

placed by the Resolutions which you transmit, and in the absence of any specific instructions from Her Majesty's Government, it was your paramount duty, without reference to any theory of administration, or to anything else but the means at your command, to take care that the present and future safety of the Colony was provided for. This you appear to have done. I do not doubt that you will continue to do so, and I congratulate myself on the circumstance that the Government of New Zealand is in the hands of an officer whose personal character will secure him a due influence in the affairs of the Colony, independently of the terms in which the General Assembly may recognise his authority.

Of the remaining Despatches the most important are those which enclose Addresses to Her Majesty from the Legislative Council and House of Representatives; of these I proceed to notice those portions which appear to me most material as bearing on the present and future policy of the Home Government.

No. 98, October 6.
Vide supra.
No. 103, October 20.
Vide supra.

In the first place, the Council and House of Representatives decline the functions which have been relinquished to them.

The House of Representatives allege that the duty of educating, civilising, and governing the aboriginal inhabitants of the Islands does not solely belong to the European inhabitants of the Colony, and assuming this duty to belong in part to the Home Government, they add that the liability of that Government is greatly increased by the fact that, from the first settlement of the Colony, the Government of the Natives has been in the hands of Her Majesty's representatives under the orders of successive Secretaries of State. They point out that the allegiance of the Natives as a body, has never been more than nominal, that the proposed transfer of authority is to be made at a time when some of them are actually in arms for the establishment of an independent authority, and that, if the colonists are left to their resources, they may be driven on the one hand to engage in a sanguinary war of races, or on the other to abandon the shew, where they cannot exercise the reality, of control, and to leave the bulk of the Maori race to virtual or even to avowed independence.

The Legislative Council, admitting that the system of Government hitherto in force has failed, state that this is not the fault of the colonists, who have always submitted to it with reluctance. They state that the war is one of the results of that system, and earnestly repudiate my statement that it is a "settlers war," on the ground that "hostilities were commenced and carried on by Her Majesty's representative at a time when he was solely accountable to the Imperial Government, and when the Legislature of the Colony had no control over his actions in this respect." And they add that "when peace, order, and the authority of the law shall have been re-established throughout the Colony," and not till then, can it be just that the powers and responsibilities of governing the Maoris should be transferred to the ordinary Government of the Colony.

The House of Representatives after alluding to the losses to which the Taranaki settlers have been subject, describe the Home Government in a similar spirit as "the authority under which those sufferings have arisen," meaning it to be inferred (as clearly appears from the context) that the Home Government is the "author" of those sufferings, and therefore, of course, eminently responsible for the increased expenses of Native Government.

And they observe that, in respectfully declining the Government of the natives, they do so, not as shrinking from the thing in itself, but because they seem to discover in my Despatches the intention to transfer to them also certain liabilities and burdens, which they consider to belong properly to the Empire.

This, I think, is a fair summary of the documents which I have before me, so far as they relate to the two great questions at issue between the Home and Colonial Governments—who shall govern the natives, and who shall pay the expense of governing them.

With regard to other matters, the Council and House of Representatives concur in disputing my statement, that the Government of New Zealand appears to have no adequate apprehension of the obligation under which the colonists lie to exert themselves in their own defence, and to submit to those sacrifices which are demanded from persons whose lives and properties are in danger. They state what has actually been done. They complain, as I understand, that the militia and volunteers have not shared with the regular army in the distribution of honours and rewards due to meritorious service. They suggest that in order to get rid of divided responsibility, the control of the military force should be entrusted to the Governor, *i.e.*, be subject to the influence and authority of the Responsible Government; and, finally, they express their hope that it may appear to Her Majesty that "a complete examination ought to be made into the respective obligations of the mother-country and the Colony with reference to the Native race, in order to an equitable 'apportionment of those obligations,'" and that Her Majesty "will be pleased to direct a full inquiry to be made into the condition and prospects of the Colony, and a reconsideration of the announced intentions of Her Majesty's Government."

Without exactly knowing what form of examination or inquiry is contemplated by the House of Representatives, I am entirely of opinion that the time has come for Her Majesty's Government to state clearly what they hold to be the respective obligations of the mother-country and the Colony with reference to the native race, especially with regard to the expense of native wars. For it is plain that the views entertained of those obligations by the Home Government and the colonists respectively are of a very opposite character. And it is, I am sure, far better that this discordance should be distinctly recognised, at whatever risk of immediate dissatisfaction, than that it should be allowed to minister occasion for continual disputes on matters of detail, accompanied by those mischievous accusations of harshness or of disingenuity which are the common results of misapprehension.