

(Enclosure.)

MEMORANDUM.

HIS Excellency, in his memorandum of November 8th, requests that he may be furnished with the evidence, upon which the opinion has been formed, which is contained in the last paragraph of my memorandum of the 24th October, in the following words: "The mind of Te Whiti is possessed with the view that the Imperial Government will interfere in his favour, a notion which no doubt has contributed largely to a postponement of the settlement of existing difficulties."

In reply, I have to state that, while I held the office of Native Minister, I had, from time to time, received such assurances, from persons in whose statements I had confidence, as convinced me of the accuracy of the opinion I had formed. These assurances were for the most part verbal.

The following extract from a telegram from Mr. Parris, dated Pungarehu, July 7th, 1881, gives an example of what I believe to have been a general feeling among the Maoris at Parihaka:—"A Parihaka Native, Pounui, talking about the fencing, said the New Zealand Parliament confiscated the land, but the English Parliament disallowed it, and that the Governor was going to give it back."

Tohu, in his speech of September 17th, 1881, said, "A stranger shall take care of us;" and Te Whiti, in conversations which have been repeated to me, has compared the position of the Maoris to that of Turkey, as calling for the intervention of the English Government in defence of a weaker people.

I regret that, through my absence in Canterbury, the reply to His Excellency's question should have been delayed so long.

Wellington, 13th December, 1881.

WM. ROLLESTON.

No. 18.

HIS Excellency Sir A. H. GORDON to the SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES.

(No. 2.)

MY LORD,—

Government House, New Zealand, 2nd January, 1882.

I have the honor to enclose the reply made by Mr. Rolleston to the question asked in my memorandum of the 8th November, a copy of which was enclosed in my Despatch No. 80, of the 3rd ultimo, and in which I requested to be informed on what evidence it was asserted that Te Whiti's course was prompted by an expectation of support from the Imperial Government.

2. The foundation for the allegation appears to be the oral statements of certain anonymous persons in whom Mr. Rolleston has confidence, no mention of which had previously been made to me.

3. The only other evidence is that of a telegram, which would appear to point less to an anticipation of help from the Imperial Government than from the Imperial Parliament.

I have, &c.,

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, &c.

ARTHUR GORDON.

No. 19.

HIS Excellency Sir A. H. GORDON to the SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES.

(No. 79.)

MY LORD,—

Government House, Wellington, 3rd December, 1881.

See No. 10.

In my Despatch, No. 73 of the 5th November, I had the honor to inform your Lordship that Parihaka, Te Whiti's village, had that day been occupied by a force of Constabulary and Volunteers, and that Te Whiti himself had been arrested without the slightest resistance.

2. Your Lordship will no doubt expect from me a full report of the circumstances which have led to events which will probably have caused your Lordship some surprise, as from previous communications your Lordship must have been induced to anticipate that the questions at issue on the west coast of the North Island would be satisfactorily settled without a resort to measures of such a character.

3. With the main features of these disputes your Lordship is already acquainted.

4. You are aware that it is, on the one hand, contended that all the lands, declared in 1865 to be "available for settlement" on the West Coast, under the Act of 1863, are absolutely at the disposal of the Crown; that the Natives dwelling upon them are, and have been for the last sixteen years, only trespassers; that, although loyal Natives were, under the provisions of the Act of 1863, entitled to compensation, their land itself was equally confiscated with that of rebels; and that any claims to the favourable consideration of the Crown which the West Coast Natives may at one time have possessed have been forfeited by their opposition to the wishes of the Government, and by their disregard of the arrangements made for the allotment of lands to them.

5. On the other hand, it is argued that the Proclamation of 1865 expressly excepted the lands of loyal Natives from its operation, and that some delicate legal questions present themselves in connection with the action of the Crown and its present powers under that Proclamation. It is, moreover, urged that the action of successive Governments has constituted a bar to the enforcement now of the confiscation; that Te Whiti and the West Coast Natives have on many grounds a strong claim to sympathy and consideration; and that the harsh enforcement of the rights of the Crown, supposing them to exist, is inequitable, and likely to be dangerous.

6. Of these widely-differing views an overwhelming majority of the colonists hold the former, which is also that advocated by almost the whole of the New Zealand Press. The minority, however, though small, contains among its ranks persons whose intellectual capacity, experience of New Zealand, and intimate knowledge of the subject in discussion, give to that minority a weight disproportionate to its numerical strength.