule Ngatiraukawa's claim to Maungatapu. Ngatiraukawa had better abide by the law of the Land Court, or between the two laws they are likely to go to the wall! They may now in their turn tell their Missionaries, to go and preach their "one flesh" doctrines to Dr. Featherston and the General Assembly.

The following appears in the journal of James Grindell, interpreter, dated July 31, 1858, published among the reports of the Native Land Purchase Department:—" When the Ngatiraukawa first established themselves in the country, each division of the tribe claimed and took formal possession of certain tracts, as their share of the conquest, of which they forthwith became the sole proprietors, and of which they ever afterwards retained possession." This applies to the whole of the Manawatu-Rangi-tikei block, and taken with the third clause of the Treaty as interpreted by Dr. Featherston in 1860, and the Judges of the Native Lands Court at a later period, would appear to give the Ngatiraukawa a clear title from the Crown to the whole of the block. It is almost a wonder that Dr. Featherston could not see it in that light, leaving the Ngatiapa to sue for any moneys they might consider due to them on account of the irregular and illegal leases in which Nepia Taratoa had allowed some of them to join.

Extract from a Despatch from Sir G. Grey, K.C.B., to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle.

"Government House, 17th December, 1863.

"MY LORD DUKE—

"4th. I ought to mention to your Grace that I believe I was the first to recommend the forfeiture of lands by those Natives who took up arms against us, and I did so for the following reasons:—Because such a proceeding is in conformity with their own customs. It will affect lands of those who have forced us into war, and leaves secure to the Native owners who have remained at peace, their large landed possessions in other parts of the Island. They will thus, from contrast, see the advantages secured by being protected by British rule, and the punishment which follows wanton attacks upon the European race and their properties. At the same time, from enactments recently made, the well-disposed Natives who retain their lands can deal as they please with them.

"I have, &c.,

"(Signed) G. GREY."

Extract from a copy of a reply from Governor Sir G. Grey, K.C.B., to the letter of the Aborigines Protection Society.

"Government House, Auckland, April 7, 1864.

"SIR—

"The object of the local Government, therefore, has been to secure to that numerous part of the Native population who have taken no active share in the present war, the whole of their landed possessions; and, also by laws framed expressly for this object, to give to the lands held by such Natives a value greater than they have previously had for their owners, by; in all respects, giving them equal rights in their landed possessions
with those enjoyed by their European fellow-subjects: the intention in this respect being to show that the rights of peaceable citizens, of whatever race, are carefully respected, and to give the Natives so valuable a stake in the country that they are not likely hereafter to hazard it lightly.

"I have, &c,
"(Signed)
G. GREY."

It is a pity Sir G. Grey, K. C. B., did not, at the same time, inform "My Lord Duke," and the Aborigines Protection Society, that, at the time he wrote, from 400,000 to 500,000 acres of fine land, chiefly the property of the loyal and peaceable Ngatiraukawa, were excepted from the operation of "The Native Lands Act:"—almost as good as confiscated—the owners fairly bailed up, their rents impounded, in order and to the very good end that those lands might fall an easy prey to the Superintendent and Provincial Government of "Wellington. Verily, hath it not been written, "Man in his best estate is altogether vanity."

In 1865 the Natives sent a petition to the Assembly, praying that the exception clause might be abolished from "The Native Lands Act." The fact of their petition having been rejected is generally attributed to log-rolling. One honorable member, who has figured largely in the Ministries of the Colony, if not to his own credit at least to the infinite damage of the colonists' pockets, having promised to support the petition, afterwards gave as his reason for not doing so, that "He saw how the matter was going, that he could do no good, therefore walked out of the House." Another honorable member frankly admitted, "The fact is, we were obliged to log-roll!" Long may these two gentlemen live alike an ornament and a comfort to their adopted country. Long may they live, occasionally to represent the Provincial Government of Auckland in the General Assembly of New Zealand. The following is the petition:—

"To the Great Council of New Zealand, at Wellington assembled.

"Tawhirihoe, Rangitikei,

"To — MANTELL,—

"Friend—Salutations to you, and to the members of the Council of the Government. This is an inquiry by us, the residents of the district lying between Ohau and Rangitikei, what is the reason that Rangitikei and Manawatu are excluded from the permissive law of the Government of New Zealand ("Native Lands Act, 1862")? Rangitikei, Manawatu, and on to Ohau, are in your prison-house. Great is the grief that has come upon us on account of your having enacted two courses of law for New Zealand—one a law for opening (permissive); the other a law for closing (prohibitory). Rather let them all (both) be open. If you persist in closing up our small piece between Ohau and Rangitikei, great will be our grief at our imprisonment by you. It would be better to make the permission general, that there may be but one law for our Island; lest some live in gladness of heart, and others in darkness of heart: that is to say, they who enjoy the permissive law, have gladness; while to us, who are bound in your prison-house, there is darkness of heart. Therefore, we, the chiefs of the district, thus restricted by you, request of you, the members of the Government, that you will remove this ill-working restriction from our territory, and permit us to go on our way in lightness, joy, and gladness of heart."

(159 Signatures.)

"May 5th, 1865.

"These men are of Horowhenau, and to be included in the matter of removing the restriction from everything, that they may all live in joy and gladness of heart."

(21 Signatures.)

These all advocate the removal of the restriction—that is, the removal of the prohibition on land leasing; even down to the smaller matters. Some have not been subscribed because they are absent about their business.

"Ohau,
"To Ihakara,—

"Friend, we have heard your proposal through Te "Peina. It is well that you should attend to the alteration of evil regulations. That also is what we are for thrusting aside, that the mana of the Governor may not rest upon our lands, even as also your desire is. Rather let his mana light upon Manawatu, and the lands of (sold by) Hirawanu, the lands which have properly become his; that would be right: but this work of the Governor is wrong. Be strong in your condemnation of your evil-working regulations. The end."

(17 Signatures.)

In April, 1866, the Superintendent purchased the Manawatu Block, said to contain 250,000 acres, from five tribes to whom the land did not belong, the sixth tribe, the Ngatiraukawa, with very few exceptions, refusing to sell (see Appendix, Dr. Featherston's report). Dr. Featherston states, "It was tacitly admitted by Aperahama te Ruru and Nepia (both Ngatiraukawas) that although they were now opposing the sale, they could not suggest any other way of settling their quarrel with the Ngatiapa." How could they? Their rents were impounded. Dr. Featherston tells them that to attempt to settle the matter by arbitration, by a division of the land, or by investigation in a court of justice, would be a mere farce. Parakaia in his petition exclaims, "Alas! for the treaty of Waitangi;" might not these men have exclaimed, "Alas! for the grand desire of the British colonists, whatever can have become of it." Those two men have since signed the deed of cession.

The following appears in a memorandum drawn by the Ministers in 1860:—"The grand desire of the British colonists in respect of the Natives, is to see the Maori people rendered amenable, in their dealings with the settlers to British law ... that all the inhabitants of New Zealand should be subjected to the control of one equal law."

The following is in Mr. Weld's memorandum, drawn in 1860, in reply to Sir William Martin:—" The practical issue now, is whether the natives are peaceably to appeal to the justice of the British Government for the recognition of their rights, or whether, if they think those rights are infringed, they are to resort to force of arms." In Mr. Richmond's memorandum:—"One practical issue now being tried, is, whether the Natives are in future to trust to the justice of the British Government for the recognition of their rights, or to force of arms."

In a despatch from Mr. Cardwell to Sir George Grey is the following:—

"Downing Street,

26th April, 1864.

"I conclude by expressing an earnest hope that the operations in which General Cameron has been engaged may have already terminated the war, and shall rejoice when I am able to congratulate you on having succeeded, by the wisdom of your measures and those of your Government, by the skill of that distinguished commander, and by the valour of the Queen's troops and seamen, in restoring the blessings of order and good government to the Country intrusted to your care.

"I have, &c,
"Edward Cardwell."

On the 14th April, 1866, the Land Purchase Commissioner, Her Majesty's agent, after ridiculing alike the idea of attempting to settle the dispute between the tribes by arbitration, by a division of the land, or by having the claims of the various tribes investigated in the Native Lands Court, says, "He now gathered that the six tribes assembled before him were all but unanimous in scouting every one of these proposals, and were more than ever convinced that the only possible solution of the dispute was, to use their own words, an absolute sale of the whole of the land in dispute to the Crown, and after having for many days patiently heard all they had to say, he had no hesitation in expressing his entire concurrence in that conviction." He concludes by telling the Natives "he had no difficulty in publicly announcing his public acceptance of the block." (See Appendix.)

It must be very satisfactory to the British tax-payers to be told by Dr. Featherston, the New Zealand Land Purchase Commissioner, that, after ten regiments of British soldiers have been sent to New Zealand at their expense, after the expenditure of a vast amount of "British blood and treasure," after His Excellency Sir George Grey's government had succeeded in desolating the homes of the Maori, decimating their tribes, confiscating their lands to the Crown, inflicting a vast amount of misery upon the Maori race, compelling them (as the Whanganui Chronicle hath it) "naked and famine-stricken to submit to the force of circumstances," inflicting..."
upon a large section of Her Majesty's subjects of the high spirited Maori race, that dull depression, that gloom, that *taedium vita* which slays with the hand of death,—after having trampled under foot the work of British Societies in this country, driving the Natives to Hau-hauism, to debauchery and to crime—all for the avowed purpose of asserting in this land the supremacy of law, "the grand desire of the British colonists in respect of the Natives," is now as far as ever from being realized. It must be very satisfactory to that modern colonial representative of British heroism, by name called Charles Heaphy, to learn that he has fought and that he has bled (query did he bleed) in vain, that the V.C. that has been bestowed upon him by his Sovereign, and which he wears with so much pride, so far from being an honour, is, all things considered, a disgrace alike to the Colony, to his fellow colonists, and to himself. Yea and verily is not the Native chief Ihakara now, as ever, justified in saying, "you Pakehas are a set of humbugs."

The following will show a marked contrast between the sellers and non-sellers. Dr. Featherston reports thus (see Appendix) of what passed at a meeting held on 28th March:—"Governor Hunia mode a still more violent speech against the other tribes, openly boasted that they (the Ngatiapas) had now plenty of arms and ammunition, and could easily drive off their opponents, and that they would now prefer an appeal to arms to any other course. He almost hinted that they had, during the West Coast campaign, reserved their ammunition for that purpose." On the 14th April, "Ihakara and the leading selling chiefs were more earnest than before in pressing the sale of the block, while Hunia to Hakeke openly declared that if the meeting should break up without the sale having been effected, he would return at once to pa building, and would decide the question of title by a trial of strength with the Ngatiraukawa."

"Parakaia (a non-seller) again brought forward his scheme for a settlement of the question (by a reference to the Land Court) which was scouted by the Ngatiapa."

The following letter, written by a Ngatiraukawa chief, was published in the Wellington Advertiser:—

"To the Colonists of New Zealand.

"Manawatu,

"*Our elder brothers,—*

We wish to ask you why you thus treat us, who are dwelling in peace and quietness? For now seven-and-twenty years we have lived peaceably under the protection of the Queen and under the law. We have been guilty of no wrong, and have always upheld the right. For what reason is justice now withheld? Your constant cry has been—'Let the law investigate.' That investigation you have now denied to us. You cast the law—the protector—on one side, and you 'jump upon the land.'

"Is it right that an innocent man should be condemned unheard? Does not the same law apply to the land? Or is it just to treat as naught what is generally admitted to be right according to the common custom of mankind?—to send a man guiltless to prison, there to dwell in darkness? Is it just that a man who has been guilty of no fault, should be driven to dwell in sadness—denied the right of inquiry?

"We know that you claim Waikato and all the land that you have conquered; you claim it by right of conquest; that conquest is but of recent date. It was thus that we got possession, many years since, of Rangitikei and of the country down this coast. Now you say that it is not right that Maori usages should become law.

"Our elder brothers, there is no injustice with the law; the law is impartial; man is insolent and unjust. Witness your springing, regardless alike of law and justice, upon Rangitikei. The saying is your's—'Let the law decide.'

"Te Waharoa came to you, he asked you to give him back Waikato. You replied, 'That cannot be, it would not be just.' Now why do you take Rangitikei out of our hands, and give it back to Ngatiapa? Here is a Maori proverb, 'Well done, thou parent with the double tongue!'

"Here is another of your precepts which we are carefully laying to heart. You have always assured us that the land of those who dwell in peace shall be protected to them by the law. Permit us to ask you where are those laws; are they asleep; whatever can have become of them?

"Our elder brothers, we wish you to explain to us what you mean by living quietly—by dwelling in peace. You have told us to live peaceably: we have done so, we are now found fault with. What sort of living in peace is it that you require of us? It is but just that they who disturb the peace should perish by the sword, and that their land should be forfeited. In our case, to those who have been guilty of no fault—who are dwelling peaceably under the law, you have denied the protection of law. Why are love and mercy withheld from those who are peaceably inclined, and who are always ready to submit to the law?
"Look you in our opinion. On the first occasion, at Wairau, the enlightened guide was the first to fall, after him the blind. Likewise at the Waitara, the enlightened guide first fell, the blind followed. On the third occasion, at the Waikato, for the first time, they both fell together into the deep. Our elder brothers, is this burden to be constantly borne? It is well sometimes to reflect: reflect then on your own conduct; be not too hard upon that of your younger brother; he is but a poor ignorant fellow.

"As the matter now stands, you have hidden away the law lest by it your treatment of innocent men, who are constant in their respect for that which is right, should be brought to light; and you have lowered the name of the Queen by using it as a menace to a loyal and unoffending people, who are striving to obey the law, and keep the peace.

"Our elder brothers, it rests with you to set this matter right. Permit the eye of the law to look into these wrongs of innocent and peaceable men. Cease from withholding the law.

"From your younger brothers,

"From

NGATIRAUkAWA."

After Dr. Featherston's formal acceptance of the block, in 1860, the Ngatiraukawas paid repeated visits to Wellington, for the purpose of protesting against the proceedings of the Land Purchase Commissioner; they also petitioned the Governor, the Assembly, and the Ministers, to have the title to the land investigated in a court of justice. Their prayers were wholly disregarded. These Natives have now petitioned the Queen of England for justice and protection—besides Parakaia's petition, there are some five others from men of different hapus. The petitioners represent some two hundred and fifty men, who with their wives and children will number at least seven hundred Natives. It has been repeatedly stated by the Wellington Independent, the organ of the Provincial Government, that Parakaia and a few Natives at Otaki are the only opponents to the sale of the block. Parakaia and some thirty men with him own 11,800 acres which they have surveyed. A large portion of their land consists of sand-hills, the other hapus own much larger blocks, consisting mostly of excellent land. The greater number of these men are living upon the block. There are many of the Natives who have a far larger interest at stake than Parakaia, and though every effort has been made to bribe and intimidate him, he has fought manfully and well for his people's rights. Parakaia, unlike the New Zealand Land Purchase Commissioners, is a noble-minded man.

So far from these petitions being attended to, the General Assembly passed a bill authorizing the raising of a loan of £30,000 for the purchase of the Manawatu Block. The debentures not having been disposed of in time, His Excellency's Ministers supplied the money which was paid down by Dr. Featherston in December, 1866. These unfortunate Natives were then told that "their land was all gone to the Queen; that it was all 'fighting ground'; that the six tribes had all met together and sold the whole block to Dr. Featherston; that there would be no further investigation as to title; that they had better sign the deed of cession and take what money was offered them; that whether they did so or not the land was gone." The above is well-known and can be proved in any court of justice—I have heard the story from many of the Natives. The following is an extract from a letter to myself from Akapita Te Tewe, a Ngatiraukawa native:—" Mr. Buller offered me money and asked me to sign the deed of cession of Rangitikei. I replied 'I will not take any of your money, none whatever.' Mr. Buller replied, 'You will not like being passed over in the distribution of the money, for the land is in Dr. Featherston's hands; you had better take some money at once lest it be all gone, and you be missed.' I replied, 'What do I care about your money being all spent, my land will be left.' Mr. Buller replied with a laugh. That Pakeha said, 'have you not heard that Rangitikei has been publicly handed over to Dr. Featherston and the Government; that there will be no further investigation?' "The following is an extract from a letter sent to me by Henere Te Herekau:—"Mr. Buller said to me, 'I saw Ngatiapa armed with guns and cartouche boxes; they were coming to set fire to your nouses on this side of Rangitikei. Ngatiapa said to me, "Buller, keep Ngatiraukawa away from Rangitikei or we shall fire upon them." Buller said to me, 'You must give your consent and sell this land to me, lest you be killed by Ngatiapa.' On April 14th we asked to have the title investigated. Mr. Buller replied, 'The title to this land cannot be investigated in the Supreme Court. Your opponents will not agree to investigation, nor will Dr. Featherston and I allow it; better sell the block, and when we have got it we will mark off reserves for you.' On 6th March, at Puketotara, Mr. Buller said, 'It is all nonsense your opposing my work; this land is in our hands; the land belongs to the Queen; you had better take the money; whether you take it or no the land is gone to the Queen.'"

These Natives, who are among the most loyal and peaceable men in New Zealand, petitioned the Assembly and the Ministers. (See Appendix.) They might as well have petitioned the east wind. What care the General Assembly for the character or the "grand desire" of the New Zealand colonists? What care they for the
Christianity or for the welfare of Her Majesty's subjects of the Maori race? What care they for Great Britain's Treaty? What care they for the honour of Great Britain's Crown? Perish the character of the New Zealand colonists, perish their "grand desire," perish the Christianity of the Maori, perish the Maori race, perish Great Britain's Treaty, perish the honour of Great Britain's Crown.

Those Natives went to Wellington to see the Governor; they also wrote several letters to His Excellency protesting against the proceedings of the Land Purchase Commissioners. (See Appendix.) A few days before the purchase money was paid down by Dr. Featherston, Sir G. Grey sent a special messenger to Otaki to fetch Parakaia and Rawiri, two of the principal non-sellers. The notes of what passed at their interview, as written by the two Natives a day or two after the interview took place, are here subjoined. I am told that Mr. Puckey, who was pre- sent, questions the correctness of some of their statements. Parakaia and Rawiri are well known — they both bear high character. Sir G. Grey sent for them, knowing them to be thoroughly trustworthy. So satisfied was he with the assurance they gave him that, there would not be any fighting, that he next day left on a tour of visits to the settlements in the Middle Island. Parakaia published their account of the meeting in the Wellington Advertiser. I believe if the Europeans and Natives who were present could all be examined upon oath, there would not be very much difference in their statements. Two young men who are Maori scholars say what Parakaia published is word for word what the Natives repeated to them a few hours after the interview closed. Doubtless Sir G. Grey was right in allowing these people's land to be excepted from the Native Lands Act, and their rents to be impounded. Doubtless he was right in denying to these men the protection of law, in telling Parakaia to "Consent to the sale of Rangitikei—give it up to Dr. Featherston; if you persist in retaining it you will quarrel amongst yourselves about it," seeing that Dr. Featherston is prepared "to make them an award in land to the extent of such claims as are admitted by the sellers," Doubtless he was right, having satisfied himself that these men would not fight, in leaving them, with the Treaty of Waitangi, to their fate. Sir G. Grey is no ordinary man; he is Governor Sir G. Grey, K.C.B., England's model Governor and famous dispatch writer—who came all the way from the Cape Colony to New Zealand to restore peace to this distracted land. Doubtless he was right. Doubtless it is right that there should be certain islands, by name called the Chathams, to which are sent New Zealand's political offenders and defaulters.

"Otaki,

"To Thomas Williams,—

"DEAR FRIEND,—

Will you publish the enclosed, being a report of what was said by Governor Grey and myself. I wish it to be read by both the Pakelas and Maoris. I was foolish enough to suppose that when he sent for me it was to tell me something good—that he would instruct Dr. Featherston to keep back his money; but when I saw him he only told me to give up the land; that if I persisted in holding the land the Maoris and the Government would fight. I assured him there would not be any fighting, No sooner did he satisfy himself upon this point than he forgot all about our being brought to grief by this dishonest land purchasing of the Government of Wellington. This is all from your friend,

"Parakaia te Pouepa."

"Wellington, Government House,

"November 26th, 1866.

"This is what was said about Rangitikei. 

"Governor Grey — Parakaia, the reason why I have sent for you is that I am alarmed. Trouble is near; this is what I fear, and why I wished to learn what you think about Rangitikei. I am much alarmed. Hostilities are now likely to take place at our end of this island. What I now desire is that you should consent to the sale of Rangitikei—give it up to Dr. Featherston. If you persist in retaining it you will quarrel among yourselves about it.

"Parakaia—You do well to be alarmed at the probability of hostilities, but go and talk to Featherston. What has been said about fighting does not proceed from me; that threat of fighting came from Featherston's friends. 

"Governor — Those tribes, "Whanganui, Ngatiapa, and Ngatikahununu, are angry because you refused to sell Rangitikei. I am grieved, very much grieved, about this, Parakaia.

"Parakaia—I was not aware that those tribes intended to fight. It must be Dr. Featherston having offered
them money caused them to be elated, and to act in that way. What right would men have to go from this to Taranaki to fight? Should we think of going to fight about the land belonging to the men of Ahuriri, as you say Ngatikahununu are coming over here to the country of these tribes without any cause, for the purpose of stirring up strife; besides, it is not my business to lecture those tribes, it is your duty to admonish them.

"Governor — Don't be headstrong, Parakaia; if you are obstinate you will only be drawing other people into trouble. You resemble a man hauling on to the rope of a canoe, until suddenly it is smashed on a rock. You are also drawing the Government into a war there.

"Parakaia—I am not responsible for that war (which you imagine will come); that talk about fighting comes from Featherston's friends.

"Governor—If you will yield to what I advise, just sign your name to the deed of cession, and say to the people— I have assented to sell this land to the Government. Featherston will take care that my piece of land shall be excluded from the block which is alienated, as well as the lands of those who are opposing the sale.' And say to Featherston, 'Have their lands excluded from the alienated portions.' This is a prudent course to adopt. Sign your names to the deed, that your own pieces of land may be secure; these will not then be touched.

The Native Lands Act, which was passed by the General Assembly in the session just closed, and assented to by Governor Sir G. Grey on behalf of Her Majesty, 10th October, 1867, provides in clause 38, one of two clauses bearing upon the Manawatu Block, "That no claim by, and no question relating to the title or interest of, any native who shall have signed the said deed of sale, shall be so referred (to the Native Lands Court).” See postscript.

"Parakaia—Why have you not hitherto advised me during these months that have elapsed? Had you spoken then I could have communicated what you said to the tribe for their careful consideration, which possibly by this time might have been agreed to; but the day of trouble about Rangitikei is near at hand—it is too late now to deliberate with my tribe. Besides, I have been dealing with McLean (who understands these questions) instead of Featherston, I might be induced to think there was some feasible plan in what you two propose. For Featherston made me a similar offer; I declined it. He pressed me to consent to the sale of Rangitikei, and promised me money. I declined it, and said, I am not a servant working for hire; no master said to me retain your land, I retain it of my own accord.

