

A COMPARISON BETWEEN  
THE EARLY COLONISATIONS  
OF  
NEW ZEALAND AND AMERICA.

---oOo---

BY " CELLO "  
=====

BEING A DISSERTATION PRESENTED AS PART  
OF THE EXAMINATION FOR M.A., 1935.

*James Thomas Burrows.*

*J. T. Burrows.*

P R E F A C E  
= = = = =

In attempting this comparison between the early colonisation of America and New Zealand, only certain outstanding features have been taken, and these of necessity have been treated in a general fashion. Two courses were open in the treatment of material. On the one hand, all the activities of the Thirteen American Colonies and of New Zealand could have been given in detail — a procedure which hardly lent itself to such a work as this. On the other hand, facts of American and New Zealand history as supplied by prominent historians could have been accepted, and nothing but a bare comparison made, all else being taken for granted.

I have aimed at steering a middle course, and have tried to give just sufficient detail to supply a background for comparisons between the two countries.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY.

=====

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Acton . . . . .                | Lectures on Freedom                                   |
| Barker . . . . .               | National Character.                                   |
| Beard, Charles and Mary . .    | The Rise of American<br>Civilisation.                 |
| Bryce . . . . .                | Modern Democracies.                                   |
| Condliffe . . . . .            | A History of New Zealand.                             |
| Currey . . . . .               | British Colonial Policy.                              |
| Curtis . . . . .               | A Commonwealth of Nations.                            |
| Durham . . . . .               | Report on the Affairs of<br>British North America.    |
| Egerton . . . . .              | Origin and Growth of Greater<br>Britain.              |
| Harrop . . . . .               | The Amazing Career of Edward<br>Gibbon Wakefield.     |
| Hight and Bamford . . . . .    | The Constitutional History & Law<br>of New Zealand.   |
| Knowles. . . . .               | The Economic History of<br>England's Overseas Empire. |
| Le Rossignol & Downie Stewart. | State Socialism in New Zealand.                       |
| Lippincott and Tucker. . . .   | Economic and Social History<br>of United States.      |
| Morrison . . . . .             | Oxford History of the United<br>States of America.    |
| Newbegin . . . . .             | The British Empire beyond the<br>Seas.                |
| Reeves . . . . .               | The Long White Cloud.                                 |
| Shrimpton and Mulgan . . . .   | A History of New Zealand.                             |
| Waters . . . . .               | An Economic History of England.                       |
| Williamson . . . . .           | Short History of British<br>Expansion.                |
| Woodward . . . . .             | The Expansion of the British<br>Empire.               |

# TABLE of CONTENTS

=====

|           |  |        |
|-----------|--|--------|
| CHAPTER 1 | INTRODUCTION   | Page 1 |
| " 2       | THE 17th and 19th CENTURIES WITH<br>SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COLONISING<br>ACTIVITY  | 4      |
| " 3       | CAUSES OF IMMIGRATION  | 11     |
| " 4       | NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF<br>EMIGRANTS   | 17     |
| " 5       | METHODS OF COLONISATION<br>(a) Typical examples of early<br>colonising methods; the<br>Company; the Proprietor;<br>conquest; philanthropy.<br>(b) New Zealand.<br>(c) The 17th and 19th century<br>Companies.                              | 23     |
| " 6       | EARLY ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND ITS<br>DETERMINING FACTORS   | 47     |
| " 7       | GOVERNMENT.<br><br>(a) Constitutional Development<br>in American Colonies.<br>(b) Early Administration of<br>Colonies in England.<br>(c) Development of Constitution<br>in New Zealand.<br>(d) New Zealand's Political<br>Debt to America. | 58     |
| " 8       | THE INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN<br>COLONISATION ON NEW ZEALAND.  | 73     |

- - o o O o o - -

CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION.

=====

Any kind of comparison between America and New Zealand may seem to be rather ridiculous, because at first glance the two countries now stand out in such vivid contrast. One is a great continent with a cosmopolitan population of many millions, while the other is a small group of islands, its inhabitants numbering a little over one million, occupying one of the most remote corners of the earth. One is amongst the foremost nations in the world to-day whose alliance and friendship are sought by every power, while the other is a country, in many parts of the world unknown, entirely dependent for its protection upon the help of the Mother Land.

Yet a comparison between two such countries may not be so unprofitable after all. In the past, small countries have played a considerable part in the progress of civilisation, and even in a young country like New Zealand, experiments have been made which have been watched with extreme interest by the outside world. New Zealand is certainly a very small community, but America is, from many points of view, only a collection of such communities and the American should be the first to testify to the importance of the small state.

There are several other interesting characteristics which the two countries have in common. The majority of the Americans are as directly descended from English stock as are the New Zealanders. Both countries are closely linked by language and tradition, and their inhabitants feel pride in the fact that their forefathers overcame tremendous difficulties and dangers to set up homes in a new land. It follows, therefore, that it is easier for Americans to understand the minds of Englishmen than those of other foreigners; because their forefathers shared similar experiences, because the two countries developed along similar lines, it is still easier for them to understand the minds and feelings of New Zealanders. Moreover, during the 19th century, families emigrating from England often separated, some members going to the United States of America and some to New Zealand. Both countries lie within the temperate zone, and the climate and geographic resources are such as to develop to the full, the initiative and energy of their inhabitants. Four of the early American colonies were founded through the work of "the Company", and it is not too much to say that but for the efforts of the New Zealand Company, the flag of France would be flying in New Zealand in place of the Union Jack. Both are essentially democratic countries. Both had the problem of the native inhabitant to face. Even in the short history of New Zealand there are steps and developments strangely similar to what have already taken place in the history of the United States of America, and New Zealand statesmen have

learned through America's mistakes and successes. Indeed, New Zealand is the colony most consciously founded on the old American colonies.

But the real value of a comparison between the colonisation of two such countries lies in this fact. No phase of England's colonial policy can be studied adequately if taken by itself. Colonial policy, like the English Constitution, is a growth, a living thing, and no part of it can be understood if isolated from earlier examples. Before England colonised New Zealand, she had administered colonies for over 200 years. Her ventures in America — bitter, hard lessons — were profitable experiences as far as New Zealand was concerned. British colonisers of the 19th century had the lessons of the past continually before them; their colonising efforts were along the same lines as those of their predecessors, but were enlightened and reshaped.

It follows, therefore, that a close study of conditions in both countries is likely to be of more real value to a New Zealander than to an American. As Bryce has said, "the value of experiments varies with the similarity of the conditions under which any given experiment has been tried to those of the country which seeks to profit by the experiment. The more closely the two sets of conditions resemble one another, the better entitled are we to draw conclusions and attempt predictions."

New Zealand should, therefore, have much to learn from America's experiences.

## CHAPTER 2.

---

### The 17th and 19th Centuries with Special Reference to Colonisation.

=====

The 17th and 19th centuries are outstanding for many reasons, but as periods of British expansion, they are of very great importance in English history. In both periods, colonial development followed and was made easier by a marked industrial revolution. In the 19th century, as well as in the 16th century, there were agrarian, industrial and commercial changes which favoured overseas expansion. On the other hand, the changes brought about during the two centuries naturally caused new problems with the consequence that the 19th century empire was a very different one from the 17th. It is the purpose of this section to explain the differences, and yet to point out that there were certain connecting links between the two Empires.

(a). Although the 19th century Empire may seem an entirely new one, it was built up upon the old system. Just of what did the old Empire consist? There were trading posts such as Surat, Bombay, Fort St George (Madras), Fort William (Calcutta), and a fort on the Gambia; a few islands in the West Indies; Newfoundland and thirteen North American colonies. Only the West Indies, Newfoundland and the American colonies can be called colonies proper, and these progressed according to what they had to offer to immigrants. Yet the trading posts, too, played their part in the growth of the Empire. They were often the starting points of great inland expansion. For



instance, the slave trade, an evil belonging to the old colonial system, led to the acquisition in 1861 of Lagos, which again led to the expansion of Southern and Northern Nigeria. Similarly, the forts on the West Coast of Africa expanded into Ashanti and the Northern Territories. In India, the trading outposts grew steadily, until in 1783 the English Government established a Board of Control which transferred the management of Indian affairs from the East India Company which for nearly 200 years had held undisputed sway. Newfoundland and Nova Scotia were the gates of the settlement of Eastern Canada, while the great tract of land owned by the Hudson's Bay Company became gradually a wealthy grain-growing province. Even the southern continents of Africa and Australia, which owe least to the old colonists, are yet connected with the old Empire. The East India Company found it convenient to have a port of call for its ships on the way to India — hence England discovered the value of Cape Colony. The loss of American colonies in the 18th century made England look elsewhere for a place to send her convicts — so Australia became a British possession. It will be shown later, that New Zealand too, has connecting links with the 17th century colonies.

The new Empire acquired not only new continents, but a whole realm of islands. Malta, Cyprus, Aden, Socotra, Malacca, Singapore, Hong Kong, Kowloon, British Columbia, Labuan, part of Borneo, Fiji, Papua; island groups such as Ellice, Solomon, Tonga and Gilbert; Sierra Leone, Mauritius, Zanzibar and New Zealand were all acquired dur-

ing the 19th century.

(b). The change in the nature of the trade is the next point suggesting treatment. In the 17th century, England desired to become fully independent of rival countries. To achieve this end, adventurers were encouraged to set forth on quests that frequently led them into trouble with other countries. Not only did these ventures prove extremely profitable, but they always received an unofficial backing by the English Government. It was the time of the chartered company which was given a monopoly of the trade of its region. The most important commodities carried by trading ships were timber, sugar, tobacco, fish, spices, cottoncloth, indigo and saltpetre. But the most profitable trade was that in slaves. It is worth noting here that this did not shock public sentiment in the 17th and 18th centuries. A great proportion of the population in Europe were serfs and the general idea existed that the white man was doing the Negro a service by taking him to a country where Christian influences could reach him. Even the New England Puritans engaged in the slave trade.

A leading characteristic of the 19th century was the radical change in its trade. Slaves were no longer articles of commerce — at least not in European countries. Spices no longer occupied their foremost position in commerce. Wheat, wool, mutton, beef, butter and cheese were never shipped over long distances till the latter half of the 19th century, and the discovery of the means of doing this gave a new importance to colonial exports. The astounding increase in the consumption of tea in England

brought another product to the front. Moreover, the industrial revolution was responsible for the importation of many new products; e.g., the popularity of wheeled vehicles and the development of the water-proofing of cloth brought rubber into demand; oilseeds became one of India's most important exports; improvements in spinning machinery meant that bags for grain could be produced on a much larger scale, and this in turn reacted on the manufacture of jute; rice was brought from India in large quantities when a machine was invented for husking the grain; England's woollen and cotton goods, her engineering products, locomotives, rails, iron bridges and harbour equipment had a great market in the colonies. There was, too, a remarkable increase in the demand for such products as cocoa, coffee, and all tropical fruits. Sugar came to be consumed in quantities previously undreamed of and tobacco grew to be a product of first rate importance. New sanitary knowledge led also to a considerable export of iron pipes for water supply.

