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ABSTRACT

This thesis is an examination of the commercial, social and political dimensions of the New Zealand timber and flax trade 1769-1840.

Chapters One to Three provide a chronological account of the trade. The level of activity was sporadic until 1827 after which time the trade expanded. The years 1769-1827 were a period of familiarization. The Europeans needed to experiment with the New Zealand products, to test the market for them and to settle traders at New Zealand. The Maoris had to learn what Europeans required and to adjust to the demands of trading. Each group used these years to get to know the other and to establish the rapport required for the trade to function. Exports of wood and fibre from New Zealand increased rapidly after 1827 because the Europeans were prepared to invest in them and the Maoris were willing to produce enough timber and flax to sustain an export trade. During the 1830s the trade prospered only for as long as the markets for the products were buoyant and the Maoris were prepared to continue to assist with the production of them.

Timber and flax trading could substantially affect the lives of those involved in it. Chapters Four and Five examine how traders adapted to the demands of the New Zealand physical and social environment and how Maoris faced changes in their work and settlement patterns, health, inter-tribal relations, and material culture.

Chapter Six discusses the increasing interest by British and colonial governments in New Zealand affairs which was stimulated in large part by the timber and flax trade. For example the sent naval vessels and issued contracts to private firms to collect cargoes of these products. They also sought to regulate affairs in New Zealand (by passing Acts of Parliament, by sending naval vessels to cruise the coast and by appointing a British Resident) at least partly in order to provide an environment which would be conducive to trading. The eventual British decision to annex New Zealand was strongly influenced by the pressure exerted on the government by those who were interested in trading with that country.
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PREFACE

This thesis is a study of the New Zealand timber and flax trade 1769-1840. It examines the commercial aspects and the social consequences of this trade. It also explores how the trade helped involve the governments of Britain, New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land in New Zealand affairs and influenced moves for annexation.

Chapters One to Three of the thesis outline the chronology of the trade 1769-1840, while Chapters Four to Six are a thematic examination of the implications of the trading process.

Earlier writers have tended to regard the flax trade in terms of the period 1827-1832 and the timber trade only in relation to the 1830s. In Chapter One it is argued that the foundations for the trade were first laid when Cook and his colleagues extolled the virtues of New Zealand trees and phormium. Thus, rather than regarding the events of the trade in the years before 1827 as isolated incidents they are examine as being part of the process of preparation, familiarization, and experimentation that was necessary before trading could take off.

Chapter Two analyses the factors which determined the quantities of phormium that were exported from New Zealand between 1827 and 1832. It looks also at the nature of the trade after the boom years had passed through to the end of the decade. Chapter Three is concerned with the activities of the spar trade and the fluctuations in the colonial timber trade in the 1830s. In addition both chapters describe the patterns of European settlement in New Zealand that resulted from the requirements of each branch of the trade.

Chapters Four and Five are concerned with the people involved with the trade and the ways in which a commitment to the trade affected their lives. These chapters are in no way

1. There have been two New Zealand theses which have included information specifically on the pre-1840 period but these dealt with neither the mechanics nor the social history of the trade before 1840. They are S.J.L McCay, 'Phormium Tenax and New Zealand History', M.A. thesis, Otago University, 1952; P.H.H. Taylor, 'The History of the Kauri Timber Industry', M.A. thesis, Auckland University, 1950.
to be regarded as a history of the Europeans or Maoris in New Zealand in the period to 1840 and neither are they a general discussion of culture contact. Moreover, although trading involved prolonged contacts between Maoris and Europeans, these chapters do not deal with the wider question of race relations. However, all these matters are touched on in the course of the discussion but only in so far as they relate to the subject of the thesis.

The final chapter of the thesis deals with the wider repercussions of the New Zealand timber and flax trade. It discusses the role of the British and colonial governments both in promoting the trade and in attempting to regulate it. It is argued that this involvement played a significant part in determining the nature and timing of Britain's annexation of New Zealand.

The study ends about the beginning of 1840 because the formal assumption of British control over New Zealand and the huge influx of colonists in that year affected the nature of the trade. What had been, from a New Zealand perspective, effectively a maritime free-trade was, from 1840, influenced by internal government regulations, import duties and the internal market demands of the new colony.

The approach adopted in this study has been to start by examining the details of the trade and then to broaden the perspective by analysing first its social and then its political dimensions. This approach is aimed to demonstrate both the development of the trade and the continuity which linked Cook's suggestion of the potential for a timber and flax trade to the events which led up to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. An account of the voyages to and from New Zealand grows in significance when the effects of the trade on the lives of the participants are considered. In much the same way contemporary commentators and the British and colonial governments also became aware of the wider implications of the trade. It was, respectively, their descriptions of the ill-effects of the trade on life in New Zealand and their moves to promote
and to regulate trading at that country that brought the timber and flax trade into the arena of British colonial policy-making. In that forum the trade took on a new importance. Thus the thesis goes on to look at the implication of the governments' involvement with the trade and how this was in part, responsible for the decision to annex New Zealand to the British Empire.

The evidence available for this study varied markedly in its quality and quantity. Information about the volumes of timber and flax which were exported annually from New Zealand (particularly the products which were imported into New South Wales) is available in broad outline in the works of other writers, from nineteenth century government accounts of colonial trade, and from newspapers.

The more detailed analysis of the volume of shipping, of voyages by individual vessels, of the process of trading and the lives of the participants of the trade was arrived at from my reading of a large range of contemporary colonial newspapers and the rich and full collections of colonial government records held in Australian institutions. To add to this colonial perspective I read the files of the Colonial Office, Board of Trade, Treasury, Admiralty and Foreign Office.

Traders, generally, were too concerned with the management of their business to leave a consistent record of their work. The letterbook left by Ranulph Dacre, which covers the years when he was trying to complete his Royal Navy timber contract, provided an all too brief exception to this rule. A few log books survive but mainly for the period before 1820, and some small snippets were found in whalers' logs.

The task of fleshing-out the skeleton has therefore been a matter of gleaning scraps of information from collection of private correspondence, from some published contemporary accounts, from parliamentary proceedings and reports from select committees, and from the journals of missionaries and visitors to New Zealand.
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Chapter One

The Timber and Flax Trade 1769-1827

From its tentative beginnings in the last decade of the eighteenth century until its sudden surge in 1827, the trade in New Zealand timber and flax appears to have been little more than a series of unrelated episodes, speculative voyages, settlement schemes and government initiatives. Yet the events of these formative years of the trade were significant in that they were the basis on which the boom in exporting in the 1830s was founded.

It was during the years 1769-1827 that Europeans slowly increased their knowledge of New Zealand, its inhabitants and its exportable natural products. Maoris also needed time to become familiar with Europeans and their commercial requirements. Indeed it was only when Maoris were willing to trade and to provide the labour necessary to prepare cargoes of timber and flax that the trade became a viable one. The trade boomed in the late 1820s because both merchants and New Zealanders were sufficiently experienced to be able to work together successfully and because the local colonial economies, the European market prospects and Maori inter-tribal relations were in a state which induced traders and Maoris to increase their involvement in exporting timber and flax from New Zealand.
TO OBTAIN the information they needed the colonial merchants ultimately had to send vessels to New Zealand. Initially, however, their views about New Zealand and their activities there were largely influenced by the accounts of the navigators and the early travellers. These contained the information shipowners needed before they would risk a vessel in unfamiliar waters: the nature of harbours and anchorages; the availability of food for crews and materials for the repair of vessels; whether the natives were friendly and a profit likely. So the shipowners and merchants turned to Cook and his company, to Crozet, de Surville and later Savage and Nicholas, for their picture of New Zealand and her resources.

Editions of Cook's works rapidly appeared in print and in a multitude of languages. British newspapers and the popular 'literary magazines' serialized and elaborated on the reports of the voyages. Sir Joseph Banks, in particular, had a huge circle of correspondents including influential civil servants and members of parliament. He was often called upon to speak about the voyages. However the most accessible sources now are the contemporary published accounts taken from the ships' and masters' journals.

Cook claimed that there was little to add to his chart and journal notes for the North Island of New Zealand. He described several harbours from both the point of safety and the need to feed his sailors. While Poverty Bay, Tolaga Bay and Mercury Bay were not discounted as reasonable anchorages, the Thames and the Bay of Islands were the sites that Cook preferred. The Thames, he said, had ample material to supply any vessel, was safe to enter and he commended it as a site for possible British settlement. He described the Bay of Islands as having 'several harbours equally safe and commodious, where there is

room and depth for any number of shipping'. ³ Here too, Cook suggested, an English settlement might be founded as supplies were plentiful and the rivers navigable. ⁴

In the South Island Dusky Bay, Admiralty Bay and Queen Charlotte Sound were selected for special praise. Of Dusky Bay Forster wrote: 'Nothing is more easy than to sail into it, there being no danger except what is visible above water, and so many harbours and coves existing in every part of it, that it is impossible to miss a convenient anchoring-place, where wood, water, fish and wild fowl are to be found in plenty'. ⁵ While neither suggested that it was a suitable site for a settlement, both Cook and Forster stressed that supplies were abundant, although they found no anti-scorbutics. Admiralty Bay was described as having good safe mooring and plenty of fresh water. ⁷ Queen Charlotte Sound was obviously an adequate harbour, but its chief advantage was the abundance of supplies, especially fish and what they took to be vital provisions of anti-scorbutics. ⁸

From the explorers' point of view, therefore, journey's end in New Zealand meant safe harbours and adequate supplies. The navigators also believed, even in the light of the massacre of Rowe and du Fresne, that Maoris would not oppose settlement or trading provided that they were handled fairly and were shown the superiority of European civilization and firepower. ⁹ But for the merchant and the speculator it was what he could take home that was important.

³ Hawkesworth, II, 369.
⁴ Hawkesworth, III, 444.
⁵ George Forster, A Voyage Round the World in His Britannic Majesty's Sloop, Resolution ... during the Years 1772, 1773, 1774 and 1775, 2 vols, London, 1777, I,188. (The long 's' of original editions has been replaced with the modern 's').
⁶ J. Cook, A Voyage Towards the South Pole, and Round the World ... In the Years 1772, 1773, 1774 and 1775, 2 vols, London, 1777, I, 70, 80, 96-8; Forster, I, 135, 187, 188.
⁷ Hawkesworth, III, 431.
⁸ For example Hawkesworth, II, 387, 394; Forster, II, 479.
⁹ For a discussion of Maori and European trading relations see Chapters 4 and 5 below.
Cook and Forster reported that seals and whales were to be found in abundance around the coasts of New Zealand.\(^{10}\) But what excited the naval and security conscious French and English sailors were the vast forests of timber and the large stands of flax. Their descriptions were enthusiastic.

Hawkesworth borrowed his information about flax from Sir Joseph Banks' journal. The *Phormium tenax*, Banks believed, excelled all common hems and flaxes. Its leaves, undressed, were used by Maoris for very strong fishing seines; partially dressed, the fibres were used for common apparel, strings, line and cordage of greater strength than common hemp; and fully dressed the silky white leaf was made into the finest Maori costumes. The flax appeared to grow in all conditions and in every part of New Zealand. His immediate suggestion was to attempt to introduce it into England.\(^{11}\) For his part, Forster believed that the exploitation of New Zealand flax could open up a trade with India where there was a need for cordage and canvas.\(^{12}\) La Billardièrè, the naturalist aboard the *Recherche* in which D'Entrecasteaux conducted a Pacific-wide search for the missing navigator La Pérouse, conducted the first scientific experiments on New Zealand flax. From Maoris at the North Cape he purchased flax and flax plants which he managed to ship to France and to cultivate. The produce of these plants enabled La Billardièrè to compare the flexibility and strength of New Zealand flax against other rope fibres. *Phormium* ranked second only to silk in both tests.\(^{13}\)

---


Trees, Cook claimed, were the principal vegetable products in New Zealand. He saw huge forests in northern New Zealand, Queen Charlotte Sound and Dusky Bay. Much of the wood was straight and clean and suitable, he thought, for any purpose except making masts, for which they were too hard and heavy.\(^{14}\) Anderson, the ship's carpenter, agreed.\(^{15}\) Although his journals contained descriptions of many trees including the kaikatea, the miro and the rimu, Cook never appreciated, as Crozet did during his stay in the Bay of Islands, that the kauri was superior to the other trees. The first kauri felled by Europeans was cut down by the du Fresne expedition of which Crozet was a member. Two trees had been felled, trimmed into spars and were being hauled towards Manawaora Bay in the Bay of Islands when, after the news of the murder of Marion du Fresne reached the timber party, they were abandoned.\(^{16}\) Crozet noted the resinous, large, clean and straight properties of the kauri and these, added to its elasticity, made it, he believed, very suitable for ships' masts.\(^{17}\) As to its density, Crozet claimed that when freshly cut the kauri did not weigh more than 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) pounds per cubic foot heavier than Riga pine.\(^{18}\)

Therefore, according to the navigators, amongst its other valuable products, New Zealand had two natural vegetable resources - timber and flax - which, given their abundance and accessibility, could reward handsomely any speculative mercantile venture.

\(^{14}\) Hawkesworth, II, 405, III, 441; Cook, I, 95.

\(^{15}\) J. Cook and J. King, A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean ... In the Years 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779 and 1780 ... Vols 1 and 2 written by Captain J. Cook and Vol 3 by Captain J. King, 3 vols, London, 1784, I, 147.


\(^{17}\) J.M. Crozet, Crozet's Voyage to Tasmania, New Zealand, the Ladrone Islands, and the Philippines in the Years 1771-1772, trans. H. Ling Roth, London, 1891, p.73.

\(^{18}\) Crozet, pp. 42-3.
It is occasionally possible to show that the accounts of navigators and early visitors were the source of the information which directed merchants and masters to New Zealand. For instance Dell, master of the Fancy in 1794, claimed that it would be presumptuous of him to describe the Firth of Thames in his private log for it had been 'already so correctly described by that late Excellent Navigator Captain Cook'. Indeed, even when aspects of Cook's description appeared to be misleading Dell blamed his own interpretation of what Cook had written rather than impugn the navigator's reputation. 19 Similarly William Wilson on the Royal Admiral in 1801 was able to chart his track into the Thames together with that of Captain Cook. 20 The extent to which colonial merchants were influenced by the navigators' writings when they too analysed the prospects for the New Zealand trade cannot be determined. It is significant, however, that it was to the places recommended by Cook - Dusky Bay, Thames and the Bay of Islands - that they first directed their vessels. Indeed editions of Cook's works had arrived in the colonies by the early nineteenth century. For example a copy of one was among the effects sold from Captain Dalrymple's estate in December 1808. 21 The navigators' influence was also indicated by the fact that merchants sent vessels to New Zealand confidently expecting that there they would find reserves of timber, flax, seals and whales.

These accounts were not, however, the only source from which colonial merchants obtained secondhand information and encouragement about the New Zealand timber and flax trade. Contemporary voyages by non-colonial shipping, at first exploratory and later routine visits by men like Peter Dillon assured them that other merchants and other markets were interested in the New Zealand produce. The commercial activities of the missionary societies, especially the CMS under the

19. King to Nepean, 4 March 1795, enclosure, CO 201/18, f. 13a-13b.
direction of the Rev. Samuel Marsden (himsel 7 a successful
trader), demonstrated the advantages of having Europeans
supervise the trade from New Zealand and the apparent ease
with which Maoris could be induced to assist in the trade.
Finally government voyages provided charts, narratives and
produce which motivated renewed merchant and official
interest in timber and flax.

HOWEVER THE timing and level of colonial merchant involve-
ment in the timber and flax trade was influenced by more
than the information (or lack thereof) they had at hand. The
growth of the trade must also be set within the context of
the expansion of colonial commerce and Pacific trade in
general from the 1790s to the 1820s.

The rise of private mercantile activity in New
South Wales in the late eighteenth century was occasioned
by the inefficiency of the supply system designed by the
British government for the penal colony and the inclination
of the inhabitants to speculate and improve their lot through
trading. Initially it was believed that persons being trans-
ported at His Majesty's pleasure ought also to be sustained
by the government. However the method of supplying the
colonies through the Victualling Board failed when supply
ships were wrecked on the way to New South Wales and Van
Diemen's Land, when the demands of the population for items
such as spirits were not being met by government imports, and
when non-official and foreign vessels arrived at the colony
with consumer goods to sell. First the officers of the New
South Wales Corps and then, increasingly, the emancipists
and free settlers of the colony sought the profits to be
made from selling imported consumer goods.22 As

22. Two Australian writers have traced the rise of the
colonial traders in the early nineteenth century -
see M. Steven, Merchant Campbell, 1769-1846. A Study
of Colonial Trade, Sydney, 1965; D.R. Hainsworth,
The Sydney Traders, Simeon Lord and his Contemporaries
1788-1821, Sydney, 1972; also M. Steven, 'Exports
other than Wool' and D.R. Hainsworth, 'Trade within
the Colony' in Economic Growth of Australia, 1788-
shipping to the colony began to increase larger quantities of imported goods became readily available for retailing. The merchants' problem lay in trying to pay for them. The colony did not have sufficient specie to allow them to pay for the goods with cash. Neither, initially, was there a product which could be exported to offset the cost of the imports.

Currency had not been thought necessary for penal colonies. However when both the colonial government and the colonial traders had to purchase imports, and when emancipated convicts began to work for wages, the demand for coins increased. The colonial government was not too severely handicapped in that it could pay for imports of supplies with bills drawn on the British Treasury. Similarly the officers of the New South Wales Corps and the colonial traders who had bankers or agents in India or Britain could offer bills against the credit in their accounts. However neither the Treasury nor the private bills could be used as internal currency and so the imports were retailed within the colony through a system of promissory notes and barter. As New South Wales agriculture developed, farmers were encouraged to sell their meat and grain to the Commissariat Store in return for which they received a store receipt. This receipt indicated the sterling worth of the goods sold and was able to be drawn, for that sum, on the Treasury in London. More commonly, however, the farmers accumulated these receipts as a credit reserve against which they issued their own promissory notes. In 1809 Governor Macquarie reported that promissory notes were the only circulating medium in the colony and that many had been issued which could not be redeemed. The alternative method of trading, he discovered, was barter and this was the way most employers paid wages.

The currency problem continued to plague the New South Wales economy through to the mid-1820s when, after several other expedients had been tried, the government
endorsed the Spanish dollar as the basic coin. Thus throughout the period covered by this chapter colonial traders could not pay entirely for their imports with currency. They were therefore obliged to look for a staple exportable product which would provide them with the credit to pay for their imports.

In their 'search for a staple' the traders looked to the wool, timber, coal and animal products which could be exported from the Australian continent. Simultaneously they looked east to 'Australia's Pacific Frontier' for products which could be re-exported to foreign markets. Their interest in New Zealand timber and flax, therefore, was not an isolated commercial operation. It was only one part of a Pacific-wide search for potential exports. Also, especially in the years before 1810, timber and flax cargoes often appear to have been taken as a side-line to the main purpose of a voyage or as products just to fill a hold on the off-chance that they might provide a return large enough to cover the costs of their collection.

The 'gentlemen traders' of this period hoped to discover a product which was renewable and which would find an assured market overseas. Timber and flax, however, could not provide the returns that were available in the luxury Pacific trades such as sandalwood, bêche-de-mer, pearlshell and tortoiseshell, but unlike these products New Zealand timber and flax were not so over-exploited that supplies were depleted to the point where trading was halted. Therefore the fitful nature of the trade before 1827 can be explained, in part, within the context of the wide variety of Pacific products which were available to the traders who wanted to be exporters. Only when the New Zealand products

---


24. This term was first coined in J.M.R. Young, 'Australia's Pacific Frontier', Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand, XII, 1966, 373-88. See also Australia's Pacific Frontier: Economic and Cultural Expansion into the Pacific, 1795-1885, ed. J.M.R. Young, Melbourne, 1967.
appeared to promise better returns than these other commodities did the merchants choose to export them.

The choice of exports was not solely determined by their availability and ease of access. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries merchants found their markets restricted by the terms of the East India Company monopoly. In 1600 Queen Elizabeth I granted a charter to a group of merchants who later formed the British East India Company. The charter gave them a monopoly over all imports into Great Britain from the oceans and lands between the Cape of Good Hope and Cape Horn (with no longitudinal limits) and all exports by British vessels into Company ports, most notably Canton and Calcutta. The strict enforcement of the Company's monopoly was one of the instructions given to the early colonial governors. Accordingly New Zealand produce which was taken from within the jurisdiction of the New South Wales governors (an area which included all of New Zealand north of Banks Peninsula) could enter colonial ports legally as part of the New South Wales 'coasting trade'. However, as with all other products, New Zealand goods could not be exported from the colonies save in vessels which were licensed by the East India Company to participate in the 'country trade', (that is, to sail within the monopoly area and into Company ports), or in Company vessels which alone could take the produce to Britain for sale.

In 1813 a British Act reorganised the rights and functions of the Company and freed all trade, save for the China tea trade, in the hitherto exclusive areas of the East India Company monopoly. At the same time, however, the colonial and home governments imposed import tariffs. In the colonies the aim was to raise revenue; in Britain, merchant lobbies had persuaded the government to protect their interests against the colonial traders. These duties were gradually removed or lessened during the early years of the 1820s as a part of government moves to encourage colonial trading.
In addition to statutory fiscal restrictions, traders were handicapped by at first not being allowed to build their own boats, and then being restricted to sailing them within the boundaries of the governors' jurisdiction (10°37' and 43°39' South and 135° East of Greenwich). Moreover, in 1813, although the East India Company monopoly was removed, the free movement of shipping between the colonies and Great Britain was restricted to vessels above 350 tons. This excluded all the vessels built or owned by Sydney traders before the restriction was lifted in 1819. Thus the trader who used his own vessel to take produce to markets outside New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land had to surrender the vessel with its cargo on arrival. Alternatively he could charter or purchase a part share in a licensed vessel.

There were methods of circumventing many of these restrictions and the story of the lengths to which the Sydney traders were often driven to get their goods to market makes exciting telling. However secret mid-Pacific rendezvous, smuggling, piracy and sailings from harbours under the cover of darkness were not the stuff of which the timber and flax trade was made. Such high adventure was confined to the trade in products, such as sandalwood, which had the potential to return significant gross profit.

In contrast timber and flax were bulky goods which did not find an easy or ready market. The cost of getting timber and flax to markets outside Australia was so high that they could only profitably be sold on a specialist and selective market. Both products were therefore announced as being best suited for naval purposes. This meant that the lives of sailors would depend on the performance of New Zealand spars and ship timbers and on the ropes or canvas made from *phormium tenax*. Neither the Royal Navy nor the merchant marine were prepared to recommend the use of these products until they had been thoroughly tested. Thus while the well-known shortage of naval timbers and hemp in Britain, and especially on the Royal Navy's East India station, created a potentially insatiable market for New Zealand timber and flax, the lead-time before the markets were
opened in the late 1820s was taken up with the meticulous testing of the New Zealand products.

The attitude of New Zealand Maoris was probably the key to the success of any voyage. Regardless of the breadth of his knowledge, his familiarity with New Zealand and the trade, or the buoyancy of the market for these products, the merchant was faced with the prospect of failure unless Maoris prepared the flax he required or hauled the timber to his vessel. Several early trading voyages were aborted because Maoris were unwilling to trade when vessels arrived in New Zealand or because the Europeans' fear of Maoris caused them to avoid going to that country. It was not until 1827 that the traders' image of Maoris changed and they began to approach the New Zealand coasts with confidence.

For Maoris too the early years of the trade (and this was not their major point of contact with Europeans) was a time of learning. They needed to learn how to prepare timber of the quality and dimensions required by Europeans, to decide on the conditions under which they would provide the huge amounts of flax needed by the traders, and to discover an equitable method of trading with Europeans. Their decision to trade also had to be made against the background of the political and social changes which were taking place in Maori life during the first three decades of the nineteenth century.

These, then, were the colonial and New Zealand contexts within which the timber and flax trade was wrought. They shaped the nature and timing of many voyages. However it was what actually happened while a vessel lay at New Zealand that determined the success or failure of an individual venture. Moreover it was the outcome of his voyages that appears to have ultimately conditioned a merchant's attitude to New Zealand and the trade.
THE FIRST commercial voyage to New Zealand specifically to collect timber or flax was sent in 1795. The snow Fancy, Dell, had arrived in New South Wales on 9 July 1794 with a cargo of rice, dhooll and wheat for the inhabitants of the beleaguered colony. Rather than having it return to Calcutta empty, the vessel's owner, William Bampton, had ordered Dell to load with New Zealand spars of sufficient dimensions for use by the navy. He probably judged that supplying the much needed timbers to the East India Royal Navy Station would also increase the profitability of the voyage. 25

The Fancy left Port Jackson on 29 September 1794 and sailed to Norfolk Island. From there, Dell had announced while he was in New South Wales, he intended to sail to a secret destination for an equally secret purpose. The contemporary commentator, David Collins, with the benefit of hindsight, reported that:

It was generally surmised ... that he was bound to some island whereat timber fit for naval purposes was to be procured; and at which whatever ship Mr. Bampton should bring with him might touch and load with a cargo for India. The snow was armed, was about one hundred and seventy tons burden, had a large and expensive complement of officers and men, and a guard of sepoys, and a commission from the Bombay Marine. New Zealand was by us supposed to be the place; as force, or at least the appearance of it, was there absolutely requisite. (*footnote Mr Dell had likewise on board a much greater number of cross-cut saws than were necessary to procure wood for the mere use of the vessel.) 26

Dell's secrecy was understandable as he held a monopoly in being the agent of the Bombay Marine. Vessels often designated 'New Zealand' as their destination or departure point without specifying which part of the country they had visited or were destined for. In this way precious seal rookeries,

flax supplies or timber stands were preserved for that vessel's exclusive use on a later voyage. Occasionally (more especially during the flax boom of the early 1830s) the designation 'speculative voyage' may have also described a vessel leaving for New Zealand.

The Fancy arrived at Doubtless Bay on 13 November 1794. This was the home of Tukita hu a, one of the Maoris who had been taken to Norfolk Island in 1793 under instructions from Governor King. Indeed it is possible that Dell visited the harbour at King's suggestion. Although Tuki claimed that suitable timber was available in the Bay Dell did not find any. Thus the next day he sailed for Thames where he knew that Cook had seen fine stands of trees.

Dell anchored in the Firth and sent the snow's boats up the Waihou River to find suitable trees which were close to the water's edge. A site was found about twenty miles up the river. The master took the Fancy up the river and anchored near the trees and off a Maori village which he called 'Gravesend'. His object in risking his vessel on a voyage up the river was to be near to his sawyers to afford them the protection of the snow's guns.

Dell was keen to preserve harmonious relations with the local Maoris because they supplied his vessel with fresh fish and apparently assisted in dragging out spars. Also, because he was surrounded by upwards of 1500 Maoris throughout his stay, Dell reckoned that his life depended on his careful handling of the situation. Therefore he allowed petty thefts to go unpunished and endeavoured to defuse tensions that arose between Maoris and sailors. On one occasion the Fancy was surrounded by 117 canoes and the Maoris appeared to be readying for an attack. Dell's journal recorded that he dispersed them by firing over their heads. However David Collins was probably referring to the same incident when, based on the account of a seaman from the Fancy, he claimed that two Maori men and a woman were killed in an attempt to drive off upwards of 3000 Maoris. Whatever action Dell actually took it prevented any assault on his vessel for, he later asserted, the Maoris 'had not the Courage Sufficient to put there design in execution, as they
are too well acquainted with the effect of Our Fire Arms, to make the Attempt'.

Throughout the months the Fancy lay at Gravesend the sawyers cut and stowed timber. This was probably kahikatea. The men who remained on board the snow were occupied in dressing and spinning New Zealand flax to make ropes. Dell's own summary of the expedition was this:

From the 12th December to the 21st February I lay at Gravesend in the River Thames in New Zealand - The number of Spars that were Cut was 213 All fit for Lower Masts for any Ship in the Navy. I think them equal to the Norway Pine, & equally as light - of this I am convinced having sawed up a Quantity into Plank fit for Decking Large Ships being 2½ Inches Thick and Fifty feet long - This Timber grows in the greatest Abundance & in some places close to the Banks of the River - Near where I lay there were many Hundred Acres of the finest Flax Plant from which I rigged my Vessel with Running Rigging - On the Whole the Natives were on very good Terms with us and regretted our Departure very much. Lime Can be got in any Quantity as there are great Quantities of Flint and Chalk - The Country is thickly wooded with the Pine & various other useful Timbers - amongst which is a Species of the Oak

Edgar Thomas Dell.

Collins added that the trees cut were 60 to 140 feet long, the largest being 3½ feet in the butt. Also the safety of the voyage proved, to Collins at least, that New Zealand could advantageously be opened up for New South Wales based

27. Kahikatea was found near the banks of the Waihou River and kauri was found only on the inland hills - T.E. Simpson, Kauri to Radiata, Wellington, 1973, pp. 10, 14.

28. King to Nepean, 4 March 1795, enclosure, CO 201/18, f. 23a-23b.
exploitation — in particular for the reserves of flax.\textsuperscript{29}

There were two vessels called Hunter involved in the New Zealand timber trade between 1798 and 1801.\textsuperscript{30} The master of the 300 tons Java-built snow Hunter was directed to New Zealand in September 1798 to 'derive some profit from his return' to Calcutta after having brought supplies to New South Wales. The master, Fern, apparently filled his vessel with 'very fine spars' from the Thames area. This task he could not have performed without Maori assistance in dragging the spars to the river side.\textsuperscript{31}

The second Hunter, an ex-prize ship, was dispatched for Thames in October 1799. Its owner, Simeon Lord, had been transported to New South Wales in 1791 and had just completed his sentence when he purchased a Spanish ship which he renamed Hunter. This voyage was the first of many trading ventures directed to New Zealand and throughout the Pacific by Lord who became a leading New South Wales trader, magistrate and landowner.

William Hingston, master of the Hunter, was instructed to complete his cargo of seal skins and whale oil, which had been loaded in New South Wales, with timber from Thames. He was then to sell this cargo in Bengal and, contrary to the terms of the British East India Company charter, he was to

\textsuperscript{29} Collins, I, 410-11. There is no evidence to support McNab's claim that they left some timber in the care of the Maoris — R. McNab, From Tasman to Marsden, Dunedin, 1914, p.80. Clearly too, after Dell's account, Nicholas' tale that 3000 spars were cut is an exaggeration — J.L. Nicholas, Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand, 2 vols, London, 1817, (Wilson and Horton Tacstimule, n.d.), I, 418.

\textsuperscript{30} This has led to some confusion in accounts of the period. See for instance McNab, Tasman, pp. 89-90.

\textsuperscript{31} Collins, II, 116,127,318; Steven, Campbell, pp. 23,24, 32-4, and, on the possible return visit to New Zealand in March 1801, pp.42,56,101.
return with a cargo of spirits and other goods which would find an easy sale in the colony. Nothing is known of the vessel's voyage save that it arrived in the Thames area leaking and next appeared in Calcutta late in 1800. When Hingston attempted to load spirits for the return journey in defiance of their monopoly, the vessel was seized by officials of the East India Company and sold, along with its inwards cargo. 32

Early in 1801 two vessels arrived in Thames to load with timber. The first was the Plumier, a former prize ship, owned and manned by Thomas Fysche Palmer, John Boston and James Ellis from New South Wales. Palmer, a member of the group of political reformers, 'the Scottish Martyrs' who were transported in 1794, had joined with Boston and Ellis, two free settlers, in farming, trading and shipbuilding activities during their time in New South Wales. In 1801, at the end of Palmer's sentence, they purchased the Plumier in which they intended to return to England. 33 To offset some of the cost of the voyage they intended to load and sell a cargo of New Zealand spars.

They arrived in the Thames in March and were busily engaged in repairing their vessel and collecting timber when the second vessel, the Royal Admiral, arrived there late in April. This vessel was a British East India Company ship which had been chartered to land convicts in New South Wales, and LMS missionaries in Tahiti. Its master, William Wilson, decided to sail via New Zealand to get spars for the China market and timber to build homes for the missionaries in Tahiti.

The Royal Admiral, a 923 tons ship, was anchored in the Firth and the long boat and yawl were manned and sent up the Waihou River. There the crew found the Plumier which had foundered and was being repaired by its crew with Maori assistance. Sawyers from both vessels established bases at

32. Hingston absconded with any proceeds from the voyage and sale - Hainsworth, Traders, pp. 65-6; Collins, II, 205, 267-8, 318.
33. Hainsworth, Traders, p. 41 and n.
a village called 'Kokremare' (also rendered 'Koramare'), home of the chief 'Hupa' [Houpa], which was situated on a tributary creek of the Waihou. As a defence against Maori attacks and thieving the men of the Royal Admiral surrounded their compound with a palisade about seven feet high.

From their base the 30-man team from the Royal Admiral travelled daily to the forest. Once the trees were cut they had to be hauled over three-quarters of a mile of swamp to the creek and then floated for forty miles or more down to the ship. Several spars were lost in the course of these operations and, furthermore, the Plumier foundered for a second time and the long boat of the Royal Admiral was wrecked and abandoned. In addition to taking the timber from 'Kokremare' Wilson's chart and the missionary journal suggested that 'Short timber' was purchased from Heke, a chief on the eastern side of the Firth, whose village appears to have been near present day Tapu.

Relations between Europeans and Maoris appear for the most part to have been cordial. According to the missionary James Elder who was on board the ship, the sawyers from the Royal Admiral were assisted in their task by a force of 300-400 Maoris. Moreover the Maoris regularly provided fresh supplies, including fish, kumara, raw and 'boiled' English potatoes and raw turnips for the Europeans.

Captain Wilson, like Dell, accepted that a certain amount of Maori petty theft would have to be overlooked in the interests of maintaining harmony. However when Maoris began making raids on the timber parties, stealing their axes and disrupting their work, Wilson detained four chiefs as hostages for the return of his property. On that occasion

---

34. This may have been the village Dell named 'Gravesend'. It is marked on Wilson's chart as being on the site of present day Hikutaia - Maling, p.73.
the chiefs escaped. At the same time he hardened his attitudes to thefts from the ship. When one of the sailors was detected stealing nails to trade privately with the Maoris he was publicly flogged 'as an example before the natives and chief'. A week later when a Maori was caught stealing a sailor's clothing he too was tied up in preparation for flogging. However he was released after the entreaties of his friends and relatives.

Later, when the timber carriage and a kettle went missing from the sawyers' camp, the captain took three of the chief's relatives hostage and then apparently set fire to Maori huts. The carriage was returned in pieces (presumably the Maoris had kept the iron) but Wilson retained his hostages. The next morning 700 (Smith said 800-900) patu wavin g Maoris surrounded the camp and after some negotiating the hostages were released.

By early June the prevalence of petty theft and the frequency with which the Europeans lost axes and clothing while they were working with Maoris provoked Wilson's stronger reaction. Knowing the attachment Maoris felt for their canoes the captain ordered that two canoes be removed as a retribution for the thefts. In the course of this a Maori was shot dead.

As well as receiving aid from Maoris, the men of the **Royal Admiral** and the **Plumier** were assisted by four Europeans who had left Lord's leaky Hunter and were living with the Maoris. These men, one of whom was called Taylor, guided the sawyers to the best timber, interpreted for the visitors (whose communication would otherwise have been limited to a few Tahitian phrases and hand signs) and helped with loading the vessels. Taylor was shipped aboard the **Royal Admiral** and the other three men reportedly sailed with the **Plumier**.
The Royal Admiral left New Zealand in June 1801 and presumably only just missed the Betsey, Captain John Myers, which called into the Thames and purchased 'some very choice spars' in mid-1801. The timber taken by the Royal Admiral rotted after being used to construct houses for the missionaries in Tahiti and it was not well received on the China market. The Plumier never got its timber to the intended market in South Africa. Instead the vessel was re-captured by Spaniards as it limped into Guam Bay in January 1802.

These were the earliest known trading vessels to visit New Zealand to get timber and flax. With the exception of the colonial armed tender Lady Nelson which returned from the Bay of Islands with seven 'very fine spars' in 1806 (some of which would appear to have been taken to England by Governor King for testing) and the General Wellesley...


37. McNab, Tasman, p. 94.

38. Collins, II, 274-5

39. Logs of the Lady Nelson, Admiralty: Captain's Logs, 666, no.1, transcription in R. McNab, Papers, (WTu, Ms 47, folder 49); S.G., 15 June 1806.

40. Report of Governor King on Timber & Ironstone, CO201/45, f. 365b-366a. Part of this report is reprinted in H.R.N.Z., I, 286-7 but the section referred to here was not included.
which loaded timber in the Bay of Islands in October 1807,\textsuperscript{41} they would seem to have been the only cargoes of timber taken from New Zealand before 1808.

Part II: 1808-1819

THE DELAY of seven years before colonial merchants again sent vessels to take cargoes of New Zealand timber or flax resulted partly from the failure of earlier ventures. Also the early years of the nineteenth century saw a phenomenal period of sealing around colonial coasts, the opening of the Tahitian pork trade and the scramble for the sandalwood to be found on Tonga or Fiji. These commodities attracted the most attention from the fledgling New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land traders between 1800 and 1810.

Even those traders who sent vessels to New Zealand were not seeking timber or flax. This was a period of massive sealing on the New Zealand coasts. From about 1803 to about 1808 thousands of seal skins and several tons of seal oil were taken from New Zealand, particularly from the coasts of the South Island. After 1808 the industry there declined because the seal population had been depleted by excessive killing. Similarly from 1799 pelagic whaling vessels sailed around New Zealand coasts and into her ports with increasing frequency. In 1808 ten vessels, mainly British and colonial, were reported whaling in New Zealand waters. The products of both these industries could be taken and sold with more ease and for greater profit than either timber or flax, hence traders' preference for them.

42. Hainsworth, Traders, chapters 9-11.
43. On sealing in New Zealand waters see for example: Sheila Natusch, 'Sealers in the South', New Zealand's Heritage, I, part 7, 169-172; Hainsworth, Traders, chapters 9,10; Steven, Campbell; R. McNab, Murihiku and the Southern Islands, Invercargill, 1907, (Wilson and Horton facsimile, n.d.), chapters 8,9,13,15.
However from 1808 the market for timber and flax began to improve. By the Treaty of Tilsit (1807) the Tsar Alexander of Russia agreed to close Russian ports to British traders and to ban Russian trade with the United Kingdom in support of Napoleon's attempts to blockade England. This 'Continental System' interfered with Britain's imports of vital supplies of Riga hemp and spars for her navy. It also drove British naval purveyors to their atlases in a desperate attempt to find a reliable source for supplies of naval timbers and flax. The merchants in England, New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land offered them sample cargoes from New Zealand. There was also a growth in the colonial markets themselves for the New Zealand products. The increase in the convict and freeman population of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land and the surge of shipbuilding which accompanied the growth of trading created new demands for spars, timbers, ropes, sails and clothing. These were able to be met with supplies from New Zealand.

Moreover this renewed demand for timber and flax occurred about the same time as the sandalwood and sealing trades were becoming less profitable through over-exploitation and the consequent depletion in supplies of these products. Unfortunately the revival in the timber and flax trade was to be short-lived.

The next cargo of New Zealand timber to arrive on the colonial market comprised 'a number of desirable fine logs, fit for flooring boards, and spars for masts' and was entered into Sydney on 17 July 1808. It was part of the cargo of the snow Commerce which also brought 3000 seal skins. The vessel had called at the Bay of Islands and Whangaroa (either place being the possible source of the timber) on its voyage home from relieving a sealing gang on the Bounty Islands.

45. S.G., 17 July 1808.
46. S.G., 15 May 1808.
Simeon Lord had directed the *Commerce'*s voyage in 1807-8 and it was he who, in the following year, chartered the *Boyd* to take a cargo of seal skins, coal and New Zealand timber to the Cape of Good Hope. The master of the ship was instructed to load timber at the Bay of Islands. However, probably at the suggestion of the Whangaroa chief Te Ara (George), who was aboard, Thompson decided to sail to Whangaroa. The result of this voyage was the destruction of the ship and the murder of the passengers and crew in November 1809.\(^{47}\)

Between these two colonial directed operations the *City of Edinburgh* went to New Zealand to secure spars for its routine repairs. The master anchored in the Bay of Islands and used the months March-May to strip and re-plank his 526 tons vessel. This was undertaken on the southern side of the Bay, in the Kawakawa/Kororareka area. The local chiefs Tara and Tupe were happy to welcome the Europeans. They erected a 'cottage' for the master and supercargo and did all that was possible to collect timber for them. An attempt to attack the vessel was made by Te Pahi, Wairaki and Matara who lived on the opposite side of the Bay and who were probably jealous of the trade advantage which had been gained by Kawakawa Maoris. However their fleet was warded off with musket and cannon fire.

Refitted, the *City of Edinburgh* left the Bay of Islands to continue on its intended voyage to Fiji to purchase sandalwood. Having failed to secure such a cargo Alexander Berry, the supercargo, decided to salvage his voyage by returning to New Zealand and filling the ship with spars which he hoped to sell at the Cape of Good Hope. Aboard the ship was Captain Ceronci, formerly master of the *Commerce*, and on his recommendation it was decided to steer the vessel into Whangaroa Harbour. But contrary winds

\(^{47}\) For a recent attempt to reconstruct the events of the attack and a review of the literature concerning the *Boyd* see S. Blair, 'The Attack on the *Boyd*', B.A. (Hons) research exercise, Massey University, 1977.
off the harbour's entrance meant that the vessel was directed into the Bay of Islands instead. Tara and Tupe again welcomed the visitors and set their men the task of expeditiously loading the vessel: a task which proceeded smoothly until the ship was fully loaded.

Throughout this visit, however, Berry continued to be told that Whangaroa Maoris had destroyed a vessel. Towards the end of the loading the Maoris at the Bay became more insistent that the Boyd had been cut off in Whangaroa Harbour. Finally Berry took a boat and went to the harbour to investigate the reports. He rescued the survivors of the massacre, and the City of Edinburgh left the Bay of Islands on 26 January 1810. The ship was blown off its westerly course and instead of arriving at the Cape of Good Hope it limped into Valparaiso the following May. It was then escorted to Lima. However the New Zealand timber did not find a market there and Berry was forced to take it to Callao where it was disposed of. While Ensign McCrae later erroneously dated the visit of the City of Edinburgh to Kawakawa River as 1815, his additional comment that the timber taken in the ship proved not to be 'durable' is consistent with the properties of kahikatea, which made up the cargo. 48

Concurrently with the renewed interest in New Zealand timber some of the leading merchants in Sydney came to regard phormium tenax as a product of significance and potential.

FOR TWENTY years the New South Wales government and
individual colonists had been trying to establish
sufficiently large stands of flax in the colony to make
New South Wales self-sufficient in this commodity. Their
long-term hope had been to produce enough flax to open a
supply trade with Britain. While these attempts were to
continue with variable success, steps were also taken to
find an economic method of exporting the *phormium tenax*
which grew in profusion and with ease in New Zealand.
Whereas previously cargoes of flax from New Zealand had
arrived in the colonies as adjuncts to cargoes of timber
or seal products, new plans were laid for the importation
of large quantities of flax.

The first significant proposal was made in 1810,
the year in which Governor Macquarie announced bounties
for the cultivation of flax in the colony. The plan was
mooted by a cartel comprised of Simeon Lord, Francis
Williams, who was Lord's business partner, Alexander Riley
and Thomas Kent. Kent was a free emigrant who between 1807
and 1810 had been unsuccessful in his attempts to grow
flax and hemp on land granted to him for this purpose in
New South Wales.

The men wrote to Governor Macquarie on 21 January
1810 to outline a proposal by which they hoped to produce
'a quantity of Hemp & Flax sufficient for the demands of
the Colony itself, and to enable us to send to England a
considerable supply for the British Navy in compliance with
the wishes and invitations of His Majesty's Ministers'.
They offered the government 'an exclusive preference' to
their flax. Presumably this was seen as a method of
ensuring that the flax would be exported beyond the Capes
Horn and Good Hope and the limits of the East India Company
monopoly. They also requested a monopoly for themselves in
the flax trade for long enough to allow them to recover
their capital outlay and as recognition for the risks being
taken by their personnel. Their aim was eventually

to establish a flax producing industry in New South Wales and to develop it to the point where it provided an export staple. Meanwhile they proposed to form a small establishment in the 'Northern Island' of New Zealand to utilize the flax plant that grew naturally there. It was planned that Kent, as a person of character (and probably the only partner to have any enthusiasm for this task) should reside at the establishment to prevent any employee 'molesting the Natives', and that he should be created a Justice of the Peace. The latter provision was to allow him to perform the same control function in regard to the deserting seamen who, it was claimed, were responsible for the depredations already practised on Maoris. 50

Macquarie's reply offered his approval and support for the plan. 51 Encouraged, the merchants added the cost of having a vessel on hand to protect the establishment to the total outlay and requested that the Governor secure for them a fourteen year monopoly. They also elaborated on their scheme to supply the British navy with flax by suggesting that convict and supply ships might load phormium tenax in Sydney or at New Zealand as backloading for their otherwise empty holds. 52

Meanwhile preparations went ahead for the expedition. The day after the merchants' first letter was sent to the Governor the following advertisement appeared in the Sydney Gazette:

ON Wages for Three Years - Wanted, Ten able-bodied Men to remain on the Islands of New Zealand. - For further particulars apply to Lord and Williams. 53

By 10 March at least 41 persons had announced their intention of quitting the colony aboard the expedition's vessel, the

53. S.G., 28 January 1810.
Included in that number was George Bruce who, with his wife and child, intended to re-settle in New Zealand. Bruce was an ex-convict who had left the government colonial vessel Lady Nelson while it was visiting the Bay of Islands in February 1806. He took the chief Te Pahi's fourteen year old daughter 'Atahoe' (Mary Bruce) as a wife, was tattooed and lived in the Bay of Islands for two years. He acted as a middleman who greatly assisted with trading negotiations between Maoris and Europeans. For instance he was held to be alone responsible for ensuring that the General Wellesley got a cargo of timber in 1807. Bruce and his wife left New Zealand on the General Wellesley and in January 1809 they returned to Sydney where Bruce met Lord and the others and agreed to accompany their expedition to New Zealand. However it seems that Lord and his partners had a disagreement with Bruce concerning his apparent belief that he was to direct the expedition when in fact his help had been enlisted solely as adviser because of his specialist knowledge of the country. Also, after the death of Bruce's wife on 25 February 1810, the merchants were made aware that it was she and not Bruce who had influence with the Maoris of New Zealand. Thus they dismissed him from the

54. S.G., 4, 11, 17, 24 February, 3, 10 March 1810.
55. Dening, p. 185.
56. S.G., 10 March 1810
57. S.G., 3 March 1810.
The departure of the expedition was delayed after the news of the Boyd massacre was published in Sydney. Kent and Riley withdrew from the venture and were replaced by Andrew Thompson, probably the wealthiest man in New South Wales, and William Leith, who agreed to manage the settlement in New Zealand. Thus on 18 March 1810 the Experiment sailed from Port Jackson.

The first news of the expedition was contained in a letter from Leith to his principals which arrived in Sydney aboard the Perseverance on 28 April 1810. Leith reported that he had been unsuccessful in finding more than small quantities of flax (he had collected less than four pounds of it) and that the timber he had seen was of poor quality and was located well away from the coasts. In short he considered that the Bay of Islands contained little that would be of value to his employers.

58. On Bruce see: G. Bruce, Life of a Greenwich Pensioner, 1776-1817, Notes and Abridgement by T. Whitely, (NPL/M, CYA 1618); G. Bruce, Life of a Greenwich Pensioner, 1776-1817, (NPL/M, CYA 1618); The Australian Dictionary of Biography, ed. D. Pike, Vols I and II, Melbourne, 1966, 1967, I, 170-1; D.W. Orchiston, 'George Bruce and the Maoris (1806-8)', J.P.S., LXXXI, no.2, June 1972, 248-54. Petitions from Bruce are found in the Colonial Office files: Bruce to Liverpool, 13 October 1811, CO201/59, f.308b-309a; Bruce to Liverpool, 6 June 1812, CO201/63, f.97; Bruce to Liverpool, 13 June 1812, CO201/63, f.26b; Bruce to Bathurst, 4 June 1813, CO201/69, f.51b-53a (H.R.A., I, VIII,92-4); Barrow to Goulburn, 19 June 1813, CO201/69, f.82b-83a with enclosure Bromley to Croker, 18 June 1813, CO201/69, f.84b-85b; Bruce to Bathurst, 8 November 1813, CO201/70, 76b; Macquarie to Goulburn, 12 May 1814, CO201/73, f.6b-7b; H.R.N.Z., I, 222; H.R.A., I, VIII, 251-2; Bruce to Bathurst, 5 August 1815, CO201/79, f.255b-256b.

59. S.G., 10 March 1810.


61. S.G., 24 March 1810.
He therefore proposed to undertake a tour of the known timber and flax areas around New Zealand coasts and to report on their advantages as sites for future projects. The areas he cited included North Cape, Whangaroa, East Cape (presumably he meant Thames), Bay of Plenty, Queen Charlotte Sound, and Port William on Stewart Island. At any rate he felt that it was necessary to leave the Bay of Islands because the Maoris there were in an unsettled state, two European vessels would not consider themselves safe together in the Bay and the members of the expedition were putting him under considerable pressure to return to Sydney by the earliest opportunity. 62

When the expedition's supply vessel, Governor Bligh, arrived in New Zealand on 28 April 1810 it was discovered that Leith and his men had already left for Sydney aboard the New Zealander, a whaler. 63 The Governor Bligh returned to Port Jackson via Foveaux Strait where the master picked up Robert Murray, a sealer, who was to command the Perseverance on the next flax expedition to leave for New Zealand. 64

The merchants had sunk £2000 into the venture. This was lost, Simeon Lord claimed, through Leith's misconduct. 65

62. Leith to Lord and others, 15 April 1810, in NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, 1810, (AONSW, 4/1723, Bundle 4, item 84, pp.266-273); H.R.N.Z., I, 301-4.

63. The New Zealander arrived in Sydney on 30 April 1810 - S.G., 2 June 1810.

64. S.G., 18, 25 August 1810. The cargo was listed as 1600 salted seal skins - NSW: Colonial Secretary: Naval Officers' Quarterly Reports, 1 July - 30 September 1810, (AONSW, X698).

65. Lord and others to Macquarie, 3 October 1814, CO201/77, f.16a; H.R.N.Z., I, 324.
While the enterprise failed to realise the immediate aims of the merchants who backed it, it did establish certain facts and influenced later expeditions. It showed the need to research and survey an area before sending out an expensive and fully equipped establishment in the hope of being successful. Also it highlighted the importance of choosing carefully the men who were to lead the expedition—especially as they were likely to encounter and to have to rely on the assistance of Maoris. Furthermore in their receipt of support from Governor Macquarie and later from the British government, the merchants established that both the colonial and home governments were interested in encouraging the trade in New Zealand flax.

When it returned to Sydney with Leith's letter about the expedition the Perseverance brought some spars which had been taken from the Bay of Islands. The Perseverance had left Port Jackson in October 1809 bound for the 'fishery'. In fact, while searching for seals, the vessel had discovered Campbell Island and its large seal population. It then appeared to have visited the Bay of Islands to load a consignment of spars on behalf of the owners—Campbell & Co. The vessel reportedly met 'with every attention from the natives' while loading. On the same voyage, however, the Perseverance took part in the retributive attack on Te Pahi's pa in the mistaken belief that he was responsible for the attack on the Boyd.

The attack on the Boyd has been held largely responsible for the decline in the numbers of vessels visiting New Zealand from 1810. Certainly it appears to have made some masters

shy at the prospect of visiting the Bay of Islands or other New Zealand harbours. For instance Samuel Marsden believed that the Ann, on which he had travelled from London, was to sail to New Zealand to load with spars for the India market. When the Ann left for Bengal in June 1810 it did have spars on board, although it is not certain that these were New Zealand spars. If they were, then the Ann must have procured them in Sydney for there is no record of that vessel having gone to New Zealand. The Governor Macquarie, however, did go to New Zealand. It returned with a cargo of timber on 12 March 1812. This vessel was reported as being bound for the Derwent River in Van Diemen's Land when it left Sydney on 21 November 1811. Yet its return cargo was clearly described as New Zealand timber. A William Leith was aboard the Governor Macquarie when it left Sydney and he, if he was the man connected with the Lord venture, may have been responsible for directing the operations of the vessel at New Zealand.

There was a more important reason for the decline in colonial trade with New Zealand in the early 1810s which had nothing to do with the Boyd affair. This was the general stagnation in the colonial economy between 1810 and about 1815. Several London merchant houses, and their sister firms in Calcutta, had collapsed. This in turn affected their agencies and branches in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. At the same time there was an oversupply of consumer goods on the colonial market. Most Sydney traders were affected by the stagnation, yet many continued to speculate, perhaps in the hope that from the depression might have sprung the chance of unlimited wealth for the man who was ready or willing to take risks. Thus while on the one hand the stagnation decreased trans-Tasman shipping

69. S.G., 9, 16, 30 November 1811, 28 March 1812.
movements, on the other hand the potential profit to be made from *phormium tenax* encouraged some merchants to chance what little they had in a search for it. Out of this environment of uncertainty came the next attempts to develop the trade in New Zealand flax.

On 19 April 1813 the *Perseverance*, Robert Murray master, sailed to New Zealand in search of flax and a site to manufacture it. The voyage was sponsored by the Sydney business houses of James Birnie and Campbell & Co. Aboard the vessel was Robert Williams, a ticket-of-leave rope worker who claimed to have invented a mechanical means of dressing *phormium tenax*.  

The merchants had stipulated that the voyage would last two months at the most, that nobody was to be left in New Zealand and that the purpose of the voyage was, in Charles Hook's words, to 'ascertain to what extent a speculation in the Flax of that country [was] practical'. It may seem strange that, at a time when he had described Campbell & Co's affairs as being 'all but utter ruin', Hook, the acting manager of the firm, should have committed the leading vessel in the company fleet to such a speculative voyage. But, as the historian Steven commented, such a move was 'indicative of the boom or bust philosophy forced on the merchants by the financial straightjacket of the colonial economy'. Hook simply could not think of any better use for the vessel.  

The site they sought was, in Williams' words, to have an 'abundance of Hemp wood and water, means to collect them, and Anchorage for the Vessel'. Their proposed area

---


of search included the western, southern and eastern coasts of the South Island. In the event the voyage was marred by accidents and personality clashes.

During the short time they spent in New Zealand members of the ship's company visited Port William, at that time an abandoned sealing station on Stewart Island, and Bluff, which they named Port Macquarie. Port William seemed to offer most of the advantages Williams required apart from the fact that very little flax grew there. 74 Bluff provided a different prospect. According to Williams' account the area around Mokomoko Inlet (which he called Duck Bay) and Omaui village possessed the advantages of an abundance of flax, a safe anchorage and plenty of willing Maori assistance for keeping a station supplied with phormium. While his visit to that area was brief, Williams felt sure that Bluff Harbour was a certain site for a flax factory. 75 The Perseverance returned to Port Jackson on 20 July 1813. 76

As this was an exploratory voyage only, and as Williams was probably in a state of pique at being forced to leave New Zealand before he wanted to, he collected only

---

74. S.G., 24 July 1813.
75. Williams' account of the voyage can be found in several places: Williams to Macquarie, n.d. (1813), AONSW, 4/1728, Bundle 7, item 46), pp.214-35; CO201/131, f.401b-413a; B.T., Box 13, pp.697-718; H.R.N.Z., I, 457-64. Commentaries on the voyage include: McNab, Murihiku, pp.131-47; B. Howard, Rakiura, A History of Stewart Island New Zealand, Dunedin, 1940, pp.43-4; A.C. and N.C. Begg, Port Preservation, Christchurch, 1973, pp.129-130 (a Chart by Williams is reproduced as plate 50); J. Hall-Jones, Bluff Harbour, Bluff, 1976, pp.8-11 (a reproduction of Williams' chart faces p.17).
76. S.G., 24 July 1813.
'a few Bundles of the raw Plants ... for curiosity and to ascertain what effects the voyage would make on them'. These bundles appear to have contained 130 seven to eight feet leaves which Williams, at Birnie's insistence, prepared for sending to England. He produced 25-30 lbs of what he described as 'poor quality' hemp from the leaves and this ultimately arrived for testing in England. While Williams did not say as much, it can be presumed that the results of the English tests were unfavourable.77

The outcome of this Hook-Birnie expedition, therefore, was a few inferior plants and leaves and the considered opinion 'that to render the manufacture of the flax at New Zealand productive would require an extensive capital'.78

About a year later a shipment of New Zealand timber was taken from the Bay of Islands in the James Haye. This vessel was sent to England on behalf of Blaxcell & Co, which firm presumably gave the orders to collect spars in New Zealand. The James Haye remained in the Bay from 10 to 15 June 1814 loading with spars for shipping directly to Britain. Apparently relations with the Maoris were very good and a cargo, together with fresh supplies, was bartered for old iron, fishhooks and tomahawks. It is interesting that the James Haye needed only five days to load its timber. This suggests that either the cargo was small or Bay Maoris had been forewarned of the visit. Possibly a Maori visitor to New South Wales had contracted with the merchants to supply their vessel when it called at the Bay.79

78. S.G., 24 July 1813.
79. J. McLaine, Journal of a Voyage from Sydney to England, 1814, and other writings, 1813-15, (TSL, Crowther Collection, C 3821); S.G. 27 August 1814; Shipping Arrivals and Departures, I, 87, 88.
Shortly after the James Haye left the Bay of Islands an advertisement appeared in the Sydney Gazette inviting 'Merchants, Traders, and Inhabitants' to a meeting to be held on 24 June 1814 to form a company which aimed to place 'an Establishment on New Zealand, for procuring Flax, Timber and other Commodities'. The men who became associated with the venture included well-established Sydney traders like Simeon Lord and Garnham Blaxcell, settlers like John Dickson, William Broughton and Edward Smith Hall, and ships' masters like William Hovell, Richard Brookes and William Campbell. Their purpose in forming a Public Joint Stock Company with 200 shares at £50 each was to use the sale of stock to raise money in a stagnant economy and to spread the liability involved in the speculation. The initial meeting decided to forge ahead with plans for the establishment provided that the missionary vessel Active returned safely from its first voyage to New Zealand. (It did, and with glowing reports about New Zealand from the crew and passengers.)

The 'company' planned to form its first establishment of 50 men at Port William on Stewart Island. They were to include sawyers, a blacksmith and shipbuilders, as well as flax workers. A small craft of 50-60 tons was to be assigned to the settlement and used to take flax from the south of the South Island across to Stewart Island where it would be processed. A larger vessel was to be used to survey the coast and search for new flax growing areas. Interested Maoris were to be invited to join in the shipping activities and others were to be taught how to dress flax properly. Above all the leading maxim for race relations was that Maoris were to be treated courteously and kindly; the aim was, in time, to produce confidence and mutual

80. S.G., 18 June 1814.
82. S.G., 31 December 1814. The advertisement claimed that only twenty men were required.
friendship and to make Maoris useful persons by 'leading them on the progressive Civilization' through the teaching of English and manual skills. ³ This plan would appear to have been suggested to the principals by Robert Williams, the ropemaker, with whom they were negotiating in an effort to gain his assistance for the venture. ⁴ However, the Governor's reply to the memorial while it included encouragement for their plans, refused their request to be incorporated or given a charter and their plea for a monopoly over the trade. He did agree, nonetheless, to forward the memorial to London. ⁵

The 'company' vessels were manned and readied for New Zealand early in 1815. The Brothers, Burnett, sailed for New Zealand on 25 May. ⁶ The Trial, Hovell, sailed the next day and gave its destination as the Marquesas Islands via New Zealand. ⁷ Clearly this vessel was to land men and supplies and then to leave on another venture. Lord and Blaxcell, the directors of the 'company', reported that they were also preparing the Endeavour to follow the other vessels to New Zealand. ⁸

William Hovell returned to New South Wales in command of the Brothers on 1 November 1815. The cargo he brought was reported as 20 spars and 3 tons of flax ⁹ and the newspaper added the information that his vessel and the Trial had been attacked while in New Zealand.

---

³ Lord and others to Macquarie, 3 October 1814, enclosed in Macquarie to Bathurst, 24 June 1815, CO210/77, f.15b-19a; H.R.N.Z., I, 323-7.

⁴ See Appendix 1.
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⁹ NSW: Colonial Secretary: Naval Officers' Quarterly Report, 1 October-31 December 1815, (AONSW, X699).
The attack occurred unexpectedly on 20 August in Kennedy Bay (named Trial Harbour by Hovell). Apparently the expedition had only collected two tons of flax and supplies of pork and potatoes in the Bay of Islands. They then sailed down the east coast as far south as Cook Strait and called in at several bays and harbours along the way. On one such call, at Kennedy Bay, they were promised a cargo of flax by local Maoris. The vessels later returned to Kennedy Bay and trading negotiations proceeded uneventfully until suddenly, local Maoris, with the help of another Maori named 'Jacka Warra' whom Hovell had shipped at the Bay of Islands, attempted to take over the vessels. They were met with musket fire, but managed to hold the decks for four hours. When the Europeans regained control their revenge was swift. The swivel guns aboard the Trial destroyed many fleeing Maoris while a boatload of sailors went ashore the next day and razed the village, the canoes and all the food supplies. Four Europeans were dead and four wounded after the attacks.

The Europeans disclaimed any responsibility for inciting the violence. They held that it was the type of action that any visitor to the New Zealand coast could expect. The missionaries Samuel Marsden and Thomas Kendall, however, blamed the misdemeanours of the masters of the vessels for the attack. Mardsen's investigations in 1820 indicated that the affair had originated as a quarrel between the masters and the local chiefs. Thomas Kendall, after citing evidence of Hovell's having defrauded Bay of Islands

91. Elder, Lieutenants, pp. 88-90; S.G., 8 November 1815; S.H., 17 November 1834. The latter source claimed that five Europeans were dead and five wounded.
Maoris when trading for supplies there, asserted that Hovell would have been at fault as he was 'an unfit man to go amongst natives'. 93

The limp conclusion to the 'company' involvement with New Zealand was the sale of the proceeds of the venture. A small quantity of New Zealand flax, a fishing seine, some table and floor mats, gum (possibly the kauri gum which became a major New Zealand export in the early twentieth century) and twenty New Zealand spars were offered at auction by Robert Jenkins, the public auctioneer, on behalf of 'The New Zealand Company' on 9 November 1815. 94 The 'company' vessels also met untimely ends. The Brothers was wrecked during a coastal voyage in 1816 95 and the Trial (which returned from its visit to New Zealand and 'Eastern Islands' on 9 August 1816 with 30 tons of sandalwood 96) was piratically seized in Sydney Harbour on 12 September 1816. 97 The company's third vessel, Endeavour, was sold on behalf of the shareholders on 1 April 1817 98 without ever having been to New Zealand.

This effort was the last involvement of any of the giants of early Sydney commerce, like Simeon Lord, Garnham Blaxcell and Robert Campbell, in the prosecution of the timber and flax trade at New Zealand. Following this failure Sydney merchants appeared to be chary of involvement with New Zealand timber and flax. Those mercantile houses which survived the recession turned their attention to the increasingly popular activities of raising livestock, the exporting of coarse wools and the financing of the new wave of whaling and sealing ventures.

93. McNab, Tasman, p. 194; Elder, Lieutenants, p. 112.
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95. S.G., 7 September 1816.
96. NSW: Colonial Secretary: Naval Officers' Quarterly Report, 1 July-30 September 1816, (AONSW, X699).
97. S.G., 14 September 1816.
98. S.G., 29 March 1817.
There was one more colonial merchant-sponsored voyage to New Zealand for timber before the late 1820s—the ship *Harriet* which left Sydney for the Bay of Islands on 23 June 1817. This vessel was dispatched by the firm of Jones and Riley, at that time the foremost merchant house in New South Wales. James Jones was the master for the voyage. The ship entered the Bay of Islands on 30 June and sailed directly to the Kawakawa River. There the task of loading the vessel proceeded smoothly until early August although Jones later told the Sydney Gazette that he had always been on his guard in expectation of a Maori attack. On 3 August Jones wrote to the CMS missionaries informing them that nine of his crewmen were on strike. He was concerned that the dissidents might join with Maoris and seize the ship. Two missionaries, Hall and King, went over to the vessel the next day and one or other of them remained there until it sailed.

Apparently the local Maoris behaved 'insolently'. Their actions ranged from spitting at and threatening the officers and crew, to attempting to lure them ashore. The bullying came to a climax on 22 August when eleven war canoes joined a fleet of smaller craft around the ship. Most of the chiefs were armed for fight. Pomare ('Bumorri') was apparently the leader of the expedition and when he tried to board the ship Jones presented a musket at him and would not let him aboard. Perhaps too the twelve guns with which the *Harriet* was manned encouraged the Maoris to stand off. The motive for the threat is unclear. Jones claimed that Maoris from the Thames and even further afield had arrived in the Kawakawa in the hope of sharing in the spoils of the attack. This would suggest that it was a planned rather than a spontaneous threat. Also the imminence of the *Harriet*'s departure may have encouraged the Maoris to take the items they wanted before the goods and the vessel departed. Furthermore the fact that nine of Jones' crewmen were on strike suggests that he, or his officers, were not capable of dealing fairly with Europeans let alone the mana conscious Maoris. The *Harriet* left the
Bay of Islands on 24 August and returned to Port Jackson with 1000 logs and spars and 5 cwt of flax. On 22 December 1817 the ship sailed for England with a cargo of colonial produce, 29 New Zealand pine logs and 199 New Zealand pine spars. 100

THE INVOLVEMENT of the missionaries with the loading of the Harriet illustrates an important aspect of the trade. The people connected with the missionary societies' establishments at New Zealand had a significant influence on the timber and flax trade. On their own behalf they exported cargoes of timber and flax to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land as well as experimenting with the products in New Zealand and teaching Maoris how to prepare timber to European specifications. In addition their work had a direct influence on merchants' involvement in the trade. The missionaries willingly assisted merchant vessels to load at New Zealand and missionary society officials encouraged the testing and promotion of the products in England.

Samuel Marsden, the New South Wales colonial chaplain who was responsible for founding and, initially, for directing the CMS mission to New Zealand, believed that the Maoris' first step to Christian conversion would be their 'civilization'. To encourage such a change Marsden held that Maoris should be taught to utilize the produce of their own country and to learn the arts of the European manufacture of the same, on the grounds that their work in those pursuits would distract their attention from 'uncivilized' activities such as cannibalism and warfare, and also stimulate a desire to follow a European lifestyle. Therefore Marsden proposed, and the parent committee of the CMS agreed, that artisans

100. W. Hall, Diary 1816-1838, (NPL/M, MLMSS 1597), NSW: Colonial Secretary: Naval Officers' Quarterly Report, 1 July-30 September 1817, (AONSW, X699); S.G., 28 June, 13, 20 September, 27 December 1817; Shipping Arrivals and Departures, I, 107.
be appointed amongst the first missionaries to go to New Zealand. Thus John King, a flax dresser and shoemaker, and William Hall, a carpenter, were selected and sent to New Zealand in company with the schoolteacher, Thomas Kendall, in 1814. In addition to the missionaries, the complement of the first mission station included three ticket-of-leave convicts - Walter Hall, Henry Shaffery and Richard Stockwell - who were to act as sawyers and labourers for the missionaries. These men were only the first of several artisan missionaries and convict assistants who were assigned to the CMS mission at New Zealand. The ropemaker John Cowell who arrived in New Zealand in 1819 and the flax-dresser and weaver James Hamlin who arrived in 1826 were later additions to the mission fields.

Through the efforts of these men the CMS mission to New Zealand served to promote the growth of the timber and flax trade. The missionary artisans, together with the missionary priests, showed Maoris how to prepare flax for export and how to saw timber to meet European requirements. In the early 1820s Maoris displayed little enthusiasm to learn these new skills. This was because there was only a small number of missionary personnel available to teach them and because the limited export and domestic markets provided few opportunities for Maoris to apply the knowledge after they had acquired it. The Europeans' demand for export quantities of timber and flax expanded in the late 1820s and Maoris found that an immediate and direct benefit could be gained by acquiring and utilizing skills for processing timber and flax. By then, however, although many Maoris still turned to the mission workers for tuition, the task of instructing the New Zealanders in these arts had largely passed to the European sawyers and flax agents who had settled in many parts of the country. Nonetheless the work of missionary artisans in preparing Maoris to contribute to the boom in the trade in the 1830s cannot be overlooked. It can be assumed, as well, that Samuel Marsden's

own reputation as a successful merchant and his fervent interest in cargoes of timber and flax would have encouraged the other colonial merchants to at least remember these products while they devoted their energies to other fields, such as whaling and wool production, in the early 1820s.

Marsden had a second reason for employing sawyers and flaxworkers in New Zealand. He was determined that the mission should to some extent be self-supporting, especially as he had personally outlayed £1900 to purchase and outfit the schooner Active for the support of the mission. Marsden's instructions to the Active's master, Peter Dillon, in March 1814 included his wish that the vessel return with a cargo of New Zealand produce. The first voyage returned with merchandise worth £300. The second cargo, which was returned from the voyage November 1814 - March 1815, included 4848 feet of timber which at 2s 6d a foot netted £606, 1344 lb flax at 1s per pound returning £67.4s and assorted amounts of fish, pork and potatoes brought the total to £693.4s. Governor Macquarie allowed these cargoes to be entered duty free (unlike the impression given by Nicholas) as his contribution to supporting the work of this mission. However when the Active returned from the Bay of Islands with a cargo of timber and flax in August 1815 the authorities did impose the prescribed levy of 1s per solid foot on the timber. This amounted to 40 percent of the proceeds from the timber, which sold at 2s 6d a solid foot. Marsden approached Governor Macquarie and pointed out that the levy was making the importing of New Zealand timber an unattractive proposition. Macquarie's response was to issue a Government Order lowering the levy to 6d per solid foot.

104. Nicholas, II, 213.
Despite this concession the voyages of the Active 1814-1819, which concentrated on timber and flax cargoes, resulted in a trading loss. In fact the work of the vessel was only sustained through the CMS paying the costs of outfits, maintenance and wages and the LMS's provision of an annual cash grant. Indeed early in 1819 Marsden decided to employ the vessel in sperm whaling which, he hoped, would return a better profit, and the master of the Active, Joseph Thompson, told Commissioner Bigge in December 1820 that of the products supplied by the New Zealand mission, 'chiefly timber, a little flax, & some pork', only the pork found a ready market in the colony.

Once they were settled at New Zealand and had become reasonably fluent in Maori, confident in their relations with Maoris and knowledgeable about the resources of the various bays and rivers in that country, the missionaries were in demand as guides and interpreters for traders. Until the mid-1820s the CMS missionaries gave assistance to those masters who requested it and Cowell and Kendall were invaluable in assisting with the loading of the Providence in the Hokianga in 1822. After about 1825, when Henry Williams took control of the mission at New Zealand, the CMS missionaries do not appear to have been permitted to assist in the work of traders. This withdrawal did not significantly affect the traders for by that time the number of secular European residents in New Zealand was growing large enough

108. See King and Hall's work with the Harriet, above. William Hall's journal described similar assistance being given to at least six other merchant vessels. See also Elder, Lieutenant, chapters X and XII.
for them to assume the mediating role the missionaries had discarded. However CMS missionaries agreed to assist the government-sponsored timber voyages of the 1820s and 1830s. Samuel Marsden went to New Zealand to lend support to the loading of HMS Dromedary and Coromandel in 1820, Henry Williams offered advice to the master of the Buffalo on how to deal with the problems of trading with Maoris in 1833, and the Rev. A.N. Brown was responsible for guiding the same vessel into Ngunguru and Tutukaka in 1838.

