

“payment for the *tapu* of Taranaki and the Umuroa. Then we will stretch out their arms and burn them with fire. To prolong their torture let them be suspended over a slow fire for a week, and let the fire consume them. Like the three men of old whom Nebuchadnezzar commanded to be cast into the fiery furnace, even as Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, shall it be with Ihaia.”—This would be incredible (especially in a man who not very long after was assuring Archdeacon Hadfield “that he was remaining in great grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ”), if it were not vouched by one of the resident missionaries, and if the native letters to the Waikato chiefs, containing an account of it had not been seen and read by the then District Magistrate there. Wiremu Kingi and Ihaia were members of the same tribe : Rawiri Waiaua and Katatore were members of the same tribe : Katatore and Tamati Tiraurau were members of the same tribe : yet all these were successively murdered or attempted to be murdered one by the other.

Every one of these feuds originated in disputes about land. There was nothing to choose between any of the contending factions in cruelty. They all assumed the “right” to determine their respective titles by force of arms, and the “interference” of the Chief was exercised only to enforce or resist the threat that “land-selling brings death.”

These then were the “rights of the tribe ;” this the “interference of the chief in the affairs of his tribe ;” which it was criminal in the Governor to announce that he would not tolerate in New Plymouth. It is something too much to find that the attempt of a Queen’s Governor to put an end to atrocities such as those which disgraced humanity in these feuds, should be branded as an infraction of the rights of the tribe and of the chief.

But this paragraph is further remarkable for being the first instance which Wiremu Kingi is unmistakably referred to as “the Chief” of the tribe. Further on at page 10, it is more distinctly stated, “*As the whole Tribe has not consented, he, as their Chief, expresses their dissent.*” Now this is a pure assumption. *It is absolutely certain that the various sections of the Ngatiawa do not recognise him as the Chief of the whole tribe ;* it is extremely doubtful whether he would anywhere be recognised as anything more than the principal man of the Manukorihi branch. There is no doubt whatever, that as between Reretawhangawhanga (Wiremu Kingi’s father) and Te Hawe, the Chief who resided at Queen Charlotte Sound, the latter was everywhere recognised as the highest Chief. The best evidence of the *status* Wiremu Kingi holds is to be found in the history of these savage feuds. If he had ever been acknowledged by the Ngatiawa people themselves as their Chief, they would not have resisted his will as they have so often done even to blood. It was because they denied his right to govern their affairs, it was because they refused to submit to dictation from him, that so many have fought with him before, and are in arms against him now. On more than one occasion they had his life in their hands ; he was actually taken prisoner in one of the fights, and was spared by the very men whom he afterwards purposed to roast alive. There is something repugnant to good feeling and common sense in supporting the claim of such a man to a position, the refusal to grant which by other Chiefs of his own tribe has been the source of so much blood being shed ; and in blaming the Governor for not permitting a tyranny, which those immediately concerned had over and over again staked their lives to be delivered from.

NOTE 30.

“*That which was darkly intimated.*”..... (Page 6)

There never was any “dark intimation” whatever by the Governor. His declarations were publicly made, and perfectly well understood by all those who for five years had been slaying each other in disputes about land. The Rev. Richard Taylor, a Church Missionary, says that the murder of Rawiri Waiaua was the first fruit of the establishment of the land league, which had been formed by many tribes at the general meeting at Manawapou in the Ngatiuanui country. The Ngatiawa perfectly well knew what the Governor meant, when he said he would no longer suffer the existence of anarchy and bloodshed in the settlement, and that he would no longer tolerate the tyranny of the land league by which they had been caused. Every one of the feuds which had occurred were founded on disputes about land. Nearly all were the result of resistance to the mandates of the land league, by loyal Natives like Rawiri and Ihaia, who claimed the guarantee of their proprietary rights under the Treaty of Waitangi, and the fulfilment of the pledges given by Governor Fitzroy and Governor Grey. It was because Wiremu Kingi had broken his distinct engagement to settle on the north bank of the river that these disputes occurred : and there was not a single Native present at the meeting of March 1859, who was not perfectly well aware that the Governor’s declaration was in strict accordance with the promises of former Governors, and inaugurated no new system of land purchase whatever.

NOTE 31.

“*Was the principle thus enunciated.*”..... (Page 6)

The assumption that the Governor’s declaration—that “he would not permit any one to interfere in the sale of land unless he owned part of it”—was directed against the right of Chiefs and Tribes, is altogether erroneous. The words cannot be twisted into such a meaning ; on the contrary, all *owners*, whether as Chiefs, Tribes or individuals, are recognised. At the same time, these words had, and were intended to have, a significant meaning. In several parts of the country Land Leagues had been formed to prevent the alienation of land, and these combinations had already commenced to interfere