Thus in the 19th century, the commodities that countries both exported and imported were largely new, and some of the commodities that were shipped in the 17th century, came to be carried on a scale hitherto unknown.

(c). There are two more interesting points for comparison between the two centuries. One of these, the different causes of emigration, will be dealt with in a separate section. The other lies in the attitude of the British Government to colonies and colonisation. British statesmen in the 16th and 17th centuries regarded the

colony as a money-making investment. Colonisation, indeed, was carried out by the chartered company, by Lords Proprietors, and not by the government at all, and those men who invested their money looked naturally enough to see some return. The following acts are sufficient evidence of this. An Ordinance of 1650 forbade the ships of any foreign nation to come to or trade with any of the English colonies in America without first obtaining a license from the English authorities. Under the Act of 1651, no colonial goods could be imported into England or Ireland or any of the colonies unless the ships in which they were brought were owned by an English or colonial proprietor, and had an English captain, and a crew, the majority of whom were English.

In addition to this, certain commodities could be shipped only to England, and an Act of Charles II compelled all European goods to be first landed in England before being shipped to the colonies.

In return, there were certain concessions to the colonies, e.g. prohibitive duties were placed upon the importation into England of such foreign commodities as sugar, tobacco and pig iron, so that the English market would be secured for the produce of the colonies. Certainly, the Navigation Acts enforced by Cromwell did not aim to bind the colonist, but were intended as death blows to the Dutch shipping trade. All the same, the acts reveal the attitude of the Englishman of the time towards the colonies.

It is important to notice that, so long as the colonies complied with the regulations of the Navigation Acts, there was very little other interference, and the colonists were

given practically a free hand in such matters as religion, government and education.

The changed attitude of statesmen in the 19th century towards colonies was the direct result of the War of American Independence. One lesson was well learned. Never again were colonies taxed for imperial purposes by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. For the greater part of the 19th century, the idea persisted that colonies were a needless expense; that they accepted British help and money only until such time as they were firmly on their feet and then they became independent.

The difficulty that Wakefield and his band had in forcing the hand of the British Government to colonise New Zealand is sufficient evidence of this. Colonial affairs at the Colonial Office were shamefully neglected and laissez-faire was the avowed policy. Yet, strange anomaly as it may seem, at no other period did the Government do so much for its possessions. Under the old colonial scheme, the Crown took no active part in founding colonies, though Parliament was willing to pay for its defence, in return, as we have already seen, for the colonies' acquiescence in the mercantile system. But in the 19th century, in spite of the heavy debts incurred through the Napoleonic wars, England yet financed her colonies in a most generous way. To have been consistent in her laissez-faire attitude, she should have given no help of any kind. Moreover, although she wanted no new territory, she yet added very considerably, as we have seen, to her possessions.

The following sums are examples of payments made during the 19th century:- £3,000,000 to Ontario ( the annual revenue of England was then only about (£12,000,000); 1867, £3,000,000

towards the Inter-Colonial Railway; in 1815, Cape Colony was purchased for the sum of £6,000,000; in 1820, £50,000 was advanced to take British settlers to Albany; the convict settlements in Australia cost £300,000 a year; in 1830, £215,000 to help South Australia; in 1842, £250,000 to assist settlers in New Zealand. Grants in aid of emigration were made in 1819, (£50,000), 1821 (£68,760), 1823 (£15,000), 1825 (£30,000), and 1827 (£20,480). In 1837 MacCulloch said that the colonies cost England £2,364,309 in the years 1833-34 — and on top of this came another £20,000,000 to compensate former slave owners!

In the 17th century, then we see that the English Parliament could not afford to help its colonies to any extent, was not particularly anxious to acquire them, yet agreed to assist in their defence. But through the efforts of trading companies, of religious bodies and of Lords Proprietors, she had colonies forced, as it were, upon her. In the early 19th century, she wanted colonies still less, but through the working of various cross-currents, empire expansion was a characteristic of the period. She did not want her colonies, yet she helped them financially. She gave them complete commercial freedom, expecting eventually that like fruit, they would fall from the tree when ripe. But instead she found towards the end of the century, that she had an empire which was bound together by all kinds of ties. The speeding up of overseas travel brought her into much closer contact with her "family" — soon to change into co-partners — and at the end of the century, there began that great imperialist movement, with its chief tangible result, the conferences of colonial premiers.

### CHAPTER 3.

#### Causes of Emigration

=====

#### 17th Century. Internal

In his "Rise of American Civilisation", Charles A. Beard says, "In reality, the English Revolution of the 17th century was a social transformation almost identical in its essentials with the French Revolution of the next century: a civilian laity emancipated itself from the mastery of the Crown, aristocracy and clergy." In that statement, we find the cause of much of the emigration of the 17th century. Many people preferred the dangers and uncertainties of distant colonisation to a domestic war. All the colonies in America except Georgia were founded under a Government that was occupied with conflict at home.

England was sparsely populated — there were only  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 million people at the beginning of James I's reign; there was a very slow increase of population and a shortage of labour. The emigration policy was therefore criticised; but toleration of religious beliefs did not exist, therefore there was emigration. It is a significant fact that out of thirteen English colonies in America, eight were founded by dissatisfied religious emigrants.

Political discontent played its part too. The 17th century was a time of struggle for sovereignty between parliament and King. The burden of the King's taxes fell for the most part on the middle class, and the Hampdens, the Bates and the Darnells preferred to fight for their rights. Others,

despairing of victory at home, left to find freedom elsewhere.

Some left because of financial stress — Georgia was founded in 1732 as an asylum for poor debtors — many were sent by relatives because they were ne'er-do-wells, while young women, some of them quite probably "young and incorrupt", agreed to be transported to Virginia in its early days to be sold as wives.

Of greater importance are the white indentured servants. These fell into two classes — those who voluntarily bound themselves for a term of years to pay their passages, and those who were forcibly carried away against their wills. "The streets of London were full of kidnappers, 'spirits' as they were called; no working man was safe; the very beggars were afraid to speak with anyone who mentioned the terrifying word America." (Baird). Lastly, thousands of convicts were either sent by judges or chose deportation themselves in place of fines or imprisonment.

#### External.

These were forces operating in England. What were the outside attractions that made emigration tolerated by the Government, and made it very popular with certain classes?

Firstly, as a political move, it was "an act of defiance to Spain". Pope Alexander VI had divided America between Spain and Portugal, and the English Government gave support to an action likely to humble its powerful enemy, and check its increasing power. Moreover, such possessions as the West Indian Islands served admirably as outposts from which Spanish Galleons could be attacked.



The rivalry with Spain had also its religious aspect, and the 16th and 17th century men were convinced that any way of crushing the Spaniards, no matter how doubtful in method, must be pleasing to God. "We shall misinterpret two centuries of English history if we fail to realise that on both sides, Catholic and Protestant, the strife was a new Crusade." (Waters).

This "crusade" gave the more adventurous sailors a first class excuse to attack Spanish treasure ships. Some of the money so gained was invested in trading companies, and we see a new motive behind overseas expansion -- the desire to control land which would yield further profits. So English traders encouraged settlement in a country from which they could obtain products more easily than in European markets.

Moreover there lay a chance to found a self-supporting economic Empire. For example, England was dependent upon the Dutch for her supply of sugar; tobacco she obtained from Spanish Cuba. If she could obtain these two products from her colonies she would be independent of her two enemies. Timber, moreover, was an urgent necessity if her navy was to remain mistress of the seas. If the colonies could supply her with timber, pitch, hemp and tar, she could be independent of Norway and Sweden. The fishing industry, too, could only be exploited successfully by companies if there were possessions in the New World.

This economic factor worked in yet a third way. As has been mentioned, colonies appeared as a convenient dumping ground for criminals, prisoners of war and "inconvenient Irish".

Finally, the appeal of the unknown, irresistible always to a certain class of restless people, was responsible for its share

of colonists. Moreover, in the early days, wild tales of the riches of America were deliberately circulated to attract the adventurers. The lines of a play written in 1605 ran, "why man, all their dripping pans are pure golde, and all the chaines with which they chaine up their streets are massive golde; all the prisoners they take are fettered in golde."

#### 19th Century. Internal.

In the 19th century, the economic factor played a much greater part than in the 17th century. After the Napoleonic Wars, there was a great depression in England. Soldiers were discharged and could find no work. Living was already very dear, and thousands were faced with starvation. Philanthropic societies and Poor Law authorities therefore made efforts to relieve the situation by helping soldiers to emigrate.

The Industrial Revolution caused much unemployment also. This, and the after effects of the war impoverished such people as weavers. A special source of income to the family was lost, too, when spinning, which formerly was done by the women and children, became a factory industry. The drop in agricultural prices ruined many small farmers whose position, as well as that of agricultural labourers, was made very difficult when "enclosures" deprived them of free grazing land. So, many of these, especially when the companies were willing to pay their passages, left for the colonies.

The increase in the population was another factor. For example, in Ireland, where it was calculated that three million people could live comfortably, there were, in 1846, over eight million. On top of this came famine. Emigration was a necessity,

and many trade unions advanced subsidies to assist people to leave the country so that there would not be so much competition for work, and a higher scale of wages maintained.

### External.

In the 19th century, as in the 17th, there were forces at work other than the internal urge. The same desire existed to obtain markets for food products and raw materials. But in the 19th century, there were new factors. New powers like Germany and the United States of America were now on the field. The Industrial Revolution and the enormous growth of population led to new demands and a complete readjustment was required. The use of machinery created a great demand for raw materials, coal and minerals. Chemistry discovered the value of products like rubber. New uses were found for many metals; more food was now required for England's population — for these reasons, companies found it profitable to invest money in overseas possessions. The possessions, moreover, proved good markets for the sale of machinery. Thus we see that the New Empire, like the old, was based on commerce.

A second motive of expansion was the desire to civilise native races, and to suppress the slave trade. This had important results in Africa, India, New Zealand, Fiji and New Guinea. Missionaries did wonderful work in many uncivilised countries. The name of such a man as Samuel Marsden, for instance, is immortal. In New Zealand, missionaries were doing good work amongst the Maoris before the New Zealand Company ever began to colonise the land, and when there was danger of French colonisation, they managed to get many Maori chiefs to sign a petition

asking for British protection. Also, French rivalry was responsible for stirring the British to action in other countries besides New Zealand. For many years after 1815, the French danger did not exist, but, chiefly after 1870, France again appeared in the colonial field. She developed a second Indian Empire in Indo-China, and became a power to be reckoned with in the Mediterranean, with colonies in Algeria and protectorates in Morocco and Tunis. Tasmania and Western Australia were settled by the English for fear of the French. Northern Nigeria and the Sudan, with consequent control of the Nile, were acquired for the same reason.

This brief comparison of the various causes of emigration of the two centuries shows many points of contrast. In the 19th century, the two internal forces so well marked in the 17th century — religion and political dissatisfaction — were absent. There were certainly two religious bodies which settled in New Zealand, but they were not forced to leave the United Kingdom for freedom of worship. In the 19th century, there was missing, too, the lure and mystery of a new world. Colonists had no hopes that they would find untold treasures in Eldorados.