"Governor—Parakaia, you possess land in many parts of this Island—you have lands at Maungatautari and elsewhere. Give up this particular piece of land to the Government, in order that the Government may treat you with consideration, in reference to your claims to those other lands.

"Parakaia—Stay! one thing at a time you are now confusing the matter in hand with irrelevant allusions to other land claims.

"Governor—What I meant was that the course for the Government might be clear; in my opinion that is right.

"Parakaia—I said to you some months ago, speak out your mind; do not remain silent, lest your silence be taken advantage of by Dr. Featherston as a consenting to his evil doings. Had you spoken then, what you now aim at might have been accomplished; but now I am taken aback, I am not clear what to do. I said earnestly on a previous occasion, Governor, speak out your mind.

"Governor—My son, I did speak before; nevertheless I now speak again distinctly. I am right in what I now propose; you are to blame in refusing to attend to it.

"Parakaia—What can I do? Can I break a tough tree? The tribe has come to a determination not to sell. I have no power to alter their resolution. I might now, perhaps, influenced by fear of you, give a hasty and useless assent to sell; but what then?

"Governor—If you fear me, give your assent. I am a wrathful Governor; assent.

"Parakaia—If it were Maori anger I should be afraid; but it is a Governor who is angry. I trust he will soon see he is angry without a just cause.

"Governor—My words are good; you are a madman; you ought to be sent to the lunatic asylum at Karore.

"Parakaia— You ought to send Featherston to the madhouse at Karore. I am no madman. The land on one side of this block has long since been ceded to you; you heard then that there was a determination to retain this portion. Subsequently Governor Browne and McLean endeavourd to purchase it, but we refused to sell. Those other tribes did not take it from us at that time. You have obtained both the Lower and Tipper Manawatu blocks; this is comparatively a small portion which we are retaining. Let Nepia, Takana, Hoeta, Wiriharai, and all the other owners of the various portions first give their assent to the sale; my assent will then follow and be of use; but tor me to venture and take the lead, and give a futile assent to the sale, is beyond my power. There is a fixed determination not to sell Rangitikei. I can now do nothing in the matter. With reference to what you say about fighting, we have nothing to do with that; it is for the Governor to put that down. Two men with conflicting interest will continue to quarrel. Now you are connected with England, Featherston with New Zealand. Owing to the troubles arising from land purchases conducted in this same faulty way, you came here
to restore peace. It is Dr. Featherston's duty to maintain the peace. It is for Parakaia's chief—for you are my chief—to mediate and judge. Attend now to what I say. My own piece of land is distinct; it has been surveyed; it is, comparatively with the block, a small piece (meaning his and his immediate friends) Nepia's is small, Rawiri's is small, Takana's is small, so is Whiriharai's, Hoeta a, so is each man's on to the end. They will none of them consent to part with their lands.

"The Governor turned to Puckey (the interpreter) to inquire about Nepia's name. Some conversation took place. The Governor then told Puckey to ask Rawiri to speak, that he might hear whether he thought the Governor or Parakaia had taken the more satisfactory view of the question.

"Rawiri te Wanui said—Their discussion has made nothing clear to my mind. But this is what I have to say. The old men of the tribe are dead; their resolution to retain this land for the use of the tribe still holds good, and the Governor was plainly informed of their determination at the time. This talk about holding Rangitikei is nothing new—questions about other places in this Island are of later date. Rangitikei still goes on. We who are alive shall not depart from the determination of those who are dead. But with regard to this talk about fighting it never came from those who are dead, nor shall that evil word originate from us, their children, who survive.

"Governor—You two did well to come to me. I am satisfied. It is well. Parakaia, our talk is ended.

"Present—Hon. J. C. Richmond, Mr. Puckey, Mr. Halse, Parakaia Tokoroa, and Rawiri Te Wanui."

"[Translation.]

"(To the Editor of the Advertiser.)

"Otaki,

"Sir,—

Please to publish my letter in your paper. I hear that Mr. Puckey questions the accuracy of the account given in your paper of Parakaia's interview with the Governor. Attend. I was Parakaia's companion, and heard all that was said by the Governor and him. I confirm all Parakaia's statement contained In the account in your paper. This is an accurate account of what passed between them at the Governor's house. "When we returned to our house in the Maori village, Parakaia immediately began to write down what had been said. It was not finished there, but on our return to Otaki it was carefully finished.

"RAWIRI TE WANUI."

In the New Zealand Herald, Auckland, Monday, July 1867. received last evening, is the following:—

RUSSELL.

"Native Fight Near Waimate—7 Natives Killed—Many Wounded—Further Hostilities Pending."
"(From our own Correspondent.)"

"July 12.

"The 'Sea Breeze' is just off, and I have only just time to write a few lines. News has just come in that
the Natives I told you of in my last as likely to come to blows, near the Waimate, and through the exertions of
the R.M. for the district, had separated and gone to their kaingas, had re-assembled and had a skirmish, killing
seven—three on Wi Katene's side, and four on Piripi Korongohi's—besides several wounded. Amongst the
killed are Renata Kawana, from Oramahoe; Piripi, Maioha, Te Maura; and the wounded, Pene Whare Oneone,
and Rautara, a son-in-law of old Kawiti.

"As they have made such a beginning there is no knowing where it will end, as all the relations of the dead
men will, I suppose, go in for 'utu' for their friends.

"The piece of land in dispute is about 411 acres, though, I believe, valuable."

"It may be a matter of wonder to some that the Natives at the Bay of Islands, who have remained loyal
throughout the whole of the late disturbances, should fight amongst themselves about the ownership of a small
piece of land. The answer is a simple one. During the war with Heke and Kawiti, a small tribe of Natives living
at a place called the Kawakawa, with others, Tamati 'Walker's people, &c., assisted the military against their
countrymen; they placed their pas, their canoes, their arms, their lives, their all, unreservedly at the disposal of
the Government. Some few years afterwards, when the country was quiet, some of Kawiti's people (old Kawiti
was then dead) accused a chief living at the Kawakawa with having bewitched (Makutu) one of their people,
causing his (or her) death. An armed party without any further ceremony proceeded to their chief's house and
shot him dead in his bed at the dawn of day. These Natives, thinking that one good turn deserves another, with
Tamati Walker at their head, applied to the Government for assistance in having these men taken up. The great
majority of the Natives would have assisted the Government. They were told in reply that "it was a native
affair, and that they must settle it amongst themselves." Well and nobly done through your Representative and
agents, Great Britain! Britain, thou art great, thou art mighty, thou art wealthy, thou art honoured amongst the
nations of the earth. Go on and prosper—perish my poor brown-skinned countrymen of the Maori race,
committed by the Almighty to thy care. What carest thou?

I have often heard a church missionary (a brave and good old man, whose grey hairs, after having expended
the whole energies of his life in the service of others, are now being brought with sorrow to the grave, seeing
the fruits of his own labour and of his brave colleagues' scattered to the winds, mainly through the
instrumentality of the New Zealand Land Purchase Commissioners), tell the following story:—"Shortly after
our arrival, I made a bargain with a party of Natives and their chief for a supply of rushes, &c., for building a
cottage for my family; they were to be paid in tobacco, so many sticks for so many bundles of rushes. They
brought the rushes a day or two afterwards and piled them in heaps, when the chief demanded some four or five
times as much tobacco as had been agreed upon, which I refused to give. The fellow commenced to dance
about, flourished his tomahawk over my head, and vowed, if the tobacco were not forthcoming, he would kill
and eat us all. My interpreters, who knew but little Maori, became frightened, and pressed me to comply with
the chiefs demand, Not a word was spoken by the crowd. I could not speak a word of Maori. I could only reply
by look. At last the chief became exhausted and sat down. After a short time spent in silence, he said, 'give us
what was agreed upon.' I placed the requisite number of sticks upon each pile of bundles, and when I came to
the old chief I broke off a piece of tobacco an inch long and threw it to him. The result was a burst of
uproarious laughter from the crowd, in which the old chief himself joined." This occurred in 1823.

The following story is told by a Judge of the Native Lands Court, of what occurred in his Court at
Waimate, Bay of Islands, some two years since:—"The court was full of natives, a young chief came up to give
his evidence, when I held out the Bible for him to kiss. He said, 'What shall I do with it, shall I bite it,' and
forthwith opened his mouth and bit the book, I did not do it myself, it was my instincts—my arm stretched
forth, Bible in hand, and I struck the fellow with all my might on the side of the head, which sent him spinning
head over heels to the other end of the court. Not a word was spoken. I, of course, expected to be killed, when,
to my astonishment, the man picked himself up, walked up to me, kissed the book reverently, and gave his
evidence like a Christian." Why did the Natives in the two cases I have instanced submit? Because they knew
that they were in the wrong and the Pakeha in the right. "Why did they fight at Waitara? Because they knew
that Pakeha was in the wrong.

When will the rulers in this country learn to treat the Natives, not as so many cattle, but as human beings? It
will, I have no doubt, be found that all that the Government have done in the Bay of Islands case is to send a
magistrate to the Natives with instructions to preach to them the time-worn "one flesh" doctrines of the old
Manawatu Church Missionaries. Why, may I ask, does not the Native Minister go to the Bay of Islands and tell
the Natives concerned that inasmuch as they have dared to take up arms and to shed human blood—this being the first offence since the establishment of the supremacy of law in this land—that their only punishment so far will be, that their block of land in dispute, consisting of 411 acres, will be confiscated to the Crown; but that if they dare to fight any more. Charles Heaphy, Esq., V.C., with the Parnell Volunteers, will be sent to the North with instructions to blaze into both sides; that their lands will, to a great extent, be confiscated, and that they will be denied the benefits arising from the Native Lands Act with respect to the remainder. If this were done, there is not a Maori in the land (poor brave fellows that they are—the British soldier says they are brave, and nothing has raised the British soldier more in the writer's estimation than the unwillingness they have displayed throughout to slay the Maori. When did the British soldier—the Irish, the English, and the Scotch soldier—ever yet meet a foeman worthy of their steel, but they made him trot) but would come forward and bare his head, and, if bare, would render it still barer in order that he might do infinite reverence and obedience to Her Majesty. They would point to their desolated homes, their decimated tribes, their confiscated lands, to their rebellion, their down-trodden Christianity, their Hauhauism, their crime, their disease, with the chances of their speedy extinction, to their tomahawks—some of them still reeking with the blood of England's best and bravest—and they would say, this is your doing: why did you not send that Majesty here before? Why did you not govern us upon those principles from the first? If that is the way and those are the principles upon which you mean to govern us for the future, we will lay down our arms, we will take the oath of allegiance, we will let the dead past bury its dead, and we will pledge ourselves henceforth and for evermore hereafter to become loyal subjects of Her Majesty, henceforth and for evermore hereafter to honour, to respect, and to obey the Governor and the Government of New Zealand.

In December, 1866, Dr. Featherston paid down the purchase money, £25,000, to the natives. I quote from the Wellington Independent of 20th December, 1866:—"Thursday, December 13th. The proceedings were short and business-like; Governor Hunia, on behalf of his people, stated that Dr. Featherston's proposal as to the tribal division of the purchase money, had now been acceded to by all the tribes concerned. He called on his Honor to send at once for the money, and to hand the shares over to the chiefs appointed by their respective tribes to receive them. He had been elected, in conjunction with Aperabama Tipae, to receive the Ngatiapa Rangitane share of £15,000, and he pledged himself here to see a fair and equitable division of the money among the several associated tribes. He called on Ihakara and Apera-hama Te Huruhuru, who had been appointed in like manner by their tribes, to be equally careful of the interests of all claimants. The Ngatiraukawa replied in friendly and conciliatory terms, and assured Dr. Reatherston that they would make ample provision for the few dissentients of their tribe who had refused to sign the deed, and would, if necessary, hand their allotted shares over to his Honor for safe custody." "Governor Hunia apologized publicly for having torn down the Queen's flag, assuring his Honor that it was not done out of any spirit of disloyalty to the Queen, but because of 'the gloom of his tribe,' and in the hope that it would precipitate the breaking up of the meeting. Dr. Featherston (through Mr. Buller) replied in an appropriate speech." "After which, Governor Hunia, as the representative of the Ngatiapa tribe and their allies, and Ihakara as the representative of the Ngatiraukawa, headed a procession to the flagstaff, holding between them the tin case containing the Manawatu deed of cession, which they placed on a table at the foot of the staff. Mr. Buller then opened the large roll of parchment, and read aloud to the assembled tribes the deed of final surrender. Dr. Featherston, as Land Purchase Commissioner, then came forward and signed the deed in due form, the signature being attested by the following witnesses:—Howard Kennard, gentleman, London; C. Wentworth Dilke, B.A., Barrister at Law, London; C. Hillingsworth, B.A., London; and Walter Buller, Resident Magistrate, Whanganui. The tribes then chanted a song of farewell to the land, with its forests and lakes, its cultivations and its fisheries, and parted for ever with it (according to their own expression) 'under the shining sun of the day.' "Saturday, December 15th.—Dr. Featherston addressed the people, through Mr. Buller, R.M., to the following effect:—'He said—' That before handing over the £25,000 in final completion of the Manawatu purchase, he had a pleasing duty to perform towards a chief who had taken an active part in the long, difficult, and tedious negotiations now successfully concluded. He was anxious to give Governor Hunia, in the presence of the assembled tribes, some token of his approbation. He had decided in his own mind that the signet ring which he was about to present to him was the most appropriate token, because of its symbolic associations. It was hardly necessary for him to explain that in the holy institution of matrimony the ring is the pledge or token of the solemn vows that are made at the altar; and that in like manner, he desired to symbolize the establishment of a firm and lasting friendship between the Ngatiapa and Ngatiraukawa tribes.

"His Honor then placed the ring on Governor Hunia's finger, with the words—' Let this ring be a token that there is no longer enmity between the tribes, and that henceforward they will live together on terms of mutual good will, in friendship with the Pakeha, and in loyalty to our Gracious Queen! And, Governor Hunia, long may you live to wear it!'

"The formal handing over of the money then took place, after which the tribes assembled under the Queen's flag, to hear Governor Hunia's speech in reply."
"The £15,000 for the Ngatiapa and Rangitane, and their allies, was paid over to Governor Hunia and Aperahama Tipae: and the £10,000 for Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitoa was paid over to Ihakara Tukumaru and Aperahama Te Huruhuru, these chiefs thereupon signing receipts on the back of the deed,' on behalf of and in the presence of the assembled tribes, 'for the respective amounts."

"The following gentlemen then affixed their names as witnesses to the signatures and payments, viz.:—H. J. Kennard, gentleman, London; C. Wentworth Dilke, Barrister, London; J. E. Illings-worth, B.A.; A. Follet Halcombe, sheep-farmer, Rangitikei; Maillard Noake, J.P., Rangitikei; M. W. Anderson, contractor, Wellington; and "Walter Buller, Resident Magistrate, Whanganui."

Thus the Manawatu purchase was completed. Thus £15,000 was paid to the conquered tribes not in possession of the land, and to strangers having no claim, whilst £10,000 was paid to the conquerors in full possession, only a few of whom were present and partook of the money; also to men who laid no claim to the land. I was informed by a Ngatikahununu chief that Governor Hunia assigned to him as his reason for enforcing the sale 'that they might be revenged upon the Ngatiraukawa, their old conquerors.' However that might be, a day or two after his having been invested with the signet ring, Governor Hunia trotted away with £4,400 of the £5,000 entrusted to his care for the Rangitane. Whether his attempted revenge may prove a success remains to be seen.

Shortly before the money was paid, 24 Ngatiraukawa chiefs went to Wellington and had an interview with the Hon. J. C. Richmond, the Native Minister. The following is their account of what passed: they are not quite clear as to the month:—" We went to Wellington in the month of (September?), 1866; our reason for going was to protest against the sale of our land, and to request that the title to Rangitikei might be investigated. Mr. Richmond heard what we had to say about holding our land, and our protest against our lands being sold by other tribes. He then rose to reply. He said, 'What you say about holding your land is right, but the difficulty is, there is but one bone and there are three dogs biting at that one bone; that is why your holding back the land is not clear. The great majority of the tribes have agreed to Bell Rangitikei; only a small minority are holding it back—this is what bothers the Assembly and the Government.'

"I rose to reply to Mr. Richmond, the Minister. I said, 'Listen, what you say is not quite clear, I am the chief of those dogs. The first bone was the other side of Rangitikei. I handed that over to Ngatiapa. That dog was made quiet, and Ngatiapa agreed to abandon all claim to this other side of Rangitikei. After that the Ngatiraukawa dog began to growl. I allowed him to sell the Ahuoturanga. That dog's anger ceased. Afterwards another of the dogs began to quarrel some. I allowed him to sell the Ahuoturanga. That dog was satisfied. As for these tribes who are now selling Rangitikei, they have no right, nor will I allow other tribes to sell my land. Would you like your sheep, cattle, horses, or land to be sold by me? You would not like it. You would prefer selling them yourself. That is the way with Rangitikei. I do not agree to allow other tribes to sell my land. If you have not the courage (kaha) to investigate the title to Rangitikei, we will swim across the seas in search of the residence of that Great Lady the Queen."

"This is what was said on the occasion of our third visit; 24 men were present and heard what was said."

"(Signed)" "AKAPITA TE TEWE."

"PARANIIHE TE TAU."

The following extract from Dr. Featherston's speech will show that His Excellency's Ministers were consenting parties to the transaction:—"The thanks of the Province are due to his Excellency's Ministers for the readiness with which, in compliance with my request, they advanced (in anticipation of the sale of the land purchase loan) the funds required to enable me to meet my engagements with the Natives."

The following will show how Dr. Featherston proposes to deal with any perverse non-sellers:—"There is, however, still a small number of Ngatiraukawa dissentients to whom, in the event of their persisting in their refusal to accept the sum set apart for them, it may be necessary to make an award in land to the extent of such claims as are admitted by the sellers," Dr. Featherston further says:—"I feel that I am entitled to say that in no previous land purchase has so liberal a price been paid, or such ample justice done to all the Natives concerned in the transaction; and I venture again to express a hope that the Council will, knowing how much the successful issue of these long-pending negotiations is due to Mr. Walter Buller, bestow upon him a substantial recognition of his valuable services."

See Dr. Featherston's speech—Appendix.

Dr. Featherston paid a visit to Rangitikei and Manawatu a few weeks since, when he told the natives that he should send 500 armed Natives to survey the boundaries of the block. I was informed of this by several of the Natives, and have their written statements. The chief Ihakara was one of my informants. Henere Herekau concludes his letter upon the subject thus:—"If you can give us any good advice respecting this evil work, do so, because Ngatiraukawa will not flinch from the snare which is being laid for them by Dr. Featherston." After
giving them this piece of information he sent the following memorandum to some of the non-sellers:—

"I agree to refer the claims of non-sellers in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block to arbitration, subject to the following conditions:—

• Two arbitrators, either Pakeha or Maori, to be appointed—one by the non-sellers, the other by the Land Purchase Commissioner; such arbitrators being persons entirely disconnected with the land or with the disputants, and wholly disinterested in the question at issue. The arbitrators to appoint an umpire, or the arbitrators and umpire to be appointed by His Excellency the Governor.
• The arbitrators to be appointed within one month from the present date, and the arbitration to take place at Rangitikei.
• All non-sellers, of whatever rank, to prove their individual claims to the satisfaction of the arbitrators, having previously signed a paper assenting to the proposed arbitration, and pledging themselves to accept, as final, the decision of the arbitrators as to the nature and extent of their claims.

"(Signed)
I. E. Featherston."

The following letter, published in the Wellington Advertiser, contains the natives reply:—

"The Manawatu Question.

"Taita, Wellington,

"Sir,—

In your paper of yesterday's issue you published Dr. Featherston's 'conciliatory memorandum,' in which he 'agrees to refer the claims of non-sellers in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block to arbitration, subject to the following conditions.' You state 'it is impossible to say now in what temper the Natives who have throughout adhered implicitly to the non-selling principle will receive this proffer of conciliation.' The following appears at the foot of a long statement sent to me by the Ngatikauwhata of what passed before Dr. Featherston paid his late visit to Rangitikei:—Dr. Featherston replied, 'I agree to the investigation.' Some of us went to Whanganui to fix a day for the investigation to take place, when Mr. Buller said, 'My friends, you must all agree that this land is in Dr. Featherston's hands. After that we will have an inquiry, and let the judges decide whether there is any land belonging to you in his hands.' We did not agree to that absurd proposal of Mr. Buller's, because we are not aware that our land is in his hands, but what we consent to is that the judges should try and discover where Dr. Featherston's land is. Dr. Featherston would not agree to our proposal.'

'The following is a statement handed to me by Parakaia:—'On the 21st and 22nd June Dr. Featherston sent for me to his office. He wanted me to agree to settle Rangitikei by arbitration. He proposed that we should choose two Maoris—one each—and one Pakeha, and that the investigation should take place at Rangitikei. I replied, 'I do not agree that you and I should have a little insignificant investigation, but let the investigation take place at Wellington, that there may be a great number of Pakeha gentlemen to judge between us. You have published in a great many newspapers; I have also done the same; the whole island has been made aware of our dispute. I do not agree to what you propose. I said to him plainly, let there be a great many Pakena gentlemen present to condemn me, that one and another may say to me—'Parakaia you are in the wrong; that I may hear them say that you are in the right; perhaps you are afraid of public investigation.' To this he made no reply. I agreed to what he proposed with respect to Paretao; he was to have arranged the matter on the 2nd July, but as he never came he must let that pass.

"Parakaia te Pou EPA."

'The following was sent to me by the Natives, being the reply from Ngatikauwhata, the hapu of Ngatiraukawa, to whom Dr. Featherston made the offer of arbitration:—'I agree that the title to the whole block
lying between Rangitikei and Manawatu should be investigated, that it may be found out how far the sellers are in the right, and how far the non-sellers are in the right; that the basis of this investigation be that each hapu have their separate claims investigated to their portions of the block; that the judges shall inquire what land in the block belongs to the sellers—what land belongs to the non-sellers. What we wish is that each hapu should prove their claim as a whole—not that each individual should be called upon to prove his separate claim; that we will not sign our names to Dr. Featherston's paper.'

