

1905.  
NEW ZEALAND.

PORIRUA, OTAKI, WAIKATO, KAIKOKIRIKIRI,  
AND MOTUEKA SCHOOL TRUSTS

(REPORT AND EVIDENCE OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE).

*Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Commission .. .. .	Page iii j
Report .. .. .	v
Minutes of Proceedings .. .. .	xv
Index to Evidence .. .. .	xxiii
Index to Appendices .. .. .	xxiv
Minutes of Evidence .. .. .	1
Appendices .. .. .	146

## ERRATUM

Page 104, in line 4, *for* "Papawai" *read* "Porirua."

## COMMISSION.

PLUNKET, Governor.

To all to whom these presents shall come and to the Honourable Sir James Prendergast, of Wellington, Knight; Herbert Samuel Wardell, of Wellington, Stipendiary Magistrate; William Henry Quick, of Wellington, barrister; and Ihaia Hutana, of Waipawa: Greeting.

WHEREAS by the Crown grants mentioned in the schedule hereto certain lands were granted to the persons therein named in trust for the use and towards the maintenance of the schools therein referred to: And whereas petitions were presented to Parliament during the last session thereof alleging that in the case of the Porirua grant, the Otaki grants, and other grants, the lands were ceded to the Crown by the Native owners thereof so as to provide for the education of their children and the children of kindred tribes, and that there has been in each case a total or partial failure to fulfil the trusts thereof, and praying that a Commission be set up to inquire into the facts concerning the said trusts and report to His Excellency the Governor the best method of administering the same with a view to legislation being introduced to deal with the matter: And whereas the Committee to which the said petitions were referred recommended that they be referred to the Government for inquiry: And whereas certain litigation has taken place with respect to the Porirua grant and the trusts affecting the same and a scheme for the administration of such trusts *cy-près* has been approved by the Supreme Court: And whereas in a judgment in connection therewith of His Honour the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Edwards delivered on the 7th September, 1900, it was stated that "The approval of such a scheme as is here suggested cannot in any way hamper either the Government or the Parliament in dealing with this trust or the trusts referred to": And whereas it is expedient that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the present position of the trusts and trust estates created by the respective Crown grants mentioned in the schedule hereto, and into the necessity or expediency of the proposed legislation with respect thereof:

Now therefore I, William Lee, Baron Plunket, the Governor of the Colony of New Zealand, in exercise of the powers conferred by "The Commissioners Act, 1903," and of every other power and authority enabling me in this behalf, and acting by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said colony do hereby constitute and appoint you, the said,

SIR JAMES PRENDERGAST,  
HERBERT SAMUEL WARDELL,  
WILLIAM HENRY QUICK, and  
IHAIA HUTANA,

to be a Commission for the purpose of making an inquiry into the present condition of the trusts and trust estates created by the said Crown grants, including in the case of each trust estate the matters following, that is to say—

- (1.) Of what the trust estate now consists—distinguishing land from money.
- (2.) The mode in which the land has been utilised and administered by the trustees: if leased—at what rental; if sold—at what price: what accumulations have been made and how they are invested.
- (3.) The total receipts and disbursements for each year since the creation of the trust.
- (4.) Whether the original trusts have been carried out, and if not, why not.
- (5.) If they cannot be carried out in their integrity, what modifications should be made in order to give effect to the original intention as far as practicable.
- (6.) In the case of the Porirua grant, whether the scheme approved by the Supreme Court gives effect to the original intention as far as practicable, and, if not, what modifications should be made in that scheme.

And you are hereby enjoined to make such suggestions and recommendations as you may consider desirable or necessary with respect to the future administration and control of the said trust estates and with respect to the necessity of legislation in the premises.

And with like advice and consent I do further appoint you, the said

SIR JAMES PRENDERGAST,

to be Chairman of the said Commission.

And for the better enabling you, the said Commission, to carry out these presents into effect you are hereby authorised and empowered to make and conduct any inquiry under these presents at such times and places in the said colony as you deem expedient, with power to adjourn from time to time, and from place to place, as you think fit; and to call before you and to examine on oath or otherwise, as may be allowed by law, such person or persons as you think capable of affording you information in the premises: and you are also hereby empowered to call for and examine all such books, documents, papers, plans, maps, or records as you deem likely to afford you the fullest information on the subject-matter of this inquiry and to inquire of and concerning the premises by all lawful ways and means whatsoever.

And, using all diligence, you are required to transmit to me, under your hands and seals, your report and recommendations in respect of the several matters inquired into by you not later than the 30th day of June, 1905, or such extended date as may be appointed in that behalf.

And it is hereby declared that these presents shall continue in full force and virtue although the inquiry be not regularly continued from time to time or from place to place by adjournment.

And lastly, it is hereby further declared that these presents are issued under and subject to the provisions of "The Commissioners Act, 1903."

## SCHEDULE.

## THE PORIRUA GRANT.

To wit, the Crown grant, dated the 28th day of December, 1850, of all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at the entrance of Porirua Harbour in the Province of New Munster, New Zealand, and bounded on the southern side by a line running from Rocky Bay, near Teti Bay, at an angle of 99° with the magnetic meridian till it intersects the base of the hills on the south side of the Onepoto Creek, the foot of the hills forming the boundary from thence to the head of the creek; on the east by the Porirua Harbour, and on the north and west by the sea the content being five hundred acres or thereabouts.

## THE OTAKI GRANTS.

To wit, firstly, the Crown grant, dated the 5th day of February, 1852, of all that parcel of land situate and being at Otaki, in the Province of Wellington, containing 396 acres 2 roods 30 perches, more or less, as more particularly described in the said grant.

Secondly, the Crown grant, dated the 5th day of February, 1852, of all that parcel of land situate and being at Otaki aforesaid, containing 68 acres 2 roods 35 perches, more or less, as more particularly described in the said grant.

Thirdly, the Crown grant, dated the 16th day of July, 1852, of all that parcel of land situate and being at Otaki aforesaid, containing 62 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Fourthly, the Crown grant, dated the 18th day of June, 1855, of all that parcel of land situate and being at Otaki aforesaid, containing 33 acres 3 roods, or thereabouts, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

## THE WAIKATO GRANTS.

To wit, firstly, the Crown grant, dated the 29th day of December, 1853, of all that parcel of land situate at Kohanga, in the Province of Auckland, containing 470 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Secondly, the Crown grant, dated the 29th day of October, 1853, of all that parcel of land situate at Kohanga aforesaid, containing 280 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Thirdly, the Crown grant, dated the 15th day of December, 1853, of all that parcel of land situate at Hopuhopu, in the Province of Auckland, and known as Pepepe South, containing 1,385 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said grant.

Fourthly, the Crown grant, dated the 29th day of October, 1853, of all that parcel of land situate at Puniu, in the Province of Auckland, containing 870 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Fifthly, the Crown grant, dated the 15th day of October, 1850, of all that parcel of land situate at Otawhao, in the Province of Auckland, containing 173 acres and 38 perches, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Sixthly, the Crown grant, dated the 29th day of October, 1853, of all that parcel of land situate at Pepepe, in the Province of Auckland, containing 133 acres 3 roods, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Given under the hand of His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Colony of New Zealand and its Dependencies, and issued under the seal of the said colony at the Government House, at Wellington, this 22nd day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and five.

In the Executive Council.

A. W. WILLIS,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

An enlargement of the above Commission, dated the 19th July, makes the following addition to the schedule :—

## THE MASTERTON GRANT.

To wit, the Crown grant, dated the 14th day of June, 1853, of all that piece or parcel of land commonly known as the Bishop's Reserve, and situated in the Borough of Masterton, in the Province of Wellington, containing 190 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

## THE MOTUEKA GRANTS.

To wit, firstly, the Crown grant, dated the 25th day of July, 1853, of all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, containing 660 acres, more or less, as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

Secondly, the Crown grant, dated the 25th day of July, 1853, of all those pieces or parcels of land situate and being at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, and containing respectively the following areas or thereabouts, viz. : 4 acres 2 roods 29 perches, 102 acres, 34 acres and 24 perches, 7 acres, 41 acres, 100 acres, 29 acres and 32 perches, 50 acres, 50 acres; as more particularly described in the said Crown grant.

A further enlargement of the Commission, dated the 29th July, extends the power of the Commissioners "To inquire and report upon any scheme submitted to you by the Natives for (a) combining the property and funds of the two trusts and trust estates created by the Porirua grant and the Otaki grants respectively, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a school for the education of Natives (including half-castes), and (b) divesting the present trustees of their trusts and vesting the management and administration of such school and of the combined property and funds in a Board, with provision that religious instruction shall not be given in the school."

The time for report was extended, from time to time, to the 23rd August, 1905.



## R E P O R T .

SIR,—

Wellington, 23rd August, 1905.

I have the honour, on behalf of the Commissioners, to hand you herewith, for presentation to His Excellency the Governor, our report on the Porirua and other school trusts, together with the evidence and an appendix.

I beg respectfully to state that the secretary of the Commission, Mr. Walter Leslie, has performed his duties, sometimes of an arduous character, indefatigably and with courtesy and ability.

The Commissions with which we were honoured are returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. PRENDERGAST,

Chairman.

The Right Hon. the Premier, Wellington.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable William Lee, Baron Plunket, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Colony of New Zealand and its Dependencies.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

We, the Commissioners appointed under Your Excellency's Commission, dated the 22nd May, 1905, the scope and period for return whereof were extended by enlargements dated the 1st, 8th, 19th, and 24th July, and the 7th and 21st August respectively, have the honour to submit our report on the various trusts into the administration of which we have been called upon to inquire, with such recommendations and suggestions as the facts revealed in evidence appear to call for.

We found it necessary to ignore the strict rules of evidence, and to receive much of a hearsay character, to which we have endeavoured to attach a proper value. We have also had recourse to all records of previous Commissions and parliamentary Committees which have dealt with these and cognate matters.

We propose to frame our report so as to deal with the several trusts in the order in which they appear in the schedules of the several commissions issued to us.

### PORIRUA.

This trust was created by a grant from the Crown, dated the 28th December, 1850, in the following terms: "Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua under the superintendence of the Right Reverend George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by a deed from the Natives been ceded for the support of the said school: Now know ye that We, for Us our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, the said Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors . . . . In trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

It is now held by trustees appointed by the General Synod of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called the Church of England, under legislative authority.

The trust consisted on the 31st March last of—(a.) The block of land described in the said grant, and known as Whitireia, containing something over 500 acres, now valued as pastoral land at from £4,000 to £5,000, but which will in all probability in a few years have a value much beyond what can be derived from mere sheep-farming or grazing operations for which it is now used. At present the land adjoining at Titahi Bay has been to a certain extent very profitably cut up and sold to residents in Wellington desirous of having country residences with a little

land within easy distance of that city. The trust estate, if cut up into lots of a few acres each, would doubtless be attractive to such persons, it being for that purpose sufficiently far, but not too far, from Wellington. The land is bounded on three sides by the sea, and it would lend itself well to subdivision for seaside residences. The land has been in the occupation of tenants and producing rental from almost the commencement of the trust, and is now under lease which expires on the 30th June, 1908, at a rental of £200 per annum; all income has gone to accumulation except the sum of £991 paid during the years 1866 to 1876 for salaries of teachers employed at the Church Missionary Society's school at Otaki, the sum of £1,154 paid as law costs and legal expenses, and the necessary costs of management. (b.) Of accumulated capital, which amounted on the same date to £9,187 17s. 10d., and which is invested as follows: namely, on satisfactory mortgages, £2,550; on deposit with a responsible company, £5,500; and a sum of £1,137 17s. 10d., at that time unproductive, but £1,000 of which was invested a week after the date named at 5½ per cent., and £137 17s. 10d. is now in hand; so that the total annual income from investments may be taken to be £472 0s. 4d., less annual charges amounting to £40. The estate is therefore now producing a gross income of £672, reduced by expenses to £630 net.

Particulars of receipts and disbursements, so far as we have been able to obtain them, are given in Appendix E.

In reply to the question whether the original trust has been carried out, your Commissioners find that no school has been established and maintained at Porirua as promised to the Native donors at the time of the cession of the land, and as required by the Crown grant, and are unanimously of opinion that the trust has not been carried out, and its object has not been attained. A small but inefficient school was carried on for a short time before and after the issue of the Crown grant, and an effort was made by Bishop Selwyn to erect a building suitable for a college, which it was his great desire to establish at Porirua; but his effort was unsuccessful, as he failed to obtain the financial assistance from England on which he relied. From that time nothing has been done towards establishing a school at Porirua. The trustees have apparently always had in view the scheme of establishing a boarding-school or college, but have not been, in their opinion, sufficiently in funds, and, while looking forward to the future, have taken no steps towards the establishment of a day-school, which would probably have been within their means for some years past. Such a school is not now required, the want being supplied by a State Board school. The trustees, however, expended nearly £1,000, as above stated, in salaries of school-teachers at Otaki, and thus, although by an unauthorised use of their funds, aided in Native education, and showed that they regarded the Otaki trust as in close affinity with their own.

The trustees in 1898 moved the Supreme Court with a view to obtaining its sanction to a scheme for the application of their funds, to provide exhibitions for children in such Church of England schools as the trustees might select. This scheme was rejected, and subsequently in 1902 one was approved under which the rents and profits of the trust are authorised to be devoted to the maintenance of scholars, preferably of the Ngatitōa Tribe, at a Church of England school, established at Wairarapa, for the education of Maori boys, and the sum of £42 4s. 9d. has been paid for the maintenance and travelling-expenses of one scholar for one year. This was a Ngatitōa from the Croixelles Island.

We are called upon by Your Excellency to report whether the approved scheme just referred to gives effect to the original intention of the trust. Our opinion is that it fails to do so, inasmuch as the original intention was to establish a local school in the neighbourhood of Porirua, and, as we think, chiefly for the benefit of children of the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes resident in the neighbourhood, and, further, because the devotion of the rents and profits of this estate to the maintenance of a school at Wairarapa, or of scholars in such school, is hostile to the sentiment of the Natives of these tribes, a sentiment operating powerfully at the present time, but even more so at the time of the creation of the trust. As a result of this feeling the Maoris of Porirua and the West Coast absolutely refuse to send their children to that school.

Before proceeding to deal with any modification in this scheme which we may consider necessary, and with the scheme submitted to us by Natives, which is referred to in Your Excellency's Commission, and which embraces a combination of the Porirua and Otaki trusts, it is desirable that we should give the results of our inquiry as to the position of the Otaki trust and its administration.

#### OTAKI.

The Otaki lands were granted not to Bishop Selwyn and his successors in office, but to William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu; Octavus Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapiti; and the Reverend Richard Taylor, of Wanganui, as trustees of the Church Missionary Society, a society with headquarters in London not amenable to the Church authorities in New Zealand, on trusts similar to those of the Porirua grant.

The trust now consists of, (a) the land comprised in the various grants aggregating 581 acres, valued by the Government Valuer in 1904 at £8,347; (b) of accumulated funds amounting in March last to £1,736 4s. 2d., deposited at call and bearing interest at 4 per cent.

The land has been leased from time to time, and in March last yielded a rental income of £267 17s. 6d. No land has been sold. The landed estate has been satisfactorily administered.

An account of receipts and expenditure, so far as we have been supplied with them, is given in Appendix J. We regret that we have found it impossible to obtain accounts of this trust antecedent to 1867.

The trusts of the Otaki grants were at one time carried out in their entirety, but for some time past there has been a partial failure, there having been no industrial training.

Prior to the date of the grant a school was established at Otaki by the Rev. Mr. Hadfield in 1839, which flourished from the beginning, and later, under the superintendence of the Rev. S. (now Archdeacon) Williams, grew to a large institution, attended at one time by as many as 130 boys, a large proportion being boarders. A school for girls was also carried on for some time. After the troubles caused by the political disturbances of 1863, the school was closed for a time, and afterwards carried on at intervals and with diminished numbers and usefulness up to the present time. There are now on the roll of the school thirty-five Maoris and half-castes, with an average attendance of twenty-five. The children now attending the school are, with two exceptions, day-scholars, too young for any education other than the elementary requirements of the first four standards. The school originally established for some years received substantial grants of money from the Government towards its support, and at that time the land was partly cultivated by the pupils for the benefit of the school. In 1903 the main building was burned down, causing a large loss to the trust, as the insurance was for £400 only, which was considered reasonable on account of its age, and since then the school has been carried on at great disadvantage in a small and unsuitable building.

There are several reasons for the falling-off both in numbers and efficiency: (a) The income of the trust was never sufficient without the Government subsidy for carrying on a boarding-school with industrial training; (b) the reduced Maori population and distracting political causes, such as the wars which took place in the sixties, hauhauism, &c.; (c) Roman Catholic children used to attend the school, but are now provided with a convent school for girls and young children; (d) the existence of a State school at Otaki. Your Commissioners are therefore of opinion that the best has been done that could be done with the Otaki endowment.

Your Commissioners have given to the scheme presented to them by the Natives for the administration of these trusts (a copy of which will be found in Appendix H), to the evidence adduced, and to the argument of counsel respecting it, their very earnest consideration before arriving at the opinion we now proceed to lay before Your Excellency.

Your Commissioners are strongly of opinion that the interest of Natives resident on the West Coast will be best served by the amalgamation of the Otaki and Porirua trusts, and the establishment of an efficient school at Otaki.

An obstacle to the accomplishment of the amalgamation presents itself in the fact that the grantees of the Otaki lands are trustees of the Church of England Missionary Society, an English society now represented in this colony by the Mission Trust Board, while the trustees of Porirua represent the General Synod of the Church of England in New Zealand. The evidence shows that the two bodies have approached each other with a view to bring this union about, but negotiations ceased when the Porirua trustees decided to establish a school in the Wairarapa.

The school which we recommend should be essentially a school for Natives and half-castes, with preference to children of the Ngatiraukawa, Ngatitōa, and Ngatiawa Tribes. While recognising the claims of Europeans to admission, they should not be admitted to the exclusion of available Native children. Children should be admissible as day-scholars from six or seven years to sixteen years of age, and no scholar should be allowed to remain in the school beyond the age of nineteen. The education given should be that of the Board schools up to the Sixth or Seventh Standard, and industrial training should be a special feature of its work, by which we mean instruction in trades and industries, such as carpentering, shoemaking, blacksmithing, book-keeping, or any other useful employment, and also the principles and science of farming as far as practicable. Physical drill should have special attention.

The united accumulated funds of the two trusts on the 31st March last amounted to £10,924 2s., from which an annual income is derived of £541; while the annual income from the landed estate amounted to the sum of £467, giving a joint total income of £1,008.

The evidence we have gathered satisfies us that a sum of from £20 to £25 per head per annum is a full allowance for the education and maintenance of boys or girls of the class in well-managed schools, and taking this as a basis, the present annual income would maintain about forty or more scholars as boarders, and a considerable number of day-scholars could be educated at the same time. As, however, a new building will have to be erected at a cost probably of close on £2,000, which will have to be taken from the accumulated funds, a reduction of income will take place to the extent of £100 a year, and consequently the number of boarders who could be maintained would be proportionally reduced. The number could be considerably increased by scholars being sent up from Government Native or Board schools on the plan followed in respect of St. Stephen's School, Auckland, who would presumably be paid for as is done there.

In order to carry out the combination of these trusts legislative authority will be necessary to divest the existing trustees and create a new body of governing trustees. The question of who should constitute the new trustees has seriously occupied the minds of your Commissioners, and we have arrived at the opinion that the denominational character of the trust should not be destroyed, and consequently the body representing the Church of England—namely, the General Synod—should be the authority for appointing or providing for the appointment of this new body of trustees.

We think the number should be seven, of whom not less than four should be laymen, and one at least of the whole body should be a Native, a member of the Ngatiraukawa, Ngatitōa, or Ngatiawa Tribes.

A Commissioner or Auditor should be appointed by the Governor, to whom the trustees should be required to submit annually a report and statement of accounts, and such officer should have power to call for such explanations as he may require, in order that the same should be laid before the Governor with his remarks thereon.

We are of opinion that power to sell portions of the Porirua and of the Otaki estates might with advantage be given to the new trustees, in order to raise sufficient money for the erection of the necessary buildings at Otaki, as the loss of income from the portion of the estates sold would probably be less than the interest on the borrowed money.

In determining in favour of Otaki as the site for the school, Your Commissioners are mainly influenced by the facts that it is more centrally situated for the tribes specially interested, and undoubtedly more accessible to the greater number than any other available site; the situation is not only accessible, but healthy. Evidence before us shows that the number of Native children of school age on the West Coast south of Rangitikei is 730, of whom about four hundred are apparently receiving no education, and we have reason to believe a considerable number of these will seek it at Otaki. The town of Otaki is sufficiently advanced to be drawn upon for artisans qualified to teach the trades we have specified, who would probably give, for a reasonable payment, two half-days a week to the instruction of scholars in their respective crafts.

The subject of religious education is one of grave importance, as it is clear that it entered largely into the minds of the donors and of the recipients of the two trusts at their initiation. We are not satisfied that religious instruction was intended to be of such a character as to have the effect of excluding the children of persons who are not members of the Church of England. While, therefore, feeling that religious instruction should not be excluded from the school, we are of opinion that no attempt should be made to influence the scholars towards any Church or particular denomination of Christianity, except on the request in writing of the parent or guardian of the child, or, if there be no parent or guardian, then on the written request of some person as nearly as the circumstances allow occupying the position of guardian, and that the religious belief of any child applying for admission should not be a matter for consideration on the question of eligibility.

#### WAIKATO.

Of the Waikato grants five are made to Bishop Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors, of certain blocks of land comprising 3,038 acres, in trust for the use and towards the support and maintenance of schools which were already established under his superintendence, so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein and maintained thereat. Two of the grants to Bishop Selwyn comprise lands near the mouth of the Waikato River forming one property known as Kohanga. Two others comprise lands near Ngaruawahia, known as Hopuhopu and Pepepe, and one is a grant of land at Puniu, a mile and half from Te Awamutu. Schools existed on or in the locality of the several trust lands at the time of the issue of the grants. At Kohanga there was a school conducted by the Rev. Mr. Maunsell, at which about two hundred boys were educated. They were taught farming, and there was a flour-mill erected on the property. At Hopuhopu and Pepepe there was a school under the management of the Rev. Mr. Ashwell. At Puniu no school was established, but there was one at Te Awamutu, in the immediate neighbourhood, conducted by the Rev. Mr. Morgan on the Church Missionary Society's estate, to which Puniu was considered an adjunct. None of these schools, though flourishing, were self-supporting. The children to a great extent grew their own food, but the clergymen in charge of them were paid by the Church Missionary Society, grants-in-aid being received from the Government. The Waikato war was the ruin of these schools. The Upper Waikatos were driven into what is known as the King-country, and held aloof until recently from all missionary influence. The Rev. G. Maunsell states in his evidence that in 1863 the Waikato war had the effect of breaking up these schools, and no attempt was made to restore them until 1893. The Government grants of money ceased early in the history of the trust, and the schools could not exist without external help. In the Upper Waikato children could not go to school without the consent of the Maori King, and this was withheld. Consequently the schools were closed in 1864. Bishop Selwyn took some of the boys to St. Stephen's School in Auckland, an institution which existed for the education of Maori boys under a similar trust.

The following is an account of what the trust estate in each case now consists of:—

*Kohanga*—

Land, 750 acres, valued by Government Valuer in 1903 at ...	£865	0	0
Money ... ..		Nil.	
Income: 1s. a year, being rent under a lease. From the present year the rent for twenty-one years will be £37 10s. per annum.			

*Hopuhopu*—

Land, 1,385 acres, valued by Government Valuer in 1905 at	£2,194	0	0
Money ... ..		Nil.	
Income, rents...	£30	11	0

*Pepepe*—

Land, 133 acres, valued by Government Valuer in 1903 at ...	£170	0	0
Money ... ..		Nil.	
Income, rent ... ..	£10	0	0

*Puniu*—

Land, 870 acres, valued by Government Valuer in 1903 at ...	£3,125	0	0
Money ... ..		2	12
Income, rent ... ..		50	0

There are no accumulated funds in these trusts.

Accounts of the annual receipts and disbursements of the above estates, so far as we have been able to obtain them, will be found in Appendix Q. We have found considerable difficulty in obtaining these statements of account, incomplete as they are, from the fact that regular and systematic accounts were not kept during the early years of the trusts, or if kept are not available. The absence of these accounts is much to be regretted, as, in their absence, much of the history of the trusts up to a comparatively recent period is lost to your Commissioners, though, if time allowed, they might possibly be obtained from the Church Missionary Society's office in London.

The fact that the net income of these estates has been paid to the trustees of St. Stephen's School at Auckland on account of the maintenance of boys from the Waikato at that school explains the fact of there being no accumulated fund.

The trust lands being, after the war, unoccupied became infested with gorse, briar, and scrub to an extent that has reduced their rental value to a nominal sum, except in the case of Puniu. Particulars of the rents of the several properties will be found in Appendix Q. We are informed by the secretary to the trustees that the Puniu Estate was let from 1869 to 1879, but that no rent was payable.

The lands having reached the state described, the trustees made considerable efforts to let the lands, with the result that a large area is unfortunately locked up under what may now seem unreasonably long leases of questionable validity, at an annual rental of 1s. per acre, which was thought at the time of the leasing to be fair and reasonable, and compares not unfavourably with that derived from the University endowment in a neighbouring locality, a return of which is appended for purposes of comparison. The trustees allege that they had no funds to spend upon the estate, and that, although after the conclusion of the war in 1864 there was an inflow of population to the Waikato, the quality of the land was so poor as compared with some of the confiscated lands that they could get no persons to rent it. This, to a great extent, is true, but does not appear to apply to Puniu, where the land is good, and has been in occupation, but where they do not appear to have been fortunate with their tenants. But, taking everything into consideration, we feel we must record the fact that an estate like Kohanga was for twenty-six years, from 1864 to 1890, absolutely unproductive, and that the total revenue from that year to 1904, a period of fourteen years, amounted to only £37 7s. The present tenant has occupied the estate for seven years at a nominal rental of 1s. per year, with a covenant to expend within that time £500 on improvements. The rental reserved by the lease for twenty-one years from the expiration of that period is £37 10s. per annum. The Government valuation shows the small amount of improvement on the estates, except that of Puniu: Kohanga, in 1903, £115; Hopuhopu, in 1905, £120; Pepepe, in 1903, nil; Puniu, in 1903, £1,375.

Your Commissioners are called upon to reply to the question, "Have the original trusts been carried out, and, if not, why not?" Our reply must be that they have not been strictly carried out since the closing of the schools.

These grants differ from those of Porirua and Otaki, inasmuch as they appear to be for the general benefit of all schools established under the superintendence of the Bishop, while the Otaki and Porirua grants are in each case for the benefit of a specific local school. It is, however, doubtful if that was the intention, as the recital of the grant contains the following words: "And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use, &c., of the same." It seems to us, therefore, that the intention was that the trust should be for the maintenance of schools in the locality of the

granted lands or at least in the district of Waikato. The schools established by Bishop Selwyn are now under the superintendence and control of trustees appointed by the General Synod of the Church of England in New Zealand, and prominent amongst them is the school at St. Stephen's, in Auckland. In consequence of the closing of the schools in the Waikato under the circumstances already mentioned, and the small amount of income derived from the estates, the trustees have applied all their available funds for the maintenance of boys from the Waikato at St. Stephen's. In this institution boys are taught, besides English up to the Sixth or Seventh Standard, physical drill and carpentry, and some are apprenticed to trades, being allowed to make their home at the school for a time during their apprenticeship. The Government nominate to it some boys every year, paying at present £20 per annum for each. Thirty such boys are now in the institution, in addition to forty mainly supported by trust funds. Your Commissioners having visited the school consider that the boys are carefully looked after, and the institution altogether is of a very satisfactory character. Your Commissioners are therefore of opinion that in view of their financial position the trustees, while not carrying out the letter, carried out the spirit of the trust. The St. Stephen's institution is in many respects conducted on similar lines to the proposed school for Otaki.

With regard to the future administration of these trusts: Your Commissioners have had before them a scheme submitted on behalf of Natives of the Waikato, a copy of which will be found in Appendix P, which appears to us of too visionary a character to be seriously entertained.

Having in view the financial position of the trustees, we are not prepared to propose any scheme which would be a more effective carrying-out of the trust than the practice of sending boys to St. Stephen's. If sufficient funds could be made in any way available, a school on similar lines to St. Stephen's, established at some point in the Waikato, say, at Ngaruawahia, would, in the opinion of your Commissioners, be more satisfactory.

A suggestion has been made, supported by many Natives, that by a combination of the Waikato trusts, aided by Government grants, sufficient funds could be provided for the support of a school at Waikato; but the consideration of such proposed combination does not appear to come within the scope of our Commission.

Your Commissioners think that the General Synod should secure representation of the Waikato tribes upon the trust.

#### OTAWHAO.

This grant is to certain persons described as trustees of the Church Missionary Society and to their successors of a parcel of land at Otawhao, containing about 173 acres, and is dated the 15th October, 1850. The land is granted "upon trust to permit the same to be used and occupied by the said Church Missionary Society in and as a mission station, or as a site for a place of worship, or for schools, or in other like manner for purposes connected with the religious and moral instruction of our subjects inhabiting these islands, and of other persons being children of poor and destitute people inhabiting any islands in the Pacific Ocean." The trust is therefore in its terms different to that of any other grant which has been under our consideration. The present trustees are members of the Mission Trust Board, and have administered the estate since 1881.

The actual area within the boundaries is, we are informed by the trustees, 184 acres. It is in evidence that a portion of the land covered by the grant had been purchased by the society in 1839, and paid for in horses, blankets, and tobacco. However this may be, the grant restricts the right of the grantees to the use and occupation of the land for the specific purposes set out.

A mission station and school were established, maintained, and flourished until the disturbances of 1863, when the school was broken up and the mission station abandoned. From the abandonment of the mission station and the closing of the school up to last year all income was expended in the maintenance of clergy of the Native race; since then in the education of Maori candidates for the ministry of the Church of England at a theological college near Gisborne.

The trustees contend that in using their funds for this purpose they are carrying out the trust, as it is not a trust of the character of those granted to the Bishop for schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language is given, but is for purposes connected with religious and moral instruction only. Your Commissioners consider that in doing as they have done they are acting within the spirit of the trust; but it is open to question whether the seminary should not be on the trust estate.

In order to obtain an income the trustees have let and leased most of the trust lands, and particulars of the several tenancies will be found in Appendix M. They have also entered into an engagement for sale to the Diocesan Board of 5 acres adjacent to the church for a parsonage for the sum of £100, and for the conveyance of the site of the church and graveyard to the Church authorities; but their power to do so is open to doubt. We think that power to carry out these engagements should be given them.

The trust estate now consists of—		£	s.	d.
Land, 184 acres, valued by the Government Valuer in 1903 at ...		4,701	0	0
Money, on the 30th June, 1905 ...		92	1	0
Income from rent ...		184	10	0
Accumulated funds ...				Nil

The annual receipts and disbursements are, so far as they have been obtained by your Commissioners, set out in Appendix M. The accounts commence only from 1894. This has been explained to us in the following way: The Church Missionary Society has its headquarters in London, and is not accountable to the Church or other authority in New Zealand as to the expenditure of its funds. The Reverend Mr. Burrows was agent for the society for many years, and considered himself responsible to the London committee. He is therefore supposed to have forwarded the accounts to England on his retirement shortly before his death in 1896. Archdeacon Williams, however, thinks this unlikely.

The lands comprised in the trust are immediately adjacent to the Township of Te Awamutu, and situate between it and the railway. There is considerable demand for land in the neighbourhood, and the trust estate would realise high prices if power to sell or grant long leases were given to the trustees. The present position constitutes a great grievance to the locality, as it impedes the progress of the township, and in the interests of the public and of the trustees should be terminated by legislation conferring the necessary power to deal with the land in the manner indicated.

#### KAIKOKIRIKIRI.

This trust has been administered by trustees who are also trustees of an estate at Papawai, held on the same trusts, who have put the revenue from each trust into a common account and dealt with them as one. This has been the cause of some difficulty to your Commissioners in their inquiry, inasmuch as the Papawai trust is not included in the scope of their Commission.

The grant creating the trust is dated June, 1853, and conveys 190 acres of land, now reduced by railway and roads to 174½ acres, situate close to the Masterton Railway-station, valued in 1904-5 at £8,340, including improvements of the value of £825. In addition to the land the trust held on the 31st March, 1905, accumulated funds derived from rents and investments to the amount of £3,809 12s. 1d.

The income of the trust is—		£	s.	d.
Rents ...		209	18	11
Interest and investments ...		159	19	3
<b>Total</b> ...		<b>£369</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>

The trust is towards the support of a college about to be established in the Wairarapa Valley by the Bishop of New Zealand so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

From the circumstance already mentioned, some difficulty has been experienced in ascertaining the exact financial position of the trust, and this has been arrived at by arithmetical process.

The lands have been utilised by letting, as shown by particulars of leases in Appendix T. The accumulations have been invested on mortgage and in deposits at interest with a sound financial company pending investment. The accounts of the united trusts since 1867 are fully supplied, and will be found in Appendix T.

Your Commissioners have to report that the trust has not been carried out until very recently, the reason assigned for this failure being that the funds derived from the trust have not been sufficient for the purpose. It does not appear to us that it was contemplated at its origin that the trust estate was to be the sole source from which funds for the establishment of the college should be derived. A promise, direct or implied, to establish the college was the inducement which led the Natives to give the land for the purpose of this trust, and they and their descendants have long felt much aggrieved at the delay in carrying it out.

We are of opinion that a boarding-school, at which day-scholars might also be admitted, was intended by the word "college," at which an English education should be given, ranging from about the Fourth to the Sixth or Seventh Standard of the present Board system, and added to this technical instruction in handicrafts and perhaps in farming. Schools and colleges, under the supervision of Bishop Selwyn or the heads of other religious denominations to whom grants were made with similar trusts, were in their early history largely aided by money grants from the Government, but now receive from that source little more than the cost of maintenance of pupils sent to them by the State.

About two years ago the trustees of a fund held by the Church of England, available for the purpose, purchased a property consisting of a large and suitable house and 150 acres of land at

Clareville, a convenient position between Masterton and Greytown, in the Wairarapa Valley, and near to a railway-station, and this has been leased to the trustees of the Papawai and Kaikokirikiri trusts at an annual rental of £70, and a school has been established which fulfils the trust. The school was opened nearly two years ago, and on the occasion of a visit made to it by your Commissioners last month had eight scholars, who, unfortunately, were on holiday at the time of the visit. It at present numbers twelve scholars, from fourteen to sixteen years of age, who are maintained free. The expenditure on account of the school for furnishing, adapting the building to its new purpose, salaries, and maintenance between March, 1903, and 31st March, 1904, amounts to £1,775 7s. 5d., of which the Kaikokirikiri trust bears half—namely, £887 13s. 8d.—which has been charged in the accounts. The cost of education and maintenance works out at about £55 per head; this contrasts strongly with the cost at St. Stephen's (£20) and Te Aute (£25), and may be attributable probably to the small number of boys at present at the school, but is suggestive of the necessity for economy in administration.

A Maori committee has been formed with a Maori chairman in connection with this school, which should tend to render it popular.

The Masterton Natives are not satisfied that the Kaikokirikiri funds should be absorbed at Clareville, which they think should be supported by the Papawai trust, and earnestly desire that a school for girls on similar lines should be established on the trust land or near to it. This desire we hope the trustees may be able to realise in the future, if not out of their own funds then with outside assistance.

The income of the Papawai trust is:—

	£	s.	d.
Rent	350	0	0
Interest from investments	138	17	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>£488</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>

The capital value of the land is £4,066.

The present leases of the Kaikokirikiri land were granted for the term of ten years, and will fall in in May, 1909. A considerable rise in values has taken place since their issue, and the income of the trust will probably be greatly increased if new leases are granted under the powers given by existing legislation.

Your Commissioners are of opinion that the Synod should place on the board of trustees a Native who, preferably, should be a member of the Ngatihamua or Ngatimoe Hapus of Ngatikahungunu.

#### MOTUEKA (WAKAREWA).

The inquiry into the Motueka trust occupied your Commissioners a considerable time, and involved a visit to Nelson and to Blenheim.

The grants in this case, issued in 1853, have evoked a large amount of discussion from the time of their issue, the fact that a large portion of the land was taken from the tenths reserved for Natives (whether so taken with or without the consent of those interested is not quite clear) being one of the causes of dissatisfaction. We have not, however, been called upon to go into the circumstances of the creation of the trust, but into its administration.

The recital of the grants is as follows: "Whereas a school is about to be established at Motueka," &c., and the trust is "so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

The trust estate at the present time consists of—

	£	s.	d.
Land, 1,075 acres, according to the grants, but said to have been reduced by the action of the river to something less, valued at	20,251	0	0

(Included in this amount are improvements valued at £8,556, of which £5,470 is for buildings and £550 for fencing.

Included in the amount for buildings is the sum of £2,271, at which the buildings used for an orphanage are valued, the balance, £3,199, representing the value of buildings on the leased portions of the property. The unimproved value is £11,695.)

	£	s.	d.
Money, cash in hand, 31st March, 1905	176	13	8
Rents in arrear, due December, 1904	54	11	9
<b>Total funds in hand</b>	<b>£231</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
Against which is a liability for loan of	305	0	0
Leaving a balance against the estate of	73	14	7
<b>Income, rent (gross)</b>	<b>£434</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>



Accounts of receipts and disbursements for each year since 1859, with the exception of from the 30th June, 1864, to the 30th June, 1868, will be found in Appendix X. These are very voluminous, but are, with that exception, complete.

The present trustees appointed by the Synod of the Church of England are the Bishop of Nelson, the Ven. Archdeacon Grace, and the Rev. Mr. Kempthorne.

The trust was at its origin fulfilled by the establishment of a school for Maoris at Motueka, which was carried on until 1857, when from various causes it was closed, and remained closed until 1862, when another attempt to establish a Native school was made, aided by a grant from the Native Department of £200 and £70 for maintenance of pupils, but this failed in the following year. The school was again opened in 1868, and with more or less success was carried on either as a day or a boarding school for Natives up to 1881, when an attempt to establish a Native school was abandoned.

The failure is attributed to various causes: to dissatisfaction on the part of the Natives at the loss of the occupation of the land, and a disposition to bring about to closing of the school; to political excitement outside the district in which members of the tribes to which the local Natives belonged were concerned; to the exodus of the Native population, and other causes, for none of which the trustees were responsible. They appear to have done their best, at considerable cost to the estate, to keep the school together, but failed.

Up to this time the trust appears to have been recognised as one strictly for the benefit of the Native race.

In 1888 the trustees expended some of their accumulated funds in the erection of a building which they used as an orphanage for the reception and maintenance of destitute orphan children of both races, and this institution has been carried on successfully up to the present time.

On the 30th June last there were 43 inmates from four to sixteen years of age, of whom 30 were boys and 13 girls. Of these, 3 boys and 2 girls were Maoris or half-castes. Of the inmates, 35 are paid for at rates varying from 5s. to 7s. per week; 3 are entirely free, and the 5 Maoris or half-castes are practically free, as no payments beyond one of £2 have been received on account of them. The cost of maintenance and management amounts to 8s. per head per week.

The accounts of the trust show a present income of over £434 a year, which may be reduced to £350 net, which would shortly enable it to maintain an increased number of free inmates in the institution.

There is one element of the institution which your Commissioners consider fails to carry out the intention of the trust. It is now practically a school or institution for destitute and neglected children. Hitherto these have been with few exceptions children sent to it by a society called the St. Andrew's Orphanage, the present manager of which is a trustee of that institution, and also one of the trustees of this trust. We do not understand that the benefits of the trust were intended specially for one class of the community, and your Commissioners are of opinion that in order to give fuller effect to the intentions of the trust the doors of the institution should be opened wider, so as to admit children other than those of the class described, and give it a broader character, and that the special claims of Natives and half-castes to the benefits of the trust should be more distinctly given effect to.

In this institution the fact that the trust was established chiefly in the interest of the Maoris should not be overlooked by the Trustees, but should be kept by them prominently in view.

Maoris who have appeared before us have opposed this orphanage on the ground that it does not comply with the trust, and have asked that a free boarding-school for Natives, in which technical teaching shall be a leading feature, should take its place, or that failing that the land should be restored to them.

As to the administration of the trust land estate, your Commissioners regret that they cannot report favourably. It seems not to have been managed to the best advantage. The estate, as already mentioned, is valued at £20,251. Deducting therefrom the capital value of the orphanage-site, 35½ acres, with the buildings, £2,953, from which no rent is derived, leaves the value of the balance of the estate, £17,298, in the occupation of forty tenants, yielding a gross rental of £437, equal to only 2½ per cent. on the capital value, which appears a very inadequate return. This result appears to us greatly due to laxity in dealing with the tenants to whom unbusinesslike concessions have been made in the matter of rent. We feel it necessary to refer to the circumstances attending the renewals of leases in 1901. On that occasion twenty-nine leases were renewed to previous tenants who had held under leases containing a clause declaring that all erections and buildings erected or placed on the said land, whether affixed to the freehold or otherwise, should become the property of the Bishop. Yet, yielding to what has been described by the Bishop as a "clamour," the trustees in fixing the new rentals ignored the improvements, and granted new leases at rentals which total only £20 more than those payable under the expiring leases made twenty-one years previously. The holders of the expiring leases desired that the value of the improvements existing on the lands held under those leases should, in fixing the new rent, be excluded

from the valuation. They appear to have been prompted to urge this by the fact that the Public Trustee at about that time was granting new leases to old tenants on the same terms under the provisions of "The West Coast Settlements Reserves Act, 1892." We regard the action of the trustees as the result of an error. These new leases are for twenty-one years, with two rights of renewal of twenty-one years each at valuation, ignoring improvements, and contain no covenant to insure or to further improve. These leases may prove to have been beyond the power of the trustees to grant.

In view of the results of the administration of the present trustees, we consider the Synod should appoint more trustees in number with a considerable lay element, and if they abstain from taking this course Parliament should be asked to provide for it. We also think that it is desirable that a Maori representative should be amongst the trustees.

In conclusion, we think it expedient to express an opinion that in all cases where the foundation of the trust has been a Maori donation, the Church or other authorities should make provision for the representation of Maoris on the governing body. We are also of opinion that in every case there should be a strong lay element in the trust.

We are further of opinion that the trustees of all similar trusts to those we have had under consideration should be required to report and account in the same manner, and to the same person, as recommended in the case of the proposed body of trustees for the Porirua and Otaki trusts.

We think the cost of any of the inquiries should not be borne compulsorily by any of the trust funds, but we make no other recommendation with regard to the costs.

We now return to Your Excellency the Commissions with which you honoured us, together with the evidence taken, and the appendix.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seals this twenty-third day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and five.

JAMES PRENDERGAST.  
H. S. WARDELL.  
W. H. QUICK.  
IHAIA HUTANA.

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 26TH MAY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq.

The Secretary, Mr. Walter Leslie, was in attendance.

The Commission was read, also the grants therein referred to.

The Secretary was instructed to telegraph to Mr. Hutana, requesting him to come to Wellington; also to obtain, for the use of the Commission, various papers and blue-books; also to apply for the services of an interpreter.

Adjourned till Monday, the 29th May, at 2.30 p.m.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 29TH MAY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq.

Mr. Stafford (Stafford, Treadwell, and Field) attended to ask to be allowed to appear before the Commission on behalf of certain Natives interested.

Mr. Stafford was informed that he was at liberty to attend the meetings of the Commission during the whole of the inquiry, unless given notice to the contrary.

The petitions presented to Parliament in connection with the subject-matter of the inquiry were perused; also Parliamentary papers of an early date bearing upon the same subject.

It was decided to call the evidence of the trustees in the Porirua trust on Thursday, the 1st June; also that of Archdeacon Fancourt; and the Secretary was instructed to write to the latter and to the secretary of the trust to that effect.

It was decided to ask Mr. Stafford to attend on the following day in connection with the question of a sitting of the Commission at Otaki, and the Secretary was instructed accordingly.

The Secretary was instructed to wire to Otaki *re* the use of the Courthouse for sittings of the Commission.

Adjourned till Tuesday, 30th May, at 10.30 a.m.

WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 30TH MAY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Mr. Stafford attended in connection with the matter of a sitting at Otaki.

It was decided that the Commission should sit at Otaki on Tuesday, the 6th June, at half past 2 o'clock p.m.

The Secretary was instructed to advertise the Otaki sitting in Wellington and Otaki papers, in English and Maori; to notify the same by letter to the Bishop of Wellington and the Ven. Archdeacon Williams, enclosing copies of the Commission; also to write to the Bishop of Auckland with reference to the Waikato grants, enclosing copy of the Commission; also to make arrangements for the Otaki sitting.

The Secretary was instructed to ascertain from Mr. E. Hadfield who are the present representatives of the Church Missionary Society in New Zealand, in connection with the Otaki and one of the Waikato grants.

The Secretary was also instructed to notify the Bishop of Wellington that the Commission would sit at 10 a.m. on Friday.

Adjourned till Thursday, the 1st June, at 10.30 a.m.

WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 1ST JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Mr. L. M. Grace, interpreter to the Commission, was in attendance.

Mr. F. J. Carter, secretary to the Porirua trustees, attended and produced a statement of receipts and expenditure in connection with that trust.

Mr. Carter was asked to amplify the statement and produce it so amplified on Monday, the 5th instant.

The evidence of Archdeacon Fancourt was taken.

Adjourned till Friday, the 2nd instant, at 10 a.m.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 2ND JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 o'clock a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

A general discussion took place on the subject-matter of the inquiry.

The Secretary was instructed to write to the Rev. Mr. McWilliam, of Otaki, informing him of the intended sitting at that place, and saying that the Commissioners would be glad to hear him on matters pertinent to the Porirua and Otaki trusts.

Adjourned till Monday, the 5th instant, at half past 10 o'clock a.m.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 5TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at half past 10 o'clock a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

The Bishop of Wellington waited on the Commission, and laid before them a report by the Committee of the General Synod with reference to a certain mortgage, in connection with which a loss had been made by the trustees.

Mr. Stafford waited on the Commission, and informed them that he had communicated with the Government in reference to the scope of the Commission, and had been informed that if there were a doubt as to its scope a further Commission could be issued. The matter was discussed, and Mr. Stafford was informed that any application for an extension of the Commission must come from him to the Government.

Mr. Carter, secretary to the Porirua trustees, attended and produced a statement of receipts and expenditure, on which he was examined, and he was requested to further supplement the information with extended details.

The Commission adjourned to Otaki at half past 2 o'clock p.m. on the 6th instant.

OTAKI, TUESDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at half past 2 o'clock p.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Mr. Stafford applied for an adjournment to the following day to enable him to confer with his clients.

Mr. Wi Parata asked that the Government should provide the Ngatitoas with counsel; also that the Commission should hear the Porirua and Otaki portions of the inquiry separately.

The Chairman informed Mr. Parata that the Commissioners could not accede to the latter request, nor had they power in regard to the engagement of counsel.

Adjourned till 10 a.m. on Wednesday, the 7th instant.

OTAKI, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commissioners sat at 10 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

OTAKI, THURSDAY, 8TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commissioners sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence, Mr. Wardell and Mr. Quick having previously visited the Church of England mission school and Roman Catholic school and ascertained the attendance of Maori children and the nature of the instruction imparted to them.

OTAKI, FRIDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Wellington on Tuesday, the 13th instant, at 10.30 a.m.

OTAKI, MONDAY, 12TH JUNE, 1905.

Mr. Quick and Mr. Wardell visited the Whitireia Reserve, Porirua.

## WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Mr. Stafford produced documentary exhibits in connection with the Otaki evidence.

The Bishop of Wellington attended and produced a written statement, and was briefly questioned by the Commissioners.

The Secretary was instructed to telegraph to the Bishop of Auckland, informing him of the intention of the Commission to open there on Monday, the 19th June.

Adjourned till Wednesday, the 14th instant, at 10.30 a.m.

## WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 14TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at half past 10 o'clock a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Arrangements were made for proceeding to Auckland, and the Secretary was instructed to leave for Auckland on Wednesday, the 15th, and make arrangements for sitting there on Monday, the 19th, at half past 10 a.m., and to advertise the sitting in the Auckland papers.

The Secretary was instructed to write to Archdeacon Williams, asking if he could supply further accounts in connection with the Otaki grants, and stating that the Commission intended visiting Hawke's Bay to hear his evidence.

The Secretary was also instructed to write to the Governor's Private Secretary, asking permission to search the Government House records for letters from Ngatiraukawa to Sir G. Grey.

Adjourned to Auckland, Monday, 19th instant, at half past 10 a.m.

## AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 19TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

The Auckland Diocesan (Church of England) Secretary attended and produced accounts in connection with five Waikato grants, and was requested to furnish further details.

Mr. J. St. Clair attended on behalf of certain Natives, and asked the Commissioners to hold a sitting at Mokau.

Mr. St. Clair was informed that the Commissioners intended to sit at Mokau and at Ngaruawahia.

The Secretary was instructed to make all necessary arrangements for the Commission to sit at Mokau on Thursday, the 22nd June, at 10.30 a.m.

Adjourned till 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday.

The Commissioners visited St. Stephen's College in the afternoon.

## AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 20TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

## AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

The Secretary was instructed to telegraph to the Secretary for Education, asking for an extension of time for the Commissioners' report to the 31st July.

## TUAKAU, THURSDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Mr. St. Clair attended, and apologized for the non-attendance of Natives. He said if the Commission adjourned to Ngaruawahia on Monday, the 26th, they would attend there.

It was decided to adjourn to Ngaruawahia on Monday, the 26th June.

The Secretary was instructed to make arrangements to enable the Commissioners to visit the Kohanga land in the meantime.

Adjourned to Monday, the 26th June, at 2.30 p.m.

SATURDAY, 24TH JUNE, 1905.

Mr. H. S. Wardell, Mr. Quick, and Mr. Hutana visited Kohanga.

---

NGARUAWAHIA, MONDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Motu Tara attended and asked that the Commission should sit at Te Awamutu or Kihikihi.

After making inquiries and taking advice as to the best means of communicating with the Natives, so as to give them time to attend, the Commissioners decided to sit at Te Awamutu on Tuesday, the 4th July, and at Kihikihi on Wednesday, 5th July, and the Secretary was instructed to have circulars printed to that effect, and to take steps to have them circulated immediately at Kihikihi, Puniu, Te Awamutu, and Otorahanga.

The Commission heard evidence.

Adjourned till Tuesday, the 27th June, at 10 a.m.

---

NGARUAWAHIA, TUESDAY, 27TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

A telegram was received from the Premier to the effect that he had advised His Excellency the Governor to extend the time for the Commission's report to the 14th July.

It was decided to telegraph to the Premier acknowledging receipt of his wire, and intimating that the Commissioners would make every effort to bring the work of the Commission to a close by the date mentioned, but expressing the opinion that it was improbable that the report could be ready by that date.

Adjourned till 10.30 a.m. on Friday, the 30th June, at Auckland.

---

AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1905.

The Commission sat and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq.

Adjourned to Te Awamutu on Tuesday, the 4th July, at 10.30 a.m.

---

MONDAY, 3RD JULY, 1905.

The Commissioners visited the Puniu Reserve.

---

TE AWAMUTU, TUESDAY, 4TH JULY, 1905.

The Commissioners visited the Otawhao Reserve.

The Commission sat and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Kihikihi on Wednesday, the 5th July, at 10.30 a.m.

---

KIHIKIHI, WEDNESDAY, 5TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Auckland on Friday, the 7th July, at 10.30 a.m.

---

AUCKLAND, THURSDAY, 6TH JULY, 1905.

The Commissioners met and decided to apply for a further extension of time to 24th July, and a telegram was despatched to the Premier accordingly.

---

AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 7TH JULY, 1905.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Monday, the 10th July.

A telegram was received from the Premier informing the Commissioners that the extension of time to the 24th instant had been granted, and that a suggestion had been made that the Commission should take evidence at Masterton.

---

AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 10TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat and heard evidence.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.  
 Adjourned to Thursday at Napier, at 10.30 a.m.

---

NAPIER, THURSDAY, 13TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat and heard evidence.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.  
 Adjourned to Saturday, at Wellington, at 12.30 p.m.  
 A letter was received from the Secretary for Education covering a question which had been asked in the House on the 5th July by the member for Masterton, in reference to a sitting being held by the Commission at Masterton.  
 The Secretary was instructed to telegraph in reply to the effect that the matter referred to could not be considered by the Commission without an extension of the order of reference.

---

WELLINGTON, SATURDAY, 15TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission met and transacted business.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq.  
 Adjourned to Monday, the 17th July, at 2.15 p.m.

---

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 17TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.15 p.m.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.  
 The Bishop of Wellington handed in a statement with reference to despatches inspected by him at Government House.  
 Mr. Stafford handed in affidavits by objectors to the scheme approved by the Supreme Court, and affidavits relating thereto by Bishop Wallis and the Rev. Mr. McWilliam.  
 Mr. Stafford brought before the Commission the matter of the scope of the Commission, referred to by him before the Commission on the 5th June, and he was requested to formulate his proposal relating thereto in writing before the Commission on the following day.  
 Mr. Hone Heke informed the Commission that he had been pursuing inquiries and obtaining information relating to the number of Maori children of school age belonging to the Ngatiraukawa, Ngatitua, and Ngatiawa Tribes, and obtained permission to recall certain statistical statements previously put in evidence, for purposes of rearrangement with additional information.  
 Adjourned to Tuesday, 18th July, at 10 a.m.