As well as assisting in the timber and flax trade at New Zealand the missionaries were also important in encouraging and promoting the testing of *phormium tenax*. As early as 1813 Marsden sent 'a few Threads of the New Zealand Flax' to the CMS in London in the hope that they would have it tested by British authorities to see if it could be developed as an exportable product.\(^{109}\) In the meantime Marsden undertook to sponsor the experiments of the Sydney ropeworker Robert Williams by supplying him with *phormium* and purchasing his rope. Thus in June 1815 Marsden was again able to forward samples, this time of dressed flax, to the CMS in London. He also requested their support to get Robert Williams' sentence remitted so that Williams could go ahead with his plans to found a settlement at New Zealand and teach Maoris how to make good rope.\(^{110}\) The samples which Marsden had forwarded were sent by the CMS to flax experts at Knaresborough. However because the specimens were too small their conclusions about its usefulness were tentative. They suggested that the best flax could

---

109. Marsden to Pratt, 16 August 1813, in S. Marsden Correspondence, (DU:Ho, MS54/13).
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be used to make linen whereas the poorest could not be used even in ropemaking. The flax was also described as having a good colour and they suggested that a price of 50-60s per hundredweight may have been obtained for it on the London market. 111

Marsden persisted in sending samples of flax and rope to London which the CMS in turn forwarded to various authorities including the Royal Navy. In April 1819 the naval commissioners replied, on the receipt of some rope and flax, by informing the CMS that they had successfully tested flax sent to them on another occasion and had in consequence recommended to the Admiral on the East India Station that he purchase rope manufactured from New Zealand flax for his squadron. 112 Pratt, Secretary of the CMS, informed Marsden of this correspondence and added that the CMS had further investigated the market for the New Zealand flax. Apparently Yorkshire manufacturers were impressed by the prospects and had recommended that the Society send a 'swingler' to New Zealand to part prepare the flax before it was exported. Moreover the Society had hopes that the flax would be useful in making paper which would lead to the erection of a factory either in New South Wales or New Zealand to supply paper to the India market. 113 Later that year the Society instructed its next artisan missionary, James Shepherd, to devote time to investigating **phormium tenax** in New Zealand and added that they intended to send the flax worker John Cowell to the mission station at New Zealand. Their aim, they explained, was 'not merely to establish a rope-walk in New Zealand, but to promote
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the exportation of the material for the supply of ropes and other works at home'.

From that time, however, the work of the CMS in promoting experiments with New Zealand flax was superseded by the efforts of the British and colonial governments in the same field. However credit must be given to Marsden and the CMS for their persistence with flax and also with experimental cargoes of New Zealand timbers and flax despite the fact that neither product was able to return the cost of its collection.

The missionaries also encouraged the plans of merchants to establish factories at New Zealand for processing timber and flax. This sprang from the missionaries' desire to inculcate Maoris with habits of industry and 'civilization'. They believed that the residence of secular artisans and traders would lend support to their own work in civilizing. It was also felt that the presence of other Europeans and the shipping that would be necessary to service these stations would remove some of the feeling of isolation that missionaries would experience. Thus Samuel Marsden supported both the intentions of Lord and his colleagues to establish a settlement in 1810 and the suggestion of a CMS London executive member, Rev. Andrew Cheap, in 1816 that the CMS encourage the foundation of a small secular colony in New Zealand.

Therefore in the period to the mid 1820s the timber and flax trade benefitted from the presence of the CMS missionaries in New Zealand. Their continued safety encouraged merchant sponsored visits and their emphasis on teaching 'useful arts' went some way to preparing Maoris for trading. Dealing with missionaries also helped Maoris in their relations with other Europeans. In addition to their involvement in New Zealand, missionary initiatives and enthusiasm promoted New Zealand products, particularly flax, in colonial and British markets.

THE EARLY to mid-1820s witnessed a period of economic boom in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. Money was injected into the economy from government spending as well as through British-funded groups such as the Australian Agricultural Company and the Van Diemen's Land Company. However the colonial merchants displayed very little renewed enthusiasm for the New Zealand timber and flax trade. They invested, instead, in the growth areas of land, stock, fisheries, building and commercial pursuits such as retailing, banking and insurance. This was reflected in the nature of trans-Tasman shipping during the decade.

Of the 155 vessel movements recorded as leaving for or returning from New Zealand 1818-1827, less than a quarter were merchant vessels engaged in the timber and flax trade. Moreover ten of these eighteen merchant sponsored voyages were undertaken in one year - 1827.

New Zealand waters in the early 1820s would appear to have been mainly the domain of sealers and whalers, although government and mission sponsored voyages accounted for 22 percent and 16 percent, respectively, of the visits to New Zealand from the colonies during the decade.

The enthusiasm in the early 1810s for importing flax and timber had waned for a number of reasons. These have been outlined earlier. Prominent amongst them was the indifferent response of colonial and export markets for these products. The poor preparation of phormium in New Zealand and the colonies had resulted in its reaching the market in an unfavourable condition for sale. For this reason and
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because its properties were not well understood, the results of tests on New Zealand flax varied widely and did not induce a heavy demand for the product. Similarly the kahikatea, of which most early cargoes were comprised, proved to be unsuited for the construction purposes to which it was put and spars of that timber were often found to be rotted inside.

The other major reason for the decline of interest was that timber and flax were only two of several exportable commodities in which a colonial merchant could invest his time and money. There were, for instance, pork and pearlshell from the Pacific Islands, and wool and agricultural products from New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. Even within the context of the volume of exports from New Zealand, timber and flax were preceded by a resurgence of sealing and pelagic sperm whaling. Many of the latter products could be taken with more ease than timber and flax and they continued to provide a better return on the merchant's investment.

The initiative in the trade in the first four years of the 1820s therefore rested largely with the government and mission sponsored voyages. These visits kept merchants informed of the state of the trade in New Zealand and the reaction of foreign markets to the New Zealand produce. The Royal Navy voyages in particular, were responsible for the discovery of sources of timber such as the Hokianga River and Coromandel Harbour and harbours like Tauranga, Manukau and even Kaipara. It was the exploratory work of mission and government ventures around the coasts of New Zealand and their initiatives in the testing and promotion of New Zealand produce in the colonies and Britain, that provided impetus to merchant sponsored voyages throughout that decade and beyond.

However while there may have been only a few merchant sponsored timber and flax ventures to New Zealand 1818-1826, and while little is known of these visits, their contribution to the development of the trade should not be underrated. These voyages not only produced quantities of timber and flax for export but they also provided merchants with a better appreciation of the extent of New Zealand's resources.
In particular it was their following up of the lead given by government and mission ventures that demonstrated the potential of the trade and the actual value of the newly discovered sources of timber and flax. Also in this period merchant vessels returned again to harbours like Whanganaroa which had fallen into disfavour earlier in the century.

The Providence was the first merchant vessel to enter the Hokianga River; it was following the lead of the colonial government schooner Prince Regent which had sailed into the River in 1820. Moreover the visit of the Providence, which began on 19 May 1822, resulted in the first export cargo of kauri from that River. Captain Herd, master of the vessel, found local Maoris most co-operative in both cutting down the trees and floating the timber to the vessel, and relations between Maori and European traders appear to have remained harmonious throughout the vessel's four months' stay. Herd loaded a cargo of 500-600 loads of timber although only some of the spars were of suitable dimensions for naval purposes. Apparently the Maoris had cut many of the larger trees too short and this had decreased their value by half.

Thomas Kendall and John Cowell, CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands, travelled to the Hokianga to act as interpreters for Herd, and to fulfil an instruction from Samuel Marsden that the missionaries visit the River. Kendall later commented that without his help Herd could have 'done nothing with the natives' nor 'procured a cargo'. The Captain appeared to share this opinion for he gave Kendall a 'gratitude' of £150 in return for his assistance. It seems that the Providence sailed directly from the Hokianga to a market in South America. 119.

This voyage highlighted important facets of the trade which were to grow in significance as the trade expanded. It showed that the Hukiang could be safely entered by large vessels and that a cargo could be taken without risk or difficulty. The value of using resident intermediaries, in this case missionaries, was again demonstrated. Finally the unevenness in the quality of the cargo had resulted from Maori unfamiliarity with European notions such as the need to keep the length and breadth of spars in proportion. For this reason it was not until European timbersmen settled in New Zealand that the timber trade could fully develop.

Early in 1823 the American schooner Cossack also filled with spars in the Hukiang. However as it was leaving the River the schooner was becalmed and wrecked on the bar across the mouth. In a letter which was published in the Sydney Gazette the master of the Cossack, John Dix, was at pains to stress that Hukiang Maoris had offered him and his crew all possible assistance and succour and recommended the River to other mariners provided they took care to leave only with the aid of a strong off-shore wind. 120

The timber resources of the Hauraki Gulf were also utilized by traders, apparently for the first time, in the early 1820s. In 1823 Peter Dillon, the redoubtable explorer, ship's master and Pacific trader, dispatched the St Patrick to 'Thames' to load spars under the command of John Florence. The vessel returned to Valparaiso with a full load. 121
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Following the success of this venture Dillon again directed the St Patrick to visit New Zealand. This time he was aboard the vessel as trading master. The voyage and trading were documented by the third mate - George Bayly - in both a published and a manuscript journal.\(^{122}\)

The St Patrick visited Tahiti, the Society Islands and the Cook Islands en route for the 'Thames' where it anchored on 31 December 1825. 'The Thames' was a generic term which covered both the Hauraki Gulf and the Thames estuary. Thus, locating the anchorage, which was described as 'off Pāroā [or 'Paroar'] 7, with West Isles about half a mile to seaward', is difficult. Professor Davidson's research led him to suggest that the Waiheke Channel, between Waiheke and Ponui Islands, was the probable place.\(^{123}\)

It is likely that Florence had also taken timber from this area on his previous trip.

Initially no Maoris could be found to assist the vessel to load. However a chief, Hinaki of Waihihi, who had visited Valparaiso with Dillon on an earlier voyage, came off to inform Dillon that the local Maoris had retreated inland to escape the depredations of the Bay of Islands warrior Hongi Hika. Dillon informed him that if the Maoris returned and cut timber they would receive a musket or equivalent gunpowder for every twenty spars they cut down, stripped and rafted to the St Patrick. He announced that supplies would also be paid for with arms and ammunition. Delicate negotiations and assurances of protection were undertaken during January and by the end of the month a workforce of about 1000 men, women and children gathered to load the vessel.


\(^{123}\) Davidson, p. 102 and n.
Apparently 50 spars remained on the shore or in the bush where they had been left, cut, after the St Patrick had not had room in its hold to take them on the previous visit. Fresh spars were prepared on Waiheke Island and at the Wairoa River ('Long River'). The trading was undertaken with ease, if Bayly's account is to be believed. For his part Dillon reportedly specified the required size of the timber and supplied the axes. The result was that:

The natives worked energetically for some time, and supplied the spars as fast as they could be taken in and stowed. The trees were felled on the side of a steep hill opposite the ship; the boughs being lopped off, they were launched down and usually came down with such rapidity that friction against the standing trees stripped off the greater part of the bark, and the end struck deep into the sand. The women and children then stripped off the rest of the bark; then all hands dragged the spars down into the water. Twenty, side by side, were secured at either end by a set of iron dogs, one being driven into each spar, with a chain through the eyes connecting the whole. Three or four canoes then towed off the raft and made it fast astern of the ship, when the chief received his musket, and, after satisfying himself of the goodness of the lock, and admiring the brass mountings, would go off delighted with his bargain. 124

However other facts about the voyage suggest that Dillon was not as self-sufficient in controlling trade as Bayly's narrative implied. The Emily, a whaler, had been in the Thames area getting supplies and Dillon took the opportunity of sending a boat and crew from the St Patrick to the Bay of Islands aboard the Emily when it sailed. His men were instructed to try and procure the services of a European carpenter to help repair the other boats belonging to the St Patrick and to retain the services of an interpreter. The boat returned without getting the men, but three days later two canoes arrived from the Bay of Islands with two Europeans aboard. These men joined the crew of the St Patrick for the rest of its stay in New Zealand.

Throughout the visit relations between Maoris and Europeans were generally good and Thames Maoris stopped the process of cutting and rafting only twice, and only then as a result of raids by their Ngapuhi enemies.

On 6 April 1826 the St Patrick weighed for the Bay of Islands. As well as filling the holds of his own vessel, Dillon had also been able to supply HMS Larne with a full cargo. Hinaki and his people were presumably paid the agreed rate of one musket for twenty spars. However at the Wairoa River Dillon was able to purchase 166 spars for '58 lb. Gunpowder and 15 Hatchets', the lower price apparently being justified because only 50-60 of the trees were cut to the required size. When the St Patrick sailed for the Bay it was filled with spars, supplied with an abundance of potatoes and had 'the pig styes full of pigs'. After repairing topmasts and the ship's pump at Kororareka the St Patrick sailed for Calcutta on 27 April.125

Whangaroa Harbour, a familiar source of timber, was re-visited by timber and flax traders in the mid-1820s. The safe and continued settlement of the Wesleyan missionaries there required and encouraged shipping visits to that harbour. Moreover the visit of HMS Dromedary in 1820 had re-established some European trust in local Maoris. For example Captain Ranulph Dacre was trading master aboard the Endeavour when it made three visits in 1824. On his second visit Dacre left a barrel of gunpowder with local Maoris to encourage them to have a cargo prepared on his return. This seal on the agreement appeared to have worked, for the Endeavour returned to Sydney with spars in March 1825.126

125. S.G., 8, 15 March, 5 April 1826; H.T.G., 4, 11 February, 1 April 1826; Davidson, pp.99-106.
The St Michael also visited Whangaroa in 1824. That ship was no stranger to the harbour, having been responsible for taking the Wesleyans to their new station in 1823. The owner and master of the vessel, John Beveridge, often combined his role of supplying mission stations throughout the Pacific with activity in the pork trade. On this occasion he used New Zealand pine to complete his cargo and add to his profit.

Merchants' initiatives, therefore, increased their knowledge of the quantities of timber and flax which could be taken from New Zealand and of the sites from which these products could be secured. However there were still questions about the New Zealand situation to which merchants required answers. Most of these related to Maoris, to their attitudes to Europeans and to commerce, and to their aptitude for the trade. Moreover merchants sought ways to overcome the problems which had made the earlier voyages uneconomic. In particular they required regular supplies of timber and flax, they needed to be certain that when a vessel called at New Zealand it would be loaded without delay and, especially in relation to timber, they wanted to ensure that the products were prepared to the specifications which would fetch optimum prices on colonial and foreign markets.

The answer to the problem of supply was to establish trading stations around the New Zealand coast where Europeans could supervise the preparation of the products and store them until vessels arrived. This idea was not new and had been the object of the companies and merchants who backed the 1811, 1813 and 1815 voyages. Such a move was also being mooted both in Britain and in the colonies in the
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early 1820s. The potential of forming settlements in New Zealand had been demonstrated by the economic success of the sealing gangs which were landed around the southern coasts of New Zealand and by the relative safety of the missionaries who resided in New Zealand. Four attempts were made to place European trading stations in New Zealand between 1825 and 1827; all of them were, to some degree, plagued with financial and planning difficulties. The two settlements which lasted long enough to begin producing cargoes demonstrated that such a method of trading was both economically viable and acceptable to Maoris.

On 11 April 1825 the Lewisham firm of Thomas and David Asquith wrote to the Colonial Office and the Privy Council Committee for Trade informing both bodies that in October 1824 they had engaged William Stewart, the man after whom Stewart Island was named, to form a settlement on that island for 'cultivating Flax & procuring Timber'. To that end they had dispatched the Prince of Denmark from London, with Stewart as master, to New Zealand. The Asquiths claimed to have outlaid £5000 on their project and on the basis of this outlay they asked for a monopoly on the trade from Stewart Island. No reply from either government department is extant, however it can be assumed that the answer was no.

In the meantime the Prince of Denmark was making an unprofitable trading voyage to the Bay of Islands and 'divers other Port & places in the South Pacific Ocean'. When this vessel returned to Sydney in December 1825 it met with a second vessel, the Lord Rodney, which had been dispatched by the Asquiths in April 1825. Stewart was instructed to load, refit and sail to the Bay of Islands and there to await the arrival of the Lord Rodney. The Prince of Denmark left Sydney on 19 January 1826 but when the Lord Rodney sailed on 23 January it carried labourers.

128. For a discussion of this point see pp. 315-6
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for the Australian Agricultural Company settlement at Port Stephens.\textsuperscript{131} Indeed the \textit{Lord Rodney} does not appear to have visited New Zealand at all before 1830.

When it left Sydney the \textit{Prince of Denmark} was described as departing for a sealing trip. However all that is left for a writer trying to reconstruct the events of its voyage January-September 1826 is speculation. Apparently while Stewart was in the Bay of Islands in 1825 he had mooted the idea of a settlement on Stewart Island. On his return he was able to recruit eight nondescript Europeans - including William Cook, Robert Day, Benjamin Turner, Hugh McCurdy and John Lee - who together with their Maori wives (nine women in total) and an unenumerated number of children, sailed for Stewart Island.

The settlement, called Prince's Town by the settlers,\textsuperscript{1} was established somewhere in Pegasus Harbour on the southeast coast of the Island sometime before 18 April 1826 when the men were reported as being stationed there by Thomas Shepherd who was aboard the New Zealand Company vessel Rosanna. They were certainly well settled by early in May 1826. Edwin Palmer, a crewman on the sealing vessel \textit{Sally}, reported that they were building a vessel, which other writers have estimated as being 60-100 tons burden, that was 'well got on with',\textsuperscript{133} when he left Port Pegasus on 9 May.

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Australian}, 23 February 1826.
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Stewart left the settlers with six months' provisions and 'a large cross-cut saw and a ripping saw, and all other tools he could find, and blocks and ropes for drawing the logs to the pit' when he sailed south to relieve a sealing gang that he had previously landed on the Antipodes Islands. He promised to return to the settlement with supplies but does not seem to have done so either during that voyage or on his next visit to New Zealand, November 1826-April 1827.

Thus when a sealer, John Boulthbee, visited the Asquiths' Stewart Island station about September 1827, he found that the settlers were surviving solely on a diet of cockles, mussels and fern root. On his return visit to Port Pegasus late in January 1828 Boulthbee described the party as 'living most wretchedly'. They had halted construction of the large vessel ordered by Captain Stewart and were trying to build an escape vessel of 25 tons to return them to the Bay of Islands - a task they expected to complete in ten months.134

In fact the party was not relieved until Peter Williams arrived at Port Pegasus late in 1829. Williams was establishing a whaling station in Port Preservation and he persuaded the settlers to assist him to set up his station. Local legend maintains that a few of the original settlers, including William Cook, worked at the whaling station during the season and returned to Stewart Island to continue constructing a vessel during the summer. In 1833 the 49 tons schooner Joseph Weller was launched at Port Pegasus.

As an addition to the timber and flax export trade the contribution of the Asquith venture was negligible. Stewart returned with one load of 1½ tons of flax in September 1826, and his final cargo entered aboard the Prince of Denmark (April 1827) was composed of an unquantified but small amount of flax, pork and potatoes. The importance of the venture lay in its putting paid to any further plans to

place timber or flax stations on Stewart Island.\footnote{135}

However William Stewart, if not on behalf of the Asquiths then possibly for the Sydney firm of Raine and Ramsay, was responsible for landing another party of sawyers/boat builders in New Zealand. This gang was settled in the Hokianga and was described by Alan Cunningham, the collector for Kew Gardens based in New South Wales, as being composed of men from the \textit{Prince of Denmark} (in his diary he says of the crew). He discovered them constructing a 40-42 tons vessel during his visit to the Hokianga in September 1826.\footnote{136} These men later worked at the Te Horeke station and dockyard which was established by Raine and Ramsay in 1827.

The second English sponsored attempt at settlement commenced with a petition to the King from a group of businessmen and Members of Parliament in September 1825. This group, which included the Earl of Durham, J.W. Buckle, W.S. Marjoribanks and R. Ellice, is usually referred to as the First New Zealand Company on the grounds that the men cited here were also associated with the New Zealand Company of 1839. Their 1825 petition requested that they be granted a Charter of Incorporation and described their aim as being to form a settlement at New Zealand to export timber and flax.

\begin{footnotes}
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Subsequent discussions in the Colonial Office also revealed that they wanted a monopoly on exports of New Zealand timber and flax as well as military protection for their settlement. Shares in the proposed venture sold well; both E.J. Wakefield and Dumont D'Urville claimed that £20,000 was sunk into the project. However in June 1826 the Committee on Trade advised the King only to incorporate the Company and not to give it any exclusive privileges. 137

Meanwhile the vessels hired by the Company, the Rosanna, Herd and the Lambton, Barnett, had been dispatched directly to New Zealand. It is unclear just how many prospective settlers were aboard the vessels – estimates of their number range from 25 to 70. However it is clear that included amongst them were ship's carpenters, sawyers, blacksmiths and flax dressers. James Herd had been appointed leader of the expedition, presumably because of his experience in New Zealand in 1822 in command of the Providence. The superintendent of the proposed settlement was to be Thomas Shepherd, who also accompanied the vessels to New Zealand.

From March to June 1826 the expedition investigated the suitability of several South Island locations and Port Nicholson as places for a possible settlement. It would appear that the sponsors had not stipulated a site in New Zealand for the settlement but had left the choice to Herd and Shepherd. They decided to continue their investigations in northern harbours. The expedition seems to have travelled up the east coast of the North Island to the Hauraki Gulf where they purchased the islands of Waiheke and Pakihi and

some land in the Thames estuary. Reportedly the arrival of numerous ferocious-looking Maoris, probably from the Thames, terrified the settlers and they refused to land there. Thus on 26 October 1826 the vessels arrived in the Bay of Islands. Here the possibility of a large number of settlers was greeted with enthusiasm by the Maoris. However the expedition moved on to the Hokianga. Some writers have claimed that threats from the CMS missionaries drove the settlers on to the Hokianga while contemporaries, such as Samuel Marsden, believed that it was always Herd's intention to establish the settlers in that River. Herd's actions in the Hokianga — purchasing Herd's Point (Rawene) on 26 January 1827 and charting and sounding the River — suggested that he and Shepherd had decided that this was to be the site for the settlement.

But late in January 1827 the expedition left the Hokianga. It arrived in Sydney on 11 February 1827. Herd sold off many of the assets of the Company and the produce of the voyage and returned to Britain.\[138\] At least one of the Company's intending settlers had remained in New Zealand while others returned there later on their own account.\[139\] However Herd's departure marked the end of the Company's official involvement in New Zealand.

Did the attempt to establish a settlement fail or was it abandoned for other reasons? One reason for the return to New South Wales was proffered by Charles Hursthouse who, writing in 1857, implied that the voyage was only

---
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an exploratory one. This was clearly wrong, for Lovett, the master of the Sally, who met the expedition at Stewart Island, was told that the settlers had plans to stay in New Zealand for at least three years. Also when the Sisters left Hobart for New Zealand on 6 September 1826 it had on board 40 sheep and 3 black cattle 'for the settlers at New Zealand'. Presumably these were to fulfil a request that Herd had forwarded to Van Diemen's Land via the Sally.

The apparent failure of the Company to settle the colonists in New Zealand was at first said to be due to the fact that they had not found sufficient produce there to ensure the viability of a colony. There was also the suggestion that, as appeared to be the case with the WMS missionaries in Whangaroa at about the same time, the settlers had left New Zealand from fear of further Maori aggression. Indeed D'Urville found evidence for the Company's claim that the Maoris of the Hauraki Gulf had devised a plot to attack and strip the vessels.

Some writers came to blame James Herd for the failure of the voyage and the aggressive behaviour of the Maoris. The Sydney Gazette was brutal in portraying the Captain as being near to senility and referring to him as the 'old commodore'. Similarly, in his February 1826 letter to Edward Bickersteth, the Secretary of the CMS, Samuel Marsden explained that he held little hope for the Company's success. He believed that Herd was held in low regard by the Hokianga Maoris because he had defrauded them in 1822. And Deloitte, master of the Faith, who visited the Hokianga while the Company expedition was there, described their progress as 'scarcely ... able to effect any one of their objects' because of mutual suspicions. But perhaps the most
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damning blast was fired by Peter Dillon (obviously a biased author) in a pamphlet in 1832 proposing a commercial settlement in New Zealand:

Captain Herd knew nothing whatever of the New Zealanders, their character, language, manners, or customs; the result was that the expedition proved a complete failure through the ignorance of its commander, who undertook to perform a duty for which he was totally unfitted, .... 147

However there may have been an alternative reason for Herd's sudden departure from the Hokianga. His activities in January 1827—charting the River and purchasing land—were not the actions of a despised or senile man. Similarly the fact that at least some of the colonists returned to New Zealand suggests that settler demands may not have been the reason that Herd abandoned the settlement. Instead, it has been recently argued by Admiral Ross that Herd possibly abandoned the mission after receiving the news from J.R. Kent, who sailed into the Hokianga in command of the Elizabeth in January 1827, that the Company had decided to withdraw its sponsorship of the scheme. 148 Certainly Herd received a letter to this effect from his London-based principals after he had returned to Sydney. The Company decided that the scheme would prove too risky and expensive for private individuals to finance without any government assistance or a monopoly on New Zealand exports. 149

Whatever the reason for its failure the fact remains that the voyage of the Rosanna and the Lambton did not result in the formation of a permanent settlement in the Hokianga. However other ventures which were on the New
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Zealand coast at about the same time as that of the First New Zealand Company, and which were sponsored by colonial firms, did succeed in this objective.

On 18 February 1826 the Sydney firm of Cooper and Levey placed an advertisement in the Sydney press asking for six men to go to New Zealand for eighteen months to saw pine and spars. The vessel prepared for their transport was said to be sailing for New Zealand on 26 February. 150

It is probable that the party eventually went to New Zealand on the Cooper and Levey vessel Elizabeth, J.R. Kent master, which left Sydney for a 'speculative voyage' on 14 March 1826. The voyage was to be a multifaceted one. The vessel first landed sealing gangs at Dusky Bay and George Sound with provisions for six months. Then Kent landed agents at other Foveaux Strait settlements and on Ruapuke Island to collect flax and potatoes for his return cargo. Finally, after a visit to the Auckland and Chatham Islands in search of seals, the Elizabeth sailed for the Hokianga where it arrived about July. Kent appears to have established some men (presumably the Cooper and Levey settlers) at Koutu Point in the Hokianga. Certainly he left his chief mate, John Martin, at Koutu to supervise the collection of a cargo of pork and spars when the Elizabeth sailed via Foveaux Strait on its return voyage to Sydney later that year. The vessel arrived in Port Jackson on 29 December 1826 with a cargo of 390 seal skins and 20 tons of flax. 151 After rapidly unloading and re-stocking, the Elizabeth left for the Hokianga again on 8 January 1827.

It was possibly on this voyage that Samuel Butler, son of the ex-CMS missionary John Butler, went to join the station. The Elizabeth's return cargo from the second visit consisted of 38 tons of salted pork and 39 spars. 152
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However Cooper and Levey appear to have decided to abandon their connection with New Zealand about the middle of 1827. Certainly the CMS missionary Henry Williams held the view that Kent's voyage to the Hokianga in the Elizabeth in May 1827 was undertaken with the intention to 'break up the establishment'. Possibly the venture had not returned the profits they had first envisaged, or perhaps Levey's departure for London late in 1826 led his partner to reassess the nature and breadth of the firm's commitment. However, while they may have closed the station, the firm did not sever its connections with the New Zealand timber and flax trade. Its vessels the Industry and the Governor Macquarie made regular visits to New Zealand in the late 1820s and returned with mixed cargoes of timber, flax and pork.

After reaching the Hokianga Kent handed over command of the Elizabeth to William Wiseman while he joined the small settlement at Koutu Point. He helped to load the Cooper and Levey vessel, Industry, with the cargo of sixteen tons of flax, twelve tons of potatoes, twenty spars and three tons of pork which were entered on the brig's manifest at Sydney on 1 September 1827. Kent then returned to New South Wales aboard the Industry. The Elizabeth returned to Sydney on 23 September with a cargo of 30 tons of flax — the largest single cargo of flax recorded to that time.

Kent was obviously not satisfied to let the idea of a station at Koutu die. Before he returned to the Hokianga in November 1827 in command of the Governor Macquarie (on which the artist Augustus Earle was a passenger) Kent
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appears to have convinced another Sydney merchant, Francis Mitchell, that such a settlement could be viable. Thus during that visit Kent purchased the Koutu land from the Maoris and re-established a sawing and pork station there. This station was managed by William Young on Mitchell's behalf throughout the 1830s.\(^{157}\)

The timber station and dockyard which was established at Te Horeke (Deptford) on the banks of the Hokianganga River was the best known of the settlements begun in New Zealand in 1827. The land for the station was purchased by Captains Stewart and Deloitte apparently on behalf of the Sydney firm Raine and Ramsay in November 1826. Raine and Ramsay were joined by Gordon Browne as a co-partner in this speculation.\(^{158}\)

There does not appear to have been a special recruiting drive to find men for the station. David Clarke, formerly the master of the colonial brig *Industry*, was the first Superintendent of Te Horeke. He moved there together with the sawyers who had previously been working under his guidance in the Hokianganga and whom Alan Cunningham had met in September 1826. Other Europeans and some Maoris also joined the station. Thus when Earle visited Te Horeke in November 1827 he found a well-established European community of about 50 men, several buildings including a fine house for the Superintendent and a vessel in the latter stages of construction.\(^{159}\)

---


158. Browne was a co-partner in Raine and Ramsay before he hired the Faith from the firm in January 1827 - W.C. Wentworth, Office Account Book, (NPL/M, A759), p.23.

The benefits of operating a European-run timber station became obvious from the very first cargo of Horeke timber. This was shipped to Sydney aboard the Faith in May 1827. The colonial press was unanimous in declaring it to be the finest cargo of timber ever imported from New Zealand. The Australian claimed that the value stemmed largely from its being sawed into long enough lengths to realise premium prices on the Sydney market.  

As well as preparing export cargoes of timber, flax and other New Zealand produce the sawyers and shipwrights at Horeke built, together with several smaller crafts, the Enterprise a 72 tons schooner, the New Zealander a 147 tons brigantine, and the Sir George Murray a 390 tons ship.

However while the station thrived, the fortunes of the principals did not. Raine and Ramsay dissolved their partnership late in 1827. Ramsay had advised that they close Te Horeke station and retrench their trading interests in the light of the looming economic depression in New South Wales. Raine, he complained, was anxious 'to make purchases and otherwise extend the business'. Thus Raine turned more to Browne for support in the New Zealand venture. In January 1828 Browne opened the 'New Zealand Timber Wharf/Yard' which became the official outlet in Sydney for the sale of produce from Horeke. But later that year Browne left for the Hokianga reportedly to take charge of the station. In fact David Clarke remained in charge at Horeke, and Browne's move was merely an attempt to escape his creditors. In his

160. S.G., 7 May 1827; Australian, 11 May 1827.
absence Browne's creditors moved against him in September 1829. When he returned to Sydney aboard the New Zealander in March 1830, not only was Browne declared bankrupt but the vessel's cargo had also been mortgaged by the firm to another merchant, William Macdonald. The parlous state of both the partners and the firm determined that Te Horeke and the Sir George Murray should be sold. Thomas McDonnell, a retired naval lieutenant purchased both in January 1831. He then settled in the Hokianga to take charge of his station. While the boatbuilding was ceased, Te Horeke remained a major export point for New Zealand timber and flax throughout the 1830s.  

IN 1827 New South Wales re-exports of New Zealand flax were valued at £1786. This sum represented a 34-fold increase on the 1826 figure of £50. From 1827 also, shipments of timber cargoes to the colonies began to increase.  


163. See Appendices 7,17,18.
There were economic reasons for this increase in cargoes. Sealing at New Zealand was in decline. In July 1826 the Sydney Gazette reported that the seal rookeries on the New Zealand coasts were again being rapidly depleted.164 This fact was demonstrated by the returns of consecutive voyages by the colonial schooner Samuel. On 28 May 1826 the Samuel brought 3400 seal skins and 1 ton of flax to Sydney from New Zealand.165 Its next cargo in September 1826 comprised only 102 skins.166 Other sealers were reporting a similar decline in their harvests. The Sally, Lovett master, returned to Hobart from a visit to Stewart Island and southern New Zealand on 6 June 1826. It had only 460 seal skins aboard. Also included in the cargo were twelve hundredweight of flax which were described as being 'of beautiful and strong fibre, and in excellent condition'.167 Other vessels like the Prince of Denmark168 and the Queen Charlotte169 also supplemented their poor seal hunts with flax. The Elizabeth, Kent master, arrived in Port Jackson from a 'sealing voyage' on 29 December 1826 with a cargo of 390 skins and 20 tons of flax.170

The economies of both New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land were depressed in the late 1820s. This was partly the result of external factors such as the crash in the English economy in 1825 which dried up the flow of capital to the colonies, and the decline in the price of wool, the staple colonial export, on the English market. The crisis caused by the stagnation in traditional markets was deepened by local factors such as harvest failure in Van Diemen's Land in 1824-6, widespread sheep disease in New South Wales in 1826

164. S.G., 29 July 1826.
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170. S.G., 18 March 1826; Australian, 30 December 1826; Begg, Boultbee, p. 167.
and droughts in the colony which resulted in grain shortages. The Van Diemen's Land economy received a boost from exporting grain to drought-stricken New South Wales and through the success of whalers like James Kelly. Many New South Wales merchants hoped that they would make their money in New Zealand flax. 171

Phormium tenax had several advantages as a product. Above all it was exportable. It attracted customs concessions and appeared to have a ready market in Great Britain. Thus although its value on the New South Wales market appears to have declined by 40 percent in the late 1820s, flax still provided lucrative returns for merchants. As an export product, therefore, New Zealand flax commended itself to the colonial merchants who were facing the possibility of financial ruin at that time.

The barter method of trading at New Zealand also encouraged speculation there in the late 1820s. In 1826 Alan Cunningham, the botanist, had complained that the trade with New Zealand was hampered because colonial shopkeepers sold the goods needed for barter with Maoris at extraordinary prices. He claimed that at that time it was cheaper for an intending visitor to New Zealand to import the goods he required for trading directly from London. 172 However one of the reasons for the deepening of the colonial depression was that imported goods continued to flood onto the markets. This caused a heavy fall in prices, particularly in 1828 and 1829. The fall in the price of trade goods in turn increased the profitability of trading at New Zealand and thereby encouraged speculation. Exports of timber, as well as flax, benefitted from the comparative decrease in their cost at New Zealand.

172. A. Cunningham, Diary, (NPL/M, CY B777), p. 46.
The new demand for New Zealand timber and flax saw three vessels which had arrived from London - Faith (October 1826), Harmony (November 1827) and Madeira Packet (May 1827) - hired to collect cargoes in New Zealand. Colonial vessels like the Elizabeth, formerly a sealer, and the general traders Governor Macquarie and Industry were also diverted to the task of serving the flax trade. Another vessel, the schooner Enterprise, was built at Horeke in 1827 and was used to ship timber to New South Wales.

This growth in imports to New South Wales came in the wake of the long series of experiments in trading at New Zealand by colonial and other merchants from 1793 to the late 1820s which were outlined above. These ventures had laid the foundations for the intensive enterprise in the trade during the late 1820s and into the 1830s. They had been years of learning during which mariners and those interested in using these products familiarized themselves with New Zealand, Maoris, and timber and flax. Given the increase in market demand the previously haphazard exploitation of those New Zealand products gave way to a new and booming era in the trade.

The enthusiasm for timber and flax had also been prompted by governments' moves to encourage merchants in this trade throughout the 1820s. These included naval supplies from New Zealand being entered duty-free into the colonies and Great Britain. In addition, British and colonial naval vessels had gone to New Zealand to select cargoes of timber and flax and to find potential sources for the supply of these products. Also official tests on both commodities had provisionally given such positive results that the Commissioner of Inquiry in New South Wales and the British government had directed that the testing and cultivation of phormium tenax and the importation of wood from New Zealand should be encouraged. Moreover the governments had offered traders some protection at New Zealand by sending naval vessels to patrol the coasts and by extending the jurisdiction of colonial courts to cover crimes committed in New Zealand.
The nature of the trade at New Zealand was also changing. The flax trade was revived without much difficulty after Maoris agreed to produce sufficiently large quantities of flax when vessels with acceptable trade items aboard were dispatched to the New Zealand coasts. A sustained growth in timber exports, however, required an infrastructure which included European residents. These men were needed because they understood the intricacies of the sawn timber and spar market and because they had to organise Maori labour to do work which was tiring and required the New Zealanders to use iron and steel tools which had been only recently introduced to that country. The process by which this infrastructure grew had begun with the earliest contacts and had been consolidated by the arrival of colonists — first the missionaries and then the timbermen.

European attitudes to trading in New Zealand had also changed by the late 1820s. The earlier voyagers and traders had approached New Zealand shores with fear and uncertainty. Masters were enjoined to take 'the most minute precautions in the interest of [their] crew, not forgetting a single one'. These measures included always having loaded firearms at hand, demonstrations of firepower and force, the keeping of a strict watch both day and night, and the erection of hemp or wire rope nets which were strung along the bulwark in order to prevent Maoris from coming aboard while at the same time allowing trading to be carried on. However the narratives and accounts of voyages in the late 1820s and 1830s did not
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include descriptions of such 'minute precautions' being taken. For instance Earle and Maning both implied that boarding nets were not used after 1827.\footnote{\textsuperscript{179}}

This new European confidence appears to have been the result of several factors. In large part it arose because the feeling of isolation, which had been uppermost in the minds of the early traders while they were on the coasts of New Zealand, was relieved by the increase in the number of mercantile voyages to that country and the growth of European settlement there from the late 1820s. This meant that, particularly in the major harbours, an individual vessel rarely found itself alone amongst Maoris. The traders therefore felt safer because the protection and threat of retaliation offered by the presence of another vessel or European residents was assumed to be a deterrent to Maori aggression.\footnote{\textsuperscript{180}} An increase in the number of visits to New Zealand led to more accurate information about conditions there being filtered through to the colonies. This would have been largely transmitted by word of mouth although some newspaper writers and other authors used their medium as a vehicle for countering what they considered to be the 'unfortunate prejudice' against trading at New Zealand, particularly in respect of the disposition of Maoris.\footnote{\textsuperscript{181}} Also, colonial traders, masters and sailors were more experienced in trading at New Zealand. In a sample of 151 of the masters who commanded vessels that brought timber or flax to Sydney between 1829 and 1839, 56 percent had skippered a vessel in
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that branch of trans-Tasman trade before. Some, like Captain Henry Hay, had more than twenty voyages to their credit. When it is considered that whaling or other voyages were not included in the sample, and that no account could be taken of the crewmen's service in New Zealand, it would seem that between them only very few of the masters or crews of timber and flax trading vessels would have approached New Zealand for the first time in the decade of the 1830s.

All these were important reasons why colonial traders came to consider the New Zealand timber and flax trade in a more positive light. However they were merely motives for the renewed interest in timber and flax and, moreover, could have been suggested as reasons for an increase in the trade in any year from about 1824 through to 1830. They alone do not explain why it was that 1827 should have been the year that the trade was begun in earnest. The answer to this question appears to have lain with events in New Zealand.

The year 1827 proved to be a turning-point for European activities in New Zealand other than trading. The CMS missionaries also dated the beginnings of their influence among Maoris - both for peacemaking and for conversions - from about 1827 and especially 1828. There were many reasons for the Maori interest in Christianity at this time. However, it was not without significance that it followed in the wake of the decline and ultimate death of Hongi Hika, the great Ngapuhi chief who had rejected Christianity because he believed it to be religion better suited to a nation of slaves than a nation of warriors.

---

The long overdue biography of Hongi has still not been written and nor has there been an attempt to analyse the nature or extent of Ngapūhi influence throughout northern New Zealand during his time as ariki. However some indication of the nature of his authority was given in a letter written by the CMS missionary George Clarke in 1827. He wrote:

It has been hitherto understood by the great body of Natives around us, that we are in New Zealand solely for Shunghee's purposes, and under his entire protection: while, on the one hand, such a supposition on the part of the Natives kept them in awe and afforded us a measure of peace; on the other, the body of Natives would take but little interest in us, for fear of exciting the jealousy of Shunghee. Clarke was referring to the situation in the Bay of Islands and Hongi's efforts to monopolize the relations between missionaries and Maoris there. This essentially meant controlling who was to receive the goods from the mission stores and who was to utilize the services of those missionaries and mission workers who were skilled gunsmiths and metal workers.

Hongi appears to have exercised a similar sway over the trade conducted between Maoris and those vessels which visited the coasts and harbours of northern New Zealand. In fact he almost succeeded in keeping the material advantages of trading (particularly arms and ammunition) as the preserve of the people of the Bay of Islands and their allies. Moreover, where necessary, he effected his control by force. For instance there were the two raids he conducted on Hauraki Maoris while they were trading with Peter Dillon in 1827. Also his last, and ultimately fatal, fight with the Ngatipou of Whangaroa Harbour was reportedly an effort to establish his control over the timber trade there. 184

183. Cited in Wright, p. 137.
However the wealth of the Bay of Islands derived from its being a safe harbour where vessels could refit, from the abundance of prostitutes there and from its supply of pork, potatoes and vegetables. Since neither the Bay's timber nor its flax were of export quality the trade in these products could not flourish until they could be purchased from elsewhere in New Zealand. The nub was that the sources of the best quality flax and timber in New Zealand were to be found along the east coast from Mahia to Whangaroa and along the west coast from Hokianga to Kawhia. And all these places were within the area of Ngapuhi nominal dominion.

While there is no documentary evidence to explain the thinking of the people in these areas it is possible that they would have been subject to attack, like the Ngatipou, if they had showed signs of establishing a flourishing trade with Europeans and had thus 'excited the jealousy' of Hongi Hika. Perhaps a fear of being attacked explains why Waikato and Bay of Plenty Maoris did not start preparing large quantities of flax for sale until 1828. This may also have been part of the reason that Europeans were not encouraged to settle in the Bay of Plenty, Hauraki Gulf or the Hokianga (see for instance the Maori reaction to the First New Zealand Company settlers) until after Hongi's wounding and the general decline in Ngapuhi power which was evident from early 1827. It is significant that that year and the next saw the establishment of timber settlements in the Hokianga, the settling of European traders in Tauranga Harbour, and the invitation to J.R. Kent to take traders to Kawhia.

Hongi's prestige had certainly been waning in the latter months of 1826 and his wounding was merely a visible sign of this decline. It is possible that Ngapuhi power might have been sustained had not the two potential contenders for Hongi's mantle - Te Whareumu of Kororareka and Muriwai of the Hokianga - both been killed early in 1828. This
left the Ngapuhi without an ariki of whom the southern tribes were afraid. It is suggested, therefore, that they took advantage of the situation. They saw that an involvement in the flax and timber trade was one way they could get sufficient arms and ammunition to ensure that they would never again be dominated by the Bay of Islands Ngapuhi. Thus they enthusiastically began to prepare cargoes of phormium and wood.

When finally Titore emerged as the ariki of the Bay Maoris, after the Girls' War in 1830, it was too late to regain a Hongi-like domination. Titore's raids to the south, successful as they were in disrupting trade and terrifying local Maoris, were repulsed by firearms and the determination of the southern tribes to defend themselves and the profitable trade with Europeans that they then enjoyed.

THUS 1827 was a year of coalescence. The combined effects of several economic influences convinced colonial traders to turn their attention again to New Zealand's timber and flax. When they arrived in New Zealand they found that the Maoris in the flax and timber producing areas were eager to trade and excited about the anticipated liberation that the timber and flax trade would bring them.
Chapter Two

The Flax Trade 1828-1840

From 1828 the flax trade developed a momentum and character of its own. In terms of the tons of fibre taken from New Zealand the peak years of the trade were 1830-1832. However the preparations for and ramifications of this boom affected European trading at New Zealand from 1828, throughout the 1830s and beyond.

The demand for New Zealand flax was established by market forces in the colonies and Great Britain; the supply was regulated by events in the flax producing areas of New Zealand and Maoris' attitudes to trading. While it was the demand that determined the beginning and ending of the boom years of the trade, it was the availability of phormium that largely explained the variations in the quantities of flax that arrived in the colonies during those years.

Activities associated with the flax trade affected more than New Zealand's commerce. The search for the quantities of flax which would make the trade commercially viable, for anchorages in which vessels could safely load the product, and for Maoris who were willing to cut, prepare and sell the fibre resulted in an intensive exploration of the New Zealand coastline and hinterland. In addition the striving for greater efficiency in the trade meant that merchants settled resident agents in proximity to major flax supplies throughout the country. And, in part, as a result of the enthusiasm generated for phormium tenax and for enterprise at New Zealand during the euphoric years of the early 1830s, the call for Britain to take control of New Zealand's affairs in the interests of trade and traders became a catch-cry for proponents of colonization.
THE INCREASE in merchant involvement in the New Zealand flax trade rapidly followed the changes in both the economic circumstances of the colonies and the prospects for trading in New Zealand about 1827. Thus in 1828 there was a 25 percent increase in the volume of flax re-exported from New South Wales, the following year saw a 350 percent increase on the 1828 figure and during 1830 re-exports rose by another 123 percent. It can only be assumed that the size of the New South Wales' imports of flax from New Zealand would have increased at least at the same rate and probably more rapidly during those years.

The volume of the trade from New Zealand was at its peak in 1831 in which year 1240 tons of flax valued at £26004 were imported into New South Wales. The annual volumes of re-exports of flax were at their maximum in the following year. There appears to have been brief resurgences in the trade in 1834 and 1838 but generally after 1831 there was a steady decline in the quantities and value of the flax imported into the colony.

Comparing the values of New South Wales imports and re-exports of New Zealand flax highlights other facets of the trade and trends in the quantities of flax traded through New South Wales. Appendix 8 reveals that in the years before 1835 the bulk of New Zealand flax imported into New South Wales was destined to be re-exported to overseas markets. From 1835, however, the percentage of the New Zealand flax that was re-exported declined markedly and after 1837 it appears that any phormium which entered New South Wales was used there.

The comparison also shows some unexpected relationships between the values of imports and re-exports. For example in 1832 and 1835 the tonnage of flax that was re-exported exceeded the year's imports. The reason for this was probably that merchants did not always have the opportunity to process and re-export cargoes of flax brought to New South Wales in the last months of the preceding year. Thus flax contained in these cargoes appeared in the re-export totals for the following year. For the same reason
re-export figures for 1826-1829 are a questionable basis for estimating the size of New South Wales imports of flax during those years. It seems safe to assume, however, that most flax imported from New Zealand at that time was destined for markets outside the colony.

While these annual total movements in the flax trade have long been known they have not allowed much more than a crude analysis of the factors which influenced the level of colonial merchants' involvement in the trade. A more detailed analysis is possible using monthly figures for the totals of flax imported into New South Wales.1

Appendix 9 shows that the quantities of flax imported each month were irregular. There appears to be no discernible pattern; even in the peak years of the trade, 1830-1832, there were some months when no imports of flax were recorded.

The quantities of flax which entered New South Wales increased as the number of trans-Tasman vessel movements increased. There was a sharp rise in the number of vessels departing Sydney for New Zealand in both 1828 and 1830 and corresponding upswings in the arrivals from New Zealand in 1829 and 1831. The extent to which this increased shipping was involved in the flax trade can be seen in that the decline of the trade was mirrored in a decline in shipping movements - for departures 1830-1832 and for arrivals 1831-1833.2 Reference to the quantity of shipping and individual voyages also explains what at first sight appeared to be a resurgence in the trade in 1834. In fact three exceptionally large cargoes (Bardaster, 208 tons in November, Louisa, 135 tons in April, and Eleanor, 130 tons in June) accounted for 81 percent of the flax imported that year.

However merchants were only willing to commit vessels to the trade for as long as they could expect to profit from it. Their income was determined largely by the prices being paid for flax. In this regard the movements in prices paid for New Zealand flax on the New South Wales market were a reflection of the conditions prevailing in the trade.3

---

1. See Appendix 9.
2. See Appendices 3, 5, 6.
3. See Appendix 10.
There was a 46 percent decrease in the price paid for flax in New South Wales from April 1831 to July 1832. This occurred because these were the months when the greatest amount of flax was imported. Clearly the colonial market for this product was glutted and the price fell accordingly. On the other hand the stability in the price quoted for flax on the New South Wales market from 1836 reflected the decline in the trade and a general disinterest in the New Zealand product during those years.

The colonial market prices were also influenced by the reaction of the British market to the New Zealand flax. For instance the increasingly large difference between the maximum and minimum prices being paid for flax in New South Wales from 1832, reflected both the need to ensure the quality of the flax before it would find a responsive market and a report from Britain late in 1832 which indicated that there was a £10 per ton difference between the prices of the best and worst flax on the London market. Similarly the peaks in New South Wales prices in March and September-October 1834 appear to have been a reaction to reports that the British market for flax was strengthening and that the prices there were increasing.

However conditions and prices on the British market for flax interested colonial merchants much more than did colonial prices. Appendix 8 clearly shows that the bulk of the New Zealand flax was re-exported. About 94 percent of it went to Great Britain although some also found its way to other markets such as the United States of America and Ceylon. Usually the fibre was re-exported by the merchants who had been responsible for its collection in New Zealand and so variations in the prices being paid for flax on the London market were directly reflected in the interest colonial merchants showed in the product and, in consequence, in the level of the trade at New Zealand.

5. See Appendix 11.
6. See Appendix 12.
7. S.H., 26 January 1837.
8. S.H., 24 September 1832.
The buoyancy of the London market and the reported enthusiasm of the British government to purchase quantities of *phormium* were two of the main reasons why colonial merchants turned to collecting New Zealand flax in the late 1820s. However the colonials were soon to discover that the London market was a difficult one in which to succeed. Initially they thought that it was only necessary for them to get the *phormium* to the market for it to realize premium prices. Thus the traders bundled the flax (dressed or green) into bales as tightly as they could\(^9\) and sent it on its way as soon as possible.

The first warning colonial merchants had of the difficulties of marketing flax came in a broadsheet issued in September 1830 by the respected London merchant Walter Buchanan. It arrived in the colony about March 1831. His circular stated that the poor condition in which the flax arrived in the United Kingdom made it almost unsaleable. Buchanan suggested how the flax should be prepared and packaged in order to make a profitable sale.\(^10\) His next circular, dated 24 December 1830, described a worsening situation. Apparently the Navy had contracted to purchase some flax at £4 3 per ton. When it was eventually delivered the fibre was in such a foul state that the contract was withdrawn.\(^11\) The price of flax on the London market halved almost immediately from £30 - £32 per ton in September to £16 - £25 by the end of the year. On receipt of this news in May 1831 the colonial press and some colonial merchants claimed that the flax trade had ceased to be profitable.

The fall in the London market price undoubtedly contributed to the lowering of the price for flax in New South Wales. Long-established colonial merchants blamed interlopers for the decline in the quality of the imported flax.

---

9. Some merchants especially imported hydraulic presses for this purpose - J. Maclaren to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 7 September 1831 enclosed in Darling to Howick, 10 September 1831, CO201/220, f.369a-369b.
10. S.G., 1 March 1831.
believed that the high prices initially obtained for flax had encouraged many new vessels and inexperienced masters and merchants to engage in the trade. These fledglings had taken whatever flax the Maoris offered to them without regard to its quality or whether it was dressed or green. They had taken little care in loading the product at New Zealand and in consequence the phormium had been doused in salt water, to its detriment. Some writers also claimed that the flax was being cut out of season\(^{12}\) in order to meet increased demand.

The interference of these inexperienced men had a two-fold effect on the profitability of, and thus merchant interest in, the trade. It meant that poor quality flax arrived on the British market along with the good. Because there was more of the inferior flax the lowering of the prices reflected the market's rejection of the product. In New Zealand their activities had the effect of raising the price paid for flax and thus further decreased merchants' profits. Apparently masters were so desperate to load their vessels that they flooded New Zealand with muskets and ammunition, which were the chief items of barter at the time. In consequence Maori demands for these goods were soon

---

12. This was a contentious point among contemporaries. The merchant Bell claimed that it was best to cut the leaves before they got too ripe. (Bell to Dumaresq, in Dumaresq to Hay, 20 November 1831, CO201/223, f.363a) and Thomas McDonnell, who traded flax, claimed that the trade had suffered from the products not being cut at the right time (T. McDonnell, Extracts from Mr McDonnell's MS. Journal, containing Observations on New Zealand, London, 1834, p.17). However Edward Meurant who was resident in New Zealand from 1828 and collected flax at Kawhia for several years, claimed that flax could be cut or pulled at any time of the year (E. Meurant, Directions for Preparing Flax From the Notebook of Mr Murant, interpreter to Mr. Commissioner Spain, no loc., 1844).
satisfied. Therefore either the Maoris declined to prepare flax unless the offering price was considerably higher than usual, or they refused to clean and select the finest fibres when they knew that they were only likely to get the same price for it as for poor quality phormium in an undressed state. Because of the general scarcity of flax and the over-abundance of traders willing to purchase it even the 'genuine' merchants were required to take all and any flax they were offered.13

The consequence of the fall in the price of flax on the London market was a slowing in the trade in the middle of 1831. However in September of the same year word was received from Britain that the government had let a contract for the supply of 500 tons of New Zealand flax. The Sydney Gazette confidently predicted that this would increase both the price and the volume of imports of phormium to the colony.14 In fact the price of flax on the New South Wales market continued to fall and the increase in the volume of imports lasted only until the early months of 1832.

In December 1831 'A misguided New Zealand trader' claimed that the flax trade was 'washed up' and that vessels engaged in it were losing £300 per voyage.15 Certainly from March 1832 there was a marked decline in the quantities of flax being imported into New South Wales.

A Sydney Gazette article in February 1832 noted that the price of flax on the colonial market had continued to fall. The writer blamed over-anxious merchants for the poor quality of the fibre which was being imported. He suggested that the only way to ensure the quality of the flax was to stipulate to Maoris that only the best phormium would be purchased from them.16 Other contemporaries considered that the trade was finished. One Sydney resident, in a letter

13. J. Maclaren to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 7 September 1831, CO201/220, f. 366b-367b; H. Donnison to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 8 September 1831, CO201/220, f. 371b.
14. S.G., 27 September 1831. Prices on the British market had risen after the news of the contract was published - H.T.C., 8 October 1831.
15. S.G., 15 December 1831.
16. S.G., 4 February 1832.
published in a Van Diemen's Land newspaper, suggested that the Prince of Denmark, which according to the writer was one of the few vessels still engaged in the flax trade, only continued to load its small cargoes of phormium as a cover for the importing of platinum which, he claimed, had been discovered in a secret mine in New Zealand. 17

What had happened, in fact, was that the economic conditions in New South Wales had improved markedly. Wool, and particularly fine wool, was again returning acceptable profits. Other branches of the Pacific trade were being re-opened and in New Zealand the decade of extensive bay whaling was just commencing. In short the particular economic conditions which had made the flax trade attractive to colonial merchants no longer prevailed and the boom years of the trade were over.

Colonial merchants continued to import flax throughout the 1830s, usually as a part of cargoes which were predominantly composed of other New Zealand products such as pork, bacon, vegetables and whale oil. 18 Fewer merchants were involved and the amount of flax being re-exported had dwindled to next to nothing by 1837. They had grown tired of having their cargoes rejected on the London market and firmly believed that phormium tenax would not repay the cost of its collection until some mechanical means could be found for cleaning and preparing the flax before it left New Zealand. 19 The death knell of the colonial trade

17. H.T.C., 25 February 1832.
was perhaps the sound of the auctioneer's hammer as the largest ropewalk in the colony, that erected by David Scott & Co on Maclaren’s Wharf, was let and the ropemaking machinery sold in December 1838.20

The decline in the trade was graphically illustrated in the changes in the use to which New Zealand flax was put. The product which was often held to be the key to solving Britain's problems of ensuring supplies of ropes and canvas for her navy21 was by the late 1830s being used, in the colonie, primarily to stuff mattresses and to fill upholstery such as sofas22 and, on the Continent, to make cheap bonnets for women.23

Thus some of the variations in the quantities of flax entered into New South Wales each month can be explained by colonial merchants’ response to the market forces of price and demand. Most of the movements in the levels of imports appear to have been related to events which affected the trading at New Zealand.

THE ATTITUDE of the Maoris regulated the growth that occurred in the flax trade from 1827. Because the successful prosecution of the trade heavily depended on the assistance and goodwill of the Maoris, the variations in their approach to trading and traders were reflected in the volumes of phormium imported into New South Wales.

No flax was imported into Sydney in September 1830. This had been predicted by the colonial press in August.24 Several reasons were put forward to explain this sudden drop in what appeared to be a vigorous and growing trade.

21. See for example S.G., 25 April 1829, 27 April 1830.
22. S.H., 13 April, 20 July 1835; C.C., 4 February 1837; G. Weller to E. Weller, 23 April 1836, G. Weller, Correspondence with E. Weller and others ... 1832-61, (NPL/M, AL609), p. 161.
23. Colonist, 12 October 1837.
Some claimed that the sudden demand for dressed flax had outstripped supplies and that this was the cause of the scarcity.25 Others believed that the problem lay in Maoris' unwillingness to trade. This was variously attributed to either their suspicion of Europeans or an over-supply of muskets and ammunition.26 Another explanation was that an unidentified 'quarrel' between Europeans and Maoris (probably an allusion to the 'Girls' War' in the Bay of Islands) had disrupted trading. It was thought that the successful conclusion of the fracas would re-open the trade.27 This optimism appeared to be borne out by the large amount of flax imported during October 1830. However imports again declined markedly in November and were well below average for the year in December. James Busby attributed the latter decline, which saw vessels returning to Sydney with empty or near empty holds, to it being the season when Maoris prepared their potato grounds and he suggested that nothing would distract their attention from that employment.28

The sudden increase in imports early in 1831 was, in part, accounted for by a renewed Maori enthusiasm for preparing and trading flax. William Williams, the CMS missionary, noted late in December 1830 that for the first time the Bay of Islands Maoris were showing some avidity in preparing flax for sale to Europeans. Williams' comments were prompted after he found that there were very few Maoris resident in Kororareka and the Kawakawa area when he visited those places to take services. (This was all the more surprising because the control of Kororareka had been the motive behind the Girls' War which had so recently been concluded.) He discovered that they had gone to various flax swamps, such as those around Te Puke (presumably this meant the area behind Waitangi) to collect and dress flax

25. S.G., 17 August 1830.
26. S.G., 4 September 1830.
27. S.G., 9 October 1830.
28. J. Busby, A Brief Memoir Relative to the Islands of New Zealand, June 1831, CO209/1, f.186b.
in imitation, he believed, of the Maoris to the south who had armed themselves by selling flax in the years 1828-30.  

The sharp decline in imports in the middle of 1831 appeared to have been the result of warfare between Bay of Islands Maoris and those of Tauranga - these two being the major centres of the trade at that time. Peace was re-established during August and this was reflected in the large export cargoes of September to November. The absence of flax imports in December probably arose from the same reasons as in 1830 but was attributed, in the Sydney Gazette, to Maoris having become very lazy and unwilling to scrape flax or chop timber.

Warfare in New Zealand again seriously disrupted trade in 1832. The trading year had begun well with large quantities being imported in January and February. New Zealand was reportedly at peace during those months although the threats of war had led to an increased demand for muskets and ammunition and a concomitant increase in the amount of flax being offered for sale. However by July returning vessels reported that New Zealand appeared to be in a state of anarchy. There was fighting which involved the Bay of Islands, Tauranga and Poverty Bay Maoris; the Waikato was the scene of skirmishing; and warfare had spread to Taranaki and Wellington. These were the areas from

29. W. Williams, Journal of William Williams, 21 August 1825-18 December 1855, (AR, typescript, MS 335), 19, 23 December 1830, 7 January 1831.

30. S.G., 1 August 1831; E. Stokes, A History of Tauranga County, Palmerston North, 1980, p. 46.

31. S.G., 9 August 1831.

32. S.G., 7 January 1832.

33. S.H., 13 February 1832.

34. S.H., 2 July 1832. Richard Davis, a CMS missionary, recorded a vessel's master claiming to have lost £1500 on a flax voyage in April 1832 because 'the natives were so universally involved in war' - S.P. Smith, Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century, 2nd ed., Christchurch, 1910, p. 447.

35. S.G., 6 September 1832.
which most flax was being exported. Thus little flax was collected in the winter and spring of 1832 save by three vessels which had taken large cargoes from places outside the battle zones. These they brought to Sydney in July and August. As late as September the Sydney Herald reported:

The flax trade is very dull, the natives being either employed in fighting, crying over the dead, or preparing to fight; on the whole, the present prospect of New Zealand holds out few temptations to the speculator. 36

However within two months peace was restored and November 1832-January 1833 saw a steady increase in the amounts of flax imported. 37

Maori warfare was also blamed for the decline in imports in the latter half of 1833 38 and it was Te Rauparaha's disturbances that affected the trade in the flax producing areas around Cook Strait and as far north as Poverty Bay in 1834. 39 Furthermore contemporaries reported that in many places there had been a notable decline in earlier Maori enthusiasm for cutting and scraping flax. This Maori 'indolence' was one reason the Sydney Herald believed that the proposed Public Company or National Factory being mooted in London late in 1833 would not succeed in getting sufficient supplies of flax. 40 A similar opinion was expressed by John Eagleton, log-keeper on the American trading vessel Emerald, while his ship lay in the Bay of Islands in 1834. He noted that the New Zealand flax was an excellent product and had a great export potential if only 'the Devils' would start cultivating and dressing it. 41 However this alleged Maori attitude was not a general phenomenon. Later in 1834 William Williams was

36. S.H., 6 September 1832.
37. S.H., 19 November 1832.
38. S.H., 3 October 1833.
40. S.H., 23 January 1834.
41. Emerald, log, 21-28 April 1834, (PAMBU, log 223, frame 142).
visiting the central Waikato and Bay of Plenty areas and
found the inland tribes busy scraping flax and transporting
it to market. Also in September 1835 the CMS missionary
at Matamata, A.N. Brown, wrote to Henry Williams at Paihia
and informed him that a local European trader — Edward
Clementson — had engaged 2000 Maoris to take 50 tons of
flax to Tauranga.

In the later years of the decade the flax trade to
the colonies was so small that it was rarely mentioned in
press reports of activities or disturbances in New Zealand.
Occasionally warfare, like that in the Bay of Plenty 1836-7,
was given as a reason for the cessation of imports. In
general, however, it became apparent that the traditional
process of dressing flax was so tedious that when it came
to producing the quantities required to supply a large
market Maoris were loath to do it. This was especially the
case where, as with the Tauranga Maoris, who had supplied
much of the flax exported during the boom years, Maoris
could produce alternative goods which found a ready market
and could be exported with less effort than flax, for example,
pig meats and grain.

By the early 1830s it was not only the activities
of the Maori residents of New Zealand that influenced the
nature of the trade there. After 1828 there began a re-

42. W. Williams, Journal, 22 September, 9 October 1834;
Bidwell met 200 Maoris temporarily settled on the
Waikato River for the purpose of scraping flax in
1839 — J.C. Bidwell, Rambles in New Zealand 1839,
Christchurch, 1952, pp.52-7.

43. Brown to H. Williams, 11 September 1835, A.N. Brown,
Letterbook, 1829-1833, (TAUP, Bernard Sladen Research
Library, typescript).

44. Colonist, 1 December 1836; S.H., 28 November 1836.
See also S.H., 1 June 1837.

45. E. Campbell, The Present State, Resources and Prospects
of New Zealand, London, 1840, p.10; E.Dieffenbach,
Travels in New Zealand, 2 vols, London, 1843, (Capper
organisation of European methods of trading at New Zealand. Throughout the decade of the 1820s, and before, colonial merchants had loaded vessels with the trade goods they thought Maoris would like and had set the master or the supercargo the task of taking the vessel around the New Zealand coasts until such time as he had exchanged his cargo of European goods for flax. This inefficient method of 'speculative' trading had begun to change by 1831 and was replaced by the resident agent system.

The latter involved an individual taking up residence in New Zealand and managing the collection and export of flax on the behalf, and in the pay, of a colonial merchant. By ensuring that a cargo of flax would be ready when his employer sent out a vessel the resident agent provided a new security and stability in the trans-Tasman trade. He was also usually able to purchase a quality cargo at the most reasonable price possible and thereby improved the profitability of the trade. In short his knowledge of local conditions eliminated much of the time-wasting and the commercial gamble inherent in the previous 'speculative' trading.

The stockpiles of flax collected by the agents could be huge. Maoris constructed buildings for storing flax which were up to 100 feet in length, 300 feet wide and 40 feet in height, although it would seem that most were about half this size. It was from such stockpiles that the large cargoes of flax on the Bardaster, Louisa and Eleanor were loaded in 1834. Apart from the arrivals of these exceptionally large cargoes the change from the speculative to the resident

46. See for example Bell to Dumas, CO201/223, ff. 364a; G. Browne to Darling, 24 April 1831, ADM 1/4248, pp. 11-12; R.W. Hay, 'Notices of New Zealand', Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, II, 1832, 133-4.

agent method of trading was most clearly reflected in an increase in the average size of the cargoes entering Sydney from 19.5 tons in 1829 to 30.4 tons in 1831.\textsuperscript{48}

Employing a resident agent, however, did not guarantee that a colonial merchant would profit from an involvement in the flax trade. Polack, for instance, gave the following accounts from a year's operations during 1830 which were sponsored by the Sydney merchant Richard Jones:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ l c }
  Expences of a small brig, charter, &c. & £1600 \\
  Collectors' salaries & 140 \\
  Cost of the article at the lowest rate & 800 \\
  £5 per ton & 230 \\
  Insurance charges, stowage, &c & \\
  Value in Sydney cash at £17 per ton & 2720 \\
  Loss & 50 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Some of Polack's figures seem to be rather high. For example Jones' resident agents were receiving an annual salary which, including their commission, provided an income twice as large as that obtained by Barnet Burns from his employers.\textsuperscript{50} Also the estimated cost of chartering the brig was much higher than the price of a similar vessel's return trip in 1832 which cost £321.13s.10d.\textsuperscript{51} As the flax trade declined these residents agents either left the country or diversified into procuring cargoes of meat, grains and other New Zealand produce for their colonial employers.

Much of the flax imported after 1834 appears to have been collected at the shore whaling stations. Black whales were hunted from April to September and those whalers who did not return to New South Wales or Van Diemen's Land during the summer months occupied themselves by preparing

\textsuperscript{48} See Appendix 9.

\textsuperscript{49} Polack, New Zealand, II, 288-9.

\textsuperscript{50} B. Burns, A Brief Narrative of a New Zealand Chief ..., Belfast, 1844, (Hocken Library facsimile, 1970), p.5.

\textsuperscript{51} Cuthbert v Hindson, NSW: Supreme Court: Civil Jurisdiction: Judgement Rolls, 3rd term, 1832, (AONSW, SB 81, Roll 70).
cargoes of flax, potatoes, timber and other products. This might explain why the amount of flax imported in the average cargo in the later years of the decade was small and why cargoes tended to be entered late in autumn (that is, when vessels returned from landing the new season's whaling gangs at stations in New Zealand) and during the spring and summer months (when the whalers had time to prepare cargoes of flax). Perhaps too the apparent resurgence in the level of phormium imports in 1838 was related to 1837's having been the first of the peak years for shore whaling in New Zealand which had meant an increase in the number of whalers who stayed in the country during the summer. Thus the observed movements in the annual and monthly totals of the quantities of flax imported into New South Wales can be explained by reference to Maori attitudes, the events and changing methods of trading at New Zealand which directly affected the prospects and conduct of trade, and, in part, to the market forces which influenced New South Wales merchants' involvement in the trade.

IN OCTOBER 1831 Ranulph Dacre, a Sydney merchant, stated that there were 50-100 'stations' occupied by traders throughout New Zealand. He implied that most served the flax trade. It is not possible, today, to determine the site of each of these stations. Nor is it possible to estimate the numbers of men who may have been involved in

52. See Appendix 9.
53. See Appendix 13.
MAP 1

SITES OF THE PRINCIPAL FLAX STATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND 1830 - 1832
the trade or who were living at New Zealand for that purpose. However a description of the major flax stations during the peak years of the trade shows the extent to which the flax trade contributed to the dispersal of Europeans around the coasts of New Zealand and from which districts most of the phormium was exported.

The major flax export points in 1831 were the Bay of Islands, the Hokianga, Bay of Plenty, the Thames, Kawhia, Taranaki, Port Nicholson, Kapiti, Cloudy Bay and Banks Peninsula. 55

Although large amounts of flax were exported through the Bay of Islands and the Hokianga very little of it appears to have been grown in that region. The phormium there was difficult to clean and so it was rarely prepared for trading. 56 Instead Bay Maoris, and those in the Hokianga, acquired flax from other parts of New Zealand, notably Thames and Waikato. This they sold to vessels which visited the Bay and the River. Indeed the Bay of Islands became the entrepot of early New Zealand.

The River Thames and the Waihou Valley had been recognised as a region with a huge potential for flax exporting from the time of Captain Cook. However the reputation local Maoris had for ferocity seemed to have retarded the settlement of Europeans there. Apparently the Sydney merchant Samuel Ashmore opened a station at Kopu in 1831 and in 1832 a young man called Jones was trading flax at Whakatiwai on behalf of the firm Jones and Walker. 57

55. See Map 1 opposite; Bell to Dumasq, CO201/223, f.36lb.
57. S. Ashmore, OLC 37b/45; J.H.H. St John, Pakeha Rambles Through Maori Lands, Wellington, 1873, pp.30,45. Dacre claimed that Jones and Walker's agent was called Captain Adams – Dacre to Brooks, 22 June 1833, (NPL/M, uncat. MS. Set 309); Ashmore to Customs, New South Wales, 25 March 1836, NSW: Customs: Letters Received from Private Individuals, 1831-40 (AONSW, 4/5112), p.33.
Most of the flax which was imported into New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land during the 1830s probably came from the Bay of Plenty/East Coast area. In April 1831 it was reported that there were three or four agents at Tauranga and four in the vicinity of Maketu.\(^58\) The first traders had gone to Tauranga in 1828.\(^59\) The three or four residing there in 1831 would have included Albert John Nicholas who was living near Te Papa before 1830, Cabbage or Kapiti who had a store in Otamataha pa near Te Papa and who was later murdered at Mokoia, and Daniel (and perhaps his brother James) Farrow who was living at the Otumoetai pa. These earliest traders were later joined by John Montefiore, cousin of Sydney merchant J.B. Montefiore, who took up residence at Otumoetai in 1832, by Thomas Scott who settled at Maungatapu before 1833, and by four Frenchmen - Louis Bidois, Emil Borell, Charles Potier and another who is known only as Ottenton - who established themselves at the mouth of the Wairoa River also about 1832.\(^60\) Included in the number of flax agents cited for Maketu in 1831 would have been Philip Tapsell who lived there as an agent for the New South Wales firm of Jones and Walker from about 1830. Then there was Franks (Whangari), Clarke and Te Ra (Taylor) who all appeared to have been living at Te Tumu pa which was two or three miles up the coast from Maketu.\(^61\) And at Mataata, to the south of Maketu, George White and Edward Clementson were, at that time, working as flax agents and collectors for Tapsell.\(^62\)

58. Brownneto Darling, ADM 1/4248, p.3

59. S.H., 17 August 1837.


The Sydney merchant Henry Donnison established the first trading station, which consisted of five or six men, at Turanga (present day Gisborne) before April 1831. He was prominent in the flax trade and was one of the merchants Governor Darling consulted, in September 1831, about the prospects of the flax trade. With his reply to the Governor's enquiry Donnison sent several samples of flax including four that he said came 'from a settlement of mine on the East Coast'. Donnison owned the schooner Currency Lass and it is probable that this vessel took his agents to Gisborne on one of its two visits to New Zealand in 1830.63 The man who was presumed, by other writers, to have led the first station at Turanga was Captain J.W. Harris, an agent of J.B. Montefiore. But he arrived at that settlement on 16 May 1831 and, at about the same time, Thomas Ralph was landed at Wherowhero (present day Muriwai in Poverty Bay) and Barnet Burns established his business at Mahia.64

Northern East Coast locations were settled shortly afterwards. Te Ra (Taylor) (apparently not the trader from Te Tumu pa) and George were trading from Hicks Bay in 1831 when Taylor was killed by Te Whanau-a-Apanui as revenge for the death of the chief Ngarara which had followed the attack on the Hawea in Poverty Bay in 1829.65 There were also two traders at Uawa (Tolaga Bay) in 1832. The men, Ferris and Burns, were respectively the agents of New South Wales merchants John Maclaren and J.B. Montefiore.66

The information about New Zealand given by Gordon Browne to Governor Darling in April 1831 included the claim that there were thirty Europeans living on Kapiti Island at that time, although not all of them were flax agents, and

63. Browne to Darling, ADM 1/4248, p.4; Donnison to Colonial Secretary, CO201/220, f.371b; S.G., 30 March, 1, 12 June, 4 September, 2 October, 6 November 1830.
65. W. Williams, Journal, 23 January 1831; Mackay, pp.115-7
66. Mackay, p. 130; S.H., 14 August 1834; Polack, New Zealand, II, 116-121.
that a station belonging to the merchant John Maclaren had been established at Port Nicholson (Wellington Harbour). It is therefore not surprising that many European traders were to be found in that area from very early in the decade. The best known flax trader in the Port Nicholson area was David Scott who, by his own evidence, did not settle there until March 1831 - clearly it was not to his establishment that Browne was referring. However in his land claim evidence Scott said that a William Weston and a Thomas Brady were living in Port Nicholson when he arrived. While Scott's evidence does not provide any information about their employment, these men might have been the Maclaren agents who were referred to by Browne. The date of their arrival in Cook Strait cannot be established although it is possible that they were landed from Maclaren's vessel, Norval, which was collecting flax and whale products in that area from August to November 1830.