The great changes introduced by the Industrial Revolution were responsible for much of the emigration, yet similar causes were operating in both centuries. Convicts were exported in the first part of the 19th century just as in the 17th century; and in both centuries there existed the desire for new markets for the Homeland's products. Finally, the rivalry of foreign countries, in the 17th century of Spain, in the 19th of France, helped to stir the English statemen to action, and as far as colonisation was concerned, acted as an invigorating stimulus.

CHAPTER 4.

## National Characteristics of Emigrants.

=====

"A nation may alter its character in the course of its history to suit new conditions or to fit new purposes. The change may be gradual, like that from 'the English people of merry England, full of mirth and game', in the 14th century, to the stern, struggling Samson of Milton's day; or it may be sudden, and almost in the nature of a conversion, like the change in Scottish national character under the influence of Calvinism." (Barker).

The colonists who left their homes in the 17th century had much in common with those who left for New Zealand in the 19th century. There are certain characteristics which for centuries past have distinguished the Englishman, and ~~may~~ it always remain true that there exist these "profound and abiding permanences". But, to quote Bryce in his "Modern Democracies", "national character, though often talked of as if it were a permanent fact due to a racial strain, is always changing." There is no doubt that the emigrants of the two periods were different types. The various causes of emigration given elsewhere will naturally throw much light upon the difference. For instance, the statement made by Beard that almost one half of the immigrants to America before the War of Independence were either indentured servants, convicts, or slaves, has a great significance in this connection. But it would serve no useful purpose to try to describe the various types that were taken to America in this way. As far as the other immigrants are concerned, there were certain forces at work which need fuller explanation.

That which did more than anything else to differentiate the colonists of the two countries, was the religious factor. As the English colonisation of America was largely a Puritan achievement, more space will be given to the character of the religious emigrants than to the early adventurers who were attracted to Virginia. The Puritan emigration, with its accompanying hardships and dangers is a thrilling tale. No body of men and women could have suffered such privations unless it was fighting for something which it considered dearer than life itself. This grim determination is a marked characteristic of the Puritan. His sturdy qualities made the colonisation of New England a success. Firstly there was outstanding his will and determination to worship in his own way, no matter what the cost. The Pilgrim Fathers faced difficulties which would surely have dismayed most colonists today. Gardiner says that the Puritans ~~were~~ strong, "not in the spirit of the mediaeval ascetic because they despised the world, but because they looked upon the world as a kingdom of God in which .... they would do their Master's will".

The Puritan, moreover, of his own accord, sought solitude. This could never be called a characteristic of the 19th century colonist. Loneliness is the bugbear of colonisation, and those nations which can stand loneliness, always have an advantage as colonisers. Volney states that the French colonist considered it a "habitual necessity" to visit his neighbours, whereas the English backwoodsman, if he were able, would sell his farm and go into the forest "ten or twenty leagues from the frontier" and there make a home for himself. The Puritan's desire for solitude resulted in certain evils. Like the ignorant Dutch farmer, he scorned the uses and claims of society and became thoroughly

selfish and unsympathetic in his attitude. He condemned poverty as a result of character and never of circumstances; he became thoroughly absorbed in himself and demanded much from others.

"Loneliness nreves the will; but it may paralyse the imagination. It fosters a stern sense of personal responsibility but it may also develop a spiritual egoism which invades the whole range of personality, and makes the general character self-centred and self-opinionated."

A third outstanding characteristic of the Puritan was his passionate zeal for work. It is claimed that energy is natural to the English race, so this zeal, helped by the climate of the new country, raised this energy to a height almost daemonic. Work was a struggle to do the will of the Lord. Some writers have even stated that the present day American's "dollar-complex" is the outcome of the Puritans' mania for work and production!

There were two settlements in New Zealand of the quasi-religious kind — Otago and Canterbury. The Otago settlers were sturdy Scotchmen who left their country because of disruption in the church, and founded the new settlement in 1848. There are certain resemblances between them and the New England Puritans — "when the stiff-backed Free Churchmen who were to colonise Otago gathered on board the emigrant ship ..... they opened their psalm-books, their minister, like Burns' cottar, "waled a portion wi' judicious care", and the Puritans slowly chanting on, rolled out the appeal to the God of Bethel:-

"God of our fathers, be the God  
Of this succeeding race! " ..... (Reeves).

These Scottish Presbyterians, though made of stern stuff, were not fired with the fanatical zeal which characterised the New England Puritans. Indeed, the little colony, like Canterbury,

an example of Wakefield's system, soon lost its identity as a church settlement. It is interesting to notice here that neither in America nor in New Zealand has a national church been the outcome of these religious settlements. Other early American colonists, i.e., those emigrants who left England for other reasons than religious ones, differed from early New Zealanders because, during the period that elapsed, forces of a different kind were at work making for further change in national character. Economic changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution were responsible for much.

In 1688, the population of England and Wales was 5,500,000, and remained practically stationary until 1760. By the end of the 19th century, it had increased to approximately 36 millions! This increase went hand in hand with another change — that in national occupation. For centuries England had been an agricultural country; the greater portion of the population occupied themselves in growing corn, and breeding sheep. Then after 1760 came the age of machinery. The machine altered everything in men's lives. It created an entirely new economic society, brought men together in large groups, where formerly they were scattered, changed their houses, their food, their clothes, and most important of all, the places in which they worked. "Men are like the dyer's hand, subdued to what they work in." (Barker). Each profession produces its own type; the lawyer, the doctor, the miner, the factory worker, the farmer, all show the effect of their occupations in their outlook on life and in their actions. But not only is the individual affected by his occupation. Again to quote Barker, "the national amalgam of occupations which marks and distinguishes a nation affects the general national life." The Industrial



Revolution was responsible, then, for a definite change in our national character. By the 18th century, England's agricultural peasantry had become a body of miners and weavers.

Production on a large scale has two results. Workers have to specialise in one particular kind of work, becoming themselves almost machines. Secondly, the population becomes essentially an urban one. In the early days, men's work had more variety and life in the open was probably an education in itself. Nothing is more true than the statement that a nation loses its vitality when it loses contact with the soil.

Towns may be the "whetstones of wit" and the "homes of taste and tact in human intercourse". No one will deny that the country man, in comparison with the town dweller, seems slow of speech and brain, and unmannered. The town dweller will assimilate new facts much more quickly than his country cousin, and will adapt himself more readily to new conditions; but the very environment in which he works, the general bustle of life and grind of work around him, the absence of the calming influence of rural scenery, and the performance of duties shut away from God's sunlight, all must result in a certain nervousness of temperament and a loss of physical energy.

More especially does this apply to the early 18th century Englishman, when England had not re-adjusted herself to economic changes, when working conditions were shocking in the extreme, and when no system of general education had yet taken hold.

There is one more change to be noted. A great source of strength to British colonisation in the 18th and 19th centuries was not present in the first period. Before the union of 1707

PAGE MISSING FROM MASTER COPY

PAGE MISSING FROM MASTER COPY

PAGE MISSING FROM MASTER COPY

all received land, and any person who transported an immigrant, received 50 acres if the immigrant remained five years.

The immigrants were to be "industrious and God-fearing settlers", who would "propagate the Christian religion". But the first group of emigrants were either adventurers out to find gold, or black sheep of wealthy families. Captain John Smith seems to be a worthy exception who saw what was needed for successful colonisation, and wrote to the Company, "I entreat you rather send but thirty carpenters, husbandmen, gardeners, fishermen, blacksmiths, masons and diggers up of tree roots, well provided, than a thousand such as we have." Smith kept up his demands with good effect.

The first ship load was entirely of men, but in the second there were two women. The Company had realised the necessity of encouraging the men to marry and settle, making Virginia their permanent home, but it was another matter to induce women to face the dangers in a new country. In 1619, to make the settlement more domestic, it gave a free passage to 90 "maidens", and sold them to the settlers. The purchase money paid the fare out. This venture yielded a fair profit, and it was repeated many times until, when the streets were cleared, some difficulty was experienced in finding maidens "of virtuous education, young, handsome, and well recommended".

However, this plan succeeded, and it helped to fill Virginia with homes. When the province became reasonably safe and settled, emigrants left England with their wives

and children. In 1624, the Company lost its charter, and the colony was administered directly by the Crown.

(b) Massachusetts.

In 1629, another great company appeared — the Massachusetts Bay Company. In direct contrast to the Plymouth settlement, which was composed of ordinary labourers and humble farmers, the emigrants of the Bay Company came from England's middle class society. They were religious dissenters, but not so revolutionary as the Pilgrims. Nor were they dependent for capital upon English trading men. Some were wealthy merchants, some owned big estates, some were university graduates and some professional men.

There was one important difference between this company and the Virginian. Instead of trying to govern the colony from England, the majority of stock holders with the controlling corporation went across to America and directed proceedings on the spot. The colonists took with them great stores of supplies, tools, live stock and goods for trading with the Indians. Their intention was to reproduce in America the society they had known in England.

As this colony grew and prospered, the Puritan churches in it grew more powerful and became increasingly intolerant of other modes of worship. This fact, together with the poor soil and the severe conditions of life, drove settlers out of Massachusetts, and three more colonies were formed in consequence — Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire.

## 2. The Proprietary Colony.

### Maryland.

Maryland was of a different type from the others. Lord Baltimore obtained from Charles I a large grant of land close to Virginia. Every year he had to give to the Crown "two Indian arrow heads and one third of the gold and silver ore found in the colony". In return for this, he was made Lord Protector of the land, head of any armed forces, of the church, and with powers to allot civil and clerical offices. Moreover, he was given the express right of establishing manors under the old mediaeval Feudal System, with lords subject to him. Laws, however, could only be passed with the consent of the freemen in the colony.

Maryland was considered by the Baltimores as a money making scheme, and the second Lord Baltimore took great care to secure the right types of immigrants to develop his colony in the way most calculated to bring quick profits.

Rich English gentlemen who paid for transporting men and supplies were made large grants of land -- five thousand acres for every five men. Each estate so founded could be a manor with all the privileges that manors in England knew. This guaranteed the formation of an aristocracy.

Secondly, smaller grants of fifty and one hundred acres were offered to men and women who came at their own expense, extra grants being made for wives and children or servants.

For all grants, a certain rental was paid to the

proprietor. To guarantee the quick cultivation, provision was made for sending out bond servants, and before long Negro slaves were in the colony.

Thus, in Maryland, was reproduced a system closely approaching the feudal one of old England, with manors owned by great landlords, the land being tilled by white bond servants, sub-tenants and slaves. There were also the middle class representatives with their smaller freehold farms.

Lord Baltimore was a Roman Catholic, but his charter was from a Protestant King, and he discreetly allowed religious toleration. However, his first appeal for immigrants for his new land was made chiefly to Roman Catholics though a fair proportion of Protestants seem to have made the first trip. Many colonists, moreover, from Massachusetts and Virginia accepted the terms offered, and migrated to the new colony.

