

CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MAORI
PEOPLE WITH THE HON. ACTING NATIVE MINISTER
AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS CONCERNING CONFIS-
CATED LAND AND OTHER OUTSTANDING CLAIMS OF
THE MAORIS.

Held in the Native Affairs Committee Room,
Parliament Buildings, Wellington, on Tues-
day, the 15th February, 1938 at 10.30 a.m.

H.T. RATANA: Hon. Mr. Langstone, on behalf of Princess te Puaa and members of the Waikato people and the many representatives of the Maori people present here today, I wish to thank the Rt. Hon. Mr. Savage, through you, Sir, for the kind remarks and the welcome that he has extended to the Maori people through you. We wish to express our hearty good wishes to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister and hope that his health is improving and we hope to see him again amongst us very shortly. We wish to thank you for the kind remarks you have made in reference to the case that is coming before you today: this is a long looked for day amongst the Maori people. The Maori people feel that there has been some injustice done to them and they feel some inquiry should be made to see whether they were in the wrong or the Government in the past were wrong in confiscating some of their lands. We are sure that the Government will look into these grievances fairly and we feel sure that the Commission which the Government has set up will deal fairly with all the cases that there will be placed before it. You have the destiny and the wealth of the Maori people in the hollow of your hand and we are sure that in dealing with different cases you will deal fairly with the cases that will be put up before the Commission. Hon. Mr. Langstone, I wish to thank you again for the kind remarks that you have expressed to the Maori people this morning. I do not wish to take up too much of the time as we have important matters to be dealt with ^{by} this Commission, so once again I thank you.

A.T. NGATA: I join with Mr. Ratana in extending our good wishes to the Prime Minister and hope that he may be speedily

102
74508

restored to health. I join with him also in congratulating the Prime Minister and the Government for the steps taken to convene this conference and like yourself we hope that something will be done to further these claims towards definite settlements in order that the Maori tribes concerned may cease to look backward. If there is any reason at all behind an effective settlement it is because we all desire that the race goes onwards and not back to past grievances. I notice many members of the Government are here and they have to be. I see my friend Mr. Rodda whose job is to keep a tight hand on the Treasury Chest. I want to raise here a point of some importance. I judge from the Prime Minister's letter convening the conference that when you get down to details of each claim there is a matter of the history of the different claims. In 1935 to go no further back, in 1935 we had got this far with the Waikato Claim. The Waikato delegates Mr. Tumata Mahuta, Mr. Pei Jones and other representatives from all over the Waikato met representatives of the Government then, and the discussions that took place between them were submitted from time to time to the Minister for Finance, Mr. Coates, and Cabinet. The Waikato proposal was then that there should be an annual payment of £10,750. That was countered by a suggestion that instead of an annual amount there should be one straight out grant of a capital sum to be invested and administered in the best way possible and the revenue from that capital sum to be devoted on the same lines as the Arawa and Tuharetoa Trust Funds, for the purpose of benefit to the Waikato people. Those were the lines of the Government offer. That was thought insufficient by the Waikato representatives and the offer was then made of an annual sum of £5,000 per year for the purpose, - that sum to be regarded as the revenue from an invested capital amount. At that point the negotiations ceased, but there was practically no disagreement as to accepting as compensation an annual payment of £5,000. At the same time the Waikatos still

dwelt upon their claim for the £10,750. Their claim today is the same as was made in 1935: they are asking for £10,750. I leave that at that point. The claim for the larger amount will be discussed by you when you confer with your officers. The next, a small claim, concerns Ngati-Rangihouhiri and Ngati-Hikakino Hapus. They took part in the war which led to the confiscation of the Bay of Plenty lands which included lands from Matata practically to Torere near Opotiki. As a result of this confiscation the Sim Commission found that the members of these two hapus were rendered landless. Some provision was made for them out of confiscated lands, an area of 300 acres in the area between Tarawera and Rangitaiki Rivers, but on account of the operations of the Rangitaiki Drainage and the Tarawera Drainage it was found necessary to take all but about 60 odd acres of that land. They were compensated by about £3 an acre. They have become almost absolutely landless. The Commission recommended that some land should be bought for them in the neighbourhood of Matata. The proposal they have to put before the Government representatives here today is that that land should be provided and they are asking that it might be most convenient for everybody if a portion of the Kawerau Block, which is under development by the Lands Department and your Department, could be substituted for land near Matata to be so set aside. That is one of the blocks of land acquired under confiscations by the State and some portion was bought at the time at about 2/6 or 3/- per acre. It is an extension of the Onepu Development Scheme on the west side of the Tarawera River. You are aware that there is a large Native block there on the opposite side of the river from Onepu. They are asking for 1000 acres. At the Kawerau the present value of the land would be about 10/- per acre while originally it would be much less, and the rest is a matter for the development. It would be advantageous so far as they are concerned to get a substantial area of developable land, but I know of none better than

that in the Rangitaiki River. That is No.2. The third claim, of the Opotiki Natives, is the next one to be dealt with. That was the first of the confiscated lands claims to come before Parliament and to be dealt with by the Royal Commission. Up to that time, 1919, the approach of all the Maori tribes in New Zealand towards the Native lands problem, was to go over the heads of the New Zealand Government and to seek redress direct from His Majesty the King. You have no doubt read of visits overseas by the late Tawhiao. They were followed in years later by Te Rata Mahuta. There have been other visits for the same reason overseas. In every case the representatives were advised by the Home Government that the complete remedy was in the hands of the New Zealand Government, but you can very well understand they had a feeling of resentment against the local Government which had perpetrated the act of confiscating their lands. The Waikatos could see no good at all in going to the people who committed the offence so they went Home to get redress from Her late Majesty Queen Victoria in the first place. The next delegation went in the time of King George, the late King, but the Whakatohea were the first to get down to earth with regard to these claims. The Commission of 1920/21 presided over by Judge Jones, Mr. Ormsby, and Mr. Strachan, Surveyor-General, reported in regard to the Whakatohea Claim after reviewing the facts. From my observation of the Commission's report two things stand out; that this tribe lost 151,000 acres by confiscation, 22,000 acres having been returned to them and that Commission was of opinion, that, although the Whakatohea had participated in the murder of Rev. Volkner, it had been the object of a punitive expedition to secure the punishment of Kereopa and others who had taken part in the murders of Fulloon and Volkner, the punishment by way of confiscation of their lands was greater than the Whakatohea deserved. In 1926 that claim was referred to the Sim Commission for a further appeal, the question then was

165

24511

5.

should that Commission recommend some amount or some method of compensating Whakatohea and after reviewing all the facts they stated that a sum of £300 a year to be devoted for the purpose of education should sufficiently compensate Whakatohea. That was in 1927 or 1928, and from that time on, the Whakatohea have been of the opinion that the amount recommended by the 1926 Commission was insufficient. Based on the acreage alone and comparing it with the acreage taken from the Taranaki and Waikato and the compensation the Commission recommended in respect of those districts we feel justified in asking for a higher amount. They have asked for and I have recommended, £1000 a year. I will let that remain. Then as regards the claim arising out of confiscations in the Wairoa District, the Commission there recommended that an amount of £300, to be devoted to education. There is, however, one section who based the claim on unfulfilled promises by the Crown to return certain sections of the Embource Block. It is some of the most fertile of the land in the Wairoa District. The Crown met that claim by saying that the Natives had commuted that into a money payment and satisfied the Commission that that was so. The land lies between Frasertown and Lake Waikaremoana. There were promises made to the loyalists and in the case of the Wairoa loyalists that promise was not carried out. It should have been possible to have settled these claims earlier, that is my opinion, but however, we had to try our best to persuade another body of Pakshas and of Governments of Pakshas. We had to try to persuade one body of Pakshas and we did not. Successive Governments come and go but the guardians of the Treasury Chest, they have a knack of sticking and always I find it difficult to persuade the Treasury that it is a good thing to have these things settled. These confiscations reveal why earlier settlers used the confiscations for getting lands for settlement. In the case of Whakatohea they took away from them all the land that mattered in the Opotiki District.

