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The histories of the first three New Zealand Parliaments have been investigated and written during recent years. This thesis is an attempt to give some idea of the importance of the first and second sessions of the fourth Parliament in the history of New Zealand. Because of the lack of time, the material dealt with has been confined within definite limits, and has been selected with the hope that it will give a definite impression of the problems confronting the colony during these years.

From the point of view both of legislation and of parliamentary leaders, these sessions are of more than ordinary importance. During these years the political stage was occupied by such men as Stafford, Vogel, Fitzherbert, Hall, and McLean - men, who as a result of their abilities and character, have exercised a powerful influence in shaping the development of New Zealand. From the point of view of legislation also, the debates show that New Zealand was passing through one of the most crucial periods in its history. The separation movement (which was to give way shortly to the struggle between Provincialism and Centralism), was indicative of the political unrest in the colony. Provincialists and Centralists were soon to commence a grim fight over the problem of a quasi-federal as
opposed to a unitary form of government. In 1867 the financial position of the colony was anything but sound. Fitzherbert did much to restore order out of chaos when he effected the consolidation of provincial loans. This piece of legislation was probably the most important yet passed by a New Zealand Parliament.

It appears from research that the parliamentary history of New Zealand has been neglected. The economic and social aspects of the development of the colony have been the favourite themes for development by the majority of historians. This is a pity, because a study of the parliamentary history of a period furnishes a good account of the thoughts, problems and ideals of that period, and of the attempts of statesmen to express those ideas in Acts of Parliament.

The New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, the files of the "Christchurch Press" and the "Lyttelton Times" have provided the primary sources of material for this thesis, while much valuable information in connection with the character of Stafford has been obtained from the Journal of Henry Sewell. Sewell was an English solicitor who came to Canterbury in 1853, and played an important part in the formation of the Canterbury Settlement. His Journal - a fitting testimony to his great intelligence and his unwearied industry - is particularly valuable because it is a commentary on the proceedings of the
General Assembly of 1854 in particular, and also provides many interesting character sketches of the prominent men of the time. Sewell was elected to the first Parliament, held office in Fitzgerald's first Ministry, and himself formed a short-lived Ministry in 1854. He is particularly well qualified to comment on the men and measures of the period between 1854 and 1872, because during that period he held various positions in nine different Ministries.

A chapter has been devoted to some aspects of the parliamentary career of the late Sir Edward William Stafford - who undoubtedly was one of the great political figures of the time, and owed that position to his great capabilities for political usefulness. It is only just that more than passing reference should be made to the career of a man who gave of his best to promote the welfare of New Zealand during the difficult periods 1856–61, and 1865–69.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the financial legislation of the sessions. The colonial treasurer of the period was vitally concerned with the finance not only of one colony, but of the six smaller governments. New Zealand during those years, as one of her Premiers has said, was a severe school of statesmanship. The passing of the years does not seem to have simplified to any appreciable extent the difficult task of laying down a sound financial policy.
CHAPTER I.

1. New Zealand History to 1852;
2. The Constitution of 1852;
3. Parliamentary History to 1865.

1. New Zealand History to 1852.

Discovered by the Dutch navigator, Abel Tasman, in December, 1642, and next visited by Captain James Cook in 1769, who annexed it to the British Crown, New Zealand remained a political No-man's land till well on into the nineteenth century. Though the islands were the resort of sealers, whalers and adventurers, they attracted a few enterprising settlers from Australia, and from 1814 harboured missions for the conversion of the Maoris. Yet it was not till 1840 that British sovereignty was proclaimed and the first batches of colonists under the Wakefield system arrived.

In January, 1840, Captain Hobson arrived at Auckland. With missionary assistance, Hobson negotiated an agreement with the Maoris on February 6th, 1840, at the Bay of Islands. This agreement became known as the Treaty of Waitangi - "the Magna Carta" of the Maori race. The treaty runs as follows:

"Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, regarding with her royal favour the native chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and anxious to protect their just rights and property, and to secure to them the enjoyment of peace and good order, has deemed it necessary in consequence of the great number of Her Majesty's subjects who have already settled in New Zealand, and the rapid extension of immigration,
both from Europe and Australia, which is still in progress, to constitute and appoint a functionary properly authorised to treat with the aborigines of New Zealand for the recognition of Her Majesty's sovereign authorities over the whole or any part of these islands. Her Majesty, therefore, being desirous to establish a settled form of Civil Government, with a view to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence of the necessary laws and institutions alike to the native population and to her subjects, has been graciously pleased to empower and to authorise me, William Hobson, a Captain in Her Majesty's Royal Navy, Consul and Lieutenant-Governor of such parts of New Zealand as may be, or hereafter shall be, ceded to Her Majesty, to invite the confederated and independent chiefs of New Zealand, to concur in the following articles and conditions:

"Article the First:
"The chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand, and the separate and independent chiefs who have not become members of the Confederation, cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England, absolutely and without reservation, all the rights and powers of sovereignty which the said Confederation or individual chiefs respectively exercise or possess, or may be supposed to exercise or to possess over their territories as the sole sovereigns thereof.

"Article the Second:
"Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full exclusive and undisputed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession; but the chiefs of the United Tribes and the individual chiefs yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of pre-emption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate, at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them in that behalf.

"Article the Third:
"In consideration thereof, Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the natives of New Zealand her royal protection, and imparts to them all the rights and privileges of British subjects." (1)

(1) Quoted by Hight and Bamford, pp.96-99.
Queen Victoria and her successors were made rulers of New Zealand; the rights of the Maoris to their lands were carefully provided for. Hobson remained Lieutenant-Governor until his death, hurried on by over-work and ill-health, in 1842. Measured by some standards, Hobson was not a great man, but his actions as Governor had won him the confidence and respect of the Maoris, who spoke of him as a "good man". He was not popular with the colonists because of his attempts to suppress their land grabbing activities.

Hobson was succeeded in 1842 by Captain Fitzroy, who had an unenviable task before him when he arrived in 1843. His attempts at monkeying with the currency had disastrous results. It was now painfully evident that the situation in New Zealand was a desperate one. Fitzroy's incompetence led to his recall in 1845. The state of affairs prevailing in New Zealand on his departure was one which could only be handled successfully by a strong and competent administrator. The Colonial Office realized that the situation in New Zealand was a difficult one; very fortunately for New Zealand the situation brought forth the man.

When Captain George Grey arrived in New Zealand from South Australia, he found much discontent in the colony concerning the question of government. Prior to 1840, New Zealand was regarded as a mere appanage of New South
Wales. Hobson, as Lieutenant-Governor, was directly responsible for his administration to Sir George Gipps, Governor of New South Wales. In the year, 1840, however, New Zealand was proclaimed a separate colony, and was to have a Legislative Council of six members nominated by the Crown. This Crown Colony type of Government found no favour with the colonists as a whole; from that time on there was persistent agitation in the colony for responsible government.

Grey's first period as Governor lasted until 1853; during that time he was an autocrat with practically unfettered powers. His rule during this period was far-sighted and successful. During Grey's first governorship the first representative constitution for the young colony was devised. The constitution of 1846 was a very complicated document and quite unsuited to the existing stage of development of the colony. Sir George Grey, as a result of his shrewd political insight, foresaw this and as a result of his representations to Earl Grey he was successful in securing its suspension.

After 1840, settlers came to New Zealand and by settling at various points on the coasts of the North and South Islands formed the nuclei of the future provinces. Thus Wellington and Wanganui were founded in 1840, New Plymouth in 1841, and Nelson in 1842, while the two southern pro-
vinces of Canterbury and Otago, which showed the working of the Wakefield system of colonisation at its best, were formed in 1848 and 1850 respectively.

In 1851 the New Zealand Company was dissolved after a comparatively short but adventurous career. The Company undoubtedly rendered great service to the colony by its activity in bringing out settlers of the right type - men and women who could adjust themselves to life in a new and undeveloped land. By championing the two great principles of self-government and the careful selection of emigrants, as opposed to the old system of the mere transportation of convicts, the Company gave an impetus to the building of an economic and social structure which should entitle it to the gratitude of present day New Zealanders.

2. **The Constitution of 1852.**

In July, 1846, the British Colonial Secretary, Earl Grey, secured the passing of an Act which was intended to give New Zealand self-government. Along with the Constitution, Earl Grey also sent a scheme for the disposal of waste lands in New Zealand. If this constitution had been put into practice, its provisions would have had the effect of subordinating a large native population to a small European minority, because the Maoris were practically excluded from the franchise for municipalities, by a provision which obliged electors to be able to read and write English.
Governor Grey saw the evils attendant upon the working of such a constitution, and in a confidential despatch of May 3rd, 1847, he urgently requested Earl Grey to suspend the objectionable parts of the Constitution. The latter was sufficiently conversant with the situation in New Zealand to realize that the Governor's arguments were sound, and consequently that part of the letters patent relating to the introduction of self-governing institutions was suspended for five years by Act of Parliament. Sir George Grey was severely criticised by the colonists for his action in regard to the constitution of 1846; their demands for self-government, reinforced by newspaper agitation, became more and more insistent. In an elaborate despatch of August 30th, 1851, the Governor elaborated his views on what he considered the most suitable constitution for New Zealand.

A change of Government in England resulted in Sir John Pakington becoming Secretary of State in place of Earl Grey. "The Colonial Office now set to work to draft a Constitution Bill and the change of Ministry which installed Sir John Pakington as Secretary of State in place of Lord Grey did not in the end interrupt its progress - thanks to the representations of the friends of the colonists. Despite a few changes the bill was based on the recommendations of the Governor. The provincial clauses were ridiculed by Molesworth as 'a most Brobdignagian Government for a series of Lilliputian States', but they emerged unscathed, and the bill,
supported by Gladstone in a powerful speech and by Wakefield
in a petition to the House of Commons, duly passed into law."

The Bill became law on June 30th, 1852. It provided
for the establishment of a General Assembly for the Colony,
and a subordinate legislature for each of the six provinces
into which the colony was divided (2). The General Assembly
was to consist of a Legislative Council of not more than
twenty members, nominated by the Crown and holding office,
for life, and a House of Representatives of thirty-seven
members elected for five years. Each province was provided
with a Superintendent elected by the people for four years.
A Provincial Legislative Council, chosen by the same electors
for a similar term, was to assist the Superintendent.
Provincial legislation was subject to a right of veto by the
Governor, who might also disallow, within three months, the
election of a Superintendent; such action necessitated a
new election, both of the Superintendent and the Council (3).

Exceptions to the legislative powers of the provincial
councils were as follows: customs duties; coinage and
currency; the establishment or abolition of courts of
judicature, except courts of summary jurisdiction; weights

---

(2) Auckland, Wellington, New Plymouth, Nelson, Canterbury,
Otago.
(3) Hight and Bamford, The Constitutional History and Law of
New Zealand, pp. 281-66.
and measures; bankruptcy and insolvency; the post office; beacons and lighthouses; marriage; dues or other charges on shipping, crown lands and native lands; laws inflicting special disabilities or restrictions on persons of native race; criminal law, except as regards summary jurisdiction, inheritance and wills.

According to Sir George Grey the franchise was low enough to include every well-conducted man who had been a few years in the colony. The qualification of members and voters was the same, viz. the possession of freehold of the value of £50, or of leasehold of the annual value of £10, or the occupation of a house of the annual value of £10 in a town, or of £5 in country districts. The Central Legislature was entrusted with the important task of controlling the crown lands.

It is important to notice that the Constitution contained no provisions for the formal establishment of responsible government, i.e. for a ministry responsible to Parliament. At the time of the passing of the Act, the Governor's ministers were as follows: the Colonial Secretary, the Colonial Treasurer and the Attorney General. These officials were appointed by the Crown and were entitled to hold office during good behaviour; they did not sit in Parliament and were not responsible to Parliament. Edward Gibbon Wakefield had arrived in New Zealand on February 2nd, 1853, and he led the agitation in the Assembly for responsible government which
was finally introduced in the year 1856.


It was on May 27th, 1854, that the first New Zealand Parliament met in Auckland for its first session. Sir George Grey's method of bringing the Constitution into operation gave rise to much subsequent controversy. On January 17th, 1853, he proclaimed that the Constitution was in operation. "In February and March he issued a series of proclamations fixing the boundaries of the provinces, the number of representatives in each Provincial Council and in the General Assembly, and making provision for the way in which the first elections were to be conducted. He took steps to have the Provincial Councils elected, and also provided them with funds to work upon, but delayed calling together the General Assembly." (1)

On the last day of 1853, Grey left New Zealand and sailed to England on leave of absence. Some critics have argued that Grey did not care to face his opponents in the Assembly; on the other hand it was a much easier task to set the provincial machinery in operation, thus giving the provinces an opportunity to get on with the work of local legislation, than it was to bring the central Parliament immediately into existence.

The Governor's action was strongly criticised by Adderley in a speech in the House of Commons on June 26th, 1854, when he stated that Sir George Grey had taken upon himself to contravene the spirit of the Act by first allowing the Provincial Councils to come into play, when he avoided calling together the General Assembly, which Parliament had undoubtedly intended should have the foremost place. Sir George Grey's action was defended by Frederick Peel, Under Secretary for the colonies. He reminded Adderley that the New Zealand colonists were largely indebted to Governor Grey for the Constitution of 1852, and also that the Provincial Councils were summoned by the Superintendents of Provinces, who were on the spot, and had no difficulties to encounter. (1)

In the absence of Sir George Grey, the senior military officer in New Zealand, and the Superintendent of Auckland, Colonel Wynyard, filled the position of Acting-Governor, until the arrival of Sir George Grey's successor. In his speech at the opening of Parliament, Colonel Wynyard said, "It will rest with the National Parliament whether New Zealand shall become a one great nation, exercising a commanding influence in the Southern Seas, or a collection of insignificant, divided and powerless petty states."