### 3. Gained by Conquest.

In 1621, the Dutch East India Company was formed for the express purpose of bringing profitable returns to its shareholders. It traded in many parts of the world, and very soon took steps to establish trading forts in the Hudson Valley. It secured two valuable military centres, Fort Orange and Manhattan, and then began to improve its estate. It started a small stream of immigration into the colony, Protestants from the Netherlands mingling with the Dutch. This was a slow process, and in 1629 huge grants of land were offered to wealthy men who would transport 50 persons to the colony. Thus great



feudal colonies were created, some of them surviving till half way through the 19th century. The company imported slaves, moreover, to work in the fields. The Dutch Reformed Church was established, and religion played no little part in the life of the colony. Missionaries worked amongst the Indians, attempting to win them to the Christian faith, though their efforts did not meet with much success. This Dutch colony was in a dangerous position from the start. English settlers kept advancing into its territory, the English grumbled about the trade that the Dutch were carrying on, and in other parts of the world, the Dutch and English were deadly rivals. It was not surprising, then, that King Charles II should have granted his brother the whole region settled by the Dutch, and in spite of bitter protests from the latter, New Netherland became English.

#### 4. Formed through Motives of Philanthropy.

The last colony formed was Georgia. In its foundation, this colony was like none of the others. It did not result from the enterprise of any commercial company, or any ambitious adventurers. Nor was it settled by any band of people seeking religious liberty. A soldier, James Oglethorpe, was for a long time, oppressed by the condition of the inmates of England's prisons. At the time, England's criminal code was extremely harsh. Men were imprisoned for long terms for trivial offences; debtors were imprisoned till they could find money to pay; religious dissentients, till they changed their views. Oglethorpe decided that the solution of this social

problem lay in another American colony. He persuaded George II to vest a large tract of land below South Carolina into the care of Trustees, and in 1733, the first settlement was made. Immigrants of any denomination except Roman Catholics were to be admitted. Slavery was forbidden at first. People of all sorts and conditions flocked to the colony, and soon it became the scene of internal strife. The task was too great for the trustees, and in 1752, Georgia became a royal province.

Thus, of the thirteen American colonies, four - Virginia, Plymouth, Massachusetts and New York - were founded by the Company; five - Maryland, the two Carolinas, New Jersey and Pennsylvania - were proprietary colonies; three - Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire - branched away for various reasons from Massachusetts; and one - Georgia - was founded for philanthropic reasons. But it is important to note that of these, with the exception of Virginia, Georgia and New York, all owed, if not their actual existence, certainly much of their prosperity to religious influences -- chiefly to religious dissent.

This forms one of the most interesting connections between the two colonial empires. Those men who from about 1830 onwards tried to effect systematic colonisation recognised that a band of men and women with similar religious beliefs had already many advantages as colonisers over a band not so bound together.

New Zealand.

New Zealand's early contacts with the outside world were very haphazard. Captain James Cook had formally taken possession of the two islands in 1769, and after the reports of his first voyage had been published, ships occasionally touched at the islands. In 1788, the first convict settlement was made at Sydney and from there traders first began to exploit New Zealand. A clothing industry was begun at Sydney and it was thought some use could be made of New Zealand flax. In 1794, a new era began when a ship visited New Zealand to secure timber. Other ships followed, for New Zealand abounded in fine straight tress, and soon a brisk trade grew up in timber and flax. Nor was it long before it was discovered that New Zealand had other possibilities. Sealers and ocean whalers began to exploit the coast, and made use of the fine natural harbours north of Auckland. It is interesting to note that the first whalers were Americans.

In 1833, fifteen American whaling ships visited the Bay of Islands, the favourite rendez-vous in the North East of the North Island of New Zealand. In 1838, there were actually more American than British whale ships in New Zealand waters. The following is the ratio of American whaling ships to those of all other nations:-

|      |     |          |
|------|-----|----------|
| 1833 | ... | 15 to 78 |
| 1834 | ... | 14 to 81 |
| 1835 | ... | 26 to 85 |
| 1836 | ... | 54 to 97 |
| 1837 | ... | 45 to 64 |
| 1838 | ... | 58 to 75 |
| 1839 | ... | 59 to 96 |

The Maoris gained their first experience of white civilisation when deserters, who escaped from the whaling

ships went to live as Pakeha-Maoris. As these men were usually the criminal type, the Maoris could not have been very favourable impressed. Indeed, there is very little to be admired in the wild doings of these escaped convicts and ne'er-do-wells who were the forerunners of settlement in New Zealand. Terrible tales of Pakeha crime and of Maori revenge were spread in Sydney until Samuel Marsden, the chief chaplain of the convict settlement there, felt it his duty to make some effort to save the Maori race. He went to England to find missionaries who would help him in the task, but terrible tales of Maori cruelty and cannibalism had reached England too, and he could not find a single clergyman to help him. However, William Hall, a ship-builder, John King, a flax-dresser and twine and rope maker, volunteered to accompany Marsden. They were to be paid a salary of £20 per annum until they could keep themselves. These sailed for Sydney, and were later joined by Kendall, a school master. In 1814, a little missionary expedition with now three missionaries with their wives and families, a ropemaker, a builder and a school master, landed in New Zealand. They brought with them cattle, horses, sheep, turkeys, geese and fowls — sufficient stock for the first farm.

While New Zealand was slowly being brought into contact with civilisation, the English Government steadily refused to accept any responsibility for it. New Zealand was mentioned in an Act of 1817 as being a place "not within His Majesty's Dominions".

This reluctance to annex New Zealand requires some explanation. The vast distance between it and England, the warlike character of its inhabitants, these two facts influenced Englishmen no doubt; but the real reason was the feeling of bitterness left after the secession of the American colonies. When the Mercantile System received its death blow, the general belief was that colonies were a needless expense. Moreover, it was felt that any advantages the colonies might afford England would only be temporary; as soon as they became strong enough, they would break away as the American colonies had done, and "reap for themselves whatever harvest the Mother Country had assisted to sow". This feeling persisted well on into the 19th century, and Huskisson voiced the opinions of many when he said that the colonies would eventually be themselves "free nations, the communicators of freedom to other nations." Yet this feeling reacted in a profitable way upon colonial policy. As the colonies were to break away from the Motherland, England should see that this severance was brought about with as little friction as possible. Let the colonies have responsible government, let them control all their own affairs, better recognise the fact that if they were not given these rights they would fight for them! It was along these lines that Lord John Russell argued as late as 1850, when he advocated the granting of liberal constitutions to the colonies.

Thus the effect of the American War of Independence had considerable influence in New Zealand's development.

At no stage was there dissension between the governing authorities of England and New Zealand. When Sir George Grey refused to adopt the constitution sent him in 1846, because he considered it violated the Treaty of Waitangi, and because the Maoris were given no voice in the Government, the Colonial Office made no protest, but recognised that the Governor was in the best position to understand conditions; when, after stormy scenes in New Zealand General Assembly, acting Governor-General Wynward asked for responsible Government, the Colonial Secretary's reply was, "the Government has no objection whatever to offer to the establishment of the system known as Responsible Government in New Zealand".

Unquestionably, the Motherland's non-interference in New Zealand affairs has resulted in that country's becoming the most patriotic of all England's colonies. But through early reluctance to annex New Zealand, the colony was almost lost to England. A French adventurer, De Thierry, claimed that he had bought a large area of land in New Zealand, and in 1823, had applied to the British Government for assistance to colonise the land. Receiving no promise of help there, he applied to his own country. When in 1827 Dumont and D'Urville visited New Zealand, and surveyed part of the coast, the missionaries became alarmed and feared that the French Government were supporting De Thierry's claims. The missionaries instigated a meeting of Maori chiefs, and a petition was drawn up asking for King William's protection. Marsden wrote urgent letters, too, to the Church Missionary Society. All this had some

effect, and England made a move at last, an engineer from Sydney, James Busby, being sent as British Resident. Busby had no power, and his task, apparently to act as adviser to suspicious independent chiefs, was a hopeless one from the start.

Meanwhile, in England, the man who was responsible for a new colonising movement, who ranks as one of England's greatest nation builders, whose name will be forever honoured in New Zealand history because he may be truthfully called the colony's founder, the man, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, had become interested in New Zealand. He saw what possibilities the little country possessed, and denounced the "slovenly and scrambling and disgraceful manner" in which it was being colonised. In 1829, he wrote his famous "Letter from Sydney" in which he outlined his idea of organised colonisation.

Following on this, he founded a Colonisation Society to put his scheme into practice. His first experiment was with South Australia, and having seen that colony founded according to his directions, he turned to New Zealand, "the fittest country in the world for colonisation". In 1837, he founded the New Zealand Association, a body formed of those who resolved to emigrate to New Zealand, and of certain prominent Englishmen whom Wakefield had interested in his scheme. The most difficult task was to make the English Government give permission, and, if possible, help to the Association to establish its colony. Wakefield, by publishing pamphlets, canvassing, interviewing prominent parliamentary men, did everything that was

humanly possible. But the Government raised objection after objection. Moreover, once the fear of French annexation was over, the Church Missionary Society, too, was opposed to the Company's scheme, wishing to see New Zealand remain independent. Eventually, Lord Glenelg, Colonial Secretary, said he would procure a charter for the Company, provided it turned itself into a joint stock concern, the charter to "be framed with reference to the precedents of the colonies established in North America by Great Britain in the 16th and 17th centuries". But commercial gain was not the aim of the founders, and this condition was declined. Lack of capital was a serious drawback. Supposing the Maoris refused to sell their land? The leaders of the expedition responsible for the repayment would be strongly tempted to take the land by force — a point Lord Howick expressed when he opposed the Bill for assistance to the Company, as it gave no guarantee that there would be "observance of justice towards the aborigines".

Wakefield was doomed to further disappointment. In June 1838, another bill for the "Provisional Government of British settlements in New Zealand" was introduced, containing all Lord Howick's suggested amendments, but Lord Howick actually led the opposition to it, and the Bill was thrown out by a big majority. At this setback, the Association was dissolved.

Then in August 1838, some of the leading men among the intending colonists decided to conform to the Government's conditions, and a joint stock company was formed.



A capital of £200,000 was raised, half of this resulting from the sale of land to settlers, land which had not yet been bought from the Maoris.

As the Government's original conditions were now fulfilled, it was thought no difficulty would be encountered in obtaining a charter. But Lord Normanby, Lord Glenelg's successor, replied that as the conditions were refused when first offered, no charter could be granted.

Wakefield and his colleagues then determined to act without Government consent. In April 1830, his brother left in the "Tory" to buy land from the Maoris, and to make some preparation for the colonists.

By this move, the Government was forced to act. A proclamation was issued extending the boundaries of New South Wales to include as much of New Zealand as could be bought from the Maoris. Captain Hobson was appointed Lieutenant Governor, and New Zealand became a British colony.

Meanwhile, the "Tory" had arrived at New Zealand, and Colonel Wakefield claimed to have bought for his company more than twenty million acres of land from the Maoris. The various articles of payment included muskets, soap, tobacco, Jew's harps, iron pots, scissors, axes, spades, et cetera — altogether goods to the value of £8983.