166
7-512

In the case of the Opape Block; on a topographical survey for development purposes of this block, we could get the Supervisors and Surveyors to say that out of an area of 12,700 acres in the block only 5000 acres were developable. You can get that vouched for by the records held in the Native Department. The Whakatohea Tribe have now 5,000 acres of decent land for their maintenance. However I am getting ahead of schedule.

F. LANGSTONE: Sir Apirana Ngata, the first thing after the speeches of welcome would be a joint discussion and the idea that I had for our business was to take the Waikato Claim first and the Whakatohea second and the Ngati-Rangihouhiri and Ngati-Hikakino thirdly and the Wairoa fourth and if we can rearrange them for the convenience of delegates well and good. The other thing was that I wanted to get them over as quickly as possible. I think the points are fairly clearly defined, there may be yourself and Mr. Ratana and possibly some others who may wish to make a few remarks on the general survey with everybody present and see the tone of the meeting and after that we would get down to business. The representatives of the Waikato would meet the representatives of the Government in this room and we would discuss what you propose. Then we get to the Ngati-Rangihouhiri and Ngati-Hikakino people and then we could come to the Whakatohea people third but we could rearrange that. There will be other things I presume, that the Government will have to consider; I mean to say, although this is being dealt with in separate tribes and hapus, we want to do something for the Maoris of New Zealand. We do not look upon them just as the Arara or Ngatiawa, we look upon them as the Maori people. I presume that if we get to some arrangement wherein the general decisions that they were going to be brought into the scheme of things, something could be done. That is for the Government I presume to consider when it is making its final decision on the matter. Firstly I wish to have the general discussion circulating around the various considerations that arose so

that everyone would be able to express themselves and then we would get right down to the major points and try to hammer out something of a practical nature so that we could put the matter before the Government. I know that there are possibly two questions involved, one is the question of a money payment and the other question that you brought forward with regard to land - the question of where to settle the Natives. We have some fairly large areas of land which are at present being developed and we may be able to get those lands which do not have to be bought and where the moneys provided are so spent or on Maori lands being developed and thereby settle the Maoris that way. I was on the Kawerau block. I thought that there was a fairly large area - something like 1000 acres - to be developed of Native owned land. I should say that 1000 acres would carry a fairly large Maori population. I think there was about 4000 acres which was Crown land which had possibly been confiscated and could be handed over for their settlement. There may be various conditions arising out of our development activities and the difficulties of boundaries and in the general question we may be able to exchange one area for the other making it up that way with Crown and Native lands to bring about a more consolidated area and I propose when dealing with the surplus lands claims which affect the Lands Department I am going to have an Officer of the Lands Department brought into and put on the committee. Mr. Ratana wishes to say a few words, well and good, or anyone else. As soon as they have spoken I am going to ask the general body to retire and the Waikatos to remain. We ought to be able to settle those four cases by today or tomorrow. I mean that we may get that far that we can put forward the recommendations because the Minister's time is limited.

TUMATE MAHUTA: Greetings to the Hon. the Minister on behalf of myself, my cousin Te Paea and other Waikato representatives. I wish to join with the very good wishes for the speedy recovery of the Prime Minister from his indisposition. We do certainly

168
2-314

hope that he will be on his feet very shortly and will again be able to attend to the affairs of the country. Sir, I would like at this stage to make some explanation for my present activities in connection with this matter. There is, I think, some misunderstanding as to why I have taken such an active part in this matter. Now I would like to recall the strong attitude taken up by certain leaders who shortly after the Commission's report put forward a claim that as the land was confiscated and taken from them so should land be returned. I took particular notice of this claim that was put forward. I waited very patiently for 4 whole years to see what way they were going to move in order to get redress in that form. At the end of 4 years two men made the announcement that they were going to come to Wellington to claim a money compensation. One was my uncle and the other my cousin. On that occasion it was quite a big gathering in a meeting house at Waihi near Huntly. When this announcement was made, out of all the people gathered there I was the only one who stood up and objected to the members' visit to Wellington to interview the Government. The reason why I did that was to give these people some further time in which they might fashion some sort of plan to get a redress in that form. Another 12 months were involved and during which time nothing further was done and at that stage I approached Mr. Taite te Tono who was then our representative to interview the Government with a view to arranging for a conference or a discussion on the question of the confiscations. Might I explain that before taking that step I had consulted a big body of men and the elders of the tribe and of course during our discussion it was put forward that payment by money was not the correct way, for blood could not be paid for in money, however, we the younger ones looked at the problem from every angle and we could see that by a monetary compensation we could do a lot of things to ameliorate the conditions of our people. Although there is only a small number who have come here on this occasion I wish to assure you that there is quite a big body of people at home who are wish-

ing us every success and who through us extend their greetings and best wishes to the Government.

TURI CARROLL: First of all I would like to extend our best wishes to the Prime Minister and sincerely hope that he will be restored to good health in the quickest possible time. Sir, to yourself I would like to thank you for this opportunity of allowing the Maori people to come to a round table conference with a view to settling our claims. It is about the third or fourth time I have been down and unfortunately we have been told the matter would be looked into and nothing further than that has been done and I do think and I do sincerely hope that this trip will be the last, and if it is possible to make settlement I am quite certain Sir that the representatives you have gathered here today for final settlement can be satisfied either with money or land. I am here with elders for the purpose and with the aid of our Sir Apirana Ngata we are here to settle for all time so that we can look forward to progress along with the Pakeha friends of the Native people. We are the representatives of both the loyalists and the rebels, but Sir, who is the better person to argue today, the rebels or the patriots. I think you have got something to consider in the way of the degree of protection given by our people to the Europeans during the waring in our district. Apart from the monetary and land compensation, we were promised the peace and the harmony of the district. I hope that you will see your way clear to consider a little advance on the paltry amount of £300 that the Commission saw fit to allow for the good work carried out in that district by the loyalists. I am sure that it is worth more than that. I am here today as a representative of the Waikato Claim. I am sure that if you can bring about the settlement of the Waikato the rest will fall in line. I sincerely hope that we will arrive at a settlement for once and for all.

MR. KEREAMA: We had hoped to see the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister in attendance at this conference and to express our regret that owing to ill health he has not been able to do so. The Maori people appreciate the fact that Mr. Savage is out to make redress for claims and grievances under which the Native peoples have been suffering. We hope that he will soon recover his good health and be at the helm, again looking after the interests of the people of this country. Greetings to you Mr. Langstone who is his substitute on this occasion. I will not delay the time of the conference, but wish to express the hope that the discussions will be undertaken in the spirit you have mentioned and that the time will not be mis-spent. We can assure you that if these grievances are settled on this occasion that the Maori people will not look backwards but will look forward and march with their European brothers in the progress of the country. We are hopeful that if the Waikato Claim is settled that we need not fear that the other claims would be settled also.

RUTERE TUHI: I am the representative of the Natives interested in the Kanhouroa Claim on behalf of the rebel Natives. I was selected by thirteen tribes as their representative at the conference. These tribes are the tribes who own Kanhouroa. There is one other tribe, that extra tribe is represented by my friend, Mr. Carroll and Mr. Hata te Poki, I am not their representative. My tribes assert that this matter should be placed before the Commission or the Native Land Court for the purpose of determining the rights affected by the confiscation. They assert too that since the land was taken away from them they ask that the land should be returned to them. They do not want any monetary compensation. That is all I wish to say.

