

## NATIVE AFFAIRS.

(44) *Parly, Pap, N.Z.*  
July, 1860,  
p. 173, et seq.

(45) *McLean, Report*  
App.: p. 39.

51. King himself was not present at this meeting, but the Waitaha was named as the Pakehas boundary to the North. The Taranakis and Ngatiruanuis were the guardians of the Southern boundary at Okurukuru, and Kingi of the Northern at Waitaha. The letter of the Rev. J. T. Reimenschneider to Mr. McLean (44) fully expresses the determination of these two Tribes on the South side of New Plymouth to uphold the land-holding policy of Kingi, and on the commencement of hostilities they immediately rose in arms to support him. Mr. McLean's declaration that King's interference "has been obviously based upon opposition to land sales in the Taranaki Province generally, as a prominent member of an Anti-Land-selling League" (45) though questioned by Sir William Martin, thus appears to be fully justified.

52. At page 55, and again at page 94, Sir William Martin endeavours to shew that there is a substantial discrepancy between the view taken by Mr. Richmond's Memorandum of 27th April 1860, of Kingi's wrongful interference, upon the pretence of chieftainship, and Mr. McLean's statement that Kingi's opposition was in the character of a prominent member of an Anti-land selling league. The observations in paragraphs 47 and 48, of this Memorandum are an answer to this refinement. The right of the Chief, if only that of the strong arm, as little deserves the name of right as the unauthorized dictation of the Land League. It is, however, plain, that Kingi belonged to a Land League in the strictest sense.

53. Finally, that Kingi stood upon might, and not upon right, is made still plainer by his demeanour. His attitude throughout has been, not that of a claimant asserting right, and demanding inquiry, but of a potentate, setting up an independent authority, and simply opposing his will to that of the Governor. "Waitara," he told the Governor in March, 1859, "it is in my hand; I will not let it go." During the whole of the time over which the inquiry into the title of the sellers extended, he maintained the same position of dogged resistance, and haughty refusal to enter into any discussion on the subject of the sale. The District Land Purchase Commissioner, Mr. Parris, who, far from being, as Kingi's pretends in his letters to Archdeacon Hadfield, at all personally obnoxious to Kingi, had always been on good terms with him, and had even been the means on one occasion of saving his life, spent day after day in the endeavour to bring him to reason. It was all in vain. He remained perfectly obdurate.

54. But his expressions at the meeting of 29th November, 1859, when the first instalment of the purchase money was paid to Te Teira's party—expressions which are very cursorily noticed in the pamphlet (see page 29)—are absolutely conclusive as to the true character of Kingi's opposition. On that occasion the following dialogue took place between the District Land Purchase Commissioner and Kingi, in presence of a considerable assemblage of Europeans and Natives. Mr. Parris asked "Does the land belong to Teira and party?" Kingi replied, "Yes, the land is theirs, but I will not let them sell it." Again Mr. Parris asked, "Why will you oppose them selling what is their own?" Kingi answered, "Because I do not wish that the land should be disturbed; and although they have floated it, I will not let it go to sea." Again it was inquired, "Shew me the justice (or correctness) of your opposition?" Kingi's reply was, "It is enough, Parris, their bellies are full with the sight of the money you have promised them, but don't give it them; if you do, I won't let you have the land, but will take it and cultivate it myself." (46).

(46) *Parris, Report,*  
App.: p. 40.

55. Something will have to be said in a future section of this Memorandum, respecting Kingi's actual preparations for the armed maintenance of his pretensions. What has been already advanced fully bears out, it is submitted, the Government proposition, that *Wiremu Kingi and his supporters, comprising members of other Tribes than his own, did not pretend to found their opposition upon right of any kind (tribal or individual) but upon force it being their announced determination to resist the further extension of the neighbouring British settlement.*

56. In the section of the pamphlet now under review, Sir William Martin endeavours to shew that *besides the Tribal claim, various claims of ownership were put forward by individuals opposed to the sale* (See page 33). He refers to certain documents, which he says "shew distinctly that there are divers persons who aver that they are interested in the land, and that they never agreed to the sale." This is very cautiously put. It is neither stated that the documents referred to make proprietary, as distinguished from tribal claims, nor whether these claims were, or were not, brought forward previously to the commencement of hostilities. At the same time, by the mention of these claims as "points in dispute" between the Government and the Natives, and by the mode in which they are referred to at pp. 44 and 63, an unwary reader may be led to suppose that proprietary claims were made before the occupation of the block and received no attention from the Government.

57. The documents referred to are four in number, viz.:—

1. A letter from Ritatona te Iwa, a Native Teacher of Waitara, to the Rev. Riwai te Ahu, Deacon of the Church of England, at Waikanae, dated Waitara, December 5th, 1859.
2. A letter—same to same—dated Waitara, February 11th, 1860.
3. A letter from Riwai te Ahu to the Superintendent of Wellington, (Dr. Featherston,) dated Otaki, June 23rd, 1860. (47.)
4. A statement respecting proceedings at Waitara, by Tipene Ngaruna.

(47) *Riwaita Ahu, Extract from Letter*  
App.: p. 47.

58. The question of the soundness of such claims as are put forward in these documents belongs to a subsequent part of the present remarks, where the question of the goodness of the title to the block is entered upon. It may, however, be remarked in passing, that Maori claimants come forward "like a swarm of bees" when anything is to be gained by so doing. "It is often found," says the Chief Land Purchase Commissioner, "that a hundred fictitious claims are adduced when the actual