

Mr. Parris.

17th August, 1861,

than ever. From what we know of the men and their conversation, this would be, by far, the better arrangement. And then as to the alternative—we simply prognosticated, from our entire knowledge of the question, if some such mode of settlement as the one alluded to, were not adopted, that the future consequences would be such as to involve the whole of the Province, both North and South, in any final arrangement that would require to be made."

160. Having heard read the portion of Mr. Turton's Memorandum, is that the plan alluded to?—It is.

161. *Dr. Featherston.*] Will you reconcile your explanation given the other day in answer to Mr. Weld's question, to the effect that your charge of "dishonourable and treacherous treatment of Wm. King and his people, to exterminate them from the Waitara," applied not to Europeans but to Natives, with your subsequent words that such treatment "was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan for the acquirement of that delightful and much-coveted district?"—I have already stated the expression was an unguarded one, and I now beg to state that the terms "treacherous" and "dishonourable" were applied to the Natives only, to those who attempted to take a dishonourable advantage of what I had been doing solely for their benefit.

162. Will you reconcile your present statement with your words "that such treatment was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan"?—I have a difficulty in reconciling the expression "in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan"; the only plan which I knew of at the time, which was purely a Native plan, *i.e.*, the one of the ambush in the Karaka Pah which, had it taken effect, would in all probability have resulted in the destruction of a number of Wm. King's people, if not in the removal of them North of the Company's boundary.

163. Do I understand you to admit that you cannot reconcile your explanation "that the words treacherous and dishonourable applied to Natives" with your subsequent words that such treatment was in accordance with Mr. Turton's peremptory plan?—By no other explanation than that I have already given.

164. You express yourself as "under apprehension of being charged with partiality for certain Natives"; do you mean to say that you were afraid of Natives making such charges?—That applied to the part which I took on behalf of Wm. King and his people, who were Natives of the Church of England, whilst those in the Karaka Pa were principally Wesleyans; many of the Europeans, who were not aware of the part I had taken, censured me for preventing the ambuscade being carried out.

165. Were you afraid of Europeans or Natives making these charges against you?—I could not say that I was under apprehension; I wished to guard myself against being charged.

Mr. Richmond submitted to the Committee that he objected to the course of cross-examination by Dr. Featherston; he objected only on the grounds of the useless consumption of the Committee's time. He (Mr. R.) had already admitted what Dr. Featherston was endeavouring to elicit, *i.e.*, that Mr. Parris had been censured by the Europeans, and particularly by the Editor of the *Taranaki Herald*. He (Mr. R.) did not object to any question except as needlessly delaying the Report of the Committee—the more questions the better so long as they were relevant.

After some further remarks by Members of the Committee, the Chairman requested Dr. Featherston to continue his cross-examination.

166. I lay before you your letter to the Private Secretary, dated December 21st, 1860, and direct your attention to paragraph 5:—"My letter to the Bishop of New Zealand alluded to these attacks of the local press and those of many of the settlers who were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and who view the frustration of the ambush as inimical to land purchases"; is the letter here referred to the letter you addressed to the Bishop on the 26th August, 1858?—It is.

167. How then do you reconcile the statement just referred to in your letter of the 21st December, 1860, with your reply to Mr. Weld?—I have already explained the difference between Natives and Europeans—the part each took; the term "dishonourable and treacherous" applied to the Natives for reasons the Europeans were not then in possession of—with the two exceptions, Mr. Whiteley and the then Editor of the *Taranaki Herald*—the latter had taken great interest in the Natives at the Karaka Pa, and was the only one, save Mr. Whiteley, who knew the arrangements I had been endeavouring to carry out with Wm. King, and I therefore felt his remarks in the *Taranaki Herald* to be censuring me for doing what he was as anxious for as any one.

Mr. Cracroft Wilson requested the Chairman to order all persons other than Members of the Committee to withdraw, and on the room being cleared,

Mr. Cracroft Wilson called the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the same question was being put by Dr. Featherston over and over again, and that the question did not relate to any facts of which the Witness was cognizant, but to a discrepancy which Dr. Featherston imagined existed between a written letter and *viva voce* evidence of the Witness; that the Witness had done his best to reconcile the apparent discrepancy; that the repeating the question savoured of unfairness towards the Witness, to which Mr. Cracroft Wilson objected, and was moreover wasting the time of the Committee, which had already sat three days listening to the cross-examination of the Witness by Dr. Featherston.

After some discussion,

The Chairman stated that it had hitherto been the wish of the Committee that Dr. Featherston should be allowed to conduct the cross-examination in whatever manner he wished, and consequently he did not think it proper, whilst admitting the force of many of Mr. Cracroft Wilson's objections, to deviate from that course in a thin attendance of Members of this Committee.

168. *Dr. Featherston.*] You stated, in your reply to Mr. Weld, that your charge of treacherous and dishonourable treatment applied to Natives; in your letter to the Private Secretary of 21st December, 1860, you state that the charge contained in your letter to the Bishop referred to attacks of the local press and of many of "the settlers who were desirous of acquiring land by any means, and who viewed