

# REPORT AND EVIDENCE

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

UPON ON

CHARGE PREFERRED BY DR. FEATHERSTON AGAINST MR.  
C. W. RICHMOND.

---

*Appointed July 17th. Report brought up August 23rd, 1861.*

---

## ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

---

*Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

---

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17TH, 1861.

*Ordered,* That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report upon the charge preferred against the late Colonial Treasurer, (Mr. C. W. Richmond), by Dr. Featherston, Member for the City of Wellington, in his reply upon his motion on 14th June, for the production of correspondence between the Government, the Bishop of New Zealand, and Mr. Parris, with power to call for persons, papers, and records and to report the evidence taken. The Committee to consist of

Mr. Weld,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Creyke,  
Mr. Renall,  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
Mr. Russell,  
Mr. Wilson, C.B.

To Report on the 31st July, Inst.

True extract,

F. E. CAMPBELL,  
Clerk of House of Representatives.

---

*Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

---

THURSDAY, JULY 18TH, 1861.

*Ordered,* That the names of the Honourable the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and Mr. Crosbie Ward, be added to the Committee appointed to enquire into and report upon certain charges preferred against Mr. C. W. Richmond.

True extract,

F. E. CAMPBELL,  
Clerk of House of Representatives.

---

## C. W. RICHMOND.

## REPORT.

THE Select Committee appointed to investigate the charge preferred against Mr. C. W. Richmond by Dr. Featherston, have the honor to report as follows :—

That there is no ground whatever for any imputation “that undue pressure has been brought to bear in the Executive by Mr. C. W. Richmond on the Waitara question,” and that this Committee without imputing blame to Dr. Featherston, consider Mr. C. W. Richmond’s vindication complete.

FRED. A. WELD,  
Chairman.

House of Representatives,  
23rd August, 1861.

MONDAY, 22ND JULY, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to notice.

Present :—

Mr. J. C. Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Renall,  
“ Russell,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
“ Weld

Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Creyke,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees.

Orders of Reference of July 17th and 18th, 1861, read.

Motion made and Question put that Mr. Weld do take the Chair.

Agreed to.

Moved by Mr. Russell, That Dr. Featherston and Mr. Richmond be requested to attend before this Committee to give evidence at the next meeting, in order that the charge be then defined.

Resolved in the Affirmative.

Moved by Mr. Chairman of Committees, That as a discrepancy exists between the several reports of the *Southern Cross* and the *New-Zealander*, Dr. Featherston be requested to give his assistance in defining the charge actually made.

The Motion being put the Committee divided, when there were—

*Ayes, 5.*  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
“ Renall,  
“ Chairman of Committees  
“ Creyke,  
“ Crosbie Ward.

*Noes, 3.*  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Russell.

So it passed in the Affirmative.

Adjourned to Wednesday at half-past 3.

WEDNESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Mr. Fitzherbert,  
Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Creyke.

Mr. Russell,  
“ Crosbie Ward,  
“ Renall.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting were read and confirmed.

Moved by Mr. Russell, That the Reports in the *Southern Cross* and *New-Zealander* of Dr. Featherston’s reply on the 14th June, be submitted to Dr. Featherston, and that he be requested to inform the Committee whether he is correctly reported by those Newspapers, and if not, in what respect he is incorrectly reported.

Resolved in the Affirmative.

The Honourable Dr. Featherston called in and examined.

Hon. Dr. Featherston  
24th July, 1861.

1. *By Chairman.*] Have you perused the report of your reply as it appears in the *New-Zealander*?—I have.
2. Is it correct?—I believe it to be substantially correct. Being a speech in reply, I cannot vouch for its entire accuracy. I corrected the notes for the *New-Zealander*.
3. Have you perused the report as it appears in the *Southern Cross* of the 18th June?—I have.
4. Is that a correct report?—It is not.

5. *Hon. the Speaker.*] Which are the incorrect passages?—They are these:—

“I do candidly avow that this correspondence has strengthened and confirmed the supposition which I had long entertained that undue pressure had been brought to bear upon the Government for the acquisition of that land; and I will go further, and say that that undue pressure was not merely on the part of the Taranaki settlers but I believe also on the part of my honourable friend the Colonial Treasurer.”

“I can come to no other conclusion than that the present Ministry is in some way responsible for the conspiracy which Mr. Parris charged against the settlers, that they are not only responsible but that they are themselves in the conspiracy, and that there was an undue pressure, both by the settlers of Taranaki and the Colonial Treasurer.”

There is also a general inaccuracy in that report. I disavow having made use of the expressions above quoted as they are reported in the *Southern Cross*.

6. *Mr. Russell.*] Do you wish the Committee to understand that you did not on the 14th June last prefer a charge against Mr. Richmond of being in a conspiracy to exterminate William King and to get possession of his land at the Waitara?—In the first place I protest against being called upon to frame a charge which I never preferred. I expected that the Chairman of the Committee would be prepared to specify the charge which he alleges I made against Mr. Richmond. The remarks I made in my reply on the day in question, went to the effect, after alluding to the suspicions I had expressed last Session as to a sinister influence being exercised at the Executive Council with regard to the Waitara, and after stating the charge against the Taranaki Settlers contained in Mr. Parris' letter, was made, not by myself, but by Mr. Parris, and that the charges contained in Mr. Abraham's Petition against Mr. Richmond are not charges preferred by me, I stated that the charge preferred by Mr. Parris against the Taranaki Settlers and the allegations in Mr. Abraham's Petition against Mr. Richmond, coupled with the fact that negotiations for the purchase of Teira's block commenced in March, 1859, a few months after Mr. Richmond had entered into the arrangement with Mr. Carrington, as mentioned in Mr. Abraham's Petition, strengthened and confirmed the suspicions I had expressed in 1860, that an undue pressure had been brought to bear in the Executive on the Waitara question.

Adjourned to Friday at half-past 10.

Witnesses ordered to be summoned:—The Hon. Dr. Featherston, C. W. Richmond, Esq.

---

FRIDAY, 26TH JULY, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Creyke,  
“ Chairman of Committees  
“ Russell,

Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Renall,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Fitzherbert.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

The Chairman stated that in consequence of certain Members of the Committee having expressed a wish that a direct charge should be framed by this Committee, he had prepared a statement of what, in his opinion, the charge was, which had been referred to by the House, but that before proceeding to lay the statement before the Committee, he should move, That the examination of Dr. Featherston be continued previously to any definition of the charge being made by the Committee.

On the Motion being put, a point of Order was raised.

*By Chairman of Committees.*] Was the definition or framing of a charge by the Committee or the Chairman, within the instructions of the House to this Committee?

The Chairman ruled, after consultation with the Honourable the Speaker, that the definition of a charge is within the instructions of the House to this Committee.

And, on the original Motion being put by the Chairman, the Committee divided, when there were:—

*Ayes, 4.*  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.  
Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Creyke,  
“ Weld.

*Noes, 6.*  
Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Renall,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
“ Russell.

Moved by Mr. Chairman of Committees, That the Chairman be desired to seek for further instructions from the House, the present instruction to the Committee being to enquire and report upon the charge preferred against Mr. C. W. Richmond, by Dr. Featherston, while no charge has been yet submitted to their consideration.

And the question being put the Committee divided, when they were :—

*Ayes, 3.*  
Mr. Renall,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson.

*Noes, 6.*  
Mr. Russell,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Creyke,  
“ Crosbie Ward,  
“ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Weld.

Mr. Fitzherbert declined to vote.

Moved by Mr. Crosbie Ward, That Mr. Weld do leave the Chair and be called upon to give evidence as to the charge alleged to have been brought by Dr. Featherston against Mr. C. W. Richmond.

And the question being put, the Committee divided, when there were :—

*Ayes, 8.*  
Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Creyke,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Renall,  
“ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
“ Weld.

*Noes, 1.*  
Mr. Russell.

Mr. Chairman of Committees declined to vote.

On motion of Mr. Fitzherbert the Committee adjourned till Monday at 10 a.m.

---

MONDAY, 29TH JULY, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Creyke,  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,

Mr. Fitzherbert,  
“ Chairman of Committees,  
“ Russell.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

In accordance with a Resolution agreed to at the last sitting of the Committee it was now moved by the Hon. Mr. Henderson, That Mr. Weld's examination be proceeded with, and that Mr. Chairman of Committees do take the Chair temporarily.

Agreed to.

Mr. Weld's examination.

*F. A. Weld, Esq.,*

29 July, 1861.

In giving evidence as to what I suppose the charge to have been, I wish the Committee to understand that it is really the House that has stated that a charge has been made; that as an individual I am prepared to state what, in my opinion, is the charge referred by the House; I have put it into form as follows:—

That Mr. C. W. Richmond abused his office of Executive Councillor and his influence as one of His Excellency's Responsible Advisers for the purpose of obtaining possession of the land known as Teira's block at the Waitara for the settlers of New Plymouth.

F. A. Weld, Esq.,

29 July, 1861.

7. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] On what grounds do you frame the terms of the charge?—From my recollection of what I heard during the debate on the 14th; Dr. Featherston's speech, and Mr. Richmond's reply; in which he alluded to the charge that had been made against him. The newspaper reports and the general opinion of those with whom I have conversed have confirmed me in the correctness of my view.

8. You state that you present the charge in these terms, "as an individual," is the Committee to understand that you decline the responsibility of stating the charge as mover of the Committee?—I am ready to state it as the individual who moved for the investigation, and think I may very properly be asked to do so. I only wished to make it clear that the House had taken the matter into its own hands and affirmed the fact that a charge had been made.

9. Having omitted to have the words taken down at the time they were alleged to have been used, how do you account for the delay which was permitted to intervene between the 14th June and the date on which you applied for a Committee of Enquiry?—I do not think it is my business to account for the delay; that was a question that might fairly have been asked when the investigation was moved for in the House; this question appears to lead to irrelevant discussion into which I do not think I should be called upon to enter.

10. Are the terms of this charge (as presented by you) the very words used, or merely your recollection of the words; or do you waive the accuracy of the terms of charge, and prefer it as only correct in substance?—As correct in substance.

11. If the simple object of the Committee be to enquire whether there is any imputation on Mr. Richmond's character, would not the preliminary difficulties in which the Committee is involved, and also the character of Mr. Richmond, have a sufficient opportunity of being vindicated by conducting the enquiry without reference to the particular person who made the charge?

Mr. Weld asked that the question now put to him be read, with a view to obtaining the decision of the Chairman whether the question was relevant to the subject.

The Chairman decided that the question could not be put.

12. Did you make any notes at the time of Dr. Featherston's speech, and if so, have you them still in your possession?—I think not, at all events I have none by me that I am aware of.

No Member of the Committee desiring to put further questions, it was moved by Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., That Mr. Weld do resume the chair.

Agreed to.

Moved by Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., That Dr. Featherston, C. W. Richmond, Esq., and the Reporters of the *New-Zealand* paper, and *Southern Cross* paper, be requested to attend before this Committee for examination.

Agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., the Committee adjourned till Wednesday, at 3 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 31ST JULY, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
" Fitzherbert,  
" Creyke,  
" Russell,

Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
" " Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Renall.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston called. (Absent.)

Mr. R. J. Creighton,

31 July, 1861.

Robert James Creighton, Reporter of the *Southern Cross* called in and examined.

13. *By Chairman*] Will you give the Committee your name?—Robert James Creighton.

14. What is your profession?—I am reporter to the *Southern Cross* newspaper. I am a reporter and short-hand writer by profession. I was employed by the Royal Commission of Refuge Harbours, and have had considerable experience in reporting law causes in England.

15. Were you present in the House as reporter on the occasion of a debate on Mr. Parris's letter?—I was. (Notes produced.)

16. Are those the notes that were taken on that occasion?—Yes; at the time.

The Witness here read several passages from his short-hand notes;

" Sir,—I am not at all surprised at the soreness manifested by the Colonial Treasurer, by the

production of these documents and while I deny that I made any charges or cast an imputation either upon the Government or settlers of Taranaki, I do candidly avow that this correspondence has strengthened and confirmed the suspicion which I had long entertained that undue pressure had been brought to bear upon the Government for acquisition of that land, I go further and say that that undue pressure was not merely on the part of Taranaki Settlers but I believe also on the part of my honourable friend the Colonial Treasurer.

"Sir, I believe according to the terms of written agreement with Carrington the Colonial Treasurer pledged to acquire that land at Waitara, now take these facts, Parris '58 writes to the Bishop that combination to exterminate King for lands on Waitara, that Colonial Treasurer, (bands or binds) himself with purchase of land for the New Zealand Company, he was (band or binds) himself to get possession of land at Taranaki and from after negotiation conspiracy had went to Taranaki and Colonial Officer, and three or 4 months negotiation for Teira's Block, I can come to no other conclusion that present ministry in some way responsible for the conspiracy, responsible some way for the conspiracy Parris charged; that not only responsible but themselves in conspiracy, and that undue pressure both by settlers of Taranaki and Colonial Treasurer."

17. *Mr. Speaker.*] How long was it after taking these short-hand notes that you wrote out the reports for the paper?—I began writing the report out on Friday or Saturday, and it appeared in Tuesday's paper.

18. *Mr. Chairman of Committees* desired to have the following *ipsissima verba* from the short hand notes:—

"Sir, with respect to the speech which I delivered at Wellington, if Honbl. Members will peruse it they will find that I simply referred to that letter stating that it contained an admission by Parris that had been solicited to join in conspiracy to get possession of that much coveted land. Sir far from having been guilty to those that read [it or which] of his statement that on contrary the statement really appears from that letter is more grave and serious nature than statements which I imputed to it. I stated that they solicited join conspiracy, but he says that existed a conspiracy on part of settlers of Waitara to exterminate King to get possession of his land. Sir the charge is not made by me but charge is made Parris; and it is Parris charge the Taranaki settlers combined to exterminate Wm. King in order to get possession of his land to carry out plan of Turton." (Then follows Sir, &c.)

The witness here stated that the above notes were made solely for the use of the Newspaper, and not with any view of using them for purposes of evidence hereafter, otherwise the catch words would have been filled in and generally the words more closely taken.

19. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] Will you state whether you wrote out the report of Dr. Featherston's speech on Saturday or a later day?—I think I may state I wrote out this speech on Monday.

20. Did you vary the order of writing out the speeches?—They were written consecutively with one exception.

Moved by Mr. Fitzherbert, That this Committee do adjourn until To-morrow, Thursday, at 10 o'clock a.m.

Agreed to.

---

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1st, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
" Mr. Fitzherbert,

Mr. Creyke,  
" Crosbie Ward,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. R. J. Creighton further examined.

Answer to No. 20 in continuation.

When I finished writing out the speeches, I returned to Mr. Weld's speech, and wrote in the sentences, introducing the letters in the correspondence. My reason for so doing was that when I began my report I was not in possession of copies of the letters; with this exception the report was written consecutively.

21. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] You state that your short-hand notes were somewhat imperfect in one part, and that there you were obliged to trust to your memory—will you particularly specify that part?—I refer particularly to the recital of the circumstances by Dr. Featherston, which led him

Mr. R. J. Creighton,

1 Aug. 1861.

to the conclusion that the Ministry were in some way responsible for the conspiracy, beginning with the words "now take these facts" and ending "negotiations for Teira's Block."

22. Is the *Southern Cross* indebted to you for the reports of speeches made in the House which appear in that paper?—Yes, entirely so.

23. Can you rely on the accuracy of the reports you take down in short hand?—Yes, when I hear distinctly, which is frequently a matter of difficulty in the Reporters' Gallery.

24. How then do you account for the remarkable inaccuracies which frequently appear in the columns of that paper where members are often reported to have said the very reverse of what they actually do say?—I am not aware of any such inaccuracies. One proof that Members do not consider so is this, I find that the *New-Zealander* has taken my report of Mr. Dillon Bell's speech in that debate and incorporated it as their own.

Mr. Fitzherbert in putting this question begged to guard himself against being supposed to disparage the general accuracy of the reports of speeches which appear in the *Southern Cross* paper; on the contrary he acknowledges that in his opinion, there was a remarkable general accuracy superior to what he had observed in other cases, but that, what he wished to test in the present case was, the value in point of precise accuracy of the reports of the *Southern Cross* regarded as evidence.

25. Referring to your explanation of the object for which you took the report in question, do you mean thereby to admit that you would, for purposes of evidence, have taken care to check yourself, so as to insure accuracy; but that in the present report you had not adopted that precaution?—In reply I beg to state that my explanation had reference to the passage to which I have previously alluded, and generally also to those sentences recited in the evidence in which minor connecting words have been omitted. These omissions do not materially if at all affect the trustworthiness of the report, while it may be observed that, in one sentence at least, the entire verbiage is preserved.

26. Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,] Dr. Featherston has also stated that he himself corrected the proofs of his reply for the *New Zealander* newspaper,—do you allow any Member to correct the proofs of his speeches in the *Southern Cross*?—When I came to Auckland, I found a practice existing among newspaper men of allowing Members of the House of Representatives to revise their speeches before appearing in the newspaper. Feeling competent to the proper discharge of my own duties, without such assistance, I set my face against this practice. On two occasions, I believe, two Members saw proofs of their speeches—not of this particular debate; I allowed no alteration that could in any way vary the meaning to be made by those two Members, and I intimated that, while as a matter of courtesy I allowed them that privilege, I could not continue the practice.

27. Mr. Richmond's rejoinder, which he was permitted in violation of the Standing Orders of the House to make to Dr. Featherston's charge, appears to be the same or nearly the same, in the *Southern Cross* and *New-Zealander* newspapers; is this the result of accident or design, that is to say did the two reporters act in concert in the matter of the rejoinder?—I act in concert with no reporter; I make my own notes of the debates and transcribe them myself. On no occasion have I done so, and certainly not in the matter of this rejoinder.

28. Chairman.] Did you hear Dr. Featherston distinctly in his reply?—I did not hear the introductory words of Dr. Featherston's reply, but he then advanced nearer the table and I heard the remaining portion of his speech. His voice fell at the end of several passages but I heard him. Generally a person practised like myself can almost miraculously catch sounds, but I do not say that the miracle took place on this occasion.

29. How far is the table at which Dr. Featherston was standing, from the spot on which you were sitting?—Speaking from recollection he was standing opposite the Chief Clerk and nearly in a direct line with myself.

Witness was discharged from further attendance.

Mr. W. Griffin.

1 Aug. 1861.

William Griffin, Reporter for the *New Zealander*, examined.

30. Chairman.] What is your name?—William Griffin.

31. Your profession?—Reporter; I report for the *New Zealander* paper.

32. Were you present as Reporter in the House of Representatives on the occasion of the debate on the production of Mr. Parris' letter?—I was.

33. Were your notes taken in short-hand?—They were.

34. Have you the notes of Dr. Featherston's reply?—I have not; I write in loose books, and it is quite uncertain whether I can find the book in which those notes were taken down: I might succeed in doing so.