A party of eight to ten men arrived at Ngamotu (a site south of present day New Plymouth) about March 1828. The agents, who included John Love, Richard 'Dicky' Barrett and Daniel Sheridan, were landed from the schooner Adventure and they remained at Ngamotu trading in flax and pork until the local pa was attacked in January/February 1832. It is not certain who sponsored the settlement but it was probably Thomas Hyndes. At the same time as the Ngamotu station was disestablished Thomas Ralph, who had moved from Wherowhero in November 1831 and who was the sole flax agent at Mokau, was

---

67. Browne to Darling, ADM 1/4248, p.4.
68. D. Scott, OLC 439/1022; S.G., 17 August, 4, 9 November 1830, 5 March 1831; R. McNab, The Old Whaling Days, Christchurch 1913, pp. 5, 6, 11.
69. S.G., 27 February, 5 May, 10 September 1828; S.P.Smith, 'History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', J.P.S. XIX, March 1910, 1-3, 25-36; McNab, Whaling, Chapter I.
taken prisoner by marauding Maoris. He was freed after his ransom was paid by another flax trader but he never returned to Mokau. 70

The Waikato harbours and flax producing sites were renowned for the quality of the phormium which was exported from them. Kawhia was first settled by Europeans when Captain J.R. Kent and his party, which included Edward Meurant, John Cowell (snr) and George Terry Howe, arrived some time late in 1829. Kent had first entered the harbour aboard the Elizabeth Henrietta in 1824, had returned in June 1828 for a visit, and finally settled there a year later. Although initially these men exported the phormium grown in Kawhia, they later moved inland to take flax from the Waipa River valley. Other agents also lived in Kawhia and its sister harbour Aotea. A Mr Slade, for instance, was landed at Kawhia in November 1830. He was the second agent left there to trade on behalf of the firm Montefiore and Lamb; George Macfarlane was their other agent. 71

Whaingaroa (Raglan) was the home of the flax agent Thomas Lonsdale from about 1832 72 and three traders lived at the heads of the Waikato River. When Charles Marshall, in the company of his employer George Paul, arrived in the Waikato River on board the Sydney Packet on 10 November 1830, he found a Captain Payne had already settled there. By September 1832, when Maoris burned their dwellings and expelled the traders from the River, Payne and Marshall had

70. Mackay, pp.152-3.
72. St John, p. 38.
been joined by another agent, Joseph Weller.\textsuperscript{73}

*Phormium* was exported from two other North Island flax regions during the boom years of the trade. The Alexander was reported to have loaded a cargo at the North Cape in 1832\textsuperscript{74} and the missionary William Williams reported that Europeans had been taking flax from Sandy Bay (now Rangaunu Bay) for three or four years before he arrived there in 1832.\textsuperscript{75} The other area was the Manukau Harbour. While it appears that no Europeans settled in the Harbour in the early years of the decade the Tranmere and the Charles were both reported as having taken flax from the Manukau during 1831.\textsuperscript{76}

In the South Island, as shore whaling stations were established, the potential of the sources of flax which had been discovered and described during the visits of merchant and government vessels in the 1810s and 1820s - Ruapuke Island, Bluff Harbour, Preservation Inlet - was reassessed. The flax there was found to provide a profitable supplement to whaling activities whereas previously the supply of it had been considered insufficient to sustain a trade in *phormium* alone. The same combination of flax collecting and whaling was also common around some of the shore stations in the north of the South Island, especially in Cloudy Bay.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{73} S.H., 6 September 1832; St John, p.5.
\textsuperscript{74} S.G., 13 November 1832.
\textsuperscript{75} W. Williams, Journal, 1 December 1832.
\textsuperscript{76} S.G., 21 June, 5 August 1831; St John, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{77} See, for example, the cargoes on voyages of the Weller brothers' vessel *Lucy Ann* - McNab, *Whaling*, pp. 98, 99, 100, 102; Browne to Darling, ADM I/4248, p. 9.
However merchants in the early 1830s considered that Banks Peninsula was the centre of the South Island flax trade. Apparently there were two European traders 'Jem' and 'Charley' living at Akaroa when Te Rauparaha captured Maharanui late in 1830. Also some speculative ventures were sent to Canterbury to further explore its potential as a flax exporting area. For example in October 1830 traders from the Vittoria went to Port Cooper and inland to Kaiapoi in search of flax for the Sydney ropemaker Jacob Wyer.

While this survey could not be exhaustive it does identify what appeared to be the areas in New Zealand from which most flax was exported in the boom years. It also enables some conclusions to be formed about the factors which determined where a flax station would be sited.

In deciding where they would place a trader the Europeans had regard for the accessibility of the river, harbour or bay, the safety in which the trader could carry out his work, and the availability of exportable quantities of flax. In making such decisions the colonial merchants often drew on the information gathered during voyages in the earlier years of the nineteenth century. For instance it would appear that J.R. Kent had visited all of the harbours between Ngamotu and Manukau as a result of his voyages aboard the Elizabeth Henrietta (1824) and the Emma Kemp (1828) before he advised his employer to establish a settlement at Kawhia in 1829.

Other merchants appeared to pursue an 'arrive and see' policy with regard to choosing sites for their agents. An example is provided by voyages which were jointly sponsored by the Sydney firms of J.B. Montefiore and John Lamb in 1830-1.

78. Bell to Dunaresq, CO201/223, f. 361b; Browne to Darling, ADM, 1/4248, p. 9.


80. J. O'C. Ross, Papers, 1973-1976(WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 1), 'John Rodolphus Kent - Master Mariner', pp. 139-142.
These merchants took traders to likely flax exporting areas and, on summing up the potential of each location, decided whether or not to leave a man to reside there and conduct trade. Montefiore visited New Zealand on the Argo late in 1830 and on this voyage landed one agent at Kawhia and, apparently, another at Kapiti Island. He terminated his tour at that stage for fear of the repercussions of the Elizabeth Affair. However on 17 February 1831 another vessel left Sydney with more Lamb and Montefiore agents. On this voyage a Mr Slade was landed at Kawhia, another agent at Mokau, a third at Ngamotu, Barnet Burns arrived at Mahia, Thomas Ralph at Wherowhero and J.W. Harris was left to set up two stations at Turanga.81

The Maoris' role in this process of selecting a site for a flax depot was twofold. When Europeans arrived in a locality and negotiated to establish a trader there, the successful conclusion to the negotiations depended on the Europeans' assessment of how well the Maoris would treat the trader and how profitable operating from that place would be. The latter they measured by the enthusiasm local Maoris evinced for scraping flax. However some Maoris played a more active part in influencing the Europeans' choice of a particular site. For instance TapSELL was settled at Maketutu by and at the request of the Te Arawa - the relatives of his brother-in-law's wife.82 Similarly the presence of a powerful protector and provider in the form of Te Rauparaha appears to have been the reason why so many Europeans lived on and traded from Kapiti Island.83

Initially the choice of the site for a flax station was not limited by any non-availability of phormium. The common swamp flax was found in most parts of New Zealand. However swamp flax is difficult to clean and so it was only for as long as the enthusiasm for European goods induced

81. Montefiore, evidence, 1838 Report, pp.57-9; Mackay, pp. 95-6; B. Burns, p.5; Montefiore, OLC 425/1008.
82. Stafford, p. 193.
83. P. Burns, Te Rauparaha: A New Perspective, Wellington, 1980, Chapter VII.
Maoris to exert themselves to prepare this poorest quality phormium that fibre could be freely purchased throughout New Zealand. After the Maoris' desire for muskets diminished or as other commercial activities opened more profitable options to them, they refused to scrape this flax. But while some merchants, as a result, found that their supplies of flax had dried up, others continued to receive large quantities from their stations in New Zealand. For example it seems that stations in the Kawhia region and those in the Bay of Plenty continued to supply flax for the New South Wales market until the late 1830s. One reason for this was that the varieties of phormium tenax exported from these regions included the kinds designated tihore by the Maoris. These flaxes were so fine that they could be scraped with a finger nail. They were found chiefly in the swamps around Mangatautari, a site just south of modern Lake Karapiro and within easy walking distance of the Waipa River. The other major source of the tihore species was the Thames Valley which serviced the Bay of Plenty outlets.\textsuperscript{84} The ease with which these fibres could be prepared meant that for local Maoris trading flax continued to be a profitable business for as long as colonial merchants were prepared to buy it. However as their returns for flax decreased so Maoris in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty areas, like Maoris elsewhere, turned instead to exporting pig meats and grains such as wheat and maize.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{84.} T. Kelly, The Soil, Climate and Capabilities of Taranaki, New Plymouth, 1866, pp.11-12.

\textsuperscript{85.} S.H., 1 June 1837.

THE INFLUENCE of the boom years in the flax trade spread beyond New Zealand, New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land.
While a depression in the trade and disillusionment with the product were evident in the colonies from 1832, in Britain merchants, naval men and pamphleteers continued to predict a bright future for the phormium tenax trade. This was despite the fact that the price for flax continued to fall on the London market. The enthusiasts' reaction to the decline in prices was to stress that it had not occurred because the flax had proved inferior to similar Russian or European products in comparative tests of strength. Neither was it held to be a reflection of phormium's value in manufacturing. Rather, they explained, the New Zealand product arrived in such a poor state that, even though it was priced more cheaply than other imported hems, it did not attract the interest of buyers. Indeed no New Zealand flax was sold in London in the last quarter of 1831.  

Unlike colonial mercantile concerns whose vision of trade was restricted to remaining solvent on a day to day basis, British houses could afford to import experimental cargoes of flax and to write off any losses against their other commercial activities. They were also in a position to respond to any hint of progress in the trade. This was clearly demonstrated in the reasons behind the sharp increases in the price of phormium quoted on the London market in June 1832 and July 1833. The first leap came in the wake of an announcement of the success of naval tests being performed on rope and canvas manufactured from New Zealand flax by the London ropemaker, M.J.J. Donlan.  

The second proceeded from moves to establish a Public Company to manufacture phormium tenax. This renewed interest was also reflected

---

86. S.G., 6 March 1832. See also Bennett, II, 78; Enderby, evidence, 1838 Report, pp.75, 78, 79; McDonnell, pp.17-18.
87. S.G., 27 October 1832.
88. S.G., 24 December 1833. The prospectus was issued again in 1834 - S.G., 24 June 1834. See also Prospectus for the Establishment of a National Factory for the Manufacture of Various Articles from New Zealand Flax, (WTu, qPAM, c. 1830).
in the level of trading at New Zealand, for it appears that on the strength of that promising situation the Bardaster and the Eleanor were dispatched from London and between them loaded 338 tons of flax.

Although by the mid 1830s the trade in New Zealand flax through the colonies to Britain had all but ceased, the enthusiasm of British writers was not dampened. For example the whaling firm of Enderby & Co had purchased Captain Harris' patent for making rope from New Zealand flax and they had used these ropes on their vessels throughout the 1830s. They claimed that the ropes were both cheaper and stronger than those manufactured from Russian hemps. Other merchants, in spite of the indifferent results of Royal Navy tests on phormium tenax during the 1830s, claimed that if the flax was well prepared before it left New Zealand for the British and European markets, its popularity would soon be revived. Indeed in 1836 and 1838 it was reported that manufacturers in France and Scotland had shown renewed interest in the New Zealand product.

This optimism was not reflected in improved prices for flax or a revival in the trade. Rather the calls for the improved management of the trade at New Zealand and the increasingly widely publicized promotion of flax as an object of strategic and national importance, became caught up in the wider question of the British colonization of New Zealand. Those who wanted to protect New Zealand's resources of phormium for Britain's use favoured colonization as a means

89. Enderby, evidence, 1838 Report, pp.72, 73, 78.
91. S.H., 28 March 1833.
to that end; those who were committed to the cause of annexing New Zealand to the British Empire gladly added flax to their list of reasons why such a move should not be delayed.

THE DURATION of the peak years of the New Zealand flax trade and some of the monthly and annual variations in New South Wales' imports of phormium resulted from recognised market forces such as price and demand. However it was the changeable trading situation in New Zealand that chiefly determined the trends in the volumes of flax imported into the colony from 1828 to 1840.

Finding extensive sources of high quality flax and perhaps establishing a resident agent in New Zealand were important to the continuation and stability of the trade, yet nothing could be done if Maoris were unwilling to trade or were not interested in scraping flax. Perhaps more than any other commercial undertaking in New Zealand at that time the flax trade required intensive Maori-European co-operation and the success of the trading depended almost entirely on the persons engaged in it. Because of this and because the flax trade was very susceptible to external influences, it highlighted the issues of Maori-European relations and government intervention in trade - issues which will be dealt with in succeeding chapters.
Chapter Three

The Timber Trade 1828-1840

There were two export timber trades carried on at New Zealand during the 1830s – the spar trade and the colonial timber trade.

The former was a risky but potentially highly profitable commercial enterprise engaged in by only a few colonial merchants and was aimed at markets in Britain and South America. The latter involved many merchants and timbermen both in the colonies and around New Zealand and its volume was largely determined by the variable demands for the New Zealand woods on the markets of New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, South Australia and Port Phillip.

The trees which became the spars and timbers of the trade were taken from several places within New Zealand. However the only sites which developed into major timber exporting areas during the 1830s were those which had the essential ingredients of the timber trade – quality woods, people with the facilities and knowledge to prepare the timbers to European specifications and a labour force which was large enough to undertake the felling, sawing and loading of the trees.

DURING THE 1820s spars from New Zealand had been taken to Britain and had performed well in tests conducted in dockyards and aboard naval vessels. As conditions for trading at New Zealand improved generally in the late 1820s so did the opportunities for the spar trade.

Very little is known about this branch of the timber trade. For example no indication can be given of the number of spars that reached Britain or any of the other markets to which they were sent. Neither is it clear what prices were paid for the New Zealand spars. However some indication of the numbers of vessels involved in the 'spar trade' is
given in Appendices 14 and 15.

There were perhaps 18 cargoes sent to London 1829-39 and 6 probably went to South America in the same period. The number of merchants involved in this branch of the trade was even smaller than the few cargoes of spars taken from New Zealand in the 1830s.

Some merchants were involved with only one cargo: for instance John Thomas Wilson's sole commitment was sponsoring the voyage of the Lord Goderich which loaded spars for Rio de Janeiro in 1836. A few New Zealand-based timber merchants were responsible for organising the export of individual cargoes: for example Thomas McDonnell arranged for the collection of the spars aboard the Earl Durham in 1837 and J.R. Clendon loaded and dispatched his own vessel, the Tokerau, when it went to Chile in 1838. However the men with the greatest involvement in the spar trade were the New South Wales merchants Ranulph Dacre (Surrey, Nancy, Bolina) and Richard Jones & Co (John Barry, Pyramus, Coromandel). The Royal Navy also took two cargoes of spars and other naval timbers during the 1830s (HMS Buffalo).

The reason for the relatively low level of interest in the spar trade was the high degree of risk involved in it. To the problems associated with sailing a vessel halfway around the world were added the difficulties presented by the rudimentary state of the timber trade at New Zealand.

Trees destined to be fashioned into spars had to be selected with special care and with a full knowledge of the various qualities required in mast-making. For this reason a merchant either made provision for the prospect that his vessel would be delayed in New Zealand while he or the vessel's master chose the suitable trees (and then had them prepared and loaded) or he took the gamble of using the services of a European timberman who was resident in New Zealand. Moreover masters had to reply on Maoris to assist in loading their vessels. Whenever they chose not to help — whether it was because they had sufficient European goods
for their needs or because the Europeans had offended them in some way - Maoris could limit the profitability of a voyage. For example in 1829 the Roslyn Castle and the Sophia were obliged to sail with partly filled holds because Maoris refused to assist with their loading. Other risks associated with a lengthy stay in New Zealand included the desertion of crewmen and the possibility of being attacked by Maoris.

Having succeeded in loading spars at New Zealand and safely delivering them to the market, the merchant faced a further set of problems which could destroy the purpose of his voyage. These stemmed from the fact that the spar market was a highly specialized and ancient one. Thus the arrival of the New Zealand products was reacted to with caution. It was not possible to be too careful or too selective when purchasing a spar because the safety of a vessel, its cargo and the lives of its crewmen depended on the quality of the timber used in its masts and yards. Mast timbers had to be strong and durable and at the same time were required to be light, flexible and elastic enough not to snap in squalls or during sudden wind changes at sea.

Indeed the art of the mast maker was so refined that, amongst other criteria, he judged the quality of a spar from its colour and smell. Also important were the smoothness of the grain, the ease with which it could be worked and the ability of the stick to retain the gummy resin that is common to conifers and which would prevent a mast from drying out and cracking.

In addition to having these qualities, the spars were also expected to be cut in the proportion of one inch diameter for every one yard in length; bowsprits were proportionately thicker, while yards were expected to be more slender. A slight deviation in the proportion of the diameter to length lowered the value of the stick significantly. Moreover even the smallest knot of rotten wood would cause a

1. S.G., 4 June, 21 July 1829.
2. S.H., 4 July 1833.
potential purchaser to reject a spar. Thus the felling, squaring and presentation of a spar was crucial in determining the price that it would obtain. A 'slight error in felling could render a single stick, potentially worth £100 as a mast, unfit for anything but £15 worth of timber'. Indeed the historian Albion estimated that only one spar in ten thousand was chosen to be fit enough to become a main-mast. 3

Clearly some merchants believed that the risks involved in the spar trade were worth taking. An obvious reason for this was that the return from selling first-class spars could be great. One commentator put their potential value as high as £198. 4 However no sales have been recorded with sufficient detail to support or refute the assertion that New Zealand spars could be worth as much as £200, but the fact that only a few merchants were involved with more than one cargo seems to suggest that their returns were not large.

Far from being induced by the chance of receiving a high price for New Zealand spars most of the merchants who were involved in the New Zealand spar trade were fulfilling the terms of a Royal Navy contract to supply spars. Thus Ranulph Dacre, Thomas McDonnell and Richard Jones & Co all arranged to have cargoes taken from New Zealand on behalf of British firms who had contracted to supply the Navy. 5 The contracts specified the required size for the spars, set a price for the supplying of the same, and determined a time within which the order had to be filled. This removed some of the risk from the spar trade and meant that the merchant

---

4. Nicolls, Memorial Relative to New Zealand, CO201/147, f.186b; H.R.N.Z., I, 606.
5. Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; S.G., 27 July, 18 September 1837.
could concentrate on the problem of getting only the best spars from New Zealand in the knowledge that there was, apparently, a guaranteed market for them in Britain.

Being a party to such a contract reportedly meant that the trade returned a reasonable profit for London merchants. However the colonial merchants who were involved do not appear to have become notably wealthy. For instance Ranulph Dacre was bankrupted in 1842, and Thomas McDonnell did not appear to have been more prosperous when he returned to the Hokianga after delivering a cargo of spars to the United Kingdom.

If the voyages which were sponsored by the Royal Navy, either through the issuing of contracts or the dispatch of H.M.'s vessels to New Zealand are discounted, the spar trade formed a negligible part of New Zealand's commerce in the 1830s. Contemporaries suggested that this was because the New Zealand spars were difficult to sell openly on the British market. Amongst the reasons for this were the high charges for getting the New Zealand woods to Britain. Because of this factor the spars were said to cost 50 percent more than those from rival sources such as Virginia. Other writers felt that the British merchants who were responsible for importing the Russian and North American timbers were actively, and successfully, campaigning against the acceptance of the New Zealand timbers in order to sustain their own monopoly in the task of supplying the Navy. However the major reason for what appears to have been a poor response to New Zealand spars in Britain, and elsewhere in the world, was the variable and generally poor quality of the exported timbers. Colonial merchants, Maoris, and European timbermen

6. A. Hawley to T. Burdekin, 13 April 1837, Burdekin Papers: Records of Burdekin and Hawley 1829-50, Letters Received from Alfred Hawley 1830-September 1837, (NPL/N, MSS 147/86x), p. 125.
8. S.H., 4 July 1833.
resident in New Zealand, were not skilled enough at judging the qualities required for first-class spars. Even a timber­
man of the experience of the Rev. William White appears to 
have been unable to anticipate the market requirements. Thus 
the cargo of 38 spars he selected for the Lord Goderich only 
returned about £650 when they were sold on the Brazilian and 
London markets. ⁹

Although the size and the returns of the New Zealand 
spar trade may have been small, the existence of the trade 
had a significant effect in the decision making which led 
up to the colonization of that country. In Britain, during 
the 1830s, several people were moved to make public comments 
on the future of the trade. For instance Sir William Symonds, 
purveyor-general of the Royal Navy, was said to have regarded 
the New Zealand timbers so highly that he used them whenever 
he could as spars for the Royal Navy. ¹⁰ Moreover even the 
merchants who had criticized the quality of the spars that 
had been imported during the 1830s agreed that, when it was 
properly selected and prepared, the New Zealand product would 
indeed be valuable for masts and other ship timbers. ¹¹ Thus 
timber, like flax, became one of the natural resources that

⁹. J.T. Wilson to F. White, 27 July 1836, Burdekin 
Papers: Records of Burdekin and Hawley 1829-50, Letter­ 
book October 1835-May 1838, (NPL/M, MSS 147/83), 
pp.75-6; B. Burdekin to T. Burdekin, 1 August 1837, 
Burdekin Papers: Records of Burdekin and Hawley 1829-50 
Letters Received from Benjamin Burdekin, 1829-40, 
(NPL/M, MSS 147/85x), p. 273.

¹⁰. Baring, evidence, Report from the Select Committee of 
The House of Lords appointed to enquire into the 
Present State of the Islands of New Zealand and the 
Expediency of regulating the Settlement of British 
Subjects therein, with minutes of evidence, G.B.P.P., 
1837-8, XXI, (680) (123) [hereafter cited as 1838 

¹¹. Nicholas, Montefiore, Enderby, FitzRoy, evidence, 
1838 Report, pp.5, 62, 71, 75, 163.
were frequently referred to as important reasons for the British government to bring the country promptly and irrevocably under Imperial control.

THE TIMBER trade between New Zealand and the colonies of New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, South Australia and Port Phillip was, initially, regarded as a sideline to the export spar trade. For example, in 1823 when Captain Herd of the Providence discovered that the Maoris of Hokianga had cut his largest spars too short - 60 feet instead of 80-90 feet - he contemplated taking the short timbers to Sydney to sell off cheaply and then returning to New Zealand to load spars which were of the requisite length. 12 Similarly in 1835 Thomas McDonnell wrote to his Sydney agents, Jones & Co, informing them of some of the difficulties he faced in fulfilling his spar contract. He noted that after a tree was felled or partly squared it was often found to be defective in some way. His answer for recouping some of the expense of partially preparing the then worthless spar was to cut it into slabs and send it to Sydney for sale as timber. 13 However from the late 1820s many merchants who had no involvement with the spar trade sent vessels to New Zealand to purchase timber for the colonial (and some South Sea Islands) 14 markets.

The trends in the volume of colonial imports of New Zealand timbers and the levels of shipping associated with that trade are shown in Appendices 4, 5, 17 and 18.

The trade grew only slowly in the years 1828-1831; there were several reasons for this. Foremost was the fact that the colonial economies were still recovering from the

12. S.G., 2 January 1823.
14. See Appendix 16.
effects of the general depression of the late 1820s and so the market for timbers to be used in shipbuilding and general construction was also only slowly improving. Those merchants who became heavily involved in the New Zealand timber trade at this time found that their returns did not repay their investment. For example, Thomas Raine and Gordon Browne began the Te Horeke timber and dockyard in 1827. Their primary aims were to export spars to London and to build vessels. However they also appear to have realised the profits to be had from importing the quality softwoods of New Zealand into New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. Thus in January 1828 Browne announced the opening of the 'New Zealand Timber Wharf (Yard)' in George Street, Sydney,

15. Thomas Raine (1793-1860) was an explorer, mariner and Sydney merchant. He will be mentioned frequently in this thesis.

In 1823 Raine, formerly the master of convict ships, settled in Sydney where, in partnership with David Ramsay, he set up in business as a general import-export merchant, shipowner and ship's agent. The firm prospered and became involved in many aspects of colonial, Pacific and Far Eastern commerce. Raine and Ramsay's partnership was dissolved in 1828 and Gordon Browne became associated with Raine in the New Zealand ventures.

In 1831, after his bankruptcy, Raine retired to his farm at Bathurst, gradually disposed of his mercantile interests and became a farmer.

Thomas Raine's biographer, H.E. Maude, commented that 'Raine stood out among his colleagues for his imagination in visualizing the commercial possibilities of new localities, products and trade routes and his technical ability to exploit them'. Thus, for example, the only thing wrong in his calculation of the prospects of the New Zealand timber trade and the station at Te Horeke was his failure to sustain his credit-worthiness or to find sufficient capital to remain solvent in the depression of the late 1820s - The Australian Dictionary of Biography, 1788-1850, ed. D. Pike 2 vols, Melbourne, 1966, 1967, II, 359-60.
a business that was to specialize in the marketing of New Zealand woods.  

Sales were slow but the signs were encouraging, and in April 1829 the Sydney Gazette applauded the Te Horeke venture as a 'Bold and spirited undertaking'. However by June 1830 both Raine and Browne were faced with financial difficulties and in 1831 they were obliged to sell Te Horeke and to close the yard in Sydney.

The other major factor in the slow growth of the trade in the late 1820s was that timber had a rival for cargo space on trans-Tasman vessels – New Zealand flax. The boom years of the phormium trade were 1828-1831 and because large profits could be made through re-exporting this product to Britain very little interest was shown in New Zealand resources which could not be re-exported from the colonies. For example, in contrast to imports of flax at this time, very little New Zealand timber was re-exported from New South Wales. From 6 July 1830 to 5 July 1831 New South Wales imports of New Zealand timbers – oars, deals and spars – were valued at £2204. About 7 percent of them were re-exported (apparently to Van Diemen's Land) while 62 percent of the flax imported during the same period was sent on to markets outside New South Wales.

In 1832 the numbers of cargoes of New Zealand woods which were entered at colonial ports and the value of timber imported from New Zealand were almost twice the equivalent 1831 figures. One reason for this was the sudden decline in the flax trade boom about mid-1832. The merchants who had committed their vessels, men and money to trading at New Zealand that year and who came to believe that collecting

17. S.G., 25 April 1829. See also S.G., 10 December 1828.
18. S.G., 1 April, 1 June 1830.
Phormium would not repay their investment, turned their attention to importing other New Zealand products - including timber. This would also appear to explain why most of the timber cargoes were entered in the latter months of 1832 and why 1832 was, until 1839, the year in which most cargoes of timber were entered into the colonies.

The increase in timber importing from 1832 also reflected the upturn in the colonial economies. The middle and later 1830s were years of growth and expansion in the colonies of the Australian continent. The European population there increased on the average at the rate of 10.52 percent per year. The population growth of some colonies was spectacular. For example the population of Port Phillip grew from 224 Europeans in 1836 to 10291 in 1841. In consequence the physical size of the colonies increased and in the larger urban centres new industries were established to service the needs of the increased population. Thus flour mills, brass and iron foundries, shipbuilding yards, soap works and breweries opened up in Sydney, while in Hobart and Launceston shipbuilding and the associated industries of sail-making and rope-making, and saw milling became the predominant local industries. This general expansion increased the demand for imported goods of all kinds and New South Wales imports, for example, rose in value by more than 500 per cent in the years 1831-1840.

The growth in the trans-Tasman timber trade was a part of this general increase in importing and was, specifically, a response to the demand for timbers to sustain the boom in residential, commercial and vessel construction. Indeed the monthly and annual variations in the number of timber cargoes entered at colonial ports from New Zealand can be explained almost solely in terms of the rise and fall of the colonial demand for the product.

In 1833 the volume of colonial imports of New Zealand timber rose by 23 percent. This increase in the exports of wood resulted in its becoming a scarce and expensive commodity in New Zealand. For instance there was very little wood for sale in the Bay of Islands when the Emerald called in April 1834, and the price which was being demanded for it exceeded the price of the equivalent product on the contemporary American market. However, in the same year, Markham found that sawn planks of New Zealand pine were 'very cheap' in the colonies.

There was a 48 percent decrease in the annual value of colonial imports of New Zealand timbers in 1834. This apparent decrease is partly accounted for by a fall in the prices paid for the product from an average of 4½d per foot during 1832 to 2d per foot in April 1834. The number of cargoes containing New Zealand woods entered at New South Wales also declined that year. However in Van Diemen's Land the market was expanding. In May 1834 the Hobart Town Courier reported a 'rage' for building in Hobart which was being fuelled by the increase in the imports of New Zealand timber. The same 'rage' for building apparently made New Zealand pine very scarce in Launceston in October 1834 despite cargoes

23. Emerald, log, (PAMBU 223), frames 025, 140.
26. L.A. 10 April 1834; S.G., 1 May 1834.
27. H.T.C., 2 May 1834.
being entered there in March, June and September which totalled nearly 100,000 feet. The large quantity which arrived at Launceston on the *John Dunscombe* in January 1835 probably went some way to satisfying the local demand and by May New Zealand pine could again be purchased in Hobart at 2d per superficial foot.

It seems that the diversion of timber to Van Diemen's Land in 1834 and early 1835 created a shortage in New South Wales. While there was a marked increase in the number of cargoes containing timber which were entered at Sydney during 1835, not enough wood was imported to satisfy that colony's demands. This was the message contained in a letter from the Sydney merchant John Thomas Wilson to the Bay of Islands trader Captain John Wright which was written in October 1835. Apparently only two New South Wales merchants, Ranulph Dacre and W.H. Chapman, had any New Zealand timber on hand at the time of writing, and they only had a little. Wilson therefore urged Wright to send some timber over as soon as possible. The shortage was not relieved during 1836, probably because a large amount of timber was also imported into Van Diemen's Land that year. Thus in October 1836 Thomas Burdekin, who had taken over J.T. Wilson's mercantile affairs in Sydney, wrote to Francis White, a timber trader in the Hokianga, informing him that good timber was selling at high prices and that he had sold a cargo recently sent over by White for 1s per foot.

The number of cargoes containing timber and the quantities of wood entered at colonial ports from New Zealand declined markedly in 1837. There were a number of possible reasons for this. New South Wales had imported a lot of wood during 1836 and by the end of that year some merchants there

32. Burdekin to White, 5 October 1836, (NPL/M, MSS 147/83), pp.89-90.
had large stocks on hand. Abraham Polack, for instance, had 65,000 feet of kauri in his yard in December 1836.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover 1837 was the first of the boom years for imports of black whale products into New South Wales. Thus colonial vessels appear to have been diverted from other branches of the trans-Tasman trade as every effort was made to get the valuable whale products to their markets.

The size of the fall in imports into Van Diemen's Land in 1837 is, in part, illusory. Although all the accounts of Van Diemen's Land imports for that year claimed that nothing was imported into that colony from New Zealand, at least one cargo of New Zealand timber entered Hobart in 1837 for in January the Brazil Packet landed 127,000 feet of wood.\textsuperscript{34} Despite the existence of this large cargo, imports of the New Zealand products and the demand for them were still lower in 1837 than at any other time during the decade. This was, apparently, partly the result of a slump in the building industry throughout Van Diemen's Land - a slump which lasted, in Launceston at least, until late in 1838.

Events in New Zealand provided another contributory cause of the decline in the volumes of imports. The Pomare-Titore war, which involved Maoris from the major timber exporting regions, was fought during March-July 1837 and in consequence little work appears to have been done in the trade in those months.\textsuperscript{35} However they seem to have returned to their work later in the year for early in 1838 a large number of vessels arrived in the colonies with cargoes of wood.

\textsuperscript{33} S.G., 17 December 1836.
\textsuperscript{34} H.T.G.T.L., 9 February 1837.
\textsuperscript{35} Beecham citing Rev. N. Turner, evidence, 1838 Report, p. 293; Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 28 March 1837, CO209/1, f.313b-317a; L.M. Rogers, Te Wirēmu: A Biography of Henry Williams, Christchurch, 1973, pp.133-5.
This sudden upsurge in imports saturated an already dull market. In consequence the price of timber in Launceston began to fall. Logs and planks dropped in price from 3d per foot in March to 2½d in July (although during May when no cargoes arrived the price was raised to 3½d) and boards fell from a peak of 4½d per foot in March to 3d in July. 36 The effects of the glut were also observed on the Sydney market. The merchant Richard Dawson was selling 'New Zealand Pine' at discounted prices in February 37 and two large quantities of kauri were auctioned (presumably to quit them) in October, although there had been only two small cargoes of New Zealand timbers entered at New South Wales since April that year. 38

The trade revived in 1839 largely because the construction needs of the new colonies of South Australia and Port Phillip created a fresh demand for New Zealand timbers. Thus the Gem, True Love and Earl Stanhope were all reported in the Hokianga loading timber for Port Phillip in September 1839. 39 There was also a renewed building boom in Launceston. 40 As a result the price of New Zealand pine rose to 3d per foot for logs and 4d for boards — prices which it retained throughout the year. 41 In New South Wales, where the population had increased by 9764 during 1838, 42 there was a scarcity of cedar and other colonial woods and this increased the demand for New Zealand imports. Thus by September 4d per foot was being demanded for New Zealand lumber in Sydney. 43

37. S.G., 24 February 1838.
40. C.C., 8 June 1839; Colonist, 29 June 1839.
41. C.C., 12 January 1839; L.G.T.L., 6 July 1839.
42. Colonist, 16 January 1839.
43. S.G., 30 September 1839.
It is therefore not surprising that, as a result of these demands, timber was reportedly in short supply in the Hokianga – the major timber exporting area – in September 1839.44

This picture of a lively and buoyant trans-Tasman timber trade belied the fact that the colonial market was nonetheless a relatively small one. No colonial merchant appears to have grown rich on the proceeds of this trade. The small size of the market, therefore, imposed limits on the overall extent of the timber trade. The demand for the New Zealand product was also affected by the quality of the wood that arrived in the colonies.

Save for the needs of the very small trans-Tasman spar trade, the requirements of the colonial timber market were not as exacting as those for the international spar trade. Nonetheless the products fetched a higher price if they were well presented. Some merchants preferred to import slabs of kauri or other roughly hewn lumber which could be sawn to their specifications in Sydney or Hobart.45 However this procedure was an expensive one because the cost of preparing the wood in the colonies was considerably higher than in New Zealand46 and because the outlay involved in shipping whole trees was greater than for transporting sawn timbers.

The preferred alternative, where this was possible, was to prepare the timbers in New Zealand. This also had its drawbacks. Colonial merchants would supply their New Zealand agents with details of the marketable sizes and quantities of timber.47 However the inexperience of many of the European and, especially, the Maori sawyers, meant that it was often difficult for a New Zealand-based agent to ensure

44. C.C., 28 September 1839.
46. S.H., 4 July 1833.
47. See, for example, Wilson to Wright, 4 April 1836, Wilson to White, n.d. /25 March 1836/, (NPL/M, MSS 147/83), pp. 39, 52.
that a cargo would meet the colonial standards. This in turn meant that a cargo would not attract premium prices and thus the returns for both merchants and agents were seriously diminished. 48 Moreover the colonial merchant often could not be sure that all his cargoes would be composed of the produce of the most favoured species of native trees.

While most contemporary descriptions of the species of New Zealand woods that entered colonial ports were rarely more exact than 'New Zealand timber' or 'New Zealand pine' it appears that the most commonly imported timbers were the kauri (Agathis australis) and the kahikatea or white pine (Podocarpus dacydioides). While both these softwoods were easier to work with than the native hardwoods in the colonies, the preferred species was the kauri.

Kauri timbers were renowned for their durability and beauty. Joel Polack believed that a house constructed of that wood was solid for at least 50 years. 49 However kauri timbers were difficult, and were thus expensive, to obtain. For instance the trees did not grow everywhere in New Zealand. Moreover they were usually found on hill sides and far away from the water's edge. 50 This meant that the huge hewn trunks would have to be dragged, often several miles, across rugged terrain before they could be loaded onto a vessel.

As a consequence it would seem that the kahikatea was the most commonly imported species. This was unfortunate for the development of the trade because kahikatea timbers were inferior to those of the kauri for the purposes for which the New Zealand products were being used in the colonies. The white pine proved, for example, to be a non-durable wood which was attacked by borer and white ants. Also when it was used for planking in an unseasoned state it contracted and expanded with changes in temperature and humidity. 51 Yet despite the fact that colonial merchants

48. For example Burdekin to White, n.d. [20 August 1836], (NPL/M, MSS 147/83), p. 84.
knew that kahikatea was an inferior wood large quantities of it were imported throughout the 1830s.\textit{52}

There appear to have been several reasons for the continued importation of white pine. Foremost was the fact that it grew on swampy land and close to rivers and streams. Thus it could be transported to vessels and loaded quickly without excessive effort and, if necessary, with only limited assistance from Maoris.\textit{53} Also because kauri and kahikatea are very similar in outwards appearance inexperienced traders were apt to confuse the two and take the white pine when they thought that they had kauri.\textit{54} However even after sawyers took up residence in New Zealand kahikatea continued to be exported to the colonies. This was because the sawyers preferred to work with it. Kahikateas were more prolific than kauris and so were often the trees which were nearest to the sawyers' pits. Moreover the white pine was the softer of the two species and was therefore quicker and easier to prepare for export.\textit{55}

However kauri and kahikatea were not the only timbers or wood products exported from New Zealand during the 1830s. Several other species were known and used both in the colonies and in New Zealand.\textit{56} For example a


\textit{56}. See, for example, \textit{[W.White]}, Important Information Relative to New Zealand ..., Sydney, 1839, pp.33-4.
European sawyer at the Bay of Islands, when questioned by D'Urville in 1827, described five timbers with which he was familiar, and Polack cited 45 different species of native trees on which he passed judgement as to their value and use in his New Zealand (1838).57

Moreover colonial merchants used New Zealand woods for more than constructing buildings and vessels. For instance in September 1831, probably in response to an acute shortage of casks in New South Wales, the Sydney firm of W. Walker & Co began making barrels from New Zealand timbers.58 Similarly, by 1836, the Wellers were employing sawyers at their whaling stations in New Zealand to fashion staves and to prepare other timbers, including kowhai, for exporting to the colonies.59

A small export trade in kauri gum was also carried on during the 1820s and 1830s. This gum is formed when the resin exuded by the kauri hardens on exposure to air. The first export shipment left New Zealand aboard the Brothers in 1814 but although cargoes of gum were exported to Britain60 and the colonies during the 1830s it did not find a ready market. This was apparently because it required too much oil to dissolve it and to make it useful for caulking boats or houses. The major purchasers of kauri gum before the 1850s were the Americans who paid a penny per pound for it. However they did not disclose what they were using it for.61

59. G. Weller to E. Weller, 29 February 1836, 29 August 1837, G. Weller, Correspondence with E. Weller and Others, Chiefly Concerning their Whaling Industry at Otago, New Zealand, 1832-61, (NPL/M, A 1609); Advertisement, S.H., 15 February 1836.
60. The Pyramus, for example, took some gum there in 1837—S.G., 14 February 1837.
61. Markham, p. 63; An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, II, 206-7.
MAP 2
PRINCIPAL SITES IN NEW ZEALAND FROM WHICH TIMBER WAS EXPORTED 1828 - 1839
Thus the colonial merchants' demands for New Zealand timbers never reached the almost frenzied state induced by the prospects of the phormium trade because, apart from the problems of ensuring the quality of the products, the market for them was limited to the quantities which could be used in the colonies.

THE RIVER Hokianga and the Firth of Thames were the major sources of the timber which was exported from New Zealand during the 1830s. However cargoes of wood were also regularly taken from the bays and islands of the Hauraki Gulf, Kaipara Harbour, Whangaroa Harbour and Mangonui Harbour. Other harbours like Whaingaroa (now known as Raglan), Manukau, Ngunguru and Tutukaka were visited by only a few timber traders, while for Bay of Islands settlers and several South Island whaling stations, exporting lumber provided a useful supplement to an income which was mainly derived from other sources.

The distribution of the timber exporting sites around New Zealand is largely a reflection of the requirements of the two timber trades of this period. Both were labour-intensive activities; thus a prime requisite at any site was a sufficient labour force. Usually it was the spar trade, with its endless search for that one tree in ten thousand which might make a mainmast, that was responsible for the earliest European visits to most of these harbours. However the needs of the spar trade were not alone sufficient to sustain the work of a timber station and it was only because of the demands of the colonial timber trade that most stations were maintained or expanded. In addition, the residence of at least some Europeans at a site appeared to be essential if the merchant was to ensure a regular supply of quality timbers.

62. Browne to Darling, 24 April 1831, ADM 1/4248, pp. 1, 4, 6, 7; Bell to Dumaresq, 20 November 1831, CO201/223, f. 361b.

63. See Map 2 opposite.
Most of the sites indicated on the map were visited only occasionally before 1840. For instance the sole reference to timber being taken from Whaingaroa found in the Sydney press came in a report that the Ann had been attacked by local Maoris while it was loading spars in 1838. Similarly, by the late 1830s only a few vessels were reported as having been to the Manukau Harbour to collect timber. This was despite the fact that both traders and missionaries were resident there from about the middle of the decade. For instance Thomas Mitchell (not the Hokianga timberman), who lived at Puponga Point near the north head of the harbour from 1835 to 1839, prepared his own cargoes of timber which he shipped to New South Wales. However the probable reason traders did not regularly visit the Manukau for timber was that there were too few Maoris living there to facilitate the rapid loading of a vessel. The other infrequently visited harbours were Ngunguru and Tutukaka where the Buffalo collected spars in 1838, and Whangarei where European visits and the prosecution of the timber trade were only occasional before 1840.

Other places had chequered histories as timber export points during the 1830s. Mahurangi Bay in the Hauraki Gulf was first settled by a party of Europeans on 23 May 1832. The group of eight sawyers/carpenters was led by Gordon Davies Browne with Joseph Kendall as his assistant. Ranulph Dacre, 64.

S.H., 3 April 1838; Colonial, 7 April 1838.


as a part of his effort to fill an Admiralty spar contract, was the sponsor of the establishment. The station seemed to be doomed from the start. The local Maoris proved to be unreliable as assistants because they were frequently attacked or were afraid of an attack from their Ngapuhi and Ngatiwhatua enemies, with whom they had been almost constantly at war from 1828. Another consequence of the warfare was that local food supplies were low and although supplies could be brought from the Bay of Islands the Europeans were often forced to survive on fern roots. As well as these discomforts it was found that the only suitable spars were at least half a mile from the water and had to be dragged there with much labour. Despite these difficulties the first cargo of 43 masts and 238 loads of timber was ready to be sent to London by August 1833.

After this initial cargo it is difficult to ascertain how many spars and how much timber was exported from Mahurangi. Separating fact and fiction from Browne's correspondence with Dacre, the only source of such information, is impossible. For instance Dacre and Browne both claimed that one reason for the eventual failure of the Mahurangi station arose from the actions of the men of HMS Buffalo in 1834. The Buffalo visited the harbour in search of spars and, according to Dacre and Browne, took the best trees, including those intended for and laying at their establishment. At the same time, the merchants charged, the naval officers overpaid the Maoris for their work and this made it impossible for Browne, later, to get them to work for less. The settlement struggled on until late in 1836 when the men who were working there shifted to the Mercury Bay station.  

67. On Dacre see Appendix 19.

68. Dacre to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 18 October 1832, NZ: British Resident: In Letters, 1833-1840 2 vols, (WARC, BRL/1); Dacre to Brooks, 2 July 1832, n.d.  [7 February 18337, (NPL/M, uncat. MSS Set 309); Dacre, OLC 156/76a; Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; R.M. Ross, 'European Trade and Settlement in New Zealand before 1840', Post Primary School Bulletin, VI, no. 7, 1952, 130-8.
Some stations, like Mangonui in Doubtless Bay, were begun for the spar trade in the early 1830s but were mainly known for their supplying of the colonial timber trade. On 14 October 1831 John Skelton, master of Ranulph Dacre's schooner Darling, sailed from Sydney with a five man party. They were to be landed at Mangonui to cut spars for Dacre's Admiralty contract. However after a house had been built and the sawyers landed, it was found that the trees there were too short for spars. Skelton therefore abandoned the station and took the men to Mercury Bay on 14 November.

Skelton had purchased land at Mangonui for Dacre and in April 1832 Dacre allowed two of his sawyers, Thomas Ryan and James Berghan, to return to Mangonui and live there as his tenants. Sawn timbers were exported from Mangonui throughout the 1830s and at least eleven sawyers were residing there in 1839. Mangonui was also a popular port for the refitting and supplying of whaling vessels for it had no grogshops to entice sailors to desert.69

Other harbours and areas from which some timber was taken before 1840 became major centres in the timber trade in the years after colonization. One such was Kaipara. The existence of that harbour had been known to Europeans for a number of years before the first timber was taken from it.

69. Busby Census, J. Busby, Despatches of the British Resident in New Zealand, 1833-40, (WTu, qMS, BUS); Dacre, OLC 155/76; Dacre to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; Berghan, OLC 259, 258a-h/558-566; S.H., 6 September 1832; S.G., 15 October 1836; R.G. Jameson, New Zealand, South Australia and New South Wales ..., London, 1842, pp.179-80.
For instance in 1820 Samuel Marsden made two visits to Kaipara and Joel Polack visited the area in 1831 and 1832. Moreover Gordon Browne knew enough about the Harbour to describe it accurately to Governor Darling in April 1831 and it appears that J.R. Kent, in the Lord Liverpool, and Ranulph Dacre, in the Surrey, both entered the Harbour in search of spars in 1832. However until 1836 it was generally assumed that loaded vessels could not safely cross the Kaipara Harbour bar. On 23 November 1835 Thomas McDonnell, in the Tui, sailed into the Kaipara Harbour and was followed, on 6 January 1836, by the Fanny with the Rev. William White, Thomas Mitchell of the Hokiang and George Stephenson aboard. They were searching for spars and McDonnell laid claim to large numbers of trees by marking them with a broad arrow and stating that they were reserved for the King while White settled Stephenson as a trader/sawyer at Rahurahu, in the northern part of the Harbour.

However before 1840 the Kaipara did not have a large enough population to support an intensive timber industry. Late in 1839 William White claimed that there were only six


71. Polack, New Zealand, I, Chapters 3-7.


75. Stephenson, OLC 407, 407a/976-7; Ross, 'McDonnell' (WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 4), p. 121.
or seven Europeans there, inclusive of the Wesleyan missionaries who had established a station in the Kaipara in June 1836. There were also very few Maoris resident in the district because the local population had not recovered from the devastation of Hongi Hika's raids in the 1820s. Although three vessels loaded cargoes in the Kaipara in 1839, the Rev. James Buller gave it as his opinion, in the same year, that there was 'no commerce in the whole district'. It was not until well after 1840, when the European population reached a sizeable number, that the Kaipara achieved its prominence as the timber harbour from which, it was claimed, more kauri was exported than from 'all other parts of the colony combined'.

Whangaroa was similarly stunted in its growth as a timber exporting area during the 1830s although kauri spars that had been taken from there in the 1820s had been highly regarded. One reason for the delay in the exportation of timber from Whangaroa was that after the sacking of the WMS station in 1827 and with memories of the Boyd massacre still lingering, few Europeans were enthusiastic about settling or trading in that Harbour. However by 1836 there were 23 sawyers and carpenters in residence and there were probably several more by 1840. A second factor in the delay was that, until 1837, Europeans experienced difficulties when trading in that Harbour. The reason for this was that Whangaroa was under the tutelage of Titore, a Bay of Islands chief. Titore was keen to ensure that vessels came to his home port of

76. The Success, Colonist, 7 August 1839; the Samuel Cunard, S.H., 11 September 1839; the Navarino, S.H., 27 December 1839.


78. Busby Census, (WTu, qMS BUS).
Kororareka to purchase their supplies and so he attempted to limit the number of vessels that traded at Whangaroa. For instance in 1834 he managed to obstruct the process of loading HMS Buffalo at that Harbour until he was given a part in the proceedings. 79 Indeed only coasters, like the Emma, seemed to freely sail into Whangaroa. The owners of these coasters lived under Titore's protection in the Bay of Islands and so, in return for this concession, Titore was able to use both the merchants and their vessels for his own purposes. 80 After Titore's death in May 1837 81 the restriction on access to Whangaroa Harbour appears to have been lifted, for seven whalers were reported to be purchasing supplies there in June of that year. 82

Whangaroa had another disadvantage. The most suitable trees were to be found well away from the water and unless Maori help was forthcoming it was difficult to load a vessel. Thus it was not until more European settlers arrived after 1840, in particular the large number of immigrants who arrived in the Lancashire Witch in 1865, that the Whangaroa kauri and kauri-gum industries expanded. 83

The timber trade did not get under way in the Thames/Coromandel area until the mid-1830s. This was because there was a near constant state of warfare in the region from 1829 to 1835. Most Europeans believed that it was impossible to safely settle among the local Maoris and those who tried it were rebuffed. For instance the sawyers from Ranulph Dacre's settlement at Doubtless Bay established a station at Mercury Bay in November 1831. In the process the schooner Darling,

79. Sadler to Busby, 11 December 1833, (WArc, BR 1/1).
80. See for example Henry Southern, statement, enclosed in Busby to Colonial Secretary, 10 October 1835, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1836, (AONSW, 4/2326.2, item 35/8736).
81. Elder, Marsden, p. 524.
82. S.H., 24 August 1837.
83. An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, III, 645.
in which they had arrived, sank and the Thames Maoris used this as an excuse to attack the station. The men escaped aboard another vessel but property worth £1200 was lost in the raid.\footnote{Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81.}

However after the establishment of peace in 1835 Gordon Browne decided to set up a station in Mercury Bay primarily to produce spars. By early in 1836 he was apparently employing groups of sawyers there as well as at his struggling station in Mahurangi Bay, and in the Coromandel Harbour. Another 30 sawyers arrived in Mercury Bay after the closure of the Mahurangi station in 1836.\footnote{Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; R.M. Ross, pp.132-8; Busby Census, (WTu, qMS BUS).} In addition to safely establishing a European settlement at Mercury Bay Browne had also managed to persuade local Maoris to remove a tapu which forbade the taking of trees from a large local forest, and this ensured that he had a ready and valuable source of export timbers. Several large spar and sawn timber cargoes were shipped from Mercury Bay and by 1840 Dacre and Browne had erected £4000 worth of buildings there. These buildings included a sawmill and a stone wharf.\footnote{Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; Simpson, pp.40-2.} Timber production at Mercury Bay continued to increase after the arrival of more settlers in the 1840s and following the formation of Mercury Bay Timber Company.\footnote{E. and V. Grayland, \textit{Coromandel Coast}, Wellington, 1965, p. 51.}

It is not certain how long Browne drew on Coromandel as well as Mercury Bay for his spars and timber. However, shortly after his arrival in 1835, William Webster, apparently in connection either with Ranulph Dacre or another New South Wales merchant William Abercrombie, acquired a monopoly over timber production in the Firth of Thames, Coromandel Harbour, and the Hauraki Gulf area (including Waiheke, Ponui, Great Barrier and Great Mercury Islands).\footnote{J. Logan Campbell, \textit{Poenamo}, London, 1881, (Whitcombe and Tombs, reprint, 1953), pp.22-3; S.G., 28 January 1840.} Webster's endeavours,

\footnote{84. Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81.  
85. Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; R.M. Ross, pp.132-8; Busby Census, (WTu, qMS BUS).  
86. Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 4 February 1841, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; Simpson, pp.40-2.  
like those of Browne, were highly successful and the Thames/Coromandel region was second only to the Hokianga in export timber production in the late 1830s.

Webster's success was a result of several factors. When Dr Jameson visited Coromandel in 1841 he noted that Webster was 'able to command a sufficiency of that element of all colonial success, labour'. Webster had gangs of Maoris engaged on dragging out the timber and 15-20 European sawyers and general hands to run his establishment and prepare his timber. 89 This level of assistance was particularly necessary in the Coromandel area because there the kauris grew on hill sides and well away from the water. Referring to his visit to Coromandel, another colonist, Charles Terry, described how spars, which would have weighed in excess of 100 tons, had to be dragged up and down two ravines before they were put in a river for floating to the coast. 90 A similar problem had to be faced in the Thames/Waihou area. There the exploitation of the timber nearest to the sea and rivers had been so intensive by 1839 that a traveller, John Bidwell, described the landscape as 'quite denuded'. He predicted that in ten years most of the easily taken timber would have gone and that the trade would die because it would be unprofitable to retrieve the trees that were left. 91 In fact timber continued to be the major export from the Thames/Coromandel area until the gold rush of 1852. 92

All the major timber producing sites had factors in common. They were, for example, all within the area where the kauri grew. John Tawell, when giving evidence before the Lords' Committee, stated that the 'Timber Trade does not exist to the Southwards'. By this he presumably meant that there was nothing of the scale he had seen in the Hokianga. 93 Also in all these places the trees were, at least initially, reasonably accessible and able to be taken to waiting vessels without too much delay.

Another ingredient in the success of sites was a large and acquiescent Maori population. While the Europeans may have been the directors of the trade, the viability of the commerce depended on Maori labour. For instance the consent of local Maoris had to be obtained before any trees could be cut. Then, generally, it was the Maoris who provided the labour force of the trade. Their role was usually confined to dragging a felled tree to the water's edge or to a saw pit and, after it was cut up by European sawyers, it was the Maoris who floated the wood to the vessel and helped to load it aboard. 94 Some Maoris, however, particularly those in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga region, also felled the trees, 95 while others became expert sawyers and timber traders in their

93. Tawell, evidence, 1838 Report, p. 119. The Helen, for example, took 381 logs of 'New Zealand white pine' from the Cook Strait area in 1832 - S.H., 28 February 1833; S.G., 7, 14 May 1833.

94. For examples of the Maoris' role see: Sadler to Busby, 11 December 1833, (BR 1/1): W.J. Lewington to G. Mair, 4 June 1840, 26 January 1841, Mair Papers, (AP, NZMSS157) Dacre to Brooks, 20 April 1832, (NPL/M, uncat. MSS Set 309); J.L. Campbell, pp.43-5; Polack, Manners, I, 168-9; Charles Terry cited Simpson, pp.44-5.

95. Polack, Manners, I, 168.
own right. \textsuperscript{96} On the whole the Maoris in the timber producing areas insisted that Europeans use their services. \textsuperscript{97} Where a European master refused Maori assistance in loading his vessel the process of stowing the cargo was so slow that what he saved in payments to Maoris he lost in demurrage charges. \textsuperscript{98}

The most important factor in the success of any station, however, was the size of its European population. To the Europeans fell the tasks of selecting the desired trees, preparing the timber to meet market specifications, arranging for cargoes to be ready when vessels arrived, and repairing or sharpening the axes, saws, ropes, pulleys and the other equipment that were necessary for securing a tree from the bush.

Because it had all these advantages, in abundance, the Hokianga River was the most important and most productive source of New Zealand timber exports before 1840.

When Ensign McCrae entered the Hokianga River in 1820 he was amazed to find the largest kauris growing right on the water's edge and he commented that shipping them would not have presented the problems of loading which were being encountered in the Bay of Islands and Whangaroa by his vessel HMS \textit{Dromedary}. \textsuperscript{99} As well as the kauri several other New Zealand native trees were to be found growing in the Hokianga. One

\textsuperscript{96} Maori timber traders and sawyers are named or described in: W. Yate, \textit{An Account of New Zealand}, introd. J. Binney, Wellington, 1970, pp. 254-280; J. Buller to Miss Dawes, 2 January 1837, J. Buller, \textit{Correspondence}, 1837-9, (NLA, MS 4020 NK2231, typescript), p. 12; S.G., 9 January 1819; Markham, p. 82; Blackett, evidence, \textit{Report from the Select Committee on New Zealand; together with Minutes of Evidence \ldots}, G.B.P.P., 1840, VII, (582), p. 68.

\textsuperscript{97} This was the case in Tamaki- Flatt, evidence, 1838 \textit{Report}, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{98} Dacre to Brooks, 22 September 1832, (MPL/M, uhc.cat. MS Set 309).

\textsuperscript{99} McCrae, evidence, B.T. Box 11, p.4479; H.R.N.Z., J, 5 35; also Abstract from the \textit{Report upon the Timbers of Van Deiman's Land, New South Wales \& New Zealand}, by Mr. Mart Carpenter of H.M.S. \textit{Ship Dromedary}, CO201/129, f. 351b.
natural disadvantage the River did have, however, was the
dangerous bar at its mouth. But the difficulties associated
with crossing it were overcome to some extent by the residence
there of a pilot, John Martin, from 1828.

There was a large Maori population in the Hokianga
area. Beecham told the Lords' Committee that the WMS mission-
aries had concluded that 5000-6000 Maoris lived there. From
the first these people were known for their enthusiastic support
of European merchants and their devotion to hard work. Also,
to the European observers at least, the chiefs in that area
appeared to retain a tight control over their people and this
enabled them to more effectively direct the work of loading
vessels. Moreover after 1828 there was only one major
outbreak of warfare in the Hokianga area. This meant that the
only delays to loading vessels seem to have occurred when the
Maoris were attending to their cultivations or else were
reportedly too ill to work.

The Hokianga River also had a comparatively large
European population. Of the 90 adult European males resident
there in 1838, 72 were probably directly connected with the
timber trade. In addition, it was claimed, many of the
forests in the River were owned by Europeans. Thus

101. R.A. Cruise, Journal of a Ten Months' Residence in
New Zealand /1820/, ed. A.G. Bagnall, Christchurch,
1957, pp.57-72.
102. McDonnell to R. Jones & Co, 17 September 1835, (NPL/M,
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from Busby to his brother Alexander, 1830-9,(WTu, qMS
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103. Busby, Census,(WTu, qMS BUS).
vessels calling at the Hokiaanga were almost certain of obtaining a cargo and sometimes they may even have had a choice of timbermen from whom to purchase the timber.105 Also, with such a large European population resident on the River, visiting vessels could be fairly certain that they would not be attacked by Maoris.

For these reasons the Hokiaanga appears, as far as the data allow for any estimation, to have been the source of 50-60 percent of the timber cargoes exported from New Zealand between 1828 and 1839, and the source of nearly all the timber cargoes entered at Hobart and Launceston from New Zealand in the same period.

THE EXPORT trade in New Zealand timbers 1828-1840 was restricted. Too little was known about the native woods and that which was known was often detrimental. The market for spars was an age old one and the intricacies of it effectively debarred the sale of a product which fell even fractionally short of the prescribed dimensions and quality of preparation. Moreover the sawn timber trade only operated within the confines of expanding, but limited, colonial markets. The key to advancing the timber trade lay in upgrading the methods of production at

105. See, for example, Wilson to Clendon, 25 March 1836, and Wilson to Wright, n.d. /25 March 1836/, (NPL/M, MSS 147/83), pp. 37, 40-1.
New Zealand and this required, above all, the residence of skilled European sawyers and timber merchants. Therefore it seemed to the Europeans involved in the trade and the commentators who strove to forecast a future for New Zealand, that the only way to realise the apparently limitless potential of the timber trade was to encourage more European settlers to reside there. And the most effective way to do this, they argued, was to bring New Zealand into the British Empire and to sponsor the colonization of the country.
Chapter Four

Resident Europeans and the Timber and Flax Trade

The reputation of the Europeans who lived in New Zealand as timber and flax traders before 1840 could scarcely be worse. For a variety of reasons they have been characterized as lawless, immoral and anti-missionary ne'er-do-wells.

Looking behind the image, however, it seems that a variety of Europeans were motivated to engage in the trade and for numerous reasons. Moreover the life they led while in New Zealand was neither as solitary nor as uncontrolled as has been portrayed. Most of them appear to have lived in the larger European settlements and, by the mid-1830s, few of them would have been more than one day's travel from another European. Also the traders appear to have striven, within the limits of their physical environment, to retain or to recreate the semblance of a life similar to that they had known before leaving the colonies or Great Britain. Significantly, too, while they resided in New Zealand the traders found it necessary to conform to, or at least to heed, social controls which were derived from the conventions, customs and regulations of two societies - Maori and European.

The successful trader was able to adapt to the physical and social environment of pre-1840 New Zealand and, within those limits, he sought out a living for himself and his dependants, and a profit for his employer.¹

¹ To avoid confusion European sawyers, carpenters, axemen and other labourers of the timber trade will be referred to collectively as timbermen; the resident middlemen of the trade who may never have sawn a log but made their living from selling timber or flax will be termed merchants; and those residents who were involved with flax will be called collectors.
THE TARNISHED image of the European traders has derived from a variety of sources and particularly from the bias in contemporary statements about conditions in New Zealand. Although they did it for different reasons, most of the colonial and British commentators, journalists, missionaries and people whose opinions 'counted' used any and every occasion they could to denigrate the traders.

Those people who were called as witnesses before Parliamentary Committees, for example, used the opportunity to maintain the false impression that the Europeans in New Zealand formed a lawless and disreputable society. They appear to have done this in order to impress upon the British and colonial governments the supposedly urgent need to colonize New Zealand or at least to protect the few responsible and respectable Europeans who lived there. For example Joel Polack, who had felt obliged to leave New Zealand because he believed that his life was in danger, told the 1838 Lords' Committee that the state of the manners and morals of Europeans in New Zealand was 'decidedly bad'. He asserted that the only two respectable European residents in that country were his friends J.J. Montefiore and Captain Powditch. Charles Enderby, the whaling magnate, was equally scathing. He wanted more government control exerted in New Zealand so his evidence stressed the disruptive effect that uncontrolled European settlement was having on his whaling interests there. He claimed that only the worst types amongst his sailors deserted and became residents of that country. And John Tawell, in an effort to support the missionary societies' call

for a halt to European emigration to New Zealand, denigrated most of the secular residents in the Hokianga and described Baron de Thierry's sixty settlers as being mainly 'of a very infamous Description, such as he had pulled up in Sydney'.

The CMS missionaries in New Zealand, who had earlier been supportive of the work of timber and flax traders, changed their opinions about the benefits of European secular activity and trading after the de facto leadership of the mission devolved from Marsden to Henry Williams. Indeed, so far had they swung towards opposing traders by 1831 that the Rev. William Yate gave it as their opinion (admittedly in the wake of the Elizabeth Affair) that flax traders were worse than whalers in having an ill-effect on Maoris.

The missionaries' condemnation appears to have sprung from many motives. They wanted, in the eyes of the Maoris and the wider world, to dissociate themselves from other less godly and less evangelical Europeans. The problem was that the Maoris appeared to regard all Europeans as belonging to one tribe and so the missionaries actively sought to show them otherwise. Such an approach was regarded as necessary for, as Kemp the semi-literate CMS storekeeper put it, 'the island is very much pested with european sailors who have left their vessels, they are such bad charictoers that we are obliged to treat them in such a way as to keep them at a distance'. Thus, for example, Captain Duke was refused permission to convalesce at the Paihia mission station in 1827 because his residence with them might have conveyed the impression that the missionaries were connected with or condoned the behaviour of the trader. Similarly although they knew that it would give offence, especially as he had been of great assistance, the CMS felt obliged to shun Captain William Brind in order to show the Maoris that they disapproved of his immorality.

7. Yate to Darling, 1 September 1831, CO201/220, f.342b-344a.
by following this policy the missionaries believed that, by the mid-1830s, they had succeeded in convincing the Maoris that missionaries were superior and worthy Europeans while traders were very 'Devils'.

Further, the missionaries found that the presence of dissolute Europeans provided a good excuse for the apparent slowness of Maori conversions. For example James Busby stated, in 1831, that the missionaries complained that 'licentious' Europeans were 'counteracting' their work and were gaining more respect from Maoris than the missionaries had been able to achieve. Similarly John King, one of the longest serving mission workers, claimed in 1838 that the secular Europeans were responsible for holding back the work of the missionaries and the progress of Christianity in New Zealand. Moreover as they moved throughout the country the missionaries seemed to measure the difficulty of their task in terms of the amount of contact local Maoris had had with traders. For example the Rev. J.A. Wilson regarded the Maoris of Matata as being 'exceedingly ignorant' and 'much injured by the residence of immoral Europeans among them', while he considered that the Maoris of Tuhua (Mayor Island) would be open to missionary influence because their island had only infrequently and briefly been visited by European traders. Similarly William Williams believed that the cold and indifferent reception accorded to the missionaries at Tolaga Bay and Otumoetai pa in Tauranga Harbour had resulted in...

13. J. Busby, A Brief Memoir Relative to the Islands of New Zealand, June 1831, CO209/1, f.196b.
from the Maoris' previous contact with European traders. 17

Another reason for missionary opposition to traders was related to their respective claims to having civilized the Maoris. Missionaries wanted to be regarded as the exclusive agents of improving the 'uncivilized' New Zealanders. 18 They and their advocates therefore tried to discount any positive trader influence in the process. Dr Marshall, for instance, concluded that:

> beyond thinning the forest of its stately inhabitants and propagating among the natives a filthy and terrible disease, commerce, while returning enriched herself from the ports of New Zealand, left the country unimproved by her visitations, and its aboriginal tenantry, not a little injured by her importations. 19

And the Rev. William Cotton, during a visit to Thames in 1843, drew attention to the debate by sarcastically in his journal that 'whatever political economists may say of the civilizing effects of trade, does not hold good of pig dealing'. 20

The development of the bad image of traders also arose, in part, from the inability of many contemporary writers to understand or to appreciate a lifestyle different from their own. As was the case with descriptions of beach-

---


combers and beach communities elsewhere in the Pacific, those who wrote about New Zealand looked with jaundiced eyes. The collector or timberman who lived with a Maori group was regarded as 'renegade', 'profligate' and 'godless' while the visitor or sightseer who judged life in the small European communities in relation to the 'civilized' society he knew, could only conclude that they were 'hells'. Similarly, while their own living standards may barely have been adequate, missionaries and other European residents looked down on the apparent material, moral and cultural poverty of the collectors or sawyers. Thus the CMS ropeworker James Hamlin wondered why a trader at Aotea Harbour, who 'looked miserable', had forsaken his former life as the mate on a ship to 'live in such misery', while the Rev. Charles Baker cast all Europeans on the Mangamuka River (a tributary of the Hokianga River) as 'depraved men' because in his view their houses 'swarmed with native females'.

Timbermen, collectors and trading masters were further denigrated because of one widely publicized misdeemeanour. Nothing seemed to inspire humanitarian passions more than the thought of a profit-hungry trader exploiting supposed Maori weaknesses and ignorance in pursuit of a few extra pounds. Just as all Maoris came to be viewed from the shadow of the Boyd massacre, so all flax traders were regarded with the


deepest suspicion following the Elizabeth Affair. This was the occasion in 1830 on which John Stewart transported Te Rauparaha and his warriors to Akaroa. There the Maoris murdered several of their enemies and captured, and later killed, the Akaroa chief Maharanui. Stewart's mistake, it seemed, was not that he performed this task but that he was caught; and then by men who were sufficiently motivated to haul him before a court of law. Other masters who became involved in similar activities were far less severely treated. In September 1832 Captain J.W. Green on the Alexander took Titore and an undisclosed number of warriors from Rangihoua in the Bay of Islands to Maketu to surprise their enemies there. When he was called to account, Green was able to convince the Colonial Secretary that he had genuinely believed that he was taking Titore to pay a friendly visit to the Maoris at Maketu; not to attack them. Because the action did not lead to an attack or perhaps because Joseph Weller, the complainant in the matter, would not press charges, Green's actions received an official reprimand and very little publicity. Similar voyages from the Bay of Islands to the Thames to transport warriors were made by an unidentified vessel in 1831 and at least three times in the Emma between 1832 and 1834. Also, Rear Admiral Ross has suggested that in April 1833 Ngapuhi Maoris hired the Surprise and the

25. Joseph Weller claimed that it was 300-400 - S.H., 8 October 1832.

26. Green to Principal Superintendent of Police, 22 May 1833, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1833, (AONSW, 4/2164.2, item 33/3563 and enclosures); S.G., 25 April 1833.


Glatton (coasting vessels) and the Byron, Kent master, to go to Hauraki with warriors to attack Thames Maoris. These actions were not reported in the Australian press. Others that were reported were excused. For instance the action of Captain Harwood in transporting Ngatimutunga, Ngatiama and Kekerewai people to the Chatham Islands in 1835, which resulted in the massacre of the Moriori population there, was reported as a highjacking of the vessel in an article which was headlined as a 'Daring Attack by New Zealand Natives'.

While they freely expressed their opinions about the Europeans who resided at New Zealand before 1840, very few commentators provided any reliable, 'factual' information about the size or the composition of the European resident population. The most recent attempt to estimate the size of the European population by using a variety of contemporary accounts concluded that the numbers rose from 300 to 2000 in the years 1831-1840. However during the years 1836-1839 James Busby, the British Resident in New Zealand, endeavoured to make accurate assessments of the European population of New Zealand. In all he compiled three censuses, the results of which are tabulated in Appendices 20-22.

The census of 1836 clearly established the Bay of Islands, the Hokianga and Northland as the main areas of

30. S.G., 26 January 1836. An American vessel, the Halcyon, also transported southern Maoris to the Chatham Islands - S.H., 7 March 1836.
European population in the North Island. Among them these areas contained over 60 percent of the adult males in New Zealand and 73 percent of the Europeans resident in the North Island. Busby's censuses showed that the adult male population of the Hokianga River remained virtually unchanged between 1836 and 1838 while that of the Bay of Islands had increased by 48 percent by 1839. From this evidence it could be concluded that the Hokianga had reached an optimum European population size by 1836 and that the extent of the timber trade there, or perhaps the entrenched interests of the earliest residents, precluded more settlement. Such a view finds support in the claim of the surgeon Tawell that most of the Europeans in the Hokianga were small landholders. This situation may have contributed to the stability of the population for, once all the waterside and desirable land had been taken, there would have been little incentive for new settlers to move there. On the other hand the continued growth in the numbers of whalers and other vessels which called at the Bay of Islands to be supplied and repaired created additional opportunities for new residents to set up in service industries such as grogselling, supplying timber, and repairing vessels. Also because the Bay of Islands was the most popular and best known port in New Zealand it was often there that Europeans first settled before they bought land or moved to other permanent residences.

The figures in Appendix 21 show that New Zealand had an imbalance in the numbers of adult males and females, a situation which was common to most frontiers of European settlement. It would seem that in 1836 the proportion was 1 female for every 4.8 males. The data also show that it was the missionary families who contributed most (51 percent) of the European children enumerated in the 1836 census.