---

WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 18TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.  
 A memorandum was received from Messrs. Stafford, Treadwell, and Field, urging the necessity for an amendment of the Commission to remove any doubt as to its scope, and asking the Commissioners to forward the same to the Government.  
 The Secretary was instructed to forward the memo. to the Secretary for Education, with a covering letter intimating that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, it was desirable that any doubt should be set at rest.  
 Adjourned to Wednesday at 2.30 p.m.

---

WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 19TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m.  
*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.  
 A supplementary Commission was received from His Excellency the Governor extending the time for report to the 7th August, and enlarging the schedule by the inclusion of a grant at Masterton and two grants at Motueka.

It was decided to sit at Masterton on Wednesday, the 26th July, at 10.30 a.m., and the Secretary was instructed to advertise in Masterton papers to that effect, and to communicate with the Mayor of Masterton and others interested.

It being ascertained that the Bishop of Nelson was in Wellington, it was decided to sit on Thursday and to ask him to attend, and the Secretary was instructed to arrange accordingly.

Adjourned to Thursday, the 20th July.

WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 20TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

The Bishop of Nelson attended, and the matter of a sittings at Nelson having been considered, was informed that the Commission would open at Nelson on Monday, the 31st July, at 10.30 a.m.

The Secretary was instructed to advertise to that effect, and take other steps to make the sittings at Nelson known to the Maoris interested.

Adjourned to Friday, the 21st, at 2.30 p.m.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 21ST JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Monday, the 24th, at 2.30 p.m.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 24TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Wednesday, the 26th July, at Masterton, at 10 a.m.

MASTERTON, WEDNESDAY, 26TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Friday, the 28th July, at Wellington, at 2.30 p.m.

The Commissioners received a supplementary Commission in terms applied for by Mr. Stafford, in regard to combination of Porirua and Otaki trusts and the elimination of religious education.

THURSDAY, 27TH JULY, 1905.

Mr. Wardell and Mr. Quick visited Clareville.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 28TH JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

The Commissioners decided to apply for a further extension of time till the 17th August, and a letter was sent to the Premier to that effect.

Adjourned to Monday, the 31st July, at Nelson, at 10.30 a.m.

NELSON, MONDAY, 31ST JULY, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Tuesday, 1st August, at 2 p.m.



## NELSON, TUESDAY, 1ST AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2 p.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Wednesday, the 2nd August, at 10.30 a.m.

A telegram was received from the Secretary for Education, informing the Commissioners that His Excellency had been advised to extend the time for report till the 21st August.

---

## NELSON, WEDNESDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Saturday, the 5th August, at Blenheim, at 10.30 a.m.

---

## BLENHEIM, SATURDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Wellington, on Wednesday, the 9th instant, at 10.30 a.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10.30 a.m. and transacted business, and at 2.30 p.m. and heard evidence.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Thursday, the 10th instant, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. and heard addresses by counsel.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Friday, the 11th instant, at 10 a.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 11TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m. and transacted business.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Monday, the 14th instant, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 15th instant, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 15TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Wednesday, the 16th August, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned to Thursday, the 17th August, at 2.30 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Friday, the 18th August, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 18TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Saturday, the 19th August, at 2.30 p.m.

The Commissioners decided to apply for a further extension of time to the 23rd instant, and a letter making the application was forwarded to the Premier.

---

## WELLINGTON, SATURDAY, 19TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Sunday, the 20th August, at 3 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, SUNDAY, 20TH AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Monday, the 21st August, at 2.30 p.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 2.30 p.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Tuesday, the 22nd August, at 10 a.m.

---

## WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 10 a.m. for consideration of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

Adjourned till Wednesday, the 23rd August, at noon.

---

## WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1905.

The Commission sat at 12 noon for final consideration and adoption of report.

*Present:* Sir James Prendergast (Chairman), H. S. Wardell, Esq., W. H. Quick, Esq., and Mr. Hutana.

---

## INDEX TO EVIDENCE.

PORIRUA AND OTAKI TRUSTS.		Page.	Evidence taken at—	Page.
Evidence taken at—			Ngaruawahia— <i>continued.</i>	
Wellington—			Kukutai, H. T. te A. . . . .	54
Carter, F. J. . . . .	.. .. .	5, 104	Kukutai, W. K. te A. . . . .	49
Chapman, Mr. . . . .	.. .. .	142	Matenga, K. . . . .	50
Fancourt, Archdeacon . . . . .	.. .. .	1, 104	Tautau, N. . . . .	47
Fowler, A. . . . .	.. .. .	96	Tirua, P. . . . .	53
Hadfield, C. . . . .	.. .. .	96	Te Awamutu—	
Stafford, Mr. . . . .	.. .. .	130	Allen, E. . . . .	68
Wallis, Bishop . . . . .	.. .. .	29, 86, 95	Bird, W. W. . . . .	66
Otaki,—			Ikarutu, te K. te . . . . .	66
Bevan, T. . . . .	.. .. .	14	Ira, E. te . . . . .	66
Heke, H. . . . .	.. .. .	23, 136	Irving, H. . . . .	70
Jennings, Mrs. . . . .	.. .. .	19	Korehu, T. . . . .	65
Kanawa, H. te . . . . .	.. .. .	28	Laurie, M. S. . . . .	70
McWilliam, Rev. Mr. . . . .	.. .. .	15	North, W. . . . .	70
Parata, W. . . . .	.. .. .	6, 20	Teasdale, J. B. . . . .	69
Puaka, Raiha . . . . .	.. .. .	10, 22	Wellington,—Fowler, A. . . . .	96
Smith, W. B. . . . .	.. .. .	18		
Stafford, Mr. . . . .	.. .. .	6	KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUST.	
Whatanui, K. te . . . . .	.. .. .	22	Evidence taken at—	
Whataupoko, T. . . . .	.. .. .	14	Masterton,—	
Whena, H. te . . . . .	.. .. .	12	Chamells, W. B. . . . .	102
Whiwhi, H. te . . . . .	.. .. .	8, 21	Cruickshank, W. H. . . . .	98
Williams, Archdeacon (letter) . . . . .	.. .. .	22	Iorns, W. . . . .	103
Napier,—Williams, Archdeacon . . . . .	.. .. .	86	Karaitiana, K. . . . .	101
			Tamati, T. . . . .	101
			Whakamairu, H. . . . .	98
			Wellington,—	
			Carter, F. J. . . . .	96, 104
			Fancourt, Archdeacon . . . . .	104
			Fowler, A. . . . .	96
			Jury, J. . . . .	97
			Parata, H. . . . .	128
			MOTUEKA TRUST.	
			Evidence taken at—	
			Blenheim—	
			Grace, Archdeacon . . . . .	125
			Harapeta, T. . . . .	122
			Kohatu, H. R. P. . . . .	125
			Kohatu, K. P. . . . .	124
			Nelson—	
			Edwards, A. R. . . . .	111
			Gully, H. V. . . . .	121
			Haycock, H. . . . .	112
			Kemphorne, Rev. J. P. . . . .	106
			Kingsley, R. I. . . . .	113, 120
			Mules, Bishop . . . . .	115
			Matenga, H. . . . .	108
			Paaka, N. . . . .	109
			Rangiauru, H. . . . .	110
			Wellington—	
			Fowler, A. . . . .	96

## INDEX TO APPENDICES.

PORIRUA AND OTAKI.		Page		Page
Accounts, Otaki (J)	.. .. .	171	Grants, Pepepe (O)	188
" Porirua (E)	.. .. .	157	" Puniu (O)	187
Affidavits (D)	.. .. .	149	Leases, Kohanga (Q)	189
Children Statistics <i>re</i> Maori (IA)	.. .. .	170	" Hopuhopu (Q)	191
Dedicatory Letters from Natives (B)	.. .. .	146	" Otowhao (N)	186
Descent of Heni te Whiwhi (HA)	.. .. .	169	" Pepepe (Q)	195
Despatches (C)	.. .. .	147	" Puniu (Q)	194
Feilding Natives, Letter from (FR)	.. .. .	171	Scheme, Mr. St. Clairs (P)	188
Grants, Otaki (G)	.. .. .	165	St. Stephen's School, Statistics <i>re</i> boys at (R)	195
" Porirua (A)	.. .. .	146	Valuations, Education Endowments in Waikato (R)	196
Leases, Otaki (K)	.. .. .	181	Ditto, Kohanga (R)	195
Letter from Rev. A. Williams, Secretary New Zealand Mission Trust Board (I)	.. .. .	169	" Hopuhopu (R)	195
Resolutions of Porirua Trustees and New Zealand Mission Trust Board (KA)	.. .. .	182	" Otawhao (N)	186
Scheme, Ngatiraukawa (H)	.. .. .	167	" Pepepe (R)	195
" Supreme Court (D)	.. .. .	156	" Puniu (R)	195
Valuation, Otaki (K)	.. .. .	181		
" Porirua (F)	.. .. .	165	KAIKOKIRIKIRI.	
	WAIKATO.		Accounts (T)	197
Accounts, Kohanga (Q)	.. .. .	189	" Clareville College (T)	202
" Hopuhopu (Q)	.. .. .	190	Grant (S)	197
" Otawhao (M)	.. .. .	183	Leases (T)	203
" Pepepe (Q)	.. .. .	194	Valuation (T)	206
" Puniu (Q)	.. .. .	192		
Grants, Kohanga (O)	.. .. .	187	MOTUEKA.	
" Hopuhopu (O)	.. .. .	187	Accounts (X)	212
" Otawhao (L)	.. .. .	182	Despatches (V)	207
			Grants (V)	206
			Leases (Y)	221
			Orphanage Statistics (W)	211
			Valuation (Y)	221

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 1ST JUNE, 1905.

THOMAS FANCOURT, Archdeacon of Wellington, examined.

1. *Mr. Quick.*] The other side are represented by counsel: does the desirability of the trustees being represented not strike you?—I am not a trustee. The trustees are—the Bishop of Wellington, the Rev. T. H. Sprott, and Messrs. T. F. Martin, G. E. Tolhurst, and E. Anderson.

2. Would it not be worth considering as to whether it is desirable for them to be represented by counsel?—I do not think the trustees feel called upon—from what I gather they feel that they should wait till the evidence is given on the other side, and then they should have that before them, when they would be able to answer it. I have had no formal communication with them, I have gathered this from the Bishop, but it may be only his individual opinion.

3. They consider their attitude to be that of defendants?—Yes.

*Mr. Wardell*: If it is the intention of the petitioners to set up a breach of trust it might be desirable for the trustees to be represented by counsel.

4. *Mr. Quick.*] They would rather not contemplate that till later on?—They have never contemplated that. The whole history of the cases that have been before the courts has been against that.

I have been in New Zealand nearly forty years, during which time I have been in the Wellington Diocese.

5. I assume what there is to know about the Porirua College during those forty years you know of your own knowledge, and prior to that you know pretty well by tradition and report?—I do not know intimately the details during the early years; but what general knowledge there is to be had I have; and I have a fair amount of secondhand knowledge through Archbishops Abraham and Hadfield.

6. Will you give us in narrative form what you know?—There are two important letters of Bishop Selwyn's, given in his Life, which throw a great deal of light on what was the purpose and intention of the Natives in giving this land, and of the Bishop in accepting it. I find in his Life that it was during a visitation he was making of the whole diocese, which took in the whole of New Zealand, he stopped at Otaki, where Mr. Hadfield was in charge of the Natives. At that time Mr. Hadfield was ill. The Bishop went with a number of chiefs and others at Otaki through their lands, till they came to Porirua, and then the Natives gave this site. The Life says, "At Otaki, a green spot in the midst of a crop which seemed to be withering away because it had no root or deepness of earth, the Bishop saw much to cheer him; and from thence the good people, many of whom had been in his Native School and College of St. John's, Auckland, accompanied him in a search over their land for the best site for a college, which was fixed at Porirua." In a letter addressed by the Bishop to the Dean of Ely in 1849 he says, "May I solicit your good offices in favour of a new institution, which we are beginning to found, called Trinity College, Porirua, to be the centre of education for the southern division of this Island? My Native scholars, formerly at this (St. John's) College, have made over 600 acres of their own land with consent of the other owners for the purpose, as they express it, of a college for the Native and English youth that they may be united together as one people in the new principle of faith in Christ and obedience to the Queen." In 1851 another letter to the Dean of Ely says, "Your ready acceptance of the office of proxenos for one of my 'twins of learning,' scarcely yet born, emboldens me to write to you again and communicate some further particulars of the plan of Trinity College, Porirua. . . . The name of Trinity College, Porirua, was no sooner announced than Mr. Harrington, the secretary of the New Zealand Company, gave 300 guineas towards the endowment fund. But the immediate cause of the early establishment (if early it can be called) of Porirua College was the goodwill of my Native scholars of the Ngatiraukawa Tribe, who, having spent twelve months at St. John's, even while we were still in the roughest state, were so satisfied of the goodness of our intentions that they voluntarily gave 500 acres of land, in the place which of all others I should have chosen, as the site of a college for 'the English and Native youth, to be brought up together in the new principles of obedience to the Queen and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.' This latter clause is a literal translation of the words of the Native grant dictated by the donors themselves." I take it there must be some other letter which probably went in as the official one. He goes on to say, "The first part of the plan has already gone to England for the consideration of the trustees of the Wellington Endowment Fund, and contains a proposal for investing £4,000 on the security of the college lands and buildings. The college must take its distinctive character from the definition contained in the grant of land. It must be for the benefit of the English and Native race. This involves the necessity of an industrial foundation, for it seems generally agreed that the Native race are not yet ripe for a system in which their whole time will be devoted to study alone." It was not intended to be what is called in the vulgar sense of the word an "industrial" school. Actually what he had in mind was the establishment of a college for higher education which, as he says, "may be the centre of education for the southern division of this Island."

7. This would point to its being intended as the centre for the southern division of this Island, just as St. John's is the centre for the northern division?—Just so.

8. *The Chairman.*] The modern notion of industrial schools did not exist in 1850?—No. The Bishop goes on to explain that the Maoris were leading an idle, dissolute, and useless life, and there were a lot of young English fellows who considered themselves superior to the Maoris, and who delighted in idling about, and he uses the expression “the best way to humble them is by work.” He evidently had in view more than the supporting of the college by their labour—he had in view also the instilling more satisfactory habits into the Maoris. He says, “I have ordained two country settlers, two farmers, one printer, one weaver, one spinner”; and he elsewhere explains how the printer was able to support himself by working five hours at printing and five hours at the college. “I am not inventing a new plan, but only endeavouring to give full effect to a course of events which I found already in progress. The only difference between us and the old universities in this respect will be that we shall at once place all our poor scholars in some working department instead of giving them exhibitions in money or commons before their ability or industry has been sufficiently proved.” My first knowledge of the site was when riding round the Porirua Harbour with Bishop Abraham, when the latter pointed out the site, and said, “There is a grand site for a theological college.” This was in 1865.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] You contend, and it has always been the idea, that it was intended not as a mere primary school, but as a school for higher education?—Yes; that is the reason why the trustees have always declined to make any attempt to establish a day-school there, as not being within the terms of the trust. The scheme in view was to raise money at Home for this college, and he desired to get hold of the Wellington endowment, which was in the hands of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at Home (£4,000), and he thought he might get that to put into the college; but the trustees evidently would not lend it.

10. Did the Bishop ever go so far as to appoint a principal for the college?—He offered it to Mr. Hadfield (afterwards Bishop). The college had at that time no existence, except in intention on paper. Mr. Hadfield had a serious illness, and on his recovery it was thought he would not be fit for missionary work, and the Bishop asked him whether he would take charge of the college he was going to start at Porirua. In 1849, in another letter, the Bishop says, “It would be too much to expect that you should be able to resume the active habits of a missionary for which your strength was never adequate, but I think that I know your mind sufficiently to feel assured that you will dedicate your returning health to such employment as is nearest to the missionary work. I would point to the Porirua College as a post in which your influence would be brought to bear on all those in whom you are most interested without much bodily fatigue. If you will consent to find head and heart for the new college, I will do my best to provide you with arms and legs.”

11. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was that prior to his appointment to the Otaki school?—No; he had been missionary at Waikanae and Otaki from 1839, and during his illness Mr. S. Williams (now Archdeacon) went there for the time being. . . . The Bishop names Te Rauparaha, Matene te Whiwhi, and Tamihana Rauparaha as having been with him; the latter had been educated at St. John’s. . . . I want to press home the fact that this was a gift by the Maoris for a college in which both races were to be educated. It was not localised down in any way; it was not given to the Nagtiraukawas; no mention is made of the Ngatitoas; and, as Bishop Hadfield says, there were never more than 125 of the latter at Porirua, and it was never intended for that tribe alone. It was made in the widest sense a general trust for Her Majesty’s subjects, and some even outside. It was a totally different trust to the Otaki ones.

12. Can you suggest any explanation of the fact that the Bishop accepted the trust in a form so different, as you suggest?—The only difference I notice is that the draftsman inserted the word “school” instead of college.

13. In every one of these grants to other bodies precisely the same words are used?—It was Sir George Grey’s fad, really.

14. If the trust was so different from the trusts in the other cases, would not the attention of the Bishop have been called to the terms of the grant, and could he have restricted the trust unless it was embodied in the grant under which he received the land?—I think the general terms of the trust are the same; the only addition seems to be the reference to the Melanesian mission, and I have no doubt he would assent to the tacking-on of that.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you remember anything about the origin of the missionary society endowments at Otaki?—No, I do not. That is a private matter and does not belong to the Church of New Zealand at all. It was outside our system entirely. It has nothing whatever to do with Porirua; it is not associated with it in the slightest degree.

16. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you justify the payment of £800 to Otaki from the Porirua trust?—No; but I presume the object of the trustees was to do something with the trust. If they had gone on doing something, there would probably have been nothing heard about it; but they were told by a high legal authority that they were doing an illegal thing, and they then kept the money strictly within the trust. I do not justify the payment, but it was merely done for the sake of doing something.

17. *Mr. Quick.*] Has the institution at Otaki always been a day-school?—It was a boarding-school at one time, when Mr. Desbois and when Mr. Knell were in charge; they were both in holy orders. They were under Archdeacon Hadfield, and were carrying on the missionary school under him. The Church never had an account presented to it nor the General Synod.

18. It was a primary school, beginning with the very elements of education?—Yes; they take up to the Fifth or Sixth Standard now.

19. It was a different scheme to that intended by the chiefs?—Yes; it was a school outside the control of the Church; it was in no way a New Zealand Church institution.

20. *Mr. Wardell.*] They are not disposed to hand it over to-day?—I do not want it; I think it would be a breach of the Porirua trust to put them together.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] You were a trustee when the litigation was going on?—Yes.
22. The Church possesses two properties in the Wairarapa on exactly the same trust?—Yes; Papawai and Kaikokirikiri.
23. Do you know anything about the intentions of Bishop Selwyn as regards those two?—They are spoken of as colleges in the grants.
24. By the scheme it would appear the trustees are permitted to give scholarships to the West Coast Maoris for education?—The scheme permits our giving scholarships to Maori children on the West Coast for their education at these schools in the Wairarapa. It does not permit us to take any of the capital money of Porirua, or any income, for the upkeep of Papawai school beyond a fair amount to be charged for the boys who go there. The General Synod gave direction to the trustees that they were to spend the income of the Porirua College in giving exhibitions to children from the West Coast to any Maori Church of England school of which they should approve; and, on the strength of that, we obtained this scheme to establish a school in the Wairarapa.
25. That school has been established for some little time?—Fifteen or eighteen months. We did not want to get very many boys to begin with. I had charge of it, and I did not want to beg and pray the Maoris to come in, but rather to consider it a privilege. I limited the number to, I think, twelve from the Wairarapa, reserving, perhaps, room for five or six from the West Coast. At present there are only some seven or nine, two of whom come from the West Coast and are being supported from the Porirua estate.
26. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know what family they belong to?—No; I have been away for some time and have no certain information.
27. *The Chairman.*] European children do not go to this Wairarapa school?—No. They would not be admitted. It is not part of our scheme. There was a strong feeling in the General Synod which was against my feeling. My feeling was that the trust was for both races, but Archdeacon Williams took a different view. It ended in the General Synod adopting his view, and saying that the trustees should for the present restrict the school to Maoris—that the lands had come from them.
28. *Mr. Quick.*] The Clareville College would reject any application from Europeans?—It would give preference to Maoris. If there was more room for scholars, and funds to support them, English children would not be rejected.
29. *Mr. Wardell.*] The view of the Synod is to ignore as far as possible and set aside the trust created by the grant, and fall back upon the trust created by the Maori cession?—The Maoris did not mention anybody; they gave it broadly; that is the General Synod's view. The term "youth" at the time the Crown grant was issued had never been interpreted to include both sexes.
30. *The Chairman.*] I do not see anything in this scheme that would justify you in using money for European children?—Well, I was defeated. I do not feel that the scheme is carrying out the trust.
31. *Mr. Quick.*] According to your interpretation of the intention, you think it is a more apt interpretation to have amalgamation between Clareville and Porirua than between the primary school belonging to the missionary society and Porirua?—Yes; I am satisfied with the scheme; the two amalgamated give a hope for a fine future. As time goes on we shall get a Maori college like Te Aute.
32. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is Clareville a Native district?—It is a centre.
33. Of what?—Of the Wairarapa; we have Kaikokirikiri at Masterton, and Papawai at Greytown. If we had put the school at Papawai, the other place would not have come near it.
34. Would there not be enough revenue from the Wairarapa estates to support a school for the Wairarapa, and estate enough at Porirua and Otaki to support one for Otaki for the West Coast?—Not enough to support a college. My own feeling about Otaki is that it stands altogether on another plane to these trusts. They are not to be treated together.
35. But if they could be amalgamated?—Then it is a question whether you would not weaken the Wairarapa institution, which for some years would hardly be able to develop. One big college for the whole place is more desirable than two small ones. We have found it to be so in connection with our own colleges, and that is the reason the Bishop has always refrained from establishing a theological college here.
36. But for the education of the children of poor parents distributed throughout the country, do you contend it is in the interests of the country that there should be one large institution?—We do not tie ourselves down to poor people; we want to get hold of the better class.
37. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know of any difficulties that arise from carrying on a day-school close to a centre of population of Maoris?—You cannot help carrying on a day-school close by; but it is not desirable to have a boarding-school in the midst of a Native population, because if a boy is discontented he has only to run home for shelter, and they are too close to Native habits to be trained out of them. Otaki would be a very bad place to put a large school.
38. *Mr. Wardell.*] Bishop Hadfield, in his evidence before a Parliamentary Committee, does not appear to think there is any disadvantage in such proximity?—He had unusual power with the Natives. Mr. Knell told me of the difficulty I mention. And there is a great difficulty in carrying out industrial training, as they do not like being made to work.
39. *The Chairman.*] We have not heard any reference to something having been actually done in the way of establishing a school before the Crown grant at Porirua?—There is something about a Mr. Servantas having been there. I have no knowledge of it except from Bishop Hadfield. I suppose they did attempt a day-school there. Bishop Hadfield says that Bishop Selwyn sent down money. He knows for certain he had £200 that passed through his hands from the Bishop to expend on this land to put it in order; he thinks probably he had more. There is another thing that shows that Bishop Selwyn intended it to be a real live thing. I heard it from Mr. F. Bradey that a large amount of timber was cut at Paekakariki at the time the soldiers were there and floated down and brought into Porirua Harbour for the purpose of building a college, but there was no money to build. A good deal of the timber was carried away by the people, and what was left served to put up a farmhouse. Whether a school was built out of that timber I cannot tell.

40. Are you aware of anything more than this reference of Bishop Hadfield to a school being established there?—No; nobody knows anything beyond that.

41. You would not suggest that these remarks of his indicated higher education?—I should say it indicated helplessness in carrying out the trust.

42. But the beginning was not that of a college but a school?—The amount of timber that Bishop Selwyn had brought down evidently indicated that he meant to build a college; but his own friends would not help him, saying that he had spent all his own money and would spend his wife's too.

43. The trustees generally have a notion that nothing has been done because you thought it was necessary to establish a school or college like St. John's—something for education of a higher kind. The object of my question was, does not the way in which the thing was begun rather indicate a different intention: not what was in the mind of Bishop Selwyn, but what was actually done—viz., there was a school of a not very assuming character, and that the object of the trust was the object of the gift of the Natives and rather for the support of that kind of school?—They would say it was part of the trust. St. John's College had a Maori school attached to it. I think my explanation is the probable one: that the big thing was tried and failed, and rather than do nothing they said, "We will do what we can amongst the local Maoris that are here." What could the trustees do except what was done, with a piece of land which was not even bringing in £30 a year?

44. At some date or time you were advised that it was not right to attempt to establish a school, because it would not be in terms of the trust?—No; that it was not right to take the money from the Porirua and attempt to devote it to another school.

45. *Mr. Quick.*] When did all this trouble begin—the attack on the trust, the Maori discontent, and so on: was it after the trustees endeavoured to get a scheme or before that?—It goes back to Wi Parata's case, and before that.

46. *The Chairman.*] Have the trustees ever formed a notion that when the fund attained a certain amount they would start something under the trust?—No.

47. Supposing they had a gift of £10,000 or £20,000, would they not consider that enough to start with?—They might have started under those circumstances; but the Porirua fund even now is not more than £12,000 or £13,000, including the value of the land.

48. Do the trustees consider £4,000 a fair valuation of the land?—It is the last Government valuation; you see there is no road to it.

49. It is free of taxation?—No; we pay land-tax.

50. Are you sure?—I think so; I may be mistaken.

51. *Mr. Wardell.*] In the amount you mention as the present asset, do you include a sum of £800 given by Mr. Harrington?—There was no sum of £800 given by Mr. Harrington. There was a sum of £300 given by him when the Porirua land was given to be expended on a library, firstly at Porirua College, or, failing that, for such other purpose as the Bishop might please to put it to. The £800 represents accumulations. We have used this money, for the time being, to buy the Clareville site. There is an extract from Bishop Hadfield's letter in a minute-book. The money was placed in the hands of the Porirua trustees and always kept as a separate trust; and, on the strength of the clause which allows the Bishop to apply it to another purpose, it was used for the purchase of the Clareville site.

52. It was bought without drawing in any way on what you realise to be the Porirua trust?—Yes.

53. *The Chairman.*] How long was it treated as part of the Porirua trust?—It never was so treated; it has always been kept as a separate trust. Bishop Hadfield used to make grants from this fund to the Wanganui Collegiate School library, for instance. The trustees are so satisfied with the scheme that they do not want to diverge from it at all. The difficulty about the West Coast Natives going to the Wairarapa is said to be that the Natives say they and the Wairarapa tribes were enemies. Well, that was a matter of fifty or sixty years ago; they have buried the hatchet now.

54. *Mr. Quick.*] It was part of the scheme of the Bishop to put an end to these tribal disputes?—Yes.

55. *The Chairman.*] Supposing that the intention of higher education were laid aside, and your notion that it was to be something of the higher kind is not substantial, but that it was to be really a school for Maori boys principally was the right idea, would you say the trustees' notion would be better—to send them to the Wairarapa rather than to amalgamate with Otaki?—Yes.

56. Why?—Because they feel that Otaki is a different sort of school; they will not lay aside the idea of higher education.

57. Supposing the right interpretation of the grant is that there is nothing substantial in this notion of higher education, but civilisation of Maori boys by contact with Europeans and education, not of a higher sort: would you say that would not be better reached by amalgamating with Otaki than by sending them to the Wairarapa?—It would depend upon whether you brought them to Porirua. I consider Otaki a very bad site.

58. Well, supposing a school were established at Porirua, what then would you say?—So far as I know, I do not think the trustees would be at all in favour of it. They have never considered it as being what you say. Supposing the legal interpretation were that the grant is only for a primary school, I cannot tell what they might say.

59. Can you give any substantial reason why there should not be an amalgamation by utilising the Otaki trusts at Porirua, or the Porirua trust at Otaki?—Yes; you would weaken the school that we have. Our whole scheme has been from the beginning to amalgamate the trusts and do something. Isolated they are weak, and if you were to take the money from Porirua away from the Wairarapa, it would prevent us from making a good strong school there. It would never be anything but a comparatively small school.



60. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would the loss of £200 a year make all that difference?—We could utilise the whole £500 or £600 revenue if we had scholars under the scheme. We started with a university man at Clareville—an M.A. of Cambridge—and are doing the thing on as liberal a scale as we can with the boys.

61. What qualification is there for going up?—They must pass the Fourth Grade before going there I think.

62. In your opinion, at the time of the cession by the Natives, could the Natives have had any idea of any distinction between primary education and higher education—between school and college?—Yes. The men who had been at St. John's knew very well what the difference was.

63. *Mr. Hutana.*] Is the site of the Wairarapa school on land handed over as a trust?—No, it is a site we bought; the Maoris were delighted with it.

64. Was it purchased with funds from these trusts?—From neither the Porirua or Wairarapa have the trustees spent any money on it. It was bought with money other than that belonging to the trusts, which was available in the hands of the Porirua trustees.

65. Do you think it would be a wise step to remove the school from there and bring it to Porirua?—No, it would be a fatal step.

66. Could it not be done by making the school at either Porirua or Otaki, and teaching trades and so on at either of those places?—They are taught different sorts of work as it is; that is part of the scheme.

67. *Mr. Quick.*] Are they taught farming?—They are taught gardening, milking, carpentering, and blacksmithing. The boys say they have too much of that sort of work. It is an essential part of the scheme of the school to inculcate industrious habits into the Maoris.

68. Do the Maoris think if the school were on the West Coast more children would attend?—The Wairarapa Natives do not say that; it is only the Otaki people. So far as I know, there has been no objection on the part of the Natives north of Otaki. We have not wished to flood the school by collecting together scholars from far away, and so shut out the Otaki and Porirua people.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 5TH JUNE. 1905.

FREDERICK JOHN CARTER examined.

*Witness:* I am Secretary to the Porirua trust; I have been so for a little over a year. The trust consists of 596 acres, valued by the Government at the last valuation at £4,000. It is let at £200 a year to the executors of the late W. Jillett, on a fourteen-years lease, from the 1st July, 1894. I produce the lease. The reason the accounts show no payment of rent for the first year is that there is a clause in the lease providing for the remission of the first year's rent if certain improvements were carried out. I produce a statement of receipts and expenditure in connection with the trust from 1874 to 1905. There is only one loss (of £300) on any investment shown in the accounts.

[NOTE.—The Bishop of Wellington laid before the Commission the following extract from Minutes of Proceedings of the General Synod, April, 1883, in connection with the transaction referred to: "There has recently been a heavy loss to this (Porirua School) trust under the following circumstances: A few years ago the sum of £600 was lent upon mortgage on the security of freehold and leasehold properties at Foxton, valued at £1,440, the leasehold property being subject to a heavy ground-rent. The mortgagor became insolvent, and the trustees were obliged to take possession of the lands. The receipts from the leasehold fell off, and were not sufficient to pay the ground-rent. The trustees, therefore, offered the properties for sale by auction, and succeeded in selling all the freehold estate except a small section in Sandon, which they still hold. The leaseholds were not sold, and the trustees having no funds out of which to pay the ground-rent recently transferred the land to a person living in the neighbourhood of Foxton for a nominal consideration. The loss of capital to the trust was £300, according to the statement of one of the trustees, but the accounts throw no light upon the matter."]

*Witness:* The accumulated net fund on the 31st March, 1905, was £9,035. The gross income from interest for the year ending the 31st March, 1904, was £336, and on the same date, 1905, £311. Mr. Powles was secretary to the trust from July, 1884, to March, 1904. I produce the following extract *re* the Harrington trust: "Extract from Minutes of Porirua College Trustees, 9th September, 1887, being memorandum from the late Bishop Hadfield: Mr. Thomas Cuthbert Harrington, secretary to the New Zealand Company, received from that company a testimonial of the value of £315, in acknowledgment of the value of his services as secretary. By letter dated August, 8, 1849, addressed to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, he intimated his intention as to the manner in which he desired to dispose of the money presented to him. 'I shall be happy to place the amount in their hands (S.P.G.) as the simplest expression in my power to offer of goodwill to the Colony of New Zealand, and though not individually acquainted, of personal respect for Bishop Selwyn.' He further adds 'that the said fund shall be applied to the purposes either of a college to be established in the New Zealand Company's settlement or district of Wellington in New Zealand, or to a library to be attached to such college. That it shall be so applied in such portions at such time or times and in such manner as shall be directed by the Protestant Church of England Bishop for the time being of the diocese in which the said settlement or district shall be comprised at the time of such application.'"

*Mr. Quick* produced the following extract from the Proceedings of the General Synod, showing that the first movement in the direction of diversion of the trust was taken in 1892: "That the trustees of the Porirua College trust and of the Papawai and Kaikokirikiri trust are authorised to apply to the General Assembly for an Act to enable them to devote the funds accruing from these properties in providing scholarships which may be held by Maori pupils attending Church schools in any part of the colony; and, further, to authorise the trustees out of the income of the trusts to subsidise Church of England Native schools now existing or hereafter to be established in other districts, until such time as it may be found practicable to establish a school or schools in one or more of the above-named properties."

OTAKI, TUESDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1905.

*Mr. Stafford* : Your Honour, I represent on this occasion the whole of the descendants of the Ngatiraukawa, who were some of the donors of the Porirua land, and who were the entire donors of the Otaki reserves. I informed the Commission that I had endeavoured to formulate the wishes of those I represent so as to place those wishes before the Commission in order to shorten as far as possible the sitting. I have formulated those wishes from instructions which I had given me by some of my clients. But those present here wish that I should confer with them so that they might be made fully conversant—the whole of them—with what is supposed to be their wishes, before placing these before the Commission. It is possible that there may be some dissentients—not from the Ngatiraukawas—but possibly from the Ngatitoas, and I would ask the Commission, under the circumstances and because I think it will tend to shorten the sitting, if they would permit an adjournment for the afternoon in order that I might confer with the whole of those interested. I ask, therefore, if the Commission will grant me this concession. I feel sure that it may reduce (if there be dissentients) the number of them.

*Mr. Wi Parata* : I should like to say a few words. I should like to point out that I do not wish the inquiry into the Porirua trust to be mixed up with that into the Otaki trusts; I wish them kept separate, because if you take them together it will cause delay and prolong the proceedings. Another matter I wish to bring before you. It is the Parliament that has authorised the Commission to inquire into these matters, and therefore I take it the Government should find a lawyer for the Natives, to appear for them before the Commission. If the Parliament has any consideration for the Natives, they should appoint some one to appear for them as counsel. This Commission is to inquire into these trusts and to report on the matters—as to funds, the expenditure thereof, and so on. I should like to point out that the Maoris gave the land, then the Europeans made a Crown grant to take the land away from them, and I want to know which of this is wrong. The land was given by the Maoris in the presence of all the people, but the Crown grant was issued unknown to the donors of the land. It was done in secret. I ask, therefore, that the inquiry into Whitereia should be kept separate from that into Otaki, so that the two should not be confounded. It may be it would shorten the proceedings.

*Mr. Quick* : Do we understand that the Ngatitoas are as a whole not represented?

*Mr. Wi Parata* : That is so.

*Mr. Stafford* : I have said I represent some of the Ngatitoas, and I believe I represent the whole, perhaps, except Wi Parata. It might be well to ascertain whether Wi Parata's objection is to the carrying-out of any educational scheme at all, or whether it is not grounded in the desire that the donors should get back the land: as to whether he is in favour of carrying out a scheme for the future management of the trusts, or whether his objection, if there be one, is not based on the fact that he desires the land to be given back to the donors.

*Mr. Wi Parata* (in answer to the Commissioners) : I have not made any application to the Government on the matter. I only got notice of the Commission intending to sit at Otaki last Thursday. I was informed of it by wire from Mr. Field in Wellington.

*The Chairman* : But you have known for some time there was to be a Commission?

*Mr. Wi Parata* : The first time I knew it was coming to Otaki was by wire. I waited to see what the Commission was about, and what it was going to do. I am not going to employ a lawyer; I want the Government to do so. I am not competent to go into all the phases of the law in regard to Crown grants.

*The Chairman* : We are quite clear that there is nothing in the Commission which would justify us in going into the matter with a view to recommending the Crown to set aside the grant. All we can do is to inquire into matters which are relevant to the application of the land and the funds which have been accumulated. We cannot entertain any notion about your not being represented by a lawyer. We cannot make any representations to the Government about not having one. In regard to the separation of the inquiries, we cannot separate them. We must go into the matter in any way that is convenient. If we find it convenient to go into both at the same time we shall do so whenever or wherever it is convenient. We are willing to hear anything you say, and if there is any legal difficulty we may be able to help you.

OTAKI, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1905.

*The Chairman* : Mr. Stafford, will you give us any information you can about this matter?

*Mr. Stafford* : In the first place, I submit to the Commissioners what I call, for purposes of convenience, a scheme for the future administration which my clients think should take place with reference to both the Porirua and Otaki reserves. Both reserves are granted upon identically the same trusts, and the Natives say that, as the purpose of the Porirua trust has never been performed, and as the land at Otaki is practically now a failure—that is, the mission scheme—inasmuch as there are very few Native scholars who attend the school at all, the two estates should be combined into one. The system they suggest in this statement will show at once what course they suggest should be taken. In substance, the statement is this: that as it is admitted on all sides, apparently, that no school can be established at Porirua, Otaki is the spot on which the school should be established. They altogether deprecate the idea of the utilisation of those funds towards the Wairarapa.

*The Chairman* : What is their particular objection to that?

*Mr. Stafford* : They say that the Natives on the West Coast will not attend that school. The school is established in the neighbourhood of the tribe which was conquered by the donating tribes, and they say it is against their custom and it is hopeless to expect the West Coast Natives to send their children to that school.

*The Chairman* : Do you understand it is offensive to their pride?

*Mr. Stafford* : It is against their custom, and they will not do it. It is in a place where the former hostile tribes are situated—one of the very tribes which were driven from this very spot by the donors of this property; and it is against their custom, and not proper, that the property which belonged to their ancestors should be utilised for any purpose in which these conquered races should have any interest at all. They say definitely and positively that it is useless to expect children from this Coast to go to Papawai. Further, there are no children really of the Ngatiraukawa or Ngatitōa who were ever educated at that school. They are not Ngatitōas at all who are being educated there; they are Ngatikahungunu, so you will see as far as the Natives here are concerned that is a useless scheme. Further, they say when these raiding tribes came from the north there were three—Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa. The Ngatiraukawa settled at Otaki, and their settlement extended from Otaki to the Rangitikei. Their descendants are still here. The Ngatiawas, including the Ngatimutunga, settled at Waikanae, but the largest portion went back to the north, and a large portion of the latter went to the Chatham Islands; and the Ngatitōa went to Porirua. The position is this: there are something like 520 children between Otaki and the Rangitikei River of ages fit for school; only twenty-five go to the mission school in Otaki, and to the public schools probably not more than forty or fifty. There are probably nearly five hundred not receiving any education at all.

*Mr. Quick* : That implies that there are a thousand Maori children between Feilding and Porirua ?

*Mr. Stafford* : I do not say that. There are 130 children of school age in Otaki, thirty at Manakau, sixty at Ohau, and so on. It will be found that not more are taught, either in the mission school or at the public schools, than one-fifth of these; we say less. So there are at any rate four hundred being untaught. They say, therefore, this is the centre, and if a school were established upon such a system as they suggest the result would be to attract either to day teaching or boarding a large number of children. They say the trusts should be combined and a school placed at Otaki managed by a proper Board. They say, "These children are uneducated; you have the mission school and the public schools, and yet you find the result of it all is that within the distance I have mentioned there are more than four hundred children of school age who are getting no education at all." They say, under these circumstances is it not wrong that this money should be devoted to higher education in the Wairarapa? That is one of their reasons. The second is that it is useless to expect from their customs that they should send their children to a Wairarapa school, and that the money would be devoted to a purpose entirely different from what the donors themselves intended. They say, "We ought to have this school"—they do not say for Ngatiraukawa or Ngatitōa; the scheme goes beyond that and says "any Native child"—"wherever they choose to come from; if they choose to come to the school there is the facility." The proposition is that boarding shall be free of charge. The funds would not be sufficient to enable this to be done fully, but provision is made for the Governor to provide by regulation the method of selection of those who should board, so that there should be no burden on the administration. They say preference in this matter should be given to the children of descendants of Ngatitōa and Ngatiraukawa. They say it will be found that if the property their ancestors gave for the education of their children is diverted to the Wairarapa it will be given to a purpose foreign entirely to what was intended. The scheme that has been suggested by the Supreme Court will only result in the granting of the funds from Porirua for the benefit of some one other than the donors. They tell me it will be found that nothing will induce them to send their children to the Wairarapa school. In regard to the plan suggested, there must be a means of providing funds for the purpose of carrying it out. The first proposition they suggest in regard to forming such a fund is that there will be the accumulated funds now in the hands of the Porirua trustees. Then they say the Porirua property should be realised on by lease or sale. Provision is made in reference to the sale—not without the consent of the Governor in Council. Care is to be taken that the realisation is only made when it will secure the purpose intended. The suggestion is that a Board shall be constituted, to consist of three out of five permanent officers of the Civil Service and two members of the Native race, descendants of either Ngatitōa or Ngatiraukawa. Powers are suggested to be given for the realisation and making profit of the Otaki land, subject to the consent of the Governor in Council as to what is to be done. The intention of this is to make a safeguard that ducks and drakes shall not be played with the estates. If the Commissioners can find a better plan, the Natives will be glad to acquiesce in it. It may not be expected that the Board would do so, but there is this further safeguard, that the estates shall not be unduly realised, or at a price which would be improper. Then there are powers as to leasing, &c. They suggest that a fund shall be thus produced to enable buildings to be erected for the purposes of a school, and also for boarding and lodging for the children, and so on. Then the scheme of education is to be similar to that taught in ordinary public schools, including the teaching of Maori, and so on. Further, there is provision made for industrial training similar to that provided for by the education system. They suggest that this part of the scheme shall not come into operation at once till funds are available to enable the thing to be done; so power is given to the Governor in Council to direct this second class of teaching. They seek to get the best teaching for their children, as is given in the public schools, and also, if the funds permit, further education to fit the younger Natives as they grow up to earn their living. This, they say, is the system that ought to be adopted. They say, "Higher education is not what we want. First of all, we want ordinary education to fit our children to earn their own living. It is useless to talk of higher education without that." Provision is made for the Governor in Council to make provision for details. The Ngatikahungunu, who are now in the Wairarapa, were one of the original tribes driven out by the conquering race. They say, "We acquired the land, it belongs to us by right of conquest; we drove them out of this district, and it is against our custom and against all ancestral story, and we will not send our children to Papawai. Whatever may be said or done, no child shall go there."

*Mr. Quick* : I suppose they know the school is not at Papawai ?

*Mr. Stafford* : It matters not where it is ; they will not send their children to the Wairarapa. They say, "Look at our wants on this Coast ; the property belonged to our ancestors ; we donated this land at Otaki ; we, Ngatiraukawa, alone gave it." Then, as to the Porirua land, they say, "The Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa donated the land there. Why should we, seeing our wants are such as they are, not have the land for this purpose ? The first consideration is to be given to our children ; that is what we want." The course I suggest to the Commission, in order to shorten the matter and to get it clear before the Commissioners, is this : I have two principal witnesses—the daughter of Matene te Whiwhi, a Ngatiraukawa, one of the donors of the Porirua land, sixty-nine years of age. Her statement goes into the whole story and expresses her desires, and relates the circumstances under which the donation was given, and so on. I think this is better got at by allowing a statement which has been prepared by me to be put into the hands of the interpreter to be read to her, and that she should be asked whether it is her statement, and then signed by her ; and the Commissioners can cross-examine her upon the statement. I think this will very much shorten the proceedings.

*The Chairman* : We think that course will be the best.

HENI TE WHIWHI examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Stafford) : My age is sixty-nine years ; I was born at the time of the Battle of Haowhenua, which was, I think, between Te Rauparaha and his tribes against the Ngatiawa. Te Rauparaha was Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa. I am not very sure as to the locality of Haowhenua ; it is perhaps near Waikanae, but it may be in the South Island. I was born at Cloudy Bay in the other Island. My father was Matene te Whiwhi ; he was one of the givers of the land at Porirua and of the land at Otaki. He was Ngatihua, a sub-hapu of the Ngatiraukawa ; he was also Ngatitooa. Before the Battle of Te Kuititanga, Matene te Whiwhi and Tamihana te Rauparaha decided to get a minister of the Church of England to come to reside in the midst of Ngatiraukawa. They told the people of their intention, and said they were going to Paihia, Bay of Islands, to ask for one. The people endeavoured to dissuade them from going, fearing that Ngapuhi might do them harm for some early acts of Ngatiraukawa against Ngapuhi. They, however, did not heed their people's warning, as the desire to have a minister in their midst to preach and teach the gospel of Christianity to their people was great. They left for Paihia, and saw the head of the mission there and told him of their wish. Mr. Hadfield was sent here, and he set up at Waikanae and at Rangiuuru (Otaki). A place was built for him alongside of Rangiuuru Pa. Ngatiraukawa were then living at Rangiuuru Pa and Pakakutu Pa. I think Mr. Hadfield arrived here in 1846. Apart from his house of residence, a church was built and also a school building. Mr. Hadfield was here two years when Bishop Selwyn arrived. Bishop Selwyn saw that Rangiuuru was not a good place to live in, and, after looking over the land in the vicinity of the Otaki Township, he suggested to Ngatiraukawa to leave Rangiuuru and come and make their home in this locality. The Bishop next asked Ngatiraukawa to give land in this locality to other hapus of the Ngatiraukawa people who were living in other parts, so that they could be near the church and the school. This Ngatiraukawa agreed to. The outside hapus of Ngatiraukawa then came to live here. The Bishop then asked Ngatiraukawa for land for the endowment of a school here. This Ngatiraukawa agreed to, and this land was given. I did not hear from my father that the Bishop gave cattle to Ngatiraukawa as payment for this land. I think Ngatiraukawa left Rangiuuru Pa for this place in 1845. I think it was in 1851 that a building for the accommodation of boys for a boarding-school on a portion of this reserve was built, and I think the building was completed in 1853. The land was given to the Bishop because he told Ngatiraukawa that it would be the means of enabling their children to be taught all the learning that was taught to European children. In 1853, I think, the Rev. Samuel Williams opened the boarding-school. I think the Rev. S. Williams arrived here in 1845. The children who came to this school came from Hawke's Bay, Wairarapa, Manawatu, Rangitikei, and the Ngatitooa and Ngatiawa settlements at Waikanae, Wainui, and Porirua. The boarding-school was made to board the children from kaingas away from this locality. The Ngatiraukawa children who lived here lived with their parents and attended the day-school. I think there were about 150 boys boarded here, and about fifty girls boarded with the Rev. S. Williams. At the boarding-school the Rev. S. Williams always conducted a short service, morning and evening. The elders in the place used to go to these services. After morning services the Rev. S. Williams used to teach the elders, after dismissing the boys and girls, the lessons of the Church. The boys and girls were taught religious lessons in the Church of England only on Sundays, when Sunday-schools were held. During Mr. Hadfield's time the Ngatiraukawa always attended services in the Rangiatea Church in very large numbers. The church, on almost all occasions, not being able to hold the people. The same was the case in the Rev. S. Williams's time. When the Rev. S. Williams left Otaki the Rev. Mr. Hadfield again took charge. After the Rev. Mr. Hadfield left, the charge of the church was left to the Rev. Mr. McWilliam. Since the Rev. Mr. McWilliam's time, the attendance has fallen away to almost five to seven persons each Sunday, and that is the state now. Before, and on the occasion of my marriage to my husband Te Reii, my father told us at his home how Bishop Selwyn approached him and Tamihana te Rauparaha, and asked them for a piece of land in Porirua—Whitireia. Tamihana te Rauparaha agreed to give the land to the Bishop, but I did not. Tamihana went to see Ngatitooa in Porirua, and told them of the Bishop's request, and said he had agreed to give the land to the Bishop. The Ngatitooa people told Tamihana that the land was not his to give and that the land belonged to Te Rangihaeata. Tamihana came back to Otaki. The Bishop persistently asked Matene to let him have the land for a school, so that their children could be taught all the knowledge of the pakeha children, and, after many efforts on the part of the Bishop, Matene te Whiwhi agreed. He knew that his uncle, Te Rangihaeata, and te Rauparaha would not override him in the matter. From that day to this nothing has been done by the Bishop's successors to carry out the words he spoke to Matene te Whiwhi and Tamihana te Rauparaha as far as Whitireia is concerned, until the Whitireia trustees applied to the Supreme Court,

unawares to us, Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa, for power to spend the Whitireia money in a district other than the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa district. I, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatitooa are against this action of the Whitireia trustees—(a) because it is against the belief which our elders held when the land was given to the Bishop; (b) it is against Native custom; (c) we, the people and descendants of the donors, should not be placed in that subservient position—we have the prior right and the absolute right according to Native custom; (d) the belief which our elders entertained in giving the land to the Bishop ought to be fulfilled by joining the proceeds of Whitireia and the Otaki reserves together so that an efficient school could be maintained. It is not my desire to make this school one for the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa children only. As a daughter of Matene te Whiwhi, I would have it open so that all Maoris and half-castes in New Zealand could take advantage of it. I would not even bar European children from entering it. I would make it as our elders did in their time when the school in Otaki here was open to receive children from all parts of New Zealand; and, as then, to leave it open for European children. But I think it only right that Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa children should take precedence over others. I would, however, make the subjects to be taught to the Maori children something more beneficial to the Maori children for after-life; that is to say, education to equip them, to enable them to live and support their children; something to remove from them their lazy habits; something to give them a better knowledge of the English language, and not the superficial knowledge which they now get, which is nothing else than a knowledge which they cannot apply to any good and practical purposes for themselves and their children. I would not say teach them all the highest branches of education—I leave that to the intellectual capacity of each child; I speak of the majority, who are in many cases more dull than the few bright children. I want to see the majority of our boys learn trades in addition to the ordinary education that would be imparted to them. The knowledge imparted to the Maori children in the present and in the past is not sufficient, excepting the few bright children. The alternative I want for the majority is a trade or some such knowledge that they could make something for their own advantage in the higher moral life. My experience of children—the majority—who have been to school and have come home is that their education is of no value, or very little, to themselves and their people. The tendency, therefore, is more to live on their parents and not to help them, or even to be able to look after themselves and their families. There have been more—and I venture to say better—boys amongst those who have no education than amongst those who have had education. There has been in them an honest endeavour to find work and do work to their advantage and the better keep of their children. These are some of my reasons for an efficient school for our children to be built in Otaki. Therefore, in short, my desire is—(a) for a better and more efficient ordinary education to be imparted to the boys and girls; (b) trades for the boys and a knowledge of land-culture and useful branches in these lines; (c) for the bright children, if their parents are able to pay for them, they can pursue the higher attainments in our universities; (d) to better the knowledge of the Maori children in English, to have a branch in the school for a kindergarten for the very young children; (e) for the girls to be taught, apart from the ordinary education, useful work, such as sewing, &c., a knowledge of cooking and housekeeping, economy in the household, a better knowledge of looking after children and their requirements in time of sickness or in life; the brighter ones can take the higher education, if their parents are able, in our universities. I desire to state that, even if the trustees of the Whitireia reserve get their own way, I, for one, and I think Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitooa generally, will not send their children to the Wairarapa school. We will do what we are doing now—send them either to Te Aute, at the Ven. Archdeacon S. Williams's school, or to our public schools. Our elders were satisfied with the work taught and the education given to their children, and the people's children, when it began on a larger scale in Otaki in the early days. After the Rev. Mr. Hadfield left Otaki, the boarding-school ceased. A day-school then was kept going. When the Rev. Mr. McWilliam left to devote his time to the work of the Church, Mr. Menzies took charge of the Otaki school. At this time the school was made a mixed school for Maori and European children. The Maori attendance was good. After Mr. Menzies, Mr. Christie took charge. The attendance of Maori children was poor, and in the end the school was closed down for three years. It was afterwards opened again under Mr. Jennings. The attendance of Maori children was good. After Mr. Jennings left, his brother took charge and the attendance was good. Since this, about ten years ago, Mrs. Jennings has been in charge. The attendance has not been good. This state of things has been brought about more by the attitude of the Whitireia trustees and the falling-off of the activity of our Church in our midst. The energy of our Church lacks that force which was shown in the early days. There has been no effort to meet the people as was the case in the old days. Thus, the falling-off of the attendance at services in our Church from hundreds in the early days to seven or eight nowadays. We have been expecting the Whitireia trustees to work together with the Otaki reserves trustees to pool the proceeds of the two reserves and build and equip an efficient school at Otaki. To this end, we spoke to the Bishop of Wellington in 1896 at Manakau, and we were encouraged by his reply to us. We also met the Bishop of Wellington in Raukawa after 1896, and we were further encouraged by his reply to the effect that he would be willing to join the two trusts if the Otaki trustees were agreeable. We applauded this answer of the Bishop's. All our hopes were dashed to the ground afterwards when we were told that the Bishop could not do it, and that he and his cotrustees had obtained Supreme Court sanction to apply the Whitireia funds to a school in the Wairarapa. This sanction then discouraged us from sending many of our children to the Otaki Native Mission school. Many children of the Church of England parents since have been sent to the Roman Catholic Native Mission school, many to the public school at Otaki, and some to Te Aute. To add to our disappointment in the Bishop of Wellington and his cotrustees, there was the acquiescence of the Rev. S. Williams to join the two trusts so as to erect and equip an efficient school in Otaki. And another reason was, that when the Whitireia trustees were contemplating the diversion of the Whitireia fund to the Wairarapa, we had on the Otaki reserve not only a school-house, but a

big building capable of boarding one hundred and fifty to two hundred boys, and this was only lost by fire a little while ago. We were never informed by the Whitireia trustees that they were asking for power to divert the Whitireia funds to Wairarapa. We would have objected if we had known of those proceedings. We did, however, ask the trustees to build a school in Otaki out of the proceeds of the two reserves. Through the non-fulfilment by the Whitireia trustees of the trust, some of us petitioned Parliament in 1876, praying that the land be returned to us. In the same year, or thereabouts, Wi Parata took proceedings in the Supreme Court to get the land back from the Church of England trustees. He failed. I and others, in 1896, petitioned Parliament to have the land returned to us, and the Native Affairs Committee reported to the effect that, since the trust has never been carried out, the Government be recommended to bring down legislation to give effect to the prayer of the petitioners. Ever since 1896, I, and others, have been petitioning Parliament almost every year. Last year we petitioned Parliament for a Royal Commission to be set up to inquire into these trusts, with a view of in the end getting the two trusts joined and the proceeds applied to the building and equipment of an efficient school in Otaki for our children. We have also asked Hone Heke and Mr. Field to do whatever they could for us in this matter for a number of years, and, in 1898, the Government actually brought in a Bill to Parliament, but the influence of the Church was too great to obtain its passage. The object of the Bill was, in its main features, to have the trust fulfilled. We now come to you for the same thing—to report that the two trusts be joined and the proceeds be devoted to building a school in Otaki and its proper equipment; and not to allow the proceeds of Whitireia to be spent in Wairarapa. In the event of the Whitireia trustees not agreeing to that, then I would ask that the land be given back to us. I do not know of any Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitoo children being at the Wairarapa Church of England Mission school. Of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitoo on the West Coast here, there are none of our children at the school in Wairarapa. If there are Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitoo children at that school, they are the descendants of Ngatiraukawa women who married Ngatikahungunu husbands, who are living in the Wairarapa ever since their marriage with their husbands. The names of these women are:—Tare Kuti, Maraea Kuti, Metapere, Paranihia Iria te Hapoki. I think the Church of England trustees should cease in both cases—Whitireia and Otaki reserves. My reasons for saying this are: (a) In the case of the Otaki reserves trustees, notwithstanding that they complied with the words of Bishop Selwyn by erecting and equipping a school, the management of that school has fallen off. The education is not sufficient for the future equipment of our children; and the head of our Church has for years lapsed from his work in our midst. (b) As regards Whitireia, the trustees of this reserve have never attempted to carry out Bishop Selwyn's words to our elders; and the Church of England ministers have ceased taking an interest for a long period of years in our people at Porirua and in Otaki. I mean the proper spiritual and moral work of the Church. I think the two reserves should be now controlled by a Board consisting of three Government officials and two Maoris. As to religious teaching, I think it should not be taught in this school during school hours or while the boarders are boarding here. My first two reasons for this are contained in (a) and (b) above mentioned. And, further, (a) there are many Ngatiraukawa Roman Catholic children and a fairly large number of Ngatitoo Mormon children in Porirua who ought to receive the same advantages as our children of the Church of England; (b) religious teaching could be taught to the children by their parents at their homes and in their own churches when they leave this school for their holidays, and at other times. I would like to see our children taught and brought up properly in the teachings of their respective Churches, I admit, but I would object to my children or grandchildren being taught the doctrines of another Church; and I know the parents of other children of other Churches would object to our Church of England teaching. If it could be done without any inconvenience, I would suggest that each Sunday the boys of each Church be allowed to attend their own service at their own churches, and to attend Sunday-school conducted by people of their own belief, in their own buildings away from this school. I cannot agree or appreciate a mixed or a picked text-book made up by a number of religious bodies for the purpose of teaching our children. I would do without the school and ask for a return of the land to us rather than suffer the above. I hold that if the ministers of our Church were alive and active, they could, with our (the parents) help, teach ourselves and our children in our respective religions, and get us to take a closer observance in their respective teachings. I, myself, always attend church every service when in Otaki, and I always go and attend service in my own religion when there is any service being held when I am away in other places. I always endeavour to carry out the teaching of my church—the Church of England.