35. Do you allow Members to correct your reports?—Yes.

36. You cannot then from your own knowledge vouch for the strict accuracy of these reports?—We can vouch for the accuracies, as far as inferences are concerned (we have never been charged with any wrong inferences); substantially our reports are true, but not accurately: that applies principally to speakers who are difficult to hear.

37. Do you remember whether your notes of Dr. Featherston's reply on that occasion were submitted for correction?—They were.



38. Are you aware whether there were any material alterations made?—I am not aware of any. Mr. W. Griffin  
1 Aug., 1861.

39. *Mr. Chairman of Committees.*] You have stated that “our reports are substantially true, but not accurately,”—will you be good enough to say more specifically what you mean by “not accurately”?—I mean where members speak in such a low tone that every word cannot be heard distinctly in the Reporters’ box.

40. Am I to understand that substantial errors arise in reports on that account, that is to say, that the meaning of members is perverted?—By no means.

41. You have stated that you allow members to revise or correct their speeches: according to your general experience has this revision been faithfully performed?—Last Session there were several instances to the contrary, but not so this Session.

42. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] What meaning do you attach to the word “inference”?—I should explain the word by saying we never go so far as to report a member opposing a motion, when he is supporting it.

43. Then can you generally, in your reports of members’ speeches, rely on the accuracy of the arguments used?—When we hear members speaking distinctly our reports are substantially correct.

44. In this particular case, can you rely on the accuracy of your report of Dr. Featherston’s speech, as reported by you, and printed in the *New Zealander* newspaper?—To the best of my knowledge that is a correct report of his speech; I am not aware that it was altered in any way.

45. If it had been altered, must you not have been aware of it?—Having heard the speech (and, from its importance, it was impressive), and written it, and afterwards compared it with the notes after it was printed in the paper, so far as my memory was concerned, I think I should have been able to discover any alterations that had been made.

46. Is the Committee to understand that, in your opinion, it is difficult to rely on the entire accuracy of reports made of speeches in the House, in consequence of the Reporters’ gallery being constructed in a manner unfavourable to the transmission of sound?—As it applies to some speakers.

47. As it applies to Dr. Featherston, how is the case?—Dr. Featherston is very difficult to hear; he speaks very low at times.

48. Do the Reporters of the *Southern Cross* labor under this difficulty equally with those of the *New Zealander*?—Of course, being in the same box.

49. Have you compared the reports of Dr. Featherston’s reply, as they appear severally in the *New Zealander* and *Southern Cross* newspapers?—I have read the *Southern Cross* since I came here; the *New-Zealander* I read at home.

Upon motion of the Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward, the Committee adjourned until Friday at 10 a.m.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 2ND, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Creyke,  
“ Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Fitzherbert,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ “ “ Henderson.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. Griffin’s examination continued.

Mr. W. Griffin  
2 Aug., 1861.

50. *Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C. B.*] Was the transcription of the reply written out by you, and revised by Dr. Featherston, or were your notes only made use of? In the former case how much of the speech is your writing?—I wrote the transcription from beginning to end, with the understanding that he would revise it, and I took it myself to Dr. Featherston’s residence; assuming the matter to be of a personal nature, I was desirous of having no mistake, at least on my part.

51. Did Mr. C. W. Richmond correct the transcription of the rejoinder which he was permitted by the House to make to the charge contained in the reply of Dr. Featherston?—He did; I gave my notes into his own hand.

52. In making the reply, Dr. Featherston stood at the table, and he was within twenty feet of you (except the few opening words); I, who was at a distance three times greater, heard almost every word; do you, with the practised ear of a Reporter, wish the Committee to understand that you did not hear Dr. Featherston on the occasion alluded to?—I heard him in the same that way you state—“heard almost every word;” on that occasion I may say I heard him tolerably well.

Mr. W. Griffin

2 Aug., 1861.

53. Have any members ever declined to correct the transcriptions, in consequence of the inaccuracy of reports made for the *New Zealander*; and have they ever referred you to the reports of the *Southern Cross*?—I cannot answer this question.

54. The rejoinder is very nearly similar in both the *Southern Cross* and the *New Zealander*,—whereas the reply, as corrected by Dr. Featherston, which appeared in the *New Zealander*, is very different from that which appeared in the *Southern Cross*; can you account for this?—No.

55. Mr. Chairman of Committees.] In reference to the last question and answer, are not newspaper reports of speeches usually much compressed?—Frequently, and absolutely necessarily so.

56. Is it not therefore possible that two reports may on the face of them differ essentially, although every word in each may have been uttered by the speaker: I suppose the case of two newspapers making different selections from the whole speech as delivered?—Yes; the Reporters when following a speaker do not always make the same selection: what may appear important to one Reporter will not be so to another.

57. Mr Fitzherbert.] Having read the *New Zealander*, have you any reason to doubt the accuracy of that particular report?—I read that report on the morning it appeared; I did not see any deviations, in point of matter, from the notes I furnished, and I had no reason to doubt its accuracy when reading it.

58. Have you now any doubts of the accuracy of that report, after having had your attention particularly directed to it and the report of the *Southern Cross*?—I cannot say, not having had time to compare the two reports: it would require careful reading, sentence by sentence.

59. Will you state whether, from the course of this examination, you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the *New Zealander* report in question?—The word “accuracy” is too close a term to apply to a report, because a report may be substantially correct, and, in the strict sense of the term, not accurate. We call a report an honest report when it gives the fair inference of what a speaker wishes to convey.

60. Is this *New Zealander* report in question an honest report?—To the best of my belief it is; I know nothing to the contrary.

61. Having reference to question No. 59, do you apply your observation as “to accuracy of a report” to reports in general?—To all reports that are given in the third person, because the language is changed.

No member of the Committee desiring to put further questions, this witness was discharged.

The Committee directed that Mr. Parris should be summoned to attend on Saturday.

Dr. Featherston being unable to attend, as previously requested, he was summoned for Saturday at 10 a.m.

On Motion of Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., the Committee adjourned until Saturday, at 10 a.m.

---

SATURDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
The Hon. the Speaker,

The Hon. Mr. Fitzherbert,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston examined.

Dr. Featherston

3 Aug., 1861.

62. Chairman.] You have heard the charge, as defined in Mr. Weld's evidence, was that the charge preferred by you, in the speech referred to in the Order of Reference?—I object to having charges put into my mouth, and then being called upon to adopt them. I deny having made any such charge. My previous answer is so explicit that I have little or nothing to add to it. When an appeal was made to me (on the debate in question), by Mr. Weld (and, I think, Mr. Bell) to withdraw certain charges, I distinctly and emphatically denied having preferred any such charges: I had therefore none to retract. But I declared in substance that, when I remembered the Taranaki Petition of 1858, and considered the charge in Mr. Parris' letter, and the allegations in Mr. Abraham's Petition, and put them together, the suspicions or conviction I had professed last Session—“That an undue pressure had been brought to bear upon the Governor, with respect “to acquiring land at Waitara,” “and that a sinister influence had prevailed in the Executive “Council,” had been strengthened and confirmed. I shall be prepared to lay before the Committee documents upon which my suspicions are grounded, and call witnesses in proof of my assertions.

63. Are you aware that, immediately after your speech referred to in the Order of Reference, Mr. C. W. Richmond rose and declared that you had brought a charge against him, which, if true, would subject him to impeachment, and that he should insist upon the investigation of that charge?

—I remember hearing Mr. Richmond, in his reply, state that I had made a charge; and I believe that he made a similar remark after my speech in 1860.

64. You seconded Mr. Weld's motion for the appointment of this Committee,—in so doing, what charge did you propose to investigate?—I think I did not second it; I seconded the motion to add the names of Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman of Committees to this Committee.

*Dr. Featherston*

3 Aug., 1861.

*The following Extract from the "Southern Cross" newspaper of 19th July, read by the Chairman.*

"July 17th.—Mr. Weld moved that a Select Committee be appointed, &c.

"Dr. Featherston seconded the motion; he could assure the House that, if the charges preferred by him against the hon. member for the Town of New Plymouth were on investigation discovered to have been unfounded, nothing would afford him greater pleasure, and he would be happy to make a full retraction."

*Extract from the "New Zealander" of 20th July, 1861.*

"July 17th.—Dr. Featherston begged to observe that he did not rise to oppose the motion, but to express his pleasure that an enquiry should be made; and, if it was proved that the charges which he had made were utterly unfounded, he should be willing to apologize for any accusations he had made against the hon. member."

65. Do you admit the correctness of those reports or either of them, even of those passages in which both papers agree?—I deny the correctness of the whole of those reports.

No further questions being put to this witness, he withdrew.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward, That Dr. Featherston having stated that he entertained suspicions that undue pressure had been brought to bear in the Executive by Mr. C. W. Richmond on the Waitara question, and that those suspicions had been strengthened and confirmed, the duty of this Committee is to enquire whether there be any ground for such suspicions.

Resolved in the Affirmative.

Mr. Cracroft Wilson declined to vote.

Mr. C. W. Richmond examined.

*Mr. C. W. Richmond*

3 Aug., 1861.

66. What is your name and position?—Christopher William Richmond. From June 1856 until July, 1861, I was a member of the Executive Council of this Colony, during a part of that period I held the office of Colonial Secretary. I then took the office of Colonial Treasurer. From about the end of 1858 until November, 1860, I also held the office of Minister for Native Affairs.

67. Were you a sworn member of the Executive at and about the time that the purchase of the Waitara Block took place?—I was.

68. What office in the Executive did you hold at that time?—I was Colonial Treasurer and Minister for Native Affairs.

69. As a member of the Executive Council of this Colony it was your duty to advise the Governor on that purchase?—It was, if called upon by His Excellency.

70. Do you admit that undue pressure has been brought to bear in the Executive by you on the Waitara Question?—I do not.

71. *Mr. Speaker.*] Did you advise the Governor to make the Waitara purchase?—The published statements of the meeting with the Natives at New Plymouth in March, 1859, show the part which I took in the matter. When Teira made his offer to the Governor, His Excellency turning to Mr. McLean (who was interpreting) asked him if the offer should be accepted; Mr. McLean replied in the affirmative. His Excellency then put the same question to me, to which I replied "Yes, sir, if there is a good Title." To the best of my recollection these are the very words I used.

At this stage of the proceedings, Mr. Richmond said "I submit to the Committee that I ought to know in what position I stand. I submit that I am not Witness, but an accused person: if so, I ought to know by what evidence the charge against me is supported. I must be supposed innocent, until I am proved to be guilty. I am, if the Committee pleases (and I place myself altogether in their hands), prepared to waive my right to be presumed innocent, and to take upon myself the burthen of proof; but I submit that I ought to be informed what evidence has been adduced against me."

After some discussion, the Committee agreed that the Chairman should communicate to Mr. Richmond the proceedings of the Committee up to this point, as he had already done to Dr. Featherston, and that Mr. C. W. Richmond be invited to make any statement to the Committee at their next meeting that he shall think fit.

On Motion of Mr. Fitzherbert, the Committee adjourned until Monday, at 10 a.m.

Ordered, That the Clerk forward copy of Mr. Crosbie Ward's Resolution to Dr. Featherston, and request that he will lay the documents referred to before the Committee and bring up his Witnesses.

## CHARGE PREFERRED BY DR. FEATHERSTON

MONDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ Creyke,

The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond

Mr. C. W. Richmond further examined.

5 Aug., 1861.

72. *Chairman.*] At the last meeting of the Committee you stated that you were willing if such were the wish of the Committee, to waive your right of being presumed to be innocent until proved to be guilty, and that, if such were the wish of the Committee, you were prepared to make a statement in disproof of the allegations adduced against you. Having since had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the previous proceedings of the Committee, are you still prepared to take that course?—I am content to make my statement at once, if the Committee pleases. But as I now learn that Dr. Featherston has stated that he will produce documents and bring forward witnesses in support of what he has said, I submit that it will be preferable in the first place to call upon him to produce those documents and bring up the witnesses. Dr. Featherston ought, I submit, to be summoned to attend the Committee during my statement, and the examination of any witness I may call, and I ought to be allowed to be present whilst Dr. Featherston states his case, and examines his witnesses.

Mr. C. W. Richmond having replied, it was resolved that no further questions be put, but that Dr. Featherston be called upon to be in attendance with the documents and witnesses he wishes to produce before the Committee, To-morrow, at 10 a.m., precisely; and that Mr. C. W. Richmond be similarly warned.

Upon Motion of the Hon. the Speaker, the Committee adjourned until To-morrow, at 10 a.m.

TUESDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,

Mr. Creyke,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
The Hon. the Speaker.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Dr. Featherston

Dr. Featherston examined.

6 Aug., 1861

73. *Chairman.*] The Committee wish you to place before them the documents referred to by you, and if you desire to call any witnesses they are prepared to hear them.

Dr. Featherston. I wish to put in a selection from Major Nugent's letter, 1st September, 1855, [Par. pps, July 1860, Enclosure 3, No. 68.]

“ On our arrival the whole of the Tribe assembled, and after one of the Chiefs had briefly stated the reports that they had heard, Wm. King, the principal Chief of the Waitara, arose and spoke for some time. I enclose the substance of his speech which I consider to be couched in fair and manly terms. On the conclusion of his speech I assured him that nothing was further from my intentions than to seize him treacherously in the night, and that I was, by my instructions, sent for the preservation of peace between Europeans and Natives, and that I would not take active steps against him or any other Natives, unless the Europeans were interfered with, and finally I recommended him to remain quietly at his Pah. He complained much of the false statements which had been made against him in the local papers, and in proof that he has some ground for his complaint, I enclose herewith copies of the last numbers of the *Taranaki Herald*, which do not disguise the wish of some of the writers in that paper to drive Wm. King and his party away from the Waitara. Now independently of the illegality of such a proceeding, the people of the Tribe have exported produce this year to the amount of between £8000 and £9000, the greater part of the proceeds of which is spent in British manufactured goods, and consequently indirectly these Natives contribute a considerable sum to the revenue of the country. I have no hesitation in saying that these people who in their position are useful and beneficial occupiers of the soil, have been on the point of being driven to become our declared enemies, and compelled to take a position in the forest where all the discontented and troublesome characters would have assembled, and from which it would have required considerable force, and a large expenditure of monies, to drive them. In the meantime the out-settlers would have been harrassed by constant alarms, and New Plymouth might have been thrown back a generation. I think that for the

present the Natives are reassured, but I cannot answer for the continuance of tranquillity between the races as such inflammatory articles are published in the newspapers, in which people of much local influence do not disguise their wishes to seize upon the land of the Natives.

"It may be in the recollection of the Officer Commanding the Troops that Wm. King during the disturbances near Wellington in the year 1846 and the beginning of 1847 took an active part on the part of the Government side, and was instrumental in a great measure in driving Rangihaeata from his fortified position in the Howkini valley; on this account I think he deserves more consideration than is manifested towards him by the local authorities."

*Selection from Sub-Enclosure to Enclosure 3 in No. 68.*

"A report, &c.," 3rd paragraph.—"Turton he said bad things about us which are false, he sent to the Waikatos, and told them I and my people were going to destroy the Town. My thoughts are that the Governor should investigate and put a stop to such wicked reports." "Turton says I am bad for going to the Kaipakopako, why does he not tell Paharama Te Waka and Honi Ropea to stop away; if they do, I will."

"The thoughts of the Superintendent and Provincial Council are bad towards us, it is the land, but they will not have it whilst this feud lasts, that subject must be talked of quietly, when the Puketapus have settled their matter, at present no land will be sold."

*Extract from Governor Gore Browne's Despatch to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, November 19th, 1855, No. 79.*

Paragraph 2.—"In answer to an Address presented to me by the Inhabitants, I took occasion to express in strong terms the necessity of our abstaining from all interference in this quarrel, and while I assured the Inhabitants of protection within the settlement, declared my fixed determination, not to allow the troops to be used for any other purpose."

*Extract from Enclosure in No. 79.*

"Since that time various portions of land have been acquired by purchase, but there is still a deficiency, and although the greater part, and all the most respectable settlers, have abstained from expressing discontent, individuals have from time to time, in conversation, by letters in the newspapers, and otherwise, shown a strong desire to expel the Natives and take possession of the lands to which they consider themselves entitled in right of the New Zealand Company's original purchase." "Such antecedents are not likely to have laid the foundation of mutual confidence, and accordingly distrust which in most other Provinces has given place to better feelings, has not done so at New Plymouth."

And after giving an account of Mr. Cooper's proceedings: the Governor goes on,—"I have however disapproved of Mr. Cooper's conduct in commencing a survey before he was assured that all who had even a disputed claim to the land desired it should be sold, and have declined to make a demand for reparation, which could only be enforced at the expense of a general war, including sooner or later all the tribes in the Northern Island. The case has unfortunately been aggravated by the injudicious zeal of Mr. Turton, a Wesleyan Missionary, whose letters addressed to the Chiefs of other tribes, as well as those in the newspapers, some of which have originated with him have alarmed Katatore's people and revived the old suspicion that the Europeans would not rest until they had slain and taken possession of that which the Maories liken to Naboth's vineyard."

*Extract from Mr. T. F. Riemenschneider's Letter to the Native Secretary, Taranaki, September 24th, 1855.*

After stating that they (the Maories) consider the Government had no just ground for interfering at all in the Puketapu quarrels, nor for taking any steps whatever against either or both of the two Chiefs, Katatore and Wiremu Kingi.

In support of their argument they give the following reasons, 1, 2, 3, 4. "Fourthly. As to Wiremu Kingi because he can be accused of no crime; he is on his own land, being the real and true Chief of Waitara."

In reference to the last named point the Taranaki Natives declared, "As long as this policy shall be adhered to, say they, (referring to Col. Wynyard's letters on the subject) mutual peace and good will will be upheld and continue between themselves, (Taranaki) and the settlers and the soldiers. But if the new Governor should set Col. Wynyard's words and plans aside, and contrary to it adopt any hostile or coercive steps against either one or both of the two Chiefs Katatore and Wiremu Kingi, as seemed to be had in contemplation by some Pakeha, here then the first step of such a kind on the Governor's part would most certainly on the part of the Natives be viewed and received as being the signal and commencement of a general war, and of a life and death struggle between the Pakeha and Maori."

"Hence they declare as soon as ever any attempt shall be made by the latter to get any of those two Chiefs in their power, all Taranaki and Ngatiruanui, &c., as far as Wanganui, will rise instantly to a man in arms, and hasten to Katatore's and Wiremu Kingi's rescue and support, and they will not relinquish the struggle until they shall either have conquered or have lost their last

*Dr. Featherston*  
6 Aug., 1861.

Dr. Featherston  
6 Aug., 1861.

man in the attempt, because, (say they), it is not merely for those two individuals the war will be waged, but it will be for the principle, which the Natives recognize as bound up in those two men as soon as they are placed between the two different races, the Pakeha and the aborigines."

"Thus fully the whole case has been repeatedly argued before me, during the last fortnight by the Natives in the Taranaki District, and there can be no doubt that they are in earnest about it. The most sober and quietly disposed amongst them declare in a manner not to be mistaken that they will rise, because they feel convinced ("Mohio Rawa") that it will be necessary for the defence and preservation of their lives, liberties, and possessions against a system of violence and oppression threatening them and theirs."