This action has been severely criticised. Not only were the Maoris underpaid for their land, but by neglecting to consult the missionaries who could have given him valuable advice, Wakefield bought land from chiefs who had no right to sell. "Buller, a missionary", said Wakefield, "had

bought, or presumed to have bought, territory by degrees of latitude while in ignorance of the rightful owners."

On January 22nd, the company's first immigrant ship, the "Cuba", arrived at Port Nicholson — a week before Hobson sailed into the Bay of Islands. Two days later the "Cuba", came the "Aurora" with 148 immigrants. Then followed the "Oriental" with 155, the "Duke of Roxburgh" with 167, and the "Bengal Merchant" with 160. These all arrived within a month of the "Cuba".

This brief survey of the colonisation of America and New Zealand reveals several features that are markedly similar. Edward Gibbon Wakefield's work, the efforts of the New Zealand Company, and the settlement of two Church parties in Canterbury and Otago, remind us of the work of other men, and other institutions in former days — of Gilbert, Raleigh, Richard Hakluyt, Thomas Smith and the London Company. Colonisation in the 19th century was, of course, a saner process, and the systematic application of carefully thought out principles is a distinguishing feature of the period. But the two stories are alike again in this — they both show the deplorable indifference of the Imperial Parliament. If it interfered, it was only to discourage.

"We are indeed almost forced to the conclusion that the British Empire is what it is in spite of the British Government." (Currey).

The 17th and 19th Century Companies.

The new Zealand Company, like the great companies of the 17th century shipped its immigrants to a new land. But the company of the 17th century was very different from that of the 19th. We have already seen that in the 17th century, it came about that the chartered Company acquired very great power, because of the profits it brought to English shores, and that indirectly it promoted much colonial expansion. The companies were of two types. First, there were those companies which existed solely for purposes of commerce, e.g. the East Indian, African and Hudson's Bay Companies. The rivalry of other countries, particularly of Holland and France, made these companies fight for their existence with the result that they grew into real powers, acquiring land and forts to keep their trade safe.

Secondly, there were companies which promoted racial expansion for commercial purposes. They invested money in countries sparsely populated by savages, and to get returns for their investment, a population had first to be introduced. In comparison with the former great trading companies, this second type had a comparatively short existence. Very often its emigrants were leaving England because of quarrels with the Government, and in their new homes were no more prepared to submit to Government in which they had no representation than they were at Home. The ideals of the promoters of the former concern, however, were very different from the commercial aims of the latter. The 1830 Theorists, Wakefield, Lord Durham, Charles Buller, Sir William Molesworth, attacked the Colonial

Office in Downing Street with an earnest desire to create a great overseas Empire, bound to the Homeland by ties of gratitude as well as of kinship. Certainly, the New Zealand Company eventually became a commercial institution; as Wakefield said, "New Zealand was founded by men with great souls and little pockets, and fell into the hands of men with great pockets and little souls." But in its origin, desire for commercial profit was never amongst the founders' aims.

This is by no means the only difference between the companies of the 17th and 19th centuries. The 19th century company had no monopoly of trade, had very limited power, and for the most part, its actions were closely supervised by the Home Government. It had no administrative functions of a state character, and so could hardly create complications with foreign powers such as had led to several petty wars in India and America. The 17th century company on the other hand, created really a kind of autonomous state. It owned large areas of land, made its own constitution, coined money, collected taxes, regulated trade and even arranged for its defence. The Church, moreover, was frequently behind these enterprises. Even the Virginian Company was charged with the duty of "propagating the Christian religion to such people as yet live in darkness".

Another point of contrast lies in the actual method of colonisation. In the 17th century, the troubles of the immigrants as we have seen, worried the company directors only in so far as they affected the profits. Wakefield had made an exhaustive study of colonial affairs. His

work is apparent in the Durham report, and before making the recommendations contained in it, Lord Durham and his commission naturally went fully into the state of affairs in America where so many constitutional experiments were being tried. The 1830 theorists selected what they considered to be the best institutions, adding their own recommendations. First, the land question was to be handled in an entirely new manner. Land was not to be given away to anyone, but had to be sold, and sold at a "sufficient price". This would prevent immigrants from acquiring land who had no means of working it. It could be assumed that the man with sufficient money to buy land had sufficient to farm it too. But the price was not to be so high that the labourer, by working land for a few years, could not save sufficient to set himself up as a land-owner. The sale of land at "sufficient price" excepted pasture lands. Nor was the sale to be by auction. The land was to have a fixed price, and "first come first served". If several arrived together, they were to draw lots. Then the land, before being settled had to be carefully surveyed by competent engineers.

Secondly, with part of the money derived from land sales, emigrants were to be brought out to the colony. The remainder of the money was to be used for Public Works schemes and to endow churches and schools. The emigrants had to be carefully selected; they were preferably to be young, and there were to be equal numbers of both sexes. If possible, representatives were to be taken from every class. Thus, an immigrant, at a later period would find

himself quite at home in colonial society. Ships that were to carry immigrants had to be well equipped, and had to have at least one competent doctor on board. No convicts were to be sent to the colonies. On this point, Wakefield was most emphatic.

Thirdly, the colonies were to be given responsible Government, as this was considered essential to the prosperity and contentment of the people.

No one will claim that this system of colonisation in practice proved entirely successful. Government opposition to the company continued after the annexation of New Zealand.

The land laws, founded in the Treaty of Waitangi, made all purchases except from the Crown, null and void. Consequently, a Land Claims Court had to be established, and disputes concerning land became the chief obstacle to progress. These delays and disputes were a serious check to the Company's efforts and a grave distress to immigrants. None of the autocratic Governors were friendly towards the Company, seeming to resent the arrangement it had with the Government, as a limitation of their own power. Sir George Grey proved the worst enemy, even objecting to the landowners' receiving any portion of the land sales. The sale of lands at a uniform price was not the boon supposed, sometimes resulting in rich capitalists monopolising large areas -- a source of subsequent trouble and expense.

Just as the North American Companies lost their charters after a comparatively short period, so the New Zealand Company in 1850, after a period of struggle and

financial worry had to be wound up.

What has been the effect of the chartered company upon the development of the British Empire? Undoubtedly the part it has played is of historic importance. It was in the age of Elizabeth and the early Stuarts that the chartered company in the modern sense of the term, had its rise. The discovery of the new world and the opening up of new routes to the Indies gave a great impulse to shipping and commercial enterprise throughout western Europe. The English, French and Dutch governments were ready to grant charters to concerns that sought trade with other parts of the world. It is to the "Russian Company" which was granted a charter in 1554 that England first came to have dealings with an empire then almost unknown. The same remarks apply to the Turkey and Eastland Companies. These concerns carried and maintained during their existence, England's influence in foreign lands.

However, the chartered companies formed during this period to trade with the Indies and the New World have a more wide-reaching influence in history. We are not concerned with the remarkable career of the East India Company, nor with the Hudson Bay Company, but only with the North American Colonies. The companies which founded them did no more than sow the seeds of future development. The companies were for the most part badly administered. Often there was a want of credit and capital; and sometimes dividends were declared prematurely or ficticiously. Some had a longer life than others, and those survived longest which extended their privileges to outsiders. But usually the colonies they

founded became prosperous only when the control of the company was removed.

Even had the companies been capably administered, their control could represent nothing more than a transition stage in colonisation. Sooner or later the state has to take the lead. A company may act beneficially so long as the colony remains undeveloped, but as soon as it begins to be settled and civilised, conflicts between private and company interests become frequent and a greater authority has to take charge.

But we must not forget that the old Companies contributed in no little way to the growth and to the prosperity of the Empire. They added new territory and stimulated the development of the Navy. They provided the Home-land with luxuries that soon developed into necessities. Their enterprise saved England from the monopolies of Spain and Portugal — they even contributed largely to the wars of the century. Moreover, they provided employment for many, offered careers to young men of good families, and occasionally financed useful enterprises that required more money than even the state could provide easily at short notice.

One of the characteristics of the 19th century is the revival of interest in the chartered company. These were, as we have seen, very different concerns from those of earlier times, having few of the privileges enjoyed by their fore-runners. But they too, have achieved remarkable results, — results that may possibly be attributed to the work and personality of those men who have been entrusted



with the direction of the companies, but results none the less noteworthy for that. Few of the 19th century companies have been financial successes, but they too have added their quota of territory to the British Empire; e.g. in Africa alone about 1,700,000 square miles. In these new lands they have acted as a civilising force until such time as their control has been taken from them. They have made roads, opened up facilities for trade, enforced peace and if sound administration counts for anything, have, for the most part, started these new lands on the way to prosperity. It is safe to say that the company officials were men of high ideals and had as their chief concern, the interest of the British Empire at heart. Take, for example, their attitude in the anti-slavery and anti-alcohol campaigns that were carried on, and in the case of New Zealand, their determination to keep out convicts with accompanying cheap labour — actions that were directly opposed to the financial interests of the shareholder.

The results achieved by the Directors of the New Zealand Company will indeed bear comparison with that of any others in the 19th century. From May 1839 to July 1850, the Company despatched 95 vessels to New Zealand, bringing in all 12,000 emigrants, whose subsequent doings more than justified the trouble taken in their selection. On two occasions, the Home Government proposed to export convicts to the colony, and to the company is largely due the success of the opposition to the scheme. It colonised the whole of the South Island, and half of the North, founding six cities — Wellington,

Dunedin, Christchurch, New Plymouth, Nelson and Wanganui. These, moreover, are evenly distributed — a big factor in New Zealand's rapid progress. It made the Englishmen of the time see possibilities of organised colonisation. And, lastly, by its efforts, it undoubtedly brought New Zealand under the British flag.

So although this particular company in the 19th century had neither the power nor the wealth of its great predecessors, it too could say it had played its part in the expansion of the British Empire.

## CHAPTER 6

### Early Economic Activity and Determining Factors.

=====

#### American Colonies.

A brief description of the physiographic features of the part of America that was settled first will be useful.

The country at first acquaintance promised little but heavy work and danger to life. The coastline was low and even, excepting in Northern New England, where it was more broken and rugged. South of New York were long bare beaches broken by the great bays of Chesapeake and Delaware. Great forests covered most of the country from the coast over the Appalachians, down to the Great Lakes, to the prairies of Illinois, to the lower Mississippi and to the Gulf of Mexico. Practically no open country existed at all and the colonists had first to clear the land before they could farm it.

The country lay wholly within the northern temperate zone, and the belt of prevailing westerly winds. The earliest European explorers had passed it because they were seeking fur-trading posts, tropical plantations and fishing stations.

But the American colonists found that in most parts, it made first class farming land. Though the northern colonists had to endure very severe winters, nowhere was the climate so severe as to prevent farming. Westerly winds blew across a continent before they reached the settled areas, and by that time were without the moisture and the keenness of the Atlantic

The prevailing wind in winter is north-west and in

summer south-west. This makes the summers warmer and the winters, especially north of Virginia, colder.

The extremes of heat and cold in the same season are greater; the rainfall is less than in New Zealand, and the transition from a cold winter of ice and snow to a tropical summer is quite abrupt.

