

Governor regrets that his Responsible Advisers should justify the promulgation of these terms by resting them:

1stly. Upon the declaration to the chiefs of Waikato which the Governor signed on the 11th of July, 1863.

2ndly. Upon a notice drawn by the Colonial Secretary, and submitted upon the 15th of December, 1863, as that which he wished to be issued, but which the Governor did not issue, substituting a letter written by himself in lieu thereof.

3rdly. Upon a draft Proclamation proposed in April last, which was not signed by the Governor. The Governor thinks that his Responsible Advisers should have been for the following reasons, precluded from taking the course that was followed on the 3rd of June.

Upon the 11th of May, the Governor explained to his Responsible Advisers that, when he signed the declaration to the chiefs of Waikato of the 11th of July, 1863, which was issued to meet a danger then thought to be threatening the settlement of Auckland, he did not intend it to be regarded as establishing the fact, that if the Natives, by their conduct, annulled rights which they might have under the treaty of Waitangi, thereupon all their land passed from themselves and their heirs for ever and became the property of the Crown.

Upon the 25th of May the Governor pointed out to his Responsible Advisers, the objections he entertained to the provisions of the Notice drawn by the Colonial Secretary upon the 15th of December, and after his having done this, the Governor thinks that his Responsible Advisers were not justified in making public declarations to the Natives of the nature of those to which the Governor had objected without further communication with him.

Upon the 11th of May, the Governor objected to the provisions of a proclamation proposed to have been issued on the 30th of April, and requested that it might be regarded as being revoked.

Upon the 17th of May, his Responsible Advisers acknowledged the receipt of this request, and informed the Governor that the Proclamation required no revocation, as it had never been signed.

The Governor regarded, and he believes justly, this language as constituting an engagement on the part of his Responsible Advisers, not to act on the provisions of the proposed proclamation.

Government House, 26th August, 1864.

G. GREY.

MEMORANDUM BY MINISTERS ON MR. CARDWELL'S DESPATCH OF THE 26TH MAY, 1864.

Ministers beg to return to His Excellency Mr. Cardwell's despatch of the 26th May, 1864, covering a paper drawn up by Mr. Gorst, entitled, "Observations on the Native Inhabitants of Rangiahia and Kikikiki."

Ministers would scarcely have noticed this document were it not for the remarks in Mr. Cardwell's despatch, from which it might be inferred that he thought it necessary to caution the Governor of New Zealand against acting in a spirit of injustice, and in disregard of equity and sound policy in dealing with that portion of the rebel tribes referred to in Mr. Gorst's paper. Of His Excellency's Responsible Advisers four out of six have resided in the colony for upwards of twenty years, and are intimately acquainted with the Native question in all its phases. They cannot admit that they are so deficient either in the necessary knowledge of facts or in the sense of justice and apprehension of "sound policy" as to make it desirable that the advice they may tender to His Excellency should be qualified by the guidance of a gentleman of so limited an experience in New Zealand affairs as is possessed by Mr. Gorst, who resided barely two years in the colony, and had only the opportunity of personally studying the Native question under one aspect and in one locality.

It might have been expected however that in the particular locality in which Mr. Gorst resided, and in which he filled an official position, being that to which the remarks in his paper relate, his information would have been accurate. It is however quite the reverse. The Natives of Rangiahia Awamutu, and Kikikiki, so far from being less implicated in the rebellion or having gone into it with less zeal than others, are perhaps those who have been the longest engaged in the promotion of this King movement, and have taken the most active part in maintaining it. It may be safely stated that whenever the leading chiefs have gone warmly into that cause, they have faithfully represented the mass of their tribes. Now the principal chiefs of the district referred to by Mr. Gorst were Porokoru, an old and particularly energetic man, who at the age of full seventy years (according to Mr. Gorst's statement in his book on the Maori king) made a pilgrimage on foot over one hundred miles of rugged mountainous country to preach a crusade of Kingism in Cooks Straits; Hoani Papita, one of the earliest and most determined supporters of the movement, who was prominent in the cause in the time of Governor Browne, and who stuck to it till his death a month ago; Taati te Wharu and his father Hori te Wharu, the former particularly known as an eager Kingite, and lastly Rewi, who has been for years the representative of the "physical force" section, the great fighting general of the King party, and the leader of that Ngatimaniapoto tribe, which has been and is the backbone of rebellion. There are probably not four such determined Kingites in the country as those mentioned, all of whom lived within from half a mile to four miles of Mr. Gorst's residence; and Ministers after careful enquiry of those who have lived for years among them, and with the light of the events of the war to guide them, have every reason to believe that the tribes residing within the limits referred to by Mr. Gorst have gone as freely and willingly into rebellion, and taken as active a part in it as any of the inhabitants of Waikato, and that they were fully committed to the King cause long before a hint had been given that the confiscation of lands might follow rebellion.

The statement made by Mr. Gorst that "the message sent down to Taranaki to instigate an attack on our troops was the act of Rewi alone, that the Waikatos had no share in it, and that there is no