

America, for example, are certainly disinterested, but few statesmen will hold that they take a sober and just view of the great question of humanity, to which they have devoted their lives.

It is not easy for supporters of His Excellency's policy to meet an attack so indirect as that which His Lordship the Bishop has made in the protest under consideration. Notwithstanding that His Lordship styles the Document "his deliberate protest," it ought probably, to be regarded rather as the outbreak of irrepressible feeling, than the expression of calm and matured opinion; and it is for that reason, but only for that reason, difficult to meet it at all points with a logical reply.

The real matter of the Protest is contained in its third Clause which is as follows:—

"Because in entire opposition to the Resolution in question I claim on behalf of the New Zealanders

"1. An investigation of all questions relating to their title to land before a regular Tribunal, with the usual safeguards against partiality or error, viz., Evidence on Oath, Arguments of Counsel, and a Right of Appeal.

"2. That Military force shall not be employed until the civil power shall have been tried, and shall have been found insufficient to carry out the judgment of the Court.

"3. That inasmuch as this Colony was avowedly formed, not for the acquisition of Territory for the English Race, but for the protection of the New Zealanders, this primary object shall not be sacrificed to the aggrandisement of the English Provinces."

Looking to the whole tenor of the Bishop's letter, and to the attitude of open opposition to the Governor which His Lordship has unfortunately assumed in reference to the Waitara land question, His Excellency's Ministers have no hesitation in treating the three subdivisions of the Clause as really meaning,

I. That William King's right was not fully and fairly enquired into.

II. That Military force was prematurely employed to take possession of the land at Waitara.

III. That the interest of the Natives of the Taranaki district has been sacrificed, in the transaction, to the interest of the European Settlers.

It is proposed to reply to these charges in succession, adverting to various collateral topics.

I. In answering the charge that the right of King was not duly investigated, Ministers would, in the first place, refer to their Memorandum of 27th April, 1860, as shewing that the negotiations for the purchase of the Block in question were carefully conducted, and unusually prolonged.

Secondly it is to be observed that William King has never put forward any proprietary or other claim, of a nature which could be recognised by the British Government, to the land on the South Bank of Waitara. A few words will here be necessary to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the position which has been taken by the British Government in reference to the Taranaki land question and to explain the true nature of King's pretensions.

Governor Sir George Grey, on occasion of his visit to New Plymouth in 1847, distinctly repudiated the claim of the Atiawas who had returned, or might return, to Taranaki, to anything beyond fair compensation for the value, as wild land, of the Block comprised in Mr. Commissioner Spain's Award, after proper Reserves should have been made for them. Accordingly his instructions to Mr. McLean (the present Chief Land Purchase Commissioner) which bear date 5th March, 1847, after directing that ample Reserves should be made, and not exceeding 1s. 6d. per acre offered for the residue of the Block, declare, that "those Natives who refuse to assent to this arrangement must distinctly understand that the Government do not admit that they are the true owners of the land "they have recently thought fit to occupy." (Parliamentary Papers, Dec. 1847, p. 12.)

Notwithstanding this explicit declaration, which accords with what Governor Grey had previously announced to the Natives at his interviews with them. (see his Despatch to Earl Grey, *ibid*, p. 4) he thought proper, (probably on grounds of policy) to acquiesce in the assertion of proprietary rights by the ancient occupants; and the precedent thus set has been followed by His Excellency the present Governor. On occasion of the Waitara purchase the proprietary right has been respected in the persons of Te Teira and the other members of his section of the Tribe; who will be paid at the rate of 20s. per acre for the land they cede. King fully admits their rightful ownership, and opposes the sale on another ground.

The right set up by King is simply the old title of the Maori Chief—the right of the strong arm, which he asserts under quite novel circumstances. At the meeting in March, 1859, when Teira's offer was accepted by the Governor, King plainly took this stand,—“Waitara” said he “is in my hand; I will never let it go”—thus defying Governor Browne, as he had before defied Sir George Grey. It is well known that when King, in 1848, deserted his Pa and cultivations at Waikanae, and was moving northward to Taranaki, Sir George Grey forbade him to settle on the South bank of Waitara. But King, having first obtained the leave of Ruru, Teira's father, to build his Pa on the South bank, disregarded the Governor's prohibition, and now pretends to claim Waitara in virtue of a species of conquest achieved by his defiant return.

The European apologists of King, as might be expected, are not satisfied with the naked simplicity of this claim, but have contrived a more elaborate and technical defence. By a strange jumble of Maori customs with the feudal notions of English law, they assert that King is now entitled in Taranaki to what they call “a manorial right”—a species of minor sovereignty—over the whole district. This right, they assert, has survived the migration to Cook's Straits of King's section of the Ngatiawa, which, they declare, was voluntary, and not in fear of the Northern Tribes, and, which took place at least 20 years before King's return. Being based upon neither the English nor the Maori rule, but upon a compound of the two, uniting the advantages afforded by either law to antiquated claims—this right is supposed to be also unaffected by the Waikato conquest, the consequent slavery or dispersion of the remnant of the tribe, and the transfer of the title of the conquerors to the