"Thus far they let me into the contents of that letter, but I rather am inclined to believe that it contained more, at all events I asked the authors of that document, point blank, whether it was not intended to convey to W. Kingi in a manner perfectly intelligible to him, the promise of Taranaki's aid and support in case it should appear as if the Pakeha had any design against his personal liberty or rights."

"The answer I received to this question frankly admitted that it was so. The letter was subsequently detained and not sent, as I strongly argued against it, as besides its having a mischievous tendency, it was altogether unnecessary and premature."

"In the course of my listening to their long 'koreros' and of my occasional arguing with them about the various points, I observed that it appeared to me, there was much reason to believe that Wiremu Kingi, had properly speaking, no land and no claim of his own to the lands at the Waitara on the South side. With much evident surprise they the (the Taranaki) looked and asked me where then his lands and his claims were, if not there, since he was the rightful and principal chief of the Waitara."

"When further I reminded them that William King had no right either to hold or to occupy land on this South side of Waitara river since in 1847 he had given his distinct promise to Governor Sir G. Grey previous to his coming up from the South, that he would not settle on this side, but on the opposite (north) banks of the river, I received in reply that William King being the head chief of all Waitara on both sides of it it was for himself to choose to say on which side and on which spot he was to reside."

*Extract from Mr. Carrington's letter 21st March, 1859, to His Excellency Governor Gore Browne.*

"It is therefore with deep concern I learn 'That special instructions from Her Majesty preclude His Excellency from coercing a minority of the Natives into selling their lands' without a discretionary alternative; 'that he felt that such a proceeding would be impolitic and unjust, and that therefore he never would sanction it,' &c."

*Extract from Capt. Steward's letter 22nd March, 1859, in reply to Mr. Carrington's letter of 21st March, 1859.*

"The Governor informed the deputation that he had reported at great length to Her Majesty's Government on Native Affairs in connexion with the Province of Taranaki, and particularly in reference to a proposal to coerce a minority of Native proprietors who might be disinclined to sell their land."

"He expressed his opinion that such a course would be (considering our engagements with the Natives) both unjust and impolitic, and Her Majesty's Government had conveyed to him, in a Despatch received by the last mail, their unqualified approval of his views."

*Extract from a Despatch by Governor Gore Browne, C.B., to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, June 9th, 1858.*

"To obtain this desirable object, I will, however, never permit land to be taken without the consent of those to whom it belongs; nor will I interfere 'to compel an equitable division of common land among the respective claimants,' as desired by the Memorialist in one of the concluding paragraphs of the petition. This decision is not less one of expediency than of justice, for the whole of the Maori race maintain the right of the minority to prevent the sale of land, held in common with the utmost jealousy."

"Wi Kingi has no sort of influence with me or the Colonial Government, we believe him to be an infamous character, but I will not permit the purchase of land over which he has any right without his consent."

*Extract from Mr. McLean's Report on the Taranaki Memorial of the Provincial Council of New Plymouth.*

"Moreover it is clearly the duty of the Government to abstain from acquiring land when the consequence of its acquisition is in any way likely to bring about serious differences among the Natives, the strict observance of this rule has been enjoined by His Excellency on all the officers of the Land Purchase Department."

*Extract from the Memorial of the Provincial Council of the Province of New Plymouth.*

"That the system heretofore adopted by the Government of requiring the assent of every

claimant to any piece of land, before a purchase is made has been found to operate most injuriously in this Province on account of the conflicting interests of the claimants, and that the sufferers by this system are invariably the men who are most advanced in civilization, and who possess the largest share in the common property. Your memorialists are therefore of opinion that such of the Natives as are willing to dispose of their proportion of any common land to the Government should be permitted to do so whether such Natives form a majority or only a large minority of the claimants, and that the Government should compel an equitable division of such common land among the respective claimants on the Petition of a certain proportion of them. That in the opinion of your Memorialists, no danger of a war between the Government and the Natives need be apprehended from the prosecution of a vigorous policy, inasmuch as a large proportion of the Natives themselves would cordially support it, and the remainder would from the smallness of their number, be incapable of offering any effectual resistance."

*Dr. Featherston*

6 Aug., 1861.

*Extract from Mr. Parris' letter to the Bishop of New Zealand, August 26th, 1858.*

"Lest I should be charged with partiality for Natives of that denomination, as some are wont to do, because I refuse to support or countenance dishonorable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people, to exterminate them from the Waitara in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan for the acquirement of that delightful and much coveted district."

*Extract of letter from Mr. Parris to Private Secretary, December 21st, 1860.*

"When Ihaia, Nikorima and their party were besieged in the Karaka Pa at Waitara, and were in a most miserable plight, Mr. Whiteley suggested to me that I should try to arrange terms of peace on the following basis, namely, that the besieged should be allowed to vacate the Pa, and that the besiegers should then destroy it. I availed myself of the suggestion, and obtained the consent of Ihaia and Wiremu Kingi, the former to leave the pa, and the latter to destroy it, and not follow them any further; and shortly after, in the middle of the night, Ihaia's party took a loud farewell of their pa, but their places were immediately occupied by his Wanganui and Mokau allies. They thus tried to take advantage of arrangements which I had attempted to make for their preservation, and but for my opportune arrival, and discovery of the ambush, would probably have succeeded.

"I was much blamed by the newspapers of the Province for communicating this intelligence, but no man with one spark of honor could, under the circumstances, have acted otherwise.

"My letter to the Bishop of New Zealand alluded to these attacks of the local press, and those of many of the settlers, who were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and who viewed the frustration of the ambush as inimical to land purchases.

*Extract from Mr. Augustus B. Abraham's Petition, clauses 27, 28, and 29.*

27. That, whilst the said Act was in progress through the Legislative Council, Mr. Fred. A. Carrington, who in his own behalf, and as agent for Messrs. Tunno, Dunne, and others, claimed to be entitled to the greater portion of the block now known as Teira's Block, remonstrated with the Hon. C. W. Richmond thereon, and threatened to memorialize the Colonial Government and the Imperial Parliament if the same were persisted in, when the Hon. C. W. Richmond represented to him that the Waitara land would not be acquired by the authorities, in order to be handed over to the land claimants on account of the great expense necessary for the purpose, and he urged the injury that would thus accrue to the settlement founded by the said Mr. Carrington and its settlers if he persisted in his opposition, and the said F. A. Carrington, entirely influenced by such representations, was induced to accept the increased terms of compensation then expressly agreed on between them, namely 37½ acres Suburban land instead of 12 acres, and 75 Rural acres instead of 50 acres, and the said C. W. Richmond then represented, that efforts should be made to acquire the Waitara land, and that a Town should be laid out thereat, where the one acre of Town land to be given as compensation at the option of the claimants might be selected.

28. That the said Mr. Richmond obtained from the said Mr. Carrington an official letter, whereby he recorded his consent to such arrangement, which he still has in his possession or power, and under such circumstances the Act was proceeded with and passed, but although the necessity for written consent on the part of land claimants was then recognised, no communication whatever was held with Petitioner on the subject although known to be in Melbourne, and he has only recently been informed of such arrangement with the said Mr. Carrington.

29. That since the passing of such Act, the Government of the Colony has proceeded to acquire land at the Waitara for the benefit of the Province.

*Extract from Mr. C. W. Richmond's speech before the House of Representatives, 16th August, 1859.*

We have, none of us, at any time pressed upon His Excellency the acquisition of land in Taranaki.

*Letter from Wiremu Kingi, Wetini, and other Ngatiawa Chiefs, to Governor Fitzroy, dated Taranaki, June 8th, 1844.*

Friend Governor,—“Salutations! Great is our love to you. This is our speech to you, listen

Dr. Featherston  
6 Aug., 1861.

to us, respecting this land, respecting Waitara; our hearts are dark by reason of Mr. Spain's words. Indeed the Europeans are wrong in striving for this land, which was never sold by its owners, the men of Ngatiawa. Now, when the Ngatiawa tribe went to Kapiti, they left some men behind on our lands, who were surprised by the Waikatos, and some of them led away captive; who, having arrived at Waikato, were afterwards returned to Waitara to dwell there. Others came back from Kapiti.

"We love the land of our ancestors. We did not receive any of the goods of Colonel Wakefield. It was wrong to buy the land which belonged to other men. There are many Chiefs to whom this land belongs, who are now at Waikanae and Arapaoa. It was love for the lands of our forefathers that brought us back to those lands. Friend Governor, our thoughts are, that those lands were never settled by the Waikatos; and when we embraced Christianity, we learnt the rules of the Gospel and to dwell in peace.

"This also is the determination of our people. Waitara shall not be given up. The men to whom it belongs will hold it for themselves. There was not a single man of the Ngatiawa tribe who received the payment of Wakefield. These are the only men who took the payment, the men of Ngamotu and Puketapu, and they had no right in Waitara. The Ngatiawas are constantly returning to their land on account of their attachment to the land of our birth,—the land which we have cultivated, and which our ancestors marked out by boundaries and delivered to us. Friend Governor, do you not love your land, England, the land of your fathers, as we also love our land at Waitara. Friend, let your thought be good towards us. We desire not to strive with the Europeans, but at the same time we do not wish to have our land settled by them; rather let them be returned to the places which have been paid for by them, lest a root of quarrel remain between us and the Europeans. Friend Governor, be kind to the Natives; the places that have been justly purchased by the Europeans, let them have them, that your judgment may be just.

"This is not from us only, but from all the Ngatiawa, though the greater part was absent. From Hakopa, Tipene, Te Watarani, Tutarahaina, Paturoi, Te Wareraka, Tamati Tirarau, Hirini Mangonui.

"By us, by all the men at Waikanae and Warekauri.

"Written by me, WILLIAM KING WHITE."

*Extract of Minute of the Executive Council, 25th day of January, 1860.*

Present:—

His Excellency the Governor.

The Hon. Colonel Gold,  
Mr. Secretary Stafford,  
"Attorney General Whitaker,

Mr. Treasurer Richmond,  
"Tancred.

"The Governor submits to the Council the question of the completion of the purchase from the Native Chief Te Teira of a certain block of land situate in the Province of Taranaki, at the mouth of the Waitara on its south or left bank, as a preliminary to which a survey of the land is necessary.

"The Council after a full consideration of the circumstances of the case, advise—

"1st. That Mr. Parris be instructed to have the said land surveyed in the ordinary manner, and to take care that the Native Chief William King be indirectly, but not officially, made aware of the day on which the survey will be commenced.

"2nd. Should William King or any other Native endeavour to prevent the survey or in any way interfere with the prosecution of the work, in that case, that the surveying party be protected during the whole performance of their work by an adequate military force under the command of the senior military officer, with which view power to call out the Taranaki Militia and Volunteers, and to proclaim martial law, be transmitted to the commanding officer at New Plymouth, that when the survey shall have been completed the officer commanding at New Plymouth shall, until further instructed, keep possession by force if necessary of the said lands, so as to prevent the occupation of or any act of trespass upon it by any Natives.

"That the Civil Authorities at New Plymouth be instructed to assist and co-operate by every means in their power with the military authorities in carrying out these instructions."

And the Hon. Col. Gold and the Hon. C. W. Richmond are to give the necessary directions accordingly.

F. G. STEWARD,  
Clerk of Executive Council.

Dr. Featherston wished to state to the Committee that he was not present to substantiate a charge, but simply, to state the grounds on which his suspicions rested.

74. *Chairman.*—Have you any witnesses to call?—Not at present.

The Chairman informed Dr. Featherston it was the wish of the Committee he should, if he desired, be present during Mr. Richmond's examination and that of his witnesses.

He did not desire it, but would if the Committee wished it.

Dr. Featherston withdrew.



On motion of Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., the Committee adjourned until to-morrow, at 10 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7TH, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C. B.,	Mr. Creyke,
„ Chairman of Committees,	„ Fitzherbert,
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,	
Mr. Weld in the Chair.	

Minutes of previous meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond in attendance.

Mr. Richmond made the following preliminary statement to the Committee.

I submit to the Committee, that the papers referred to by Dr. Featherston, do not support the charge made against me, that I have abused my office and influence, and have been party to a conspiracy for depriving William King of his rights. Except Mr. Abraham's petition, to which I shall presently refer, and the minute of the Executive Council of March, 1860, the documents referred to do not bear at all upon the question of the part which I personally took in the business of the Waitara purchase. The argument against me, so far as I can make it out from the mass of documents cited yesterday by Dr. Featherston (which I have not yet examined), is simply this, that all Taranaki settlers desired and intended the spoliation of the Waitara natives, and that I, as one of those settlers, must necessarily have participated in the feelings and designs of the class to which I belonged, and must have used my influence accordingly.

Mr. C. W. Richmond.

7th Aug., 1861.

I might fairly decline to make any defence against an accusation founded upon such grounds as these, but as I am anxious frankly to inform the Committee of the real position which I assumed in these transactions, I shall proceed as if a *prima facie* case had been made out against me. In the first place, I beg to record my absolute, unqualified, denial of the charge made, or insinuated, against me. I have not initiated any single step in the transactions to which the charge refers, either directly or indirectly, either officially or privately, either immediately, by advice or recommendation tendered to His Excellency the Governor, or mediately, by influence and suggestion. I have, on the contrary, rigidly confined myself to the statement of my opinion when called upon to give one, and to the execution of His Excellency's directions. These assertions may not be capable of strict proof; but I believe I shall be able to place before the Committee evidence which will satisfy them of the truth of what I state.

Had I employed undue pressure, that pressure must have been ultimately exerted upon Mr. Parris; I propose, therefore, first, to examine that gentleman.

In the course of that examination, I shall put questions to Mr. Parris relating to a private correspondence which I carried on with him, and I shall ultimately produce that correspondence for the perusal of the Committee.

Mr. Parris.

7th Aug., 1861.

Mr. Parris called in and examined.

75. Mr. Richmond.] What is your name?—My name is Robert Parris, I have been District Land Purchase Commissioner at Taranaki since June, 1857, and I still hold that appointment.

76. Previously to the offer of the Waitara block did you ever receive instructions from the Government to open negotiations for that block, or for any other land at Waitara?—I did not.

77. Was the purchase of land at Waitara ever suggested to you by me, publicly, or privately, directly or indirectly?—No, by no means whatever.

78. Did you ever solicit the offer of the block by the Natives?—I did not.

79. Was, or was not, the offer of the block the purely spontaneous act of the Natives concerned?—It was.

80. Do you think that any member of the late Administration was aware, beforehand, of the intention of Te Teira to make the offer which he made at the meeting of March, 1859?—Not one of them to my knowledge—not even the Chief Commissioner, up to the morning of the meeting; neither was I aware that Teira had his native mat with him, until I saw it thrown down.

81. Subsequently to the offer of the block, did the Government urge on the completion of the purchase, or were you allowed ample time to endeavour to arrange the differences between the Natives?—I was never urged on by the Government.

82. Did you at any time previously to the survey of Teira's block correspond, privately, on Native affairs at New Plymouth with me?—I remember writing a few private letters to you, one subject, the line of road from Waikato, to which District the Government had sent me—another letter (subject), Native reserves, but I believe I never alluded to Teira's land in any but one, that of the 21st September, 1859.

Mr. Parris.

7th Aug., 1861.

83. Will you produce that letter?—Yes. [*Letter put in.*]

[*The letter referred to by Mr. Parris will be found in the Appendix.*]

84. Did I, in any of my letters to yourself written previously to the military occupation of the block, advert to the Waitara purchase, and if so, in which letter, and what did I write upon the subject?—I have one private letter of yours, the only one referring to Teira's land. [*Letter put in, see Appendix.*]

85. Was that the only reference I ever made to the Waitara purchase?—I do not remember your making any other allusion to the Waitara land.

86. In the letter I now read to you, addressed to myself, of 21st June, 1859, you mention, incidentally, that "Teira was getting very anxious about his offer," did you receive any reply from me to that observation?—I think I can say no, with safety. The only letter from you respecting the Waitara land, I have handed in to the Committee.

87. In your letter of 21st September, 1859, printed with the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives (1860, E 4, p. 25), you write "that the state of Teira's question was then such that it was desirable that it should be settled one way or the other before long, inasmuch as the Natives in the District were being kept in constant excitement by it." Now, was that your own unbiassed opinion?—It was my own unbiassed opinion.

88. Did you ever address any remonstrance to the Government, or to any one of the Ministers, against the attempt to acquire the Waitara block?—I have never done so.

89. Was your opinion from the first against the justice of Wm. King's opposition?—It was.

90. Was the Assistant Native Secretary's letter to Teira dated 14th July, 1859, [1860, E—3, page 8.] transmitted through your hands? See letter in Appendix.—Yes, it was.

91. In that letter it is stated that the Governor "has agreed to take the land"; did you understand that as meaning that the land would be taken regardless of the claims of any of its owners who might dissent from the sale?—I did not understand it in that way.

92. The concluding paragraph of my private letter of 27th August, 1859, to which you have already referred, states that the Governor felt himself pledged to complete the purchase; did you understand that to mean that the purchase was to be completed without due investigation, or without due regard to the possible rights of dissentient Natives?—I understood the enquiry was to go on, I did not understand the purchase was to be completed without due investigation, or without due regard to the possible rights of dissentient Natives.

93. What were the terms of your final instructions to proceed with the purchase and pay the first instalment?—The terms of my instructions were to make an immediate advance. [*See letter (27th September, 1859,) from Assistant Native Secretary (1860 E—3 No. 12, page 8.)*]

Mr. Richmond having closed this Witness's examination, the Chairman submitted him to the Committee for cross-examination, and the following questions were then put

94 *Chairman.*] Will you point out to the Committee exactly what you refer to when you state in your letter of December 21st, 1860, to the Bishop of New Zealand, "that you were blamed in the public newspapers for not allowing Ihaia's ambush to take effect"?—At the time of the difficulties with the Natives in the Karaka Pah, I received a letter from the Rev. Mr. Whiteley [*See Appendix*] requesting me to intercede on behalf of those Natives, who were expecting every day to be their last, being invested by Wm. King's war party, (composed of 800 against 80,) who had cut a great quantity of fern, which was to be tied up in order to set fire to the Karaka Pah, and drive the inhabitants out of it, that Wm. King and his people might fall upon them. At the suggestion of Mr. Whiteley, I proposed terms to Wm. King, that Ihaia and his people might be allowed to escape from the Pah, and not be followed by William King's people, and that Wm. King's war party should then destroy the Pah. I was for fully one week getting Wm. King to consent to the proposal. After he had consented in the presence of Mr. Whiteley, Ihaia and Wi Korowhiti, the Whanganui Chief, also consented to the arrangement. It was my custom then to visit them every morning, fearful the arrangements should miscarry. On Saturday morning, the 8th May, 1858, on fording the Waitara River below the Karaka Pah, I was met by Wm. King on the opposite side, when he said, "They are all gone," meaning the people at the Karaka Pah; I then asked him if any of his people had followed them, he replied, "No." On approaching the Karaka Pah, at the nearest Stockade to it (of Wm. King's) there were a number of men assembled to go to the Karaka Pah to destroy it. I instructed them to remain until I had visited the Pah myself, which on doing, I discovered everything was removed from the Pah, and only armed Natives in the trenches in ambush (principally people of Mokau and Whanganui). Having discovered this, I of course prevented their turning to account what I had done to save their lives against Wm. King's people, for their destruction; and that was the meaning of my remark in my letter to Bishop Selwyn, in which I stated, "because I refused to support or countenance dishonourable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people,"—the expressions "dishonourable" and "treacherous" were intended to apply to those Natives only who had planted the ambush in the Karaka Pah. The settlers of Taranaki were not aware of any arrangements to which Wm. King had consented that Ihaia and his Natives should be allowed to abandon the Karaka Pah unmolested. I was censured by some, by no one in any way connected with the General or Provincial Governments.