JIM EDWARDS: On behalf of the Whakatohea and my elders here we join with other parties in regretting the indisposition of the Prime Minister. We regret very much that he is not present here today amongst these Maori people. He has preached all

over the country as the Saviour of the Pakeha and the Maori people. Sir we have fought for years for a principle and you have achieved that principle by being returned to Parliament. They are fighting for a principle but unfortunately their principle was not achieved the same as yours. We look to you the present Government to assist us our Maori people in achieving that principle affecting the confiscating of our land. I endorse Mr. Carroll's remark that a settlement of these claims be finally made today or tomorrow. We are wasting time by coming here year after year. We sincerely hope that your deliberations tomorrow or today will be fruitful so that the Maori people will look forward and run with their Pakeha brothers in the progress of New Zealand. Sir we earnestly hope that our deliberations will be final. We are not here today to dictate but to fall into line with the others.

F. LANGSTONE: The Waikato representatives will remain. We can get on to the business and we will adjourn at 1 o'clock and then resume at half past two.

(All the Maoris with the exception of the Waikatos then left the room.)

We had better ask the representative of the Waikato to state the case and then we can reason with them from knowing their point of view.

PEI JONES: Sir, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will not take us very long to put forward the claim before the conference, it is simply the claim which was put forward previously and the same claim will be repeated on this occasion. It is as follows:-

(Reads from file).

At this stage I would like to add in addition to what has previously been presented to the past Government with regard to the suggestion that the Waikato Claim which was fixed by the Commission at £3000 could not by any stretch of imagination be

in excess of the Taranaki. I understand that the suggestion is that the Waikato were more blameworthy than the Taranaki. As against that we contend that the whole trouble started in Taranaki and that if any blame is attached to anybody the blame should be equally shared by all concerned. The Waikato was not more blameworthy than the Taranaki people. Although they had twice as much land confiscated in the case of the Waikato than the Taranaki they were awarded a lesser amount.

LANGSTONE: The Arbitrary figure is 10/- per acre.

PEI JONES: That claim of 10/- is only for a portion of the lands confiscated. I have worked it out here, area originally confiscated 1,202,172 acres, returned to Natives 314,364, finally confiscated 887,808. Area for which no compensation is claimed is 124,502. In this area there is 13,945 acres which was referred to the Native Land Court by the Native Land Claims Adjustment Commission in 1922.

F. LANGSTONE: In the report it says that in addition to what you have said there is £22,987 paid to Natives for compensation: what was it for ?

PEI JONES: It was paid to certain Natives. Following on the figures I have just stated 763,306 acres on which the claim is based at 10/- per acre, £381,653 less £22,987 leaving £358,666 which is the amount mentioned. We also point out that in the Commission's figures of £358,666 there is a net area of 110,555 acres for which no payment is being made. An area of 110,555 acres. 10/- an acre is purely an arbitrary figure.

F. LANGSTONE: How much was the land worth at that time £10 or 10/-.

PEI JONES: We looked up some more records and find that 10 years prior to that they were buying land at 8/- per acre.

F. LANGSTONE: That would be for selected areas at 8/- per acre.

When you are going into 10,000 acres you are going into rivers, lakes and mountains. It would not be an average taking the land at that time.

PEI JONES: At 8/-, we take it as average value and in the case of Waikato Confiscations they actually took the best of the Waikato District.

F. LANGSTONE: Taranaki was not worked out on an acreage basis.

PEI JONES: The Commission did not work it out on any basis.

F. LANGSTONE: It was only with regard to Waikato that they claim an acreage basis. In my time the Waikato land was supposed to be worthless so that before then there was not much value attached to that land. I do not think we can work on that acreage basis, because Taranaki had 462,000 acres confiscated and the Waikatos 873,861 acres confiscated.

PEI JONES: There is a suggestion in the Commission's report that the Waikato were more blameworthy than the Taranaki, we deny that. That is why we fixed on an amount not less than Taranaki. The claim should not be less but pro rata on area taken.

F. LANGSTONE: What would be the reaction of the Natives themselves if they were paid a sum which was all pooled into one fund, what would be the reaction of the Maoris to that?

PEI JONES: I do not think they would like that. They would like to know how much they are getting per annum.

F. LANGSTONE: They would be allowed to draw until it was exhausted.

PEI JONES: Each tribe would like to be treated separately. Take the Native Purposes Fund for instance, there is a grievance from certain parts of New Zealand that they are not getting the same amount as other sections of New Zealand who have been

putting forward applications for amounts. Some people might wake up and find that their portion or share of the Fund had been taken up by others.

F. LANGSTONE: I do not think the Government will give 10/- per acre.

PEI JONES: To be just as frank we anticipated that you would be asking for a compromise and on that point we would like some statement for the benefit of the people at home.

F. LANGSTONE: All that I want to say is I want something to put forward that I can reasonably hope that when it is presented to the Prime Minister it will be a good argument and that is going to be agreed to and enforced. If I cannot do that I feel in my mind that we get back to where we were. I want to be able to put forward something that the Government will agree to. That is the compromise I want to get. I am hoping that with the activities that are going on that in the next 10 years the Maori people will be aristocrats that their incomes will be so big that they will have everything they want. They will be coming and asking the Pakeha to take something they will have so much. I can see wonderful development there. I do not want them to think there is an injustice and keep on bringing it up.

PEI JONES: Have you any figure in mind ?

F. LANGSTONE: I have not, but I will do the same as you. I will talk with the Treasury.

PEI JONES: I want to ask you in settling the Waikato to keep in mind the reaction of the comparison with the Taranaki.

F. LANGSTONE: Possibly in the compromise we can have something like that.

(The conference adjourned at 1 p.m. until 3 p.m.)

(Meeting resumed 3 p.m.)

Mr. Pei Jones: Sir, in answer to your desire to compromise this claim, Tumate Mahuta has decided to put forward a compromise figure of £7875, which is the half-way figure between the claim as originally put forward and the £5,000 offered by the previous Government. Tumate would also like you to understand that in making this compromise he feels rather diffident about the attitude certain sections of the people will take with regard to it because there has been a certain amount of misunderstanding in some quarters about the nature of Tumate's negotiations with the Government over this thing, and he would like, if possible, to have a proviso similar to the previous one, not for his own benefit, but for those other people who think that if they were representing the tribe they would get a much better settlement. He himself and others who are with him in this matter will not make any further claim to the Government on the matter other than the figure he now puts forward as the compromise. But there are, as you know from certain communications that have been going forward, certain people thinking that if they were representing the tribe before you and the Government they would get a much more satisfactory settlement. Tumate would just like to have that proviso added for their benefit. He thinks he is doing the best he can under the circumstances.

Mr. LANGSTONE: The position I have got to put forward for their consideration is that we provide the sum of £125,000 and you can draw each year not exceeding £10,000 until you have exhausted the sum. We limit you up to £10,000 a year and the total sum of £125,000 is £25,000 more than the Commission.

Mr. PEI JONES: Tumate would like me to say at this stage that he was and still is hopeful that the Government would be able to make a better offer. As a matter of fact we have come to this Conference with this in mind, that any settlement we may arrive at will not be less than the £5,000, and they

certainly understood that from the remarks of the Prime Minister at Ngaruwahia on the 8th March of last year.

Mr. LANGSTONE: We accept the £5,000 and will pay you that amount. I have the right to pay you £5,000 a year of the capital sum it represents.

Mr. PEI JONES: At 3% or what rate?

Mr. LANGSTONE: I suppose it would be capitalised at 4%.

Mr. BODDA: At 3½%.

Mr. PEI JONES: There is one point about this thing, it comes back to a comparison of Taranaki and Waikato. In Taranaki there is an Act, the West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, which protects their lands and from which they derive a very considerable income, £30,000 to £40,000 a year I understand. There is nothing like that in Waikato, and they feel that in settling the Waikato claim they should get fairly generous treatment.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Yes, there was a wise provision made in the West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, but for many years those people got very little. It was only due to the work going on.

Mr. PEI JONES: It is quite a complicated thing. I do not know what the records show, but in the case of Waikato a lot of the lands that were returned after the Rebellion were returned to friendly Natives. Ancestral claims were ignored with the result that a lot of these people fearing that a time might come when there would be an investigation into their titles immediately sold them. That was not the case in Taranaki. Their estates were conserved both from that point of view and by the legislation which was applied to them. In the case of Waikato a lot of people who were landless got those lands and, fearing that the titles might be investigated, immediately sold them.