"From what the natives said to me themselves, I gather that they want to have the whole matter settled according to law. They are standing out for those 'rights' which Dr. Featherston told the House, on August 7th, 1860, 'the Government were bound to respect and preserve inviolate.' They want to see a practical illustration, in 1867, of what has hitherto only appeared in a memorandum drawn in 1860. The grand desire of the British colonists in respect of the Natives is to see the Maori people rendered amenable in their dealings with the settlers to British law;' or, as it is expressed further on in the memorandum, 'that all the inhabitants of New Zealand should be subjected in their mutual dealings to the control of one equal law.'—I am, &c,

"THOMAS C. WILLIAMS,
"A Native of New Zealand,"

Dr. Featherston buys these men's land from five tribes who have no title whatever to the land, tells them their land is "all gone to the Queen," that there will be "no further investigation as to title, &c.," and now, at this late period, offers them arbitration, and calls upon them "to prove their individual claims to the satisfaction of the arbitrators." Dr. Featherston's doing so is simply impertinent, seeing that "Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession." And, as Dr. Featherston told the House, on August 7, 1860,—" It follows that whatever rights, especially territorial, the Natives possessed at the time the treaty was made, the Government is bound to respect and preserve inviolate." With respect to arbitration, Parakaia and his people would have as good a right to purchase any land, for which Dr. Featherston holds a Crown grant, from the original Native owners, and then offer to refer the matter to arbitration, one of the arbitrators to be chosen by the Maoris. Dr. Featherston should now be content to consider the case as closed, so far as he is himself concerned—high time it should be so—and allow others to interfere. The Natives have petitioned Her Majesty to "send persons to investigate carefully this wrong." God grant she may so do.

[Translation.]

(To our Mother the Queen of England.)

This is my petition, the petition of Parakaia te Pouepa, a Maori, of the Ngatiraukawa tribe, living at Otaki, New Zealand.

In the year 1860 we wrote to your Majesty, making known to you our grief caused by the proceedings of Governor Browne at Waitara, and praying you to send a Governor to investigate that act of injustice of the Government.

Our cry at that time went forth from our love to another people, the Ngatiawa, at Taranaki, and their lands. I now cry unto your Majesty on behalf of my people and our own land, which land is being taken from us by Dr. Featherston.

We have always, borne in mind that your great name alighted justly and peacefully upon New Zealand in the year 1840, through the treaty of Waitangi, that the chiefs of New Zealand then ceded to your Majesty the sovereignty of this island, and we feel assured that your Majesty the Great Queen of England will now on your part protect us, your children, and our lands.

I now write to you respecting the land of my people, lying between the Manawatu and Rangitikei Rivers, in the Province of "Wellington.

My tribe, the Ngatiraukawa, gained possession of that country by conquest, in the year 1830, before your Majesty's Sovereignty alighted upon this island, and we have always held possession up to the present time.

I wish to make known to you the regard we showed to former Governors of yours, who came from your presence. In the year 1847, Rangitikei was sold to Governor Grey; in the year 1858, Manawatu was sold to Governor Browne; in the year 1858, also, the Ahuoturanga was sold to Governor Browne. These are large
blocks of land that were ceded to your Governors. The desire to sell of those people, Ngatiapa, Rangitane, and a portion of my own tribe, was thus gratified; this portion which I and my people are retaining is comparatively small.

I wish to make known to you our kindness and liberality to those tribes whom we had conquered, and who were spared by us when Te Rauparaha urged us to destroy them all. Rangitikei, a large extent of country, we restored to Ngatiapa; Ahuoturanga, also a large extent of country, we restored to Rangitane. Now those tribes and the Government have joined to take forcibly from us this our reserve. These are our houses and our plantations that are being taken—the means of support of my people.

In the year 1862, the Governor and the Assembly established a court for investigating Maori lands.

I wish to make known to you that it was only the land of my people, of Ngatiraukawa, that was excluded from that court.

In the year 1863, Ngatiapa came to disturb my people. They came with guns in their hands—my people also rose up with guns in their hands. I wrote to Governor Grey and Mr. Fox, the Minister, requesting them to send Mr. McLean to investigate (whakawa) Rangitikei. I received a letter from Mr. McLean, wherein he expresses his willingness to do so, But Dr. Featherston came instead, in the year 1864. We he came we had ceased from contention, and were patiently awaiting the arrival of Mr. McLean, the man whom we preferred as judge between us. All Dr. Featherston did in his capacity of judge was to try and buy the land for himself, and to give his support to Ngatiapa, followed by his false statement that he saved these tribes from death.

In the year 1865, my people petitioned the General Assembly to abolish the law excluding our lands, that our titles might be investigated in a court of justice, but the Assembly would not listen to them.

In the year 1866, Dr. Featherston came again, and made a determined effort to purchase our land. We did not give our consent. He then used the following threatening words to me and my people:—" This land is in my hands; 800 of Whanganui, 200 of Ngatiapa, 100 of Rangitane and Muapoko have consented. All these tribes went with me to fight against the tribes who are contending with the soldiers of the Queen. They have all agreed that this land shall be sold to me; they are the great majority, you are but a few. You shall not hold back this land." When my people heard his threatening and taunting words they were overwhelmed (paralyzed) with shame and fear. I replied, "Friend, what title have the hundreds of those tribes that you have enumerated to this land; only after investigation in a court can this land be justly sold to you." He replied, "Parakaia, the jurisdiction of that court will never be extended to this land."

After bearing these words of Dr. Featherston, a number of us went to Wellington to the Governor, to the Assembly, to the Ministers also, and entreated them to allow our titles to be investigated according to law. On the first occasion thirty-five of us went, on the second occasion fourteen, on the third occasion twenty-four. When the others became weary, I still persevered by myself alone. But they would not grant our prayer. Then I said to myself, "Alas! for the treaty of Waitangi, whatever can have become of it?"

In the month of December, 1866, Dr. Featherston paid money to some of my own tribe, the great majority of whom had no title to our land; he also paid money to tribes from a distance who had no title whatever to our land; he then told my people, "All your land has now become the property of the Queen."

Therefore, I, your humble servant, pray your Majesty to send persons to investigate carefully this wrong, to protect me and my people, and to raise up the treaty of Waitangi which has been trampled under foot by the Government of New Zealand.

PARAKAIA TE POUEPA.

Otaki, New Zealand, 

July 4, 1867.

Appendix.

"Taita, Wellington, 

"DEAR SAMUEL,—

As you were many years resident in the district, I shall feel obliged if you will furnish me with any information relative to the respective claims of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatiapa tribes, to the lands lying
between the Manawatu and Rangitikei rivers.

"Your affectionate brother,

"THOMAS C. WILLIAMS.
"Rev. S. Williams, Te Aute.

"Te Aute, Hawke's Bay. "DEAR THOMAS,—

In answer to your inquiries about the Manawatu claims I may briefly state that, when the Rangitikei block of land was offered for sale by Ngatiapa in 1848 and 1849, D. McLean, Esq., Land Purchase Commissioner, called upon me at Otaki, where I was residing, and asked me to help him in obtaining the consent of Ngatiraukawa, together with Rauparaha and Rangihaeata to the sale, without which he said he could not effect the purchase. I promised him my assistance, and for that purpose entered fully into the subject with the Natives. Rauparaha and Rangihaeata were furious at the idea of Ngatiapa, whom they styled the remnant of their meal, attempting to deal with the land, and blamed Ngatiraukawa in unmeasured terms for having stopped them in their work of extermination, saying that had they been allowed to do as they wished the difficulties of that time would never have arisen. I was surprised on observing the great coolness which was manifested upon the subject by Ngatitao, excepting only those who were living with Ngatiraukawa, as were Rauparaha and Rangihaeata and on asking the reason they told me that whatever claim they had to the land in question had been given over to Ngatiraukawa. Several members of the conquered tribes told me that they owed their lives to Ngatiraukawa—that Te Rauparaha would have killed them all had not TeWhatanui, one of the principal chiefs of Ngatiraukawa, befriendied them. They always spoke of him as a father, and admitted that the Ngatiraukawa were the kai kotikoti whenua (the dividers of the land). The subject has caused considerable excitement amongst the Ngatiraukawa, but I urged them to act a generous part towards those who had been so harshly treated in past years, and after repeated discussions amongst themselves, they at length agreed to allow Ngatiapa to sell their land on the north aide of the Rangitikei river, and keep all the purchase money, on condition that they were not to deal with any of the land to the south of the river. I do not, however, consider Supposition is not fact, most worthy Samuel Williams.—(T.C.W.)

that either party understood that Ngatiapa were, by this arrangement, entirely debarred from occupying portions of the south bank of the river if they wished to do so, or from receiving a portion of the proceeds in the event of Ngatiraukawa disposing of it. The Commissioner expressed his gratification at the generous manner in which Ngatiraukawa acted, more particularly in not accepting any of the purchase money, of which Ngatiapa had previously expected them to take a large share.

"Your affectionate brother,

"SAMUEL WILLIAMS."

"MY DEAR THOMAS,—

In acceding to your request that I should furnish you with some information concerning the rights of the tribes connected with the Rangitikei-Manawatu district, I will endeavour to condense as much as possible what I say on the subject. I came into the district in 1839, before the Queen's Sovereignty was established in the country, that is, before it was proclaimed a British Colony. I do not think there are many other Englishmen alive who knew the Natives of the district at that time. Ngatiraukawa were then in undisputed possession of the district. They also asserted claims to land on the north side of Rangitikei, but as they were at war with another tribe to the southward, and had their attention occupied with this, I do not recollect seeing them located on that side. The previous owners, Ngatiapa, had been conquered by them, and were held in a state of subjection; some being actually in slavery at Otaki and Kapiti, others resided on the land as serfs, employed in pig-hunting and such like occupation. They had ceased to be a tribe. They had no organisation, no rights. Even that portion of the tribe which lived between Rangitikei and Whanganui was in a state of degradation. It was without 'mana.' It would take me too long to detail the proofs of this, and it is unnecessary. There would have been then no room for questioning the title of Ngatiraukawa. There was no one to question it; it was a self-evident fact that they were in undisturbed occupation. They have never ceased to occupy and hold possession. There is then clear evidence to prove their conquest from Ngatiapa, and their possession in 1840. Well, then, as English law, on a
transfer of sovereignty, recognizes all previously existing municipal rights, the title of Ngatiraukawa must remain unchanged until the present time, unless it can be shown that they have alienated their land by some formal act of their own. That there never has been any such formal act of alienation on their part is notorious. It is not, I believe, alleged that there has been any act of the kind, on the contrary, when, at the time the north side of Rangitikei was sold, Ngatiapa attempted to lay claim to the south side by building a but there, this was forthwith destroyed by Te Rangihaeata, and the attempt was thus crushed in the bud. But further, when Ngatiraukawa, in 1849, consented to forego all claim to the north side of Rangitikei, they distinctly and emphatically, in the presence of the Land Purchase Commissioner and others, reasserted their title to the south side, and their determination to retain it. I do not think the investigation of any title could have given less trouble to the Native Lands Court than this, had it been brought before it. There was nothing complicated to unravel. After what I have said, you may think it strange that regent difficulties should have arisen. If you do think so you can have had little acquaintance with the doings of Land Purchase Commissioners. The difficulties were all purposely made by Government officers. I must try to explain what I mean. Notwithstanding the strength of the Ngatiraukawa title, there was one vulnerable point in its exterior, small indeed, almost infinitesimal. But what can escape the scent of that most omnivorous of all land sharks—a Superintendent created Land Purchase Commissioner? Let me see, then, whether I can make this point intelligible. I am now alluding to the fact that some Ngatiapa men had been allowed to return to, and live in, the immediate vicinity of the late chief Nepia Taratoa, and were permitted by him to receive some part of the money paid as rent for lands illegally leased by Englishmen. I will show how this came about. When Ngatiraukawa accepted the Christian religion, they, unlike the American slave-holders of the Southern States, deemed it inconsistent with their profession of religion to retain their fellow men in slavery. They let their slaves go free. Several of those men continued to reside among their former masters. There were some inter-marriages; they were thenceforth treated as equals, but without any thought of their being again reinstated in their former possessions. There were one or two Attempts made about the year 1855 to regain a footing there, but these were instantly stopped. Subsequently it was agreed to erect a mill at Makohai, on the Rangitikei River, for the joint use of Ngatiapa and Ngatiraukawa. In consequence of this there was a joint endeavour to raise funds for the purpose agreed upon. This gave rise to the first leases to squatters, in which both parties combined, but this was only a temporary arrangement agreed upon for a specific purpose, with a view of arriving at an object concerning which there was no difference of opinion.

"Some time afterwards, during the Taranaki war, when the whole of the tribes on this coast had their attention more or less pre-occupied with matters of general interest, Nepia Taratoa, being alarmed, wished to have his old slaves again around him, they being for the most part avowed Kingites, He invited some of them to come to his neighbourhood. In order to secure their services, he promised to let some of his lands, and pay them with money derived from the rents; what was done was to promise them some temporary participation in the proceeds from the leased lands. This act of his, which was done without the sanction of the tribe, could not possibly be construed into a formal transfer of the land.

"It has never, I believe, been alleged that there was at this time, or at any other, any division of the land with Ngatiapa, but the joint participation by two different tribes in the ownership of land is a kind of tenure absolutely unknown to Maori custom, and utterly repugnant to the whole system. I defy any one to produce a single instance of any such joint tenure. When two tribes have lived intermingled, either one was the acknowledged superior and the other the inferior, or there were well defined boundaries to their respective possessions. In my opinion Ngatiapa had no kind of right to the Rangitikei-Manawatu block of land.

"Shortly after Nepia Taratoa's death, Ngatiapa began to assert a claim based on his liberality, which, together with rumours that their claim might be acknowledged by the Government, so alarmed Ngatiraukawa, that they early in 1863 sent a large party both to remove some cattle and sheep which were supposed to be there on the authority of Ngatiapa, and also to occupy and cultivate land close to the Rangitikei river.

"Ngatiapa made some little show of resistance, but there can be no doubt, nothing farther would have been heard of Ngatiapa's claims had it not been for the unfortunate fact that, when the Government, after many months delay, thought it advisable to appoint some person to investigate the respective claims of the two tribes, they selected Dr. Featherston, the Superintendent of the Province, who had previously secured the appointment of Land Purchase Commissioner. Anything more absurd and unfortunate than this appointment it would be difficult to imagine.

"Nevertheless, Ngatiraukawa, knowing that if there was to be an open investigation their claims must be recognized as good, signed a bond, to abide by the decision of the arbitrator. Ngatiapa, on the contrary, knowing full well that their claim under such circumstances would not hold good, but must prove untenable, positively declined the investigation. They, however, handed over all their supposed rights to Dr. Featherston, in which of his capacities—whether as Superintendent or Land Purchase Commissioner, or arbitrator appointed by the Government to act impartially—does not appear. Dr. Featherston thus became a party to the dispute. He
took his side with Ngatiapa. From that time forward any solution of the difficulty was hopeless. Dr. Featherston
was determined to obtain the land. Ngatiraukawa were equally determined that, so long as the Ngatiapa claim
was acknowledged, they would not sell.

"As the Land Purchase Ordinance was still unrepealed, Dr. Featherston impounded the rents, that is he
cautions the squatters not to pay their rents. This was the second blunder he committed. It at once confirmed
the suspicion raised in the minds of Ngatiraukawa by his acceptance of the Ngatiapa claims, that he was trying
to coerce them into acquiescence with his wishes.

"The result was a dogged determination to hold their land to the last. From that time the purchase of the
district by Dr. Featherston was simply an impossibility.

"I was nearly forgetting to allude to what has been repeatedly asserted, that there was danger of an
inter-tribal war. Such an assertion is really ridiculous. I ought to know something of the feelings of the natives
of this district, but I do not hesitate to say there never was the least chance of it. To suppose it possible for the
miserable remnant of Ngatiapa to have ever seriously contemplated war with their old conquerors is an opinion
that could only have been entertained by those wholly unacquainted with the relative numbers and antecedents
of the two parties. I cannot, however, conceal my opinion that the frequent allusion by Dr. Featherston to the
probability of war had a tendency to create in the minds of the natives an impression that the Government
would not be sorry to see hostilities take place, in order that it might then either co-operate with Ngatiapa or
make such a war a pretext for confiscation.

"But Ngatiraukawa, resting on their clear and undisputed possession ever since the treaty of Waitangi, have
carefully avoided giving any excuse to the Government for charging them with acting illegally. As Parakaia
rightly remarked to the Governor—' It is the duty of the Government to keep the peace of the country, and
protect loyal men in their rights.' He and others, who have remained staunch in their support of the Government
all through the war, feel amazed when they find Kingites, like Kawana Hunia, who only recently hoisted their
King's flags, and strutted about with their guns on their shoulders and their two cartridge boxes on their backs,
in defiance of the Government, now allowed at public meetings, at which the Superintendent presides, to utter
unre-buked threats of war,

"I have, perhaps, said as much as you care to learn from me. That Ngatiraukawa were the acknowledged
owners and possessors of the land in 1840 there can be no question. That they have never subsequently
alienated it is equally clear. The attempt of the Superintendent to set up a claim for Ngatiapa on the ground that
many years ago they owned the land, and his subsequently impounding the rents to force Ngatiraukawa to sell,
are points which I hope X have made clear. I will now conclude with a few extracts from Carlyle's life of
Frederick the Great, in order to show that, though Dr. Featherston is supposed to have gained some credit for
cleverness by these moves, there is nothing novel or original in them.

"This Duchy of Cleve, all this fine agglomerate of Duchies, Duke Wilhelm settled were to be inherited in a
piece by his eldest son. . . . This settlement, by express privilege of Kaiser Carl V., nay of Kaiser Maximilian
before him, and the laws of the Reich, Duke Wilhelm doubted not he was entitled to make; and this settlement
he made. The painful exactitude of Duke Wilhelm and his lawyers has profited little, and there are claimants on

"What greatly complicated the affair was the interest the Kaiser took in it. . . . Evidently what would best
suit the Kaiser and Spaniards was this, that no strong power whatever got footing in Cleve to grow stronger by
possession of such a country; better than best it would suit, if he, the Kaiser, could himself get it smuggled into
his hands, and then hold it fast. Which privately was the course resolved upon at head quarters." P. 307-8.

"A letter is yet extant from the Aulic Council to their Vice-Chancellor, who had been sent to negotiate this
matter with the parties; letter to the effect that he must devise all manner of quirks, and achieve it. And
accordingly quirks did not prove undevisable on behalf of the Kaiser. Since you cannot agree (says the Kaiser),
and there are so many of you who claim (we have privately stirred up many of you to the feat), there will be
nothing for it but that the Kaiser must put the country under sequestration, and take possession of it with his
troops till a decision be arrived at, which, probably, will not be soon, and the Kaiser forthwith did as he had
said." P. 312.

"It was not until forty-two years after, in 1666, that an effectual partition could be practically brought
about. In fact, there never was in the German Chanceries, or out of them, such a lawsuit, armed or wigged, as
this of the Cleve Duchies, first and last. And the sentence was not practically given till the Congress of Vienna,
1815, in our own day, gave it; and the thing Johann Sigismund had claimed legally in 1609, was actually
handed over to Johann Sigismund's descendants in the seventh generation, after two hundred and six years. P.
323."

"(Signed)
OCTAVIUS HADFIELD."
The following written statement was handed to me by Mr. James Hamlin, who was Mr. Buller's interpreter in 1863:—

"The offer of arbitration was accepted by the Ngatiraukawa and Rangitane; the Ngatiapa only partially did so.

"In 1863, Mr. Buller received instructions to draw out an arbitration bond, which I translated, and then received orders from Mr. Buller to take them up to Rangitikei, and get the three tribes to sign them. The Ngatiraukawa and Rangitane readily did so, but the Ngatiapa did not. Mr. Buller, finding the Ngatiapa would not sign the bond, suspended their salaries for being constables and assessors."

The following extracts from a speech delivered by Dr. Featherston to the electors of Wellington on Wednesday evening, the 21st February, 1866, will show that the Superintendent of Wellington had made up his mind to purchase the 'Manawatu block of land' at least two months before he 'accepted' it as the only possible means of preventing an inter-tribal war—will show how that the 'good old Aaron' could, when it suited his purpose, become transformed into a 'roaring lion;' will show that the gentleman engaged by the General Government of New Zealand as Land Purchase Commissioner, &c., entertained very peculiar views with respect to a native policy:—

"Dr. Featherston, who was received with loud applause, said—

"The course I pursued then was the same as that which had for its object the promoting of what I believe to be the true interest of this Province, as in getting rid of the difficulties which lay in the way of purchasing the Manawatu block of land, and more especially in rendering my assistance, however humble it may have been, in subduing the rebel natives on the West Coast, and bringing them to submission. (Hear, hear)"

"Is the British army degenerated? Was it not composed of men having the same metal and courage as those who have fought and conquered in every country and under every clime? I consider the Imperial troops to be the finest in the world; I say that the British army stands far higher in every respect than that of any other country. Look at what has been done by any of the regiments now in New Zealand, and then tell me that those regiments are unable to cope with the Maori, and are unequal to New Zealand warfare. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I ask you, who long remember your gallant friends of the 65th, and many another regiment, whether you believe that they were not the same men in this country as they have ever proved them selves in other countries? Will one of you in this room say that men who have fought and lost their lives at Rangiriri, at the Gate Pa, at the Orakau, were unequal to cope with the Maori and unfit for New Zealand warfare? But if you dare to make such an assertion, what will you say to the signal success of General Chute between Whanganui and Taranaki, with a flying column of some four or five hundred men? That gives the lie at once and for ever to any aspersions on the English troops; that settles at once and for ever that Imperial troops, if properly handled, are equal to any emergency, and instead of being unequal to the natives, those natives are terrified at them, and dare not make a stand against them. (Hear, hear.)"

"Sir, I confess I never held any faith in the elaborate native policies which have been at various times propounded by statesmen in this colony. I have always adhered to the principles I enunciated twenty years ago, that as it is utterly impossible to preserve the native race from ultimate extinction, from annihilation through their connection with a civilized people, our chief duty consisted not in attempting elaborate theoretical policies, but in rendering the dying conch of the race as easy and comfortable to them as possible. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the same course which was a good policy twenty years ago, is, it appears to me, only gaining daily more strength. Twenty years ago these natives amounted to from eighty to a hundred thousand, whilst now how many are they? Not more than forty thousand at the outside, and in twenty years to come there will be but a mere handful left. What then is the use of hatching native policies for a race which you cannot possibly preserve?"

The following are extracts from Dr. Featherston's reports presented to both Houses of the General Assembly, by command of his Excellency:—

**ENCLOSURE 1, IN NO. 6.**

"Notes of an interview between his Honor Dr. Featherston (Land Purchase Commissioner) and Ihakara te Hokowhitukuri, at Scott's Accommodation House, on Wednesday, 22nd November, 1866.

"After mutual greetings, and some desultory conversation on other subjects, his Honor referred to the Rangitikei question, expressing his regret that, since their last meeting, attempts had been made to create discontent among the natives, and to disturb the existing arrangements for the sale of the block to the Crown."