(1) Harrop, England and New Zealand, p. 287.
The Governor's Speech foreshadowed the impending struggle between centralism and provincialism, which struggle was to end in 1876 with the abolition of the provinces. He put forward the need for a strong central government in these words: "The power of the central government will be required to be strengthened and extended, while the legislative authority of the provinces will need at the same time to be rather narrowed in scope."

As already remarked, the constitution of 1852 did not contain any provisions for the establishment of responsible government. In regard to the Governor's Speech, Sewell wrote in his Journal: "It was a long story about particular measures, but not a word of responsible government, or a change of ministers." (1) New Zealand at this time possessed representative but not responsible government, this had still to be gained. This question of the grant of responsible government to the colony was taken up early in the discussions of the Assembly.

The interesting story of the steps leading to the establishment of responsible government has already been set forth (2). It was on December 8th, 1854, that Colonel Wynyard received from the Secretary of State, Sir George Grey, a statement in connection with the institution of

(1) July 11th, 1854.

(2) e.g. in the "History of the First Parliament of New Zealand", by Pierr.
responsible government in New Zealand. The dispatch said that Her Majesty's Government had no objection to offer to its establishment. Responsible government in England under which Ministers were responsible to Parliament, rested on usage only, and not on any written law. Wynyard's action in refusing to introduce responsible government without first referring the matter to the Imperial Parliament, was commended by Sir George Grey, who considered that the Acting-Governor had, in the circumstances, pursued the right course.

The most important act (1) of the first Parliament was the Waste Lands Act (No.6) empowering the Governor to alter the land regulations for any province on the recommendation of the Superintendent and Council of that province, and providing for a separate account of land revenue and expenditure for each province, and the allocation of any surplus funds to the respective provincial governments.

During the life of the first New Zealand Parliament, provincialism was in the ascendant. Sir George Grey by his action in calling together the Provincial Councils, whilst making no attempt to summon the General Assembly, had given a great impetus to provincialism. This, with the comparative geographical isolation of the different settlements and their independent origins, accounts for the strength of

the early Provincial Councils.

It was evident from the session of 1856 onwards that a conflict between centralism and provincialism was in the long run, inevitable. In many cases the Superintendents of the provinces were also elected to the General Assembly; the presence of six of them at the opening of the Second Parliament in 1856 did not augur well for the future. At this time the six provinces were each characterized by a sturdy individualism and a strong local patriotism. They had been established at widely different points on the coasts of both islands; they had been settled at different times; and some of them by people of different types.

The distances between the provinces, leading to isolated settlements and communities, along with the difficulties of communication did much to accentuate the initial differences between the provinces. Many of the early Superintendents were brilliant men, and were able to champion the claims of their respective provinces in the Assembly; such men as James Edward Fitzgerald, Dr. Featherston, one of the most polished speakers ever heard in the House, Richmond of New Plymouth and Henry Sewell of Canterbury, were all eager to support the claims of their respective provinces.

The new Governor, Sir Thomas Gore Browne, in his Speech opening Parliament on April 15th, 1866, expressed his intention of governing according to the principle of
responsible government. After considerable difficulty Henry Sewell formed the first ministry. Associated with Sewell in this ministry were Dillon Bell, Frederick Whitaker, M.L.C., and Henry John Tancred, M.L.C. The ministry was a feeble one. Saunders says, "After having failed to obtain the assistance of any of the ablest and most experienced men in the House, Sewell would have placed himself in his only proper position, if he had gone back to the Governor and reported his failure." The two great political questions of the moment were centralism and provincialism; Sewell's policy was definitely a centralist one but his ministry was in office only a fortnight.

The next ministry headed by William Fox lasted from May 20th to June 2nd. Fox's policy did not secure the support of the House, and when the Auckland "progress party" withdrew their support he gave way to E.W. Stafford, Superintendent of Nelson, who formed the first stable ministry in the parliamentary history of the colony. Stafford carefully avoided the extreme centralist views of Sewell, and the distinctly liberal protection and security of the provinces of Fox, so that the provincialists were adroitly complimented and the Premier was left free to shape the future control as the temper of the House might dictate.

The ministry solved the financial question by
resolutions which the House passed on July 2nd. Land revenues were to become the property of the provinces, subject to certain interest charges on a loan which was to be raised for the purpose of redeeming the debt of the New Zealand Company, now met by the proceeds of one quarter of the land sales, and the provision of funds for the purchase of native land. £200,000 was to be raised for the former purpose, the Southern provinces being responsible for interest and sinking fund. Auckland was to be relieved retrospectively as well as prospectively from all share in the debt. £180,000 was to be devoted to land purchase and the liability for this amount was to be shared between Auckland, Wellington and New Plymouth in the proportion of 5:5:2. The Imperial Government should be asked to extend its guarantee to a loan of £500,000 which would settle the native land purchase question and the debt of the General Government.

This "compact of 1856" was of inestimable value to the South Island provinces which were fortunate in possessing large areas of flat fertile land (e.g. parts of the Canterbury Plain) ready for cultivation. These provinces thus became possessed of ample funds which enabled them to commence the important work of providing such important public facilities as education, roads and railways. The North Island provinces were shortly to pass through the
period of the Maori Wars. Purchases of land by Northern settlers were hampered by the attitude of the Maori Land League and by the fact that nine-tenths of the lands in the North Island were still in Maori hands. Again the land in the North was heavily wooded in parts, or covered with scrub and fern-factors which hampered human settlement. The lands of the North Island, owing to the configuration of the country did not lend themselves to such easy cultivation, on the whole, as the lands of the South.

The loan of £500,000 was duly guaranteed by the Imperial Government, but the Waste Lands Act of 1856 was disallowed on the ground that the guarantee of the loan of £500,000 would be seriously impaired if the power of regulating the sale and disposal of lands should lodge in the provincial legislatures instead of in the general Government; this disallowance marked a definite increase in central as opposed to provincial control.

By the Land Revenue Appropriation Act (No.67) one sixth of the land revenue of the northern provinces was to be deducted for the purpose of providing a fund for further purchases of native land. But the most important Act of the session was the New Provinces Act (No.70). Many of the outlying districts of the various provinces were beginning to complain of the dominance exercised by the various main towns of the provinces. These districts
were given over to pastoral occupations and were sparsely populated. The agitation for the creation of new provinces was due largely to the efforts of the squatters in the more remote parts of the provinces, who argued that land revenue raised in any district should be expended on public works in that district. Agitation for the establishment of new provinces was very strong in Hawke's Bay (Ahuriri) and Southland (Murihiku). Consequently in 1858 the General Assembly passed an Act allowing new provinces to be formed under certain conditions. Shortly after the passing of the Act, the new provinces of Hawke's Bay, Southland and Marlborough came into being by hiving off from the parent provinces of Wellington, Otago and Nelson. These new provinces had their own Provincial Councils, "and the tiny Southland Council of nine members was the object of much ridicule" (1). Dr. Morrell's criticism of the Act is well founded. He says, "the New Provinces Act was a clever tactical move in the political struggle, but the success was scored at the expense, not only of the provincialists, but of good government in New Zealand" (2).

During the session of 1860, constitutional questions were relegated to the background, and with the outbreak of the Taranaki War in 1860, the question of native affairs

(1) Concliffe: i.d., p.125.

(2) Morrell, i.d., p.105. For an excellent discussion of the Act and its working see Morrell's "Provincial System in New Zealand", pp.95-102.
affairs became all important. Fox and Featherston, champions of the cause of provincialism, attacked the government strongly in regard to its treatment of the war, and ultimately in February, 1861, it accepted defeat and Fox and the peace party came into power.

The third New Zealand Parliament was composed of four ministries (1). The year 1861 marks the beginning of a period of estrangement between North and South as a result of their respective attitudes towards the financing of the Maori War and the native problem generally. Fox took office in 1861 but was hampered by the smallness of his majority. While the "supremacy of the Queen" was at stake the South supported the War; but the South had no sympathy with Fox's scheme for the establishment of civil institutions among the Maoris. During this ministry, the arrangement of 1856, whereby native affairs were left under the direct control of the Governor, was replaced by the principle of colonial responsibility in native affairs; responsible government was thus carried to its logical conclusion.

Great gold discoveries in Otago in 1861 gave an impetus to the Southern separation movement. The southern provinces, removed from the difficulties of the native war and urgently concerned with their own problems, complained of

(1) a. Fox Ministry, July 1861 - August 1862.
   b. Domett Ministry, August 1862 - October 1863.
   c. Whitaker-Fox Ministry, October 1863 - November 1864.
   d. Weld Ministry, November 1864 - October 1865.
of the evils of government from a distance. Otago in particular vigorously championed separation as a means of overcoming the evils attendant upon their connection with the North Island - evils which hampered Southern development. "It was perhaps during 1861 that the strongest demand was made in the South Island for political separation, a demand that was strengthened by the intimations of the Duke of Newcastle that the New Zealanders must meet the expenses of a war in which the South Island had scarcely more interest and far less responsibility than the Duke himself" (1). Separation was a topic of absorbing interest in Otago in 1862 and again in 1864. In the latter year a public meeting at Christchurch demanded that native policy should be revised, lavish expenditure curtailed, and more reliance placed on the resources of the colony.

These years - undoubtedly the most difficult which the colony had experienced - were a period of reckless provincial borrowing. The Domett ministry made the fatal mistake of allowing provincial borrowing to be carried on at a feverish pace. Moorhouse, Superintendent of Canterbury, initiated the scheme when he suggested that a tunnel should be put through the hills between Lyttelton and Christchurch. The work - a tribute to the energy and foresight of Moorhouse - was completed successfully at a cost of £300,000. Within six months the Domett ministry sanctioned £1,871,000 of

provincial laws. This orgy of provincial borrowing had an adverse effect on the attempts of the central government to raise loans for carrying on the Maori War. In connection with the Waikato War, the Whitaker-Fox Ministry sanctioned a loan of £3,000,000, hoping to defray a portion of the cost by selling part of the confiscated Waikato lands and colonising part with military settlers. It was quite evident that the finances of the colony were becoming hopelessly confused. Reader Wood was colonial treasurer from July 1861 to October 1863; although a capable politician, he was hardly equal to the difficult task of reorganizing the finances of the colony at such a critical time.

The cause for separation found little support outside Otago. On the other hand, a strong sentiment in favour of shifting the seat of government to a more central position claimed a large following. On November 25th, 1864, an address was presented to the Governor, Sir George Grey, by the House of Representatives, requesting the Governors of the Colonies of New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania to appoint one Commissioner each for the purpose of determining the best site in Cook Strait. The Commissioners decided, "that Wellington, in Port Nicholson, was the site upon the shores of Cook Strait which presented the greatest advantages"
for the administration of the government of the colony.” (1)

In February 1865 the seat of government was removed to Wellington, during the Weld Ministry’s tenure of office.

An attempt was made by the Domett Ministry to remedy some of the grievances of Otago. By the Representation Act, 1862, Otago was given four more members, while the appointment of a Supreme Court Judge did much to remove the defects in the administration of justice within that province. (2) Both Houses passed a resolution in favour of the establishment of telegraphic communication between the several provinces and the seat of Government. The only constitutional problem of any importance discussed in the Assembly of 1862 was that in connection with the method of electing Superintendents of Provincial Councils. Fitzgerald’s Bill, probably introduced as a result of Macandrew’s irregular proceedings in Otago, might or might not have led to a change of system, but was thrown out by only one vote. Domett finally resigned on account of a lack of cohesion in the Government.

Though Fox was a member of the new ministry, it was led by Whitaker of Auckland. The House rejected the Ministry’s proposals for an administrative separation of the islands with a Lieutenant Governor for the South. This government

(1) New Zealand Parliamentary Record, p.3.

(2) The judge appointed by the Domett Ministry was C.W.Richmond.
had difficult problems ahead of it as regards the raising of the £3,000,000 loan and the establishment of military settlers on the confiscated Waikato lands. Neither the Imperial Government nor the Governor was prepared to give the military settlement scheme its whole-hearted support. As to the conduct of the war, the colonists could see no prospect of its immediate conclusion. Southern opposition to the war was very outspoken. The Otago Provincial Council threatened to start a separation movement, "unless some measures can be taken which shall lead to the early termination of the war on terms consistent with the honour of the colony and the safety of the northern settlements" (1).

Weld addressed a public meeting at Christchurch in September, and put himself at the head of the movement for a revision of native policy, urging that the colony should rely upon its own sources for the settlement of the native problem. Such a changed attitude towards the native question was henceforward known as "the self-reliant policy". Owing to friction with the Governor, the Whitaker-Fox Ministry resigned in September, 1864.

Weld was called upon to form a ministry and thus given an opportunity to put his policy of "self-reliance" into action. This ministry acted upon the report of the Commissioners and removed the seat of government to Wellington.

(1) Quoted by Morrell, i.d. p.108.
Auckland vigorously opposed the change, fearing that she was to be left to deal with the native problem unaided. The northern attitude received general support in Otago. Auckland, supported by Otago, began an agitation for separation from the South. Financial considerations, however, were the chief obstacle in the way of the separation movement. The Weld Ministry was finally defeated on the question of finance. On June 30th, 1865, only £600,000 of the £3,000,000 loan had remained available for appropriation. Fitzherbert was unable to persuade the Imperial Government to guarantee the remainder of the loan, or to make a grant in aid for a few years. In his budget of 1865, Fitzherbert proposed to take from the provinces their right to the surplus customs revenue, and to make yearly grants in aid in place of the former arrangement. On October 11th, 1865, the Ministry was defeated on the financial proposals and thereupon resigned. It was now evident that the colony required an administration which could make both ends meet; Stafford seemed the person most likely to achieve this object and he accordingly began his second period of office as Prime Minister on October 16th, 1865.
One of the outstanding political figures of the period was Edward William Stafford, the first Superintendent of Nelson. Stafford's political career dates from the opening of the first New Zealand Parliament (1). During the next thirteen years, he was twice Premier of New Zealand (2). The young colony was particularly fortunate in having a man of Stafford's ability at the helm of state during nine of the most critical years in its early history (3).