In addition to vaguely estimating how many Europeans lived in New Zealand, some contemporaries were also willing to hazard a guess about the composition and disposition of the European population. Thus the CMS missionary William Yate claimed that there were 150-200 runaways (both deserting sailors and convicts) in New Zealand in 1837 — that is about 10 percent of his estimate of the total European population. About the same time a writer in the *Sydney Herald* asserted that there were 200-300 convicts hiding in New Zealand. The numbers of respectable non-missionary families in New Zealand was said by Yate to be 12-14; and James Busby assessed that three-quarters of a million pounds worth of British property was at risk should the action in the Pomare-Titore war of 1837 have spread to include European residents.

Other commentators waxed lyrical about the composition of the European population. For example John Bright wrote:

> It will appear from past detail, that these brown masses had not many years heaved their volcanic heights in sight of our navigators, when one after another our countrymen annually perched upon them, to seek that which crime or poverty denied to them elsewhere: the victim released from the tempest; the convict escaped from the chain-gang and the noose; the daring preacher to open the holy book; the needy and runaway skipper satiated with the sea and its many perils; and the tradesman flitting from his

---

34. S.H., 30 March 1837. See also the Rev. J.D. Lang's description of the social 'refuse' who resided in New Zealand — J.D. Lang, *New Zealand in 1839*, 2nd ed., Sydney, 1873, p. 3.
36. J. Busby to Secretary of State, 20 April 1837, CO209/2, f. 320a.
obligations and the prison walls in Sydney—all gradually came on the quest to New Zealand, where they had neither a creditor to fear, or a law to restrain them. The American, too, occasionally bolted from his ship; next the needy emigrant, to be early on the spot hereafter to be famous; then Frenchmen from Australia; and the Catholic piety sent its representatives ...

Busby's 1836 and 1838 census figures (Appendix 22) provide an apparently more accurate picture.

About 31 percent of the total male adult population of the North Island of New Zealand in the mid-1830s was involved directly with trading timber. The largest body of timbermen was found on the Hokianga River, although the amended figure for the Thames/Coromandel data brings the total number there to 46 as compared to the Hokianga's 1838 figure of 48. In relation to their place in the community it can be seen that timbermen comprised at least half the male members of the European population in some areas, including 67.5 percent in Whangaroa and 60 percent in the Hokianga. At the Bay of Islands, however, they were a minor group—about 20 percent of the total. These figures therefore tend to support, or are supported by, the conclusions about the sites from which most of the export cargoes of timber were taken before 1840. Unfortunately Busby did not indicate which of the 'traders' enumerated in the census were marketing timber or flax.

With reference to the other figures in Appendix 22 it is perhaps surprising that shore whalers, notably the 50 men in the East Coast/Hawkes Bay area, comprised the largest occupational group in the North Island population, for this activity is usually associated with the South Island. Also, the composition of the Bay of Islands population reflected the role of that port as a servicing centre. About 35

percent of the population was engaged in service trades (trader, grogseller, clerk, blacksmith, ship-chandler) and probably several of the enumerated carpenters, sawyers and settlers were also involved in supplying and servicing vessels.\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, according to Busby, in 1836 the 20 groomsellers of the Bay of Islands were located in only two centres. About 60 percent of them lived at Kororareka and the rest were installed at Pomare's pa at Otuihu.

THE EUROPEANS who resided at New Zealand for the purposes of trading timber and flax came from a number of different backgrounds. Many were in New Zealand for the first time, others had traded there previously and some had earlier been attached to the mission stations. They went there for a variety of motives and under a diversity of circumstances. Often the only thing they had in common was their involvement in the trade.

Some fitted the stereotype of a timber or flax trader - the escaped convict, ship's deserter or social dreg who fled to New Zealand in the hope that his life there would be more pleasant. In his census of 1836 Busby clearly indicated that George Thomas, a trader at 'Hohoro' (Houhora?) in District 1, was a convict. Other escapees had also lived in New Zealand on their skills as traders and timbermen. George Bruce, the European who was living with Te Pahi's daughter in the Bay of Islands in 1807, was reputedly either an escaped convict or a deserter (or both) who had left the government vessel Lady Nelson to settle in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{39}

A few ex-convicts and convicted criminals went to New Zealand after the expiry of their sentences. For example,

\textsuperscript{38} This was the impression given by the Independent, 9 August 1834.

\textsuperscript{39} Macquarie to Secretary of State, 12 May 1814, H.R.N.Z., I, 322-3.
Thomas Poynton, an industrious Sawyer in the Hokianga, had been transported to New South Wales for Whiteboyism. He had apparently served his sentence when in 1828, at the age of 27, he arrived in the Hokianga. John Poyner, a Bay of Islands trader, had been given a full pardon after serving two years of his life sentence in Van Diemen's Land. He returned to Great Britain but, after the granting of his pardon was the subject of a Home Office investigation, he decided to sail for New Zealand where he arrived in the late 1820s. Another ex-convict was the Hokianga Sawyer John Marmon who had been convicted of theft in Sydney. He was sentenced to serve time on government vessels and it was from one of these vessels, the Elizabeth Henrietta, that he disembarked at the Bay of Islands early in 1825. As to his motive for going to New Zealand, it is probable that Marmon was the European whom the botanist [illegible] Cunningharn met in Hokianga in 1826 and whom Cunningham described as a man who preferred to live with Maoris in an 'extremely degraded Cond[1] rather than remain in the colony, and to suffer a 'shameful and merciless traducement of his Char[acter]'. A wish to escape from their past, especially if, like Marmon, they believed that they had been wrongly convicted, probably motivated several men to start a new life in New Zealand.

40. The Whiteboys were an illegal Irish agarian association.
41. Markham, pp.41-93; Australian, 4 May 1838; Colonist, 20 October 1838.
Amongst the deserters from vessels who made some contribution to the early timber trade can be counted Taylor and his three companions who had left Lord's Hunter in 1799 because they considered it to be too leaky for safety and who assisted the Royal Admiral to load in 1801; 44 John Hawkins Johnson who left his whaler to become a sawyer in the Bay of Islands in 1827; 45 and John Lees Faulkner who deserted his whaler in the Bay of Islands and who by 1836 was resident in Pomare's pa at Otuihu being employed as a carpenter. In 1840 Faulkner established himself as a trader at Otumoetαι in Tauranga Harbour. 46

New Zealand was also the destination of men who had faced financial difficulties in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. For instance in 1830 George Frederick Russell, reputedly a relative of Lord John Russell a British Prime Minister, undertook, at the age of 22, the direction of the Te Horeke timber station and dockyard after the bankruptcy of his Sydney employer (or partner), a flour merchant named Rennie. In 1836 he was resident at Te Papa on the Waihou River and by 1838 had bought land at Kohukohu, a settlement which, owing largely to his efforts, became the largest centre for timber exporting in the Hokianga. Russell was a respected merchant and one of the leading residents on the Hokianga. 47

---

44. 'Missionaries on board the "Royal Admiral", March 13-July 22, Tahiti 1801, (NPL/M, FM 4/328), p. 11.
Major Henry Oakes had arrived in Van Diemen's Land as a free settler in 1824. There he made wasteful investments in land and in September 1828 he was declared insolvent. He managed to secure an Indian Army pension and, as well, his friends in India cleared his debts. Leaving his farms under his wife's management, Oakes sailed to the Hokianga in October 1833. He seems to have settled at Pakanae early in 1834. However his timber trading activities cannot have proved very profitable for he relied on his pension to sustain himself and, later, his wife and seven children. Oakes and his family left Hokianga early in 1837 after a party of Maoris, apparently influenced by the WMS missionary William White, threatened their lives. 48

The catalogue of men who went to New Zealand after facing financial difficulties in the colonies would include Gordon Davies Browne — the man whom S. McD. Martin, a timber merchant and political journalist of the 1840s, justifiably described as 'in great measure entitled to the credit of having established the timber trade in New Zealand'. Browne arrived in New South Wales in June 1826 as Sydney agent for John Marshall, a London merchant with East India Company connections. He invested his own and £4000 of his employer's money in Thomas Raine's New Zealand venture; and lost the whole of it. Browne then left for New Zealand to take over the management of Te Horeke in 1828 but had to return to Sydney and face his creditors in March 1830. However he was certain in his belief that trading at New Zealand would eventually recoup his and his employer's funds. He

48. 'Henry Oakes', (AOT, Correspondence file), H.T.C., 6, 27 September 1828, 18 October 1833, 18 March 1836; H.T.G., 20 September, 27 December 1833; S.G., 17 January, 11 May 1837; J. O'C. Ross, 'Thomas McDonnell', (WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 4), pp. 147-8; S.H, 19 January 1837; Oakes OLC 12/12; Governor Arthur to Busby, 6 February 1834, (WArc, BR 1/1); Oakes to Busby, 17 December 1836, (WArc, BR 1/2); Markham, pp. 31, 32, 48, 88.
therefore spent about two years as a flax collector at Whangarei and in other places in the Hauraki Gulf on behalf of the Sydney merchant Archibald Mossman. Then he joined Ranulph Dacre in his schemes to exploit timber in the Firth of Thames, Hauraki Gulf and Coromandel Peninsula. Running three (and possibly more) stations proved disastrous for Browne's health and he was only seven stone in weight when he gave up his other responsibilities and settled permanently at Mercury Bay. Instead of prospering, however, Browne fell deeper into debt and died, insane and insolvent, in 1842. 49

Most of the men involved in the timber and flax trade appear to have been young men whose decision to settle in New Zealand was both free and deliberate. New Zealand was seen as a land of adventure by 16 years old George William White when he arrived in the country after running away from the English boarding school to which he had been sent by his father who was a surgeon serving with the British forces in Ceylon. White lived at Matata and was one of Tapsell's flax collectors. 50

Other young men arrived in a less spectacular manner, usually from one of the colonies and in the employ of a colonial merchant. 51 For instance Thomas Ralph, whom Joel

49. O. Browne to Mr Moxon, 9 October 1830, O. Browne, Letters, 1823-42, (NLA, MS 330); Dacre to Brooks, 26 August 1831; R. Dacre, Letterbook, 1831-2, (NPL/M, uncat. MSS. Set 309); Dacre, statement, 28 June 1862, Browne, OLC 408, 408a-c/978-81; S.G., 7 June 1826, 27 March, 1 June 1830; Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, I, 257-8.

50. D. Chitty, 'Early Bay of Plenty Families (5): George and Bennett White', Journal of the Whakatane and District Historical Society, XI, no. 4, December 1963, 178. He is not to be confused with Barnet Burns who sometimes used the pseudonym 'George White'.

51. Some even advertised their willingness to go to New Zealand and their qualifications and experience for the job they wanted - for example, 'H.D.', S.G., 28 August 1834; 'A.B.', S.H., 24 November 1836; 'Person', S.H., 2 August 1839.
Polack described as 'a young man respectably connected in Sydney' was collecting flax in Mokau Harbour and Uawa (Tolaga Bay) on behalf of J.B. Montefiore & Co. Thomas Mitchell, a timber merchant on the Hokianga was the brother and agent of the prosperous Sydney merchant Francis Mitchell. Thomas was one of the few Europeans in the Hokianga who was well regarded by the Wesleyan missionaries. When he died on 6 November 1836, at the age of 27 years, he left a European wife and five children. Also included in this group of young men was Thomas Lonsdale who traded at Kawhia (1830–31) and Whaingaroa Harbour (Raglan) from 1832. He died in 1838 at the age of 24 years.

Two other young men of note went to New Zealand and prospered in the timber industry. William Webster, an American who had reportedly escaped from his whaling vessel in the Bay of Islands in 1835, arrived in New Zealand at the age of 20 years. He worked first for Gordon Browne at Coromandel, but as Browne's mind failed Webster appears to have taken charge of the station. From there his 'empire' expanded to encompass other sites in the Hauraki Gulf and the Firth of Thames from which he exported timber, flax, potatoes and pork. He was regarded by contemporaries as 'Wepiha, King of Waiau'. Webster was bankrupted in the early 1840s and left for America shortly thereafter. His connection with New Zealand endured, however, through a series of government-level litigious quarrels concerning Webster's land claims which

52. Polack, New Zealand, II, 290-5.
lasted into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{55} The other young man of note was Frederick Maning who had emigrated to Van Diemen's Land with his father, a Customs House clerk, in 1823. In July 1833, at the age of 22, Maning went to live in the Hokianga apparently to act as agent for a Hobart merchant named Campbell. Maning worked as a general trader and timber merchant for some years and in 1865 he was appointed a judge of the Native Land Court.\textsuperscript{56}

Some of the residents had visited New Zealand previously and had then decided to return. Barnet Burns, for instance, had tired of his life as a Sydney bank clerk two years after he had left the sea and accepted the position. He took an opportunity to serve for eight months around the coasts of New Zealand aboard the \textit{Elizabeth}, H.B. Brown master. Because he 'took a great fancy to that part of the world' he was determined to return either as a trading master or resident agent. Thus he was about 23 years old when he contracted to collect flax on behalf of J.B. Montefiore & Co and sailed for New Zealand.\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, Edward Meurant had spent some time sealing in New Zealand about 1823 before he began collecting flax at Kawhia in 1829;\textsuperscript{58} a Mr Meares had helped to build vessels at the Te Horeke shipyard on behalf of Raine and Browne before he opened his own timber station in Whangaroa in 1830;\textsuperscript{59} Benjamin Turner had been employed as a sealer at New Zealand before he agreed to join Asquiths' timber station


\textsuperscript{56} H.T.C., 25 June, 5 July 1833; Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, II, 400-2; Markham, pp. 58, 91.

\textsuperscript{57} Barnet Burns, A Brief Narrative of a New Zealand Chief ..., Belfast, 1844, (Hocken Library facsimile, 1970), pp. 4-5; Narrative and suggestions of Barnet Burns, 19 April 1836, CO209/2, 453b-454b.

\textsuperscript{58} L.G. Kelly7, 'Edward Meurant: being an account of the ancestry, life and descendants of Edward Meurant', (AP, typescript dated 17 July 1950, N2920b, MEU).

\textsuperscript{59} S.G., 30 December 1830.
and dockyard at Port Pegasus, Stewart Island, in 1826;\(^{60}\) and Thomas McLean, a sawyer in the Hokianga, had stayed on after the First New Zealand Company settlers, with whom he went to New Zealand, returned to Sydney early in 1827.\(^{61}\)

Other flax collectors and timbermen had some years of experience as visitors to or residents in New Zealand before deciding to become traders there. Many had been sailors or masters of vessels on the New Zealand coasts. For instance John Rodolphus Kent had been concerned with voyages in search of New Zealand flax and timber as a colonial navy master in the *Prince Regent* (1820), the *Mermaid* (1823) and the *Elizabeth Henrietta* (1824-5), and as captain and trading master on vessels belonging to Francis Mitchell of Sydney before he settled, albeit fitfully, at Kawhia and Ngauruhoe from 1829 until his death in 1837.\(^{62}\) For Peter Dillon, however, an involvement with New Zealand timber and flax trading was but one part of his larger role in the maritime history of the Pacific Ocean. Dillon had first visited New Zealand as a crewman on a whaler, then as master of the missionary vessel *Active*, and at the helm of his own timber trading vessels in the 1820s. From July 1835 to about March 1836 he was resident at and in charge of a trading establishment at Mangatapu in Tauranga harbour.\(^{63}\)

When Philip Tapsell settled at Maketū in 1830 he was 53 years old and had taken the opportunity to retire from the sea. He had lived aboard whalers for most of his working life, and had made at least three voyages to New Zealand prior to settling there as a trader. According to his Reminiscences

---

60. The *Daily Southern Cross*, 6 October 1876.
61. Markham, pp.29,88.
62. J.O'C. Ross, 'J.R. Kent', (WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 1) and his articles based on the manuscript - 'Captain John Rodolphus Kent, Sailor and Explorer', 'Captain John Rodolphus Kent, Flax Trader in the Waikato', 'Captain Kent - his Last Years', Historical Journal, Auckland-Waikato, nos 33-35, September 1978, April, September 1979, pp.18-23, 35-38, 28-30.
63. J.W. Davidson, Peter Dillon of Vanikoro: Chevalier of the South Seas, ed. O.H.K. Spate, Melbourne, 1975, esp. chapters 2,4,6,16.
Tapsell had left his whaler, the Minerva, and was in Sydney when, having failed to secure a passage to England, he approached the firm of Jones & Walker and offered to act as their flax collector in New Zealand. Because the flax trading boom was at a peak and because of Tapsell's experience and knowledge of the country 'his offer was at once accepted'.

Tapsell lived at Maketū from about 1830 until 1836 when, during the internecine warfare between the Arawa and Ngaiterangi, his house and flax store were destroyed. He moved to Rotorua, then established himself as a trader/boat builder at Whakatane, and in later years he again used Maketū as his base. After a life of comparative poverty he died, at the age of 94, in 1873.

A number of timber and flax traders had been connected with one or other of missionary stations in New Zealand before they became collectors or timbermen in their own right. The WMS and CMS employed artisans on their mission stations both to free the mission teaching staff from manual work and to teach Maoris mechanical skills in order to fit them for a 'civilized life'. Many of these lay workers left the employment of the missionary societies after a few years in New Zealand and went to other parts of the country to use their skills to their own advantage. For instance John Cowell (Senior) first went to New Zealand as a flax worker at the CMS station in the Bay of Islands in 1819. Cowell remained attached to the CMS until his enforced 'retirement' in 1823 after which he went to Sydney and bought Robert Williams' ropeworks in 1824. In 1829 he returned to New Zealand and lived at Kawhia, where he was mainly employed in collecting

64. P. Tapsell, Reminiscences, 1779-1864, 1869, (WTu, qMS Tap 1869), pp.110-111.
flax, until his death in 1839. 66 There was also William Spickman (Spikeman), a ticket-of-leave convict who, throughout 1826 at least, was employed as a herdsman by the CMS in the Bay of Islands. In December that year he returned to New South Wales to marry and to obtain his emancipation. George Clark, a missionary, strongly recommended that Spickman be re-employed by the mission. Indeed he appears to have continued to work for the CMS until he went to Whangaroa in 1834. There, with his partner Parrott, he set up as a timber sawyer. Parrott, who was apparently married to a woman connected with the CMS, left Whangaroa before 1836. 67 George Stephenson also had experience in the New Zealand mission field. He was a Methodist lay preacher in Hobart who had been sent to assist the WMS in Hokianga as a carpenter. In November 1835 he left the mission to begin a business of his own and by January 1836 he was established as a timber merchant in Kaipara. 68

The sons of some missionaries became involved in the timber and flax trade. For example, the Sydney merchant Thomas Marsden who had agents in New Zealand was the son of Samuel Marsden, founder of the CMS mission to New Zealand; 69 Joseph Kendall, who began to work with Gordon Browne at Mahurangi in 1832, was the son of Thomas Kendall; 70 and Samuel Butler, son of the one-time leader of the CMS mission John Butler, eked out a barely subsistence living as a timber, flax and pork trader and interpreter in the Hokianga from 1827 to December

66. George & Gwen Howe, 'Johnny Cowell - Pakeha-Maori Trader', Historical Journal, Auckland-Waikato, no.28, April 1976, p.13. Cowell may also have decided to leave New South Wales in 1829 because another ropemaker - Jacob Wyer - had set up in competition with him - S.G., 5 November 1828.


69. S.H., 5 March 1838.

70. Dacre to Brooks 20 April 1832, (NPL/M, uncat. MS Set 309).
In addition to these men Thomas Bateman, who worked his kauri land on the Kaeo River, was the son-in-law of Thomas Kendall.

Some men appear to have been encouraged to become involved in the timber and flax trade at New Zealand after the advantages of trading in the country had been impressed upon them by their relatives who had lived or worked there. For instance Francis White was a blacksmith in Durham County, England, and brother of the WMS missionary William White. William was involved in timber trading while still in the employ of the WMS and his glowing reports of the potential of the trade encouraged Francis to leave his business, to borrow money, and to establish himself as a timber sawyer and merchant in the Hokianga in November 1835. Francis White was never a leading merchant on the River although he did serve on the Auckland Provincial Council 1860-1. He then returned to his old trade as a blacksmith in Auckland and died there in 1877.

In 1829 Kawhia and the banks of the Waipa became the home of several blood and law relatives of the first government printer of New South Wales — George Howe. Mary Ann Risdon, Howe's daughter, arrived with her husband John Cowell (Senior) and step-son John Vittoria Cowell, her brother George Howe, and William Risdon, who was apparently also one of her relatives. Presumably all of them had been motivated to leave Australia by Kent's description of the flax to be obtained from the Waikato area and the Cowells'  


knowledge of New Zealand and flax dressing. 74

Three other timber and flax traders can be singled out for their backgrounds and motives for settling in New Zealand. For Joel Polack trading in New Zealand was an extension of similar exploits throughout the world and his work as a merchant and ship-chandler in Sydney. Polack had been well and privately educated in London, as the many classical allusions in his books show. He first went to the Hokianga in 1831 in the employ of Thomas McDonnell. Polack worked at Te Horeke until 1832 during which time he made two visits to the Kaipara Harbour on McDonnell's behalf. He returned to Sydney, and then in 1833 settled at Kororareka as a general trader and ship's agent. In 1838 Polack returned to London and in that year and 1840 he produced two two-volumed works on New Zealand and Maoris. He was in New Zealand again until 1849 but later left for California where he died in 1882. 75

In its uncomplicated honesty of motive and intent, the statement by Thomas McDonnell, timber merchant and sometime Additional British Resident in New Zealand, to the 1844 Select Committee on New Zealand, probably summed up the thoughts of many traders who went to New Zealand:


75. Polack, evidence, 1838 Report, p. 79; Polack to Colonial Secretary, 29 October 1834, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, (NPL/D, N, Ar/1, item 34/8220); Polack to Colonial Secretary, 8 April 1837, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1837, (AONSW, 4/2368.2, item 37/6104); S.H., 25 March 1833; Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, II, 789-90; Ross, 'Thomas McDonnell', (WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 4), p. 48. J. C. Reid, 'Joel Polack - The First Jewish Settler', New Zealand's Heritage, I, part 9, 243-6.
In 1830, being on half-pay (as a naval officer), I had nothing particular to do, and had a vessel of my own, and I proceeded out to New South Wales; subsequently I heard something of New Zealand, and looking at its geographical position, and an offer having been made me at Sydney at the time to purchase some land, and also a vessel, I purchased both, and proceeded on with my family there. 76

McDonnell moved to Te Horeke in April 1831. He was a prosperous and enterprising merchant and in 1835 was awarded a contract to supply New Zealand spars to the Royal Navy. From 1841 the timber trade in the Hokianga went into a slow decline and McDonnell's fortunes paralleled this. The magnificent house at Horeke burned down in 1842 and he and his family were forced to move into one of the cottages on the Horeke estate which had formerly been used by one of his employees. In 1857 McDonnell left the ruins of what had been a prosperous timber station and retired to Auckland where he died in 1864. 77

The Rev. William White, while he was Superintendent of the WMS mission 1830-36, founded a thriving timber and pork trading business at the Mangungu mission station. Before he had answered the call to be a missionary in New Zealand White had been a carpenter by trade. He therefore quickly recognised the value of New Zealand timbers. It was perhaps natural that he should use his training to teach Maoris the same skills, besides which he obviously enjoyed that type of manual labour and claimed to feel closer to God when he was 'bathed in perspiration' and fatigued after a hard session of chopping or sawing.

White bought large tracts of land on the Hokianga which included, according to his European merchant rivals, two of the finest timber stands on the River. He also employed 20-30 and sometimes up to 100 Maoris as sawyers at the Mangungu station. Apparently White encouraged Maoris to bring their trees to the station where he would superintend their sawing operations and let them use the WMS saws and sawpits.


77. Ross, 'Thomas McDonnell', (WTu,MS papers 1500,Folder 4); Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, II, 357-8.
The Maoris gave White half the timber in return for his assistance as well as relying on him to sell their remaining half to any visiting vessels. So large had his business become that in 1835 he decided to employ a timber merchant full-time at the station and to secure the services of a saw sharpener. Given these facts it is little wonder that contemporaries regarded Mangungu as the 'leading mercantile establishment' in the Hokianganga.

In addition to his Hokianganga operations White was also conscious of the reserves of timber in the places he visited while touring the coasts on mission business. It was during White's time as leader that a WMS station was opened in the timber rich Manukau Harbour and a WMS sponsored vessel first entered the Kaipara and Whangape Harbours.

To his superiors and colleagues White appeared to be more concerned with secular matters such as timber and pork trading than with evangelism, the task for which he was being paid. The complaints about White's over-involvement with timber trading were first aired by his colleagues in New Zealand and his immediate superior, Joseph Orton in New South Wales, from about 1832. This charge was one of the reasons for which White was dismissed from the Society in 1837. A second reason for his dismissal - that of having sexual intercourse with Maori women - appeared to have been an accusation which was largely manufactured at a meeting of Hokianganga timber merchants in 1836. Their opposition to White, it is suggested here, was not based on their concern for any effects White's lapses may have had on the morality of Maoris. It reflected instead their strong desire to be rid of White as a competitor. Apparently as early as 1833 a band of 26 Europeans had tried to run White out of the Hokianganga. On that occasion they failed; in 1836 they succeeded. The evidence against White was circumstantial but the meeting was contrived so that White was adjudged guilty. The suggestion that there was a commercial conspiracy against White is given further support by the fact that the convenor of the meeting, and White's chief accuser, was also his greatest trading rival - Thomas McDonnell. McDonnell's efforts to fill his naval spar contract had been frustrated by White's control over both the Hokianganga timber trade and the labour of local Maoris. Also
throughout 1835 McDonnell and White had been fighting an inglorious battle over their conflicting claims to have been the first to enter the Kaipara Harbour and to possess the proprietary rights to the kauri there. McDonnell therefore seized on the 'trial' as an opportunity to be rid of his foe.

White was sent to England and was dismissed from the WMS. However he returned to the Hokianga in 1838. He re-established himself as a timber merchant in partnership with his brother Francis and continued to trade from that River for many years. 78

THE SORT of life a resident trader led while he was in New Zealand was restrained by his physical environment and how he adapted to it, and also by the social environment in which he worked. The life-styles of individual traders therefore varied widely. However rather than attempting to characterize the lives of all the European residents the following discussion will concentrate on a comparison of the lives of those traders who lived in larger centres such as the Hokianga with those who lived in predominantly Maori communities.

It seems that all the European residents in New Zealand felt that they were isolated. Before going to New Zealand they had been conditioned by the British and colonial press to believe that New Zealand represented the 'ends of the earth'. Moreover the supposed dangers of visiting or residing at New Zealand provided material for colonial jests. For example Mrs ...

Reiby of Launceston sent 'her love' to her friend Mrs Dacre who was in New Zealand aboard her husband's vessel. She promised to give Mrs Dacre a jar of jam on her return to the colony, provided that in the interim 'the New Zealanders do not make a dinner of you all'.

New arrivals at New Zealand expressed or amplified their feelings of being cut off from 'civilization' as fear, particularly a fear of Maoris. Writing 30 years after his arrival in the Hokianga Judge Maning recalled that on first entering the River 'I went below and loaded my pistols, not that I expected at all to conquer the country with them, but somehow because I could not help it'. The Maoris' animation as the vessel anchored looked to the inexperienced Maning 'very much as if they were speculating on an immediate change of diet'. His reaction is the more surprising when it is recalled that Maning had entered a River where several Europeans were already residing. Barnet Burns, on the other hand, was the only European for several miles around (it felt to him like at least one hundred miles) when he was landed at Mahia in 1831:

I was obliged to carry my musket, and constantly sleep with it by my side; in fact I had to keep watch all the time. Then, for the first time since I took my fancy to visit New Zealand, I felt frightened at my situation: I knew that I was not sure of my life an hour.

Evidently these feelings of isolation and fear did not fade quickly or completely. For instance Joel Polack, after five or six years' residence in New Zealand, still conveyed in his


81. B. Burns, Narrative, p.6.
writings a pervasive awareness of being a man alone amongst the Maoris - a people he continued to describe as 'treacherous', capable of 'systematic' murders, and 'fickle' in their dealings with Europeans. 82

Yet while traders undeniably felt isolated while they were in New Zealand it should not be implied that their life was a solitary one. The closeness of the European settlements in New Zealand meant that, by the mid-1830s, most residents would have known of at least one other European who lived within one day's travel. Moreover visiting sailors and merchants would have occasionally provided some company for even the most isolated individuals. In addition some traders were able to take advantage of the increased frequency of trans-Tasman shipping in the 1830s to make return visits to Sydney or Hobart. For instance, Thomas Battersby, a trader in the Bay of Islands, made five return voyages between New Zealand and New South Wales from 2 August 1832 and 12 December 1834; 83 Edward Fishwick, a Hokianga merchant, visited Van Diemen's Land twice in 1834; 84 and F.E. Manning returned to the colonies at least three times between 1834 and 1839. 85

Nor did the European male residents necessarily lack for female companionship. Data from Busby's 1836 census show that 71 (27.5 percent) of the 258 households in Districts 1-4 had adult European females in residence. Another 13 (5 percent) of the households were listed as having 'half-caste children' living in them. If it is assumed that the presence of half-caste children indicated that a Maori woman was also in residence then at least 32.5 percent of the adult European males in these Districts had adult females in their households.

It appears that women were most likely to be found living in the households of missionaries and grogsellers.

82. Polack, New Zealand, II, 9, 14, 355-6.
83. See S.H., 2 August, 1 October 1832, 18 March, 14 November 1833, 26 June, 12 December 1834; S.G., 8 March 1833; Marshall, p. 235.
85. S.G., 16 September 1837; H.T.C., 29 August, 31 October 1834, 15 March 1839.
Missionaries were encouraged by their Home societies to marry before leaving for New Zealand. Grogsellers were probably more likely than other residents to have European wives because they were the wealthier members of the European community and were thus better able to support a wife and family. Also, most found that they required a woman to attend to the boarding establishment which was usually attached to their public house.

From Busby's data it appears that most of the European women lived in larger communities such as the Bay of Islands and the Hokianga. It is assumed that they would have been less hesitant about going to live in these places than residing in predominantly Maori communities. Yet even those males who lived in the largest and best ordered communities could find it difficult to persuade European women to join them. For example Busby's 1839 census recorded that on Gilbert Mair's station at Wahapu in the Bay of Islands there were 32 European males of whom only 7 had wives. Later that year the following advertisement appeared in the Sydney Herald:

NOTICE - WANTED FOR THE WAHAPEE, about a dozen young ladies, as there are a great many gentlemen there who want wives. On the Wahapee at present there are several families, but some how or other they are so exclusive, that there is no society for single men. All the young ladies who mean to speculate are requested not to mind money as they will always find Pork and Potatoes there.

86. See, for example, Ben Turner who was probably the Bay of Islands grogseller referred to as being worth £1000-2000 – S.H., 20 March 1837. See also Independent, 9 August 1834.

87. For instance Mrs Wood, formerly a hotel proprietress in Sydney, helped her husband run a public house at Tapeka Point, Bay of Islands.
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However this invitation would appear to have been declined for in 1846 Mair noted that there were still only 7 women amongst the 40 European adults on his station.  

European wives were not unknown outside the larger settlements. Mary Ann Risdon Cowell, for example, lived at Kawhia with her husband John from 1829 until her death in 1838. Also when William Marshall returned to Port Waikato in 1840 after a prolonged visit to Sydney, he took his new wife with him. However Mrs Marshall did not enjoy the life for she finally left her husband and New Zealand around 1850.

Busby's figures can only be regarded as a rough guide to the number of households which had Maori women in residence. In fact many, perhaps most, of the collectors and timbermen had Maori companions. From the Maori point of view such a union meant that the European was more closely associated with the hapu and could be expected to exert himself more earnestly in trading on behalf of his wife's people. That is why chiefs often gave their daughters to traders. For instance George White was married to Ringa Ono, daughter of Rangetakina, the chief of the Ngapotiki amongst whom he lived in Matata. Similarly the flax traders who went to Kawhia with Kent were all provided with highly ranked wives. Having provided a European with a wife also gave her relatives some claim on his generosity. Thus Marmon complained that his wife's relatives would descend on his home and tax his hospitality and Dominic Ferrari, a Genoese carpenter who worked for Polack, appeared to have had his wife on some sort of leasing arrangement, for whenever he stopped making payments to her relatives they took her away.
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In European eyes Maori wives were more than companions — they were investments. Many regarded a liaison with a Maori woman as a method of introducing a feminine touch to their living conditions. 95 Even Joel Polack had a Maori partner for, as he explained to James Busby, when he left his store to go trading in other parts of the country he would most certainly have been robbed if he had not left his 'wahine' in residence. 96 However few Europeans would have been as cynical as Edward Markham who commented that living with a Maori woman while in New Zealand was the surest way of getting her people's protection for the trader's life and his property. Also, he added, the women became 'useful and very much attached if used well'. 97

Other men overcame problems of domesticity by employing servants: James Busby had two; Joel Polack brought a French servant with him from New South Wales in 1833; 98 and William Marshall, before he was married, had a servant named Logan. 99 Many Europeans also followed the practice of the missionaries and employed Maori servants.

The traders had varying standards of housing. Typically the collector was supplied by his host hapu with a home of Maori design and construction as an accepted part of the conditions of his remaining with them. 100 Occasionally these houses were constructed in a European architectural fashion, while some were rooms at the end of the hapu flax store. 101 Sometimes the traders were housed in the best building in the village. For example Dr Marshall found that two sawyers in 'KaiMonga' village in Whangaroa Harbour had hired the chief's house and had constructed their sawpit nearby. 102
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Because they were able to construct their own houses, timbermen tended to be better sheltered than collectors. For instance Elihu Shaw, a sawyer who had emigrated to Hokianga with his wife Mary and three children in 1838, wrote to his old employer in England and informed him that they had arrived safely and were sharing a house with three others. However they very quickly began preparations for building and furnishing their own home.¹⁰³ This would probably have resembled the many other European-style homes, constructed of weatherboard and lined to keep out the cold, which were being built when Markham stayed in the Hokianga in 1834.¹⁰⁴ Some timbermen apparently built themselves superior houses. John Marmon, for instance, claimed to have a 'fine big house' which was two storeys high - a claim which was supported by Markham's comment about Marmon's 'fine house'.¹⁰⁵

For some of the residents their houses seem to have been their refuge from the savage surroundings in which they lived. Marmon insisted on living as much to himself as was possible given the Maori society into which he had entered. His house was built outside the village of his protecting chief, Raumati, and Marmon seemed to have been successful in maintaining a nuclear family unit of the type he had known in Sydney (except, that is, for the customary visits of his wife's relatives.)¹⁰⁶ Other traders deliberately designed their homes and furnishings to recreate familiar surroundings. Thus Philip Tapsell fitted his house out like the cabin of a ship with

¹⁰³. Cited in J. Walton, *Twelve Months' Residence in New Zealand; Containing a Correct Description of the Customs, Manners, etc. of the Natives of that Island, with other Information valuable to Emigrants*, Glasgow, 1839, p. 31.

¹⁰⁴. Markham, p. 41.

¹⁰⁵. *New Zealand Herald*, 27 November 1880; Markham, p. 60.

such care that the CMS missionary William Wade believed that
visitors could actually imagine that they were at sea.107

The élite of the Bay of Islands, ship-chandlers like
J.R. Clendon, Gilbert Mair and George Greenway, presided over
large establishments which have been described as 'semi-
feudatories' and townships in themselves.108 Te Horeke timber
station in the Hokianga stands out as the best known and
possibly the only example of a comparable standard of living
amongst the merchants of the timber trade.109

Visitors to New Zealand commented unfavourably on
the residents' staple diet of pork, potatoes, tea and sugar,
which was occasionally supplemented by flour, rice and ship's
biscuit.110 Indeed one traveller, after residing for two
days at the 'Commercial Hotel' in the Bay of Islands where
every meal included pig meat of some description, felt that
he could never a look a pig in the face again!111

Of course their diet differed with the place in which
the Europeans resided. The collectors or timbermen who lived
on sites which were away from the main ports had to rely
largely on stores supplied by their employers and on any fresh
meat, fish and vegetables they could purchase from local Maoris.
Sometimes, when local supplies were unavailable or had been
depleted by consumption or Maori depredations, they could, if
they had sufficient barter or money, purchase food from places
like the Bay of Islands or from visiting vessels. Alternatively
they could be forced to live on fern root and berries and to
subsist as best they were able until new supplies arrived from
the colonies.112 This situation applied also to their supplies of

107. A.H. Matheson, 'Otumoetai Pa and the Early Times in
Tauranga', Journal of the Tauranga Historical Society,
no. 52, December 1974, OT 20.

108. J.R. Lee, Southseaman; the Story of the Bay of Islands,
(WTu, qMS, LEE), p. 61.

109. J.O'C. Ross, 'Te Horeke: Pre-Colonial Shipyard and
Trading Establishment', The Records of the New Zealand

110. Bright, p. 121.

111. W. Cleveland, Journal of William Cleveland, 22 March
1838–22 November 1842, 2 vols, (NPL/M, B1566-1567),
30 September 1840.

112. For example the sawyers of the Mahurangi timber station in
MS Set 309).
European goods such as clothes, shoes, tobacco and alcohol.

In the larger and longer established centres the choice and availability of food was, in part, expanded by the development of farming and horticulture and the maturing of fruit trees which had been planted years earlier. In addition, as a result of increased trans-Tasman shipping, more European goods arrived for sale in New Zealand. Moreover as the Bay of Islands became a popular place for whalers to call and purchase supplies, the traders and ship-chandlers there were obliged to keep a larger variety of stores on hand. These goods were therefore also available to resident Europeans who could either purchase or steal them.

Other needs were met by the inventive efforts of individual settlers. This was particularly the case with alcohol production. For example, Busby's census recorded that James MacDiamid had established himself as a brewer at Kororareka in 1836 (he had moved to Whangaroa by 1839); John Marmon claimed to have 'grown adept in the manufacture of grog'; and Peter Abercrombie, a timberman on the Waikato River in Thames, established a 'bug' for distilling alcohol. Timber and flax traders did not discard all the pleasures and conventions of their earlier life in European society. Those traders, such as Thomas McDonnell, Gilbert Mair and James Clendon, who could afford it, attempted to create a life which resembled as closely as possible the style they had been accustomed to prior to their going to New Zealand. Yet the active desire to retain something of their past was not limited to the wealthy and to those people who lived in the largest centres of European population. Even the collector

or timberman who resided alone in the Maori communities held dear the memories and habits of a lifetime. This was shown, for example, in the reverence some traders retained for Sundays. Thus when the CMS missionary John Morgan visited Matamata in 1834 he was surprised to find that the Sabbath was regularly observed there even though no missionary was in residence in the area. Apparently the local flax collector, Edward Clementson, had rigidly enforced this principle and on Sundays had raised a flag to signal that he would not purchase flax on that day. He had also induced local Maoris not to travel on Sundays. And Clementson was not unique in this regard. The following year another CMS missionary, A.N. Brown, visited Matamata and, rather sceptically, arranged for local flax collectors to attend his Sunday service. All three presented themselves at the appointed time.

This attention to externals and, as well, to the material reminders of their past was also illustrated in the size and dignity of European funerals, in the regularity with which, by the late 1830s, missionaries were being asked to marry traders to their Maori 'wives', and by the evidence that amongst the effects left by some Pakeha-Maoris were counted a copy of Shakespeare's plays, a classical dictionary and the Book of Common Prayer.

Europeans living in large centres had many more opportunities to remind themselves of, and to recreate, the life they had known before moving to New Zealand. For instance Kororareka had a billiard room and dances were also held at which music was provided by the local orchestra. Even as
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early as 1834 the imported newspapers and other reading matter in the Bay of Islands were reasonably up to date.\textsuperscript{122} There was also at least one race meeting in New Zealand before 1840. The meeting, which was held at Oneroa Beach in the Bay of Islands on 28 April 1839, was previewed and reviewed by the colonial press. Unfortunately the card was reduced to one race which was not run for a prize but to settle a debt between Benjamin Turner, a grosgeller of Kororareka, and Captain Roberton, a 'mad' Bay of Islands trader. Turner's horse 'Don Pedro' beat Roberton's gelding 'Pinto' by three necks, according to the Sydney Gazette; the Sydney Herald reported exactly the opposite result!\textsuperscript{123}

The other advantage which came from living in larger communities was the access this gave to the services of professionally trained men who could make frontier life easier. For instance Busby's 1836 census listed four surgeons in the Bay of Islands. However Busby did not take account of missionaries, like William Williams, who had these skills nor did he include the many surgeons who visited the Bay on whaling vessels.\textsuperscript{124} Medical men also lived in other centres. A Dr Ross was in the Hokianga in 1838, and the Wellers apparently employed a surgeon to service their whaling stations.\textsuperscript{125} Also the Bay had a professional launderer called Edward Mahoney.\textsuperscript{126}

Another indication of some Europeans' attempts to look beyond the standard of living they endured in New Zealand was their earnest attempt to provide good educational opportunities for their children. The missionaries ran schools for Maoris and for their own children, but in line with their general principle of dissociating themselves from secular
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Europeans, they refused to allow other European or half-caste children to attend the classes. Those residents who could afford to do so sent their children overseas to receive an education. For instance Thomas McDonnell's wife and children stayed in London when he returned to Te Horeke in 1835 because they believed that the children would receive better tuition there.\footnote{127} Also, Thomas Mitchell in the Hokianga sent his son to school in New South Wales\footnote{128} as had David Clarke, the onetime Superintendent of Te Horeke.\footnote{129} Others preferred to keep their children in New Zealand and one Bay of Islands family advertised for a governess to go there and teach 'English, French, Music, Drawing and Dancing'.\footnote{130} The other European children had to survive on what they could learn informally from their parents. However, late in the 1830s, James Busby and the CMS missionaries in the Bay of Islands proposed to open a school for half-caste children. The Victoria Paternal Institution was proposed to fill a need to educate these young people and to fulfil the responsibility of the European fathers to their children. Two meetings were held to discuss the project but plans were halted after the announcement of the British decision to colonize New Zealand.\footnote{131}

Very few of the men or families involved in the timber and flax trade appeared to have been materially well endowed by or for the trade.\footnote{132} In fact many, both in larger centres
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and in the bush, had a standard of living that others considered to be very near or even below subsistence. For example Samuel Butler, a timberman in the Hokianga, was described as being so 'badly off' in 1834 that 'no one knew how he existed'.133 Later the same year Butler wrote to his father about his plight and explained that the Maoris were demanding more for their flax and other produce while the returns he was receiving on the European market had declined. As an indication of his reduced circumstances he noted 'Times will not permit bread every day, and drinkables are quite out of the question'.134 Another Hokianga timber merchant, Francis White, was similarly described as being in a financially 'very unpromising' position in 1838.135

The traders therefore sought ways to supplement the income they received from timber and flax. For example as the flax trade declined many collectors became agents for potatoes, maize and pork which they sold to visiting vessels for export, or sent to the growing centres of European population such as the Hokianga and the Bay of Islands. J.W. Harris, a flax collector who lived at Turanga (Poverty Bay), first began to diversify his activities by approaching the vessels which anchored in Poverty Bay and offering to help them to get supplies of fresh vegetables, fruits and meat.136 Later he became involved in organising local Maoris to cultivate maize and to salt pork for the New South Wales market.137
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Also, in the winter of 1837, Harris opened a shore whaling station near his trading depot. He continued to hunt whales from that station until 1842.\(^{138}\)

Other Europeans were not quite as enterprising. Many of the sawyers became involved in allied occupations such as construction. John Marmon, for instance, is credited with having built many of the Te Horeke station buildings and Judge Maning's house at Onoke in Hokianga.\(^{139}\) Other timbermen extended their work into boat-building. For instance Thomas Styles in the Hokianga built both the Tui and the Industry,\(^{140}\) and G.F. Russell, in collaboration with Alexander Chapman, built the Fanny at Horeke in 1835 and the Hokianga at Te Papa in 1837.\(^{141}\) Similarly both Tapsell at Whakatane and Thomas Millon at Pipitiwai in the Firth of Thames made trading vessels for local Maoris in return for grants of land and supplies.\(^{142}\) Sawyers and collectors also proved to be good as interpreters and guides. For instance Markham considered that Marmon spoke Maori better than the missionaries.\(^{143}\)

Some timbermen returned to their earlier occupations to earn themselves extra income. For instance Captain William Young often acted as pilot for vessels wanting to cross the Hokianga River bar.\(^{144}\) Similarly, there was Thomas Florance
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who, after he had failed to get his sawmill into production in the Bay of Islands and when his claims to prime timber land were pre-empted by missionaries, found that his services as a surveyor (he had been in the New South Wales Colonial Survey Department) were much in demand as landowners sought to establish and sub-divide their land claims in preparation for the expected onslaught of immigrants.145

Thus there were probably as many different life-styles among the Europeans engaged in the timber and flax trade as there were individuals. Clearly the options available to the trader in the bush were more limited than those enjoyed by the Europeans who were resident in larger centres. However the manner in which an individual lived his life was not determined by his choice alone. His life was shaped and his choices restricted by the social environment in which he lived.

THE REV. Frederick Wilkinson believed that Europeans went to live in the Hokianga 'not to make Money, for that they cannot do, but to live in a loose profligate Manner. They have easily found a Living there'.146 Apart from his errors of fact, Wilkinson sustained the contemporary myth that the life
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led by non-missionary Europeans in New Zealand was unhindered by the restraints placed on 'civilized' men and that they enjoyed all the, equally mythical, 'savage freedoms' of Maoris. Indeed, in describing the work and life of individual Europeans who resided in New Zealand, writers can lose sight of the fact that not one but two sets of social and cultural controls bore on the traders who lived there. Primarily the trader had to be constantly aware that he was living in a country which had a majority Maori population. While Europeans may generally have regarded themselves as 'superior beings' and Maoris as 'sages' who existed to 'obey their every wish' and to 'submit to all their whims', in practice the viability of their trading required the maintenance of cordial relations with Maoris. This was especially the case in the timber and flax trade, where the work required prolonged and intimate contacts with Maoris.

Maintaining a close working relationship was largely a matter of commonsense. For instance striking or killing a Maori was bound to raise resentment, as it would in any society. Similarly swearing, spitting and the use of sarcasm were not likely to enhance a trader's reputation. Traders in New Zealand were particularly concerned to avoid offending Maori customs and tapu laws. Thus mariners and traders, both by word of mouth and in their writings, gave advice and examples to their fellows in order that they might avoid giving offence.

For the most part, and in the interests of commerce, traders made allowances for what they regarded as Maori


'propensities and habits',\textsuperscript{149} even for some of those that infringed European customs and laws. For instance traders came to believe that thefts and trading malpractices were Maori arts and an indication of their uncivilized state.\textsuperscript{150} Therefore they were prepared to tolerate a degree of thieving and other acts of 'guile' or of a 'petty nature' which they would not have tolerated from members of their own society. They became resigned to the inevitability of finding stones in the bottom of baskets of potatoes, discovering mats steeped in water in the middle of bundles of flax that they paid for by determining their weight, and purchasing baskets of foodstuffs only to find that a thin layer of the finest produce had been used to disguise inferior goods below.\textsuperscript{151}

The degree to which resident Europeans felt bound to make allowances for Maori customs and the extent to which this altered the way they lived their lives in New Zealand differed with their circumstances. Some Europeans, like the haughty Thomas McDonnell, endeavoured to remain above and disdainful of both Maori and European contemporaries.\textsuperscript{152}

Others like timberman Octavius Browne (brother of Gordon Browne), tried to learn enough of the Maori language to
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\textsuperscript{150} J. Hawkesworth, An Account of Voyages undertaken ... for making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere, 3 vols, London, 1773, II, 359; Savage, pp.56-7; Earle, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{151} G. Bayly, Sea-Life Sixty Years Ago, London, 1885, p. 130; S.H., 18 May 1837; Cowan, pp.132-3.
\textsuperscript{152} Characteristic of McDonnell's attitude was the fact that after being a timber merchant in the Hokia for almost a decade before 1840 (and apparently throughout his long life in New Zealand) McDonnell never learned to speak Maori - Ross, 'Thomas McDonnell', (WTu, MS Papers 1500, Folder 4), pp.86,89. It has been claimed however, that he took a Maori wife while his European wife was living in London - P.J. Gibbons, 'Some Thoughts on the Pre-1840 Pakeha-Maori', Term Paper, Massey University, 1969, p. 3.
be able to communicate with their Maori boatmen and guides. They also came to feel some esprit de corps with Maori timbermen. 153 John Marmon, the Hokianga timberman, and James Caddell, a collector based at Ruapuke Island in Foveaux Strait, had a radically different relationship with their Maori hosts. These men were Pakeha-Maoris.  

Pakeha-Maoris, like the beachcombers of the Pacific, were transculturalites. This term refers to individuals who either temporarily or permanently become detached from their societies and who are caught up in the customs, ideas, values and activities of another society. 154 The most obvious signs of the Pakeha-Maoris' transition were their taking Maori wives, their living near their protecting chiefs on land that had been alienated to them in return for their services in facilitating trade, and their becoming an integral part of the tribal structure. The latter point was demonstrated, for example, in actions such as their going to war with or on behalf of their host tribe. 155 Some Pakeha-Maoris found, in the 1820s especially, that they were more acceptable to Maoris if they dressed in Maori mats and discarded their European clothing. 156 Others, like Barnet Burns, believed that being tattooed was useful in establishing their influence, acceptance and privileged trading position among Maoris. 157 A few Pakeha-Maoris became so akin with their Maori hosts that they began to believe in Maori prayers and tohunga prophesies. 158

153. Browne to Eliza Moxon, 3 February 1842, (NLA, MS 330).
155. For example Tapsell - Kemp, Journal, 13, 14 March 1832.
Blosseville's description of James Caddell provided an example of the extreme case. Caddell at the age of 16 years was marooned in the south of the South Island when his sealing vessel was wrecked. When he was next seen by Europeans (from on board the *Snapper* in 1822) he had been tattooed, had married the daughter of a local chief, had forgotten his English tongue, and looked and behaved like his Maori hosts. Observers believed that he had been 'transformed' from an 'English sailor-boy', into a 'dauntless and terrifying New Zealand chief' and that:

> he had so fallen into the manner of life of these savages that he had become quite as open an cannibal as any of them. He had embraced their ideas and beliefs, accepted with faith their fables, had yielded to all their customs, so much as that one might have believed that New Zealand was his true native country. His vicious and crafty nature had caused him to be favourably received by the natives ... He was considered a very dangerous man, but by not placing too great a confidence in him /the Europeans who went seeking flax/ found him of considerable assistance. 

There was a wide variation in the degree to which these men became part of Maori society, or in Polack's terms 'a child' of the host tribe.\(^{160}\) The extent of their 'transformation' depended on circumstantial factors such as their personality, whether they were in New Zealand from choice or against their will, and the extent to which the local Maoris wanted a particular European to live with them. As a rule the further a European lived from other Europeans the greater was his degree of transculturalization.

However, classifying particular timbermen and collectors as 'Pakeha-Maoris' is difficult, and while the term may have described their position during some periods of their involvement in the trade it may not have been true of their whole time in New Zealand. For instance Captain J.R. Kent,

---

during the periods he was settled on shore in Kawhia or at Ngaruawahia, lived with a Maori wife, was under the protection and direction of a Maori chief, lived in a kainga and in most respects became a part of Maori society. However he interspersed his periods on shore with times when he left his wife and Maori hosts to undertake the command of a variety of European vessels in which he toured the coast collecting flax. 161

Kent was, therefore, like J.V. Cowell, Philip Tapsell and Barnet Burns, a trader who saw that becoming a Pakeha-Maori would facilitate his trading. John Marmon and James Caddell, on the other hand, were Pakeha-Maoris who saw that an involvement in the timber and flax trade would enable them to lessen their dependence on their Maori hosts. 162

While the traders who lived in centres with larger European populations may not have needed to observe Maori customs to the extent that they became Pakeha-Maoris, they nonetheless had to take care to respect Maori proptries and laws throughout the period to 1840. 163 In addition to heeding Maori customs and tapu restrictions those traders who lived with or near large groups of other Europeans were also constrained by European values and sanctions. Hokianga River society, for example, was markedly sectional and the Europeans living there all felt the constraints of the 'class-consciousness' that resulted.


In part these social distinctions were created by the traditional attitudes Europeans brought with them from Britain or the colonies. For instance James Buller, a WMS missionary, summarized his view of the structure of Hokianga society and the missionaries' attitudes towards their fellow residents during his initial voyage up the River. He wrote:

At nearly every bend, a rude and lonely hut was standing. This was made of slabs, and thatched with grass. A boat, or a canoe, floated in front of it, or was lying on the beach. It was the home of some white man, living in a semi-barbarous style, with a Maori woman, and surrounded by their half-caste progeny. He was perhaps an escaped convict, or a runaway sailor. About two hundred of these classes were living on the shores of the river. They worked as axe-men, sawyers, etc., for the few traders who were located on their respective establishments. 164

The imported distinctions were reinforced by the economic interdependence of the merchants and timbermen on the River. The Hokianga timber merchants required regular and sufficient supplies of spars and timbers if they were to be effective agents for their colonial or British employers. To that extent they relied on the work of the sawyers whom they either employed on wages or whose produce they contracted to purchase. However the merchants grew wealthier from the trade than did the sawyers because, it appears, it was they who determined what timber would be exported from the River. This situation arose because, by the 1830s, when a colonial or British merchant sent a vessel to the Hokianga, the task of loading it was usually assigned to a specified agent. Therefore even if a sawyer had been willing to face the risks and costs of freighting his timber to Sydney or Hobart for sale,

he may not have been able to secure enough cargo space in a vessel even to get the wood out of the River. By the late 1830s this control of the trade had devolved onto a few leading merchants. Indeed it was claimed that after 1837 George Frederick Russell of Kohukohu had a stronghold over timber exports from the Hokianga.\(^{165}\) Timbermen, therefore, were forced to accept whatever the merchants were willing to pay them for their timber.

However the merchants' ascendancy over the livelihood of the sawyers went beyond this. The timbermen required provisions, and the only readily accessible source of these were the stores controlled by the merchants. The inflated prices charged at these stores served to further reinforce the distinction between merchants and timbermen. Baron de Thierry\(^{166}\) claimed that shirts which sold at 25-28s per dozen in Sydney were retailed at 6s each in the Hokianga, and that 9s 4d blankets were sold to timbermen for £1.0.0d. De Thierry argued that because the timberman was unable to afford these 'comforts of domestic life' (and because he had to sell his timber through the merchant) he was 'driven' instead to a feeling of futility which he expressed by pursuing vices, such as drunkenness, on an unparalleled scale.\(^{167}\) Many merchants also allowed their clients to become indebted to them for goods or grog\(^{168}\) and then offered them only low prices for the wood they agreed to supply to discharge their debts.

Hokianga merchants also attempted to impose a similar control over other aspects of the lives of the European residents of the River. For instance the missionaries and

---


166. Charles Philip Hippolytus, Baron de Thierry (1793(?)-1864), self-styled Sovereign Chief of New Zealand, arrived in the Hokianga in 1837. He eked out a living as a merchant, timberman and farmer at Mt Isobel until 1845. He spent his later years in Auckland -J.D. Raeside, Sovereign Chief, a Biography of Baron de Thierry, Christchurch, 1977; Encyclopaedia of New Zealand, III, 394-5.
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merchants combined to inflict the most severe restrictions on
the spirits-loving timbermen. In September 1835 a public
meeting of missionaries, merchants and Maoris resolved to
prohibit the importation of spirits into the Hokianga River.
The timbermen demonstrated their opposition in a vocal and
oft-times violent way. However the Prohibition, which was
officially in place for about a year, proved to be ineffective
because timbermen and some merchants managed to smuggle
spirits off visiting ships or to bring them across from the
Bay of Islands. Moreover the Hokianga Maoris proved less
than rigorous in enforcing the ban.

The Europeans who lived at timber stations also found
their lives regulated, to some extent, by the whims of their
employers. For instance David Clarke, the Superintendent of
the Te Horeke station, was instructed by his employers,
Thomas Raine and Gordon Browne, to keep the settlement 'as
regular and orderly as possible' and to control the issuing
of spirits so as to avoid drunkenness. He was also told to
observe the Sabbath strictly, particularly by forbidding all
work on Sundays either on the station or by the men on their
own account. In addition he was to assist the missionaries
in every way that was possible. Clarke apparently
followed these instructions and as well as keeping his station
in order he was largely responsible for provisioning the WMS
missionaries throughout 1827 while they struggled to establish
their station in the Hokianga.

169. See, for instance, C.O. Davis, The Life and Times of
Patuone, the Celebrated Ngapuhi Chief, Auckland, 1876,
pp.31-4.

170. R.B.H. Sharp, 'Alcohol in New Zealand 1642-1840',
B.A. (Hons) research exercise, Massey University, 1976,

171. T. Raine, An Extract from Mr. Clarke's Instructions
from Messrs Raine & Gordon D Brown. Merchants, Sydney,
(1827), (WTu, Misc MSS 1022); S.G., 21 May 1828;
H. Williams, The Early Journals of Henry Williams
1826-40, ed. L.M. Rogers, Christchurch, 1961, 15 June
1827.

Gordon Browne seems to have enforced the same rules at his stations at Mahurangi and in Mercury Bay. For example on Sunday 16 January 1834 Hodgskin recorded in his narrative that the residents at the Mahurangi station did not work on that day and were clean, neat and well dressed. Presumably these men had little choice but to live by the rules imposed on their station if they wished to remain employed. In contrast, at Webster's Herekino station Sundays were apparently times for drunken revelry.

Living in a community increased the possibility of the trader's becoming involved in disputes with other Europeans. Brawling and fighting among drunken timbemen was a frequent occurrence in the Hokianga and undoubtedly in other timber communities. However, the most serious and the most common grounds for dispute between Europeans concerned property (particularly land) and the right to control trade.

For instance shortly after Gordon Browne had established his station at Mahurangi in May 1832 he left Joseph Kendall in charge and sailed for Hokianga to buy supplies for the men. Meanwhile the Lucy Ann called at the station. On board was Joseph Weller who had been forced to leave the Waikato River after a Maori attack on his station there. Weller proceeded to remove stores and timber from the station on account of a debt Kendall apparently owed the Wellers. Browne returned to find that Weller had also broken down his sawpits and convinced four of his men to return to Sydney. In addition he had persuaded Kendall to place the rest of the stores and the men of the station on the Lucy Ann, supposedly because Weller had heard that the local Maoris were about to attack

173. Hodgskin, p. 35.
175. See for example Markham, p. 31, and the complaint of Dennis Brown Cochrane, McDonnell to Colonial Secretary 22 September, 3 October 1836, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1836, (AONSW, 4/2326.2, items 36/8243, 36/8626).
the station. The _Lucy Ann_ was preparing to sail from the
harbour when Browne returned and, with the support of local
Maoris, he tried to force his way aboard the vessel and to
reclaim his property. After being repelled Browne succeeded
in taking one of the _Lucy Ann_ 's boats which he held, after
the vessel sailed, as a penalty for the theft of his goods.\footnote{176}
Whether Kendall was indebted to the Wellers or not (they had no
claimed a debt due before Kendall left Sydney) Joseph Weller's
objective appeared to have been to dislodge the fledgling
station. His action in destroying the sawpits and in attempting
to seduce the other sawyers away attest this motive. Perhaps
he felt that his firm had a prior or better right to the
timber to be exported from Mahurangi.

The famed 'Battle of the Plank' also revolved around
a question of commercial rivalry. In December 1836 Captain
William Crow, master of the _Brazil Packet_, returned to the
Hokianga to load his vessel. Crow had arranged with two
resident sawyers to prepare some timber for him and to claim
their supplies on credit from the merchant (possibly Francis
White) who was Crow's agent in the Hokianga. Apparently the
merchant refused to part with any goods and the sawyers had
been forced to borrow money and to beg for supplies in order
to sustain themselves during the ensuing winter. When Crow
returned he refused to load their timber, and thus enable
them to clear their debts, until he had loaded timber from
another station further up the River which was owned by Thomas
Cassidy. The sawyers feared that Crow was planning either to
seize their timber without payment (as he had done to another
timberman earlier) or to offer them only a small price for it.
Alternatively, they feared that he would fill his hold with
Cassidy's spars and leave without collecting the timber they
had prepared. Thus they called on their fellow residents to

\footnote{176. Police Superintendent, New South Wales, to Colonial
Secretary, 12 October 1832, with three enclosed affidavits, (AONSW, 4/21642, item 32/7634); R. Dacre
to Colonial Secretary, 18 October 1832, (AONSW,
4/2164.2, item 32/7845); G.D. Browne to Bourke, 22
November, enclosure Browne to Busby, 22 November 1833,
NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, (NPL/D,
N Ar/1, item 34/2051).}
support their cause. Thomas McDonnell, some of whose timber Cassidy had apparently stolen for selling to Crow, gathered a party of timbermen and merchants at Koutu (One Tree Point) together with the Maoris who were responsible for protecting them. The host marched on Crow’s station where they found Crow, William White (the then deposed WMS missionary) and John Marmon, together with their Maori supporters who included Tamati Waka Nene. Instead of developing into a bloody battle, the affair ended when McDonnell set fire to the timber that was in dispute.177

These two cases illustrate aspects common to many inter-European conflicts: no permanent physical harm was done to any person involved; both concerned the desire for control over resources and trading; and in both instances the Europeans encouraged their Maori supporters to join in the affray.178 However disputes over the control of trade were not restricted to the large centres. For instance Marshall and Payne, the only two traders at Port Waikato, quarrelled over the right to load the Samuel when it called at that port in 1831.179

The other major type of inter-European dispute related to land and the ownership of the resources on it. One particular quarrel involved land in the Hokia nga which William White had purchased from Thomas Cassidy in 1834. Apparently from that time one boundary line of the property had been disputed by the merchant Thomas Poyntton who owned land adjoining it. An attempt was made to clear up the dispute in 1836

177. Markham, pp.87-8; S.H., 19 January 1837; Wigglesworth, 'Marmion', p. 46.
178. See a similar example where William Webster claimed that another timberman stole 2000 feet of timber from him and was encouraging local Maoris to rob his store - Webster to Busby, 25 November 1838, (W Arc, BR 1/2).
179. St John, p. 33.
when both men drew up a boundary line which was witnessed by selected leading Hokianga residents. However in April 1839 Poynton accused Francis White of taking timber from his land. Again the matter was taken, apparently agreeably, to arbitration. Thus when, in Poynton's view, the Whites continued to take his timber, he went to Francis White's yard and took 21 spars which were to be held until White returned the timber that Poynton claimed had been taken from his land. The dispute again tested the loyalties of both the Maoris and Europeans on the River and in July the matter was referred to James Busby, the British Resident. When Busby ruled in Poynton's favour William White took the case to Sydney and submitted it to the Governor who advised him to follow the due process of law. White, however, seems to have let the matter drop. 180

In sum, while some observers may have believed that the European community in New Zealand was 'as bad as it can be' and that the Europeans there were the 'very refuse of society', 181 in fact most traders led hard and tedious lives which were regulated, especially in the larger centres, by socio-economic divisions and by the customs and conventions of two societies.

180. Poynton to Busby, 12 July 1839, William and Francis White to Busby, 12 August 1839, (WARc, BRI/2); Busby to Colonial Secretary, 30 July 1839, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1839, (AONSW, 4/2460.4, item 39/9482); William White to Colonial Secretary, 12 September 1839, (AONSW, 4/2460.4 item 39/10163).

181. Flatt, evidence, Montefiore, evidence, Wilkinson, evidence, 1838 Report, pp.44, 61, 97; C. Darwin, The Voyage of the Beagle, (new edition), London, 1959, p. 414. These men were referring specifically to the Bay of Islands, but their comments may be taken as their attitude to most secular European residents.
IT IS clear that the resident European timber and flax traders and the lives they led differed from the descriptions provided by their contemporaries. In their ranks were included a few deserters, runaways and ex-convicts, but the bulk of them were young men, many of whom had been to New Zealand before as sailors, visiting traders or mission station employees. Other merchants, timbermen and collectors were encouraged to go to New Zealand by friends and relatives and because they believed that there they would find an outlet for their talents and skills.

The Europeans found that their way of life in New Zealand was restrained by the physical and social environment in which they lived. There were obvious variations in the circumstances of those traders who lived alone, or virtually so, in the predominantly Maori communities and those who chose to live in larger European settlements. Whether or not they had European spouses, the quality and nature of their housing and the variety of their diet often depended on where in New Zealand they lived. Moreover while all the traders strove to retain some aspects of the life they had known before going to New Zealand, living in a larger centre provided more opportunities for employment and for sustaining a life-style that most closely approximated that found in the colonies or Great Britain.

The extent to which their lives were influenced by Maori and European laws and conventions also differed. At one end of the spectrum were the Pakeha-Maoris who lived as Maoris. At the other extreme were the wealthier merchants in the larger European settlements whose daily lives were little affected by Maori customs and who attempted to live by and to impose upon their fellow residents a pattern of social divisions, morality and laws which they brought to New Zealand with them.

In the last analysis, however, the nature of a merchant's, timberman's, or collector's life in New Zealand depended on his
personal attributes. The successful traders were those men who could adapt to their new environment, who could retain respect in their dealings with other Europeans in New Zealand and with their colonial and British employers, and those who gained the confidence and co-operation of the Maoris amongst whom they worked.
Chapter Five
Maoris and the Timber and Flax Trade

European merchants found that those Maoris who participated directly in the process of exporting timber and flax were innovative, skillful and enthusiastic traders. The New Zealanders' primary aim was to acquire European goods. A study of the items which were bartered for fibre and wood not only provides evidence of changes in Maori demands, but also allows further conclusions to be formed about the areas in New Zealand from which timber and flax were exported.

The results of their participation in the timber and flax trade and the demands it made on them were not the same for all Maori traders. It took a considerable amount of time to prepare these products for selling to Europeans. Making provision for that time often involved some interruption to Maoris' daily and seasonal work patterns, their social obligations and the pattern of their warfare. Moreover, for those Maoris who did not live near the coast or a trading port the process of selling wood and fibre could involve individuals or groups either in transporting their produce to a suitable port or in shifting their homes to a site which was nearer a European trader. The other requirement for successful trading was Maoris' willingness to accommodate, or at least to tolerate, the presence of European traders.

FROM THE time of the first contacts Europeans became aware that Maoris knew how to barter. Cook complained, in his Journal entry at Queen Charlotte Sound on 20 November 1773, that the exchange of tapa for Maori curios was weighted in the Europeans' favour 'till an old man, who was no stranger to us, came and assisted his countrymen with his advice and in a
moment turned the exchanges above a thousand percent in their favour'.

Nicholas reported that the master of the **Jefferson** laid a similar charge against Tupe and Tara, two Bay of Islands chiefs, for having spoilt his trade in 1814. They had 'incited' the others 'to every species of extortion; and the consequence was, that he was either obliged not to buy from them at all, or to purchase their supplies at more than four times what they were worth' (according to the master's notions). Nicholas supported the veracity of this statement from his own experiences. He laid down a cardinal rule for trade in New Zealand: 'to bargain distinctly for everything, and to take nothing for granted that is not previously stipulated'. If the European left the Maori to stipulate his own price, 'they will generally make it exorbitant, and oppose any abatement that might be required by the purchaser, insisting upon having their extravagant demand'.

He admitted that the same was common practice among the merchants of Europe and by way of summary he characterized Bay Maoris as being as keen on profit 'as the most crafty Jews on the Royal Exchange'.

Later writers sustained this view. A commentator in the *Sydney Gazette* in 1829 reported that it required 'no common skill to traffic with the New Zealanders, who are extremely shrewd in making bargains'. Similarly in 1833 the Rev. John Orton dismissed the opinion of the WMS missionary William White that missionaries should intervene

between Maoris and traders to protect the former. He did so on the grounds that Maoris appeared to him to be 'quite competent to negotiate their own affairs and to make their own bargains, they are uncommonly shrewd and keen in all transactions of barter and business'.

Moreover European commentators found that this bartering was not solely confined to Maoris' trading with Europeans. Maoris bargained amongst themselves. The missionaries called such events hoko or hakari, meaning fair or show. In 1823 the WMS missionaries Hobbs and Turner reported the proceedings of a fair at Whangaroa where European knives and fish hooks which had been obtained from the missionaries were traded for fish, mats and other items brought to Whangaroa by Maoris who had travelled some distance to trade. In fact trading of this kind seemed to be a regular feature of most Maori occasions. Polack claimed that, certainly in the 1830s, bartering was an integral part of the business at even the sacred hahunga ceremonies. He also suggested that by the late 1830s the market had become the sole reason for retaining the hahunga.

Bargaining and cunning in trade were not the only examples of Maoris' commercial acumen. They were also quick to take advantage of new and changing markets. For example in 1820 the Whangaroa Maoris planted a speculative crop of potatoes when HMS Dromedary first arrived in their harbour. Their speculation was successful because the ship was still there in November when the potatoes were dug and sold to the crew.

Similarly when Maoris travelled overseas they discovered that shipping was subject to a variety of port dues and charges. Many began to introduce these in their own harbours. For example, in 1835 harbour dues were paid by means of gifts to local chiefs in the Bay of Islands; the Hokianga Maoris were considering charging anchorage fees by the mid-1830s; in the Thames, port dues were being charged early in 1836; and Commander Wilkes noted in 1840 that it was customary to pay Te Rauparaha two muskets or the equivalent as dues before entering Cloudy Bay. Another European inspired offshoot of trading was the introduction of currency. Indeed by the mid-1830s it was reported that in the Bay of Islands money was replacing barter as the dominant means for exchange.

Thus while Maoris may have learnt new commercial conventions through their contact with Europeans they were, from before the time of first contacts, as adept at the skills of buying, selling and assessing the value of their products as any visiting trader.


BY THE late 1830s the profits being made from the timber trade by Maoris seemed very large to European commentators. At any one time a chief, as receiver and redistributor of trade goods, could be a comparatively wealthy man. The Rev. James Buller claimed that some chiefs in the Hokianga received upwards of £100 worth of goods for a single ship-load of timber. Later, in 1841, the ex-missionary and merchant William White informed a meeting in Hokianga that in return for timber 'in the next six months myself and two other merchants will pay the natives at least five thousand pounds they are a rich people'.

However trying to more accurately determine what Maoris received for specified quantities of timber and flax during the period 1769-1840 or even attempting to indicate if there is any observable trend in the variety of prices paid by Europeans for these products, is impossible. This is largely because the type and the quantity of European goods that Maoris received in exchange for wood and fibre were determined by a combination of factors. These included Maoris' demands, the items which Europeans had to offer and the relative commercial skills of individual Maori and European traders.

Appendix 23 summarizes all the quantifiable exchanges that were found during this study. These examples serve to illustrate the range of variables which determined the goods that Maoris received.

These figures cannot in any way be regarded as averages or 'typical' in the amounts of goods that were exchanged. The two bargains of 1814 were struck by the Rev. Samuel Marsden, a hard-headed trader but one who enjoyed a great deal of mana among the Bay Maoris with whom he was trading. In consequence the price paid probably included a factor of gifting and might have been lower than would ordinarily have been the case. On the other hand, because they were forbidden to trade in muskets, which were much in

14. J. Buller to Miss Dawes, 2 January 1837, J. Buller, Correspondence, 1837-39, (NLA, MS 4020, NK 2231), p.6.
demand, the men of HMS Dromedary in 1820 did not have much success in procuring one spar for an axe. So too, the 1834 figure from the voyage of HMS Buffalo cannot be regarded as typical of the trade at that time. The master of the Buffalo was accused of spoiling Maoris by overpaying them for their timber. Moreover Richard Hodgskin's diary of this voyage showed that after the Maoris had received the payment many of them sold their muskets, cartouche boxes and bayonets back to the ship's company and purchased from them half-worn blankets in exchange.16

The other bargains cited may not even have been typical of the exchanges made during the voyages to which they refer, let alone be guides to 'average' payments. The giving of a musket in 1815 got the trader, William Hovell of the Trial, the promise but not the receipt of a ton of flax. Peter Dillon's payment, one musket or equal value of powder for 20 spars, represents the maximum he was prepared to offer. In fact he purchased much of his timber for a consideration which was lower than that recorded here. Finally Tapsell's estimate for Maketu in the 1830s probably suffered from being the recollection of his old age.

