

I have caused a copy of the "Casualty Roll" to be sent to the public papers and also to the Emigration Commissioners, the Agents-General for Crown Colonies, and to Mr. Morrison.

Governor Sir G. F. Bowen, G.C.M.G.

I have, &c.,  
GRANVILLE.

---

No. 10.

COPY of a DESPATCH from the Right Hon. Earl GRANVILLE, K.G., to Governor Sir G. F. BOWEN, G.C.M.G.

(No. 121.)

SIR,—

Downing Street, 4th November, 1869.

I have received your Despatch No. 83, of the 7th of July, informing me that strong comments have been made in the Colony on the following paragraph from my Despatch No. 30, of the 26th February:—

"I see it stated in the newspapers that you have offered a reward of £1,000 for the person of the Maori chief Titokowaru—I infer alive or dead—and £5 for the person of every Maori rebel brought in alive.

"I do not pronounce any opinion at present as to the propriety of these steps, but I must observe that they are so much at variance with the usual laws of war, and appear, at first sight, so much calculated to exasperate and extend hostilities, that they ought to have been reported to me by you officially, with the requisite explanation, which I should now be glad to receive."

On this you say, in the first place, "It is contended that this passage implies that the Maoris now in arms . . . are foreign enemies, or, at all events, belligerents, with whom the usual laws of war must be strictly observed;" and it is "felt that the question thus raised is of the highest practical importance."

I think you would have done well to point out to those who thus argue, that my Despatch nowhere hints that the Maoris are foreigners—a doctrine which I had never heard of before I perused the Attorney-General's Opinion; and that the legitimate inference from my Despatch is the direct contrary to that which is drawn from it. I there state that the proceedings of your Government are entirely at variance with the usual laws of war, and yet, with this unequivocal announcement, I pointedly refrain from pronouncing any opinion on them, and imply that I expect to receive from you a sufficient explanation.

Later in your Despatch you state that it has been asked, "Why should the Ministry be blamed for adopting against Maori murderers and rebels, measures far less stringent than those for which Lord Seaton, Sir H. Ward, Lord Torrington, Lord Canning, and other Governors, have been applauded."

If these questions were addressed to you, I think you should have pointed out that whatever blame was implied in my Despatch, was directed, not against your Ministers, but against yourself; and that, as regards yourself, the blame did not relate to the propriety of measures adopted, on which I did "not pronounce any opinion," but to your omission to report and explain them.

With regard to the Governors whose acts are quoted by the supposed questioner (whose argument you appear to adopt), I am not prepared to inquire whether the most severe acts of Lord Seaton, Sir H. Ward, and Lord Torrington, were those for which they were held entitled to public approval.

But I feel it a duty to express my surprise at the allegation that Lord Canning was applauded because he was party to the severities—in some instances very lamentable—which were resorted to during the Indian Mutiny. It was not by the adoption, but by the dauntless discouragement, of sanguinary measures, that Lord Canning earned the admiration which was finally acknowledged to be his due.

You are "informed," you say, "that there appears to be a very general determination to resist the active interference of any Imperial authority in the internal government of New Zealand."

Your knowledge of the policy of the Home Government, as explained in the numerous Despatches addressed recently to yourself and your predecessors, would have justified you in assuring your informants that Her Majesty's Government