

You say correctly that you have more than once brought abuses to my notice, but I cannot recall any instance of your having done so except in the course of private conversation, nor any abuse of a nature to warrant in the least the grossly exaggerated statements to which I referred in my letter.

I have, &c.,

FREDERICK J. MOSS,

British Resident.

Rev. J. K. Hutchin, Mission House, Rarotonga.

Enclosure No. 4.

DEAR SIR,—

Rarotonga, 12th October, 1897.

As far as I am aware, the law of the 24th December, 1890, says nothing about permits being signed by the Arikis appointed mouthpiece. I have looked over the law again just now, and find these words: (9.) "In the case of natives, the permit shall only be issued on the written authority of the ruling Ariki of the district."

The law is plain enough, and permits issued by any other person than the ruling Ariki are evidently illegal, according to law, which you, I believe, drew up, and which you presented to the chiefs for discussion on the 24th December, 1890. Mr. Laurence brought the matter of the sale of permits before your notice in the year 1893, so that there was no need for me to again draw your attention to the matter. Why you never took any notice of what was said to you I could never make out, for every missionary and every British Resident can only desire the good of the natives.

As regards calling your attention to abuses of the liquor traffic "in private conversation only," I recollect an instance of a very public conversation where the matter has been brought before your notice.

I have, &c.,

F. J. Moss, Esq., British Resident.

JOHN J. K. HUTCHIN.

Enclosure No. 5.

REVEREND SIR,—

British Residency, Rarotonga, 13th October, 1897.

I have just received your letter of the 12th, in reply to mine of same date. Allow me to refresh your memory as to what took place in the year 1890, to which you refer.

I arrived here on the 18th November from New Zealand. You were away, but expected back soon. The Rev. J. Chalmers was in Rarotonga, and at once brought to my notice the gross and open drunkenness prevalent among the Maoris, both men and women. I found his statements more than justified. Nineteen known houses were openly retailing the worst liquor, and fourteen quarter-casks of rum had just been openly landed and stored by a trader (brought from San Francisco). Yet the law was total prohibition, with yourself (as agent of the London Missionary Society, a member *ex officio* of the Arikis' Council), and with 150 police—all your Church members—for its enforcement.

The Arikis' Council was convened on the 24th November, and a temporary law passed at once, prohibiting, under a penalty of 150 dollars (£22 10s.), the sale of liquor to natives. I then went round the group.

On my return the Arikis' Council again took up the question. They insisted on one law for both races—European and Maori—and were unanimous against prohibition, as having been a dead failure. You will remember, as you were present at this meeting, which took place on the 22nd December. The final vote was deferred till the 24th, to enable Mr. Gelling to take the opinion of the Europeans—his constituents—in the meanwhile.

On the 24th he reported that only two were in favour of prohibition, and the present law was passed without dissent.

I venture to say that, at its worst, drunkenness among the natives has never approached by a long way that which prevailed among them with prohibition, at its best, in 1890.

Other points appear to have escaped your recollection. For example, Judges Tepou, Maoate, and Tekao were appointed to carry out the temporary law of the 24th November, 1890. They naturally, and in accordance with native custom, as "the Arikis' mouthpiece," took up the same position in the law of December. That they did so was known to you, to me, and to all people, and let me remind you that their right was never questioned till about two months ago. The Licensing Officer then, with my approval, took the extreme course of refusing any but the Arikis' own signatures. In doing so he certainly strained the law, and has brought upon himself powerful native hostility, against which I have done, and am doing, my best to protect him.

I regret much to see that you are taking a different course, and practically give aid to those whose only objects are avowedly to gratify personal rancour, and who are openly seeking to persuade the Arikis and Judges that not they, but the British Resident and the Licensing Officer, are the only persons concerned, or to be blamed.

You are right that the Rev. Mr. Laurence wrote to me in 1893, but not on the "sale of permits." That is a phrase of recent coining, and I regret to see it adopted by you. Mr. Laurence called it "charging fees." If you refer to the mission records you will find that, so far from not noticing Mr. Laurence's letter, I sent him a full reply from Judge Tepou, who justified the charging of fees. He justified it as the universal and recognised practice under the existing missionary law, which made fines and fees the only remuneration for Judges, police, and officials of every kind, instead of the salaries given elsewhere. Nor should it be forgotten that Tepou, and, in fact, all the Arikis and Judges, were, and still are, members of the mission church, and high officers, over whom mission influence is and always has been undoubted.