Stafford, who was born on April 23rd, 1819, at Edinburgh, was the eldest son of Berkeley Stafford of Maine, county Louth, and of Anne, third daughter of Lieutenant-Colonel Duff Tytler. During his early life in Edinburgh, Stafford joined a cultured circle which moulded his intellectual interests. After completing his education at Trinity College, Dublin, he emigrated to Nelson in January, 1843. He took a prominent part in public affairs in his adopted province, and held the office of Superintendent of Nelson from 1853 to 1856.

Although not brilliant, Stafford proved himself to be

(1) May, 1854.
(2) Also Premier for a short time in 1872.
(3) (1856-61); (1865-69).
a sound, economical administrator, and when in power, a very capable leader. The following references to Stafford, coming from Henry Sewell, one of the most competent observers of the time, are worthy of notice. "I like what I have seen of him (Stafford) but he has great faults, principally an intense egoism, and a habit of making speeches of dreary prosiness" (1). Sewell described Stafford as "a good looking gentleman, person", and as a result of impressions gained during the life of the first New Zealand Parliament he was convinced that, "Stafford was really the best man fitted to lead the colony". (2)

During his first period as Premier, Stafford was given ample opportunity to display his political talents. Commenting on this period (1856-1861) Pember Reeves says: "judgment in choosing colleagues and officials, very fair administrative abilities, attention to business, and an indisposition to push things to extremes in the House were some of the qualities which enabled Stafford to retain office for four years, and to regain it more than once afterwards" (3).

Stafford's talents were nicely proportioned, so as to ensure their greatest usefulness. "Cautious without timidity, bold without rashness, self confident without jealousy of others, and not unwilling to take good advice,"

(1) Sewell's Journal, June 13th, 1854.

(2) Journal, August 22nd, 1854.

(3) Long White Cloud, p.193.
fond of personal power, but careful to use it legitimately, Stafford has good judgment, a tenacious memory, a broad grasp of politics, and a fair knowledge of men" (1). In general debate, his speeches were often marked by irrelevancies, verbiage and misconstruction of his opponents' arguments; but on great occasions they were noted for their breadth, clarity and argumentative power. His debating ability was seen at its best during the discussion of Whitaker's separation proposals. One of his ardent admirers and intimate acquaintances (Edward Wakefield) describes his debating powers thus. "He (Stafford) rejoiced in the excitement of debate, being himself by far the finest speaker in the House at that time, and he had laid himself out to make me an effective debater too. When I was going to make my first attempt, he said to me just before I rose to speak, 'Stick to the point, and do not speak long'. I spoke for about a quarter of an hour, and when I sat down he said, 'Capital! You will soon get the ear of the House, and may become a great power in it in course of time if you keep up to that standard'."

As a financier, Stafford was sound and practical. The financial statement of 1865, although presented by Jollie, was in reality prepared by Stafford, who, as

---

(1) Gisborne, New Zealand Rulers and Statesmen, p. 88.
Jollie said, "had applied himself, with his usual assiduity to the task of re-arranging the estimates in a new form, divided into distinct and well-defined classes, modelled upon the existing arrangements of the United Kingdom" (1). A careful study of political economy, assisted by that rare gift of ability to grasp leading principles and to apply them sensibly, stood Stafford in good stead during his second Ministry, when, for a period, he held the offices of Colonial Secretary, Colonial Treasurer and Postmaster-General along with that of the Premierships. This period offers an excellent example of Stafford's wonderful capacity for public work and his unflagging interest in the welfare of his adopted country. After the session of 1866, he reconstructed his Ministry so as to free himself of this well-nigh superhuman task. Edward Wakefield describes his first "official" meeting with Stafford as follows: "I found Stafford a very different man from the easy-going country gentleman and sportsman whom I had known at Nelson. He looked thin and care-worn as he sat at a long table amidst despatch-boxes and piles of official papers. . . . After greeting me cordially, he pushed away the work he was engaged upon, and entered upon a very grave explanation of the duties of

(1) P.D., Vol.1, 1866, p.362.
my position" (1). (Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.)

According to Gisborne, "Stafford would have done excellent work had there been a clear field before him, in adjusting the mutual relations of colonial and provincial institutions. Fully appreciating the respective advantages of general and local self-government, he would have been the last man to turn their forces against each other" (2). When, in 1865, the colonial party resolved upon the abolition of the provinces, Stafford joined, as one in the ranks, in that summary proceeding. Much of the legislation passed during the second Stafford Ministry was undoubtedly directed to this end.

On the whole he held sensible views on the native question. "Stafford's ruling principle in dealing with them (the Maoris) was that they, being the original owners of the soil, should never be forced to part with an acre of it against their will. At the same time, he laid it down clearly that, when the Maori title in any land had been voluntarily relinquished by cession to the brown, or by lawful sale to individuals, the rights of the new owners should be rigorously upheld by the Courts and enforced by the Government" (3). Gisborne, however, attributes the fall (4)

(2) Gisborne, i.d., p.89.
(3) Wakefield, i.d., p.7.
(4) June 28th, 1869.
of the second Stafford Ministry, to its bellicose attitude over the native war. Pember Reeves supports this opinion when he says that "Stafford, who was much more easy-going in ordinary politics than Fox, was usually identified with those who held that peace could only be secured by successful war" (1). In 1869, McLean and Fox together carried a motion of want of confidence in native affairs against Stafford. An impression prevailed that he was inclined to press the war in circumstances where forbearance and compromise would be an advantage to the colonists. Here again, Sewell's observations on Stafford's character, seem to be well justified. "Stafford is dreadfully deficient in tact, and I am apprehensive of differences between him and the Governor" (2).

Stafford was never very popular at any stage of his parliamentary career. Thus he made himself unpopular because of his attitude towards an Ordinance of the Otago Provincial Council which authorized the lease of land under certain conditions. "Everywhere I find Stafford spoken of with dislike. He seems to have affronted everybody. He has earned for himself an amount of unpopularity which is scarcely remedied by the good opinion which Richmond and Whitaker have obtained for the Government" (3).

(1) Reeves, i.d., p.193.
(2) Journal, October 29th, 1856.
On September 10th, 1872, Stafford became Premier on a motion condemning the public works policy of the Fox-Vogel administration, but he resigned on October 11th, after Vogel had carried a no-confidence motion against him. In 1874 he returned to England and lived there for the rest of his life. Stafford was essentially a statesman, and on his retirement from colonial politics, his opponents acknowledged his great qualities thus: "honourable ambition, industry, coupled with great power of work, extended information, the faculty of expression in debate, inflexible honesty of purpose, and practical training of a high order" (1).

Stafford died in London on February 14th, 1901.

Opening on June 30th, 1866, the first session of the fourth Parliament was likely to improve important because of the many difficult and important questions then agitating the colony. The session also helped to justify Gisborne's assertion that many of our public men have shown in the performance of public duties, "ability, public spirit and other great moral quantities of no ordinary kind". It was marked by a prolonged debate on separation, showed clearly that the inevitable clash between provincialism and centralism was drawing nearer, brought on a ministerial crisis which relieved Stafford of his weaker colleagues, and finally devoted close attention to the vital problem of laying down a sound financial policy.

The separation movement had aroused great interest, particularly in Auckland and Otago. The Middle Island (South) Association had been formed, to urge the cause of separation and had collected statistics to justify the recognition of the South Island as a separate colony. The early part of the session was devoted to a prolonged debate on separation, which ended with the defeat of Whitaker's (1)

(1) Superintendent of Auckland.
proposals - proposals which provided for the separation of Auckland from the South. "In Auckland 'separation' was the great issue at the general election of 1866. In Otago, most of the candidates, whether successful or not, supported a modified separation, a cordial union of members, and no increase of taxation." (1)

The Stafford Ministry had difficult problems to contend with in defence, colonisation, and provincial loans. Jollie, the Treasurer, precipitated a ministerial crisis when he proposed to revise the tariff and also to deprive the provinces of their share of the Customs revenue. Provincialists of all shades did not feel happy over the disclosure of unpalatable truths and turned the Ministry out. An unusual situation now arose. Moorhouse, the mover of the motion which led to the fall of the Ministry, declared in favour of the reconstruction of the Ministry under Stafford. Accordingly, Stafford, whose administration was characterized by efficiency and economy, continued as Premier and selected his new colleagues from the Weld administration. Members were divided into the two camps of Provincialists and Centralists. Stafford, as leader of the colonial party was determined to abolish the provinces.

The fourth New Zealand Parliament was opened by commission on June 30th, 1866 (2). The Speaker ordered the Clerk to summon members of the House of Representatives to the

(1) Morrell, Provincial System in New Zealand, p.156.

(2) Commissioners appointed by the Governor were: the Hon. Thomas Bartley, the Hon. Andrew Russell, the Hon. John Johnston, and the Hon. James Prendergast.
Legislative Council to hear the commission read by the Clerk. Dillon Bell, member for Mataura, proposed that Sir David Munro, who had been Speaker in the last parliament, should be re-elected Speaker. The freedom of debates from scurrility and violent language was attributed to the impartiality and vigilance of Sir David, "and in proposing him again, he believed that he was interpreting the wishes of almost every member of the House." (1)

On Tuesday, July 3rd, the Governor's Speech was delivered. His Excellency mentioned the increase in the number of members of the House of Representatives and the consequent broader representation in Parliament of the interests in the colony. (2). Native affairs were dealt with at length in the opening paragraphs. The success of the British regulars in the closing campaigns had increased British prestige. On the East Coast, the military operations of the colonial forces aided by loyal natives had contributed to the general result. It was the Government's desire to do away with misunderstandings between the natives and the white settlers, and to encourage the Maoris to live peaceably. Natives who had been taken in arms were now free; several ringleaders, including the notorious Te Kooti, had been temporarily banished to the Chathams, while those guilty of murder had been tried in the Courts.


(2) However, the franchise was not yet universal.
The Governor mentioned three factors which would be of importance in the economic development of the colony: a faster mail service to England by way of the Isthmus of Panama, the electric cable which was to be laid across Cook Strait, and the increase in gold production, augmenting revenue and attracting immigrants. Rigid economy in the public service expenditure would be a feature of the estimates for the ensuing year.

The Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech is the customary answer, paragraph by paragraph, to the opening Speech. This address is moved in both Houses. Two members in each House are chosen by the Government for moving and seconding the address. Any paragraph in the address may be amended in the same form as amendments to other questions. When the question for an address, whether amended or not, has been agreed to, a committee is appointed in the House of Representatives "to prepare" or "draw up" an address, and withdraws immediately for that purpose. The address is reported by the committee, then read a first time by direction of the Speaker, and a second time (at length) upon question. Amendments may be proposed to any paragraph, either when the clerk has read such paragraph, or after the second reading of the whole address. But no amendment can be proposed to the address, after the question of adopting the committee's report has been proposed from the chair. Since the Speech sets out the policy of the Governor's responsible Ministers,
it is sometimes the occasion for the motion by the Leader of the Opposition, expressing want of confidence in the Government. After the address has been finally agreed to, it is ordered to be presented to the Governor. The Houses meet together for this ceremony.

The Address for this session was moved by Campbell of Oamaru and seconded by Newman of Raglan. After noticing the prosperity of the goldfields districts, and the necessity for economy in the public service, the former referred to the financial condition of the colony, criticising the manner in which the provinces had gone into the market for loans, to the prejudice of the general Government.

Newman outlined the proposals to increase the numbers of (representatives) members in the House of Representatives and hoped that consideration would be given to a better distribution of constituencies. He felt that the natives had been treated, during the war, with forbearance. He condemned the conduct of certain religious teachers and other people of high standing who deprecated the Government's action towards the natives, as well as the opinion of "a certain class of officers who came out to fight our battles, but who, disliking the service, and finding bush-fighting not likely to be conducive to their comfort or promotion, wrote home to friends and sweethearts, long doleful letters, containing all sorts of untruthful charges." (1) The British troops had fought well

and earned the gratitude of the colony; but they should be withdrawn, as the colony could not afford the £40 per man necessary for their retention. "It will be a matter for rejoicing", he said, "when the last soldier leaves our shores for during the last two years there has been a great change in the feelings of the people - I speak, of course, of the North, and of Auckland in particular: we no longer have the same excessive fear of the natives." (1) Small local volunteer or militia forces, would be sufficient for the suppression of any native wars. As for finance, Newman preferred a property tax to a stamp duty; the property tax was paid by the wealthy, and consequently did not check the development of the colony.

Richmond of Grey and Bell asked who had given the order for General Chute's campaign, the only result of which had been the alienation of a friendly chief - William King of Umuroa. Stafford closed the debate. Admittedly William King had fled; since then he had been reassured and was now living in his own house near one of the outposts. If Richmond would consult the Appendix of the Journals for last session, he would find the orders for the West Coast campaign. References had been made during the debate to the omission from the Speech of names of certain notable Europeans, like Donald McLean, and of friendly Maoris who had rendered valuable services to the Government during the war. Stafford said that it was the view of the Government that these

(1) P.D., Vol.1, p.757.
services should be recognized in separate resolutions. The address was adopted and ordered to be presented to the Governor the following day.

In the Legislative Council, the Reply, after minor amendments proposed by Mantell, had been agreed to, was passed without a division.

A long debate on the question of separation was introduced on July 11th by Whitaker who asked the Colonial Secretary (Stafford) whether the Ministry intended to propose any change in the present form of government. Whitaker's real object, in which he was supported by the other Auckland members, and the members for Otago, was to obtain for Auckland and Otago an improved form of provincial government.

Stafford replied that if the question meant separation, then the answer was "No". His ministry would not propose any radical change in the form of government at the request of the Auckland people, unless it would benefit the whole colony. Thus at the very outset Stafford showed that he had not abandoned his anti-provincialist opinions.

