

to find it difficult to make his mind up as to how he should say it, and seemed uncomfortable as to how I would be likely to take it. He remarked that there was no harm in a man speaking strongly at first, provided he laughed afterwards. At length he spoke in a very quiet manner, seated in my tent, and with about 120 Natives gathered close around. He began by saying that the destruction of the beacons was his work, for he wanted to know what they meant. There were other subjects to discuss: there was the township and road; but to-day he would speak of the harbour of Kawhia and the beacons. There were other harbours he might claim: there was Kaipara, there was Manukau, there were others; but Kawhia was the last, and could it not be left to him—to him alone? The beacons, What did they mean? What was the object of them? Perhaps they implied a taking possession of the land. The road also he objected to. He disapproved of roads, and had not been consulted about this one, nor about the opening of Kawhia. He was content with the letter of the Queen sent to him (Treaty of Waitangi).

I replied that the Treaty of Waitangi had two sides. The Queen had undertaken to respect the rights of the Maoris to their lands, but the Maoris had agreed to accept Her Sovereignty. No lands had been taken without payment, except where tribes had first violated their part of the treaty. The beacons did not take possession of the land: their purpose was obvious—namely, to guide vessels, and prevent loss of property and lives. The harbour was claimed under the Sovereignty of the Queen; and, as a servant of Her Majesty, I could recognize no other Sovereign authority in New Zealand. As he well knew I had informed him of my first coming to Kawhia; but he had left on his travels previously to my arrival. It was not intended to seize land. No; even the place where I had encamped the Constabulary was not claimed by me. When the time came for the removal of the Constabulary the land would belong to whoever were proved to be the lawful owners of it. As for the construction of roads over Native lands, that was also a lawful act. It was no theft, but a valuable present to the owners of adjacent land. The destruction of the beacons was wrong—very wrong—and a repetition of it could not be tolerated. Those who had destroyed them had brought the Constabulary here, not I. I could see little excuse for that wrong act; but, as Tawhiao alleged there had been misconception, I would take no further action about it.

Tawhiao: "I will re-erect the beacons myself. I hope it is not already done. I will proceed at once to do it."

I informed him that the work was done, and that presently the steamer would return to her anchorage.

Tawhiao expressed his intention of going to Wellington next session, and hinted that he would have no objections to visit Wellington in the "Hinemoa" on her next trip. Very little pressing would probably have induced him to return to Wellington with me. He afterwards, in company with two other chiefs, dined with me on board the "Hinemoa," where he seemed to enjoy himself very much, and left apparently in high good humour.

I may, in conclusion, be permitted to express the opinion that the establishment of a Constabulary station at Kawhia, although forced on Government as a necessity, will have a beneficial effect on the Maori mind in the furtherance of law and order.

JOHN BRYCE,

Minister for Native Affairs.

16th October, 1883.