Some discussion arose on the question of Mr. Parris's further attendance, (he being about to start for Taranaki,) and the Committee unanimously agreed that it was decidedly necessary he should

delay his leaving. Upon this decision being conveyed to him, it was moved by Mr. Creyke that this Committee adjourn until Thursday at 10-30 to receive a further statement from Mr. Richmond.  
Committee adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward, Mr. Chairman of Committees,		Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B
		Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of the last meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond resumed his statement.

At first sight the concluding paragraph in my letter of the 27th August, 1859, to Mr. Parris, seems somewhat at variance with my assertion that throughout the transactions to which this investigation refers, I confined myself strictly to giving an opinion, when called upon to do so, and to the execution of the Governor's directions. It can, indeed, scarcely be thought that the few words of the paragraph in question, written more than five months after Teira's offer, betray any undue urgency ; and as regards what I say in that passage of my letter, about the Governor's firm determination to proceed with the purchase, my words express no more than what had already been communicated to Mr. Parris through Mr. Smith's letter to Teira of 19th July, 1859, [1860, *E—No. 8, page 3.*] But it may be asked why did I interfere at all? Why did I step in between the Governor and the Officer of the Land Purchase Department. The explanation will be found in the correspondence which I now produce.

Here Mr. Richmond put in copy of a letter from himself to His Excellency Governor Browne, dated 18th July, 1861 ; Also, copy of the Governor's reply thereto, dated 19th July, 1861.

*Mr. C. W. Richmond.*  
8th Aug., 1861.

Parnell, July 18th, 1861.

DEAR SIR,—The House of Representatives having agreed on Mr. Weld's motion to appoint a Select Committee to investigate the charge preferred against me by Dr. Featherston, I intend to produce to the Committee the whole of my private correspondence with Mr. Parris.

Your Excellency is aware that the correspondence relates almost exclusively to the proposed road from Auckland to Taranaki, via Mokau and the White Cliffs, and to the management of the Native Reserves at New Plymouth. In only a single instance is the Waitara purchase mentioned by me, and it is to this that I wish to invite your Excellency's attention.

On the 27th August, 1859, about five months after Teira's offer, I replied to a letter from Mr. Parris, on some questions respecting which in his capacity of a Commissioner of Native Reserves, he desired my opinion for his private guidance. At the conclusion of my letter I referred to the Waitara question in the following terms :—

"The Governor is very anxious about the completion of the purchase from Teira. I am sure you will press the matter as fast as appears prudent. It would satisfy His Excellency if, without writing officially, you would let me hear privately how things stand. I have been in hope that Mr. McLean's visit would effect something, but he delays so long. The Governor feels he is pledged to effect the purchase."

I wish to ask your Excellency to be good enough to state what is your recollection of the circumstances under which I wrote the paragraph I have cited ; particularly whether it was written with your Excellency's cognizance ; and whether or not it was written in lieu of an official instruction which your Excellency had proposed to the Assistant Native Secretary, Mr. Smith, to convey to Mr. Parris.

I remain, &c.,  
C. W. RICHMOND.

To His Excellency Colonel Thomas Gore Browne, C.B.

Government House, July 19th, 1861.

DEAR MR. RICHMOND,—In reply to your letter of yesterday's date, I must commence by observing, that when I went to Taranaki in March, 1859, I was determined at all risks to put an end to the bloody feuds at that place which had so long disgraced the Government.

I considered the acceptance of Teira's offer (on behalf of his people) likely to effect this object, and was therefore anxious that the title should be investigated with as little delay as possible.

Five months having elapsed without my receiving any conclusive report on the subject, I instructed Mr. Smith to write to Mr. Parris, desiring him to hasten the negotiations as much as was compatible with proper care and due caution. I remember your then telling me you thought it scarcely prudent to write officially to Mr. Parris, lest he should be induced to hurry more than

*Mr. C. W. Richmond.* would be wise in an enquiry needing so much care : you added that if I pleased, you would write privately to him on the subject, to which I assented.

8th Aug., 1861.

Mr. Parris' reply dated September 21st, and addressed to you, was referred to me, and I find a minute, written upon it in my own hand writing, as follows, dated September 27th :—

The word "satisfied" being underlined. "If Mr. Parris is *satisfied* that Teira and the others who offer to sell, have an indisputable title to the land, an advance should be made to them at once in part payment for it. They should however, be told that the purchase will not be completed until Mr. McLean reaches Taranaki. This should be done by first mail."

Soon after this Mr. McLean fell ill.

In justice to you I must say that, during the five years it has been my good fortune to have you in my Executive Council, the affairs of Taranaki have come very often under consideration between us, and I have observed, in discussing them, that you have always been more than usually careful and guarded : you have invariably treated them as impartially as if you had been an inhabitant of the Middle Island, altogether unconnected with New Plymouth.

I am, &c.,

T. GORE BROWNE.

To C. W. Richmond, Esq.

Since I received His Excellency's reply of the 19th July, I have found the following Memorandum in His Excellency's hand writing, which must have been handed to me by Mr. Smith, the Assistant Native Secretary. The Memorandum accords with His Excellency's statement, that the proposition to instruct Mr. Parris to proceed, originated with himself.

#### MEMORANDUM.

"Instructions should be sent to Taranaki to close the purchase of Teira's land, which was commenced when I was there, without delay, *if possible*. There is little chance of Mr. McLean's reaching Taranaki for some time.

T. GORE BROWNE.

The Assistant Native Secretary and Minister for Native Affairs.

Mr. Richmond continued.

I now hand in Mr. Parris' letters to myself, written between the time of Teira's offer and the direction given by His Excellency in Council to proceed with the survey of the Block.

The letters in the margin handed in by Mr. Richmond [*see Appendix.*]

No. 1, June 21st, 1859.

No. 2, July 6th, 1859.

No. 3, August 6th, 1859.

No. 4, August 20th, 1859.

No. 5, Sept. 21st, 1859.

I lay these letters before the Committee merely as negative evidence. Except in those points which have been already touched upon in my examination of Mr. Parris, our correspondence contains nothing relating to the Waitara purchase. I should not have thought of corresponding privately with Mr. Parris upon such a subject, except with the distinct permission of His Excellency the Governor. Accordingly my only mention of the subject is proved to have been made with the cognizance and at the request of the Governor.

One letter is missing, viz., that of the 9th September, but I am certain it can be of no importance. I have asked Mr. Parris for a copy, but he tells me he has kept no copy.

On receiving the letter marked No. 5 in appendix (21st September, 1859), I immediately forwarded it for His Excellency's information, and he minuted upon it the direction dated 27th Sept., 1859, referred to in His Excellency's letter to myself of the 19th July, 1861. Mr. Smith's letter (E. 3. 1860, page 8) to Mr. Parris of the 27th September, 1859, instructing Mr. Parris to pay an instalment to Teira's party, provided Mr. Parris should "be able to satisfy himself that the parties offering it had an indisputable Title," was written in obedience to the above minute of His Excellency's.

Mr. Richmond expressed a wish for time to be allowed him to summon Mr. McLean and Mr. T. H. Smith, to which the Committee agreed, and on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Ward the Committee adjourned till Friday the 9th instant at 10 a.m.,

FRIDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Hon. the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
" Cracroft Wilson, C.B.

Minutes of preceding meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond applied to the Committee for time to complete his statement. The two witnesses in attendance were Mr. McLean and Mr. T. H. Smith; if the Committee would receive their evidence and adjourn, it would enable him to complete his case.

Question put and passed on motion of Mr. Carleton, That Mr. C. W. Richmond have leave to complete his statement, after the rising of the Committee, and furnish the Clerk with the same.

Question put and passed on motion of Mr. Carleton, That Mr. Weld have leave to retire from the Chair for a while, and that Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B., do take the Chair.

Agreed to.

Mr. Richmond continued : Having now established, as I trust to the satisfaction of the Committee, that I never, either before or after Teira's offer, put any kind of pressure upon Mr. Parris, I proceed to call the other Officers of the Native Department who were in anywise connected with the purchase.

Mr. McLean called and examined.

95. *Mr. C. W. Richmond.*] What was your position in the Government Service during the years 1858, 1859, 1860?—I was Chief Land Purchase Commissioner.

96. Previously to the offer by Teira's party of the Waitara block, did you receive instructions from the Governor or from any Member of the late Ministry to open negotiations for the purchase of that block or of any other land at Waitara?—No; I received no such instruction.

97. Before Teira's offer, was the purchase of land at Waitara ever suggested to you publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, by me or by any Member of the Stafford Ministry?—Never.

98. Do you believe that the offer of the block was the spontaneous, unsolicited act of the Natives concerned?—I believe so.

99. I believe you were absent from Auckland during the time which elapsed between Teira's offer and the Military occupation of the block?—Yes, I was absent.

100. Are you aware, or do you believe, that any Member of the late Ministry pressed the Governor to complete the purchase?—Not to my knowledge, but I have since heard statements, by parties opposed to the late Ministry, to the effect that such pressure was used, but I am not aware of any just foundation for such statements. Teira's offer to sell the land at Waitara was made in March, 1859, during the Governor's visit to Taranaki; previous to that time I was not aware that he or his party had determined upon making the offer.

Witness was discharged from further attendance.

Mr. T. H. Smith called and examined.

101. *Mr. C. W. Richmond.*] What was your position in the Government Service during the years 1858, 1859, 1860?—I was Assistant Native Secretary.

102. In that capacity had you any thing to do with the Land Purchase Department?—I took charge of the correspondence in the absence of the Chief Commissioner.

103. Previously to the offer by Teira's party of the Waitara block, did you receive instructions from the Governor or from any Member of the late (Stafford) Ministry to open negotiations for the purchase of that block or of any other land at Waitara?—No.

104. Before Teira's offer, was the purchase of land at the Waitara ever suggested to you, publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, by me or by any Member of the Stafford Ministry?—No.

105. Do you believe that the offer of the block was the spontaneous unsolicited act of the Natives concerned?—I have no knowledge whatever upon that subject.

106. Are you aware, or do you believe, that any Member of the late Ministry pressed the Governor to complete the purchase?—I am not aware of any pressure having been used.

107. Will you look at this Memorandum [here the Governor's Memorandum of 27th August, 1859, (see appendix) was handed to this Witness by Mr. Richmond]. Have you any recollection of the circumstances under which that Memorandum was written, and of what was done in consequence of it?—To the best of my recollection this Memorandum was given to me by His Excellency, accompanied by verbal directions to write to Mr. Parris to instruct him to proceed with the negotiations for the purchase of the Waitara block. Letters had been received addressed to the Governor by Teira and others, claiming the fulfilment of the promise made by the Governor, that the lands should be purchased if the sellers could prove their title, and urging that the matter should be completed without delay. After receiving these directions from His Excellency, I went to Mr. Richmond. I believe I took this Memorandum with me, and told Mr. Richmond of my directions to write to Mr. Parris as above. We had some conversation upon the subject, and to the best of my recollection Mr. Richmond expressed his opinion that it would be better not to send official instructions to Mr. Parris lest he might feel there was no option or discretion left him as to the immediate prosecution of the negotiations; that he (Mr. Richmond) was writing privately to Mr. Parris and would mention to him the Governor's anxiety that there should be no unnecessary delay. I concurred in Mr. Richmond's view, and requested him to see His Excellency and explain his views to him. Mr. Richmond promised he would do so; I also saw the Governor afterwards and mentioned to him what had been done, and he expressed his approval.

*Mr. McLean.*

9th Aug., 1861.

*Mr. T. H. Smith.*

9th Aug., 1861.

Witness was discharged from further attendance.

Mr. C. W. Richmond

9th Aug., 1861.

Mr. C. W. Richmond continued his statement.

I feel ashamed to argue that no attempt to put a pressure upon His Excellency Governor Browne was made by myself or by any of my colleagues. Any one who knows Governor Browne is aware that any such attempt would have been fruitless, and I trust that the papers already before the Committee will satisfy them that the late Ministry throughout the whole of these transactions, left the initiative to be taken by His Excellency, with whom it properly rested. But I go beyond, saying that neither I, myself, nor any of my colleagues ever urged the matter with the Governor. I declare that we never even suggested a single step in the proceedings. In proof of this, I here quote from the Ministerial Memorandum dated 25th May, 1860, signed by myself. [1860, E—1B., Page 5,] the following passage :—

“The insinuation that the war is one of aggrandisement, that it is undertaken for the sake of acquiring territory, is quite untrue. The proceedings which have led to it were under the immediate superintendence and control of the Governor. His Excellency will confirm the statement that those proceedings were not, at any stage urged upon him, *or so much as suggested to him by the Responsible Ministers.*”

This, and other public declarations to the same effect, have received Governor Browne's tacit concurrence, and will, I doubt not, be expressly confirmed by His Excellency, should the Committee think it necessary and proper to seek such a confirmation.

The Committee will also observe that pressure, whether upon the Governor himself, or upon any of the Officials in positions intermediate between His Excellency and Mr. Parris, must ultimately have been exerted upon Mr. Parris, who was the Agent actually dealing with the selling Natives. Now Mr. Parris unequivocally denies that any pressure was put on himself, and his evidence establishes, that the negotiation with Teira's party was allowed to take its natural and legitimate course.

Since I commenced this statement I have looked through the documents adduced by Dr. Featherston as the grounds of what he now terms his “suspicious.” I will notice these supposed grounds under four heads.

1 The alleged opinions of some of the more violent settlers at Taranaki, and what are termed by Major Nugent “inflammatory articles” in the Public Journals of the year 1854, are alleged as evidence against me. Such a ground of accusation ought, I submit, to be at once rejected. It is not even pretended that I am in any wise connected with, or responsible for, the utterance of the opinions and the publication of the writings which are referred to. I may state to the Committee (though it is more than I could be fairly called upon to do), that I have never had any share in the conduct of either of the two papers published at New Plymouth, and that since I have been in office, *i.e.*, since June, 1856, I have not contributed a single line to either paper with the exception of one article, written in 1857, which in no wise related to the acquisition of land or to Native Affairs.

It is not my business to defend the conduct of the Taranaki newspapers. I have strongly dissented from opinions occasionally advocated in those publications. But I take leave to say that, when the extraordinary causes for irritation and discontent which have been so long at work in the settlement of New Plymouth, are fairly considered, the sentiments of the settlers, as indicated by the general tone of their public journals, will appear wonderfully temperate. Due allowance always made for the trying circumstances in which they have been placed, the settlers of New Plymouth are entitled, I maintain, to the warm approval of their fellow-colonists, whilst any who, for a political purpose, have sought to defame them in the hour of their misfortune, deserve to be covered with lasting shame. The argument of my accuser is, that the people of New Plymouth desired and intended the spoliation, if not the extermination, of William King and his people, and that I, as one of the Representatives of the place, must have participated in this desire and intention and have forwarded it by all the means in my power, however illegitimate. No man would dare to state the argument in this form, but this is what is meant. I reply by utterly denying the truth of the imputation upon the people of New Plymouth; and as regards their influence for good or for evil upon me as their Representative, I declare that I was returned to the House of Representatives in 1855 without opposition, and unfettered by any pledge whatever as to my future line of political action, and that my Constituents have ever since left me free to take my own course, and have abstained from every kind of attempt to influence me. They appear to have considered that when I became a Member of the Government I ceased to represent their special interests: at all events, they have acted as if they thought so.

2. The second ground of suspicion is derived from Mr. Parris' private letter to the Bishop of New Zealand, dated 26th August, 1853. Mr. Parris in his evidence before this Committee, and also in his letter to the Private Secretary, dated December 21st, 1860, [1861, E—4, p. 3,] has explained that his statements in that letter implicated no Member of the Government, but referred to certain comments made upon his conduct by the press and by some of the Settlers. Mr. Parris has further shown that he never made the charge which it has been attempted to foist upon the House of Representatives as an accusation preferred by him against the Settlers, namely, that they “were combining for the purpose of exterminating William King and his Tribe at the Waitara,” and has explained that the phrase “dishonourable and treacherous treatment of William King and his people to exterminate them from the Waitara” refers solely to the ambush at the Karaka Pa, planned by King's Native adversaries.

It is true that Mr. Parris was severely censured by persons at New Plymouth for interfering in the Native feud, and that, in his letter to the Bishop, he alluded to this censure with strong feeling. It can, however, be shown, that Mr. Parris wrote under a misapprehension. The Settlers, generally, were ignorant at the time, that Mr. Parris had been the medium of effecting a truce

between the contending Native parties, under cover of which Ihaia's party had endeavoured to commit the act of gross treachery to which he refers. The Settlers knew nothing of this truce, or of the engagement to evacuate the Karaka Pa, and to them Mr. Parris appeared in the light of a meddler, whose officious interference had saved the stronger party from the effects of a stratagem deemed perfectly fair in Maori warfare, and resorted to in self-defence by the weaker party.

A single individual (the deceased Editor of the "Taranaki Herald,") who was, I believe, aware of all the circumstances, appears to have condemned Mr. Parris, not, however, for revealing the ambush (which, it was admitted, he was under the circumstances in honor bound to do), but for taking upon him to act the perilous part of mediator in the Native feud. The danger of such an interference is, indeed, obvious; for if the ambush had succeeded, Mr. Parris would have been held responsible by the Natives for the blood of all who fell. They would certainly have believed that he had planned the whole thing. Mr. Parris seems to have mistaken the ground of censure, and to have supposed that the "Taranaki Herald" attacked him—for an act which honor and prudence alike dictated.