On July 24th Whitaker criticised the existing form of government as specially unsatisfactory to the province of Auckland from the point of view of revenue and population and area. Trinidad, Jamaica and Van Diemen's Land were separate colonies no larger than Auckland. At this time the agitation in Auckland for some form of separation was undoubt-
edly very strong. The activities of the Northern Association had resulted in unanimous resolutions of public meetings, the election of Whitaker as Superintendent, and the separatist attitude of the Auckland members in the House. Whitaker could proudly boast, "that there was not a constituency from the North Cape to Taupo in which a man would have stood a shadow of a chance if he had not said that he was in favour of separation." (1)

He also referred to the dissatisfaction in Otago over the division of powers in the goldfields, the administration being in the hands of the provincial executive, whilst legislation remained a function of the general government; all the southern provinces were smarting under a sense of injustice in regard to taxation and finance. This question of finance was not a fleeting one. At various times during the past twelve years the Auckland Provincial Council had passed resolutions in favour of separation. One did not have to seek far for the causes of this agitation; the present evils were due to the distance between governors and governed.

During his period of office as superintendent he had realized this very clearly, particularly in regard to the mal-administration of native affairs. Referring to the delay in the despatch of documents required by the Auckland Native Land Court, Whitaker said that he had asked the Secretary of Lands,

a friend of his, why they had not come, and received the answer, "Look how beautifully they are arranged. You would not disturb them?" "Yes they look very beautiful here", was his rejoinder, "but what is the good of them after you lose your lands?" Much valuable time was wasted over complaints regarding the native administration in Auckland, because of the deadening influence of the control centralised in Wellington. To facilitate the settling of disputes and disturbances, Auckland should have control of her own native problems.

At present too much time was devoted to legislation, both provincial and general. Separation would relieve the South Island of liability in connection with native affairs and would free the South from this constant discussion on native administration. Native affairs were essentially a Northern problem. Yet, native administration should not be under the control of a superintendent and provincial council. "They (i.e. Auckland) wanted the conservative principle of having a second chamber and a lieutenant-governor - still, however, maintaining a link between the two parts of the colony." (1) The adoption of this policy (i.e. separation) would mean the limitation of southern financial liability in regard to native affairs. Such colonial authorities as Sir George Grey and Charles Buller

(1) P.D., Vol.1, p.798.
advocated separation, Whitaker concluded by moving that the House go into committee to consider the following resolutions.

"1. That in the opinion of this House, temporary provision should be made for the better government of the Province of Auckland.

"2. That with a view to that object, the office of Superintendent of the province should be abolished, and the whole administration of the government conducted by a lieutenant-governor, with the advice of an executive council.

"3. That the provincial council should be abolished, and a provincial assembly established.

"4. That such provincial assembly shall have exclusive power of legislation on all subjects except as shall be reserved for the general assembly.

"5. That no law to be passed by the provincial assembly for any of the purposes hereinafter mentioned should have any force unless assented to by the Governor-in-Chief—that is to say:
   a. The imposition, abolition, alteration, or regulation of duties and customs.
   b. The establishment or abolition of a Supreme Court, or the alteration of the constitution, jurisdiction, or practice of such court.
   c. The regulating of the current coin, or the issue of any paper currency.
   d. The regulating of the carriage of letters between any of the provinces of the colony, and between the colony and foreign places.
   e. The erection and maintenance of beacons and lighthouses on the coasts.
   f. The regulation of marriages.

"6. That on all such subjects the general assembly of the colony and the provincial assembly should have concurrent powers of legislation: provided that all laws made by the general assembly, control and supersede any law made by the provincial assembly on any such subject.

"7. That all pecuniary debts and liabilities of the colony should remain, as at present, a charge on the colony, and proper arrangements be made for securing the due payment of the share chargeable to the Province of Auckland.
"8. That after a day to be fixed, the whole revenue arising within the province should be made provincial revenue.

"9. That after such a day the whole cost of the civil and military government of the province should be borne by the province, and an equitable contribution provided towards the expenses of the general assembly.

"10. That, in consideration of the continuation of the existing arrangements whereby the land fund is made provincial revenue, and in consideration of the Province of Auckland relieving the colony of the expense of the administration of native affairs, and the cost of military defence within the province, an annual allowance - to be fixed upon the basis of the estimated amount of such expense - should be made by the colony to the province.

"11. That effect be given at once to these resolutions, so far as it is competent for the general assembly to do so; and that the Imperial Government be applied to to give full effect thereto with the least possible delay." (1)

Graham of Franklin seconded the motion.

Stafford said that although the Government opposed separation, it could be discussed in committee. He gave a strong denial to the rumour that the Government had no policy. While commending Whitaker's earnestness and impartiality he remorselessly exposed the weakness of the scheme. He said, "He found that while the people of Auckland wanted the whole authority over their own affairs (2), they also wanted to come into the House and take part in the legislation of the colony (3); he found that while they wanted a whole of the revenue of their own province (4), they also wanted to obtain a

---

(2) Resolution 4.
(3) Resolution 6.
(4) Resolution 8.
portion of the revenues of the rest of the colony - to dip their hands into the pockets of the South \(^{(1)}(2)\)". It was not the Government's intention to introduce a change acceptable to Auckland only. He asserted the irrelevancy of Whitaker's reference to Jamaica and Trinidad and to the statistics of Auckland. Auckland's problems would not be solved by political isolation. The powers of the proposed provincial government were ill-defined, quoting the clause, "in certain cases the powers (i.e. of the provincial assembly) should be concurrent with those of the general government" \(^{(3)}\), he endeavoured to show its absurdity - "for instance in marriage laws, so that a man might be married under the laws of Auckland and unmarried under the laws of the colony; and in the currency, so that bank notes of Auckland might be of no use elsewhere" \(^{(4)}\). Stafford concluded with an emphatic refusal to agree to the resolutions.

Whitaker's resolution was amended by Dick, Superintendent of Otago, so as to include other provinces. A division followed; the amendment was defeated by 42 votes to 18, the minority including many Auckland and Otago votes; it was quite evident that a large majority of the House were definitely opposed to separation. Auckland members, led by Whitaker, formed the spearhead of the attack against the present system

\(^{(1)}\) Resolution 10.
\(^{(3)}\) Resolution 6.
of government; generally speaking Otago members, under Dick's guidance, were staunch supporters of the northern agitation.

Moorhouse, Superintendent of Canterbury, was of the opinion that separation would benefit the colony. Auckland, if separate, would seriously consider the cost of future wars before entering upon them; hitherto Southern provinces had partly financed native wars. He outlined a scheme for the administration of native affairs, involving the division of the North Island into three provinces, the superintendents of which should administer native affairs, while the expense of administration should be borne by the provinces concerned. Moorhouse had said that unless more convincing arguments were brought forward he should have to vote for separation, but cast his vote with the majority.

For Jollie, separation meant the disruption of the colony, with such evil effects as the abandonment of the Panama mail service and the electric telegraph service. He believed that in spite of the evil effects of the loan policy of 1863 (1), the colony was financially sound. The South Island would be well advised to honour its obligations under the loan, thus assisting the North Island in its struggle with the native problem.

Hall (Heathcote) argued that if Whitaker's scheme, which

(1) During the Whitaker-Fox Ministry's period of office, the Assembly approved a loan of £3,000,000, for the conduct of the Waikato War.
which undoubtedly the best one the Separationists could devise, was shown to be impracticable, the Separatist agitation must collapse. He confined his remarks mainly to the financial provisions of the resolutions; in particular, he vigorously opposed Resolution 10. Whitaker required the South Island, in return for the continued possession of its land revenue, to grant an allowance to Auckland. The compact of 1856 gave the South Island the revenues from the sale of land; Whitaker had helped to establish that compact, and should be the last man to jettison it. As far as Hall could see, the resolutions advocated neither real separation nor real unity. "The uncertainty, confusion and conflict" predicted by Gladstone, as the result of the proposed concurrent jurisdiction of the General Assembly and the Provincial Councils, would be the inevitable outcome of the scheme. Limited liability was supposed to be the basis of the scheme, yet no indication had been given of the limits.

Auckland was to pay for the administration of native affairs within its own borders and to contribute to the charges of the colonial debt. Auckland would find no difficulty in paying the charges in prosperous times. What would be the position in times of financial difficulty? Would the Auckland Assembly be willing to impose additional taxation in order to meet the cost, when such taxation was
the result of a bargain which their predecessors had made with the South? In times of financial difficulty, or native disturbances, the South would have to help the North.

The Provincial governments, according to Hall, had carried out important work; yet their functions were temporary. Separation meant a colony weakened by political divisions; a united colony, with a strong central government was necessary for progress. The resolutions proposed a remedy which was worse than the disease.

Ward (Avon) proposed an amendment for the purpose of including such other North Island provinces as might be willing to take upon themselves representative government, and that of native affairs within their own borders. His amendment was defeated, another indication of the opposition of the majority of the House to any scheme of separation—whether it be complete, partial or insular separation.

Carleton (Chairman of Committees) made a strong attack on the Constitution Act of 1852, which he charged with "the disruption of the colony". Provincial loyalty, the result of the provincial system set up the Act of 1852, was opposed to a feeling of nationality, which was being fostered by the reaction from the idea of separation. The faulty working of the Act justified the demand for separation. Yet opponents of separation were determined to preserve intact such an Act. "By voting against Resolution 1 the Committee will declare
that the Constitution Act needs no further amendment; that it provides for all our needs; and that as amended by ourselves, it is the perfection of legislation." (1)

Bryce (Wanganui) emphasised the impracticability of the proposals. Provincial powers should be curtailed, while provincial councils should be replaced by simpler and more effective institutions. With the breakdown of local insolation and the growth of the colony, the provincial system had lost its utility. Separation meant the pauperization of Auckland. The case for separation was not strong enough to justify a change.

Whitaker concluded the debate. After answering some of the more important criticisms of his proposals he said, "If the present state of things were allowed to continue, a war would ensue worse than any that had come to them yet, and he begged the House not to refuse the granting of this request, and not to dash from the people of Auckland, all hopes of bettering their condition. Surely he had shown that they had a grievance, and the House would not refuse to admit it." (2)

Whitaker's proposals were a compromise between real and nominal separation. There were to be two Governors and two assemblies. Decisions of the General Assembly were, if necessary, to overrule those of the Auckland Assembly. The

Governor's consent to various provincial laws was essential (1). All responsibilities and expenses in connection with native affairs and military defence within its borders, were to be borne by Auckland. On the financial side, the proposals advocated separation of the revenues of the various provinces, but Auckland was to contribute to the expenses of the General Assembly, while the latter body was to make a fixed yearly grant to Auckland for native purposes. Wellington, Hawke's Bay and Taranaki were not included in the scheme.

An editorial in "The Lyttelton Times" of July 24th, 1866, condemned Whitaker's scheme as feeble and unjustified. "What Auckland wants, according to the first edition of its demands, is a new suit of clothes, with a proper peg to hang them on. Let its Superintendent go out at one door, to reappear at another under the name of local Governor. Let the Provincial Council in like manner re-appear as the Provincial Assembly. The necessary result of all this would be that the parties could for the future wear their gold or silver lace, and the Aucklanders would be gratified with the display of all the wonted paraphernalia and bedizenments of gubernatorial residence. We sincerely hope that the General Assembly will be considerate of their feelings and liberal in the matter of laces and lacings. Only let them see that the

(1) Imposition etc. of Customs duties; currency regulation; establishment of a Supreme Court, etc.
people of the South are not required to pay the bill."

A leader of the "Christchurch Press" was equally convinced of the futility of the proposals. "One simple answer to the entire argument is that all these native troubles had their origin, and rose to their greatest heights when the headquarters of government were established, and the annual sessions of the General Assembly were held in Auckland. Moreover, when Whitaker was the Premier of an essentially Auckland ministry, with the whole resources of the colony at his disposal, the Waikato campaign was planned and carried out - with what effect the passionate cry for separation in the South Island can best testify" (1).

A recent investigator comments on Whitaker's proposals in similar vein when he says, "The objects of Auckland and Otago were really by no means the same. They had both demanded an enlargement of provincial powers; but Auckland chiefly wanted to manage her Maoris in her own way, Otago to manage her funds in her own way. If the Imperial Government had been willing to act as a deus ex machina, agreement might have been possible but not otherwise. Auckland could only manage her natives in her own way by means of a subsidy from the rest of the colony; thus the very system which Otago desired to avoid would be established more firmly than ever." (2)

(1) July 28th, 1866.
(2) Morrell, i.d., p.158.
There was very little to be said in favour of Whitaker's proposals. Those proposals, were, to say the least, very one-sided. Whitaker had devised an elaborate scheme to meet the needs of Auckland, without any consideration of the legitimate needs of other portions of the colony. Stafford showed the weakness of this aspect of the scheme when he said, "The Government could not bring down such a measure as that before them, because it could not frame a measure within the four corners of Mr. Cardwell's despatch that would satisfy the people of Auckland and be just to the rest of the colony." (1) Emphasising the same point, Stafford said that "Whitaker had proposed a change acceptable to the people of Auckland without any consideration for the rest of the colony, and he might say that that was a thing which the Government of the colony could neither do themselves, nor accept from one another." (2) Whitaker maintained that it was impossible to govern the Maoris from any place other than Auckland, and emphasised the injurious effect of the absence of some local government in Auckland, with powers co-extensive with those of the general Government. Stafford's replies were conclusive. "The very fact of a defeat of the rebels in Auckland would at once cause them to go into Taranaki or Hawke's Bay; what would Whitaker do then? . . . . . . If there was this necessity for a Government on the spot, how would Whitaker apply his argument to Poverty Bay? Would Whitaker say Auckland could

administer native affairs better than a Government with its seat at Hawke's Bay?" (1) Donald McLean at Napier often settled disputes without any reference to the general Government; Stafford's pertinent question was, "Why did not Whitaker do the same?"

