

settled." The "wrong, very wrong, very wrong," applies to any extension whatever of the European boundary.

But why are only two of the letters from Wiremu Kingi to Archdeacon Hadfield produced? There were three. Those dated 2nd July and 5th December 1859, are given by Sir William Martin; the intermediate one, dated 27th July 1859, is omitted. In this letter there are two remarkable statements. The first is this:—"Your clear words have reached me, and I have seen them.....If, indeed, you had not heard the word which you quote in your letter to me; but, is it not so, you and the Rev. Mr. Williams heard the word of Reretahangawhanga relative to Waitara, saying that it should be held? That was Rere's word and mine, *and that word was also from you two.*" What the "clear words" were will, perhaps, never be known. Archdeacon Hadfield has denied giving any advice to Wiremu Kingi since 1839 to hold the Waitara; but in a letter from him to Archdeacon Govett, at Taranaki (as reported by Mr. Parris), he said that "he would not advise Natives to sell their land,—that he was not pleased with anything the Government had done for the Natives,—and that the Governor would find that a large party of the Natives at Otaki would espouse William King's cause."

The second statement is this:—"Mr. Parris has also talked of my being shot with a gun, and simply burying me outside—I am not to be taken to the graveyard. It was his plan (or idea) to fetch Te Whaitere [Katatore]: he died, and in like manner by Mr. Parris also shall I die. Mr. Parris is glad that I should die, so that he may get the land. He rejoiced also at the death of Te Whaitere Katatore, that the land might be clear."

Sir William Martin no doubt considered that this tissue of wicked calumnies against a man who, it is perfectly well known, saved the writer's life, would be too much for any one to credit. If the letter had been published, it might have destroyed the effect of the other two.—(see Notes No. 41, 47).

NOTE 39.

"He maintains that the land cannot be alienated."
"It cannot be inferred.".....(Page 8.)

Sir William Martin appears here to change his ground as to the true meaning of King's letters: but though the language is carefully guarded, the qualification is only apparent, not real. He says, "it cannot be inferred from this that Wiremu Kingi did not assert also some individual claim to land within the block." This negative way of putting it escapes the difficulty to Wiremu Kingi's apologists of absolutely denying, as the Government do, that these letters contained any notice of proprietary right: but it as carefully avoids affirming that they *did* contain such a notice. If Sir William Martin could fairly have stated they did, he would certainly not have contented himself with such hesitating words. The point was of far too great importance not to have been taken if anything in the letters had warranted it.

NOTE 40.

"We have seen that in the official statement."..... (Page 8.)

It is true that failing other proprietary claims being preferred, the Government assumed to have extinguished the title of the real owners. But the Government never assumed this in the sense of excluding or denying the proprietary claim of any one who might show that he possessed it. The Government constantly invited such claims, and on the 29th November 1859, when the first instalment was paid to Teira, Rauponga, and the other sellers, a memorandum was read expressly saving the rights of every one having a proprietary claim and not assenting to the sale. The memorandum was as follows:—"If any other person can prove that he owns any part of the land within the boundaries above described, his claim will be respected, and he will be allowed to retain or sell the same as he may think proper."

NOTE 41.

[Letters from Ritatona te Ina.] (Page 9.)

These letters are now for the first time seen by the Government. The same remarks may fairly be made as to withholding these letters as have been made in the case of the letters from Wiremu Kingi to Archdeacon Hadfield and from Riwai te Ahu and the other Ngatiawa Natives to the Superintendent of Wellington. (See Notes No. 38, 47.)

The second letter of 11th February 1860, says:—"On this account it was that I wrote to you and Hadfield, [on the 5th December] that you two should speak to the Governor. But we and Wiremu Kingi are waiting for the fulfilment of your word, that Mr. Hadfield should write to the Governor." The Governor never received any letter of the sort, either from Mr. Hadfield or Riwai te Ahu. It is strange that any persons professing to have at heart the welfare of the Natives and the maintenance of peace, should receive letters in which they are repeatedly prayed to write to the Governor, withhold the letters from the Governor's knowledge, publish them for a controversial purpose without any allusion to the fact of their having been withheld, and then accuse the Governor of neglecting the warnings they contained.

But the second letter is the condemnation of the writer. It contains the proof of the intention of