"Dr. Featherston said—"But apart from all this, he felt sure that Ihakara would agree with him that to attempt to get the ownership to this particular block investigated and settled in any Land Court would be a mere farce. Every effort had been made to induce the disputants to agree to a settlement of their claims by arbitration, but to no effect Neither tribe would admit itself in the wrong, or submit to an adverse decision of"
the Court. It was only after these efforts had failed that the natives talked of selling the block, and the leading Ngatiraukawa chiefs had repeatedly acknowledged, both to him and Mr. Buller, that a sale of the whole of the land in dispute was the only possible solution of this long-standing difficulty. With regard to the caricature, which seemed to have produced so much irritation and heart-burning, he would ask how it was possible that the Superintendent and Mr. Buller could, with truth, be represented as driving the natives into a sale of the land, when the offer of sale had come from the natives themselves.’ Ihakara acknowledged that he could see no escape from the difficulty but by a mutual sale of their disputed claims to the Queen.

"(Signed)
"I. E. FEATHERSTON.

"Superintendent's Office, "Wellington,

30th June, 1866."

"Notes of a meeting at Maramaihoea, Rangitikei, on Monday, the 4th December, 1865. Present—About sixty natives (chiefly Ngatiraukawa), Dr. Featherston, and Mr. Buller.

"His Honor replied at some length. He requested them distinctly to bear in mind that the proposal for the sale of the block came, in the first instance, from the natives, and not from the Commissioner; that on separate occasions the land was offered to him by the several tribes claiming it, as their only means of settling the quarrel; and that he ultimately, in the name of the Queen, accepted that offer, subject to future terms, to be mutually agreed upon. He came up originally not to treat for the land, but to propose an arbitration of title, and to prevent the effusion of blood between the contending tribes. . . . He made no attempt to induce the natives to surrender their disputed claims to the Crown; he said not one word to them about the sale of the land. He simply endeavoured to adjust an angry dispute which threatened to embroil the district in an inter-tribal war, and he suggested to them a plan, the object of which was not to alienate, but to secure to each tribe its fair share of the land.

Why was the land excepted from the operation of the Native Lands Act, 1862?—T.C.W.

His plan was rejected by the Ngatiapa, who of their own accord offered the land in absolute sale to the Crown. As this offer virtually amounted to a pledge that the tribe would not assert their rights by force of arms, or continue any longer to threaten the peace of the district, he felt bound to accept it. But in so doing he was careful to explain to them that he did not accept the land, but such right or interest as they might hereafter be proved to have in the land. ‘By so doing he disarmed the Ngatiapa and put an end to the threatened collision. He did not, however, take advantage of this arrangement to force either party to terms. He simply explained to the Ngatiraukawa and Rangitane, at Ihakara’s pa, what he had done, warned them against disturbing the peace of the district, and proposed the withholding of all rents till some amicable arrangement had been mutually come to.’

"(Signed)
I. E. FEATHERSTON.

"Superintendent's Office, "Wellington,

30th June, 1866."

"On the 27th March, Dr. Featherston had a long interview with Ihakara. This chief stated! emphatically his determination to sell the disputed block, mentioned £21,000 as the price he was prepared to propose, and warned Dr. Featherston that there would, at the commencement of the meeting, be strong opposition from a section of his tribe.

"On the 28th March, Dr. Featherston, accompanied by Mr. Buller, R.M., proceeded to Turakina. On the following day his Honor held a meeting at the Ben Nevis Hotel, with about fifty of the principal Ngatiapa claimants. Dr. Featherston pointed out to them that unless the tribes would now consent to co-operate in a final effort to settle this long-standing difficulty, there seemed very little prospect of anything being accomplished at Te Takapu.

"Aperahama Tipae, in reply, spoke with much bitterness of the Ngatiraukawa and their chiefs. He declared that the Ngatiapa would never consent to unite with the other tribes in the proposed sale, and that nothing, therefore, could be gained by their attending the meeting at Manawatu. He said that while the Ngatiapa were still in favor of selling, they would not consent to divide the purchase money with the Ngatiraukawa, or with
the Rangitane, and that unless Dr. Featherston was prepared to close with the Ngatiapa, irrespective of the other claimants, he would consider the negotiations at an end, and would encourage his tribe to take up arms again in defence of their rights.

"Governor Hunia made a still more violent speech against the other tribes, openly boasted that they (the Ngatiapas) had now plenty of arms and ammunition, and could easily drive off their opponents, and that they would now prefer an appeal to arms to any other course. He almost intimated that they had, during the West Coast campaign, reserved their ammunition for that purpose. This extreme violence was however distasteful to the meeting.

"Dr. Featherston rebuked Hunia, Aperahama, Tipae and others for the statements they had uttered, said they knew full well that their threats were of no avail with him; that he regarded them as mere Maori bounce; emphatically warned them against taking the law in their own hands, and, while acknowledging the services they had rendered, expressed a hope that the result of the recent campaign had been to establish a conviction in the minds of all the Maoris, that the Queen's Government was both determined and able to enforce law and order. . . .

"Although the discussion lasted for several hours longer, nothing definite was arrived at, the whole of the natives present declaring that they would not take a penny less than £40,000, and that the other tribes should not share the payment with them; that their great desire was to fight, and take the land by right of conquest. . . .

"On the morning of the 5th April there were about seven hundred natives present . . . Ihakara said, ..." His offer to sell the land to Mr. McLean had not been listened to by the tribe, and he had on that account resolved to retain Rangitikei. He would have continued to oppose the sale of the land had he been able to discover any other way out of the difficulty. There were only two ways open to him—one was to fight the Ngatiapa, and take forcible possession of the soil; the other was to sell the land to the Queen, and to let the Ngatiapa sell also. . . . Had the title to the block been clear he would probably have asked a million pounds for it! but as it was fighting ground he would ask Dr. Featherston for a very small price, only £21,000. Horomona had proposed that the price to be paid to Ngatiraukawa should be £20,000. He would add another thousand to this, and ask for this payment on behalf of all the tribes concerned. This would show that he was selling, not for the sake of the money, but to prevent fighting. If his share should only be sixpence he would be satisfied. It was the price of peace. He thought more of the blood of his young men than of the Queen's gold and silver. After describing the boundaries of the block, Ihakara concluded by calling on Dr. Featherston to accept his offer, and pay the money.

"Speeches were then delivered by the following, viz:—Wiriharai, Tohutohu, Takana, Te Kooro, Reupena Te One, Horopapera Te Tara, Hare Hemi Taharape, Heremaia, Te Tih, Paranihi To Tau, Henare Hopa, Te Rewiti, Henare Te Herekau, Rawiri Te Wanui, Parakaia Te Pouepea, Te Kepa Kerikeri, and Rota Tawhiri. All these speakers declared themselves more or less opposed to the sale.

"Henare te Herekan urged that a further attempt should be made to get the exception clause in the Native Lands Act repealed, and to have the question of title in this case investigated and adjudicated on by the Native Lands Court. In this proposal he was supported by Parakaia te Pouepea, from Otaki. . . .

"April 7. . . . Many who at the outset had declared against the sale, were now avowedly favourable to it, and it was evident that the spirit of opposition had been in a great measure crushed by the resolute determination of Ihakara and the other leading chiefs to effect a sale of the block.

Ihakara made a final speech to the following effect. . "Dr. Featherston, the land is yours. Give me the payment. Here are the people, let them consent. Refuse not, lest there be fighting. . . . Listen not to the words of my relatives (meaning the opposition). Pay the money and all the opposition will disappear. It was so when the Awahou block was sold. Rangitikei is in your hands, hold it fast for ever and ever! The people are now waiting for your reply."

It was here determined to send a deputation of ten chiefs to fetch the Ngatiapa. Governor Hunia first gave an angry refusal, and afterwards consented to attend the meeting. "The Ngatiapa were received at Te Takapu with every demonstration of good feeling."

April 14.—The utmost anxiety was manifested for a final and decisive reply, and at the appointed time the natives had assembled, and were waiting eagerly for Dr. Featherston's arrival

"Ihakara called upon Dr. Featherston to reply to the speeches that had been made. The latter invited any of the chiefs present who might wish to address the meeting before he closed the proceedings to do so. The discussion was thereupon resumed. Ihakara and the leading selling chiefs were more earnest than before in pressing the sale of the block, while Hunia Te Hakeke openly declared that if the meeting should break up without the sale having been effected, he would return at once to pa-building, and would decide the title by a trial of strength with the Ngatiraukawa—"

"parakaia again brought forward his scheme for a settlement of the question (by a reference to the Land Court), but the proposal was scouted by the Ngatiapa. It was tacitly admitted by Aperahama Te Hurthuru and
Nepia that, although they were not opposing the sale, they could not suggest any other way of settling their quarrel with the Ngatiapa,

"About 3 P.M. Dr. Featherston rose and made the following speech, which was interpreted to the meeting by Mr. Buller, R.M.:—. . . "Ihakara and other speakers had given a truthful history of the dispute, and he had little or nothing to add to it, but as there were many present whom he had not met at previous meetings, he was anxious that it should be made clear to all how it was that he first came to act as mediator between them—how it was that he came to be dragged into this long-standing quarrel. Not one of them dared to assert that he had ever asked them to hand over either the quarrel or the land into his hands. Not one of them dared deny that the three tribes had themselves forced upon him, whether he liked it or not, both the quarrel and the land in dispute. On the contrary, Ihakara and others have declared that he had appeared amongst them only after all other mediators had failed in persuading them to desist from appealing to arms for the settlement of the dispute. But he had not come up of his own accord or uninvited. He came up at the request both of the tribes and of the Government. Why had they invited him? was it not because during a long period they had ever regarded him as their friend—as one in whose justice and integrity they had implicit faith? Why had the Government urged him to undertake such a difficult mission? Simply because they knew that the tribes had confidence in him, and would be more likely to be guided by his advice than by that of any other person. He would call upon them to say whether by the steps he had taken to stave off the inter-tribal war, and to bring the quarrel to an amicable termination, he had done anything to forfeit their confidence. When he arrived amongst them, in January, 1864, he found both parties in a state of angry irritation—hostile pas erected—the red flag flying—nay, the very day for the commencement of the strife almost fixed, both parties proclaiming that, rather than surrender their claims, rather than admit the slightest claim on the part of their opponents, they would fight and die on the land. . . . What did he do? For many days he went backwards and forwards between the litigants, proposing various terms, urging them to come to some compromise. . . .

"What he now wished clearly to ascertain was whether any one of the proposals he made in 1864 to the tribes can be carried out.

"It was then proposed to settle the question by arbitration. Arbitration means that each tribe should appoint a certain number of arbitrators; that if the arbitrators cannot agree, they appoint a third party to decide between them. This was a custom constantly adopted by pakehas, and the decision of the arbitrators or umpire is accepted as a final settlement of the matters referred to them. Now suppose that they had gone, or will to day agree to go to arbitration, and that the award of the arbitrators had been or will be that the land in dispute belongs to the Ngatiraukawas and Rangitanes, would the Ngatiapas have acquiesced, or will they now acquiesce in that decision; or if the arbitrators decided that the Ngatiapas were the sole owners of the land will the other tribes assent to give up their claim? (Universal dissent.) Unless the three tribes are prepared to pledge themselves to abide by the award of the arbitrators, arbitration is useless, and will only embitter the dispute, and lead to a recourse to arms.

"Another proposal was, that the three tribes should divide the land—but they objected to this, that they never could agree in what proportions the land should be divided—whether each tribe should lake a third, or one tribe a half, and two tribes the other moiety; but even if this difficulty could be got over, who was to decide what portion of the land was to belong to this tribe, what portion to the other—who was to decide whether one tribe should not be confined to the sand hills, another tribe to the good land—whether one tribe should not have all the land for which, according to one proposal, he had been called upon to pay two shillings an acre, another tribe all the five shilling land, the third all the land they were asking one pound an acre for. Can these difficulties, which were pointed out in January, 1864, be now overcome? Is a division of the land now practicable? (Kahore, kahore.)

"Another proposal had been made during the discussion by Parakaia and others, that they should take the land into the Native Lands Court, and have the title of the three tribes claiming an interest in it investigated by that Court. But Parakaia had omitted to tell them many things connected with that Court. He had not told them that all the tribes must consent to take the land into the Court—that each tribe must employ surveyors to mark out the boundaries of the land it claimed—that the tribe must be prepared to accept the decision of the Court. Were they all prepared to comply with any one of these conditions? Would they all consent to go into the Court? (No, no.) Would any one of them dare to send surveyors upon the land, every inch of which they had declared to be in dispute, to be fighting ground?

Extract from copy of a letter from Major Edwards, R.M., to the Hon. the Native Minister:—
"ResidentMagistrate's Office, Otaki, 21st July, 1866.
"Sir,—
"I have the honor to inform you that Mr. Hughes passed through this place, en route for Wellington, on Wednesday last, having completed the survey of Parakaia's land in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block. . . .

"(Signed) J. T. EDWARDS, R.M."
"The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington."

Would they agree to abide by the decision of the Court? (Enough, enough.)

"He had gone through the proposals for the purpose of ascertaining whether one of them was practicable. Let the tribes say with an united voice, that they agree to any one of them, that they will go to arbitration; let them say that they will divide the land; let them say that they will submit their claims to the decision of Judge Parakaia, and he would declare his concurrence in it.

"He now gathered that the six tribes assembled before him were all but unanimous in scouting every one of these proposals, and were more than ever convinced that the only possible solution of the dispute was, to use their own words, an absolute sale of the whole of the land in dispute to the down, and after having for many days patiently heard all they had to say, he had no hesitation in expressing his entire concurrence in that conviction."

"During the whole time the discussions had lasted he had refused to take any part in them, or to answer a single question, or to give the slightest hinting of his intention. They had declared that they had said all that they had to say, and now formally called upon him to declare, whether or not, as the only means of preventing bloodshed, he was prepared to accept the block and complete its purchase. He knew the responsibility which his decisive answer would entail upon him, but he had not the slightest hesitation in giving it. . . He, Dr. Featherston, repeated what he had then and often since said, that he would purchase no land without the consent of the people. But what did he mean by the consent of the people or tribe? He did not mean that the opposition of one man (not a principal chief) should prevent a whole tribe selling their land. Neither did he mean that a small section of one tribe should be allowed to forbid some six or seven tribes disposing of a block which they were anxious to sell. However much he might insist upon having the consent of the tribe, of all the real and principal claimants, he would be no party to such a manifest injustice as would be implied by one or two men, probably possessing little or no interest in the land, forbidding the tribe selling it, or in a small section of one tribe opposing the wishes of some half dozen tribes, especially when the carrying out of the decision of the majority was the only means of avoiding an inter-tribal war.

"The question then that arose in his mind was whether there was such a consent of the tribes assembled before him to the sale as would justify him in at once declaring his acceptance of their offer. He would, therefore, call upon every one of the tribes to declare publicly before this meeting by their chiefs whether or not the tribes consented to the sale.

"He would call upon the several tribes to give their answer by the chiefs. He called upon the Whanganui tribes to say whether or not they were agreed to the sale. Tamati Puna at once said, 'We are unanimous; all have consented.' Dr. Featherston then called upon the Ngatiapa to declare what their decision was. Governor Hunia, on the part of their tribe, said, 'You know our decision; we all insist upon the safe.' What say the Muaupoko tribe? Hoani Te Puhi replied on behalf of the tribe, 'We are all unanimous in favour of the sale.' What is the answer of the Ngatiotoa to this question? And he called upon Matene Te Whihi, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, and Hohepa, distinctly and severally to reply on behalf of the tribe they represented. The three chiefs, one after the other, declared that the tribe were unanimous. What said the Rangitane? Peeti Te Aweawe replied, 'We, also, are unanimous; all have consented.' Lastly, he would call upon the Ngatirankawa, who he knew were divided in their opinions, Ihakara expressed his regret that they were not like all the other tribes unanimous in favour of the sale, but the large majority of them were so determined to sell, especially all the principal claimants, that he insisted upon the purchase being completed. Knowing that those who were at present holding out would soon become consenting parties, he never would listen to any other mode of adjusting the dispute. Dr. Featherston then said that his course was clear, five of the six tribes were unanimous in their determination to sell, and of the Ngatiraukawa only a small section opposed the sale. Of that section the two principal chiefs, Nepia Taratoa and Aperahama Te Horn, had some time since given their consent, and had repeatedly protested against the delay that had occurred in bringing the transaction to a close. Great chiefs like them were not in the habit of repudiating engagements entered into in the face of the whole tribe. He was certain, therefore, that the present opposition would not be persisted in. Of the other opponents many had already told him that they would abide by the decision of the majority, and would sign the deed of purchase. He felt, therefore, so confident that the deed would ultimately be executed by all the real claimants, that he had no difficulty in publicly announcing his acceptance of the block, and in congratulating them upon this long-standing feud being thus amicably settled and finally adjusted.

"[This announcement was received with great applause, not a few of the opponents exclaiming, 'Rangitikei is fairly sold, is for ever gone from us!']"

"Dr. Featherston then reminded them that there were other questions to settle, viz,—the price, in what proportion the purchase money was to be divided, and what chiefs were to distribute the money. The two latter might be left till the deed was signed, but the price must be fixed before the meeting broke up. Several amounts had been mentioned, some exorbitant, others not unreasonable. Let the tribes leave this matter in the hands of
their chiefs, and they would find him prepared to meet them in a liberal spirit. This was ultimately fixed at £25,000. . . .

"The deed of purchase has been prepared with due care, and is now being executed in the district by the several tribes claiming the land. The deed will be signed by over a thousand natives, and on its completion the purchase money will be handed over to certain chiefs, as in the case of the Upper Manawatu and other purchases, to be nominated by a general meeting of the tribes at Parewanui (Rangitikei), of which sufficient notice will be given. The chiefs will divide and distribute the money in such manner as may be agreed on among the tribes sharing it, and it is not anticipated that any difficulty will arise.

"(Signed)
"I. E. Featherston.

"Superintendent's Office, "Wellington,

30th June, 1866."

The following appears in the speech of his Honor the Superintendent on opening the third session of the fourth Provincial Council of the Province of Wellington, April 26, 1867:—

**MR. SPEAER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE PROVINCIAL COUNCIL,—**

"When I last met you, I announced that I had entered into an agreement with the various tribes claiming a title to the Manawatu Rangitikei block, by which I hoped to set at rest the formidable land dispute which had for several years threatened the peace of the Province. After intimating that at the great native gathering at Takapu, on the banks of the Manawatu, I had formally accepted the cession of the disputed block to the Crown as the only means of finally and for ever removing the cause of strife, I informed you that the final deed of surrender had yet to be executed, and that it would require to be signed by between one and two thousand claimants, and that several important questions had yet to be settled—namely, as to what tribes the purchase money was to be paid, what proportion each of the tribes should receive, and what chiefs should be appointed to receive and distribute the money. It is satisfactory to me to be able to state that the deed of cession has been duly executed, nearly seventeen hundred claimants having signed it, and that the questions just adverted to have been finally and amicably settled.

"From the detailed minutes of the proceedings, which will be laid before you, you will observe that at the Parawanui meeting in December last, probably the largest gathering of natives ever held in this Province, the six tribes claiming to be more or less interested in the land, after long and angry discussions, failed to come to any arrangement as to the division of the money, and then appealed to me for my opinion on the subject, distinctly guarding themselves from being bound to adopt it. While anxious to evade the responsibility of deciding a question which, by the terms of our agreement, rested with the settlers—a responsibility which I had from the first declined to undertake—I, nevertheless felt that the alternative was one of peace or war, that if the meeting should break up without the completion of the purchase, the rival tribes would at once assert their conflicting claims by force of arms, and that the whole of the West Coast district would be speedily plunged into a general Native disturbance. To prevent, therefore, any further complication of the question, and to aid those chiefs who were really anxious, at almost any sacrifice, to preserve the peace, I at length submitted a proposal to the meeting, which though at first violently denounced by the Ngatiapas, was ultimately unanimously accepted by all the tribes concerned as perfectly fair and equitable. Chiefs were then appointed by the sellers to receive the respective shares, and the distribution of the money was left entirely to the Natives. I stipulated, however, with the Ngatiraukawa chiefs that a liberal sum out of their share should be set apart for the outstanding claimants of that tribe, and this was accordingly done. Since the payment of the purchase money, upwards of one hundred and fifty of these (mostly remote) claimants have given their consent to the sale and signed the deed. There is, however, still a small number of Ngatiraukawa dissentients to whom, in the event of their persisting in their refusal to accept the sum set apart for them, it may be necessary to make an award in land to the extent of such claims as are admitted by the sellers.

"The question of reserves is now in course of settlement. The Ngatiapa and Rangitane have accepted the portions allotted to them, and the Ngatiraukawa reserves will be defined as soon as the claims of dissentients have been satisfactorily adjusted. The back rents, amounting now to between two and three thousand pounds, which were impounded by me in order to prevent hostilities in 1863, are still unpaid, as I have been anxious to get all the minor details of the purchase arranged before re-opening a question not altogether free from difficulties, though not of a very formidable nature. And I here must bear testimony to the great patience and forbearance shown by both the Ngatiapa and the Ngatiraukawa chiefs with respect to this matter."
"After nearly four years of constant anxiety on this subject, it affords me no small gratification to repeat my assurance to you of the final and peaceful adjustment of this our only native difficulty; for, in spite of all that has been said and written, I do not hesitate to assert that the Manawaiu-Rangitikei purchase, while from its very nature, and the magnitude of the interests involved, probably the most laborious one ever undertaken in this country, is as complete and satisfactory a purchase as could have been effected from the Natives under the peculiar circumstances of the case. My chief difficulty has been caused by a few designing Europeans, who, from selfish motives have, by intrigues with the Natives, and misrepresentations in the newspapers of the Colony, endeavoured to foment tribal strife and frustrate the purchase—attempts which, had they been successful, must have entailed upon the Province, and upon the natives themselves, the most calamitous results.

..."I feel that I am entitled to say that in no previous land purchase has so liberal a price been paid, or such ample justice done to all the natives concerned in the transaction.

"The thanks of the province are due to His Excellency's Ministers for the readiness with which, in compliance with my request, they advanced (in anticipation of the sale of the land purchase loan) the funds required to enable me to meet my engagements with the natives. And I venture again to express a hope that the Council will, knowing how much the successful issue of these long pending negotiations is due to Mr. Walter Buller, bestow upon him a substantial recognition of his valuable services.

"The Small Farm Association will naturally be disappointed at the slowness of these dealings with the natives."

The following letter appeared in the WellingtonAdvertiser;—

"Otaki, May 22, 1867.