#### RAIHA PUHA examined.

*Witness (to Mr. Stafford):* I am a daughter of Rawhiri Puaha, of Ngatitoo, one of the donors of Whitireia land in Porirua to Bishop Selwyn. An uncle of mine, Rawhiri Kanae, was also amongst the donors, and also a cousin of my father's, Nohorua. All the donors are relatives of mine. I object to the action of the Whitireia trustees in spending the Whitireia funds on a school in Wairarapa. I object because it is an act which violates the reasons which caused our elders to give this land to Bishop Selwyn. That reason was: they believed when the land was asked for by Bishop Selwyn of our people he gave them to understand that a school was to be built in the midst of their people, and for the benefit of the children of their people. I object because it is contrary to Native custom. This land was given to Bishop Selwyn because he asked for it, and Matene to Whiwhi, Tamihana te Rauparaha, and Bishop Selwyn came to Porirua from Otaki and asked Ngatitoo to hand it over to the Bishop for a school. My elders agreed, because they wanted their children to be educated in English ways and pursuits. My father waited, and so did Ngatitoo, for the school to be erected, as the Ngatiraukawa had had a school already built in Otaki, and because he could not get one built he sent my brother to the Auckland (St. John's) College. My uncle, Hohepa Tamaihangā, had always urged Bishop Hadfield to have a school built, but of no avail. I wish that a school be built from the proceeds of the two reserves.

If the wish I now express cannot be given us, then I would ask that the Porirua land be given back to the descendants of the donors. If the land is to be used properly for the building of a school in the midst of our people, I would suggest that it be cut up into building sections and small-farm sections, so as to increase its producing-capacity.

1. *Mr. Quick.*] You live at Porirua?—Yes.
2. Is there a pa there?—Yes, a Ngatitōa pa. All the Natives there are of the same hapu.
3. Do you think a college ought to be erected at Porirua?—Yes; I should like it at Whitireia.
4. You think that is what was intended by your father and uncle?—Yes, that was my parents' wish.
5. Would you consider it right to have a college erected at Otaki?—There is a school at Otaki already.
6. But would you consider it right to have this college erected at Otaki?—No; I wish it to be at Whitireia.
7. You would object to the money coming from Whitireia going to a school at Otaki?—What I wish is that the income arising from Whitireia should be spent on Whitireia.
8. You decidedly object to its being spent at Otaki?—I will not consent to having it spent at Otaki, because they have a school there already.
9. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you consent to its being spent in Wairarapa?—I will never consent to that either.
10. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you speak for the Porirua Natives?—Yes.
11. They would not consent?—They would support me in what I say—that is why they have not attended here. I am their representative.
12. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many children are there at the Porirua Pa?—About thirty, perhaps there may be more; there are others at Pukerua, Waikanae, and other places.
13. *Mr. Quick.*] Do the Pukerua and Waikanae Natives belong to Porirua?—Yes.
14. We have been told that when the Bishop was here at one time he consented to having the two trusts amalgamated, and the money expended on a school at Otaki: were your people at Porirua consulted at that time?—No, I was not here; I was not asked to come, and I was not consulted, nor were my people.
15. Does Wi Parata belong to your people?—Yes.
16. Does he represent the Waikanae Natives?—He is partly Ngatiawa and partly Ngatitōa.
17. What are the Natives at Waikanae?—Some are Ngatitōa, and some are Ngatihuāmia, a hapu of Ngatitōa.
18. If the Commission were to report that the money should go to Otaki, would the Porirua people petition against it?—Yes, I would petition.
19. Even if the Bishop consented to it?—If the Bishop consents what can I do? But I would send my petition.
20. Perhaps the Bishop would be as strong as you?—Perhaps he would be stronger; but he would not be right. I should petition at any rate.
21. *The Chairman.*] Supposing the question was only as between whether the children should no longer go to Wairarapa but should go to Otaki, would you prefer that? Supposing you cannot have a school at Porirua, would you prefer the funds to go to a school at Otaki and not to Wairarapa?—I prefer neither one nor the other; I would like the land given back to me.
22. But supposing it must be one of the two, what then?—I would not consent to either.
23. *Mr. Stafford.*] Supposing the Commission said, "We cannot advise a school at Porirua, but there must be a school": would you prefer the school to be at Otaki rather than in Wairarapa?—Well, I have said I will not consent to either.
24. *Mr. Wardell.*] If we say further that we cannot hold out any hope of the return of the land, which would you choose, if you had to choose Wairarapa or Otaki?—Well, I will not consent to either; if I cannot have it I will have nothing.
25. *Mr. Stafford.*] Tell us what you really mean?—I will not consent to Wairarapa, I will not consent to Otaki; leave it at Whitireia.
26. But supposing the Commission says it is not to be there, but it must be somewhere?—Then I am helpless, and can do nothing; I cannot get my wish gratified.
27. Would you not prefer Otaki to Wairarapa?—No, there is not much difference; it amounts to the same thing.
28. *Mr. Hutana.*] Have you and your people, Ngatitōa, met Ngatiraukawa and discussed the matter as to where the school is to stand if it is shifted from Wairarapa?—No, we have not had any meeting to discuss the matter. The Ngatiraukawa paid no heed to our request that they should come to Porirua to discuss the matter.
29. Supposing you discussed the matter and it was arranged to have the school, where would you consent to have it—here?—No, I would not consent to that, and my people would not consent.
30. *Mr. Quick.*] Is it a matter of family pride, that you think Ngatiraukawa ought to come to Porirua to consult with you?—No, it is not a matter of unfriendly or jealous feeling; it is simply that they did not come when requested.
31. You think they ought to come to Porirua?—Yes; it would have been well if they had come, because Whitireia belonged there, and the thing should be discussed on the spot.
32. *Mr. Hutana.*] If Ngatiraukawa will consent to have the school at Whitireia, that would settle the matter as far as you are concerned?—Yes.
33. *Mr. Stafford.*] If you cannot get the school at Porirua you want the money or the land?—Yes; I want the land and the money.



34. How many children of Ngatitōa are there at Porirua?—A good number, perhaps twenty or thirty, or more; if I count all Wi Neera's family it would be twenty, but there are others besides; some are going to school and some are not.

35. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are the Natives at Porirua living in a community or scattered throughout a large district?—All are living together at Porirua, but there are some at Pukerua and other places. The village is at the large house called "Toa."

36. *Mr. Stafford.*] Did you sign the petition to the House of Representatives out of which this Commission arose?—I may have done so.

*Mr. Stafford:* In reference to the question of a school at Porirua, your Honour, it does not seem to me that the question enters into consideration, even from the Church point of view. The eighth paragraph of the statement of claim shows that to be the case, and I would also refer you to the affidavit of Archdeacon Fancourt. It seems to me the position is that we may dismiss from this question the question of a school being established at Porirua; and it comes back to the one point: is there to be a school, and, if so, where? or are these moneys to be diverted to a purpose outside the district?

HAKARAIA TE WHENA examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Stafford): I am a farmer residing at Otaki. I belong to Whehiwhehi Hapu of Ngatiraukawa. When the Bishop visited Manakau, we, the people living here, went there to meet him, and we assembled in the hall there. There were also some European residents present; and our elders, Ropata te Ao, and others asked the Bishop to renew the college here. It had been a strong college, but it had fallen away, and we asked him to restore it to its former position. The Bishop's reply was "Very well." He had just arrived to be Bishop in this part of New Zealand, and he was then new to the conditions of the two trusts. When he had inquired into the matter and had seen the position of the trusts, he was quite willing to have the college renewed; and he was very glad to meet the Maoris and hear their statements in regard to the matter. They thought the thing was then completed. We waited from that time till 1904, when we heard that the college had been removed to Wairarapa. Archdeacon Fancourt was sent to see us here to request us to send our children to the Wairarapa. We replied that we would not consent to let our children go there, as the Bishop had consented to renew the college here, and the Bishop had not yet told us, subsequent to the interview at Manakau, that he had changed his mind and the college was not going to be established here. Archdeacon Fancourt told us the idea of a college here had been given up, and that the children had better be sent to the Wairarapa, and the money from Whitireia would be applied to support them there. We said we would not consent to that. At that time the Bishop was in England. When the Bishop returned from England last June twelve months, a letter was sent to Mr. McWilliam informing him that he wished to meet the Ngatiraukawa assembled here in the month of February, and that he would be here in reference to Whitireia. Consequently Ngatiraukawa all assembled, and Mr. McWilliam also attended. The first intimation we received from the Bishop was that he had already built a school at Wairarapa, and he would ask us to send our children there, and that the income from the land at Whitireia would be applied to the support of the Wairarapa establishment. We again said we would not consent to this "because you have already agreed to re-establish the college here and to carry out the wishes of our old people to have the college here." The Bishop replied that the thing could not now be altered, as the place had been built. Then he asked Ngatiraukawa to allow the money arising from the Otaki trusts to be added to those from Whitireia, and to be applied to the Wairarapa establishment. Then matters became difficult, and we began to express ourselves indignantly about the matter. We informed the Bishop that the children of the Church of England people were all attending the Catholic school, because they were much better able to teach than the Church of England; and we told him we had never given the Roman Catholics any land, yet "see how they do their work so well," while the Church of England, to whom a large amount of land was given, were weak, and did their work indifferently; and "if you do not comply with our wishes we will abandon your Church and join the Church of Rome." At that stage the Bishop ceased to speak. Then he informed us that there were two trusts and separate bodies of trustees, that the Otaki trusts were separate from Whitireia, and that he himself was a member of the Whitireia trust; that they would approach Archdeacon Williams and if he consented to add the proceeds of the Otaki trusts to the Whitireia trust, then he would be able to re-establish the school here. At this, those assembled in the house gave loud applause, taking it for granted that the thing was virtually settled, for they knew that Archdeacon Williams was always in support of having the school established here. That was all that took place that day. Then he arranged with Ngatiraukawa to meet them in the following April, when Archdeacon Williams was to be present. The April meeting did not come off; but I think it was in June that he sent a letter to Mr. McWilliam asking him to assemble Ngatiraukawa, and we thought it was to finish what we had been discussing before, and we all assembled in the house, and Mr. McWilliam attended also. Then the Bishop told us he had not come that day about Whitireia, that he had come to see them about the moneys at that time being collected from the Maoris to support the Maori clergy. He wished to see the subscription-lists and see how much they had collected. We replied, "No, let us settle the old trouble first, and then ask us about this money afterwards. These lands have been now sixty years in your hands, and we do not know how they stand to-day. We, the descendants of the donors, know you have not carried out the trusts." The Bishop then replied, "I have already told you I did not come here about Whitireia; and I must inform you that the trustees of Whitireia have not yet met to discuss the position," but he thought the members of the trust had made up their minds to adhere to the Wairarapa establishment. Then we replied, "You did not tell us in February that there were others besides yourself whom you had to consult; we took it your word alone was sufficient. Now we will not hand over this money until these former troubles are finished." The Bishop then said, "How are you going to support your ministers?" We said we could not help that; if there was no money it was not our fault. That ended the matter, and



the Bishop went away. That is all I have to say on that matter. After this meeting we asked Archdeacon Williams to come here about the matter. We informed him that the Bishop had consented to re-establish the college here, but that we were waiting his view of the matter. Archdeacon Williams told us that he had consented long ago to what they were asking. That was the view he had placed many times before the Synod. He asked us further to be persistent, and urge the matter, as he was getting an old man, and would like to see the thing accomplished soon. Archdeacon Williams wanted the school to be at Otaki; he wanted it re-established on the old site. The view he took was that the Porirua trust should be added to the Otaki to strengthen the undertaking. He said the Wairarapa school was not suitable for the large tribes here to send their children to—that there was already a school in the Ngatikahungunu district at Te Aute, which would serve the Wairarapa and the Te Aute territory. He gave no other reasons. I am one who supports the proposition to establish a school here, and all the Ngatiraukawa from here to Rangitikei are with me on this point. I would like the school to teach ordinary education, and mechanical and industrial pursuits. We have counted 134 children in Otaki of school age. My own family, including my grandchildren, number twenty-four. Not many attend the Church of England school—perhaps twenty. Not many attend the State school—I could not say how many, there are not thirty. Out of 134 children, nearly ninety do not attend any school. The children who attend the Roman Catholic school come in the train from Ohau; their parents are Church of England. About fifteen local children attend the Roman Catholic school. If a school were established at Otaki, I would like it administered by a Board of three members of the Civil Service and two Natives.

37. *Mr. Quick.*] Do the Roman Catholics board any children?—No; the children that attend the school come by train.

38. Do you object to religion being taught in the school?—Yes.

39. Do you object to its being taught in the Roman Catholic school?—The reason I object to having it taught in the proposed school is that it would prevent Roman Catholic children coming to be taught, and Wesleyans would not attend.

40. How is it that Church of England children come from Ohau to the Roman Catholic school?—Where else are they to go? The school is a good one, and the children are well taught there. The great object of the parents is to have their children well taught.

41. Do you object to religion being taught in Roman Catholic schools?—I would not take it upon myself to interfere in that arrangement.

42. *Mr. Stafford.*] Nobody has said they teach religion to the Protestant children?—I have never been there and I cannot tell; but I think the parents follow the Church of England service, and the children are taught by their parents.

43. *Mr. Quick.*] Why do they not send their children more to the Board school if they do not want religion taught?—I am only speaking for myself; my objection is only as far as I myself am concerned.

44. *Mr. Wardell.*] How do you account for so many children not coming to the Otaki schools of one kind or another?—Many of them live across the river, and the distance is too great.

45. What difference would it make if another school were erected?—They would board and live at the school.

46. To what do you attribute the small attendance at the mission school?—The main reason is that the teacher is not competent.

47. *Mr. Quick.*] Where were you educated?—In the old college.

48. You were taught religion there, were you not?—Yes.

49. Do you object to your children being taught in the same way?—If it is confined to instruction by the Church of England it will bar the children of other bodies.

50. But supposing it is not confined to Church of England children?—If religious instruction by the Church of England is insisted upon in the school, it would bar others from attending.

51. Did none but Church of England children go when you were educated there?—Only Church of England.

52. How many used to go?—Over a hundred; they used to come from Napier and all parts. At that time it was the only important Native school in existence. Archdeacon Williams was here then. Te Aute was not in existence.

53. Would you not call that a very good school at that time?—Yes; it was a good school.

54. So the school at present simply wants improving?—Yes.

55. On the same lines?—And add to it industrial and mechanical instruction.

56. You would be willing to see the school brought back to what it was before with industrial and mechanical instruction added?—Yes; that is what I should like to see.

57. If you could see the school as good as it was, religious education would not be out of place?—My objection is not to religion being taught, but I want it put in a secondary position. I am religious myself and so are my children.

58. You do not object to religion being taught so long as the general education is good?—No.

59. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you think a school will best succeed without teaching religion, or teaching it, if the other things are taught?—The one in which there is no religious instruction would be most successful.

60. Do you know that no religion is taught in the State schools?—I did not know that.

61. Would you like the school to be conducted in the same way as the State schools?—Yes.

62. Are there a large number of Ngatiraukawa Roman Catholics?—Not many.

63. *Mr. Wardell.*] Supposing the present school to be maintained at Wairarapa, do you see any objection to your boys going there?—So far as I am concerned, I would not send any children there.

64. Why?—One reason is the distance from home, and another is that the place given for a school has been discarded and set aside, and I would not support the other. I think the whole of the Ngatiraukawa are of the same opinion. It would be preferable to send them to the Government school.

65. Have you any tribal reasons?—No

66. *Mr. Quick.*] You know that Albert Hini sent his boy to Te Aute: would you not send your boy to Te Aute?—I could not tell you why he sent his son there. He was only one instance out of a large number of the Ngatiraukawa.

67. But there are several who have gone there from here?—Perhaps they came from Ngatiapa and Whanganui.

68. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know of any yourself?—I know of three of Rawiri's children who go there because Archdeacon Williams is there. In fact, Archdeacon Williams asked for them to be sent there, and came and took them away; they are almost like his own children. But if Archdeacon Williams had not been there they would not have gone.

69. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know in the old days children used to go to St. John's in Auckland to be educated?—I have heard that; there were not many; it is a long time ago.

70. They were some of the best men?—Yes.

71. Why should you not do as your ancestors did?—Those are different times; the law was different; the Maori was in a different position.

72. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you think it proper that the trust fund should go in a manner in which the Bishop wished it to go—to the Wairarapa?—We object to that, and so do the European residents here; they tell us they would not do such a thing.

73. Do you not think the wants of the West Coast require a school to be here instead of in the Wairarapa?—Yes; this is just as large a district as the Wairarapa.

74. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you understand that not a farthing goes to the Wairarapa except with a West Coast boy?—I am not aware of that.

75. It is so?—That may be so; but we are told so many things that I do not know what the position is.

76. It is time you were told the truth?—Then was not what the Bishop stated the truth—making a promise to re-establish a college here?

77. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you know of any Ngatitōa or Ngatiraukawa from this coast that have been sent to the Wairarapa school?—No, I think not.

#### TAUTANA WHATAUPOKO examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Stafford): I belong to the Ngatitōa tribe. I am a chief. I live at Porotowiaao, near Levin, where Rangihaeata and other Ngatitōa chiefs are buried. I and the Ngatitōa want the moneys from Whitireia endowment and the Otaki endowments added together to establish a school. If it is found that Porirua is unsuitable I should like the school to be at Otaki.

78. Why do you think Otaki the best place?—It is centrally situated for one thing, and on account of the population; and it would be closer to the people of Ngatiapa and Whanganui if they wish to send their children there.

79. What do you think about the idea of sending the money to Wairarapa?—I will not consent to that; I object to it.

80. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would children from this Coast go to the Wairarapa, in your opinion?—No; they would not.

81. Why?—Their elders would not allow it.

82. For what reason?—We have land here set aside for educational purposes on which to erect a college.

83. Is there not any objection to sending your children to the Wairarapa?—Yes, we have; who is to pay the expenses of them going there?

84. We have been told there is a feeling of animosity towards the Ngatikahungunu which prevents the Ngatiraukawa sending their children there?—I have nothing to do with that.

85. It is merely on the ground of distance?—Yes; and the thing is here, given for this purpose, and we want it used for that purpose.

86. *Mr. Quick.*] Supposing the train fare was paid by the trust and the children got a better education for nothing than they got here, and they were maintained for nothing, would you have any objection?—Well, I object to this; the money would be better spent in this district.

86A. But how is it some children go to Te Aute?—Because there is no college here.

#### THOMAS BEVAN examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Stafford): I am sixty-nine years of age. I reside at Manakau. I have lived amongst the Ngatiraukawa for sixty years. I know their lands and their customs. I arrived here in 1846, when they brought Te Rauparaha back to Otaki, and some thousand Maoris met him at the mouth of the Otaki. In 1848, Tamihana Rauparaha and Matene te Whiwhi, Rawhiri of the Ngatitōa, and other Natives of the Ngatiraukawa all agreed to give two blocks of land for the education of their children. I could not say whether the agreement about both blocks was at the same time. They were given for the education of Ngatitōa, Ngatiawa, and Ngatiraukawa children. The present school reserve and 500 acres at Whitireia belonged to the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa Tribes in both instances. I am speaking from my own knowledge at the time. This was the first college put up on the reserve just after the gift—a college and school—and Te Rauparaha built the church.

87. Was the administration satisfactory for a number of years?—The college was established, and there were about one hundred and fifty or two hundred boys at it. It went on in a most thriving way. At that time Archdeacon Hadfield was the manager and the Rev. Mr. Williams. It was a boarding-college. Before that the Government had allowed the college about £1,300 or £1,500 a year.

88. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you certain you are speaking accurately as to this money grant?—I am not certain of the amount; but they received a subsidy of either £1,300 or £1,500 a year. The college

went on thrivingly up to about 1857 or 1858. Then Tamihana Rauparaha, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatitōa found some faults about the administration of the money they were receiving from the Government. When the Government received this complaint about the administration of the money, they sent Royal Commissioners up to make inquiry, who went to the college. Henare Taratoa was the teacher at that time. The Commissioners asked for the books, and he said "I cannot produce the books, they are missionary property." When the Commissioners could not get the books, they collected the children and made inquiry as to what clothing they wore, and how many times a day they were taught, and what sort of bedding they had, and what kind of food they had to eat. They returned to Wellington and the money was stopped. Archdeacon Hadfield was away at that time. When he came back he found the money was stopped. He then gave notice to the parents of the children that there would be no more boarding-school, but there would be a day-school. The children all broke up and went to their homes—to Manawatu, Rangitikei, Porirua, and Waikanae. I think this was in 1859. Ever since then the school has been dwindling down to its present state. The present state is this: it is a day-school, and as soon as the children go home they go to their parents; they sit down at night with the children all round telling fairy tales, and they go amongst the tohungas. I do not think the attendance at the school is above ten or fifteen.

89. You know the district well?—Yes.

89A. Are there numbers of Maori children who ought to go to school who do not attend?—Yes; a large proportion of them. I do not believe out of every twenty children there are three or four who go to the State school, and they would be better without such education as they are receiving now. I suppose throughout the district extending from Otaki to the Manawatu there are one hundred and fifty children uneducated, getting neither religious nor any other education, but growing up ignorant and superstitious. Hospitals and doctors are no use in the district, for they will not attend them; they have their own prophets, and you cannot persuade them to go to any one else. I believe if there was a boarding-school on this land as a central college there would be an enormous quantity of children attending it; but while it is carried on as a day-school it is of no use whatever.

90. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you not think, if a boarding-school were erected, it would be better to place it away from a centre of population—at Waikanae, for instance?—No; because when they had a boarding-school here the parents never troubled them; they never went near or interfered. It would be just as good to have it here as to take it anywhere else.

91. But would not the children out of school hours get away home and play truant, and so on?—No.

92. Why?—I am going by the time when there was a boarding-school here. One never heard of any children running away or going amongst the parents, or the parents interfering with them. It was carried on in a most beautiful manner. If the Church wants to keep up its congregation now is the time to take the children in hand and bring them up with religious instruction.

93. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you recollect the circumstances of the donation of this land? Did you understand that these lands were given for the education of young children or for higher education, beyond the common schools?—It was given for the higher education; because they were making industrial children of them by teaching them farming and so on; learning something beyond education.

94. Is that what you mean by the word "higher"?—Yes.

95. In using the word "college," do you understand it to signify the class of education to be given, or was it only a school at which children were boarded?—It was a boarding-school for higher education.

96. What do you understand by "higher" education?—To bring them up as good scholars and useful people.

97. *Mr. Quick.*] I should have thought, if the school were in the thick of a Maori population, it would be difficult—even if it were a boarding-school—to keep the children away from the parents at night and from playing truant?—I do not think so. I am quite certain it is not so. They are very anxious now to get as high education as they can. It is pitiable to go up the Coast and see the state of the children—so much neglected by the Government and the missionaries.

98. I suppose things fell off on the West Coast to a large extent owing to the Hauhau rebellion, and so on?—Some twenty years ago it was very bad here, but that is gradually dying out. But the Maori tohungas are carrying on most disgracefully; they will not call in a doctor. It is no good to get grown-up people to go to the churches now; they have been breaking faith with the Church for so many years that they will not go back, and the only way to save the young is to bring them up on religious principles.

99. You do not agree with what is said about going away from religion altogether?—No; that is what I am fighting against.

100. You have children on this coast?—Fourteen.

101. Where were they educated?—There was no school for them to go to; they are all self-educated, but they are all doing well.

OTAKI, THURSDAY, 8TH JUNE, 1905.

Rev. Mr. McWILLIAM examined.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] We have received from Archdeacon Williams the accounts in connection with the Otaki trusts from 1893—the date at which he took charge under the Mission Trust Board, and we have in a blue-book the accounts for the years 1872, 1873, and 1874. Are you in a position to give any information as to the financial transactions of the trust from its commencement up to 1872?—None whatever. I had nothing to do with it.

2. Can you give us any information as to financial transactions of the trust between 1874 and 1893 ?—No, I cannot, except the small working-expenses of the school, such as buying books, and school fees.

3. Can you give any account of expenditure upon or connected with the school during any of the years I have mentioned ?—For 1872 the receipts were £17, chiefly school fees ; these accounts seem to be from October, 1872, to February, 1874. The expenses in that period were £11 8s. 6d.

4. In the blue-book the fees for 1872 are given as £11 12s. 10d. ?—I have only two entries belonging to 1872, which amount to £3.

5. The totals for 1872 and 1873 ?—About £8.

6. *Mr. Quick.*] In whose handwriting are the entries ?—In mine ; but they are very far back ; I had nothing to do with the rents, it was only school fees.

7. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know of any payments by the Porirua trustees to the Otaki school ?—Simply by hearsay. I believe a portion of my salary was paid for a time out of the Porirua fund—£12 per annum, I think. But I believe objection was taken to it, and it was refunded.

8. According to the accounts furnished, £800 was paid by the trustees to the Otaki school, a great deal in salaries to Mr. McWilliam and others ?—I never heard of that. I have heard Bishop Hadfield say that payments were made on account of the number of Porirua boys who attended the school. I heard that £12 of my salary was paid for a few years out of the Porirua fund on account of Porirua boys being here. Objection was taken to it when they were withdrawn, and the money was refunded. I never heard of any other payments.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] You say some boys from Porirua were sent up to the school, and these were payments for those boys ?—The Bishop considered it only fair to take part of my salary from that fund on account of those boys being at the school. They were not boarding at the school, but living with relatives. On the roll for 1867 I find some few names from Porirua—two girls and three boys ; in 1868, 5 ; 5 in 1869, 4 in 1871, 1 in 1872, 2 in 1873, 2 in 1874. In 1875 there are none that I recognise, but I was not teacher then.

10. How long have you been here ?—From 1868 to the present time ; from 1868 I was four years teacher. Since then I have been incumbent.

11. The grants are to the Church Missionary Society : that is a voluntary association for missionary purposes in England, is it not ?—Yes.

12. It is not connected with the Church in New Zealand in any way ?—The Church of New Zealand has control over it to a certain extent ; they have grants from the society and have control over the expenditure.

13. Was there any control by the Church over the Missionary Society's money ?—I think so ; they got a certain grant year by year, and the Church of New Zealand, by a Board or the Bishops, had control. My salary was paid by the secretary to the Church Missionary Society for years.

14. It did not come from the Church of England in New Zealand ?—No.

15. The society is represented out here by a Board ?—It is at present.

16. The Porirua grant to Bishop Selwyn is on a different basis to the grants to the missionary society ?—I believe so.

17. You have been, as incumbent here, for many years in close connection with the school ?—Yes.

18. Can you give us a kind of running account of the prosperity or otherwise of the school, from the time you first remember it onwards ?—It has been a fluctuating thing, as most Maori things are. Sometimes the attendance of children has fallen off. It has never been stagnant ; there has always been a teacher. If the attendance has at any time fallen off it has not been for want of room or for want of a teacher, but because the Maoris cannot stick to anything.

19. It was at one time very flourishing ?—Before my time there were, I believe, 170 boarders. It has always been a boarding-school up to now. Mrs. Jennings has two boarders now.

20. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do the boarders pay anything ?—No, except for their clothes.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] You allude to the fluctuation in attendance owing to the peculiarities of Maori character : do you find that affects a day-school more than a boarding-school ?—Much more.

22. In order to give a boarding-school fair play, would it be advisable to place it in a centre of Maori population or at some distance from it, say, at Waikanae : would it be advisable to place it there, or to keep it amongst the Maoris at Otaki ?—I never heard of boys being taken away from a boarding-school, even if close to a Maori place ; it is only when they come day by day. All boarders, so far as I remember, have always been most regular.

23. But did they come from the immediate vicinity or from a distance ?—Sometimes from the village itself ; they never thought of trying to absent themselves even if there parents were here.

24. In your spiritual capacity you mix a good deal with adult Maoris ?—Yes.

25. A scheme has been put before us purporting to voice the ideas of the Ngatiraukawa, in which they want a school or college without any religious education at all : is that your experience of what their sentiments are ?—I never heard them express anything of the sort.

26. Is it the sentiment of the Maoris that there should be a school endowed from these funds without any religion being taught at all in it ?—I should think the very opposite. It was for a Church of England school the land was given, and they all understand that. I never heard any one express a wish to have that altered.

27. I suppose children of other denominations have been admitted to the school ?—Yes ; we have had a few Roman Catholics, when they had no school, admitted with the Archdeacon's consent, who was a trustee. They cost the school nothing, being day-scholars.

28. When children of other denominations are admitted, are they forced to submit to the services of the Church, or are they allowed to absent themselves ?—The question has never arisen. The Roman

Catholic children were just taught by me in the same way as those of the Church of England. I taught them the catechism. They were told when they asked for admission they would be so taught, and no question was ever raised.

29. Have you any rule of conduct in regard to the question, if any difficulty arose in this way? Would it be a condition precedent to coming to the school that they should be taught the catechism?—No; they were simply told they would have to be the same as other scholars, and no question was raised. As soon as they had a school of their own of course they were withdrawn.

30. Is the decrease in number caused to a large extent by the Roman Catholics having a school of their own?—Not to any large extent.

31. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think, if the Natives desired schools without religious instruction, they would communicate that opinion to you?—No, I do not suppose they would.

32. How long have boarders been charged nothing?—I am not aware they ever paid anything. Their board costs 1s. a day, which is charged to the trust.

33. *The Chairman.*] Have you considered whether a good school could be established at Otaki by the consolidation of the two trusts: take the income from the endowment as being worth £1,500 a year, on that basis could an effective school be established for that, or would you say still in the interests of the Church of England and the Maori children the system of exhibitions to the Wairarapa would be the more expedient—quite irrespective of the Maori feeling?—I have not thought the matter out very definitely; but I should fancy a school amongst the tribe themselves, even if it were not such a school as Te Aute, would be better than sending the boys away, if there was an income sufficient to keep it up.

34. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you say what boys have gone from Otaki school to Te Aute?—I have no list; but I know two or three have been going annually for some time.

35. Do you know how many go from here to Clareville?—None from this district.

36. There have been marriages between Ngatikahungunu men and Ngatitōa women, and their children have gone there?—Yes, but they have been resident in the Wairarapa.

37. A little confusion may have arisen in this way?—Yes.

38. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do I understand that 1s. a day is charged for the boarding of the boys, or that the trustees pay 1s. a day for the maintenance of the boys?—The trust pays 1s. a day to the manager of the school for their maintenance; it is free to the pupils.

39. *Mr. Quick.*] Was the old school that was burnt down insured?—Only for £400, unfortunately.

40. What would it cost to replace that building?—At least £2,000 to put up such a building as that.

41. You say there never was any trouble in regard to boarders breaking away and remaining away?—No; they seemed to consider it a matter of honour that they should stay till they went away altogether.

42. *The Chairman.*] But day-scholars are irregular?—Yes; not through their own fault, but they are kept by their parents to mind the baby, or help in the fields.

43. And for amusements?—Of course, they play truant as Europeans do.

44. Are they taken away for tangis?—I do not know if they are taken, but the parents are too much occupied to look after them, and they stay away.

45. In the case of day-scholars who live in the neighbourhood, is the attendance seriously irregular?—In my experience, the attendance is very irregular. At certain seasons of the year they are kept away for a great deal to help in the fields, and so on.

46. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are Maori children more erratic in attendance at a day-school than the same class of European children?—I should fancy the parents have less control over them.

47. *Mr. Quick.*] European children do not get their own way so much?—That is it.

48. *Mr. Stafford.*] Your experience is that when the school was a boarding-school in its successful period no difficulty was experienced in boarding the children resident in Otaki?—None whatever.

49. So if there were funds to do it, that would be no objection?—No.

50. You would not consider it necessary that the school should be taken to some other locality to secure regular attendance?—I do not think so.

51. You say it is part of the condition upon which children come that they should be taught the catechism, and so on, the same as the others?—Yes.

52. And whatever their parents might be they were taught that, and it would be so in the future, if administered by the Church?—I suppose so.

53. Would not that have the effect of excluding a number who belong to other denominations—particularly Roman Catholics?—I do not know whether it would; the Roman Catholics are the most exclusive sect, and they were the only sect that sent their children. It might exclude them, but only for the reason that they have room in schools of their own.

54. Assuming that we have funds and a building, and teaching of the best class, would not the effect of religious teaching be to exclude those children of parents belonging to denominations other than the Church of England?—We have had no experience, except that Roman Catholics asked to be admitted.

55. But at that time they had no other school to go to?—No; now they have a school of their own they would not ask for admission.

56. Would not the effect be to exclude Mormons?—I do not think so.

57. Do you think a better scheme would be to establish a well-equipped school in Otaki, rather than have the funds of the Porirua trust go towards a school in the Wairarapa?—It would be decidedly best to have a school here if possible.

58. You do not know of any children who have gone from the West Coast to the Wairarapa ?—Not one.

59. How long has the school been established in the Wairarapa ?—About two years.

60. Can you give us any idea of what the feelings of the Natives would be in the matter ?—My experience is that they would refuse to send a single child there.

61. What are your grounds for thinking so ?—From conversations with the Natives up and down the Coast ; they are all against it entirely.

62. If a school is to be established, you consider the best scheme would be to establish it at Otaki ?—Decidedly.

63. And with proper control you might have a better attendance of day-scholars ?—Yes.

64. Supposing there was legal power to compel attendance, would you find any difficulty ?—No ; I do not think there are six in Otaki who do not attend school now.

65. The mission school has fallen off very much of late years in attendance ?—No.

66. What are the numbers who attend the school now ?—For a number of years it has been about twenty or thirty. The population itself has decreased greatly since there were 170 boys there. There are a good number attending the Roman Catholic and State schools. There are thirty-five attending our school.

67. The money contributed from Porirua was contributed on the basis that Porirua children were being educated here ?—So far as I know.

68. Is there any practical distinction between the two trusts ? Are they not both for religious teaching ?—Yes.

69. Although one refers to the mission and the other to the Bishop, the practical intention is the same ?—Doubtless.

70. Do you not think it proper, under the circumstances, that the funds from Porirua should be used to establish a school at Otaki ?—I do.

71. Do you not think it is the best purpose they could be put to ?—I have said so.

72. *Mr. Quick.*] You have spoken of the objection to sending children to the Wairarapa : how is it there is no terrible objection to sending them to Te Aute ?—For the reason that Archdeacon Williams is at the head of that school ; for no other reason. He taught the parents of these children, and was looked up to as their father. There was great objection to Te Aute at first, but after one or two had been induced to go, it was found no harm came to them.

73. But there must be children who have gone there who were born after he left here ?—But he has been in constant communication with them.

74. Do you think if Archdeacon Williams died, Te Aute would not get them ?—I could not say.

75. *Mr. Chapman.*] The scheme put forward by Mr. Stafford apparently is that there should be no religious education at the school : have you sufficient experience of the Maoris and knowledge of their ways of thought to be able to say whether they would approve of a school where their children would be taught no religion at all ?—From what I know of them, I should think they would not like it.

76. Quite apart from the fact that one of the purposes of the cession was religious education ?—Yes:

77. Do you think the sentiment of the Maoris as expressed in the " cession " survives to this day ?—Not to the same extent, apparently ; but, as far as I know, it still exists.

78. *Mr. Wardell.*] It was mentioned by a witness yesterday that the State subsidised the school to the extent of £1,300 or £1,500 a year for some years : have you any knowledge of that ?—No. I have been told by Bishop Hadfield that it never received anything. I know nothing of it.

79. Do you think a school of a higher class than now exists at Otaki would be a better thing for the Native community of the West Coast than two schools of a lower grade—one at Otaki and one at Papawai ?—I should say a higher-grade school here would be the better, because there are State schools within reach of the Natives.

80. I mean a school to include education from the kindergarten up to the highest ordinary State standard ?—I should say one large school is better than two small ones.

81. *Mr. Stafford.*] What is the largest Ngatiraukawa settlement ?—Otaki, I should think.

#### WILLIAM BURNES SMITH examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Wardell) : I am master of the Otaki State School. The average daily attendance is at present 170 ; the average daily attendance of Native children I could not give exactly, but there are twenty-five Maori and half-caste children on the roll.

82. *Mr. Wardell.*] How does their average attendance compare with those of European children on the roll ?—It is not so good.

83. Are there any special circumstances in your knowledge contributing to this difference ?—Occasions arise more frequently among the Maoris ; a tangi will take a great many children away, in or out of the district. And working in the fields and home-work takes down the average attendance of Maoris more than in the case of white children.

84. Have you formed any opinion as to whether greater advantages would be afforded the Native children if they were maintained and boarded in a school rather than by their attendance at a day-school ?—I have formed the conclusion that it would be a great advantage to the Native children to be boarded.

85. Are they attentive pupils ?—They are attentive and good-natured, but they have not the staying-power of white children, and get careless at times.

86. Have you observed any racial animosity between the European and the Native children ?—I never had a single case of any trouble between them ; they mix freely and friendly. If there is any bias, it is rather that the Maori children are inclined to be popular among the white. They are good-tempered and generous to a fault.

87. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you think, if a well-kept school were established in Otaki, it would be better for the Maoris themselves?—Yes, I think so.

88. If funds were available for teaching and boarding, and so on, and the school were well equipped, would it not be an advantage to the Natives?—Decidedly it would; you would have a homogeneous school.

89. Could it be so arranged as to get the attendance of the children?—I am afraid it would need special legislation.

90. Assuming the system adopted contains the same machinery for compulsion as yours, would it be a success?—Undoubtedly.

91. Do you think such a school is wanted in Otaki?—I do.

92. *Mr. Chapman.*] A school with compulsion?—We have compulsory powers in the State school with reference to Maori children, and our Truant Officer has acted on several occasions.

93. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you think there are a considerable number of Native children in and around Otaki that want education, and are not being educated at all?—There are a considerable number.

94. *The Chairman.*] Have you formed any opinion as to whether there are any considerable number of children of Ngatiraukawa in the Otaki district whose parents or relations would desire that they should have what is called a better kind of education rather than a useful education? Would they prefer to send their children to a school where carpentry and blacksmithing and farming operations are taught, rather than to a school of a higher class—a secondary school with industrial training?—I have not had very much opportunity of forming an opinion on that subject, but I gather from the parents I have asked that there is not a very great ambition to go further than the Seventh Standard. My opinion is that the Seventh or any other standard is not so important as giving practical technical education to enable them to earn a livelihood later on, and not go back to their hapu and forget what they have learned. Any school should make a strong point of giving the children technical education; that should be the strongest point.

95. *Mr. Wardell.*] In some schools, the obligations of an industrial training is claimed to be satisfied by teaching boys milking cows and getting in the horses and doing a little farming: does that satisfy in your mind the requirements of industrial training?—Not at all.

96. You suggest they should be taught trades to enable them to take positions as skilled artisans?—That is my idea.

MRS. JENNINGS examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Wardell): I am teacher of the Otaki Mission School. I have thirty-five children on the roll—twenty boys and five girls. The average attendance since the beginning of the year has been about twenty-five. The ages of the children range from fourteen years to five (boys); the eldest of the girls is eleven. The proportion of the sexes varies a little; there are generally a few more boys than girls. The attendance is always fluctuating; there are good and bad times—more bad than good. I attribute the bad attendance to the indifference of the parents. They seem to get worked up occasionally, and the children come regularly; then the attendance drops, and we call on them, and the attendance grows up again, and so it goes on. I instruct them up to the Fourth Standard. Those who desire to go beyond, the boys go to Te Aute and the girls to Hukarere. Those who go are transported at the cost of their parents. Their education and maintenance is free. I usually look to send two or three a year to Te Aute, but I do not always do so. It is boys who generally go; not so many girls go on. The girls generally leave school when they are fourteen or fifteen. There are no records of the school prior to March, 1903, when it was burned down. Since that fire three boys have gone to Te Aute; two of these are still there; one came away on account of illness. There was accommodation in the large school building for over a hundred; the rooms were not all furnished; there was bedding supplied for ten at most.

97. *Mr. Wardell.*] We have been told that at one period there were over one hundred boarding there. Have you any reason to know that?—I have heard so.

98. What became of the furniture?—At the time of the fire there was a stack of iron bedsteads.

99. Is there any desire on the part of the parents that the children should board?—Yes; I have frequently had parents asking me to take their children to board.

100. Do you think it would be for their advantage to board?—Most decidedly.

101. What is the cost of boarding?—About 1s. a day; that is what is allowed to me. I consider, in the seventeen years I have had it, it just pays expenses; perhaps a larger establishment would be cheaper.

102. *Mr. Chapman.*] That is allowed for their food?—Yes.

103. Does that allow for attendance as well?—They live with me as part of my household, and I receive that for looking after them and mending, and so on; 1s. covers it all, unless I want anything special in the way of bedding, &c., when a special charge is made on the fund.

104. Have you any experience of day-scholars?—It is a day-school principally.

105. You have heard what has been said about irregularity of attendance: do you agree with it?—Yes, the attendance of day-scholars is most uncertain and irregular; it cannot be depended upon.

106. *Mr. Quick.*] If the school were restored, it would accommodate 120?—Yes, easily.

107. In other words, the Church Missionary Society could do it now as it was done before?—Yes. I suppose so.

*Mr. McWilliam* said that when there were 170 boys there they were working and growing their own food; they worked only half-time in the school.

108. *Mr. Stafford.*] Are there 150 Maori children in Otaki?—I could hardly say; including half-castes there would be.



OTAKI, FRIDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1905.

The scheme submitted by Mr. Stafford having been read (see Appendix),

*The Chairman*: The mode of dealing with these Porirua and Otaki trusts by amalgamating them and applying them in the way that has been read has been officially announced and interpreted. We are asked to recommend that this plan shall be adopted. If there are any persons who desire to address us against the adoption of this plan, now is the time for them to do so.

WI PARATA examined.

*Witness*: I am one. I object to this scheme. I will commence from the time when the Natives gave this land to the Church. The first person who brought the news of the Gospel to these parts was a Maori, and Waikanae was the first place where he announced the new Gospel. Ngatiawa were the people living there then, and Ngatitooa. After this trouble arose, known as the fight at Kuititanga; at that time Ngatiraukawa had not embraced Christianity. Ngatiawa and Ngatitooa only had done so. After the battle of Kuititanga, the Ngatiraukawa thought they had been beaten because the Ngatitooa and Ngatiawa were Christians. Tamihana te Rauparaha and Matene te Whiwhi went to Ngapuhi to get the new religion and a clergyman, and Mr. Hadfield came and took up his residence at Waikanae. He went there because the people there had embraced Christianity. After that, Ngatiraukawa embraced Christianity. Then Mr. Hadfield used to travel between Waikanae and Otaki, visiting each place. After that, religion spread to Rangitikei and to Wellington, and when the Bishop heard all these people had embraced Christianity he came down here, and as soon as he got here he commenced to apply to Ngatiraukawa for land. Tamihana te Rauparaha and Matene were the chief men in the tribe—the other chiefs took their lead from them and supported what they did and said. Accordingly a meeting was held in Otaki, and the question of giving land to the Bishop was discussed. The land was to be given for the purpose of teaching the people principles of Christianity only; they did not know of anything at the time beyond that. After that Matene and Tamihana went to Porirua to ask Ngatitooa to also hand over a piece of land for the same purpose, and they consented to do so. They meant it was not to be applied to any other purpose than the teaching of religion. In the year 1850 the land was Crown-granted, and the conditions upon which it was given were altered. The people who gave the land had never been informed that the land would be diverted in this way; the grant was made in secret, it was not made in the presence of Ngatitooa and with their full knowledge, they being the people who had given the land. I will confine my remarks now to Porirua only. Owing to the length of time during which this land lay idle without any school on it—from 1850 to 1860—the donors, seeing it was idle, requested the Church to give it back to them, on the occasion of a meeting with Governor Brown at Kohimaramara, near Auckland, and ever since that time we have kept that in view and wished this land to be returned to us. Fifteen years after 1860 I took proceedings at law against the Bishop, for the reason that the purpose for which the land had been given had not been carried out. But I did not appear in presence before the Supreme Court, the matter was conducted in another room, and there it was decided that this land was Crown land, and apparently the original gift by the Maoris of the land was put on one side and not considered at all. After that the Natives sent a petition to Parliament to have the land returned to them; that was not to ask for the erection of a school there, but for the land to be returned to them. Since I have been here listening to the powers conferred upon the Commission, I have come to the conclusion that they are not in accordance with the intentions for which the land was given by the Maoris. They are entirely from a European point of view, not a Maori. The object of giving the land was with the object of teaching the new religion, with a view to cause intertribal wars and the killing of men to cease. Now I hear to-day that it is suggested that the children are to be taught how to kill and destroy human beings. At the time the land was given it was so given under the powers of the Treaty of Waitangi. At that time the Maoris still had their mana, and they gave their land under their mana. But when the land was Crown-granted that mana was set on one side, and the land appeared under a different mana. I will not presume to say anything about the Governor's instructions to you and the inquiry you are to hold into this land. It would appear that the Commission has come here to make inquiries because the trusts have not been given effect to, and it is with a view to having them given effect to the Commission is now sitting. I will leave out the first four paragraphs, and will take the fifth. In regard to this, I have to say if these trusts cannot be carried out in their integrity, then I say, return us the land. In reference to clause 6, in the case of the Porirua grant, it is here suggested if the scheme approved by the Supreme Court cannot be given effect to what modifications can be made, and if that cannot be done the land should be given back to the Maoris. The Commission should not consider the Crown grant only, but should also consider the gift behind the Crown grant. This land was given under the mana of the Treaty of Waitangi, which was approved of by the Queen. The Treaty of Waitangi gave certain powers, but this was taken away outside the powers of the Treaty of Waitangi. Speaking for myself, I cannot approve of the present scheme. The part I most disapprove of is the part where it is suggested that Maori children should be taught how to kill human beings—military drill. That is not the work of religion; that was not the purpose for which the land was given. I attended the school at Otaki. At that time the children attending the school were mostly older than eight or nine years—they were well grown boys; they were so selected to be strong and work in the fields. I was attending the school in 1852, and I saw that the masters treated the Maori children differently from the manner in which they treated European children. We were taught only to read and write—to read Maori books and to write Maori only. At the time Archdeacon Williams, of Te Aute, had charge of the school I was here. I saw no good in it; others may have seen good in it, but I saw no good in the way in which he looked after the children. Most of their time was occupied in tilling the soil. I do not wish to say anything bad of the clergymen of those days, but I am informing the Commission of what they did. From that time to this, this strange way of managing a mission school has been in force.



1. *Mr. Quick.*] The children do not till the ground now, do they?—No, they do not do it now, we having brought the land into cultivation and improved it. I do not know how they manage the schools just now, but during my time I know how they managed them. You must not understand me to mean that I wish to have a school, the school is too late for us now. I was not intended for these schools; I now am an old man. Perhaps you will say, “You have plenty of children,” but I have nothing to do with that. These lands have now been in European hands fifty-five years, and nothing has been done. I have finished what I have to say.

2. *Mr. Wardell.*] From whence do you derive your knowledge of the motives of the donors in giving the land?—I was quite old at the time the lands were given.

3. But you were at school in 1850, and the land was given two years before that?—I was grown up when the land was given.

4. Two years before you went to school?—I had been educated a little at Waikanae before I came here.

5. When were you born?—In 1837. The old people did not conceal the matter. They talked about it in the presence of all the people.

6. Was Matene te Whiwhi at a meeting at Kohimaramara?—Yes.

7. Did he take any part in the demand for the return of the land made at that meeting?—No.

8. Did Tamihana te Rauparaha?—No.

9. Did any of the donors?—No, it was only Hohepa Tamaihenga.

10. *Mr. Quick.*] Was Tamihana alive when you brought your action against the Bishop in 1875?—No.

11. Who of the donors were alive then?—They were all dead.

12. Whom did you represent—yourself only, or any others?—I took proceedings on behalf of myself and a lady sitting over there for the people of Porirua.

13. The Ngatiraukawa were not mixed up with it?—No.

14. Did the people of Porirua ask you to take those proceedings?—No, I did it myself because of what I had heard had been said at Kohimaramara, and also because the land had been so long lying idle without a school.

15. Nobody else moved in the matter but you?—Myself only. The reason why I took action myself was that I knew the people at Porirua did not know how to go about getting the land back; they had no idea they could do so.

16. Have you been asked to sign this “scheme”?—No, because I will not consent to it.

17. Have you been attending meetings where the scheme was talked about?—No, I have been at no meetings; they do not tell me about those.

18. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do you say Matene was dead when you brought your action?—Yes, I think so.

19. Did he not die in 1881?—Perhaps it may be so; if so, he was alive.

20. Did you not go up to Matene in reference to taking this action?—I do not recollect that. I misunderstood the question; I did not mean to say they were all dead in 1875.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] You did not approach Matene to get him to join in the action?—I do not recollect going to Matene.

22. *Mr. Chapman.*] Do you know of any meetings being held at Porirua to discuss the question of what is to be done with the land?—I do not know.

23. Have any meetings been held at Waikanae?—No.

24. Are there many persons at Waikanae interested in this land who belong to the tribes?—No, not many.

25. You claim to be one?—Yes.

26. Have you discussed it with others at all?—No.

27. Then your objection to the scheme is that it does not carry out the intentions of the original donors?—Yes.

28. And you want to get the land back again?—Yes.

29. Do you say you are a successor to one of the donors?—Well, it is not as though they who gave the land were the only owners of the land.

30. It was tribal land?—Yes.

31. And you would claim tribal land to come back?—Yes.

32. Do you know, not taking your own notion but the sentiments of the people of your tribe and other tribes, whether they would like their children to be educated without religious instruction?—No, we do not like that; we like them to be taught religion, it is very good for them.

33. And the Maoris generally?—Yes.

34. *Mr. Quick.*] Did you not give a site for a church at Waikanae?—Yes, for a good object, not for teaching children how to fight.

35. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you wish the same religion taught in the school established on the land by these grants as you gave your site for?—I think it was the religion that civilised us. I think the teaching of religion in schools is a good thing. If you leave only secular matters to be taught in school it will do great harm to the Maori children. Those children who attend the Government schools only seem to learn how to swear and use bad language.

