

Bishop of New Zealand.

17 Oct. 1860.

have enabled them to devote themselves to self-government in secular matters?—I have reason to believe that the interest which they exhibited in these religious matters would have been equalled by their interest in secular matters.

1120. *Mr. Fox.*] Has the introduction of Representative Institutions among the Europeans created any interest in the Native mind?—I think that it has given rise to an increase in their own runangas.

1121. Do you consider that the introduction of Representative Government among the Europeans has materially altered the relations of the Natives towards the Government; I mean in reference to the expediency of managing them on the old system which existed before the introduction of those Institutions?—I think they are well aware of the system of election as practised among ourselves; and I agree with what Mr. Fenton says, that a good deal of the authority among the Natives is also elective, though restricted to particular families.

1122. *Chairman.*] Do you think that the change in the system of European Government and the excitement existing in the Native mind in reference to law and civil Institutions, absolutely necessitates the introduction of some new system among them?—I should rather say that the necessity of some good system has always existed and has never been satisfied.

1123. *Mr. Fox.*] Do you consider that the King movement was one which might have been successfully opposed by a passive system of neglect and indifference, or would it have been more likely to be rendered innocuous by active operations, which might have worked it into a system of local administration and self government, such as is above suggested?—I agree with Mr. Fenton in his remarks on this subject at the beginning of his Report; that every movement for good among the Native race ought as much as possible to be brought under the directing hand of Government (see 1st page of his Report).

1124. Then you do not think that neglect and indifference was a wise method of treating the excitement of the Native mind involved in the King movement?—I am not aware that there was in any quarter any neglect or indifference on the subject, but theoretically I think that no such subject can safely be so treated. But I would distinguish here between the substance of the movement and its name. The substance I believe to be good; to the name I see no reason to attach much importance. But even as a name I have continually opposed it.

1125. Then I infer that you do not consider that the use of that name originally expressed an idea antagonistic to the Queen's sovereignty?—I have rarely met with any Natives who expressed any opinion adverse to the Queen's authority. The very idea of monarchy is so new to the New Zealanders that they can very imperfectly comprehend what the Queen's sovereignty means. The unity or monarchical idea of the sovereignty gained more ground, I think, under the old system of government than it is likely to do under the present, where so many persons of various classes in all parts of the country are known to possess the power of controlling the acts of the Governor, as the representative of the Crown. I think that the new Constitution has, therefore, impaired the abstract idea, feeble at the best, of the Queen's sovereignty. The reason I have for thinking this is, that whenever I have asked Natives what the use of the King was, they always answered, "To take care of their land for them;" and never stated that he was to be set up as a rival to the Queen.

1126. Are there not districts in which a strong desire for law and civil government exists, without any connexion with the King movement of the Waikato country and West Coast?—The desire for law and better government I believe to be universal among them.

1127. Is the connexion with the Waikato King movement universal?—I believe that the King movement did not extend widely over the country till questions on the subject of land began to take a more serious turn.

1128. To what do you allude in that reply?—I mean not simply the present war, but the general agitation and talk on the subject of land since the Constitution. A very wide feeling of suspicion has been gradually growing up that some new system (*tikanga hou*, as they call it) would be introduced in relation to their land.

1129. Were they satisfied with the recognition of their rights in relation to land, on the part of the Government, which was involved in the land purchases effected previously to the agitation to which you refer?—I must distinguish, in answer to that question, between different parts of the country. The uncertainty and suspense which continued for so many years on the subject of land sales in the New Zealand Company's settlements generally, and especially at Taranaki, has left a feeling in those places different, I think, from any which I have observed in the Province of Auckland. In the latter Province, from the simpler course of procedure, dissatisfaction on the subject of land sales has, I think, been rare; and private purchases, carried out before the colonisation of the country, have been almost always acquiesced in by the Native vendors without any expression of dissatisfaction.

1130. The system acted on in the Auckland Province, I apprehend, was regarded by the Natives in conformity with the principle of the Treaty of Waitangi?—The system pursued in the Auckland Province was simply, as far as I have observed, that the Natives sold from time to time whatever land they pleased and kept whatever land they pleased: which I believe to be strictly in conformity with the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi.

1131. Would any departure from that system be calculated to excite suspicion in the Native mind?—Land is, of all other things, the point on which the Native mind is the most sensitive: not so much from any idea of the value of the land itself, as from a sense of obligation to maintain the right. The most worthless pieces of land have been frequently the causes of the most bitter wars; as at Ihutaroa, on the Waikato. It was customary to give away or sell to a neutral party the debateable land, as the best or only way of making peace.

1132. I presume that such a sale would be the mutual act of the two contending parties?—Yes; they would agree, in order to take away the bone of contention.