Mr. LANGSTONE: In Waikato they certainly got a worse deal so far as confiscation is concerned, but you can have the £5,000 a year.

177
12-5-53

Mr. PEI JONES: That gets back to the point where we left off with the previous Government. Tumate agreed to that provided that there is no prejudice with regard to bringing forward a claim for the larger amount. He is not putting that forward at this stage with the object of coming back himself but there are a large number of people who think that the claim should be pressed for the greater amount.

Mr. LANGSTONE: If the claim is settled now is it not more valuable to the elderly Maori and those who need assistance? If we go on developing that land the young fellow does not need any other funds. Is not the land going to be more valuable? The only way in which the Maori could live was either to get rent from his land or sell it. Now we are utilising the land and we are drawing every year from the Unemployment Funds. We are drawing money which is not loaded on to the lands being developed. We can show better returns than even the Pakeha development on the average. There is the stock, the houses, fencing, grassing, manuring, laying on of water supply. It is £4.12.6 per acre. There is nobody else in the wide world who could develop for less. There are good reasons for this. The Maoris have co-operated splendidly and they have allowed themselves to be organised and the result is that the money that is paid in their wages comes from the Unemployment Fund and is not loaded on to their land. We are able to supply first-class materials and also avoid charges in transferring stock. We try to avoid all these things and the result is that we are getting splendid results today and if the Maoris view that point and make arrangements for the £125,000, which is £25,000 more than the Commission offered, they could have it as a lump sum or they could draw up to £10,000 a year. I should say that that would be more beneficial to them in the interests of their particular people. You have got this as a final settlement, you have got the development going on as a permanent settlement, and in another ten years if we make the same progress as we have made in the past five years, what position do you think the great majority of the Maoris will be

in? They will be "home and dry".

Mr. PEI JONES: Except in the case of the Waikatos who have got so very little land as compared with the King Country Maoris. The King Country Maoris have the land for development. The position is not the same when dealing with the Waikato Maoris whose lands were confiscated.

Mr. LANGSTONE: There is an area to be developed at Moerangi. I presume there are some other areas, aren't there?

Mr. PEI JONES: No, that is the only area to which development can be applied. The rest of the Waikatos have merely residential areas scattered here and there.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Have they any land that is rented where the leases will be falling due?

Mr. PEI JONES: No, they are almost entirely landless. A lot of them prejudiced their chances by fleeing from the territory. Some of them settled at Te Kuiti and others at Otorehanga and they only hold residential areas of about 5 or 6 acres each. They are much worse off than the Taranaki people and they seek some treatment which might put them somewhere nearly the same as the Taranaki people.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Many Pakeha people who are worse off than your Maori people have to be taxed to pay this money. I must consider them. The Maoris would not like to receive something for nothing from the Pakeha. I must look at both sides.

Mr. PEI JONES: As a matter of fact, going back into ancient history at one time I understand Sir George Grey was desirous of making a generous settlement with the Waikatos but he was not so generously disposed towards the Taranakis, and on that account the Waikatos refused to compromise with him. They thought that the Taranaki people should be considered. Now things are reversed, the Taranakis have had their claims settled and the Waikatos are now coming forward. They think they have been left

1791
7-15

in the lurch from a monetary point of view. I do not know at this stage whether Tumaté would accept a proviso to come forward at some future time.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I do not suppose we could stop anybody coming forward at any future time.

Mr. SHEPHERD: No, they could petition Parliament.

Mr. LANGSTONE: What we want is the consensus of the good Maoris to say that under the circumstances they have agreed and they will not take any further part in it, but we cannot restrict anybody from petitioning Parliament. You do not need even to emphasise that point - you have got the right. What we want to do is to get a settlement and to treat the Maori right and treat the Pakeha right. I understand the attitude taken up by yourself and Tumaté. Now, is there any Crown land that we can transfer?

Mr. PEI JONES: No.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Some of the Waikato Maoris will have to shift to where there is land. Would they object to shifting from the Waikato?

Mr. PEI JONES: Some of them would shift but a lot of them would not.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I was wondering whether we could make arrangements with the Tuwharetoa to get some of their land for the Waikatos.

Mr. PEI JONES: Some of the Tuwharetoa land that has been purchased by the Government?

Mr. LANGSTONE: I do not think that has been defined. I think there is some Crown land past Kuruia.

(Messrs. Langstone and Jones consult map).

Mr. PEI JONES: Well Sir, we would be glad if you would allow

us time to discuss the matter and meet again to-morrow morning. We consider that £125,000 is inadequate and we certainly understood from the Prime Minister's remarks at Ngaurawahia that he would not make a lower settlement than the other Government. We think that £125,000 would not produce £5,000 a year at least.

Mr. LANGSTONE: We do not want to draw on the Pakeha for £5,000 a year but we want to provide a sum for the Maoris, to use for the Maoris. You can go away and think about the matter.

Mr. HODDA: This offer is a better one than that of the last Government.

Mr. SHEPHERD: This meeting is to settle a lump sum.

Mr. PEI JONES: We had in mind about £180,000.

Mr. HODDA: How do you arrive at that?

Mr. PEI JONES: 3%.

Mr. HODDA: £5,400 a year at 3%?

Mr. LANGSTONE: Directly you put percentages into it you can make it mean anything at all. I do not want percentages at all, I want a capital sum. I hope that within the next ten or fifteen years the Maoris will not need anything at all - they will be all right. I do not want to bother about "Kingdom Come" because you and I will not be here then. The Maoris should not consider one single item alone. We must look at the sum total. If Waikato was the only one it would be all right but there are others. There are some who are completely landless, and some who have only 100 acres among 68. I want the Maoris to understand that they are all brothers and sisters in the big scheme of things and we have got to assist the lot of them. I think that is as far as we can get now. You can talk it over and we will meet to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Meeting adjourned 3.45 p.m.)

(Meeting resumed 10 a.m. 16th February).

Mr. PEI JONES: We would be prepared to accept the offer partly in land and partly in money subject to a grant of land as suggested.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I want you to picture the whole question. I promised £125,000 and if there is any land to be added I cannot say, but I will see the Prime Minister, let him know all costs and let you know.

Mr. PEI JONES: What about interest?

Mr. LANGSTONE: I could not commit the Government regarding interest. It will probably have to be a lump sum. If it suits the Government we might pay in, say, twenty equal instalments or pay a capital sum at once.

Mr. PEI JONES: We understand that the £125,000 would remain a lump sum in addition to an award of land.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I don't want to talk of either too much at the moment. I want to discuss the matter with the Native Department and the Treasury. Leave it to me and I may be able to arrange something about land. I was struck with the fact that the Waikatos have no land. I want to arrange things in such a way that in, say, twenty years the improvement in the Maoris' position will make them economically equal to the Paksha. Leave it to me and it will not be less than £125,000.

Mr. PEI JONES: We discussed the possibilities of the proposed settlement and thought that if the Government was not prepared to make any interest payment on the capital sum it would be better to get a settlement by way of a lump sum payment and then find our own investment.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I may be able to arrange that, but I will have to discuss that matter with the Minister of Finance. Although I may make tentative arrangements here I cannot run another Minister into difficulties. I do not want any misunderstandings.

182
7-1-10

I want to be clear exactly what we mean. I promised £125,000. You leave it at that and I will take the matter up and see if there is any land or just exactly what will be done. We will let you and all the other Maoris know what has been done with regard to the settlement of these confiscation claims and the other claims. You can imagine that it is going to be a pretty big thing and we want to do justice to everybody.

Mr. PEI JONES: You will give this matter due consideration?

