

(1.) They were both confidential, and therefore he was prohibited from doing so by the Regulations.

(2.) Newspapers on *both* sides were regularly sent Home. The objection of Ministers is tantamount to a suggestion that a Governor should never send Home Opposition papers.

(3.) In their Memorandum of 10th June, 1882, Ministers claim that the Governor's despatches should always be shown to them before transmission; but to this they have no right.

II. Sir Arthur Gordon says that Sir James Prendergast and Mr. Whitaker take exception to his expression of a "disposition" to share the views advocated in the four articles enclosed in his Despatch of the 22nd October, 1881.

He answers:—

(1.) His agreement referred only to the articles then enclosed. To suppose (as Sir J. Prendergast and Mr. Whitaker do) that in that despatch he expressed agreement with articles which did not appear until a fortnight later, is absurd.

(2.) He admits, and never denied, that the views with which he expressed agreement were those of the minority; but maintains that they were right, and that the minority comprised many of the ablest and best men of the colony.

III. Sir Arthur Gordon says that Ministers and Sir James Prendergast take exception to his having mentioned in his Confidential Despatch that it was only from his Private Secretary, Mr. Murray, that he received information as to the progress of affairs in New Zealand during his absence in Fiji.

Concerning this Sir Arthur Gordon says:—

(1.) That before he left the colony the promise was made that during his absence he should have the fullest information as to what was going on in New Zealand.

(1.) The complaint made was not that he had not shown the confidential despatches of the 22nd October and the 4th December, 1881, but that he had not shown the open despatch of the 28th December, 1881. This complaint (as stated in the memorandum of the 25th January, 1883) was a mere reiteration of those made by Ministers in the memorandum dated the 10th June, 1882. It is extremely surprising that a gentleman of the eminence and experience of Sir Arthur Gordon should gravely assume that on the 10th June, 1882, Ministers could have referred to despatches of the existence of which they were ignorant until the Imperial Blue Book, published in August, 1882, reached the colony.

(2.) Ministers are aware that all the leading newspapers in the colony—the *Lyttelton Times* amongst the number—are sent Home in a bag by themselves. No complaint of this was ever made; but what was complained of was that, in addition to this, certain portions of the *Lyttelton Times* were cut out and forwarded as enclosures in despatches, in such a manner that they, and they only, would be laid before the Imperial Parliament with the despatch.

Again, in Sir Arthur Gordon's despatch of the 4th November, 1881, he promises to forward a collection of articles from newspapers supporting the policy of the Government. Was this done? None of them are printed in the Blue Book.

(3.) No such claim was ever made. The claim made was that Sir A. Gordon, having seriously impugned his Ministers, they should have had an opportunity of answering his charges, so that both statements could be laid before the Imperial Parliament at one time, instead of some months elapsing between the publication of the Governor's charges and the answers of the Ministers.

(1.) *a.* Mr. Whitaker never said anything about articles published after the 22nd October, 1881; the articles sent with the despatch of that date are quite sufficient to support his words.

*b.* It is plain that Sir Arthur Gordon did concur with the views expressed in the later articles, as he forwarded them specially as enclosures to his confidential despatches of the 4th November and 2nd December, 1881, "in continuation of the extracts previously forwarded."

(2.) This matter is not now under discussion; and if it were, it would be easy to show, by the result, that the policy adopted by the Ministers on the West Coast of the North Island was unquestionably right.

(1.) Whatever promise may have been made to Sir Arthur Gordon Ministers consider must have been of a private character, and they hold that it was not their duty to communicate directly with him. There was in their opinion therefore no neglect on their part in abstaining from doing so. It does appear that, as a matter of courtesy, Sir John Hall did offer to communicate with Sir Arthur Gordon, but the offer was declined.