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that if Whitaker's argument as regards "government on the spot" was justified in the case of Auckland, it must also be justified in every other province. Yet if the scheme was to apply only to Auckland, what was to be done with Hawke's Bay, Taranaki, and the territory between Taranaki and Wanganui, which was infested with some of the most hostile tribes in the colony?

Stafford stressed the futility of Whitaker's suggestion that native affairs should be administered by a Lieutenant-Governor and a nominated chamber. He would ask, if they had a Provincial Assembly, where would Whitaker get its members, if not from among the very men who formed that Council, and what right had Whitaker to throw dirt at those men as Provincial Councillors, whom he would take his hat off to as members of the Provincial Assembly? (2)

The defeat of the proposals, because of the reasons so well expressed by Stafford (3), sounded the death-knell of

(3) See p.41-42.
the separation movement, which had its origins in the dis-inclination of the South to shoulder the financial burdens of the Maori War. Increasing financial complications arising from the £3,000,000 loan removed separation from the sphere of practical politics. Provincial feelings were undoubtedly strong in 1866; such feeling did much to give the province the semblance of a self-contained unit. On the other hand, the influence of the ideals of unity and nationality was making itself felt. New Zealand was destined to become, as a result of the coalescing of the six original colonies, one united colony. Improved communications in the form of better roads, the telegraph system and improved postal and shipping services—these were powerful influences making for the unity of the colony and hastening the breakdown of provincial isolation. The overthrow of the provincial system was the logical outcome of the working of these forces. "Many of the colonists believed that 'the division of New Zealand into two or three separate colonies would dwarf the political intellect of the colony' (1), that the participation of the South Island in the responsibility for native affairs was not only 'a relief from mere cash-box considerations' (2) but a safeguard for the natives themselves; and that separation would be 'the grave of the long cherished visions of future greatness and nationality' (3)." (4)

(1) Memorandum of Weld (December 30th, 1864).
(2) Ibid.
(3) "A N.Z. Colonist" in Otago Daily Times (May 30th, 1862).
(4) Morrell, i.d., p.160.
Jollie, the Colonial Treasurer, presented his financial statement on Wednesday, August 8th. He outlined the advantages of the new system of managing Treasury business as follows:-

a. The presentation of the Financial Statement earlier in the session.

b. More frequent communication between receivers, collectors, sub-treasurers, and the treasurer, thus giving the latter a more immediate and effective control over revenue.

c. Grants sanctioned by the House to receive ministerial approval before payment; thus replacing the former principle of ministerial approval after payment.

d. Future advances of public money to be made for limited periods and amounts, and with the assent of the Minister concerned.

The revenue and the expenditure of the past financial year were reviewed. On August 30th, 1865, Fitzherbert, Jollie's predecessor, had estimated the revenue at £2943,500, including £5,000 from distillation and £37,500 from stamp duties. Omitting the latter items, the revenue received was £902,094. 30s. 4d., made up as follows: - (estimated revenue subjoined for comparison.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue received (1865-66).</th>
<th>Estimated Revenue (1865-66).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>s. d.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>798,100 12 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>49,391 4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>29,209 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>14,981 1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees on issue of Crown grants</td>
<td>2,732 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Board</td>
<td>563 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraphs</td>
<td>5,079 16 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,036 16 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2902,094 3 4

£2943,500 0 0

The large increase of £155,000 in Customs revenue, over that of the previous year was attributed to the increased production of the West Coast goldfields. Interesting figures, showing the condition of the colony's export trade, were quoted. Gold valued at £2,859,249 was exported during the year, (1865-66), an increase of 33% over the previous highest year (1863-64). Up to June 30th, 1866, the total gold export from the colony was valued at £10,506,053. These figures indicate the importance of gold exports to the colony. The return of exports and imports was not complete, but the volume of trade transacted was indicative of the colony's soundness. As a result of the increased gold production and rapid pastoral development in the colony.

(1) To the above amount, £5,500 for light dues, was to be added.
(2) Fees and Duty.
South Island, export figures for the year (1865-66) constituted a record.

Exports increased by £1,530,376; imports decreased by £913,622 over the same period (1865-66). The following table shows the position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865-66</td>
<td>£4,699,152</td>
<td>£5,270,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-65</td>
<td>£3,168,776</td>
<td>£6,183,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Zealand with a revenue of £1,500,000 for the current year compared favourably with South Australia, New South Wales and Canada. In 1864, the revenue of the latter with a population of 2½ millions, and a territory three times as large as that of New Zealand, was only one third greater than that of New Zealand. The following tables show the authorised and actual expenditure for the period 1865-66.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td>200,803</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>391,157</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Services</td>
<td>169,882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,480</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised expenditure (3 preceding years)</td>
<td>167,655</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167,655</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil List</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent charges</td>
<td>224,733</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (actual expenditure) did not include a sum of £288,281.11s.9d, which was due to the provinces as their

(1) Includes permanent charges.

(2) Prior to June 30th, 1866.
share (1) of the entire Customs for the year. Under the terms of the Appropriation Act, the financial surplus of 1864-65, amounting to £112,376.11s.3d. was used partly to pay off past expenditure incurred by past governments, and partly also to augment the revenue of the past year. Such expenditure was made chargeable by the Appropriation Act against revenue and not against the £3,000,000 loan. As a result the Government paid the provinces in 1865 a surplus of £269,157.17s.4d. instead of a surplus of £155,340.17s.4d. which they would have otherwise received.

Jollie next reviewed expenditure of the £3,000,000 loan for the year 1865-66. In his financial statement of August 30th, 1865, Fitzherbert estimated the balance of the £3,000,000 loan available on June 30th, 1865 as £602,063. Fitzherbert had also estimated that £310,000 would be the necessary cost of maintaining military settlers throughout the colony. For the year ending June 30th, 1866, the loan was drawn on for £411,391.18s.7d. for the purpose of "defence" and public works.

After this brief survey, Jollie outlined the Ministry's defence proposals for the current year; this portion of the Ministry's proposals evoked general opposition, and played an important part in bringing about the Ministry's dismissal. A sum of £310,000 was to be devoted to the purposes of

---

(1) Three-eighths.
native expenditure and what was technically termed "defence". Owing to the withdrawal of the imperial troops, the Government's intention was to establish a volunteer military service of one thousand men. Under peace conditions, the yearly cost of such a force was estimated at £109,000. The huge sum of £200,000 was to be devoted to maintaining military settlers, along with other "defence" charges. Thus approximately £310,000 was to be the cost of defence under peace conditions; Jollie took particular care to emphasise the fact that the estimates were based on a peace footing; he did not make any reference to the probable extent of war expenditure.

Transactions concerning the loan during the financial year were reviewed. £500,000 had been offered on the London market; with the exception of £18,200, this amount had been disposed of, or exchanged against 8% debentures. The Home Government would guarantee half a million 4% debentures transferred to it by the Weld Government, in part payment of the colony's debt. On June 30th, 1866, the total permanent debt of the colony was £3,399,537.15s.ld., less an accumulated sinking fund of £116,641.1s.8d. The total authorized debt was £3,650,000. Consequently £250,462.4s.1d. of the loan remained still to be raised.

Expenditure was estimated as follows:
Supplementary expenditure for the previous year was £33,835.2s.6d. Tariff revision would result in an increase of £50,000 on the Customs revenue of the previous year (£798,000), providing that the existing gold export trade were maintained. Ordinary revenue (excluding customs) was set down as follows: the actual revenue of 1865-66 being subjoined for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Revenue (1866-67)</th>
<th>Actual Revenue (1865-66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>35,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>60,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraphs</td>
<td>9,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse dues</td>
<td>8,500 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown grant fees</td>
<td>12,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of lands &amp; deeds</td>
<td>17,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£146,500 0 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total ordinary estimated revenue was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous ordinary revenue (as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duties - nine month's receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed distillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£1,056,000 0 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a particularly sharp sting in the tail of this speech. Jollie calmly informed the House that his arrangements would deprive the provinces of their customary share of the Customs revenue. Changed circumstances rendered it impossible for the Government to continue the subsidy of \( \frac{3}{8} \) of the Customs to the provinces. He said, "New Zealand, I foresee, will require a larger and larger proportion of its own resources for its own wants; . . . . I would strongly recommend the provinces henceforth to rely more upon themselves and their own local revenues, and less upon the fluctuating and precarious surpluses which it may be in the power of the General Government to continue." (1)

Revenue was estimated at over £1,000,000, including £50,000 from a stamp duty. The amount to be expended on defence was approximately £310,000, and coincided almost exactly with \( \frac{3}{8} \) of the Customs revenue, hitherto apportioned to the provinces to enable them to perform governmental functions coming within their own sphere. This portion of the revenue was now to be seized by the Government; for the future, provincial governments would have "to scratch for themselves". Having thus relieved them of their revenues, the Treasurer very blandly emphasised the importance of "self-reliance". Stafford's intention was to expend about one-third of the revenue upon defence; the Government's

defence problems were to be solved by impoverishing the provincial governments.

Fitzgerald in an able speech, marked at times with mistakes, vigorously opposed the defence expenditure and the proposal to deprive the provinces of their share of the Customs revenue. When Stafford moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, Fitzgerald moved an amendment (1), "To leave out all the words after 'that' in order to insert certain resolutions. Such a motion expressed a want of confidence in the Government; if the House refuses to go into Committee of Supply on the motion of the Government, it is equivalent to a refusal to grant supplies (2). Fitzgerald's resolution expressed regret that Stafford had not provided for a reduction of expenditure, and protested against the war expenditure, and the fixing of provincial revenues by law. Stafford, as leader of the Opposition, said it was possible to reduce expenditure by £240,000. He had made that statement for political ends, since the financial statement made no reference to the promised saving of £240,000. Fitzgerald estimated the saving at £30,000. Fitzgerald quoted the following extract from an editorial in the Nelson "Examiner" (3). "We have been favoured by Mr. Stafford with a few figures showing sums, which, in his

(1) August 14th, 1866.
(2) Muir: How Britain is Governed, p.223.
(3) September 29th, 1865.
opinion, might have been saved on the estimates had the expenditure of the Government been reconsidered according to the terms of his (Stafford's) resolutions." According to the editorial, Stafford placed the total saving on the ordinary estimates at £145,125, and on the loan estimates at £146,391 - an approximate reduction of £300,000 in the expenditure of the current financial year.

The contemplated military force was unnecessary, it meant additional burdens for the taxpayer. Local police could maintain order, their cost to be jointly defrayed by the provincial and general governments. "I believe", Fitzgerald said, "that it is the bounden duty of the colony, now with the utmost rapidity to wind up these war-establishments altogether; and to abandon the notion of having a standing army with great names." (1)

Fitzgerald saw clearly the death-knell of provincialism in the success of the measure. The financial relations of the provinces and the general Government were unsatisfactory. At present, many functions were performed by provincial governments; if the latter were deprived of their share of the general revenue they could not function properly, "Upon the provinces depend the future history and prosperity of New Zealand. So long as the provinces possess these large powers it is an absurdity, which will not bear argument, to

take away their revenues, or to leave this large portion of the government of the colony wholly unprovided for." (1) He charged the Ministry with incompetence, and urged its reconstruction under Stafford's leadership.

The conclusion of the session marked the close of Fitzgerald's parliamentary career. Great expectations were formed of Fitzgerald's future in New Zealand politics after his arrival in Canterbury in 1850, but they were not to be fulfilled. His literary ability, brilliant oratory, good debating power, coupled with considerable power of humour and pathos, were attributes pointing to a distinguished career in politics. Nevertheless, that career, lasting from 1853 to 1866 was a brilliant failure. We are told that he was "a thorough Irish gentleman - quick, impulsive, and winning in manner and conversation." Yet his speech on the financial proposals was truly indicative of Gisborne's assertion that, "with all his great gifts he was impracticable and impractical. He was rash, impetuous and inattentive to good advice; he had too much faith in himself, and too little in others." (2) As Superintendent of Canterbury he did nothing of mark, while his short-lived term as Minister of Native Affairs in 1865, brought about the defeat of the Weld Ministry.

(2) Gisborne, i.d., p.82.
Fitzgerald's rather intemperate speech provoked an immediate though unconvincing reply from Stafford. Though he charged Fitzgerald with ignorance of the proposals, his speech did little to substantiate the charge. He merely referred to some of the figures used by Fitzgerald. Any attempt to settle a fixed portion of the revenue on the provinces must be preceded by consolidation of the colony's revenues. He bitterly reproached Fitzgerald for voting against separation. The most enlightening part of the speech prophesied that "the day from which the provincial power and system would date its decline would be the day it attempted to make an aggression with the view of destroying the General Government of the country." (1)

Vogel examined the financial proposals in regard to their effects on the provinces. A satisfactory financial arrangement must guarantee the provinces a share of the Customs. Provincialism was on trial; the destruction of the system was the logical outcome of the revolutionary proposals before them. Jollie had told the provinces they must shift for themselves, but that they had his good wishes. "There are many unfortunate wretches condemned to the Chathams", said Vogel, "for proceedings less revolutionary than are indicated on the speech of the Colonial Treasurer." (2)

On August 15th, both the motion and the amendment were rejected; the latter without a division. Moorhouse, who urged the reconstruction of the Ministry under Stafford, proposed a motion "that the Ministry as then constituted did not possess the confidence of the House." He was successful in defeating the Ministry by a majority of thirty-three in a House of sixty-one (1). On this occasion the opinion of the House on the incompetence of the Ministry was strongly expressed.