There was no lack of food for the early Americans. Shellfish were found in abundance along the sea-shores, and all the tidal rivers teemed with fish. All kinds of game were plentiful "from quail to raccoon, to wild turkey and deer; and at times the flights of wild pigeon darkened the air". (Morrison).

Early methods of agriculture were extremely wasteful and primitive. The immigrants brought with them the methods of cultivation that they understood in their home country. After the preliminary clearing of the land had been done, the colonists had to experiment with crops in an endeavour to find out what would thrive best under the new conditions. Many experiments had to be abandoned, but these efforts were rewarded by the successful development of new crops and their production was a big factor in the colonists' prosperity. In the development of Indian corn, valuable assistance was obtained from Indians themselves. In America, this food was the mainstay of the settlers for a long time, and it contributed more than any other crop to early prosperity.

Other lessons, too, were obtained from the Indians. F. A. Bruce, in his "Economic History of Virginia" says, "clearing new ground has always been regarded as the most

tedious and searching task of the Virginian labourer, and however frequently he may be called upon to perform it, he always shrinks from the tax which it imposes upon his strength and patience".

At first the colonists began to prepare the ground by chopping down the trees, and attempting to make the area quite clean before planting. This took considerable time, and it was not long before they copied the native method. The Indians used to kill the trees by girdling them with an axe or by lighting a fire round the trunks. Then the crops were planted amongst the dead trees left standing. Later these trees were either burned again as they stood, or else were carted into heaps and burned there. This method enabled the farmer to plant his first crop much sooner, and it is not surprising that it was used for more than two centuries while pioneers were moving across the continent. In fact, in New Zealand to-day, farmers follow this same principle. A bush "burn" clears the undergrowth and kills most of the trees, and then clover or some other grass suitable for grazing cattle is sown; and an area that was once dense bush, the following season will supply food for many head of cattle, and, the season after, will produce a crop of wheat, oats or barley.

It is not easy to draw hard and fast lines in the matter of early American industries. Some were carried on in all the colonies; but in a general way, three areas have characteristic activities — New England, the Middle colonies and the Southern colonies.

Everywhere, the most important industry was agriculture; but in addition, in some parts, lumbering, ship-building, fishing and the production of iron were important occupations.

#### New England.

Farming conditions in New England were very different from those of the more Southern colonies. A severe climate, and generally an unproductive soil were serious obstacles. Certain parts were more prosperous and produced good crops of corn, hay, potatoes and garden produce. Indian corn was a very important cereal, serving as food, as an article of trade and even currency. The early colonists of Massachusetts sometimes grew wheat, but this was always an uncertain crop, and later, much of the wheat required was supplied by the Middle colonies.

The chief raw materials for clothing were wool, flax and hemp. Cotton was imported from the West Indies; Hemp was brought from England, from Russia or from Sweden. The first cattle were brought into Plymouth about 1624, and sheep, also, were imported at an early date.

#### The Middle Colonies.

The soil and the climate of this part were much better suited for farming. Wheat soon came to be the most important single crop. It was shipped down the Delaware, the Schuylkill, and the Susquehanna to mills. The area around the Hudson, and the Mohawk Valley not only kept New York well supplied with wheat and flour, but these products were exported as well.

It was soon discovered, too, that market gardening was a profitable pursuit. The Germans and Dutch led the field in

this industry, the German farmers introducing the methods of their home country. Cattle, sheep, pigs and horses were soon produced in large numbers. Moreover, there was such an abundance of food and the climate was so mild that great herds of cattle used to be driven from the Southern states, to be fattened before being sold. Another important industry was the breeding of draught animals. Conestoga horses, noted for being the finest animals of this type in colonial times, were first bred in Pennsylvania.

#### Southern Colonies.

The colonists in this region had special advantages not enjoyed by the northern farmers. Not only was their part of the country specially suited for the growing of tobacco, rice and indigo, but in the case of tobacco, no experimenting was necessary. The Indians had already learned to cultivate it before the coming of the English, and there was a growing market for it before Jamestown was founded. Tobacco was the leading commercial crop in Virginia and Maryland; rice and indigo in South Carolina. Cotton did not come to be of importance until later. It was grown in a small way, but too much difficulty was experienced in separating the fibre from the seed to make the crop of any commercial importance. Virginia's soil was too rich for wheat -- there was too much growth in the stalk and not sufficient grain. Pigs, cattle and horses were produced in all the Southern colonies, and Maryland and Virginia in addition, produced large quantities of Indian corn.

But the tobacco industry rested on the surest foundation.

Not only were the soil and climate perfectly suitable for the growth of the plant, but there was an almost unlimited supply of land. Moreover, practically no capital at all was required to grow tobacco. The farmer on the smallest scale — the man just released from bondage — could grow it and be assured of earning an income just as surely as could the wealthy planter with his gangs of slaves. The navigable rivers, extending far inland, made the country easily accessible, and this was another important factor in the development of the industry.

The production of tobacco had a very definite effect upon the history of Virginia. Prospects of huge profits encouraged immigration of persons of all descriptions, adding to an already very cosmopolitan population. Then, as it was possible for practically every man to be a farmer, there was a great demand for labour. This was one of the main causes of the development of the slave system. Again, as farmers prospered, great estates became common, creating, according to P. A. Bruce, "a rural gentry as proud as that of England". The farmers' prosperity reacted in more evil ways. Other kinds of farming showed no progress; methods were slipshod and wasteful, and manufactures were neglected. Virginia was dependent for her manufactures upon England and upon other colonies.

Virginia had also produced a certain amount of rice and indigo before either of these products was grown elsewhere. However, it was in South Carolina that both crops were subsequently grown on a large scale. It was soon discovered



that rice thrived best on swampy lowlands, in a region where the climate and ever present malaria made conditions impossible for a white man to work. Hence again the necessity for negro labourers.

Thus the effect of growing rice in South Carolina was similar to that of tobacco in Virginia. The cultivation of indigo increased the demand for slaves, and it soon became, too, a money making crop.

To summarise briefly, we see that the early economic activity of America was governed by the two important geographic factors — land and climate. In the north, poor land and harsh climate produced farmers on a small scale who struggled to grow wheat and other cereals. In the middle states, a milder climate and better soil produced more successful farming, larger holdings and market gardening. In the south, the growing of tobacco, rice and indigo was carried on under ideal conditions.

Everywhere, the early colonists were terribly handicapped by lack of capital, and by the absence of farming implements. Most of the work was done by hand labour and with the simplest of implements. Their success bears testimony, under these conditions, to the thrift and energy of the colonists, and to the rich nature of the country.

#### New Zealand.

The two main islands of New Zealand, the North and the South Islands, are long and narrow. Their total length is over 1,000 miles, and as no part of the surface is more than 75 miles from the sea, the whole country is therefore within reach of marine influences.

A chain of mountains, the Southern Alps, runs along the West Coast of the South Island, leaving but a narrow strip of land between the mountains and the sea. This range is of the utmost importance to the South Island. The prevailing wind in summer is the Nor'-wester and its moisture is condensed on the western slopes. Consequently, the West Coast provides some of the best bush scenery in New Zealand. The range also is the watershed for all the important rivers that flow across the island. Much of the South Island is hilly, but the Canterbury province on the east Coast is one belt of rich plains suitable for wheat growing and for sheep grazing. These plains are continued by a narrow belt of more or less fertile land which stretches round the south-west extremity of the island and expands into plains around Invercargill. Most of the country north of Canterbury is too hilly to be cultivated, but is excellent country for sheep grazing. The West Coast, with its heavy rainfall, is a dairying region.

The Southern Alps are continued into the North Island in ranges of various names which lie to the east of the island, and do not reach any great height. To the north-west of this belt lies the volcanic zone, remarkable for its geysers, hot springs and other volcanic phenomena.

One extinct volcano, Mount Egmont, on the western coast, is of special importance. From its slopes run myriads of small streams which flow across Taranaki. This province has a heavy rainfall and is the chief dairying region in New Zealand.

There are other small fertile plains round Hawke's Bay on the East Coast, and in the Wellington and Auckland provinces. The North Island is mostly hilly and is therefore more suitable for grazing sheep than for agriculture.

The climate of New Zealand is that of any island in a temperate region, i.e., the winters are mild and the summers only moderately warm. Rain on the whole is plentiful, and falls throughout the year. The climate generally is well suited to the development of agriculture, but this is almost confined to growing root crops for stock, and about enough wheat, oats and barley to supply local demands. Fruit growing is making progress in warmer regions.

The chief occupations are the grazing of sheep and cattle. The temperate climate is of course partly responsible for this, but most of the country is too hilly for cultivation. The fact that to-day frozen meat can be shipped for thousands of miles has proved the greatest stimulus to sheep-farming. This is one of the biggest factors in New Zealand's prosperity. Cattle are used mainly for dairying, and very little beef is exported.

The early discoveries of gold attracted many sturdy immigrants to the colony, brought money into the country, and played no little part in the development of those provinces where the discoveries were made. Other industries begun early were the mining of coal and kauri gum. Manufactures in the early days were of no importance.

In America land has been used more for agriculture than for pastoral purposes. It was found that ~~that~~ mixed farming was more profitable, and the tendency was to do this on a

small scale. Consequently, small farms resulted, because large owners have usually been ready to divide their estates and sell at a profit to smaller farmers. The reverse was the case in New Zealand. As this country is predominantly pastoral, large farms were found to be more profitable, — sheep-farming is most profitable when carried on on a large scale — and wealthy people refused to part with their land at any price. New Zealand has not managed to avoid land evils, and there has always been trouble about this. In fact, there has scarcely been a year since Responsible Government was granted that parliament has not passed new land laws or amended old ones. Edward Gibbon Wakefield's land system has already been mentioned. The sale of land at a sufficient price in theory was a good one because it undoubtedly secured settlers of a good class. On the other hand, it just as certainly helped to produce a landed aristocracy in New Zealand. Under the Provincial System, provinces were able to develop their settlements in their own way, and this fact made for much confusion and dissatisfaction in later years.

In New England states, climatic conditions determined to a certain extent, the size of the farms. Owing to the inferior soil and the harsh climate, land was naturally cheaper, and one would expect the farms to be large ones. This, however, was not the case. Severe winters made it difficult for one man to hold more than a very limited amount of land, as the season during which he could do any active farming was short, and in the winter he had to keep his stock under shelter. Again, much of the land, before it was of any use

for farming, had first to be irrigated, and this cost money. These conditions all made for smaller holdings. In New Zealand, on the contrary, the climate is mild, and the farmer can work his ground in mid-winter, and sheep and cattle can remain in the open all the time. Still State legislation has done much to reduce the size of large holdings, and to-day New Zealand is a country of small farms.

