

Riwai te Ahu probably meant to admit. If Teira has a good title to his own cultivations and subdivisions, so has every other Native who is a party to the sale, including a number of absentees at Queen Charlotte Sound under Ropoama te One, who is a Chief of the *hapus* concerned in the sale. The title of the sellers, then, to part of the block is certain. The Government contends that their title to the whole is probable. The question as to the extent of their ownership was what the survey would have brought out when it was forcibly interrupted by Wiremu Kingi.

NOTE 44.

"In these documents the grounds of the opposition to the Government are clearly disclosed.".....
(Page 11.)

Not one of these documents was ever submitted to the Government till they were read in the House of Representatives. Assuming that they "clearly disclosed" the grounds of opposition, it was as clearly the duty of those persons who received them to communicate them to the Government at the time.

NOTE 45.

"If anything be plain"..... (Page 11.)

The points in dispute, then, were not so difficult to ascertain as they appeared to be at page 5. William King, it is said, representing the whole tribe, stands upon the fact that the whole tribe have not consented to sell the Waitara land.

As has been said already, it must not be believed for a moment that William King is the Chief of the whole tribe. William King is undoubtedly a chief of the Manukorihi section of the Ngatiawa tribe. He never has been and never would be acknowledged by the other sections of the tribe as the head chief of Ngatiawa.

But even if he were, the difficulty at once arises as to what is meant by the consent of the whole tribe. Does Sir W. Martin mean that it is necessary in every sale to get the consent of every man? not of the families, or subdivisions, or "communities," but of the whole *tribe*? If so, in the case of Ngatiawa, scattered as that tribe is, it is of course a simple impossibility. Being an impossibility, it has never been attempted, and yet, without it, large blocks of land have been acquired at Taranaki.

If this is not what Sir W. Martin means, what is his meaning? Does he mean a majority of the tribe? If so, what majority? How many men of the tribe will be sufficient to constitute a veto on a sale—one, or ten, or fifty? These questions are not irrelevant or unfair. It was the bounden duty of Sir W. Martin, 1st, not to state an impossible proposition: 2nd, having used a term which in its natural sense affirmed an impossible proposition, to define his term in that sense in which it could be specifically assented or objected to.

NOTE 46.

"In the case of the Bell Block."..... (Page 11.)

The instance given by Sir W. Martin in support of his statement is rather unfortunate.

1. The block was in the Puketapu country. The whole tribe of Ngatiawa did not agree to the sale; nor did all the Natives of Puketapu.
2. William King's opposition to the sale was not "withdrawn," for he never made any. He was not there at the time.
3. He never "ceased to oppose," for he had never made any opposition.
4. His people never "assented," for they had nothing whatever to do with the sale.

It is of importance that the circumstances of the Bell Block purchase should be accurately stated. When Sir George Grey made his visit to New Plymouth in March 1847, he commenced the treaty for the purchase of the Grey Block, which was soon after concluded to the satisfaction of all parties. In May 1847, the New Zealand Company came to their agreement with Lord Grey. As soon as this agreement became known in the Colony, Sir George Grey determined on suspending all operations for the purchase of land in the Company's settlements. As respected Taranaki this was officially notified by the Governor to Mr. Dillon Bell, at that time representing the Company at New Plymouth.

In March 1848, Sir George Grey revisited New Plymouth, and specially authorised Mr. Bell to enter into negotiations with a Puketapu section of the Ngatiawa for the land between Mangati and Waitaha, now known as the Bell Block. The land was offered by Rawiri Waiaua and others, and violently opposed by Katatore, Parata te Huia and their followers.

"After the preliminary negotiations, a day was named (says Mr. Bell in his report) to commence cutting the boundary lines in order to try the right of the disputants. Parata, Katatore, and the other hostile men, *immediately cut lines as boundaries of their own land, and then prepared to resist by force the determination of the others to sell theirs.* I took out with me the whole of the friendly party to work, numbering nearly 60 men. The battle began at the first line, and at some places the ground was fought for inch by inch. The natives only used their fists, sticks, and the backs of their tomahawks; anything like a sharp edge was most religiously let alone; and it was wonderful to see the amount of battering they endured without really using the deadly weapon they carried. The end of it all was that in a few days I had cut the whole of the lines, and that *tangis* and feasts caused a