A similar lack of precision is seen in the other few examples of specific bargains struck during the peak years of the trade - late 1820s and 1830s. They consist of general comments that outline the types of European goods which were exchanged without any guide to quantities. However the data suggest that an early predominance of firearms as trade items gave way to more diverse tastes and, finally, to an apparent preference for blankets and European clothing.

The sealer John Boultbee recorded that in 1827 Maoris on Pahia Peninsula in Southland sold flax and potatoes for powder, balls and muskets. Some other European goods

16. R. Hodgskin, A Narrative of Eight Months' Sojourn in New Zealand ..., Coleraine, 1841, p. 36.
were also traded but muskets were the most popular item.\textsuperscript{17} Then in 1831, probably on the basis of his observations of trading in the Cook Strait area during 1830, the Sydney merchant Bell was able to respond to the question put to him by Lieut-Colonel Dumesq:

Q. Would not Woolen Cloths, Blankets \&c be exchangeable for the Flax?
A. In the Winter Season Blankets \& Wollen Slops (?) are very good trade. For Pigs, Potatoes, Curiosities Labor \&c and small parcels of flax. The usual exchange is Tomahawks, Pipes, Fish Hooks (?), Knives, Tobacco, Cotton Hkchfs, Paper for Cartridges (?) Lead or Musket Bullets, Cartouch Boxes, Bayonets, Cutlasses, Bullet Moulds \& Leather Belts — They are all very fond of smoking, and are beginning to like Rum which inclination will no doubt increase rapidly amongst them. \textsuperscript{18}

In the following year the \textit{Australian} reported that Maoris were willing to trade their flax for 'blankets', 'blue gurrahs' (rough Indian muslin) and 'Parramatta cloth' (wool and cotton mix coarse cloth made in the Parramatta convict factory).\textsuperscript{19}

The variety of Maori demands does not seem to have lessened as the decade progressed. Referring to his time in New Zealand in 1834 the CMS catechist John flatt told the House of Lords' Committee in 1838 that blankets, axes, adzes, knives, razors, muskets and powder were exchanged for flax.\textsuperscript{20} However a payment for timber and spars taken from Waiheke Island in December 1839 was composed solely of scarlet blankets, prints and European clothing.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[17.] A.C. and N.C. Begg, \textit{The World of John Boultbee}, Christchurch, 1979, p. 171.
\item[18.] Bell to Dumesq, enclosed in Dumesq to Hay, 20 November 1831, CO201/223, f. 364a. The '(?)*' indicates that the words were obscured by the frayed edge of the manuscript.
\item[19.] \textit{Australian}, 14 October 1831.
\item[20.] Flatt, evidence, 1838 \textit{Report}, p. 54
\item[21.] Octavius Browne to Eliza Moxon, 3 February 1842, in O. Browne, \textit{Letters}, 1823-42, (NLA, MS 330).
\end{enumerate}
What little general comment is found concerning the amounts of goods exchanged for timber and flax in the 1830s suggests that there was some consistency in the price sought by coastal Maoris. Variations in the quantities of goods Maoris received were more likely to occur between coastal and inland people. Thus Polack wrote, with reference to flax:

The value of the article varies exceedingly in price throughout the country: thus a basket of flax of one hundred pounds weight, might formerly have been purchased for the value in barter of three-pence in several stations to the southward of the Bay of Islands, whereas in such places where Europeans resided in numbers, competition consequently took place; the same weight could with difficulty be procured for fifty times that amount; and a ton of flax is probably more expensive in the Bay of Islands, than in Sydney, where it is imported from the south and west coasts of New Zealand. ... In the interior villages in New Zealand, the native manufactures and produce are extremely cheap, whereas European goods are altogether as dear. We have seen a native satisfied at receiving half a head of tobacco (the 24th part of a pound) for one hundred pounds of flax, which he had moreover carried over hill and dale, full forty miles. 22

An alternative source of information concerning the types of goods Maoris received are shipping records. A sample of outwards cargoes from the colonies, 1829-1839, is provided in Appendix 24. While bearing in mind the qualifications outlined in the notes attached to this Appendix the data from this sample of cargoes can be said to show those items which were most commonly exchanged for timber and flax. In addition they provide some insight into the changes in the variety of European goods being offered to Maoris (which, it is held, reflects changes in Maori demands) and a further indication of the areas of New Zealand in which trading was concentrated at certain times during the 1830s.

22. Polack, Manners, I, 185.
The data suggest that blankets, European clothing, alcohol, tobacco, ironware/tools, arms and ammunition were the items most commonly found in the outwards cargoes of vessels which returned with cargoes of timber and flax.

Blankets were significant items in cargoes especially from the mid-1830s. It is not certain when Maoris began using European blankets but these were requested as trade items from the crew of HMS Dromedary after April 1820 when cold weather set in.23 Also, throughout the 1820s the missionaries pursued a policy of encouraging Maoris to accept blankets as trade in place of arms and ammunition. Thus by 1827 the CMS reported a huge demand for blankets in the Bay of Islands24 and in 1829 the Rev. John Hobbs reported that blankets alone would secure pork for the WMS in the Hokianga.25

By the mid-1830s, referring again to the northern regions, Markham and Yate claimed that blankets had replaced mats as the usual Maori apparel.26 The demand for blankets seems to have spread throughout New Zealand during the 1830s and this accounts not only for their prevalence in vessels' cargoes but also for the special imports of 'heavy blankets' which had been purchased with the New Zealand trade in mind.27

European clothing was also found as part of most of the cargoes. Some of this would have been for the European settlers at New Zealand but Maoris also began to use it from the early years of contact. At first they wore the garments as a mark of refinement and decoration; this point being highlighted by descriptions of the placement of it about their persons on important occasions such as visits to pa and attending church. \(^{28}\) However as the 1830s progressed Maoris living near the larger centres of European population came to wear clothing in the same way as Europeans. By 1840, most notably in the Bay of Islands, the Hokianga, and the various whaling stations, Maoris' wearing of European clothes, in varying states of repair, was commonplace and only a few of the older Maori were seen to wear traditional cloaks. \(^{29}\) However in most parts of New Zealand it was not common to see Maoris wearing European fashions until later in the nineteenth century. \(^{30}\)

Consignments of alcohol and tobacco figured prominently among the sample cargoes. Many were destined for the use of the Europeans living in New Zealand \(^{31}\) and so much alcohol and tobacco was illicitly re-imported to the colonies that it raised the ire of colonial authorities. \(^{32}\)

---

28. Maoris wore uniforms at Marsden's historic sermon - Marsden's Account of his First Visit to New Zealand, H.R.N.Z., I, 363. See also descriptions in Yate, p. 159; Polack, New Zealand, I, 80, 393.


31. Markham, p. 47.

32. S.G., 5 July 1837.
However the Maoris’ consumption of these items was still sufficiently large to arouse contemporary comment.

Tobacco smoking became popular in the northern regions of New Zealand in the late 1820s. 33 Shortly afterwards it was being viewed as an addiction. Edward Markham recalled that tobacco was the ‘current coin’ in the north in 1834 34 or at least so it seemed to the European travellers and traders who had to precede every request for Maori assistance with the offer of a fig or two of the weed. 35

Moreover by the late 1830s tobacco smoking was practised by Maoris of all age groups and in most parts of the country. 36 Many Maoris who had not seen a European had come to know and use tobacco. Thus Joel Polack claimed to be the first European to have visited the Kahu River (which flows down to the Kaipara Harbour) in 1832, yet he found that tobacco was in great demand. 37 Also Thomas Cheesman reported that smoking was commonplace among the otherwise unsophisticated Maoris of Ngunguru and Tutukaka in 1837. 38 This process, whereby the use and knowledge of European things preceded the arrival of Europeans in some parts of the country, was a common phenomenon and other examples included iron, potatoes, Bibles and Christian worship.

34. Markham, pp.47, 61-3.
37. Polack, New Zealand, I, 132.
38. T.F. Cheesman, Logs and Journal on Board HMS Buffalo, 27 April 1836 – 20 March 1841, (WTu,fMS 1836-1841 P), 9 October 1837.
Some Maoris were recorded drinking alcohol in the early 1830s. However the habit does not seem to have spread much beyond these Maoris, who lived in areas where there was constant contact with Europeans. Even in these places it appears that the regular drinking of alcohol was the prerogative of chiefs. Pōmare of Otuhiu, for example, was reckoned to be one of the biggest grogsellers in the Bay of Islands. It was rumoured that he had his own still and he was reported to have retained European traders in his pa solely to ensure a regular supply of spirits.

Chiefs elsewhere, who were closely associated with the timber and flax trade, also drank 'ardent spirits'. Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata of the Kapiti region were noted for their drunkenness and their freebooting for liquor and Mōetara, a Hokiang a chief, was described by a missionary as being 'sorely wounded on the great battle field of intemperance'. Moreover some Maoris secured large quantities of alcohol. Markham recorded that one Hokiang a chief had fifty gallons of rum which he intended to use to demonstrate his hospitality to his guests at a forthcoming haka ri. Thus while the use of tobacco was widespread among Maoris of all ranks and in many parts of the country, alcohol drinking was confined to a smaller section of the Maori

39. William Yate cited in Wright, p. 70; H. Williams, Journals, 30 December 1832.


43. S.G., 7 April 1838; D.P. Millar, 'Whalers, Flax Traders and Maoris of the Cook Strait Area: An Historical Study in Cultural Confrontation ', Dominion Museum Records in Ethnology, II, no. 6, April 1971, 69.

44. Markham, pp.30, 89 n.14.

45. Markham, p. 52.
traders who were in regular contact with Europeans.

The value of iron as an item of barter was well established in whichever part of New Zealand a European trader called. Although Maoris were introduced to iron by the navigators, their demand for it, and particularly for finished tools such as axes, adzes, hoes and spades, appeared to be unabated throughout the period of this study. In the Bay of Islands area the process of replacing Maori stone and wooden implements with European iron tools was said, by one commentator, to have been completed by the mid-1830s but even there the requirement for more iron-ware does not seem to have diminished. The demand throughout New Zealand for iron and iron products continued to be large because loss, breakage, rust and wear kept depleting stocks.

It is not known when Maoris first began to purchase muskets. Firearms were certainly associated with the bartering of cargoes of flax from the time Simeon Lord gave Hongi, Pomare and Te Koki muskets in 1815 in expectation of their providing him with flax. Between 1829 and 1831 arms were a predominant part of all the cargoes in the sample (Appendix 24). This was probably because most of the flax traded in the late 1820s came from areas where the people were spurred to trade by a desire to arm themselves and to thus escape being again dominated by Bay of Islands Ngapuhi.

From 1831 the relative importance of muskets in the sample cargoes, and presumably their value as a trade item, declined. Large cargoes of muskets cited in a manifest after that year, such as the Byron 1833 and the Bardaster 1834, were an indication that the vessel was bound for areas of New Zealand where muskets were in short supply. In these examples it was to Kawhia and Tolaga Bay that they were respectively bound. By 1835, however, muskets appear to have been of such limited value as trade items in some areas of New Zealand that cargoes of them were returned to the colonies unsold. Examples of this include the voyages of

46. Polack, Manners, I, 194-5.
the Nimrod 1835 which visited Poverty Bay, and the James Laing 1836 which tried to barter muskets in the Hokianga. Even the Achilles which visited Mercury Bay and the west coast (presumably Kawhia) in 1837 could not quit more than two cases of muskets.

This discussion confirms Dorothy Urlich's analysis of the diffusion of firearms in New Zealand. She showed that firearms were first introduced in the northern ports - the Bay of Islands and Whangaroa. During the 1820s muskets were spread to Maoris as far south as Cook Strait. As more tribes collected muskets, especially through trade, they were able to use them against their enemies or to sell them to their allies. In this way, Urlich argued, by 1830 most of the coastal hapu had at least one musket for every two warriors. During the early 1830s, through continued warfare and inter-tribal trading as well as through the medium of European trade, musket ownership reached saturation level (one firearm per warrior) in most parts of the North Island. The corollary to her argument is that where there was a surplus of arms there was also a dampening of the market and demand for them. 47

The same cannot be said for the items for which the extensive use of musketry created a demand - gunpowder, lead, cartridge paper, flints and cartouche boxes. The manifests showed that these items continued to form a part of almost every cargo in the sample. Earle noted this effect in 1827. He said that while the Bay of Islands Maoris had probably bought all the muskets they needed there would be a bottomless demand for ammunition and powder to keep them firing. 48 Maoris also liked to keep large quantities of powder (and presumably other accoutrements) on hand. For

48. Earle, pp.84-5.
instance the trader Bell reported to Colonel Dumaresq that he had met a chief on the Kapiti coast in 1830 who had seven hundredweight of powder stored in his sleeping quarters. Others, Bell went on to assert, kept as much as a ton or two of powder.49 Thus while the purchasing of muskets decreased during the 1830s, ammunition continued to be a popular trade item.

Iron pots, soap and tea were the other European trade goods which were frequently mentioned in the sample cargoes. These goods did not come into general use among Maoris before 1840. Only those Maoris who lived near major trading outlets or large European settlements appear to have used them consistently. For instance Jameson claimed that, by 1840, iron pots were regarded as indispensible by Bay of Islands Maoris and that most households there appeared to have at least one.50 Soap was reported to be one of the items the missionaries exchanged for the pork, potatoes and maize that Maoris brought to sell at a 'fair' in Waimate in 1835.51

Participating in the timber and flax trade was one route by which a Maori trader could acquire a variety of European goods. Maori demands changed with time and Maoris' tastes often differed according to the location of their hapu. The latter point is important in understanding the significance of the changes in the overall composition of the cargoes during the 1830s (Appendix 25). Increasingly they included items such as alcohol, iron pots, soap, tea and European clothing - items that appear to have been little used in New Zealand outside of the areas where Europeans were resident in large numbers. The inference is that after 1836 timber trade vessels were bound for trading with Maoris who were living in ports which had a large European populace. This is consistent with the conclusion of an earlier chapter, that the timber trade was based on centres which had significant European populations.

49. Bell to Dumaresq, CO201/223, f.367a.
The use of European goods had a significant impact on pre-contact Maori technology. It also indirectly affected many aspects of Maoris' social and cultural life. Timber and flax traders, however, rarely concerned themselves with the secondary consequences of providing Maoris with European goods. Their overriding aim was to offer to Maoris any items which would induce them to prepare cargoes of wood or fibre. Nonetheless some contemporaries did take the time to make observations about the effects of the introduction of certain goods — notably blankets, European clothing, tobacco, arms and ammunition.

Edward Markham wrote 'Rum, Blankets, Muskets, Tobacco and Diseases have been the great destroyers of Maoris'. Earlier in his account he had claimed that the Maoris' misuse of blankets was the reason for the prevalence of consumption in New Zealand. In support of this he cited the case of a Maori who wore three blankets in the height of summer but who, by the winter, had given two away and was continually cold. The Wesleyan missionary James Buller was also concerned that, along with warfare, bad diet and uncleanness, the injudicious use of European clothing and blankets was contributing to Maori population decline. He gave as his example Maoris who wore two blankets at once only to take the blankets off to lie on the damp ground when they got too hot. Other commentators and writers made similar claims about the effects of the replacement of traditional Maori clothing by European equivalents.

Markham also claimed, on the basis of his visits to the Bay of Islands in 1834, that 'European clothing is becoming so necessary to them now, that the Natives are fast loosing the art of Matt making'. This apparent decline in cloak production was again underlined late in 1836. At that

52. Markham, pp.47, 83.
53. J. Buller to W. Lawry, 6 October 1838, (NLA, MS4020, NK2231) p. 163.
55. Markham, p. 66n.
time Bay Maoris were preparing for war and they had to produce so many new kahu kuri (dogskin cloaks) for the warring chiefs that they needed to import dogskins from New South Wales. 56

The evidence provided by contemporary writers also suggests that the smoking of tobacco by both Maoris and Europeans assisted in improving relations between them. This sense of camaraderie is portrayed in Polack's many descriptions of his sitting around a fire often in miserable and damp conditions, talking and smoking with his Maori guides. 57 Similarly a measure of tobacco became an acceptable and, for Europeans, an inexpensive and willingly given form of utu. For instance when Markham's dog Venus bit Moetara's bared buttock, the chief demanded one fig of tobacco for every tooth mark. Markham cheerfully parted with eight figs as compensation for a crime which in earlier years may have cost his dog's (or his own) life. 58 Whereas previously Europeans had resented being obliged to provide utu for crimes they were often unaware that they were committing, the almost ritualized payments of tobacco became a small price to pay to rectify relations between themselves and Maoris.

Traders and other contemporary commentators tended to the view that the introduction of muskets did not increase the number of casualties resulting from Maori warfare. 59 They

56. S.G., 26 November 1836.
57. See, for example, Polack, New Zealand, I, 153.
58. Markham, p. 30.
59. Bigge to Bathurst, 27 February 1823, B.T., Box 28, pp. 7190-7191; H.R.N.Z., I, 589; Bell to Dumasqr, CO201/ 223, f.368a; J. Buller to Miss Dawes, 2 January 1837, (NLA, MS4020, NK2231), p.15.
Such a view contradicts the view advanced by several twentieth century writers, for example Wright, Chapter V; Shawcross, pp.195,261-2; J. Binney, 'Christianity and the Maoris to 1840: A Comment', N.Z.J.H., III, no.2, October 1969, 163; A.R. Vayda, War in Ecological Perspective, New York, 1976, Chapter IV.
concluded this because the weapons received by Maoris, at least in the 1820s, were of a poor quality and because Maoris, generally, were inexpert in handling the new weapons.

The most common type of firearm taken to New Zealand before 1840, and the type of action most preferred by Maoris, was the flint-lock musket, although the New Zealanders were also reported in possession of pistols, cannons and double-barrelled shotguns. Under optimum conditions a well-kept flint-lock musket being used by an expert marksman was an inefficient and inaccurate firearm. The weapons sold to Maoris were, at best, second rate. For instance George Bayly recorded that Peter Dillon had bought second-hand muskets to exchange for timber and that the crew spent much time on the voyage to New Zealand in cleaning and polishing the iron action so that it would be shiny enough to deceive the Maoris. Similarly Bell informed Dumesq that, initially, providing a trader could manage to fire the musket once, he could sell it. By the early 1830s, however, the Maoris were skilled at selecting the best of the firearms and James Busby reported that one master could not sell a cargo of muskets because they were 'single bridled' and thus did not meet Maori specifications.

60. R. McNab, The Old Whaling Days, Christchurch, 1913, p. 161; J. Busby to A. Busby, 1 March 1839, J. Busby, Letters to James Busby, 1830-1866; and Letters from Busby to his brother Alexander, 1830-9, (WTu, qMS BUS); E. Campbell, The Present State, Resources and Prospects Of New Zealand, London, 1840, p.18.


62. Polack, Manners, II, 95; Markham, p.38.


66. Bell to Dumesq, CO201/223, f.364b.

67. J. Busby, A Brief Memoir Relative to the Islands of New Zealand, June 1831, CO209/1, f.188b; Bell to Dumesq, CO201/223, f.364b; S.H. 11 May 1837.
The gunpowder cartridges and musket balls used in the muskets were also of a poor quality and were often in short supply. For example Maoris usually stored the powder under inadequate shelter and so it often got wet. Occasionally, too, traders who were anxious to spread their meagre trade items as far as possible were not adverse to adding sand to the powder. On the other hand it was a paucity of supply that led Maoris to make cartridge cases from paper torn from books and to substitute peach stones or pieces of melted down pewter spoons for musket balls.

Maoris in the northern regions of New Zealand appeared, to Augustus Earle, to be afraid when handling muskets and to be unsure of their aim unless they were very close to their target. Ten years later, in 1837, another writer claimed that Maoris were still loading their muskets incorrectly, were not taking aim before firing, and were shooting at such a distance from their target that the balls were unlikely to reach it. In his opinion most of the killing was being carried out using traditional weapons. Indeed some Maoris were also openly scornful of muskets, which they considered to be ineffectual instruments for attack.

68. Cruise, p. 192.
69. A. Sutherland, Barter and Coinages of Early New Zealand, New Plymouth, 1939, p. 29.
70. Best, 'Notes', J.P.S., XIII, 14-15; Markham, p.92.
71. Earle, pp.92-3; see also Cruise, p. 192.
73. Polack, New Zealand, I, 175; S. Locke, 'Historical Traditions of the Taupo and East Coast Tribes', Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute, 1882, XV, 444.
The value for a Maori of possessing a musket, the Europeans believed, was the psychological power it gave to its owner. The strength of a hapu or tribe came to be calculated on the number of weapons it could muster, and the knowledge that even a very small group could gather enough firepower to defend itself reportedly led to a lessening in the amount of warfare in the 1830s. Thus Polack claimed that the general armament of the 1830s had restored the equilibrium between the various tribes. For that reason, he concluded, honour was satisfied during the Pomare-Titore war of 1837 after several hundred thousand shots were fired and only a few people were killed.

A MAORI'S involvement in the processing and selling of wood and fibre appears to have had a direct impact on his work patterns, social obligations, warfare, and sites of work and residence.

One consequence of the decision to produce commercial quantities of timber and flax was the large amount of time involved. Scraping flax was a laborious and boring task. Shepherd's European informant, James Caddell, described the method thus:

First choose the finest leaves of full growth cut them and stripe about a quarter of an inch wide and all the (length?) of the leaf off the outer edges then strip the hard substance out of the centre if the leaf when so done two flat pieces of the leaf will then remain The upper or smooth shiny side is the side on which the flax grows the side opposite to it should be cut across nearly through with a Mussel shell or Knife about Nine inch from the upper point of the leaf when so done place the Mussel shell with the right hand exactly opposite

---

74. Cruise, p. 192; Bell to Dumaresq, CO201/223, f. 366b.
75. S.H., 30 March 1837.
76. Polack, Manners, II, 20-22.
the cut on the other side of the leaf and with
the left hand hold the end of the leaf and draw
it still holding the shell with the right hand
and the flax will entirely separate from the
leaf and when so done the flax requires nothing
more to be done but to dry it until it is
hukled - . 77

Caddell estimated that a woman could dress twenty pounds of
flax a day; but Shepherd found that five to six pounds was
the maximum limit. 78 The writer of 'Sketches of New Zealand'
claimed that an exceptionally good day might produce fifteen
pounds of dressed flax, although ten pounds was average. 79
However Dieffenbach felt that ten pounds could only be
achieved by a skilled operator on a good day. 80 Multiplying
the average daily production by the large tonnages of flax
exported from New Zealand gives some indication of the time
that was needed to be devoted to flax preparation and the
potential change in Maori work patterns. 81 Not included in the
calculations above are other aspects of the flax trade, for
instance the labour involved in the building of a flax
storehouse or the time taken to find and cut the leaves,
to bundle them and to transport them to the nearest port.
The travail was excellently portrayed by Judge Maning:

/a/ small hapu, or clan, had to manufacture,
spurred by the penalty of death, in the shortest
possible time, one hundred tons of flax, scraped
by hand with a shell, bit by bit, morsel by
morsel, half-quarter of an ounce at a time. 82

77. T. Shepherd, Journal on the Brig Rosanna on the
Coasts of New Zealand, 5 March - 12 November 1826,
(NPL/M, FM 3/120), p.14; also B. Howard, Rakiura,
A History of Stewart Island, New Zealand, Dunedin,
1840, p. 364.
78: Shepherd, p. 14; Howard, p. 364.
79. S.H., 1 June 1837.
80. Dieffenbach, II, 54.
81. It will be recalled that not all the flax that was
exported had been dressed and much of it was in a
green state.
82. F.E. Maning, Old New Zealand: A Tale of the Good
Old Times ... by a Pakeha Maori, 1887, (Golden
The timber trade was no less demanding. Polack provided his readers with the following description of tree-felling and removal:

The usual method is to cut with axes near the base of the tree, when a party in turn are soon able to effect their purpose. They next attend to dragging the spar (tree) through the bush to the water; this consumes much time and labour; small round pieces of timber being laid down as "ways" for the spar to glide over. The time consumed in this work depends principally on the nature of the locality; some trees have taken no less than three months' continual work to remove from the place it had fallen to the water-side.

He went on to point out that in northern New Zealand all the timber near the water had been used (by 1837) and that trees had to be dragged from even further distances. They were also floated down creeks and rivers which, in consequence, became blocked and which were thereby rendered useless for transportation purposes. Polack's estimate of three months' effort seems rather excessive. However his description clearly indicates that the timber trade was very demanding of Maoris' time.

Most of the Maoris involved in the trade appear to have increased production of fibre and wood seemingly without interruption to their pattern of daily and seasonal work. The planting and harvesting of annual crops, for example, apparently took precedence to the preparation of timber and flax. Thus Europeans were frequently reported to have found all Maori work in the trade at a halt during the months October-December and February-March (the precise dates varied with seasonal factors and the location of the hapu) during which times Maoris planted and harvested their crops.

The timber and flax trade's potential for altering traditional work patterns was contained to some extent by

83. Polack, Manners, I, 169; also Campbell, Poenamo, pp.43-45.
84. See, for example, Busby, Memoir, CO209/1, f.186a; T. McDonnell to R. Jones & Co, 17 September 1835, in Riley Papers, Documents 1817-1856, (NPL/M, A109), p. 94; Cruise, p. 163.
the introduction of European technology and the extensive use of slaves. Heavy work such as digging and clearing was performed more quickly and easily using metal tools in place of stone and wooden ones. Also the time devoted to such tasks as fashioning fish hooks from stone, bone or shell and the weaving of mats diminished as many Maoris came to use metal fish hooks and to display a preference for blankets as their ordinary attire.

Slaves were captured in large numbers by the Ngapuhi during their raids in the 1820s and were taken back to the northern ports. They were used primarily to increase agricultural production so that the Ngapuhi could supply visiting European vessels. Slaves were also used to assist with the other branches of Maori-European trade including scraping flax and dragging spars to vessels. Te Rauparaha, on the other hand, left most of his defeated enemies in possession of their lands. In return he exacted tribute and labour services from these people. It is said that Te Rauparaha had upwards of 2000 slaves and in the early 1830s they provided most of the flax which he traded with Europeans. Apparently Te Rauparaha placed such heavy demands on these people that the Ngatimutunga chose to leave for the Chatham Islands rather than continue to submit to him.

Some Maoris, therefore, seemed able to involve themselves in the trade without obvious interruption to their daily and seasonal work patterns. However in the Hokianga, from the mid-1830s, commentators increasingly reported that Maoris were devoting themselves to working in the timber trade throughout the year. The Europeans held that this

85. Shawcross, p. 272; Parsonson, 53.
86. This was a common practice - Best, 'Notes', J.P.S. XII, 165.
87. J. Rutherford, Papers 1926-1963, (AU,Box XXI, folder 1, F.31/1), 'Note on Maori Casualties in their Tribal Wars, 1801-1840', p. 5.
89. S.H., 7 April 1836.
implied a willingness on the part of Maoris there to take a fuller part in the trade.\textsuperscript{90} The Wesleyan missionaries, and some visitors to the Hokiang a, however, charged that the change had been forced on Maoris by the timbermen. The European traders reportedly put the Maoris into debt by supplying them with blankets, alcohol and tobacco on credit to such an extent that the Maoris became unable to pay for the goods without devoting themselves almost exclusively to working for Europeans. This in turn meant that work such as planting and harvesting was neglected because the Maoris were too busy labouring to clear their debts. Thus, after a strenuous day in the forest, a Maori may have returned to a meal which consisted of little more than fern roots because his neglect of his cultivations meant that he had little else to eat. Moreover working in damp forests induced, or at least aggravated European-introduced colds and illnesses among Maori workers.\textsuperscript{91}

The general effect of this increased labour and impoverished diet was an obvious decline in the health of Hokiang a Maoris.\textsuperscript{92} In 1837 the WMS missionary William Woon cited medical opinion that 'through hard Work and scanty Diet many of the Natives engaged in the Timber Trade are shortening their Lives' and by 1840 Jerningham Wakefield claimed that their devotion to the timber trade had left Hokiang a Maoris lesser in 'stature' and 'muscular power' than Maoris he had seen elsewhere in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{90} McDonnell to R. Jones & Co, 17 September 1835, (NPL/M, A109), p. 95.


\textsuperscript{92} Tawell, evidence, 1838 Report, pp.119-20. Maning claimed that the flax trade had also contributed to Maori ill-health - Maning, pp.206-214.

It was also claimed that by the late 1830s the food situation was so acute that Hokianga Maoris, instead of producing enough potatoes and maize to sustain an export trade with New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land as they had done formerly, were obliged to import food from as far south as Cook Strait to sustain themselves. They probably also purchased European foodstuffs imported from the colonies. It was a great concern to some commentators that the food being brought in to feed the Maoris was being transported and retailed through the agency of European traders. This they saw as merely extending the vicious circle of Maori indebtedness.  

There are other explanations and counterclaims for these observations of illnesses amongst Maoris on the River. For instance Wakefield was describing Hokianga Maoris just after they had suffered the effects of a debilitating influenza virus which had been introduced by immigrants from New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land in 1839. Moreover there may have been an element of exaggeration in the missionary accounts. Thus, for example, Danson Coates, the lay secretary of the CMS, claimed never to have heard of the apparently serious situation in the Hokianga. This is significant for although CMS missionaries did not live in the Hokianga they did visit it, and in other matters showed themselves to be aware of events affecting Maoris and Europeans on that River. Also the purchasing of food from other localities need not have been an ill effect of trading. Perhaps the returns to be gained from devoting all their time to timber trading were large enough to make it more profitable for Maoris to purchase supplies than to take time off to cultivate and harvest their own.

95. Colonist, 11 May 1839.
On balance it would appear that while the working patterns of many Maori traders were little affected by their participation in the timber and flax trade, for others (notably some of those in the Hokianga) the results of their involvement were evident in their move away from cultivating their own food and by a comparatively greater decline in their health.

Maoris' social obligations also came into conflict with their work in the trade. European traders often expressed their annoyance that Maoris' commitments to religious and social ceremonies frequently superseded their work as traders. For instance a stopwork during the loading of HMS Dromedary in the Bay of Islands in 1820 was occasioned by local Maoris' duty to attend a funeral. 97 However by the 1830s, at least in the major trading ports, Maori keenness to trade occasionally overrode their social commitments. For example Augustus Earle recorded that in 1827 Hokianga Maoris were faced with the choice between attending tangi observances and trading. 'Avarice overcame filial affection' and the Maoris continued to trade. This greatly satisfied Earle who regarded it as a sign that an involvement in commerce would soon rid Maoris of their 'barbarous rites'. 98

It cannot be assumed that this was the general case or that it was typical of Maori traders throughout New Zealand. Nor can it be shown that trading was alone responsible for any changes. To some extent the questioning of the traditional tapu system that appeared to be occurring in those parts of New Zealand where Maoris had contact with European traders was also responsible for lessening the time spent in traditional religious observances. On the other
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hand Christian Maoris often found that the requirements of
their new religion affected their work patterns and trading.
This was obvious, for example, from Maori statements about
the soul-searching they faced when choosing between more
faithfully serving God and their commitment to trading.\(^99\)
Moreover for Hokianga Maoris the required prepara-
tions and travelling for Sabbath worship could, at the
extreme, occupy three or four days of their week.\(^100\)

Competition between Maori traders for the perceived
benefits to be gained from the timber and flax trade
appeared to simultaneously promote and check Maori warfare.
The trade-related intensified rivalry between Maori groups
revolved around two issues: who had the right to sell
particular stands of wood or phormium; and who had the right
to trade with Europeans.

Timber and flax were not major items in the pre-
1769 Maori economy.\(^101\) In those times there would have
seemed to be plenty of both commodities to satisfy the small
Maori demand for them. It also appears that the ownership of
forests and flax swamps was only vaguely defined, if at all.
As one old man in Te Taonui's Popoto hapu on the Waihou
River in the Hokianga stated in 1827 to the WMS missionary
John Hobbs:

> Before ships came every place was common. Before
> ships came the Trees stood as common property
> before ships came the flax stood and every person
> took what he would and there was more than an
> abundance for every one. But now the white people
> come and pitch upon this place and that place and
> buy it. But who is to have the payment? It belongs
to every body. 102
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When the Europeans arrived, the size of their demands and the Maoris' competition for the trade goods inevitably raised the issues of rights and ownership.

Disputes of possession could lead to threats of violence and fighting.\(^9\) Cruise, for example, wrote that in 1820 Te Toki of Kawakawa in the Bay of Islands was unable to supply some trees nominated as suitable by the carpenter of HMS *Dromedary*. Apparently his right to cut and sell them was being disputed by another group.\(^1\) Similarly the *Sydney Herald* reported that Titore's raid on the Tauranga area around the middle of 1832 was 'to decide the right to some flax grounds. The fight was expected to be a sanguinary one'.\(^2\)

In 1836 Titore was, in turn, the subject of a threatened raid when the Ngatiwhatua of Wairoa in the Kaipara Harbour disputed his authority to give Thomas McDonnell permission to remove trees from the Wairoa River. On this occasion the matter was settled through the arbitration of James Busby.\(^3\)

Maori traders also competed amongst each other for the right to trade with Europeans. In its mildest form the rivalry was expressed in the readiness with which Maoris damned or slandered each other - a technique they called 'heneraki'.\(^4\) For instance in 1793 Tukitahua, a chief in Doubtles Bay, warned Dell, master of the *Fancy*, not to visit Ngahuruhuru,
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a chief in the Bay of Islands, on the grounds that Ngahuruhurst was a noted cannibal and would probably eat him. 108 Similarly Cruise reported that the Maoris who were travelling from Sydney to New Zealand aboard HMS Dromedary frequently made pejorative comments about other chiefs and tribes. He claimed that their motive was to attempt to influence the master of the Dromedary to visit only their part of the island 'by reflecting on the benefits of so doing and exaggerating the dangers of trading at any other port'. 109

However the intensity of their efforts to monopolize trading could lead to threats and, occasionally, to direct action. Already mentioned in this context was Hongi's attack on Whangaroa in 1827. Fears of a similar attack were expressed by Hokianga Maoris in 1819 and again in 1827. On the earlier occasion they told Marsden that although they welcomed the chaplain's visit they were afraid that Hongi would be offended if, in the future, any vessels entered their River. 110 The situation was similar in December 1827 when, shortly after the WMS missionaries had arrived to establish their station in the Hokianga and after a rapid growth in the European population on the River during that year, John Hobbs reported local Maoris' fears that Hongi was preparing to attack them. Ostensibly this was to revenge an insult offered to a female relative of his who lived in the Hokianga. However Hobbs recorded that the Hokianga chief Patuone believed that Hongi wished 'to disturb the place to drive the white people away from the Hokianga: this appears likely', Hobbs added. 111 Another example of the effects of trading rivalries in this period was Augustus Earle's claim that Te Whareumu, chief of Kororareka, was murdered during a feud in 1828 largely because of the jealousy of his
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'decided advantage over every other tribe, by his trade and intercourse with Europeans'.

Other trade-related Maori quarrels centred around European traders — particularly resident agents. A trader was regarded as the valued property of the Maori group with whom he worked and a vital vehicle for their trade with European shipping. Once a chief had declared himself to be the protector of all or any individual Europeans who visited or resided in his territory this was tantamount to extending his personal *tapu* to cover them and their possessions. Interfering with these Europeans was regarded as a violation of *tapu* property and it was avenged as such. There was also a practical reason for the Maoris' defence of a trader. The better protected a trader felt the more likely he was to stay and conduct business on behalf of the *hapu*; and the longer he stayed the more likely he was to be liberal in his dealings with his patrons. It was for a combination of proprietary and self-interested motives therefore that Maoris sometimes found themselves in inter-*hapu* disputes in their efforts to protect and encourage their European traders.

The timber trade in Hokianga provided two examples of inter-*hapu* disputes which evolved from one group's mistreatment of Europeans. The first was the *Fortitude Affair* in April 1833. The *Fortitude* was a schooner owned by London merchants and chartered by Clendon and Stephenson who were merchants resident in the Bay of Islands.

It had been in the Hokianga loading timber for Van Diemen's Land and was leaving the River during a fog when it struck on a mudbank at Motukauri. The Hikutu of Whirinaki, in accordance with Maori custom, laid claim to the wreck and Plundered it. They took possession of all the items in the

---
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cabin including the ship's papers. Moetara, a Ngati-Korokoro chief who had assumed the role of protector of the Europeans on the Hokianga, took a party of warriors to Motukauri to demand satisfaction from the Hikutu. In the ensuing quarrel one of the chiefs in his party was killed. This incident sparked a full battle in which several Maoris on both sides were killed. Estimates of the dead ranged from 16 to 21 and a few more were wounded.

A Sawyer, Thomas McLean, had an establishment at Motukauri and in retaliation for their losses this station was attacked by the Hikutu. Fearing that a similar treatment might await other European traders, Moetara moved to fortify a nearby station at One Tree Point which belonged to Captain William Young. Here Moetara was joined by Patuone and Nene together with about 300 Maori and European supporters. The skirmishing which followed continued throughout May without serious loss of life, and was eventually settled with the return of the Fortitude's papers.  

The similar defence of Europeans often referred to as the 'Battle of the Pork' occurred between December 1834 and January 1835. A disaffected tribe of Maoris, the Ashaties, attacked the house of a Sawyer called John Ryan

113. Busby to Colonial Secretary, 17 May 1833, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1833, (AONSW, 4/2164, item 33/4328); Customs Officers, Launceston to Colonial Secretary, 28 May 1833, VDL: Customs: Inwards and Outwards Correspondence, 1833-40, (AOT, CUS 4), pp.5-6; R.P. Wigglesworth, 'The Myth and the Reality', B.A. (Hons) research exercise, Massey University, 1974, p. 14; Markham, pp.89-90 n.17; Polack, New Zealand, II, 50. Moetara was rewarded for defending the Europeans with a gilt sabre and a military cloak from Lieutenant-Governor Arthur of Van Diemen's Land – H.T.C., 4 April 1834.
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at Kohi (or Omanaia). They stripped everything from it, dragged his Maori wife from the house by her hair and beat her. In retaliation George Russell, the leading European merchant on the Hokianga, and the WMS missionary William White formed a party of fifty armed Europeans. They were joined by 400-500 Maoris under the command of Patuone, Nene and Matangi. The whole body grouped for an attack on the offenders' pa. One account suggested that the Europeans tried to negotiate, the other claimed that they attacked the pa immediately on landing near it. The engagement ended without loss of human life. However the Maoris in the attacking group killed 150 pigs and destroyed potatoes and provisions belonging to the defenders. The Europeans followed by firing the pa. 115

In other respects the prosecution of the timber and flax trade seemed to act as a check to some Maori warfare. Occasionally Maoris' preparations for war were interrupted by the demands of the trade. Examples are provided from the visits of the Harmony to the Hokianga in 1828 and of HMS Buffalo to Whangaroa in 1834. The Maoris from whom the Europeans wished to procure spars were, when the vessels arrived, preparing for war. Whereas the involvement of Bay of Islands Maoris in warfare had prevented the Experiment from loading flax or timber in that harbour in 1810, both the Harmony and the Buffalo secured full cargoes - and in rapid time. 116
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Moreover trading and the time needed to prepare timber and flax for export were arguably factors which inhibited Maori warfare in the 1830s (and beyond) and promoted the gradual establishment of peace throughout New Zealand. If it is accepted that intertribal warfare was frequently motivated by the prospect of economic gain through plunder, the taking of slaves and the acquisition of land and resources, then at least one reason for the decline in warfare (especially Ngapuhi warfare) in the 1830s was the fact that trading with Europeans seemed the most effective way to obtain the possessions Maoris most prized at that time — namely, European goods. Maori warfare declined first in those regions where trading with Europeans was most intensive, it could be said, partly because the Maoris there came to realise that the time they previously devoted to a search for economic gain through warfare could more effectively and profitably be used in preparing wood, fibre and other commodities for trading with Europeans. Certainly this was Polack's view for he claimed that by the late 1830s Maoris had transferred the energy they had previously put into warfare to striking hard bargains with Europeans. Peace provided Maoris with time to gather products for sale and created an environment which attracted European traders to their area.

For some groups of Maoris an active involvement in the trade meant more than a disruption to their work, social routines and warfare. It involved moving from their own area to reside in another, or travelling long distances in order to dispose of their produce.

The temporary relocation of a group or an entire village seemed to be a common occurrence from the time of the first contacts. Cook estimated that two-thirds of the
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population of Queen Charlotte Sound moved to camp around his vessel in February 1777. Similarly, large numbers of Maoris were in attendance when the Fancy was in Thames in 1793 and the St Patrick was in the Hauraki Gulf in 1826. Also Cruise noted that Paroa marched his people for five days from the North Cape, at the risk of being attacked, in order to view the prospects of trade with HMS Dromedary; and that in the Kawakawa area a whole village had moved to reside closer to the place from which they were removing spars. Some chiefs even contracted to provide men to assist a trader at some distance from their village. Thus, according to Dillon's probably inflated account, Pomare of the Bay of Islands took 2000 men to Hauraki to help load the St Patrick. And, in 1833, another chief, Patuone of the Hokianga, agreed to take a party of men around to Mahurangi Bay to assist Gordon Browne to haul out and load a cargo of spars and timber.

Other groups had to travel long distances to sell their flax. The Te Arawa, for example, because they had no outlet to the coast, had been forced to take their flax and produce to sell at the Ngaiterangi controlled centres of Te Tumu, Muriwharau and Tauranga, and risk possible attacks, until they got their own trader, Philip Tapsell, in 1830.
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Similarly the Opotiki Maoris were obliged to carry their dressed flax to Whakatane. Their problem was that although the harbour at Opotiki was safe for the entry of European vessels, the traders and masters boycotted it as a port of call following the attack on the John Dunscombe and the kidnapping of its crew in 1834. Inter-tribal animosity appeared to explain why some unidentified Maoris who lived around the Rotorua lakes reportedly took their flax, mats, pigs and birds through Taupo to Kapiti where they traded them for arms and ammunition, and also why the Ngati Maru of Thames forced the Ngati Haua to take their flax to Tauranga by refusing to allow it to be exported through Thames ports.

Some Maoris shifted their residence permanently for the purpose of being in a better position to participate in the trade. In order to get Tapsell settled at Maketū in 1830, the Te Arawa, his wife's people, negotiated with hapu of the Ngaiterangi for permission to reside on some land at Maketū and to scrape flax at Paengaroa. While permission was only granted by one of the seven hapu that they consulted, the Te Arawa moved en masse from their lands around Rotorua to occupy the Ngaiterangi land around Maketū. Polack found that a similar migration had taken place to Tolaga Bay. Te Kani-a-Takirau had invited the Whanau-a-Rau and the Urungawera from Tokomaru Bay to move to Tolaga Bay to dress flax and to sell it to one of the two traders who resided there.

The relocation of hapu to take advantage of trading opportunities was also evident in the Hokianga River. After the First New Zealand Company had disbanded in Sydney in 1827,
some of the sawyers who had gone to New Zealand with the Company returned to the Hokianga. They initially settled on Patuone's land but then moved to Pakanae to be under Moetara's protection. The site chosen by the sawyers was some distance from Moetara's existing village so the chief convinced his people to move closer to them. Thus when Augustus Earle visited Pakanae in April 1828 Moetara was busy assisting his people to erect their new homes. Similarly, in March 1837, the Rev. James Buller reported that a tribe (unnamed) had left their home 200 miles away and settled near Mangungu, the site of the Wesleyan Mission Station. Buller believed that these people had moved in order to be permanently near the means of grace. However his added comment that they had all taken up employment with local European settlers might suggest that their real motive in shifting was to acquire European goods by seeking work.

Individuals also moved in order to take advantage of opportunities to trade. For instance Edward Parry Hongi, a fervent Christian, left the CMS mission farm at Waimate and went to Whangaroa solely to establish himself as a sawyer there. Apparently his move, sometime in 1834, was encouraged by the presence of HMS Buffalo in that Harbour.

The effects of these movements and relocations on tribal and individuals' lives would have been manifold. Their repercussions on land ownership wrangles, for example, were still being felt as late as the 1880s when the Land Courts heard much conflicting evidence of particular groups' rights to the land on which they lived. One thing which the presumed advantages of trading, particularly in flax, did not do was, as has been alleged, drive Maoris from their
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'high, dry and airy' hill top pa to damp, fortified lowland sites where 'they were cut off by disease in a manner absolutely frightful'. 134

Maoris had traditionally lived in small groups which moved around their tribal and hapu lands. In 1769 the true Maori communal unit consisted of a number of hamlets 'plus a compound or cluster of huts within the pa which [were] collectively, through the seasons or over a number of years, utilized by any one group'. 135 Only at times of crisis did large numbers of Maoris congregate in pa. Thus Groube defined a pa as a 'communal habitation sited and built in such a way that its primary purpose was to protect its occupants in times of war'. 136

This combination of lowland hamlets and fortified pa used for defence seems to have continued to characterize Maoris' settlement patterns until the middle of the nineteenth century. 137 For instance William Yate claimed that Maoris did not usually live in large villages. Instead he described them as living in small groups scattered throughout their tribal lands. The pa, he added, was used as a place of refuge in times of danger. 138

134. Maning, pp.207, 209.
135. L.M. Groube, Settlement Patterns in New Zealand Prehistory, Otago University, 1965, p. 53.
There were variations. Clearly some Maoris lived in large kainga and the process of amalgamating small groups into larger bodies proceeded apace in the Bay of Islands during the ten years following 1814. Indeed some writers have seen the formation of these larger settlements and the apparent increase in Maori co-operative enterprise as signs of the influence of the demands of European trade on Maori settlement patterns and commerce. Also, certain pa were occupied at times other than war. Some groups lived in their pa for particular seasons (usually the winter) and in other cases pa were able to be permanently occupied and to serve as bases for moving to daily employment.

Thus participation in the timber and flax trade not only provided European foods for Maori traders but, for many of them, also induced changes in their work routines, social obligations, warfare and their places of work and residence.

A MAORI group's first problem in commencing trading was to attract a European to their area. Most Europeans, especially those visiting New Zealand for the first time, approached Maoris with fear. Much of what they heard and read before visiting New Zealand condemned Maoris as, amongst other things, cunning, treacherous, aggressive, ferocious and cruel.
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They therefore tended to frequent only the well-known ports and to avoid new areas. To overcome this reticence Maoris living in the unvisited places could travel to meet the Europeans and endeavour to persuade them to come to their areas. On such missions some Maoris journeyed to other parts of New Zealand while others sailed as far as Sydney or Hobart. For example the Waikato envoy Te Puaha went to the Bay of Islands in 1828 to invite J.R. Kent to bring traders and to settle at Kawhia, while Patuone, a Hokianga chief, arrived in Sydney in 1826 in an effort to persuade merchants there to send vessels to his River. He even offered to leave his son in Sydney as a hostage for the well-being of European sailors who visited the Hokianga. However at the height of the timber and flax trading boom Maoris found that even the slightest hint of their having phormium or wood of export quality for sale was usually sufficient inducement to bring Europeans to their areas.

Having attracted a European to visit for the first time the Maoris then had to retain his services and encourage him either to settle with them or, if he were a vessel's master, to visit them again. As was the case with other Polynesian societies, Maoris were a hospitable people. Extending and accepting hospitality was a major part of their pre-1769 way of life. They had evolved an elaborate social etiquette which was applicable to such occasions, and good relations could be maintained, even between enemy groups, provided these rules were observed. The welcoming of Europeans had many features in common with inter-tribal hospitality. For instance Europeans responded favourably to gifts of food, wood and water, and the attentions of women. What was significantly different in entertaining Europeans was the latters' unintentional, and sometimes deliberate, offences against Maoris' tapu, social mores, and etiquette, and their apparent


disgust for certain Maori practices. The exigencies of trading, therefore, could demand that Maoris choose between the maintenance of their own customs and their desire to encourage visits by European traders.

In the years of initial contacts it seemed that Maoris were quick to punish any infringements of tapu with penalties that would have been appropriate in their own society. However after regular trading relations were established the incidence of Europeans being punished for breaches of tapu diminished. This Maori forebearance was obvious in the northern ports of New Zealand from about 1820. It was regarded as a measure of the new maturity of Maoris as traders and was also an indication that European traders had begun to learn, both through personal experience and through reading and listening to the reports of other visitors, how to avoid giving undue offence to Maoris.

Apparently the fear of driving away Europeans also caused Maoris to modify or hide activities frowned upon or thought repulsive by traders. Cruise noted that while Maoris did not deny that they were cannibals, nobody from the Dromedary actually witnessed such a feast. His conclusion was that to avoid being interrupted or reproved by Europeans the consumption was done secretly. Similarly Polack claimed that the practice of killing slaves and hanging a wife on the death of a chief had been abolished in those parts of the country (in his example the south-west portion of the Thames Estuary) where Europeans lived. He also contended that by the late 1830s Maori slaves in the Bay of Islands could refuse the commands of their chiefs in sure knowledge that their lives would not be forfeit, as would previously have been the case. Europeans had set themselves up as protectors of slaves and a chief knew that to kill one may have resulted in Europeans refusing to trade with him. Indeed Earle found, in 1827,
that threatening to withdraw the 'seat of trade' from Kororareka was so powerful a weapon that it dissuaded the chief Te Whareumu from killing an inveterate Maori enemy who had arrived in the Bay of Islands on a European vessel.\(^{148}\)

This was not to suggest, however, that trading caused the abolition of all Maori practices that were abhorrent to Europeans or that by the 1830s Europeans were not punished for breaches of tapu or Maori etiquette. Even in the harbours of northern New Zealand Maori belief in the tapu system continued. For instance in 1831 and 1833 missionaries reported that Maoris who were cultivating kumara in the Bay of Islands were still tapu on these occasions.\(^{149}\) Similarly other factors, such as their conversion to Christianity, also affected Maoris' belief in tapu and demanded the discontinuance of certain of their customs such as cannibalism and the keeping of slaves.

Moreover European traders were not immune from punishment for breaches of Maori customs. Usually such a reaction came from a group of Maoris who were unused to dealing with Europeans. An instance is the death of 'Katene' in Hicks Bay in the early 1830s. However even in the areas of prolonged contact such as the Bay of Islands and the Hokianga the entry in wahi tapu or trespass on tapu burial sites continued to be punished severely in all reported cases. Breton cited an instance of a captain who entered a Bay of Islands wahi tapu in 1832. 'His curiosity', Breton noted, 'cost him a disturbance with the natives, and a good sum of money to boot'.\(^{150}\) Similarly Polack recalled that in the Hokianga during the 1830s when a visiting captain or ship's passenger committed a similar offence
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local Maoris mounted a force to attack the European settlement at Te Horeke. However their honour was satisfied with an *utu* of blankets, muskets and tobacco. 151

Significantly Maoris also used European's knowledge and fear of the consequences of tapu breaking to regulate trade to their advantage. Being aware that they knew the cost of breaking tapu, Te Wetere of the Bay of Islands explained to the officers of the HMS Dromedary that his pigs were tapu and could not be slaughtered and sold to feed their men. However when the Cumberland, a whaler, arrived and offered muskets and powder in exchange for supplies of pork (the master of the Dromedary having refused to trade in these items) this tapu was quickly removed. 152 This same restriction was used by Kiwikiwi, a Kawakawa River chief, to block another hapu, who lived further up the same River, from trading with Europeans. In Maori rite when a fishing seine was being made the section of the river parallel to the bank on which it was being formed became tapu, that is, no one was allowed to pass along it. Until Europeans defied the tapu and sailed up the River, the people who lived further inland were unable to get access to European goods. 153

While in general Europeans were made welcome by Maoris because of the trade goods they brought or were likely to engender, Maoris did not treat all Europeans alike.
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Frenchmen they openly mistrusted,\textsuperscript{154} convicts were held in contempt;\textsuperscript{155} fools and interlopers were soon sent packing;\textsuperscript{156} and even Pakeha-Maoris were scorned and regarded as being lower than gentlemen and merchants because they did not wear socks.\textsuperscript{157}

By at least appearing to accommodate European behaviour and opinions, the Maoris succeeded in convincing foreign traders that their desire for trade goods had softened their attitude to Europeans and made trading almost anywhere in New Zealand a less hazardous affair. Kent commented during the voyage of the \textit{Mermaid} in 1823 that he was 'much pleased with the manner of our reception by these Southern savages, they with great warmth told me that they did not intend to kill any more white men now that we had become friends by commencing trade'.\textsuperscript{158} By 1827 Earle was confident enough to assert that he doubted there would ever be another massacre of Europeans in ports frequented by shipping.\textsuperscript{159}
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Similarly the resident trader was able to travel throughout the country apparently secure from the possibility of being murdered. Polack claimed that during his visit to the Kaipara area in 1832 he felt 'no sensation of fear; certain that my mission as a trader was of too much importance to the tribes in the vicinity, to permit them to attempt any harm on me ...'. In the same vein the Rev. Frederick Wilkinson told the 1838 Committee that Maoris were 'very fond of having Europeans amongst them; they think they are very useful to them; they bring Trade, and they obtain their Blankets by that Means, and various other Things they require'. The protection that trading provided extended beyond the person of the trader to encompass his goods and Maoris or Europeans who travelled with him or who formed part of his establishment.

It was usually the task of the chief to arrange the sale of timber and flax to Europeans although small quantities of flax were occasionally sold by whanau from the produce of their personal land holdings. This was because the production of the large quantities of timber and flax which Europeans demanded, in return for even a single musket, usually required the combined efforts of a hapu. Only the chief could direct the work of his people and to him fell also the task of redistributing the goods ('wealth') received from the European traders.
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Some chiefs felt secure enough to trade on their own behalf. Taumawa in the Hokianga, for example, oversaw the cutting, sawing, measuring and selling of timber on behalf of his hapu and also ran a retail store for the sale of European goods. Other chiefs used fellow Maoris as intermediaries in trading. For instance Tuai in the Bay of Island used a Maori who had worked on European vessels and who had learned some English as his negotiator.

Europeans, especially Pakeha-Maoris were, however, the most widely employed intermediaries. They haggled on behalf of their hosts and took the responsibility, under the authority of the chief, for ensuring that the hapu had enough produce to purchase the European goods the Maoris wanted. It was little wonder that good Pakeha-Maoris were valued at twenty times their weight in muskets, were endowed with land, houses and wives to bind them to the hapu, and were seen to be under the personal protection of the chief. In the 1820s and early 1830s, it has been claimed, a Pakeha-Maori could himself constitute the difference between poverty and wealth for a hapu. But Pakeha-Maoris were not the only Europeans who were used as trading intermediaries. Missionaries, settlers and whalers were also used for this purpose.

Often the relationship between the resident agent or timberman and his chief was not dissimilar to that enjoyed by Pakeha-Maori intermediaries. Many of the European traders lived with the Maoris, understood them and gained their trust. From the Maoris' point of view the essential

164. J. Buller to Miss Dawes, 2 January 1837, (NLA, MS4020, NK 2231), p. 12.
165. Duperrrey, pp.39, 57.
166. Maning, p. 18.
difference between European intermediaries and European traders stemmed from the role they played in the trading process. The former were part of a solely maritime trade. Maoris used them as 'commission agents' to sell produce on the New Zealanders' behalf to the trading masters of visiting vessels. The advent of resident agents and timbermen altered the focus of the timber and flax trade as far as Maoris were concerned. Instead of looking for the arrival of the next vessel in order to sell their wood or hemp, Maoris found that for them the trade could be a land-based one. The European traders usually purchased timber or flax whenever it was offered to them. At worst, if their supply of trade goods had been used, they could be relied upon to pay for any produce consigned to their care at mutually agreed prices and as soon as their colonial employer dispatched a vessel to them. It was their role as regular providers of goods, and as potential hostages should sufficient payments not be forthcoming, that commended these Europeans to their Maori hosts.

Therefore, like the colonial merchants, Maori traders found that the use of resident agents and timbermen brought stability to the trade.

THE TIMBER and flax trade offered new opportunities to the Maori trader. Through the processing and selling of wood and fibre he could acquire the European goods he wanted. Obtaining these goods, however, required from him both a commitment in time and a willingness to accept a certain degree of social change. The nature and extent of these requirements varied between traders. For many it involved no more than diverting some time and labour to processing timber and flax. Others were faced with considerable alterations to their work patterns and temporary or permanent

168. Browne to Darling, 24 April 1831, ADM 1/4248, p.12.
shifts in their place of residence.

The approach a Maori took to the trade was determined by his perception of his abilities as a trader and his experience in dealing with Europeans. Some acted as their own agents, Most appear to have relied on intermediaries. Certainly all of them seemed to find that sustaining commercial relations with Europeans required the toleration of attitudes and habits different to their own.

The indirect or secondary consequences of Maoris' participation in the timber and flax trade were manifold. Arguably, as was the case with the introduction of muskets, they affected the life of every New Zealander. In addition it was the Maoris' positive attitude to trading and towards the Europeans with whom they dealt that increased the participation and interest of English and colonial merchants in trading at New Zealand. This, in turn, led to a greater government involvement in matters connected with that country and strengthened the calls of those who believed that New Zealand should be colonized by Britain.
Chapter Six

The Governments and the Timber and Flax Trade

The British and colonial governments' policies and actions markedly affected the conduct of the New Zealand timber and flax trade in the years before 1840. The governments promoted the trade by dispatching naval vessels to load cargoes of timber and flax, by issuing contracts for supplies of these products, through allowing timber and flax to enter their ports duty free, and in a variety of less direct ways. Indeed without this encouragement there would have been far less commercial involvement in New Zealand before 1840. They also attempted to regulate the trade. This they did through a variety of measures including customs dues, the registration of New Zealand-built vessels, the extension of British criminal and civil jurisdiction over crimes committed in New Zealand, and the appointment of a British Resident. These regulatory measures were usually proposed or tempered with a view to advancing trade with New Zealand. But the effect of the official involvement in the timber and flax trade was to strengthen the role of the trade lobbies amongst the multitude of pressures which led towards the annexation of New Zealand.
THE BRITISH and colonial governments sent naval vessels to New Zealand both to promote and to regulate trading there. The particular objective of many of these voyages was the encouragement of the timber and flax trade.

There were two naval sponsored visits in connection with the trade in the 1790s, the earliest of which was probably that of the Daedalus in 1792. The master was acting on Admiralty orders to take Maoris to the newly founded colony of New South Wales in order that information could be gained from them about the production and dressing of flax. The master kidnapped the first two Maoris, Tukitahua and Ngahuruhuru, who boarded his vessel and the two chiefs eventually arrived on Norfolk Island in 1793. They provided Lieut-Governor P.G. King with what little knowledge they had of Maori methods of dressing flax before he personally escorted them back to New Zealand. Their visit served to encourage King to press on with his plans to establish a flax processing industry based on the phormium tenax which grew on Norfolk Island. However his attempts to utilize the plant failed when it was found that the flax could not be dressed by any known European method.

1. For a list of these vessels see Appendix 26.

The story of Tukitahua and Ngahuruhuru has often been told. See, for example, R.A.A. Sherrin and J.H. Wallace, Early History of New Zealand, Sydney, 1890, pp.78-85; R. McNab, From Tasman to Marsden, Dunedin, 1914, pp.77-80, 82-5; D. Collins, An Account of the English Colony in New South Wales, 2 vols, London, 1798, (Library Board of South Australia facsimile, 1971), I, 282-3, 346-7, 519-31; R. Milligan, The Map Drawn by the Chief Tuki-Tahua in 1793, ed. J. Dunmore, Mangonui, (1964).
Later in 1793 Major Grose, the Administrator of New South Wales, dispatched the colonial schooner Francis to Dusky Bay 'in order to ascertain how far that place ... may tend to the benefit of His Majesty's Service, as connected with these [New South Wales] Settlements'. 3 The schooner accompanied the Britannia, Raven, which was returning to Dusky Bay to collect some sealers who had been landed by Raven on an earlier visit. The Francis returned to New South Wales on 7 November. The master reported that he had found a quality timber, described as comparable with English oak for durability and strength, which had been used by the Britannia's sealers to build a vessel. However little else was reported that was encouraging and the exploitation of the resources of Dusky Bay from New South Wales was deemed not to 'promise much'. 4

It was not until the dispatch of HMS Dromedary from Britain in 1819 that the government became directly involved in exporting cargoes of New Zealand timbers. 5 The master had been ordered to off-load his cargo of 369 convicts and 'to proceed to New Zealand, there to endeavour to get a cargo of those very large trees or spars known to grow in that country'. 6 The Dromedary left Sydney for New Zealand on 15 February 1820 in company with the colonial schooner Prince Regent. The vessels went first to the Bay of Islands, possibly because this was the best known harbour and because it had a small European population. While they managed to get some kahikatea from the Bay of Islands it was the kauri that they had been directed to acquire. Thus the vessels sailed to the Hokianga River. The

3. Grose to Dundas, 3 September 1793, CO201/8, f.78b.
5. The small cargo of timber gifted to the Governor by Te Pahi in 1806 and which was taken to New South Wales aboard the colonial armed tender Lady Nelson does not appear to have been part of a government policy aimed at importing New Zealand spars - S.G., 15 June 1806.
Prince Regent entered the River and marked a passsage for the Dromedary to follow. However the Hokia nga bar proved too great an obstacle to the larger vessel's entry. Eventually the bulk of the load was collected at Whangaroa.

With some difficulty, largely due to a shortage of Maoris willing to assist with loading the vessel, the Dromedary, in ten months, collected 117 spars in New Zealand — 92 kauri from Whangaroa, 21 kahikatea from the Bay of Islands as well as 2 rimu and 2 totara spars. In his report on the timber the carpenter on the Dromedary stated that kauri was an excellent timber, easily accessible in the Hokia nga but more difficult to procure in Whangaroa. Totara and rimu he also considered to be fine timbers but kahikatea, he reported, was too inclined to have rotten knots and was thus less valuable for naval purposes.

Part of the reason the Prince Regent accompanied the Dromedary to New Zealand was in order that it could report back to Governor Macquarie on the expediency of sending another naval vessel to load at New Zealand. In the event Kent must have reported favourably on the prospects, for the storeship HMS Coromandel, Downie, was sent on to New Zealand after unloading its cargo of convicts. It arrived in the Bay of Islands on 31 May 1820. Captain Downie saw the problems that beset the

8. For the voyage of the Dromedary see Cruise; A. McCrae, Journal Kept in New Zealand in 1820 by Ensign Alexander McCrae, ed. F.R. Chapman, Wellington, 1928; W. Jowett, Papers, ca.1819-1835, (WTu, MS Papers 1141), 'Diary'. A later report suggested that the loads on the Dromedary and Coromandel consisted of 98 and 105 spars although the report did not make it clear which load belonged to which ship. Navy Commissioner to Hay, 6 June 1827, H.R.N.Z., 1, 675.
10. Macquarie to Bathurst, 28 February 1820, CO201/99, f.121a; H.R.A., 1, X, 284.
in trying to load at the Bay of Islands so he sailed southwards. On 22 June the Coromandel anchored in the harbour to which it gave its name. After nearly twelve months of searching for topmasts suitable for battleships and 'after suffering many privations & hardships', Downie succeeded in purchasing a suitable cargo. It is not known how many spars were taken but the cargo appeared to have included kahikatea as well as kauri.

The costs of procuring these cargoes were prohibitive. However these two voyages were significant for the promotion of the timber trade in that they indicated to British and colonial merchants that the British government was interested in purchasing spars from New Zealand. In addition the voyages led to the European 'discovery' of two important sources of timber - namely the Hokianga River and Coromandel Harbour. At the same time the Reverend Samuel Marsden, who had gone to New Zealand aboard the Dromedary to visit the CMS mission stations and to 'use his influence with the New Zealand chiefs for procuring the Timber of that Country required for the use of His Majesty's Navy', made overland treks which included what may have been the first European visits to the Tauranga, Manukau and Kaipara Harbours. Also naval officers used their


14. Macquarie to Bathurst, 28 February 1820, f.121a.

time to chart the Bay of Islands and the Hokianga River—data which were later used by traders and residents.  

HM sloop Larne made a very brief visit to Thames in February 1826. With the assistance of the trader Peter Dillon, the master of the sloop was able to load a cargo of spars in less than one week.  

The next naval vessel to arrive in New Zealand for a cargo of spars was HMS Buffalo which entered the Bay of Islands on 18 November 1833. After experiencing some initial difficulties in obtaining Maori assistance the vessel was loaded with 67 spars from Whangaroa and an undisclosed number from Mahurangi Bay. Moreover the chief Titore agreed to reserve a stand of quality trees in Whangaroa which Sadler, master of the Buffalo, had selected for a potential future cargo. (The Navy later rejected this offer.) Sadler had demonstrated to the Navy that a cargo of spars could be procured in six months although an unofficial, and biased, contemporary account suggested that Sadler had expended £10,092.15.0d. in securing his cargo. According to the writer that meant that he had paid £180 per spar or £35 per load of timber. The same report claimed that the Navy was offering only £8 per load for the timber being supplied to it under contract from firms operating at New Zealand.  


18. Busby to Hay, 31 December 1833, CO209/1,f.211b-212b; Sadler to Busby, 11, 30, 31 December 1833, 16 March, 7 June 1834, Dacre to Busby 3 October 1834, NZ: British Resident: In Letters, 1833-1840, 2 vols, (W Arc,BRL/1); Wood to Busby, 9 July 1835, (BRL/2); Busby to Colonial Secretary, 2 July 1834, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1834, (AONSW,4/2246.2,item 34/5826).  

19. S.H., 9 October 1834.
Little is known of the two later voyages made by HMS Buffalo to collect cargoes of New Zealand timbers. Between 18 September 1837 and 18 March 1838 the vessel loaded 75 spars in Ngunguru Bay and in July 1840 the Buffalo was wrecked while attempting to load spars at Mercury Bay.

The Navy maintained an interest in New Zealand timber throughout the 1840s. The colonial government moved to appropriate all naval timber for government use and one more vessel, HMS Tortoise, was sent out in 1842-3. However by the 1850s, with the advent of steamers and a move away from wooden ships, the Navy no longer required New Zealand timbers.

In addition to the voyages sent to obtain cargoes of New Zealand timber, other government vessels (of the colonial marine) were sent to obtain shipments of phormium tenax during the 1820s. The masters of the colonial vessels appear to have had the dual task of exploring the possibilities and the potential of a trade based on the New Zealand flax, and collecting phormium specimens for planting and for manufacturing in the ropewalks and cloth factories of New South Wales.

The first vessel of exploration sent to New Zealand was navigated by William Edwardson who had distinguished himself by his charting of Bateman's Bay and other bays on the New South Wales coast. In the Snapper, a 29 ton cutter, Edwardson sailed for New Zealand on 7 November 1822. His assignment was to follow on the work of Robert Williams from the voyage of the Perseverance in 1813 (Williams was apparently also on board the Snapper) by surveying the flax resources of the South Island, charting the bays, and returning with a cargo of

---


21. Cheesman, 10 April 1840-7 March 1841.

22. Willis, pp.31-4; Colonial Office to Hobson, 14 February 1841, CO209/8, f.31b-33a; Order, 30 October 1841, New Zealand Herald and Auckland Gazette, 10,17 November 1841.

23. S.G., 8 November 1822.

24. On Williams see Appendix 1.
dressed flax. He visited the familiar sources of flax and concluded that only Ruapuke Island and Port Macquarie (Bluff Harbour) had supplies of flax large enough to support a viable industry. The comment on his chart of Port William, Stewart Island, 'No Flax to be Obtained', was equally applicable to Chalky Inlet, the rest of Stewart Island, and Codfish Island. The Snapper returned from its five months' cruise on 27 March 1823. Apparently only one ton of dressed flax had been obtained.25

Six weeks later the New South Wales government dispatched the colonial cutter Mermaid (a vessel rigged with rope made from New Zealand flax), J.R. Kent master, to get flax - both leaves and plants - and to make a more thorough investigation of southern flax supplies. The cutter sailed on 8 May 1823.26 Kent's voyage established Ruapuke Island as the flax centre of southern New Zealand, although his description of flax-gathering - standing waist-deep in water with the air temperature at 9°F and with little help from the Maoris - was not encouraging for merchants. Moreover the local Maoris had only a little dressed flax to sell on this occasion.

Kent expressed astonishment at Williams' and Edwardson's descriptions of the fine flax grounds at Bluff. The flax there he considered 'not sufficiently long for one of our smallest casks'. (This may have been because Kent was making his inspection during the winter when the old leaves of the flax were dying and before the new growth had begun.) He also discovered that the flax at Bluff was five miles distant from a suitable anchorage.


26. S.G., 8 May 1823.
Drawing, therefore, on his knowledge gained whilst in command of the tender Prince Regent in 1820, Kent asserted that the North Island was far better endowed with exportable phormium than was the South Island. The Mermaid returned to Sydney with about 12 cwt of flax which had been preserved in salt water and with two Maori women who had agreed to teach the convicts how to dress the green flax.

On 5 November 1823 Kent again set sail for New Zealand, this time in command of HM colonial brig Elizabeth Henrietta. The reasons for the voyage were described as 'to complete certain enquiries ... of a delicate nature to the natives themselves' and 'to promote the civilization of the inhabitants of the island by supplying them with British Manufactures in exchange for their flax'. Kent appears to have been given a free hand to conduct his investigation.

During the voyage Kent visited the Hokianga River, the 'Taranaki Coast', Cook Strait, Banks Peninsula and Otago. At all these places he collected flax plants and green leaves which he ordered to be encased in moss collected from Port William, Stewart Island. (Presumably this new experiment with preserving phormium followed the failure of his previous use of salt water.)

The Elizabeth Henrietta was collecting more flax at Ruapuke Island when it was blown ashore on 25 February 1824. While that vessel was being refloated Kent was reassigned to the Mermaid, which had been dispatched to assist with the salvage of the Elizabeth Henrietta. In the Mermaid Kent continued his extensive tour of the New Zealand coastline in search of flax supplies. He returned to Sydney on 12 March 1825

28. S.G., 21 August 1823.
29. S.G., 6 November 1823.
30. R. Carrick, ed., Historical Records of New Zealand South Prior to 1840, Dunedin, 1903, p. 108.
with 25 tons of dressed flax and a number of plants. 32

This was the last government speculative flax venture. While the voyage served to indicate the importance the government placed on finding supplies of flax and on the phormium trade that could be developed, the cost of the 17 months' excursion must have been huge and this may have deterred the government from sponsoring further visits. If nothing else, it warned merchants of the dangers of a purely speculative trade. Perhaps too, the departure from New South Wales in December 1825 of the promoters of these voyages - Governor Brisbane and his Colonial Secretary Frederick Goulburn - put paid to future ventures.

The voyages by government naval vessels played a significant part in promoting and encouraging the involvement of merchants in the timber and flax trade. They contributed to the merchants' knowledge of the known sources of these products and the whereabouts of the new supplies. They highlighted some of the difficulties of trading in New Zealand while they also added substantially to the safety of voyaging in New Zealand by providing detailed and accurate surveys of many major anchorages. According to James Busby:

The Success of these vessels having demonstrated the practicability of maintaining the trade, it was accordingly thrown open without restraint to the enterprise of private individuals; and it appears, in its increase to have exceeded the most Sanguine expectations which Could have been entertained respecting it. 33


33. J. Busby, A Brief Memoir Relative to the Islands of New Zealand, CO209/1, f.185b.
NAVAL VESSELS were also sent to New Zealand to attempt to regulate affairs in that country. The British Admiralty decreed in 1821 that 'one of His Majesty's Ships should always be stationed on the Coasts of New South Wales' and be used to promote 'the general benefit of His Majesty's Service'. In June 1826 the Admiralty further decided that these vessels also 'be ordered to inspect occasionally the Coasts of New Zealand'.