Thus, upon examination, what has been presented to the House as Mr. Parris's charge against the Taranaki Settlers disappears: the "dreadful revelation" of "a combination to exterminate William King off the land at Waitara," which has been received with such "profound sensation" wherever it has been mentioned, and which has, I fear, but too well answered the purpose of its inventors, vanishes away. Secret thoughts and feelings, expressed by Mr. Parris in confidence, under the seal of privacy to his spiritual teacher, to his Father in God, have been wilfully disclosed—not to the Governor of the Colony—not to the official superiors of Mr. Parris,—but to a prominent political opponent of the Government—to a party leader, for a party purpose. As was to be expected, in such a case, the true meaning of the passionate and involved expressions of Mr. Parris' letter to the Bishop has been utterly perverted. Upon full enquiry, it plainly appears, First, that Mr. Parris never did state that any of the Settlers were planning or intending "dishonourable and treacherous treatment of William King and his people." Secondly, that Mr. Parris was not justified in intimating that any Settler would have approved of such conduct, even on the part of King's Maori enemies. The treachery that Mr. Parris refused to countenance was that of Wiremu Te Korowhiti, of Whanganui, and his men, in which it will scarcely be thought that I had any share. The censure under which Mr. Parris was chafing, was that of the *Taranaki Herald* and of some of the Settlers who did not understand the facts of the case; censure with which, whether just or unjust, I had as little to do as I had with the ambush.

3. The next point to which I shall refer is the Minute of the proceedings of Executive Council of the Colony on 25th January, 1859 (1860, E 3, page 11). The formal language of this Minute might be strained to support an inference, that the Members of the Council (*i.e.*, the Ministry), had been the first to propose that the Troops should be used to protect the survey of the block. Such an inference is sufficiently rebutted by other published documents—see particularly the Governor's Despatch to the Duke of Newcastle, dated 29th March, 1859 (1860, E—3, page 3). On this subject, I further beg leave to refer to my speech in the House of Representatives on Mr. Fox's motion of "want of confidence," as reported in the *New Zealander* newspaper of 13th July, 1861.

4. I have next to notice the statements contained in the 27th, 28th, and 29th clauses of the petition of Mr. Augustus Brown Abraham. Dr. Featherston, in the speech referred to in the Resolution appointing this Committee, has professed to extract three statements from this petition.

That I declared that I would take no steps to acquire the Waitara unless the New Zealand Company's purchasers would first surrender their rights to the sections originally selected by them at Waitara.

That I gave a solemn pledge to Mr. Carrington, that if the Company's purchasers surrendered their right to the sections so selected, the Government would take steps to acquire the Waitara.

That the solemn pledge referred to was embodied in a written agreement with Mr. Carrington.

Mr. Abraham's petition has been referred to the General Committee on Private Grievances, and Mr. Carrington and myself have been examined before that Committee. The Report of the Committee establishes that the first and second of the foregoing statements are untrue. The 3rd statement is Dr. Featherston's own invention. Dr. Featherston pretends to draw from Mr. Abraham's petition, the inference that I was concerned in "negotiating a conspiracy" for depriving the New Zealand Company's Land Claimants of their purchases of land in the Waitara. This minor conspiracy, it is suggested, was a preliminary to the greater one for the extermination of William King. The existence of the supposed plot against the land claimants is disproved by the Committee's Report on Mr. Abraham's petition, to which, and to the evidence taken before that Committee, I beg to refer.

Having now disposed of every tangible ground of suspicion alleged against me before this Committee, I wish to turn for a moment, to the *charge* which I supposed to have been made, but which, I understand, is now disavowed by Dr. Featherston. I am not going at present to contest the truth of Dr. Featherston's statements, or the fidelity of the revised report of his speech which he supplied to the *New Zealander*. I shall only say that the distinct accusation contained in the latter part of Dr. Featherston's speech as reported by the short-hand writer in the *Southern Cross* of the 18th June, 1861 (page 5), is precisely the accusation to which I conceived I was replying, when I rose in the House immediately Dr. Featherston had finished speaking. That is the charge of conspiracy which I supposed to have been publicly made, which I promised publicly to meet, and to which I now claim the right of giving a very brief reply.

Mr. C. W. Richmond

9th Aug., 1861.

The following is the passage in the Report which contains the accusation to which I refer :—  
 “Now take these facts: that Mr. Parris wrote to the Bishop in 1858; that a combination to exterminate William King from the land at Waitara existed; that at the same time the Colonial Treasurer binds himself with the purchasers of land from the New Zealand Company to get possession of the land at Taranaki, and three or four months after this negotiation with the Colonial Treasurer, that negotiations for the purchase of Teira's block commenced. I can come to no other conclusion than that the present Ministry (*i.e.*, the Stafford Ministry) is in some way responsible for the conspiracy which Mr. Parris charged against the Settlers; *that they are not only responsible, but that they are themselves in the conspiracy*, and that there was an undue pressure both by the Settlers of Taranaki and the Colonial Treasurer.”

I reply that it has been fully proved before this Committee, or before the Committee on Private Grievances—

*First*, That Mr. Parris did not write to the Bishop in 1858 that a combination existed to exterminate William King from the land at Waitara, nor is there the slightest ground to say that such a combination did exist;

*Secondly*, That I never did bind myself to the purchasers of land from the New Zealand Company, or to any other persons, to get possession of the Waitara, or of any other land at Taranaki;

*Thirdly*, That the negotiations for the sale of Teira's block originated with the Natives, and not with the Government.

The whole fabric, therefore, of the accusation falls to the ground.

I have made my defence so as not to involve any consideration of the merits of what is known as the Waitara Question—the merits, that is, of the pretensions advanced by the Chief Wm. King. If King has been in the wrong, as I believe he has, all ground for the charge of conspiracy is cut away. But, by affirming my political integrity upon the grounds which I have laid before them, the Committee will not pronounce upon the merits of the Waitara Question. My condemnation would, indeed, prove that the Crown had been betrayed into the commission of a great wrong, but my acquittal will establish nothing beyond the political good faith of myself and my late Colleagues.

To the subtle insinuation, that I, in some unexplained way, exerted an undue influence or pressure, I have replied in the only possible manner, by subjecting every Officer concerned to the most searching examination which I could devise, and by a frank and complete disclosure of every circumstance within my knowledge connected with the subject of investigation. I do not feel it to be necessary to comment upon the evidence thus brought under the consideration of the Committee. I could never have anticipated the necessity for such an investigation; but I am not ashamed of anything which it has brought, or can bring, to light, inasmuch as I know that, in the most secret transactions, I have never betrayed the honour of the Colony.

On motion of Mr. Speaker, the Committee adjourned until Tuesday, the 13th August, next, at 10.30 a.m.

---

TUESDAY, AUGUST 13TH, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
 “ Russell,  
 The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
 “ “ “ Henderson,

Mr. Creyke,  
 The Hon. the Speaker,  
 Mr. Fitzherbert.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond and Dr. Featherston in attendance.

Mr. Parris

Parris examined.

13th Aug., 1861.

108. Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.] Will you have the goodness to explain what the “trying circumstances of a most painful nature” were, you referred to in your letter, August 26th, 1858, to the Bishop of New Zealand?—These remarks had reference entirely to the ambush which was planted in the Karaka Pa.

109. You are certain that those remarks were without reference to any proceedings on the part of Europeans?—They had no reference whatever to any European.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, 15th, at  $\frac{1}{2}$ -past 10 a.m.

---



THURSDAY, AUGUST 15TH, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Russell,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
“ “ “ Mr. Henderson,

Mr. Creyke,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
“ Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. C. W. Richmond and Dr. Featherston in attendance.

Mr. Parris cross-examined.

110. *Dr. Featherston.*] Will you produce the letter requesting your attendance at this Committee?—I have not with me the letter requesting my attendance before this Committee,—but I can procure it, if the Committee wish. I have no copy of the letter requesting my attendance in Auckland, but I can procure one; it did not state for what purpose I was required,—merely a request for my attendance in Auckland.

*Mr. Parris*  
15th Aug., 1861.

111. How long have you been in the service of the General Government, and in what capacity?—Since June, 1857, as District Land Purchase Commissioner.

112. When did you first proceed to Taranaki as an Officer of the General Government?—I was living at Taranaki at the time of my appointment.

113. When did you first arrive in New Zealand?—In the year 1842.

114. Will you state in what Province you located yourself?—In the Settlement of New Plymouth: it was not a Province then.

115. How many years were you settled in Taranaki?—I was absent from the year 1847 to the year 1852: I believe those are the correct dates.

116. Have you had ample opportunity of becoming acquainted with the opinions and feelings both of the Settlers and Natives in that Province?—I think I have.

117. Do you know the history of that Settlement; and are you acquainted with the principal events that have occurred there since its foundation up to the present time?—Most of them, I believe.

118. Are you especially acquainted with the history of the Waitara?—I am.

119. As Land Purchaser Commissioner, you would necessarily make yourself acquainted with everything that had occurred in relation to that District?—I endeavoured to do so.

120. There are, I presume, few documents relating to that District with which you are not conversant?—Not many.

121. What is your knowledge of the Maori language; are you so far proficient in it that you understand all the Natives say, and the Maories understand all you say?—I believe I understand most they would say; and, in answer to the last portion of your question, I may say I have never found them not able to do so.

122. I place before you Wiremu Kingi's letter of the 8th June, 1844, addressed to Governor Fitzroy; [letter read, see pages 15 & 16.] have you seen that letter before?—Yes, a long time since.

Mr. Richmond enquired of the Chairman whether the Committee had decided that Dr. Featherston should now be permitted to cross-examine the Witness after his (Mr. Richmond's) statement had been put in? If so, whether he was to be at liberty to re-examine the Witness, and to put in a further statement? He did not wish to be understood, however, as raising any objection to the further examination of the Witness. He submitted to the Committee that, as he was an accused person, the Committee was in strictness bound on broad principles of justice to conform to the ordinary modes of a judicial procedure; at the same he was perfectly ready to waive any advantage which such a mode of procedure would give him.

The Chairman replied, the Committee understood that Dr. Featherston should be permitted to cross-examine the Witnesses; at the same time they were perfectly agreed on Mr. Richmond's having the privilege of re-examination and rejoinder.

Mr. Chairman of Committees desired to append the following note:—

The mode of taking evidence before a Select Committee is entirely at the discretion of the Committee, subject only to the rule contained in the Standing Orders of the House; and that it is usual to give to both parties the unrestricted right of examination and of cross-examination, at any convenient periods of the proceedings.

Mr. Richmond hereupon reiterated his assertion of his rights as an accused person, independently of any Standing Orders applicable to the ordinary proceedings of Select Committees,—but declared his perfect willingness and desire to waive any such rights.

Dr. Featherston stated that he wished the Committee clearly to understand that he was not present to substantiate any charge, but merely to state the grounds on which his suspicions rested. He wished to add that his present course of cross-examining Mr. Parris was owing to an expressed wish of the Committee.

Mr. Parris.  
15th Aug., 1861.

The Chairman referred to the Minute of the 6th August, which is as follows:—"The Chairman informed Dr. Featherston it was the wish of the Committee that he should, if he wished, be present during Mr. Richmond's examination, and that of the Witnesses."

"Dr. Featherston replied he did not desire it, but would, if the Committee wished it."

The Chairman stated that he considered that the Committee had taken no action which expressed its wish that Dr. Featherston should cross-examine Witnesses, unless at his own desire.

Mr. Fitzherbert objected to the term used by the Chairman, viz., "That Dr. Featherston should be permitted to examine Mr. Parris." Mr. Fitzherbert's recollection is that Dr. Featherston was unwilling to attend at the examination of Mr. Parris, but consented on being pressed.

Examination resumed.

123. *Dr. Featherston.*] Are not the sentiments contained in that letter very much the same as those which William King repeatedly expressed both verbally and in writing, during the recent negotiations for the purchase of a block of land at Waitara?—They are very similar, I grant, but they could not have the same effect as at the time the letter was written, inasmuch as the claimants referred to by Wm. King in his letter, were then (in 1844) opposed to the sale of the land, and are no doubt the natives who have now sold it; for at that time Rawiri, Raupongo, and Ropopama were living at Arapawa (in Queen Charlotte's Sound) Tamati Raru and other claimants were living at Waikanae with William King and his people.

124. William King in that letter asserts the right of himself and people to the Waitara, and declares their determination never to permit its alienation; did he not use precisely the same language during the negotiations for Teira's land?—Yes, for himself only.

125. I place before you a letter of the 1st September, 1855, addressed by Major Nugent to the Major of Brigade. See pages 12 & 13—[Letter read.] Have you seen that letter before, if so, how long since?—I never saw this letter before. I heard of it. I took Major Nugent the information that the natives were talking of going to the Bush, and accompanied Major Nugent and the Bishop to the Waitara.

126. Major Nugent says that the articles in the *Taranaki Herald* "do not disguise the wish of some of the writers in that paper to drive Wm. King and his people from the Waitara"; do you think there was any foundation for the charge?—I do not know.

127. Major Nugent also says, "I think for the present the Natives are reassured, but I cannot answer for the continuance of tranquillity between the races as long as such inflammatory articles are published in the newspapers, in which people of much local influence do not disguise their wishes to seize upon the land of the Natives"; do you consider that there was any foundation for that charge?—I do not believe the Settlers have ever wished to seize the land of the Natives, but were desirous to obtain it by fair and lawful means.

128. You have heard read the charges preferred by Wm. King in his speech (a copy of which was enclosed in Major Nugent's letter 1st September, 1855. See pages 12 & 13,) against Mr. Turton, and also against the Superintendent and Provincial Council of Taranaki; do you consider that there was any foundation for this charge?—I do not know.

129. Were you yourself aware of the existence of this feeling on the part of some of the Taranaki settlers?—No.

130. Do you know who the writers of leading articles in the *Taranaki Herald* were at the time referred to by Major Nugent, or who was the Editor of the paper?—I do not remember.

131. Governor Browne in his Memorandum enclosed in his Despatch to the Secretary of State (dated the 19th November, 1855) repeats the charge preferred against certain Taranaki Settlers by Major Nugent in the following words:—"Since that time various portions of land have been acquired by purchase, but there is still a deficiency, and although the greater part, and all the most respectable Settlers have abstained from expressing discontent, individuals have from time to time, in conversation, by letters, in the newspapers and otherwise, shown a strong desire to expel the Natives and take possession of the lands, to which they consider themselves entitled in right of the New Zealand Company's original purchase"; can you state to the Committee the particular circumstances which induced Governor Browne to reiterate such a charge?—I can not; I would state there was always a strong desire to obtain land by purchase, that there were two parties of Natives contending among themselves about the same question. The majority of the resident Natives, since the year 1854, have been anxious to alienate their lands, the minority being supported by disinterested tribes having no interest in the land, to the very great annoyance of the Settlers, whose properties have on many occasions been endangered by Natives coming from other parts supporting the opposition, quarrelling and fighting close to the Settlers' homesteads.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward, the Committee adjourned until Saturday at 10.15 a.m.

---

FRIDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Fitzherbert,

Mr. Renall,  
“ Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston arrived at 10 minutes past 11, and after expressing his regret at having unavoidably detained the Committee, proceeded with the cross-examination of Mr. Parris.

Mr. Parris' cross-examination continued.

Mr. Parris  
16th Aug., 1861.

132. *Dr. Featherston.*] In the same Memorandum Governor Browne, alluding to the collision between Katatore and Rawiri, alleged to have been induced by Mr. Commissioner Cooper's proceedings, says, “ The case has unfortunately been aggravated by the injudicious zeal of Mr. Turton, a Wesleyan Missionary, whose letters addressed to the Chiefs of other Tribes, as well as those in the newspapers, some of which have originated with him, have alarmed Katatore's people, and revived the old suspicion that the Europeans would not rest until they had slain and taken possession of that which the Maories liken to Naoboth's vineyard.” Do you consider that there was any foundation for this charge against Mr. Turton?—All that I know in the matter is, Mr. Turton did exert himself considerably, but whether injudiciously I am not prepared to state.

133. You cannot state in what “ his injudicious zeal ” consisted?—I cannot.

134. Can you produce any of the letters written by Mr. Turton, and referred to by His Excellency in the extract just read, and can you state what was their purport?—I cannot.

135. Can you furnish the Committee with a list of the Officers of the Provincial Government of Taranaki in 1855, at the time when the charges (to which I have called your attention) were made against the Taranaki Settlers by Wiremu Kingi, Major Nugent and Governor Browne?—I believe I could from memory, but I will furnish a correct list in writing.

136. You are acquainted with the Petition to the House of Representatives of the Provincial Council of Taranaki, dated 19th May, 1858, and I call your attention to the three last paragraphs but one of that Petition.

“ That the difficulties under which both races are now labouring can only be removed by an entire change in the policy of the Government, which shall enforce law and order among the Natives, and give support and aid to such of them as are willing to sell land.

“ That the system heretofore adopted by the Government, of requiring the assent of every claimant to any piece of land, before a purchase is made, has been found to operate most injuriously in this Province, on account of the conflicting interests of the claimants ; and that the sufferers by this system are invariably the men who are most advanced in civilization, and who possess the largest share in the common property. Your Memorialists are therefore of opinion that such of the Natives as are willing to dispose of their proportion of any common land to the Government, should be permitted to do so, whether such Natives form a majority or only a large minority of the claimants ; and that the Government should compel an equitable division of such common land among the respective claimants, on the petition of a certain proportion of them.

“ That, in the opinion of your Memorialists, no danger of a war between the Government and the Natives need be apprehended from the prosecution of a vigorous policy, inasmuch as a large proportion of the Natives themselves would cordially support it, and the remainder would, from the smallness of their number, be incapable of offering any effectual resistance.”

Do you consider the proposal then made by the Provincial Council a just and honourable one?—Not the whole of it ; my meaning is simply this, the Natives at the time were capable of offering effectual resistance. I wish to state that at that particular time a block of land was offered to the Government by a party of Natives who had taken forcible possession of it, who were not the owners, and that their resistance would have been effectual and honourable.

137. Is it not clear that this proposal was meant as the beginning of a new policy, which should enforce the partition of their lands amongst the Natives?—It would appear so from the wording of it.

With reference to question 136, I beg to state the reason why I gave the reply I did, was, the Ika Moana block of land which had been offered was the cause of the continuation of Native feuds, and produced the memorial referred to.

138. Was it not, in your opinion, the intention of the Provincial Council, that a compulsory partition of their lands should be enforced upon the Natives?—I was never aware of it, nor do I know.

139. Did not the proposal clearly indicate a desire if not determination on the part of the Provincial Council to acquire land by any means?—[Mr. Richmond objected to the question as being wholly irrelevant to the subject of enquiry, and relating to a subject on which the witness could have no special knowledge. The Chairman ruled the question might be put.]—I do not know.

The Committee adjourned until Saturday, at 10.30. a.m.

SATURDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present :—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
 “ Russell,  
 The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
 Mr. Fitzherbert,

The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
 Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
 The Hon. the Speaker.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Dr. Featherston, Mr. Richmond, and Mr. Parris in attendance.

Mr. Parris  
 17th Aug., 1861.

With reference to question 135 put yesterday Mr. Parris put in a list of the principal Officers of the Provincial Government of Taranaki in the year 1855, and stated as follows :—

“I went to the Government Offices this morning to see a Gazette published in Taranaki in the year 1855, and found that the principal Members of the Provincial Government were :—

Mr. Charles Brown, Superintendent,  
 “ Chilman, Provincial Treasurer,  
 “ C. W. Richmond, Provincial Attorney.

Cross-examination resumed.