"THE HON. J. C. RICHMOND,—

"SIR,—

I have read Dr. Featherston's speech to the Council at Wellington, delivered on the 28th April, 1867, in which he says that Mr. Buller had finally and completely settled the reserve for Rangitane. This statement all have seen published in the Government Gazette of date May 2, 1867.

"This is my reply to those false statements of Dr. Featherston, which appear in the Gazette—I say to myself surely Dr. Featherston must be in the dark, has he not been informed, is he not aware of the fact of Rangitane's reserve having been suppressed. Sir, you will see the statements of Parakaia and Hoani Methana published in the newspaper (Advertiser) of the month of March. On the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th of that month we interrupted the survey, we finally stopped it on the 9th, by carrying away all the poles, the bottles and pegs that were stuck in the ground; the bill-hooks we took from the hands of Mr. Buller and his Maori friends, and carried them to the village. Was not that a prohibiting of that work; is it necessary to slay a man with an axe, to kill him outright in order to stop a survey? Is not taking all their implements away sufficient? for not only did we take them away, but we carried them all with us to our homes. Ninety men were present, and contended about those bill-hooks that were taken. Parakaia returned the four bill-hooks, retaining the poles, and two bottles, in all sixteen, here the matter ended. The pakehas took down their tents and retired, the Maoris retired, Rangitane retired. Hirawanu and his people retired; those only remained who had opposed the survey. Buller and I left. This letter which I now send you is to contradict that statement which appears in Dr. Featherston's Gazette, that the survey was finally and completely settled. Look here. Buller knows in his heart that these statements of mine are correct, notwithstanding the falsehood and deceit, Buller, that you and your friend are publishing and practising.

"Sir, please to publish this in the Government Gazette,

"PARAKAIA TE POUEPA."

The following letters and protests from the Ngatiraukawa non-sellers are extracted from papers presented to both Houses of the Assembly:—

Copy of a letter from Parakaia to Pouepa and others to the Assembly:—

"Manawatu, 14th April, 1866.

"To the Assembly,—
"That is the word expressing our intention to hold fast to the land which was publicly spoken to Dr. Featherston. First,—This side of Rangitikei I kept back from the hand of Governor Grey and Mr. McLean, that is to say from Ngatiapa, and I surrendered the other side to that Governor. After that Governor Browne urged (upon us to sell) Rangitikei and Manawatu. I agreed to sell Te Awahou and Te Ahuoturanga; the desires of these tribes were accomplished (in respect of the sale of those lands) to this Governor and that Governor, the desire to sell land to the Queen has ceased. This is my heart's core that you are striving to obtain. 'We do not like to give up this small piece to you.' That was the constant word of Ngatiraukawa to Dr. Featherston on the 5th April. The third word was to the effect that the Land Court alone could solve the difficulty attending this land. This is what we are waiting for.

"On the 14th April Dr. Featherston made answer to us. His words were clear to the four tribes. His attaching blame to us was a new word. There are eight hundred of Whanganui, there are two hundred of Ngatiapa, Rangitane, and Muaupoko are one hundred; but you, O Ngatiraukawa, are a half—a small portion. Another word of Dr. Featherston's was, 'We went together with these tribes to fight against the rebel tribes upon the authority of the Queen; they have consented to the sale. I have agreed to their (proposal). This land is in my hand.' Now we objected to his word. 'Your doing is simply taking our land by force. The eight hundred of Whanganui are not present at this meeting. You utter your mysterious words (kapu tauranga) to intimidate us.' He replied, 'That is all. It is done. I will give the money to the sellers.' We answered, 'It is wrong. I will hold on to my own land for ever. I will not take your money,' This was always the word of all the people."

(Here follow the signatures.)

"Statement by Henere Te Herekau and Hare Hemi Taharape."

"Manawatu, 16th April, 1866.

"This is what was publicly said to Dr. Featherston on the 5th April. These are the words of Ngatiraukawa against the sale of Rangitikei:—

"Dr. Featherston, listen attentively. Act justly towards those within your Province. Ngatiapa were desirous of selling this land on a former occasion. Ngatiraukawa refused to let it be sold, and it was not sold. They permitted the opposite side of the River Rangitikei te be sold. It was sold to Governor Grey. Ngatiapa were satisfied. The River Rangitikei constituted the boundary. Subsequently Ihakara wished to sell Manawatu, Ngatiraukawa assented to his wish, and Manawatu was sold to Governor Browne. The boundary began at Kaiwhence to Omarupupaka, and continued to Pukingahau, where it ended. This was the permanent boundary. Afterwards Te Hirawanu sold the upper part of Manawatu, Ngatiraukawa assented, and that was sold to Governor Grey during his second government of New Zealand; Te Hirawanu was satisfied, and the boundary was fixed at Mangawharawhara Te Kotopiko, and Paripuwha, above Oroau, where it ended. This was a permanent boundary. This land which you are wishing to purchase we will never allow you to purchase—this must be kept for our support. It must be carefully subdivided. We will pay the surveyor and assist him.

"Dr. Featherston made no reply whatever to these statements of ours.

"On the 12th of April we, Ngatiraukawa, stood in the presence of Dr. Featherston and expressed our opinions strongly. Dr. Featherston, do not purchase our land without our assent, lest you do wrong. If there be any dispute about our land, let it remain as it is. Let a law court act that it may be finally settled, because a court has been established for Maori lands. Do not pull a man down by the back part of his head lest he have a bad fall and death follow. For our land will not be given up to you to purchase, never. No work has ever been completed in wrong-doing. When it if agreed upon by those dwelling in the land, then a sale may be completed.

"Dr. Featherston replied, 'There are 800 men of Whanganui, 200 of Ngatiapa, 100 of Rangitane and Muaupoko tribes, which went with me to fight against the bad tribes. They have agreed to sell; this land has become mine: I will give them the money.'

"Ngatiraukawa replied: 'We shall retain our own land, we shall not receive your money.'

"On the 16th of April we again stated our views to Dr. Featherston. 'Listen, Dr. Featherston: Do not give your money to those who are selling the land, but survey the land, that you may see the land belonging to those men who are selling; then you will be acting rightly, but you give your money first to those who are selling the land, and then when you go with your chain to survey our lands, your chain will not touch the land—it will be interrupted. You, the pakeha will be angry without a cause, inasmuch as you are seizing our land illegally.

"Withhold your money, lest it be the occasion of stirring up strife, and the people of this place be brought into trouble by you.
“Hare Hemi Taharape to the Hon. the Native Minister.

"Manawatu,

18th April, 1866.

"To Colonel Russell,—

"This is my protest against the proceedings of the sellers of Rangitikei, who have settled on my piece of land without authority. This is it. I will explain my boundary.

"It commences at Paranui, &c. (here follows a statement of the boundaries.)

"I will not take Dr. Featherston's money if offered by him of his own accord for my land. Sufficient.

"From HARE HEMI."

Copy of a letter from Nepia Taratoa and others to His Excellency the Governor:—

"Matahiwi, Rangitikei,

April 24, 1866.

"To Governor Grey,—

"Friend—

Salutations. This is a statement of ours for your information. Rangitikei is our residence. The piece of land belonging to my father, withheld from your hand, did not produce a murmur from the tribes. After that Governor Browne (arrived) Ngatiapa wanted to sell, but my father and all the tribes arranged for another place; Manawatu (was offered) to that Governor of ours. Governor Browne did not say any bad words to us in those years; that he would kick us with his feet, or would seize our lands close to Manawatu, even to all its branches. No, it was rather our Superintendent who seized the reserves excluded from that purchase of the Governor's at Manawatu. Te Paretao was one, Te Rewarewa was another seized by him. Now this is Rangitikei which is being seized. If trouble should come upon us this year it will be through Dr. Featherston. This land selling is not by the residents of Rangitikei.

"Ihakara belongs to Manawatu, others belong to Whanganui, and others belong to Porirua. These are the voices (people) approved of by your friend Dr. Featherston. The reason why this land is seized is that these voices (people) intimidate others.

"This kind of selling is very wrong. Enough. This is another word to you. This land purchase is by your second Provincial Government. (Should read:—' This land purchase is a foul wrong that is being perpetrated during your second term of Government.' T. C. W.) Enough then. It is for you to prevent this land being now seized by Dr. Featherston. The people have written to the Assembly enough."

(Here follow the signatures.)

Copy of a letter from Nepia Taratoa and others to the Honourable Native Minister:—

"House of Matene, "Otaki,

30th April, 1866.

"To Captain Russell (Native Minister).

"What we have said is true. Neither Ngatiapa, Rangitane, nor Muaupoko have anything to do with it (the land).

"This is the truth. On our arrival they were all killed or beaten by Te Rauparaha. The authority of the land had also departed, and they remained slaves.

"Again Te Rauparaha was continually slaying the people who had murdered his children. On account of our long residence among them, at last Te Rauparaha ceased slaying them, and then they lived.

"The word of Te Rauparaha went forth: Let all the land remain for Ngatiraukawa as far as Rangitikei, and as far as Otaki.
"By this we obtained authority over these lands, and by this our withholding the land is just. Again we have been living on it for many years.

"The people of Ngatiraukawa who have joined in the sale of the land, and Ngatiapa. these people are jealous on account of the small pieces of land belonging to them; another reason is that they have no influence amongst tho people who have large pieces of land at Rangitikei.

"Now these are the people who possess the authority and the greater portion of the land."

(Here follow the signatures.)

"We have lived on the land thirty-one years.

"The fire of Ngatiapa has not been kindled up to the present day.

"Meaning that Ngatiapa has not occupied the land.

"This is why our speech has been put forth—first, to Governor Grey; second, Governor Browne; third, Governor Grey again.

"Our determination to hold fast to the land is fixed, and we will never cease."

Copy of a letter from Kooro to One and others to His Excellency Governor Grey:—

"Puketotara,

13th June, 1866.

"O Friend Governor Grey,—

"Salutations to you. This is a writing to you from us, so that you may know our thoughts respecting the land which is being sold by Hoani Meihana and Tape te Whata. It is situated between Rangitikei and Oroua. We, the chiefs and all the people, are averse to the sale of that land. This is to be a lasting possession for us. The boundary commences at Whitirea, in the region of Manawatu, thence towards the sea by way of Te Atatuhi to Otpure; the bounary turns off there and goes to Kaikokopu, thence to Kakukuera, Oraanuka, Puketotara, Te Kawau, Totarataepa, Kopnapokoro Te Puta, Whakam-oetakapu, Pareoa, Papauku; there it strikes off and goes to Umutoi on the Oroua, Te Awahuri, thence following the course of the Orouft to Puketotara meeting the formed boundary at Whitirea. We are the proprietors of this tract, that is to say, of that portion of the block towards Oroua and Manawatu. There are also some persons dwelling on the side towards Rangitikei who are holding on to it. Perhaps they have been to you to explain their views, and to let you know who they are; so therefore, when you have seen our thoughts do you send them on to the Runanga, so "that they may also see. This is all we have to say to yon from the men of the following hapus":—

(Here follow the signatures.)

"Enclosed is a sketch map of the piece of land in question for you to look at."

Copy of a letter from Kooro and others to his Excellency the Governor;—

"Puketotara,

13th July, 1866.

"O Father the Governor,—

"Salutations to you. Mr. Bailer has come to Puketotara here, and has desired us to sign our names to the document disposing of Rangitikei and Oroua, but we did not consent to do so for we are not willing to sell our land. Our letter and chart also were sent to yon on the 13th June, 1866, That is our fixed determination for ever. Do you then take care of the letter and the chart also.

"This is all from us."

(Here follow the signatures.)

Copy of a letter from Rawiri Te Wanui and others to the Hon. the Native Minister:—

"Otaki,

July 19, 1866.

"To Colonel Russell,—

"Salutations to you, O Friend! We have heard that Dr. Featherston is coming to bring the money for
Rangitikei. O Friend, give heed, as regards our land at Rangitikei, we are not willing that other tribes and other men leap on to it, and sell it. Is it right that a party not interested take upon himself to sell land or a house belonging to some one else? No, that person would not agree to it, for another man to sell it in that way. Is such doing in accordance with the law, that which Dr. Featherston and his colleagues are doing? Is that which Dr. Featherston is doing correct in your estimation? To our mind it is wrong; it is not according to law, it is wrong; do you also condemn it? Let not Dr. Featherston come here and go on disturbing the (relations which exist) between you and us. But rather carry it out in accordance with the law. Let the Court decide between Dr. Featherston and his friends the sellers of our land on the one part, and us on the other part. That is all"

(Here follow the signatures.)

"Wellington, 9th May, 1866.

Notes of an interview between the Hon. Colonel Haultain, acting for the Native Minister, and thirty-five natives of the Ngatiraukawa tribe, on the subject of the sale of the Manawatu block.

"After some preliminary conversation, Henere Herekau, in the name of all present stated the object of the interview. He said that those present represented the Ngatiraukawa tribe who were opposed to the purchase of their land by Dr. Featherston. In the first instance only eight of their tribe agreed to the sale; subsequently, however, in consequence of the representations of Dr. Featherston and Mr. Buller, seven more agreed, and ultimately seventeen. Those present, however, were unanimously opposed to the sale, and not one of them had signed the agreement.

"Parakaia Pouepa then spoke, and said that he came to protest against Dr. Featherston's statement that 1,100 natives consented to the sale. He had not seen that number, and those who consented belonged to strange places; they came, he believed, from various parts of Whanganui.

"Colonel Haultain then informed them that Dr. Featherston had not sent in any report to the Government of what had taken place in respect to the purchase of the Manawatu block, but when Mr. Buller came down a full report would be made to the Government. In the meantime they were not in a position to state what they would do, not having sufficient information to enable them to judge of the case.

"He wished them to leave a document, signed by all of them, stating their objection to the sale to Dr. Featherston. Parakaia then read a document (enclosed) which was to be accepted as expressing the opinion of all present.

"In reference to this document, Parakaia said that they had applied first to Mr. Fitzgerald, secondly to the Bishop, and thirdly to the Government, and expressed in general terms strong disapproval of the course taken by Dr. Featherston in respect to their land.

"Colonel Haultain then told them that he would take the letter, and it should be considered by the Government when they had received Dr. Featherston's report. In the meantime they might rest satisfied that no sale would be allowed unless the owners of the land agreed to it."

The Assembly voted £30,000—the purchase has been completed. The owners have not yet agreed to the sale. So much for Ministers promises when Maoris are concerned. T.C.W.

Extract from a copy of a letter from Hunia Te Hakeke and others to the Honourable the Premier:—

"Turakina, March 23, 1866.

"Friend Mr. Stafford, and your colleagues,—You know (because) you have distinctly seen that the land of the Ngatiraukawas is at Maungatapuari. They have sent in their claims. Let the Europeans clearly understand that (Maungatapuari) is their land."

* * * * *

(Here follow the signatures.)

Copy of a letter from Hunia Te Hakeke and others to his Honour I. E. Featherston:—

"Turakina,
August 1, 1866.

"Friend,—

"Salutations to you. We have received your letter of the 26th of last month. O sire, good are you! Great is our joy for the words of your letter to us. We have seen your words, showing us the works of the two men of Ngatiraukawa. We have not seen his work, cutting boundaries; he does it clandestinely in the bush. It is not right for him to cut boundaries at Oama rupapako; his work is wrong; he has no land here. The boundaries of his forefathers are at Maungatutari, where he can do such work of his. Our land we don't like him to take the smallest portion of; our selling of the land to you has been proclaimed to all these tribes. Parakaia's work is that of a thief; we have not seen his boundaries. We do not wish that the smallest piece be left in his hands; we have completed the consent of the large boundaries.

"Friend, Dr. Featherston, mine and Mr. Butter's work is at an end—the writing the names of the people.

"Friend, the thought is with you to draw near the day for the meeting at Parewanui, in the weeks of this month. What do we care about that man Parakaia causing trouble; if he is able to cause trouble among the Native tribes his body will see death.

Hunta is the wearer of the ring; the principal seller of the Manawatu block; the gentleman who lately made his appearance in the "Illustrated London News."—T.C.W.

as it has been settled by all the tribes, the consent of my work to you.

"From your friend,

"HUNIA TE HAKEKE,
"And eight others."

Copy of a letter from a Ngatiraukawa chief (non-settler) which was published in the Advertiser;—

(To the Editor of the Advertiser.)
"Otaki,

April 23, 1867.

"This is an answer on the part of the Ngatiraukawa for our elder brothers, the pakehas, and the Government of New Zealand, to Ihakara Tukumaru's letter. He states in his letter that we have no claim on Rangitikei. Do you listen? He, on the contrary, has no standing place on the Rangitikei block, not even the smallest spot. It was only when he joined us in asserting our claims against the Ngatiapa, in 1863, that his foot rested at Tawirihoe. It is true that Ngatiapa had a claim formerly, but it has been ours by conquest since the year 1831, and the date of our taking possession of this land.

"We don’t deny the claim of Rei and Tapa, and their people each to his small piece.

"Is it right, we should like to ask, for strangers to dispose of another man's property? We say that a man ought to have the disposal of his own property either to sell or to withhold, it is for himself to determine, especially when he has been many years in possession of his property. We have been thirty-six years in possession of the land at Rangitikei, and have held it, and yet all these tribes, whose names have been written, are said to have sold Rangitikei to Dr. Featherston.

"Say, then, our elder brothers, on what ground do these tribes rest their claims to Rangitikei. In our opinion they have no claim. This is the reason why they have no claim, because it has become ours by conquest, in the same way that you pakehas obtain land. We are right in keeping possession; we do so under the protection of the law, and in obedience to law.

"And now, our elder brothers, cease from hiding the law. Let it come and ascertain the right of Ihakara's title, and that of the tribes who are acting with him. Ihakara has not a leg to stand upon—he has no claim to Rangitikei—his claim rests upon lies. By these means he got hold of his Pakeha accomplices and his lies have been taken up by his Pakeha friends, and they all lie together. Let us have done with that. What we still ask of you, elder brothers, who, together with us, are bothered about this matter, is to cease from withholding the law. Let us have the law, that the matter may soon be settled. It is for this reason that we repeat, let the law come.

"(Signed)
"NGATIRAUKAWA.
The following appears in the *New Zealand Advertiser's Summary of June, 1867*, published in Wellington:—"Again we are able to report that no disturbances have taken place with the Natives since we last wrote. The English troops are gradually going, and Colonial troops are idle. At Tauranga, the last place where the disaffection manifested itself, the Arawa contingent has been disbanded, and the Hau-haus have quietly dispersed, or come in and taken the oath of allegiance, being thoroughly beaten and disheartened, and absolutely starved into submission. We believe that the prospect of a sojourn at the Chatham Islands, under an armed guard, and with compulsory work to do, has had more effect in bringing this about than the presence of all the Imperial troops that could be mustered in the island. There seems to be a strange misapprehension in the minds of some of the authorities at home with regard to the retention of a regiment in this Colony. They conceive that if a regiment is left we are going to pay for it. We are going to do nothing of the sort. The Governor may recommend its retention, but the Ministers elected by the country will take no responsibility in the matter. Let the regiments stay by all means, but let them be solely at the Imperial charge, for we cannot afford to keep up the expensive game of the past six years. We are well enough able to take care of ourselves, including our Maori brothers, without further Imperial interference, and we certainly shall not pay to have that interference."

*Postscript.*

The General Assembly closed its Session on the 10th October. In the meantime an amended Native Lands Act was passed. I quote from the *Wellington Independent*.—

"**THE MANAWATU BLOCK.**—The Whanganui Times, in announcing that a sittings of the Native Lands Court will shortly be held at Rangitikei, reprints clauses 38 and 39 of the Native Lands Act, passed in the Session just closed, by which the Governor is empowered to refer claims of non-sellers to the Native Lands Court, but claims must be established individually, and not by hapu, the sellers being, of course, excluded from all interference in the matter. The clauses were introduced into the Act at the suggestion of Dr. Featherston, and run thus:—(38) The Governor may at his discretion refer to the said Court the claim of any such person in land within the boundaries described in the second schedule hereto, being the boundaries described in a certain deed of sale to the Crown bearing date the thirteenth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, and expressed to be a conveyance by Natives entitled to land within the district excepted from the operation of the said Act by section eighty-two thereof. Provided that no claim by and no question relating to the title or interest of any Native who shall have signed the said deed of sale shall be so referred, and the Native Lands Court shall in the manner prescribed by the said Act investigate and adjudicate upon such claim and the interest in and title to any land so claimed. (39) From and after such date as may be appointed by the Governor in Council the eighty-second section of the said Act shall be repealed except so far as relates to the land included in the said deed of sale the boundaries of which land are set forth in the second schedule hereto. Provided that every holder of a land order originally selected within the block of sections laid out by the New Zealand Company at Manawatu shall be entitled to retain the particular section selected whenever the Native title may be hereafter extinguished and every certificate issued by the Native Lands Court in respect of the land comprised in the said block or any part thereof shall be and be on the face thereof described to be subject to such of the rights hereby reserved to claimants to the land comprised within such certificate."

I again quote from the *Wellington Independent*.—

"Among the papers laid before the Assembly, by command of His Excellency, we find a very interesting memorandum by the Hon. J. C. Richmond on the Rangitikei-Manawatu land dispute, attached to the petition of Parakaia and others which was recently forwarded to the Queen. The gist of the memorandum is contained in the following paragraph:—'It must be understood that the exact definition of a Maori land claim is rarely, perhaps never, possible. It would be impracticable to make any award to the non-contents in this case which would not be challenged by the sellers, who, though they have parted with their own interest in the land, might view its occupation by the other natives with great bitterness. The case is one, in short, of compromising an insoluble quarrel between half-civilized men, whose titles all rest on violence of a comparatively recent date, and who are only half weaned from regarding violence, even now, as the ultimate appeal. One side alleges conquest as its ground, the other the power to reconquer. Both appeal to Christianity, one to clench the status quo at the time of its introduction, the other to claim the restoration of territory then newly taken from them.'

Trash.—T.C.W."

We always peruse with interest anything coming from Mr. Richmond's pen, and he is certainly entitled to speak with authority on this Manawatu question, having held the post of Native Minister during the progress of the long and tedious negotiations for its final settlement. Mr. Richmond considers the Manawatu purchase the settlement of the 'insoluble quarrel' between the tribes, but adds:—'A share of the purchase money is reserved
for the non-contents, and large allotments of land will in any case be set aside for them. It has, however, been thought advisable to allow considerable delay in winding up the transaction, that as many as possible of the non-contents may come in.

When well wearied.—T.C.W.

It is doubtful whether the quarrel might not be renewed, if an extensive part of the block proportioned to their numbers were at present laid off for them.' He also informs the Home Government that the petitioners have been repeatedly assured of full justice, and that no surveys have as yet been made in the purchased block, except to define reserves for the sellers.