From a mercantile point of view there were several aspects of these regulatory voyages that increased the safety of trading at New Zealand. The visits meant that the British government was willing to 'show the flag'. Commissioner Bigge, for instance, had suggested the presence of a well-armed vessel and a well-disciplined company could prove a deterrent to provocative or ill-advised actions by Europeans or Maoris. The first 'cruise' by a naval vessel was that of the Satellite in 1823. Usually the masters and crew of these vessels would use their time in New Zealand to fraternise with European residents and Maoris. One exception was HMS Warspite which was in the Cook Strait area for seven days in January 1827 and did not even land a boatload of men. These cruises also involved the upholding of British government interests in New Zealand. For instance HMS Tees was dispatched to attempt to rescue the Elizabeth Henrietta from the rocks at Ruapuke in 1824.

Naval officers were expected to enforce British justice and take offending Europeans to New South Wales or Van Diemen's Land for trial. Captain Laws of HMS Satellite, for example, arrested the four ringleaders of a mutiny aboard the whaling brig Minerva, Philip Tapsell master, in the Bay of Islands in January 1829. The men were returned to Sydney and committed

34. Bathurst to Brisbane, 8 May 1821, H.R.A., 1, X, 498.
35. Hay to Bourke, 26 March 1832, and enclosure, H.R.A. 1, XVI, 573-4.
for trial as pirates in May. The outcome of the trial is unknown. However from Laws' statement it seems clear that his presence prevented the mutineers from combining with local Maoris and taking the vessel. Similarly HMS Dromedary took time out from its search for timber to arrest and return the General Gates and its convict crew to New South Wales.

Another law enforcement task undertaken by naval officers, before the appointment of the British Resident, was that of apprehending any escaped convicts they saw in New Zealand. For this reason Driscoll, the boatswain of Hyde Park barracks, accompanied HMS Zebra to New Zealand in 1831 and 1832 to identify the convicts there. Apparently his attempts to arrest suspects, on the first visit at least, were thwarted by Maoris' refusal to surrender the men. The presence of a naval officer also provided a forum of appeal for disputes. Thus the arrival of FitzRoy in command of HMS Beagle in December 1835 prompted the referral of three disputes for his adjudication.

The Navy's role was seen to be, in part, to protect Europeans from Maori threats. For that reason, HMS Zebra was sent out to Taranaki in 1832 to investigate a report that Waikato Maoris were planning to attack Europeans who resided there. Later HMS Alligator used the threat to destroy Pomare's pa at Otuihu in the Bay of Islands in order to secure the return of a boat that Pomare, quite fairly as it turned out, had seized as payment for a bad debt. Also the voyage of

38. Laws to Colonial Secretary, Bay of Islands, 27 January 1829, Attorney General to Colonial Secretary, 2 March 1829, Laws to Colonial Secretary, Sydney, 20 May 1829, in NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letter Received 1829, (AONSW, 4/2020, items 29/1446, 29/1627, 29/3935); Colonial Secretary to Attorney General, 25 February 1829, 5 March 1829, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Sent to Judicial Establishments etc., (AONSW, 4/3737), pp.136,145. See also P. Tapsell, Reminiscences, 1779-1869, (WTu, qMS TAP, 1869), pp.106-7.
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43. S.G., 19 July 1832.

44. S.H., 17 April 1834; S.G., 19 April 1834.
HMS Alligator to rescue Mrs Guard and some of the crew of the Harriet in September 1834 is an excellent example of this perceived task of protecting European traders. Another example of a naval officer using the might at his disposal to side with Europeans against Maoris, is provided by the voyage of HM Brig Pelorus to Thames in July 1838. On 28 July Chetwoode, the master of the Pelorus, addressed the local Maoris, the Ngatitamataara, on the wickedness of their crime in attacking the schooner Hokiang. He informed the Maoris that his task was to protect the European traders who respected European and Maori laws and to punish, without favour, any Maori or European who 'conducted himself in a manner unbecoming the character of the nation to which he belongs'. The Pelorus, he concluded, was large enough to destroy the whole Maori race and should they persist in attacking European vessels the Queen would have to (although with extreme reluctance) order their destruction. The Maoris thereupon offered reparation for the attack. Not only did the Navy try to protect the Europeans from the Maoris, but during the 1830s, naval officers were also directed to attempt to mediate in inter-Maori disputes. For example William Hobson, commanding HMS Rattlesnake in 1837, was sent to assist in negotiating a settlement in the Pomare-Titore war that was raging in the Bay of Islands. While peace was not established during his stay, Hobson felt that his achievement in obtaining the agreement of Maoris not to attack European residents during the war was worthy of note.

45. Lambert left a statement about the reprisal with Europeans at Kapiti, Cloudy Bay, Port Nicholson, Mana Island, and the Bay of Islands. In it Lambert stated that the King of England, however much he wanted to cultivate the friendship of Maoris, would not tolerate behaviour such as the attack on the Harriet and would punish all offences in the same severe way. The Europeans were supposed to transmit the information to local Maoris - Lambert to Busby, 25 October 1834, enclosing statement, 11 October 1834, (WARc, BR1/1).

46. Fairburn to Busby, 20 July 1838, (WARc, BR1/2).

47. Hobson to Bourke, 8 August 1837, (AONSW, 4/2368.2). The second master of the Coromandel in 1820 had assisted Samuel Marsden's efforts to bring peace to Thames and between the chiefs Te Puhí and Te Hinaki - Downie, 11 August 1820; Elder, Letters, pp.275-7.
After 1833 the warships assisted the British Resident, James Busby, in some of his tasks. Thus when HMS Alligator returned to the Bay of Islands in 1834 the master was instrumental in assisting Busby to identify the Maori who had attacked his house.\(^{48}\) Also the arrival of HMS Hyacinth in March 1835 lent weight to Busby's demand that the chiefs punish Rete, the man who had admitted attacking the Residency.\(^{49}\)

When they visited New Zealand the naval officers were also often called upon to perform various other functions which directly or indirectly involved British interests there. These included rescuing a local vessel Caroline, from probable destruction on some rocks in Whangaroa Harbour;\(^{50}\) presiding over a meeting of chiefs to select a New Zealand flag and then saluting it;\(^{51}\) investigating the murder of a whaler, Captain Cherry of the Caroline;\(^{52}\) delivering mail;\(^{53}\) and undertaking to investigate the state of the 'commercial interests of Great Britain and the Australian Colonies and the Civilization and protection of the Natives'.\(^{54}\) Of practical value for trade were the efforts the Navy made to chart the coasts of New Zealand. It has already been shown that many of the vessels that came for timber and flax left charts and instructions about the harbours they visited or discovered. So too HMS Warspite apparently spent part of its time surveying the Cook Strait area and HMS Pelorus was responsible for surveying Mercury Bay and 'discovering' Pelorus Sound. The colonial press

\(^{48}\) Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 30 October, 28 November 1834, CO209/1, f.253b-255b, 256b; James Busby to Alexander Busby, 17 November 1834, J. Busby, Letters to James Busby, 1830-1866; and Letters from Busby to his brother Alexander, 1830-1839, (WTu, qMS BUS).

\(^{49}\) Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 16 February 1835, CO209/1, f.277b-278a.

\(^{50}\) HMS Alligator, S.G., 17 April 1834. The ship's carpenter assisted in repairing another vessel, the Emma, which had been badly damaged in the same storm.

\(^{51}\) HMS Alligator, H.T.C., 2 May 1834; S.G. 8 January 1835.

\(^{52}\) HM Brig Pelorus, S.G., 6 October 1838; S.H., 8 October 1838.

\(^{53}\) HMS Challenger, S.H., 22 October 1832.

\(^{54}\) HMS Rattlesnake, Bourke to Hobson, Memo, (15?) May 1837, (AONSW, 4/2 368.2, item 37/173).
heralded the Pelorus surveys as being of 'considerable utility to our Colonial trading masters'.

THE SENDING of naval vessels to New Zealand was just one of a number of government moves which had the effect of promoting the timber and flax trade in the period before 1840.

From very early in the contact period various government departments expressed an interest in one or both of these products. For instance Sir Philip Stephen, Secretary to the Admiralty, asked Captain Cook to get flax seed and plants during the course of his third voyage. Similarly the Colonial Office instructions given to Governor Phillip, the first Governor of New South Wales, required him to investigate and cultivate the flax which was to be found 'in the islands not far distant from the intended settlement' at Botany Bay. Also, throughout the early years of the nineteenth century, the home government was made aware of events in the New Zealand timber and flax trade through both despatches from the colonial governors and letters from individuals to government offices. Occasionally a Department of State was forced to comment on some development in the trade. For instance the Colonial Office placed before the Privy Council Committee on Trade Governor Macquarie's despatch concerning the 1810 attempt by Lord and others to establish a factory at New Zealand together with their request for a monopoly over flax exports. Lord Liverpool later informed Macquarie that:

altho their Lordship's think that the Proposal is deserving of Encouragement from His Majesty's Government, great doubts are entertained of the Expediency, of granting the monopoly demanded. 59

55. S.G., 6 October 1838; S.H., 8 October 1838.
56. Stephens to Cook, ALS Letter, 20 July 1776, NLA, MS688).
58. For example Watson to Hawkesbury (Board of Trade), 15 October 1789, Ho 31/14; Hurry to Hobart, c. April 1804, CO201/34, f.89b-90b; Boyles to Bathurst, 5 September 1818, CO201/93, f.108b-117a.
59. Liverpool to Macquarie, 15 May 1812 (Draft only), CO201/60, f.35b-36a.
At the same time as the Dromedary and the Coromandel were dispatched for New Zealand the Colonial Office appointed a Royal Commissioner to investigate the state of the Australian colonies, and New South Wales in particular. Part of Commissioner Bigge's brief was to look at colonial agriculture and commerce and to report on 'their actual State and the means by which you consider that they can be most readily promoted'.

Bigge seemed to regard his commission as being broad enough to encompass affairs in New Zealand and he took evidence from visitors to, and missionaries connected with, New Zealand. His recommendations concerning New Zealand were expounded in a letter to Lord Bathurst in 1823. Bigge was enthusiastic about the future of the flax industry. He believed that a factory should be established at New Zealand with, initially at least, a detachment of troops to defend the European flax workers. He foresaw the factories being both self-sufficient and capable of maintaining the troops from their profits within a year of their establishment. The Commissioner was less enthusiastic about New Zealand timber exports. He concluded that most reports on New Zealand timber had been based on the performance of the 'inferior' kahikatea which formed the bulk of the timber imported into New South Wales. However he felt that the cargoes of the Dromedary and Coromandel would give the Royal Navy a chance to better assess the potential of New Zealand timber.

Bigge's public report On the State of Agriculture and Trade in the Colony of New South Wales was received in the colony in February 1824. It was a concise document. For that reason the large amount of space Bigge devoted to describing and praising the work of the Sydney ropemaker Robert Williams in preparing New Zealand flax clearly showed the importance the Commissioner placed on promoting the importation and processing of this product. Bigge had also commissioned tests in Britain.

60. Bathurst to Bigge, 30 January 1819, H.R.A., 1, X, 10.
on the rope made from Williams' dressed flax. He reported their favourable results. 63 To promote the use of phormium tenax Bigge recommended that convicts be employed to plant flax in New South Wales, that the government purchase the patent to Williams' ropemaking machine, and that Williams' rope be used on all colonial vessels. 64 As an encouragement to the timber trade Bigge recommended the abolition of import duties on timber brought to the colony in colonial vessels. 65

Commenting generally Bigge described the trade with New Zealand as being 'very inconsiderable'. He believed that this was the result of the frequent conflicts between Maoris and Europeans at New Zealand. He considered that the traders' unwillingness to visit New Zealand was a response to the near constant tribal warfare in the country. Like many other commentators he recommended that, in order to encourage and promote trade and to control inter-racial behaviour, naval vessels should be sent to cruise around New Zealand. 66

Lord Bathurst instructed Governor Brisbane to carry out the recommendations of the Bigge Reports. 67 When he enquired later for a report on the progress of the work, Bathurst was informed that the programme for planting phormium tenax had 'been much attended to, several Cargoes [having] arrived from New Zealand'. The duties on timber had also been removed. 68

Independently of the Colonial Office initiative a wealthy Scottish merchant, Walter Ferguson, wrote to Lieut-General R.L. Ferguson (M.P. for Kircaldy Burghs) praising the virtues of New Zealand flax. He believed that if the flax were cultivated in New Zealand, rather than left to grow there naturally, it would be possible for Britain to import all her

63. Tests at the government yard in Knaresborough in 1818 had given indifferent results - H.T.G., 30 January 1819
65. Bigge, pp.87-8.
66. Bigge, pp.57-8,60.
requirements for hemp from that country. This would free
Britain from her dependence on the 'autocrat of all Russia'.
Fergus suggested that Fergusson forward the letter to the
Board of Trade. He also recommended that skilled flax dressers
be sent to New Zealand at government expense to test the flax
in its natural environment - apparently the *phormium tenax*
grown in New South Wales was an inferior product. Finally
Fergus calculated that New Zealand flax could be imported into
Britain at £10.0.0d per ton less than Baltic hemp.

Fergusson forwarded the letter with a covering note
stating that Fergus was a prosperous and sensible businessman
and that his views were worth considering. The Committee for
Trade responded to the letter by requesting that the Colonial
Office instruct the Governor of New South Wales to investigate
the potential of New Zealand flax and to send samples to the
Committee for proper experimentation. The Colonial Office
reply noted these comments and stated that since Bigge had
brought flax samples back from New South Wales, the Committee
would receive a copy of the results of his tests in due course. 6
Thus two important government departments were concurrently
showing a renewed interest in New Zealand flax.

The government then moved to encourage traders to supply
Britain with naval supplies. By the statutes 6 George IV c III
and 7 George IV c 48 of 1825 and 1826, flax and naval timbers
(those larger than eight inches square) from New South Wales,
Norfolk Island, Van Diemen's Land and New Zealand, could be
imported into Great Britain duty free until 1 January 1833.

In Clause X of 6 George c III a special case was made for
the New Zealand produce. While timber and flax which was pro-
duced in New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and Norfolk Island
had to carry a certificate from the customs officers in the
colonies stating that it was the growth and produce of that
particular settlement, the goods that were imported directly

69. Fergus to Fergusson, 11 January 1822, BT 1/160; Wilmot
to Lack, 21 February 1822, BT 1/161, CO324/144, pp.33-4;
Lack to Wilmot, 14 February 1822, CO201/110, f.25b;
from New Zealand would be entered duty free provided that the master of the vessel was prepared to state on oath to the customs officers at the port of importation, that he had loaded the timber or flax at New Zealand.

The table of duties which accompanied the Act distinguished between flax and hemp. Flax appeared to be defined as linen-making fibres, whereas hemp was fibre destined for rope manufacture. Flax was to be charged a duty of 4d per hundredweight, which was to be decreased annually by 1d until, from 5 July 1828, it was to be levied 1d per hundredweight. Hemp was to be charged £4.15.0d per hundredweight if dressed, 4s.8d if undressed, and to be admitted free if from a British possession. As far as imports of phormium tenax were concerned, flax-quality fibre from New Zealand was charged at the flax rate while the hemp fibre was taxed at the foreign rate until, by 7 George IV c 48 the table of duties was amended to allow all hemp from New Zealand to be imported duty free.

These duties (or lack of them) were a large decrease from the £80.0.0d per ton (dressed) and £7.13.4d per ton (undressed) imposts on flax which had formed one of the complaints in a petition signed by 1260 Sydney residents in 1819. However the lower duties did not automatically apply to all imported timber and flax. For instance no relief was allowed on masts, spars, deals and yards under eight inches square. Also New Zealand grown produce shipped via New South Wales or Van Diemen's Land had to carry a customs note to the effect that it had been taken in British vessels and by British traders.

A new stimulus was given to the New Zealand timber and flax trade by a series of decisions made by the Lords of the Admiralty in 1831. They requested that a 'strict enquiry be made' concerning the availability and cost of importing New Zealand...
Zealand flax. Lord Howick of the Colonial Office therefore instructed Governor Darling to ask local merchants about the prospects of the trade in this product.74 Darling's reply was dated 10 September 1831 and included three non-committal replies from John Maclaren, Henry Donnison and Richard Jones. None of the merchants could give any definite answers but all stressed the difficulties of trading with Maoris at New Zealand and the problems of getting good quality dressed flax.75 When Viscount Goderich wrote to Governor Bourke regarding the contents of the replies Darling had forwarded, he stated that the reason for the request had been to 'obtain as much Information as possible in respect to an Article, which at some future period may be made available for purposes in this Country to which the Flax of other Nations is now applied'. Goderich ended by stating that he had no instructions following the request for information although he suggested that Bourke encourage people to grow flax in the colony, and especially on Norfolk Island, but to so without committing the government to spending money or giving promises that they would purchase the flax in the future.76

However the Admiralty Commissioners had been busy in other directions. Early in 1831 they accepted the offer of Buckle, Bagster and Buckle to supply 800 tons of flax at £41.15.0d per ton (although the current market price for flax was £20.0.0d) and gave them three years to fill the contract.77 The Navy Board had been carrying out extensive tests on phormium tenax throughout the 1820s. By 1828 the Board officers had come to the conclusion that, while New Zealand flax and hemp fibres were superior to the Russian article, the cost

74. Howick to Darling, 10 February 1831, H.R.A., I, XVI, 76.
75. Darling to Howick, 10 September 1831, and enclosures, CO201/220, f.364b-374a.
76. Goderich to Bourke, 6 April 1832, H.R.A., I, XVI, 598.
of establishing a large enough crop in Britain or New South Wales and the cost and uncertainty of arranging for deliveries direct from New Zealand when adequate supplies of Riga hemp could be obtained in Europe, precluded their recommending that steps should be taken to establish an extensive importation of *phormium tenax.* At the same time private tests were being carried out. A London flaxworker, M.J.J. Donlan, claimed to have perfected a method of mechanically dressing and working New Zealand flax. He patented this process before sending samples to the Navy for testing. Another process, patented by Captain J.W. Harris, M.P., involved combining the rope fibres with caoutchouc to give additional flexibility.

The government experimentation was apparently carried out secretly and was only publicly exposed on 29 March 1832 when Lord Teynham moved in the House of Lords that the Government table the figures for Royal Navy hemp and flax imports together with all information 'relating to the use and experiments made to the *phormium tenax*, or New Zealand flax'. In reply to the motion Earl Grey stated that he would table the returns of imports but that the full results of the tests were too voluminous and too expensive to publish. Such reticence and secrecy fuelled the hopes of colonial exporters that the letting of a permanent contract for the supply of New Zealand flax was imminent.

For Captain Harris and his method see: Harris to Admiralty 1831, ADM 1/1965, H. 33; Harris to Admiralty, 1835, ADM 1/1970; Enderby to Board of Trade, 14 February 1832, BT 1/284; S.G., 5, 14 May 1831.
80. The Times, (London), 30 March 1832; British Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, 1832, XI, col. I076; S.G., 28 July 1832. Lord Teynham of Maidstone was a Whig peer who gained notoriety for his attempts to embarrass the Tory government.
Zealand flax to the Navy was imminent.\(^{81}\)

In the event nothing seemed to come of the interest and experimentation or of the initial contract to Buckle & Co. Perhaps the cost and inconvenience cited by the Board officers in 1828 proved to be a stumbling block. Also the *phormium tenax* which reached Britain seems to have been of a generally poor description. It therefore probably came as no surprise to merchants when Parliament passed the 1833 Act, 4 & 5 William IV c 56, which ended the period of preferential tariffs for New Zealand flax. By the terms of the Act all flax fibre of whatever origin was to be entered at 1d per hundredweight, dressed hemp at £4.15.0d and all undressed hemp at 1d per hundredweight. The effect was that Russian hemp could be imported more cheaply than the New Zealand flax which it also generally surpassed in quality in the market place. The predicted effect of the passing of the Act on the importation of New Zealand flax was that the lowering of the duty would 'be the means of driving it out of use'.\(^{82}\)

Meanwhile government sponsored tests on New Zealand timbers, which were also being carried out during the 1820s and into the 1830s, aimed to compare the New Zealand product with those traditionally imported from Russia and Scandinavian countries, Canadian and North American pines and the poon which grew in East India.\(^{83}\) The Admiralty considered the kauri spars

---


82. S.H., 21 January 1833.

to be 'exceedingly desirable for naval purposes' and 'equal, if not superior, to those of Russia or America'. However the voyages of the Dromedary and Coromandel had shown that the cost of their collection by Naval vessels ('£50 per cent more than those from Virginia') had ruled out continuing that method of importing them. The answer, it seemed, was to use the same system of letting Naval contracts to private firms that had worked for the Baltic and Canadian trade.

The only other concession that the British government appears to have made to facilitate trade in New Zealand timber was the decision of the Board of Trade to allow New Zealand spars which exceeded 70 feet in length, (Riga and Canadian timber was rarely of this dimension), into the United Kingdom duty free.

Colonial and British merchants also saw signs of governments' interest in the timber and flax trade in less tangible official moves. For example there were visits by government botanists. Charles Frazer, the Colonial Botanist, had been in charge of planting New Zealand flax around Sydney in response to the suggestions in the Bigge Report. Apparently his efforts had not met with a great deal of success and so he was dispatched to New Zealand to make a study of the plant in its native environment as well as to collect seeds from other New Zealand native flora. His visit was a short one for he saw the Bay of Islands and Thames only briefly during the voyage of HMS Larne in February 1826. Alan Cunningham, Botanical Collector for the Royal Gardens stationed at New South Wales, made a more thorough study of New Zealand flora during his visit. He left Sydney in August 1826 and returned.

85. On these contracts see pp.109-110.
86. The Times, (London), 7 June 1838 cited in Colonist, 6 October 1838.
87. J. Herton to Montagu, 23 January 1824, VDL: Colonial Secretary: General Correspondence, (AOT, CSO 1/71/1446); S.G., 23 January, 5 April 1826; H.T.G., 4 February, 11 February, 1 April 1826.
in January 1827. During his time in New Zealand he visited the Bay of Islands, Hokianga, Thames, Whangaroa and Tauranga. His contribution to New Zealand botany was significant and his special concern for the commercial potential of timber and flax made the information he gained useful to those who were interested. The Colonial Botanist, Richard Cunningham, brother of Alan, also visited New Zealand. He went out on the Buffalo in 1833 and spent time in Whangaroa, Thames and the Bay of Islands before returning to Sydney on HMS Alligator in April 1834.

In addition to encouraging the testing and experimentation of private artisans like Robert Williams, the colonial government commissioned 'official' experiments with New Zealand flax. In 1814 the convict John Hutchings, who had been appointed to investigate the natural products of New South Wales on behalf of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, was able to report on his examination of dyed flax and to present his conclusions on how Maoris were able to colour their dressed phormium. He also expressed a wish to visit New Zealand.

The British Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce also sought to encourage the growth and use of phormium tenax throughout the 1820s. Therefore in 1824, 1826 and 1829 they offered medals and cash prizes to persons in Great Britain who grew the flax.

88. S.G., 30 August 1826, 20 January 1837.
   Cunningham made a private visit to New Zealand from April to October 1838. Apart from the fact that he terminated the visit because of ill-health, little else is known of this visit - S.H., 15 October 1838.
91. Bathurst to Macquarie, 12 November 1812, H.R.A.,l,VII, 540-1; Macquarie to Bathurst, 30 April 1814, and enclosures, CO201/72, f.256a-256b; H.R.A.,l VIII,224-5.
92. S.G., 26 February 1824, 9 January 1826, 5 December 1829.
Thus the British and colonial governments had a continuing and multifaceted interest and involvement with New Zealand timber and flax. This government encouragement both promoted the trade and provided an impetus for traders to invest in exporting these products. In turn, however, the increased involvement of European traders at New Zealand created problems for the British and colonial governments.
Part II: Regulating the Trade

THE DIFFICULTIES the governments had to face centred around the designation of New Zealand as a foreign country over which the British colonial and home governments had no right to exercise power. At the same time the Crown recognized its responsibility to protect the lives and property of British subjects while they were in that country. Also, as contacts increased, the governments found that it was necessary to try and control the activities of their traders at New Zealand. The governments' moves in these areas affected the conduct of trade. This was seen in the growth of customs regulations in the colonies, in the extension of the legal jurisdiction of the colonies to cover crimes committed at New Zealand and in the appointment of a British Resident.

Because, in theory, the penal colonies were supposed to survive on a balance of local production and supplies sent from Great Britain, there was at first no system of duties or other fees to restrict the importation of goods into the colonies. There were early attempts to control the quantity of alcohol being brought into New South Wales but the first general and legal imposition of import duties and port fees was levied by Governor Macquarie. These had been ordered in the light of the growth in colonial trade and because of economic stringency in Great Britain. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Liverpool, required Macquarie to draw up the charges in order to increase colonial revenue. These he ordered from 26 June 1813. New Zealand flax was not separately mentioned among the items enumerated in Macquarie's Proclamation but it probably fell under the five percent ad valorem duty on all foreign goods which was imposed at the same time. However New Zealand timber was to be taxed at the rate of £1.0.0d for every 20 spars and, if the timber was in log or plank, 1s.6d per solid foot.

94. S.G., 26 June 1813.
The scale of fees was amended in a Government Notice dated 19 August 1815. It stated that as New Zealand timber did not sell at the high price anticipated in 1813 the Governor had lowered the duty on log and plank to 6d per solid foot although the duty on spars remained unchanged. The lowering of the duty had been the result of the Rev. Samuel Marsden's approach to the Governor on the matter. However the burden of the duties was not greatly lessened by this move. In 1820 Marsden wrote to the CMS complaining that he could only afford to let the missionary vessel Active enter New South Wales ports once a year because 'the duty upon the timber and the port expenses of various kinds were so ruinous'. Hence the calls for the lowering of the duties continued.

New Zealand products were not amongst the imports which, after 1819, received drawbacks on duties if they were re-exported. However all duties on goods imported into the colonies through the efforts of colonial merchants from anywhere in the South Seas were, after the recommendation of Commissioner Bigge, abolished in 1825. Yet under the same Proclamation, 25 October 1825, Brisbane continued to impose a five percent ad valorem duty on imports of foreign goods. This was the beginning of a dichotomy which was to prevail until 1840. New Zealand was to be regarded both as a foreign state and as a part of the colonial coasting trade.

96. Yarwood, p. 190.
100. NSW: Colonial Secretary: Returns of the Colony, 1827, CO206/69, f.96.
When the first professional customs officers arrived in the colonies in 1827 they set about reorganising the prevailing system of the control and collection of duties. They noted the anomalous situation with regard to New Zealand but continued to allow goods to be entered duty free as had been the case when they arrived in the colony. Perhaps at their suggestion the matter was clarified by an Act of the Colonial Legislature. Clause XLII of the Act, 'For the Regulation of the Customs of New South Wales and its Dependencies', which came into force on 5 April 1830, stated:

... That all Vessels trading from one Part of Colony to another Part thereof beyond the Heads of Port Jackson, or with any of the Islands in the South Seas on which there are no public Establishments, European or American; And also all Vessels employed in the Whale, Seal, or Sea Elephant Fisheries, shall be considered as engaged in the Coasting or Colonial Trade. They would therefore have their cargoes entered duty free.

In Van Diemen's Land the situation was different. The customs officers had levied a five percent ad valorem duty on all goods from New Zealand. Thus in December 1830 J.G. Briggs, a merchant and owner of the Dragon, complained to the Colonial Secretary that he had had to pay the five percent duty to enter his New Zealand timber at Hobart whereas it would have been duty and wharfage free in New South Wales. He claimed that the Van Diemen's Land merchants should be allowed to 'participate in the Profits' to be derived from the New Zealand trade to the same extent as their New South Wales counterparts. The Van Diemen's Land customs officers agreed with this sentiment and the Lieut-Governor directed them to admit Briggs' cargo duty free and to find out about New South Wales practices. When the officers informed Governor Arthur that the New South Wales government allowed New Zealand goods to.

101. Customs, New South Wales to Customs, Van Diemen's Land 22 January 1831, VDL: Colonial Secretary: General Correspondence, (AOT, CSO1/480/10687); Customs to Colonial Secretary, 29 January 1836, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, Customs, 1836, (AONSW, 4/2315.2, item 36/890).

102. S.G., 1 April 1830.
to be entered duty free and generally free of wharfage fees, he informed the officers that he would 'approve of the produce of New Zealand being imported into this Colony exactly on the same terms as that of New South Wales'.

New Zealand produce was, as the New South Wales officers had implied in the letter cited above, given other customs advantages. When New Zealand cargoes were landed at a sufferance or a private wharf, wharfage fees were only one-third of those applying at public wharves. Also if a merchant were to tow New Zealand timber from the importing vessel and land it at his own wharf, without incurring additional expense for the government, the timber could be landed free of wharfage. The Lieut-Governor of Van Diemen's Land did not seem as willing to favour New Zealand produce in this way.

Apart from these privileges, vessels sailing to and from New Zealand were charged wharfage, tonnage and other dues on the same scale as vessels engaged in foreign trade.

Where it was obviously in their best interests the colonial merchants supported the favoured status which was accorded to imports from New Zealand. However as a market they preferred New Zealand to remain classed as foreign. This was particularly useful for merchants who wanted to export tobacco
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and spirits to New Zealand. When these products were landed in the colony for 'home consumption' the importers had to pay a heavy duty.\textsuperscript{108} If, however, they were destined for foreign countries (that is, for re-export) the spirits and tobacco were held in the colonial bondstore and put on board the exporting vessel without this duty being paid. Traditionally vessels travelling to foreign ports were allowed a supply of duty free consumables based on the estimated length of the voyage and restricted to half a pint of spirits per man per week and, for whaling vessels, half a pound of tobacco per man.\textsuperscript{109} Apparently any spirits or tobacco declared in the cargo as destined for the supply of a whaling station or for trade with Maoris were also issued from the bondstore.\textsuperscript{110} This was particularly important when tobacco became an indispensable item of trade with Maoris.

A problem arose because there were no agents or customs officers at New Zealand who could check that the spirits or tobacco cleared for that country were actually landed there. Some merchants, it seemed, smuggled barrels of spirits back into the colonies, declared it as flour or whale oil from New Zealand, and therefore had it entered duty free. They then sold the alcohol and tobacco at large profit to themselves but, at the same time, under the cost of the legally imported and duty paid items.\textsuperscript{111} Some shiploads of spirits and tobacco never got to their destination at New Zealand. They were off-loaded onto other vessels along the coasts of the

\begin{itemize}
\item[108.] See, for instance, Brisbane, Proclamation, 14 January 1825, \textit{H.R.A}., 1, XI, 492-3.
\item[109.] Customs, Launceston to Customs, Hobart, 29 November 1830, VDL: Customs: Inward Correspondence, 16 April 1827-18 November 1850, (AOT, CUS1). The 1830 New South Wales Act allowed one gallon of spirits per man per month - S.G., 1 April 1830.
\item[110.] J. Jones to Customs, 12 January 1839, NSW: Customs: Letters Received from Private Individuals, 1831-40, (AONSW, 4/5112), f.123.
\item[111.] Minute No.25, 6 May 1831, NSW: Executive Council:Minutes (AONSW, 4/1517), p. 200; Customs to Colonial Secretary, 30 July 1832, and enclosure (AONSW, 4/2190, item 32/5642); S.H., 5 July 1839.
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colonies and then smuggled back to Sydney or Hobart.\textsuperscript{112}

This legal fiction of New Zealand's being at once a foreign state and part of the coastal trade of the British colonies was eventually faced in 1839 when the New South Wales Legislative Council debated a Bill to repeal the Customs Act of 1830. The only contentious clause in the Bill was Clause L which aimed to restrict the definition of 'coasting trade' to ports and harbours on the colonial coastlines. A special subcommittee was established to hear evidence concerning this clause.\textsuperscript{113} All the submissions came from merchants involved in the shore whaling industry of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{114}

The subcommittee recommended that New Zealand and other South Sea Islands be considered foreign ports and that goods imported from thence should be subject to a five percent ad valorem duty. However because of the destructive effects such a tax would have on the industry and on the investments of colonial merchants, the subcommittee recommended that whale products obtained by British seamen be exempt from duty.\textsuperscript{115} The Council was unmoved by the request and Clause L of the New South Wales Act 3 Victoria c3 included only the ports from Cape Capricorn to the eastern limits of the province of South Australia in the duty free coastal trade of New South Wales.

The dire consequences predicted by those who opposed the passing of the clause were hardly given a chance to eventuate. Before the Act was sent to London for approval

\textsuperscript{112} See, for example, the case of the Dart and William in Customs to Board of Commissioners of Customs, 7 July 1831, NSW: Customs: Copies of Letters Sent to the Board of Commissioners of Customs, London, 1829-1835, (AONSW, 4/5116,), p.122-3; S.H., 13 June 1831.

\textsuperscript{113} S.H., 17 July 1839.

\textsuperscript{114} The witnesses were Francis Mitchell, John Jones, Ranulph Dacre, George Weller, Stuart Donaldson and Thomas Walker

\textsuperscript{115} Customs' Regulations Bill Committee, Report, 16 July 1839, N.S.W. Legislative Council: Votes and Proceedings, 1839.
(10 February 1840) Governor Gipps had extended the boundaries of his Commission to cover the parts of New Zealand which had been ceded to the Crown. By Hobson's proclamation on 21 May 1840, this included the whole country. Trans-Tasman trade, in consequence, became duty free until 18 August 1841.

The other area in which the governments gave New Zealand a special status was in the registration of New Zealand-built vessels. The problem was two-fold. The colonial ports were not 'free ports', that is, only vessels from those nations permitted to trade with British possessions were allowed to enter the ports. While New Zealand had no shipping it was never deemed necessary to add her to the list of approved countries of origin. The second aspect of the problem was that because there was no government and no bureaucracy in New Zealand the vessels built there could not be registered. Without a registration a vessel was liable to seizure and attack by the shipping of any other nation. This was a particularly significant problem for the timber and flax trade since most of the vessels which were laid down in New Zealand were being built for the prosecution of that trade.

The first record of an attempt to deal with the problem concerned the New Zealander which had been built at Te Horeke in 1827. When the brigantine arrived in port

117. Abercrombie to Colonial Secretary, 5 May 1840, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1840-1, (AONSW, 4/2504); Customs to Colonial Secretary, 18 November 1841, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1841, (AONSW, 4/2527.4, item, 41/10074), E.J. Tapp, Early New Zealand, A Dependency of New South Wales, 1789-1841, Melbourne, 1958, pp152-3.
118. The three vessels previously known to have been built in New Zealand did not face these problems. The Providence partially built by Britannia sailors in 1793, was sailed to Sydney from Dusky Bay in 1796. Similarly, the Assistance which arrived from the same place in March 1796. Raine's first New Zealand-built vessel, Enterprise, was apparently given New South Wales registry without any problem in March 1828 - Raine to Sir George Murray, 3 January 1828 (sic), in Darling to Murray, 4 January 1829, NSW: Governor: Despatches, 1829, (NPL/M, A1204), pp. 31-41; H.R.N.Z., I, 686-7; Tapp, p. 9.
her owner Thomas Raine requested that a register be provided for her by the New South Wales authorities. F.N. Rossi, the acting Collector of Customs, sought the advice of the Governor. It was decided to grant the New Zealander a temporary licence to trade with New South Wales. This was not considered as a registration of the vessel (that is the colonial government would not undertake to protect the New Zealander on the high seas or in foreign ports) and the licence was only to be held until the British government had deliberated on the matter. Darling then forwarded Raine's application to England with the commendation that:

in a political point of view, it appears highly desirable that Mr. Raine and such persons as are disposed to form Establishments at New Zealand should receive every possible encouragement. 119

This despatch evoked no response from the Colonial Office 120 although the Commissioners of Customs wrote to the New South Wales customs officers on 28 July 1830 and directed that because New Zealand was not a British possession the New Zealander could not be registered by them. 121 The problem did not go away. It arose again when the Sir George Murray (perhaps Raine named the barque after the Secretary of State for the Colonies as a political move to urge attention to the problem of registrations) arrived in Sydney on 18 November 1830 and was promptly arrested and its cargo seized by the customs officers. 122 Raine was bankrupt by this time and the Sir George

120. H.R.A., 1, XIV, 958. It is missing from the microfilm copy of Colonial Office papers.
121. Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 28 July 1830, NSW: Customs: Letters from Board of Customs, London, 1826-1833, (Australian Archives, Sydney, SP 1083/4), p. 54.
122. Customs to Colonial Secretary, 19 November 1830, NSW: Customs: Copies of Letters Sent Within the Colony of New South Wales, 1829-1832, (AONSW, 4/5)05), pp.213-5.
Murray and its cargo had been promised for sale to satisfy creditors. Thus Raine's trustees applied to the Executive Council for the return of the cargo and a licence of the type issued to the New Zealander. They were prepared to enter into a £10,000 bond to surrender the vessel and its cargo should the British government decide that the barque was in fact liable for seizure. The Executive Council 'deeming it of importance to the interest of the Colony to encourage as much as possible a trade with New Zealand' decided to grant a licence to the barque for trading between New Zealand and New South Wales. The Colonial Secretary instructed the customs officers to issue the licence and in the meantime the matter was again sent for decision in Britain.123

The response of the British Commissioners of Customs to this move was to order that vessels from New Zealand were entitled to import produce from their country of construction to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land but that registrations, either British or colonial, could not be issued.124 The vessels that were thus licensed were permitted to pay duties and fees at the same rate as vessels of British manufacture.125

The situation was further complicated by the expiry of the original licence granted to the New Zealander. When the vessel arrived in Sydney in January 1833 it was arrested and its whale oil confiscated. The vessel was released after the owner, J.H. Grose, agreed to enter a bond for twice the value of the vessel and its cargo while the matter was referred again to London.126 In October 1833 the Treasury instructed

123. Minute No. 1, 6 January 1831, (AONSW, 4/1517), pp.62-3; Colonial Secretary to Customs, 12 January 1831, NSW: Customs: Letters Received from Colonial Secretary, 1831, (AONSW, 4/5078), f.281b.
124. Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 27 August 1831, (Australian Archives, Sydney, SP1083/4, p.122.
126. S.G., 15,17, 19 January, 2 February 1833; S.H., 10 January 1833.
the Board of Customs that all licences granted to New Zealand-built vessels were to be limited to three years and that no more licences were to be issued after the end of 1833.127

That remained the situation until James Busby, as British Resident in New Zealand, assembled a meeting of 20-30 chiefs in March 1834. At this meeting the chiefs chose a 'New Zealand flag' which was in turn recognised by a salute from the guns of HMS Alligator.128 By recognising the flag and making Busby's appointment, the British government had officially acknowledged the independence of the 'State of New Zealand'. Customs officials again asked if New Zealand shipping and produce should be regarded as foreign.129

By this time the colonial governments were too committed to encouraging trade with New Zealand to change the system. Besides in New South Wales the Legislative Council which would have had to approve any changes was largely composed of merchants who had a stake in New Zealand trade.130 Lieut-Governor Arthur responded by declaring that all vessels which were flying the New Zealand flag would be regarded as New Zealand registered and their produce would be entered into Van Diemen's Land duty free.131 Governor Bourke referred the matter again to the Colonial Office,132 but continued to allow the customs officers to issue licences to New Zealand-built vessels,

127. Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 20 December 1833, (Australian Archives, Sydney, SP1083/4) p.256; Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 26 February 1836, NSW: Customs: Letters Received from Board of Commissioners of Customs, London, 1835-36, (AONSW, 4/5060), f.384.
129. See for example customs officers note, 7 October 1834, or Busby to Colonial Secretary, 4 September 1834, (AOT,CUS4; pp.37-40.
130. These were Robert Campbell, Richard Jones, Alexander Berry, John Macarthur and John Blaxland.
131. Arthur to Busby, 23 October 1834, (WARc, BR1/1).
such at the Fanny in 1835.\footnote{133}

In reply to Bourke the Colonial Office agreed that a vessel could be regarded as New Zealand registered if it flew the New Zealand flag and carried a certificate of registry signed by Busby and 'the Chiefs'.\footnote{134} Also the Treasury stated that it was prepared to relax the conditions of the Reciprocity Act (3 & 4 William IV c54) which required that three-quarters of the crew of the vessel would have to be Maoris. Instead they directed that:

... in the present state of New Zealand, all Vessels there built and owned and navigated jointly, or separately, by Natives of the Island, or by British Subjects, shall be admitted at the Australian Colonies as the proper Ships of that Island \footnote{135}

And that was where the matter rested.

FROM THEIR concern to make the trade with New Zealand as free as possible the colonial and British governments were willing to amend, bend and even disregard statutes, regulations and conventions. However they were also quick to impose regulations on the trade. In so doing they were attempting to extend British legal jurisdiction and protection to both Maoris and Europeans in New Zealand.

The credit for the first attempt to regulate Maori-European contacts belonged to Governor P.G. King. Taking the widest interpretation of his Commission over the islands
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135. Customs to Colonial Secretary, 17 August 1835, (AONSW, 4/5106), p.334: Colonial Secretary to Busby, 19 August 1835, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Copies of Letters Sent Outside the Colony, "Foreign", 1831-1836, (AONSW, 4/3523 item 35/17). See also Customs note on Dacre to Colonial Secretary, 20 March 1838, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1838, (AONSW, 4/2412.1, item 38/2800).}
'adjacent' to New South Wales, King required that masters be responsible for the welfare of any islanders they brought to Sydney and also that no islander could be taken from Sydney without written permission from the Governor. The operation of this order did not remove complaints about the ill-treatment of Maoris. Therefore Governor Macquarie issued a Proclamation on 1 December 1813 which allowed for masters of vessels trading at New Zealand to be fined £1000 should they mistreat islanders in any way. Masters had to sign a bond to that effect before they left Sydney or any other colonial port. To this he added prohibitions on removing Maoris from New Zealand without the permission of certain chiefs and Thomas Kendall, whom he had appointed a Justice of the Peace, and on leaving Europeans in New Zealand without similar permission.

The ineffectiveness of the measures of 1813 was shown by the result of Samuel Marsden's bringing before the New South Wales magistrates two well attested and documented cases of Maoris being ill-treated by Europeans visiting New Zealand. Both cases were dismissed as being outside the jurisdiction of the court. Moreover, as Bigge was to point out in 1823, because no duplicates of the bonds were taken, only in the unlikely event of a vessel's returning to New South Wales and the production of adequate and reliable evidence, could any prosecution succeed.

The next attempt at control through legislation came in the passing of an Act by the British Parliament. The Act (57 George III c53) provided for the punishment of murders and manslaughters committed outside 'His Majesty's Dominions' as if they had been committed on the High Seas (the process

140. Bigge to Bathurst, 27 February 1823, B.T., Box 28, 7187-8; H.R.N.Z., I, 588.
for such punishments having been defined in 46 George III c54). New Zealand, Tahiti and Honduras were specifically mentioned in the Act. The weakness of this legislation was that, until 1823, there was no provision for Supreme Courts in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. Offenders would thus have had to be taken to Ceylon for trial. The only known New Zealand related charges to be brought under this Act were brought against James Dunleavy and three others who had murdered James Aldridge. The alleged murder took place aboard the Dromedary in Whangaroa on 21 November 1820. The trial took place in Sydney on 29 December 1820. Dunleavy was found guilty while the other men were acquitted. Counsel for the defence requested an arrest of judgement and so sentencing was deferred. No further information is available but it is assumed that the defence counsel persuaded the colonial court to rule itself incompetent to try such a case.

The Act which provided for the establishment of Supreme Courts in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land (4 George IV c96) also extended the range of crimes that could be tried in the colonies and declared that any crimes committed by British subjects in the South Seas Islands, specifically New Zealand and Tahiti, would be tried and offenders punished as if the crime had taken place in Britain. Governor Brisbane caused a special Proclamation to be printed announcing the extension of legal jurisdiction to cover crimes committed in the South Seas, as did Governor Darling and Lieut-Governor Arthur when an amended Act (9 George IV c83) replaced the earlier Act in 1828.

The effectiveness of these new powers and the competence of the colonial judiciary were tested in 1827 by the case of Denis McDowell. He was tried for intent to inflict grievous bodily harm on an intending fellow settler on board the Rosanna while the vessel was in New Zealand. He was freed when his

141. Yarwood, p. 192; Adams, pp.52-3.
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143. S.G., 20 May 1824, 17 November 1828; H.T.C., 20 December 1828; Adams, p. 53.
counsel successfully argued that Lord Ellenborough's Act (43 George III c57), under which he was being tried for 'cutting and maiming', did not apply to New Zealand as the country was outside the boundaries of the New South Wales Act.144

There were two other attempts to provide legal control over the behaviour of traders at New Zealand. The first was Governor Darling's Proclamation, 16 April 1831, banning the importation of preserved heads.145 The second was the abortive attempt in the Imperial Parliament to give the Governor of New South Wales power to provide legislation for the prevention and punishment of crimes committed in New Zealand.146

Throughout the nineteenth century merchants used various colonial courts and legal processes in attempts to create some order and control in the New Zealand trade. First they used legal instruments to try and give some security to property and lives in New Zealand. These included agreements between owners and masters defining duties and payments,147 the witnessing of charter party agreements, bonds of bottomry and the like.148 Some settlers and merchants had colonial lawyers draw up and register land sales between themselves and New Zealand Maoris.149 Declarations, such as William

144. S.G., 24 March, 6 April 1827, 17 May 1831; Brisbane to Bathurst, 8 February 1825, H.R.A., I, XI, 495-6; McLaren and others v Denis McDowell, Information, 21 March 1827, NSW: Supreme Court: Civil Jurisdiction, (AONSW, S.B.589).
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Lewington's 'Protest of the Loss of the Herald', were also lodged with the Supreme Court, in this case for insurance purposes.\textsuperscript{150}

The second call on colonial courts were civil cases. Mostly these involved non-fulfilment of contracts. For instance Matthew Hindson refused to pay the cost of chartering the Bee from William Cuthbert after it had returned from New Zealand. Hindson charged that Cuthbert had taken advantage of the voyage to send supplies to his flax agent in New Zealand when Hindson had regarded the charter as being exclusively his. The court assessors found for Cuthbert and awarded him the full payment for the charter.\textsuperscript{151} Other civil offences brought before New South Wales courts included the non-payment of wages,\textsuperscript{152} the deserting of a sailor in New Zealand\textsuperscript{153} and the misappropriating of whalebone.\textsuperscript{154}

Criminal proceedings which concerned New Zealand can be divided into three types - European v European, 'Maori' v European, European v Maori. Murder was the crime for which most of this litigation was brought. On many occasions the suits were unsuccessful largely because of a lack of evidence being available from New Zealand.\textsuperscript{155} Other cases never got past the laying of informations with the Police Magistrates, presumably also because of insufficient evidence\textsuperscript{156} or because witnesses and even defendants managed to escape before
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arriving in Sydney.\footnote{157} However two celebrated cases of European murderers being tried and executed in the colonies for crimes committed at New Zealand (and on the high seas) showed that the law was not without teeth. James Doyle was executed for putting Captain Wright, a Bay of Islands settler, in 'bodily fear' and stealing from him,\footnote{158} and Samuel Hivell, Thomas Harris and Robert Smith were hung in Hobart for the murder of Captain Bragg aboard the \textit{Industry} in 1835.\footnote{159}

Other criminal charges preferred for incidents in New Zealand included insubordination on a whaling vessel,\footnote{160} alleged assault,\footnote{161} and a charge of mutiny against soldiers of the 50th regiment who were court martialed following incidents on board HMS \textit{Alligator} during the voyage to rescue Mrs Guard and her children in 1834.\footnote{162}

The Act of 1817 (57 George III c53) had, arguably, been intended to cover 'murders and manslaughters' committed by Europeans against natives as well as against other Europeans. It had been recognised that by some traders' mistreatment of Maoris 'great violence has been done, and in general, scandal and prejudice raised against the name and character of British and other European traders'.\footnote{163} However the Acts of 1823 and 1828, while they had extended the range of crimes that could be tried by courts in New South Wales, had not reiterated the position that Europeans could be held criminally liable for outrages on Maoris. The infamous case of John Stewart - the \textit{Elizabeth} Affair - was an example of the
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exception under this law. The case was before the New South Wales Supreme Court from 14 February to 30 June 1831. Because the proceedings had been delayed throughout the session, Stewart was eventually bound over on a personal security of £1000. He took this opportunity to flee from justice.

The case was a complex one. Keen to make an example of Stewart, Governor Darling and the Executive Council had demanded that he be charged with the capital offence of being an accessory to murder. The Crown Solicitor, W.H. Moore, believed that such a prosecution could not be sustained since he could find little in the relevant body of law to show that a murder had been committed. (It was, after all, an act of war.) He had suggested that a minor charge of misdemeanour be proceeded with. 164 Meanwhile the men who were charged with Stewart and all the witnesses used the delays in proceedings to escape from the colony. It has been suggested that this may have been the result of collusion between certain merchants and law officers. 165 However when the case was finally referred to the home government the law officers of the Crown gave it as their opinion 'that by the Law of England Captain Stewart and Clementson the Mate are guilty as Accessaries, before the Fact, to the Murder of Mara Nui and his Wife' and that under 9 George IV c83 the courts of New South Wales were empowered to try the case. 166 But by then Stewart had escaped and the case was not proceeded with.
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The only other attempt, in court, to bring Europeans to book for offences against Maoris was the charge brought against William Henry Wolley and John Smith. They were accused of beating up a Maori sailor with a capstan bar aboard the whaler Elizabeth. In committing Smith for trial the magistrate commented that because Maoris had a revengeful disposition 'such conduct might cause the death of several Europeans at New Zealand'.

There appear to have been three attempts to bring Maoris to justice for crimes against Europeans. After the Haweis attack in 1829, Campbell & Co, the owners of the vessel, wrote to the Governor and asked if the Maori ringleaders could be brought to justice in New South Wales. The Attorney General replied to the Governor's inquiry that 9 George IV c83 applied only to the crimes of British subjects in New Zealand and did not confer any jurisdiction for the courts over crimes committed by Maoris. However such niceties did not prevent the attempt to prosecute 'Teapati, Tyapoo and Tetarroo' who had been picked up at sea while adrift in a whaling boat. It had been reported that they had killed five seamen on board the Ploughboy, an American whaler, and had then escaped in the boat. The Maoris claimed, to the contrary, that they had merely tried to escape from the violence of the master after one of them had accidentally frightened away a whale before it could be killed. The case was only dismissed for lack of conclusive evidence.

Finally, an attempt to take a Maori sailor to New South Wales to stand trial for murdering a fellow crewman in New Zealand failed when other Maoris freed him from his confinement aboard the Nimrod.

Thus, with varying success, traders and officials were able to appeal to legal process in their efforts to control traders in New Zealand. However, even this small measure of
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stability gave merchants the confidence to invest in trading at New Zealand. They were still more encouraged when a quasi-legal authority was appointed to reside in New Zealand.

JAMES BUSBY, the British Resident at New Zealand 1833-1840, received his instructions from Governor Bourke on 13 April 1833. His tasks were to be multifarious but were ill-defined. At the core he had the dual role of protecting both the Maoris from attacks by Europeans and the 'well disposed' Europeans at New Zealand from Maori reprisals. This he was to do in order to 'establish upon a permanent basis that good understanding which is important to the interest of Great Britain and [New South Wales] to perpetuate'.

The other 'important object' Busby was to keep in view was his 'duty to assist by every means in [his] power the commercial relations of Great Britain and her Colonies with New Zealand'. To do this Busby was instructed to become the 'medium of all communication' between the chiefs and European merchants and masters. He was also ordered to send to New South Wales accurate and detailed information about shipping in New Zealand waters and to report on the state of agriculture (especially flax cultivations) and commerce.171

Traders in New Zealand welcomed Busby's appointment. They thought that the British Resident's primary task would be to provide them with security for their lives, their property and their commercial activities.172 They also believed that
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Busby would act as a court of appeal for disputes between themselves and between traders and Maoris. At the same time, however, they hoped that he would not interfere with any extra-legal mercantile activities which provided them with a profit.

Their overriding concern for security was reflected in the reaction of Bay of Islands residents to the Maori attack on the Residency in 1834. They used the occasion to draw up a petition requesting that the colonial government provide more protection for Busby (and thereby for themselves). This same search for security gave rise to the two attempts to found vigilante groups in the Bay of Islands. The first Association of residents was formed in September 1833 and provided for a series of fines for Europeans who performed such 'crimes' as undercutting the agreed price for spirits, and breaking and entering. The better known Kororareka Association of 1838 aimed to protect European and Maori property against transgressors of either race.

Busby was not provided with special powers for the fulfilment either of the grand design outlined in his instructions or of the hopes of traders and settlers. Instead he was left to rely on moral suasion to effect his tasks. Thus his role was destined to be a limited one. Yet within the limits of his position the British Resident functioned effectively and positively when dealing with commercial problems.

As Resident, Busby was primarily an arbiter. His critics asserted that his isolation at Waitangi, where he
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was removed from both missionary and other European settlement, and the fact that he did not mingle with Maoris and Europeans in the Bay or elsewhere, resulted in his being ineffective. To the contrary it is argued here that this aloofness was one of Busby's strengths. Busby succeeded as an arbiter precisely because he was seen to have no stake in the outcome of disputes, because he appeared to welcome any requests for his assistance, and, probably more importantly, because he seemed to be able to provide workable solutions.

Most of the quarrels submitted for Busby's arbitration appear to have concerned disagreements between European residents in New Zealand. As the only officially recognised non-missionary settler in New Zealand Busby, like the consuls of other South Seas Islands, became the focal point for expressions of European discontent and, to a lesser extent, the symbol of the racial superiority Europeans felt they had over Maoris; hence again their concern over the Maori attack on the Residency.

The squabbles usually concerned the protection of property. For instance in 1833 when Captain John Wright shot two of Captain James Clendon's cows for trespassing, Clendon went to Busby for arbitration. Meanwhile his partner, Samuel Stephenson, shot two of Wright's cows, an incident which led
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to abuse and an exchange of blows between Wright and Hill, a retainer of Stephenson's. These events had come at the end of a long series of minor disputes between the two men. Both appeared before Busby and gave their accounts. It is not certain what Busby advised them to do but he appeared to receive no further reports of this dispute. 179

Busby claimed that during the early days of his appointment he had been frequently appealed to to enforce the payment of debts. Usually he protested that he had no authority to deal with such matters. 180 Occasionally, however, he appears to have intervened, and usually successfully. For example when Edward Fishwick of Hokianga sold John Poyner of the Bay a cutter, Emma, local Maoris took possession of the craft and refused to give it up. On investigation Busby found that the dispute concerned a debt Fishwick owed to the Maoris. Busby apparently convinced Fishwick to honour the debt and the cutter was duly returned to its rightful owner. 181

Satisfied customers recommended that others apply to Busby for adjudication. J.R. Clendon, although newly appointed to the post of American consul, advised William Green to refer to Busby a disagreement concerning a boat he had purchased from another settler named Jerome but which had been subsequently taken away by the third mate of a vessel in the harbour. Apparently the boat had been seized because of a debt owed by Jerome to a Bay trader, George Greenway. After Busby convinced Jerome to pay up, the boat was returned to Green. 182
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As the decade progressed the inter-European quarrels referred to Busby increasingly concerned land. However one of the first disputes Busby dealt with involved John Poyner and Gilbert Mair, and the ownership of Tore Tore Island at the mouth of the Kawakawa River. As usual the trouble had been brewing for some time before Busby was approached. He investigated the matter and, apparently to the satisfaction of both parties, declared in Mair's favour. The matter was complicated by a debt Poyner owed J.R. Clendon and for which he agreed to surrender the timber which he had stored on the island. Poyner's slowness to evacuate the island and Clendon's misunderstanding of Poyner's activities in preparing to remove the timber from the island, led to a clash between the two men and to Clendon's forcibly taking the timber. Again Busby was called to intervene and again he ruled against Poyner. The incident was then closed.183

So well respected was Busby as an impartial and successful arbiter that even the two leading merchant settlers in the Bay of Islands, Gilbert Mair and James Clendon, were willing to defer to his judgement. Throughout the latter part of 1838 and early in 1839 the two men had been unable to resolve an acrimonious quarrel over payments owing for repairs to the barque Tokerau in which they owned part shares. In the final
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letter of the dispute Mair suggested that 'the matter ... be referred to Mr Busby as umpire whose decision we shall consider final'.

Busby was also called upon to arbitrate in disputes aboard vessels. For instance he threatened legal action against the master of the Luisa in an effort to force him to take a sailor back on the vessel after the master had falsely accused him of deserting. Also in December 1835 when the crew of the whaler Rose appealed to Robert FitzRoy (then visiting the Bay aboard HMS Beagle) for assistance against the tyranny of the vessel's master, he handed the dispute over to Busby. The Resident went on board the whaler and discovered that the situation was as bad as the crewmen had described. He took the unusual step of advising them to leave the ship, which course was followed by all but two of them. Later, in December 1836, he was appealed to by the crew of the Marian Watson, a New South Wales trading vessel, who claimed that their master was keeping them prisoner. Two days later the master claimed Busby's help against his mutinous crew. Busby went on board the vessel and appears to have solved the difference. Also, when a deserting sailor escaped in a whaleboat from the Anastasia, George Greenway, the merchant who acted as agent for the whaler, asked Busby to get back the boat. Apparently Maoris had found the boat on the shore and claimed it by their law of salvage. Busby wrote twice to Rewa, the chief involved, and secured his agreement to return it.
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Hemi Kepa Tupe of Whangaroa considered Busby to be 'the adjudicator for the Maoris and the Pakehas.\textsuperscript{189} Certainly Busby appears to have gained some standing in Maori eyes and he became increasingly knowledgeable about the intricacies of Maori society. Busby seems to have become fluent in Maori. In the correspondence files of the British Resident early drafts of letters in Maori were prepared in a handwriting other than Busby's.\textsuperscript{190} By 1838, and probably before that date, Busby was drafting his own Maori language letters.\textsuperscript{191}

Busby formed a special association with some Bay chiefs and it may have been from them that he learned Maori and Maoritanga. At the meeting of the Congress of United Tribes in 1835 Busby succeeded in getting the chiefs to elect an Executive Committee of five of their number with whom he could consult and through whom he could act when necessary. Very little is known about the work or the membership of this Committee. The only reference that has been found of it was included in an indirect way in letters concerning the arrest of Edward Doyle and James Golding. There is a letter signed by three members of this Executive Committee, and written by another, in which they agreed that to the best of their knowledge Doyle and Golding were guilty of theft and attempted murder. The aim of the letter was to indemnify the government if Doyle or Golding sued them for false arrest.\textsuperscript{192}

The signatories were Haoni W. Heke, Wharerahi and Te Kamara. (The identity of the other chiefs on the Committee is unknown). They were not inconsequential men, nominated to the Committee as a sop to Busby. Heke was a young but respected
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chief of the Ngati Tautahi hapu. Hori Kingi (King George) Wharerahi, whose name is often rendered as Wharenu, was the eldest brother of Rewa and Moka of the Ngai-te-wage hapu.

He was much respected as a peacemaker by both the Europeans, in particular Henry Williams of the CMS, and the Maoris. It was he who escorted the WMS missionaries from Whangaroa after their station was sacked and he who helped to negotiate the peace at Hokitanga after the death of Wharemu in 1828.

Te Kamara (Campbell), who was known as Kaitiaki, was a Ngati-kawa chief who sold Busby the land at Waitangi reportedly without consulting his people. Te Kamara was a prominent peacemaker, having filled this role during the Girls' War of 1830. He was also regarded as a prophet and seer.

His association with these men would have given Busby mana in Maori eyes. Yet, for Te Kamara at least, an involvement on Busby's Committee did not guarantee automatic support for all government moves regarding New Zealand. He spoke most eloquently and stunningly against signing the Treaty of Waitangi on 5 February 1840 although he, with the other two known chiefs of the Committee signed that document on 6 February. Wharerahi was also a signatory to the 1831 Petition from the chiefs to King William IV in which they requested his protection.193

Maoris took some of the quarrels between themselves for Busby's arbitration. For instance, in the midst of the reverberations which followed the Maori attack on the Residency, Pomare appealed to Busby to mediate in a dispute he was having with Pene Raiti. Maoris also referred disagreements between themselves and European traders and settlers to Busby. For instance, probably in October 1834, Busby held an investigation to determine whether a Captain Brown had murdered a Maori called Warangai after he had been requested to look into the affair by Mauparana and Pomare. Similarly Taonui from the Hokianga appealed for Busby's assistance to exact compensation from Europeans who had allowed their cows to trespass onto his land.

The bulk of Busby's dealings with Maoris, however, appear to have arisen from calls for assistance from Europeans. Thus, for instance, Busby with customary zeal executed the request from the Admiralty to assist HMS Buffalo to load in 1833. He accompanied Sadler to Whangaroa to aid negotiations for the timber; he sought the advice of Henry Williams when Sadler was having difficulties getting Maoris to drag timber from the forest to the ship; and he kept abreast of the movement of the vessel as it continued to load, offering valuable advice and assistance whenever he was called upon.

Many of his dealings with Europeans and Maoris concerned the settlement of squabbles. For example, in April and May of 1835 James Harvey at Kororareka had trouble with Rewa. Rewa had

194. Busby to Pomare, 18 October 1834, (WAre, BR1/1).
196. Taonui to Busby, 21 April 1838 and 9 May 1838, (WAre, BR1/2).
197. Hay to Busby, 2 May 1833, (WAre, BR1/1).
198. See Busby/Sadler correspondence: 21 November, 11, 30, 31 December 1833, 7 January, 16 March, 7, 9 June 1834, (WAre, BR1/1).
had promised to build Harvey a fence and a house in return for certain goods. Instead, Rewa stole the goods from Harvey and refused to complete the work. Busby spoke to Rewa and wrote to his brother Moka and thereby managed to elicit a promise for the completion of the work. While the friction between Rewa and Harvey endured despite Busby's arbitration, Harvey wrote Busby one of the few letters of thanks he appears to have received. Towards the closing years of the decade Busby was also appealed to to sort out complications in European purchases of Maori land.

If Busby had not been available to help in some of these disputes they may well have grown into major confrontations which would have interrupted trade and European-Maori relations. It is not claimed that Busby's presence or his work brought concord and harmony to New Zealand but rather that where he did intervene it was with some success.

In accordance with his instructions Busby submitted shipping statistics for the Bay of Islands bi-annually to New South Wales from 1833 to 1840. At first he relied on the representative of a colonial insurance company, who was resident in the Bay of Islands, to supply him with the information. However after a disagreement with this man Busby was forced to tell the New South Wales Colonial Secretary that he could not continue to submit shipping returns unless the masters were in some way compelled to report to him. In reply Busby was

199. Harvey to Busby, 23 April, 10, 21 May, 4 August 1835, (WArc, BRl/2). For other examples of Busby's arbitration see Busby to Colonial Secretary, 16 March 1835, CO209/1, f.281b-283a; Flatt, evidence, 1838 Report, p. 40.

200. For example Davis to Busby, 2 December 1839, Hargreaves to Busby, 9 December 1839, (WArc, BRl/2) and Busby to McDonnell, 9 February 1836, McDonnell to Busby, 16 February 1836, enclosed in McDonnell to Colonial Secretary, 20 July 1836, (NPL/D, N, Arl, item 36/6585).

201. Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 4 June 1835, and 12 August 1835, CO209/1, f.291b-292a,320b-321a.
informed that no such compulsion could be enforced and that he was obliged, in line with his instructions, to make every effort to get the information, even if it meant personally boarding each vessel that entered the harbour. From that time Busby never failed to make his returns which were published in the Votes and Proceedings of the New South Wales Legislative Council.

In his instructions Busby was also told that he could commit Europeans who had broken British law to the justice of the New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land Supreme Courts. He was advised to follow a process described as 'at best but a prolix and inconvenient operation'. By this method he was required to send a witness to one of the colonies with a letter of introduction. After the taking of a deposition from the witness a bench warrant would be issued and sent to New Zealand. Busby would then be required to capture the accused, get him transported to the colony, and to make sure that a sufficient number of witnesses and enough relevant material were also forwarded to ensure the conviction. When the situation warranted it Busby discarded the nonsense of this procedure. On 18 June 1837 Edward Doyle and three other men robbed Captain John Wright (a trader in the Bay of Islands). During the course of the robbery they treated Wright and some of the women in his household with violence. Busby took immediate steps to capture the perpetrators and succeeded in detaining Edward Doyle and James Golding aboard a vessel in the harbour. On the arrival of HMS Rattlesnake Busby immediately


203. Bourke to Busby, 13 April 1833, CO209/1, f.112b-113a. For an example of this method in operation see the case of the suspicious death of William Smith of the New Zealand coastal vessel Amelia - Busby to Colonial Secretary, 10 February 1837, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1837, (AONSW, 4/2368.2, item 37/4371); Colonial Secretary to Busby, 16 May 1837, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Copies of Letters Sent Outside the Colony, "Foreign", (AONSW, 4/3524), pp. 89-90.
handed the prisoners into Hobson's care. He also sent the necessary despatches and three reliable witnesses to Sydney on the Rattlesnake.204

On a later occasion Busby took the law into his own hands. Partly because he feared that the Europeans might have tried to make an example of the accused by lynch law and also because local Maoris had asked him to preside, Busby chaired the investigation into the murder of Henry Biddle, a trader on the Hokianga, in May 1838. During his trial the prisoner, a Maori called Kite, confessed his guilt and agreed that he deserved to be executed. At the conclusion of the hearing Busby, with the consent of the Europeans and Maoris who were present, ordered that the man be shot. When the matter was referred to the Attorney General of New South Wales for his comments he replied that 'it would not be to the honour of the British Government to countenance so strange a proceeding'. To this charge Busby replied that the situation in New Zealand and the requirement to protect the safety of Europeans on the coasts demanded measures which, even if they appeared to be 'strange' to the Attorney General, were entirely acceptable to all who took part.205 In other instances of what he considered to be criminal behaviour Busby satisfied himself by taking evidence from victims and witnesses and submitting this to New South Wales in his despatches.206

204. Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 3 July 1837, and enclosures, CO209/2, f.353b-361a; Hobson to Bourke, 8 August 1837, (AONSW, 4/2368.2, item 37/11574).

205. Gipps to Glenelg, 5 October 1838, and enclosures, CO209/3, f.3b-10b; Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 9 November 1838, CO209/3, 84b-88a.

206. For example Busby's comments on the abandonment of men from the whaler Elizabeth - Busby to Colonial Secretary, 13 May 1833, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1833, (NPL/D, N,Ar 1, item 33/4325).
Busby's assumption of a semi-judicial role was also reinforced by British and colonial government decisions which appeared to delegate such a function to him. For instance he played a crucial role at the New Zealand end of the compromise that was reached concerning the registration of New Zealand-built vessels. Busby could register New Zealand vessels by completing and signing a prescribed form and certifying them to fly a New Zealand flag. Busby was supposed to get chiefs to sign the registrations as well but the surviving registrations for the Trent, Mercury and Tokerau were not witnessed by any Maoris and nor, presumably, were the certificates he issued for the Industry and the Fanny.

When colonial customs officers clamped down on apparent-ly illegal attempts to import foreign oil duty free they also required Busby's assistance. However Busby's actions helped rather than hindered the New Zealand merchants. In the incident that gave rise to the first request from the customs officers for Busby's help, Mair and Powditch, merchants of the Bay of Islands, had sent whale oil to New South Wales aboard the Fortitude. It was confiscated by the customs officers who were acting on information that the oil had been taken in an American vessel and that the merchants had tried to get it entered duty free as colonial caught. The customs officials sent Busby a declaration to administer to Mair and Powditch, on oath, which stated that they had deliberately attempted to defraud customs laws. Busby replied that he had no power to administer such an oath but that he had investigated the matter and as far as he was concerned no fraud had been attempted. The customs officers were obliged to let the oil enter the colony duty free. On later occasions Busby's certification

207. J. Busby, Certificates, Trent, 23 January 1838; Mercury, Browne to Busby, 27 April 1839; Tokerau, /1838/, (WArch, BR1/2).
208. Customs to Busby, 21 March 1835, (WArch, BR1/2).
209. Busby to Customs, 11 May 1835, (WArch, BR1/2).
also meant that oil was entered duty free into New South Wales. Eventually, in 1837, the Commissioners of Customs in London declared that if oil imported directly from New Zealand was accompanied by a note from Busby to the effect that it had been imported and caught by British subjects in British vessels it would be entered into Great Britain at the minimal duty usually levied on colonial and British caught oil.

The British Resident never once performed one particular task which was mentioned specifically in his instructions of 1833 and which provided a major reason for his appointment — namely the detention and return of escaped convicts. Busby claimed that when the convicts, deserters and the like heard that he had been appointed as Resident in New Zealand they either took the earliest opportunity to leave the country or retired inland and away from his sight. This story of the dishonourable Europeans queuing, lemming-like, on the shores of New Zealand in fear of Busby's arrival, was carried in contemporary newspapers.

In fact Busby did not arrest persons he believed to be convicts because by the time he arrived in New Zealand these men were so entrenched in the fabric of New Zealand society that to wrench them away would have done more harm than good. In June 1833 when Busby asked Hokianga chiefs to hand over all the escaped convicts who were living on the River they said that they only knew of two. One, who had lived with them for ten years, was married to a chief's daughter and they were loath to part with him. The other had acquired so much property Busby feared that removing him would leave Maoris

210. For example Customs to Busby, 2 October 1835, (WArc, BRI/2); Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 15 July 1836, (AONSW, 4/5060), f.424.

211. Board of Commissioners of Customs to Customs, 25 August 1837, NSW: Customs: Letters Received from the Board of Commissioners of Customs, London, 1837-39, (AONSW, 4/5061).'

212. J. Busby to A. Busby, 22 [July] 1833, (WTu, qMs BUS).


214. This was probably John Marmon.
free to plunder and retake his lands, a course in which Busby felt they should not be encouraged.\textsuperscript{215} On another occasion, a grogseller and well-known thief called Sullivan apparently tried to plunder the ship \textit{Cheviot} while it lay in the Bay of Islands in February 1836. On being observed before he could execute his plan, Sullivan headed for the shore with one of the ship's boats in pursuit. He was captured and detained on board the vessel with the intention of delivering him up to justice. However the next day a large party of well-armed Maoris, in nine canoes, surrounded the \textit{Cheviot} and demanded that Sullivan be released or the vessel would be attacked. He was liberated shortly after.\textsuperscript{216}

In this, as in his other work, Busby tempered his actions to take cognizance of the special circumstances which prevailed in New Zealand and in so doing undoubtedly assisted in stabilizing the commercial community in New Zealand.

Busby also performed a social welfare role on behalf of Europeans in New Zealand. This was not a task specified by his instructions but one which probably arose from his Christian concern for his fellow countrymen.\textsuperscript{217} He undertook the administration of several estates.\textsuperscript{218} In this way he was able to give some security to those who sought credit from other settlers as well as providing an impartial forum where creditors could submit their claims on the deceased's estate for scrutiny and equitable settlement. For instance when John Poyner died in August 1835 his debts amounted to £86.7.6d. The sale of his personal effects had realised £19.8.9d and Busby later supervised the sale of Poyner's cutter \textit{Emma}, the proceeds of which covered the rest of the debts.\textsuperscript{219} Of Busby's efforts in administering the estates the Registrar of the Supreme Court

\textsuperscript{215} Busby to Glenelg, 25 February 1839, CO209/4, f.58b.
\textsuperscript{216} Busby to Colonial Secretary, New South Wales, 20 February 1836, CO209/2, f.162b-163a.
\textsuperscript{217} Wheeler, p. 283.
\textsuperscript{218} As well as Poyner's they included: Heggie and Buchanan, Henry Boyle, Michael Sullivan, Alexander Gray, Daniel Salmond, John Smith and Assolam, a French sailor killed in the Chatham Islands' Maori attack on the \textit{Jean Bart}.
\textsuperscript{219} Busby to Colonial Secretary, 10 August 1835, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1835, (AONSW, 4/2287.3, item 35/8228).
of New South Wales noted that the Judges considered that 'Mr B exercised a Sound Discretion in taking charge of the property, being the only constituted authority in any way representing the British Government in a Savage Country'.

