speedy oblivion of the hard blows that had been exchanged."—(Parl. Pap. 1st July 1852, p. 239, 240.)

At that time William King was not at Taranaki at all. He shortly afterwards met Mr. McLean at Wanganui, and put in a claim to the Bell Block. The claim was investigated when the payment was divided, and disposed of by the Natives themselves, who awarded him *nothing*. He had nothing whatever to do with opposing or with ceasing opposition to the sale, but was placed in the ridiculous situation of having put in a proprietary claim which was laughed at by the Puketapu people, and abandoned.

The Bell Block purchase, therefore, cited by Sir W. Martin as proof of the correctness of his doctrine that the consent of Wiremu Kingi and the whole tribe was necessary, happens to be conclusive evidence of just the reverse.

NOTE 47.

"*They raise plain issues.*"..... (*Page* 11.)

Any one reading this would of course be led to believe that these issues had been raised before the commencement of hostilities; whereas the Government had vainly invited the claimants to bring forward their claims, and they had never done so. It was the bounden duty of persons possessing documents which in their opinion raised these issues, to have communicated them at once to the Governor, even if the letters themselves did not repeatedly pray that this should be done.

The Governor may not perhaps have an official right to complain of Archdeacon Hadfield not sending him the letters he received from Wiremu Kingi; but when the Superintendent of a Province receives remonstrances addressed to him in his public character on matters of grave public importance not within his functions to deal with, and when such remonstrances expressly pray that these matters may be laid before the Governor, the Governor has just grounds of complaint against an officer who withholds them altogether from his cognizance, and lets them see the light for the first time only to serve a party purpose in a debate in the House of Representatives. A double evil is produced by such proceedings: the Natives are invited and encouraged to address the Superintendent on Native grievances which he has no power to redress, and are then led to believe that the Governor pays no attention to remonstrances which he was never permitted to see. [*See Notes* 38, 41.]

NOTE 48.

"*How could these officers, being agents for the purchaser, be fit and proper persons to decide on the validity of all the objections made to the purchase?* (*Page* 12.)

The answer to this is that these persons never decided at all. The decision in cases of difficulty has invariably been in the Governor's hands, where alone it could properly rest if no Tribunal was in existence.

But the objection here made comes rather late. These officers have been the means of acquiring nearly 30,000,000 acres for the Crown in New Zealand without objection on the part of Sir W. Martin, who was Chief Justice during the time when by far the largest part was purchased. The truth is, that investigation by means of the flexible practice of the Land Purchase Department, has hitherto afforded a better security for bringing out the truth as to Native title, than any formal and solemn enquiry before a Court of Law would have done; and must continue to do so until the Natives themselves shall give their assent to the institution of a Land Court.

That the Officers of the Government were the proper persons to conduct the enquiry was certainly the opinion of the party with which Sir W. Martin is identified. In a letter addressed to the Governor by Archdeacon Hadfield on the 15th April 1856, he says:—"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; *and that these should be entrusted to* "*those only in whom the Government has perfect confidence, and who are directly amenable to the* "*General Government.*" (Parl. Pap. July 1860, p. 234.)

NOTE 49.

"*It is plain that he, Mr. Parris, did not investigate*".....
"*If, as appears, the Government had determined.*".. .....
"*Contrary to what was certified by Mr. McLean.*" (*Page* 12.)

If the general tribal title of the Ngatiawa had ever been admitted by the Government, there would of course have been a necessity to enquire into that right as now claimed for W. King. But as in accordance with the acknowledged custom among the various sections of the Ngatiawa themselves and the plan invariably pursued by the Government, no general tribal right would be admitted, but on the contrary the Government would necessarily recognise nothing but the separate tribal rights of families and subdivisions, there was nothing to enquire into in connection with a general tribal claim.

The Government never pretended to "recognize nothing but the individual right." As stated in Note 2, it is not disputed that everywhere in New Zealand the Native tenure is tribal rather than individual. An unsuccessful attempt was made some years ago by the Chief Commissioner to individualize Native claims at Taranaki which was referred to by him in his statement before the Board of 1856; in the