"There is much truth in Mr. Richmond's remarks, and we consider that the Government, in the interests of peace, would have been perfectly justified in hanging the question up till all danger of the kind indicated had passed away. It seems to us, however, that the present position of the purchase alters the whole case, and the settlement of dissentient's claims has become now a very simple matter. The tribal dispute has been got rid of by purchase. Of the six tribes originally claiming to be interested in the block, five have unanimously agreed to the sale and taken their share of the purchase money—in other words, they have been bought out of the concern, and have nothing more to do with it. Their reserves have been defined,

Query.—T.C.W.

and their claims are finally silenced. Of the other tribe (Ngatiraukawa) the great majority, including nearly all the principal resident claimants, have agreed to the sale, some four hundred of them having signed the deed and taken their share of the purchase money. In all, about 1700 Natives have signed the deed of sale. The small party of non-contents who allege claims within the block and refuse to part with them, have taken up this position—they will not themselves define their claims, nor will they accept the Commissioner's definition of them, or agree to his award. The fact is that so long as a man like Parakaia, whose individual claims are very insignificant, can assert a general claim to the whole block, and obstruct the purchase, he is a great man among his fellows. The moment he is reduced to proving his actual claims and confining himself to them, he will, of course, fall back to his proper rank; and Parakaia is too shrewd a man not to know this himself. What we therefore require is, some means of compelling these outstanding claimants to come in and prove, before an impartial tribunal, what portions of the block they are fairly entitled to. Arbitration was proposed, and was agreed to by a section of the claimants, but this proposal fell through, owing to the difficulty of finding competent arbitrators. We have now, however, the remedy in the Native Lands Act of last session. By a clause in that Act—inserted, we understand, at Dr. Featherston's suggestion—the Government is empowered to fix a special sitting of the Native Lands Court at Rangitikei, to hear and adjudicate on all these claims. The Government, will, accordingly, refer to this Court all claims that have been sent in by the protesting party, and will accept its decision as final. When this has been done his Excellency will, we understand, be advised to proclaim the Native title extinguished over the rest of the block, and the vexed question of the Manawatu will then be a thing of the past."

I quote from the New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, second session of the fourth Parliament:—

"Wednesday, September 18th. Native Lands Courts at Turauganui. Mr. Carleton, in moving that the correspondence between the Government and the Judges of the Native Lands Court on the sitting of the Court at Turanganui, laid on the table of this House, be considered, presumed the whole case was shown in the correspondence which he held in his hand. . . . He could hardly conceive anything more irritating to the Natives than the conduct of the Government throughout the whole of the matter. It was calculated to destroy all their confidence in British institutions. He did not say that it destroyed all confidence in the Government, because they had not entertained any confidence in the Government for several years past. The Natives had confidence in the Queen, where they believe they could obtain the ear of the Queen, or where they could obtain access to the Crown. They did not believe in Governors, they did not believe in Governments, for the proceedings of Governments had been such as to destroy what little of confidence might at any time have been supposed to exist in the Native mind. In regard to Native matters, he (Mr. Carleton) had no confidence in Governments. He did not believe they would purposely do injustice, but they did not understand the question. The sooner the whole of that power of meddling and muddling was taken out of their hands, the better it would be for the peace of the country and the finances of the Colony. At last the Court proceeded to sit at Turanganui. What was the result? Another adjournment was applied for. Extreme dissatisfaction was manifested amongst those who had been brought away from their homes again and again, at their own cost, and the same amount of dissatisfaction was felt by those who had to receive them according to the law of Maori hospitality, a law which was never violated. They thought they were being made fools of. Nothing remained but for the Judge, although he himself could not help being exceedingly dissatisfied, to attempt to bring back the Natives to confidence in British institutions. Judge Monro could have adopted no better, no more judicious, course than he did on that occasion to preserve the peace of the country, and restore confidence in British institutions. He (Mr. Carleton) would reiterate the words 'British institutions,' for he could not expect the Natives to have confidence in anything
else, although he did see some rising gleam of confidence in that house—in what they call the 'white runanga.' Judge Monro proved to them that there was an institution in the country on which they could depend; an institution in which there was no vacillation, no question of mere expediency involved; an institution which was regulated by considerations of law and equity alone; an institution which was powerful in itself, and beyond the influence of Government. That was the first thing the Judge endeavoured to show to the Natives. He showed them the perfect independence of the Court of that Government which they justly distrusted. So long as the Government could override that Court, the Natives would not believe in that Court. That Court was the true guarantee for peace at the present moment; and in the same proportion as the Court was tampered with or interfered with, in the same proportion were the chances of another outbreak. He (Mr. Carleton) did not think the Judge could have given a more judicious proof of the independence of the Court—that it was staunch to the Natives; an institution in which they could place their entire confidence—than he did by the course he had adopted. Did anybody deny that? The Government denied it practically, but they should recollect that that House had decreed the independence of the Court, and caused it to be appointed, not durante bene placito, but quamdiu se bene gesserint—not during pleasure, but during good behaviour. Was the House of opinion, when doing that, that they were decreeing a sham, or that their action would ever become a sham? The intention of the House ought to be carried out. He (Mr. Carleton) did not doubt the House would affirm, whenever called upon to do so, that the Judges of the Court were justified in asserting that independence which was made a special condition of their appointment. . . It mattered very little to the Judge what confidence the Government might have in him, so long as he retained the confidence of that House; but in the last paragraph the Government attempted to make him believe that at one time they were inferior to the Court, and at another time so superior as to be able to give directions. They supposed themselves superior to everything at once; they brought to his mind a phrase of Cicero's:—'Tres personas unus sustineo; meam, adversarii, judicis. 'I am playing three parts—I am plaintiff, defendant and judge.' That appeared to him to be the position which the Government were attempting to arrogate to themselves. He had avoided details as much as possible. He had risen for the maintenance of a principle, and it was seldom he did rise except for such a purpose. He cared very little for details, but he had a very clear appreciation of principles, especially those in which they had been brought up in the mother country; and whenever he saw a principle infringed, whether by a friendly Government, or one to whom he was in opposition, most assuredly would he rise for the maintenance of that principle. The special principle which he had then risen to maintain was that no interference could be tolerated as to the Courts of law. It was not only on that occasion, not only in reference to the Native Lands Court, that interference had taken place, but it had also taken place with regard to the supreme Court in a manner that was highly objectionable. He did not specially refer to the present Administration, for he looked upon the General Government as one and continuous. He had seen correspondence with the Judges land on the table of which he was ashamed; and on all occasions whatever upon which he perceived the slightest inclination to any interference with the judicial Courts, so long should be rise to protest against it in the strongest terms. He could not tolerate an attempt to browbeat a Court of law. He hoped that the House would think fit to maintain the perfect independence of a Court which had been constituted by itself."

"Mr. Stafford said . . . He entirely agreed in the terms his hon. colleague had made use of in reference to the conduct of Mr. Monro. He could only say it was very fortunate for that gentleman that he had not had to deal with him instead of his hon. colleague. He (Mr. Stafford) should not have let him off so easily, but would have gone a great deal further, and have stopped his salary, and then he would have allowed him to rush to that House, as he appeared to have done.

"Mr. Carleton: The hon. Member is entirely under a misapprehension. I have had no communication, directly or indirectly, with Mr. Monro.

"Mr. Stafford believed, if there was one thing more calculated than another to provoke a breach of the peace, it was the action of Mr. Monro on that occasion. They were told that the Judges of the Native Lands Court were to be higher than the Legislature and the Government of the country. They were told at the same time that no Governor had the confidence of the natives, and that they only believed in the Queen. When had the Natives ever communicated with or approached the Queen, except through the Governor? And yet the House was told by its oldest member, by one who specially attributed to himself a knowledge of Native character, that the Natives did not believe in the General Government or the Governor, but only in the Queen, who practically never interfered with them, and never would. It would be teaching them to lean upon the very rottenest reed if they were advised not to listen to either the Governor or the Government. This was what the Natives had been advised in 1860, and with the most dire effect, as they were deluded enough to act upon it. The man who gave such advice, either through want of sagacity or otherwise, was no true friend to the race. He would bring the question to an issue in consequence of the language used by the hon. gentleman; and he would, let the House determine, so that there could be no mistake about the matter. He would tell the hon. gentleman that, so long as he had the honor to be one of the advisers of the Crown, he would take such action as
circumstances might require, even if it should be to suspend the operation of the Judges of the Native Lands Court, whenever such a course was for the public interests—aye, even if the Judges were swept away altogether. He and his colleagues would take that responsibility upon themselves, when they thought public interests demanded it. If, therefore, the hon. member thought that was an improper position, or one which would not be upheld by the Legislature, he had now a fair opportunity of taking issue upon the subject. He would leave to his hon. colleague, who was familiar with the details, to advert more particularly to some observations of the hon. member for the Bay of Islands, but he wished it to be distinctly understood that he should never scruple to suspend the action of a Court of so tentative a character, and one which was altogether an experiment, as that which it was proposed to hold under the East Coast Titles Act. It had been a question of policy to create these Courts, and it was every day becoming a question whether it was advisable that they should be continued. He, for one, should never hesitate, so long as he had the responsibility of administering public affairs, to arrest any action, whatever, which he thought to be injurious to public interests, even though it might be taken under the name of a Court." They will be brave Judges who, after reading the above speech which fell from the sapient lips of that great man the Prime Minister—not of Europe, not of Britain, but of New Zealand—who, thinking that injustice may have been done to the Natives, and being desirous of amending that injustice, would undertake to adjudicate upon the claims of Ngatiraukawa non-sellers. I trust the Judges will be advised, and before they enter upon their very delicate mission to the Manawatu, will do themselves the honor of waiting upon the Hon. E. W. Stafford, and of ascertaining from him how the "advisers of the Crown" would wish them to give their decisions, otherwise they will be "swept away." Their position and their income will not be worth one solitary week's purchase; far better for them that they should be found toying with millstones among the waters of the Manawatu, than that they should offend against the peculiar views respecting the public interests entertained by New Zealand's Prime Minister!

The Hon. J. C. Richmond, who has "held the post of Native Minister during the progress of the long and tedious negociations for the final settlement of the Manawatu question," must be either woefully ignorant of the facts of the case, or he must have been filfully misstating the ease to Her Majesty's Government, when he says—" It is doubtful whether the quarrel might not be renewed if an extensive part of the block proportioned to their numbers were laid off for them." Such a statement, to say the least, comes with a very bad grace from the Native Minister of a Government that has but lately expended three millions of colonial treasure with a vast amount of "British blood and treasure," inflicting at the same time a vast amount of misery upon the Maori race, for the avowed purpose of asserting in this land the supremacy of law! Such a statement is worse, it is entirely untrue. The Ngatiraukawa, and they alone have held possession of the block for now nearly forty years. All that Ngatiapa wanted with the block was to sell it to a land-sharking Government. The New Zealand Magistrates, and among them there are many very worthy men, have repeatedly stated that were there no receivers of stolen property there would be fewer thieves. The Hon. W. C. Richmond, in 1860, writing to Her Majesty's Government in defence of his Waitara purchase and Waitara war, stated,—" The grand desire of the British colonists, in respect of the Natives, is to see the Maori people rendered amenable, in their dealings with the settlers, to British law, and that all the inhabitants of New Zealand should be subjected in their mutual dealings to the control of one common law." The Hon. J. C. Richmond, writing, in 1867, in defence of the Manawatu purchase, in a case where 250,000 acres have been purchased from five tribes having no title to the land, speaking of the sixth tribe, the real owners, says:—"It is doubtful whether the quarrel might not be renewed if an extensive part of the block proportioned to their numbers were at present laid off for them." In either case a kind and paternal Government must have the land. Had the British Government condescended, in 1860, to investigate the Waitara purchase, they might have preserved the unfortunate Maori race from much subsequent rebellion, crime, and misery; they might have saved a vast expenditure of "British blood and treasure;" they might have saved this unfortunate Colony from the burdens which are now so great a hindrance to its advancement and prosperity. If the British Government will now cause the Manawatu purchase to be thoroughly investigated, they will soon see how much reliance is to be placed upon statements emanating from New Zealand statesmen respecting matters wherein the Maories are concerned.

The Hon. J. C. Richmond tells Her Majesty's Government, speaking of the unfortunate non-sellers, "It is doubtful whether the quarrel might not be renewed if an extensive part of the block proportioned to their numbers were at present laid off for them."

The Hon. E. W. Stafford tells the Judges of the Native Lands Court if they act in opposition to the public interests he will "sweep them all away." It is easy to foretell the result. Unless Her Majesty's Government interfere there has been attempted, and ere long there will have been accomplished in the Manawatu acts of bare-faced impudent injustice and of cruel oppression.

The General Assembly have now enacted that "The Governor may at his discretion refer to the said Court (the Native Lands Court) the claim of any person affecting the title to, or interest of any such person in land within (the Manawatu block)." What about the "six tribes?" Who are to decide what title five of the six tribes
had to the land, and how far the General Government were justified in using those five tribes, numbers of them armed at the expense of the colonists, as a lever whereby to "crush the opposition" of the real owners "to the sale?" What about the "seventeen hundred signatures?" Who are to decide how many of the seventeen hundred men represented by those signatures had no title whatever to the block? What is to be done in the case of men who may have signed the deed of sale upon certain conditions, which conditions have not since been fulfilled by the Government? What again in the case of men who signed the deed when in a state of intoxication? What in the case of men who signed the deed, being weary of the whole question, living, as they were, under a Government which never interfered in Maori quarrels saving only when something was to be gained? Who are to decide whether the sale and the purchase first and last have or have not been a most impudent swindle? Who are to decide whether or not the deed of cession ought to be burned, and the Land Purchase Commissioners, with others, sent away to the Chatham Islands?

The largest of the Chatham Islands is used as a penal settlement for the Maoris.

Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain "confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families thereof, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, as long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession." The General Assembly of New Zealand purchased 250,000 acres of fine land, the rents of which had been kindly and judiciously impounded—from five tribes having no title to the land—then enacts that "any person" of the sixth tribe may, "at the Governor's discretion," have his claim heard in the Native Lands Court before Judges whom the Prime Minister is prepared to "sweep away" "if they act in any way in opposition to the "public interests." The Assembly, with an impudence that ia alike remarkable and inimitable, have, by the 39th clause of the Native Lands Act, fixed certain land orders issued by the New Zealand Company as so many mortgages upon land which is purely Maori property—land to which the Government have no shadow of a title. In fact the whole of the legislation, first and last, with respect to the Manawatu country, would appear to be so many little attempts at amendments upon the Treaty of Waitangi. Question.—Which should win—Great Britain's Treaty, or New Zealand's Bills?

Some few years ago the writer, himself a tall and stout man, was riding upon a tall and stout horse, some eleven miles from the city of Auckland, where he met with a very little man on foot, with whom he had some very high words. The discussion not proving satisfactory, the writer told the little man to "go to Jericho," and endeavoured to show him how his horse could trot. The little man, nothing daunted, drew himself up to his full height, which was not much poor little fellow, he then shouted after the writer with loud voice, and in tone alike indignant and defiant—" I a'int afraid of you, big as you are!"

When one reflects (the Maoris say "it is well sometimes to reflect") that New Zealand is a country each and every of whose cities might be blown down about the ears of the owners and the proprietors thereof by one solitary British frigate, when one reads the speeches of hon. members wherein it is calmly proposed that the House should go in for a declaration of its independence, the members it is to be imagined each and every of them standing upon their heads; when one reads the speeches of the honorable the Ministers, with the various, ominous, and formidable memoranda transmitted across the seas, from time to time, from the Ministers of New Zealand to the Ministers of Britain, one feels disposed to pat them each and severally upon the back, and with hearty and heartfelt admiration to exclaim, "Well done, little one!"

Great Britain should not forget that when Christian missionaries first landed in New Zealand, bearing in obedience to the commands of their Maker the blessings of salvation to the heathen, the Maoris were a race of wild and savage cannibals. Great Britain should not forget that when in 1840 she obtained Peaceable possession of the Islands of New Zealand by treaty through the instrumentality of Christian missionaries, the Maoris were at least professedly a Christian people—cannibalism had entirely ceased—war and bloodshed had almost ceased—the Sabbath was respected—in every pa and in every village throughout the land was heard the tinkle of the bell, sometimes of its substitute in the shape of a suspended musket-barrel, summoning the Maoris to morning and to evening prayer. Their law then, poor brave fellows, at the time when the Anglo-Saxons were weak and unarmed in this land was love (aroha) to the Pakeha. Wherefore this estrangement? How this sad change? Why has it become necessary that after twenty years of almost peaceful occupation fifteen thousand Anglo-Saxons should have been engaged, armed with fifteen thousand British bayonets, acting in the service and in the name of the Queen of Britain in decimating the tribes of the Maori, desolating their homes, confiscating their lands to the Crown, inflicting a vast amount of misery upon the Maori race, compelling them "naked and famine-stricken, to submit to the force of circumstances," trampling under foot the work of British Societies in this country, driving the Maoris to Hau-hauism, to debauchery, and to crime.

Britain should not forget, that though she is great, she is great only by comparison. This world is a great world, revolving through space, but far less than many other worlds, inhabited, doubtless, by peoples far more mighty, far more wealthy than the British. Britain should not forget, that though she herself is great, the God of the Christian churches is greater than she.
In conclusion, let me ask every candid minded man to urge upon the British Government that they should "send persons to investigate carefully this wrong" in order and to the good end that they may "trot out" the real delinquents and at the same time clear the Christian churches of Britain, and their agents who for half a century have laboured in this land, many of whom have already departed this life, others again are now standing upon the brink of the grave, with the Bishop of New Zealand, his colleagues and their ministry from the charge of having "been more than any man supposes the cause of that long and protracted war the burdens of which now hang about our necks to the hindrance of public and private prosperity."

THOMAS C. WILLIAMS,

A Native of New Zealand. Wellington, New Zealand,

November 25, 1867.

The following letters were published in the Daily Southern Cross, Auckland, Saturday, November 16, 1867:—

"(To the Editor of the Daily Southern Cross.)
"Sir,—

"A letter appeared a few days back in your newspaper relative to mercy being extended to the Maori prisoners. This induces me to send you a letter that I received from William Thompson while he was on a visit to the Governor at Wellington. William Thompson correctly thought that the native character was not properly known by the Europeans, and he wrote me several letters relating to his own life and that of his ancestors, to show that they (the Maoris), when even cannibals, could be merciful.

"William Thompson tells, in the enclosed letter, how that he tried to prevent crime and prevent war, that he made peace at Taranaki, and that he endeavoured to establish schools, &c.

"War, unjust war, has brought ruin to many Natives and Europeans, and left a debt on the Colony that our grand-children will scarcely live to see paid. It is seven years, on the 20th of this month, since the Taranaki war was begun. My friend's letter may be interesting to some who, like myself, were always opposed to war, and to strangers it will show that the Maori is not the savage some represent. If you can afford space, I would like the Maori as well as the English translation to be printed.

"Yours, &c.,

"GEORGE GRAHAM.

"Cliff, Hobson-street, "Auckland,

November 14, 1867."

[Translation.]

"Wellington,

"To Mr. George Graham.

"Friend,—Good and bad men are not of to-day; such existed formerly, at the time of my ancestors, at the time of my parents, and now in my time. They gave instructions to their children, as my father also gave instructions to me, to be kind to the people of low degree; this was his teaching to me, as it was also his father's to him, when his uncle Herea was killed by Ngatiraukawa, who was killed as an offering to propitiate (the gods) upon this occasion of the building of their house—Tutuakarewarewa; therefore did he assume the name of Taingakawa.

An offering."
After the death of Herea Tukuteteiheke came to Horotiū, regardless of the consequences, Taingakawa te Waharoa being absent at the time. When Ngatihaua saw him, they raised a shout. "It is Tukuteteiheke." It was heard from one end of Ngatimaniapoto to the other; some went to carry wood, some to carry covers, some to carry stones, therewith to cook Tuku. When the news reached Taingakawa te Waharoa he went there and found the fire was alight; he went straight to Tuku and gave him his nose (rubbed noses). So Tuku was saved. Then again a war party was sent to Rotorua; Puhirua was attacked, and fell, by Ngatihaua, Ngapuhi, Ngatipaoa. Haere-wharara fled. Now that man belonged to Ngatiraukawa; he was overtaken by the army. When Taingakawa te Waharoa saw it he took it and led him back to his own people (saved his life). Then, again, when Ngapuhi and Ngatiwhatua were at war, and they fled before Hongi Hika, and those which escaped came to Patotere—when Te Waharoa heard of it he took them to Maungakawa, the 140 of Ngatiwhatua, and treated them kindly there; the chiefs were Te Roro o te Eangi, Tamahiki, Pateoro, and Te Tinana. When he sent them back to Kaipara, he said to them—'Go; do not come back in one year, or in two years, but come when you are supplied with guns, powder, and balls (meaning, do not hastily commence war); then come and seek revenge for your dead,' that is for Te Tinana, who had been murdered by the grandfather of Rewi, by Tukorehu.

"At the commencement of the war with Ngatipaoa, he having seen how disposed to evil the chief of his two hapsus, Ngatihaua and Ngatikoroki, were (these chiefs were disposed to evil on account of Ngatipaoa having killed their men, and taken away their lands Horotiū and Maungakawa), then he went to Takurua, chief of Ngatipaoa, and recited his song. This was the song:—"Hiehie, go go, return; lead back your children to your own land; come not here to disturb our tranquillity." He then went thence to Tauranga; after which his people killed Takurua. He returned not to his people, being vexed at their having murdered Takurua, and he suffered his own people to be killed in payment for Takurua. He remained at Tauranga two years. During the second year his sister was killed by Ngatipaoa; then was his heart pained; then he came back to seek redress for the death of his sister. Then fell Ngatipaoa, Ngatimarua, Tamatera, Whanaunga, Te Tawera, and Te Patuwai, and they were caused to go back to their own place, to Hauraki. After this, our man Te Hunga was murdered at Rotorua. Maketu fell in consequence. The women, Tumaia, Tamahuka, Rama, and Peti, were captured. Te Waharoa looked upon them, and sent them back to Rotorua. After this the daughter of Hikairo, Pinenga-a-Riri, married my elder brother. Then the peace was firmly established. After they had lived together for two months, the war party of Taraia rushed upon Waiharakeke, and Pinenga-a-Riri was taken a captive. Ngatihaua stood up to seek payment, but Te Waharoa would not let them. He died in the year 1832, and I grew up: but I did not carry out completely the intentions of my father. After his death Ngatihaua wished to plunder the property of Mr. Brown, minister; my people plundered the whole of his property. I then asked them, and they were all given back. Then I arranged for the robbery (made restoration), four pigs and a piece of land—that was in payment for the large matters stolen. Then, for the wine drunk by my younger brothers, one pig, four baskets of taro, and six nets of potatoes. This was discontinued at that time. I embraced religion. A missionary was now stationed at Tauranga, I urged on the people to cease fighting amongst themselves, but they would not hear. I kept on year by year to urge upon them; at last they all embraced religion. I then turned my attention to establishing schools to examine in class those who were candidates for baptism, and then I used to pass them on to the minister to be baptized. As religion grew, I entertained the idea of having a large church built to be a gathering place for those who up to that time had been antagonistic to each other, so that their animosity might cease. When that house was built it was named Babel, in length it was 24 yards, in breadth 10 yards. Then the Arawa, Waikato, and Ngatipaoa were called; those were the tribes who assembled in that house at that meeting, for the purpose of causing animosity to cease. There were consumed 2,000 baskets of potatoes and kumeras, 3,000 pigs, 20,000 eels, 8 casks of tobacco; one cask of tobacco was contributed by the Government, that is to say by Edward Shortland. Having thus put a stop to old feuds existing between Rotorua and Hauraki, I wished to turn my attention to Waikato, Mokau, Kawhia, and Rangiaohia, that they might all work in unison. I made the attempt, and succeeded. I made the attempt to become possessed of laws for the suppression of crime, for a partial runanga, and magistrates, but the war at Taranaki intervened. I went there and made peace. I again made the attempt, but I had become weary of those things, and I forsook them in the Waikato war. I forsook law, and forsook religion, neither have I yet become desirous for those two things. (Thompson meant that with war he neglected religion, and he could not think our laws just. We refused to enquire into the cause of the war, and broke faith with him after the fall of Rangiriri by not making peace at Ngaruawahia, where the Governor promised to talk with the Maoris.) Here let my thoughts end. From your friend, "W. TAMIHANA TE WAHAROA."