Mr. LANGSTONE: Yes, it will be discussed with the other things. Suppose that I cannot find any land. Well, that would be considered and we would have to arrange so that the Maoris would have to make their own purchase instead of the Government making it for them. The spending of the £125,000 would be for the improvement of the land. The people would possibly pay something to a Board that may be set up. We must have some proper supervision over the expenditure of the money as we have over the Arawa Trust Board and that sort of thing. When voting money from Parliament we must have certain legal enactments. We do not want mal-administration or mis-expenditure of moneys.

Mr. PEI JONES: We quite appreciate that.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I think you can go away and rest assured that I will see what can be done in the general wash-up of things.

Mr. PEI JONES: Does that mean, Sir, that you may have some proposition to put before us very shortly during our stay here?

Mr. LANGSTONE: No, nothing can be done until after the 31st March, in the next financial year. Our financial year is from the 1st April to the 31st March and every provision has been made for expenditure this year. The Maoris will know that anything that is done cannot be done until a certain date. I cannot commit the Government to anything this year because we have only another six weeks to go and we are at the end of the financial year and every commitment has been allocated. The Government will have to

consider what it can do in relation to all the other things it has to do.

Mr. JONES: At this stage the idea of paying out of the capital sum is not acceptable. We prefer to have the amount invested in some way and if the Government is not prepared to do that we will have to try and do it ourselves rather than have the capital sum paid in instalments.

Mr. LANGSTONE: We will consider that. I will do my best but there are limits. We must all be reasonable and I want that spirit of trust to exist and the feeling that we have confidence in one another. The right thing will be done as far as it is humanly possible to do it. Another fact is with regard to the remissions that we have given on survey fees running into nearly £100,000.

Mr. PEI JONES: As a matter of fact the Waikatos have not participated in those things.

Mr. LANGSTONE: They were hesitant in coming forward.

Mr. PEI JONES: They have not benefitted by survey liens and in view of their numbers and comparing their supposed settlement with other people who have had their grievances met they think that they should get fairly generous treatment. As a matter of fact a lot of the fighting was borne by the Waikatos.

Mr. LANGSTONE: We cannot help those things and it is no good trying to make it impossible for me to arrange a settlement. I want to make a settlement with Waikato but I also want to make a settlement with the others. You will understand that in any settlement it is the aggregate that is concerning the Government and Treasury, but I assure you that we will do the very best we can and it will not be less than £125,000.

Mr. PEI JONES: Reverting to the question that part of the settlement be an award of land, we have already made some enquiries in regard to the land available and there is an area of about

14,000 acres on the Western side of Lake Taupo which appeals to us and which we would like examined by the Government.

Mr. LANGSTONE: The Lands Department paid for that land but I will see if I can arrange anything. We are spending more than £100,000 on the road from Tokaanu to Mamumu. That is going to open up a lot of timber. Where that road goes through the open land is thought of, but I am not giving you a promise. I am just prepared to consider if it is practicable and how it can be done.

Mr. PEI JONES: We are having a meeting on the 18th March. Could a representative of the Government make an announcement of the result of this conference then?

Mr. LANGSTONE: No, but as soon as we are able to make the announcement we will do so.

Mr. JONES: Some people think that we are not acting for the tribe.

Mr. LANGSTONE: The people who were asked to come here are the representatives of the Waikato tribe.

Mr. PEI JONES: Well Sir, I would like to thank you very much for the patient way in which you have dealt with this matter. Although we are rather disappointed that we did not get a settlement that we could go back and lay before the people we can appreciate your difficulties. We would like to extend through you our thanks to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister and we hope that you will convey our best wishes to him. We now turn our faces homewards but we do not want you to think that we resent the treatment that we have received here. We appreciate the difficulties you are confronted with and now go back in the hope that when a settlement is arrived at it will be somewhere near what is acceptable to us.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned 10.40 a.m.)

(Meeting resumed 11 a.m.)

SIR APIRANA NGATA: Regarding the Ngati-Rangihouhiri and Hikakine claim, the head of this delegation is Mr. Kere Wano of Whakatane representing these two sub-tribes. I do not think I can add much to what was said yesterday. There is not much in the Matata district which can be set aside by way of compensation as most of the land is in private hands and the rest is in the hands of the Crown with settlers on it. There is also a fair amount of swamp. The suggestion I made yesterday was for the Government to make provision to set aside a portion of the Kawerau Block on the western side of the Tarawera River. The boundary would be about here.

(Sir Apirana Ngata and Mr. Langstone consult map.)

KERE WANO: We quite agree with what Sir Apirana Ngata has said. If the Minister thinks that the tribe can live comfortably on this land we are quite willing to take it on. We want to make a decent living out of the land. That is all we want and the sooner we get on to the land the better because we have no land. That is all I have to say but I do not like delaying things. I like to get on it straight away.

MR. LANGSTONE: There is one thing I would like to point out for your consideration. Naturally no decision can be given today on any particular case and I think the Waikato people were a little disappointed for they thought there was to be a decision. The Government naturally will have to see what the whole lot is going to come to if it is going to get the true picture of the whole thing. Although some of the Maoris may not get as much as they think they might have got all that the Government wants to do is to get the right picture before us, and until we have heard all of them and until the whole thing is put into some sort of shape, we are not able to give a decision on any one claim. The only thing we can do this morning is to give mature consideration to your claim which, I take it, is that you are asking for 1000 acres to be set aside in the Tarawera area to be used for these two particular hapus who are almost landless.

1986
24302

Sir APIHANA NGATA: Yes, that is the plan.

Mr. LANGSTONE: That will have to be considered in the general scheme because the Waikato Natives have very little land and there is a great number of Waikatos - about 14,000 I think, and the question of these people has to be considered, and whatever is done will have to be taken as part of the sum total and I want the Maoris to look at it in that way. Suppose that you leave it to me and I will go into the matter with the Lands Department and see what can be arranged, and when I am submitting a report to Mr. Savage I will take them all as I think they should be taken and then we will know exactly what the sum total is going to cost. As a previous Minister of the Crown you know, Sir Apirana, that a Government has got to allocate its money each year. Some of the people were asking for interest on their money but I am not concerned with that. I am concerned with an annual payment only until a certain sum has been exhausted because I am hoping that in a period of 20 years we will have a far different position existing among the Maori people. The problems that we see with us today will not be with us in 20 years' time and the extent of confiscations and the question of surplus lands will cease to exist, having petered out by the effluxion of time. If you will leave this claim to me it will be considered with due and mature seriousness along with all the other claims. I cannot go any further than that this morning.

Sir APIRANA NGATA: I think that the delegation will have to be satisfied with that at this juncture. Naturally they want to go home and tell their people the result of their "fishing".

Mr. SHEPHERD: They have only had a "bite".

Mr. LANGSTONE: They can say they have "baited their hooks" and left them in Wellington. The Government is anxious to get a final settlement and the Maoris have got to appreciate the fact that the Government must look at this thing as a whole and not

197
7-0

from the point of view of each individual tribe.

Mr. KEREM WAREO: I thank you, Mr. Langstone, for what you have said to our deputation. I hope when we get back we will be able to tell the tribe what the decision was. We leave it to you. Whatever you think fit for the tribe we are quite satisfied. I am afraid I am not a good speaker in English but if it was my own language I could tell you much more. I thank you very much.

Mr. P. HOHAPATA: Sir, I would like to endorse the remarks made by the previous speaker and also to thank you for the kind attitude you have taken towards this complaint of ours.

Mr. J. WIRETI: Mr. Langstone, I thank you for the assurance that you will give every consideration to the claim of the Ngati-Rangihouhiri and Ngati-Hikakino hapus. I also thank Sir Apirana Ngata for his assistance and I trust that the discussion of this matter will come to a satisfactory conclusion. We will all be pleased to hear the final decision of the Government as soon as possible.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Thank you, gentlemen, and you can leave it to me.

(Meeting adjourned from 11.20 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.)

Mr. LANGSTONE: We will now deal with the Whakatohea claim.