140. *Dr. Featherston.*] Do you consider that the Provincial Council in urging upon the Government that such of the Natives as are willing to dispose of their proportion of the common land to the Government should be permitted to do so, whether such Natives form a majority or only a large minority of the claimants, or that the Government should *compel* an equitable division of such common land among the respective claimants on the petition of a certain proportion of them, represented the opinion of their constituents?—I believe they did represent the majority of the constituents.

141. Can you furnish the Committee with a list of the Members of the Provincial Council in 1858, and also a list of the Officers of the Provincial Governments in 1858?—I think I can.

142. I lay before you Mr. Carrington's letter to the Governor, dated 21st March, 1859, and call your attention to paragraph 2 :—

“It is therefore with deep concern I learn ‘That special instructions from Her Majesty preclude His Excellency from coercing a minority of the Natives into selling their lands’ without a discretionary alternative ; ‘that he felt that such a proceeding would be impolitic and unjust, and that therefore he would never sanction it,’ &c.”

Was the opinion thus expressed by Mr. Carrington concurred in by the Taranaki settlers generally, or by any considerable number of them?—I cannot say.

143. Was it not the opinion of the Provincial Council in 1858?—I never heard the Provincial Council express an opinion favorable to coercing the Natives into the sale of land.

144. I lay before you a letter from the Governor's Private Secretary to Mr. Carrington dated 22nd March, 1859, in which he states :—

“The Governor informed the deputation that he had reported at great length to Her Majesty's Government on Native Affairs in connection with the Province of Taranaki, and particularly in reference to a proposal to coerce a minority of Native proprietors who might be disinclined to sell their land.

“He expressed his opinion that such a course would be (considering our engagements with the Natives) both unjust and impolitic, and Her Majesty's Government had conveyed to him, in a Despatch received by the last mail, their unqualified approval of his views.”

Were you present at the deputation referred to?—I was not present.

Dr. Featherston called the witness's attention to the date of the deputation's waiting upon the Governor, and on some consideration the witness begged to be allowed to correct his reply, owing to a misunderstanding on the point of date. He would now say he was present at a deputation, but could not say it was the one referred to. Mr. Carrington was not a member of the deputation he accompanied.

145. Did the Deputation urge upon the Governor the views expressed by the Provincial Council in their memorial of 19th May, 1858?—Trusting to memory—the deputation urged upon the Governor the necessity of acquiring more land for the Settlers in the Province. I do not remember any other subject.

146. Did the deputation urge upon the Governor the proposal to coerce a minority of Native proprietors who might be disinclined to sell their lands?—I do not remember that they did.

147. Can you mention the names of any of those who were present, more especially of those who urged upon the Governor the proposal to coerce the Natives into selling their land?—I can mention some of the names of the Gentlemen forming the deputation, but all I could not now remember. Mr. Thomas King, Mr. Gledhill, Mr. Harry Atkinson, and I think Mr. Humphries ; but I have before stated that I do not remember their urging the Governor to coerce the Natives into selling their land, but on retiring, I distinctly remember the deputation expressing themselves entirely satisfied with the Governor's explanation relative to the difficulties connected with the purchase of land from the Natives.

148. *Mr. Russell.*] In what capacity did you attend that deputation?—At the request of the Governor, as District Land Purchase Commissioner. I would also state, Mr. Halse, Assistant Native Secretary, was present at the deputation I refer to.

*Mr. Parris.*  
17th August, 1861.

149. *Dr. Featherston.*] Referring to the Governor's Memorandum of the 19th November, 1855, in which His Excellency states "that certain proceedings had raised the suspicion that the Europeans "would not rest until they had slain and taken possession of that which the Maories liked to Naboth's "vineyard," will you state whether you have ever heard the phrase "until they had slain and taken "possession of Naboth's vineyard" used by the Natives?—I never have.

150. I lay before you your letter to the Bishop of New Zealand of 26th August, 1858, and draw your attention to the second paragraph:—

"In the absence of a Clergyman able to confer with them, I consented to talk the subject over "with them and report to your Lordship, which I have much pleasure in doing, as a member of the "Church (unworthy as I am) but not in the capacity of a Government officer, lest I should be charged "with partiality for Natives of that denomination, as some are wont to do, because I refuse to support "or countenance dishonourable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people, to exterminate "them from the Waitara in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan for the acquirement of that "delightful and much-coveted district."

Will you state by whom the district was coveted: by Europeans or Natives?—In reply to this question I wish to state that it was an unguarded expression, hurriedly written in a private letter, which I never for one moment supposed would have been so perverted as it has been, for the purpose of being made political capital. The expression principally alludes to Natives, but there are no doubt some Europeans who had a right to covet it, having paid for it 16 or 18 years previously. I would further state in so coveting it, I do not think they had a desire to expel the Natives from the district. The allusion to Mr. Turton's peremptory plan, is that Mr. Turton suggested, as near as I remember, that the justice of the case demanded that Wm. King and his Natives should be removed north of the Company's boundary.

In reply to Dr. Featherston, who submitted that this answer was not a sufficiently direct one, the Witness said: By Natives who were the present claimants of the district and had a desire to sell it to the Government, which had been the cause of the Native feuds.

151. *Mr. Fitzherbert.*] Do the Committee understand then, that the District was not coveted by Europeans?—I have already stated it might have been by those who originally purchased land in that district.

Mr. Fitzherbert submitted that the Witness's reply was an indirect one; he wished to obtain a direct affirmative or negative to his question.

The Witness stated there was no doubt but that the Europeans coveted it, so far as it could be obtained by lawful means.

152. *Chairman.*] Were you ever employed by any person apart from the Government to purchase land to the north of the Waitara?—No.

153. *Dr. Featherston.*] Am I to understand that the District was also coveted by its Native owners?—So far coveted as to enable them to sell it to the Government.

154. Can a man covet his own property?—If he is prevented making that use of it which he wishes; by might and not right.

155. Was any attempt ever made to acquire the Waitara for any particular set of Natives?—Not that I am aware of.

156. Will you describe what Mr. Turton's peremptory plan was?—I have already stated it, but I repeat it, that the justice of the Waitara question demanded that Wm. King and his people should be removed North of the Company's original boundary. He also mentioned Titirangi, which was not the original boundary; really, it was at a place called Taniwha. I wish to add that when Mr. Turton suggested this plan, the Natives who have now sold the Waitara were included in Wm. King's people.

157. I was not referring to the "justice of the Waitara question," my question was simply to enquire of you Mr. Turton's peremptory plan?—The only plan I am aware of was the one I have stated before, to remove them North of the Company's original boundary.

158. Was it any part of Mr. Turton's plan to acquire the Waitara for any particular set of Natives?—I cannot say.

159. *Chairman.*] From whence do you derive your knowledge of Mr. Turton's plan?—From the journal of Mr. Turton published in the *Taranaki Herald*, as nearly as I remember in 1855.

The clerk read the following paragraph, being selection from a "Memo. by Mr. Turton in reference to a correspondence between the Bishop of New Zealand and Mr. Parris":—

"If, therefore, his Lordship can only persuade William King to retire from the *league*, and remove, with Katatore and his people, to the other shore of the Waitara, leaving the whole of the block on this side, to be *disposed of* by those who are now its sole and rightful owners—thus causing it to be immediately occupied by a large European population—then the Ngatiruanuis would retire quietly home, and the question would be peaceably settled. But if some minor arrangement of this kind is not proposed and agreed to, then I will venture to prophecy that the final settlement of this perverse dispute, to render it effectual, will have to include the whole of the seaboard, from the White Cliffs on the one hand, to Wanganui on the other."

"When we mentioned our proposal in the last paper, we meant to say that that was the most lenient measure which, under the circumstances, would be accepted by the injured party. Otherwise, the *full justice* of the case would require, as regards William King's people, that they should be at once removed away beyond the original Surveyor's line at Titirangi; and by no means be allowed, (after all their opposition to the Government, for the past three years,) to reap the commercial advantages of the Northern banks of the Waitara, which in a short time would make them more unbearable

Mr. Parris.

17th August, 1861,

than ever. From what we know of the men and their conversation, this would be, by far, the better arrangement. And then as to the alternative—we simply prognosticated, from our entire knowledge of the question, if some such mode of settlement as the one alluded to, were not adopted, that the future consequences would be such as to involve the whole of the Province, both North and South, in any final arrangement that would require to be made."

160. Having heard read the portion of Mr. Turton's Memorandum, is that the plan alluded to?—It is.

161. *Dr. Featherston.*] Will you reconcile your explanation given the other day in answer to Mr. Weld's question, to the effect that your charge of "dishonourable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people, to exterminate them from the Waitara," applied not to Europeans but to Natives, with your subsequent words that such treatment "was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan for the acquirement of that delightful and much-coveted district?"—I have already stated the expression was an unguarded one, and I now beg to state that the terms "treacherous" and "dishonourable" were applied to the Natives only, to those who attempted to take a dishonourable advantage of what I had been doing solely for their benefit.

162. Will you reconcile your present statement with your words "that such treatment was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan"?—I have a difficulty in reconciling the expression "in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan"; the only plan which I knew of at the time, which was purely a Native plan, *i.e.*, the one of the ambush in the Karaka Pah which, had it taken effect, would in all probability have resulted in the destruction of a number of Wm. King's people, if not in the removal of them North of the Company's boundary.

163. Do I understand you to admit that you cannot reconcile your explanation "that the words treacherous and dishonourable applied to Natives" with your subsequent words that such treatment was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan?—By no other explanation than that I have already given.

164. You express yourself as "under apprehension of being charged with partiality for certain Natives"; do you mean to say that you were afraid of Natives making such charges?—That applied to the part which I took on behalf of Wm. King and his people, who were Natives of the Church of England, whilst those in the Karaka Pa were principally Wesleyans; many of the Europeans, who were not aware of the part I had taken, censured me for preventing the ambuscade being carried out.

165. Were you afraid of Europeans or Natives making these charges against you?—I could not say that I was under apprehension; I wished to guard myself against being charged.

Mr. Richmond submitted to the Committee that he objected to the course of cross-examination by Dr. Featherston; he objected only on the grounds of the useless consumption of the Committee's time. He (Mr. R.) had already admitted what Dr. Featherston was endeavouring to elicit, *i.e.*, that Mr. Parris had been censured by the Europeans, and particularly by the Editor of the *Taranaki Herald*. He (Mr. R.) did not object to any question except as needlessly delaying the Report of the Committee—the more questions the better so long as they were relevant.

After some further remarks by Members of the Committee, the Chairman requested Dr. Featherston to continue his cross-examination.

166. I lay before you your letter to the Private Secretary, dated December 21st, 1860, and direct your attention to paragraph 5:—"My letter to the Bishop of New Zealand alluded to these attacks of the local press and those of many of the settlers who were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and who view the frustration of the ambush as inimical to land purchases"; is the letter here referred to the letter you addressed to the Bishop on the 26th August, 1858?—It is.

167. How then do you reconcile the statement just referred to in your letter of the 21st December, 1860, with your reply to Mr. Weld?—I have already explained the difference between Natives and Europeans—the part each took; the term "dishonourable and treacherous" applied to the Natives for reasons the Europeans were not then in possession of—with the two exceptions, Mr. Whiteley and the then Editor of the *Taranaki Herald*—the latter had taken great interest in the Natives at the Karaka Pa, and was the only one, save Mr. Whiteley, who knew the arrangements I had been endeavouring to carry out with Wm. King, and I therefore felt his remarks in the *Taranaki Herald* to be censuring me for doing what he was as anxious for as any one.

Mr. Cracroft Wilson requested the Chairman to order all persons other than Members of the Committee to withdraw, and on the room being cleared,

Mr. Cracroft Wilson called the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the same question was being put by Dr. Featherston over and over again, and that the question did not relate to any facts of which the Witness was cognizant, but to a discrepancy which Dr. Featherston imagined existed between a written letter and *viva voce* evidence of the Witness; that the Witness had done his best to reconcile the apparent discrepancy; that the repeating the question savoured of unfairness towards the Witness, to which Mr. Cracroft Wilson objected, and was moreover wasting the time of the Committee, which had already sat three days listening to the cross-examination of the Witness by Dr. Featherston.

After some discussion,

The Chairman stated that it had hitherto been the wish of the Committee that Dr. Featherston should be allowed to conduct the cross-examination in whatever manner he wished, and consequently he did not think it proper, whilst admitting the force of many of Mr. Cracroft Wilson's objections, to deviate from that course in a thin attendance of Members of this Committee.

168. *Dr. Featherston.*] You stated, in your reply to Mr. Weld, that your charge of treacherous and dishonourable treatment applied to Natives; in your letter to the Private Secretary of 21st December, 1860, you state that the charge contained in your letter to the Bishop referred to attacks of the local press and of many of "the settlers who were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and who viewed

the frustration of the ambush as inimical to land purchases"; will you reconcile these statements?—I have already stated the part that applied to Europeans, and the part that applied to Natives; I did not state in my letter to the Private Secretary that the Europeans had been guilty of anything treacherous or dishonourable, but that I had been censured for refusing to countenance such conduct.

Mr. Parris.

17th August, 1861.

169. Do you not make in your letter to the Private Secretary this charge, "that many of the Settlers were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and that they blamed and attacked you for preventing Wm. King and his people falling into the ambushade because the frustration of the ambush was inimical to land purchases"?—I admit the statement in the letter, the expression "obtaining land by any means" meant any means that would facilitate the purchase of land.

Mr. Fitzherbert wished, before the cross-examination was continued, to put a statement on record. It would be desirable that, previous to any discussion on the same, all persons other than Members of the Committee should withdraw; and, on the clerk clearing the room, the following statement was handed in by Mr. Fitzherbert:—

In reference to the objection made by Mr. Cracroft Wilson, Mr. Fitzherbert here wishes to state that, from his observation of the nature of the replies given by the Witness (Mr. Parris), the repetition of the same question (in different shapes), in order to elicit a reply, is, in his opinion, necessary.

And on the Witness being recalled, Dr. Featherston continued his cross-examination of Mr. Parris.

170. Will you mention the names of some of the many Settlers referred to in the paragraph just quoted in question 169?—The then Editor of the *Taranaki Herald*, Mr. Richard Brown, was one; there were also some remarks in the *Taranaki News* (Editor, Mr. Finnie). I was also censured in the hotel, while taking some refreshments, by various parties, Messrs. Greenwood, Dickson, Woon, Finnie, and many others whom I do not now remember, neither can I remember who raised the question. I was also censured by some ladies in a store.

171. Are those some of the parties who were desirous of acquiring land by any means?—Those are some who were desirous to obtain land by any means that would facilitate the purchase of it.

Dr. Featherston called the Witness's attention to this reply, it was not an answer to his question, he must put the question again.

Mr. Parris stated, I admit what I have stated, and I endeavour to give satisfactory explanation of those statements as far as I can; on matters of opinion I decline to answer. If the Committee think my answer an unsatisfactory one, I will add a further explanation.

The Chairman requested Mr. Parris (if possible), to give a fuller reply.

In continuation of my reply to the last question, I have no hesitation in stating further, that as there were two parties of Natives contending in the District upon the question of the sale of land, the stronger were opposed to selling, and the weaker, for a number of years, had been endeavouring to sell to the Government; the settlers, not knowing my position with the two parties as an intercessor, very naturally were of opinion that, had the ambush been carried out, the question would have been very much simplified.

172. And those Settlers blamed you for preventing the ambushade?—I was blamed.

173. I lay before you, the Bishop of New Zealand's letter to Governor Browne, and direct your attention to paragraph 3, (i. e.):—

"Mr. Parris's letter was written to me on the 26th August, 1858, to give me a report of an effort made by the Taranaki tribe to obtain a clergyman to reside among them. In the course of his letter, Mr. Parris was led to state the anxiety of mind which he felt for the Natives of his District, and spoke of plans which had been suggested for the acquisition of the Waitara. I understood him to refer to plans of the same kind as those against which I had remonstrated in my Pastoral Letter in 1855. I have shown Mr. Parris's letter only to a few persons, and have constantly refused to allow it to be published. As, however, it has been publicly mentioned, it will probably be found to be the best course to allow it now to be published, but I shall not do this without Mr. Parris's consent. The only use which I have made of it has been to shew that the danger arising from the excessive eagerness of some of the Taranaki Settlers to obtain possession of the Waitara, was the same in 1858 as I had represented it in 1855."

Do you admit the construction put by his Lordship upon your letter to him of the 26th August, 1858?—I do not: I did not mean to remark (that is imply), that any plans had been suggested; I never denied the strong desire of the Settlers to acquire land.

174. Did you not, in that letter, refer to any plans that had been suggested for the acquisition of the Waitara?—None whatever.

175. Did you not refer to the peremptory plan of Mr. Turton in your letter to the Bishop?—I did; those plans were suggested three years previously by the justice of the case demanding William King and his people's removal to the District North of the Company's boundary.

176. I place before you the Bishop's of New Zealand's letter to yourself of the 2nd January, 1861, worded as follows:—

"In compliance with the request contained in your letter of 28th December, 1860, I herewith furnish you with a copy of your letter to me of August 26th, 1858, and transmit it as you desire, through the Private Secretary.

"You will see from the tenor of the letter, that it was not a private communication to me, nor written at my request, but a public document written at the request of twenty Natives of the Taranaki tribe on a subject of common interest, and forwarded by you, not as a private friend, but as a member of the Church in the absence of a clergyman able to confer with the Natives."

"Your incidental mention of the state of feeling between the English Settlers and the Natives contained nothing new or private. It related only to the plans of Mr. Turton and others, the

Mr. Parris.  
17th August, 1861.

"mischievous character of which had already been exposed by His Excellency Governor Gore Browne in his Memorandum of November 19th, 1855 (Parl. Papers, July 1860, page 177) and "by me in my Pastoral Letter of the same year. Your opposition to those plans was as well known "and open as mine, or it would not have exposed you to the invidious remarks to which your letter "refers.

"I can see no reason why you should now wish to conceal or retract a single word of that "letter, which is as honorable to your feelings as it is favorable to the Native character. Having "placed the letter, at your request, in the hands of the Government, I shall reserve to myself the "full discretion of giving any further publicity to it, which I may hereafter consider necessary."

Do you admit the construction put by the Bishop in his letter upon your letter to him of the 26th August, 1858?—I admit it.

177. Mr. Richmond.] Did your letter refer to plans proposed by Mr. Turton only, or to plans proposed by Mr. Turton and others, as stated by the Bishop?—To Mr. Turton only; my letter is a sufficient explanation of that.

178. Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.] Did you mean, by admitting the construction contained in the Bishop's letter of January 2nd, 1861, that you ever supposed that the Bishop had a right to show your letter—26th August, 1858—to any person?—Certainly not.

Mr. Fitzherbert moved, That this Committee, having sat from half-past 10 a. m. until 4 p. m., do now adjourn.

Amendment moved by the Chairman, That this Committee, having sat from half-past 10 a. m. until 4 p. m., do adjourn at half-past 5.