Other examples of Busby's welfare role included his dispatching of a Frenchman, Francis Regier, to New South Wales on the grounds that he was insane and needed proper treatment. Another welfare project was aborted by the arrival of Hobson's administration. Busby planned to open the Victoria Paternal Institute on his land at Waitangi. The Institute was to be responsible for educating the half-caste children of European sailors and settlers. Busby believed that Europeans were obliged to make some provision for their children and he also cherished the hope that educating these children (a field into which the Roman Catholic missionaries had moved) would lead to a greater European influence over their mothers and the Maori people in general.

Thus James Busby played an important role in the commercial life of New Zealand in the 1830s. His arbitration, his knowledge and his influence were available to, and were sought after by, traders, both Maori and European. Yet many, and particularly his contemporaries, have condemned him as being ineffective in his role as Resident.

While it is not possible to reference the reasons why these people criticised Busby, some suggestions can be made which appear to explain their opposition. The premise of this discussion is that, generally, each commentator's objections were based on their perception of Busby's role and, particularly, how his performance differed from their expectations. The British government, for example, may have hoped

220. Colonial Secretary, New South Wales to Busby, 27 May 1840, enclosing Manning to Colonial Secretary, 15 May 1840, J. Busby, Despatches of the British Resident in New Zealand, 1833-1839, (WTu, qMs 1833-9P).

221. Busby to Colonial Secretary, 6, 12 September 1839, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand, 1840, (AONSW, 4/2501, item 39/11064).

222. J. Busby to A. Busby, 5 September 1839, (WTu,qMs BUS). For the prospectus of the Institute see S.H., 4 September 1839.

223. See also the discussion in J.M. Ward, British Policy in the South Pacific, Sydney, 1948, pp.80-91.
that appointing a Resident would relieve them of the need to further intervene in affairs at New Zealand. But complaints and demands for further action continued to arrive at the Colonial Office from residents at New Zealand as well as from British and colonial merchants. Governor Bourke, whose views were also coloured by an apparent personal dislike of Busby, probably thought that the Resident should deal with New Zealand affairs and leave him free to govern New South Wales. Instead a steady stream of despatches arrived from Waitangi, all of which required answers and which, in effect, increased the governor's workload with regard to New Zealand. The denigration of Busby's work by the missionaries at New Zealand, it is suggested, grew partly from a fear that his appointment would ultimately lead to the British colonization of that country. Equally it may have arisen from their seeing a Resident as a potential rival to their self-appointed position as the 'civilizers' and advisors to the Maoris. The traders and other secular residents in New Zealand were also scathing of Busby's work. While they clearly appreciated and benefitted from his assistance in times of need, they seem to have thought that the mere presence of a Resident should have prevented these problems from arising. Finally Busby himself appears unwittingly to have diminished the value of his own work. In his despatches he over-dramatized the state of affairs in New Zealand and his feelings of helplessness in attempting to deal with problems. His aim was to bolster his claims for more powers and more resources to carry out his task more effectively. Instead he wrote himself out of a job. On the basis of this evidence later writers have also judged Busby as incompetent.

Clearly Busby did not have the power to right every wrong or to establish peace and security in the Bay of Islands, let alone throughout the country. Therefore he should not be condemned for having not done so. However, within the smaller commercial scenario, and within the limits of his time and his authority, Busby's work as Resident can be pronounced a success.
Part III: Trade and Intervention in New Zealand

THEIR INVOLVEMENT reflected the importance the governments placed on the timber and flax trade and its ramifications in the fields of imperial and colonial security, honour and commerce. The governments' moves were also responses to the anxieties expressed to them by a variety of individuals and pressure groups.

There is no doubting that throughout the age of timber ships and tall sails the Royal Navy was always in need of timber for masts and decking, and flax and hemp for sails and ropes. The traditional sources of imports of these products were Scandinavia and Russia. However the British had for a long time realised the danger of having to rely almost entirely on foreign countries to provide the imports of these essential products.\(^2^{24}\) The danger was exemplified in 1714 when Charles XII closed the Baltic ports to the British. Fortunately Britain could turn to imports from her American colonies which seemed to abound in timber. However by 1783 these colonies too were foreign soil.

It was for this reason that British strategists followed Cook's voyages with interest. This also explains why Cook was instructed, before his final voyage, to get samples of New Zealand flax. The samples he had brought back on earlier occasions had been successfully worked into rope and canvas by a French woman in London.\(^2^{25}\)

In the same year as American Independence was recognised James Maria Matra, a friend of Sir Joseph Banks and a seaman on Cook's first voyage of discovery, proposed that the British government consider founding a colony in New South Wales. One of the advantages of such a colony was held to be


\(^2^{25}\) Stephens to Cook, 20 June 1776, (NLA, MS 688).
the super-abundance of flax and timber resources just across the Tasman in New Zealand. He described both these products as being of sufficient quality to provide the greatest utility to the country and navy.226 These recommendations were transferred, in very similar words, into a plan proposed by Sir George Young for the colonization of New South Wales.227 Young was a friend and ally of Matra and the two men had made representations to the government to gain some support for their proposals in both 1784 and 1786.228 Finally, this same suggestion that Britain take advantage of New Zealand's timber and flax appeared as an objective in the anonymous 'Heads of a Plan' which were circulated together with the announcement of the government's decision to found a penal colony in New South Wales.229

From this and other evidence it has been argued that one of the major reasons behind the British government's decision to form a penal settlement in New South Wales was its desire to exploit the flax and timber of Norfolk Island and New Zealand and thus to provide for the needs of the East India Royal Naval Station. It also wanted to keep other nations, notably the French and Dutch, from colonizing the continent. Indeed providing for Britain's increasing population of convicts appears to have been a secondary consideration in the founding of the colony.230

226. 'A Proposal for Establishing a Settlement on New South Wales'. CO201/1, f.47b-61b; H.R.N.Z.,I,36-42.
and flax on Norfolk Island failed to prove of value for naval purposes, the governments doubted the wisdom of expending more money on similar attempts to colonize New Zealand. For this reason New Zealand timber and flax was not actively sought by the governments until about 1820.

What had happened in the interim to encourage the British to look for new sources of naval supplies were the Treaty of Tilsit (1807) by which Baltic ports were closed to British shipping thus drastically reducing supplies of timber and hemp, and the 1812 Anglo-American War, which had been preceded by trade embargoes against England passed by the American Congress including the Non-Intercourse Act of 1807 which banned trading with British vessels.\textsuperscript{231} Again Britain was forced to realise the dangers of relying on foreign sources for her supplies of timber and flax. The emergency of 1808-1810 was met by a huge increase in timber exports from Canadian forests. However it was quite clear that Britain needed new and reliable sources of supply.

One such source, the Navy seemed to have recalled, was New Zealand. Thus in 1819 they instructed the Admiral Commander in Chief of the East India Station to encourage the growth of New Zealand hemp by procuring rope manufactured from it for the use of his squadron.\textsuperscript{232} They also sent the Dromedary and the Coromandel to investigate the potential and nature of New Zealand timber and requested that the Governor of New South Wales supply updated information on the \textit{phormium tenax}. Seen in the same light, the abolition of duties on flax and naval timbers for ten years from 1823 appears to have been an attempt to procure supplies for testing by the Navy Board, and to see if the commodities could be profitably and regularly supplied to the London market. It seemed that

\textsuperscript{231} Albion, pp. 336-9, 357-8.
\textsuperscript{232} Navy Board to CMS, 6 April 1819, cited in McCay, p. 71.
New Zealand timber and flax were no longer being regarded solely as supplies for the East India Station but also for use in Britain.

The private flax and timber contracts of 1831 (and the timber contracts in subsequent years) were let at a time when, generally, the Royal Navy was making large economies in annual expenditure. Clear the strategic importance of the New Zealand supplies and, presumably, the positive and encouraging results of the tests being carried out on both products by the Navy, justified channelling monies into this new field while retrenching in most others. Renewed measures for tightening expenditure in the mid-1830s may have been the reasons why the Admiralty, in 1835, turned down Titore's offer to set aside trees at Whangaroa for the exclusive use of the Royal Navy. However the decision not to send store ships to New Zealand was reversed and the Buffalo left twice more for New Zealand. General naval expenditure was also increased in the late 1830s in response to Russian and French re-armament and the realisation that the British Navy was falling behind those powers in comparative strength. New Zealand timber and flax, therefore, were resources that Great Britain needed.

However successive governments were unwilling to over-commit themselves in the exploitation of New Zealand timber and flax resources in the belief that this would inevitably lead them into some sort of military presence in New Zealand or possibly even the colonization of the country. This tentativeness was seen, for example, in the handling of the First

234. Barrow to Busby, 9 May 1835, (WARC, BR1/2).
New Zealand Company Petition in 1825. The Privy Council Committee for Trade recommended to the King that the Company be incorporated for 21 years in recognition of 'the Benefits to the Commerce and Navigation of the United Kingdom and Your Majesty's Subjects in general which may result from such an Attempt if it should prove successful'. However they refused to grant the Company an exclusive monopoly over trade from New Zealand.\(^\text{236}\) In part this tentative response may have been the result of fears expressed by Lord Bathurst in the Colonial Office. He felt that too great an involvement might lead the government into granting requests for troops to defend the settlement. While this was rigorously denied by the Company at the time, the next year, after it seemed that they would fail to secure their monopoly, the Company did approach the Colonial Office with a request for the government to establish a 'Fort and Small Complement of Men at New Zealand'.\(^\text{237}\)

Although the government was unwilling to commit itself wholeheartedly in support of plans aimed at utilizing New Zealand timber and flax, it reacted very differently when it was felt that its chances of securing the resources were in doubt. The importance Britain placed on the potential of New Zealand timber and flax also lay behind British government moves to regulate affairs at New Zealand. In essence, when contact between Maoris and Europeans at New Zealand appeared to be creating anarchy and thus inhibiting trade — a trade potentially vital to the security of the nation and Empire — it was then that the government felt obliged to intervene.

It has been argued\(^\text{238}\) that Britain was moved to intervene in New Zealand affairs primarily because she felt a moral responsibility to do so. This duty, it was argued, stemmed from two principles. First, prevalent contemporary

\(^{236}\) Report of Privy Council Committee for Trade and Plantations, 5 June 1826, PC 1/4303.

\(^{237}\) Bathurst to Lyttleton, 29 March 1825, Lyttleton to Bathurst, 30 March 1825, CO201/167, f.229b-232b; Lyttleton to Horton, 22 March 1826, CO201/179, f.91b-93a.

\(^{238}\) Adams, especially Chapter 2.
opinion held that Britons outside their own country were entitled to the protection of British laws. Second, the new wave of humanitarianism, which influenced Colonial Office circles, demanded that Maoris be regarded as a sovereign and independent people who deserved to be protected from being forcibly disturbed in the lives they were leading. Britain's attempts to regulate events at New Zealand, for example by extending the jurisdiction of colonial courts, sending naval vessels to cruise along the coast, and appointing a British Resident, are, by this reasoning, held to be responses to the knowledge of this 'sacred duty' towards Europeans and Maoris.

The present study accepts that this was one of the important reasons for British intervention. However it is also contended that there were significant trade-related motives behind all the government moves to regulate affairs in New Zealand.

On the surface the 1817 Act to punish murders and manslaughters, which appears to have arisen from information of atrocities given to the government by the CMS\(^{239}\) was a worthy attempt to cope with a problem which was regarded as widespread in New Zealand and the Pacific. The Act recognised that murdering native people was a crime deserving of the severest penalty. It also made mention of the effects of such murders and manslaughters in raising 'a general scandal and prejudice ... against the name and character of British and other European traders'. In other words not only were the crimes prejudicial to Britain's good name, but they also impeded the profitable and safe conduct of trade; for these reasons they needed to be stopped.

Moreover the expansion of naval cruises in the 1820s seemed to occur in response to a request from the Lords' Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Plantations. The Committee had deliberated on the Memorial from fifteen mercantile firms which had been presented in 1826. The merchants

\(^{239}\) Yarwood, p. 192. For the Memorial to which Yarwood refer; see CMS Memorial, CO201/88, f.456b-467b; H.R.N.Z., I, 417-29.
asked that the government consider safeguarding their interests and their shipping in New Zealand. In reply the Committee stated that 'every possible protection should be afforded to His Majesty's subjects' who traded on the New Zealand coasts, and they asked the Navy to implement this principle.\textsuperscript{240} Such a request was not new. Commissioner Bigge had suggested to Lord Bathurst at the Colonial Office in June 1825 that the 'occasional presence' of a warship would 'check the licentiousness and outrages of the crews of English Vessels' and 'increase the respect that the Natives already feel for the naval and commercial Superiority of Great Britain'\textsuperscript{241}

The government was soon faced with the claim that the 'occasional' visit of a warship was not having the salutary effect that the supporters of this form of intervention had expected. Therefore, in the wake of the Elizabeth Affair of 1830, the Colonial Office asked that the Admiralty station a warship permanently in New Zealand and that the crew be given authority to visit trading and whaling vessels when they arrived. The reason given for their requests was that these measures would provide some authority for the protection of 'the very considerable and rapidly increasing Trade between New South Wales and New Zealand' and of the 'Mercantile Establishments' formed there, as well as for restraining the 'bad conduct of the Masters and Crews of the Vessels resorting there for supplies'.\textsuperscript{242} The Admiralty's reply was that no more authority could be given to masters of naval vessels visiting New Zealand nor would one be stationed there. Instead they re-issued their order of 1826 to the Commander of the East India Station.\textsuperscript{243}

\textsuperscript{240} Torrens to Twiss, 24 January 1829, CO201/207, f.444a; Adams, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{241} Bigge to Bathurst, 27 February 1823, B.T., Box 28, pp. 7203-4; H.R.N.Z., I, 594.

\textsuperscript{242} Howick to Barrow, 5 January 1831, CO209/1, f.19b-20b. A summary is found in H.R.A., 1, XVI, 574.

\textsuperscript{243} Elliot to Howick, 7 January 1831, CO209/1, f.21b-22a. A summary is found in H.R.A., 1, XVI, 574.
In spite of repeated requests the Admiralty would not change its policy on this matter. For instance in the wake of the Harriet affair of 1834 Governor Bourke wrote an emotional despatch in which he threatened to withdraw the British Resident and to warn the British settlers in New Zealand that they were 'altogether without the pale of British protection', unless 'at least one Ship of war be Stationed permanently in these Seas'. Bourke's threat was parried by the Admiralty statement that 'the cost of maintaining a vessel solely for this purpose would be so great as wholly to preclude the possibility of entertaining such a purpose'.

Amidst the quibbling over the exact quantity of the protection to be given, nobody disputed the fact that the Royal Navy should be involved in protecting British commercial activity in New Zealand. And the British were not the only nation who maintained this principle. In the 1830s when French whalers began to frequent the New Zealand coasts, the French government sent warships to cruise with the whalers and to protect them. Large French naval vessels were engaged for this purpose - for example the Venus, a frigate of 2000 tons, 58 guns and 488 men. As well as protecting French sailors from the shipping of other nations French naval officers were also quick to avenge Maori infractions. This was seen in their reaction to the massacre of the crew of the Jean Bart in the Chatham Islands in 1838.

After the Acts of 1817, 1823 and 1825, and the ordering of cruises by naval vessels came, in sequence, the appointment
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245. Bourke to Stanley, 18 September 1834, CO201/240, f.504a-b; Glenelg to Bourke, 28 October 1835, H.R.A., 1,XVIII, 172.
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of a British Resident. In 1832 Viscount Goderich informed Governor Bourke that a British Resident had been appointed to New Zealand 'partly with a view to protecting British Commerce in the Islands of New Zealand and in the adjacent Islands in the South Seas and partly in order to repress the outrages which unhappily British Subjects are found often to perpetuate against the persons and property of the Natives and the peace of Society in those Regions'.\textsuperscript{248} This statement was reinforced by Lord Glenelg after he had accepted the seals of the Colonial Office\textsuperscript{249} and James Stephen, Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies, confirmed it in response to a query from the Foreign Office in December 1838.\textsuperscript{250}

The idea for appointing a Resident appears to have had antecedents in the practice of the East India Company.\textsuperscript{251} It was first mooted in relation to New Zealand in the Memorial from Lord & Co in 1810 in which they suggested appointing Thomas Kent, who would be made a Justice of the Peace, to reside at their proposed settlement in New Zealand. His task was to control the interaction of Maoris and traders. Kent's later withdrawal from the Company altered the planning and eventually nobody was employed in that position. Governor Macquarie had agreed with this idea and perhaps this prompted him to appoint CMS missionaries Thomas Kendall and John Butler Justices of the Peace before they went to the mission station at New Zealand.

The idea of a government appointed and government paid Resident for New Zealand was proposed to Governor Darling by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{248} Goderich to Bourke, 14 June 1832, (AONSW, 4/2164.2); H.R.A., 1, XVI, 662.
\item \textsuperscript{249} See Glenelg to Bourke, 28 October 1835, H.R.A., 1, XVIII, 171.
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by Alexander Baxter, the Attorney General of New South Wales, in July 1829. The Governor had referred to Baxter the request from Campbell & Co to seek some way of punishing the Maoris responsible for attacking their vessel, the Hawesis. Baxter replied that the courts were not empowered to punish Maoris. He then departed from the precise question of his brief to suggest that a Resident should be appointed. He would need, the Attorney General wrote, to be a man 'conversant with the customs and language of the people, and possessed of such temper and intelligence as would enable him to compose differences and disputes arising between the people of the two nations'. Baxter added that as far as he could see the Europeans were initially at fault in most of the attacks and that therefore the Resident should be created a magistrate with power to commit offenders to New South Wales.  

The next official mention of a Resident came in Darling's despatch of 12 August 1830. With it he enclosed a letter from Samuel Marsden which gave the reverend gentleman's opinions on and descriptions of the Girls' War. Darling told Sir George Murray that his first reaction had been to recommend sending a Resident to New Zealand but he decided on reflection that stationing a small naval vessel at New Zealand was a better scheme. In support of his claims that affairs in New Zealand needed controlling, Darling cited the extensive trade that had grown between New South Wales and New Zealand and also noted the need to support the good work being done by the missions. He supplemented these claims in a despatch dated 22 September 1830 in which he enclosed a detailed account of trade between New Zealand and New South Wales, 1 January to 14 August 1830.

252. Attorney General to Colonial Secretary, 27 July 1829, (AONSW, 4/2020, item 29/6056). This letter was laid before the Executive Council on 4 August 1829.


It therefore cannot have been too unexpected an action, either in London or in Sydney, when Darling announced to the Colonial Office that, in the 'present emergency' (following the revelation of the Elizabeth Affair) he had decided to appoint a Resident to New Zealand. Again he stressed that he was concerned about the effect that actions such as Stewart's would have on the increasing trade with New Zealand; this was Bourke's concern when later the same year he too suggested sending a Resident to protect and promote commerce and to catch the convicts whose activities were disrupting trade. 255

When the Colonial Office forwarded Darling's despatch of 13 April 1831 to the Treasury together with Lord Goderich's request for money to pay a Resident and a military force at New Zealand there was no ambiguity in the stated reasons for the move. The Treasury were told that the appointment was being made 'to protect the lives & properties of British subjects residing in New Zealand as well as the very valuable Trade of those Islands'. 256 The significance of the commercial motive for the appointment was consistently argued by the Colonial Office. For instance in 1832 when Peter Dillon applied to the Colonial Office for protection for his proposed commercial colony in New Zealand he was informed that 'H.M. Govt. have not overlooked the importance of the commercial intercourse which at present exists between this Country and those Islands, and that it is in their contemplation to place a Resident at the Bay of Islands or other suitable Station in New Zealand for the better protection of the persons who may be engaged in it'. 257

The Colonial Office made a similar response to reports from New South Wales of complaints that the colony was required to pay Busby's salary and expenses. For example John Blaxland,

255. Darling to Goderich, 13 April 1831, CO209/1, f.69b-72a; H.R.A., 1, XVI, 237-41; Bourke to Goderich, 27 December 1831, H.R.A., 1, XVI, 482-6.

256. Howick to Stewart, 27 September 1831, T 1/2830.

a non-official member of the New South Wales Legislative Council, each year registered a complaint against the payment of Busby's salary. In the only recorded reply to Blaxland's complaints Lord Stanley stated that Busby's appointment was considered 'necessary for the protection of the Trade' between New South Wales and New Zealand.258

The trade-related motive for establishing a Resident became widely known in the colony, as was seen in the arguments of those who publicly protested against the appointment. They claimed that the size of the trade did not warrant an officer to regulate it and that Busby's powerless position was of little use in protecting traders when, after the attack on the Residency in 1834, it did not appear that Busby could even protect himself.259

Other commentators believed that the colonists would have more to complain about if New Zealand were made a British colony and the profits made by colonial merchants from the New Zealand trade were usurped by settlers in that country.260 Also Bourke, in 1833, assured the Colonial Office that Blaxland's protest over Busby's salary was 'not the prevailing opinion in the Council nor amongst many intelligent and influential Persons out of Doors'.261 However, by March 1839, the feeling against the further payment of Busby's salary was so strong that Governor Gipps feared that only by using the Official majority in the Legislative Council would he get Busby's salary paid that year.262

258. Stanley to Bourke, 30 April 1833, H.R.A., 1,XVII, 89.
259. See S.G., 29 January 1833, 22 July 1834.
Thus it would appear that, at least in the matter of appointing a Resident, the safeguarding of commerce was the foremost consideration in government decision making. Even the protection of Maoris was seen to be necessary only in that it discouraged them from retaliating for any grievance on the next vessel that appeared, thereby making traders wary of approaching New Zealand coasts and slowing the growth of the valuable trade. Therefore while some people may have considered Busby's appointment to have been inspired by humanitarian motives, those who approved the appropriation of money, the Governor who wrote his instructions and oversaw his work, and the colonists who were obliged to vote his salary, considered that the British Resident's over-riding aim was to promote trade and to secure European property.

GOVERNMENT DECISION making was influenced both by the information it received from its own sources (for example Navy Board tests on timber and flax) and, to a varying extent, by the data provided from pressure groups. Interested individuals, such as prospective colonists and colonizers, colonial governors and merchants, also pressured the governments in a variety of ways, hoping thereby to gain improved conditions and prospects for trade. The colonial newspapers reflected the opinions of the élite of colonial society - the legislators, the merchants, the influential men. Therefore an analysis of newspaper comments would tend to reflect the views of that part of the community. It is the contention of this study that the editorial comments and opinions expressed in the newspapers were the same as those being expressed to the governor

263. Bourke to Stanley, 23 September 1834, H.R.A., I, XVII, 545
264. Adams' dealt with the influence of the pressure groups on British government decision making with regard to New Zealand - Adams, chapters 3 and 4. Here it is intended to elaborate on the place the timber and flax trade had in their proposals.
and other colonial and British decision makers.

Significantly the press did not seem to come alive to the potential of trading with New Zealand until the late 1820s, about the same time as the large increase in shipping arrivals and departures between the colonies and that country. Even as late as 1826 the Sydney Gazette exclaimed that New Zealand was probably the most 'forbidding and appalling place on earth for colonists' and that it possessed 'not so much as a solitary advantage'. However throughout the 1830s almost every discussion about New Zealand referred to the advantages of the commercial exploitation of its natural resources and especially its timber and flax. The need to foster trade also became inextricably linked to calls for Britain or New South Wales to colonize New Zealand.

Timber and flax were held to be trade products of immense value to the Royal Navy and thus to the security of Britain and her Empire. Newspaper comments fell into one of two camps: either the advantages of timber and flax were expounded in order that merchants and readers would come to appreciate the value of these commodities as trade items; or the emphasis was to warn the governments that unless these resources were secured in British hands then some other nation - France, Russia, Netherlands, America - would usurp them and gain the strategic advantage of New Zealand as a naval and military base.

---

265. S.G., 21 February 1826.

266. For examples see: S.G., 2 April 1829, 27 April, 14 August 1830, 5 January, 15 March 1832, 24 September 1839 L.A., 7 February 1831; S.H., 24 December 1832. The Clergyman John Lang, went so far in extolling New Zealand's timber and flax that he claimed that the country would become the Baltic of the Southern Hemisphere - J.D. Lang, New Zealand in 1839, 2nd ed., Sydney, 1873, p. 50.

Indeed so aware was the colonial government of the interest of foreign powers that it twice sent naval vessels to New Zealand to warn off Frenchmen whom they believed were taking possession of the country and her resources. In October 1831 HMS Zebra was sent to the Bay of Islands following press reports from the CMS missionary William Yate that men from the Favourite were attempting to set up a fort in the Bay of Islands. Captain de Saumarez was given two letters which informed the Frenchmen that Great Britain considered New Zealand to be under its 'protection' and that they would protest against the taking of that country by any other foreign power. In the event the scare proved to be a false alarm. 268 However a similar rumour concerning the intentions of the French vessel Venus late in 1838 prompted Governor Gipps to re-issue the letters and claims of 1831 and send them to New Zealand. 269

The other aspect of the colonial demand that Britain or New South Wales secure the commercial advantages which New Zealand had to offer arose in relation to the droughts suffered by New South Wales. The three year drought which ended in November 1829 had drastically reduced food supplies in the colony. When drought conditions appeared to be recurring in the late 1830s the press voiced the opinion that New Zealand was 'the perfect granary for New South Wales', 270 and that the islands should be secured as a hedge against the disastrous plight in which the colony found itself in times of drought. 271

268. Lindesay to Goderich, 4 November 1831, and enclosures, NSW: Governor: Governor's Despatches, 1830-1, (NPL/M,1267-12), pp.1062-5; S.G., 29 October 1831; Adams, pp.75-7.

269. Colonial Secretary to Senior Naval Officer, New South Wales, 5 December 1838, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Copies of Letters Sent to Naval and Military Officers, 1838-1839, (AONSW, 4/3801, item 38/486, pp.220-1.

270. New Zealand had provided 99.4 percent to 100 percent of all'maize imports to New South Wales 1835-1838 - NSW: Colonial Secretary: Returns of the Colony, 1835-1838.

271. S.G., 12 May 1836, 28 February, 24 September 1839; Colonist, 26 January 1837, 26 December 1838.
It was scandalous, the newspapers held, that New Zealand, 'beautiful and fertile beyond praise, should be allowed almost to lay waste - a receptacle for crime'. The fear of Maori violence and the depredations of escaped convicts, it was believed, were responsible for interfering with the smooth and full-scale exploitation of New Zealand's resources. Trade could not be freely undertaken in a country where 'every man is either a robber, or the victim of robbery: it is a scene of universal violence and depredation'. The newspapers held the British and New South Wales governments responsible for repairing the damage that the escaped convicts and unruly sailors were apparently inflicting on trade. With regard to Maori violence it was believed that colonization alone would ensure the safety of European lives in New Zealand.

The humanitarian view with regard to the sovereign independence of native people had no place in these discussions of New Zealand trade. It was believed that Maoris ought to be taught to respect and fear Europeans or, at least, not to interfere in trade. Government action to control Maoris such as the Alligator reprisal for the Maori attack on the Harriet received universal approbation in the colonies. It was also believed that trade would confer only benefits on Maoris. Even the reported facts of the deadly trade in arms...
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were mitigated or ingeniously twisted into being seen as a benefit. Some claimed that muskets lowered the mortality rates in warfare and, therefore, increased the Maori population. One newspaper even welcomed Hongi Hika's 'musket wars' claiming that by 'reducing his tributary chiefs to civil order' Hongi was providing an environment in which European merchant settlements could 'thrive and be secure'.

Some commentators made concessions for Maori opinion. The Hobart Town Courier, for example, argued that Maoris might initially balk at the idea of European colonization. However it was believed that this should not deter the government because ultimately the Maoris would benefit from learning to till the soil and living like and with 'civilized' men.

The same views were expressed in letters sent to British government departments, most notably the Colonial Office, from individuals wishing to colonize New Zealand or to hold some official position in any government settlement in that country. Almost invariably their plans or comments stressed the abundance of timber and flax in New Zealand and how important these products were to the security and well-being of the British nation. The fact that few of these writers dwelt on the possibility of a foreign power usurping Britain's 'right' to the timber and flax supported the thesis that such fears were of colonial manufacture.

Most of the writers believed that British intervention in New Zealand, either by a military presence or by colonization, was necessary if trade was to prosper. They believed

279. S.G., 14 August 1830, 21 April 1831.
280. H.T.G., 10 June 1826.
281. H.T.C., 5 April 1839.
283. Adams, pp.77-80. However for an example of one rather naive attempt to push this case see Anon to Colonial Office, 7 April 1828, CO201/197, f.12b-13b.
that the uncivilized state of Maoris and the Europeans' fear of violence were inhibiting trade and for that reason something had to be done.284

Usually these letters met with no reply from the Colonial Office or with a note to say that they had been received but that the government had no intention of colonizing New Zealand.285 However some of the submissions were given a great deal of attention. Nicolls' plan to settle colonists and to provide military protection for them had been well researched and had already received the support of some government officials and merchants. His plan was for the government to finance the initial settlement but that the cost should be repaid by the Company within a year and from the proceeds of sales of timber and flax. The plan seemed to get no further than being investigated by the Colonial Office.286

Also, Robert Torrens' plan to place a detachment of troops near the major flax and timber area in New Zealand (this place being unspecified but probably the Hokianga) to protect European traders and sawyers was referred to the Board of Trade. The Board stated that they did not think themselves competent to give an opinion on the proposal, but they were willing to agree that the promised supplies of flax and spars were much needed.287

In summary, colonial and British 'public opinion' was united in regarding New Zealand's timber and flax resources as being of vital worth to Great Britain. (With this the Board of Trade also appeared to agree.) However only the colonials

284. Thompson to Dundas, (postmarked 22 November 1792), CO 201/7, f.360-362, H.R.N.Z., I, 584-5; Robert Bayles to Bathurst, 5 September 1818, CO201/93, f.108b-117a; Nicolls, CO209/147, f.183b; H.R.N.Z., I, 602; Fisher to Goderich, 19 November 1831, CO201/233, f.389b-391a; Torrens to Twiss, CO201/207, f.443b-444b; BT 1/259.
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seemed to demand intervention or colonization as a counter to the possible usurpation of British rights by a foreign power. Moreover the presence of Maoris and convicts in New Zealand was regarded as a hindrance to efficient trading. For the sake of promoting better trading, writers chose to ignore issues such as Maori sovereignty and independence. Significantly the reported problem of convicts, while it loomed large in colonial discussions of trade with New Zealand, did not figure prominently in British commentaries.

As well as being subject to 'public opinion' about New Zealand and her timber, flax and trading conditions, the British and colonial governments were frequently lobbied by pressure groups. There were the various missionary societies, the proponents of colonization like Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the idealists who could be described as 'humanitarians', and many others. These people used a variety of methods to expose the governments to their views including letters to officials, public pamphlets, speeches and questions in Parliament, and evidence presented before Parliamentary Select Committees.288 Here it is intended to examine the role of two groups - the colonial governors and the merchants - who appeared to influence the making of many of the decisions described above.

THEIR RAISON d'être gave colonial governors almost absolute power in their colonies. Thus their attitudes towards trade or New Zealand determined the amount of official support that was given to colonial merchants to encourage their interest in timber and flax and other New Zealand products. Also, because information from the man-on-the-spot was taken notice of by the British government, the colonial governors were a pressure group which very largely determined which items of information and ideas about New Zealand were forwarded to government offices.

288. Adams, Chapter 3.
The governors and administrators from Phillip to Hunter were largely concerned with establishing a viable penal colony and had neither the time, the resources, nor a sufficiently large freeman population to encourage trade. This did not stop their forming opinions about the potential of their colony and its surrounding islands. Phillip, for example, foresaw an Empire being founded on the commercial wealth of New South Wales and the Pacific. With regard to New Zealand flax he had been instructed to send home flax plants and to encourage the growth of the same on Norfolk Island and in New South Wales. Presumably he did so.289

However it was in Governor King's time (1800-1806) that the first real impetus was given to commercial development in the colony. This was accompanied by a resurgence of interest in New Zealand resources. King freely encouraged colonial agriculture (for instance, by importing 12,000 vine cuttings and supporting the introduction of fine wool rams into the colonial flock), commerce (for example, by his support for Bass' fishing monopoly at New Zealand and his encouragement of Robert Campbell's attempt to flout navigation laws and send the Lady Barlow to London), and industry (particularly through his steps to conserve shipbuilding timbers, to introduce linen manufacture and to promote coal mining). He was probably the most constructive of the early governors.290

King was clearly partial towards New Zealand's prospects and he desired to leave his mark on that country. Probably this enthusiasm derived from his long and close association with Sir Joseph Banks whose devotion to New Zealand is legendary.291 Moreover in 1792, while he was


291. See, for example, King to Banks, 26 November 1807, J. Banks, Banks Papers, Australia and South Sea Islands, 1774-1809, (NPL/M, A83).
Lieut-Governor of Norfolk Island, King had proposed a scheme for colonizing New Zealand, with himself as governor, which was detailed enough to include an estimation of the number of axes, hoes, iron pots and lead nails which would be required by the settlers and the items he considered necessary for purchasing land from Maoris. King was convinced that the fine timber of New Zealand and the phormium tenax would be of national importance - as he frequently told both Banks and the Colonial Office.

He also sought to impress Maoris with displays of friendship in an effort to encourage them to welcome European traders. He accompanied Ngahuruhuru and Tikitahua to New Zealand in 1793 probably knowing that his action in leaving Norfolk Island without permission would produce an eventual uproar. Later, when he was Governor of New South Wales, King took the opportunity of Te Pahi's visit to Sydney to offer him the finest hospitality and to have him escorted home in a government vessel. It was also King who attempted, by the publication of an Order in 1805, to prevent masters from stranding islanders in Sydney.

Governor Macquarie was a pragmatist. He was interested in anything that had development as its goal. If a commercial scheme offered a profit and a product which could be exported to Britain, it received his almost unqualified approbation.

Thus, for instance, he strongly supported Lord's request for a monopoly over the New Zealand flax trade in 1810; he allowed a ticket-of-leave convict (Robert Williams) to accompany the 1813 voyage of the Perseverance; and he encouraged the schemes the merchants of the 'New South Wales New Zealand Company' in 1815.

---
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Macquarie was also keen to assist in the proper regulation of trade. After receiving a letter from Samuel Marsden dated 1 November 1813 in which Marsden complained of the ill-treatment of Maoris by a ship's master, Lasco Jones, Macquarie issued a Proclamation on 1 December 1813 imposing bonds on traders.296 Macquarie later appointed Justices of the Peace to try and control inter-racial clashes in New Zealand. He was also eager to ensure that nothing disrupted the growth of trade with New Zealand. Thus in August 1815, just 26 months after he promulgated the first scale of colonial duties, and after representations from Samuel Marsden, he lowered the duty on New Zealand timber on the grounds that it was not fetching as high a market price as had been predicted. Similarly he supported the merchants' call for customs drawbacks on produce that was to be exported and this may have been the reason the British government agreed to the request.297

It can be seen therefore, that the early Governors played a positive role in seeking to promote trade and to encourage the fledgling and largely experimental efforts of merchants to develop the trade in timber and flax, even to the extent of amending colonial regulations and commending merchants' schemes to the British authorities.298

Sir Thomas Brisbane, Governor of New South Wales 1821-1825, was charged primarily with implementing the recommendation of the Bigge Reports and with getting the Colonial revenue on a stable footing.299 Amongst Bigge's recommendations was the encouragement of trade with New Zealand and the cultivation of flax in New South Wales.

296. S.G., 4 December 1813; Marsden to CMS, 15 March 1814, Missionary Register, November 1814, p. 460; H.R.N.Z., I, 321.
However, even before the Bigge Report on Agriculture and Trade had been presented to the British Parliament, vessels of the colonial marine had been dispatched to New Zealand. The government's aim was to encourage trade with New Zealand. James Busby wrote:

> From the Ferocious Character of the Natives, the Colonial Government, before permitting private individuals to embark on the trade, judged it advisable to dispatch several of their own vessels in the years 1824 and 1825, for the purpose of opening a Communication with the Tribes along the Sea Coast, and of Sounding their dispositions.

The merchants later followed this lead. 300

It is hard to ascertain whether it was Brisbane or his meddlesome Colonial Secretary Frederick Goulburn who provided the impetus for these moves to open up the New Zealand trade and the exportation of flax. Brisbane may have been acquainted with Bigge's opinions before they were presented in his Reports and before the Governor left for New South Wales. Alternatively Bigge may have discussed his findings with Goulburn or other officials before he left New South Wales for England. Busby certainly had formed the impression that it was Goulburn who had 'anticipated the greater advantages which would result to the Colony, by encouraging the industry of the Natives of New Zealand, in the preparation of this indigenous production of their Soil'. 301 This conclusion is supported by the evidence that Brisbane rarely mentioned New Zealand in his despatches, although it was presumably he who had to order the vessels to sail. 302

Governor Ralph Darling, who followed Brisbane, was keen to involve himself in all aspects of colonial affairs. He was particularly anxious to re-stimulate the economy of

---
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New South Wales which had been depressed by the combined effects of drought and a major recession in the late 1820s. For instance it was during Darling's governorship that the Colonial Customs Act was passed which declared, officially, that trade with New Zealand would be conducted duty free. He also ordered exemptions from some other charges. Furthermore it was at his insistence that the customs officials in the colony and Britain were moved, for the sake of trade, to accommodate New Zealand-built vessels with recognised licences and eventually with registration. Also Darling's interest in New Zealand and her flax trade was inspired to some extent by his fear of French expansion in the Pacific and his desire to occupy all the areas the French might have in view to settle.

However Darling's concern for New Zealand was motivated by more than security and economics. He believed that the government's formation of an establishment at New Zealand was 'much to be desired on the Score of humanity'. Thus after receiving Marsden's report on the Girls' War, Darling supported the missionary's call for a naval vessel to be stationed at New Zealand to protect Maoris and the well-disposed traders. He later added that he felt obliged to intervene at New Zealand because the Maoris had asked for his protection.

It was Darling who issued a Proclamation banning the long-time practice of importing preserved Maori heads. In this matter Darling received the support of, in fact was directed by, his Executive Council which had decided on 14 April 1831 that a Government Order be published 'expressive of the

305. Chiefesto King William IV, Petition, 5 October 1831, enclosed in Yate to Colonial Secretary, 16 November 1831, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, New Zealand 1831-2, (AONSW, 4/2127.7, item 31/9841).
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Governor's earnest desire that Vessels trading with New Zealand may discontinue the inhuman practice of purchasing and taking from thence preserved human heads'.\(^{307}\) Darling, and later governors, also gained support for trade regulating and promoting measures from the Legislative Council of the colony. Most of the non-official members of the Council — Robert Campbell, Alexander Berry, Richard Jones, John Macarthur and John Blaxland — had, or had once had, direct links with trading at New Zealand.

Finally Darling considered contact with New Zealand to be of such vital concern to the colony that in a letter he left for his successor, Bourke, concerning the affairs in New South Wales, he devoted over a third to stressing the importance of the New Zealand timber and flax trade and of controlling affairs in that country. He urged Bourke to follow his lead and stated that the formation of an establishment at New Zealand 'ought on no Account to be Neglected'.\(^{308}\)

Governors Bourke and Gipps were not as interested in New Zealand as Darling had been. Bourke was criticized by the Colonial Office for being 'rather sparing' in his despatches on New Zealand\(^ {309}\), while Gipps openly expressed his disinterest in New Zealand and his confusion concerning Busby's role. He also had asked that Busby's salary no longer be a charge on the colonial funds within a year of arriving in New South Wales.\(^ {310}\) Indirectly, however, both men had important roles in New Zealand's trade and her future. It was at Bourke's suggestion that Busby wrote his despatch of 16 June 1837 which apparently had a marked effect on Colonial Office decision making. At the same time Bourke had commissioned William Hobson (later first resident Governor of New Zealand) to report on the conditions
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in New Zealand and to suggest possible methods of improvement. Probably in line with his general policy of balancing the colonial budget, it was Gipps who, in July 1839, signed the colonial Act which declared New Zealand to be a foreign country for trade and duty purposes. Strangely, only a year earlier, he had re-issued the letters of 1831 which claimed that New Zealand was under the special protection of the British government.

Van Diemen's Land governors did not have a major influence on trade with New Zealand because the trade between New Zealand and their colony was generally too small for their actions to have much effect. Governor Arthur was sufficiently interested in trade or New Zealand to declare the trade duty free in line with New South Wales practice, although he turned down a request that Van Diemen's Land should pay some of Busby's salary. Arthur also encouraged merchants to send him information about New Zealand based on their visits. Interestingly, Lady Franklin, wife of Arthur's successor, declared her intention to visit New Zealand in 1839 although nothing came of it. The Van Diemen's Land government also encouraged the importation of New Zealand timber and flax in a more direct way - by frequently placing tenders to purchase it.

The interest each governor took in New Zealand and her trade largely determined what was done at the colonial level to stimulate or ignore the potential of trade with New Zealand. It was also their reports, or lack of them, that tended to determine Colonial Office policy. In this sense colonial
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colonial governors can be seen as a pressure group who could affect British government policy. They were also autocrats whose actions, especially before the 1830s, appeared to influence the pace and direction of colonial involvement in New Zealand and her timber and flax trade.

MERCHANT INTERESTS both in the colonies and in Britain also seem to have had an important effect on the timing and the direction of many of the government decisions concerning trade.

Pressure from merchants occasionally led to measures which promoted the prospects of trading at New Zealand. For instance in 1817 Governor Macquarie sought and granted various concessions to encourage trade after he was approached by colonial merchants. Also it was pressure from merchants that persuaded the sub-committee of the Legislative Council to recommend preferential treatment for whale oil under the proposed Customs Bill of 1839.

There is more evidence of merchant influence, particularly British merchants, in the governments' moves to regulate trade and trading in New Zealand. On the face of it merchant interest in this aspect of government decision making would have seemed to be counter productive. The trade with New Zealand was unhindered after the abolition of import duties on products from that country. Also the anomalous situation of New Zealand's being considered as a part of the coastal trade for the purposes of imports and as a foreign market for exports presumably suited merchants well. Some of their calls for controls sprang from the inevitable rivalry between colonial merchants and their British counterparts. The latter felt that the proximity of New Zealand to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land gave the merchants there certain advantages
in costs over home merchants. For instance wages were the major cost of any voyage. Whereas the British merchant would have to pay wages to and from Britain as well as while the vessel was at New Zealand, the colonial merchants' wage bill was lower for they had to meet freight costs only on the voyage to the market. For this reason the British whalers had persuaded the government to impose heavy and selective duties on colonial caught whale oils in 1809 and 1819.315 However from their mutual concern to protect trade both colonial and British merchants continued to press the government to intervene in New Zealand right until the time the decision to colonize New Zealand was finally made.

Assuming a role for the merchant lobby in government decision making leads one to question why they were able to influence the governments: the arguments in their letters and petitions were not new and, after 1830, in the face of the rapid increases in both exporting and importing at New Zealand, they appeared to have no proof that conditions in the country were a demonstrable barrier to trading there. Presumably the influence of this lobby arose from their important place in the economy of Great Britain and the colonies 316 (although New Zealand trade was just a small part of their total interests), as well as from their supposedly accurate information about New Zealand which had been gathered at first hand by the crews and masters of their vessels. For whatever reason, it seemed that when a group of merchants made proposals to the government about New Zealand trade, they were attended to.

315. Enderby and others to Cottrell, 18 July 1805, CO201/130, f.198b-199a; D.R. Hainsworth, The Sydney Traders, Simeon Lord and his Contemporaries, 1788-1821, Sydney, 1972, p. 139; Statute, 59 George III c52.

316. For instance about half of the Petition of 1819, which was signed by the 1260 residents in New South Wales and which called for improvements in matters of colonial administration and policies, was devoted to a call for the lifting of duties - Petition, 22 March 1819, H.R.A. 1, X, 55-65.
Take for instance the petition from fifteen merchants to the Board of Trade in 1826. The arguments for intervention were very familiar: New Zealand was held to have resources which were valuable to Britain, like whales and timber and flax; vessels could refit and refresh cheaply in that country; and her timber and flax were of a quality which would render Great Britain independent of Russia and the United States of America for these supplies. It was claimed that France appeared to be contemplating colonizing New Zealand and that the wanton behaviour of some European sailors and the volatility of the Maori character had combined to make New Zealand unsafe for visitors. Also the merchants believed that British settlement and commerce would benefit Maoris, and in fact had been requested by them. Yet on the basis of this application the Lords of Trade were moved to support the request for a small military force to be stationed in New Zealand, and they also added their own suggestion for a naval vessel to patrol the coasts.\(^{317}\) The Admiralty responded by ordering occasional visits by its vessels.\(^{318}\)

In New South Wales it was a merchant, Gordon Browne, who finally convinced Governor Darling that he should appoint a Resident at New Zealand. Browne's letter outlining the probable effects of the Elizabeth Affair\(^ {319}\) also prompted Darling to make further inquiry into the state of New Zealand which confirmed him in his opinion.\(^ {320}\) However Darling was replaced by Bourke before a Resident was sent to New Zealand. Governor Bourke arrived in New South Wales on 2 December 1831 and was sworn in the next day.\(^ {321}\) The colonial merchants wasted

\(^{317}\) Petition, 24 April 1826, BT 1/223; H.R.N.Z., I, 663-6. See also S.G., 22 November 1826.

\(^{318}\) Howick to Barrow, 5 January 1831, CO201/1, f.19b.

\(^{319}\) Darling to Goderich, 13 April 1831, and enclosures, CO201/219, f.407b-460a; H.R.A., 1, XVI, 237-41.

\(^{320}\) See letters from William Yate and Thomas McDonnell in Darling to Goderich, 7 September 1831, CO209/1, f.77b-86a. Gordon Browne provided Darling with an extended report on the state of New Zealand which also accompanied the despatch above but is now found in ADM 1/4248 and in a shortened form as R.W. Hay, 'Notices of New Zealand', Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, II, 1832, 132-6.

\(^{321}\) Bourke to Goderich, 3 December 1831, H.R.A., 1, XVI, 473.
no time and a deputation met the Governor on 13 December. Reportedly the merchants expressed 'Considerable anxiety' that 'the intercourse with New Zealand should be placed on a better footing' and requested that a Resident be stationed at New Zealand to protect trade. Bourke took the message to his Executive Council on 22 December and obtained their approval to recommend to the British government that a Resident be sent to New Zealand with a military force. This subject formed the topic for Bourke's second gubernatorial despatch. The merchants had formed his resolve and motivated him into action.

About the same time, although after the British government had decided to appoint Busby to New Zealand, four of the merchants who had signed the 1826 petition wrote to the Colonial Office and suggested that, for the sake of promoting and protecting trade, a Resident should be appointed to New Zealand and be paid from a tonnage tax on visiting vessels. They had even selected their suitable candidate - Robert Robinson. Two things are significant here. The idea of having a Resident in New Zealand must have been discussed before the letter was sent and the idea may have reached the Colonial Office informally before that time also. Moreover three of the firms who signed the request - Donaldson Wilkinson & Co, Robert Brooks, and Buckle, Bagster and Buckle - either had, or were to receive, government contracts to supply New Zealand timber and flax.

In any event Busby was appointed and almost immediately the Colonial Office was questioned on the effectiveness of his role. In December 1834 a petition from 21 residents in the Bay of Islands arrived in the Colonial Office. The petition, which dwelt on the attack on the Residency, spoke in emotional terms of the importance of New Zealand trade and the need to protect the lives and properties of the residents from Maori violence. A letter enclosed with the accompanying despatch

322. Bourke to Goderich, 23 December 1831, and enclosures, H.R.A., 1, XVI, 482-4; S.H., 19 December 1831.
323. Gore and others to Goderich, n.d. (received 12 March 1832), CO201/229, f.552b-553b. See also British Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, 1832, XIII, cols 507-8.
from Busby appealed to the Resident to do something to protect the wives and children of Bay residents and to bring honour to his position as Resident by seeking out those who attacked his home. This despatch was followed by two from Governor Bourke. In the first he stressed that Busby had failed to fulfil his instructions in that he had not protected British and colonial commerce nor repressed European and Maori outrages which interfered with trade. He wanted to withdraw Busby. The second despatch reiterated that Busby had been ineffective in suppressing any crime and in securing European property. In the light of this trade related pressure the Colonial Office decided, by May 1835, that Busby's appointment should not be 'kept up'.

While it has been shown that Busby in fact played a significant role in facilitating trading at New Zealand, this was not the judgement of his contemporaries. Thus traders' and the Governor's complaints, that Busby was not securing trade, provided the grounds for a reassessment of Busby's position. As the 1830s wore on neither Busby nor his situation appeared to improve. It was time to make a new decision and the pressure to colonize New Zealand grew. In addition to other circumstantial influences (like the pressure brought to bear on Glenelg by Lord Durham on behalf of the New Zealand Association which moved the government to decide to annex New Zealand late in 1837, the historian Adams stressed the significance of the arrival, on 18 December 1837, of a series of despatches from Busby which James Stephen described as having a 'very important bearing upon the New Zealand question'.

324. Busby to Hay, 10 May 1834, and enclosures, CO209/1, f.239b-248a.
326. Bourke to Stanley, 6 December 1834, H.R.A. 1,XVII,597.
327. Hay to Coates, May 1835, CO209/1, f.249b,360b. This decision was rescinded by the new Secretary of State, Lord Glenelg - Glenelg to Bourke, 28 October 1835, H.R.A., 1,XVIII, 170-4; see also Adams, pp.91-2.
These documents, Adams asserted, had a significant effect in determining Glenelg's irrevocable decision to authorize the British colonization of New Zealand. However another document, one which arrived in the Colonial Office on 19 December, the morning after Busby's despatches, also had a bearing either in support of or as a catalyst to Glenelg's realisation of the 'fatal necessity' of annexing New Zealand.

That document was a Memorial signed by forty merchants, and addressed to the Prime Minister Lord Melbourne. In it they pointed out that whaling and other trade links with New Zealand had grown to large proportions. They added that the Bay of Islands, the harbour most frequented by shipping, lacked a 'controlling power', that four to five hundred intoxicated seamen could be seen fighting each other, or communicating diseases and a bad example to local Maoris. New Zealand, they believed, had the facilities to be a 'Maritime power'. However the lack of direction in the country together with the class of Europeans who generally frequented the shores inclined them to think that piracy and buccaneering would become a more common enterprise than regular trade. They concluded:

That under the present state of affairs in New Zealand we find by experience that the representative of the British Government has no sufficient power to check the evils already existing, much less to prevent a realization of our worst fears for the future and it is in the confidence that Colonization will be the only sure means of preventing the evils anticipated, that we are induced to recommend it? to your Lordship.

Of the forty signatories, eight had signed either the 1826 petition or the 1832 letter requesting a Resident.

The Memorial received an early answer - on 20 December 1837. According to James Stephen's draft note, the merchants were informed that Glenelg had received their Memorial and that 'it will not fail to receive the anxious consideration of HM Government'. Indeed this document was

330. Memorial, 16 December 1837, CO209/2, f.445b-446b.
specified as one of the key papers referred for the consideration of the 1838 Lords' Select Committee.331

Thus the views of the merchant lobby were read and seriously considered during the crucial days when the British government decided to take full control of affairs in New Zealand. This was a fitting climax to the decades during which considerations of trade were to the fore whenever decisions about government involvement in New Zealand were being made.

FROM THE earliest years of European contacts with New Zealand British and colonial governments strove to promote and protect the trade which involved New Zealand timber and flax. As part of this policy the governments involved naval vessels in voyages to collect timber and flax and to provide information which might assist the merchants who traded in these products. They further promoted the private exploitation of New Zealand's resources by contracting to purchase timber and flax. Import duties, harbour fees and concessions relating to the registration of New Zealand-built vessels were also designed, altered, suspended or abolished to facilitate trade with New Zealand.

Moreover the extension of legal protection to cover crimes committed in New Zealand, the regulatory visits of naval vessels and the eventual appointment of the British Resident were all moves designed to control those aspects of the New Zealand social environment, namely Maoris and convicts, which

were presumed to be disadvantaging trading.

However, in the light of her failure to effectively protect trading at New Zealand with minimum intervention, Great Britain was forced to face the 'fatal necessity' of annexing the country as the only effective way to fulfil her moral duties and to secure New Zealand's timber and flax supplies for her exclusive use.
CONCLUSION

The New Zealand timber and flax trade 1769-1840 has been analysed in three dimensions - commercial, social and political.

The trade differed from other early commercial activities in New Zealand, such as sealing and pelagic whaling, in that the phormium and the woods of New Zealand were unlike the European varieties with which the merchants and the market were familiar. Before the trade could be established, therefore, the traders had to get to know about the varieties and properties of New Zealand timbers and flax and the market for them had to be tested. The usual commercial considerations also applied. For example the profits to be derived from trading timber and flax had to be measured against other areas of investment and commerce.

It differed too in that the trade in wood and fibre required close co-operation between Maoris and Europeans. This could be built up only slowly and through the trials and errors by which the two groups learned to deal with each other. Also before trading could begin in earnest Maoris had to have the time and opportunity to adjust to the demands of the trade and to learn what Europeans required of them. The Europeans, likewise, had to overcome their fears of trading at New Zealand and to settle traders there to organise the preparation and purchasing of the products. For this reason the merchants watched the progress of the New Zealand missions with interest. They were also encouraged by both the protection being promised by the British and colonial governments to Europeans living in New Zealand and the other aspects of the governments' promotion of the trade.

Attempts to initiate a regular trade in timber and flax before the late 1820s foundered because one or more of these conditions for commercial success were not met. However from 1827 the trade boomed because the European merchants favoured it as an investment and the Maoris, owing to the decline of Hongi's hegemony, were able to produce the required quantities of timber and flax.
During the 1830s the same combination of market forces and Maori and European attitudes to the trade determined the volumes of phormium and woods that were exported from New Zealand. The trade in flax flourished for as long as the colonial merchants believed that it would fetch high prices on the British market. When that market rejected the New Zealand product the traders' interest in phormium fell away and their investments were diverted to other exportable commodities such as fine colonial wools and the products of bay whaling. However during the years in which colonial imports of flax were at their peak the monthly variations in the volumes of fibre arriving in the colonies were related to events in New Zealand, to the fluctuations in the Maoris' commitment to processing flax and to the development of the system of trading that utilized the services of European resident agents who arranged the preparation of cargoes.

The timber trade of the 1830s was aimed at two markets. One was the highly specialized spar trade which provided cargoes of ship timbers mainly for the British Royal Navy. Because of the high costs of transporting the timbers to Great Britain and the poor quality of the exported wood, the trade proved to be neither popular nor particularly profitable. The other arm of the trade, the provision of construction timbers for the colonial markets, gave employment to many European and Maori residents of New Zealand. The returns from the trade and the numbers of cargoes of New Zealand woods entered at colonial ports were, however, limited by the small size of the markets and the colonists' varying demands for building materials. Nevertheless merchants thought it worth continuing in the trade throughout the 1830s and beyond.

Timber or flax trading encouraged Europeans to settle in New Zealand. In the past these European traders have been stereotyped as convicts, deserters and social dregs who preferred an 'uncivilized' and lawless existence in New Zealand to the rigours of life in an orderly community. Such an assessment reflects only the bias in contemporary comments about these men. They were in fact drawn from many backgrounds
and their reasons for choosing to live in New Zealand were almost as varied as the individuals themselves. Once Europeans settled in New Zealand the lives they led were affected by the type of community - Maori or European - in which they lived, and by the opportunities and inclination they had to retain aspects of the life-style they had formerly known. In general their lives were hard and tedious and were regulated by the customs and conventions of both Maori and European societies.

The lives of the Maori participants were also modified by the trade. For the most part it led to their receiving a large range of European goods, most notably arms and ammunition, blankets, tobacco and European clothing. It also made demands on them. For most it meant diverting time and labour from customary work patterns, interrupting their social obligations and warfare, and learning to tolerate European traders - both visitors and residents. Other Maoris were obliged, in addition, to transport flax to distant ports or to shift their residences to a site which was nearer to a European trader. There is also some evidence that working in the trade had an ill-effect on the health of some Maoris and created new rivalries between some hapu. Whatever the social consequences of their involvement, however, it is clear that these Maoris willingly grasped the opportunity for trading phormium and wood and proved to be efficient and effective commercial partners for the Europeans.

The British and colonial governments became increasingly involved in the trade. They sent vessels to New Zealand to collect cargoes of timber and flax and to secure information which might be useful to merchants wishing to trade there. They also contracted to purchase cargoes of the New Zealand products. Other measures which were aimed at promoting trade included the waiving of import duties and harbour fees, and concessions, for New Zealand-built vessels.

The governments also became involved in attempts to regulate affairs in New Zealand by extending the jurisdiction of colonial courts, providing naval vessels to cruise the
coasts and appointing a British Resident. Their intentions were to create an environment which would increase trading activity.

However British government officials came to believe that these measures were not sufficient to provide law and order and a prosperous trade. By the late 1830s the only solution appeared to them to be the annexation of New Zealand. A significant reason for this decision was the desire to secure New Zealand's timber and flax for Great Britain's exclusive use.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1

ROBERT WILLIAMS – FLAX DRESSER

Most of the individuals involved in the New Zealand flax trade aimed solely to make a monetary profit. Robert Williams was involved with *phormium tenax* for reasons other than the money which he hoped that it would provide. He believed that being the discoverer of a mechanical means of dressing New Zealand flax would cause him to be cast in the role of the saviour of the hemp reliant British navy, would see him presiding over a vast flax-dressing industry in New South Wales or New Zealand (and preferably both), would give him status and prestige in a society of self-made men and would provide him with an early emancipation and a salve to his convict past.

Williams had been 'brought up from infancy to the Manufacturing of Hemp and Flax'. He arrived in New South Wales aboard the *Ann* on 27 February 1810. (Samuel Marsden had returned from a visit to England aboard that vessel). As was the case with other skilled convicts, Williams was encouraged to ply his trade in the colony and thereby sustain himself. He opened a ropewalk at 64 Castlereagh Street and in March 1812 announced that he was expanding the size of his establishment to cope with the demand for his products. Rope and canvas for shipping were in short supply in New South Wales so Williams was able to readily borrow money from colonial merchants for the purchase and expansion of his business.


3. S.G., 7 March 1812.

As well as working with imported hemp and flax, Williams began to experiment with flax from New Zealand. Lord's expedition of 1810 fired Williams' imagination and by 1811 his experiments were sufficiently advanced for him to apply to Governor Macquarie for government assistance in his project. Macquarie apparently went to see Williams' machine in action but did not regard the project as one worthy of government patronage.\(^5\)

Williams therefore approached Simeon Lord and offered to sell him the rights to the process. The trader was interested in supporting the work but on terms which Williams found unacceptable. Thus when Birnie and Hook approached him about their proposed expedition on the Perseverance in 1813 Williams was eager to listen. The negotiations for the voyage were protracted because Williams was determined to secure the best financial and social advantage from his involvement\(^6\) but on 29 March 1813 agreement was eventually reached.\(^7\) Williams had convinced himself that his exploratory voyage would lead to a prosperous future for his business and so he borrowed more money to make improvements to his home and ropewalk and concentrated on his experiments with phormium to the neglect of the other branches of his work.\(^8\)

The voyage in the Perseverance, April-July 1813, allowed Williams time to visit Stewart Island and Otago Harbour. He was enthusiastic about the potential for a flax station in Otago Harbour, however he allowed his interest in the execution of his grand design to cloud his assessment of the factors of costs and profits which were important to his merchant backers. Birnie's decision, based on this


6. Birnie - Williams Correspondence, 1813, CO201/131, f.413b-418b; B.T., Box 13, pp.560-4, 583-5, 727-8; H.R.N.Z., I, 466-70.

7. Williams to Birnie, 29 March 1813, CO201/131, f.415b; B.T., Box 13, pp.593-4.

voyage, not to proceed with the project left Williams in financial difficulties. Williams again appealed to Governor Macquarie. He pointed out the potential benefit of his work to both New South Wales and Great Britain and then explained that his inquiry into New Zealand flax had 'Much imbarrest his Circumstances'. He stated that, as he had received no returns from his experimenting (with which he was still continuing), unless the government gave him assistance his efforts would be halted and somebody else would reap the benefits by following on his work. Macquarie apparently extended to Williams the assistance he required. Williams therefore continued to experiment and run his business, undaunted even by the poor results of the tests on the flax and rope Birnie had sent to England for analysis after the voyage of the Perseverance. Again, late in 1814, Williams approached Macquarie with a request for more assistance.

In September 1814 Williams was negotiating with Lord and Blaxcell, on behalf of the New South Wales New Zealand Company, about his accompanying their proposed voyage to New Zealand. As part of their offer the merchants agreed to support Williams' application for emancipation. In return Williams appears to have provided the Company with the proposals which formed the basis of their memorial to the Governor on 3 October 1814. However these negotiations broke down when Williams demanded to be appointed 'principal Artist and Director' of the proposed settlement. Lord and Blaxcell on the other hand regarded his tasks as being solely to erect his machine and train men to use it before he returned to New South Wales within six months of the formation of the settlement. Lord was clearly infuriated by Williams' pretensions and visions of self-grandeur so he terminated the

10. Williams to Macquarie, 18 September 1814, CO201/131, f.428b; B.T.; Box 13, pp.824-5.
negotiations and withdrew his and Blaxcell's support for Williams' petition for emancipation. 11

After he was rejected by the Company Williams either approached or was approached by Samuel Marsden with a proposal that he join the CMS settlement at New Zealand. Encouraged by Marsden's interest, and because he considered his work to be a public service, Williams petitioned Governor Macquarie for emancipation. This move was also prompted by the fact that he was again in financial difficulties. Not, he believed, through his own incompetence, but because the promissory note currency in New South Wales enabled some merchants to utilize the system to their own advantage. In practise this meant that Williams was paid only when the interest rate on issuing bills was low, although when he used the notes to pay his pressing creditors they would accept them only after deducting a heavy discount. This left him in the position where his costs and income were almost the same. 12 Because he was a convict Williams could not sue his debtors or seek legal remedy against the sharp monetary practices of the merchants. Macquarie initially granted Williams' request for emancipation. However he then rescinded the order, Williams claimed, in response to a letter sent to the Governor by Simeon Lord. This letter had presumably denigrated Williams' character. In return Williams derived some cold comfort from the failure of the Company's efforts at New Zealand. 13


12. Williams to Jones & Riley, CO201/131, f.444b-448a; B.T., Box 15, pp.1583-93; Hainsworth, Builders, pp. 57-8.

13. Williams to Macquarie, 17 November 1814, B.T., Box 13, p. 861.
Williams returned to his business and in April 1815 he announced that he had received three hundredweight of 'New Zealand hemp' from the cargo of the Active and that he was working it for public sale. In fact he did not do this because his New Zealand flax dressing machine was not working at that time. Instead he substituted some twine he had worked previously and which he had in stock. Marsden's response was to send the rope to England for testing and to request his Parent Society to press for Williams' emancipation so that he could go to New Zealand to establish a ropewalk there. Williams was so encouraged by this response that, in anticipation of a contract to dress all the CMS imports of flax, he purchased more machinery and built a new and larger machine. The CMS, however, decided that the results of the tests on Marsden's samples were encouraging enough for them to sponsor a ropewalk of their own in New South Wales. Thus with government assistance, in the form of the provision of convict labourers and a suitable building, the CMS became Williams' competitor rather than his patron.

Williams despaired of joining another enterprise and so devised a plan to establish his own settlement in northern New Zealand. In May 1816 he submitted this plan to Macquarie, at the Governor's request, together with samples of his work. Then in April 1817 he submitted another almost identical Memorial and further samples of flax which Macquarie forwarded to London together with his recommendation that Williams' work and plan be accorded a

14. S.G., 29 April 1815.
15. Marsden to Pratt, 30 June 1815, S. Marsden, Correspondence, (DU:Ho, MS 55/9).
16. Williams to Marsden, [1817], CO201/13l, f.440b-442a; B.T.; Box 15, pp.1576-82.
17. Williams to Macquarie, 24 May 1816, B.T., Box 15, pp.1400-8; Williams to Macquarie, 6 June 1816, CO201/13l, f.436b; B.T., Box 15, p. 1409.
favourable response from the British government. The Colonial Office referred this despatch and the samples to the Admiralty for their 'consideration & opinion how far it would be decent (?) He to encourage the Memorialist in the execution [of the] project which forms the subject of his application'.

Lord Bathurst's reply to Macquarie's despatch was dated 21 July 1818. It enclosed the results of the tests on Williams' rope and dressed phormium and the opinion that 'the New Zealand Article is weaker than the Riga and Chili Hemp nearly in the proportion of one third'. This was tempered in the report of the men who did the tests by their comment that the sample was too small for definitive analysis and that the flax imbibed tar well and had the potential to make fine canvas. Bathurst did not offer Macquarie any advice on what to do with regard to Williams' application, and he appears to have done nothing.

Meanwhile Williams continued to experiment with New Zealand flax to the detriment of his business. Thus in February 1820 he obtained permission to go on board HMS Dromedary, which was lying in Sydney, to test his flax rope against samples of English rope on board the ship. While the two English ropes broke under the weights 4 tons 3 cwt and 4 tons 4 cwt 3 qr's respectively, Williams' rope only gave way under 5 tons 19 cwt. This demonstration impressed


19. Draft note, CO201/84, f.64a.

20. Admiralty to Colonial Office, 22 June 1818, CO201/91, f.8b-9a; H.R.A., 1, IX, 818.


23. S.G., 12 February 1820.
Commissioner Bigge who had arrived in New South Wales on the Dromedary and who was charged with investigating the potential of colonial industry. Bigge took extensive testimony from Williams about his work and took further samples of flax for testing in England. These tests also proved the superiority of Williams' rope and Bigge was moved to devote a large space to Williams' work in his published report on the agriculture and trade of New South Wales. Bigge recommended that New Zealand flax be extensively cultivated in New South Wales, that Williams' patent be purchased by the government and that his work be encouraged by the purchasing of his rope for all the vessels in the colonial service.  

Williams was again being pressed by his creditors. In February 1822 Underwood and Levey sued him for debt. The Sydney Gazette announced that Williams was having to sell his ropeworks to pay the debt but the next week reported that he had not sold and was continuing business as usual.

Apparently the government had offered to advance Williams money to keep his creditors at bay, in return for which he agreed to accompany the colonial naval vessel Snapper on a voyage to New Zealand. News of the promise of money and his future prospects initially satisfied Williams' creditors but by September 1822 they were again preparing to proceed against him. The government then committed itself to the Snapper voyage, and Williams and his assigned servant Benjamin Ellesy were apparently on board the vessel when it left Port Jackson on 7 November 1822. The voyage would

25. S.G., 8 February 1822.
27. Williams to Colonial Secretary, 18 September 1822, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Letters Received, 1822, (AONSW, 4/1753, Bundle 16, item 180).
28. Colonial Secretary to Harbour Master, 7 October 1822, NSW: Colonial Secretary: Copies of Letters Sent within the Colony, 28 June - 28 November 1822, (AONSW, 4/3506); S.G., 8 November 1822.
have returned Williams to the south of the South Island where, nine years earlier, he had advocated establishing a settlement. Like the earlier visit this voyage also proved a disappointment for Williams. His flax dressing machines were sneered at, even by the Maoris, when the largest which was operated by ten men failed to produce flax as rapidly as one Maori woman with a shell. 29

However it is possible that Williams did not accompany the Snapper and this may account for the poor performance of his machines. The Governor received a letter from Williams dated Sydney 21 November 1822, a time when the Snapper was in New Zealand. In it Williams again asked for financial help to keep his creditors at bay. He stressed his contribution to the body of knowledge about New Zealand flax, he talked of a depression in the ropemaking business, he wanted twenty assigned convicts to boost his production of rope and he offered to superintend the government's scheme to plant phormium in New South Wales. 30 The government did not appear to be prepared to again come to the rescue.

In February 1824, in the same month as the Bigge Report with its glowing comments on Williams' work arrived in the colony, Williams sold his flax dressing and cordage works to John Cowell. Cowell had previously been employed by the CMS to teach and experiment with the dressing of flax at their station in the Bay of Islands and had ten years experience in the King's Dockyard in London before that. 31 Within a year Cowell had the business in a state where he could work up 100 tons of flax per annum. 32 As for Williams, he disappeared from view after Cowell took over and is presumed to have died broken and penniless.

30. Wiliams to Colonial Secretary, 21 November 1827, (AONSW, 4/1753, Bundle 16, item 182).
31. S.G., 19 February 1824.
32. S.G., 4 January 1827.
Robert Williams was not directly responsible for the collection of much more than a handful of New Zealand flax. He was in most respects a pathetic character. He was a dreamer. Yet it was his commitment and vision which encouraged merchants and governments to seriously consider the value of New Zealand flax and its potential for supplying canvas and ropes for ships. His dogged perseverance earned him the commendation of Governor Macquarie, Samuel Marsden and Commissioner Bigge, all of whom he had convinced of his sincerity and the value of his work. The extent of his influence on the flax trade and government policy-making will never be measured, but his role in promoting *phormium* during the late 1810s and early 1820s at a time when many of the decisions which later affected the trade were being made, singled him out as a significant contributor to the New Zealand flax trade.
APPENDIX 2

TRANS-TASMAN VESSEL MOVEMENTS, JANUARY 1818 - DECEMBER 1827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL OF VOYAGE</th>
<th>Gov't</th>
<th>Whaler/Sealer</th>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Timber/Flax</th>
<th>Merchants</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of entries into colonial ports from New Zealand</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of departures from colonial ports to New Zealand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vessels with timber or flax as part of the inwards cargo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 155

(Sources: S.G., 1818-1828; New South Wales Almanack 1818-1829; H.T.G., 1818-1828; VDL: Customs: Register of Ships Entered Inwards and Cleared Outwards at Hobart 1824-5 January 1830 (AOT, CUS 29).)
### Volumes and Values of Flax Imported Into New South Wales from New Zealand, Annually, 1830 - 1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contemporary Accounts</th>
<th>Davidson</th>
<th>Cust 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume (tons)</td>
<td>Value (£Stg)</td>
<td>Volume (tons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>19,603</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>26,004</td>
<td>931.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>14,234</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>362.5</td>
<td>7,179</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures for 1831, 1833-1840 - NSW: Colonial Secretary: Returns of the Colony; Figures for 1830 - S.G., 5 July 1831; Figures for 1832 - S.G., 31 January 1832.


VALUES OF TIMBER IMPORTED INTO NEW SOUTH WALES FROM NEW ZEALAND, ANNUALLY, 1830-1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS¹</th>
<th>DAVIDSON²</th>
<th>CUST 6³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value (£ Stg)</td>
<td>Value (£ Stg)</td>
<td>Value (£ Stg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>3,664</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>12,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NSW: Colonial Secretary: Returns of the Colony, 1830, 1835-40.
APPENDIX 5

VALUES OF FLAX AND TIMBER IMPORTED INTO VAN DIEMEN'S LAND FROM NEW ZEALAND, ANNUALLY, 1832-1839

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FLAX</th>
<th>TIMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value (£Stg)</td>
<td>Value (£Stg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: GB: Customs: Imports into Colonies by Country, 1832-1839, (CUST 6/1-8).)
APPENDIX 6

TOTALS OF VESSELS ARRIVING AT COLONIAL PORTS FROM NEW ZEALAND AND OF VESSELS DEPARTING FROM COLONIAL PORTS FOR NEW ZEALAND, ANNually, 1815-1839.
VESSELS ENTERING SYDNEY FROM NEW ZEALAND 1815 - 1839

Source: S.G. 1815 - 1840
VESSELS DEPARTING SYDNEY FOR NEW ZEALAND 1815 - 1839

Source: S.G., 1815 - 1840
VESSELS ENTERING HOBART FROM NEW ZEALAND 1818 - 1839

Sources: H.T.G. (Bent), 1818 - 1824
H.T.G. (Ross & Howe) and H.T.C., 1825 - 1832
VDL: Customs Department: Registers of Ships Entered Inwards and Cleared Outwards, 1833 - 1839, (AOT, CUS 31, 34, 35)
VESSELS DEPARTING HOBART FOR NEW ZEALAND 1818 - 1839

Sources: H.T.G. (Bent), 1818 - 1824
H.T.G. (Ross & Howe) and H.T.C. 1825 - 1832
VDL: Customs Department: Registers of Ships Entered Inwards and Cleared Outwards, 1833 - 1839. (AOT, CUS 31, 34, 35)
VESSELS ENTERING LAUNCESTON FROM NEW ZEALAND 1829 - 1839

Sources: L. A., 1829 - 1837
C. C., 1838 - 1840

VESSELS DEPARTING LAUNCESTON FOR NEW ZEALAND 1829 - 1839

Sources: L. A., 1829 - 1837
C. C., 1838 - 1840
NOTE TO APPENDIX 6

Appendix 6 shows the annual totals of vessels designated as arriving from or departing for 'New Zealand' between 1815 and 1839.

