

Mr. Parris.

7th Aug., 1861.

83. Will you produce that letter?—Yes. [*Letter put in.*]

[*The letter referred to by Mr. Parris will be found in the Appendix.*]

84. Did I, in any of my letters to yourself written previously to the military occupation of the block, advert to the Waitara purchase, and if so, in which letter, and what did I write upon the subject?—I have one private letter of yours, the only one referring to Teira's land. [*Letter put in, see Appendix.*]

85. Was that the only reference I ever made to the Waitara purchase?—I do not remember your making any other allusion to the Waitara land.

86. In the letter I now read to you, addressed to myself, of 21st June, 1859, you mention, incidentally, that "Teira was getting very anxious about his offer," did you receive any reply from me to that observation?—I think I can say no, with safety. The only letter from you respecting the Waitara land, I have handed in to the Committee.

87. In your letter of 21st September, 1859, printed with the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives (1860, E 4, p. 25), you write "that the state of Teira's question was then such that it was desirable that it should be settled one way or the other before long, inasmuch as the Natives in the District were being kept in constant excitement by it." Now, was that your own unbiassed opinion?—It was my own unbiassed opinion.

88. Did you ever address any remonstrance to the Government, or to any one of the Ministers, against the attempt to acquire the Waitara block?—I have never done so.

89. Was your opinion from the first against the justice of Wm. King's opposition?—It was.

90. Was the Assistant Native Secretary's letter to Teira dated 14th July, 1859, [1860, E—3, page 8.] transmitted through your hands? See letter in Appendix.—Yes, it was.

91. In that letter it is stated that the Governor "has agreed to take the land"; did you understand that as meaning that the land would be taken regardless of the claims of any of its owners who might dissent from the sale?—I did not understand it in that way.

92. The concluding paragraph of my private letter of 27th August, 1859, to which you have already referred, states that the Governor felt himself pledged to complete the purchase; did you understand that to mean that the purchase was to be completed without due investigation, or without due regard to the possible rights of dissentient Natives?—I understood the enquiry was to go on, I did not understand the purchase was to be completed without due investigation, or without due regard to the possible rights of dissentient Natives.

93. What were the terms of your final instructions to proceed with the purchase and pay the first instalment?—The terms of my instructions were to make an immediate advance. [*See letter (27th September, 1859,) from Assistant Native Secretary (1860 E—3 No. 12, page 8.)*]

Mr. Richmond having closed this Witness's examination, the Chairman submitted him to the Committee for cross-examination, and the following questions were then put

94 *Chairman.*] Will you point out to the Committee exactly what you refer to when you state in your letter of December 21st, 1860, to the Bishop of New Zealand, "that you were blamed in the public newspapers for not allowing Ihaia's ambush to take effect"?—At the time of the difficulties with the Natives in the Karaka Pah, I received a letter from the Rev. Mr. Whiteley [*See Appendix*] requesting me to intercede on behalf of those Natives, who were expecting every day to be their last, being invested by Wm. King's war party, (composed of 800 against 80,) who had cut a great quantity of fern, which was to be tied up in order to set fire to the Karaka Pah, and drive the inhabitants out of it, that Wm. King and his people might fall upon them. At the suggestion of Mr. Whiteley, I proposed terms to Wm. King, that Ihaia and his people might be allowed to escape from the Pah, and not be followed by William King's people, and that Wm. King's war party should then destroy the Pah. I was for fully one week getting Wm. King to consent to the proposal. After he had consented in the presence of Mr. Whiteley, Ihaia and Wi Korowhiti, the Whanganui Chief, also consented to the arrangement. It was my custom then to visit them every morning, fearful the arrangements should miscarry. On Saturday morning, the 8th May, 1858, on fording the Waitara River below the Karaka Pah, I was met by Wm. King on the opposite side, when he said, "They are all gone," meaning the people at the Karaka Pah; I then asked him if any of his people had followed them, he replied, "No." On approaching the Karaka Pah, at the nearest Stockade to it (of Wm. King's) there were a number of men assembled to go to the Karaka Pah to destroy it. I instructed them to remain until I had visited the Pah myself, which on doing, I discovered everything was removed from the Pah, and only armed Natives in the trenches in ambush (principally people of Mokau and Whanganui). Having discovered this, I of course prevented their turning to account what I had done to save their lives against Wm. King's people, for their destruction; and that was the meaning of my remark in my letter to Bishop Selwyn, in which I stated, "because I refused to support or countenance dishonourable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people,"—the expressions "dishonourable" and "treacherous" were intended to apply to those Natives only who had planted the ambush in the Karaka Pah. The settlers of Taranaki were not aware of any arrangements to which Wm. King had consented that Ihaia and his Natives should be allowed to abandon the Karaka Pah unmolested. I was censured by some, by no one in any way connected with the General or Provincial Governments.

Some discussion arose on the question of Mr. Parris's further attendance, (he being about to start for Taranaki,) and the Committee unanimously agreed that it was decidedly necessary he should