And, on the original question being put, the Committee divided, when there were:—

Ayes, 1.  
Mr. Fitzherbert,

Noes, 3.  
Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
„ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
„ Weld, Chairman,

And so it passed in the negative.

Cross-examination resumed by Dr. Featherston.

179. Did I understand you to say the other day, "that the offer of the land at Waitara was "first made in March 1859, and that no one was aware beforehand of the intention of Teira to "make the offer which he made at the meeting of March, 1859"?—On the arrival of the Governor, the Natives both North and South came to the town to pay their respects to him, including the Taranaki, Ngamotu, Puketapu, and Waitara people, and were all present when the offer was first made by Te Teira of his land to the Government.

180. Were you yourself aware?—I was.

181. When were you first aware of Teira's desire to make the offer?—Twelve months previously; perhaps more.

On motion of Mr. Fitzherbert, the Committee adjourned until Monday next, at half-past 10,

---

MONDAY, AUGUST 19TH, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:

Mr. Fitzherbert,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
" Creyke,

Mr. Russell,  
" Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
The Hon. the Speaker,

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of preceding meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. Parris in attendance.

Mr. Chairman of Committees moved for leave to acquaint the Bishop of New Zealand with the charge preferred against him by Mr. Richmond, contained in the written statement received by this Committee on the 9th instant,—namely, that of improperly disclosing the contents of a letter, and expressed in the following words:—" Secret thoughts and feelings expressed by Mr. Parris in confidence, under the seal of privacy, to his Spiritual teacher, to his Father in God, have been wilfully disclosed,—not to the Governor of the Colony,—not to the official superiors of Mr. Parris, but to a prominent political opponent of the Government, to a party leader for a party purpose. As was to be expected in such a case, the true meaning of the passionate and involved expressions of Mr. Parris' letter to the Bishop has been utterly perverted."

Which terms are contradictory to His Lordship's statement, (2nd January, 1861,) that the letter was not a private communication to himself, nor written at his request, but a public document written at the request of twenty Natives of the Taranaki tribe, on a subject of common interest, and forwarded by Mr. Parris, not as a private friend, but as a member of the Church, "in the absence of a Clergyman able to confer with the Natives."



Moved as an Amendment by the Hon. the Speaker, That the Question be not put, being entirely irrelevant to the subject before the Committee, and in opposition to the rules of the Standing Orders of the House.

And on the Original Motion being put, the Committee divided, when there were,

*Ayes*, 2.  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
“ Chairman of Committees.

*Noes*, 4.  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Russell,  
“ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Weld.

And so it passed in the negative.

On the Amendment being put the Committee divided when there were,

*Ayes*, 4.  
The Hon. Mr. Speaker,  
Mr. Weld,  
“ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Russell.

*Noes*, 2.  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
“ Fitzherbert.

Mr. Creyke declined to vote.

Question proposed by Mr. Chairman of Committees, That the Bishop of New Zealand be desired to attend before this Committee, with a view to his being examined in regard to that portion of Mr. Richmond's defence, which is based on the alleged improper disclosure by his Lordship of the contents of a letter.

Mr. Fitzherbert moved the adjournment of the Debate until the next meeting of the Committee, in order to ensure a fuller attendance,

The Committee divided on the question of adjournment, and there were,

*Ayes*, 3.  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
“ Weld,

*Noes*, 4.  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
“ Creyke,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Russell.

And so it passed in the negative.

Motion made and Question put, That Mr. Chairman of Committees have leave to withdraw his Motion, on which the Committee divided, when there were,

*Ayes*, 4.  
Mr. Weld,  
“ Fitzherbert,  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees.

*Noes*, 3.  
Mr. Creyke,  
“ Russell,  
“ Cracroft Wilson, C.B.

And so it passed in the affirmative.

Mr. Parris produced a List of Members of the Provincial Council of Taranaki in 1858:

*Town District*.—Edward Larwill Humphries, Isaac Newton Watt, James Cragg Sharland, Francis Ullathorne Gledhill.

*Grey and Bell*.—Wm. King Hulke, Harry Albert Atkinson, Robert Maxwell Sunley, William Bayly, Thomas King, George Yates Lethbridge, Peter Elliott.

*Omata*.—Richard Brown, William Outfield King, Alfred William East, Henry Henson Wood.

182. *Dr. Featherston*.] Will you look over Wm. King's letter to the Governor, dated Waitara, February 11th, 1859, (E—No. 3A., p. 5):—

“Waitara, February 11th, 1859.

Mr. Parris.  
19 August, 1861.

“FRIEND, GOVERNOR,—

“Salutations to you! I have a word to say to you and to Mr. McLean. Do you hearken to our Runanga respecting the land. Do you hearken. The boundary commences at Waitaha, thence along the boundary of Tarururangi to Mangaraka, thence on till it reaches Waiongana,—it there ends; again it proceeds along the course of the Waiongana stream till it reaches the boundary of Paritutu, where that ends; again it commences at the mouth of the Waitaha, thence along the coast line in a Northerly direction to Waiongana, Waitara, Turangi, Waiau, Onaero, Urenui, Kaweka, Kupuriki, Waiti, Paraeroa, Karakaura, Te Kawau, Poutama, and Mowhakatino. The boundary of the land which is for ourselves is at Mokau. These lands will not be given by us into the Governor's and your hands, lest we resemble the sea birds which perch upon a rock—when the tide flows, the rock is covered by the sea, and the birds take flight, for they have no resting-place. I, therefore, bethought me of what was said in former times about holding land. My word is not a new word, it is an old one. Governor Hobson, Governor Fitzroy, and Governor Grey have all heard it; and, now that you have come, O Governor Browne, I send the same word to you that I sent to the Governors to hold back my land. You, O Mr. McLean, are aware of that word of mine; when you first came here and saw me, you heard the same word from me—‘I will not give the land to you.’”

183. To what land does Wm. King refer?—The land included from Waitaha, South, to Mokau, North,—it includes Teira's block.

*Mr. Parris.*

19 August, 1861.

184. How do you reconcile your statement that Teira's offer was first made in March, 1859, with the following one, in your letter to the Chief Commissioner, dated September 13th, 1860, (1860, E—No. 4, paragraphs 1, 2, 3,) as follows:—

"I have the honor to forward for your information the following further particulars relative to meetings and interviews with the Waitara Natives, for the purpose of discussing and investigating the title to the block of land sold by Teira and party to the Government.

"The first meeting was convened by Teira, to declare publicly his intention in the matter, on the 28th November, 1857, at the Kuhikahi Pa, Waitara, which meeting I attended. On that occasion, Rawiri Rauponga appeared undecided, although both he and Patukakariki had intimated to me their desire to sell land on the South bank of the Waitara. Patukakariki has some substantial claims in the pieces excluded from the block sold by Teira and party. Wm. King has also two very small allotments there. For this reason, I refused to allow that part to be included in the block, although the parties selling are the largest claimants there. Previously to this, Horima Kumukumu had been to inform me that his father, Patukakariki, had decided to sell the land in question, on account of disputes they had had with some of Wm. King's people about the occupation of it,—and very shortly after this he died: had he survived, I have no doubt that he and his father would have supported the sale, and that they would have sold also the piece of land to which they have substantial claims, but which is now excluded from the purchase. At the before-mentioned meeting, Teira, Retimana, and Hemi Pataka, spoke and declared their intention to sell their land. They warned Rauponga and Patukakariki not to betray them, intimating that they had encouraged them privately to be strong in the matter, but now were afraid to speak out. William King was the only man who spoke for the opposition. He said nothing about claims to the land; but threatened war, if any land was sold,—as he did also in his letter to Ihiaia and Nikorima, respecting the sale of the Tarurutangi block?"

—That letter does not say the land was offered. Teira convened a meeting to talk over the matter; I was present, but the land was not offered to me.

185. You commenced negotiations with Teira and others in November, 1857, and continued them off and on till March, 1859, when you received positive instructions?—I did not commence negotiations for the land in 1857, unless my attending the meeting can be construed into the same. I submit it could not be negotiated for, unless offered for sale.

186. When did you commence negotiations for the Waitara block?—I do not remember waiting upon Wm. King and his people to negotiate, before the land was offered by Teira, in March, 1859; but, knowing that there was a desire on the part of some of the claimants to sell, I endeavoured to make myself acquainted with the question.

187. You state in your letter, September 13th, 1860, (E—No. 4, page 4,) "The negotiations for the Tarurutangi block were resumed at the request of the Natives themselves, and reopened Teira's offer as a collateral question;" when was Teira's offer reopened?—I do not remember the exact month, but it must have been towards the middle of the year 1858.

188. You stated the other day that, previous to Teira's offer in March, 1859, you had never received any instructions or suggestions from any member of the late Government with regard to acquiring land at the Waitara; did you never receive any instructions from Mr. McLean?—I do not remember that I ever did.

189. Did you ever intimate to the Government that you had commenced negotiations, towards the middle of 1858, with Teira for a block of land at Waitara; and if so, when?—I believe I reported the meeting that took place in 1857, and, no doubt, intimated to the Government there was a desire on the part of some of the Natives, to sell land at Waitara.

190. Did you intimate to the Government that you had commenced operations with Teira, when the question was reopened, in 1858?—I do not remember: if I did, the letter would be on record.

191. Were you aware of His Excellency Governor Browne's disapproval of Mr. Commissioner Cooper's conduct, in 1858, "in commencing [I quote His Excellency's words] a survey before he was assured that all who had even a disputed claim to the land desired it should be sold, and that His Excellency had declined to make a demand for reparation which could only be enforced at the expense of a general war?"—Not being in the service of the Government at the time, I was not aware of the Governor's views on the subject.

192. Were there not many Natives who had, at any rate, disputed claims to portions of Teira's block, who not only did not desire to have it sold, but protested against its sale?—They never protested to me; only in the shape of a general protest, against the sale of land within the boundary alluded to in Wm. King's letter—that of Waitaha and Mokau—but always refused to explain their claims in Teira's block.

193. In your letter of the 16th February, 1860, addressed to the Colonial Treasurer, you stated that, at a meeting, Wm. King used these words:—"I will not consent to divide the land, because my father's dying words and instructions were to hold it." What was the date of that meeting?—On the Monday previous to February 16th.

194. Was that the only occasion on which Wm. King used that or a similar expression?—He generally used that expression when I was talking with him on the subject.

195. In your letter to Mr. C. W. Richmond, of the 21st September, 1859, you hold out no hope of Wm. King withdrawing his opposition to the sale, and you state that you are looking out for the arrival of Mr. McLean, as the state of Teira's question is such that it is desirable it shall be settled one way or the other. In your letter to Mr. C. W. Richmond, of November 19th, 1859, you express a hope that His Excellency will not think that you have unnecessarily delayed paying an instalment, "for it was a matter which gave you great anxiety of mind on Teira's account;" and, in your letter to Chief Commissioner McLean, of the 2nd December, 1859, (1860, E—No.

3, page 36,) you say, "Teira stops in town since he received the instalment, considering it not safe for him to stop at Waitara." Are the Committee to infer from that statement that you apprehended that going on with the purchase would lead to a collision between the Natives themselves, or between them and the Governor?—The state of things in our district had been such previously, that Natives themselves considered they were not safe when offering land to the Government, as the opposition had declared that any who did so should be killed—and hence arose my anxiety about Teira's safety.

196. Did you apprehend that proceeding with the purchase would lead to a collision between the Natives and the Government?—I was of opinion that for the honor of the Government it was quite time that the Native question in Taranaki should be met boldly in justice to the Natives, who for a very long time (since the year 1854) had kept the District in a state of commotion, quarrelling, fighting and destroying each other. What I mean by meeting the question boldly, is, that the Natives seeing the Government were determined to meet the question boldly, would have withdrawn their opposition.

Dr. Featherston submitted the Witness had not given a direct answer to his question, and he therefore should put the question again.

On the question being read over to the Witness by the clerk, he replied, I did not.

197. Is it your duty, as District Land Commissioner, to keep the Governor advised of the state of the Native mind,—particularly in reference to negotiations for purchase of land?—I presume it is.

198. Did you ever address any remonstrance to the Governor against persisting in the attempt to acquire this land?—No.

199. What construction did you put on the following passage in Mr. C. W. Richmond's private letter to yourself of the 27th August, 1859: "The Governor is very anxious about the completion of the purchase from Teira. I am sure you will press the matter as fast as appears prudent. It would satisfy the Governor if, without writing officially, you would let me know privately how things stand. I have been in hopes that Mr. McLean would effect something, but he delays so long. The Governor feels he is pledged to effect the purchase."—The inference I drew from that paragraph was, that I was left free to continue the negotiation.

200. Was the following Memorandum of the Governor transmitted to you?—"Instructions should be sent to Taranaki to close the purchase of Teira's land, which was commenced when I was there, with as little delay as possible. There is little chance of Mr. McLean reaching Taranaki for some time."—No, it was not.

201. The Governor having declared "that he felt himself pledged to effect the purchase," did you contemplate the possibility of His Excellency, under any circumstances, retreating from the position he had assumed?—I did not.

202. What induced you to express a hope in your letter of the 19th November, 1859, "that His Excellency would not think that you had unnecessarily delayed paying an instalment?"—The document referred to explains. Just about that time the Ngatiruanui people were in the District visiting the Native villages for the first time since the murder of Rawiri Waiau, and I considered that it would be injudicious to proceed with the payment of the instalment whilst they were in the District; as there was a little delay on that account, I expressed a hope that His Excellency would not consider the delay had been unnecessary.

203. Did you consider that, after Mr. Smith, in his letter to Teira, dated 19th July, 1859, declared "that the Governor had agreed to take the land," "that the Governor's word would be kept," that His Excellency would neither forget nor alter,"—you had any option or discretion in the matter?—Yes, I considered if I could have reported that the claim was not a good one, the Governor would have withdrawn.

204. When did you commence the enquiry into Teira's title, and for what period or periods was your enquiry suspended?—I commenced my enquiry, as before stated shortly after the first meeting was held in 1857, and the enquiry was only suspended during my absence in Waikato. I never ceased making enquiries, during the peace negotiations betwixt Ihiaia and Nikorima and Wm. King's people—without pressing meetings of Wm. King's people and Teira's people, while those negotiations were pending.

205. Was the enquiry ever completed?—My official reports will show. Yes, so far as Wm. King's bearing would allow of its being completed; he having refused to give any explanation further than those I officially reported, I continued to wait upon Wm. King so long, that I gave offence to the sellers, who declared Wm. King should not receive any of the payment.

206. How do you reconcile this with the Governor's declaration contained in the terms of peace offered to the Ngatiawas, "That the investigation of the title and survey of the land at Waitara was to be continued and completed without interruption"?—Considering that a matter of opinion, I must decline to answer it.

207. Are you aware that a Commissioner has been appointed to investigate claims in that particular block?—I am not.

208. Supposing Mr. Richmond's letter of the 27th August, 1859, had been official instead of private, would you have pressed on your enquiry and proceedings more rapidly?—Certainly not more rapidly than I did.

209. Have you ever previously been asked by the Government to transact public business of importance by private correspondence?—I before have been requested to correspond privately, but not with any view to keep the question referred to private, as far as I am aware.

210. What particular advantage was it supposed would accrue to the public service from a departure from the regular practice in the case of the Waitara?—I do not know.

211. Is not one of the results of such a practice to prevent the correspondence being made public?—I cannot say.

Mr. Parris.

19 August, 1861.

*Mr. Parris.*

19 August, 1861.

212. Would it not have had that effect in the present case, had Mr. Richmond not voluntarily placed this private correspondence with you before the Committee?—Not that I am aware of.

213. Did you ever hear of a proposal to lay out a township at Waitara, and of the plan under which the New Zealand Company's Land Purchasers were to have a town acre given them in addition to a certain quantity of rural and suburban land?—I did not.

214. Had you at any time, or have you now, personally, an interest in any lands at Waitara?—Not any whatever,—never had.

This closed Dr. Featherston's cross-examination of Mr. Parris.

Dr. Featherston stated he wished to call Mr. F. A. Carrington. Mr. Richmond had charged him with inventing the last paragraph referred to in Mr. Augustus B. Abraham's petition, (namely, paragraph No. 29), and it was necessary that Mr. Carrington should be examined.

Re-examination of Mr. Parris by Mr. Richmond.

Can you state whether I was ever a Member of the Provincial Council of New Plymouth?—Not to my knowledge; I can state that you never were.

As legal adviser of the Superintendent was it understood that I was a political Officer or had any share in the Provincial Government?—It was not. You were simply fixed upon by vote of the Provincial Council as the gentleman to be referred to for legal opinions.

215. You have stated that you were not aware who edited the "Taranaki Herald" at the date of Major Nugent's letter, can you state who were the editors of the "Herald" during the period, say from 1852 to 1855—to the best of your recollection?—The editorship changed hands during that time, but I do not remember at what particular date. Mr. Crompton was editor, and afterwards Mr. Phene. I am not aware of any other editor during that period.

216. In your letter to the Bishop of New Zealand, 26th August, 1858, did you allude to any plan or proposition for removing Wm. King from the Waitara, except Mr. Turton's proposition, made in his journal, and published in the "Taranaki Herald" of 1855?—No other plan whatever. The allusion had reference to the plan of the Natives, which if carried out, would no doubt have cleared them from the District; and it was merely the clearance from the District caused my allusion to Mr. Turton's plan.

On motion of Mr. Speaker, the Committee adjourned until To-morrow at 10.30 a.m.

TUESDAY, 20TH AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Creyke,  
Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
" Fitzherbert,

Mr. Russell,  
" Renall,  
" Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
Hon. Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of preceding meeting read and confirmed.

Mr. Parris and Mr. F. A. Carrington in attendance.

Mr. C. W. Richmond and Dr. Featherston present.

Re-examination of Mr. Parris continued by Mr. Richmond.

*Mr. Parris.*

20 August, 1861.

217. When in your letter of September 13th, 1860, [1860, E. 4, p. 29,] you speak of Teira's offer being re-opened about nine months after Katatore's murder, i.e., about October, 1858,—by whom do you mean that the question was re-opened?—By the Natives themselves.

218. Had you at that time commenced negotiations with Teira's party for the purchase of the block?—No.

219. Did you at that time take any part in the discussions and negotiations which were taking place amongst the Natives themselves?—No; I was merely a listener.

No Member of the Committee desiring to put further questions to this Witness, he was discharged from attendance.

Mr. Chairman of Committees Moved, and Question was proposed, That the Bishop of New Zealand be desired to attend before this Committee, with a view to his being examined in regard to that portion of Mr. Richmond's defence which is based on the alleged improper disclosure by His Lordship of the contents of a letter.

The Committee divided, when there were:—

Ayes, 3.  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson.

Noes, 5.  
Mr. Creyke,  
Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Russell,  
" Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
" Weld.

And so it passed in the negative.

Mr. F. A. Carrington called and examined.

Mr. F. A. Carrington.

20th Aug., 1861.