SIR APIRANA NGATA: In this case the Commission recommended an annual amount of £300 to be devoted to educational purposes but that was considered at the time the report was made to be insufficient in view of all the circumstances, and when the Natives met Mr. Coates in 1928 at Whakatane the amount suggested was £1,000. I may say that at that time and until quite recently the mind of the then Government was running on annual payments and it seemed to the tribes that the whole problem centred around the quantum of the annual payments. The then four Maori members, Sir Maui Pomare, Mr. Tau Henare, Mr. Uru and myself all urged Mr. Coates that the payment in the case of Whakatohea should be increased

to £1,000 annually and that the purpose of the grant should not be restricted to education but should embrace land settlement. The Whakatohea problem has been an insufficiency of land for their support. The Commission, in reviewing their circumstances in 1921, says quite definitely that their best lands, which were near the Opotiki Township, had all been confiscated. They were given back the Opape block. The facts set out by the 1921 Commission were that an area of 440,000 acres had been taken from the Whakatohea and part of that had been returned to them. Then in summing up we find that the area taken was 181,000 acres. The area of the tribal lands of the Whakatohea actually taken was 173,000 acres and 22,000 acres were returned to them. That would be here on the map.

(Mr. Langstone and Sir Apirana Ngata consult map).

That brings us back to this Opape block. You have two problems: one is virtual landlessness and the other is a recommendation of the Commission that these Whakatohea people were punished much more severely than circumstances warranted. We have got to admit right away that the state is doing a fair amount by these people in common with the rest of the Maoris. Their land is being developed and units established on it and quite a large section of the Whakatohea get their living out of it. About 24 units are established there and the maximum would be about 70 units, that is, provided there is nothing better offering. They are hard workers and get quite a lot of casual employment.

MR. LANGSTONE: What is the number of their tribe?

SIR APIRANA NGATA: About 1300 or 1400 actually living in this area. If you compare their condition with Waikato or Taranaki the acreage figure for Opotiki works out at about one-sixth of the figure for Waikato and about one-quarter of the figure for Taranaki. If you take it on the basis of lands confiscated these people rank very high on the list of tribes who lost their lands by confiscation. I do not think an attempt was made to

189
7-335

value Opotiki but it was one of the largest settlements in the Dominion and its value was very well known in the 'sixties. I understand that these people carried on a trade with Auckland, taking the produce from their lands, maize, wheat, pigs and so on, and they were a highly civilised Maori tribe until the Volkner trouble came along. If you take it on a money basis, notwithstanding the Commission's report of £300, in my opinion, and I have been of that opinion ever since the report of the Commission was tabled, £300 is inadequate and £1,000 per annum should be the sum granted to the Whakatohea.

Mr. LANGSTONE: For what period?

Sir APIRANA NGATA: Well, they rank with the other claims so we leave it to the Government. Alternatively, if the mind of the Government is running upon land grants I want to point out that in the whole of that area, with the exception of odd pieces, there is no land unoccupied in the hands of the Crown or land held by Europeans at a reasonable price which could be acquired for the use and occupation of these people. Near the Ohiva Harbour there are European lands, grants made to military settlers of 50 acres, I think. I examined these with a view to recommending them for development for these people. The position was that owing to sundry mortgages by grand-children of the military settlers, in order to get the present owners out of trouble you would need to pay them about £10 an acre. Other than these, I do not know of any lands in the district. The same position holds on the Gisborne side. If land is the main consideration you have got to go outside the Opotiki district or buy land as was suggested some years ago at somewhere about £25 to £30 an acre, but that would bankrupt any trust fund. If you think in terms of land you have to go into the pumice country about Rotorua. There are some blocks on the road between Rotoiti and Maketu that might be acquired and it might not be too far for the Whakatohea to go out there and settle. However, I am just entering that suggestion. If the mind of the Government is on land they have got to go out of the district.

170
2376

Mr. J.D. EDWARDS: I think Sir Apirana has stated the case very clearly and has covered all the ground. I do not think there is anything left for me to say other than to stress that, prior to the upheaval, the Whakatohea was one of the most progressive Maori tribes in the Dominion. They owned scows and were trading between Opotiki and many other Auckland ports, such as Whakatane, Tauranga, Matata and Mercury Bay, and with the increase in their farming operations they found that one or two scows were not sufficient to cope with their output. This shows the extent of the farming operations in Opotiki which consisted mainly of wheat (there was very little maize) also pigs, kumaras and pumpkins. They also had quite modern implements at the time, such as ploughs, carts and horses, the latter being supplied by a white man named Wilson. Therefore, you can see that a progressive state of affairs existed then, but we cannot say now that the Whakatohea can afford to buy scows to trade between Opotiki and Auckland because their valuable properties have been confiscated. We consider that the recommendation of the Royal Commission of the small amount of £200 is not justified because of the farming operations going on at the time of the upheaval. We have nothing to look forward to and we appeal to you to give us a lead so that we can look forward the same as we looked forward before the upheaval which, to our mind, was not caused by ourselves. You must understand that in those days our people were a little primitive and it was your duty to lead us and I hope you will lead us and try to consider our plea favourably. In regard to the portion of land behind Opotiki it is absolutely useless. My own idea is that apart from our plea for compensation if the Crown can see its way to exchange the back country that is not productive and not likely to be productive with some more suitable land for settlement somewhere else as long as it is land to be developed for the benefit of my people. I am speaking personally but I intended to put it before the tribe. I have a piece of Opape No.8 but it is only a waste of money trying to develop it.

Mr. LANGSTONE: How many acres would there be in the area

that is useless?

Sir APIRANA NGATA: The back part of Opape is about 156 acres.

(Sir Apirana Ngata and Mr. Langstone consult map).

Mr. J.D. EDWARDS: I do not think I have any more to say just now other than that you consider our plea for an adequate return for the land which was confiscated.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I can only tell you exactly what I have informed the other representatives. I will bring this matter before Cabinet because I want to get a picture of the whole thing. I cannot make a decision on any one. I can see difficulties with regard to providing land for you. I suppose there are difficulties even if we go outside the area. I take it that the thing that you are after in this case is the question of a cash payment per annum.

Sir APIRANA NGATA: Yes.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I agree that we should reserve this high, mountainous country that is useless for settlement, but the immediate thing that I can see in this case is that the £300 offered by the Commission is considered totally inadequate and you desire to increase that amount to something more reasonable. The question then of putting the Maoris to work either on their own land or a general Development Scheme is an after consideration. I will put it before the Government and you can rest assured that we will do the best that it is possible to do, taking the whole lot into consideration, seeing how much it is going to cost and how it can be spread to be most beneficial to all the Maoris.

Mr. J.D. EDWARDS: I take it that you would keep the unproductive area separate from the compensation claim. You would not amalgamate the two?

Mr. LANGSTONE: No. There are a lot of areas that should be set aside and I think we should perpetuate the memory of a lot of

old Maori settlers by naming the land after their ancestors. It would be a generous gesture on the part of the Maoris if they said that it is no good trying to develop this land but we will keep it for the plant and bird life. Any such areas could be made big National Parks named after the various ancestors. I might be able to set up a Park Board - but that is outside this altogether.

Mr. J.D. EDWARDS: On behalf of myself and my elders, I thank you very much, Mr. Langstone, for your sympathetic consideration in listening to us and I only hope that this will bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. LANGSTONE: Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned from 12.20 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.)