All things considered, New Zealand's economic structure resembles most closely that of the middle and mid-west states in America. In both exists prosperity, a high standard of living, and distributed wealth. The main source of wealth in both lies in natural resources, and the energy of the people is mainly devoted to farming. The rural population too, is about the same in both countries. The mineral resources in the Middle States have been developed to a greater extent than those in New Zealand, and in consequence, mining operations affect a greater proportion of the people in the former country. But before this development, any of the Middle States, Pennsylvania for instance, in about 1783, bore a striking resemblance to New Zealand. New Zealand is as much effected to-day by the small farming communities as Pennsylvania was then. A prominent politician recently spoke of New Zealand's population as being "rural minded", and in spite of the changes brought about by electricity and other great modern inventions, this statement could be applied with equal truth either to Pennsylvania in 1783 or to New Zealand to-day.

## CHAPTER 7

### GOVERNMENT

#### i. Constitutional Development in the American Colonies.

The rapid growth of self-government in the American colonies is a very important factor in American and British history. The colonies' industries came to be closely controlled by the Navigation Acts and their manufactures were repressed; but in political and religious affairs, the colonists were left very much to themselves. Because of this, and because the various colonies were settled for widely different reasons, they followed very divergent lines in their political development. It is important to notice that the part the colonists played in their own government resulted in a certain independence that was a big factor in the trouble that followed later.

Before discussing the efforts made in England to control the colonies, it is necessary to deal briefly with the differences in constitutional development in the colonies themselves.

Virginia, as we have seen, began its existence under the control of the Chartered Company. For three years it was controlled by a government committee. This committee elected from the settlers a "Resident Council" which appointed its own President. The council had charge of all local administration, though all its regulations had first to be passed by the King and the committee at home. It had also the right to

try offences against its laws. However, all appointments to official positions, all questions of taxation and trade, and any matters concerning the general policy of the enterprise were left to the committee in England presided over by the King. In 1609, when James realised the profits from the colony were not what was expected, he allowed the company to control its own affairs, and from 1609 to 1624 it had complete control.

The company's directors, under their new charter, could nominate a governor with assistant officers. The governor, as their representative, could compel martial law and could compel obedience to regulations which he had issued. In 1619, the governor was instructed to call together a Representative Assembly. Each free settler had the right to vote, and the assembly was to consist of one House. This new body had not the powers of representative government that New Zealand knew between 1852 - 56. It had three chief duties:-

1. To put the instructions sent out by the company into the form of regulations.
2. To add regulations of its own.
3. To draw up petitions to the company.

In 1624 the charter was annulled, and from then on, the crown appointed the governor and the council, while an assembly was elected by the settlers.

Maryland was a proprietary colony, i.e. the crown gave all the power that it exercised itself over Virginia, to a proprietor who financed the settlement himself, and recouped

his expense in the sale of land. The proprietor thus appointed the governor and council, and exerted, no doubt, considerable influence in the framing of laws. However, in these proprietary colonies, as in others, the popular assembly, once formed, soon grew in political power.

It is when we reach the colonies that were formed for religious reasons that we find real political independence. The Pilgrim Fathers' colony of Plymouth was, as far as internal affairs were concerned, practically an independent community. As soon as they possibly could, the members paid their debt to those men in England who had financed the company, and then they governed themselves, appointing their own officials without reference to the home country. It was only in such matters as defence and trade that they were brought into official touch with England, and then their obligations existed more in theory than in practice.

The same applies to the larger colonies of New England. Massachusetts began under the control of a chartered company. But the company's members invested for religious and political reasons rather than commercial. As a result, all the stockholders, the council and the governor removed in a body to America. The company then became identical with the colony which really remained an independent state during the 17th century. Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Haven, being offshoots of Massachusetts, enjoyed the same political privileges. The other colonies were proprietary in type and the proprietors usually had greater power even than the founder of Maryland.



## ii. Early Colonial Administration in England.

Before the settlement of Virginia, England had no experience in colonial management. The government of Englishmen in a distant land was an entirely new problem, and the experiences of Spain and Portugal were of little assistance. England was entering upon an experimental stage in colonial management, and the form of government shaped and moulded during the 17th century was New Zealand's heritage. To quote from Bryce's "Modern Democracies" — "Those who settled Spanish America had an equally vast and rich territory open before them. Those who settled Australia and New Zealand had an equally noble inheritance of freedom behind them."

Although there was not one colony which was founded and controlled by government enterprise from the beginning, yet it soon became necessary to formulate some policy to regulate their relations with the mother country. This incidentally involved setting up a department to supervise colonial matters, and soon we find developing what came later to be called the "Old Colonial System".

The committee set up to deal with the Virginia Company during the years 1606 - 09, might have developed into a Colonial Department had James not lost interest in the colony. After 1609, the King, advised by the Privy Council, dealt directly with the colonies. He told the House of Commons in 1623 that Colonial matters were none of their business, and that he and the Privy Council would administer them.

In the reign of Charles I, a Commission of Trade was appointed, but it had as one of its duties, to discuss colonial matters. This commission expired after one year, and in 1630, the Privy Council Committee of Trade and various plantation commissions worked together to supervise "external activities". In 1634, a more permanent Commission for Plantations came into being, and Archbishop Laud was set at the head of it. Theoretically, its power as far as the colonies were concerned, was great. It could "make laws, impose penalties, remove governors, appoint judges, hear complaints and review charters." We can readily imagine Laud's chief aim was to restrict the independence of the Puritan colonies, but in actual practice the commission achieved nothing effective. Laud's commission disappeared in 1641 and again the Privy Council handled colonial affairs until the outbreak of the Civil War, when a new commission for plantations was appointed with the Earl of Warwick as its president. It lasted till 1649. During the Commonwealth, Cromwell set up a Colonial Board of forty-three members, which was superseded in 1660 by separate Councils for Trade and for Plantations. The members were Privy Councillors, ex-officials of the colonies, planters and merchants. They acted in an advisory capacity, and made reports for the guidance of the Privy Council. In 1665 these two councils expired and their functions were taken over by committees from the Privy Council.

In 1670, the Council for Plantations was revived and in 1672 was fused with the Council of trade which also had been revived. The members of this body were paid for their services, and held regular meetings twice a week. The following year, the Privy Council Committee dealing with the colonies received a permanent secretary with a proper clerical staff, and until the Revolution, he was primarily in charge of colonial administration. He was supposed to act upon the expert advice of the Board of Trade, a body which functioned efficiently until about 1724, and thenceforward declined until in 1748, the Earl of Halifax became its president and set himself to revive its influence. He succeeded in restoring to the Board the various deliberative functions which the colonial secretary had usurped. Until the Revolution, the Board of Trade did try to treat colonial problems in a broad and generous spirit, but its policy was always to subordinate the colonial governments to that of the mother country.

### iii. New Zealand's Constitutional Development.

The history of the constitution of New Zealand falls naturally into certain well-defined periods.

(a). From May 1840 to November 1840, New Zealand was a dependency of New South Wales under a Lieutenant Governor. During this period, the Crown's representative came into conflict with the New Zealand Company, which had, according to the provisions of its Charter, proceeded to take steps for the preservation of law and order. A scheme of government was proposed that was practical and necessary; but it was not one to fit in with the authority of a Lieutenant Governor, and very soon the two powers came into conflict with disastrous results for the Company.

It was only a short time too, before the settlers realised that separation from New South Wales was essential for the progress of the two colonies. It displeased no one, therefore, when a despatch was received from Lord John Russell declaring New Zealand a separate colony.

(b). The second stage is from 1840 to 1853, when New Zealand was a Crown colony with a Governor, and a nominated Legislative Council. The laws were to be consistent with the law of England, and to be subject to the confirmation of the Crown, and the Council was to be guided by any instructions issued by the Crown. The Governor had also to summon an executive council, consisting of the Colonial Secretary, the Attorney General and the Treasurer. This body was to be consulted regularly, but the Governor could always act on his own initiative when the matter was a

pressing one, and in any case, he was not bound to follow its advice.

It was under these conditions that Sir George Grey was of most service to New Zealand. Always an autocrat, he was irritated by any limitations to his power; and, practically unhampered in the Crown Colony period, he gave New Zealand the full benefit of his wide experience as a Governor in the full sense of the word, and of his knowledge in the handling of native races.

In 1846, owing to agitation at Home by the friends of the New Zealand Company, an act was passed to "make further provision for the Government of the New Zealand Islands." It repealed the act of 1840 and established an assembly of a Governor, a Legislative Council nominated by the Governor, and a House of Representatives elected by the Mayors, Aldermen and Common Councils of the various municipal bodies. There was also to be a general assembly consisting of the Governor in Chief, a Legislative Council appointed by the Crown, and a House of Representatives to be appointed by the Houses of the several Provinces from their own members.

Grey refused to put this act into operation chiefly because he considered the constitution was not truly representative in that the Maoris were given no place in it. He considered it violated the Treaty of Waitangi, and such an act might easily be the signal for a native rising. In 1848, as a result of Grey's unremitting efforts, an act was passed by the Home Government suspending for five years parts of the constitution to which objection was made.

In 1848, Grey passed the Provincial Councils Ordinance Act which provided for the establishment of Councils in each province.

(c) The third period is from 1853 to 1856, a period of Representative Government. New Zealand was a self-governing colony with a Governor, a nominated Legislative Council (Upper House) and an elected House of Representatives.

Between 1848 and 1851, when the first act for Representative Government was in suspension, the feeling for self-government was steadily growing stronger. Sir George Grey recognised the position, and in spite of the fact that it meant the beginning of the end of the autocratic power of a Colonial Governor, suggested to Earl Grey, the Colonial Secretary, that a new act be passed on more liberal lines than the one in 1846.

The Constitution Act of 1852 was drawn up with the direct assistance of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. It provided for a General Assembly for the colony, and for a subordinate legislature for each of the six provinces into which the country was divided. The General Assembly was to consist of a Legislative Council nominated by the Governor and a Lower House of Representatives. The franchise was based on property ownership. The Governor retained his power over the Executive Council, and the Crown reserved its right of control over native affairs.

In the Provinces, the people elected a Superintendent and a Legislative Council for a term of four years. The Legislation of the Council and of the Superintendent was subject

to a right of veto by the Governor, who could also dissolve the Council or disallow the election of the Superintendent.

(d) The fourth stage was from 1856 to 1907.

Although the Act of 1852 gave general satisfaction, it had one serious defect. It made no provision for the Executive Council. Government was Representative, but not Responsible. In England, this important point had been decided as a result of the struggle between King and Parliament in the 17th and 18th centuries. Although the little struggle in New Zealand between May and August, 1854, was in many ways a first-class comedy, yet behind it all there was a trace of that seriousness which in the 17th century culminated in the glorious Revolution of 1688.

There is no need to state in detail the various happenings that led eventually to the granting of Responsible government. The Representative House would transact no business until the executive (which included Edward Gibbon Wakefield) was chosen from the members of Parliament. A compromise — an executive partly nominated and partly representative — was no more successful, and eventually the Acting-Governor wrote to England asking for full Responsible Government for New Zealand. The reply came that no legislation was needed to introduce Responsible Government and that the Governor was authorised to accept a Responsible Ministry.

Thus New Zealand attained to Responsible Government. The Governor was appointed from England; the Legislature consisted of the Legislative Council (Upper House) nominated

by the Governor, acting on the advice of his Ministry, and a House of Representatives.

