

senting to those unjust terms." With regard to the allegation that Mr. Richmond had "represented that the Waitara land would not be acquired by the authorities in order to be handed over to the land claimants," it is clear that Mr. Richmond was referring not to any action on the part of the General Government, but to the opposition which it was well known the Province would raise to the incurring of a heavy expense for the benefit not of the Province but of the claimants. And with regard to the allegation that Mr. Richmond represented that efforts would be made to acquire the Waitara land, and that a town should be laid out thereat, Mr. Carrington admits that it is not correct, but alleges that Mr. Richmond said that "a town would be laid out at the Waitara," which Mr. Richmond explains by referring to the well known feeling of the inhabitants as to laying out a town there when the land was so acquired.

The Committee will therefore see that the allegations in the 27th paragraph are founded upon an erroneous view of the transaction, and give a colour to it which Mr. Carrington's evidence and any fair construction of his letter must efface. It seems clear then,

1. That instead of Mr. Carrington remonstrating and threatening on the subject of the clauses of 1858, his remonstrance was against the clause of 1856:
2. That Mr. Richmond did not represent, upon such remonstrance, that the Waitara land would not be acquired by the General Government:
3. That it was therefore not under the influence of such a representation that Mr. Carrington accepted the clauses of 1858: and
4. That it was not in consequence of such acceptance that Mr. Richmond represented efforts would be made to acquire the Waitara, and that in point of fact he did not make such a representation at all.

F. D. BELL.

[Read at meeting of Committee, 31st July.]

EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Carrington examined.

1. *Chairman.*—Will you state to the Committee what you know about the matters contained in this Petition?—Witness put in the copy of a letter which he had written to the Petitioner and which he said stated what he knew upon the subject.

(*Letter read.*)

Auckland, 31st January, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR,—In reference to the question which you most unexpectedly put to me the other day, "Did you ever sign any document surrendering your right to your Waitara land?" I replied why do you ask me? Your answer was "Because I feel almost certain that you have." I then told you that I had, at the request of Mr. Richmond, written an official letter saying that I would consent to take for myself, and for Mr. Tunno and Edwin Downe, whose interest I represented, one acre of Town land and $37\frac{1}{2}$ acres of Suburban land, or 75 acres of Rural land for every 50 acres of land which we had formerly selected and taken possession of at the Waitara.

I give you my sacred word that I would never have done this had I not been convinced from conversation which I had with Mr. Richmond, and the unprincipled feeling manifested by others, that it was utterly helpless for me to think of getting any portion of the Waitara land, did I not sacrifice myself and those I represented by assenting in writing to the unjust terms I have named.

I have neither my letter book nor my papers with me relating to this matter, they are in New Plymouth, but as you are interested in this affair and ask me to tell you the facts of the case I will do so as far as my memory serves, and I believe I can give you a faithful statement; but I cannot give exact dates without my papers.

After an absence of fourteen years from this Colony I returned to New Plymouth in July 1857. Subsequent to my arrival in that settlement I heard that an Act had been passed by the General Assembly called "The Land Orders and Scrip Act, 1856." This Act had special reference to land formerly selected by Settlers and others, but now unhappily claimed by Natives. It deprived people of that which once they legally and equitably held and offered in lieu an equal quantity of land in other parts of the Settlement, which land I would not accept as a gift, as it was subject to taxation and no return could be got from it.

On perusing the said Act I at once saw that it was unwarrantable, and that its aim was to supersede the written instructions of Colonial Ministers as well as an Act of Parliament.

I forthwith addressed a letter to His Excellency the Governor remonstrating against the Act, and received a reply from his Secretary, telling me that my letter had been referred to his Responsible Advisers, from whom I would hear. By the same mail, as intimated, I received from the Colonial Secretary a letter telling me that he had received my letter addressed to the Governor in reference to the Land Orders and Scrip Act of 1856, and he informed me that it was proposed in the next Session to amend the Bill, but whether it would in any way lessen the injustice I complain of he did not say. During the Session of 1858, I requested one of the representative members to let me know what amendment was proposed in regard to the Land Orders and Scrip Act of 1856. I received a letter from him telling me that the Lower House had amended the Bill, and had allowed people to have "one acre of town land or $12\frac{1}{2}$ acres of suburban land, or 50 acres of rural land for every 50 acres of land which they had selected at

F. A. Carrington, Esq.

1 July 1861.

(About August)
1867.