HENI TE WHIWHI (recalled) examined.

36. *Mr. Stafford.*] When did Matene te Whiwhi die?—I do not remember the year.

37. Do you remember Wi Parata bringing an action against the Bishop about the Porirua land?—Yes.

38. Was he living then?—Yes.  
 39. Was he living for some time afterwards?—Yes.  
 40. Do you know whether Wi Parata went to him in reference to bringing that action?—Yes; he spoke to me and to Matene.  
 41. What did Matene say?—He was silent and said nothing.  
 42. Did he agree with Wi Parata?—All I know is that he said nothing.  
 44. Did you say anything?—No; but he asked me to sign my name, and I signed my name. Matene was present.  
 44. *Mr. Quick.*] He would not sign?—He said nothing, and he did not sign.  
 45. *Mr. Chapman.*] Have you seen the scheme which was read this morning?—Yes.  
 46. Before you came into Court?—Yes.  
 47. Has it been explained to you?—Well, I have heard it read out.  
 48. Do you understand that it provides that there is to be no religious teaching?—Yes; and I will give the reasons why I do not approve of religion being taught.  
 49. Has it been discussed among your people?—Yes.  
 50. Have there been meetings?—Yes.  
 51. And this scheme has been discussed at the meetings?—Yes.  
 52. How many were there at the meetings?—A large number of Ngatiraukawa.  
 53. Who explained the scheme?—Hone Heke.  
 54. *Mr. Quick.*] Who drew up the scheme?—Heke.  
*Mr. Stafford:* I drew up the scheme.  
*Mr. Quick:* Under instructions from Heke?  
*Mr. Stafford:* No; he consulted the Ngatiraukawa and he gave me instructions from Ngatiraukawa. Meetings had been held and the scheme submitted to those who chose to come—the principal people.  
*Mr. Quick:* Did the Ngatiraukawa go to Heke or did Heke come to them?  
*Mr. Stafford:* If there is a suggestion that this scheme is a concoction by Heke and myself—  
*Mr. Quick:* I made no such suggestion.

Letter from Archdeacon WILLIAMS;

The following letter from Archdeacon Williams was read:—

“I would gladly have availed myself of the privilege of giving evidence before the School Trust Commission at Otaki, in compliance with the request of the Otaki Maoris, had it not been that I have been warned by more than one medical man against exposing myself to any damp and cold weather. Failing my being able to attend in person, I shall be much obliged if you will kindly call the attention of the Commissioners to the following facts in connection with the sixth head of the Commission:—

“The allied tribes of Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa have always occupied a very different position from that of the East Coast Natives of the southern part of this Island, although they avoid speaking of it, and the old missionaries always avoided raising the question. In consequence of their intertribal feuds, the East Coast Natives deserted their homes and retreated to Nukutaurua (Table Cape) for safety; and up till about 1841 to 1843 there was not a Maori to be found on the East Coast from Wellington to the northern part of Hawke’s Bay. After the three above-named tribes had embraced Christianity the East Coast Natives were allowed to return to their homes, and retain their country unmolested. This was a very gracious act on the part of the dominant tribes. We can therefore hardly be surprised, when they are practically told that they shall not benefit by their Porirua school trust unless they send their children to be educated at Wairarapa, the homes of many of their old enemies, without their wishes having been consulted in any way, that they should appeal to the Government to protect them from what they regard as an act of injustice.”

RAIHA PUAHA examined.

*Witness:* I have certain objections to make to this proposed scheme. I did not give my consent to it. I do not approve of the land being cut up and sold or leased as proposed; but if it is leased for the purpose of establishing a school on the land itself I would agree to that. I want a school on the land itself.

(To *Mr. Quick*): Four of the donors were relatives of mine. Rawiri Hikihiki was a cousin of mine; he was half Ngatitōa and half Ngatiawa. Te Rauparaha, Tamihana, and Matene were half Ngatiraukawa and half Ngatitōa. Hoani te Oko was half Ngatitōa and half Ngatiawa. Wiremu Kanae, Rawiri Puaha, and Watarauhi Nohorua were pure Ngatitōa. The block of land (Whitireia) is in the middle of Ngatitōa country.

KIPA TE WHATANUI examined.

*Witness:* I object to the scheme. There are two things I object to—the proposal to sell the land and the suggestion to teach the children military drill. I speak in reference to the Otaki reserve. I belong to Ngatiraukawa, Ngatitōa, and the English. My father was an Englishman. This land at Otaki was asked for to be given for educational purposes—to teach children, first the Christian religion, and to teach them the knowledge of civilisation and how to till the soil. This reserve was a free gift to the missionaries; it was not paid for with money or in kind of any sort, horses or cattle; and it was given knowing that it was stated in the Treaty of Waitangi that the Crown only could buy land, that no Maori or private person could so. So they gave it as a gift to the missionaries. A college was built on the land which had been given by the chiefs of Ngatiraukawa. In 1859 I went to that college and I was taught religion there. I was taught English and how to till the soil. Our work was

clearing raupo and toe-toe and flax off the land. This land was not given to the missionaries to be theirs for ever, but to build a school there. Therefore, if there are no children attending the school, the land is to be returned to the Maoris. In regard to the suggestion that Maori children should be taught how to drill and carry arms, at the Maori conference at Kohimaramara it was announced that the Queen did not approve of the Maori people carrying arms or being taught their use; nor did she approve of the Maoris being taken outside the borders of New Zealand for warfare.

*Mr. Stafford:* If there is any real objection to military drill, we will eliminate that from the scheme.

*Witness:* Our earnest wish is that the Government should put up a school on the Otaki reserve, and we want the Government to cut up the land at Whitireia and lease it, and apply the funds to establish a school here. In regard to the suggestion that there is jealousy between the Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatikahungunu as being the reason they will not send their children to Wairarapa, I want that suggestion withdrawn; we never made any such reference or allusion.

55. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you say that children from Otaki (Ngatiraukawa) would go to Wairarapa?—No; they will not go to that school. But that is not because of intertribal jealousy. We want a school on the West Coast. For many years we have been in the habit of sending our children to Te Aute, and they get ill there and come home to die. Last year I sent mine, but I brought him home and he recovered.

56. *Mr. Chapman.*] Do you approve of the school teaching no religion?—Religion is the salt of life; you cannot dispense with it; it is an excellent thing.

57. This scheme says no religion is to be taught?—Well, that is wrong; that was the reason why we gave the land—for religious teaching.

#### HONE HEKE examined.

*Witness:* My tribe is Ngapuhi. I am member of the House of Representatives for the Northern Maori District. I am connected both with Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa. I am very closely related to the nieces of Heni te Whiwhi, one of the donors of the Porirua land—that is, to her younger sister's children who married into the Ngapuhi. I am also very closely related to many members of the Ngatiraukawa Tribe. I take an interest in their welfare, not only through relationship, but through appeals made to me through leading members of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa in 1896, after I became a member of the House. I think it would be as well for the Commission to understand how I came to take an interest in this matter. In 1896 I was approached by Heni, who is a daughter of one of the donors of the Porirua land and also of the Otaki reserve. I was also approached at the same time by Raiha Puaha in 1896, and Wi Neera, a son of Wiremu Kanae, one of the donors of Porirua, and by Hohepa Tamaihenga, now dead: also, a prominent leader of the Ngatitooa Tribe living at Porirua, and many others; the object being to present a petition on their behalf to Parliament praying for Whitireia to be returned to them on account of the non-fulfilment in carrying-out of the trusts according to the intention of the Natives in giving the land to the Church of England. I said to them that there was a certain etiquette in these matters, "You have a representative of your own and you ought to submit your petition to your own representative." Then the appeal to relationship was mentioned, and they thought I should be a better representative to present their petition and to conduct it before the Native Affairs Committee. The result of this petition was that on its investigation by the Committee the present Chief Justice sat with the members of that Committee; it reported recommending to the Government that, since the original trusts and the intention of the donors had not been carried out by the trustees, legislation should be brought down to enable the land and accumulated rents to be returned to the descendants of the donors. The Government refused to bring down legislation in that direction, but agreed to bring down legislation to give effect to the original intention for which the land was given to the Church, and a Bill was introduced in 1898. It did not pass into law. Since that time the same members of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa people have persistently asked me, and got me to present petition after petition, to still urge their claim for the return of the land. But in 1903 a change came about in the method of agitation—that is, instead of them asking for the land, they agitated with the trustees (Archdeacon Williams and the Bishop of Wellington) praying for the setting-up of a school to give effect to the original intention for which the Porirua and Otaki lands were given to the Church. When the members of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa Tribes began this new course of action, the Ngatiraukawa invited me to attend one of their meetings in their meeting-house at Otaki to discuss the question. They wanted me to listen to their arguments and also make suggestions. I attended their meetings, but I never expressed any opinions in regard to any method of conduct. I simply said, "It is for you to express an opinion and to tell me what you desire. After you have given expression to that, then I can direct you as to how you should proceed in the matter." The result of this was continual meetings in Otaki and also in Wellington. Members of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa, coming down to Wellington on other matters as well as this, met and interchanged opinions. The last important gathering of members of these tribes took place in Wellington during last session. The intention was to meet Mr. Field, the European representative, and also myself. We met in a room in Parliament House, and there were many members of Ngatiraukawa there, Henu being one. Of the Ngatitooa, Raiha Puaha was present, and also Wi Neera, son of Wi Kanae, one of the donors, and one or two others. The whole trend of the conversation with Mr. Field then was to urge an inquiry on the Government into these reserves, so as to bring about the establishment of a school for the education of their children. A little prior to this I was invited by Ngatiraukawa, as was also Mr. Field, to attend a public meeting in one of the public halls in Otaki last year. The meeting was open to Europeans and Natives, the object being to hear our views in regard to what course the two races who sympathized in the action the Ngatiraukawa had begun should take. Petitions were

drawn up, and these were circulated among the European settlers and residents and also among the Maoris. They were presented to the House by Mr. Field and myself, and it was on those petitions your Commission was issued by the Government. So from 1896 to the present time I have fulfilled a promise which was extracted from me by the Ngatiraukawa to support them in this matter. During this period the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa, in everything they desired to present to Parliament, have always come and asked me to help them. That is the cause of my interest in this matter.

58. *Mr. Stafford.*] You have sought to find out what the Natives themselves want?—Yes.

59. What inquiries have you made?—When Mr. Field and I obtained a fairly good idea of the Government's intentions in regard to the appeals made to them on this matter, then we directed the Natives to send round books to all their settlements and to write down the names of all their children in every settlement within the Ngatiraukawa district, from Otaki to the Rangitikei. That was done. The object of doing this was to present before the Commission a list showing that there were a large number of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa children wanting education. It was to do away with an impression created by a statement made by European members of the Church of England at the time when the trustees of the Whitireia Block sought Supreme Court sanction for power to divert the Whitireia funds to a school in another district. The statement in effect was this: that a school could not be built on Whitireia, because there were not a sufficient number of children. I forget the number mentioned, but I think it was stated to be not more than thirty or forty. Then, when we knew the Government did intend to bring about an inquiry, I suggested to the Natives that we must bring facts before the Commission. That is the reason why these books were circulated in two or three parts of the district.

60. What was the information sought for?—The number of Ngatiraukawa children who are not having any education at all now. It is to show that the Ngatiraukawa are not a dying tribe; and to show that the taking-away of moneys belonging to any of their reserves and spending them in another district is against the facts that we sought to bring before the Commission. [Exhibit A put in.] This is one of the books of which there are two. It shows the children of Ngatiraukawa (excluding the Muaupoko of Horowhenua, the Ngatiapa of Rangitikei, and the Rangitane) from settlements near Foxton up to near the Manawatu, giving the names, sex, age, parents, trustees, home, and district. There are 237 children. The other book which will be produced [Exhibit B] will complete the tale from Foxton to Otaki.

61. This was the first piece of information you sought to get?—Yes.

61A. During these inquiries you made, did you seek to find out what the opinions of the Natives were concerning the diversion of these trust-moneys to the Wairarapa?—I did not ask the opinions of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa, but they expressed their opinions to me—that they entirely objected. The reasons they gave were that it was entirely against the intention for which their elders gave the land to the Church of England. It was against Native custom; and expressing these opinions they said, "We will never agree that these funds should be taken away," and they asked me to help them to get them back again.

62. What do they say about their own wants on this Coast?—Their main desire was to get the lands back; and during the whole of the discussions they could not forget the fact that they must get these lands back. But, in the event of not getting the lands back, then they turn their minds to saying, "Let us urge the Government to devise some means by which the original intentions of the donors of these lands shall be given effect to."

63. There came a time when this idea of getting back the land, if not abandoned, was thought to be next door to hopeless?—Yes, when the majority of them realised that it was hopeless to ask for the land; and that being the case, they said, "We will turn our attention to bring about the spending of the money from the reserves in the midst of our own people."

64. They thought the next best thing was to try to establish a school on the West Coast?—Yes, in Otaki.

65. Did you then seek to ascertain from them what their wishes were in regard to what kind of a school it should be?—They explained the kind of school they wanted. As a sort of preliminary, they directed their speeches this way: that the education imparted to the Native children under the present system of education was not effective or sufficient. There were a large number of boys who came back from school who could speak English, their parents believing they understood it; but by experience they came to know that their speaking the English language was not sufficient to enable them to obtain work to maintain themselves. Therefore they directed their argument and statements in this way: "We want a school to impart to our children a good and effective education in English, and, in addition"—and they emphasized this—"we want our children to be taught hand work," that is, industrial knowledge, a knowledge of some trade—what is called "technical instruction" in the public schools.

66. These ideas of the Natives on the subject were put on paper?—Yes. There was a meeting of Heni and other Natives, who were asked by those who did not come down to Wellington to meet you on the matter at your office. I met the Ngatiraukawa here to discuss with them what was to be done, and I was told they were sending representatives to Wellington, and I went with them. The object of the meeting at your office was to put the ideas of the Natives on paper, so as to lay them before the Commission.

67. Was any influence used by you or myself to induce them to adopt this scheme?—There was no necessity for doing so. I received a copy of the draft scheme some few days before the Commission sat.

68. Were meetings convened of the Ngatiraukawa and others to consider the scheme as it appeared on paper?—That was my object in leaving Wellington. After the Ngatiraukawa had met you, and the scheme had been submitted to them, I decided to come with the scheme and place it before as many of the Ngatiraukawa as I could meet. This was done to the best of my ability. The weather was

bad, and this caused many of the Ngatiraukawa not to come to Otaki, and there were other attractions. I had more than one meeting, because the Ngatiraukawa could not come all at once; and whenever one or two new members came along I had to repeat the explanation of the scheme.

69. Do you think this scheme which has been put before the Commissioners represents the wishes of the Natives?—At one of the meetings I explained the scheme. The first thing objected to by those present was that in the first paragraph. They objected to having the Porirua reserves transferred from the present trustees to the Public Trustee. They gave their reasons, which were pretty strong, and I could not persuade them from it, and I noted their objection to submit to Mr. Stafford. He agreed to have it erased. Then the Natives suggested, instead of there being two governing bodies for Porirua and Otaki, the two reserves should be administered by a Board. Their wish in this direction was complied with. In regard to the construction of the Board under the original scheme, they were all members of the Civil Service. The Natives said, "Why should we not have a voice in the control? Are we not the proper persons, as descendants of the donors?" And they suggested that the Ngatitooa and Ngatiraukawa should have representation on the Board, and it was altered accordingly. The selection would be by popular vote. The other matter objected to by the Natives was that in regard to the selection of children. They said, "The Ngatitooa and Ngatiraukawa ought to have precedence over all." That was not in the original scheme, but it was included. These were the main features objected to by the gathering of those Ngatiraukawa I could get together.

70. In these discussions was the religious question made the subject of particular discussion?—No, it was not; but among other questions they did touch on it by saying, "The Ngatiraukawa do not belong only to the Church of England, we have members of the Roman Catholic Church also among the tribe," and in regard to the Ngatitooa, at Porirua, they said, "We have Ngatitooa belonging to the Mormon sect." Therefore, they said, "We must allow all the children of members of other religions to take advantage of the education to be imparted in this school."

71. Was the question forced on them of having no religions taught?—No; so far as I can tell, this scheme does virtually represent the wishes of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooas. I firmly believe it is really the wish of those people. But there is still a strong desire to really get hold of the land since an opening has been afforded for discussion and the expression of opinions.

72. Have you expressed your own ideas to them on this point?—Very forcibly. I have always been telling them that this matter is not a new thing; that several attempts have been made, and that the Natives on every occasion have failed to get the land back. And I have said that this Commission is not only not charged with the function of inquiring into this aspect of the question, but I know the Government is against the land being given back; and, speaking as a member of the House, I know that members of Parliament are entirely against it.

73. Then the real thing was to get a scheme of education they would agree to?—That was the main object.

74. In regard to the necessities of this district, have you any information as to the number of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa children living between Porirua and Rangitikei?—In round numbers, the number of Ngatiraukawa might be put down at six hundred. In regard to Porirua and Waikanae, including Ngatiawa children, I would put the number down at not less than one hundred.

75. (To Mr. Quick): This is excluding foreign tribes; but the foreign tribes would be entitled to the teaching under the scheme. There is no Native school managed by the Education Department within that district.

76. *Mr. Stafford.*] Can you tell how many Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa children are attending the public schools within the limit referred to?—I have not been able to obtain exact information in regard to that; but I have asked members of the Ngatiraukawa to obtain from the teacher at every centre the names of such children, and it is our intention to submit them to the Commission later on.

77. Can you understand the objection of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa to sending their children to the Wairarapa school if the Whitireia funds are spent there?—As a Maori myself, I can fully understand the feelings of the Natives in regard to this matter. Before giving my knowledge in regard to it, I might state that it is quite true what previous Native speakers have said that it was not on account of the old hostilities between themselves and other tribes on the East Coast. The great desire of the Natives now is to try and remove from their memory all past hostilities. But the main cause of the objection arises from their knowledge that their elders gave these lands for a specific purpose—viz., for a school for the advantage of descendants and people of the donors. The Maori custom on the point is this; it is not right and proper (and no chief or set of chiefs belonging to Ngatikahungunu or any other tribe would do it) to accept any land or goods or mats or ornaments if there have not been any causes for that generosity being bestowed upon them. They will refuse to accept benefits if there is no former cause for them between them and the people whom the benefit really belongs to. Natives will only accept benefits from another tribe or chief if there is some prior cause for them taking it. And there is a custom among the Maoris called *ohaki*. The rule governing *ohaki* is this: either during the lifetime of a chief or a number of chiefs, they give something to a member of another tribe or to a member of his own tribe. It may be land; it may be mats, or stones, or clubs. This *ohaki*, or gift, is given for a specific purpose—away from the immediate relatives of the chiefs giving the *ohaki*. The rule after the death of this chief or these chiefs is this: that none of his immediate relatives or their immediate relatives have a right to dispute or take away the property that was given as an *ohaki* before he or they died. That is *ohaki* according to the Maori giving of this land. As regards Bishop Selwyn, the Maoris would look upon his word as an *ohaki*, to be carried out in its entirety after his death; and these are the roots of the great objection the Maori feeling has in regard to the transference of the fund at Whitireia to another place. Another thing is a matter of pride. This land belonged to their elders, and the benefits, if there are any benefits, ought to be given immediately in the midst of the people

of the donors. The descendants of the donors should not be made to travel into another district belonging to another tribe in order to receive these benefits. I think these reasons are enough to show the feelings of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa.

78. If this fund is diverted to Wairarapa, they will refuse to share it?—I am open to believe the statements of other witnesses, and also to believe the expressions of opinion in several meetings I have attended on this point.

79. Supposing a school were established in Otaki, properly conducted, and so on, as in the scheme put before the Commissioners, what attendance of Native children would result, in your opinion?—I think if a school as set out in the scheme were established, more especially adding trades to the education of the children, all the eligible children of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa would be sent to it. It goes without saying that, although they may desire to send the whole of their eligible children to this school, it would remain on the capacity of the school as far as funds are concerned to limit the number.

80. If there were sufficient accommodation and the school well equipped, they would all take advantage of it?—I mean if there were enough funds all eligible children would attend.

81. You have had a list made of the names of Native children in Otaki at present?—Yes; there are 152 in Otaki proper, including the settlement across the river. [Exhibit C produced.]

82. What is the Native custom in regard to Maoris born of parents belonging to two different tribes, such as Ngatikahungunu and Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa?—The Native custom on this point is this: it is stated that there are three Ngatitōa and Ngatiraukawa children attending the school in the Wairarapa. These children are the issue of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa women married to Ngatikahungunu husbands living in the Wairarapa. The rule is this: on any occasion when the children of such a marriage come to their people of Ngatiraukawa or Ngatitōa, as visitors, in the course of the address of welcome by the local tribes they would be addressed as “Kahungunu.” Their Ngatiraukawa or Ngatitōa blood is not recognised at all, because they were born in a district other than that of their people. The cry of blood only arises in cases where a murder is committed of one of the children of such marriage. If the murder were committed by a Ngatikahungunu, or a person in their territory, then the Ngatiraukawa blood appeals to the people to seek for revenge. And, secondly, it arises on questions of titles to land. Then the question of relationship of blood is called forth again when they make a claim to any land. The tribe or family would recognise their Ngatikahungunu relatives so long as that relative has stayed away within a limited period of time, and not long enough to exclude him from the title to the property.

83. Such children as you mention would, except for these two purposes, be looked upon as strangers by the two tribes?—Yes; there is only this: supposing any Ngatiraukawa travelled into the district where these children are, then it is their duty, should they feel inclined, to send for their relatives and welcome them to their homes.

84. Have you made any observations in regard to the general effect of past and present education systems on the Maori?—I have devoted a great deal of attention to this particular point, and my experience tells me this, that notwithstanding the higher education we obtain either at Te Aute or St. Stephen's in Auckland, and taking the public schools as well, in the majority of cases the education is not sufficient. It may not be the fault of the education; it may be the intellectual capacity of the children. But the general knowledge (in regard to the majority of Natives) which they have acquired has not turned out sufficiently practical to get them employment in any trade or profession in the English life of the country. Take, for instance, the capacity to spell; the majority of Maori children coming from the schools are very deficient in that. In composition they are very deficient; in grammar they are absolutely bad. Therefore, when they apply to be taken on as clerks or anything of that kind they cannot be accepted. I am speaking of the majority. The sharper and more intellectual boys are a minority—such as Ngata, Pomare, Moffatt, Parata, and others. At St. Stephen's the rule is this, and it has shown itself to be beneficial to the boys: after passing the Fourth and Fifth Standards, if they are not able to gain a McLean scholarship, and if they cannot remain at school any longer, the caretaker of the boys would go and consult tradespeople (I am speaking of the time before labour legislation came into force in regard to apprentices) and get employment for those boys as apprentices—perhaps to one of the big saddlers in Auckland, or a large upholsterer, and several carpenters, blacksmiths, boat-builders, and other trades; and every boy that has been taken on in this way has turned out a first-class journeyman; and instead of going back to their homes and becoming a burden on their parents, they have lived on their trade. Some have married European wives, have had children, and are supporting their wives and children on the trades they have acquired. To come back to the Government Native schools, we have this system, that if any boy passes a McLean scholarship, he can either go forward to Te Aute for higher education, or he can ask the Government, and on the recommendation of the Native School Inspector, obtain a sort of premium of £18 to enable him to enter a trade carried on in his own locality. It is paid to the tradesman who takes the boy on. This is in regard to boys whose parents are not sufficiently well-to-do to send them to Te Aute. My experience is that the acquisition of a trade is more beneficial to the Natives as a whole than the seeking for higher education. It does not bar the sharper intellectual children from seeking higher education in secondary schools or universities. There is an instance in Otaki. A Ngatiraukawa boy who has passed the Sixth Standard was taken on as a compositor on the local paper. Another Ngatiraukawa pupil of the mission school has also been taken on as a compositor, and a third boy. I am told by the proprietor of the paper that the boy from Te Aute, who passed the Sixth Standard, is the better of the three on account of his education.

85. Do you think this scheme put before the Commissioners will have the effect you have suggested?—I think if this scheme is capable of being carried out, and if the funds are used for this purpose, it would bring about that result. In regard to the girls, it is very necessary that a higher method of educating them should be adopted in the direction of maternal affection and the proper bringing-up of children when they are young, and more especially when they are sick, and a better knowledge of the care of the home.

86. What is the condition generally of the children in this district?—My knowledge of the condition of the children who have had no education at all is that there is a tendency to ignore parents. According to European ideas and motherly care of children, young children ought not to be allowed out late at nights, but this you will find existing in a good many parts of this district. I do not say there is an absolute ignoring of parents. There is a great deal of fault to lay at the feet of the parents. They require a higher and better knowledge of the proper care of children, and that is why I say the girls ought to receive particular attention. And in a school such as this, all that knowledge which tends to create a better understanding of the motherly care to be bestowed on children should be taught. The affections of the Maoris are great and more than great for their children, but affection can be overstepped, and this does go on with Maori parents.

87. If the Commissioners were to decide for the expenditure of the Whitireia funds in the Wairarapa, according to the Supreme Court scheme, what would be the effect on the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa?—The people would feel very sore indeed. My opinion in regard to it is this: Mr. Quick said the other day that there is not a penny of the Whitireia funds paid for children attending the Wairarapa school if they are not West Coast children. I should like to state, if it is the case—and I can quite believe the statements made by the Ngatiraukawa that they will not send their children—the position would be that the Whitireia funds would remain idle, and no one would benefit by them.

88. It would be going on accumulating as it is now?—Yes. I should like to make this suggestion to the Commission, should it decide on allowing the Whitireia funds to go to the Wairarapa, and the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa children refuse to go there. My suggestion, so as to give the benefit to the children of the donors and their people, if a scheme could be devised to allow loans to be advanced to the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa residents in the district to enable them to improve their properties and obtain money for the betterment of their homes and children, which they cannot get now.

89. If the Otaki Mission School is not assisted by means of this trust fund from Whitireia, but goes to Wairarapa, what would be the position of the school here?—It would be entirely useless. The education here at the mission school is not sufficient; it is waste of money. Even supposing Archdeacon Williams or his successor asks the children who are capable of passing the Fourth Standard to go on to Te Aute, even the education at Te Aute is not sufficient; unless there is something to back it up in the shape of learning trades, it will go for nothing. It is not sufficient unless a boy has particular application to further his knowledge.

90. You have come to the conclusion that the only scheme which will be effective to benefit the descendants of the donors will be the scheme which has been put before the Commission?—I believe it is the only one which would give the majority of the boys of the two tribes the best opportunity of gaining a practical knowledge of things, enabling them to support themselves and their children.

91. You do not mean that the scheme must be adhered to literally in detail, but the general main outlines of the scheme?—That is so; the Commission may alter it, but these are the major points.

92. *Mr. Quick.*] Do I understand you to mean the major points are amalgamation of the trusts, a good sound English education on primary lines up to the Fourth Standard?—If the school could go on to the Sixth Standard it would be very much better.

93. But the gist of the whole thing is good, sound, technical education?—That would be the only means of giving success to the school.

94. If these three essential points are gained by the recommendation of the Commission, that would meet the case?—If a standard up to the Sixth were maintained, and a good technical knowledge be imparted; and you must have the means.

95. *Mr. Wardell.*] Then, as to higher education, you think it could be best supplied by children being sent from here to Te Aute or Victoria School, so as to limit the education here to the Sixth Standard?—Yes. I ought to say, if the funds are found by the administering body to be capable of extending the standards to be imparted to the boys, it should be done here. But if the funds would not allow, then, I say, limit to the Sixth Standard, and where there are intelligent boys, allow them to proceed to Te Aute, or if their parents are able to send them to a higher school or university, that should be done. But if the funds are capable of teaching higher education in this school and technical knowledge, it should be all combined in this.

96. You were a St. Stephen's boy?—Yes.

97. Were you educated elsewhere?—I began in a country school in the Bay of Islands.

98. Does St. Stephen's commend itself to you as a good means of education?—Yes. Though owing to agitation, the Department began teaching technical education about five years ago; before that, I think, St. Stephen's has done more for the children who have not been able to get higher education to keep themselves for life than any other school.

99. You would represent this as according with your ideas as to what education should be?—Yes, knowing the capacity of the Maori intellect. It is for the duller lot of children I recommend a knowledge of trades.

100. *Mr. Chapman.*] How did the paragraph about religious education come into the scheme? Who first brought it forward?—The Natives themselves suggested, when the matter was discussed, that the Otaki reserve was given for the benefit of the Ngatiraukawa as a whole. Among those there are two sects of religious bodies—the Roman Catholics and the Church of England—and it was their knowledge of this fact. They said the Roman Catholics ought to receive the same benefits as the Church of England, and, therefore, the better course is that no religion at all should be taught in the school.

101. But the original gift of land was essentially for religious education?—That is so. The Native reply is, "We do not consider the original intention, because the trustees have not fulfilled the intention of the original donors."



102. But surely, generally speaking, when a gift is made for a particular thing the donors' intention has to be considered somehow. The intention of the original donors was not only that there should be religious education, but that there should be religious education under the clergy and Church of England?—But here is another feature of the Maori argument: "It is all very well to discuss the past ideas, they were all right, but we are changing now and we want to give the benefits of this school to all the Ngatiraukawa, whether Church of England or Roman Catholic, or any other sect."

103. How would it give it to these people who think religious education is part of the scheme?—I would give you the answer of Heni. She said it is entirely right that all the different children of different religions should receive the same advantages as the Church of England children, and she said, "We can teach our children by allowing them to go to our own church, or we can teach our own children at our own homes."

104. Did they ever do so?—Speaking from my knowledge of the past, up to about ten years ago the Church of England everywhere in New Zealand from the Bay of Islands to here was particularly strong. But since that time there has been an incursion of the Mormon religion, and it has cut into large areas of the Church of England religious people, and not only in this district. At Porirua, those who were Church of England before were converted by the Mormons. At present in my electorate more than seven thousand have seceded from the Church of England and become Mormons. The rule in those days was that the Maori lay readers every Sunday after service kept the people to teach the catechism. It was the same thing here; all the early lay readers undertook the work of teaching the catechism. But that has ceased. The cause I do not know. The Commission has not asked many of the Native witnesses. I believe they could have said why the Church of England has failed. Here is another reason: In my district the Church of England has failed in every essential among the Maoris. They generally used to go and visit every settlement and see whether there were any sick, and see to those who were dead by burying them; but during the last ten years in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga that has not been done. You will find no minister going round to the settlements as in the early days, and this is one of the main causes which has led the Natives to be lax in attendance at church.

105. That appears to me to show that they will not get religious education at home?—You are quite right. But one of the main causes here, according to their own statements, is the fact that, after asking the Bishop of Wellington year after year to fulfil the trust and build a school, when they heard the funds were diverted to Wairarapa it caused many parents to refuse to attend service here.

106. What chance will the children have of receiving religious education if they do not get it at school?—I would suggest it would be far better that the benefits of a school should be allowed to spread to children of all religions, than to force religious subjects on a fixed scale and drive the children of another faith away from it.

107. We have no evidence that that would be so; when there was no other school for them to go to they would go to the present school?—I know the religious feeling among the Maoris; I have acted as a mediator between two hapus in relation to religious differences. I had to interfere to prevent bloodshed in consequence of excitement over discussion over religious teaching. Their religious feeling is not so mild as some Europeans think. It is as strong among the Maoris as amongst the Europeans.

108. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you conceive it would be for the benefit of the Native community to establish a low-class school at Porirua for the benefit of the local children, and to divert a portion of the income from Whitireia for that purpose?—No; if that is done you will cripple this intended institution. You want to get all the funds you can get to make the scheme a success.

109. How would the children at Porirua benefit by a school here?—By becoming boarders. Every effort should be made to create as strong a fund as possible.

110. *Mr. Stafford.*] Do the Natives think that as in the public schools there is liberty of conscience there should be the same in Native schools?—I have not heard the opinions of the Natives here, but the opinion of my own people divided up into three or four religions is that it is a great advantage to the parents to have Native Government schools, and to have them in an absence of religion. They greatly appreciate the adoption of a system which enabled them all to send their children for ordinary education. Religious matter is not allowed in Government Native schools.

Mr. Stafford put in *whakapapa* showing descent of Heni te Whiwhi, which was affirmed by Hakaraia te Whena.

HEMI TE KAWANA (JAMES COOTES) examined.

*Witness:* I am a Ngatitoo and Ngatiraukawa. I have heard the scheme which has been put before the Commissioners, and I approve of it. I say it is a good scheme.

111. *Mr. Stafford.*] It is a very much better scheme than to send the money to the Wairarapa?—Certainly; we all approve of it, and we signed it.

112. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is it the general wish of the Ngatiraukawa assembled in Otaki that this scheme should be given effect to?—We helped to make it.

113. *Mr. Chapman.*] You do not want to have religious education?—It is not allowed in the State schools. It would bar many from attending school if it were allowed, because there are a number of religious bodies here. Roman Catholics and others would not allow their children to attend. We have been perpetually asking Government to bring this to a head. We spoke to the Premier when he was here, and he promised this should be last December, when Huia Onslow was here.



WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1905.

Bishop WALLIS examined.

*Witness*: I have heard that certain statements have been made at Otaki, and I desire to make the following statement to the Commission: I have been Chairman of the Trustees of the Porirua College Endowment since January, 1895. The trustees hold this estate on behalf of the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called the Church of England. They retain their office during the pleasure of that Synod, one of the conditions of their appointment being that they shall resign their office whenever they shall be called upon to do so by the General Synod, or by any person or persons lawfully acting under the authority of the General Synod on that behalf. Further, they are bound by the constitution of the Church to administer their trust in such manner and for such objects or purposes as the General Synod shall from time to time direct. On the 15th February, 1898, the General Synod ordered the trustees to apply forthwith to the Supreme Court of New Zealand for power to expend the net rents and profits arising from the trust in accordance with a scheme on which the Synod had determined. This scheme is set forth on page 6 of the printed "Statement by the Trustees and Judgment of the Supreme Court." In accordance with this direction, the trustees petitioned the Supreme Court in July of that year that the trust might be varied in the manner above referred to. The Court in May, 1899, declined to adopt either the scheme proposed or the counter-scheme filed by the Solicitor-General on behalf of the Government. The trustees then submitted another scheme which, though opposed by the Government, was approved by the Supreme Court in September, 1900, with certain modifications which brought it into closer agreement with the General Synod's scheme. The trustees reported their proceedings to the General Synod in January, 1901, but no action was taken by that body. In March, 1901, the Solicitor-General appealed against this decision of the Supreme Court to the Court of Appeal, which decided that the property of the trust had reverted to the Crown. The trustees thereupon in September of that year applied to the General Synod for direction. The Synod ordered them to appeal to the Privy Council against the judgment of the Court of Appeal. This appeal was successful. The trustees again reported their proceedings to the General Synod in 1904, and again no action was taken by that body. The trustees therefore claim that they have acted throughout in absolute loyalty to the General Synod of the province. I have mentioned these facts at length to support my contention that to the General Synod alone belongs, so far as the laws of our Church are concerned, the power of determining the application of the trust, and that I have no more voice in this matter than any other member of that Synod. It is, however, my duty to inform the Commissioners of matters connected with the administration of the trust, and as Chairman of the trustees I have directed that all such information as they may desire shall be supplied. I am happy, also, not as trustee but as the Bishop of the Church of England in the Diocese of Wellington, to offer an opinion on some of the matters connected with the Porirua trust. First, I would plead that time has not been given to test the efficiency of the scheme approved by the Supreme Court. Though this approval was given in 1900, considerable uncertainty prevailed as to whether it would be carried into effect until early in 1903, when the judgment of the Privy Council was published in this colony. Application was also made to that Council by Wi Neera and others that the property should be restored to the descendants of the original donors. This application was dismissed only a few months ago. Natives who sympathised with the applicants were naturally disinclined to send their boys to the college in Wairarapa, or to take any step which might be construed as an acceptance of the scheme approved by the Supreme Court. A reference to the scheme will show that this impression is incorrect, but it may take some time to remove it from the minds of the Maoris. At Clareville College there are now three scholars from the West Coast, two of them of the Ngatitua Tribe, who are supported by the Porirua trust, though none of these come from the neighbourhood of Otaki. I would respectfully draw the Commissioners' attention to the fact that the donors did not ask that the trust should be administered for the benefit of their own descendants; even Europeans were to be admitted to its benefits, though this the trustees do not desire. Thirdly, it would be extremely difficult on account of (1) the smallness of the funds and (2) the difficulty of obtaining well-qualified teachers to maintain efficiently two separate colleges, one on the East and one on the West Coast. And, seeing that on account of the first of these considerations each college would be compelled to receive but a small number of scholars, the usefulness of the influence of one scholar upon another (which is a very important factor in colleges) would be materially reduced. The stimulus to energy in manual work, which is not congenial to many Maori lads, would be also seriously diminished if one boy or two were learning shoemaking, one or two others carpentering, &c. For these reasons especially I trust the Commissioners will see their way to recommend that the present scheme shall have a trial before it is superseded. I wish to add a few more considerations with regard to an amalgamation of the Porirua and Otaki trusts, which I hear has been urged. (1.) These trusts differ in character. The trustees of the former are subject to the direction of the General Synod; the trustees of the latter are not. Again, the Porirua trust is for a college—that is, for lads who are to receive not a higher education in the English sense, but an industrial training; the Otaki trust is for a school for children. (2.) A proposal in this direction has been made to the General Synod (of which the Ven. Archdeacon S. Williams, who, I understand, advocates such action, is a member) and rejected by that body. The trustees of the Porirua estate thought at one time that it would be beneficial, and approached the New Zealand Mission Board, which is trustee for the Otaki estate, in order to ascertain its opinion. The Board in February, 1897, took the following action: "A resolution of the Porirua College Trustees having been considered, in which it is proposed that the Otaki school should be transferred to trustees appointed by the General Synod, on condition that a large sum of money from the Porirua trust be made available for promoting its efficiency, it was resolved, 'That the Board is prepared to accede to the proposed arrangements on condition that the school continues to be conducted in accordance with the terms upon which the trust is held.'" In January, 1898, just before

the meeting of the General Synod, it was resolved, "That, if approval be given by the General Synod of resolution 3 (above quoted) of the New Zealand Trust Board, passed on the 23rd February, 1897, the Secretary be requested to communicate with the Church Missionary Society and to prepare immediately a deed providing for the transference of the Otaki school, and the lands on which it is situated, to the General Synod." This proposal was rejected by the Synod, which adopted instead the scheme already referred to. (3.) The trustees of the Porirua College Estate are willing to administer the Otaki trust, independently of the Porirua trust, if it be transferred to them, and have expressed (by a resolution passed on the 23rd June last) their readiness to endeavour to maintain the present school at Otaki in good working order, if it be handed over to them. I am strongly of opinion, and I am speaking from knowledge, that it is unadvisable on moral grounds for the boys of the Otaki trust and the lads of the Porirua trust to be educated under the same roof. If there is not proper provision for the education of the children at Otaki, I would submit that it is the function of the Education Department to meet this want. (4.) I hold that it would be dangerous to the morality of the lads educated under the Porirua trust that they should be educated in a town of the size of Otaki. I would far rather see the college at Whitireia than in or near a town. I urge this consideration with earnestness. It would be subversive, also, of the discipline of the college if the parents or friends were near enough to interfere with the training of the lads, or to attempt to draw them away to tangis or other gatherings. It is for these reasons that the Clareville college has been placed neither near the pa at Kaikokirikiri (Masterton) or near that at Papawai (Greytown), but several miles from any pa or township. I have authorised the Secretary of the Papawai and Kaikokirikiri trust to present to the Commissioners a time-table of the work done at Clareville college, which stands on a large estate admirably adapted for training in farm-work. Religious education in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England is to my mind so plainly bound up with the Porirua College Trust that I do not wish to trouble the Commissioners with any remarks on this subject.

1. *The Chairman.*] Can you refer us to any documents to show the nature of the Clareville school?—I have instructed our Secretary to bring before you the time-table we adopt, list of boys, &c., and to give you all the information you want.

2. Do you not look upon it as a school for higher education?—Not as we understand it. The difference between it and the education at Otaki is this: it would be for lads who have passed the Fourth Standard or above it, and though there would be literary training, the greater part would be industrial training. For example, at Clareville there are classes for shoemaking and carpentering, and the boys are taught to do different work on a farm. It is something entirely different to what "higher education" means to an Englishman—a better literary education.

3. Has any scheme been drawn up by the Diocesan Board about the Clareville college of a definite nature?—Several resolutions have been passed and a time-table approved. For instance, it sets forth the hours they are to spend in farming, carpentering, &c., and there is a provision that children shall not be kept at non-educational farm-work longer than is necessary, and so on.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would the resolutions already carried embody what you have just stated?—Yes.

5. It has been pretty well assumed by many besides the Church authorities that the Porirua trust was intended for a higher education. Can you point to anything which shows this was the original intention when the trust was first established, except the use of the word "college" in the grant?—We have relied a great deal on the word "college," and, according to the letters published in the Life of Bishop Selwyn, he said he wanted it to be in the south like St. John's in the north.

6. *The Chairman.*] There seems to be a great deal to show that was in the mind of the Bishop. But is there anything that shows that it was in the minds of the Natives other than the use of the word "college"?—I have not thought about that, but I notice in the Porirua grant it is for "English and Native youth"; in the Otaki grants it is for children. The use of the word "college" and the expression "English and Native youth" combined to make us think a college was intended.

7. *The Chairman.*] We have not yet got, and we do not know we can get without getting the evidence of Archdeacon Williams, any definite information about the position and constitution of the representatives of the Church Missionary Society—who they are, and so on?—The Mission Trust Board is composed of the three Bishops of the North Island, and three clergy and three laymen, who are co-operative, subject to the approval of the Church Missionary Society. The Board is responsible for the Otaki school, but I was told that the Board handed over the whole management of Otaki by resolution to Archdeacon Williams.

8. What has been put before us is that the best thing to do would be to deprive both trusts of the religious element connected with them: who would be the right person to go to in order to hear what the Church Missionary Society has to say on that point?—Archdeacon Williams, certainly.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] Archdeacon Williams knows very fully, and is thoroughly mixed up with, the Otaki people?—Yes.

10. Are the members of the Trust Board still willing to carry out their resolutions in regard to the amalgamation of the trusts?—I cannot say.

11. In regard to the Porirua trust, we have a dedicatory letter: do you know if there was anything prior to the grants to the Church Missionary Society that would indicate the wishes of the Natives?—I know of nothing at all. I never heard the circumstances under which the land was handed over.

12. It has been denied that any of the boys at Clareville come from the West Coast. They are said to belong to Ngatikahungunu fathers and Ngatiraukawa or Ngatitooa mothers?—Bishop Hadfield told me when I came here there were only thirty Ngatitooas left; we were not told to take any account of Ngatiraukawa. In the judgment of the Supreme Court we were told to give preference to Ngatitooa. We have chosen two Ngatitooas, and had their genealogy brought before us.

13. Are they of Ngatikahungunu fathers?—It may be so. If Bishop Hadfield is correct, and you have to eliminate out of those the women, there is a very small area to select from.

14. *Mr. Chapman.*] The Natives at Otaki seem to have a notion in their heads that the Whitireia funds are being spent for the benefit of the Clareville college, for Wairarapa Natives: is that a correct impression?—Absolutely incorrect. I have heard it said at Otaki, and have always denied it. The money now spent is for the education of these three boys from the West Coast, and no penny will ever be spent for any purpose except scholarships for the West Coast Natives. It amounts to some £30 a year.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] According to the scheme, there is no right to exclude boys belonging to any denomination whatever: there is no religious test at Clareville?—No, we train them all in Church of England doctrines.

16. Supposing there was a Ngatitoo Mormon sent there, what would happen?—We should have to consider the matter. The trust is so specific in saying that it is for education in religion that we could not very well cut him adrift from religious teaching. It is a question we have not yet faced; no boy has been rejected because he was not a member of the Church.

17. You would admit him without asking questions?—We never have asked them. We are forbidden to ask the question of West Coast boys; we are not allowed to refuse a boy on that ground.

18. One reason the Natives eliminate religion is on account of there being Mormons and others?—We regard it as a Church school, at which religious education is considered one of the essentials.

19. You do not exclude any children of any denomination?—We never had an application from another denomination.

20. *The Chairman.*] The meaning of that is, "We will not keep you out because you are a Mormon, but as soon as you come we will turn you into a good member of the Church of England"?—Yes, that is what it means, and I should try to with all my might.

21. You understand that to be the proper meaning of the scheme of the Supreme Court?—Yes; I should have no hesitation in doing so. If the father or mother said, "We do not want that to be done," we should have to think it over.

AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 19TH JUNE, 1905.

WILLIAM STEPHEN COCHRANE examined.

*Witness:* I have been the Church of England Diocesan Secretary for the last twenty-five years. I have received a copy of the Commission, and, in compliance with your request, I have had some information compiled as to the annual income and disbursements for each of the several trusts, which I produce.

1. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you any idea what schools these would have been that are referred to in the grants as having been established?—There was a school at Puniu under the Rev. Mr. Morgan, one at Taupiri (Hopuhopu) under the Rev. B. Y. Ashwell, and one at Kohanga under the Rev. R. Maunsell.

2. Were St. Stephen's and St. John's existing at that time—when the grants were given?—Yes.

3. It might apply to them as well as to the Waikato?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you access to early accounts of this Kohanga trust?—There was no income in the way of rent from 1853 to 1890. Prior to the Maori war it was worked by Mr. Maunsell. All expenses were defrayed by contributions towards the maintenance of the scholars. The land was used for farming purposes, and cattle were kept on it.

5. Was any record of the income kept?—No, I do not think so, but it was before my time. I believe they lived on the produce of the land, and sold and bought just as a farmer would do now. There were contributions made by the Government towards the cost of the scholars, but that was spent on maintenance. From 1890 there was a small income, but it fell off, because generally farming property depreciated. Then, in 1897, a lease was granted for twenty-eight years. The land was covered with gorse so high and thick that a man on horseback could not see over it nor ride through it. It was found there was very little chance of letting it in that state, so it was let for twenty-eight years—the first seven years at 1s. a year, and the other twenty-one years at an annual rent of 1s. per acre, on condition that the tenant spent £500 in clearing off the gorse and improving the land. This he has done, and it is now fenced and clear of gorse except for young growth. The seven years has just expired, and the first year's rent at 1s. an acre is now available, and will appear in the accounts for the present year. The "disbursements" shown in the accounts are rates and sundry charges. The total net receipts for the last years, for the 750 acres, are £32 13s. 11d.

6. In 1860, the property was let to a Mr. Spargo at £50: have you any note of that?—I must refer you to the following statement of Sir William Martin before a Commission of inquiry, 24th March, 1869. "I became a trustee of this property (Kohanga) in 1861, but having been previously a member of the Native Board of Education I am conversant with the history of the school prior to that date. There was a school established at Maretai, a little below Kohanga, under the superintendence of the Rev. R. Maunsell (now Archdeacon) at the date of these grants, removed to Kohanga in the year 1853. In 1855 the number of scholars at Kohanga was 81. Prior to the Act of 1858 public money was annually given to the support of the school, the distribution of which is shown by the returns regularly furnished, such grants commencing in the year 1853. The school was maintained at Kohanga until Mr. Maunsell was obliged to leave the place, and the scholars were dispersed by the commencement of Native disturbances in 1863. The distribution of the capitation allowance under the Act of 1858 will be found in Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives for 1865, E. No. 3B. On Mr. Maunsell's removal the Rev. Joshua Te Moanaroa, a Native deacon, was left in charge of the station. A part of the buildings was temporarily let for a few months, for which a small sum was obtained. In the

year 1866 one Mr. Revell was appointed schoolmaster at Kohanga, and at the beginning of the year following he had a daily average attendance of twenty-five scholars, which fell off before the close of the two years that Mr. Revel remained there to about half the number. The school estate was let for a term of two years to a Mr. Spargo at £50 per annum, Mr. Revell receiving from the trustees this amount supplemented by them to the sum of £75 in the first year out of other sources. Mr. Revell also received aid from the general Government and support also from the Natives, but the latter amount did not come up to the sum promised by them. Since Mr. Revell's removal the school has entirely ceased, and at present there is no school and no revenue arising from the estate."

7. *Mr. Quick.*] How far does your recollection go back?—I have been in the diocese since 1860.

8. *The Chairman.*] Your books do not show that anything was received during the period you speak of?—I cannot discover any rent actually paid into the trust. I may explain that in the early days, these trusts were worked by trustees appointed by Bishop Selwyn. These trustees did all their work voluntarily, they had no clerk to look after accounts, and the only records are, in some cases, small books referring to the school, and Church almanacs in which reference is made to accounts. I can find no record of income from this property during the early years of the trust.

9. Spargo's lease must have been antecedent to 1869: it was not then current?—No; I believe the land was then in a fair state of cultivation, but after that, on account of disturbances, people drifted from there to where land was to be had of better quality, and freehold instead of their having to lease it.

10. *Mr. Quick.*] The place was devastated by war for some period?—From 1864 to about 1869.

11. Are any of the old trustees alive still?—No, not one.

12. *The Chairman.*] Can you give any explanation as to why land should recently be let at £37, whereas it was let for £50 thirty or forty years ago?—My explanation would be that in 1869, or thereabouts, things were too unsettled for any one to take it up on long lease. It was only let after the Church had improved it to a certain extent, and got it into order. There were buildings on it then, which were afterwards allowed to go to ruin. No one cares to build on leasehold land. About that time, also, the Waikato land had been confiscated; the military had had grants given them, and the tendency was to go on to land which was said to be very good, and nobody thought of settling at Kohanga, which even now is a place not easy to get to; settlers would not think of going there. The Maoris did nothing to it, and allowed it to get overgrown with weeds and gorse. The trustees had no money to spend on it.

13. *Mr. Quick.*] It is unrateable land there?—The rates paid on it have been very small; for many years it was not rated at all.

14. Is there a great deal of Maori land in the neighbourhood?—Yes; there is a large block alongside leased to the same man who has this.

15. What are the terms of the lease?—The lease is for twenty-eight years from January or July, 1897; the first seven years at 1s. a year, and afterwards at an annual rental of £37 10s. (1s. an acre); the land to be cleared of gorse and grassed, which has been done, or is about being completed. It is let to Mr. A. Muir. He is a farmer living in the neighbourhood—at Tuakau, I think.

16. *The Chairman.*] Are you able to say the arrangement of the whole lease was a fair transaction?—I think it was a very good lease, because the tenant undertook to spend £500 in improvements, including clearing the gorse, fencing, draining, and grassing.

17. *Mr. Wardell.*] What do the receipts represent?—Rents; nothing else.

18. (To the Chairman): The figures are all from records; I can speak to the figures, and the information in the epitome is all from documents.

19. *Mr. Quick.*] Where did the rents come from for the seven years prior to 1896?—There was a seven-years tenancy granted to a man named Crawford, who was going to work a flax-mill on the banks of the river. He was not going to cut flax from the land, but to use it as a sort of depot for flax.

20. You put down there being no receipts from 1854 to 1869 to the disturbances owing to the war?—Yes.

21. And from 1869 to 1889 to the fact of confiscated land being taken up which prevented any inquiry for this land?—Yes. This is only an impression. The trustees hoped to be able to utilise the Church land for a school again, and there was perhaps a little delay on that account.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] You are not in a position to give us information as to receipts and expenditure in connection with the school carried on on the property, or the expenditure of money-grants from the Government made in connection with it?—No; I can find no record of it.

23. *Mr. Quick.*] Mr. Maunsell was driven out by the war?—Yes; he left about 1863, and the scholars were dispersed.

*Witness:* I should like to call attention to an irregularity in the two grants. The measurements do not fit in very well. The grants have never been accurately surveyed and the boundary of one does not fit quite into the adjoining one. The Maoris claim there ought to be a reserve. We have only leased to Mr. Muir what is contained in the grants, and he is perhaps exercising rights he is not entitled to. I should like to explain, on behalf of the trustees, that they were approached a few years ago to have a school erected there for Maori children; and, after receiving reports from the Government Inspector, Mr. Muir was approached and he was quite willing that a certain piece should be taken for a school on a site to be agreed upon. The Government took a site which he was not willing to grant, because it meant fencing a long road. There is a piece of 5 acres reserved as a cemetery, and when the gorse was cleared and it was surveyed off, we undertook to fence it off. The Education Department thought they would like to put the school there, and we were asked to dedicate the road and this piece for a school-site. Mr. Muir objected in the first place, and the Maoris objected; and I have here the following letter from the Maori clergyman who wrote on behalf of the Maoris: "The people of Kohanga asked me to inform the General Trust Board of their view with reference to the marking-off the 4 acres for the school. They do not approve of the site of the school (4 acres) being taken from the place set

apart for the cemetery. One acre is much too small for burials, as it is now nearly filled; and so where are they and their descendants to be buried? They say, 'Let that school be put on the site of the former school, and if that cannot be done, let the school be put on some other place on the 700 acres of Kohanga, and leave the cemetery as it is.' If you do not assent to their wish there will be no school there. I am hoping that a reply to their word will be sent by you." So, although this site was chosen by the Government, it was not accepted by the Maoris. The trustees have made no objection to putting a school there if possible, but the Maoris negatived it.

24. *Mr. Quick.*] Is there a Maori clergyman there now?—He only visits from Hopuhopu.

25. *The Chairman.*] What is the nearest Maori settlement to this land?—I believe there are a few Maoris on the river close to the land.

26. Were they the Maoris who were moving for a school?—Some of them; I could not tell their number.

27. *Mr. Quick.*] Have the trustees any scheme in view in regard to the expenditure of these moneys from year to year?—They are of opinion that what they have been doing in the past is the correct thing to do—to bring boys from the Waikato and educate them at St. Stephen's.