"New Zealand Wars." A Letter to the Times
By Charles Flinders Hursthouse.
Mr. Gladstone. (Hansard's Debates, vol. 176, page 1477.)
"I do not see how England could, with justice, throw the whole responsibility of the War on the Colony. The
policy which has led to the War has not been, exclusively that of the Colony. The Home Government has
approved it, and is, so far responsible for it."
London:— Edward Stanford 6&7, Charing Cross, S. W.

Index.

SIR,

As, owing to its unique, unparrelled, features, the Question of the Imperial Parliament succouring New
Zealand, (a National Property) in War and Disasters, brought on partly by Imperial Parliament Servants at the
Colonial Office, may, yet, have to be discussed this Session—and as, indisputably, it would be a Question
touching national honour and justice, I venture to hope that you may see fit to glance at some of its "facts and
truths" stated in the accompanying Letter to the Times.

Certain late "Successes" over the Rebels may be distorted into Victories, heralding Solid Peace—but it is
notorious, that, in the intermittent, savage War which for years has paralysed or desolated the finest Provinces
of New Zealand, such "successes" have often been achieved before:—only to result, on our side, in idle
trumpeting and the dropping of arms—but on the Rebels’, in fresh plots and combinations, enabling them to
make a more effective re-appearance in the field.

I would also, ask you to observe, as shown in the Letter, that "Maori Wars" are not so much struggles
between New Zealand and the Enemy, as between the weaker half, the North Island, of New Zealand and the
Enemy; and that in fighting power and resources the North Island may prove weaker than the Enemy—for it
must be remembered that the scenes of the last six months, which have already so taxed the defensive powers of
the Colonists, have been the work of only a few bands of Desperadoes—that the powerful "Maori King" tribes
have, ostensibly, taken no part therein—and that long experience of the wily Maori character warrants the belief
that they are standing aloof, watching the end of the present outbreak, only to make sure that the great Queen,
over the ocean has abandoned her rights and duties in New Zealand, and that her "Red Coats" will never daunt
them more—when, more safely and successfully, they might plot a general combination and rising of all Rebels
from North to South, and test the truth of their boast of being able to drive the "Pakeha" into the sea.

I would further beg your attention to that inhuman practice of "hiring Savages to destroy Savages," which
the Crown's refusal to aid the Colony compels the Colony to adopt—one which Admiral Sartorious, at page 16
of the Letter, so justly denounces—one which, for the reasons there given, must weaken the chance of
civilization being able to save even a remnant of the Race—and one of which, as seen at page 27, our Maori
Allies will make the most.

Two New Zealand Public Men, Mr. Weld and Mr. Weld and Fitzgerald—who, as leaders in Lord Racon's
"Heroic Work" of Colonization, merit every Colonist's respect—have lately published their defence of that
 crude and premature policy of "Self Reliance" which, in evil hour, they were deluded into helping the Colonial
Office to saddle on the Young Colony. But their exculpations utterly ignore three pregnant facts of the
case:—the one, that we who differ from them love "Self Reliance" quite as much as themselves, but contend
that in New Zealand, it comes too soon—the second, that, even if it had not come too soon, it would still have
been the Young Colony's duty to herself not tamely to submit to its being "forced" on her by the Colonial
Office, and to seeing that peccant Institution shuffling, scathless, out of disasters which it, mainly, had brought
on—and the third, that though the present costly "Self Reliant" effort of the Colony to, suppress the present
partial Outbreak may be, successful, it would, still, leave that great "root Difficulty" of the Native Question,
described in the Letter at page 8, and on, utterly untouched.

That, for economical and mother considerations, the British Crown may justly decline to aid a British
Colony in a domestic War, is one thing, and may be true—but that the British Crown, after having done
much to bring a" Savage War" on a Young Colony, may justly stand aloof and give the young Colony no aid
therein, is altogether an other thing, and utterly false—as indeed the most reckless of Economists must admit,
and as Mr. Gladstone's words, quoted in the Letter, show that, when out of power himself, thought.

But, even if the Imperial Parliament should refuse aid, either of men or money, in suppressing Wars and
Troubles desolating the National Property in New Zealand, I trust, Sir, that it would, still, regard it as a duty to
Christianity and Philanthropy to help in the work alluded to at page 10 of the Letter—namely that of
energetically labouring to civilize and "save" the Savage after he has been, "tamed."

I am, Sir,
Very respectfully yours,

Charles Flinders Hursthouse.

GREAT YARMOUTH, MARINE TERRACE

APRIL 3RD, 1869.

"New Zealand Wars."

Mr. Gladstone. (Hansard's Debates, vol. 176, page 1477.)

"I do not see how England could, with justice, throw the whole responsibility of the War on the Colony, The policy which has led to the War has not been, exclusively, that of the Colony. The Home Government has approved it, and is, so far, responsible for it,"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR

In our last New Zealand War, divers young Officers, bored by dullness of Bush Camp and absence of Loot, pining for pomps and pleasures of more civilized quarters, avenged the cruel fate, casting them in such a Colony, by showing up its many iniquities and pretty generally damning everything therein.—Colonists, remembering the blundering pluck of these fledging warriors, and the work which, though not allowed to do, they came to do, regarded such effusions far more in sorrow, than in anger, and were content to retort that if the Royal Army in New Zealand was slow at "fighting," it was, at least, quick at "writing."

But, in a late Times, there appears a letter from Colonel Gawler, wherein, free from the fetters of diffidence, he in substance, boldly asserts that the Almighty is so angered by the exceeding Wickedness of the New Zealand Colonists, in the plotter of New Zealand Wars, that he does not bless their efforts to end them. But the "facts" of the good Colonel's letter only match its theology; for while he asserts that all New Zealand Wars have been caused by "Land," it is notorious that, in two of the three, Land has been no more the cause than Tenterden Steeple that of Goodwin Sands:—" Heke's" springing from that worthy convert's disgust at Queen's Customs driving from the Bay of Islands the lawless Whalers and Traders who were such free consumers of his Pigs, Peaches, and Slave Girls—and the "Wanganui," from the accidental wounding of a Maori by a Middy.

But Colonel Gawler is not alone in his denunciations of colonial wickedness—he has fit coadjutors in Missionaries of the Rev. Taylor's stamp, who, disgusted at the apostacy of "blanket-and-tobacco" created converts, and unable to punish them, seize unfortunate Colonists, as vicarious whipping posts, and protest that it is the "model" which they exhibit to the Maori, not the Maori's own inherent savagery, which makes Christ's Truths "foolishness" to him; and incites him to the triumphant perpetration of such atrocities as the murder of the Rev. Mr. Volkner, the massacre of babes and women, the hideous mutilation, and the roasting, alive, of Prisoners of War, But the sufficient answer to the Rev. Taylor and his brother Bigots is this,—that a hundred years ago, and before the Maori had ever seen a Colonist, he was the like wily brutal Savage which, in grain, as a race, he is now. Those "characteristics" of craft, treachery, turbulence, weasel-like lust of blood, which, vented in ferocious internicine feuds and massacres, it is believed, reduced his numbers nearly one-half in the 70 years elapsing between Cook's visits and the commencement of Colonization, are, however hidden by lacquer of civilization, his "characteristics," still—and while History will record no instance, in ancient or modern times, of any Savage race being so tenderly dealt with as the Maori has been by British Colonization, it will also record that down, at least, to anno domini 1869, such tenderness towards him was as the rolling of the Sisyphus stone, all in vain.

The truth is, Sir, though critics of the Gawler calibre and irate Missionaries may tail or refuse to see it, that in the matter of New Zealand Wars, our luckless Colonists have been infinitely more sinned against than sinning. Indeed, as Revolutions are not made with rose-water, so the treatment which young New Zealand has experienced from successive British Governments, (ripening the Maori into the rebellious Savage, and then foroing on her, alone and unaided, the work of subduing him) is not to be roincingly described as mistaken or unjust, but as nationally disgraceful, and is one which none of the Six Australasian Colonies will quickly forget.

For nearly a quarter of a century, our Colonial Office, (inspired by Utopian Philanthropists of the Buxton
type, deluded by true Aborigenes "Destruction" Societies and Exeter Hall) jealously excluded Colonists from all share or part in the management of the Maori; and sought to tame and save him by a Policy, not inaptly, stigmatized as that of "Tracts and Treacle"—a Policy under which it is notorious that during the sway of New Zealand's two first Governors-(Hobson and Fitzroy) and their chief Vizier, a Missionary Gunsmith, the Colonists were treated as the inferior race and, the Savage, for the most part, suffered to do just as he pleased. Under this policy, the Maori presenting himself before Governor Fitzroy red-handed from the "Massacre of Wairau," was mildly admonished not so to stain himself 'again, whereupon, he called His Excellency a Paukena, a soft Pumpkin, whom he could eat. Under this policy, furious at the Crown's award that he had fairly sold Taranaki, and then, as now, having millions of acres of fertile wild land of which, dog in the manger, he made no use, he vowed to sack the Settlement, when most of Taranaki was instantly given him back. Under this policy, objecting to Custom Houses, Custom Houses were instantly swept away, and the whole fiscal system of the colony altered to his whim—while, the many minor cases, where, under this policy, he was suffered to spit on the Crown's paper laws might almost be counted by scores.

At last, the Colonial Office, having, as we have seen, had the sole exclusive management of this Pet of Exeter Hall for nearly five and twenty years, finding him wax more and more costly turbulent and unruly; seeing, indeed, that, in this Christian Convert of theirs, Missionary Councillors had foisted on it a very Wolf, with but little even of the Sheep's clothing, began, not unnaturally, to wish to get rid of him; and, as a first step thereto, arranged, that in all further dealings with him, its own Officer and Agent, the Crown Governor of the Colony, should seek aid and council from the Executive Ministry of the Colony's Legislature—and it was under such "new arrangement" that the notorious "Waitera Purchase" was subsequently made.

Now, Sir, even the most rabid of Philo-Maories, admit that, up to this transaction, the Waitangi Treaty, by which the Natives made over the Sovereignty of the Islands to the Queen had, in the matter of Land, been faithfully observed by the Queen—and assert that the first overt violation of the Waitangi Treaty was this "Purchase of Waitera"—and that, from it, have successively sprung all those Maori "Wars and Troubles which have since desolated the Colony. I, with most others, hold that, for the honour and interests both of Crown and Colony, it was right to make and defend the Waitera Purchase. But, right or wrong, it was the deliberate Joint act and deed of Crown and Colony—and, hence, in national honour and equity, it necessarily follows that its "consequences and results" must be borne and provided for by the one contracting party as well as by the other; and that the Crown has no shadow of claim or excuse for backing out of such consequences and results, on the plea of non-participation in, or non-responsibility for, the Act and Deed which produced them.

But it may be said that however much and justly Colonists were aggrieved by having the sole management of the spoilt and pampered Savage transferred to and thrust on them, as was finally done by the Colonial Office of the Duke of Newcastle, yet that in 1863 they fully accepted the charge by suffering Mr. Weld's Ministry to proclaim for them that New Zealand adopted the "Self-Reliant" Policy.

This, however, would be quite untrue. When the imperial Troops had done just enough to make the Savage a still fiercer Rebel; when all close observers saw the struggle was not half over, the Colonial Office, in pursuance of its long cherished design of quietly getting altogether rid of the Maori with his Whims and Wars, insisted on withdrawing the Troops unless the young Colony paid for them. But, with a grievous Debt already contracted in aid of attempted suppression of bloody Rebellion—with dwarfed resources caused by Rebellion's stopping Immigration and driving away capital and labour, the young Colony could not pay for Troops—and, as Rebellion had been brought on her far more by the Crown's acts and laches than by her own, it would have been monstrously unjust for her to have borne the entire cost of suppressing it even if her infant exchequer would have enabled her to have done so. But, here, unfortunately, Mr. Weld committed a disastrous political blunder. Instead of officially denouncing this cruel-scheme of the Colonial Office; instead of refusing to stain his hands by, in any way, promoting it; instead of daring Downing Street to take the responsibility of withdrawing the Troops in the midst of ft crisis it, mainly, had brought on, Mr. Weld, piqued at the miserable slanders published against the Colony at home; disgusted at the squabbles and quarrels between Governor Grey and General Cameron, ever paralysing the action of the imperial Troops, impulsively, pettishly, declared that New Zealand would adopt Self-Reliance, dispense with the Redcoat, and, thenceforth, against the Maori, defend herself. Had he, happily, defied the Colonial Office, told it, in plainest words, that its own imbecile handling of the Maori had done the most to pamper and innate the Maori into the Rebel—and backed such defiance by a public petition to the Queen, signed as it would have been by 99 in 100 of the Northern Colonists, praying her not to abandon the young Colony in its peril—and thus forced the responsibility of withdrawing the Troops wholly on the Colonial Office, it is more than probable that this Institution would not have dared to take such responsibility, through the well founded fear that its possible results might prove such as to bring down on One Colonial Office the pretty general contempt and indignation of an aroused British public. But, unfortunately, the Weld Ministry had not the acumen to see the good policy of such course, or the boldness to adopt it; and the instant they took to "tall talking" about Self-Reliance they gave the Colonial Office an
advantage over them which it used in such a way as to make it appear to the world that imperial troops were withdrawn from New Zealand not against, but with, her will and consent. By some few, indeed, Mr. "Weld's "Self-Reliance" was hailed as grand and even "chivalrous"—and, inasmuch as it was undoubtedly Quixotic, it might possess a dash of the chivalrous. Yet, when we remember that any collapse of the Self-Reliant Bladder could not have brought war, massacre, and ruin on Mr. Weld and his safe South Island friends and constituents, but solely on the poor Northern Settlers, we are aptly reminded of Artemus Ward's burst of chivalry, when he cried, "in such a cause as this, my friends, I would shed the last drop of my Brother's blood." If before Mr. Weld took on himself to proclaim "Self-Reliance" for young New Zealand, he had condescended to learn the views of the North Island people thereon, he would have found three-fourths, if not nine-tenths, of them protesting against it; and the small minority accepting it only on the positive condition that an effective Colonial Force should at once be created and maintained as some equivalent for the loss of the imperial Troops. But this Force, the very root and foundation of his "Self-Reliance," Mr. Weld and his fatuous South Island successors never raised other than on paper—hence, not even a Watch much better than Dog berry's could be found for guarding those Chatham Island Prisoners whose escape has done so much to relight a cruel war; and, hence, the hasty levies sent by the Stafford Ministry to march against the monster Tito Kowaru exhibited many a Recruit with whom Sir John would not even have marched through Coventry.

But even if the "Self-Reliant" policy had not thus been arbitrarily forced on the Colony, even if it had not been inequitable and unjust, and even if the North Island had endorsed it, the Colony could never have thoroughly carried it out because the Crown has so shaped her Constitution that, in matters of "Native and Self-Reliant Policy," she is divided against herself—inasmuch as when her "North "Island arm would be put forth to the effectual chastisement of the Maori, it, is by her "South" Island arm, held back. As a geographical fact, it may be known, here, that New Zealand is formed by two great Islands, North and South—but it is certainly not known here that the latter, where Natives are no more a power than Gypsies with us, has been as little the cause and creator of Maori Wars and Troubles, as Wales or Wilts—and certainly not known, here, that in respect to the great fundamental requirement in all Countries, security of life and property from rebel violence, the people of the South Island are no more affected by Maori atrocities than the people of Middlesex or Kent. In truth, the South has had little or nothing to do with New Zealand Wars beyond helping to pay for them. At first, when she hoped one vigorous effort might end them for ever, she heartily helped to make it; and her Representatives in New Zealand's Parliament were foremost in voting war supplies. But, this vigorous effort, like every succeeding one, miserably failed—she fears, with reason, that every further, unaided effort, may fail; and sees no prospect of cessation of alien war calls on resources which she needs to husband for the peaceful colonization of her fertile wastes. To the North Island, Peace is as essential as air and light,—to the South, it is almost as much of the luxury as the necessary. Indeed, in her great Immigrationary Interests, the South has been actually a "gainer" by Maori Wars and Troubles, for, notoriously, during the last few years, a large amount of fructifying capital and labour has been diverted from the North Island to the South, because life and property have been secure in the one, and not in the other.

The injurious way in which this difference of position and interest between North Island and South, in regard to Native Troubles, operates to the prejudice of the former, may rudely be shown by supposing that Fenianism had become dominant in Ireland, and that Irish members were a majority in the House—that in some great European convulsion, the France of the Third Napoleon, like the France of the First, menaced England with invasion—that Mr. Gladstone asked for £5,000,000 as necessary to place the coasts in security—and that his successors never raised other than on paper—hence, not even a Watch much better than Dog berry's could be found for guarding those Chatham Island Prisoners whose escape has done so much to relight a cruel war; and, hence, the hasty levies sent by the Stafford Ministry to march against the monster Tito Kowaru exhibited many a Recruit with whom Sir John would not even have marched through Coventry.

But even if the "Self-Reliant" policy had not thus been arbitrarily forced on the Colony, even if it had not been inequitable and unjust, and even if the North Island had endorsed it, the Colony could never have thoroughly carried it out because the Crown has so shaped her Constitution that, in matters of "Native and Self-Reliant Policy," she is divided against herself—inasmuch as when her "North "Island arm would be put forth to the effectual chastisement of the Maori, it, is by her "South" Island arm, held back. As a geographical fact, it may be known, here, that New Zealand is formed by two great Islands, North and South—but it is certainly not known here that the latter, where Natives are no more a power than Gypsies with us, has been as little the cause and creator of Maori Wars and Troubles, as Wales or Wilts—and certainly not known, here, that in respect to the great fundamental requirement in all Countries, security of life and property from rebel violence, the people of the South Island are no more affected by Maori atrocities than the people of Middlesex or Kent. In truth, the South has had little or nothing to do with New Zealand Wars beyond helping to pay for them. At first, when she hoped one vigorous effort might end them for ever, she heartily helped to make it; and her Representatives in New Zealand's Parliament were foremost in voting war supplies. But, this vigorous effort, like every succeeding one, miserably failed—she fears, with reason, that every further, unaided effort, may fail; and sees no prospect of cessation of alien war calls on resources which she needs to husband for the peaceful colonization of her fertile wastes. To the North Island, Peace is as essential as air and light,—to the South, it is almost as much of the luxury as the necessary. Indeed, in her great Immigrationary Interests, the South has been actually a "gainer" by Maori Wars and Troubles, for, notoriously, during the last few years, a large amount of fructifying capital and labour has been diverted from the North Island to the South, because life and property have been secure in the one, and not in the other.

The injurious way in which this difference of position and interest between North Island and South, in regard to Native Troubles, operates to the prejudice of the former, may rudely be shown by supposing that Fenianism had become dominant in Ireland, and that Irish members were a majority in the House—that in some great European convulsion, the France of the Third Napoleon, like the France of the First, menaced England with invasion—that Mr. Gladstone asked for £5,000,000 as necessary to place the coasts in security—and that the Irish Members would vote but one. In such crisis, what course Mr. Gladstone would take, is not easy to say—but assuredly there is one course which he would not take;—for the sake of retaining place and power, he would not shut his eyes to real danger, affect that England was unduly alarmed, trust to chance, and undertake the responsibility of her defence with means ridiculously inadequate thereto. But, illustrating small things by great, this, substantially, is what the political Vicars of Bray composing New Zealand's Stafford Ministry have done; and now that a brutal War is crimsoning the fields of the North Island Colonists with the blood of women and children, they seek to palliate their gross neglect to provide against it by pleading that if they had asked their Parliament for the necessary "ways and means "they would have been refused, inasmuch as "South Island" Members, virtually, commanded a majority there.

See Appendix A, page 25.

But, if the South Island cannot be counted on effectively to aid the North in so vital a work as the suppression of barbarian Rebellion, how much less is she to be counted on in the succeeding work of vigorously attempting to civilize and save the Barbarian: a work which carried out on any scale likely to return fruits, might, for a long period, entail an expenditure of at least £100,000 a year. The former, she would admit to be, for the North Island, a work of practical necessity—but the latter she might well regard as one more of sentimental philanthropy, with which, she, at least, need have nothing to do—and yet, you, Sir, with almost every member of the imperial Parliament, and, even still, many Colonists, with my humble self, would regard
this latter work as essential as the former; and hold it to be no less the function and duty of Civilization and Christianity to attempt to save the Savage, after taming him, as it was to chastise and tame him.

Encouraged as the Maori has been to view the withdrawal of the Queen's Troops as a sign of the Queen's abandonment of the Colonists to their fate, and inflamed by recent successes, such a spirit of lawlessness and audacity has been engendered among the rebel, half-rebel, and neutral tribes, and such doubts and fears of being on the weaker side instilled into the few who are, really staunch allies, that, for some years to come, an effective force of four or five Regiments, with as many light gun boats, may be necessary to win a solid Peace for New Zealand, and prevent scenes there, which might startle half Europe with their atrocity. Such a Force the South Island will not effectively aid to create and maintain; and such a Force the North Island, alone and unaided, and numbering as she does but a handful of male adults, scattered in isolate districts over a rugged country, whose daily labour is, for the most part, necessary to their families, cannot create and maintain.