The controversy over the financial proposals was indicative of the impending struggle between provincialism and centralism and showed the tendency of provincialism to conflict with centralism on matters of national policy. Vogel's attitude to provincialism at this stage is worthy of notice, since Vogel, the former great provincialist, was, more than any other man, responsible for the act abolishing them in 1875. Stafford supported by Jollie, was of the opinion, that the colony's needs must come first. With that end in view Jollie intended to impose a stamp duty and to deprive the provinces of their share of the general revenue, in order to carry out the defence proposals. This move was an extremely bold one; apart from the rights and wrongs of provincialism, public feeling of the time was definitely in favour of the retention of the system. If the

(1) Ayes 47.
Noes 14.
Ministry had carried the measure, a powerful blow would have been struck at the provincial system. Provincial governments would necessarily have to resort to taxation; if they were to continue as governing bodies, after having been deprived of their share of the general revenue. To a large extent, the very existence of the Ministry depended upon its ability to cut down expenses. And yet, the Treasurer had proposed a defence estimate of £310,000 which sum could very conveniently be defrayed out of the share of the Customs hitherto apportioned to the provinces. The opposition of the South Island was again aroused by the mounting cost of maintaining military forces in the North to overawe the Maoris.

Moorhouse had expressed the hope in the debate, "that if Ministers went out of office on the vote upon that resolution, they should have the gratification of seeing his honourable friend the Colonial Secretary (Stafford) at the head of the new Government, which would embrace an important part of the late Weld administration. . . . They should keep at the head of affairs a strong and competent Government for a number of years.

An interesting position now arose since Moorhouse's attitude prevented Stafford from advising the Governor to send, as was customary, for the mover of the resolution. The Governor, acting on his own judgment immediately sent for Moorhouse, who advised him to send for Stafford. The
latter consented to select a Ministry. From the first it seemed to have been tacitly agreed that Stafford should remain in office, but that he should part with Jollie, Russell and Paterson.

After a week's adjournment, Stafford announced his coalition ministry on August 24th. He continued as Premier and Colonial Secretary, Fitzherbert replaced the incompetent Jollie, as Treasurer, Hall of Canterbury became Postmaster-General, while Richmond took office as Commissioner of Customs. Richardson had no portfolio; Neilson became Minister of Defence.

Stafford's new colleagues were the old Weld Ministry, with the exception of Sir Frederick Weld and Fitzgerald. His action in regard to the selection of the new Ministry has been strongly criticised by one competent observer, and also commended by one equally as competent. "Stafford should firmly have refused any partnership at any compromise with such a speculative, time-serving Treasurer as Fitzherbert, or with such a representative of war-loving Taranaki as Richmond. The very day upon which Stafford agreed to such an unnatural alliance marks a distinct change, a visible loss of power, in all his future public work. . . . . The Stafford who, in 1865, could explain why the salary of a constable in Otago had been raised, could not, in 1869, explain why the transactions of the Treasury could not be understood by the financiers of the House."(1)

But Gisborne, who had many years of official and political experience in New Zealand, says, "At the same time, no shadow of reproach rests on the loyalty of Stafford to his former ad interim colleagues. . . . His political abilities and his general agreement in the principles of that party naturally fitted him, in the absence of Sir Frederick Weld to be its leader; and he must, in his heart, have been glad to escape from a disagreeable and anomalous position." (1)

The new Ministry lasted until June 28th, 1869; the Ministers were competent and good men of business. Stafford, though not a brilliant man, was an able administrator; Fitzherbert was one of the best financiers in the colony. Richmond, Richardson and Haultain had shown ability in general and provincial activities. Hall as Postmaster General (2), proved himself a man of great administrative gifts, and as industrious as the Premier himself.

It would seem that large sacrifices of personal opinions on such burning questions as finance, native affairs and defence, must have been agreed on in order to set up this "unnatural alliance". This was evident from Stafford's ministerial statement, which made no reference to the original motion to deprive the provinces

(2) He had been trained in the London General Post Office.
of their revenues. Members were told that their grants would have a direct bearing on the provincial grants.

"He wished the House to weigh what he had said with respect to the provinces, as the amount which the provinces would get would decidedly depend upon the amount of ways and means which the House might grant." (1) The defence estimate would be curtailed, mainly because of the retention of a British regiment. He congratulated the House on the retention of the regiment. However, when it is remembered that the entire removal of troops was an indispensable preliminary to the introduction of Weld's policy of "self-reliance", it will be understood to what extent Weld's colleagues must have yielded before they could congratulate the country on the retention of a single regiment.

Fitzherbert's financial statement was presented on September 5th. The expenditure already granted would be economically administered. Although the Government had reduced the defence estimate by £39,000, it would not abandon the policy of self-reliance, but would establish an armed constabulary in place of "a rudimentary army". Ordinary expenditure for the current year (1866-67) would amount to £1,057,058, including a grant of £318,750 to the provinces, out of the estimated customs revenue of £2850,000.

(1) P.D., p.894.
Estimated Expenditure for the Year 1866-67.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent charges (interest and sinking fund)</td>
<td>£266,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil List</td>
<td>£27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government House and domain</td>
<td>£7,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public departments</td>
<td>£36,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>£64,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>£143,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>£29,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>£46,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£30,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary (charges and interest on Treasury Bills)</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total proposed specific appropriations by General Assembly for Colonial and provincial services | £738,308
Total proposed general appropriation by General Assembly to the provinces for special appropriation by Provincial Councils | £318,750
Total proposed ordinary expenditure | £1,058,058

This result was obtained by:

1. The reduction of £39,000 in the defence estimates, and
2. The omission from the estimates of certain charges of a permanent character.

Fitzherbert estimated the revenue available to meet current expenditure at £1,058,500, including £50,000 from stamp duties, £45,000 from bonded warehouses and £7,000 from postal taxation.

Estimated Ordinary Revenue for year ending June 30th, 1867.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>£850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary miscellaneous</td>
<td>£146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duties</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded warehouse duties</td>
<td>£4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed distillation</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional postal revenue</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£1,058,500

In regard to ordinary revenue and expenditure the colony was in a very satisfactory position. A very important
feature of the statement was the proposal to wind up the
£3,000,000 loan. He submitted the following "proposal
for appropriation in liquidation of appropriations under
the £3,000,000 loan."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military settlers</td>
<td>£207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Strait cable and telegraph extension to</td>
<td>£38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury bills (removal of seat of Government)</td>
<td>£11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities on account of final settlement of</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military settlers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£306,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unexpended balance of loan                           | £170,000 |
Balance to be provided for                            | **£136,500** |
                                                     | **£306,500** |

The above advances (not necessarily to be spent that
year) amounted to £306,500. The unexpended available
balance of the loan was £170,000, so that £136,500 would
have to be provided for. A bill to indemnify past expend-
iture of the £3,000,000 loan, and to appropriate the unexpend-
ed balance of £170,000 would be introduced.

Another bill, authorising the issue of Treasury Bills
for £150,000 to cover the above-mentioned balance of £136,500,
and also providing for a currency so regulated as to extend
payment over three or four years, would be introduced.

Surplus revenues were a fertile source of injury to the
colony; the partnership between the colony and the provinces
set up by the Surplus Revenues Act bred quarrels and mis-
understandings and prevented the development of a sound financial policy. Fitzherbert was on sound ground when he said, "I believe that a large proportion of the differences which have from time to time occurred in this legislature may be traced to the fact that the various governments of New Zealand all dip their hands into a common purse." (1) No alteration in the existing arrangements would have to be effected that year, but ultimately those arrangements would have to be scrapped. A sum of £318,750, to be issued monthly to the provinces, would be entered in the Appropriation Act (2). Adverse fluctuations in ordinary revenue would be counteracted by the issue of Treasury bills to augment current revenue. Fitzherbert here referred to a problem which he was to tackle in a later budget - the necessity for the conversion of provincial and general loans into a common "New Zealand Stock".

Fitzherbert defended taxation in the form of stamp duties; such taxation placed the burden on the shoulders best able to bear it. If the tax brought in more than the estimated amount, direct taxes would be reduced next year. He moved that supply be granted with the aid of stamp duties. Moorhouse opposed the stamp duties on the ground that any deficiency in revenue should be met by the issue of Treasury bills.

(2) Muir, i.d., p.221.
Carleton, Chairman of Committees, in a long speech, reviewed the ills that Auckland had been subjected to because of the Southern majority in the House. But for Southern votes, the war of 1860 would have nipped in the bud. Besides their share of the Customs, the Southern provinces had substantial land revenues to work upon. "The South had two strings to her bow, but it was otherwise with the North. To the North it was nothing less than ruin to lose the three-eighths of the Customs. Auckland had little else. The general Government might administer the government of Auckland themselves if the three-eighths were stopped." (1)

Ward's amendment, that it was inexpedient to impose stamp duties until a revised customs tariff should have had a sufficient trial was defeated. (2) In a very able speech, Vogel dismissed the proposed stamp duties as unnecessary. He said, "I find that the revenue of 1865-66 amounted to £902,134, whilst the estimated revenue for 1866-67, without stamps, is £1,008,500 - in other words, that without this new taxation we are to have an increase of revenue of £106,336." (3)

The debate continued for more than two weeks, "and afforded the best opportunity to attack or support the Government upon almost any ground, so that old sores and

(2) Ayes 42, Noes 20.
old scores were dragged in with more or less effect, but in no case with any danger to the Government, which easily commanded a majority of twenty to twenty-five for its financial proposals." (1) A perusal of the speeches delivered during the debate, confirms the above opinion.

The Ministry declared the passing of the measure necessary for the success of their financial scheme. Rather than precipitate another Ministerial crisis, the House sanctioned the stamp duties by a majority of nearly two to one. (2) The tax was necessary to the North since those provinces depended solely on their share of the customs for the discharge of their governmental functions; failure of the measure meant a reduction in provincial grants. Consequently Northern members supported the measure en masse, as did Southland and Nelson members. Three Canterbury and four Otago members helped to swell the majority.

On Friday, October 5th, the Customs Tariff Bill, which aimed at a more equitable distribution of duties, was finally passed with minor amendments.

On Wednesday, October 3rd, Sir David Munro, the Speaker, presented to the House a mace, which Sir Charles Clifford, the first Speaker, had sent from England. (3)

(2) Ayes 41, Noes 20.
(3) Speaker from 1854 to 1861.
Sir David referred to the ability and impartiality of Sir Charles. The Speaker showed his admiration for the British form of government when he said that, for centuries in England the mace had been the symbol of beneficent rule, which was the basis of British liberty and happiness. "It must be the anxious and earnest desire of every member of this House, that, under God's blessing, the same results attend its presence here." (1)

This mace was destroyed when the old Parliament House was burnt down in 1907. The mace now in use was presented to the House in 1910 by the then Prime Minister, Sir Joseph Ward, Bart., and his colleagues in the Ministry. It was ordered by him when on a visit to England and is a replica in silver gilt of the mace in the House of Commons except that on one panel there is a representation of the Southern Cross and the initials of New Zealand.

Reference to the titles of the eighty-two Acts (including three private Acts) passed during the session shows that the legislature dealt with important problems affecting various aspects of the development of the colony. Thus ten Acts dealt with the administration and conditions of tenure of Crown, native, and waste lands in the provinces of Auckland, Taranaki, Hawke's Bay, Canterbury and Otago. The financial discussions resulted in thirteen

Acts dealing with the complicated problem of colonial and provincial financial relationships. Five Acts dealt with transport and communication. Twenty-four amending Acts, intended to remedy defects in previous legislation, were passed. Several Acts effected a consolidation and revision of existing law, in order to make for a simplification of the law and its administration.

The Governor's Speech which was delivered on October 8th, 1866, referred to the introduction of stamp duties as a sounder and more equitable system of taxation which would result in a lightening of the taxes which have hitherto been imposed upon many articles of necessary consumption. Increased material prosperity as reflected in an increase of public revenue, along with continued peace in the native districts of the North Island, were matters for congratulation. During the recess, consideration would be given to a measure to establish municipal institutions throughout the country, so as to grant self-government to rising localities. Parliament was prorogued on Monday, October 8th, until Thursday, December 27th next. After several prorogations it met again on July 9th, 1867, when the second session of the fourth Parliament commenced.
CHAPTER V.

The second session opened with a cheerful speech from Governor Grey on July 9th, 1867. During his tour of the southern provinces he had been very favourably impressed with the progress and orderliness of that part of the colony. Colonial troops had been successful in establishing peace throughout the North Island. He had found the embers of dissatisfaction dying out, and the manner of his reception by the Maori population, even in the districts recently in rebellion, inspired confidence in the future peace of the country. The colony would benefit from the improved postal system agreed on at the Melbourne Postal Conference. There was the customary reference to the Government's legislative proposals and to the forthcoming visit of the Duke of Edinburgh to New Zealand. (1)

Cox (Timaru) moved the Address in Reply, in terms little more than an echo of the speech. (2) As several members were absent, Reynolds (Dunedin) moved the adjournment of the debate for ten days. (3) Stafford opposed the

(1) In 1869, the Duke planted five trees in the Christchurch Botanic Gardens.
(2) Seconded by Taylor (Wellington).
(3) The Provincial Councils of Canterbury and Otago were still in session.
motion as "an unwarrantable interference with the time of the House"; further discussion led to Fitzherbert's assertion that the question of adjournment was one for the Ministry to decide. Vogel retorted that Stafford only wanted an excuse to resign. After much heated but futile debate, the Address was agreed to without amendment, and finally presented to the Governor on July 12th. Only four members of the Legislative Council spoke to the Address which was agreed to without a division. Southern opposition, led by Vogel, made its presence felt very early in the session; the clash between Vogel and Stafford was indicative of the impending struggle between Provincialists and Centralists.

Early in the session, McLean introduced a bill of more than local interest. It gave the Maoris the right to elect four representatives of their own race to Parliament. It was fittingly introduced by one who, as Stafford said, "was so conversant with the native mind as McLean". As Native Secretary he had discharged his duties with singular aptitude. His remarkable knowledge of the Maori language, customs and character had been of inestimable value to him. Gisborne says of him, "There is no other man who, throughout a long career, did so much for New Zealand in adjusting difficult native questions and in facilitating the peaceful union of both races."