Many contemporary sources provide figures for colonial shipping arrivals and departures; they provide almost as many different totals for annual and monthly vessel movements. Therefore rather than presenting all the different figures, and in order to provide a clear indication of trends in trans-Tasman shipping, only some of the available data is represented in these graphs.

The sources used in constructing the graphs were those which consistently gave the highest figure for annual vessel movements. This decision was made on the grounds that, as vessels were usually listed by name, it is unlikely that these sources had over-estimated the annual total of trans-Tasman shipping.
APPENDIX 7

VOLUMES AND VALUES OF NEW ZEALAND FLAX RE-EXPORTED FROM NEW SOUTH WALES, ANNUALLY, 1826 - 1837

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS¹</th>
<th>TAPP²</th>
<th>DAVIDSON³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume (tons)</td>
<td>Value (£Stg)</td>
<td>Volume (tons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>(58 bales)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>(956.7 cwt)</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7,231</td>
<td>7,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>14,406</td>
<td>14,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>751.8</td>
<td>16,376</td>
<td>751.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>806.5</td>
<td>15,949</td>
<td>806.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>211.05</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>275.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures for 1826, 1827, 1829-1834 - NSW: Colonial Secretary, Returns of the Colony (S.H., 16 February 1835 stated the volume for 1834 as 391 tons);

Figures for 1828 - S.G.T.L., 23 July 1829;
Figures for 1835 - S.G., 9 February 1836;
Figures for 1836, 1837 - S.H., 19 March 1838.

## APPENDIX 8

VALUES OF RE-EXPORTS OF NEW ZEALAND FLAX FROM NEW SOUTH WALES EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VALUE OF IMPORTS OF PHORMIUM INTO THAT COLONY, ANNUALLY, 1830-1837

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Percentage 79

(Sources: As for Appendices 3 and 7)
APPENDIX 9

TONNAGES OF FLAX IMPORTED INTO NEW SOUTH WALES FROM NEW ZEALAND, MONTHLY, 1829–1839.
### Tonnages of Flax Imported into New South Wales from New Zealand, Monthly, 1829-1839.

Together with the number of cargoes each month (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>1829 Tons n</th>
<th>1829 n</th>
<th>1830 Tons n</th>
<th>1830 n</th>
<th>1831 Tons n</th>
<th>1831 n</th>
<th>1832 Tons n</th>
<th>1832 n</th>
<th>1833 Tons n</th>
<th>1833 n</th>
<th>1834 Tons n</th>
<th>1834 n</th>
<th>1835 Tons n</th>
<th>1835 n</th>
<th>1836 Tons n</th>
<th>1836 n</th>
<th>1837 Tons n</th>
<th>1837 n</th>
<th>1838 Tons n</th>
<th>1838 n</th>
<th>1839 Tons n</th>
<th>1839 n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(e) 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(d) 2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(h) 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>579.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Plus 7 bales  
(b) Plus 29 bales  
(c) Plus 700 baskets  
(d) Plus 3 hundredweight  
(e) Plus 75 bundles  
(f) 24 bales, 53 bundles  
(g) Plus 25 bundles, 84 bales  
(h) Plus 5 hundredweight  
(i) 3 hundredweight  
(j) Plus 27 bales  
(k) Plus 3 hundredweight

(Sources: S.G., 1829-1840; S.H., 1831-1840; S.G.T.L., 1829-1830, 1834-1840)
NOTE TO APPENDIX 9

These data do not account for all the flax-related voyages or for all the flax imported into New South Wales from New Zealand during the decade of the 1830s. What they do represent is the most detailed analysis that is possible given the paucity and selectivity of the contemporary sources. The data were extracted from newspaper shipping columns (which often depended on a reporter being on the dock at the right time) and the Sydney General Trade List which was compiled from Customs House records by a customs clerk, Matthew Gregson.

Just how representative these figures are can be tested by comparing the annual totals from this table with the totals compiled each year by the customs officials (Appendix 3). The totals are very similar and certainly follow the same trends. One variant is the total of 579.5 tons for 1830 which is 45 percent lower than that derived from customs sources. The reason for this was that the source used for that year was the Sydney Gazette where the printing of this information was, at best, haphazard. Also any attempts to supplement the newspaper information from the Harbour Master's Daily Reports of shipping and cargoes proved fruitless as the entries for 1830 are also vague regarding the amount of flax actually imported. Moreover the figure here for the tonnage of flax imported during 1834 supports those of CUST 6 and Davidson rather than that derived from the 'Returns'. Significantly the totals in Appendix 9 (which would understate rather than overstate the total imports) for flax imports in 1837 and 1838, exceed those in Appendix 3.

This raises the question of how reliable any of these figures are. It is not only a problem which concerns historians. Contemporary evidence also casts doubts on the accuracy of customs records such as those used to compile the 'Returns'. When Colonel Dumaresq questioned Mr Bell about the amount of flax which was imported from New Zealand, Bell replied that it was impossible to estimate. Speaking in November 1831 he said that the most that could have been imported in one year was 1000-1200 tons. However he added that it was impossible to reply on customs figures because merchants always overstated the size of the cargo they had imported. Bell did not elaborate on why the merchants might have done this. However because New Zealand produce entered into New South Wales duty free and appeared to pay no wharfage there was no cost in overstating the size of imports.

1. Bell to Dumaresq, enclosed in Dumaresq to Hay 1831, CO201/223, f.363b.
## APPENDIX 10

**FLAX PRICES IN NEW SOUTH WALES**

**1829-1839**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>PRICE (1Stg)</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1829 | February | 30 | S.G., 7 February 1829
| | June | 20 | S.G., 9 June 1829
| 1831 | April | 22 | S.H., 18 April 1831
| | July | 18-20 | S.H., 4 July 1831
| | August | 20 | S.G., 23 August 1831
| | September | 18 | S.G., 20 September 1831
| | October | 13 | H.T.C., 8 October 1831
| | November | 18-20 | S.G., 17 November 1831
| 1832 | January | 17 | S.G., 21 January 1832
| | July | 15 | S.H., 16 July 1832
| | August | 16-18 | S.H., 23 August 1832
| 1833 | January | 16-18 | S.G., 26 January 1833
| | S.H., 10 January 1833
| 1834 | February | 15 | S.G., 8 February 1834
| | March | 18 | S.H., 3 March 1834
| | April | 11 & 15 | S.G.T.L., 19 April 1834
| | S.H., 21 April 1834
| | May | 11-14 | S.G., 10 May 1834
| | September | 18-20 | S.H., 4 September 1834
| | October | 18 | S.H., 9 October 1834
| | November | 16 | S.H., 27 November 1834
| 1835 | February | 12-16 | S.H., 16 February 1835
| | June | 12-15 | S.G., 9 June 1835
| | July | 15 | Wellers Correspondence2
| 1836 | March | 12-14 | S.H., 21 March 1836
| | April | 13-15 | S.H., 21 April 1836
| | May | 11-13 | S.H., 19 May 1836
| | November | 11-12 & 15 | S.G.T.L., 26 November 1836
| 1837 | January | 11-16 & 18 | S.G.T.L., 7 January 1837
| | January | 11-18 & 20 | S.G.T.L., 14 January 1837
| | April & December | 11-12 & 20 | S.G.T.L., 8 April 1837 & 28 December 1837
| 1838 | August & November | 11-12 & 20 | S.H., 22 August, 7 November 1838
| 1839, September & December | 11-13 & 15 | S.H., 30 September, 30 December 1839
| | November | 30 | S.G., 9 November 1839

1. This was the price offered by a ropemaker for supplies of flax.


4. This price was received at an auction.
NOTE TO APPENDIX 10

Appendix 10 is based on quotations in the Sydney Current Price List which was published in the Sydney Gazette and the Sydney Herald. It seems that the list was based on the wholesale price of the produce in the Sydney market. It can only be a guide to the trends in the value of the flax and not a description of actual bargains. Thus for instance in April 1836 the Sydney Herald printed flax prices as £13-15 whereas the merchant George Weller was confident of getting £18-22 per ton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Price (£Stg)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>July (?)</td>
<td>31-38</td>
<td>S.G., 13 January 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>S.G., 17 July 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>S.G., 26 December 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>28-38</td>
<td>S.G., 21 April 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>H.T.C., 7 November 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July (?)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>S.G.T.L., 23 July 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September (?)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>S.G., 20 February 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October (?)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>S.G.T.L., 8 October 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>S.G., 1 July 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May (?)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>S.G., 24 August 1830¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>S.G., 10 February 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>S.G., 20 August 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.H., 23 May 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>May (?)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>H.T.C., 8 October 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>S.H., 20 February 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832³</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>24.10.0-36</td>
<td>S.G., 26 May 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>16.5.0-18</td>
<td>S.H., 18 October 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5.0-22.10.0</td>
<td>S.H., 18 October 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23-26.10.0</td>
<td>S.H., 18 October 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>S.H., 29 August 1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>20-27</td>
<td>S.G., 30 November 1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>20-26</td>
<td>S.G., 16 December 1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>S.H., 2 July 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>18-24 &amp;</td>
<td>S.H., 14 December 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>S.G., 17 December 1835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Apparently the price being offered by the Marine Board.
2. The naval contract price promised to Buckle, Bagster and Buckle.
3. In September the Sydney Herald reported Ceylon prices as £24.10.0-£25.0.0 and £33.0.0-£36.0.0 - S.H., 24 September 1832.
4. The first prices were for poor quality, the second fair and the highest for the best flax.
## APPENDIX 12

**QUANTITIES OF PHORMIUM TENAX IMPORTED INTO GREAT BRITAIN, ANNUALLY, 1829-1840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FROM NEW ZEALAND</th>
<th>FROM THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECT (tons)</td>
<td>(tons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>127.15</td>
<td>129.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312.40</td>
<td>312.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>786.25</td>
<td>830.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>793.35</td>
<td>793.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>369.59</td>
<td>381.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>249.89</td>
<td>249.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>390.59</td>
<td>390.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>91.37</td>
<td>96.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: An Account of the Quantity of Phormium Tenax, or New Zealand Flax, imported in each of the last Three Years, ending 5th January 1832, into Great Britain, stating the Ports where received, G.B.P.P., House of Lords, Sessional Papers, 1831-2, CCIX, (118), p. 657; An Account of the Quantity of Flax Imported from New Zealand into Great Britain, during the Years 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836, and 1837; distinguishing each Year, G.B.P.P., House of Lords, Sessional Papers, 1838, XVIII, (148), p. 531; F.D. Bell and P. Young, Reasons for Promoting the Cultivation of the New Zealand Flax, London, 1842, p. 32.)
APPENDIX 13
VALUES OF ALL PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO NEW SOUTH WALES FROM
NEW ZEALAND, ANNUALLY, 1835-1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1835 Value</th>
<th>1836 Value</th>
<th>1837 Value</th>
<th>1838 Value</th>
<th>1839 Value</th>
<th>1840 Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
<td>(£Stg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beer &amp; Ale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spirits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Arrack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brandy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowroot &amp; Sago</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley, Oats, Peas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter &amp; Cheese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosities</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour &amp; Bread</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowder</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware &amp; Ironmongery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>3881</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Provisions</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td></td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>4057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Skins</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Hogs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallow &amp; Fat</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber &amp; Spars</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>4493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Casks &amp; Staves</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deals &amp; Battens</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oars</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalebone</td>
<td>7579</td>
<td>7047</td>
<td>7758</td>
<td>7578</td>
<td>44100a</td>
<td>4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Black Oil</td>
<td>19665</td>
<td>12572</td>
<td>24925</td>
<td>28182</td>
<td>37675</td>
<td>20109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sperm Oil</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>9539</td>
<td>4062</td>
<td>5623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>35547</td>
<td>32150</td>
<td>40967</td>
<td>54003</td>
<td>10141</td>
<td>53427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. This figure seems to be extraordinarily high and may have been a copy clerk's error. Data from other sources suggests that the figure should have read £14,100. If this was the case then the amended total for 1839 would be £121,141.

(Source: NSW: Colonial Secretary: Returns of the Colony, 1835-1840.)
## APPENDIX 14

VESSELS WHICH APPEAR TO HAVE TAKEN SPARS FROM NEW ZEALAND TO GREAT BRITAIN, 1829-1839, TOGETHER WITH AN INDICATION OF THE PLACES WHERE THE SPARS WERE LOADED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>SPARS LOADED AT</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>S.G., 4 June 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Roslyn Castle</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 4 June 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 25 April 1829; Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 25 April 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829-1830</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 27 March 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1833</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>S.G., 28 May 1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.H., 14 March 1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>HMS Buffalo</td>
<td>Mahurangi/Whangaroa</td>
<td>S.H., 28 September 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>S.H., 16 January 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Derwent</td>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>S.H., 6 February 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Bolina</td>
<td>Mercury Bay</td>
<td>S.H., 27 July 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Pyramus</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 14 October 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-1838</td>
<td>Earl Durham</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 24, 31 August 1837, 13 January 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Achilles</td>
<td>Mercury Bay/Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 24, 31 August 1837, 16 January 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>John Barry</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td>S.G., 13 October, 3 November 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>HMS Buffalo</td>
<td>Tutukaka/Nunguru/Thames</td>
<td>S.G.T.L., 2 November 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Francis Spaight</td>
<td>Hokianga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 15

VESSELS WHICH APPEAR TO HAVE TAKEN NEW ZEALAND SPARS TO DESTINATIONS OTHER THAN GREAT BRITAIN OR THE COLONIES, 1835-1839

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Draco</td>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>S.H., 15 October 1834: Owens&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>S.H., 2 July, 15 October 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.H., 30 June 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Lord Goderich</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro, thence to London</td>
<td>1838 Report&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Tokerau</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>S.H., 30 July 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.G., 31 July 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Vanguard</td>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>S.H., 14 December 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>S.H., 12 December 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Patriot</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>S.H., 15 October 1838, 15 May 1839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


APPENDIX 16

VESSELS WHICH TOOK NEW ZEALAND TIMBER TO DESTINATIONS OTHER THAN THE COLONIES, 1832-1836.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Sir George Murray</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>S.H., 31 July, 2 August 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Tranmere</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>S.H., 5 May 1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Bolina</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>S.G., 4 November 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Fortitude</td>
<td>Tahiti</td>
<td>S.G., 7 January 1836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 17

NUMBERS OF VESSELS ENTERING COLONIAL PORTS WITH CARGOES OF NEW ZEALAND TIMBERS, ANNUALLY, 1828 - 1839

Source: See Note to Appendices 17 and 18.
APPENDIX I8

NUMBERS OF VESSELS ENTERING COLONIAL PORTS WITH CARGOES OF NEW ZEALAND TIMBERS, MONTHLY, 1828 - 1839

1828

- New South Wales - Sydney
- Van Diemen's Land - Hobart
- Van Diemen's Land - Launceston

1834

- South Australia - Adelaide
- New South Wales [Victoria] - Port Phillip
NOTE TO APPENDICES 17 AND 18

There is a relative lack of statistical information about the timber trade and what exists is often conflicting. For example, in Appendix 4 the total from CUST 6 for the value of timber imports into New South Wales for 1836 is 51 percent less than the figure extracted from the annual totals in the 'Returns'. However the figure for 1838 from CUST 6 exceeds the other by 74 percent. It is not possible to reconcile these differences.

There is also a problem in attempting to assess the volume of timber that was imported into the colonies. This arises from a lack of standardization in the measures cited in contemporary descriptions. For instance the term 'spar' was used to refer to woods of widely varying lengths and widths, while even the most common basic denominator, 'feet', was not clearly defined in the sources as either cubic feet or superficial (square) feet. There also appears to be no way to reduce the variety of terms such as 'spars', 'rickers', 'deals', 'battens', 'oars', 'logs', 'boards', 'loads' and 'pieces' to a common measure which would allow the sort of analysis that is possible for flax cargoes.

Instead it has been necessary to enumerate all the known cargoes of New Zealand timber imported into the colonies whether the quantity in the cargo was known or not. Appendix 17 represents the annual totals of cargoes while Appendix 18 is a monthly breakdown of the same cargoes. These Appendices represent only the number of entries by vessels carrying New Zealand timbers which came directly from that country. Some New Zealand timbers also appear to have entered various colonial ports after being trans-shipped or off-loaded at another colony. Thus, for instance, of the £3650 worth of New Zealand timber imported into New South Wales 6 January 1832-5 January 1833, £181 worth (2.7 percent) was transhipped to 'other British colonies' by which, it is assumed, the customs officials meant other colonies on the Australian continent.1 Certainly in 1831 the Argo and the Resolution (which had not been to New Zealand) both took New Zealand pine in their cargoes from Sydney and unloaded it at Hobart and Launceston respectively.2 Similarly in 1833 Launceston's imports of New Zealand timbers were valued at £1200.3 However only one cargo appears to have been entered there directly from New Zealand - that of 40,000 feet aboard the Fortitude in May. 4

1. S.G., 31 January 1833
2. H.T.C., 10 December 1831; L.A., 26 October 1831.
Unless this cargo was understated in size or was of exceptionally fine quality (valued at over 7d per foot) then probably over half Launceston's imports of New Zealand timbers in 1833 (calculated at 2d per foot) came indirectly from New Zealand.

While these figures may not represent all the timbers or all the cargoes of New Zealand woods entered into colonial ports they do provide a reasonable basis for a discussion of importing trends.

Sources

These graphs were constructed from data gathered from many sources. Because much of the information was conflicting it was subjected to a variety of checks and cross-checks. Therefore each figure on the graphs has more than one origin.

The Sydney totals were drawn mainly from newspaper sources - Sydney Gazette, Sydney Herald, Sydney General Trade List - with information also from the Colonial Secretary's shipping papers, for example the Harbour Master's Daily Reports. For Hobart most information was derived from the Customs and Marine Board papers with supplementary data from newspapers such as the Hobart Town Courier. Launceston, Port Phillip and Adelaide figures came primarily from the newspapers published in each port - namely, Launceston Advertiser, Cornwall Chronicle, Port Phillip Gazette and South Australian Gazette.
APPENDIX 19

RANULPH DACRE

Ranulph Dacre (1797-1884), master mariner, adventurer and merchant, was an important figure in the New Zealand timber trade before 1840. Dacre arrived in New South Wales in 1823. From 1824 to 1831, as master of several vessels, he made trading voyages throughout the Pacific and around the coasts of eastern Australian and New Zealand. He was particularly well known to the Maoris of Whangaroa from whom he purchased timber in the mid-1820s. In 1831 he settled down in Sydney and married.

The same year Roberts Brooks & Co of London contracted with Dacre for him to oversee the felling of their Admiralty contract for 100 New Zealand spars. This involved Dacre in several visits to New Zealand for, at times, he personally supervised the loading of the timbers. In the course of filling this contract Dacre sponsored the setting up of stations at Mangonui Harbour, Mahurangi Bay and Mercury Bay and, as well, he personally explored the Kaipara Harbour while in command of the Surrey in 1832.

From 1835 to 1838 Dacre was joined in partnership by another Sydney merchant, William Wilkes, and by 1840 Dacre was regarded as one of the leading merchants in New South Wales. He owned his own wharf, was a director of several companies, the owner of many vessels, and had been appointed as a magistrate. From that year, too, the insanity of his New Zealand agent, Gordon Davies Browne, forced Dacre to become more closely involved in the running of the Mercury Bay station.

- Dacre was declared insolvent during the New South Wales depression of 1842-4 and in 1844 he moved to Auckland, New Zealand. During the next fifteen years he established himself as a leading merchant and shipowner in Auckland and he personally commanded several voyages between New Zealand and Sydney. These voyages involved him in a variety of commercial ventures including trading sandalwood, exporting cattle and sheep, and, as well, in an unsuccessful attempt
to supply New Zealand greenstone to the China market. In 1854 he formed a partnership with another leading Auckland merchant, Thomas Macky.

Dacre left the sea in 1859 and, with his wife and seven children, settled in Auckland. He is remembered as a notable merchant, shipowner and philanthropist. In 1878 he and his wife left New Zealand for Britain where Dacre died in 1884.

Ranulph Dacre's contribution to the exploration of New Zealand harbours and to the development of the timber trade in the 1820s and 1830s was great. He was responsible not only for the exporting of large cargoes of the timbers to New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and Great Britain but also for establishing several of the major timber exporting stations around the coasts of New Zealand.

## APPENDIX 20

**CENSUS OF THE EUROPEAN ADULT MALE POPULATION OF NEW ZEALAND, 1836, 1838, 1839.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT a</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1836 (February)</th>
<th>1836 (June-August)</th>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>(228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>161+29&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total North Island</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Island</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>180&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chatham &amp; Stewart Islands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a. District 1: North Cape to Whangaroa  
   District 2: Whangaroa  
   District 3: Bay of Islands  
   District 4: Hokianga  
   District 5: 'all places south of the Bay of Islands and Hokianga'

b. This was a very low estimate - see P. Adams, Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand, 1830-1847, Auckland, 1977, pp.27-8.


d. These were 'sailors' on New Zealand owned vessels whom Busby listed amongst the figures for District 5.

(Source: Busby Census, J. Busby, Despatches of the British Resident in New Zealand 1833-40, (WTu, qMS BUS).)
APPENDIX 21

CENSUS OF EUROPEAN ADULT FEMALES (F), EUROPEAN CHILDREN UNDER 12 YEARS (C) AND HALF-CASTE CHILDREN LIVING IN EUROPEAN HOUSEHOLDS (H) IN THE NORTH ISLAND OF NEW ZEALAND, 1836, 1838, 1839, WITH TOTALS INCLUSIVE OF EUROPEAN ADULT MALES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1836 (February)</th>
<th>1836 (June-August)</th>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>(494)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>(162)</td>
<td>(185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CENSUS TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Sum District Totals)</strong></td>
<td><strong>568</strong></td>
<td><strong>799</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) District

\(^b\) Total

\(^c\) Sum

\(^d\) Total
a. District 1: North Cape to Whangaroa
   District 2: Whangaroa
   District 3: Bay of Islands
   District 4: Hokianga
   District 5: 'all places south of the Bay of Islands and Hokianga'.

b. Half-caste children were not enumerated in this census and are not included in the District 4 total of 162, but they probably numbered 30-40.

c. In the Colonist, 17 October 1838, the European population of the Hokianga was reported as being 192. Also, William White claimed, in 1839, that 170 Europeans lived there - [W.White], Important Information Relative to New Zealand ..., Sydney, 1839, p. 5.

d. In July 1840 John Blackett, who was in New Zealand from March 1839 to February 1840 and who stayed with Busby, stated that the Resident had taken a census 'upwards of a year' before and had enumerated 1100 'whites' living 'north of Thames' - Blackett, evidence, Report from the Select Committee on New Zealand; together with the Minutes of Evidence ..., G.B.P.P., 1840, VII. (582), p. 69.

(Source: Busby Census, J. Busby, Despatches of the British Resident in New Zealand 1833-1840, (WTu, qMS BUS).)
Busby stated that the figures for 1 February 1836 were his estimation of the size of the European population. However the figures for the second census of 1836 were compiled in the format of a list of the names of every male head of a family, his occupation, his whereabouts within the district and the composition of his household. The information appears to have been collected over a number of months. Totals for Districts 1 and 2 were dated 6 June and 5 June respectively. Other totals are not dated. However District 5 must have been tallied during July 1836 for according to the figures both Mangapouri and Te Papa mission stations were closed while the Rotorua station at Te Koutu was listed as open. It cannot be ascertained when the Hokianga figures were compiled but the Bay of Islands census was not compiled until after 17 August 1836 because Henry Abbott Mair, who was born on that day, was included in these figures. The 1838 figures for the Hokianga were supplied to Busby by G.F. Russell in June 1838. The 1839 census was compiled with less care than that of June-August 1836. Busby merely made additions or amendments to the 1836 data to indicate the new information. In doing so he invented a code which he did not apply consistently and neither did he provide an adequate key to enable a researcher to decipher the code. Therefore the figures for 1839 are bracketed in Appendices 20 and 21 as an indication of the tentativeness of the data. These figures include all the persons Busby listed in each district for 1836 together with those households he added to the lists in 1839 (Busby does not appear to have amended the 1836 data for District 5) and do not take account of any changes, through deaths or departures from New Zealand, in the 1836 population. The 1839 data, for the Bay of Islands at least, were compiled before 16 November that year because Busby's fourth child born that day was not included in the census.

1. He sent part of this summary to the Colonial Secretary in New South Wales - Busby to Colonial Secretary, 26 January 1836, CO209/2, f.154a.
2. For example, of the missionaries who were previously at these stations the Rev. James Stack was listed as residing at the Bay of Islands and not at Mangapouri and the Rev. J.A. Wilson was listed in residence at Puriri Station.
3. It was closed on 8 August 1836 - J.A. Wilson, The Story of Te Waharaoa, 2nd ed., Christchurch, 1906, p.113.
### OCCUPATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN ADULT MALES RESIDENT IN THE NORTH ISLAND OF NEW ZEALAND, 1836, 1838

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
<th>DISTRICT 1 1836</th>
<th>DISTRICT 2 1836</th>
<th>DISTRICT 3 1836</th>
<th>DISTRICT 4 1836</th>
<th>DISTRICT 5 1836</th>
<th>TOTALS 1836</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
<td>No. % of District Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader</td>
<td>4 33</td>
<td>7 20.5</td>
<td>21 13.6</td>
<td>15 16.1</td>
<td>16 20</td>
<td>13 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary/Mission Employee</td>
<td>2 16</td>
<td>30 19.5</td>
<td>4 4.3</td>
<td>7 8.75</td>
<td>12 7.5</td>
<td>48 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>6 50</td>
<td>16 47</td>
<td>11 7</td>
<td>8 8.6</td>
<td>38 47.5</td>
<td>4 1 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>7 20.5</td>
<td>20 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 12.5</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td>28 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groggeller</td>
<td>20 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>11 7</td>
<td>4 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat-Builder</td>
<td>2 1.3</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td>8 5</td>
<td>11 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>5 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>4 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>7 4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 8.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>4 2.6</td>
<td>5 5.4</td>
<td>6 7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>6 3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Resident</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master CMS Vessel</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailmaker</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.25</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>55 59</td>
<td>58 36</td>
<td>113 23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. As for Appendix 20

b. The sailors on New Zealand owned vessels were listed amongst the figures for District 5.

(Source: Busby Census, J. Busby, Despatches of the British Resident in New Zealand 1833-40, (WLU, QMS BUS).)
NOTE TO APPENDIX 22

Because of the problems in the 1839 data, which were explained in the note to Appendices 20 and 21, and because there are large gaps in the information about occupations in that census, only the information from the second 1836 census and the 1838 census of the Hokianga has been summarized in Appendix 22.

Busby's description of each man's employment was followed in compiling the table. However the distinctions he made were not always clear. He occasionally linked the designation 'grogseller' with another occupation such as 'trader' or 'blacksmith'. Such an individual was entered here as a grogseller, and the artisans attached to the mission stations were enumerated as 'mission employees'.

In discussing these figures and assessing their relevance to the study of the timber and flax trade it is also necessary to explain that in many respects the picture for 1836 is distorted. The totals for Districts 4 and 5 of 55 and 58 males, respectively, in unspecified occupations has a significant influence on the total percentages because they comprised 23.4 percent of the total males enumerated. If, in combination with the 1836 figures for Districts 1-3, G.F Russell's census figures for the Hokianga are used, and if it is assumed that 36 of the males in unspecified occupations in District 5 (described by Busby as 8 at Gordon Browne's establishment for processing spars at Coromandel and 28 on his establishment at Mercury Bay) were timbermen, then the percentage of males whose occupations were directly related to the timber trade (i.e. sawyers and carpenters) comprised 31 percent of the total male adult population of the North Island of New Zealand in the mid-1830s.
APPENDIX 23
EXAMPLES OF BARGAINS STRUCK BETWEEN MAORIS AND EUROPEAN TRADERS FOR PURCHASES OF SPARS AND FLAX, 1814-1834

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE AND DATE</th>
<th>EUROPEAN GOODS</th>
<th>SPARS/FLAX RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Islands 1814</td>
<td>1 axe (value 10s)</td>
<td>3 spars (value £8)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Islands 1814</td>
<td>5 axes &amp; 3 hoes</td>
<td>16 spars (probably kahikatea)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Islands 1815</td>
<td>1 musket</td>
<td>1 ton of flax offered³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Islands 1820</td>
<td>1 axe</td>
<td>1 spar (kahikatea)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames 1826</td>
<td>1 musket or equal powder</td>
<td>20 spars⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maketū (?) 1830s</td>
<td>1 musket</td>
<td>8 cwt flax⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaroa 1834</td>
<td>2 blankets, 2 muskets, bayonet, scabbard and cartouche box, 20 lb powder, 18 musket balls, a few fish hooks, pipes and 4 lb tobacco</td>
<td>1 spar⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Simeon Lord, Trading Agreements Concerning Flax between Maori Chieftains at the Bay of Islands and Simeon Lord, 1815, (NPL/M, Ah 47; WTu, MSS 1815P).
5. G. Bayly, Sea-Life Sixty Years Ago, London, 1885, p. 126. This can be compared to the 36 lb of gunpowder (value about £3.10s) that D'Urville gave to a European Sawyer in the Bay of Islands for 360 ft of kauri wood planks in 1827 - O. Wright, comp., New Zealand 1826-1827, Wellington, 1950, p. 200.
7. R. Hodgskin, A Narrative of Eight Months' Sojourn in New Zealand ..., Coleraine, 1841, p. 15.
GLOSSARY

Because some of the quantities in these data are now obsolete, or at least unfamiliar, the following list will assist in forming some appreciation of the volume of exports to New Zealand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bale</td>
<td>10 short reams paper, 2½ cwt wool, 3-4 cwt yarn, 500 lb, also a non-standard measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel</td>
<td>36 gallons ale or beer, 230 lb butter, 100 lb gunpowder, 26.2 imperial gallons, 31½ gallons wine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>roll of cloth, the size depending on the nature of the cloth (e.g. 40 yards cotton, 70 yards wool).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>120-480 hoops, 2 reams paper, otherwise a non-standard measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushel</td>
<td>56/63 avoirdupois lb, 64 pints (dry).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>196 lb, 25 muskets, occasionally a superficial measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cask</td>
<td>72-84 lb butter, 2 cwt wheat flour, 672 lb weight, 110 gallons cider, 300 lb spices, 224 lb tobacco, 8-11 cwt sugar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundredweight (cwt)</td>
<td>100, 108, 112, 120 lb. Usually 112 lb in imperial measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>12-26 gallons oil, 52 lb wheat, 100 lb ginger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keg</td>
<td>10 gallons (sometimes less), 1 cwt nails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack</td>
<td>10 measures cloth, 240 lb flax or wool, 4 cwt yarn, 280 lb meal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>301 lb (usually a measure of ballast).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>12 bushels, peas, 16 bushels, salt, 108 imperial gallons beer or ale, 120 imperial gallons cider, 126 imperial gallons oil or wine. A pipe is sometimes called a butt and in wine measure equals a ½ tun. A half-pipe of wine is a hogshead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound (lb)</td>
<td>16 ounces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puncheon</td>
<td>72 gallons beer, 84 gallons wine, sometimes also soap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>60 skins of parchment. Sometimes means a piece, 30 square feet, in cloth measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skíh</td>
<td>3 cwt cinnamon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierce</td>
<td>42 gallons oil or wine, 320 lb dry measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>20 cwt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tub</td>
<td>84 avoirdupois lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tun</td>
<td>252 imperial gallons wine or oil, 259 gallons ale or beer, occasionally 208, 240, 250, 303 gallons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>OUTWARDS CARGO</th>
<th>INWARDS CARGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(together with known calls in New Zealand)</td>
<td>(and consignees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUSIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829 (Kapiti)</td>
<td>4 cases muskets, 1 barrel gunpowder,</td>
<td>40 tons flax, 5 tons potatoes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 package gunflints, 6 grindstones,</td>
<td>1 bundle mats, 1 bundle spears –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 axes, 12 iron pots, 1 pig lead,</td>
<td>Crombie, McLaren &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 piece woolen cloth, 1 punccheon run,</td>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 20 August 1829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 baskets tobacco, 1 box tobacco pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>4 cases, 30 muskets, 3 casks gunpowder,</td>
<td>35 tons flax, 1 ton potatoes, 5 casks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bag shot, 24 iron pots, 36 axes,</td>
<td>pork, 3 bundles mats, 2 bundles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 pig lead, 1 ton salt, 1 punccheon run</td>
<td>spears – Crombie, McLaren &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 22 October 1829)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 15 January 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENCY LASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Cook Strait)</td>
<td>5 barrels gunpowder, 4 cases muskets,</td>
<td>80 tons flax – H. Donnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bag bullets, 12 iron pots, 2 dozen axes,</td>
<td>(S.G., 10 February 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 package bolts, 1 case knives,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ton flour, 1 ton salt, 4 casks beef,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cask brandy, 1 keg tobacco, stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 23 November 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIZABETH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Kapiti, Hokianga)</td>
<td>2 cases muskets, 5 barrels gunpowder</td>
<td>35 tons flax – Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; stores</td>
<td>(S.G., 27 July 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIZABETH &amp; MARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Cook Strait)</td>
<td>4 cases muskets, 2 casks gunpowder</td>
<td>31 tons flax – P. Cavenagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 19 February 1830)</td>
<td>(S.G., 3 August 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dona Kemp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>3 cases muskets, 16 kegs gunpowder,</td>
<td>10 tons flax – F. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cask musket balls, 1 box window glass,</td>
<td>(S.G., 10 May 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ton salt, 1 bale slops,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cask vinegar, 24 pairs blankets,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 lbs flour &amp; bread, 1 punccheon run, 5 kegs tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 21 December 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MADEIRA PACKET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>2 casks flour, 14 bags biscuit,</td>
<td>23 tons flax, 3 tons pork,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 casks pork, 1 chest tea, 1 cask sugar, 11 kegs gunpowder,</td>
<td>40 live pigs &amp; sundry returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 cases muskets, 1 bale slops, 1 cask rum,</td>
<td>stores – Thos Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 baskets tobacco</td>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 14 May 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 5 February 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ZEALANDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>9 cases muskets, 20 half-barrels</td>
<td>24 tons flax – R. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gunpowder, 2 cases tobacco pipes,</td>
<td>(S.G., 28 December 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 piece sheet lead &amp; stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 19 October 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORVAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Cook Strait)</td>
<td>3 barrels gunpowder, 500 flints,</td>
<td>110 tons black oil, 10 tons flax,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 lbs balls, 18 powder flasks,</td>
<td>6 tons whalebone, 20 empty casks –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 cases muskets, 20 tong casks,</td>
<td>J. McLaren &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hhd brandy &amp; stores</td>
<td>(S.G., 9 November 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 17 August 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCE OF DENMARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Bay of Islands, Tauranga?)</td>
<td>11 cases muskets, 17 barrels powder,</td>
<td>25 tons flax, 3000 ft plank –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 bags salt, 3 bags rice, 3 bags sugar, 2 cases soap, 1 bale slops,</td>
<td>J. McLaren &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cask vinegar, 6 bags nails, 1 hhd brandy, 2 puncheons rum, 4 kegs tobacco &amp; stores</td>
<td>(S.G., 5 April 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 19 October 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANMERE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 (Cook Strait)</td>
<td>5 cases muskets, 21 casks 1 keg</td>
<td>17 tons flax –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gunpowder, 1 box tobacco pipes,</td>
<td>(S.G., 26 June 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 case ironmongery, 1 rein cartridge paper, 1 bale slops, 6 iron pots,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pigs lead, 1 keg tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G.T.L., 6 May 1830)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARGO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Whaling supplies, 9 hhd flour, 2 pipes brandy, 3 kegs</td>
<td>40 tons flax – A. Mossman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hhd rum, 2 pipes brandy, 3 kegs</td>
<td>14 tons flax – JohnBilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 baskets tobacco, 3 cases muskets,</td>
<td>(S.G., 29 September 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 kegs gunpowder, 1 cask ale, 3 mats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>super, 1 bale blankets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 3 May 1831)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENCY LASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>6 cases muskets, 20 kegs gunpowder,</td>
<td>28 tons flax, 30 spars –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 cases hardware, 1 case tinware,</td>
<td>H. Donnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 kon tobacco &amp; stores</td>
<td>(S.G., 29 November 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.G., 6 September 1831)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENCY LASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831 (Nga Hotu)</td>
<td>1 case muskets, 10 barrels gunpowder,</td>
<td>17 tons flax – H. Donnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cask flints, 1 box pipes, 1 cask</td>
<td>(S.G., 21 February 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hardware, 1 bundle slops, 1 punccheon run, 2 kegs tobacco &amp; stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darling 1831
(Mahia coastal cruise)
4 bales woollens, 1 box leather, 9 cases muskets, 3 casks ironmongery, 1 case hardware, 1 box oil, 22 casks powder, 1 box colonial pipes, 1 punchoon run, 5 baskets tobacco & stores (S.G., 15 February 1831)

Dart 1831
1 keg gunpowder, 3 kegs tobacco, 1 punchoon whiskey & stores (S.G., 25 October 1831)

Fame 1831
6 cases muskets, 20 cases gunpowder, 2 bales slops, 6 boxes tea, 6 bags sugar, 2 cases tobacco pipes, 1 punchoon run, 2 skins tobacco & stores (S.G., 14 June 1831)

Lord Liverpool 1831
(Rawhia)
13 cases muskets, 1 case cartouche boxes, 62 casks gunpowder, 1 keg pig lead, 1 package lead, 1 bundle leather, 1 bale slops, 1 case calico prints, 3 barrels flour, 2 mats sugar, 1 chest tea, 1 case hardware, 1 punchoon rum, 1 punchoon whiskey, 1 pipe 3 hdds brandy, 1 hhd 3 cases gin, 1 hhd tobacco (S.G., 4 October 1831)

Prince of Denmark 1831
1 hhd brandy, 5 kegs tobacco, 4 boxes tobacco pipes, 100 iron pots, 4 cases hardware, 6 cases muskets, 24 casks gunpowder, 3 cases, 2 bales slops & stores (S.G., 16 August 1831)

Sydney Packet 1831
8 boxes tobacco pipes, 19 casks powder, 1 case flints, 20 muskets, 1 sheet lead, 20 cartouche boxes, 1 crate ironmongery, 1 cask hardware, 1 bale blankets, 1 bale shirtings, 2 guns & stores, 1 bale flannel (S.G., 25 October 1831)

Alexander 1832
8 boxes tobacco pipes, 19 casks powder, 1 case flints, 20 muskets, 1 sheet lead, 20 cartouche boxes, 1 crate ironmongery, 1 cask hardware, 1 bale blankets, 1 bale shirtings, 2 guns & stores, 1 bale flannel (S.G., 5 June 1832)

Prince of Denmark 1832
4 boxes tobacco pipes, 1 bale slops, 1 bale blankets, 1 case ironmongery, 3 kegs tobacco, 1 hhd rum & stores (S.G., 8 May 1832)

Friendship 1833
(Hokianga)
2 cases muskets, 24 cartouche boxes, 1 bale bags, 4 casks gunpowder, 1000 flints, 1 case pipes, 6 kegs colonial tobacco, 2 casks run & stores (S.G., 26 March 1833)

Lord Byron 1833
(West Coast)
51 kegs gunpowder, 7 cases muskets, 3 rolls lead, 9 casks hardware, 3 bags salt, 3 cases pipes, 3 bags flour, 1 bag sugar, 5 punchoons 2 hdds run, 5 kegs tobacco & stores (S.G., 1 October 1833)

Bardaster 1834
(Tolaga Bay and tour of North Island flax stations)
16 casks brandy, 1 cask 7 cases gin, 59 kegs 1 skins tobacco, 5 cases 4 casks wine, 2 hdds porter, 1 cask 54 bags sugar, 9 chests 6 boxes tea, 14 bays rice, 1 cask 8 bags salt, 4 cases soap, 1 case candles, 5 barrels 79 kegs gunpowder, 4 kegs bales, 5 casks pitch, 48 coils rope, 3 cases muskets, 10 bales blankets, 1 case beeds, 1 case flints, 1 case shoes, 1 keg leather, 2 cases apparel, 2 crates saddlery, 2 bales hats, 7 cases 2 cases 5 bales slops, 3 cases books, 4 cases pipes, 100 iron pots, 100 axes, 1 anvil, 1 washing machine, 2 anchors, 39 pickaxes hardware & ironmongery, 1 cask cutlery, 25 bundles blank iron, 1 case alons, 1 case seeds, 2 casks herrings & stores, 1 cask whiting (S.G., 4 August 1834)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortitude</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>2 casks rum, 3 casks brandy, 30 cases gin, 15 cases tobacco, 9 mats sugar, 5 chests tea, 5 boxes candles, 7 boxes soap, 9 cases beer, 15 cases tar, 3 cases pitch, 8 keys paint, 6 jars oil, 3 bales blankets, 3 cases pipes, 2 bundles twine, 12 bolts canvas, 1 bale slops, 2000 bricks &amp; stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlequin</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1 punccheon run, 5 keys tobacco, 9 casks gunpowder, 1 case pipes, 1 case 1 bale slops, 2 cases hardware &amp; stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>11 packages ironmongery, 2 bales slops, 1 half Blanket, 6 cases ale, 5 chests tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1 cask ironmongery, 1 bale blankets, 2 cases ale, 1 cask haberdashery, 1 chest tea, 4 hds. run, 1 tierce tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1 bale blankets, 1 case muskets, 1 case hardware, 1 cask rice, 2 pipes tobacco, 3 kegs tobacco &amp; stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>30 kegs gunpowder, 2 cases muskets, 1 case ironmongery, 3 cases tobacco-pipes, 1 case stationery, 1 case medicine, 1 cask tobacco &amp; stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Laing</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>3 cases muskets, 2 hds. porter, 1 cask wine, 1 cask sugar, 30 iron pots, 5 barrels flour, 12 bags rice, 5 bags sugar, 5 jars paint oil, 1 jar turpentine, 4 boxes soap, 1 keg white lead, 1 cask cheese, 3 bags biscuits, 1 keg shot, 3 bales slops, 2 dozen shovels, 19 kegs gunpowder, 11 cases groceries, 2 casks earthenware, 4 bales blankets, 1 tub 16 bundles spades, 1 cask slops, 1 cask ironmongery, 2 casks fowling-pieces, 1 coil rope &amp; stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilles</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>3 cases clocks, 4 tierces 40 baskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 kegs tobacco, 2 casks porter, 6 casks 16 mats sugar, 4 cases apparel, 2 cases groceries, 19 sheep, 3 cases books, 31 packages hardware, 20 packages furniture, 4 punccheons 18 casks run, 60 barrels flour, 2 cases hatches, 5 boxes pipes, 50 boxes soap, 12 barrels vinegar, 2 casks earthenware, 15 bags 5 cases rice, 40 casks wine, 5 tons bread, 59 packages gunpowder, 1 hhd brandy, 5 casks salt, 2 bales 2 casks 2 packages slops, 3 cases muskets, 2 casks sago, 1 cask currants, 2 chests 6 half-chests 5 packages tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1 ton flour, 3 bags sugar, 3 bags salt, 1 tierce beef, 8 bags bread, 4 dozen iron pots, 1 case axes, 1 case muskets, 3 boxes tobacco, 4 hds. gin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlequin</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>60 tierces salt, 32 kegs gunpowder, 3 cases ironmongery, 1 barrel gin, 9 kegs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cargo Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil Packet</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>2 cases ironmongery, 12 bags nails, 1 bale slippers, 1 case apron, 1 bale blankets, 5 casks flour, 4000 bricks, 7 bags sugar, 3 chests tea, 2 cases wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlequin</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>16 casks ironmongery, 4 casks hardware, 2 bales blankets, 30 tons oil casks, 8 casks slops, 4 cwt lead, 4 ton iron hooping, 5 boxes pipes, 60 casks gunpowder, 2 cases muskets, 3 chests tea, 4 bags 2 casks sugar, 1 cask cheese, 1 box soap, 2 hods flour, 1 puncheon 4 hods rum, 15 cases 1 cask gin, 5 hods brandy, 15 casks tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>68 tierces salt, 4 cases pipes, 20 casks gunpowder, 150 iron pots, 2 casks ironmongery, 1 bale blankets, 20 bundles spades, 15 tons casks, 2 bales slops, 8 casks tobacco, 5 casks brandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1 cask ale, 1 cask ironmongery, 1 package collars, 2 cases books, 1 package hats, 2 pipes wine, 4 pipes wine, 8 quarter-pipes wine, 14 cases Geneva, 2 casks wine, 1 hods brandy, 1 tierce tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>3 casks 13 bags sugar, 1 cask 1 case oatmeal, 6 half-chests tea, 20 boxes soap, 14 bags 31 casks salt, 1 cask medicine, 1 cask barley, 1 bag hops, 1 bag malt, 1 case wine, 1 case currants, 1 case crockery, 2 cases haberdashery, 1 case books, 5 casks earthenware, 2 ploughs, 15 cases apparel, 1 seraphine, 1 case books, 1 cask axles, 1 package tent poles, 1 case furniture, 1 case iron bolts, 2 cases clover seeds, 1 case slates, 1 cases 1 keg ironmongery, 4 cases 1 package 1 cask hardware, 1 hods saddlery, 2 puncheons turnery, 4 casks nails, 2 kegs potash, 6 cans turpentine, 1 cask spern candles, 2 cases stationery, 5 cases hats, 2 harrows, 2 boulds handkerchiefs, 20 bags bread, 5 tierces 37 casks 6 boxes tobacco, 2 barrels 1 case brandy, 2 pipes arrack, 4 hods rum, 4 bales 1 case slops, 1 bale blankets, 10 bags flour, 55 cases gin, 10 boxes pipes, 8 bundles spades, 28 shooks, 40 barrels gunpowder, 43 packages baggage, 80 boxes soap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S.G.T.L., 25 May 1839)
The cargoes have been selected in the following way. A total of 145 cargo manifests taken from data relating to New South Wales were listed in alphabetical order for each of the years 1829-1839. A 25 percent (36 item) sample was decided upon. It was chosen by using random numbers and counting down the lists until 36 cargoes had been selected. Four timber cargoes entered into Launceston have been added to allow for a brief comparison between the cargoes from the two ports.

However there are difficulties in attempting to use descriptions of export cargoes as a measure of what Maoris received for their wood and fibre. To begin with there is no way of determining which items among the wide selection of goods in the outwards cargoes were those which were exchanged for the timber and flax in the return cargo. Neither can it be shown that any of the products in the export cargoes had been used to acquire the particular timber or flax the vessel took to Sydney or Hobart. Instead the goods may have been used to restock a resident agent's or a whaling station's store, while the timber or flax had been previously purchased in exchange for quite different goods. Nor are the shipping records entirely reliable. For example the declarations of returned goods to be found amongst the inwards cargoes of the Achilles 1837, the Fortitude 1834 and the Socrates 1834, included goods which were not declared in the published manifests when the vessels left for New Zealand.

There are other qualifications to be borne in mind when using these data. Because the conduct of the trade required prolonged contact and co-operation between Maoris and Europeans it also gave Maoris opportunities to get European goods by methods other than the exchanging of wood and fibre. For example Maoris' thieving and begging for gifts were everyday occurrences while vessels lay in New Zealand, according to European narratives and commentaries. Also visiting traders, because of the duration of their stay and because they necessarily had to engage Maoris to help them find, collect and load these products, provided European goods to Maoris in return for services, for food and for prostitutes.
FREQUENCY OF APPEARANCE OF SELECTED ITEMS AMONGST THE OUTWARDS CARGOES OF VESSELS IN THE SAMPLE\(^1\) OF VESSELS ENGAGED IN THE TIMBER AND FLAX TRADE, 1829-1839.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1829</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1833</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms/Ammunition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Pots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes (Tobacco)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools/Ironmongery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL ANNUAL CARGOES | 2    | 9    | 9    | 2    | 2    | 5    |

1. Appendix 24.
### APPENDIX 26

**BRITISH AND BRITISH COLONIAL VESSELS WHICH VISITED NEW ZEALAND ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, 1793-1840.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE ON COAST</th>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>MASTER</th>
<th>OBJECT OF VISIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1793 January</td>
<td>HMS Daedalus</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Collect Maoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793 August</td>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td>Raven</td>
<td>Returning Tukitahua &amp; Ngahuru-huru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793 October</td>
<td>HMC Sloop Francis</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>To Dusky Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804 June</td>
<td>HMC Brig Lady Nelson</td>
<td>Symonds</td>
<td>Return Te Pahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806 April-May</td>
<td>HMC Brig Lady Nelson</td>
<td>Symonds</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Feb-Dec</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Promedary</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 May</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Coromandel</td>
<td>Downie</td>
<td>Escort duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 June</td>
<td>HMC Schooner Prince Regent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822 November</td>
<td>HMC Brig Snapper</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Flax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 April</td>
<td>HMC Satellite</td>
<td>Currie</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 May-Aug</td>
<td>HMC Cutter Mermaid</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Flax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825 March</td>
<td>HMC Brig Elizabeth Henrietta</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 Feb-March</td>
<td>HMC Tees</td>
<td>Coe</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 Apr-June</td>
<td>HMC Tees</td>
<td>Coe</td>
<td>Salvage of Elizabeth Henrietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 June</td>
<td>HMC Cutter Mermaid</td>
<td>Penston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826 February</td>
<td>HMC Larn</td>
<td>Kingcombe</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827 January</td>
<td>HMC Warpsite</td>
<td>Rous</td>
<td>Took Marsden to New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827 Mar-Apr</td>
<td>HMC Rainbow</td>
<td>Jervois</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828 February</td>
<td>HMC Pandora</td>
<td>Fisk</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828 May</td>
<td>HMC Schooner Isabella</td>
<td>Jervois</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829 Jan-Feb</td>
<td>HMC Satellite</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 May</td>
<td>HMC Crocodile</td>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>Took Archdeacon to New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831 November</td>
<td>HMC Zebra</td>
<td>de Saunarez</td>
<td>French scare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832 March</td>
<td>HMC Zebra</td>
<td>MacMurdo</td>
<td>Taranaki to protect traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832 November</td>
<td>HMC Challenger</td>
<td>Freemantle</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833 Feb-March</td>
<td>HMC Imogene</td>
<td>Blackwood</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833 May-June</td>
<td>HMC Imogene</td>
<td>Blackwood</td>
<td>Took Busby to New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833 June</td>
<td>HMC Brig Governor Phillip</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>After convicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833 August</td>
<td>HMC Schooner Isabella</td>
<td>Hansen/Kinghorn</td>
<td>After convicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833 November</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Buffalo</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 March</td>
<td>HMC Alligator</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>After convicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 Sept-Oct</td>
<td>HMC Alligator</td>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>Harriet rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 Sept-Oct</td>
<td>HMC Schooner Isabella</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td>Assist Alligator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835 March</td>
<td>HMC Hyacinth</td>
<td>Blackwood</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835 December</td>
<td>HMC Béaigle</td>
<td>FitzRoy</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836 June-July</td>
<td>HMC Zebra</td>
<td>McCrae</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836 Sept-Oct</td>
<td>HMC Brig Victor</td>
<td>Crozier</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 May-July</td>
<td>HMC Rattlesnake</td>
<td>Hobson</td>
<td>Offer protection to residents and shipping during Pomare-Titore war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 September</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Buffalo</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 October</td>
<td>HMC Brig Conway</td>
<td>Bethune</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 May-June</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Buffalo</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 July</td>
<td>HMC Brig Conway</td>
<td>Bethune</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 July-Sept</td>
<td>HMC Brig Pelorus</td>
<td>Chetwoode</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839 December</td>
<td>HMC Brig Pelorus</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Took Bishop to New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839 January</td>
<td>HMC James</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>After convicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 Jan-March</td>
<td>HMC Herald</td>
<td>Nias</td>
<td>Took Hobson to New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 Apr-July</td>
<td>HMC Store Ship Buffalo</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A: Official Papers

(1) Unpublished

GREAT BRITAIN

(Public Record Office files mainly on Australian Joint Copying Project microfilm.)

a) Admiralty and Secretariat:

Papers,
(ADM 1/4248, photocopy from Public Records Office)

Log Books, etc. Masters' Logs,
(ADM 52/3938, 4002, 4341-2)

Log Books, etc. Supplementary, Series I: Masters' Logs,
(ADM 54/33)

Log Books, etc. Supplementary, Series II: Explorations,
(ADM 55/38)

b) Board of Trade: In-Letters and Files, General, 1792-1840,
(BT 1: Australian Joint Copying Project, Reels 3056-3064)

c) Colonial Office:

New South Wales Original Correspondence to the Secretary of State, 1784-1841,

New South Wales Miscellanea, Blue Books and Statistical Returns, 1822-1841,
(CO206/63-82)

New Zealand Original Correspondence, 1830-1840,
(CO209/1-8)

Tasmania Miscellanea, Blue Books, 1822-1840,
(CO284/44-63)

Colonies General Original Correspondence, 1825-1845,

Colonies General Entry Books of Correspondence, Series I, 1818-1840,
(CO324/140-147)
d) Customs:
Imports into Colonies by Country, 1832-1841,
(CUST 6/1-10)
(Dr P.W.T. Adams supplied me with his notes taken from these volumes at the Public Records Office, London.)

e) Home Office:
Various: Correspondence and Papers, Departmental, Council Office,
(HO 31/4)

f) Privy Council:
Papers, Mainly Unbound,
(PC 1/3967, 4303)

g) Treasury:
In-Letters and Files, Treasury Board Papers,
(T1/746, 2361, 2389, 2830)

NEW SOUTH WALES
(Mainly in Archives Office of New South Wales)
a) Colonial Secretary:
(i) Correspondence
Letters Received, Indexes to Registers 1829-1840,
(2345, 2348, 2351, 2354, 2357, 2360, 2362, 2364, 2366, 2368, 2370, 2372, 2374, 2376, 2378, 2380, 2382, 2384)

Letters Received, Registers of Letters Received, 1829-1840,
(2346-7, 2349-50, 2352-3, 2355-6, 2358-9, 2361, 2363, 2365, 2367, 2369, 2371, 2373, 2375, 2377, 2379, 2381, 2383, 2385)

Register of Minutes and Memoranda Received, 1826-1841,
(4/1074-5)

Letters and Petitions Received, 1810, 1812, 1813, 1822,
(4/1723, 1727, 1728, 1753)

Letters Received, 1829, 1833,
(4/2020, 2199.2)

Letters Received, 1833-1840,
(Ar l in NPL/D)

Letters Received, Customs, 1832-1839,
(4/2190, 2235.2, 2272.5, 2315.2, 2357.2, 2398.3, 2446.2)
Letters Received, New Zealand, 1831-1842,
(4/2127.7, 2164.2, 2246.2, 2287.3, 2326.2, 2368.2,
2412.1, 2460.3, 2501, 2540, 2581.4)

Letters Received, Van Diemen's Land, 1833-1834,
(4/2218, 2265).

Copies of Letters Sent Within the Colony, 1822-1823,
(4/3505-7)

Copies of Letters Sent Outside the Colony, 'Foreign',
1831-1839,
(4/3523-4)

Copies of Letters to the Collector and Controller of
Customs and the Surveyor of Distilleries, 1827-1840,
(4/3695-7)

Copies of Letters Sent to Judicial Establishments,
the Sheriff and the Coroners, 8 September 1828-27
February 1830,
(4/3737)

Copies of Letters to the Master Attendant, Masters of
Ship, the Harbour Master and the Port Master, 1832-1834,
(4/3780)

Copies of Letters to Naval and Military Officers
1832-1839,
(4/3799-3801)

(ii) Other Papers

Returns of the Colony, 1822-1823, 1825-1841,
(4/251-273)

Naval Officers' Quarterly Reports, 1810-1824,
(X698-X701)

Ships Musters, 1816-1825,
(4/4771-5)

Sydney Harbour Masters' Daily Reports of Vessels
Arriving and Departing, 1826-1840,
(4/5139-60)

Reports of Vessels Arrived (Shipping Reports),
1826-1841,
(4/5198-5220 and WArc, microfilm, NZMS Reels 6 and 7)

b) Court of Civil Jurisdiction:

Miscellaneous Agreements, Indentures, Assignments,
(1113, Bundle 30)
Indictments and Informations 1809-1813,
(1146)

Criminal Papers
(1152, Bundle 10)

Appointments, Commissions and Licences,
(1157, Bundle 20)

c) Customs:

Index to Letters Received from the Colonial Secretary,
1829-1840,
(4/5038-9)

Copies of Letters Sent to the Board of Commissioners
of Customs, London, 1829-1840,
(4/5045-6, 5058)

Index to Enclosures and Policy Directions Received
from the Board of Commissioners of Customs, London,
1826-1840,
(4/5055)

Index to Letters Sent to the Board of Commissioners
of Customs, London, 1829-1846,
(4/5056)

Index to Letters Received from the Board of
Commissioners of Customs, London, 1826-1838,
(4/5057)

Letters from Board of Customs, London, 1826-1833,
(SP 1083 in Australian Archives Office, Sydney.)

Letters Received from the Board of Commissioners of
Customs, London, 1834-1840,
(4/5059-63)

Letters Received from the Sub-Collector of Customs,
Port Phillip, 1836-1840,
(4/5074)

Letters Received from Colonial Secretary, 1829-1840,
(4/5076-86)

Index to Letters Sent to the Colonial Secretary,
Officials and Private Persons, 1829-1840,
(4/5104)

Copies of Letters Sent Within the Colony of New South
Wales, 1829-1841,
(4/5105-6, 5108-9)

Letters Received from Private Individuals, 1831-1840,
(4/5112)
d) Executive Council:
   Appendices to the Minutes, 1825-1840,
   (4/1438-44)
   Minute Books, 1825-1840,
   (4/1515-9)

e) Governor:
   Governor's Despatches, 1815-1839,
   (Al190, 1191, 1204, 1206, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1214,
   1217 in NPL/M)
   Governor's Despatches, Transcripts of Missing
   Despatches, 1823-1840,
   (Al267-4,-5,-12,-13,-14,-19 in NPL/M)
   Despatches Received from Secretary of State,
   1838-1839.
   (Al278, 1280 in NPL/M)

f) Supreme Court:
   (i) Civil Jurisdiction
   Judgement Rolls, 1824-1854,
   (SB 81, 82)
   (ii) Criminal Jurisdiction
   Informations, 1824-1836,
   (SB 589)
   Informations Not Proceeded With, 1832, 1834-1835,
   (SB 654)
   Unsorted Papers, 1831.

g) Vice Admiralty Court:
   Instance and Prize Papers, 1795-1814,
   (1163)
   Case Papers,
   (2/8583-6, 8588, 8590, 8592, 8593)
   Instance Papers, 1826-59, 1874-1880,
   (4/7595, 7598-7604)

NEW ZEALAND

a) British Resident:
   British Resident: In Letters, 1833-1840,
   (BRL/1-2 in WArC)
   Busby, J. Despatches of the British Resident in New
   Zealand 1833-1840,
   (qMS BUS in WTu)
NSW Archival Estrays, Papers Concerning the British Resident, New Zealand, 1833, 1835-1836, (uncat. MSS Set 608 in NPL/M)

b) Old Land Claims Files:
Ashmore 37b/45; Berghan 259, 259a-h/558-66;
Browne 408, 408a-c/978-81; Dacre 76, 76a/155-6;
Harris 347/839; Montefiore 425/1008; Oakes 12/12;
Scott 439/1022; Stephenson 407, 407a/976-7; Mair 155/306.

VAN DIEMEN'S LAND
(Mainly in Archives Office of Tasmania)

a) Colonial Secretary:
General Correspondence, 1824-1841,
(CSO 1, 5)

Registers of General Correspondence, 1824-1841,
(CSO 2, 6)

Indexes to General Correspondence, 1824-1841,
(CSO 3, 4, 7)

Returns for the Compilation of the Annual Official, Financial and Statistical Reports, 1826-1827, 1833, 1836-1838,
(CSO 49)

Draft and Duplicate Copies of the Annual Official, Financial and Statistical Reports, 1822, 1825-1828, 1831-1835, 1837-1840,
(CSO 50)

Copies of Letters Sent Within the Colony, 1832,
(CSO 52/5)

Copies of Clearances Issued to Ships Leaving Hobart, 1823-1828,
(CSO 63)

Port Officers' Reports of Ships' Arrivals at Hobart, 1834-1840,
(CSO 92/1-4)

Miscellaneous Correspondence, Reports and Returns Relating to Shipping, 1835-1840,
(CSO 94)

George Town Port Officers' Semi-Weekly Reports, 1837-1840,
(CSO 95)
b) Customs:

Inwards Correspondence, 1827-1850,
(CUS 1)

Copies of Inwards Correspondence from the Board of Trade, 1826-1840,
(CUS 2)

Letterbook of Inwards and Outwards Correspondence, 1833-1840,
(CUS 4)

Collectors' Letterbooks, 1831-1840,
(CUS 5)

Naval Officer: Record of Duties Collected at Hobart Town and Port Dalrymple, 1824-1841,
(CUS 8)

Register of Ships Entered Inwards and Cleared Outwards at Hobart, 1824-1830,
(CUS 29)

Register of Ships' Arrivals with Lists of Passengers, 1830-1833,
(CUS 30)

Register of Ships Entered Inwards, November 1831-1840,
(CUS 31)

Register of Ships' Clearances, With Lists of Crews and Passengers, 1828-1833,
(CUS 33/1-2)

Register of Ships Cleared Outwards, 1833-1840,
(CUS 34)

Register of Ships Cleared Outwards, 1834-1840,
(CUS 35)

Register of Colonial Vessels of the Port of Hobart, 1830-1840,
(CUS 38)

Register of Ships' Arrivals from Port Phillip, 1837-1840,
(CUS 54)

Register of Ships' Departures to Port Phillip, 1837-1840,
(CUS 55)

c) Executive Council:

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Executive Council, 1825-1839,
(EC 4/1-7)
d) Governor:
Letterbook of Despatches to Treasury and Other Home Government Offices, 1826-1839,
(GO 30/1)

e) Legislative Council:
Draft Minutes of Proceedings in the Legislative Council, April-September 1826, August 1835-August 1836,
(EC 7)
Minutes of Meetings, with Acts Passed by Council, 1826-1839,
(LC 2/1 in Parliamentary Library, Hobart)
f) Marine Board:
Reports of Ships' Arrivals with Lists of Passengers, 1829-1840,
(MB 2/39/1-4)
Returns Made by the Port Officer, Marine Department, of Outwards Passengers, 1834-1838,
(MB 2/42)
Lists Made by the Port Officer, Marine Department, of Outwards Passengers, December 1836-February 1838,
(MB 2/43)
g) Supreme Court:
Tasmanian Supreme Court, Minute Book 1835-1839,
(MS 3539 in NLA.)

(2) Published


Great Britain Parliamentary Papers:
British Parliamentary Debates, 3rd Series, 1832.

An Account of the Quantity of Phormium Tenax, or New Zealand Flax, imported in each of the Last Three Years, ending 5th January 1832, into Great Britain, stating the Ports where received, House of Lords, Sessional Papers, 1831-2, CCIX, (118).

Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements), 1837, VII, (425).

Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords Appointed to Enquire into the Present State of the Islands of New Zealand and the Expediency of Regulating the Settlement of British Subjects therein, with Minutes of Evidence, 1837-8, XXI, (680) (123).
An Account of the Quantity of Flax Imported From New Zealand into Great Britain, during the Years 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836 and 1837; distinguishing each Year, House of Lords, Sessional Papers, 1838, XVIII, (148).

Correspondence with the Secretary of State Relative to New Zealand, 1840, XXXIII, (238).

Report from the Select Committee on New Zealand; together with the Minutes of Evidence ..., 1840, VII, (582).

Report from the Select Committee on New Zealand, together with Minutes of Evidence, 1844, XIII, (556).

Account of Imports to and Exports from British Colonies, in the Years 1835 to 1844, Commons Paper, 1847, (37).

Statutes consulted: 43 George III c 57, 57 George III c 53, 59 George III c 52, 4 George IV c 96, 6 George IV c 111, 7 George IV c 48, 9 George IV c 83, 3&4 William IV c 54, 4&5 William IV c 56.

Legislative Council, Votes and Proceedings, 1824-1840.

B: Non-Official Sources

(1) Manuscripts

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTIONS

Archives Office of New South Wales

Cunningham, A. Journal in New Zealand 28 August-25 November 1826, (S2 11)

Dixson Library

Atkins, John F. 'Narrative of the Sufferings and most Miraculous Escape of Mr John F. Atkin, 2nd. officer of the Brig Hawis...', (MS 22)

Cotton, W.C. Journal of a Residence at St. John's College, the Waimate from Saturday July, 22nd. to Wednesday Oct. 4th. by William Charles Cotton, M.A., and An Overland Journey to Wanganui, from Thursday, October 5th. to Sunday Novr. 26th. 1843, (MS 37/5)

Mitchell Library

Arthur, Sir G. Papers, 1821-1855, Vols 20-1, 24-27, (A2180-1, 2184-7)
Banks, Sir J. Banks Papers, Australia and South Sea Islands, 1774-1809, (A83)

Bonwick Transcripts, (Bigge Appendix, Boxes 11, 13, 15, 20-2, 25, 27, 28; Missionary, Boxes 49, 50, 53)

Brisbane, Sir T.M. Papers, 1812-1837, (FM 4/1627)

Bruce, G. Life of a Greenwich Pensioner, 1776-1817, (CYA 1618-1)

——— Life of a Greenwich Pensioner, 1776-1817, Notes and Abridgement by T. Whitely, (CYA 1618-2)

Burdekin Family. Papers, 1784-1956, (MLMSS 147/33x, 52x, 83, 85x, 86x, 87x, 88x, 89x)

Catlin, E. Journals, 1827-1836 Made on Whaling Vessels on Voyages from Sydney Northwards to Japan and Eastwards to New Zealand, (CY MLMSS 1800)

Cleveland, W. Journal of William Cleveland, 22 March 1838-22 November 1842, (Bl566-1567)

Coquille (Corvette). Journal, 22 June 1822-8 May 1825, (MS 129)

Crawford, J.C. Papers and Views, 1837-1864, (FM 4/3150)

Cunningham, A. Diary of A. Cunningham, September-December 1826, (CY B777)

Dacre, R. Letterbook, 1831-1832, (uncat. MSS Set 309)

Downie, J. Capt. Remarks on Board the Ship Coromandel October 20, 1819-August 31, 1820, (B209)

Hall, W. Diary 1816-1838, (MLMSS 1597)

Hawke, G. Extracts from Diary, September 3, 1836-March 15, 1837, Relating to New Zealand, (MLMSS 847)

Kendall, T. A Journal of My Proceedings During a Voyage from Port Jackson to New Zealand Commencing March the 7th in the Year of Our Lord 1814... (A1443)

King, P.P. Journal of a Visit to New Zealand and Norfolk Island in HMS Pelorus, December 12, 1838-January 28, 1839, (C764-2)

Lamb, J. Letterbook, 1826-1834, (uncat. MSS Set 310)

Lang, J.D. Papers 1835-1873, Vols 1 and 9, (A2249-2)

LMS Archives, Missionaries on Board the "Royal Admiral", March 13-July 22, Tahiti, 1801, (microfilm, FM 4/328)

Lord, S. Trading Agreement Concerning Flax between Maori Chieftains at the Bay of Islands and Simeon Lord, 1815, (AA 47 and MSS 1815P in WTu)


Marsden, M. Journal of Martha Marsden /1837/, (B328-2)


Ramsay, D. Papers, 1818-1845, (MLMSS 564)

Shepherd, T. Journal on the Brig Rosanna on the Coasts of New Zealand, 5 March-12 November 1826, (microfilm, FM 3/120)

Spark, A.B. Diary of A.B. Spark, Vol 1 1836-1843, (A4869)

Towns, R & Co. Papers, 1829-1940, Vol. I, (MLMSS 1279; also Ms Papers 768 in WTu)

Weller, G. Correspondence with E. Weller and Others, Chiefly Concerning their Whaling Industry at Otago, New Zealand, 1832-61, (A1609)

Wentworth, W.C. Office Account Book, (AW 51)

National Library of Australia

Browne, O. Letters, 1823-1842, (MS 330)

Buller, J. Correspondence, 1837-1839, (MS 4020, NK 2231)

King, P.G. ALS Letter to Sir Joseph Banks, 8 January 1806, (MS 9/98)

Stephens, Sir P. ALS Letter to Captain Cook, 20 July 1776, (MS 688)

Tasmanian State Library

Haigh, A. Journal 1834-1838, (C3811)

Kelly, J. Papers in the Possession of the late Captain James Kelly, c.1825-40, (Crowther Collection, uncat. papers)

McLaine, L. Journal of a Voyage from Sydney to England, 1814, and other writings, 1813-15, (Crowther Collection, MS C 3821)

NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTIONS

Alexander Turnbull Library

Berry, A. 'Alexander Berry's Account of the Destruction of the Ship Boyd ...', (qMS 1811-1822 P)

Busby, J. Letters to James Busby, 1830-1866; and Letters from Busby to his brother Alexander, 1830-1839, (qMS BUS)

Cheesman, T.F. Logs and Journal on Board H.M.S. Buffalo, 27 April 1836-20 March 1841, (fMS 1836-41P)

HMS Conway. Journal and Log of an Officer Serving Aboard HMS Conway 1836-ca.1841, (qMS 1836-45)

Emerald. Log, 21-28 April 1834, (PAMBU, 223)

Herald. Official Declaration of Loss, 1829, (MS Papers 982 and MS 4248 in NLA)

L'Hérosine (corvette). Papers Relating to the Corvette, 1837-42, (MS 1837-42 HER)

Hobbs, J. Journals, August 1827-January 1828, December 1835-mid 1837, (Micro MS 620)

Jowett, W. Papers, ca.1819-1835, (MS Papers 1141)
Raine, T. An Extract from Mr Clarke's
Instructions from Messrs. Raine & Gordon D.
Browne. Merchants Sydney, (1827), (Misc MSS 1022)

Ross, J. O'C. Papers, 1973-1976, (MS Papers 1500)

Royal Admiral. Extracts from the Log & Journal of
M.E.I.C.S. Ship Royal Admiral, William Wilson,
Commander on a voyage from London to New South
Wales thence to New Zealand, Otaheite and
China, 1800-1802, Records of the Honourable
East India Company's Marine, (microfilm)

Tapsell, P. Reminiscences, 1779-1869, (qMS Tap, 1869)

Woodriffe, D. Memoranda, ca.1804, (MS Papers 937)

Auckland Institute and Museum Library

Baker, C. Journals of Charles Baker, 1827-1867,
(typescript, MS 22)

Brown, A.N. Journals, 1835-1846, (typescript, MS 40)

Whiteley, J. Journal 1832-1863, (typescript, MS331)

Williams, W. Journal of William Williams, 21
August 1825-18 December 1855, (typescript, MS 335)
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