216. *Dr. Featherston.*] Will you read over the paragraphs in Mr. Abraham's Petition numbered 27, 28, 29? I wish you to state what took place between you and Mr. Richmond?—There was no compact entered into. The Land Orders and Scrip Act of 1856 was about being amended when I had an interview with Mr. Richmond, and the result was, so far as concerned the claimants of land at the Waitara, that whereas we were to receive by the original Act only 12½ acres of suburban land or 50 acres of rural land for every 50 acres of land which we had originally selected, it was conceded by Mr. Richmond that we should receive 37½ acres of suburban land or 75 acres of rural land. Mr. Richmond said, Are you satisfied with that, Mr. Carrington? I said, I am. Mr. Richmond then said to me, Be so good as to put it in writing in the form of a letter and send it to me; which I did. The letter is published, and is as follows:—

*Land Orders and Scrip Act.*

"Auckland, 2nd August, 1858.

"SIR,—

"In reference to the individuals who, under the judicial award of Her Majesty's Commissioner of Land Claims, own land in the Waitara district, in the Province of New Plymouth, I now do myself the honor to state that I, on the part of myself and those I represent, (namely, Edward Rose Tunno and Edwin Down,) am willing to abide by the conditions of clause 8 of the amended Act, substituting for 12½ acres of suburban land 37½ acres; for 50 acres of rural land 75 acres.

"I have, &c.,

"F. A. CARRINGTON.

"The Honorable C. W. Richmond,

"Colonial Treasurer,

"Auckland."

217. Is that the letter referred to in Mr. Abraham's Petition?—Yes.

218. Did Mr. Richmond ever represent that it would be unfair to purchase the Waitara unless the New Zealand Company's land claimants abandoned the selections?—No, he did not state that. What Mr. Richmond stated, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I am pretty clear on the subject, was, You cannot expect the Province to go to the expense of acquiring the Waitara land, and then hand it over to you and your friends.

219. When did Mr. Richmond make that statement?—At the time that we had that interview. The interview referred to in my letter, the date of the letter will show.

220. Was that before the arrangement?—It was at the same interview before the letter was written.

221. Did you ever mention that statement to any one?—I have mentioned it once in a strictly private conversation.

222. Do you consider yourself at liberty to divulge to whom that statement was mentioned?—I would rather not mention, because I think it involves a name it would be better to avoid introducing.

223. Have you any objection to state what the reply of that party was?—No, I have not. The reply of the party was "Did he say so? then he had no right to do so."

224. *Mr Fitzherbert.*] Will you refer to the letter? It is addressed to Mr. Richmond as Colonial Treasurer. Was that the office he held at that time?—It was.

225. Was he in office as Native Minister?

Mr. Richmond submitted the question was irrelevant; he objected to its being put; it had been admitted already in evidence that he held that office.

The Chairman stated that, as the fact was already in evidence, it was certainly useless to waste the time of the Committee by putting it again.

Mr. Fitzherbert did not wish to press the question, he would put another one.

226. Did you of your own knowledge know whether at that time Mr. Richmond was Minister for Native Affairs?—I understood him to be so.

Witness discharged from further attendance.

On motion of Mr. Creyke the Committee adjourned until Thursday at 10.30, a.m.

THURSDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.

"Creyke,

Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,

Mr. Renall,

"Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Fitzherbert,

Hon. the Speaker,

Mr. Russell,

Hon. Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Minutes of preceding Meeting read and confirmed.

Moved by Mr. Weld, That there is no ground whatever for any imputation that undue pressure has been brought to bear in the Executive by Mr. C. W. Richmond on the Waitara Question, and that this Committee considers his vindication to be complete.

Amendment proposed, that the following words be inserted after the initial:—"while circumstances may have given rise to the suspicions which have been referred to this Committee for investigation, the Committee finds that." [Mr. C. Ward.]

Amendment put, the Committee divided, and there were:—

*Ayes, 5.*  
Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
" Fitzherbert,  
Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Renall.

*Noes, 6.*  
Mr. Creyke,  
" Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,  
Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Russell,  
" Weld,  
The Chairman.

So it passed in the negative.

And on the Original Motion being proposed, an Amendment was proposed by Mr. Chairman of Committees, That the following words be inserted after the word "Committee":—"without imputing blame to Dr. Featherston."

Amendment put, the Committee divided, when there were:—

*Ayes, 6.*  
Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
" Renall,  
" Russell.

*Noes, 4.*  
Mr. Creyke,  
Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.  
" Weld.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

And on the Motion as amended being put, the Committee divided, when there were:—

*Ayes, 9.*  
The Hon. Mr. Crosbie Ward,  
Mr. Chairman of Committees,  
The Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
Mr. Fitzherbert,  
" Renall,  
" Russell.  
The Hon. the Speaker,  
Mr. Creyke,  
" Weld.

*Nay, 1.*  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

In reference to the Amendments, the Hon. the Speaker wished to record his objection to the insertion of the words "without imputing blame to Dr. Featherston" not being within the scope of the matter referred to the Committee.

Mr. Creyke desired to record the same objection.

Mr. Cracroft Wilson protests against the insertion of the words "without imputing blame to Dr. Featherston," because the question to which they refer is without the province and beyond the scope of this Committee.

On motion of Mr. Fitzherbert, the Committee adjourned until Friday, at half-past 10, to receive the report from the Chairman.

---

FRIDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1861.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present:—

Mr. Creyke,  
" Chairman of Committees,  
" Russell,

Mr. Weld in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Henderson,  
" The Speaker,  
Mr. Cracroft Wilson, C.B.,

Minutes of last Meeting read and confirmed.

Report brought up by the Chairman, read and approved, and ordered to be presented to the House.

Committee adjourned *sine die*

---

## APPENDIX.

The whole of Mr. Parris' private correspondence was laid before the Committee in full, and placed at their disposal. Such portions as were clearly irrelevant have been epitomized by order of the Committee.

F. A. WELD,  
Chairman.

### No. 1.

Letter No. 1.—Mr. Parris to C. W. Richmond, Esq., dated 21st June, 1859. Describes circumstances of Ihaia's attempt to give himself up to Wm. Kingi and his people. States that Kingi has been trying to stop the work at the tunnel through the White Cliffs near Mokau, and concludes as follows : "Teira is getting very anxious about his offer, which is regarded as the turning point of the Land question in this Province. If bought, the Natives say all will go, and, *vice versa*, if not, none will."

Letter No. 2.—Mr. Parris to C. W. Richmond, Esq., dated 6th July, 1859. Submits questions respecting the administration of the Native Reserves at New Plymouth, and the right of certain Natives to be put in possession of lands over which they had a right of pre-emption reserved to them by the deed of Cession. Does not notice the Waitara question.

Letter No. 3.—Mr. Parris to C. W. Richmond, Esq., dated 6th August, 1859. Reports his exploration of proposed line of road from New Plymouth, via Motukaramu and Waipa, to Auckland. Recommends a loan to the sons of Ta Kerei of Awakino. This letter is written from Otawhao, and bears a Minute by the Governor respecting the Loan.

Letter No. 4.—Mr. Parris to C. W. Richmond, Esq., dated 20th August, 1859. Reports his return from journey of exploration. Narrates circumstances connected with the prosecution of Wi Te Ahoaho and Bishop for obstructing the road leading to the Waiwakaiho bridge. Requests to be informed if there is any probability of an alteration of the Mail route from Auckland to New Plymouth to the inland line (via Motukaramu) and presses for an answer to his inquiries contained in his letter of 6th July, 1859.

### No. 2.

MR. PARRIS TO MR. C. W. RICHMOND.

New Plymouth,  
September, 21st, 1859.

DEAR SIR,—Since I wrote to you, the 9th inst., I have been investigating Teira's question, in order to give an opinion as to the opposition likely to be offered to it, and am sorry to say that I find Wm. King full of his dogged obstinacy, assuming the right to dictate authority over land offered by the rightful owners to the Government. He takes this ground, not being able to refute the claims of Teira and his supporters, who, from all I can gather from disinterested Natives, are the rightful owners. Wm. King's son told me a few days since, that if they consented for Teira to sell his land, others would do the same—(quite true). They were therefore determined not to allow any one to sell, admitting at the same time that they believed the Governor would not buy, so long as there was an opposition.

Teira is emboldened by the justice of his claims. I therefore find it necessary to restrain him in many of his propositions, lest anger should arise and violence ensue. He offers to cut the line, but at present I decline to give my consent, knowing the opposition he is sure to meet with.

About a fortnight since, some Natives erected some fencing on his land, whilst he was in town to see me on my return from Waikato. On his return to Waitara he cut down the fencing, upon which they threatened to burn a canoe of his; he told them he should not attempt to prevent the burning of his canoe, but if they did it, he would at once proceed with a fire stick, and fire the three paha (at the mouth of the river) which they knew were on his land.

Teira's father (Tamati Raru) told Wm. King for the first time last week that it was only stubbornness on his part to oppose Teira in the sale of the land on the south bank of the river: that his (Wm. King's) land was on the north side, in answer to which Wm. King threatened violent opposition.

The prevailing opinion among the Natives is, that Teira's offer will settle the question of the sale of land for a long time; if purchased, more will immediately follow; if not purchased, those who want to sell will be afraid to move in the matter.

The most favourable prospect of the whole is, Teira has induced a party of the Ngatiruanuis to take a favourable view of the land question. He came to me on the 14th inst. with a Native of the Pakakohe, who informed me that he had come with a message from his brother and one hundred supporters, to inform me that they were going to propose the sale of a large block of land, of from 15 to 20 miles beach frontage, from a place called Ohangai to the Patea river. The acquisition of such a block of land would be the making of the Province. The land is exceedingly good, with good sheep runs, and the Patea river much superior to the Waitara.

I was hoping that Mr. McLean would have returned by this time, for the state of Teira's

question is such now, that it is desirable it should be settled one way or the other before long, Natives in the District are being kept in constant excitement in consequence thereof.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT PARRIS

The Hon. C. W. Richmond,  
&c., &c.

### No. 3.

MR. PARRIS TO MR. C. W. RICHMOND.

New Plymouth, November 19th, 1859.

MY DEAR SIR,—The steamer having arrived two days earlier than was expected, I am disappointed in writing to the Governor respecting Teira's question as I promised to do, having been beset for the last fortnight by Natives, on questions respecting Native reserves, which have not been alienated.

I am engaged all my spare time endeavouring to individualize the claims in the Puketotara reserve, which I assure you, Sir, is an undertaking, there being so many distinct families interested in it. However, I hope to get through with it.

Teira is now with me going into the question of his first instalment. He assembled the people at Waitara together this week, to see if any one would repudiate his right to the land, but there was not one amongst them could do so. He explained to them that he was going to town to settle the question with me, and to fix the day for the first payment, which, when agreed upon, he would return and inform them the day he should take it.

Wm. King was absent from Waitara stopping at a place about two miles therefrom, there having been some unpleasantness among them, respecting the King question, to which Wm. King professes to be opposed. A fortnight ago two Natives from Kawhia on their way to Ngatiruanui, called at Waitara, and left privately a King's flag, with some Natives who are favourable to the cause, which on being discovered was warmly repudiated by Wm. King, who accused the people of deceiving him, and threatened to leave for Waikanae (too good to be realized).

Teira went to Wm. King, on leaving to come to town, and had a very friendly interview with him. He told him what he was going to do, and explained that he had done nothing privately, but that the opposition had. (Meaning their private correspondence, with Waikato, soliciting support for the opposition.)

I propose paying an instalment next week, and I trust His Excellency will not think I have unnecessarily delayed doing so, for I assure you, Sir, it is a matter that gives me great anxiety of mind on Teira's account.

I have been hoping the people might be led to see the inconsistency of their opposition to Teira and his supporters, whose claims I am more than ever convinced are just.

I have, &c.,

ROBERT PARRIS.

The Hon. C. W. Richmond,  
&c., &c., &c.

### No. 4.

MR. PARRIS TO MR. C. W. RICHMOND.

New Plymouth, 16th February, 1860.

SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, conveying instructions to proceed with the survey of Teira's land at Waitara without delay.

I hope it will not appear to His Excellency's Government, that there has been any unnecessary delay in this matter, on account of the work not having been proceeded with before, the reason for which I will endeavour to explain, and trust it will justify the course I have adopted.

The determination of the Government in this matter having been made very public, together with the usual exaggerations, a complete state of excitement was produced throughout the district, so much so that some of the Natives were positively proposing to burn their wheat crops. I was engaged for many days going amongst them explaining and reconciling them to the true facts of the case.

At the time I received my instructions, a party of Natives (about forty) who crossed over from Arapawa to Kapiti were on their way to this place overland, to join a party who came in a vessel; these people are friends of Teira's, who requested me to defer the work until they arrived, for fear the Ngatiruanuis should obstruct their passage through that district. They arrived on the 10th instant.

On the 11th instant, a party of Ngatiruanuis (about fifty) arrived at the Town Pa, on their way to Waikato to attend a meeting of the Kingites. They sent for me to go to the Pa, which I did, and had several hours' discussion on the subject of Teira's land, and the King movement. Upon the former question they were much more reasonable than I expected; but on the latter I found they entertain very dangerous ideas. They believe they shall reclaim the Sovereignty of New Zealand. I considered it to be my duty to be firm with them, I told them the Sovereignty was vested in the Queen of England, and that they would yet regret ever forming a compact for the purpose of reclaiming it.



This being their first visit to the Paketapu district since the late feuds, their ceremonies at each Native village occasioned a further delay in Teira's matter, for I considered it would be impolitic to commence whilst they were in the district.

I was with William King and his people on Monday last, and went fully into the question with them, informing them of the determination of the Government in the matter. I endeavoured to work upon them, by explaining to them how very much the Government had been troubled with the Waitara question. That sixteen years ago there were Europeans on the land who were removed by the Government. That soon afterwards Ihaha and Matiu (William King's brother) offered to sell Waitara to the Government. That in consequence of the Government declining to purchase of them, Ihaha sold some of the land to an European, which the Government also disallowed. That a bad feeling arose with them and Ihaha's people in consequence of their continued opposition. That both parties had been drawn into the quarrels of the Paketapu's, which had recoiled upon themselves at Waitara. That this state of things had induced Teira and party to sell their land, in order to be under the Government. That it was now their duty to endeavour to meet the Government in this matter and settle the question without any unpleasantness.

In reply to this a young man called Hemi Te Koro, spoke favourably, but before he had finished William King perceiving the tendency of his views, got up and said "I will not consent to divide the land, because my father's dying words and instructions were, to hold it.

I have appointed Monday next, the 20th instant, for the first attempt at the survey, I shall accompany the surveying staff myself. William King has been duly informed.

On the 14th instant, I heard of orders having been issued to the Volunteer Corps, to hold themselves ready to march to Waitara with the Troops, when I addressed a letter to Col. Murray, copy of which I herewith enclose.

I have, &c.,  
The Hon. C. W. Richmond, Native Minister, Auckland.  
ROBERT PARRIS, District Commissioner.

No. 5.

[MR. W. C. RICHMOND TO MR. PARRIS.]

Auckland, August 27th, 1859.

MY DEAR MR. PARRIS,—

I have received yours of the 20th, and am very sorry to hear what you tell me about the Waiwakaiho Bridge Road. I have heard nothing of the matter, except from yourself. Of course I cannot pretend to form any judgment upon it.

In reply to your question respecting the probability of the transfer of the Mail to the Inland line, I consider there is a good chance of such a transfer.

Schultz, the Port Master at Kawhia, was asked a few weeks ago to endeavour to arrange a partition of the Coast Service between the Kawhia and Mokau people, so as to get over the difficulty with the latter. But, in my opinion, the Inland line, if practicable, would be far preferable to the Coast line: and this prospect of a change should be borne in mind in any conversations you may have with the Natives.

I ought to have acknowledged your letter about the reserves in the Waiwakaiho block. I am strongly of opinion that the question with Henry Te Puni ought not to be mixed up with the settlement of the reserves and purchases of other Natives unconnected with him. The whole transaction has been a discredit to the Department; but faith should be kept, and Henry Te Puni's conduct ought not to be imitated by the British Government.

I concur with you in thinking that there is no occasion, under the Native Reserves Act, to obtain the consent of every Native who signs a deed whereby a reserve is made. It appears to me sufficient, if those who are recognised by the Natives themselves as having an interest in a reserve, concur in its cession to the Queen, for the purposes of the Act. The other course is likely rather to raise than to settle questions. It may be desirable to refer the question for the opinion of the Attorney-General.

The Governor is very anxious about the completion of the purchase from Teira. I am sure you will press the matter as fast as appears prudent. It would satisfy His Excellency if, without writing officially, you would let me hear privately how things stand. I have been in hopes that Mr. McLean's visit would effect something—but he delays so long. The Governor feels he is pledged to effect the purchase.

I am, &c.,

R. Parris, Esq.

C. W. RICHMOND.

42 CHARGE PREFERRED BY DR. FEATHERSTON AGAINST MR.  
C. W. RICHMOND.

No. 6.

[MEMORANDUM.]

Instructions should be sent to Taranaki to close the purchase of Teira's land, which was commenced when I was there, without delay, if possible.

There is little chance of Mr. McLean reaching Taranaki for some time.

T. GORE BROWNE.  
August 27th,

The Minister for Native Affairs and Assistant Native Secretary.

No. 7.

[REV. MR. WHITELEY TO MR. PARRIS.]

Thursday Morning.

MY DEAR SIR.—I return you many thanks for your letter of last night. My knee is rather better this morning, and I think I shall try to leave this about 10 o'clock to go down to the scene of strife, and stay the night somewhere in the neighbourhood, as I am afraid to tax my knee too much by returning the same day.

The state of things is painfully alarming for these poor Natives, that are thus hurrying each other into eternity. O that God would in some way interpose to save them from destruction.

With regard to the point you allude to, I shall be most happy to converse with you thereon. Whatever may be the nature of your instructions, we may rest assured, they were sent in anticipation of no such state of things as at present exists. No such state has presented itself in the history of these quarrels heretofore, or in the history of Maori quarrels for many many years.

I am sure, therefore, both the Government and the public would hold you harmless, if by deviating from those instructions you could in any way interpose to prevent the further effusion and waste of blood.

May our merciful Father guide and direct you, and all of us, in the right path at this fearful crisis.

Pardon haste; if I can get off earlier, and you are not gone, I will accompany you, and be glad of the privilege.

Pray keep the Mahoetahi Natives out of it if possible.

Yours, &c.,

I. WHITELEY.

R. Parris, Esq.

No. 8.

ASSISTANT NATIVE SECRETARY TO MR. PARRIS.

Native Land Purchase Department,

Auckland, September 27th, 1859.

SIR,—With reference to the offer to the Government by Teira and others of a block of land on the South bank of the Waitara river, I have the honor, by direction of the Governor, to convey to you His Excellency's authority to make an immediate advance in part payment for the land referred to, should you be able to satisfy yourself that the parties offering it have an indisputable title. You will, however, inform Te Teira that the purchase will not be completed until Mr. McLean visits Taranaki.

I have, &c.,

T. H. SMITH,

Assistant Native Secretary.

R. Parris, Esq.