Sir AP'IRANA NGATA: Sir, this case deals with the Wairoa confiscated lands, and the representatives are Mr. Hata Tipoki, Mr. Turi Carroll and Mr. Eutene Tui. Mr. E.A. Mitchell was unable to come to Wellington. It was thought advisable to suggest four representatives owing to the division of parties in the Wairoa district. Mr. Eutene Tui was selected by the Maori Labour organisation in Wairoa. The various petitions which were submitted to Parliament from time to time centered for the most part around the Kanhouroa block near Frasertown which is a strategic point. You will find running right through the representations and the petitions two main claims. In regard to the Kanhouroa block the petitioners allege that a promise was made by the Government to provide twenty 50 acre sections out of the Kanhouroa block which was confiscated to satisfy the claims of the Government in regard to rebellious acts in the Wairoa district. The answer of the Government to that was that they held in their possession an agreement committing the twenty 50 acre sections into a money payment of £800 and the Commission takes the view that that was so. In addition, certain promises were alleged by the Wairoa people to have been made on behalf of the Government by Mr. Locke and Mr.

Biggs. This is where the two parties in the Wairoa district divide off. You have the claim of those who supported the Crown during the troublesome days in Wairoa and those who did not support the Crown, but committed what were termed "acts of rebellion". The Commission of 1926 inclined to the view quite definitely, with the exception of Mr. Reed who differed from the findings of the others, that so far as the promises made to the Maoris were concerned the Government had failed to carry them out, and the subsequent recommendation of £500 a year made in its report appears to have been made in view of these promises not having been fulfilled. I investigated to see if the loyalists had been compensated by grant of land in some other way, but the only reserve which was made within this country which could be connected in this way with the people who sided with the Crown was the Pakowhai block of 500 acres. The records show it had been set aside for Miri Karaka and her people but other than that we are not aware of any land grants having been made so that we must support the view of two members of the Commission that the Government failed to carry out the promises made to the loyalists. Now, in regard to the so-called "rebels", according to the Department's statement which we have here the confiscation in the Wairoa district differed from the confiscations in Waikato and elsewhere in that a different procedure was adopted. Under the East Coast Titles Act the Native Land Court had to distinguish between loyalists and rebels and there were not what I may call "acts of confiscation" as had taken place in the Bay of Plenty, Waikato and other districts. There was a loss of land by that section which had committed acts of rebellion against the Crown. In the report the position of the Wairoa Natives who had taken up sides against the Crown is not emphasised. The Commission seems to have been satisfied that in regard to Kauhoroa the Natives had failed to make out a case, but on the other hand the Crown had proved to the Commission that it had given a quid pro quo and the whole case from the rebels' side fell to the ground. Then there are the four blocks, Ruatiki, Taramarama, Tukurangi and Waian, which we say

were confiscated by the Crown although the records show that they were sold by the Deed of Cession. While the Natives were deprived of this large section of country they were not left landless in the same sense as in the case of the Waikatos or the Whakatohea. They were left with a grievance as to the excessive amount of land that was taken for their offences. If, on the other hand, you were to regard tribes living on the Waiau River which is the tributary of the Wairoa River, one can see today that that particular sub-tribe is one of the worse off in the Wairoa District and compare unfavourably with similarly situated Natives in the Opotiki District. The old Native Land Act vesting the land in ten trustees on behalf of the tribe had brought about the sale of most of the land on the coastal side of Wairoa right up to Mhaka and right back to the Mangapoike River. These blocks were sold by the ten owners who thereby deprived the next generation of the Wairoa people of most of their lands, but one can see that the Government is not to blame for the action of the ten owners in selling the best of the Maori lands. Our claim therefore is this: So far as the definite recommendation of the Commission is concerned, notwithstanding Mr. Reed's opinion, those who represent the claim which is sought to be met by a grant of £200 say that that is too small and they want a larger amount. The amount suggested at various meetings held in the Wairoa District subsequent to this report appearing was £900 a year. Now, the case of the so-called "rebels" today, according to Rutene Tuhi, is that they want the Native Land Court to investigate the ownership of the Kauhourea block on the assumption that it is being returned to the Natives by the Crown. I suppose that certain promises by the Government have become interpreted as the intention of the Government to return part or whole of the Kauhourea block. That is why we had a request by Rutene Tuhi that he was here to represent not those who claim money compensation but those who claim that on the return of the Kauhourea block there should be an investigation by the Native Land Court to determine who is entitled to the land according to Native custom.

Mr. BODDA: What is the area of this block?

Sir APIRAMA NGATA: About 40,000 acres.

Mr. BODDA: Is it settled by Europeans now?

Sir APIRAMA NGATA: Yes, all of it round about Frasertown is occupied by European farmers. Now, I want to suggest an alternative so far as Rutehuia's claim is concerned. One can see the impracticability of the Crown carrying out the promise to make available twenty 50 acre sections of the Kanhouroa block because the land is in European occupation and an undertaking like that would cost a lot of money as portions of the block are worth £40 or £50. I suggest an alternative in order that the Government may consider not only those whose claims are considered here and who may be termed "landless" but the case of those who took part in the rebellion and in respect of whose acts the Crown took the measures it did to acquire this country, that their claim might also be recognised by the Government. If it is proposed to satisfy one in terms of the Commission and no others, you will only be dealing with a small part of the difficulties in regard to Wairoa instead of clearing the whole thing up. When the Prime Minister visited Ngauruhia he found the Waikatos at the cross-roads there. The younger generation had made up their minds that blood could be compensated by money but there are a number of the people who want land. The Prime Minister told them that it was quite impracticable but there is a section who believe that the so-called injustices are not properly compensated and that there is no proper settlement without something being done in regard to this Kanhouroa block, the return of it or a portion of it, or the return of some land. As to the recommendation of a monetary compensation when we learned of the suggestion made by yourself to the Waikato people to take part of their settlement in land in the Taupo district we have been considering that alternative. If a suggestion is made by the Government representatives in regard to a grant of land which might be considered in the Wairoa district

we submit first and foremost part of the Kakariki estate. That is a nice block.

Mr. LANGSTONE: How many acres in it, about 10,000?

Sir APIRANA NGATA: Yes, I think they have developed about 7,000 acres but there is another 5,000 acres in the Kakariki estate. If that does not meet with the approval of the Crown representatives the alternative suggestion is that bordering on the Papuni Station, one of the stations administered by the East Coast Trust, and also on the Wainaha Station there is an area of provisional State Forest of about 8,000 acres but probably only one-half or one-third of it would be developable. Assuming it to be 8,000 or 9,000 acres, I have the opinion of Mr. Jessop, who knows the country, and he puts a value upon it of about 10/- an acre. The proposal would be to vest it with the rest in the East Coast Commissioner. It would be just like adding one more estate to those already controlled by him or in connection with the East Coast Trust, or under some system like that. Some of these blocks are administered by corporate bodies and we believe more in land investments than in these annual payments. That is the proposal that is being submitted to you for consideration by those who represent the loyalists on whose behalf the recommendation is made by the Commission. I read Mr. Reed's memorandum against the findings of the Commission, and I am bound to say that after a review of all that, when one goes back to his concluding paragraph Mr. Reed might just as well have put his signature to the report of the other Commissioners. We do not stress on sentimental lines the claim of the loyalists. Mr. Reed's opinion was that the claim of the loyalists was met by the Agreement of 1876. There was a Judge of the Supreme Court presiding over that Commission and his view was that the Agreement was not an answer to the claim put forward that the Crown had not carried out its promises made to the loyalists during the 'sixties.

Mr. LANGSTONE: If the money had been paid to the Natives in

two separate sums instead of being incorporated as one payment for the land, would not that have made the difference? There was £1500 to be paid to the loyalists and evidently there was some separate correspondence to get this money sent forward so that the Maoris could be paid and that was deducted from the £12,000 paid for the four blocks. In so far as the confiscations were made, they were prepared to give all of those back to the loyalists but they did not act on this. It went before the Court and the Court then distributed the land in accordance with the Native interests in the land and not based upon loyalty or upon rebellion. Consequently they got it back again when the Crown bought it with the understanding that this area was to be taken and £800 was to be paid for it. £800 was paid. Then there were the twenty 50 acre sections but £800 was alleged to have been paid in lieu of twenty 50 acre sections. We have got two positions: one is the re-purchase of this and included in the re-purchase was the £1500 promised to the loyalists, and the other is that we have the £800 alleged to have been paid for Kanhouroa and £800 alleged to have been paid in lieu of the twenty 50 acre sections.