---

(1) Gisborne, i.d., p.137.
The bill had a good passage through the House, though there was some feeling among Southern members that Maori representation would upset the balance of power. Four Maori districts were created - the Northern, Western, Eastern and Southern districts, each district to return one Maori representative. Power was given the Governor to alter the electoral boundaries. The population of the various districts was estimated as follows: the district North of Auckland, 9,274; the Western division of the North Island, 15,198; the Eastern division of the same Island, 12,635; the South Island, 2,000.

By the above Act the Maori was given political equality with the European; one of the most powerful influences making for good relations between the Maoris and the Europeans, is the fact that the former have enjoyed for many years social and political equality with the latter. There is an absence of race discrimination either in public or private life. This alone, is sufficient to justify the principle of Maori representation, in spite of the fact that there are only approximately 75,000 Maoris in a population of 1,570,000.

The Provincialists came to grips with the Centralists in the debate on the delegation of certain powers to Superintendents. In February, 1867, Macandrew was re-elected Superintendent of Otago by a large majority. The Government allowed the election, but refused to recommend
the usual delegation of powers to him as Superintendent; this action was tantamount to the Central authority taking over a department of the Provincial Government, and raised a storm of indignation in Otago. Vogel, a staunch provincialist, seized this opportunity to test the strength of the Centralists. On July 16th he threw down the gauntlet when he proposed "that in the opinion of this House the authority under the Goldfields Act should be delegated to the Superintendents of the provinces in which the goldfields are situate." He hoped that the debate would not descend to personalities; his own speech, nevertheless included a violent attack on Stafford and Richmond. Stafford's assumption of the goldfields powers and the appointment of a goldfields member of the House to the position of Goldfields Agent were roundly condemned.\(^1\) He saw in the Government's action a veiled attack on provincialism. "However the members of the Government might hide their intentions, they were at heard strenuously opposed to the provinces, and that was one of the many struggles that honourable members might have to make for the maintenance of their provincial institutions." \(^2\)

Vogel's views on provincialism were to undergo a radical change during the next eight years.

O'Rorke (Onehunga) a strong advocate of provincialism,

---

\(^1\) Bradshaw, a Government supporter.

seconded the motion. In spite of Vogel's plea, he introduced the personal note in his criticism of the Government. "If there was malversation of office on the honourable member's (Macandrew's) part, was there not a malfeasance of duty on the part of the General Government, in not bringing an offender of such magnitude (if he be) to trial, instead of allowing him to go unindicted for such a long period."(1)

In a short, temperate, and convincing speech, Stafford explained that the Government had not disallowed the election because Macandrew's re-election was almost a certainty; again, the Government would not subject Otago to the practical difficulties in the local administration that would inevitably follow such a disallowal. He concluded with an amendment, acknowledging the propriety of provincial management of the goldfields as a general rule, but also making provision for exceptions. Henceforth the debate was marked by plain speaking. Ludlam, Cargill and Cracroft Wilson argued that no government would be justified in delegating important powers to a man of such antecedents as Macandrew. "There was no doubt that Macandrew had not only once or twice, but constantly used the public purse for his own private purposes."(2) It was

---

(1) P. Debates, Vol. I, p.64.
foolish to suppose that the Government was bent on destroying the provincial system. The division, however, proved that many members held the contrary view.

As the debate progressed, the old issue of provincialism versus centralism came to the front and led to a stern struggle between the two parties. Hostile criticism was levelled at the Government's action in allowing Macandrew's election and yet refusing him the usual delegated powers. Macandrew, in a weak, unconvincing speech which glossed over the charges of dishonesty attributed to him, deprecated the personal nature of the debate and urged that the question be discussed on public and constitutional grounds. Public opinion in Otago was unmistakably in favour of Macandrew and supported him in his resistance. "The Colonial Secretary", declared the "Daily Times", which had strongly opposed his candidature, "virtually ignores the fact that Provincialism is a distinct and decided feature of the New Zealand Constitution, and that it is little short of revolutionary for any Government to invade its privileges without legislative sanction."(1) A referendum taken in Otago decided by an overwhelming majority in favour of provincial management of the goldfields.

Hall, in a very able speech, emphasised the colonial importance of the question. He did much to destroy

(1) Otago Daily Times, April 15th, 1867.
Featherston's argument in support of Macandrew when he said that no election success could justify crime. His quotations from the Auditor-General's Report did not reveal Macandrew's past actions in a very favourable light. One of his most outspoken and unanswerable statements said, "I think it is an insult to the House to say that there is not in these papers (1) ample proof that he did take money from the public chest, and used it for his own private purposes."(2) The Government finally consented to delegate the powers to the executive Government of Otago; in spite of this concession, Vogel's motion was defeated by four votes only. The Ministry had had a close call; the division list showed that the provincial party was by no means impotent. "A party which went into battle in Hall's phrase, "with the name of Macandrew on its banners," fought on when the substance of its demands had been granted and then emerged defeated by only four votes, might justifiably feel that the provincial system had a good deal of life in it yet."(3)

Southern agitation made a final but ineffective protest on July 24th when a public meeting in the Princess Theatre, Dunedin, passed a strongly worded resolution condemning the

---

(1) "The Case of Mr. Macandrew", tabled in the House.
(3) Morrell, Provincial System of Government in New Zealand, p.175.
Government's action. A copy was sent to the Speaker who refused to act as an intermediary "for handing insults to the Legislature". The first paragraph ran, "That this meeting protests strongly against the recent vote of the House of Representatives in refusing to delegate the usual powers under the Goldfields Act to his Honour the Superintendent, as it is a deliberate insult to the people of this province. And further, that the people of this province will no longer submit to such usage but will use every and any means to resist such unconstitutional encroachments on their representative institutions."

As the session progressed, Provincialists became more and more convinced that Stafford was employing such legislation as the Municipal Corporations Act, the County of Westland Act, and the Local Government Bill, as the thin edge of the wedge in his attempt to destroy the provincial system. The last named bill, a clumsy arrangement of approximately four hundred clauses, was based on a combination of the principles of subsidies of £2 for £1 out of colonial revenue in aid of local rates, and endowment out of the Land Fund. Ministers justified the measure as a means of protecting outlying districts which had been neglected by the provincial governments. In spite of Ministerial assurances that the bill was a "permissive" one, and capable of modification, Provincialists saw in its success the
beginnings of the end of provincialism and defeated it by nine votes on the second reading. Such a vote warned Stafford that a direct attack on the provinces at that stage could end only in defeat. However, for the present, the Ministry was content to hasten slowly in its campaign against provincialism.

The mushroom growth of population in Westland following the discovery of gold there in 1865 created a problem which found its solution in another attack on the provincial system.

By the end of March, 1865 there were 7,000 diggers on the West Coast; at the end of 1866 their numbers had increased to 50,000. The Provincial Government proclaimed the whole West Coast of Canterbury a goldfield (1), and sent over Rolleston, the Provincial Secretary, with governmental powers along with officials to maintain order on the fields. To facilitate communication between Westland and Canterbury, the Provincial Council had opened up a coach road over the diggings to Arthur's Pass, while road and telegraphic communication was established between Christchurch and Hokitika early in 1866. The West Coast obtained representation on the Provincial Council at the close of 1865.(2)

The above arrangement did not suit the goldfields

(1) In March, 1865.
(2) Two members (Messrs. Borff and Frasser).
population; they complained that Canterbury was growing rich at their expense and that their interests were neglected under the present arrangement. A strong feeling for separation expressed itself in a petition of 2,600 inhabitants of Westland asking Parliament to constitute their district a separate province. "The continual sense of wrong under which Westland had laboured so long found a vent in the movement for separation from Canterbury. Several fruitless meetings were held, until, at last, a committee of about a dozen patriotic men was elected, and it drew up such a bill of indictment - a full statement of Westland's grievances - as was never before witnessed in the Southern Hemisphere. . . . To the energy of Stafford and Hall, Westland was indebted for her severance from what she regarded, rightly or wrongly, as a cruel stepmother." (1) Consequently a "temporary and provisional measure" (the expression is Stafford's) establishing the County of Westland, was introduced on September 24th, 1867. Because of the migratory nature of the population "the Government believed that all that it was proper to ask the House to do at present was to establish some temporary means of conducting the government of Westland until the whole subject could be carefully considered, with a view to future legislation."(2) He

made no attempt to explain the provisions of the bill, leaving this task to Hall "who", as Moorhouse admitted, "understood the affairs of the West Coast, and every detail and arrangement there."

The debate developed into an interesting duel between Hall and Moorhouse (1). Hall, in a very fine speech, reviewed the history of the government of Westland. The latter district attracted attention as the result of gold discoveries there in 1865; miners from Australia and Otago flocked there, attracted by the sensational finds at Hokitika in 1865. "Up to that time, the district was almost a terra incognita, and access to it by land was very difficult. One person had even in the old days succeeded in taking a mule across; but he had in several places to drive it into the Teremakau river and allow it to take its chance as to whether and where it would come out alive."(2) The Provincial Government of Canterbury did its best to satisfy the needs arising from such a large influx of population. Westland's financial affairs were kept separate from those of Canterbury. The cost of construction of the West Coast Road was apportioned between Canterbury and Westland, each province being responsible for the cost of construction upon its own side of the watershed. Local legislation for the special needs of the West Coast was not

(1) Superintendent of Canterbury.
neglected. Hall confessed however that much of the ordinary legislation of the Council was a "dead letter" as far as Westland was concerned (1). The disposal of waste lands on the West Coast was a vexed question and was responsible for much of the present discontent. He made good use of the petition to justify the measure before the House. Canterbury and Westland though one politically, were, nevertheless, two geographically distinct areas separated by the Southern Alps. Westland was admirably situated for trade by sea with Otago and Australia, it had little in common with Christchurch on the plains. Eastland (Canterbury) was essentially an agricultural and pastoral area basing its prosperity mainly on the export of wool; Westland on the other hand, for many years to come, must necessarily depend on the export of gold. Such a diversity of interests could not be adequately served under the existing form of government. Hall even admitted that "the bulk of Canterbury members were as ignorant of the affairs of Westland as if they had lived in Australia." (2)

Moorhouse (Westland) describing the petition as "a piece of madness", "would rather see the whole of Westland erected into a province." (3)

---

(1) One Order Paper of the Council contained 15 Notices of Motion concerning Westland.


In spite of his strenuous effort to bring about the adjournment of the debate and the reference of this question to a Select Committee, the bill passed the second reading by a majority of seven votes (1).

The County of Westland Act (No.25) vested the authority of Superintendents in the Governor, with power of delegation, and provided for the election of a County Council with a Chairman appointed by the Governor. The latter retained legislative and financial powers; surplus revenue was to be distributed amongst road boards and municipalities (2).

The Act was disallowed by the Commons; as a result of correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Ministers concerned, the Law Officers of the Crown expressed the opinion that "the General Assembly of New Zealand had not the power to separate one part of a province from the rest and to make such part into a county, under a separate and distinct form of Government, or to vest in the Governor the powers vested in him by this Act". (3) However, the passing of an Imperial Act, validated the measure, and in future the Assembly was to have "the power of abolishing any province at any time heretofore or hereafter to be established in New Zealand, or of withdrawing therefrom

(1) Ayes 27, Noes 20.
(2) See Harrap, The Romance of Westland, pp.114-120.
the whole or any part of the territory comprised therein, and of passing laws for the peace, order, and good government of the territory so withdrawn from or ceasing to form part of... any such province whether territory shall or shall not be included within the limits of any other province."

In his memorandum on the Act, Hall did not forecast a very bright future for the provincial system. Because of various reasons, "provincial governments no longer furnish that provision for the local administration of local affairs which is an important element of efficient government in any country, but especially in the case of one so peculiarly situated as is the colony of New Zealand; moreover the financial embarrassments of the provincial governments (have become involved) make it exceedingly doubtful whether in some cases they can themselves be maintained for any length of time." (1)

Fitzherbert presented his Financial Statement on August 22nd, 1867. Commenting on the statement, "The Lyttelton Times" said - "The long experience, distinguished ability, dexterity and exquisite tact of the Colonial Treasurer are abundantly displayed and we rise from the perusal of his budget speech with mingled feelings of admiration, dissatisfaction and regret." (1) A leader of the Christchurch "Press" described it as, "The most comprehensive and well-considered scheme that has ever been laid before the country, but it contains one lamentable flaw, which will make shipwreck of the whole." (2) Morrell refers to it as "a masterpiece of clear and effective presentation enlivened by much humour and rising at times to eloquence." (3) Nevertheless, in spite of the criticism levelled at it, the fact remains that the statement was the most ambitious and comprehensive statement yet presented to the House. Fitzherbert, after emphasising the arduous task he had experienced in preparing the statement, dealt first with the purely routine portion of the budget. He drew the

---

(1) September 4th, 1867.
(2) August 22nd, 1867.
attention of members to the following tables and revenue, estimated and actual (in summarised expenditure).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditure</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure, 1866-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For 1866-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil List</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Charges</td>
<td>232,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Houses and Domains</td>
<td>2,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Departments</td>
<td>42,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>59,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>122,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>23,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>40,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>71,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>9,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil List</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Charges</td>
<td>232,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>2,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Departments</td>
<td>42,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>59,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>122,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>23,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>40,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>71,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>9,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total proposed Appropriations for Colonial Expenditure 6,559 18 4

and Provincial Services Payments to Provinces, 738,306 June, '66. 18,356 5 10

Payments to Provinces 318,750 £1,083,382 18 1

£1,057,058

The estimated ordinary revenue for 1866-7 was £1,058,500;
the ordinary revenue actually received was £1,028,006. 5s. 10d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Ordinary Revenue, 1866-7</th>
<th>Ordinary Revenue Actually Received, 1866-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Warehouses</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps</td>
<td>50,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>688 15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,844 16 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123,089 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£1,058,500  £1,028,006 5 10

The following analysis of the accounts for the year ending June 30th, 1867, was tabled. In drawing attention to it, Fitzherbert said, "The brevity of the statement is not to be regarded as any of the time taken to arrive at it."
Receipts, 1866-7.  
£  
s. d.  
Ordinary Revenue 1,028,006  5  10  
Incidental 17,489  10  9  
Extraordinary  
£1,345,495  16  7

Expenditure, 1866-7.  
£  
s. d.  
Ordinary 1,065,328  18  1  
Extraordinary 282,370  17  10  
£1,345,753  15  11

Fitzherbert's budget proposals for 1867-68 were quite orthodox. Against an estimated revenue of £1,084,000 he placed a proposed expenditure of £744,000 (approx.). The following tables show the position:

Estimated Revenue, 1867-68.  
£  
Customs 70,000  
Bonded Stores 5,000  
Stamps 75,000  
Miscellaneous 134,000  
£1,084,000

Proposed Expenditure, 1867-68.  
£  
Civil List 27,500  
Permanent Charges 505,018  
Class i - Public  
Class ii - Public 4,376  
Class iii - Law and Justice 69,892  
Class iv - Postal 155,241  
Class v - Customs 44,810  
Class vi and vii - Native and Militia 52,101  
Class viii - Miscellaneous 39,403  
£744,178

The prosperity of the colony was still mainly based on the gold export trade. During 1865-66, gold valued at £2,605,000 was exported, compared with £2,858,000 for the preceding year. Up to June 30th, 1867, the colony had exported gold valued at thirteen millions sterling. There would be no increase in taxation during the ensuing year; however, it was not possible to reduce taxation at present. £70,000 was expended on defence in 1865-6; in accordance with the Government's decision not to maintain a large peace.
defence establishment, that amount was set down at £28,000 for 1867-8.