28. *The Chairman.*] They have had board and free education?—Yes.

29. Clothing?—Not in all cases. The boys who are supported by Government get an allowance of £18 a year, and find their own clothing. We admit Waikato boys on the same terms; they pay nothing, but find their own clothing. In many cases where the parents are not in a position to pay for their clothing we have paid for it, not out of Kohanga funds, but out of St. Stephen's estate.

30. *Mr. Quick.*] What kind of education do they get at St. Stephen's? Is there any technical education?—We have a carpenter's workshop, and we pay an instructor, and they get so many hours a week. Since the school was burned down the boys rebuilt it, found all the labour, and did the work under the superintendence of an English instructor and an assistant.

31. *The Chairman.*] Do you teach them farming operations?—Market-gardening; for many years they have grown potatoes and vegetables.

32. Do they sell any?—There is not enough ground for that.

33. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any industrial training in other small trades?—Only in carpentering. It is systematically taught, and has been for many years.

34. Have any boys gone into trade as carpenters?—One boy I know is building houses in the Waikato. There are some in trades in town; two are apprenticed to coachbuilders and one to a blacksmith; one is a clerk in the Survey Office. We cannot keep trace of them all; we do not keep any record after they leave. When they are apprenticed they live at St. Stephen's and pay a nominal proportion of their wages till in a position to keep themselves.

35. No instruction of any kind has been given at Kohanga since 1863?—I think about that date.

36. *Mr. Quick.*] It would be quite impossible to have technical instruction at Kohanga even if things went on as in the old days?—No, you could not have it.

37. Since when have boys been coming from Kohanga to St. Stephen's?—During the last twenty years from Waikato generally.

*Mr. St. Clair:* I have been asked to appear before the Commission on behalf of the original donors of Kohanga—the Kukutai section of the Ngatitipa Tribe. The Natives are wholly unprepared for the Commission, and ask me to ask the Commissioners to sit to hear evidence at Tuakau or Kohanga, and they would also like the block viewed. Some of the Natives there were at the school which stood on the land, and could give valuable information as to how it was conducted in the old days under Archdeacon Maunsell, when it was a great success. They had a flour-mill there and grew their own wheat, and were taught a great number of useful things. They will also propose a scheme for the continuation of the work Archdeacon Maunsell did in the district.

38. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you any documentary evidence beyond the Crown grant showing dedication of the land?—I believe Mr. Kaihau has. I have seen documentary evidence in which the Kukutai, through Bishop Selwyn and Chief Judge Fenton, were induced to set aside the land. I believe I am also to be instructed on behalf of the Natives who gave Hopuhopu, which is three miles from Ngaruahia.

Mr. St. Clair was informed that the Commission intended to sit at Tuakau.

AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 20TH JUNE, 1905.

Bishop NELIGAN examined.

*The Chairman:* I understand this to be your position: You know really very little of the facts except just recently, but you have some opinions and some advice you can offer. If you would like to draw up something of a more formal kind, in addition to what you are now about to say, we shall be glad to receive it.

*Witness:* When I came here two years ago I tried to investigate the trusts in connection with the Natives that had to be administered by the Board. I saw that there were a good many difficulties connected with the administration, and that they were being fairly met by the Trust Board. I formed the conclusion then, which the experience of two years has certainly strengthened, that the system of administration of the Native trusts in the Waikato which the Board had adopted was quite the best system that could have been adopted under the circumstances. On inquiry, and in my travels in the Waikato, I never came across anybody amongst the Natives who spoke in a complaining way about the trustees, either amongst the Native clergy or the Natives themselves. I have inquired from time to time if there were any Waikato boys at St. Stephen's School and found there were. The other chief thing one noticed in connection with the trusts was the property at Hopuhopu, which for some time

was not let. Subsequently it was discovered that the ecclesiastical law and the civil law were at variance, and some said the ecclesiastical law only allowing a twenty-one-years lease interfered with the letting of the property. But the Trust Board took upon themselves to let it for periods of forty-two years, and since then the General Synod has taken the first steps to bring the ecclesiastical law into harmony with the civil, so as to give the trustees power to take advantage of the Public Bodies' Powers Act. Mr. Cochrane knows all the details in connection with the trusts, which do not directly come before me. All that comes before me is as Chairman, and it is my business to see how the boys at St. Stephen's, and the girls at the Victoria School are looked after. I have always formed the conclusion that the Natives were getting as good benefits as were possible under the conditions. I mean by this that these two schools were the best channels whereby, under the various trusts, the Natives could derive the advantages of the trusts.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us the process by which boys from the Waikato are admitted to St. Stephen's?—Applications come to the Trust Board, and boys are either sent as Government scholars or on the foundation. We take in as many as we can. The Government scholars are so-many, and then others are on what we call the foundation—the proceeds from the trust.

2. We understand that St. Stephen's receives Native pupils from the northern part of this Island?—Yes. I do not think we have anybody from Taranaki; we have always had some from the Waikato.

3. Are you aware whether the applications for admission to the school have exceeded—especially from the Waikato—your capacity for accommodation?—I could not answer offhand so that my reply would be very valuable; but my impression is, from the last two or three meetings of the Trust Board, that the applications for admission are in excess of the accommodation at present. But whether these applications for admission are in excess owing to increased demand from the Waikato or not, I could not say.

4. You are not familiar with the financial conditions of the school—such as expenses of maintenance, &c.?—Not with what it is to-day, because we leave it to a sub-committee of the Trust Board, to go into it very carefully—Mr. Batger and Mr. Robertson—and they know all the details. I do know that our trust funds are now being drawn on to their fullest extent; and on the occasion of the last meeting, at which we had applications to admit boys, we had neither room in the school for them at present nor money to support them on the foundation.

4A. I understand St. Stephen's is supported from various trusts other than those which are the immediate subject of inquiry?—Yes; there is a definite St. Stephen's trust.

5. And revenue from other lands than these blocks in the Waikato?—Yes, I think so. I cannot say exactly where it is, but there is a definite St. Stephen's trust with clauses in it different to these others. It specifies that there must be a school at Taurarua, and it has not been altered. Some of the trustees felt—and I must confess I have a great deal of sympathy with them—that the school might, with more advantage to the Maori race, be in the country; but it is impossible to do it.

6. Are you able to say, as a matter of opinion, whether smaller schools in one or two localities would tend more to the advantage of Native pupils than concentrating them in one position here at St. Stephen's?—As a matter of my own personal opinion, as the result of two years' observation, it would be infinitely better to continue combining the efforts, but to combine them in such a manner that the Natives could be taught not only, as we teach them, carpentering, but farming, blacksmith-work, and such things. That is my own opinion. If one could thus concentrate all the efforts and have one good farming and technical school, it would do a great deal of good for the Maori people.

7. Can you tell us whether any educational establishment of any class exists in the Waikato, either upon or in the neighbourhood of the blocks into which we are inquiring?—I know of none except the Native school near Mahuta's place on the other side of the river from Huntly—a State school.

8. You know of none under the management of the Church of England in the district?—No.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] The one you refer to is an ordinary Board school for Maoris?—Yes.

10. Have you any idea of the number of children attending it?—I do not suppose there are more than forty or fifty.

11. As far as you know, the Government are not doing more in the Waikato for the education of children than you are by your trusts?—Not in the sense of boarding or technical schools.

12. They do not teach industrial pursuits?—I do not think so. We did offer lately a site at Kohanga for a State school, but nothing has been done in the matter. I think one reason why there may have been a time when Waikato boys may not have come to the school was this: probably the fall in attendance was synchronous with the antagonism to Christianity on account of Hauhau-ism. It is only within the last few years there has been any sort of general movement of kindness towards Christianity. Even since I have been here I have seen the most remarkable change take place.

13. *Mr. Wardell.*] Has the practice of Hauhau-ism absolutely ceased?—It is hard to say what has ceased and what has not. You might say Te Whiti-ism had ceased, and yet it has not. It is on the wane very decidedly, but one cannot altogether say any of these things have ceased. Probably it would be unwholesome that they should cease suddenly, as one might have the same sort of sudden change that took place in the early days. Going back to the question about Taranaki, I do know there is a girl from Taranaki in the Victoria School. It was a great advantage to get some one from Taranaki. The Victoria School is partly supported by the St. Stephen's trust, and in part by the Government, and in part again by a foundation. The Victoria Ladies' Association collect so-many scholarships, and the Government provide a minimum of twenty. The foundation-stone of the Victoria School was laid by the present Prince of Wales, and it was only opened two years ago. It is distinctly prospering. It is very valuable. The education of the girls is limited to primary education, unless a girl shows exceptional ability. The chief aim is to give the girls what is called the three Rs. They do all the housework, and we are trying to teach them the elements of agriculture; we have no space

to do more. They are taught domestic economy. Mr. Hogben is very particular that cooking should be an ordinary class subject. They are taught sewing and make everything. There are about forty girls there now.

14. *Mr. Quick.*] St. Stephen's is under Government inspection?—Both schools are.

15. It is looked upon as advisable to keep in touch with the Government?—The Government has a direct hold on these institutions. There are a minimum of twenty Government scholarships to the Victoria School, and a maximum of thirty to St. Stephen's.

16. What has been the tenor of the Government reports?—They have been of a most satisfactory character in the way of approving of the general system of education, and Mr. Hogben is recommending considerable latitude in the way of the working of the syllabus. For instance, he recommends that cooking should be a class subject, backing up what we have been trying to do—*i.e.*, to make the training wholly practical. The Government only leave the children two years in either school, which is too short a time.

17. Are the girls taught neatness in their attire, and so forth?—Yes.

18. You give places in Victoria School to girls from these districts?—Yes. The St. Stephen's trust gives the Victoria School a grant of £50, thus fulfilling a portion of that trust, and we take into a Victoria School any one and from all parts.

19. So these reserves contribute to Victoria School?—Not directly.

20. But a girl coming from those parts would have her education paid for by the trustees?—The Trust Board give an annual subsidy to the Victoria School.

21. In respect to that particular girl?—No; in respect to the school.

22. But supposing there were no Waikato girls there, would the trustees give anything?—The trustees of St. Stephen's trust are bound to; they are all under the Trust Board. Victoria School was built almost entirely by voluntary subscriptions, and when it was built the trustees of St. Stephen's said, "We will give out of our trust £50 a year."

23. That is the limit?—Yes. Where the £50 comes from, whether 10s. from Kohanga and 5s. from somewhere else, I do not know.

24. Who is best able to give us information in regard to that?—Nobody knows so much as Mr. Cochrane.

25. You say it might be advisable to amalgamate the trusts and have a school in the country?—Not exactly; I think the question was whether I thought small schools scattered would be a wiser plan than one big school, and I said "No."

26. But did you not say you doubted whether it would not be better if St. Stephen's were further afield?—As a matter of my own personal opinion, had there been any possibility of that.

27. It would not be so central?—No; there are disadvantages.

28. Would it not be more expensive?—One does not know that.

29. Do you find the apprentice scheme work well?—There is no question about that; that portion of the work is being done excellently. We are in correspondence with the Government as to the further development of the apprentice scheme. It opens the question, what is most likely to be beneficial for the Maori race: to teach the young Maoris trades wherein they become very speedily proficient, or to teach them skilled farming? and that is where a diversity of opinion might arise.

30. It has been alleged that it is trouble thrown away to teach them skilled farming, because if they go among their own people they will not go in for anything beyond growing enough kumaras to live on, and that sort of thing?—I may be wrong; but when I think of some of the Irish schools (and the Irish peasants are exceedingly like the Maoris in many ways) where they are taught farming and carpentering, &c., I do not think it is an impossible scheme, but it is a matter of opinion. I would far rather see the Maoris on the land; I think the danger of the glare of the gas-lamps is very real indeed to the Maori race.

31. Physical or moral danger?—Physical; we can prevent the moral danger, and we do.

32. Unless the Maoris are seised of sanitary laws they are more likely to suffer physical deterioration in town than in the country?—Yes; it is a very big question.

33. *The Chairman.*] It seems to me, this is the case: the first complaint of the Waikato persons who say they are specially interested in the grants in the Waikato is that, under the circumstances, the land should come back to them. It may be pretty easy to answer that by saying, "No; you, or some persons looked upon as being able to deal with the land, dealt with it, and the land has gone from you and cannot come back." Some of them say, besides, this: "We have got these grants and we wish to have, and ought to have, a school on the land." It may also be easy to answer that—I do not say it is, but it may be. But is there any way of arriving at a conclusion that possibly the St. Stephen's system is not sufficiently direct, that it does not come fully home to those persons who are interested in the land; that it would come more home to them if there were a school, not on each section of land, but somewhere in which what is going on could be seen by the Maoris? Is it possible for us to say that would or ought to satisfy the Maoris, and that it can be done out of present revenues, or that there is any prospect of these revenues being increased by the Church or otherwise?—I say, at present there is no possibility of that being done with the present revenue. It may be that in twenty-one or forty-two years, when the land has been sufficiently improved to be of value, it could be done out of revenue; but at present it is wholly impossible. I do not think the Church people themselves would raise any money to build a school, and it is not fair to ask them.

34. Do you think there is any prospect of the more wealthy Maoris making other gifts of land in aid of such a scheme?—I think that if gifts were made sufficient to justify the trustees in extending their educational operations, they would extend them to-morrow; but they feel quite unable to extend their educational operations at present with the income they have.



35. *Mr. Wardell.*] The trustees are now only beginning to realise that by tying the lands up for twenty-one or forty-two years at a nominal rental they may become reproductive. That means it would be a hundred years from the date of the grant before the revenue is anything more than nominal out of these lands. I should like to hear whether you have formed any opinion on these facts?—This struck me when I first inquired into the matter. The first causes of the delay in these lands being productive arose from the war. Nobody went into the Waikato for some time. The second cause of delay, I have been informed, was the peculiar wording of the instructions to trustees by the General Synod, and the unwillingness of any trustees to go beyond those instructions. The instructions to trustees were at variance with the civil law, and there was an unwillingness on the part of trustees to go to the full length of the civil law. I was informed that the fact of the trustees only offering leases for twenty-one years very seriously interfered with the letting of the property. I have not been long enough in the colony to know whether that information is correct. The fact remains that when this objection was removed by the action of the trustees, this land has been taken up with the exception of some 200 or 300 acres. Then the third answer is: I am informed that there is land there which is very unproductive, as has been proved by various people who have been trying to farm it, and nobody is willing to take it up. There are three causes: the war, the twenty-one-years lease, and the bad quality of the land.

36. *The Chairman.*] What has been the operation of the twenty-one-years lease?—It was too short a period; it was not worth a man's while to sink his capital for a lease of twenty-one years; and there was better land elsewhere at a better rate.

37. You have said you are not aware of any school, under either the Government or the Church, which could be utilised in this way—where they teach farming, or carpentering, or blacksmithing—where boys from the Waikato scholarships could be taught?—I know of none.

Bishop Neligan subsequently forwarded the following statement: I have been Chairman\*of the General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland since I came here two years ago. The Board manages the trusts now under inquiry as well as the St. Stephen's, and some other trusts connected with the Church of England. I made investigation on my first acquaintance with the work of the Board into the methods and policy of the Board. The conclusion I then formed has been strengthened by two years' experience—*i.e.*, the system of administration of the trusts now under inquiry was the best system that could have been adopted under the circumstances. I have travelled a good deal amongst the Natives in the Waikato and elsewhere, and have had good opportunity for forming a judgment on the attitude of the Waikato Natives in connection with these trusts. I have never come across any one among the Natives who complained in any way about the policy of the Trust Board. I have, from time to time, ascertained that there were Waikato boys at St. Stephen's School, and Waikato girls at the Queen Victoria School. In my judgment, the fact of Waikato boys and girls attending these two schools is as faithful and true fulfilment of the Waikato trusts as can be given under the circumstances with which the Board has had to deal during my chairmanship. I was struck by the fact of the Hopuhopu property being unlet for some time. Inquiry gave the information that the ecclesiastical law was at variance with the civil law in the matter of duration of lease for such property. I was informed that this was one main cause why the property was unlet. The Trust Board subsequently took upon themselves the responsibility of granting leases for forty-two years, in accordance with the civil law, and at the General Synod of 1904 they took the first steps necessary and possible for bringing the ecclesiastical and civil law into harmony. I was informed, also, of two other causes accounting for the Hopuhopu property being unlet—the war, and the poor quality of the land. I have not been in the colony long enough to know how far my information is reliable or not. But I have met the alleging of these three causes sufficiently often to make me regard them as being of considerable force. It certainly is a remarkable fact that, even with the railway running through the property, and the markets of Auckland, Hamilton, and Cambridge being so handy, yet the property remained unlet so long. The ecclesiastical twenty-one-years lease may have had something to do with it, but I strongly incline to the belief that the poorness of the land had more to do with it. Anyhow, these are the three causes I have learned were accountable: (1) the war, (2) the twenty-one-years lease, (3) the poor land. Since the time of granting leases for forty-two years a very considerable quantity of the property has been let. Land for dairying purposes has also become scarcer in the Waikato. Whether these two things together, or the former alone, are sufficient to account for the property now being let or not, it is hard to say with any degree of certainty. My own opinion is that both things together are accountable. The methods whereby pupils are provided for at the two schools in Auckland are as follow:—St. Stephen's School: The Government pays for a "maximum" of thirty boys; the Trust Board pays for the other boys from the St. Stephen's trust and Waikato trusts, if they are yielding revenue, and we call these boys "on the foundation." There are some seventy boys in the school. Queen Victoria School: The Government pays for a "minimum" of twenty girls; the Trust Board pays £50 per annum to the school out of the St. Stephen's trust; the "Queen Victoria Association for Befriending Maori Women and Girls" collects funds for granting scholarships for other girls. There are under forty girls in the school. Generally: Applications for admission into the schools are sent to the Trust Board, and are considered by a sub-committee of the Board, consisting of Messrs. Batger and A. Robertson with myself. In the case of girls, we consult with Mrs. Neligan, who acts as lady visitor on behalf of the Board. At present St. Stephen's School is full and can receive no more boys; in the Victoria School I think there are still a fair number of vacancies for Government scholars. We have some half-dozen old St. Stephen's boys who are now apprentices living at the school, and we have had some correspondence with the Government in view of this side of our work being wisely undertaken. The headmaster of the school is, at present, hopeful of the effort. The Victoria Association of Ladies have as one of their objects the befriending of the girls after they leave the school. An Old Boys' Association has been formed in connection with St. Stephen's. By these two methods we are trying to follow up our boys and girls



after they leave our schools. The St. Stephen's trust is different to the trusts under inquiry. Some of us have thought that the wording whereby the locality of the school is fixed at Taurarua (its present site) is unfortunate. The Board has not gone into this point at great length, but it has considered it. For myself, I am inclined to the opinion that schools in the country would probably be more advantageous to the Maori race than schools in Auckland. I have some fear of the effect of "the glare of the gas-lamps" on the Maori people. I know that under any system, and no matter where schools may be placed, there are likely to be disadvantages. I know that there is, reasonably, considerable diversity of opinion on the point of town or country localities for such schools. But my own opinion is the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. The Maori peasant is, in many ways, very like the Irish peasant, and both want to be "on the land." I cannot help thinking that it would be possible to teach farming and agricultural handicrafts to the Maori youths. We do teach the boys carpentering at St. Stephen's, and, under proper supervision, they erected the present big schoolroom themselves. They make excellent skilled artisans. The girls at the Victoria School are thoroughly trained in all housework, domestic economy, making clothes, and so forth. They have to do everything in the house for themselves. Mr. Hogben, the Inspector, encourages us to make the training in both schools as practical as possible. He allows some latitude in the syllabus in order to secure the teaching of cooking, the elements of agriculture, and so forth, so far as it is possible. I certainly am not in favour of two or three small schools. It is better from every point of view to combine efforts and do the work of one school thoroughly well. So far as my knowledge goes, there is no school in the Waikato which in any way attempts to do what we are doing in our two schools. I include in this statement efforts of the Government. The attitude of the Waikato Natives towards Christianity has been greatly changed during even the past two years. For some years the hostility was so real that the number of Waikato boys who came to St. Stephen's was small, but I think the statistics prove that the number has increased in proportion to the decrease of hostility towards Christianity. It is hard to say how far either Hauhauism or Te Whiti-ism has ceased. What one can say is, at present they are on the wane. Probably it would be unwholesome if these movements of a partly religious character were to cease suddenly. One might then have the same sort of sudden change that took place in the early days of the evangelisation of the Maori race. Wholesale and sudden changes are seldom healthy signs of national life. The Trust Board offered a site at Kohanga for a school. That was some considerable time ago. We have heard nothing further from the Natives on the matter. So far as we are concerned, we are very desirous to meet the wishes of the Natives in the matter of a site for a State school. It would certainly be of advantage if the Government scholarships at both our schools were of longer tenure than two years. We do, from time to time, put a boy or girl "on the foundation" after the expiry of the Government scholarship. The Government, no doubt, have good reason for their policy in this particular, but, in my opinion, it would mean added benefit to the Maori people were Government scholarships occasionally extended. I do not think that there is any reasonable prospect of the public contributing funds to found another Maori school, nor of the wealthy Maoris providing the funds. But, were such funds forthcoming, the Trust Board would start schools, wherever wise, as speedily as possible. The Board is very ready to extend its educational operations wherever and whenever it can with any prospect of financial security. We are beginning to touch the Taranaki Natives, and we have now a girl from Taranaki in the Victoria School.

GEORGE MACMURRAY, Canon, Diocese of Auckland, examined.

*Witness* : I should like to point out to the Commission that the origin of the Otawhao property is different from that of the others. The Otawhao grant is situated at Te Awamutu, and over 100 acres was bought by the Church Missionary Society about 1839, and 70 acres was given by Potatau in 1852, the whole being combined in a Crown grant issued by Sir George Grey. There are really 184 acres included in the boundaries. This was sworn in evidence given before the Royal Commission in 1869 by Rev. R. Burrows (*vide* first report). In regard to the terms of the Crown grant, the reason of the different terms in this grant is this: the primary object of the Church Missionary Society was not school-teaching, but preaching the Christian religion, and they only used schools as a secondary agent in this work. They got the land for the purposes of the Church Missionary Society, and school-work was only subsidiary; their work was religious rather than educational. It should be remembered that the colony owes its existence to the work of the Church Missionary Society, and the society acquired most of this land before New Zealand was a Crown colony.

38. *Mr. Quick.*] The society took possession of this Island after Mr. Marsden's arrival?—He was sent out in 1814; he was working for eleven years before getting a single convert; and between 1825 and Bishop Selwyn's arrival, practically the whole race had been converted to Christianity.

39. *The Chairman.*] Does your knowledge about this property as to administration go as far back as 1869?—My personal knowledge only goes back for five years; I have been a trustee for that time. Speaking of what I have learned, the mission work was wrecked at the time of the war. The mission station was abandoned, and the place occupied by soldiers, and after the war there was no opportunity of re-establishing the work. It is only since nine years ago that we have been in any way successful in winning the friendliness of the Waikato Maoris.

40. *Mr. Quick.*] Prior to 1869 the place was upset by the war?—Yes; and after that year there was a resentful feeling caused by the war and by confiscation which alienated the Maoris, not only from the Sovereign, but from religion.

41. This is the only grant the society has in the Waikato?—Yes—that is, of the properties mentioned in the table of reference. It owns a property at the Waikato Heads.

42. *The Chairman.*] Have you any knowledge of the administration of the trust in regard to this particular piece of land?—The revenues from the land went to the Church Missionary Society until 1881, then to the New Zealand Mission Trust Board. It has been let for many years. The money from 1869 to the end of 1903 was used for the maintenance of Maori clergy throughout the diocese.

43. *Mr. Quick.*] The revenue was not ear-marked for the Waikato?—No.

43A. I suppose there have been large grants to the society up to recently?—Yes; the work was maintained by large grants from the Church Missionary Society at Home, and herein lies the answer to the question of the maintenance of the schools in the Waikato in the old time. In the old time the society established these schools, and with the money of the society they were maintained. Unless there was money of this kind coming in it would be ridiculous to start a school at Hopuhopu or Kohanga; it could not be done.

44. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you of opinion that it was ever, in the initiation of the trust, contemplated that these lands were to be the sole source of maintenance of the schools?—Not at all.

45. The Natives were providing a site in consideration of the society doing something?—Yes. The school could not have existed if the society had not spent large sums in the maintenance of clergy and the schools, and without such a grant schools could not be maintained now.

46. Are you of opinion that in the giving of this land there was a preliminary promise, or implied promise, to maintain the schools if the land was given?—I could only answer as a matter of general information; I have no personal knowledge. I believe the Natives saw the work that was being done, and recognised the value of the mission-work, and said, "We will give you this land." But, in the Te Awamutu case, the large proportion of it was bought with the money of the missionary society. I do not know what was paid for it.

47. *Mr. Quick.*] The Church Missionary Society and their successors have always been employing Maori clergymen in this part of New Zealand?—Yes.

48. Even through the war-time?—Yes; but not in the Waikato.

49. You consider it would not be a proper appropriation of the money accruing from this grant to amalgamate it with the others?—No; it was acquired by a different body, and for a different purpose, and it was acquired in a different way.

50. Who acquired it?—The Rev. John Morgan was the missionary at the time in Te Awamutu.

51. *The Chairman.*] Is the property let now?—Its present rental is £165 a year; it is farm land. It is the desire of the trustees to cut it up into smaller sections, and to deal with it in smaller sections. By doing so it would be made much more valuable. It is close to Te Awamutu, and our difficulty arises from the fact that the town people complain that owing to the property being unsaleable, the township is hindered in its progress. Some of it is let on building lease for thirty-five years. An area of 5 acres 1 rood 30 perches, including the old and historic cemetery, has been conveyed to the General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland, under the conditions of the trust in the Crown grant, for a sum of £100.

52. Has any doubt ever been expressed as to whether you have power to lease these lands?—There is a doubt; and I may say I was granting a lease the other day, and had a clause put in protecting myself and my cotrustees against any defect in the title. There is a doubt as to whether we can lease or sell, and that has been the cause of very serious difficulty for the advancement of the township. The land runs into the heart of the township. Owing to the difficulty of dealing with it the township is hampered. If we had power to sell or lease, the property could be developed very largely. The property lies on both sides of the road, between the station and the township. I was seriously considering the wisdom of consulting my fellow-trustees as to whether we ought not to apply to Parliament for a private Act to enable us to deal with this land, so as not to hinder the development of the town.

53. What is the doubt about the title?—Our difficulty lies in the wording of the original Crown grant—"to be used and occupied." There is no doubt of title in my mind, but there is doubt about the power to do what is needful for the development of the township.

54. *Mr. Wardell.*] And you think it would be beneficial to your interests if you had power to deal with it by lease or sale?—Yes.

55. The present New Zealand Mission Board is actually in the position of the Church Missionary Society?—Yes.

56. How did they acquire a legal position?—When the properties were purchased there were certain persons in New Zealand who acquired the property as trustees of the society. The society, in 1881, changed its trustees and formed the Mission Trust Board. The old trustees transferred their property to the new trustees.

57. *Mr. Quick.*] Really, they continue to be trustees for the Church Missionary Society?—Yes, they are really the agents; that, I fancy, is their legal position.

58. *Mr. Hutana.*] The income derivable from this property has been expended on the support of Maori clergymen?—It was up to the time when I became a trustee, and it was expended so up to a little over twelve months ago. But during the past five years there was another change in the position of the society, and during the last twelve months the income has been expended in the education of Maori clergy.

59. *The Chairman.*] Can you refer us to anything in print showing how the change in the trustees has been brought about?—Yes.

60. *Mr. Hutana.*] Is the Christian religion taught in the schools supported by these moneys?—Yes; but no portion of these moneys goes to St. Stephen's.

61. *Mr. Wardell.*] Does any contribution from the trust lands go to St. John's?—Absolutely none. It has its own distinct property and revenue. It has nothing to do with any of these lands.

62. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you tell us anything about the Otaki reserves?—The person who can give definite information about them is Archdeacon Williams. They are held in trust precisely similar to St. Stephen's and the Porirua trust.

63. You draw a distinct line of demarcation between the Otawhao and Otaki trust?—Yes.

64. *Mr. Hutana.*] Are you of opinion that the Christian religion should or should not be taught in these schools?—I say it should.

65. *Q* Would it be advisable, in your opinion, to amalgamate all the revenue from these trusts and devote them to one purpose?—I must draw a distinction between those for religion distinctly and those for educational purposes.

66. Do you think that was the idea the Maoris had when they gave the lands? Do you not think they did not distinguish between the two—that their whole object was that their children should be taught religion and educated?—In the case of this particular trust the great majority of the property was bought, and the body that bought it was a religious body—not for teaching-schools.

67. Was it not necessary to have a school attached to the institution so as to enable the children to read the text-books of religion?—There was one before the war.

68. Do you think a good strong school could be established somewhere under these trusts now?—My opinion is that the revenue from these trusts is utterly inadequate to the maintaining of a school; and from my experience I believe the very best possible expenditure of the money has been made. To attempt to use little dribblets of income to establish a school at Hopuhopu or Kohanga would be absurd; it could not be done.

69. Would you get a sufficient revenue if you cut up the land into small sections?—Any one with any experience of the letting of Hopuhopu land would know that the trustees were thankful to get anybody to make any bid for the use of the land on account of its poor quality. I am speaking from personal experience as a trustee in saying it was almost impossible to get any one to take it up. I should like to say this in regard to Waikato boys going into the school at St. Stephen's: During the years I was a managing trustee, all applications were sent to me for reference, and I advised the trustees as to the admission of boys. I examined the applications most carefully, and whenever it was possible to take in a Waikato boy I was most anxious to do so. Of late years the applications have been very much in excess of the power of the trustees to grant admission, and of course boys have had to be refused. But the full power of the school in maintaining boys has been used up to the present.

70. *Mr. Quick.*] Is there any chance of improving and extending the accommodation?—There is no money to spend upon buildings. The trustees have been expending the full income upon maintenance. In regard to what the Bishop said about moving to the country, it might be a good thing to do, but there is no money to do it.

71. *The Chairman.*] Do the St. Stephen's trustees present any annual report?—There is a report presented to the Diocesan Synod each year, and always a summary of, or extracts from, the Inspector's reports. Mr. Pope in one of his last reports spoke of how when he found in a Maori village a young Maori showing himself to be more active and intelligent than others he was sure to be a St. Stephen's boy, and spoke of the wonderful change he could see resulting from the work of St. Stephen's.

72. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any rule by which you recognise a claim to admission to St. Stephen's?—There are a number of things we have to take into consideration in weighing the applications. The Government have always expressed a dislike to our taking on our foundation boys who had facilities to go to one of their Native schools, and have expressed a wish that we should give preference to those who were without facilities in their own villages. If two boys applied, and one had a Native school within a quarter of a mile and another had not one within five miles, we should give preference to the one further away from facilities. There are a considerable number of Government Native schools in the Waikato.

73. Is there any educational qualification for admission to St. Stephen's, or any personal or religious qualification?—No; a boy has to be of sound physical health and to pass our doctor, so as not to be a source of danger to the school. He must pass the customary standards in the Native school. The only exception is this: cases have occurred where a boy has been too far from facilities for education, and we have made an exception and taken him in rather than let him grow up in ignorance. There is no question about religion. No one is asked what his religion is. Nothing is done to turn them from their own religion. Every year I have a confirmation class at St. Stephen's, and if a boy tells me he has been brought up a Roman Catholic I do not take him in that class, but he has to attend the ordinary prayers and services.

74. Have there been any Roman Catholics or members of any other sect who have intimated to you that they were not members of your Church?—Yes; I ask them at confirmation class what their religion is, and if they are Roman Catholics I do not prepare them for confirmation. When a boy comes as a heathen it is pointed out to his parents that he must receive religious instruction as part of the trust. A boy who is a Roman Catholic or a Wesleyan, for instance, is not interfered with. I should like to add my strong protest against any scheme which would divert the use of this trust from its primary purpose—the carrying-on of spiritual work among the inhabitants of these Islands. The Church Missionary Society came to New Zealand and acquired this land for this purpose. I should consider the enforcement of such a scheme an unjust and wholly indefensible confiscation of private property.

GEORGE MAUNSELL, Clerk in Holy Orders, examined.

*Witness:* I am a son of the late Dr. Maunsell and a missionary of the Church Missionary Society. I desire to lay before the Commissioners the following statement, which contains the facts respecting the Waikato school trusts, so far as I understand them:—

These estates were given in the year 1853 for the support of schools in the Waikato already in operation. Buildings were erected on the sites thus given and the scholars moved into them, and for about ten years were maintained there by cultivating the soil and by grants from Government and help from friends of the mission. About three hundred men, women, and children were being educated under the supervision of the Rev. R. Maunsell, Rev. B. Y. Ashwell, and Rev. J. Morgan. The following extracts from reports to the Church Missionary Society by these missionaries show the object of these gifts:

The Rev. R. Maunsell writes (7th August, 1854)—“The Governor visiting the other institutions, it struck me that I also might get good for my school by a visit. Immediately on his arrival, Sir George Grey, at my request, applied to the chiefs for more land for the school. The people who owned this property (Kohanga) immediately came forward and offered it. I accepted the offer, and Sir George Grey discussed boundaries and obtained their signatures to the deed of surrender (*vide* ‘Maori Deeds,’ Vol. i.). The land was surveyed and a grant given before Sir George left. I hope soon to have all our party gathered together in our *kohanga* (nest).”—(Church Missionary Society Report, 1855, p. 215–16.)

The Rev. B. Ashwell (1853) *re* Taupiri Boarding-school—“The Natives have given 1,385 acres opposite Pepepe for the support of the school, for which a Government grant has been issued under the new legislation. The permanent maintenance of the Taupiri schools must eventually depend upon its success. Twenty acres are already under cultivation.”—(Report, 1854, p. 255.)

The Rev. J. Morgan (3rd November, 1853) *re* Puniu—“The block given up at Otawhao for my school when surveyed proved to be 870 acres. When this estate is brought under grass and stocked it ought to support, clothe, and educate a school of 300 children.”—(Report, 1854, p. 255.)

Again, Rev. B. Y. Ashwell (3rd July, 1854) *re* Pepepe—“In 1852 100 acres of land were given for a teachers’ institution at Pepepe, and eventually chiefs endowed that institution with 1,385 acres opposite to Pepepe.”—(*Church Missionary Gleaner*, 1855, p. 47.)

In 1863 war between the bulk of Waikato tribes and the Government broke up these schools, and no attempt was made to restore them until the 7th February, 1873, when the following resolution was brought forward by Hohaia, Ngahiwi at a meeting of the Native Church Board, the late Bishop Cowie being president, and the present Bishop of Waiapu acting as secretary. This was the initial meeting of that Board. “There are these lands given before this for establishing schools for the Maori children of these districts—viz., Kohanga, &c. This Board desires to know from the trustees what moneys are derived from thence in the year. In the opinion of this Board it is advisable that Maoris should be placed on the list of trustees for those places in conjunction with pakehas. The Bishop is requested to bring this matter before the General Synod.”—(Carried at Hopuhopu.) The Board met next year (1874) at Kohanga, the Bishop again presiding, when a similar motion was brought forward by Hori Kukutai. The discussions which ensued upon these resolutions affirmed the necessity for immediate steps being taken to reopen schools on those estates, the buildings still standing, and Government being willing to pay masters for day-schools; but nothing in that direction eventuated. I was present and interpreted for the Bishop at both meetings. Next year I was moved to Tauranga, and lost sight of these matters. In 1900, after twenty-five years’ absence, I returned and was appointed to Waikato, and in itinerating throughout that district was horrified to find that the buildings had disappeared and the estates were overrun with noxious weeds. The Natives I met strongly objected to the estates being let and no schools provided for, and blamed us, the founders of the above institutions. For three years I have been endeavouring to get them redress; first from the trustees, then in the Synod, but unavailingly. The Government were more sympathetic and were willing to rebuild at Kohanga, and I went thither with the Inspector of Schools, but found the whole estate of 750 acres let, only 5 acres at the churchyard being reserved to be fenced in by the tenant, who most inflexibly refused to allow any school to be built, as the scholars would disturb his stock and there was no recognised mode of access to a school. A sum of £200 was placed for Kohanga with the trustees by Archdeacon Maunsell in 1864, but does not appear to have been invested but hid in a napkin. At Hopuhopu the trustees promised to reserve 30 acres for a school and parsonage, but to make this estate available it is necessary to settle the parents on the estate as well—in fact, to make a model settlement under the eye and tuition of a Native priest who has been moved there and a small cottage built for him. At Puniu a like state of affairs to Kohanga prevails. There are only two Government schools in a district 150 miles long, whilst on the Bay of Plenty there are six or seven times that number in a like area and amongst a similar number of people.

#### *Notes on Debate re Schools at Hopuhopu, March, 1873.*

Heta proposed that schools should be established within the district; that the children be taught the Scriptures; that the parents should provide part of the maintenance—*e.g.*, clothing and food. They had begun in April of that year and charged a sixpenny fee per child, and had been at work for three quarters.

Mita Karaka: They wished to have schools. Why should the Government still require further sections for school-sites when they had already appropriated estates for that purpose—*e.g.*, Kohanga Maoris should be admitted into the Native School Trust.

Eruera Ngara: Where land has been given for schools the site for new schools should be taken for that. Once giving was quite enough.

Hohaia Ngahiwi: They had given estates. If leased, what were the proceeds? Let them be leased for Native-school purposes.

Hohua Nuanaroa: In 1853 Kohanga was given because the old site, Maraetai, was inferior land and belonged to the Church Missionary Society. Governor Grey wanted the school shifted to Otaki, and then Ngatitipa gave the land to prevent it. Governor asked for the land.

Heta: It was said that the land was to be given for our own children. Government still desired fresh sites for schools. What are the trustees doing with these lands? Why are they not leased? They have been lying idle for fourteen years.

Mita Karaka: He would press the resolution at future meetings. He asked whether the proceeds of these estates would in future be given to the schools.

The Bishop answered, “Undoubtedly.”

Eruera: What have become of the proceeds? On what terms does Mr. Pritt live here?

Rev. B. Y. Ashwell : If the land is not applied to the use intended in three years' time, let it be returned to the original owners to cultivate.

*Extracts from Hochstetter, 1859.*

Taupiri : The missionary school numbers 94 pupils—46 girls and 48 boys.  
 Otawhao is one of the principal stations of the Anglican Church. A church, a school, &c., meadows, and smiling fields have taken the place of an old Maori pa.  
 Upon the fertile banks of the Waikato, above Taupiri, there appear settlements with beautiful farm lands—Hopuhopu, Pepepe, &c.

*Deed of Gift, Kohanga, 1853.*

This is the word of us, the Chiefs of Ngatitipa, a tribe living at the mouth of the Waikato River. This is a deed of gift from us to Governor Grey as land for Queen Victoria and her heirs for ever. Yes, Governor Grey consented to this, that the land should be given to the Church of England in New Zealand as land for schools for the European and Native children, to cause them to grow up as church-members in good behaviour. Governor Grey consented that the place for the dead should be separated and fenced lest cattle, &c., should trample on it.

75. *Mr. Quick.*] Are you stationed in the Waikato?—No; I have been removed to Auckland, where I am doing Maori work. Occasionally I visit the lower Waikato. I still belong to the Church Missionary Society.

76. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you seen the £200 given by your father in any of the accounts?—Yes; in an account rendered to the General Synod a year or two back.

77. What was it given for?—The cattle belonging to the estate were sold at the time of the war, when the school was broken up, and the money was given for the benefit of the Kohanga school to the trustees.

78. Has it been invested?—No; it was put into the Native Pastoral Fund. I brought the matter before the Synod, and they passed a resolution *re* Kohanga that the trustees be instructed to try and get the tenant to concede a suitable site for a school, or else that they should purchase a site from an adjoining property.

79. Has the £200 disappeared?—They say the amount is still untouched, but the proceeds have been used and invested with other moneys of a similar character.

80. Was this invested in your father's lifetime?—It must have been.

81. Did he not protest?—I do not know whether he troubled himself about it. He died in 1894.

82. What is the quality of the land at Kohanga?—It is fair grass land. We used to cultivate it. The institution was an industrial one. The method of work was—so-many school hours and so-many hours working on the farm. We had a man named Spargo as agricultural instructor, who went out with the pupils.

83. What year did you return after your long absence?—In 1900. I know the land from 1855. I lived there for seven years and was for two years schoolmaster there—in 1860 and 1861. In 1900 the land was all overgrown with gorse.

84. It was at that time let on lease for twenty-eight years: does it strike you there was anything remarkable about the conditions of the lease—twenty-one years at 1s. a year?—No; I thought it was fair because of the dense gorse.

85. Then at the end of twenty-one years the rent was to be £37 10s.: what about that?—That is a very moderate rent; under present circumstances, I do not think it is a fair rent. There are large swamps there, but the present tenant gets 7s. a ton royalty on flax growing there. He must get from flax alone a great deal more than his rent.

86. Do you know that flax is taken off the estate?—I was told so by the Maoris, who told me last January they were paying Mr. Muir a royalty for it.

87. Present circumstances do not apply to eight years ago?—No; it was as much as they could get at the time they let it.

88. Do you know anything about the flax-market eight years ago?—No; I cannot say I do, but if I remember right, it was pretty good.

89. Are you able to understand the statement that the net income from the property since the foundation of the trust to June, 1904, has been £32 13s. 11d.?—It is the first time I have heard the statement. I have often wanted to get hold of it.

90. Does it come as a surprise to you?—I never knew that they had got any income from it.

91. You are surprised it is so much?—Yes.

92. *Mr. Quick.*] You have heard the prior evidence?—Part of the Bishop's and Canon Mac-Murray's; and I saw Mr. Cochrane's in the paper.

93. Your father having devoted a large portion of his lifetime to this particular district and the Natives, your sympathies are in the direction of having a local school?—Yes, undoubtedly; and the Maoris have impressed it on me that we have dealt unfairly with them in not having local schools.

94. They are petitioning to have the land given back to them?—But they want local schools, for all that.

95. Then their petitions do not represent their wants?—When you take petitions like that you have to look at the names. If they have all the names of the tribe they would be unanimous. I recognise several names in the petition (1898) *re* Hopuhopu.

96. Would those people whose names you recognise be under the influence of Mahuta?—They would do anything he instructed them to do; they would not do anything without his sanction; I should think they signed under his instructions.

97. At the time this petition was signed Mahuta and the Governemnt were not reconciled?—That is so; and I should say the same remark would apply to the petition *re* Puniu.

98. Were the King Maoris Christians at that time?—They were just giving up Hauhau-ism.

99. Then you would take these petitions to have been signed and presented by Maoris who were not Christians, and who were under the influence of a King who was estranged from the Crown?—Just so; they had only a short time before moved back into the district from the King-country.

100. Are they descendants from original donors?—Oh yes. I should say the signatures are genuine; the writing of some names shows that they were instructed in schools. I recognise some of the names as representing undoubtedly original donors.

101. Are they coming back to Christianity now?—They are willing to have services, and do not treat us with the opprobrium they used to. More than that, they like their Native minister very much, and petitioned that he should not be removed.

102. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any professed Hauhau-ism amongst them?—No, it has died out; they will listen to any one who holds service, no matter of what sect. The observance of Sunday is by Mahuta's proclamation.

103. *Mr. Quick.*] Where do you think the funds should come from to establish local schools?—From the Government.

104. Would the Government subsidise them?—The Assistant Secretary for Education, in a letter dated the 1st November, 1900, says, "This Department has for some time had before it the question of establishing a Maori school on the lower Waikato, and the Minister is prepared to carefully and favourably consider your proposal that Kohanga should be the site of that school."

105. The trustees are willing to fall in with that?—But they have let the site. It was their neglect; they should have reserved a site for the school. I proposed meeting a difficulty with the tenant in this way. I said the Natives did not require 5 acres for a burial-ground, that 2 acres were sufficient, and the other three would do for a school-site. But the Maoris were most indignant; they said it had been promised for a burial-ground.

106. *Mr. Wardell.*] Did you have any negotiations with the tenant?—Yes. He did not want a school, because the children would disturb his stock. After some interviews with the tenant, the Government sent a surveyor who marked out a very unsuitable site in a deep gully, and the Department objected. Another objection of the tenant's was, that it would have necessitated taking a road from one end of the property to the other, which he would have had to fence. He held the adjoining land, and said if the Department did build a school they should have no means of access to it.

107. *Mr. Quick.*] The trustees would facilitate it if they could?—Yes; but they had themselves locked it up.

108. Can you see any way of unlocking it?—No; the only way would be to compensate the tenant, or take it under the Public Works Act, or to prove that the trustees exceeded their powers in letting the block without reserving a school-site.

109. If that could be managed in some shape that would meet your difficulty?—Yes.

110. You would not do away with the scheme of scholarships to St. Stephen's for boys from the Waikato?—No; I would make the two work together. If there were schools in the Waikato, the best boys could be drafted off to St. Stephen's.

111. Your idea is that the trustees are doing the best they can with the funds, but they could do better if they had a site at Kohanga?—I say they made a mistake in not providing for a school-site.

112. Could the difficulty be got over by persuading the Maoris in regard to the cemetery-site?—Perhaps the Commission might be able to do so.

113. Would 2 acres be enough for the burial-ground?—They have been fifty years filling up a quarter of an acre.

114. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would the site be convenient for the school?—It would take in the site of the old schoolhouse.

115. *Mr. Quick.*] Why should the trustees not do it in spite of the Maoris, if they are unreasonable?—Well, they say "If you do it we will not send our children"; and the Government says, "If you will not come to terms with the Maoris we will not build."

116. *The Chairman.*] For what kind of school do you think 3 acres would be enough?—A day-school.

117. Are there any Native day-schools in the Waikato?—Only one opposite Huntly.

118. *Mr. Wardell.*] At the time the grant was made was the school at Kohanga in actual existence?—Yes, ten miles further down. Just after the grant was made the buildings were floated up the river and put on the ground. In regard to Hopuhopu, it is, undoubtedly, a great part of it poor land, but the Maoris were very anxious to get hold of it. We have spoiled it with blackberries and gorse. Poor land would not produce gorse to grow over a man's head. In 1875 the buildings were still there; Mr. Ashwell was living on the spot, and later it was in pretty fair order. I think the buildings were afterwards burnt down. It is kauri-gum land. I do not think the gum has been worked out of it. The gum is a valuable asset—so much so, that the Maoris used to go and pilfer the gum; and there is also flax, which should be of some value.

119. *Mr. Quick.*] Could any one get a living out of it?—The Maoris did till they had notice to quit. I think in some of the old accounts there is a statement that part of the revenue was from royalty on kauri-gum.

120. Would any one take it up for that purpose now?—I have no doubt they would.

121. *Mr. Wardell.*] When did you see it last?—At the beginning of last year.

122. Do you think the arrangements made in regard to rent and the lease were reasonable?—I think the trustees did well in regard to the lease.

123. Out of 1,300 acres there were only about 400 acres not leased?—I suppose that is the kauri-gum land.

124. *Mr. Quick.*] With what view would you settle Maoris on it?—I would make a model settlement and have the people close at hand to keep up a school there. My proposal is that they should give land, not to parents but to the children by nominal lease.

125. *Mr. Hutana.*] Are you a member of the Church Mission body who assembled at Hopuhopu in 1873?—Yes.

126. Was the object for which the meeting was called with a view to establishing schools in these parts?—Yes.

127. You would like to see schools established in these localities?—Yes.

AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JUNE, 1905.

W. S. COCHRANE (examination continued).

[Witness produced a further detailed statement of receipts and expenditure.]

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] How is it there are no rates between 1892 and 1898?—During Crawford's tenancy he paid the rates. During the present tenancy the tenant is paying them. There are no rates owing.

2. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know what is the rateable value of the property?—We have had no notice served on us. Native schools are all exempt from land-tax, and consequently the tenants are only rated for Road Board purposes. I think the rate used to be on a valuation of from 5s. to 6s. an acre, and now on about 10s. per acre. It may be more, because a good many improvements have been made during the last few years. I cannot say what the Government valuation of the land is.

3. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you received any account from the tenant showing how the £500 was expended?—No. He has written to say he has spent it. He did most of the clearing during the first two years.

4. Have you called on him for particulars?—Not yet; we intend to do so; his time is just up. I produce a list of boys maintained at St. Stephen's by the various trusts. The only accessible register is from 1892. The room was burnt down in 1904, and all prior registers are burned, so there is no means of telling what boys were maintained previous to that time. This list shows that we have maintained fifty-seven boys from the Waikato since 1892, of whom sixteen are still there. I produce particulars of the present lease of the property. In regard to Hopuhopu, I produce a statement of receipts and disbursements. I can find no trace of any receipts and expenditure during the years from 1854 to 1884. Part of the time there was a missionary—the Rev. B. Y. Ashwell, who had the use of the land, did all the improvements, and put up some buildings.

5. *Mr. Quick.*] In regard to the note at the end of your statement, you mean that during the whole of this time, if there was a balance, it was used for the maintenance of Waikato boys at St. Stephen's?—Yes. It was paid into General Account from year to year, and went towards the maintenance of the boys as far as it would go; the same applies to all the trusts. I produce particulars of the leases of the property now current.

6. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is it the same property that McDonald was paying £30 for that was let to Stewart for £12?—No; the former took the whole 1,385 acres. He was not a man of means, and he could not keep it. After that, efforts were made to let it in portions, and a complete survey was made with subdivisions. McDonald was the only tenant who took it as a whole. A reserve of 47 acres was set aside for the Maori clergyman stationed at Hopuhopu, for the purposes of a vicarage and maintaining himself. It was found to be too large; he could not keep it clear, and he agreed to allow a Maori, Piripi Pena, to have 32 acres.

7. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you any recollection whether in the early days, as far back as you can go, the noxious weeds were as troublesome as they are now—had they found their way into the Waikato?—Yes; the first time I went up I had them pointed out to me; there was sweetbriar, but not so much gorse.

8. *Mr. Wardell.*] Clearing gorse and rabbits seems an annual charge?—For some years it was.

9. Is that charge continuing?—No, the tenants have to do it now.

10. Are there any special covenants in any of the leases?—In some the first five years are free of rent, on condition that the tenants clear the land. They all have improvement clauses.

11. Is there any covenant for renewal?—Not in all; in some there is.

12. There is no increase in the rent?—No.

13. *The Chairman.*] How did you get the power to lease?—We acted on the advice of our solicitor. This is the opinion under which we acted, taken from the *Church Gazette*, December, 1904: "In pursuance of the instructions of the Synod last session, the Board obtained an opinion as to their legal position in regard to the leasing of country lands. The opinion was that the Board could exercise the powers of leasing conferred by the Public Bodies' Powers Act without restraint of any kind, the said Act giving power to grant leases for twenty-one years with covenants to grant renewals for periods of twenty-one years at any one time, or to provide for the payment for improvements at the end of the term, and that under section 5 of 'The Trustees Act Amendment Act, 1894,' it is within the powers of the Board to grant leases for twenty-one years, containing a provision for the renewal for a further term of twenty-one years at the same rental and on the same conditions. The General Synod were asked to empower trustees to grant leases under the provisions of 'The Public Bodies' Powers Act, 1887,' and Amendment Acts, 1891 and 1896, but the motion was lost because the Synod could not give such authority until clauses 24 and 26 of the constitution were repealed. The Synod, however, took the first steps necessary by passing a statute, and if this statute is re-enacted at the next session of the General Synod, it will then be competent for the Synod to invest trustees with those powers."



14. *The Chairman.*] Some of us are rather astonished to find a covenant of renewal at the expiration of twenty-one years for a further term of twenty-one years at the same rent: can you give any reason why this is not an imprudent arrangement?—My explanation is, that for many years the trustees have used their best endeavours, and have only succeeded in leasing two blocks for twenty-one years. They then offered to lease for twenty-one years, giving five years free of rent, and nobody would approach them. We got some of our neighbours to try and get tenants; we got many applications, but no one would take a twenty-one-years lease. The ground, they said, was in such a state that for the first five years there would be nothing but outlay, and for the next fifteen there would be nothing to be made out of it; they asked for a fifty-years lease straight out. The trustees, feeling the difficulties they were under, and being anxious to get rid of the annual expenditure of clearing gorse and destroying rabbits, consulted their solicitors as to the best way of extending the time, and they advised that leases could be granted for twenty-one years, renewable for a further term of twenty-one years. The trustees found no tenant would take it at twenty-one years subject to an increased rent at the end of that time.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] Did you call for tenders?—We called for tenders every few years.

16. *Mr. Wardell.*] I see no charge for advertising?—We did it by sending notices to Ngaruawahia.

17. *Mr. Quick.*] Who are the trustees?—A body of nine incorporated under the name of the General Trust Board, which holds other properties as well as those belonging to Native schools.

18. How often do they change?—There have been three changes in the last two years; some have been there a good many years.

19. *The Chairman.*] What is the nature of the soil after it is cleared and got into condition? what stock would it carry? is it agricultural or ploughable land?—There is a small flat near the river which would be agricultural, but the hills and swamps can only be pastoral. The swamps, with draining, would make good arable land.

20. What is the soil of the hills?—It is a loamy clay that might be worked into growing wheat, &c.

21. There has been a great change during the last five or six years in regard to the estimation in which people regard land on account of the dairying business, and so on?—That is the only reason we have been able to let any lately. There is better land in other districts, and this has been passed by. It is very uninviting, even to the eye. There are no nice-looking farms such as you will see further on in the Waikato.

22. *Mr. Quick.*] I was under the impression that Waikato soil is very poor generally?—From Mercer to Ngaruawahia, with the exception of Waerenga, it is very inferior.

23. Who are the trustees?—They are, at present, the Bishop of Auckland, and Messrs. J. Batger, H. Brett, R. A. Carr, J. Dacre, A. B. Robertson, S. Luke, and J. H. Upton. There is one vacancy; Mr. H. B. Morton is in England, and has resigned.