Sir APIHANA NGATA: The Commission was satisfied that the second £800 had been paid and it was also satisfied that the promise to the loyalists had not been carried out. I would like Mr. Rutene Tuhi to say something.

Mr. RUTENE TUHI: I will describe the boundaries of the Kanhouroa block.

(Consults map with Messrs. Langstone and Shepherd).

The petitions we presented to Parliament affect the area, the boundaries of which I have just given. All the blocks I have just referred to were included in the previous confiscation. Karaitiana, Chief of the Hawkes Bay districts, asked what was to be done with the three blocks I have just mentioned. The Chief of the Wairoa replied, "Sell them." When that was disposed of their attention was drawn to this other block. Kanhouroa was the block that was taken in order to comply with the requirements of

the Government. The Government granted a sum of £400 for a portion of this block on the other side of the stream - £400 for the land on the western side of the Mangapike and £400 for the land on the eastern side. Mere Kaka, grandmother of Mr. Hata Tipoki, got some of the money. That is the position in regard to Kauhoroa. At that time the rebels could take no part in the proceedings, thinking that if they so decided possibly the Government forces would commence shooting them down again. Now, in regard to the sections that were reserved we know nothing of those reserves. It was Mr. Sim, who conducted the case before the Commission, who told us that there were twenty sections there, and that those sections are still incorporated in the portion of the Kauhoroa block confiscated. Our petitions were in connection with the whole of the Kauhoroa block and not specially in connection with any sections incorporated in that block. The recommendation of the Commission was that the Natives get £300 per annum for ever, the Natives requested that they receive £900, and the matter was placed in Sir Apirana Ngata's hands to present to the Government. Whether he has done that or not we do not know. The tenor of the recommendation by the Commission was that £300 was to be spent in furthering the education of the Maori youths in the district. Immediately after that Ngati-Kahungunu again signed up a petition and that petition is before Parliament at the present time. Since they have not received any word as to what the result of that petition was they again signed another petition which was sent to Mr. Sim to prosecute. It was as a result of that that Jack Mitchell and Sidney Christie took a hand in the matter. Their contention was that they were to come down and get the money for the purpose of erecting the two houses now in course of construction in the Wairoa district. Sir Apirana referred to a meeting, but I am sorry to say that owing to illness I was not able to attend that meeting. On the following Sunday the matter regarding Kauhoroa was again brought up. We were told then as to what had transpired at that meeting

and it was then that I stated that I would not agree to any of the proposals put forward. We claim that the land, Kauhoroa, should be returned, and we are averse to the recommendation and the proposal for money payment and we still adhere to that intention from that time down to the present. We have been supported by the tribes whom I mentioned yesterday in this contention. I still adhere to those assertions and I am not able to depart from what the people intended at that time. The loyalists are well provided for in this matter since Mere Kaka and others participated in the money, but not so the rebels.

Mr. LANGSTONE: But there are no rebels and no loyalists today. They are all loyalists.

Mr. HATA TIPOKI: Greetings to the Minister and to your Government. We thank you for the invitation issued to us and we come in compliance with that invitation. We come in the hope that perhaps this present Government might finally settle this matter since we have been nursing it in our memories for very many years. Rutene has described the boundaries of the Kauhoroa block. Those boundaries are accurate. I want to make this distinction that this Kauhoroa block comprises three blocks; Pakowhai, Waharera and Makapua. You, Sir, as Minister, could easily see for yourself that in these block-reservations have been made in the case of each block. That is to show you that both the rebels and the loyalists were owners in the whole of the blocks. With regard to the explanation made by Sir Apirana Ngata we have come with those arguments. This matter was discussed at a meeting at Wairoa at which the question was asked, what was their opinion in connection with this Kauhoroa matter, whether they were agreeable to the £300 a year as compensation, was it too little or was it too much. We left it to their principal women, who were principals in connection with the petitions sent in, that they should make known their minds regarding the matter. Those women said that the amount was too small and that it should be £1,000. Sir Apirana Ngata suggested it should be a little less. We were satisfied at that time.

according to Sir Apirana's explanation of the position, that the land itself would not be returned. It was then that I made up my mind that whatever the Government might choose to award in its graciousness we will accept that. Personally, I do not make any distinction at all at the present time as to whether some Natives are loyal or some are rebels. To me they are all the same. It is for the Government and its Ministers to decide how this matter should be settled. If the Government in its wisdom gives land some distance away from this block I am quite agreeable to take it. That is all I have to say.

Mr. FURI CARROLL: I do not think I could add very much to that. I agree that we should not be talking about rebels and loyalists. We are all alike because we are all living on these lands. I think that these rebels had more than their share. It is not a case of starvation altogether with them. If the loyalists participated in anything it appears to me that they have had their share also. I think it is a Maori custom that a Rangatira shares things with his people and I think that has happened with the so-called rebels, the Hauhans. I would just like to support Hata Tipoki in his statement that it is impracticable for the Kanhouroa block to be returned. If you can give us a parcel of land that can be developed economically and increase the £300 it must prove beneficial to these people. I appeal on behalf of the younger generation and if the same policy as in East Coast land can be adopted I am quite certain that it is only a matter of time before the thing will be of great benefit to the rising generation.

Sir APIRANA NGATA: In regard to the area I indicated, it is provisional State Forest. It is wedged in between the farms administered by the East Coast Trust and two blocks in the Urewera Country.

(Sir Apirana Ngata and Mr. Langstone consult map).

Mr. BODDA: Have you any special reason for suggesting an increase?

Sir APIRANA NGATA: The question was put to the Maori members by

Mr. Coates to make our own recommendations after consultation with the various tribes and that was when the figure of £300, suggested in regard to the Wairoa people, appeared to us to be too small.

Mr. BORDA: If you take the Waikato claim on the same basis it would run into thousands.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I presume that on the East Coast many leases will expire by the effluxion of time and will not be leased to the Pakeha and the Maoris will go on to that land.

Sir APIRANA NGATA: We hope so, but there is no guarantee. The Pakeha settlers may get up some agitation to a future Government about it. Well, Sir, it looks like the end of this portion of these conferences and I want to thank you on behalf of my own section of the delegates for the patient hearing that you have given us. I think they can all go away feeling that if settlements can be arrived at which would be satisfactory to the Natives without undue burden upon the state then you and the other members of the Government will do your best to get rid of these claims. One matter which Mr. Carroll brought up yesterday is that of payment of a proportion of the expenses of these delegates. I do not refer to all the Natives who came down but to the official representatives who may say that they were invited by the Government to Wellington to take part in this conference. I know, of course, that as plaintiffs they are not entitled to any consideration in regard to expenses. Two years ago, however, the expenses of the Waikato representatives were provided by the Government. The Southland representatives, prior to 1935, had their expenses provided by the state. There is an item on the estimates, something like £50, and I think these delegates in Wellington should get their accommodation paid.

Mr. LANGSTONE: I could not give you any promise here. I have always felt that the best way of doing business is to come direct as we are here today. We have not only got some material facts to deal with, we have got the human side and the satisfaction that is

going to accrue from it, because even if we give money and we have not got that satisfaction we have not accomplished much. We are just as anxious as the Maori people that the thing should end. The continual harping on these things is no good to us or to the Maoris. We do not want any more meetings; I want to see this settled. I will have a look at the land you have mentioned and if there is waste land that can be brought into productivity and providing there is no danger in regard to flooding, I am quite sure that even the State Forest Department would not raise any objection to the reservations being uplifted. However, this will be taken in conjunction with the other claims, but I am really more concerned about the most serious cases. We want to treat everyone with sound judgment and common-sense and do the right thing. If you will leave this with me when we wash up the whole thing and get a true picture we will just see how far Wairoa will come into the scheme of things.

(Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.)