

## NATIVE AFFAIRS.

35. The assertion, at page 17, that the meeting of March, 1859, was not the time or place for Kingi to state the nature of his claim, will be noticed in a subsequent page.

## III.—THE POINTS IN DISPUTE.

36. If the author of the Pamphlet were not blinded by a false theory, he would experience little difficulty in his inquiry, "What were the precise points contended for by the agents of the Government on the one side, or by William King and his people on the other." There was really no contention (in the author's sense) between the agents of Government and Wiremu Kingi; no "points" were raised; because Kingi with his supporters wholly declined to enter upon the discussion of the title to the Block.

37. The view taken by the Government of the rights of the returned Ngatiawa was in exact accordance with Governor Fitzroy's arrangement. Had there been put forward any such claim of an over-riding Tribal Right as the author imagines, it would probably not have been admitted. But it will be seen, in the sequel, that no such claim was advanced—that Wiremu Kingi's claim, if claim it can be called, was not of so refined a character.

38. The Governor's policy in Taranaki was new in so far as His Excellency deliberately announced his determination to put down Maori violence, but there was no other novelty about it. The terms of the Governor's speech at New Plymouth, represented as so vague and dark, and those of the Chief Land-purchase Commissioner's letter of 18th March to the Chiefs of Waitara (p. 24), in which Sir William Martin discovers the plain indications of a new and aggressive policy, are identical with the language used by all former Governors in reference to the same subject. Neither that letter, nor the letter of the Assistant Native Secretary (p. 23) was written under any special instructions, or is couched in any unusual phraseology. Such expressions are quite commonly used by the Natives themselves in reference to their land claims.

39. It is curious to observe how closely the language of Mr. McLean's letter of 18th March, 1859 approaches to that of Governor Fitzroy's address to the Natives in 1844, when he declared to them his intention to respect the outstanding Ngatiawa claims.

## GOVERNOR FITZROY IN 1844.

..... "Point out your respective possessions 'correctly. Do not quarrel: do not say, 'All 'this is mine, all that belongs to me,' but mark 'it out quietly, and do not encroach on any other 'man's possession, but each man point out his own. 'Do you ask why we are thus to take down the 'names of your places? It is to prevent future 'mistakes. You have heard that no land will be 'taken unjustly. If you sell it to the Europeans, 'well; but you must be careful each to sell his 'own property, and then he will receive the pay- 'ment himself,' &c., &c. (38).

(38) Gov. Fitzroy,  
App.: p. 24.  
(39) McLean,  
App.: p. 36.

## MR. MCLEAN IN 1859.

"This is a word to you to request you to make 'clear (point out) your pieces of land which lie in 'the portion given up by Te Teira to the Gover- 'nor. You are aware that with each individual lies 'the arrangement as regards his own piece. In 'like manner Te Teira has the arrangement of 'his piece. Another cannot interfere with 'his portions, to obstruct his arrangements, for he 'has the thought for what belongs to himself.... 'We will not urge for what belongs to another 'man, as with him is the thought as regards his 'own piece.' (39).

40. Having concluded his search for the Government principle, the author "proceeds to gather, as well as he can, the Native view of the case." Rather, he proceeds to *construct*, as well as he can, the Native case. Certainly it has never been so well put together before. It is worth remarking with what tact adverse points are kept out of view. Any one, for example, who desires to consider the effect of King's declarations to Mr. Parris, adverted to at p. 29, must look for the full Report in (*E No. 3, p. 2, 1*)—wherever that may be. Another important document, King's letter of Feb. 11th, 1859, is not referred to until page 93, long after a reader of the Pamphlet may be supposed to have safely reached the desired conclusions. Not a word is cited from the original of this letter, for which a reader is referred to "*Pap. E., No. 3a, p. 5.*"

(40) W. Kingi, Letter  
App.: p. 31.

41. Sir W. Martin commences with Kingi's letter of the 25th April, 1859 (40) in which King claims the spacious "bed-room" of Waitara, of which one wall is at Waitaha and the other, 40 miles off, at Mokau. *Petiruma* (bedroom) is an Anglo-Maori word. Its use by King in this letter seems traceable to the circumstance that Native visitors to Mission stations are warned not to enter the sleeping apartments of the family.

42. That King meant by Waitara the whole district on both banks of the river will presently appear to be certain, for he says that his word is an old one. His attitude as regards land-selling is, he says, unchanged, and the position now assumed by him in reference to a particular proposition is merely the maintenance of that attitude. "I have no new proposal to make," he says, "either as regards selling or anything else." The regular course pursued by Natives in making their land claims is to state their boundaries. Such claims are sent in to the Land Purchase Office in profusion, and as many as 50 or 100 names of places are often given in letters from Natives defining their own boundaries. It will presently be seen what the boundaries of King's claims really are when he states them with the usual precision.

43. King's real position is very clearly though briefly stated in the next letter, quoted by Sir William Martin—that, namely, to Archdeacon Hadfield, dated 2nd July, 1859. This material passage has, of course, escaped Sir W. Martin's italics. Kingi writes, "*What I say is, that the boundary for the Pakeha is settled, viz., Waitaha. That is all: let them remain there.*" Waitaha