24. Were these the trustees when the leases were granted?—With the exception of Messrs. Carr and Robertson. In regard to Puniu, I produce statement of accounts and particulars of lease.

25. Under what circumstances was the rent reduced in 1890?—The tenant said he could not make it pay at the old rent. The first twenty-one-years lease had expired, and he took a verbal tenancy. Tenders being called in 1896, the next tenant got it for £50. The present tenant leases it, the rent for the first year being 1s.; the second year, £25; and the remainder of the term, fourteen years, £50 a year. There is no right of renewal. He has the whole estate.

26. *Mr. Hutana.*] Were the rents in these leases based on a valuation of the land?—No; they were not based on any special valuation; they were based on the best offers received after inviting applications. In regard to Pepepe, I produce statement of receipts and expenditure and particulars of lease.

27. *The Chairman.*] What is the explanation of this first year's rent £5, and £6 9s. 9d. spent in fencing?—I believe that was for a dividing-fence between another owner and this land. The first tenant only remained a year. He was the first tenant of the land that we know of.

28. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the explanation of the item "Legal expenses, £5 10s."?—Expenses in connection with attempting to let the property. The tenant never paid for the lease or more than one year's rent.

29. *The Chairman.*] From 1886 to 1893 you only received £5?—Yes. The tenant had the property for seven years at 1s. a year, for seven years at £5 a year, and the next seven years at £10 a year, on an improvement lease. He has no right of renewal.

*Mr. Quick.*] All these accounts are audited every year for the Diocesan Synod?—Yes, every year.

31. There is a Finance Committee in the Synod?—Yes.

32. And all accounts are overhauled in committee by the Synod?—Yes.

33. Can we take it for granted that up to 1864 the property was occupied as a mission station in which the instruction of Maoris was carried on?—I am not in a position to tell you what was going on; it was in the occupation of the missionaries.

34. It was not let to anybody?—No.

35. When boys are apprenticed from St. Stephen's, is a trade chosen for them by their parents, or how?—It is left to themselves or their parents to indicate what trade they would like.

36. *Mr. Hutana.*] Would you think it an improvement to add to the trades taught that of shoe-making?—I think it would be a great improvement.

37. Do you teach blacksmithing?—No.

38. Would it be advisable to do so?—Yes.

39. Do you teach tailoring?—No; they seem to choose work of a stronger class, such as coach-building and carpentering. Very likely tailoring would suit some boys. They do not choose it, because they have no knowledge of it.



40. Would it not find employment for them when they went back to their kaingas?—I quite agree it would suit many.

41. *Mr. Quick.*] If any boy chose that trade you would not object to apprentice him to it?—No. I should like to explain the position of the apprentices. The trustees have all they can do even with the income from St. Stephen's to keep the number of boys who are anxious to come to the school. When it is time for them to leave, having passed a certain standard, and they wish to choose a trade, the Government is approached; they agree, if they approve of the boy being apprenticed, that if St. Stephen's will maintain him they will pay for three years £12 a year towards his maintenance. The trustees have either to make up the difference or the boys have to pay it out of their wages. The boys generally start at a small wage and pay a very small sum the first year, a larger sum the next year, and so on. Without assistance from the Government we could not maintain them.

42. *Mr. Wardell.*] How much does the Government pay for each boy they send to the school from a Government school?—Eighteen pounds a year up to the beginning of this year; they are now going to pay £20.

43. Can you show us by the accounts of the school the cost of maintenance of children at the school?—Last year's accounts show we spent £1,461 16s. 6d. in maintaining sixty-seven boys.

44. *The Chairman.*] Can you furnish us with the same account for three or four years?—Yes; I will furnish the Commission with it later.

45. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many out of those who have gone up from the Waikato to St. Stephen's have been sent from Government schools?—Not one that I am aware of. The list does not contain the names of any boys from Government schools that I am aware of.

46. *The Chairman.*] Do the mission trustees send a report to the Diocesan Synod?—No.

47. Then you cannot give us any account of their expenditure at all?—Nothing at all. Their report would go to the General Synod, if anywhere.

48. You know some Maoris think a school could be established with advantage at Kohanga?—Yes; but maintenance depends upon means to maintain, and where the means are to come from the trustees cannot say.

49. Irrespective of the question of maintenance, are there enough people there to establish a school for?—I really could not say; but I have heard there are not. May I be allowed to put this in evidence? The trustees were approached for a school-site somewhere on the Kohanga property. The Education Department was moved to report on it as to whether it was desirable or not. I believe they reported in favour of it. The Department of Lands and Survey were instructed (I do not know by whom) to survey a site that might be approved of, and, either with the consent of the Maoris or with some one's consent, they marked a site alongside the burial-ground reserve. The plan was submitted to Mr. Muir, and he strongly objected to a road being taken right through his property which would necessitate considerable fencing; and besides this, a letter was received from the Natives stating that they objected to it. The trustees never made the move or wished to put the site there; they were willing, with the consent of the tenant, to give a site to be agreed upon on which the Government could establish a school.

50. *Mr. Wardell.*] The trustees have no power to give a site, having leased the whole property?—Yes; except the 5 acres for a cemetery, and it was thought a piece of that might be taken as it is not likely to be filled for a long time.

51. *The Chairman.*] This goes to show that if a site could have been procured a school could be partly established somewhere there. Did nothing happen afterwards to show that was not the opinion of the Government or any one?—I heard a rumour that the Education Department changed their mind, and, on further inquiry, found a school could not be maintained there.

52. The intention was for a primary day-school?—Yes.

53. There is nothing, so far as you know, in the circumstance that some Maoris thought a school could be put there—and the Education Department to a certain extent thought so—that goes to show that such a school as you would establish could be profitably put there even if you got the funds?—No.

54. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you think it would be an advisable thing to do, seeing that Victoria School and St. Stephen's are together in the same locality, to move one of them to Kohanga or to Hopuhopu?—I think it would give the boys more scope for obtaining certain technical instruction if they had more ground on which to work.

---

NGARUAWAHIA, MONDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1905.

ROKA HOPERE examined.

*Witness (to Mr. St. Clair):* I live at Taupiri. I am a licensed Native agent. I am the daughter of the Rev. Heta Tarawhiti, the incumbent of Taupiri during Mr. Ashwell's time. The evidence I give will be in reference to Hopuhopu and Pepepe. These lands were handed over by my parents and ancestors for a place on which to erect schools. After the lands were ceded schools were put on the land, and we were educated there. But they did not continue many years and then ceased. I commenced my education there and finished it in Auckland after the schools ceased. There are a good many in our family who did the same. At present there is no school on the land. The schools ceased in 1876; but from 1873 to 1876 the attendance fell off very much. The clergymen in charge at that time were the Rev. Mr. Ashwell and Archdeacon Pritt. I think the school started about 1859 or 1860 at Hopuhopu, but the school at Pepepe was considerably before that. It was established before I was born (1860). When I grew up and could talk there was no school at Pepepe; the school was moved from Pepepe to Hopuhopu. There have been three schools. Taupiri and Pepepe were contemporaneous. Mr. Ashwell established them a long time before the war. Taupiri is two miles from Pepepe. It is not included in the Pepepe grant. The big school was at Taupiri. From 1876 to the present

time there has been no school whatever on these lands. They are entirely covered now with black-berry, and for many years we asked the Bishop (Cowie) to return the land to us. In reply to our request, we were told that these lands were to supply funds for the maintenance of St. Stephen's, and he asked us to send our children there. But our minds were not satisfied with that, because we wish our girl children also educated with the boys, which could not be done at St. Stephen's; therefore we wanted the school on the land. Now, we think if they cannot establish the schools on the land let the land be returned to us; then we could perhaps lease the land and get money to send our children to the English schools. There is a girls' school in Auckland, and we have made application for admission for our girls to that school, and have been told we should have to pay £20 per pupil—that is, girls who have not passed a certain standard; we are not asked to pay for girls who have passed that standard. That being the case, we are enabled to make use of the school. Our earnest wish is that a school should be established on the very land we handed over, and if they will not grant us that concession we ask that the land be returned to us. In reference to Taupiri, there was a school there, and when the school ceased the land was returned to the Maoris. It was only lent for the Church Mission, and when the school ceased the Natives claimed it in the Native Land Court, and those who proved their claims got the land (1890).

1. The school was removed from Taupiri?—Yes; the school at Taupiri was for girls and at Hopuhopu for boys; they were kept separate.

2. It was only lent?—They intended to give it wholly to the Church Missionary Society, but it was never done; they never asked for a title.

3. *Mr. Quick.*] Is there any Government school for Maoris now in this part of the country?—There are Government schools, but they are distant from Maori settlements.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Which is the nearest to the Native population at Hopuhopu?—About half a mile from where the Maoris are numerous.

5. *Mr. Quick.*] What is to prevent the children being taught there, primary education, and then going to Victoria School and St. Stephen's?—The children say they are afraid of the European children—that they beat them. In regard to the Huntly School, the Maori children get beaten by the European children, and they will not attend the school.

6. *The Chairman.*] How many Native children are likely to be able to go to the school, if there were no such feeling?—If circumstances were different, probably about one hundred children would attend these schools.

7. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do any attend at the present time?—A good many do; in my locality about twenty, but a large number do not, being afraid of the European children.

8. *The Chairman.*] Do you really mean afraid, or have they an indisposition to mix with them?—I think it is really a disinclination to go, and they make the excuse of being afraid of the English. But if my children will not go I thrash them and make them.

9. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would this disinclination exist if there were a purely Native school?—That is rather difficult to answer.

10. The grant as given by Sir G. Grey says these schools are to be used for the education of children of all races: have you any reason to believe that is different from what the Maoris intended in giving the land?—Yes, it is different from what they intended, and probably the alteration was made after the land was given. I speak from hearsay—from my parents, who told me the land was given for the Maoris only.

11. *Mr. Quick.*] Do your children go to the Board school?—Yes, as there is no other school on these lands—two boys and two girls. The eldest has passed into the Fourth Standard.

12. And when she has passed that standard she can go to Victoria School?—Yes, that is so; but I wish my younger children to go there also.

13. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think your children would reach the Fourth Standard in a school which is purely a Maori school earlier than in a State school?—In regard to my own children, I should say they would pass the Fourth Standard quicker in a Government school.

14. Do you think the interests of the Natives would be most advanced by a mixed school or by a purely Native school?—From the point of view of the wealthier of the Native race, I think schools for the separate races would be the best. In the interests of the Maori race I should prefer an unmixed or wholly Maori school. That was the way I was educated—in a purely Native school.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] What do you mean by the "interests" of the Maoris—the educational interests, or what?—Firstly, the children would all attend the school, and they would be enthusiastic about it, and would attend to the instructions of their masters. That was the attitude of the Maori children in the old days. We paid great heed to our masters, and obeyed them; whereas in European schools the children would not have the same encouragement.

16. You said your children would get on better in a European school than if it were a Maori school: do you want to alter that opinion?—That is because I live as a European. But what I now say is in reference to my people who are not in the same position. When I said the children are afraid of the European children I was referring to the children of my tribe.

17. Is there any difference between your tribe and any other tribe?—The reason is that I live with the Europeans.

18. Is your husband a European?—He is a half-caste; but we live as Europeans.

19. Are there any purely Native Government schools in this district?—There is one a little below Huntly; I think about a hundred go to it. It is a boys' and girls' school.

20. Do the children go there by train?—No; it is only the children on the same side, the Rakau-manga, who attend the school. There is no road-bridge over the river; they use boats and canoes.

21. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you represent your people in reference to these two grants?—Yes; but a great many hapus gave the land; I only appear for mine.

22. Have not the various hapus met together and appointed some person to appear for them, so as to shorten the proceedings?—No, we have not, because we were taken by surprise as to the coming of the Commission.

23. If you had time could you arrange matters in that way?—Yes, I think so.

24. Are we to understand that a hundred is the total number of children handy to Pepepe and Hopuhopu?—Yes; there would be a body of about one hundred day-scholars. But if a school were built and a place for them to board, there would be a great many more than that. I should think there would be over three hundred. I do not believe there are more than ten Waikato children attending St. Stephen's School. I should like to see a school on the land somewhat similar to Mr. Ashwell's old school, on the same lines, where the masters would be in residence and clergymen to teach religion. The land was given for that kind of school, but in consequence of the war the thing was broken up, and the pupils were scattered.

25. Would you not like a more effective school than those old schools?—Of course that would be very much better if we could have it.

26. I mean more effective in the way of mechanical and industrial education?—That is what the Maoris would like now.

27. *The Chairman.*] Have you considered at all what the commencing cost of establishing such a school as you speak of would be, and what would be the necessary annual expenditure for its maintenance?—I have thought of that, and, no doubt, a large sum of money would be required.

28. How much do you think it would cost to begin with?—That is a question too difficult for me to answer.

29. How much would the annual expenditure be, do you think, for providing teaching, &c.?—I could not tell you.

30. If there is one such school established will not the other Natives interested in the several grants think there should be a school of the same kind on their places?—Yes, that might be so.

31. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think enough money would come out of the land for such a school?—Perhaps so, if it were leased; if you include all the back rents.

32. Do the Natives own any land round the boundaries of the Hopuhopu Block?—Some are Europeans and some are Maoris.

33. Has the Maori land been leased or dealt with in any way?—No, they are living on it.

34. Do they make use of it and cultivate it?—Yes, they cultivate it; not that adjoining Hopuhopu, but a little way off.

35. Are those lands in the same state in regard to overgrowth of scrub and woods as Hopuhopu?—Hopuhopu is alone in that respect—in regard to being covered with briar; the land this side of Hopuhopu is the same, but not the lands below, which are clear.

36. Is that due to difference in soil?—I think it is, because the people at that end are lazy. The part of Hopuhopu which is improved is that occupied by the Native clergyman and a small piece leased to a European. Pepepe is entirely overgrown.

---

NGARUAWAHIA, TUESDAY, 27TH JUNE, 1905.

NIKORO TAUTAU, Clerk in Priest's Orders, examined.

*Witness (to the Chairman):* In former days these lands were given by the Maoris to the Church of England for education purposes. At one time there were schools upon them, and a resident clergyman; and the reason why this ceased to exist was owing to the action of the Government, that is, the war which brought trouble, and owing to the war the school was removed to St. Stephen's, in Auckland, and the Church decided to lease these lands and to use the rents derived therefrom in support of the Auckland institution. But when they leased the lands they did not derive a very large revenue from them. Kohanga was leased to Mr. Muir, and owing to this, trouble began between the Board and the tenant. The trouble arose in this way: There were four subdivisions of the land; two parts were lands given by Maoris to the Church, one was given for a burial-ground, and the fourth was given for a fishing-station for the Maoris, and also for a burial-ground that was called Tikirahi. There were two burial-sites. When they leased the lands the lessee got three portions, and when the Natives wanted to have a school put there the 5 acres meant for a burial-ground was surveyed off for the school. At that time I was at Kohanga, and the Maoris told me they objected strongly to that arrangement; that they did not wish a school put on that sacred plot of ground. I spoke to the trustees, and we had a long discussion. I asked the Bishop to send some one to visit the spot and discuss the matter with the Maoris. When he who was sent by the Bishop returned, the trustees sent me a report on the matter. I sent it to the Natives at Kohanga to Tupaea Ruihana. The report was to this effect: that the Trust Board had agreed that the 5 acres was not to be diverted from the purpose of a burial-ground, but that they could not put a school on the other portion of the land because it was leased to Muir; but that if the Maoris could select a piece for the school-site the Board would send the money to purchase a site outside the block; and that they were not to be anxious about Tikirahi—the fishing-station—if that was included in the lease, it could not be helped. Our talk about the land ceased at this point. In regard to Hopuhopu, I corroborate what Roka Hopere said. Hopuhopu is surrounded by European residents, and it would be a good thing if there were a school at it. But there would be a drawback in the fact that very few children are near; it would be difficult to get together thirty children. I approve of a separate school for Maoris, because it depends a good deal on the teacher. Some teachers take an interest in Maori children and some do not. I had a little child whom I sent to school for two years, and I was told the child was never taught, and she knew nothing at all; and in the case of the Hukanui School the Natives took away their children owing to one of their girls being beaten by a

European boy. That is a Government school for European children which Maoris used to attend. When the parents approached the master about the matter he paid no attention to them, and gave them no sympathy. The girl was, in consequence of the beating, three weeks in the hospital. After that I spoke to the people of Hukanui (which is nine miles from Taupiri and eleven from Hopuhopu) and asked them whether they would like a school at Hopuhopu, so that their children might go there, and they approved of that. When I approached the Taupiri people to send their children, they said they could not do so without Mahuta's sanction. I went to Mahuta, and he said, "I will reply to your request by-and-by." He has not given a reply yet. In reference to what Roka Hopere said yesterday, that a large school should be established in this district (Hopuhopu), I believe if a school like that were built you could get four hundred children for it. It is easy of approach, and accessible from all parts. Kohanga is too far away, and difficult to get at. Then we are met with the difficulty that it would take, perhaps, £20,000 to establish a school, and that the lands are quite inadequate for that. I would suggest this: the land of the Waikato people has been confiscated by the Government, and, therefore, the Government should give enough land to maintain the school. The administration complained of by the Church in reference to these lands is a very small matter compared to the injury the Government has done the people of Waikato; therefore it is proper that they should find land for the schools. I think the first Commission they should send here should be a Commission to inquire into the attitude of the Government in reference to supplying land for the landless Natives; and when the mote has been taken out of the Government's eye it will be time for the Government to remove the beam from some one else's eye.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] You say from three to four hundred children would attend a central school?—Yes, quite that number, perhaps more.

2. Would they attend a school run on the lines of the ordinary Government Native schools, or a development of something beyond—a school something after St. Stephen's type, an industrial and technical school—they would attend a school of that class?—Yes, I think so, if the Government ran it. For instance, myself and W. Graham are suggesting that a school should be established at Hopuhopu or Hamilton. The latter said if it was at Hamilton he would give them some land on which to put it. Then we looked about to see how we could raise the funds and we could not see how to do so. So the matter rests. I forgot to say this, there is a piece of land surveyed by the Government off Tauwhare—10 acres, divided into three parts, a church-site, a site for a Courthouse, and a school-site—and I have requested the Government, in compliance with the wish of the Natives, to build a school on that block. I ask the Commissioners to put this in their report and urge the Government to give effect to this. They have consented to have the school built, but they are too long about it. There is a school at Tauwhare, but the Maoris want a separate school for themselves.

3. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the objection to sending pupils from here to St. Stephen's?—A great many reasons. The first is, after the war the Maoris refused to send them to any school at all. They said the war was caused by the Church, and their children would be instructed in a way which would mean their own destruction. Now a change has come over them, and they want schools. They sent some to St. Stephen's, but when they sent others they were told the school was full, and they were sent to the Government Board schools in the Waikato. The various schools are Rakaumangamanga, Te Kohua, Parawera, and Mangatautari. The number attending the schools are: Te Kohua, forty at first—in five years there were none, and when the next lot of children got old enough the school went on again; at Parawera there are forty attending; I cannot say how many there are at Mangatautari; at Rakaumangamanga there are about sixty. They are all primary schools, there are no boarding-schools.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you consider the maintaining of the children is important: would they go without being maintained?—Of course, if there were no provision for maintenance only the neighbouring children could attend.

5. That would mean about thirty?—Yes.

5A. Can you tell us the distance between these schools?—From Rakaumangamanga to Te Kohua it is forty miles; thence to Parawera about thirty miles; thence to Mangatautari about twenty miles; that is as nearly as I can say.

6. Are there any Native schools conducted by the Church of England or any other body?—No.

7. Can you give any idea of the number of Native children who do not go to school?—That is a difficult question to answer. Including the Waikato proper, beginning at Kohanga and Whaotū, there would be about three hundred who do not go to school. There is a school at Whaotū. In the district between Matamata and Tauwhare there are about eighty who have no school.

8. *Mr. Hutana.*] A large school here would be a good thing, but there is no money?—Yes.

9. You suggest the Government should have a school and run it?—Yes; if the Government take the matter in hand a good strong school could be run. I live on one of the sections at Hopuhopu. The soil is peculiar; it has poor characteristics. Portions are swampy, part is hilly, and part is flat; the flats are very good, but a portion of the flat land—about 100 acres—is pumice. There are four different qualities of land.

10. What do you raise on the portion you occupy?—On the rich part I put 1½ acres in oats, and got 3 tons of chaff off it. The hilly land is some of it good and some very bad. In regard to the swampy portion an expenditure of about £80 is required to drain it. The hills are gum-land.

11. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is any gum taken off the hills now?—At one time there was, but none at all now. In a very dry season you might get some out of the swamps.

12. *Mr. Hutana.*] If the swamp were drained you might get some?—Yes.

13. *Mr. Wardell.*] You are aware portions of the land are leased : do you know the terms on which they are leased ?—There were two portions leased before, and this last year the balance was all leased. The leases were made in this way : five years the tenant was to have the land free ; for twenty-one years at 1s. an acre. One portion of the land was set aside for a residence for the minister—47 acres—and also for a school-site.

14. Is there a right of renewal ?—All I know is from hearsay.

15. Are you satisfied that the terms of the lease are fair under the circumstances ?—Yes, it is a fair rent seeing that the land was encumbered by blackberries and briars.

16. If you think that is a fair rent and the area is 1,300 acres, the total revenue to be derived from the whole estate is about £65 a year ?—That is a fair rent, because a man going on it would have to spend £5 an acre before he got any return.

17. You recognise that £65 would be an insignificant sum to apply to the maintenance of a school ?—Yes.

18. Do you think while the trustees have only that income they can appropriate it better than by paying the expenses of boys at St. Stephen's ?—No, they could not.

19. Do you recognise in this list of boys attending St. Stephen's any boys from this neighbourhood ?—I recognise six as coming from the Waikato—Henry Marshall, Tena Poiwhare, Te Huka Kaaho, Tainui Kaaha, William Amukiti, and Pene Coffin.

20. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you approve of a girls' school and a boys' school at St. Stephen's being so close together ?—It is a dangerous thing to lay fire and powder close together.

21. Would you not think the plan adopted at Te Aute and Hukarere the better plan ?—Yes.

22. *Mr. Quick.*] One of the rules at St. Stephen's is that the boys are not to go near the girls' school : did you ever know that rule broken ?—No.

23. Then there is no danger so long as this rule is kept ?—That is so.

*Mr. St. Clair :* The last witness has laid the matter fully before the Commission. I wish to add that the reason we, in the scheme I shall lay before you, ask the Government to assist in carrying it out is that the Maoris have suffered severely, not only the loyal Natives on the West Coast, but those who assisted the Government Commissariat Department by conveying goods up the river in canoes to the danger of their lives. Yet they lost the greater part of their land, and we consider it is not asking too much to ask the Government to assist in educating their children.

*The Chairman :* It is not so much our business to inquire whether the Government ought to assist in some scheme, but whether we ought to say the past administration of the present trustees has been satisfactory, or, if not, in what sense it could be improved ; that is practically what we have to say.

*Mr. St. Clair :* We recognise the difficulty, in that the lands are leased, and to get them back would mean compensation to the tenants. That position will have to be faced. The lands are in bad order, and it would cost a considerable sum to put them into a proper state of cultivation so as to produce revenue. But we are providing for all that in our scheme, which I now lay before you on behalf of the Natives. (See Appendix P.)

#### WIREMU KARAKA TE AHO KUKUTAI examined.

*Witness (to Mr. St. Clair) :* I live at Tauwhare, near Kohanga. Whata Kukutai was my grand-uncle. He was the head of the tribe, and gave Kohanga to the Church ; I remember him doing so. I could not tell you how old I was at the time. My father was alive at the time, and took a prominent part in the gift. He was a catechist. The land was given for the purpose of educating us near our kaingas. Ngatitipa gave the larger piece and Ngatipo the smaller. A school was established there shortly after.

24. Besides being taught in the ordinary school-work, were they taught agriculture ?—Yes, some were.

25. Did you grow sufficient produce on the land to support the school ?—Yes.

26. What did you grow ?—Wheat, potatoes, sheep, and cattle. We ground the wheat in a mill.

27. Who built the mill ?—The Maoris ; its remains are still there on the boundary of the land.

28. During your time how many boys were at the school ?—Two hundred.

29. Had you any difficulty in finding food for them ?—No difficulty.

30. The land was sufficient to support them all ?—Yes ; of course the Maoris used to supplement the supplies from their own places.

31. Did you learn carpentering or blacksmithing, or industries of that kind ?—Yes.

32. Who put up the buildings you used to live in ?—Europeans.

33. Did any of the boys assist ?—No.

34. Explain the position of the various sections of the land—the piece that Ngatitipa gave and the piece that Ngatipo gave ?—Five acres was given for a burial-ground, and was reserved by our parents. Tikirahi was cut out of the ground for our use and also for the burial of the dead. It was to be used for fishing purposes—for whitebait and eels. We live there now.

35. You have heard the proposals submitted to the Commission : do you approve of the proposal to establish schools at Kohanga, Hopuhopu, Puniu, or Te Awamutu ?—No ; I want the land returned to us.

36. When you say you want it returned to you, you mean to the whole tribe or the descendants of those who gave the land ?—I want it given back to Ngatitipa, the hapu who gave it. When the land is returned to me, I would like a school put on it.

37. Will you be satisfied if the land is vested in trustees for that purpose ?—No, I am rather troubled about that. What I want is the land given back.

38. Supposing the Government will not give the land back to you ?—All I say is, the school has

ceased, and let the Government give us back the land.

39. If we could restore the state of things which existed when Archdeacon Maunsell was alive, would you be satisfied?—Yes, I have no objection to that school; but I want the land given back to the donors.

40. Supposing the Government will not give it back, would you be satisfied if a proper school were endowed and established at Kohanga?—I have no objection to the school, conditionally on the Government giving us back the land. Let a small area be cut off for a school.

NGATETE KARAKA TE AHO examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. St. Clair): I live at Wairamarama. I am a grand-nephew of Kukutai. I was educated at Kohanga; I was there at the same time as last witness. Generally, I support his evidence as to the purpose for which the land was given.

41. Can you give some idea of the number of children likely to attend a school at Kohanga if it were to be established?—About forty.

42. Including those at Pututaka?—Yes, and Wairamarama, somewhere near the site of the old school.

43. Are they not going to school at present?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Wardell.*] The land below Kohanga belongs to whom?—It belongs to us.

45. It is not in the occupation of Europeans?—No.

46. And that above Kohanga?—It belongs to the Maoris.

47. Is the land about there all the same quality?—Some parts are good and some inferior.

48. How do you account for the difference in the appearance of the lands, the Maori land on both sides being clear?—One is covered with weeds and the other is not.

49. How many years has Mr. Muir been there?—Five or six.

50. Has he done much to clear the ground of rubbish?—Yes, he has cut it down, but it grows up again.

51. It is much clearer of weeds now than four or five years ago?—I do not think it is much improved.

52. The Maori lands alongside look clear of weeds: is that so?—Yes, that is so. The reason of that is that noxious weeds did not get there. The missionaries brought the briar there.

53. *Mr. Hutana.*] Did the briar spread to the boundary but not get across?—It did not spread across the creek.

54. Were they hedges?—Yes, the missionaries thought it a good thing for hedges.

55. Do you approve of the scheme submitted by Mr. St. Clair?—Yes.

56. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you agree with what the last witness said?—Yes.

57. *Mr. Wardell.*] In respect to what?—In reference to the gift of the land for school purposes, and, further, that the land should be returned to the donors.

58. Do you give a reason for asking for its return?—Because our parents gave the land for a school for us to go to; and we having given land for a site on which to put a school, I ask the Commission to consider the matter from that point of view, because the school has now ceased.

59. If the school were re-established, would not that carry out your wish?—Yes; but all the land is not required for a school. A small area would be sufficient.

60. How would the school be maintained if there were only land for a site for a school and playground?—The school land would support it. But 700 acres is too much; they should reduce the area.

61. Are you identified at all with the scheme put forward by Mr. St. Clair?—I approve of the scheme.

KAPENE MATENGA examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. St. Clair): I live at Tauranga, near Kohanga. I cannot tell you my age.

*Mr. St. Clair:* He was an old man at the time of the war; he is probably ninety.

62. Do you remember when Whata Kukutai gave Kohanga to the Church?—Yes, it was at a big meeting, at which I was present.

63. Tell us what occurred at that meeting?—Archdeacon Maunsell spoke first, saying, "Send your children to school, so that they may be taught the English language, and become ministers." We approved of that. He further asked them for a piece of land for a site for a school, and the meeting replied, "Yes; and when the school has done its work the land is to be returned to us." They did not want the school for teaching Europeans; the school was to be a Maori school. That is the gist of what took place.

64. Do you represent Ngatitipa only or Ngatipo also?—I am speaking on behalf of Ngatipo only.

65. Were there any Ngatipo at the meeting?—Yes.

66. Did they give land also?—No, they gave no land.

67. Do you know of any gift of land by them?—I do not.

68. Do you know of a great quarrel between the two tribes, to settle which they gave the land to the Church?—I remember the fight.

69. Do you remember the terms of the peacemaking?—I remember the peacemaking.

70. Do you remember the land being given to the Church, so that neither party should have it?—No.

71. Do you know if Katipa and Tiata took part in that quarrel and peacemaking?—Yes.

72. And they agreed to sink all their differences for their children's benefit?—Yes.

73. And that was the reason the land was handed over for the Church?—This land at Hikutoroa was with the Government, and they gave the Ngatipo £100 to make the peace.

74. *Mr. Wardell.*] Who made the remark about the land being returned to the Natives after the school had done its work?—Our committee made that condition.

75. What was the reply to that?—Archdeacon Maunsell made no reply; he neither said “Yes” or “No.”

76. *Mr. Quick.*] That was some years before the war?—Yes.

77. What made you expect the school would come to an end?—We did not know when it would cease, but we thought when the children were educated it would cease, and the school did cease.

78. Did you not expect your children to always want education?—But the school has ceased.

HONE PATENE (JOHN BARTON) examineu.

*Witness* (to Mr. St. Clair): I reside at Whatawhata. I know Hopuhopu and Kohanga, and I know the object for which they were given.

79. Explain your own personal experience of education of the Natives, and the result?—I was born in 1858, at Three Kings, Auckland. At that time there was a very large school there, one of the largest in New Zealand; it was a Wesleyan school. I was not educated there. But I can speak from knowledge and hearsay of large questions concerning these endowments, and the evidence I can give will bear upon these trust reserves. The school at Three Kings was for the purpose of educating the Natives in English, and teaching them industrially and technically. Blacksmithing, carpentry, and farming were taught there. My elder brothers and sister were taught at that school. Some were taught farming, others carpentry, and others were given a commercial training to fit them for clerks, &c., When I was quite an infant my parents and brothers and sister returned to our home at Whatawhata. It was after that time the lands at Hopuhopu and Kohanga were administered for the benefit of Maori schools. My father, who was a Wesleyan clergyman, took part in the management and administration of those lands, supporting the work and efforts of the Church of England. He was not a salaried man; he worked for nothing.

80. *Mr. Quick.*] Was he acting as a Wesleyan minister at the time? Had he a parish of his own?—Yes, he was in charge of the Waipa Parish.

81. Do you mean he encouraged his children to go to these schools?—The reason of that being that he was related to Ngatitipa and other donors of the land. He would go to the Maori kaingas and urge them to support these schools by sending their children. My father had his own private school, and my sister Martha was the teacher of it. She set aside 25 acres of land for that school, and when Sir Donald McLean visited the district in 1869 he gave assistance to that school from Government money. The subjects taught there were farming and English and Scriptural knowledge. When I passed the Fourth Standard in that school I went to the grammar-school in Auckland. The evidence I wish to give is in the direction of showing that the most advantageous school for Maoris is a technical one—that is, the most suitable for Maoris who are landless; but those who have land should be taught farming. As to higher education such as being lawyers, engineers, &c., that will not benefit the Maoris just now. And the expense of sending children to the higher English schools is too great; they have not the means for it, except an odd Maori here and there. The first thing to teach a Maori child is to know the difference between right and wrong, and it is detrimental to the child if he is sent into an English school before he knows that difference. When I went to Auckland I was the only Native there; and I was taught a great many bad things by the European boys, including bad language. But, because I had been well instructed in the difference between right and wrong at the school at home, I was able to discriminate when amongst European boys. A great many boys are sent to schools in European centres, and when they return home they develop into worse characters, the reason being that they are sent when they have had no home training. If a school were established here in a Maori centre away from the temptations of towns, it would be productive of very great good. And let all teachers be married men; and the teaching should be not only for boys but for girls also. In fact, the girls want training more than the men. Now that we have been placed on the same footing as Europeans in regard to paying rates, the Government should support our request for a school. I would raise money by subscription for my part of the scheme. There are 40,000 Maoris in New Zealand, and they pay at the rate of £2 per annum, which is equal to £80,000, in Customs and so on. From that you can see we do our share towards supporting the government of the country. In regard to the small children, they are quite unfitted to attend the schools in Auckland, and they have not the means to maintain them in Auckland. I strongly support the evidence given by Roka Hopere and the others.

82. *Mr. St. Clair.*] You have read the scheme as to establishing three schools?—Yes, and I thoroughly support it.

83. What is your experience as to the result of Natives being properly trained in farming?—I am one who was taught farming. I began when I was seven years old. I am now forty-seven, and I have formed a farming company in my hapu under a document legally drawn up. This company has been in existence now for fifteen years. Before it was formed my hapu were digging gum, and made nothing out of it; they were badly off and drank and wasted their money. Now they are able to buy buggies worth £60, and drive about in them, from the proceeds of the company. The money with which we started was obtained through bush contracts, and with it we invested in buying cattle. The grass-seed with which we sowed our farm was grown by ourselves. If you visited the station you would think it was a European one. We receive fees for our pedigree bulls, and we get as much as £30 for them when selling them. We are farming 25,000 acres of our own land in the Parish of Waipa. I wish to illustrate that owing to my experience in being instructed as a farmer I was able to lead the people on to the land, and got it improved in this way. There is nothing better for a Maori to learn than to be taught how to farm. I strongly support the establishment of the three schools.

84. *Mr. Quick.*] Would it not meet all requirements of the scheme if the Government sent experts to teach the Maoris to farm?—That would be a very good thing. We breed pigs and cattle. It is not suitable land for sheep; it is too damp. It grows wheat and oats.



85. Your argument is not so much in favour of a school as in favour of an expert to teach farming?—That is what I mean. I merely give the illustration that there are Maoris capable of doing this kind of work, and therefore, if a school were established, I would say it is quite easy to teach Maori children.

86. *Mr. St. Clair.*] Could the schools be made self-supporting?—If the children were taught how to farm, they could grow the produce on the land and sell the portion not required, and that money could be applied to the maintenance of the school. I think the school would be self-supporting if competently managed, and if they were supported by subscriptions from benevolent people; and for my part, I would certainly contribute towards their maintenance. If you do not do something for the Maoris, in twenty or thirty years they will disappear. But you can see in me and my hapu an example of how they are able to rise and make a good living. I have done all this without payment or asking for payment. If Mahuta and Kaihau and other leading chiefs follow my example they could do the same. If the thing is taken up in real earnest it is quite easy to do. But you cannot do anything without energy.

87. *Mr. Quick.*] You had a little knowledge of agriculture with a great deal of energy?—That is so. But the mana and power of Mahuta and Kaihau far exceeds mine, and if they adopt my plan they could do a great deal more. I am not a chief.

88. Would there be difficulty in getting Mahuta and Kaihau to get an expert to teach farming?—I cannot say; I do not know what they have in their minds. In my own opinion, I thoroughly appreciate the idea. It would be much easier for an expert to teach young people than grown-up people; therefore, if the schools were established and experts sent, the thing would work satisfactorily.

89. *Mr. Wardell.*] How is Pepepe used now?—I could not tell you.

90. How is Hopuhopu used?—On one portion there is a Native minister located who has cleared the land of weeds.

91. Taking your knowledge of the whole estate, do you think it is in a condition in which it could be utilised for the establishment and support of a school?—At present it is much overgrown with briars and stuff; but if a school were established it could soon be cleared and made good land, because in my infancy it was good land.

92. We have been told the land is let at 1s. an acre for twenty-one years, with right of renewal for another twenty-one years at the same rate: do you think that is judicious management of the land on the part of the trustees?—No, I do not.

93. Does it in any way represent the value of the land?—What depreciates its value is the noxious weeds.

94. Well, taking the fact that they are there?—I give it as my own opinion that it is not an adequate rent for the land.

95. To what do you attribute the present condition of the land?—The reason is bad management on the part of the missionaries; you can see it has been badly managed.

96. When did the troubles connected with the war cease, so that men could reoccupy their lands?—It was after 1866.

97. It was in 1863 the missionaries left the lands?—No; Mr. Ashwell remained. He left in 1872.

98. When did the neglect begin?—About 1877.

99. When did the neglect extend to?—Up to the present time. The lessee cannot overcome the weeds. It was in good order up to 1877.

100. What portion was under cultivation at that time?—I could not tell you the area, but it was the piece between the train and the river. The flat was the part that was cultivated.

101. Were the hills free from scrub, or the reverse?—At that time the hills were free of briars; the whole land was free of briars.

102. *Mr. Quick.*] What was growing on the hills at that time?—Nothing but fern.

103. Did not the place become neglected because the Waikatos would not send their children to school?—Mr. Ashwell was a bad manager; he did not manage the school well.

104. He was a great many years there, was he not?—He became too old for the position, and so the children ceased to attend.

105. Was it not because the Maoris were sulky about the war, and would not send their children to school?—These Maoris were loyal and never left the district at all. My father supplied the troops with food for three weeks for nothing. Bishop Selwyn was a great friend of my father's.

106. Do you not know the petition was signed by Mahuta and his people?—Yes.

107. It is not the loyal Natives who moved in this matter?—I could not say unless I saw the names. The purpose for which these lands were given was for the support of schools. After getting into the hands of the Church they diverted the purpose for which it was given.

108. Do you know anything about St. Stephen's School?—The only thing I know is we cannot get our children there; the majority are sent back. They are very stringent in admitting children. A great many are seeking admission, and they cannot get there. It may be owing to lack of accommodation or owing to regulations.

109. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are any of the buildings still on Hopuhopu or Pepepe?—No; they rotted away.

110. *Mr. Quick.*] Is all your 25,000 acres good land?—Yes.

111. How many people are there in your hapu?—About sixty; with succession orders the number has increased now. I have 25 acres set aside for school purposes, but we do not require a school there, because the Government school is handy.

112. If it takes 25,000 acres to keep sixty people, do you think any of these reserves would keep sixty people?—Of course you know it would not; but they were given for a special purpose.

113. Do you know the whole of the money from these lands is devoted to school purposes?—If it is true that they are expended in support of St. Stephen's. But why are our children not received?



114. Do you suggest they are not doing the best they can with the money?—I would say the rents should be applied in support of a school at Hopuhopu if it can be got.

115. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would an increase in the number of Government Native schools in the district and a central industrial training-school, in your opinion, meet the requirements of the district?—If you can get that done it will meet all requirements. We want all our children to go to school regularly and as soon as possible. My idea is that the best thing they can do is to cast aside all old customs and teaching, and take hold of the pakeha teaching—wipe away all hapu distinctions and all distinctions of rank, and adopt pakeha customs. That is the only way in which they will save themselves. The living in communities must be done away with, and tangis should cease.

116. *Mr. Quick.*] You do not object to religious instruction in schools?—I approve of it; it is a matter of great importance.

117. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think that religious teaching can be given in any one school which will be acceptable to Wesleyans and Church of England and every sect?—My opinion is that no attention should be paid to distinctions between denominations; the word of God should be taught without reference to sect.

118. Do you wish for undenominational religious teaching and the teaching of the two races associated in the same school?—Undenominational teaching and the teaching of both races; that is how I was taught—with European boys.

119. *Mr. Quick.*] Were you taught undenominational religion?—I was intended to be brought up as a Wesleyan clergyman; but I did not agree with the distinction between sects, and I did not become one.

120. Do you mean you would like a Church of England school to which any one could go?—Yes; that is how I was taught. There was very little difference between Wesleyans and Church of England as I was taught.

121. That is what you admire?—Yes. Roman Catholics came to the school, but when the religious instruction came on they were allowed to go away.

#### PANA TIRUA examined.

*Witness.* What I have to say is similar to what Kapene Matenga said about Kohanga. I was one of the children who attended the school, and my mother was one of Archdeacon Maunsell's young women about the station. I corroborate what the old man said about the meeting. I heard it said that the land was given to educate the children. I was grown up at the time. I was married about the time the land was given. We children were all told the land was given for our benefit and education. The school was kept there till the war, when it ceased when Mr. Maunsell left. When he went away the Ngatitipa gave him another piece of land. When he went away we concluded he had abandoned the land and that it had been given back to us. They did not expect him back again.

122. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you suggest, when you gave Archdeacon Maunsell this other piece of land he gave up Kohanga to the Natives?—No; it was a gift. When Archdeacon Maunsell left we lived on the Kohanga land till the houses rotted away, and a great many are buried there, and a great many in the 5-acre cemetery.

123. Do you make any complaint about the management of the land since Mr. Maunsell left?—I do not agree with Mr. G. Maunsell's suggestion that part of the 5 acres should be taken. We want the school at Kohanga.

124. Where would you like it?—At Kohanga.

125. Is there not room on the piece you are living on?—It would be within call from where we are living.

126. Where do you want the children of your village taught?—I say, return Kohanga to us and we will get a school put there. I object to Mr. Maunsell suggesting anything, because his father went away. When the land is returned we will approach the Government, and they will put a school there. We do not approve of the lease to Muir.

#### TAHUNA HERANGI examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. St. Clair): I live near Ngaruawahia. I was not educated at any of these schools; I was educated at Te Kohua. I do not belong to the Waikato Tribe. I can say nothing in reference to these lands, but in reference to the existing schools. My wife belongs to the Waikatos, she is a sister of Mahuta. A few years ago I sent my children to the St. Stephen's School, but the committee of management would not receive them; yet they are connected with these lands that form these trusts, and would have a right in Hopuhopu, and Kohanga, and Puniu.

127. *The Chairman.*] What reason was given when they declined to take them?—The answer was that they could not take children of rank like mine—that I was in a position to pay for them. But I say these schools were set aside for Maori children irrespective of rank or position. St. Stephen's is supported by these trusts, and I can safely say the Waikato children who have been admitted at present do not exceed ten. During all the time from 1892 to the present time not more than twelve Waikato children have been admitted to that school. Others have been admitted from Ngatimaniapoto, and from Kawhia and Raglan. I think a large amount of the money which belongs to the Waikatos is being spent in support of other children. In regard to the kind of school I would support, I approve of what John Barton said, that special schools should be erected for the Waikato people. A school is a very important matter indeed. The majority of the children in the Waikato are running at large; there might be about five hundred not attending school. In the Waipa there are quite three hundred from Ngaruawahia to Whatawhata, including Hone Patene's people. If there were a school at Hopuhopu it would be most beneficial to the Maori children in this district; but there must be buildings for the maintenance and boarding of the children on the plan suggested by Patene, and they should be taught trades and callings. I have heard the scheme and I approve of it.

128. *The Chairman.*] Do you think St. Stephen's is a good school?—Yes, so far as it goes, seeing that it only contains a limited number.

129. If all the land was properly let and all the money laid out in paying the expenses of pupils from these districts at St. Stephen's, would that be a good plan?—Yes, that would do; but it would be much better to have it here if there are enough funds.

130. One school for all the reserves?—I would like St. Stephen's to be left where it is, and have one special school for all these places.

131. Where should it be?—At Hopuhopu, I think; it is nice, dry, warm soil.

132. *Mr. Wardell.*] Which is better, Hopuhopu or Pepepe?—Hopuhopu.

133. Failing Hopuhopu, would Pepepe do?—Yes; one is on one side of the river and the other the other.

134. What became of the Ngapuhi boys from St. Stephen's that were driven down here?—I do not see why the Waikato lands should maintain Ngapuhi boys. I only suggest that Waikato boys should be educated on Waikato soil.

135. *Mr. Hutana.*] If you established a school at Hopuhopu, would you object to Ngapuhis going there?—There would be no objection to that.

136. *Mr. Quick.*] St. Stephen's is more central for all, is it not?—Yes, that is so. But you must remember it is about twenty years since the Waikatos returned to the river, and during all that time the children have not benefited by St. Stephen's, and have not gone there. This year I tried to get my girl into Victoria School, but they would not receive her. They said I could afford to pay for her.

137. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are they right in saying that?—No; I am not a moneyed man.

138. *Mr. Quick.*] Did you offer to pay anything at all?—I thought if I sent them vegetables and produce of that kind that would meet the case, and I wrote offering to do so.

139. Are you in receipt of rent from any lands let?—Yes, but it is a mere nothing. My wife's lands are leased. I have some land (100 acres) for which I get £150; that is payable to six children. I have a farm in the Waipa Valley, and I have land in the Maniapoto, which is lying idle. My brothers are occupying it.

140. How much do you get out of your wife's land?—I could not tell you.

141. *Mr. Hutana.*] How many of your six children go to school?—One went to St. Stephen's, some went to Three Kings.

142. It is being carried on still?—Yes; but I did not agree with the way in which it was carried on.

143. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many children from Waipa district attend the Government Native schools or State schools?—None.

144. Are there any Government Native schools in the Waipa district?—No; there is one at Huntly.

HURA TEREMI TE AHO KUKUTAI examined.

*Witness:* I come from Kohanga. When Archdeacon Maunsell left Kohanga the word the Governor spoke to Kukutai was that he would be protected under the mana of the Queen and of the Government—he and all his descendants. That is why these men say “Return us the land,” in order to give effect to the word of the Government.

AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1905.

Bishop NELIGAN (examination continued)

1. *The Chairman.*] Since we were in Auckland we have heard some sort of proposal of a so-called scheme. We should like to hear anything you may have to say about it?—I have jotted down a few notes on the scheme which I will read through. I start by saying that during my two years here I have never heard of the Waikato Natives having any scheme for the development of the reserves alluded to until I have read the scheme submitted by Mr. St. Clair. I shall deal with the details of that scheme presently. The immediate point is, this is the first intimation, so far as my knowledge goes, that the Trust Board have had of the Natives having any proposals to suggest. I do not know the date upon which these proposals were drawn up by the Natives, but I presume the date is very recent. The Commission has informed me, when I appeared before it on the 20th June, that the date of the petition to the Crown from the Waikato Natives, in respect of these particular reserves, is some time in 1898. I venture to point out the following deductions from these considerations: (1.) The Crown allows some seven years to elapse before inquiring into an alleged breach of trust on the part of the General Trust Board of this diocese. The interval does not indicate any serious anxiety on the part of the Crown as to the sufferings of the Natives at the hands of my Board. (2.) For two years I have been Chairman of the Board. During that period, so far as I know, the Natives have never made any representation to my Board on the matter in hand. This fact suggests the conclusion that the alleged grievance is more apparent than real. I venture to press these two deductions upon the attention of the Commissioners. They are important in relation to the policy my Trust Board has been pursuing for some time. It is worth noting that if the Crown has not regarded an alleged grievance by the Natives as of sufficient importance to demand immediate inquiry, but allows seven years to elapse before inquiry, the Crown must be seized of some information which has led it to the conclusion that the Board of the diocese must have been doing their best under the circumstances in which they were placed. Even were the Board blameworthy, which to my certain knowledge of two years they are not, the Crown by allowing such an interval as seven years to elapse is also blameworthy. The Natives likewise, by neglect of representations to the Board, to my knowledge for two years have acquiesced in a policy which they now assert amounts to a breach of trust. I respectfully suggest to the Commissioners that inquiry should be made as to the cause for (a) the silence of the Crown for seven years; (b) the silence of the

Natives for two years ; (c) the voice of the Crown now ; (d) the voice of the Natives now. Neither my Board nor I are seized of information that can explain these points. That they are points worthy of consideration is obvious. Turning to the scheme as submitted by Mr. St. Clair, I take the paragraphs seriatim : (1.) I deny the truth of the allegation of failure on the part of the General Trust Board of this diocese "to carry out the purposes for which the reserves . . . were given." Further, "the original intention of the donors" has been as faithfully carried out as was at all possible. Mr. St. Clair's clients have never, so far as I am aware, acquainted my Board with any facts whereby "the original intention of the donors" could have either been more accurately ascertained or more faithfully discharged. The present proposal of the Natives, as submitted by Mr. St. Clair, does not throw any further light upon "the original intention of the donors." (2.) Both I myself and my Board would be glad to extend our operations in order to give "combined technical and agricultural instruction" to the Natives all over this diocese. But whether Kohanga, Hopuhopu, or Puniu afford the best sites is a matter upon which we should need considerable expert advice. With the land at Te Awamutu my Board has nothing to do. (3.) On the 20th June, before the date of this Native proposal, I informed the Commissioners that, given the money, my Board would do what is now suggested. I also informed the Commissioners that I did not think such work could be enterprised to-day on the basis of public subscription. I am still of the same opinion. The Natives appear to know of two private individuals willing to help. If those private individuals will communicate with me, I will co-operate with them in feeling the public pulse, on condition that the 1853 terms of the grants of these reserves are adhered to. I am not acquainted with the aims and objects of the American International Brotherhood League. I presume the Commissioners will be furnished with full and accurate information hereon. I venture, however, to suggest to the Commissioners that they should, for the purpose of obtaining information that may be useful, communicate with the Governor of Cape Colony and the Archbishop of Cape Town concerning what is known as the Ethiopian movement. It is possible that such information would be helpful in such a connection. (4.) (a.) I have already expressed the readiness of my Board to extend its operations on sound educational lines, had it the money, and so need not touch further on the first paragraph of this section beyond reminding the Commissioners that in the two schools, St. Stephen's and Queen Victoria, "the Maori youth of both sexes" are being educated "to become respectable settlers and citizens." The pakeha, moreover, has discharged by far the larger share of the cost of the erection of the Queen Victoria School. Thus he has shown action not inaction "in a deed of mercy" for his Maori brethren. (b.) I assert that the Waikato Maoris are receiving in St. Stephen's and Queen Victoria Schools benefits beyond those at all likely to accrue under "the proposed scheme." Further, there is no "widespread ruin to adjacent lands" through the growth of noxious weeds on the Board's property. The Board have, when the property was unlet, complied with the demands as made by the Government Inspector in this matter. (c.) The present tenants of the Board's property are taking such steps that in time "the noxious weeds will be eradicated." It is to the advantage of the tenants to do so speedily. I submit to the Commissioners these facts : (1.) A considerable amount of the Waikato property is now let to improving tenants. (2.) Any interference with those tenants would be a hardship on them. (3.) The "scheme" of the Natives is impracticable. (4.) The "scheme" provides no evidence of any breach of trust on the part of the General Trust Board.

2. *The Chairman.*] Have you formed any estimate about what revenue the Church grants produce at present ? I am not supposing any of these leases will be disturbed, but on the basis of the present leases have you formed an estimate of what may be looked upon as the revenue ?—I could not answer that without asking the Diocesan Secretary ; he would be able to say.

3. Some Natives say that what is right is to have a school on each grant. We may suppose that is looked upon—whatever it might have been originally—as being quite impracticable. The next suggestion made—I think by some of the Natives—was that if this cannot be done there might be a school for the combined localities in the nature of St. Stephen's ; that if there were a revenue of, say, £1,000 a year, or even something less—with a sum of money to start with to erect buildings—a school of that sort might be established ?—I think, if there were a sum of money sufficient for such a scheme, we should be only too glad to go in for it.

4. *Mr. Quick.*] The most practicable suggestion is this : Roka Hopere and the Maori clergyman thought there should be a central school at Hopuhopu. They thoroughly understood that it would be impracticable to have one on each reserve. It seems to me that it is a matter of £ s. d. ?—Wholly.

5. No doubt the trustees would be only too glad to put a central school there if they had the money ?—I can honestly say there is no limit to the zeal for the education of the Maori people on the part of the Board if it had the money. But it has not got the money. It would take years and years before the land was productive.

6. Is there any chance of extending the capabilities of St. Stephen's ?—I think I said before that some of the trustees at one time since I have been here contemplated the removal of St. Stephen's, and found we were unable to remove it owing to the terms of the trust, which definitely states that the school must be at Taurarua.

7. It may be admitted that St. Stephen's is doing good work, but is there any chance of its being extended in use ?—We would extend it to-morrow if we had the money to pay. We are in communication with the Government on the question of housing old St. Stephen's boys who go out as apprentices. The accommodation for this purpose is as full as it can be. It is a new departure, and has only got into form within a few months. We can only take in half a dozen apprentices, and we have done so.

8. You have plenty of land, the question is as regards buildings ?—Well, there would not be plenty of room for wooden buildings, because if they were to encroach more on the playing-field it would become dangerous to health. The boys must have a large area for playing. You might put a stone building on half the ground. It is wholly a question of money. When the old schoolroom was burnt down, the rebuilding was done by the boys under the school technical instructor on the plans of Mr. Bartley,

who kindly acted as honorary architect. The Premier told me that we ought to get a grant to help to pay for the schoolroom, and that he had sent a letter to the Native Department saying we were to get a grant. That is a year ago. I have written to him twice about it, and I wrote several times to the Native Department asking how much we were going to get. I have got no answer at all. I give this as an instance of the difficulties in regard to money.

9. It may be taken into consideration that within the last two years Victoria School being built was a considerable demand on the pockets of the Church people, and there might be some difficulty in getting subscriptions for a further building for the boys?—The Church people of New Zealand gave over £5,000 to start the Victoria School in public subscriptions.

10. *Mr. Wardell.*] The Church people only?—No, I am wrong. It is more accurate to say the public of New Zealand gave over £5,000, and I do not think they would be prepared to give money now for a similar purpose.

11. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is it your idea that in the giving and accepting of these trust lands it was contemplated that they would in themselves maintain, and be the sole means of support, of the schools which were in existence at the time the grants were given?—No, I should not say it was contemplated—by the recipients anyhow—that the grants would be sufficient wholly to maintain the schools, because it was early days and a considerable amount of money was coming into the country for Native purposes at that time. If I were given land now for the benefit of the Church I should not presume that immediately it would pay for the object for which it was given; but eventually it might as the country got more settled.

12. Does it appear to you that in the giving of these lands the Natives were led to expect, as a return for their giving the lands, that something would be done by those to whom the lands were given?—I should say the Natives did expect something to be done. What that something was would be a different thing then to what it could be to-day. I should say they did expect to get something as a result.

13. And was that something what is set out in these trust deeds?—I presume it was the apprehension of that something in the minds of the Government of the day when the grants were made.

14. Do you think the trusts have been fulfilled?—For two years I should say the general purpose of the trusts has been fulfilled as well as it could be under the circumstances that exist to-day.

15. Reading the trust in the case of Hopuhopu, you understand that this trust has been fulfilled by the education and maintenance of children at St. Stephen's?—Yes, I should regard the advantages given at St. Stephen's and Victoria Schools as a faithful fulfilment of the trust under present-day conditions.

16. At Victoria School is payment received from the children?—If a parent chooses to pay we should let him, and we do try to get the parents to contribute towards the support of their children there.

17. But that is not the case at St. Stephen's?—I cannot recollect a case of a parent paying anything for St. Stephen's. In regard to Victoria School, we felt the time had come when it was better for the Natives to encourage them to pay something, however small, towards the education of their children; and it was better, also, from the point of view of getting sympathy for the Natives from the pakeha, to be able to say the Natives are trying to do something.

18. Your answer applies to all the trusts—that the provision at St. Stephen's satisfies the trust?—As much as it can be fulfilled.

19. *The Chairman.*] I suppose you concede that the original idea was a school in the neighbourhood of the land, which was apparently carried out?—Yes.

20. What has happened since the grant and since the original idea was carried out has quite altered the circumstances, and the nearest you can do with the means at your disposal is supplying religious education at St. Stephen's and Victoria Schools?—That is exactly what I think.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] Does the young Maori clergyman living at Hopuhopu have among his duties that of educating the children in any way?—His duties are those of a clergyman; he would do as other clergymen do, gather the children at Sunday-school, and so on. He would not have a day-school.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you aware of any action taken by the trustees, immediately after order was re-established in the Waikato, to look after or to protect the estates in their hands?—I could give no information about that.

23. So far as evidence has come to us, there appears to be a long interval of many years—from 1867 to within the last few years—before anything was done to protect the estates or turn them to profitable account: that is not within your knowledge?—No.

Canon MACMURRAY (examination continued).

*Witness (to the Chairman):* I regret to say I am unable to produce statement of receipts and expenditure in connection with the Otawhao property, as requested. I can only produce the receipts and expenditure from March, 1896, up to the present date. The Rev. R. Burrows was agent and trustee of the property. He died early in 1896, and Mr. Theo. Kissling was appointed solicitor and agent of the New Zealand Mission Trust Board property. He died suddenly about two years ago, and whether Mr. Burrows did not hand his books to Mr. Kissling or whether they were lost during his term of office, I cannot say. When Mr. Kissling died I got all the books and papers I could get. He died suddenly of apoplexy, and I had to go to his office and get the books and papers as best I could, and I handed them over to Mr. Campbell, our solicitor. There are no records amongst those books and papers of any accounts prior to 1896.

24. *Mr. Wardell.*] You really have no records to confirm the accounts given by Mr. Burrows, except the fact that you find them in a parliamentary paper?—No.

25. Have you any evidence in support of the statement that 100 acres of the property was purchased?—I do not know that I could lay my hand on anything, but I am satisfied it is true, because I have

been told it by the late Dr. Maunsell, who was an old missionary here at the time. He told me this was purchased by the Church Missionary Society. I have no written evidence. I am quite certain if I had time to communicate with the Church Missionary Society at Home they could supply evidence of it. They have a record of all transactions.

26. If the purchase was effected in 1839, it was effected irrespective of any local legislation?—There was no government in the country at the time. I should like to point out that the fact of there being any government in the country is due to the work of the Church Missionary Society. If it had not been for them there would be no Colony of New Zealand.

27. *Mr. Quick.*] I suppose these accounts are sent Home regularly to the Church Missionary Society?—It is extremely probable that Mr. Burrows sent them Home.

28. Mr. Burrows was under no obligation to account to the Diocesan Synod?—No, I think Mr. Burrows always looked on the Church Missionary Society at Home as his master, and possibly he sent all these books Home to the society. That is the only way I can account for them not being there. He worked in harness up to the day of his death. He gave this work up a couple of months before he died.

29. Do you look upon yourself as his successor?—As a trustee I am his successor. Mr. Kissling was the business agent; I am not the business agent of the trust. I produce particulars of lease in connection with the property. I expect a considerable increase of revenue from the 1st September next, the date of expiry of Teasdale's lease.

30. *Mr. Quick.*] Is any portion of this revenue devoted to school purposes?—The whole is devoted to the maintenance of Te Rau College for the education of Native clergy.

31. Do I understand you to say you would welcome legislation in regard to removing of difficulties in disposing of the property by sale or lease?—I have said I, myself, have been seriously thinking of moving Parliament for a private Bill to get the power of sale or lease off the property. I have spoken to one or two trustees, but not to the trustees as a whole. I believe it will come up before them at their next meeting.

32. In regard to this particular reserve?—Yes; it would be too late to move during the currency of this Parliament, as notice of a private Bill has to be given before the session.

33. Do you think it wise to grant fresh leases until the matter is settled?—We must deal with the lease expiring, and in whatever terms we make with new tenants we will make provision to enable us to deal with it if we get a Bill through. Personally, I think it is not only a desirability but a necessity that we should have the power.

34. *The Chairman.*] Who is carrying on Mr. Kissling's business?—His brother; but he knows less about this than I do. In 1880 a lease was issued for thirty-five years to Mr. Andrew, and we may assume he has paid his rent. In 1897 the same tenant got a farm of 19 acres for ten years, and has been paying rent regularly ever since. The first was a building-allotment, on which he built a shop. Then, there is a small allotment he is holding at will, and for which he pays £2 12s. Then Captain Bockett got a lease in 1902 for thirteen years, for which he pays £7 10s. a year—the old mission house. J. H. Lyons in 1880 got a lease for thirty-five years at £10. Since the year 1880 there have been three important building-leases. Then, the next lease was issued in 1893, and one in 1897; that is the lease in existence at the present time. Teasdale's, whose lease is just run out, was, I think, a fourteen-years lease.

35. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many houses have been erected on these leases?—Four houses have been erected on building-leases.

36. Does it strike you that the use you are making of the money is a fulfilment of this trust?—I consider it is a fulfilment of the trust, considering the facts. Te Awamutu was the very centre of disturbance at the time of the war. The work was wrecked by the war, and soldiers came and lived in the mission premises.

37. For which you got £100 a year?—Yes; but it showed the impossibility of going on with the work. It is only nine years since the Waikato Maoris would receive any of our clergy.

38. Prior to that, there were no clergymen of the Native race?—Not in the Waikato; they would not be received.

39. But there were European clergymen?—Yes.

40. Then why could not the land be occupied?—Because the Maoris were so hostile to religion that they would not listen to any religious teaching of any kind.

41. *Mr. Quick.*] The European clergymen were there for the Europeans?—Yes. Of course, in its literal sense, the trust might be applied to Europeans. But we have felt there was a moral obligation to always use the money for the Maoris so long as there were Maoris to get the benefit of it. The Maoris have always had the benefit of it.

42. *Mr. Wardell.*] The money, since 1903, has gone for the education of the Native clergy?—Yes.

43. *Mr. Quick.*] Are they maintained at Te Rau as well as educated?—Yes.

44. *The Chairman.*] Does the missionary society present any statement of accounts to the Diocesan Synod?—No, it has nothing to do with it; they are not subordinate to the Diocesan Synod.

45. *Mr. Quick.*] Does not the Mission Trust Board consider it has any obligation to the Diocesan Synod?—No; the Trust Board is the successor of the Church Missionary Society, which existed before there was any Synod or government of either Church or State.

46. *Mr. Wardell.*] Archdeacon Williams has already expressed a strong opinion in favour of union of the trusts held by the Church Missionary Society and by the Synod where that is considered advantageous?—The only case I know of where he has expressed such an opinion is that of Porirua and Otaki.

47. How far would it apply to others?—The Trust Board could never hand over any of its trusts to anybody without the consent of the parent missionary society. It might be prepared to hand over its property under possible circumstances to the General Synod, but it is not prepared to do that at present. I think that at the present time there is no body who could so fully satisfy and carry out the

intentions of the original trust as the New Zealand Mission Trust Board. In the days to come, it may be possible to see our way to hand over all properties to the General Synod of the Church, but that time has not come yet.

48. Would your view in regard to the amalgamation of trusts in the Waikato be the same as that of Archdeacon Williams in regard to the trusts in Otaki?—No; I agree to the amalgamation of Otaki and Porirua trusts, because they are identical. I object to the amalgamation of the Te Awamutu trust with the educational trusts in the Waikato, because it is essentially different.

49. You have no desire that the Commission should recommend legislation in this direction?—Certainly not. I want you to bear in mind the distinction between this trust and the others mentioned in the Commission. It was acquired by a different body for a different purpose, and by different means. I was willing that power should be sought to unite the Porirua and Otaki trusts, conditionally upon the institution being placed at Otaki. That was the strict condition laid down, because of the sentiment of the Maoris, the Otaki Natives being of the same tribe as the Porirua Natives.

50. *Mr. Quick.*] As regards the management of the trust, who should be the rulers of these endowments when amalgamated? So far as legislation is concerned, you would consent to any that would bring about this object?—I should have no objection to a recommendation by the Commission that the Otaki and Porirua trusts be amalgamated, provided that the institution be at Otaki.

51. Is that an absolute condition? Assuming the institution were placed at Waikanae, for instance?—It would be more to the advantage of the Maori race to have one good institution supported by the Otaki and Porirua reserves rather than two small institutions. The reason I would place it at Otaki is that by placing it there we should not wound the sentiment of the Otaki and Porirua Natives. Their sentiments ought to be considered to a considerable extent. The Porirua Natives would not object to its going to Otaki.

52. *Mr. Quick.*] But we have found out that they would?—I remember the Porirua Natives saying they had no objection to going to Otaki in my presence at the time of the special session of the General Synod, about five years ago.

53. Now their feeling is in the direction of a school at Porirua or "Give the land back"?—I am speaking of what I heard at that time.

54. Would it be objectionable, do you think, to have a school at Waikanae?—I do not know the locality.

55. The thing that strikes one as regards having a school in the midst of a Maori population is in regard to the boys getting away home, and that sort of thing?—If it were properly managed that difficulty would disappear.

56. You would be in favour of a school on St. Stephen's lines?—Yes.

57. *Mr. Wardell.*] If it should be felt that a suitable school for Waikato could be established at Te Awamutu, would you object to the other Church trusts being amalgamated with yours, and a central school made?—I should like again to emphasize the fundamental difference in character between the Otawhao and other trusts. They do not belong to the same people; they are not under the same trust; they were acquired in different ways and for different purposes.

58. *Mr. Quick.*] Therefore, what you consent to in one case as being according to the original intention, you dissent from in the other as being no way of carrying out the original intention?—Quite so. The Commission referred to me a scheme about the Otaki trusts. Of course, I have nothing to do with Porirua. But this scheme for Otaki, with which I have to do, I may say I consider would be an utter breach of the eighth commandment to take it from the Church trustees, who are using it for the purpose for which it was originally given, and to hand it over to a body which says distinctly that no religious instruction shall be given to any child while in the school or a boarder. Such a scheme would be an utter subversion of the trust, and could not be entertained by any one with regard for the trust. The whole scheme is, in my judgment, utterly impracticable and a violation of the trust. I am certain a school carried on on those lines would do the Natives no good. I have been in close contact with St. Stephen's for thirteen years, and I say its influence on the Maori race in the North Island is almost beyond estimation. In regard to the scheme of Mr. St. Clair's, I have only to indorse what the Bishop says. It is a crude impracticable thing which would tend to hand over this property to an organization of which I know nothing, and which I should distrust very much.

59. *The Chairman.*] I understand you to say you could see a substantial difference between the grant to the Church Missionary Society of the Otawhao land and the grant to the Church of the other lands in the Waikato. Is there a substantial difference?—There is this difference: in the first place, the Otawhao property was not given to the Church, but to a private society within the Church.

60. Still, we look upon that as being the Church?—The members of the society look upon it as a private society within the Church. We do not submit our actions to the control of the Diocesan Synod, for example, which has no control over the actions or property of the society. In the case of the other estates, they are held by the Diocesan Trustees, and are subordinate to the Church organizations. The Church Missionary Society is a religious organization; the General Trust Board is an ecclesiastical organization. The object of the trust is different. Its object was distinctly to spread religion; the other trusts were given for educational purposes.

61. But the heading of the grant shows that it is for a school in the Waikato?—I want you to remember that was Sir George Grey's interpretation of facts, which was not always in consonance with the ideas of the society who bought this land before it was a Crown colony for evangelising the Natives, and in the course of their work put a school there; and Sir George Grey fastened on that fact.

62. I am not supposing the society is prepared to abandon what they consider to be property put into their hands to deal with, but do you not think many might take the view that the society is practically the Church when dealing with religious instruction, and that a school in the neighbourhood of Otawhao was what was contemplated as well as a mission station? What I think some persons

may have in their mind is this: if the Church grants are not enough for a school, and, if by the aid of Te Awamutu they would be enough for a school in the locality—in the Waikato district—would it be unreasonable to say “Well, amalgamate the trusts and keep it connected with the Church of England, and establish a school if the revenue be enough”?—I think it would be unreasonable. I think it would be withdrawing from the Church Missionary Society property purchased by itself for distinctly religious purposes, and it would not be in harmony with the principles of justice to do it.

63. Is there nothing in the Church Missionary Society's annual reports under the heading of “New Zealand” that can help you in reference to the accounts?—No. The missionary society withdrew all direct control over the Board from 1882. It gave a grant beginning with £2,000 a year to the Mission Trust Board, in addition to the revenues from its properties. Now there is no vote at all. Since the grant was withdrawn the Church people of this province have to raise the money. This diocese has to raise for Maoris alone £1,100. We have raised money for the extension of St. Stephen's trust in the direction of a girls' school, and every year we have to raise £1,100 for the maintenance of the Maori clergy.

64. Does the Mission Board prepare annual reports?—Yes; the Rev. A. Williams will be able to furnish you with the reports and account of moneys received from our agent in Auckland, Mr. Walton.

65. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you tell us what is done in other dioceses in the Island in regard to Maori purposes by way of subscription?—Wellington has to raise about £852, and Waiapu about £692.

66. The three dioceses then between them raise nearly £2,200 annually for the benefit of the Maoris, irrespective of endowments?—Yes; to be accurate, £2,648, besides what is raised in the South Island to assist us.

67. *Mr. Wardell.*] In what way is it applied?—For the maintenance of the Maori clergy.

68. *Mr. Quick.*] Does it not go further than the Maori clergy?—In some cases to Europeans who give their time wholly to Maori work.

*Witness:* I desire to draw the attention of the Commissioners to resolutions passed by the New Zealand Mission Trust Board in 1903. The Board was then, owing to the withdrawal of the grant from the Church Missionary Society, obliged to hand over to the Church authorities the responsibility for the maintenance of the Maori clergy. The Dioceses of Wellington and Auckland corresponded with the Mission Trust Board with a view to getting the Mission Trust Board to surrender to the diocesan authorities certain churches and cemeteries in various parts of the country. The diocesan authorities considered that as the responsibility for the stipends of Native clergy had passed to them the legal control of the churches and cemeteries should pass to them also. The Mission Trust Board admitted the rightfulness of this being done, but were not clear whether in all cases they could give a good title. They have conveyed several of such churches to the diocesan authorities, giving such a title as is in their power. The Land Committee of the Mission Trust Board was authorised to do the same as regards the church and historic cemetery at Te Awamutu, and, if it could be done, to arrange for the conveyance of a site for a vicarage. This Land Committee was willing to convey to the Diocesan Trust Board a section of 5 acres, which is separated from the rest of the property by a road on which the church stands, and included in which is the cemetery, to be used for a clergyman's residence, for a schoolhouse, for a place of public worship, or purposes of a religious or moral character (in other words, for the purposes of the trust), and for a consideration of £100 to be capitalised and interest to be used for purposes of the trust. The Land Committee were advised that by Act of Parliament trustees were authorised to sell for “public purposes”; and that the maintenance of worship efficiently might be deemed a public purpose. That at any rate by securing that the purposes of the trust would be fulfilled we might offer to give such a title as we could. We agreed to do this, although the deed of conveyance has not yet been signed. The following are the resolutions I have referred to: “That the New Zealand Mission Trust Board is of opinion that it cannot legally part with any portion of its freehold property for any purpose except for a full valuable consideration.” “That the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Wellington and the Commissary administering the Diocese of Auckland be informed of this fact, and that in consequence the Board is unable to give any portion of its property to the diocesan authorities.” “That the New Zealand Mission Trust Board is aware that it has offered to surrender, upon specified conditions, certain churches and consecrated cemeteries to the diocesan authorities; these properties having practically passed out of the control of the Board, and not being available for purposes of revenue, the Board will give such a title to them as is in its power.” “That the Land Committee be authorised to sell a portion of the Te Awamutu perty as a site for a vicarage if the trust permits of this being done, and, if not, to lease a portion for such period and on such terms as may be agreed upon.” “That the Land Committee be authorised to arrange what portion of land at Te Awamutu is to be conveyed to the Auckland Diocesan Trust Board for a church and cemetery site.”

ALEXANDER MUIR examined.

69. *Mr. Wardell.*] You hold the land at Kohanga, for the first seven years at a rental of 1s., for the next twenty-one years at 1s. per acres, £37 10s. ?—Yes.

70. There are certain conditions as to improvements: what improvements have you made in fulfilment of those conditions?—I have spent about £1,400 on the place. It contains, according to the deed, 750 acres; I have cut down 600 acres of furze, which cost me £1 5s. an acre at the time it was done.

71. Who did it for you?—Whatever labour I could employ in the district—Europeans and Maoris. Some of it was done by contract. Some of the contractors left their contracts, and I had to let it to others.

72. It was stated at Ngauwahia that 300 acres was the total area of scrub you had felled, and that you paid 12s. an acre for that: is that true?—No; any one who knows the truth knows that is not true. You cannot get gorse cut anywhere for £1 an acre.



73. What did you pay for your cutting?—As high as £1 10s. an acre.
74. Can you say to whom it was paid?—I could by reference to my books; I think W. McLean had a contract for 120 acres.
75. Did you employ the men yourself, or did your son?—I, myself, did all the letting of contracts, and the money was paid out of my pocket; and I know the work was done, and my books will prove it has been done. I paid for 600 acres, but one often has to pay for more than is actually done when there is no accurate survey.
76. How long is it since the 600 acres was cleared?—About six years ago is was finished.
77. What state is it in now?—It has a considerable quantity of furze on it. Furze cannot be ploughed down and done away with; it is very troublesome to eradicate.
78. We were told it is fairly covered with new growth to about 3 ft high?—It is fairly covered, but there is no seed in any of that furze. It is free from seed. I have watched and burned it at the right time, so that it produces no seed.
79. Are you going to plough it?—I am looking forward to ploughing it; I expect to get my £1,400 back, but not for six or seven years, perhaps.
80. Ploughing is one of the best ways to removing furze when burned down?—When I cut it, some of it measured 8 in. or 9 in. through at the root. We did not burn it for two years after it was cut, so as to consume all the seed on the ground. The seed cost us 12s. 6d. or 15s. an acre; we sowed it with *Danthonia*, rye-grass, clover, and cocksfoot. I knew I should not get much out of the seed, but I kept the sheep there to eat the young furze. Last year I got three hundred and fifty pounds' worth of wool off the clearing.
81. Have you any other property there?—I lease adjacent land from the Natives, for which I pay 2s. 6d. per acre a year.
82. How do you account for the fact that the land immediately above and below Kohanga is clear?—Ask me what Kohanga was like when I took it.
83. What was it like?—I had the furze cut down and tried to plough it, but the roots of the furze were too thick to allow it. I put a good man on and paid him £1 a week and his food. I measured an acre, and after he had been working seven weeks he had just finished the acre, and I paid him £7. If you saw my books, you would say that the paddocks which look so beautiful cost me very dear. I have bonedusted them and ploughed them three or four times.
84. Have you done any fencing on the Kohanga Block?—No; I might have done perhaps 30 chains.
85. The land you have cleared is overgrown again?—No, it is not; there are sheep on it now. I spent between £300 and £500 in draining the land; part of a boundary-fence has been put up; it is no use to put it up where the furze is growing.
86. *Mr. Quick.*] Did you take the reserves on either side at the same time as you took Kohanga? You have land, have you not, on both sides of the Waikato leased?—I have a place called Taupiri, which I leased from the late Hori Kukutai; that joins Kohanga; it is leased from the Ngatitipa; the lease of the two places commenced about the same time.
87. Is Taupiri much better land?—Much better land. I was giving £3 an acre to purchase Taupiri, and I would have reckoned Kohanga very dear at £1. That is how I reckoned the rent.
88. Is there a road to Kohanga?—There is a right-of-way between Kohanga and the Kakina land.
89. Is there a road from Tuakau to Kohanga?—There is a road that comes down to Kakina; you could not drive over it in winter-time.
90. Does that road go right on to Kohanga?—It is one of the Kohanga boundaries.
91. In winter-time it is dangerous to travel?—Yes.
92. Is it a good road in summer-time?—With careful driving you can drive to Kohanga.
93. The general approach is by water?—When I send sheep in the winter I send them in the punt; in summer I drive them by the road.
94. Did the road exist when you took the place?—The road-line was there, but it was not clear.
95. *Mr. Wardell.*] The condition of the land at the time you took it was the result of neglect?—I would not like to say that, because I have seen men make mistakes. They plant furze hedges sometimes.
96. Have you any reason to believe during the period from 1864 to the time you occupied it, anything had been done to prevent the spread of noxious weeds?—I should not like to go as far back as that.
97. At the time it was occupied by Mr. Maunsell what condition was it in?—It was not worth more than £1 10s. an acre.
98. Was it overrun with gorse and scrub?—The gorse was not known at that time. The Maoris are the people who scattered the furze.
99. Do you attribute the growth of the gorse to such a size to neglect in the management of the property?—It was a very unsettled time, and land was an ugly thing to handle.
100. What do you think it is worth now?—I suppose it would sell at auction at about £1 10s., as it is now.
101. Have you fenced in the cemetery?—No.
102. We are informed a desire has been expressed for the establishment of a Native school at a site chosen on the block, but you object to surrender the land for the purpose: is that so?—I do not recollect exactly. I think I have said that anything the trust wanted I was willing to comply with, if it was reasonable; but not to cut it up into a road.
103. Are you prepared, if a block of a few acres is required for school purposes, to surrender it?—Provided you do not put a mile of road to get at it, which I would be supposed to fence on both sides.



104. *Mr. Quick.*] When you took this land, how did you know it was in the market?—By being told.

105. Was it advertised?—I could not say. I think the Natives told me I could lease it.

106. Do you know of any land of similar character leased on similar terms in the Waikato?—I do not; except some at Taupiri.

107. Was there any demand for land at Kohanga about eight years ago?—No; land was at a very low value at that time.

108. Had that been so for some years prior to that?—No.

109. *Mr. Wardell.*] Your first seven years has expired?—Yes; there is about half the ground clear of noxious weeds; the swamp land is quite clear.

110. *Mr. Quick.*] How much swamp is there?—Somewhere about 200 acres.

111. Is there any flat land besides the swamp?—It is rolling ground.

112. *The Chairman.*] Were there any buildings on the land when you took it?—There are buildings there which do not belong to the Church. It was originally a flour-mill.

113. *Mr. Quick.*] How much hilly land is there?—It is all rolling ground except the swamp. It is good second-class land.

W. S. COCHRANE (examination continued).

*Witness:* I produce reports of the Synod for the years 1899 to 1904, as published in the *Church Gazette*, in reference to the cost of maintaining boys at St. Stephen's; and also the reports of the Government Inspector for those years on the working of the schools. These show the cost to have been as follows:—Year ending 30th June, 1899, 57 boys, at a cost of £1,068 2s. 11d.; 1900, 58 boys, £1,072 2s. 3d.; 1901, 66 boys, £1,025 1s. 9d.; 1902, 69 boys, £1,401 2s. 3d.; 1903, 66 boys, £1,404 5s. 11d.; 1904, 67 boys, £1,461 16s. 6d. The boys are not there all the time every year; they come at different times of the year. These sums include all school expenses. They do not include rent or furniture, except bedding. They pay for their own clothes.

114. *Mr. Quick.*] According to these figures, you lose by the Government boys?—Yes; but the Government pay us £100 a year towards the cost of the school-teacher, and give us £100 a year for the general purposes of the school—that is, £200 a year over and above the £20. Thirty is the limit of the number of Government scholars.

115. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is your usual number of pupils?—We have had sixty-nine.

116. *Mr. Quick.*] You would be as well off if you never had any Government boys?—Well, we can always keep sixty boys at a cheaper rate per head, and the salary of the masters and manager would be the same.

117. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the general number of Government scholars?—From twenty-seven to thirty.

JOHN HENRY UPTON examined.

*Witness (to the Chairman):* I am one of the trustees of the Waikato estates, and I have been so for twenty-one years—that is, since 1884. St. Stephen's is the basis of support of the whole institution. It consists of 67 acres, about 40 of which were given by Sir George Grey, and about 27 by Bishop Selwyn, purchased out of funds which he and his supplied. That estate has really supported the school from that time to this. The Waikato lands have been held by the trustees and administered by them to the best of their ability, but, unfortunately, without much pecuniary result. Hopuhopu contains about 1,385 acres. It is situated seventy miles from Auckland, and the railway runs through it. At first sight it ought to be a valuable endowment, but as a matter of fact for many years it has produced no revenue at all; there was an absolute loss, which was paid out of the funds of the trust, though as time went on it became a little more valuable. It was a mission station. Mr. Ashwell was for many years the missionary there, and subsequently Archdeacon Pritt. They did not live out of the estate nor did the Natives maintain them. The Church Missionary Society paid their salaries and those of their assistants, and they carried on the work of the mission—teaching religion and a certain amount of education. They had schools there, but the estate never supported them from the first day they went there till they left, after the war. In my time, 1884, when the trustees had to administer the estate, we found it pretty much as it is now, or was, until leased quite recently, in a very bad state. The land itself is poor; where it is not swamp it is extremely infertile land. Immediately after the war—perhaps four years—there began to be settlement in the Waikato (I came here in 1866). There is a certain quantity of land in the Waikato, beyond Hamilton to Te Awamutu, that was settled. It was believed to be very good land, and some of it undoubtedly was. At that time—and this is a most essential thing to remember—cattle fetched a great price, and so did wool, and, therefore, land which was at all capable of growing grass became of value, and settlers chose land which would grow grass, and left untouched that which would not. Our land would not grow grass, and it was left untouched. After a time we got a tenant, and he paid at the rate of, I think, £50 a year, but he threw it up. In 1885 it was let for twenty-one years at £30 a year without any special conditions, the trustees being glad to get a tenant at all, but that tenant could not make a living out of the land as it was so poor. Three years after he threw it up a portion only of the estate was let for twenty-one years, on an open lease at £18 10s., to two tenants. In 1902 another lot of 180 acres was leased for twenty-one years at £9 a year. In 1904 a block of 463 acres was leased in three lots to three tenants for twenty-one years, the first five years free from rent and the remainder of the term at an annual rent of 1s. per acre, with the right of renewal at the end of the term. It was found that no tenant could be got for this back part of the property unless he had the right of renewal. We had no right to give a renewal, the extent of our powers being to lease for twenty-one years under The Bishop of New Zealand Trust Act. I believe that in 1894 a new Trust Act was passed, and in that Act there was power to grant a renewal. We were satisfied, by the advice of our solicitor, that we had power to grant the further extension at the same rent or at any other rent. By this means we were able to get two tenants for this untractable

piece of land. In respect of the value of the land, the railway runs through it, and there is not a foot of land on the railway-line of any value that is not at once sought after by the public. We advertised the land in the *Church Gazette* (3,500 subscribers) for years. We only advertised in that paper because if we had advertised in the daily papers we should have had no means of paying for the advertisement. We should have expended in a month's advertising a year's income from the estate. So we advertised in the *Church Gazette*, and the notification went abroad throughout the province that the land was for leasing. And we not only advertised in that way, but we appointed an agent in Ngaruawahia, and asked him to put up a notice in his store that the land was open for leasing for any offer. The result was that we were able to let the remaining acres. I believe we have got the highest market price, and we are not at all confident that the tenants will remain on their leases. There has been a great fall in the value of stock, and this means a fall in the price of land. I believe we have got the full value of the land at the present time. When the Natives call to mind there was a school there in Mr. Ashwell's day, they did not know that Mr. Ashwell was maintained, and the schools were maintained, not out of the estate, but out of Church Missionary Society grants.

118. *Mr. Quick.*] So that when they speak of it being self-supporting, it is all nonsense?—Quite so. It is impossible that it could support a man who does not work extremely hard, and then only with manure.

119. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was it ever contemplated that the schools should be supported by the estate?—I should say not. I remember a remark made by Mr. Burrows, who new the Natives well, "Any land given to the Church by the Natives is always poor land, they never give any good land." That is true in this part of the country. As far as the Natives are concerned, the education of their children has not received help from them. It has always been provided by the Europeans. This land is poor land, and always has been; it is in the midst of a poor country. To show how little the Natives have done, within twelve miles of this land, in a straight line, the Natives own 95,000 acres of land, and of this from 50,000 to 60,000 acres are very good land indeed, but no fraction of help has ever been given by them. Yet we take the children from that estate to our Native schools and support them. My son, who has a farm in this part of the country, has a house which was built by a man who had been educated at St. Stephen's, and no house could be better built, thus showing the value of the instruction given there.

120. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the income of St. Stephen's from the trust estates?—£659 a year from St. Stephen's, £5 a year from Papakura, £50 a year from Puniu, and a small sum from Hopuhopu and Kohanga, perhaps £20 in all. The Government contribute £775. The Government send a considerable number of boys and they pay £18 a year for each. Other contributions amount to £77, a little being from the parents of the boys. The trustees, in days gone by, tried as far as possible, where the Native were well off, to get contributions from them towards the support of their children, but it was found exceedingly difficult to find out whether the Natives were well off or not, and the trustees may have been lax in not insisting that the Natives should pay where they could.

121. From the period of 1866 until 1885 can you give us any idea of what was done to maintain the estate in proper order?—No, I was not a trustee at that time, but it is common knowledge here that in the early part of that period the whole of the Waikato and the Native business in this part of the country was in a state of great uncertainty and doubt. It was extremely difficult to do anything with land that was not in accessible places and of good quality. The first settlers in the Waikato who took up land came to grief. Scarcely one of them came through successfully, so serious was the fall in the value of land. Land that in 1868 was bought at £15 per acre at Te Awamutu was unsaleable at £5 about ten years ago. At that time a farm alongside our estate at Puniu, in perfect order, was offered to me at £5 an acre; now, since frozen mutton and butter have come, and there has been a rise in wool, that land has gone up to £15 an acre. But the land at Hopuhopu has not increased in value, and is practically valueless now. It is composed of two parts. The flat consists of poor pumice, and nothing will grow on it unless you put in bonedust.

122. That is the portion which was cultivated in Mr. Ashwell's time?—Yes; there might be little bits good, but no considerable quantity of it. When the rain comes after you put in manure, it washes it through the pumice, and the land is as poor as ever. There are about 200 acres of flat, and the rest consists of low hills composed of a sort of sandy clay, very poor indeed. A little filip was given to it a few years ago when it was found that there was a little kauri-gum in the swamp; but the reason we are sure there is not a great quantity of kauri-gum there is because it has been well prospected, and is so far south as to be out of the kauri-gum area. In regard to Pepepe, it is a good deal like the higher land of Hopuhopu, but it has little bits of river-flat. The present tenant has had it since 1884 on lease for twenty-one years—seven years at 1s. a year, seven years at £5, and seven years at £10—and this lease is about to expire.

123. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you expect to get more when the lease has expired?—We shall offer it by auction or by tender.

124. But there was an establishment for Maoris who lived there?—They were maintained by the Church Missionary Society. Mr. Ashwell paid £400 out of his own pocket to erect the building; there was never any income from the estate.

125. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many pupils were there in Mr. Ashwell's school at the time the land was given by the Natives?—I could not tell you. The total receipts from Pepepe amount to £76 during all my time; the first income was derived from it in 1891.

126. *Mr. Quick.*] Mr. Ashwell lived on it up to your time?—Yes.

127. What was the position of the place when he left?—It was a missionary establishment, the Church Missionary Society paying the clergyman and his assistants.

128. How many Natives were maintained there?—I fancy there were forty Natives there, but I do not think they were maintained. The Natives lived out of their own cultivations, though these were not necessarily confined to the estate. I am not aware that the Church Missionary Society ever maintained the Natives at the school.

129. We have been led to believe that they maintained themselves by their own labours?—It would have been on a very small scale if confined to Hopuhopu alone; it is certain that wheat could not to any extent have been grown there. In regard to Kohanga, the first lease was in 1889—30 acres at £5 a year for seven years. It was let to a man, not that he hoped to get anything out of the land, but he hoped to make something out of the flax. In 1897 a lease was granted for twenty-eight years, the first seven at 1s. a year, and then twenty-one years at an annual rental of £37 10s.; the land to be cleared and grassed during the first term, which has about expired.

130. Did you advertise it in the usual manner before letting?—Yes, it was made known in every possible manner; we were only too anxious to get a tenant. It was more inaccessible at that time than now. It is situated at the end of a tract of country some of which is very good land. It was not opened until about fifteen years ago. The present tenant, Mr. Muir, came to us in consequence of the advertisement, which he must have heard of somewhere. He is surrounded by Natives, and he happens to be a *persona grata* with the Natives, and could therefore live there; but it would not have done for any one who did not know how to get on with the Natives. When he took it up it was nearly all covered with very strong and high gorse. I have not seen it since the improvements took place, but Mr. Muir is a man of exceptional ability in dealing with rough land, and a man of great substance and character, and there is no doubt he has done the best thing in the way of clearing it. I have no reason to doubt that he has spent £1,400 on it, but we shall make investigations ourselves. If he has got six hundred ewes on it, there must be a great deal of grass amongst the gorse now. We know that he has made one improvement which was not foreseen by us—namely, the draining of the swamp. At present the swamp is more or less covered with flax, but we have no doubt that when Mr. Muir has done with it it will be a valuable piece of land. In clearing a tract of land with heavy gorse he must have been put to great expense. The price for cutting mixed bush in this part of the country varies from £1 2s. to £1 4s. an acre. There is no comparison between light tea-tree and heavy gorse, and I have no doubt that Mr. Muir's statement that the clearing of the gorse cost him £1 10s. an acre is true. About 600 acres of the total area was covered with gorse.

131. You know something of value of land?—Yes.

132. How did you gain your experience?—I have had a great deal to do with lending money. I am a member of various associations, and necessarily one thus acquires a general knowledge, and, again, during the last ten years I have been putting my sons on the land. We have gone into the original bush and turned the primeval forest into a smiling valley, so that I think I am able to say something about the cost of clearing land.

133. Your associations lend money throughout the whole of this district?—Yes.

134. Which is done through skilled valuers?—Yes, and personal inspection.

135. So it may be assumed that from valuations that have passed through your hands, from personal inspection, and the fact of your having purchased farms, you know what you are talking about?—I think I do.

136. How long, as a general thing, does it take in this part of the colony before you can put the plough into ground where strong gorse has been growing?—I never cleared gorse, but part of my farm happened to be large tea-tree, and I should think it was seven years from the time it was cut to the time it was first ploughed. All I know about gorse is paying for its being cleared, and one has no sooner paid one bill than one has to pay another. I believe the seed is the trouble, and hence the importance of getting rid of the seed and letting it lie so that all the seed shall be thoroughly burned with hot fire. It would take from two to four years to rot the roots of gorse.

137. We have been told, in regard to Kohanga, that in Mr. Maunsell's time it was a self-supporting successful establishment, where the Natives maintained themselves by growing their own food?—Mr. Maunsell was a servant of the Church Missionary Society, and his salary and those of his assistants were paid by the society—and they are not poor-salary payers. A part of his duty was to instruct the children in the art of agriculture, and no doubt they grew vegetables and perhaps some of their food, but the money came from London, and not from Kohanga.

138. *Mr. Wardell.*] Were the schools at Kohanga established before the land was given?—I think there is no doubt of that.

139. Does it not seem to you probable that the land was given by the Natives in consequence of what they saw was being done for their good, and what they anticipated would continue to be done?—It is very probable.

140. Do you not realise that the land has ceased to be used for their good?—No, it is still used for their good by paying for the maintenance of Natives at St. Stephen's School. In regard to Puniu, in 1869 a lease was granted for twenty-one years—seven years free of rent and fourteen years at £100 a year. Before that lease expired there came a great fall in the value of cattle and produce. The tenant was a good farmer, but found he could not pay £100 a year, and the rent had to be reduced, and in 1890 it was reduced to, for five years, £57 a year. Then, in 1896 it was leased for two years to a bad tenant, who did not manage the property right. A lease was granted for fourteen years—at £25 a year for two years, and at £50 a year for twelve years. When he took the land it was in very bad order, and this two years at £25 was a contribution of the landlord towards putting it in order. The present tenant is a good one. He got his lease in 1896, but butter has come in since then and the land has largely increased in value. We recently had it valued by a competent farmer, and we know that the value is considerably more now. It was perhaps worth £5 when he took it, and some of it is probably now worth £10 an acre, while some of the poorer part is not worth more than £1. The whole is valued at between £3,000 and £4,000. Some land near the Puniu Estate is worth £15 an acre. Our valuation is that it is worth £200 a year, which would mean a capital value of £4,000. When the present tenant took it there were 400 acres in grass and about 300 acres an untractable tea-tree swamp; but the effect of his tenancy will be that at the end of his lease we shall receive a better estate.

141. *Mr. Quick.*] From what you state, Puniu is the only one of the properties that is valuable land?—Yes; it is the only one that has produced anything for the school. The total net income from it is £1,481 spread over thirty years; there is nothing in hand now. The Government valuation of the Puniu Estate is £3,125.

142. More could be done if the St. Stephen's fund was a larger one?—Yes.

143. How many acres are there in St. Stephen's?—Sixty-seven.

144. And a portion is used as a site for the buildings and playground of St. Stephen's?—Yes.

145. And part for the Victoria School?—Yes.

146. And the balance?—It is let, and the income applied to the support of the school.

147. Including the £50 a year given to the Victoria School?—Yes.

148. In what manner have you let the property?—The trustees may lease for twenty-one years, but they have to get the authority of the Standing Committee before they can lease on a building-lease for sixty years, stating what they propose as the upset price; and then in every case the land is offered by auction. If no one bids the upset price the land is held for a certain time, and any one may take it up at not less than the upset price; then the process is repeated again.

149. It was mentioned to me in conversation that certain sections had been rather grabbed at, and money made by reselling the sections after the lease had been obtained, and that in one case a man got £167 for his lease?—When the trustees arrived at the position that they were able to offer the land, it was cut up by the advice of an auctioneer into allotments; his recommendation was considered, and an upset price fixed on each, and the recommendation of the trustees was then sent to the Standing Committee, who agreed, and the sections were put up to auction and sold. Of course, some one may have sold his allotment for a £50 bonus, or something of that sort. St. Stephen's is used now for the Native school, but the trust is not for Native children solely; it is for the poor and destitute children of both races, and the white people have as much claim as the Natives. They have not the same claim to Puniu, Kohanga, and Hopuhopu. Why the trustees do not have a mixed school is because they believe it is impracticable to have the two together, and that it would be a very dangerous experiment to have a mixed boarding-school. And they have found that the whole of their resources are not large enough for their work in respect to the Natives. Many years ago the orphan home was established for white children and Natives also, but they are practically all white children there now. Bishop Selwyn set aside a portion of the St. Stephen's Estate for this orphans' home—5½ acres. He allowed them to build there, and they became the occupiers of this ground at that time. We have never sought to disturb them, but they have made claim on us to contribute to their expenses, which we have declined. The girls' school was built on a portion which they leased from us—three acres.

150. *Mr. Wardell.*] Then these 8 acres have passed from revenue?—Yes; we get nothing from them.

151. *Mr. Quick.*] You told us that about half the estate was purchased by Bishop Selwyn: have you any idea what he paid for it?—I believe about £15 an acre.

152. Purchased from the Crown?—Yes. Sir William Martin gave a specific part of it, and I think Mr. Swainson also gave a piece; they bought it and gave it to the school just as Bishop Selwyn did. There are four Crown grants, which show the price to have been about £15 an acre. The four grants contain 67 acres. I cannot prove it, but it is a fact that the process mentioned in the deed relating to Bishop Selwyn's endowment was not gone through. Bishop Selwyn gave the money, and Sir George Grey caused those grants to be drawn and went away out of the harbour before Bishop Selwyn saw them, to his great dismay. Mr. Burrows told me that that which appears to have been given by the Government was given by Bishop Selwyn and his friends out of their own pockets. Bishop Selwyn found the money and gave it to the Government for the land, and Sir George Grey's action was the cause of a serious difference between him and Bishop Selwyn. May I offer my own opinion in regard to Native education. The Natives in the northern part of this Island have immense quantities of exceedingly fine land—hundreds of thousands of acres. They have done nothing for themselves in the way of their own education—I am speaking of the Province of Auckland. Their only gifts are small compared with the vast quantity of land they have got. They have not done their duty in providing reserves for schools for their own children. I go further and say that a great deal of land has been acquired by the Government from the Natives, and the Government have not set aside adequate reserves for Native education. In Auckland the Natives are being educated at the expense of the Europeans.

153. Do you know of any other large tracts of Native land besides the one you mentioned of 95,000 acres?—Yes. At the Bay of Islands there is an estate of 75,000 acres to which Epsom cannot hold a candle for quality. In the Maungakihia Valley there is a large area, and in the direction of Hokianga there is any amount of good land, and again south of Puniu in what is called the "King-country."

154. *Mr. Wardell.*] No reserves have been given by the Natives north of Auckland?—Not to any extent. About Auckland they have given small grants to the Wesleyan body, but my point is that the endowments set aside out of Native lands are totally inadequate for the education of Native children, and the Government in buying the land from the Natives have not set aside endowments as they ought to have done.

155. *Mr. Quick.*] You recognise that the Government are carrying on Native schools in Native districts by a vote of Parliament: do you think that vote is insufficient for the purpose to which it applies?—I should not say that; my point is that we white people are paying that money, and not the Natives.

156. *Mr. Wardell.*] You heard me put a question to Mr. Muir in regard to a site for a school, would you be prepared to facilitate the setting-apart of a portion of that land for the purpose of a Government Native school?—Undoubtedly; just as I would if certain people liked to set up a school in Hopuhopu and pay for it. I am confident that if a way were found to set up a school on these estates the trustees would gladly give up the land for the purpose. They would give up the whole reserve.

157. If the Government are prepared to take over and establish a school at Hopuhopu?—We should be delighted to help them if we could.

158. And that applies to Kohanga?—Yes.

159. But not to Puniu?—No; if you took that from us we should have to keep five boys less at St. Stephen's.

160. In stating that, you say you are willing to abandon religious instruction?—That will be cared for; I am confident about that. I cannot conceive any education being given without religion; what religion it is I am not concerned about.

161. *Mr. Quick.*] Are you speaking so as to commit your cotrustees?—No. I can speak with absolute confidence that they would agree as to Hopuhopu and Kohanga. Puniu is a valuable asset of income to St. Stephen's, which would suffer if its income were minimised.

162. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would you suffer if, by a school established in the Waikato and supported by the trusts, you were relieved at St. Stephen's of the five boys represented by the Puniu funds?—I should not like to see St. Stephen's interfered with. It is a highly successful school, and it would be a grave evil if the operations of the school were lessened to any degree. The loss of Puniu would lessen them. Religious instruction at St. Stephen's has never been too insistent, it has always been given with a light hand; dogmatical religion is not the prevailing tone. The teacher has to read prayers, and the boys have to take part in them, and the clergyman of the parish attends from time to time to give instruction of an elementary kind; but there is no sort of special or undue attention paid to that part of the education; there is nothing like extreme dogma. No inquiry is made as to the religious faith of a boy; but while he is there he has to go to church and hear prayers read, and he receives such elementary religious instruction as the chaplain chooses to give.

---

TE AWAMUTU, TUESDAY, 4TH JULY, 1905.

TU KOREHU examined.

*Witness:* I reside at Kihikihi. I know the Otawhao and Puniu lands. I heard from my parents and elders that those lands were handed over for school purposes. At that time Mr. Morgan was clergyman here. My father's name was Wharaki te Re; he was not one of the donors, but his children gave the land. I do not know the names of the donors. After Mr. Morgan was here Mr. Gorst lived here, and then the school was largely increased under him. When the war came between the Maoris and Europeans the school ceased. From that time till now there has been no school, but there has been no reason why there should not have been a school.

1. *The Chairman.*] Was the school on the granted land?—Yes, and there were about two hundred children there attending it. I am speaking of Otawhao; there was never a school at Puniu.

2. Was there no mission station there?—No. We know of no reason why the school has not been going on, and the trusts have not been carried out. We know of no reason to prevent that being done. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion it was mere waste handing over the land, and it should be returned to me.

3. Is there any Government Native school anywhere near here?—There is a school at Parawera, about ten miles away.

4. Is there any reason why there should be a school here?—If the Government had built a school at Te Awamutu, the Natives would have brought their children to such a school.

5. How many children of school age would go if there was a school?—I could not tell you, because this land was confiscated.

6. If a school was built here no children would go to it?—That is so.

7. *Mr. Wardell.*] If a school were established on the same lines as under Mr. Morgan and Mr. Gorst do you say no pupil would come to it?—No, there would be none now, because new schools have been placed in other parts of the district and have been in existence two or three years.

8. What do you mean by saying there is no reason why a school should not have been carried on?—I could not explain it to you, because the missionaries left no word behind that there was to be a school at Te Awamutu.

9. What would be the good of it if the children would not go to it?—Why did they make schools at Parawera and other places? If they said the children were to come here, we would bring them here.

10. Can you tell us the number of children living in the neighbourhood, including Kihikihi?—None whatever.

11. Where is the nearest kainga?—There are some at the Puniu Bridge and other places along the river. They go to the Government school at Kihikihi. There is no Government Maori school nearer than Parawera. The Natives gave the site for the Government school at Parawera. I think there are more than twenty children go to that school, and two go to the Government school at Kihikihi. There are a great many other children, but their parents will not send them to school. I think there are about twenty in our villages who do not go to school.

12. *The Chairman.*] Do any Church missionaries come to see you?—No.

13. Is there no Church missionary anywhere in the neighbourhood?—There are two Native clergymen who visit us, one a Wesleyan and the other Church of England; they live at Kopua.

14. Do any of your people go to see them?—No; they visit us, and so did Nikora Tautau before he went away to Ngaruawahia. The people who had the mana in this land at Otawhao and Puniu were Te Paewaka and Tu Korohu, my grandfather. The former belonged to the hapus Ngatipatukoko, Ngatinaeae, Ngatiporeteuaki, Ngatingamuri, and others. The latter belonged to Ngatiparetekawa, Ngatingutu, and others

## TE KARAUNA TE IKARUTU examined.

*Witness* : I live at Whatawhata. I belong to the tribe that gave the land. Ngatiruru and Ngatiwera-koko are the hapus that gave the land—so I have heard.

15. *Mr. Hutana.*] Have you heard who ceded the land?—Porokoru was one, Haunui was another, and Muimoa te Katea. I corroborate what the former witness said—that the land was given for school purposes. Puniu was given for the purpose of raising stock to maintain the school. I have heard that children from Tauranga used to come to this school.

## ERUETI TE IRA examined.

*Witness* : I live at Kahotea on the lower side of the river from Otorohanga.

16. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you know who gave the land at Te Awamutu?—Yes, Porokoru was one, and Wanana. I was not here when the land was given, but I heard it.

17. Are you a descendant of these people?—Yes, I am a descendant of Porokoru. I was residing in Pirongia, and did not know Puniu had been given for school purposes till I saw the survey-line that had been cut. I was grown up at the time. I made inquiries who had given the land, and found Porokoru had given it. I asked him why he had not informed the true owners of the land before giving, so that all might hear and give their consent or disapproval. But Porokoru did not attach much importance to what I said. I said I never would consent, and I hold to that now.

18. *Mr. Wardell.*] Did Porokoru say what he had given it for?—No.

19. Was your father living at the time?—Yes.

20. Why did not your father speak about it?—He did not know; he was living across the river.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] Did Porokoru bring the land into the Native Land Court?—No; he exercised the rights of a chief. I support what Tu Koretu said in saying that the Maoris show great neglect in not sending their children to school about here. At Otorohanga they attend well. I do not agree with what Tu Koretu said about the mana of the land; they had mana over the men, but not over the land.

## WILLIAM WATSON BIRD, Inspector of Native Schools, examined.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many Government Native schools are there in the Waikato between this and Kohanga?—One: Rakaumanga, on the opposite side of the river from Huntly. I should say there were sixty on the roll, but the attendance has been more or less unsatisfactory, and I should think not more than forty-five are attending.

23. Is there any other Native school within easy distance of this place?—There are two—one twelve miles off at Te Kopua; there are about sixteen children attending it. The other is at Parawera, seven miles from Kihikihi and ten from Te Awamutu; forty-four children are attending it. The children at Parawera come long distances to school, and the parents there are very keenly interested in their school, and exert all their efforts to send their children as regularly as they can. The school was only established lately.

24. Has it come to your knowledge that there are any Native children not attending schools in the district?—Of course I know something about the position of Kohanga and Pakau. I cannot say I know of any who are not attending schools in this neighbourhood.

25. *Mr. Quick.*] From how great a distance do the children come to Parawera?—About seven miles on horseback.

26. They are not fed or maintained in any way?—No.

27. Has it been represented to you at any time that other Native schools are required in this district?—Yes, at Kohanga.

28. Did you make any inquiry into the matter?—Nearly five years ago Mr. Pope, who was then Inspector, visited Kohanga, and since then we have had some correspondence with the people on the subject. The difficulty has been that the Natives are not prepared to give a site as the Department requires—some 3 acres.

29. Is there any site on the Native school reserve at Kohanga that would be convenient?—Not to my personal knowledge. But all proposals from the Government to establish a school there have fallen through on account of the Natives being unwilling to give up any land for the school.

30. You mean outside the 750 acres already given?—I could not say that. The Natives stated, if they gave a site for a school, upon the school falling through, as it might do in the course of time, the land should revert to them. They had had enough of giving land to the missionaries. This was an impossible condition for the Government to accept, seeing that the building cost £700, and the land would be worth about £5 an acre; we should want about 3 acres. Then, I presume, the Natives were unable to give the land because it was leased.

31. *The Chairman.*] You do not know of any correspondence between the trustees of this reserve and the Department?—No. I may say in regard to this I had intended to call upon the Rev. G. Maunsell, who was aware of the circumstances, and discuss with him Kohanga and other Native-school proposals, but I never managed to catch him when in Auckland. I dare say he knows more about it really than the trustees.

32. Is that the only case in which representation has been made to the Department in favour of further Native schools in this district?—There was an application for another school at another place near Kohanga—Pakau, between Kohanga and Tauranganui, but the two are wrapped up together somehow.

33. *Mr. Hutana.*] Would it be advisable, in your opinion, to establish a school of an improved kind in the Waikato?—Before I could reply to a question like that I should want to know first of all whether it was going to be a boys' or a girls' school, or one for both sexes, and then I should want to know where you would propose to put it.

34. Say it was at Hopuhopu?—As far as my own personal opinion goes, I should prefer to see a higher school established in a purely Maori country, and at some distance from pakeha habitations.

35. *The Chairman.*] What is your reason for that preference?—My own personal opinion is that it is a mistake to take away the best boys and girls from a kainga to educate them in a town.

36. What brings you to that conclusion? Is it better for the Maori scholar or better for the people generally?—It is better for the Maori race generally. The taking-away a boy or girl from his kainga to educate him in a city is apt to give him notions of life altogether foreign to those to which he will have to return.

37. You will admit that, if the right idea is that Maori boys should be taken and put to learn industrial pursuits for the purpose of enabling them to get a living as mechanics, it would be better to take them to the town?—I admit that, but a Maori boy will not readily find employment as a mechanic; and if he returns to his kainga he is neither pakeha nor Maori.

38. *Mr. Wardell.*] You mean he will not seek employment?—No; and if he does get employment in the town, what advantage is that to the Maori race generally or to his people? He is lost to his people.

39. *The Chairman.*] There are many of your opinion, and many of another opinion, that it is better to take him to a large town to take up European ideas and habits, and disassociate him from his people's habits. Others think it better to give him a certain amount of European ways and let him go back to his people?—At present we have no better course to follow than to send the Maoris to the higher schools at Auckland or Napier; but the after-career of those who graduate from those secondary institutions does not seem, so far as my own experience goes, very encouraging.

40. *Mr. Wardell.*] You look upon it as advancing the individual at the expense of the race?—That is so.