The Ministry was now selected by the Prime Minister from members of Parliament.

(e) The final stage was entered upon in 1907. On September 26th, New Zealand became a self-governing Dominion.



#### iv. New Zealand's Political Debt to America.

The great divergencies in the constitutions of the <sup>American</sup> // colonies have already been described. After a time of experiment, however, the government in all colonies became more or less uniform. The highest official was the governor, appointed either by the King, the Company or by the Lords Proprietors. He had the power to call, prorogue or dissolve the legislature, to veto its laws and to appoint the various colonial officials. The Council, in most cases, was appointed by the Crown or by the Proprietors. Its function was chiefly to advise the Governor, but also it formed the Upper House of the Legislature, and sometimes acted as the highest court in the colony. The third branch of the Government was the Assembly or Lower House. The members were elected by the people and were always very conscious of their political rights. In no colony was universal suffrage to be found. In most cases, the right to vote depended upon the possession of property.

This was the established form of government in the colonies when New Zealand came to be settled. The first important change to be noticed, however, is the selection of the Governors. Few of the Governors of early America were men of outstanding ability. Some were unprincipled place-seekers, and the majority were men very limited in outlook, who were anxious to avoid disputes, and as their term of office was short, shelved difficulties whenever possible for their successors to handle. To-day, the choice of a colonial governor is a very important question. New

Zealand has been most fortunate in her Governors. They have been men who have for the most part, entered fully into the lives of the people, have been popular and have worthily upheld the traditions of Royalty. Sir George Grey earned a place among the great Empire builders, and to select one from more recent Governors, Lord Bledisloe will be set down by New Zealanders as one of the fine Englishmen of the age.

Experience in handling the American colonies had resulted in several important constitutional principles being established. In the first place, the War of Independence settled the question of colonial taxation. In 1778, the Imperial Parliament abandoned its right to tax its colonies. Secondly, it was recognised that the colonists had the right to share in their own government. In America, the franchise had varied in different colonies, but even in the case of the proprietary colonies, the popular assembly had rapidly acquired power for itself. Thirdly, it was accepted that if a colony had Representative Government, no English law had force within that colony unless it had been passed expressly for it, or for all the colonies. A law passed for England could have force if the colonial courts accepted it, or if it had been adopted by an act of the Colonial Legislative. The vetoing of colonial legislation by the Home Parliament has also been a source of continual ill-feeling before 1783, for the Crown had sought to exercise overseas, the right which had fallen into obedience in England. In most cases, the legislation which was vetoed was of a type that clashed with England's wishes for imperial trade. The

colonists did not deny the Crown's right to veto, but they had no intention of having their wishes continually overridden. As a result, they kept passing temporary acts which were renewed when necessary. They relied on the fact that an interval of two or three years generally elapsed before the decision of the Home Government was carried into full effect.

These clashes illustrated the weakness of the whole administration long before 1783, and the 1830 Theorists examined the question thoroughly before they decided that the only solution to the problem was to grant Responsible Government to a colony as soon as it was fit to govern itself. It was thus New Zealand's fortune to win Responsible Government easily, and with comparatively little friction. Even during the period of Representative Government, she suffered from none of the jobbery and patronage that after the War of Independence retarded the progress of England's other colonies. For English Statesmen did not learn their lesson easily, and for fifty years after the Americans had won independence, with the exception of the question of taxation, it is true to say that no change was made in colonial policy. Indeed, many of the evils became accentuated. We have seen that in 1673, a paid secretary and staff handled colonial affairs. In 1782, the Home Secretary took charge, assisted by a committee of the Privy Council. In 1794, a new department was created — that of a secretary for war, and it had some dealings with colonial affairs. In 1801, these two departments were united, the head of it

becoming secretary for war and the colonies. There were twenty two secretaries during the next half century, making the average tenure about three years each. It is easy to understand, then, that power fell into the hands of the permanent officials whose control was so bitterly criticised by the "Theorists". They alleged that the officials had no sympathy with colonial aspirations, and kept as much control as possible in their own hands. As a result, governors and other colonial officials were appointed who went to the colonies with no intention of associating with the working colonists, and who sometimes even did not stir out of the British Isles, but appointed ill-paid deputies to perform their duties. In 1854, the two departments for war and the colonies were separated, and the colonial office received its modern organisation, an organisation which has evolved after the trial and error of three centuries. Two other principles had been established without difficulty. It was recognised that all matters relating to the aborigines should be left to the colonial government, and freedom of worship was an accepted fact.

Thus New Zealand's political heritage was a wealthy one. All the principles of colonial government that were established in the 17th and 18th centuries were hers; of all the bitter lessons of colonial government learned by English statesmen through trial and error, none was at the expense of New Zealand.

## CHAPTER 8.

### The Influence of American Colonisation on New Zealand.

=====

To the colonisation of the American colonies, then, or rather to England's loss of them, New Zealand owes a very great debt. The Declaration of Independence had a very direct effect on the Motherland's policy towards her possessions. We have already seen that the period immediately following the American War was one of the darkest in the history of the British Empire. All history's experience seemed to point to the fact that a rupture between a country and its colonies was a fatal necessity. All the great empires of the past — Grecian, Roman, Spanish, Dutch and French — had fallen, and why should England claim she was an exception? So the colonial office would learn nothing from the War of Independence. History had simply repeated itself, and would keep on doing so until all England's colonies had fallen away. Consequently, the old commercial system still prevailed, the political liberties of the colonies were more restricted than ever, and the Colonial Office showed nothing but deplorable ignorance of the conditions and **requirements** of the countries it was controlling.

This old Colonial System had a very detrimental effect upon England's established colonies. Political development in Australia was checked, and her population for generations was tainted through the transportation of convicts; in Canada there was so much friction between the English and the French

population, that civil war seemed inevitable, and there were English statesmen who advocated leaving Canada to her fate; in Africa, all anti-British feeling there, culminating to-day in a movement in some parts for secession from the Empire, can be traced back directly to the evil effects of early colonial administration.

But none of this evil touched New Zealand. Rather she benefited by the old system. By the time her formal colonisation began, men were casting about to find what was wrong with the system of colonisation. The trouble in Canada was acute, and when Lord Durham was sent there to try to right matters, he and his assistants took careful note of what had succeeded in America's self-governing communities.

The historic Durham report outlined methods of colonial government which, put into practice, undoubtedly prevented the disintegration of the Empire. There remained New Zealand still to be colonised. So, thanks to the 1830 Theorists, an effort was made to do it systematically, to select only those features of the old colonial system that were good. Wakefield's system of colonisation embodied all that was successful in early American experiments, plus those ideas of the thoughtful Imperialists of the time. Thus New Zealand was consciously founded on the old American colonies. The New Zealand Company was the first of the more modern attempts to apply the old Chartered Company system in a modified form. The effect of the American colonisation is everywhere. The Mayflower compact was in the minds of the pioneer expedition of Wellington settlers when they agreed to a code of laws

for the government of their colonies; the charter granted to the New Zealand Company in 1841 has much in common with those granted to Penn and Baltimore; Gladstone supported the Constitution Act of 1852 because the powers given to the colony "are so many approximations to the old colonial system of the Empire"; and the Canterbury Association in 1851 delegated its authority to a committee resident in the colony just as the directors of the Massachusetts company had done.

In accordance with the new ideas, New Zealand's constitution developed through the various stages of growth until she was granted what the Americans had fought for — Responsible Government. One does not mean that the form of Government adopted in New Zealand was modelled upon that of the United States of America. True, Responsible Government as Englishmen understood it, does not exist in America — a fact which, incidentally, Durham failed to recognise. The New Zealand constitution naturally is based upon the English one. In certain details, however, it does resemble that of America. A colonial constitution must, of necessity, be a written one. That in New Zealand is not nearly so full as that in the United States; there are many conventions and laws that lie outside it. But it does supply the frame-work of New Zealand's political structure, and therefore resembles the American constitution and not that of England. Just as in America, the power to interpret the provisions in case of dispute is the Supreme Court which may be called on to decide whether a certain act of the Government is according to the constitution.

At one stage, New Zealand experimented with a type of federal government. At the time, the only federations in existence were the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation, and in the discussions during the establishment of the Provincial Councils, the example of the United States was often cited. The system was not truly federal, as the legislation of the councils was subject to the veto of the Governor; but all the same, it was a federation, and like most federations, was established because geographical conditions kept groups of people in isolation. The federal scheme, moreover, has frequently been advocated as a means of keeping the British Empire together. A concrete proposal was made in 1911 by Sir Joseph Ward, New Zealand's Prime Minister, but the scheme, though possessing some good points, was considered impracticable.

Other benefits accrued from the American revolution. It affected the selection of colonial governors. These were no longer poor relations of men in power -- men with no interest in their work, who usually took the opportunity to try to make their fortunes. The three Governors of New Zealand during the Crown Colony period -- Hobson, Fitzroy and Sir George Grey -- were all men of ability with some previous experience of colonial life.

Many of America's legislations have been of interest to the whole world, but to a country like New Zealand, especially so. New Zealand is proud of her democratic government, and therefore feels a live interest in the history of the first great republican and democratic state of the modern world, a



state which was among the first to experiment with religious liberty, manhood suffrage and popular education. The period of reconstruction after the civil war, the use of arbitration in settling disputes, the use of a high tariff — these were lessons in America's history of great value to New Zealand. Other lessons were learnt too, and not all were models to be copied. The problems of racial relations were of special interest because New Zealand had the question of the Maori population to face. The difference in the attitudes adopted can be largely accounted for, of course, by the moral advance of civilisation. The early American colonists ignored all claims of native ownership, and no one worried about the ultimate fate of the Indians. The colonists would willingly have enslaved them, but their fierce spirit made them poor subjects under the yoke. The treatment afforded the American Indian played its little part in the great humanitarian movement of the 19th century. The early colonists in New Zealand, influenced by this, and by the religious revival of the 18th century, acknowledged native ownership of land, built schools and churches for the Maori, and gave him all the rights and privileges of British subjects.

In more modern times, America's effect has still been marked. Literature from the pens of such writers as Mark Twain, Bret Harte, Artemis Ward, Fenimore Cooper and Mary E. Wilkins has a ready sale. New Zealand boys will always glory in the tales of the wild west and stories of cowboy and Indian. America's influence on education, business methods, music, and sport is felt in New Zealand as elsewhere. New

Zealand has coined only very few words herself, but has borrowed freely from other countries. Many slang "American" words are in everyday use, and with the advent of the "talkie", more will creep in.

There are few ~~actual~~ contacts between the United States of America and New Zealand, and these have occurred chiefly in respect of the whaling and gold-mining industries, mail services and trade. There is a demand for American motor-vehicles and agricultural machinery in New Zealand, a demand accounted for, perhaps, by the similarity of farming conditions.

Finally, the shifting of the centre of international politics nearer the Pacific, has brought America to the fore as far as New Zealand is concerned. The Dominion realises that America is the important country in the Pacific, and successful co-operation with her is very much in its interest.