See appendix B, page 25, on temporary "Separation "of the North Island from the South.

The indisputable facts that for the first twenty years and more of the Colonization of New Zealand the Crown jealously reserved to itself the exclusive management of the Maori—that in this period it did much to create him that law-scoring Savage which he now is—that both the Waitera Purchase and the subsequent Confiscations were as much its acts and deeds as they were those of the Colony—that it forced the Self-Reliant Policy on the Colony—and that, after having contracted a crushing Debt in efforts to secure Peace, the young Colony may prove too weak to achieve such result—are grave and pregnant facts which, taken and weighed together, are amply sufficient to indicate and establish, by their own intrinsic force and virtue, that, in national honour and equity, it is now the duty of the Crown to aid the Colony with Troops,—while, if any further considerations were needed to determine the Crown to adopt such course, there are some of no little pertinency close at hand.

For instance, let it be remembered that, for more than twenty years, our Countrymen have been suffered, nay encouraged by the Crown, to emigrate to New Zealand, in the belief that, as they were emigrating to a British Colony, British Law and Order would be maintained there. When as Pioneers for tens of thousands of their Countrymen, and as much, perhaps, for the good of the Parent State as for their own, they moved off to the Antipodes, they never dreamed, and by no official word act or deed of the Crown were ever prompted to dream, that in addition to their own hard but legitimate work of subduing the "Wilderness, they would have put on them the extraneous and still harder work of subduing the Savage—nor that, when the Crown's past handling and management of the Maori had done so much to inflate him into an Animal with whom the purest philanthropy could effectively deal only by "Force," that they, alone and unaided, would be called on to provide such Force.

Again, we know that the duty of protecting and improving a Property is a duty devolving on the Owners of it. Who, then, are the Owners of New Zealand, a Country nearly as large as the United Kingdom, capable of supporting a population of full 20,000,000 in easy plenty? Surely not the mere Pioneer Colonists who happen to have been the first to plant new homes there; who are but as ripples of the coming tide, the mere advanced guards of tens of thousands of their countrymen who will follow them. With due regard to all Native Eights, the principal Owners of a Young British Colony and magnificent Emigration Field, such as New Zealand, are the 30,000,000 of little British Isles. It is their noble Freehold Domain, where tens of thousands of them, as much for the Nation's profit as their own, may take fresh lease of life, land find temporal salvation:—the domain more than ever valuable to the Nation now that the Scales seem falling from her eyes, and "State Emigration" becoming dimly visible to her as the true panacea for Pauperism and poverty-created Crime—the sort of Land to which Abram went when the Lord said unto him:

"Get thee out of thy country, and from they kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land which I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing."

—the sort of Land which Moses promised Israel, when he said,

"For the LORD thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks, of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.

The people of the Mother Country, then, being at least part, if not chief, "Owners" of New Zealand, it follows that it is the duty of their representative, the Crown, to aid the Pioneer Colonists in the work of defending and protecting such joint property.

As to the argument of its being unfair for young Colonies such as the Australasian; to require military aid from the Crown because they pay no imperial taxes, it is one far more specious than real; insomuch as by and through the vast and lucrative trade they create for the Mother Country they furnish no small portion of her community with part of the "ways and means "of paying imperial taxes, and do thus, substantially, pay a share
of them as much as if they carried them, direct, to the imperial exchequer. While as to the moonshine occasionally crazing the disciples of professor Goldwin Smith as to our Australasian Group of Colonies costing us more than it is worth, it may suffice to say that were it possible to reduce to figures and display in £. s. d. the various gains, profits and advantages, direct and indirect, which the Mother Country has reaped from it, we should probably find that every pound she had expended on it had brought Her a fifty back; and thus see that Lord Bacon, or Sir Joshua Child (for whether it was the bigger or the lesser Luminary, I forget) was, indeed, right when he told us that "Colonization was the very best affair of business in which an old, over-peopled, Country, can engage."

In a late leader, alluding to the merited testimonial dinner to Mr. Fitzherbert, you quote Major Atkinson's speech as strengthening your idea that the Colonists need no Mother Country aid, but can thrash and tame the Savage, themselves. The Major's post-prandial confidence in the fighting powers of Colonists, gracefully resting in his case on personal gallantry in the field, is not to be contemned. Like every other Colonist, of Anglo-Saxon grit, he would rather win solid Peace by his own good sword than be aided therein by any Ally, white or black. And were the "experiment" tried of pitting Settlers against Maories to fight the quarrel out to its bitter end, I agree with him that in the long series of what, in "ferocity," would be as rat and weasel combats between them, extending probably over many years, cool and patient spectators, here, might at last see the former, however torn and mangled, come conquerors out of the arena. But, surely, every man whose humanity and philanthropy is not a mere paying "Bray" for the Market Place and Exeter Hall, but something for practical Christian use, would protest against any such gladiatorial "experiment" ever being tried. Those for whom our sympathies are now chiefly enlisted are the Rural Settlers of the North Island—the blessed silent Men who don't howl at Hastings and make Colonial politics a trade, but who subdue the Wilderness and make the desert blossom like the rose: whose blooming homesteads won from the waste by toil of years are annihilated in a night, whose wives and children are massacred, by the biped wild beast yclept the Maori. And such men I opine, are not, to be made the "corpus vile" on which opinions are to be tested, "experiments" to be tried—but are men whose deadly perils, (as great as those of Abyssinian Captives) should weigh, with other considerations, to sweep away the closet cobwebs, of our pseudo Political Economists, the false teachings of our Goldwin Smiths, and lead to the speedy despatch of imperial Troops to their aid.

I would, further, venture to remark that in the various New Zealand leaders with which the Times has lately favoured us, three leading views expressed therein are radically incorrect:—the one, that friendly Natives should now be hired by us to destroy Rebel Natives—the other, that there is no War in New Zealand the third, that in "fighting power and resources" the Rebels are vastly inferior to the Colonists. Touching the first, permit me to observe that after a quarter of a century's close observation and study of the Maori character, and several years personal acquaintance with it, I would heartily endorse the following pregnant words of Admiral Sartorious, in a late Times,—"Give the friendly Maori the warm generous hand of friendship—hut, Heaven forbid, he should ever have reason to believe that in the battle and the fray he commands the first place."

Looking, too, at the feeling now spreading among hitherto neutral, friendly and half friendly Tribes, that the Colonist's may prove to be the weaker side, it is probable that no large Native Force could now be raised; while, further, were we to go into some bloody crowning fight with Allies such as the Kupapas,


they might lose us the day. But, even if any effective trusty body of loyal Savages could now be raised to subdue their fellow Savages under the rebel flag, the process, as shadowed forth by the characteristic Maori letter

See Appendix D, page 27.

given at the end would probably be one of scenes revolting to humanity — while, at the same time, any such Maori-achieved triumph would cause so general an "inflation "of the entire Race, such a sense of superiority over and contempt for the White Man, as would assuredly produce crops of further troubles, and destroy any chance Civilization might still have of saving the remnant of the race by bitting it in to British law and order, weaning it from Barbarism, and toning it to Plough and Fleece. As to your idea that the scenes we have lately witnessed in New Zealand have not been of gravity and horror sufficient to be called "War," I would observe that if gentlemen, sitting at home in slippered ease and parlour safety, innocent of "villainous saltpetre" and far from War's alarms, would test the "dignity of 'Labour," by just moving to New Zealand and hewing out Bush Farms for themselves near the precincts of Poverty Bay or Patea, they would quickly discover not only that" War," but that War of a very desperate and brutal character was in the Land. War which has already swept away flourishing pioneer Settlements, which has exhibited the hideous spectacle of the torture, the "roasting, alive," of white Prisoners, the massacre of women and children, and which the most trusty Native Authorities, justly fear may spread and burst into a storm desolating half the entire Colony.

Finally, as to your expressed opinion that the Rebels are far weaker than the Colonists in "fighting power and resources," permit me to say this. The observations at pages 8 to 11, and appendix A, show that, virtually,
the Maori War waging in New Zealand is not so much a War between both Islands and the Enemy, as between the North Island and the Enemy. Now the entire white male population of the North Island is but little over 40,000; and as it exhibits a remarkable proportion of children and youngsters in their early teens, the number of males between 18 and 50 would be found disproportionately small. The actual number of Natives in the North Island is not accurately known, owing to the various difficulties of taking much other than a conjectural Maori Census, but it may still be taken at about 60,000. Now, in estimating the amount of the Maori's "fighting force" from the number of his population, two pregnant facts are to be borne in mind—the one that it is a population exhibiting a remarkable fewness of females, children and aged men, and that a large proportion of the females, in all save the actual fighting, in stockade building, in food finding, in commissariat work, are almost as good Men as the Males. Hence, the actual "fighting force and power "of a population of 50,000 of the Maori Race would, numerically, be found perhaps even double that of a population of 60,000 of any other race, white or black. Again, we have to remember that a large portion of the Savage Races with which. Anglo-Saxon Colonization has had to wrestle in almost every quarter of the world has not had the weapons of Civilization like those which the Maori for years has been buying and storing up—that no race of Savages has ever been half so well armed as his—and that none, not even the Red Indian, has ever shown such dexterity in the use of arms.

The Maori, too, having his pigs, tame and wild, his sea fish, tons of eels, birds, wild roots, and various indigenous edibles, is able to subsist by annually scratching in patches of potatoes, and has no farming to do. He has no settled pursuit, no shop, office, mine, ship, or bank to attend. At his pleasure, he can emerge from his Bush eyrie, and swoop down on the Settler with no more disturbance to himself or family than in our case might follow from our going forth to stalk the highland red deer. How different it is with the North Island Settlers I need not say—and looking both at the nature of the Maori and of his Country, at his arms, war cunning, and freedom to fight, it is sober truth to say that it would be easier to defeat, subdue, and bring to terms, in an open civilized country, 20,000 or 30,000 of the best troops of France or Prussia than such a Body of Natives as may now soon be tempted to take the field against the Settlers of the North Island.

If the Government, weighing the great exigency of the case, its many unique, unparalleled features, the fact that New Zealand Wars and Troubles have, at least, been as much caused by Crown as Colony, and other considerations indicating that "help "ought now to be sent her, decide on sending it, no form of it would be so effective as that of three or four regiments of troops,—for they, and they alone, would beneficially act and operate in two ways:—well led, as the Rebels know, they have, as "Fighters," no equals—; while, at the same time, their mere reappearance on the scene would have a signally deterrent and quieting effect on all neutral and wavering Tribes, and a most assuring encouraging one on all friendly Tribes, inasmuch as it would instantly and strikingly show to all Natives from North Cape to South, that the hopes of the Rebels, the fears of the Friendlies, that the Great Queen over the Ocean had abandoned her rights and duties in New Zealand, were, alike, foolish and vain.

Clothed with thin additional moral force and power, and taking fighting qualities only to he equal, 3000 or 4000 Queen's Troops could now do more to prevent Rebellion spreading, more to win a solid Peace in New Zealand, than double the number of Colonial. Such a Force, despatched at once, ere the fire further spreads, operating with strong bodies of Colonial Rifles, and a few bands of trusty Natives, and, the whole, handled by a commander of the Magdala Napier stamp, would quickly win and dictate terms of a Peace in New Zealand, equally advantageous to both races—when if the North Island had but the wisdom to unlock her magnificent Wild Lands, and adopt popular Land Regulations, not forgetting grateful provision for "Military Free Grants," she might, in two or three years, draw to her shores an influx of Population, of capital and labour, power and strength, which would daunt the most desperate of any remaining disaffected Natives from ever disturbing her Peace again.

Indeed, assuming there were no pressing emergency in New Zealand—assuming that the national honour, and the Crown's share in the protection and development of the Crown's and the Colony's "joint" Property there, did not call for the prescence of Queen's Troops there, might it not, still, be reasonably asked, "where could they better he" Mr. Cardwell's Budget will provide for just as many Troops whether New Zealand be in or under the sea. Imperial Troops must be somewhere—and in New Zealand, they would be in the finest climate in the world, in a country which might well be made a Military Sanatorium of the Empire, in one affording them the finest training ground, and in one close to the Crown's "rich and tempting" Possessions in Australia, and not far from India, China, and Japan, where, perhaps, more than anywhere, the British Soldier may look for work.

It may be that the next mail will show us that Fortune has, in turn, smiled on us, that Poverty Bay has been avenged, Tito Kowaru driven to his lair. But evanescent interludes such as these have many and many a time occurred in the long tragedy of Maori War. They are not Peace—not the solid permanent Peace under which capital and labour would flow into the Land, plough and fleece progress, and industry resume her crown—not the Peace now to be secured only by the maintenance, for three or four years, in the North Island, of a body of
Troops such as has been indicated, and whose operation and effect would be both curative and preventative.

Encouraged by the reception which Mr. Cardwell, when at the Colonial Office, gave to certain suggestions of mine on a then pending "New Zealand Difficulty;" and remembering how, in Fableland, a very humble animal once served and saved my Lord, the Lion, I, some three years ago, in a printed letter to my Lord Carnarvon, ventured to counsel him to keep about three regiments in New Zealand till war passions had more subsided and till more time had been given for coaxing the Maori to plough; and I have since learned that such high authorities as Governor Grey and General Shute advised the same. His Lordship, however, getting unfortunately heated in a sort of "despatch war" with the Colony, turned deaf ear to all such representations; and the calamities foretold as likely to arise from petulant persistence in his own policy, have arisen; and thus, much to my grief, made my prophecies only too true. Let us hope that Lord Granville, free from all bias of past differences between Colonial Office and Colony, will be more ready to listen to the claims of reason and honour and justice.

The various considerations mentioned at pages 11 and on, taken and weighed together, indisputably show that it is the duty of the Crown now, and quickly, to aid the Colony with Troops, but there is another consideration bearing on the question which all who would regard the loss of our six magnificent Australasian Colonies as a "national loss might do well to weigh. Despite that "effusive loyalty" of theirs which you say is so amusing, they are, here and there beginning to awaken to the idea that a young Country half as large as Europe, and by Nature one of the world's richest, may have some higher destiny than that of gold-digging and wool-and-tallow growing for a certain tight little Island lying 15,000 miles distant from them in the North Sea; and that the day is approaching when their wisest Policy would be Separation from the Crown and Federation into some young Australasian Republic, modeled partly on the Great Republic of the West Now, the arguments in favour of such Policy would be much strengthened could the fact be pointed to that in a cruel War, brought on one of them partly if not mainly by the acts and laches of the Crown, the Crown had refused it Help and left it to its fate. For if, in some European convulsion, the Crown were forced into War with some great Naval Power, or combination of Powers, and the Australasian Colonies, as rich exposed Dependencies, were attacked, as nearly happened in the Russian War, the very reasonable fear would be that just as the Crown, deterred by popular clamour for spurious State Retrenchment, had refused to aid New Zealand, so the Crown might act in the case of all or other of the Australasian Colonies. Once let the spectacle be exhibited of the British Crown abandoning a young British Colony in War and Troubles which the Crown had been instrumental in bringing on her, and the mere fact of its being an "internal" War which the Crown had brought on one Colony, a "foreign" War in another, would not possess the slightest legitimate signification or weight.

Though the day may be far distant, it seems to me that, sooner or later, our six Australasian Colonies will, pacifically, separate from us; and, in some form or other, take their place or places among the young nations of the world. We have grown too wise to seek to prevent their hoisting a National Flag as we did in the case of those thirteen historic Colonies of ours now so great and happy under the Stars and Stripes: Mother Country would say to Daughters, "go in peace and prosper." But, looking at that ill-feeling which despite the lapse of a century still clouds our political and social intercourse and communion with America, we must see that, in the event of a political parting between England and Australasia, it would be of infinite benefit to the future interests of each that the latter should commence her career free from the memory of any grievance, free from any sense of injury at the hands of the former. Hitherto, with the marked but sole exception of New Zealand, the Crown's policy towards Australasian Colonies has been worthy of the Crown's repute—and, surely, if the political connexion between them is to be dissolved, and Old England's glorious Flag no more to dominate Australasian seas and shores, it should disappear therefrom without speck or stain.

But far be it from New Zealand to come a pauper supplicant for help—she asks" it as her just right. Should the Crown elect to refuse it, sooner or later, she might show the world she could do without it. She has already incurred a more crushing Public Debt, and generally done and suffered more in the work of defending herself; than has ever been done by any British Colony of equal age and strength, and, doubtless, she could do and suffer even more. But those who boast not that jaunty indifference to the sufferings of others exhibited by Lord Monck in seconding the Queen's Speech; and those whose ethics would not permit them to stand aloof from a deadly combat on the paltry plea that a young Combatant, on whom they had partly brought it, might, at last, win it without their help, and come all the stronger from it, cannot but remember the exigencies of this New Zealand case:—the deadly perils of the Rural Colonists and their families—the anihilation of flourishing pioneer Settlements—the stoppage of Immigration—the flight of capital and labour—the paralysis of all North Island Industries—the massacre of white women and children, with all the horrors and calamities of protracted barbarian War. New Zealand wants no sham Peace, no idle suspension of arms such as followed from delusive Cameron Campaigns. She wants the permanent cessation of chronic murderous Rebellion, a solid, lasting Peace—a Peace which, alone and unaided, she might possibly win in ten or a dozen years, but which, with due and just aid from the Crown, might, perhaps, be won in one.
In conclusion, Sir, as it is, much the practice of a portion of the London Press, to insinuate that those who venture on a word in behalf of our "Young Britain of the South," are actuated only by mean and mercenary motives, permit me, therein, to say, for myself, that, though one of the early Settlers in New Zealand, I have long ceased to have the slightest interest at stake there—and am led to address this poor letter to you solely in the hope that it may prove even a "mite" towards the good work of propagating Truth about a magnificent young Land where happy years were passed, and of arousing Mr. Gladstone, now happily in power, to act in the spirit of those pregnant words of his, quoted at the commencement.

Respectfully yours,

Charles Flinders Hursthouse.

*Marine Terrace, Great Yarmouth.*

**Appendix.**

(A, referred to at page 10.)

**The "Stafford Ministry," and the "Poverty Bay Massacre."**

*Wellington Independent*—" We cannot dwell over the details. Only think of a peaceful settlement at the darkest hour which precedes the dawn. The inhabitants are wrapped in slumber; the little children repose peacefully in cots by the bedside of their parents; the fathers and mothers sleep in fancied security. Suddenly dark forms emerge from the fern and bush, climb over the palisades, and with a ferocious yell, rush on the houses. Then there is wild confusion. Lights flash about, men spring from bed vainly to seek for arms; helpless women cower in corners, commending their souls to their Maker, while little children shriek out in unmeaning fear. God help them all! for the crack of the rifle is heard, and some meet a merciful death at once, while others are massacred under repeated blows of the deadly tomahawk. Then there is a bloody saturnalia to follow. The heads and thighs of the murdered victims are chopped off; their bowels ripped up; while tattooed men eagerly drink the blood from the palpitating corpses, and the burning of a woman's body finishes the terrible scene.

Who are we to blame for this? We solemnly assert that on the head of Mr. Stafford and his colleagues in the Ministry, the blood of the men, and women, and children who have thus been slain will rest; and when the last awful day of reckoning comes they will require to account for it. We make this accusation advisedly and with due consideration. The facts warrant it."

**Division of New Zealand into Two Colonies.**

(B, referred to at page 11.)

This radical difference of position and interest between North and South Islands in "Native Matters" has led to an agitation for their temporary separation into two Colonies—the former, becoming, for a time, a Crown Colony, administered by a Crown appointed Governor and Nominee Council (including such thorough Masters of all Maori matters as Donald M'Lean and Dillon Bell, with some leading friendly chiefs) and the latter, retaining her present form of Constitution, intact, or "refitting" it in any way she might deem best. Sir George Grey, I believe, favours such a policy—and I certainly think it would be best; and that, too, whether the North Island is to have Mother Country aid or not. When solid peace has been won, and when the Maori, if ever, is the "Coated Yeoman," the two Islands would be easily re-united, and New Zealand be made that real "Unity" which now she is not. The following remarks from a late New Zealand Journal express a similar view—"The action of the Constitution should be suspended in the North Island until peace be permanently restored. The North Island should be placed under the direct rule of a Governor, irresponsible to the Colonists, and holding power and authority direct from the Home Government. Our acceptance of sole responsibility in native affairs was a mistake. The Maories, who formerly venerated the governor as the real representative of the Queen, have discovered that as things now are he is only a plastic instrument in the hands of a Ministry, who are again a changeable body, resting on the will of Parliament. Hence all but the shadow of authority has vanished in the eyes of the Maori, and with it has vanished also all but the shadow of their former respect; and that respect will not reappear until feudal chieftaincy is again assumed on behalf of Her Majesty with regard to the Maories of the North Island. This would necessitate a resumption of native control in the North Island by the Home Government, and its relinquishment by the Government of the Colony. It means, in short, a suspension of the Constitution as regards the North Island; and a temporary separation of the two islands, financially at least, until pacification is effected under the direct control of the Queen's representative."

**Our Maori Allies.—the Kupapas.**
The Evening (New Zealand) Herald of the 11th November, has the following:—"The Kupapas have turned out, as we prophesied, a miserable failure. They will boast, and clamour, and consume, but they will not fight. They get 3s. 6d. a day and rations, and are worse than a flock of sheep in the presence of the enemy. They cannot be depended upon, and they embarrass the movements of the regular troops. Old men and boys have been assisting to swallow up the revenue, and they have given nothing in return but trouble and annoyance. Their behaviour at Moturos, with the exception of Kemp and his 70 men, was disgraceful in the extreme, and contributed to defeat. Hunia and his men bolted. Out of 470 men and boys, 400 were rank cowards. We made a grand mistake in employing them, and, if we allow them to retain their arms after they are dismissed, they will show themselves at once our masters. The British prestige will have become a shadow if we are to be driven back by the Hau-haus, and dictated to by the friend lies. It is time that the Government looked in some other direction for the means of finishing the war than in that of the friendly Maories. The great mistake all along has been to arm natives at all; but it is never too late to mend, and after disarming the Kupapas let them be sent to their respective villages."

The Maori on "Extermination."

From a letter addressed by the loyal natives of Wanganui to Dr. Featherston, Mr. Fox, Mr. Richmond, and the members of the General Assembly, we extract the following:—"Friend, Mr. Fox, our advice is that this tribe, the Ngatiruanui, should be exterminated!—not one should be left alive to create fresh troubles in this island. Do you consent to this proposition, viz., let the women be preserved as slaves for the Europeans, and all the children killed, lest they should grow up and destroy and eat more Europeans and natives."—From a late New Zealand Paper.

GEO. WITT, Printer, 7, Earl's Court, Leicester Square, London.