Many of the past financial troubles of the colony were attributed to the Surplus Revenues Act (1858). Under that Act, the provinces had been overpaid to the extent of £183,000. "Unless, therefore, it be decided to force on fundamental changes, which may be effected in either of two ways, according as either party holding extreme views may be dominant; that is to say, the provinces may be cast adrift and left absolutely to take care of their own loans and credit, their necessities being provided for by direct taxation, or the General Government may be cast adrift, the colonial debt be disintegrated, and the payment of its interest and sinking funds parcelled out as a charge on different portions of the colony, and the General Government reduced to a shadow." (1) His proposals represented a via media between such extreme views. The Surplus Revenues Act should be repealed, the colonial revenues consolidated, while such revenues should be divided equally between colonial charges on the one hand and provincial charges and sums available for provincial appropriation on the other. Discussing the combined provincial debt of £183,000, Fitzherbert said, "We propose to abandon this claim on the part of the Government, but to require some provinces to pay such sums as

shall adjust the amount fairly between all." (1)

Moreover, since Auckland, Canterbury, and Otago could not meet their obligations under the £3,000,000 loan, their respective debts would be remitted, and the whole loan made a colonial charge. The confiscated lands, "another legacy of the policy of 1863", would, subject to the fulfilment of certain engagements, be handed over to the provinces. Referring to the proposed adjustment between the provinces of the debt of £183,000, Fitzherbert said, "I think this may be considered an unusually pretty transaction, for every party comes out satisfied. The General Government assumes the dignified attitude of Paterfamilias hushing the clamour of his nine children, who were expecting to be punished, by a judicious distribution of sweetmeats, which he himself disdains to taste." (2) Fitzherbert's proposals evoked indignation and bitter criticism in the Southern provinces. "It (the Budget) exhibits an extraordinary generosity to the North, and a corresponding demand on the liberality and forbearance of the South." (3) Altogether the North Island gained £416,985 over the deal, while the South Island benefited to the extent of £111,500. Fitzherbert saw that the majority of the plums went north of Cook Strait. "The large bonus to Auckland of

(3) Editorial, Lyttelton "Times", September 4th, 1867.
about £300,000 of debt cancelled and cash handed over was a hard fact: surely the Loan Allocation Act could have been suspended instead of being repealed. (1) However, the scheme was finally carried into effect without much alteration.

The Public Revenues Act (No. 84) provided for a monthly payment to each province of one half of the Consolidated fund monies arising therein. "Indeed the bill did everything short of arriving at the climax which some ardent minds seemed to desire, the decapitation of Ministers for spending money without authority." (2) The consolidated revenue payable to the provinces would be subject to certain "provincial charges" - the latter including customs, stamp, judicial and various other departments, local militia and volunteer forces - and the provinces' monthly shares of the interest and sinking fund of loans charged upon their respective revenues under the consolidation scheme. A deficiency could be met by drawing on the Land Fund for provincial charges.

Fitzherbert had referred to the need for the consolidation of provincial loans in his financial statement of 1866. He tackled this problem in his next financial statement. The appearance on the London Market of a great

(1) Morrell, Provincial System of Government in New Zealand, (Auckland received £250,000 from Otago under the "adjustment"; and relief from a debt charge of £300,000).

variety of paper, all secured on different parts of the revenue of the colony, all bidding against one another with the lender of capital, had had a disastrous effect on the credit of the colony generally, and had resulted in very serious loss and embarrassment (1). To give the imprimatur of the General Government to provincial debentures would be merely playing into the hands of private individuals, while a compulsory exchange of provincial for colonial debentures would impair the credit of the colony. His plan provided for the raising of a loan, as required, to effect the conversion of provincial into colonial securities at a fixed rate. Debenture holders would be allowed three years to come in. Ample security would be offered to creditors in the consolidated revenue. A loan would be raised to cover unissued provincial debentures, and paid over to the respective provinces. Provincial debts incurred previously would remain as charges upon the provinces that had incurred them. Fitzherbert anticipated a considerable reduction in the debt of the colony, as a result of this plan.

The House having given its sanction to the principle behind the consolidation of provincial loans, Fitzherbert nominated a select committee consisting of Stafford, Macandrew, Vogel, Campbell, Jollie, Stevens, Williamson, Featherston, Fitzherbert, Curtis, and Moorhouse "to inquire

(1) P.D., Vol.1, p.557.
into'', what he called, "questions of detail''. That committee adopted the unusual procedure of embodying its recommendations in a bill, to be adopted by Parliament, by which the increased value of provincial securities resulting from the guarantee of the General Government was to be pocketed, by the holders of provincial debentures, at the expense of the colony. Fitzherbert's original scheme was opposed by Russell, the ex-Minister, in the interests of the Bank of New Zealand. "Russell objected in particular to giving the Agents permission to purchase bonds at various prices according as the debentures of each province stood in the market. "They are all equally valuable," he said, "to the General Government in carrying out its policy of consolidation" - and to the preferential claim given to the bonds bought up or issued by the General Government to the prejudice of bond-holders who might refuse to accept the prices offered. (1) Referring to the report Fitzgerald said, "The Committee have thought fit to declare explicitly and in unmistakable language that the colony is liable for provincial loans, and will declare its liability, and without reservation assume that liability prior to consolidation." (2)

The Public Debts Act and Consolidated Loan Act (Nos.

89 and 90) modified Fitzherbert's plan to meet the objections of the Bank of New Zealand. A loan of £7,000,000 at 6% was to be raised for the conversion of provincial and colonial debentures. In future, provincial loans, whether converted or not, were to be charged on the consolidated revenue, while interest charges were to be deducted from the provincial share of that revenue. In future, provincial councils were not to pass any ordinance raising a loan or guaranteeing the payment of any interest or subsidy. This "modified" scheme revealed very clearly the powerful influence exerted by that "silent Sphinx" - the Bank of New Zealand on the financial policy of the colony.

Featherston justly criticised the scheme as unduly favourable to debenture holders. He vigorously opposed the colonial guarantee to provincial bonds prior to the conversion of the latter into colonial bonds. During the third reading of the Public Debts Bill he said, "It is not a scheme for the consolidation or conversion of loans for the benefit of the colony, but it is a consolidation for the benefit of shareholders of the Bank of New Zealand, for the benefit of those who have already sent private telegrams to their agents at home, to buy up the debentures at a discount, with the object of making a profit out of the transaction." (1) In an editorial of October 10th, 1867, "The Lyttelton Times" denounced the scheme in no

uncertain terms. "It may be an open question whether the Bank of New Zealand (1) would not govern the colony as well or even better than Stafford and his colleagues. But as we are presumed to be under the rule of the latter we should prefer their government to be a tangible reality rather than a solemn sham. As the Government Banker and Loan Negotiator for the colony and the principal provinces it has gained an amount of political influence which demands the serious attention of all thinking men who are interested in the welfare of the colony." While admitting that bondholders reaped undue advantages (2) under the Consolidation scheme, Morrell's judgment seems just: "When Fitzherbert went Home as Government Agent, he was in the good books of the financiers, and the consolidation scheme was undoubtedly a financial success. . . . . The scheme had at least retrieved some of the mistakes of the past, and the provinces would never again be allowed to borrow at their own sweet will." (3) All the Government members accepted the daring proposals of the Select Committee, and the bill after much discussion, passed the third reading on October 1st, 1867.

---

(1) The Bank was holding approximately 4/ million provincial debentures.

(2) Featherston estimated that the Colony lost approximately £300,000 over the conversion.

(3) Provincial System in New Zealand, p.173.
During the course of his speech, Fitzherbert referred to the claims dating back to 1848 of the Imperial Government for the services of Imperial troops, etc., and the counter claims of the colony. An unsuccessful attempt had been made by the Imperial and Colonial Commissioners to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the respective claims.

The position may be described in tabular form thus:

**Imperial Expenditure.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitation Charges for Imperial Troops</td>
<td>358,817</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound Int. Capitalized Annually</td>
<td>187,278</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances for Colonial Troops</td>
<td>582,158</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>201,710</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,304,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colonial Expenditure.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial debentures sold at par</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Roads</td>
<td>102,875</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of River Transport Charges</td>
<td>97,322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>206,852</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£906,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During his visit to England in connection with the consolidation scheme, Fitzherbert reviewed the position with the Secretary for the Colonies, and following on this discussion the respective claims of the Imperial Government and the Colonial Government were wiped out. When he was in England, Fitzherbert served his country well and earned the thanks and approval of the Parliament and people of New Zealand.

The following statement of expenditure for colonial defence during the period 1858-1867 is worthy of notice.
Expenditure in year 1858-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-60</td>
<td>27,076</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-61</td>
<td>62,634</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-62</td>
<td>54,172</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-63</td>
<td>203,013</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>353,146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-65</td>
<td>336,259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-66</td>
<td>473,348</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-67</td>
<td>327,180</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the Domett, Whitaker and Weld Ministries expenditure on colonial defence increased by leaps and bounds; from £54,000 in 1861-62 to £886,000 in 1864-65. Under the Stafford Ministry such expenditure had decreased from £886,000 to £327,000. For the same period customs revenue had increased from £643,000 to £364,000. (1)

On October 6th, 1867 a very interesting and important session was brought to a close when the Governor prorogued Parliament. During the session, ninety bills, dealing with many important topics, were passed. (2) The financial legislation alone entitles this session to be ranked as one of the most important sessions of the provincial period. (3)

No previous Parliament had passed such far-reaching legislation as the Surplus Revenues Adjustment Act, the Public Debts Act, the Consolidated Loan Act and the Loan Allocation Act Repeal Act. The majority of the other Acts dealt with

(1) The figures are approximate.

(2) "The Governor’s Salary Act" and the "Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act", were reserved for the Queen's assent.

(3) 1854-67.
more than purely routine matters. In such legislation as the County of Westland Act, the Municipal Corporations Act and the Local Government Bill (1) many interested observers, including provincialists, saw the setting of the stage for a general attack on the provincial system. In the debate on the County of Westland Bill the centralist view on the future form of government for the colony was clearly expressed. The next few years were to be devoted to a bitter struggle for ascendancy between the Provincialists on the one hand and the champions of a Centralism based upon more localised institutions on the other. A very strong body of opinion favoured radical reform as opposed to Provincialism. This view was well expressed in an editorial of the Christchurch "Press" of August 27th, 1857. "The time must come when the General Assembly will resume much of the power that for the general advantage has been committed to the provinces. We must learn to drop the American idea of federation which, however well suited to the United States, is inapplicable to a country of such easily manageable dimensions as New Zealand, and revert to the English model - a supreme Central Government delegating its powers to the local authorities, and leaving local affairs to be managed altogether by municipalities and other local institutions." In the short space of eight years

---

(1) Not passed.
this view found practical expression in the Act for the abolition of the Provinces.

During the next eight years many of the weaknesses of the provincial system were thrown into clear relief. With the breakdown of provincial isolation, provincialism lost its utility, and became a barrier to the unification of the colony and the development of a sound national policy. In the session of 1868, Stafford carried his attack on the provincial system a stage further. He said, "I shall now urge our friends to take every opportunity of pointing out how miserably insufficient the present political system is to meet the wants of the people, and of demonstrating how, whatever little efficiency it once possessed, has as a rule died out. . . . . The provincial system has been tried and found wanting, and cannot survive." This opinion, formulated after several years of keen observation of the working of the provincial system, was shared by a powerful body of opinion throughout the colony.

The fourth New Zealand Parliament marks a period of keen political activity in the development of the colony. Statesmen during these years (1), were confronted with difficult problems in the relationships between colonial and provincial finance, native wars, the unremitting con-

(1) 1866-1870.
flict between provincialists and centralists, land settlement, and the problems which inevitably follow the discovery of rich goldfields. An appreciation of the critical stage through which the colony was passing, leads to an admiration and respect for those legislators, who, during the first two sessions of the fourth Parliament, placed 172 Acts on the Statute Book, in an attempt to direct national development along sound lines. The year, 1867, witnessed the departure of Sir George Grey and of most of the Imperial troops and also the beginning of the end of the period of the inglorious Maori wars. For many years to come national development was conducted with conspicuous success, and one can only hope that the efforts of future legislators will be marked by the same success as characterized those of the statesmen who laboured during the period 1866-1870.
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