41. And that he is not an improving element in his race?—Rather the opposite, I am sorry to say.

42. Do you think if they improved St. Stephen's they could teach agriculture there?—On a small scale, and if they do it as well as they are doing the carpentering they would make a very good thing of it.

43. *Mr. Quick.*] The Maori is generally being brought into contact with Europeans except in the Urewera country: I suppose there is hardly any other place where they are not constantly brought into contact with Europeans?—Very few places. But at the same time they seem to prefer to keep to themselves, and the same may be said of the pakeha.

44. I do not think there is any feeling of that kind amongst Europeans?—I think you will find it in some places.

45. If the Maoris are isolated after being at St. Stephen's, would there not be a tendency to relapse into Maoridom?—Yes, that is so.

46. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would they not carry into Maoridom the information and education they had acquired?—But it would not supply them with a means of livelihood.

47. Where is there any place outside the Urewera where Maoris are not brought into contact with Europeans?—In all places they keep themselves to themselves. I know to my own personal knowledge of a place between Wellington and Wanganui where the white element objected to the Maori element in the school.

48. *Mr. Quick.*] We have had evidence that the Maori boys were rather favourites in a school?—We had an application to establish a school forwarded by the committee of a white school who objected to the presence of Maoris in their school—Waitotara.

49. That is a singular application, is it not?—It is rather frequent. It is difficult to get proper hold of, but the feeling is there.

50. *Mr. Wardell.*] There is no religious instruction given in the Government Native schools?—No; not according to the regulations; but many of our teachers conduct Sunday-school, and so forth. We never inquire the religion of the children attending, and we do not know.

51. Have you ever found any objection to children being sent up to a denominational school such as St. Stephen's?—I have found objection: the Roman Catholics object to send their girls to Victoria School, and also to send boys to St. Stephen's.

52. Have you heard of any objections from other bodies?—I have heard complaints from Mormons that their Church was not respected, but that disrespect was not from the teachers of St. Stephen's but from the other boys.

53. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think it is feasible to have a high-class school in the midst of a Maori population?—It all depends on how high you intend to go. In the case of girls, it is a mistake to carry them beyond the Fifth Standard. After that they had better learn practical work, which will make them good mothers and wives.

54. Victoria School was started for that purpose?—That is so.

55. *Mr. Wardell.*] In regard to technical teaching, you realise the benefit of a school of that class in a purely Native community?—That is my own personal opinion; I do not speak for the Department.

56. Do you think a school where boys alone could be maintained and taught up to the Sixth Standard, with technical and artisan and agricultural training, would be beneficial?—I should certainly say, Yes.

57. You would regard it is highly beneficial?—Yes. But I ought to let you know in the case of a school at Rakaumanga the Government erected there a workshop, in which the boys were to get training in carpentry and woodwork. It has been established now four years, and I cannot say it has met with the success one could hope for. The explanation I have heard given is that the Maori boys there, being close to Taupiri, find employment at flax-milling or coal-work, or something of that kind. That is one objection to the establishment of a higher school near town. Town attracts the young fellows, and they will not study at school when they can get 10s. a week.



58. *Mr. Quick.*] It seems to me, to make it successful you must board and maintain?—That would be a much wider scheme than our Department are prepared to undertake.

59. But if it could be done by endowments, you would say a boarding-school would make the school much more efficient?—Most certainly.

60. What sort of boys does St. Stephen's turn out?—Some turn out very well and some very badly. The Maori boy, on returning to his kainga, has no chance. This is the trouble: he is a pakeha in some ways and he has to live in Maori fashion entirely, and it is worse for the girls than the boys.

61. They are carried a step too far at St. Stephen's to make them acceptable to their own people when they come back?—I would not say that. I do not want to make reflections on a hardworking institution. But I will give you my own candid opinion. Take the case of a girl who leaves her kainga to go to any institution. She leaves home at fourteen or fifteen years of age and goes to a secondary institution, and is taught on the lines of a grammar-school, and at the end of her scholarship period she goes back to the kainga. During her residence at a secondary school she has become accustomed to proper food, proper hours, proper bed, all the latest sanitary arrangements, privacy, &c. She has been disciplined, also—not allowed to do what she likes. When she goes back to her kainga, what is she going to do? She has no privacy, no proper food, she has to drop back into Maori ways—and some of them drop very soon—and you can not blame the girl. That is why my views tend in the direction of keeping the girls at home. If you ask what is the remedy I would propose—of course it is impossible to swap horses in the middle of the stream—we have nothing better than the existing schools—but I would say establish a continuation school in each district such as has been suggested in the Waikato, so that the girl who has passed the Fourth Standard should not be transplanted to pakeha soil, but should learn to cook, to scrub, to work, to look after children as she sees them in Maori kaingas every day of her life. She will not get false notions into her head, nor be trained up for two years and then suddenly brought down with a crash in a Maori kainga. It ruins them—that is the long and short of it. Many girls I have known have simply had to give up after a very short struggle, and to fall back into Maori ways, and some of them seem to be worse after it. If you could take them home and marry them to a respectable man who would look after them it would be all right, but they have not got the chance.

62. *Mr. Wardell.*] Could these classes be attached to the Government day-schools specially for girls?—It is quite possible they will be attached. The boys are already being taught carpentry in five or six places, and in some cases the wives of some of the teachers are taking an interest in the girls and teaching them cooking, &c. Parawera is a case in point.

63. *Mr. Quick.*] Then very little alteration in regard to the day-schools would meet the case?—Yes; I may say the developments in handwork in Maori schools are due to the Inspector-General of Schools, who was the first to introduce handwork and to propose the establishment of workshops in the schools, and cooking and dressmaking I know to be part of his scheme.

#### EDWARD ALLEN examined.

*Witness:* I am a farmer, residing at Cambridge. I am valuer for the diocese and the missionary society in the Waikato. I have been requested by Mr. Cochrane to give evidence before the Commission. Twelve months ago I valued the Puniu property for the trustees. The lease was within five years of expiry, and the lessee had it at a nominal rent at first; he had spent a good deal on the property, and he wanted to know what the trustees would re-lease it at if he spent a certain sum on the place.

64. *Mr. Wardell.*] You were taking into consideration what his work had been on the land?—I was valuing the property and his improvements; I valued what the land was worth in open competition.

65. Did you form an opinion as to the value of the freehold of the land?—I went all over it. Some was worth £10 and some worth £1; and I averaged the whole at £5; the whole estate being worth some £4,000. There are five or six different sorts of soil. The value of the property would be about the same now.

66. How does the property compare with that known as Major Jackson's?—There is more bad land on it; there is some very poor cold flat near the Puniu River.

67. *Mr. Hutana.*] Is there any land there under water?—There is an undrained swamp. I could not say whether it dries up in summer; it is all rushes and swamp, and has not been cultivated. Cattle would get bogged on some of it. I should say the estate was worth £200 a year; it is near a factory and within a mile of the township.

68. *The Chairman.*] Did you know the land at the time the lease was granted?—I knew this much of it: they advertised it for offers all over the Waikato, and only got one offer—Mr. Bowden's; so I know it must be in a bad state.

69. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know that it was advertised in all the papers?—I think I saw it in the Waikato papers.

70. *The Chairman.*] Irrespective of this fact about it being advertised, did you know enough of the land then to be able to form an opinion, taking into consideration its condition, what would be reasonable terms on which to let it?—No; but farmers talk, and everyone seemed to know that the tenant who had been on it had let it go to rack and ruin, and nobody bothered to tender for it.

71. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think somebody ought to have prevented the tenant letting it go to wrack and ruin?—There seems to be no means of doing so in this country.

72. No means of keeping a tenant up to his conditions of lease?—Many farmers I know have ridden roughshod through their leases, and that is why people object to leasing land. In this case he went bankrupt, and that settled it.

73. *Mr. Quick.*] How long have you been farming in the Waikato?—Twenty-seven years.

74. Do you know the character of the land from here to Kohanga?—I do not know much of it down there.



75. Do you value for other bodies?—I value for the City of Auckland Sinking Fund Commissioners and for some fire-insurance companies for purposes of investment. I have been doing so for eight or ten years. I value for three of four different companies.

76. *The Chairman.*] What was the value of the land when you first knew it?—I did not see the state it was in.

77. *Mr. Wardell.*] Taking the land between this and the railway-station, on the right of the road, is there much difference in quality and character of the land between this Puniu?—Mr. Bowden's is about the same quality, but further back it gets poor. For farming purposes, if it is similar to that about Bowden's house, I should say it was worth £10 an acre; but I have never been over the Te Awamutu land.

78. Do you know what stock is carried on the farm?—It was well stocked.

79. What do you estimate the area of the swampy portion?—About 80 or 100 acres; but it is not real swamp, cattle go through most of it.

JOHN BURGESS TEASDALE examined.

*Witness:* I am Chairman of the Te Awamutu Town Board, and I was requested by the Board to ask the Commission to sit at Te Awamutu. In regard to the Puniu land, I valued it for the Government six or seven years ago for rating purposes. So far as I recollect, my valuation was close on £4,000. I think the last witness's valuation would be a fair one. I should say the value now would be about £6 an acre. Mr. Bowden has improved it very much.

80. *Mr. Wardell.*] What was the condition of the place prior to Mr. Bowden's tenancy?—Most of it was not cultivated at all. I knew the land fifteen years before he had it.

81. During the fifteen years was the land profitably occupied?—Yes; the tenant made it pay. He kept cultivating certain portions of it; about half of it was clear when Westney gave it up. It was not in as good condition then as it is now. I followed Westney for a year with a partner, and when I left my partner kept it up. It was then let to the Rev. Mr. Rispham, and that was the period when it went back. In regard to Otawhao, some five or six years ago the Town Board invited Mr. Seddon here to try and get him to take over the mission property. The land was required, there being no other building-sites. We had a meeting here, and Mr. McKerrow came afterwards to see the land. He must have valued it very low, for he only offered £2,000 to the mission for it, which they refused. This was in 1900. Since then we have asked for the land to be cut up—both the Government and the Mission Board—but nothing has been done until the last week or so. They have sent a surveyor to mark it off in quarter- and half-acre sections. He is also making a plan of larger sections. I think, myself, the small sections are too small for the development of the town.

82. *The Chairman.*] Are they proposing to lease or sell it?—To lease it only, and the leases appear to be very short, and they have no improved values in them. If you want a piece of land to build on, they will ask you £5 ground-rent per annum for a  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre.

83. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think that is exorbitant?—Certainly, except for one or two special sections. If the tenant is going to build and get no compensation for improvements, it is unreasonable to offer a lease for twenty-one years.

84. *Mr. Quick.*] What do you propose, a lease for a longer term, or what?—Yes; or that the Government should take it over.

85. *Mr. Wardell.*] Has it ever been intimated to you that it is doubtful whether they have the power to lease at all?—Yes. The town has not been able to move at all because they cannot cut the land up. The leases where the shops stand were leased in the early days by the Rev. Mr. Brady, who got very large rentals for subleases; and the society bought him out afterwards. What I desire for the welfare of the town is that there should be long leases with improvement clauses—leases for at least sixty-six years. So far as the Church is concerned, they have never been any benefit to the district or town in any way. The parsonage formerly used by the clergyman has been taken and let, and the parishioners have had to find a new site to erect a house for the resident clergyman.

86. *Mr. Quick.*] Do the Church community complain?—Certainly they do.

87. Is the parsonage built solely by the people of Te Awamutu?—By the people of the parochial district.

88. You have a special collection now and then for it?—Yes.

89. *Mr. Wardell.*] You say although the trust is for schools or Church purposes the community has had no benefit from it, either in the way of public worship or schools?—The church was built for us; we have kept it in repair; it is on the trust land.

90. Do you say 5 acres have been sold?—It is supposed to have been; I do not know whether it has. I believe sections with a frontage to the road of 2 chains, 5 chains deep, would sell at £40 an acre, freehold. I am paying nearly £40 an acre ground-rent for my corner.

91. What are you paying per acre for your farm land?—Seven shillings and sixpence.

92. You say in the interests of the town and locality the Town Board are desirous that the trustees should have power to lease for a long period or to sell?—Yes.

93. Can you put before us anything in respect to the needs of a school for the education of Native children in this district, or other children?—I have no doubt a higher school would be of great advantage, especially being so near the railway-line. It would have to be a boarding-school. Two or three Native boys and girls go to the school here at present. I wish to impress upon the Commission that it is impossible for the township to progress unless the trustees have power to grant longer leases.

94. So far as we understand, the trustees will be willing to fall in with your views?—It would be very easy for them to give more encouragement to a man to enable him to live than they do, and to put improvement conditions in their leases. I have offered to let them cut building-sections off my frontage if they would give me a long lease of the back part. The population of the township is about four or five hundred, but the district is a large one. The township is increasing. During the last five years perhaps a dozen new houses have been put up.

## HUGH IRVING examined.

*Witness*: I am a farmer, residing at Te Awamutu. I have always looked upon the mission property as keeping the place back. I have been here about five years. It gives the impression that the place is going backwards. I know from my own knowledge that there is a considerable demand for land in the vicinity of the centre of the town for building, and if it were cut up into sections of 5 or 6 acres it would sell very freely.

95. *Mr. Quick.*] You look upon the thing from the same point of view as Mr. Teasdale, and you corroborate his evidence?—I did not pay much attention to the whole of his evidence. It would be better to dispose of the freehold than to lease it, unless the trustees give full valuation for improvements. Although the land is leased in a sort of way, it looks really like unoccupied land. Within the last year or so a block near the station has been cut up by the owners and sold in 5- or 6-acre blocks, which have been built upon. The natural way to extend the town is towards the railway-station, and this property blocks it.

## WILLIAM NORTH examined.

*Witness*: I am a farmer, residing at Te Awamutu, and a member of the Town Board. I have been so for a great many years. I have lived in the district for about twenty-seven years. I can corroborate all Mr. Teasdale said about the drag this mission property has been on us. But he did not mention that there have been fourteen or fifteen families who came here and would have built here, but who had to go away because they could not get sites. They have gone to Hamilton instead. We have tried all we know to get things altered, but there seems to be no remedy. We approached the Government to get them to take the land from the mission and administer it. We always have had doubts as to whether the mission had any right to the land at all. Te Awamutu would have been a flourishing town had it not been for this land.

## MATTHEW SHAW LAURIE examined.

*Witness*: I am a farmer and livery and bait stable proprietor, living at Te Awamutu. I have just applied for a lease, and been granted one, of a portion of the mission property— $\frac{1}{4}$  acre on a building-lease for fifty years from the 1st July, and the balance on a grazing-lease. For the  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre I am to pay £5 a year ground-rent; for the balance (3 acres) £5 a year on a ten-years lease, with the right of resumption by the trustees of part for building purposes. I think there ought to have been a compensation clause. I think if the land were cut up into sections it would be for the benefit of the township.

96. *Mr. Wardell.*] It has been stated that land with a frontage to the road and running back 5 chains would sell at £40 an acre: is that a fair value?—I should think so.

97. What would it be worth for ground-rent for fifty years?—About £1 10s. an acre.

## KHIKIHI, WEDNESDAY, 5TH JULY, 1905.

## TU POTAHU examined.

*Witness*: I live at Puniu. I speak in reference to the land called Puniu, otherwise known as Moewha, and Otawhao, situated near the railway-station at Te Awamutu. The Bishop asked us to give him these lands for school purposes and this was agreed to by the chief Te Katea, son of Te Paewaka. Tu Korehu handed over all this land to Te Paewaka and his hapus, and so the donors of the land were Te Katea, Porokoru, Epiha, and Heni Waikato, and other chiefs of the hapu Ngatikoura, Te Werekako, and other hapus. There was no school placed on Puniu. I am a descendant of Tu Korehu, the principal donor of the land. A school was erected at Te Awamutu. When it was under the management of Mr. Gorst old people used to attend it; there were as many as twenty studying there. Shortly after the war took place, and the whole work ceased. There were a great many children who used to attend the school. There may have been as many as fifty or one hundred.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you regard the war as sufficient reason for stopping the school?—I do not know. All I know is that it ceased and no school was started afterwards.

2. Have there been any children in the neighbourhood who could have attended the school if it had been reopened?—There were no Maoris there nor children after the war; we went away to the other side of Puniu.

3. What is the wish of the Natives in regard to the land now?—I would like it returned to the people who gave it—to the descendants of the donors.

4. What about the establishment of a school now?—It would be useless to us, because we have no settlements round about.

5. Would you think Puniu a good site for a central school for Waikato, where children could be taught to use their hands as well as their heads?—Yes; but all this country has been confiscated, and it would be better to put it amongst the Maoris where they live, at my settlement. The Government have put a school at Parawera.

6. How many children are there at your settlement?—If there were a school there, there might be as many as fifty to go to it.

7. Of the same kind as the school at Parawera?—Yes.

8. What is the name of your kainga?—Pukekawakawa, at Puniu.

9. *The Chairman.*] Do you know what the trustees are doing with the money they get from the land?—We do not know how they expend the revenues; all we know is that they are obtaining revenue from it.

0. They say they are taking Maori boys from the Waikato district and educating some of them at St. Stephen's School, at Auckland?—The land was given, however, for the Maori children.

11. *Mr. Quick.*] They do not educate white children with it, only Maoris?—That may be so.

12. *Mr. Hutana.*] Have you any children from your village going to St. Stephen's?—Yes; children of Ngatimaniapoto are at St. Stephen's. One of mine went there, but is he dead. Others send some there.

13. Do you know any from this neighbourhood who are there now?—I know of some from Kawhia, and some from Otorohanga.

14. *Mr. Quick.*] Were the donors of Puniu Ngatimaniapoto?—No; they were Waikato. Te Paewaka was Waikato. I am Ngatimaniapoto and also Waikato. I am speaking as a Ngatimaniapoto.

MARIA EPIHA examined.

*Witness:* I live at Mangakopara on the Mangatautara Block. I am a descendant of Epiha, who has been mentioned as one of the donors of Puniu. I attended the school at Te Awamutu under Mr. Morgan. There were two divisions of the school; I belonged to the second; the first was for half-castes. At the time I was at school a request was made for Puniu to be handed over to the mission. The applicant for the land was Mr. Morgan. I will mention the names of the donors as far as I can. Te Paewaka, Epiha, Warana, Hemi Waikato, and Pita te Kawa. Tati Warekawa was there and witnessed the donation. Otawhao was a pa of Paewaka. We were living here at that time. Otawhao was the first piece of land asked for and handed over for the mission for the minister at Te Awamutu, and he then asked for Moewha to be given, and it was given.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] To whom?—The Europeans to whom it was given, so far as I can remember, were Mr. Morgan, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Hadfield, and a doctor whose name I forget—Purchase (?).

16. Were you at school at the time Puniu was given?—I saw them and I heard my elders give the land to them.

17. Did they come up here when the land was given?—Yes; they came to Mr. Morgan's house at Te Awamutu.

18. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you remember the cession of Te Awamutu?—No; I was very young and do not remember it.

19. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know what Puniu was given for?—For a residence and a site for us children at school.

20. *Mr. Hutana.*] Was it not given for land to produce food for the children at Te Awamutu?—It was given for cultivation and for us to live upon while attending school.

21. Were they contemplating two schools, one at Te Awamutu and the other at Puniu?—Yes; Mr. Morgan contemplated removing it from Te Awamutu, because the latter was too small. That was the object for which the land was asked; and before they could complete the new arrangements they were overtaken by the war. Puniu was chosen because it was unoccupied and clear.

22. Do you want a school placed on the land and the trust carried out, or what do you want?—I would like the land returned to us, the descendants of the original donors, and after that we will consider the matter of a school. We already have a school at Parawera alongside our houses, and we are suited so far as schooling is concerned.

23. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us how many children there are in the neighbourhood who are not attending school at all?—All the children at Parawera are going to school. I cannot say anything about other children. The school is very satisfactory; the only thing we complain of is that we have to maintain our own children.

24. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you want the school to look after your children and feed them?—During the time I went to Mr. Morgan's school he clothed and fed me and gave me lodging, but I do not want that now. I do not wish my children to be maintained in the same manner; I prefer the present system.

25. Do you know that after the children have passed these schools they are taken to a higher school?—We are considering that matter.

26. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are we to understand you are satisfied with the school and the teaching of the school: all you want is that the school should maintain your children?—No; I do not want that. I could not send my children away from home, because they are too small.

27. Then what is it you wish?—I want to keep my child at home. I cannot tell you what I want.

28. Do you complain about the money from Puniu being spent on the support of boys from the Waikato at St. Stephen's?—Yes, I do.

29. On what grounds?—We, the donors, have no children there.

HAMUERA TE MOKOROU examined.

*Witness:* I live at Parawera. I came here in consequence of seeing the notice about the Otawhao land, and I want to state the hapu who lived at Otawhao. They were Ngatiwerakoko, Ngatikoura, Ngatiruru, Ngatiwaenganui, and Ngatiparihaehaeora.

30. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you dispute that the land was given to the mission?—No; I do not wish to dispute it.

31. Do you know who the donors were?—No. What I came here for was to say that we have a school at Parawera; but from the time of the mission station at Te Awamutu to the present there has been no school there. I do not want a school at Te Awamutu now, because we are now supplied with one at Parawera.

32. Do you object to the money from the land going to support boys at St. Stephen's School?—Yes, I object.

33. *Mr. Quick.*] Why do you object?—I have just heard for the first time that the moneys are diverted to St. Stephen's. Our children are at the school in our village, and I should like the money applied to the purposes of that school.

34. Why should the money be applied to Parawera when the Government supplies the money for that school?—Well, that is so. We will consider the matter.

35. Are the children at Parawera taught any handicraft?—No.

36. Do you know they are taught handicraft at St. Stephen's?—Yes, I have heard so.

37. Do you not consider that a good thing?—Yes.

38. How do you expect it to be done at Parawera?—I would let the master teach technical education there.

39. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any objection to boys going to St. Stephen's on account of religious teaching?—We can make no objection, because the matter rests with the parents.

40. Would it be any objection in your mind to sending children there?—No; I should have no objection. Religious teaching is a thing we desire, and our wish is that when our children are advanced they should be sent there. I object to the money going to St. Stephen's, because in our particular case we have no children there.

41. But that is only an accident: you might have some there at some time?—That is so.

42. Then if some children go there is it not right that the money from Puniu should go towards supporting them?—Well, yes; it would be all right when that takes place.

43. *Mr. Hutana.*] Would it not be more advantageous to your children if the school at St. Stephen's were moved closer up here in the midst of the Maori people—a school for higher education than you get at Parawera?—I cannot tell you whether it would suit all the Maoris, because some send their children to schools at a distance, and some to the Government school close by.

44. When the children have passed the standards at Parawera, would it not be advisable to send them to a school where they could be given technical training, such as blacksmithing, carpentry, &c.?—Yes; but as to the money that has already been expended, I make no objection to that. But in the future let the Natives think it over what shall be done with the money from the trust, and give an answer.

45. *The Chairman.*] These lands are being held in trust for the benefit of the children, and now all that is left for us to do is to devise or suggest a course whereby the trusts can be given effect to; therefore, it is no use going outside the scope of the Commission and asking that the land shall be returned to you?—Then, what I say is we would like to consider the point and give the Commission an answer in reference to the expenditure of the money—whether it shall be spent at St. Stephen's or some other way. I would ask for time to consider it.

46. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us that you and other Natives of the neighbourhood would rather the children should be sent to St. Stephen's than to a school of a similar character if it could be established in this neighbourhood—suppose it were at Puniu?—Yes, it would be well.

47. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you mean it would be better to have it at Puniu than at St. Stephen's?—Yes, I think so.

RIHI HUANGA (MRS. MAINWARING) examined.

*Witness:* My tribe is Ngatimaniapoto. I live at Kihikihi. My hapus are Ngatihuaio and Ngatingutu. I know the land at Te Awamutu and at Puniu. I resided there before the war. I was born there. My kainga was Te Tomo. The land at Te Awamutu on which the school stood was divided into two parts. One part was sold by my grandmother to Mr. Morgan—the part on which the school stood, opposite to where the church now stands and then stood. I think the area sold was about 100 acres. My grandmother's name was Kataraina Huangā. The land was paid for in horses and blankets and tobacco, and all those goods were handed over to my grandmother, and she took them to her relatives at Hangatiki. There was only one horse.

48. *The Chairman.*] How do you know all this?—I was told by my grandmother, with whom I was living. The other part of the land was handed over as a free gift for a site for a church and for school purposes. At that time Mr. Morgan asked for land to be given as a place on which to put horses and stock for the school, and Puniu was handed over. When we were at the school we used to grow our own food; we did not buy any; the school-girls and all the children worked. The people who have just been giving evidence are strangers, and have nothing to do with the land at all.

49. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you claim to have any interest in the land now?—Yes, I still have claims on the land. Now the land is no longer used for school purposes it ought to be returned to us.

50. *Mr. Hutana.*] Would you be satisfied if the trusts were fully carried out now?—Do you mean by that that a school should be established on the land? Inasmuch as we cannot attend that school now, the land should be returned to us.

51. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know the names of any of these petitioners attached to this petition presented to Parliament in 1898 in regard to the Puniu land?—I never saw the petition till now. I do not know any of the names attached to it; they are people from the lower Waikato.

52. Do we understand that most of the people who gave land were Ngatimaniapoto?—Yes, the right to the land was with the two hapus I have mentioned.

53. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you deny that it was given by Porokoru, Epiha, and others?—It was not they who gave the land.

54. Do you deny that it was given by a Ngatimaniapoto chief to Te Paewaka, and by him given to the mission?—I deny that. You will find evidence in connection with the matter recorded in the Native Land Court books.

55. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you know whether the claims of the persons who ceded the land are recorded?—I could show that my grandmother altered the boundaries when she went to mark out the ground. In regard to my statement that the land should be returned to the Natives, I should like the revenue arising from the land to be given to us for our children, or else put a school on the land.

56. *The Chairman.*] Or a church?—Yes, a church is a good thing.

57. Would that satisfy you?—There are plenty of churches. Why our children will not go to St. Stephen's is because it is so far away.

58. Have you really considered how many children could be got to attend a school if it were established?—That is a question well worthy of consideration, because the people are scattered in other parts, and there are already schools in other parts. I cannot say how many children would come. We want the revenue from the land expended on our children and not on European children. Sometimes the children sent to St. Stephen's return home to die, and they tell me they are not properly taken care of there. I would send my children there if I thought they would take proper care of them.

59. What have you heard that is not right in the care taken of them?—I heard they are thrashed by European children there—perhaps not in the school, but by those running about in the road.

60. Do you say, supposing it would be useless to establish a number of little schools, it would be better to have one big school in the Waikato?—Yes, I would like to see a large school at Puniu; all our children would go to it.

MAKERITI HINEWAI (MRS. W. H. GRACE) examined.

*Witness*: I am a niece of the chief Rewi Ngatimaniapoto. We resided at Kihikihi and Te Awamutu, where I attended the school. Mr. Morgan was the minister and Mr. Ireland was the teacher. I know the land that was given to Mr. Morgan for the school-children—given to the Church of England. It was a gift for the maintenance of the children of the school. I am speaking of Puniu and also Te Awamutu. Some of the children belonged to Ngatimaniapoto and some to Ngatiraukawa. It was a large school, and Maoris and half-castes attended it. I know this land was given by my uncle for the benefit of Ngatimaniapoto and Ngatiraukawa. Rewi had the mana over all these lands, and he had also the mana over the tribes and the people who have spoken on this matter. Tu Korehu was another of the chiefs. If Rewi were alive, no one would dare to come and try to take the land away.

61. *The Chairman*.] We are quite satisfied that you are interested in the proper use of the land, and are a very proper witness; but what we want to know is whether you are dissatisfied with the present use of the land?—No; we do not raise any objection to the way the money is expended, because it is spent on our children at St. Stephen's.

62. Are there many who agree with you about this?—Yes, and if they came here they would support what I say.

63. Are you satisfied with the system by which the Government have local schools and the Church people maintain some of the children at St. Stephen's?—Yes, I see no harm in that.

64. Have you ever visited St. Stephen's?—Yes, and a large number of our children have grown up there, and have been taught trades.

65. Do you approve of the way in which the children are treated?—Yes, I approve of the system.

66. Do you think it would be a good thing if the school were increased in size and more children taken in?—I would like that.

67. *Mr. Wardell*.] Would it be more satisfactory if such a school were in the Waikato?—I am not able to say anything about that, inasmuch as there are a good many Government schools. There is one at Kihikihi, and some Maori children attend it, and the school is satisfactory to them. In reference to the statements made by the people of the Waikato, I say those people were living under the mana of Rewi and Tu Koretu.

WILLIAM HENRY GRACE examined.

*Witness*: I have been a resident in this district for nearly twenty-five years. I am a son of a missionary of the Church of England, who devoted his life to christianising the Maoris. In my childhood I lived at Taupo, and in passing through to the Church of England grammar-school in Auckland, I used to pass through this district. In 1860 I passed through and stayed at Mr. Morgan's, at Te Awamutu. There was a school there at that time attended by both girls and boys. I should say there were quite a hundred there, and they were all maintained at the school and around it. Some lived at the school, and the relatives of others maintained other children, so as to be near the school. I passed through Te Awamutu eight times prior to the war, and I remember on one occasion seeing the young boys of fourteen and upwards cutting acres and acres of wheat with sickles. All that wheat had been put in by the boys of the school under superintendence. At that time all round the district the Maoris were most industrious and were all in good circumstances. They used to grow their own wheat, and were taught by the missionaries—Church of England and Roman Catholic—to turn it into flour. They had assistance from Sir George Grey in education in cultivating the land. A man was appointed to show them how to plough. I learned a great deal from Rewi as to what took place in former days on these mission lands. He told me about twenty-five years ago that they were given for the purpose of educating the children in the Anglican Church, and that he and many chiefs in the Waikato took part in consulting together and fixing on the property they should give away. Just now the Maoris think that through these technicalities that are arising there is a chance of getting the land back, and they are now coming before the Commission to show that they are the owners of the land; but at that time it was a tribal business. It was decided by the tribe and the chiefs of Ngatimaniapoto. Their object was to establish a school by which the children of their tribes should be educated, and up to the time the war broke out there were children attending the school from all the surrounding districts, and even half-caste children whose fathers were Roman Catholics attended the school. The war spoiled everything; it scattered the Maoris to all parts. But on the outbreak of the war Bishop Selwyn, to try and retain some of the scholars, took them down to St. Stephen's wherever the parents would allow him to do so. When the war broke out, the mana of Tawhiao was dominant over all the Maoris, and they objected to any children being sent to school, which was a heavy handicap against the Church trustees in getting

children from this district. They absolutely refused to send their children to any Government school. It was only as time went on that the Ngatimaniapoto Natives in this district began to avail themselves of sending their children to St. Stephen's. There are some boys who are a credit to the school, but the trouble has always been that there are not sufficient funds to allow a greater number of boys to go there, and the trustees have had to make selections. I could not say whether the funds from the Waikato are only expended for Waikato boys. I have been informed that the funds for the purpose of maintaining Waikato boys were not enough to maintain many boys. In regard to the list that has been put before the Commission of boys at St. Stephen's, there are no Waikato boys in it that I can recognise. Powhare, Kaahu, Terangi, Tau, and Morgan I recognise as Ngatimaniapoto. Of late years within my own knowledge a great many young fellows have been raised at St. Stephen's that are a credit to the Natives in this district, and who have obtained good situations both privately and in the Government service; and there is one from Kopua who went to St. Stephen's, and from there went to Te Aute, and now holds a scholarship of £50 as a student at the Auckland University.

68. *The Chairman.*] Do you know yourself what steps St. Stephen's authorities take for the purpose of inquiring for Waikato boys? We are given to understand that the funds are not enough to establish a school (irrespective of whether it is desirable or not), and the next best thing is to take boys connected somehow with the grant lands and put them at St. Stephen's. Do you know what inquiries the authorities make for the purpose of picking out boys who have grounds for representing the Waikato grants?—Many Natives apply to have their children taken on, and then the authorities make inquiries to see whether it would be advisable to take some particular boy. If he has a good record they take him in, so as to turn out boys who will be a credit to the race. They are a little particular; they do not want a Tom-Dick-and-Harry sort of boy who may turn out no credit. I do not know what steps they take to ascertain if he is from the Waikato. But a letter addressed from here or Otorohanga, or Pirongia, would be taken to come from a Waikato boy, his parents residing at any of those places.

69. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you say that Ngatimaniapoto have as much right to be taken as Waikatos?—I should say so, because this land is on the borders of Waikato and Ngatimaniapoto.

70. The Puniu land is the best endowment?—It is productive land. I would not hold Hopuhopu if it were given me. It is bad land.

71. You consider the Ngatimaniapoto boys have as much right as the boys of Waikato?—Yes; some of the donors were Ngatimaniapoto chiefs.

72. *Mr. Wardell.*] From your knowledge of the matter, would you describe the land given as Ngatimaniapoto or as Waikato?—If you go into ancestral rights, it was Ngatimaniapoto land; but afterwards it got mixed up. This is a Ngatimaniapoto settlement.

73. *Mr. Quick.*] Rewi had the chief mana over the land?—Yes. The great men here were Paewaka, Rewi, and Korehu.

74. *Mr. Wardell.*] You say a good many apply to get to St. Stephen's and are rejected: by what process is the selection for admission made?—On inquiry they find how the child has progressed at another school, and select the most promising pupils.

75. The educational basis is the one on which selection is made?—Yes.

76. But that would not apply to young children: how would that be done?—I do not know.

77. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you suggest anything that would be better than St. Stephen's for Ngatimaniapoto and Waikato Natives?—From my knowledge of the Maori, I would say keep the school at St. Stephen's. If you want to raise the children to become initiated into our ways, have them away from their people. A school here might be better in respect to getting more scholars, but there is this detriment: they are alongside their parents, who are always coming in and interfering. If you mix the Maori and European children, when the Maori children see the European children caned they see they are being treated alike. But in some Maori schools if the master canes a child the parents think it a most serious offence, and take the child away. The contact with their own parents is harmful. Let them be away from their parents if you are going to bring them up to our standard.

78. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think the object of the education is to make them cease to be Maoris and to become pakehas, or to lift the race through them?—My idea is to take them away and make them pakehas; if you do not do that the race will go down.

79. But you would only preserve the individual, you would not help the race?—A number will always retrograde and go back, and some will hold to our ways. The Maori girls' school is a very good idea, so that an educated Maori can marry an educated wife. If he marries an uneducated girl, he is dragged back to her position. If we are going to make the Maoris a strong people, we must make them pakeha in their ways of thinking.

80. Then it would be necessary to lift the whole race individually. I am pointing out that the removal of the individuals into another sphere deprives the race of any benefit that would be derived from that individual's personal advantages?—We can best build up a race by taking a boy away from his own race and educating him as an English boy. I would instance Togo, who was educated in England and who has made the Japanese what he is.

81. If they are taken out from their own people and put into pakeha surroundings, they will cease to exercise any influence over the race, will they not?—There are examples where Natives have been taken right out and passed degrees and so on, and have gone back to their tribes and are trying to bring them up to make good people of them. If we do more in this way we shall make them a people.

82. *Mr. Quick.*] Those are the class who call themselves young New-Zealanders?—Yes, such as Ngata and Dr. Pomare, who are devoting their whole time to elevating their people.

83. And if it were not for Victoria School and Hukarere these young men would have no educated wives to marry?—No. In regard to having a school on this property, it would be an advantage, but there are no funds to maintain it; therefore, let it remain at St. Stephen's.

84. *Mr. Wardell.*] In expressing your opinions are you giving the opinions of the Natives of the district or your own individual opinion?—My own opinion. If you search out the intelligent Natives and ask them what they think, they will tell you they think it better to keep the school as it is.

85. How are we to get at the intelligent Natives? We have taken steps to circulate notices of our sittings here and elsewhere?—They do not care to come forward; it takes time to get hold of them; they do not understand what the Commission is here for. A number of witnesses who have come before you think the Commission is for the purpose of giving the land back to the Maoris, and they are all trying to set up a *prima facie* case as owners of the land.

86. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do you think they could at St. Stephen's carry on similar farming operations to those you saw at Te Awamutu School?—No, they could not; but there is other work they can do there in the way of technical education, which you could not get here; they are obtainable only in Auckland. If you want to apprentice boys to learn shoemaking or carpentering, it could not be done here.

87. You admit they could not grow their food there?—Yes, I admit that.

JOHN ORMSBY examined.

*Witness:* I reside at Otorohanga. I belong to the English Church. I am a Ngatimaniapoto. In the days gone by, when these grants were made to the Church, similar gifts were made to other denominations—to the Roman Catholics at Rangiahia and the Wesleyans at Kawhia and Aotea. I believe they hold them now. They are all for the same purpose. All these denominations were working in the way of instilling into the Natives the Christian faith. The Natives at that time, seeing the value of what was put to them by the missionaries, grasped the idea with earnestness, and in their respective places vied with one another in giving these reserves. Some were given, and some were bought by the different Churches. As to the question whether they are carried out in accordance with the trusts made at the time, we can only compare the present with the state of things that obtained at that time. The Te Awamutu was the first school I went to. So far as I could understand, there was no distinction made as between different creeds; it was a matter of convenience between the Churches, which were the closest to the people. The children at the school were taught the elements of farming in all branches; they had a certain number of hours' schooling, and part of their time was devoted to farming pursuits. I noticed myself they went in eagerly for farming, growing wheat and potatoes, and the eldest of the boys used to take a great interest in threshing out the wheat. Things continued in this way till the breaking-up of European settlement in the Waikato through the war. One of my brothers was taken to St. Stephen's at the time of the breaking-up of the school through the war, and the members of the Church took all the children who were willing to go with them to St. Stephen's. Subsequently there was a long period of estrangement between the Natives and the Europeans, especially in this part of the district, the Natives setting their face against all Europeans—I mean the Ngatimaniapoto and the Waikatos.

88. *Mr. Wardell.*] Except for purposes of land-settlement would you speak of the Ngatimaniapoto and Waikatos as one?—I was going to say, in speaking of matters generally, when speaking of the Waikatos it includes Ngatimaniapoto. I took a prominent part in getting the first school put up in the King-country. In order to get it, seeing that it was before our titles were ascertained, we had to lease a portion of land from the Wesleyans at Kopua to establish a Native school on it, which used to be a Wesleyan mission station. Only a nominal rental was paid for it.

89. *Mr. Quick.*] Do they carry on school-work of their own?—No, but they carry on missionary work. In regard to the manner in which selections are made of pupils for St. Stephen's, they are made, so far as I know, from children who have passed the Fourth Standard, and the Inspectors recommend or suggest to the parents that children showing capacity should be sent on to a higher school. St. Stephen's is looked upon as a secondary, or higher school to the primary Native schools. If the parents are willing, the Inspectors recommend, and the children are admitted to St. Stephen's.

90. *Mr. Wardell.*] But the Government pay for those, and others are supported out of the funds: how are the latter selections made?—I do not know. I have heard of some children who have not passed the qualification and yet have been admitted to St. Stephen's, and possibly they may be the children whom the Board have taken under the trust. There has been a great deal of doubt as to whether the trustees have carried out their trust in the way they should have done.

91. In what direction, as regards centralising their efforts in St. Stephen's?—It is very hard for me to say either one way or another, seeing the number of children being now taken on at St. Stephen's, and not being able to draw the line between pupils supported by the Government and those supported by the trusts. It would greatly depend on the Trust Board's own statement to give the Commissioners an idea as to the number of children taken under the trust. The Commissioners would be better able to draw their conclusions from the statement of the trustees.

92. But we are here to receive suggestions or criticisms?—So far as I am concerned, they have carried out their trust to the best of their ability, although they may be lacking in the way of placing the trusts so that they can get as much revenue as possible from them.

93. *Mr. Wardell.*] You say the trustees may be wanting in diligence in making the most of the land?—I think if there is anything lacking it is in that direction.

94. *The Chairman.*] I do not understand you to give that as your opinion?—There is a doubt in the minds of others as to whether the trustees have carried out their trusts. In my own mind, if there is a doubt, it is in respect to their not utilising the land to the best advantage. You can only judge of the present by the past, and in the past they included education in farming pursuits; in the present day there is nothing of the farming element. I think that is a mistake—to confine technical education to handicrafts.

95. *Mr. Quick.*] The difficulty is to combine them; you see that difficulty?—Yes.



95A. In those days they taught farming and nothing else, and now they teach handicraft and no farming?—I think they used to teach shoemaking and carpentry as well.

96. Can you suggest any alternative?—The only alternative I can suggest and the only drawback, in my own mind, is this: that confinement is hostile to the Native feeling. St. Stephen's stands in a very limited area. I am not speaking against its administration. But Natives as a rule are against being confined in a small space, which is the position with the scholars at St. Stephen's. They want sufficient area to give them, say, a mile square if possible, and they should be occupied there in manual labour. Whenever they have any spare time, it should be devoted to something they can use their hands on.

97. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand you to say you know as a fact the trustees have not done right?—Well, in regard to the Te Awamutu property, you can only lease it for twenty-one years without right of renewal; if that is so, it bars any one from taking up sections.

98. *Mr. Quick.*] But the trustees are not to be blamed for that; that is their limit according to their rendering of the law, as advised by their solicitors. They are willing to exercise more power if they had it?—Well, if there is any blame to be attached to them, it is that they have not endeavoured to amend the law in this direction, seeing their disability; that they have not tried to amend the Act in such a way as to help the position.

99. With a view to increasing the revenue of the estate?—I believe it would be the means of doing so by inspiring confidence in would-be settlers.

100. *Mr. Wardell.*] In regard to Puniu, do you suggest that there has been any neglect in connection with the letting of that estate?—I would not say so much about that, because I am not conversant with the exact position. But I am given to understand as regards the other, that they could have taken steps to amend the position.

101. *Mr. Quick.*] It is not so very long ago that a demand has arisen so strongly for land at Te Awamutu, is it?—It is a good while ago since I knew this land was an obstruction to the development of Te Awamutu; of course the demand for land is increasing daily.

102. *The Chairman.*] Do you imagine a school placed elsewhere, with the advantages of a higher class of education—something in the direction of St. Stephen's—would be a greater advantage than St. Stephen's?—I think so; but if the intention is simply to confine the teaching to technical education without farming pursuits, you could not better St. Stephen's. From my own personal observation, there is a disadvantage in the boys' and girls' schools being so close together. They are not allowed, according to the rules, to associate together; but we know what it is to rebel against rules.

103. Supposing some benevolent Maori or European who has got more land than he wants were disposed to make a gift of, say, 100 acres of land within thirty or forty miles of Auckland, and said, "I will let you have this for an industrial school where carpentering and agriculture is to be taught": would it be better for the Natives of the Waikato if the trustees accepted such a gift and established a school there, rather than to establish a school in the Waikato?—I do not think it makes any difference where they are taught in the country after they are removed from St. Stephen's. If they were taught amongst us, I think it would be a good thing. At the present time, we have in the heart of Otorohanga a Board school which was originally given as a Native school. We ceded the land for a Native school, and it was subsequently taken over by the Board. It is attended by half Natives and half Europeans, and there is not the slightest hitch between them; and I do not see why the same thing should not obtain in another case. We have better qualified teachers, and there is no antagonism between the two races.

104. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think the Government could by a little outlay supply what is necessary in regard to technical education at that school?—I do not know whether they could combine it with that school, but we have made representations to the Government to set aside an area by which technical education combined with farming pursuits could be undertaken; but we did not get a satisfactory reply.

105. *Mr. Wardell.*] At what period were the local troubles after the war sufficiently calmed down for the school at Te Awamutu to be re-established?—The first school opened after the troubles was the one I am speaking about, in about 1884 or 1885—that is, in the King-country. There was always a Native school at Karakariki, a little south of Ngaruawahia.

106. The circumstances would not have justified the trustees in taking steps to reopen a school prior to that date?—They could have reopened in these parts.

107. At what period would you suggest the school might have reopened with advantage to the Natives?—I am satisfied that the school could have been opened with advantage at least ten years after the breaking-out of the war, at Te Awamutu or Hopuhopu—that is, in about 1873.

108. *Mr. Quick.*] Were not the natives in these parts subservient to Tawhiao?—A great number were, but others came in and laid down their arms, and were friendly.

109. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would there have been children to attend the school at that time in any number?—More than sufficient for the funds to be able to meet.

*Witness:* I wish to add, regarding the lands given to the Wesleyans at Kawhia and Aotea, and to the Roman Catholics at Rangiawhia, nothing has been done, to my knowledge, since the war by either of those denominations towards reopening schools at those three places.

#### KEREKEHA HUIARANGI examined.

110. *The Chairman.*] We are endeavouring to find out whether the trustees have well or badly utilised these lands, and whether they have failed to carry out the trusts. We have been given to understand they have done as well as they could, that missionaries have been sent into the Waikato, and the funds from the Bishop's grants have been taking boys to St. Stephen's: have you anything to say on this subject?—At the time Mr. Morgan was residing at Te Awamutu, he said the church should be built at Wharepapa and Manukarere. After that he asked for children to be sent to school, and some of the Ngatiraukawa attended. The elder men of Ngatiraukawa used to attend the school at Te Awa-



mutu. They came back and told the people that this land was given for school purposes at Otawahao. There was no school on the Puniu land.

111. What the trustees say is that the Government established some Maori schools, and that has taken a number of Maori children in the Waikato district; so even if they got money enough from the letting of the lands to establish more schools, there would not be children to come to them: is that so?—If that is the case, we, the donors of the land, ask you to return us the land.

112. *Mr. Quick.*] How can the Ngatiraukawa say they are the donors of the land?—They are one people, Ngatiraukawa and Waikato.

AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 7TH JULY, 1905.

Canon MACMURRAY (examination continued).

*Witness:* I put in a list showing the present tenants of the Te Awamutu trust lands, with rental, terms, and conditions of lease. The net annual income is now £164 10s. The whole estate is let, but a large proportion of the property falls in on the 1st September next—the piece occupied by Mr. Teasdale (70 acres), in addition to the triangular piece—in all about 130 acres. I may mention that the reason why I did not take any steps to develop the property was that I was waiting for that portion to fall into our hands. I could not do anything for the development of the place till it came in. This will explain why it is only within the last three or four months I have been taking any active steps to develop the property.

1. *Mr. Quick.*] Would it not be advisable to wait till you get a private Act put through Parliament?—If I were sure of getting it through, yes. But if there were any probability of getting an Act through authorising us to deal with the place I would let it for grazing for a year, or something of that sort.

2. If you proceed to let immediately after September, what is your idea with regard to the term of lease?—For grazing and building the leases would be different. For grazing-leases ten years, for building-leases I should think fifty years, or I should not object to sixty years if there were a decent house or building erected.

3. You would bind the tenant down to lay out so much on the building?—Yes. If we got anything that would help to develop the place and improve the property we would be willing to give a long lease.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] How long has Teasdale held the lease?—For fourteen years.

5. In saying that the Mission Trust Board would consent to an amalgamation of the Otaki and Porirua trusts on the condition that the existing trusts are carried out, do you mean an amalgamation of the Porirua with the Otaki trust, or of the Otaki with the Porirua trust? Is the trustee to be the Mission Board or the Diocesan Board?—The answer is very simple. I think in 1902 or 1903 the question was raised at the Mission Trust Board meeting by the Porirua trustees, who asked us if they would place an institution at Otaki would we surrender our Otaki property to them. We said we were willing to surrender the Otaki property to the Diocesan Trustees on condition that the united institution should be placed at Otaki. We definitely passed a resolution to that effect, and the two reasons why we put the condition that the institution was to be at Otaki were that (1) at that time the school was there, and its removal would cause hardship to the Natives in the place who were benefiting by it; and (2) the Otaki Natives and the Ngatitōa Natives were kindred tribes, and there was a sentimental feeling of sympathy between the Porirua and Otaki people.

6. *The Chairman.*] But the offer was not accepted?—Not by the Porirua trustees; they adopted a different course, and we declined to surrender the property.

7. Do you think the Mission Trust Board would apply the same principal to Te Awamutu and the other Waikato lands?—I am quite certain they would strenuously oppose any such thing, for this reason: they were willing to amalgamate Otaki and Porirua, because the trusts were precisely the same. The Otaki trust was acquired not principally for religious but educational purposes; the wording of the trusts is the same. Te Awamutu, on the other hand, was acquired not for educational but religious—for missionary—purposes, and it would be a diversion of the trust did they do so.

8. Have you anything further on that head you wish to say?—Nothing, except that I might add, I think, the Home society that spent half a million of money in evangelising the country would think they were treated in a very ungrateful way by the country if there was any attempt to take this property and divert it to a different purpose. It has poured money lavishly into this country to evangelise it, and never taken one penny out of any revenues it has from lands or anything else in the country, and it certainly deserves considerate treatment.

9. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would you suggest that the revenue derived from the estate which is the subject of this grant could be taken out of the colony for the benefit of the society to whom it was granted?—I believe the property that was bought is as much private property as any other private property, subject to the trust that is in it. I do not think the Te Awamutu property could be treated in that way, but a great deal of property that is held by the society might be; not that the society would ever dream of doing it, but with a great deal of its income it legally has the right to do so.

10. *The Chairman.*] Are you able to point out to us any way that other missionary bodies in the Waikato or the disturbed districts have been equally with yourselves obliged to abandon what they were doing before the war?—I have no personal knowledge beyond the knowledge of the man in the street. I believe the same thing has happened to others; and what amazes me is that this inquiry includes only the Church of England properties, when Roman Catholic and Wesleyan trusts in the Waikato are not being inquired into. I know absolutely nothing about them.

11. Are you able to point to anything the man in the street says about other missionary bodies?—The only thing I have heard said is that they were all on the same footing, and they did not understand how and why the Church of England was selected for inquiry alone.

12. Nothing more definite?—No.

13. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know whether there are any denominational foundations similar to this belonging to other denominations in the Waikato?—I have never troubled myself about other bodies, and have never inquired into their trusts and management. I have always found enough to do to attend to my own.

14. *The Chairman.*] Seeing your grant is for what we may call material purposes—that is, a site for an institution—no doubt at that time a missionary station was the principal idea—has it occurred to the trustees that it might be objectionable to apply the funds to some purpose which does not present any physical appearance to the Natives? For instance, supposing a church were erected, it would be something they would see, and it would be within the grant, or even if it were a mission-house, that would present something to the Maori mind as being in compliance with the grant?—There always has been a church on the mission property.

15. A parish church?—No; it has always been a mission church; only it is not realised sufficiently that from the time of the war the Maoris would not use the church in this neighbourhood.

16. You say, in the first place, in the present day churches are erected by the Church itself, and there is not the same demand for a mission church?—There is no demand for a mission church in this land since the war. The church that was there was intended for a mission church, and would always have been given to Maori services if they were possible. It did not belong to the diocesan body, but to the missionary body. We are only now proposing to hand it over to the diocesan body; it is not yet handed over. Up to the present date it has been in the hands of the missionary body, although it has been used by the white settlers, because the Maoris would not use it. I do not think the Maori population in the neighbourhood of Te Awamutu is very large. The conditions have so changed that we have to look at the trust in the broadest way. The trust is distinctly a wide one—for a church, a mission station, or a school, or for other religious and moral purpose—and reading the trust in the broadest way, under the altered circumstances we came to the conclusion that the best way to apply the revenue was to maintain a Maori ministry, and we have now come to the conclusion that the best way to use it is to educate young Maoris for the ministry. I believe we are making the best use of the trust in so doing.

17. *Mr. Quick.*] There were two priests ordained the other Sunday, one of whom was to go up there?—Three deacons and two priests were ordained. One of the priests goes to the Waikato, to this very neighbourhood, and one of the deacons.

18. *Mr. Wardell.*] Were they educated out of the funds from this land?—This money went to their education.

19. *The Chairman.*] Have you received any complaints about the non-application of these revenues to proper purposes?—I have received no complaints, nor have any representations been made to the Board that I know of. The bitter complaint in Te Awamutu was from the town people, of the non-development of the property, and that was not our fault.

20. *Mr. Quick.*] You have had a plan made of subdivisions of the property?—I am negotiating with a surveyor. About two months ago I went over the property, and had a surveyor to advise about the subdivision.

21. They seem to think at Te Awamutu the subdivisions were too small?—So they were as first suggested, and I refused to accept them. The present subdivision provides for larger sections.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you it in contemplation to apply for legislation to enable you to lease for longer periods?—I have discussed the matter with individual members of the Board; it has never been discussed by the Board as a Board, but it is to be brought up at next meeting for the purpose of applying to Parliament to remove any doubt as to our power to lease. We do this because we feel it is in the interests of the township that we should be better able to deal with it.

23. And it is in the interests of the society?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think there is a demand for Maori clergymen in the Waikato?—Yes; the progress of interest has been most remarkable during the last nine years.

25. You cannot be said to be in close touch with the Natives personally?—Well, I am in touch with them through St. Stephen's School, where I come into contact with the parents and relatives of boys in a way an ordinary English clergyman would not. So far as my knowledge goes, the parents are exceedingly pleased with the treatment and education the boys get at the school.

26. We have had two opposite opinions with regard to the uplifting of the Maori race. The Inspector of Maori Schools gave the opinion that the only way to do so was by putting a school in amongst the Maoris, with technical education, so that the boys from the kaingas would not be taken away from their people; that by this means they would level upwards; and he thinks it is a mistake to take them away and educate them and send them back afterwards. On the other hand, we have other evidence to the exact contrary?—There will always exist these two strongly marked lines of opinion. My own opinion is that I know St. Stephen's has done a very great work for the young people, and Mr. Pope, the late Inspector, who has been amongst the Maoris more years than Mr. Bird, so far as I understand, has been months, held the opinion that the influence of St. Stephen's for good amongst the Maoris was enormous.

27. I suppose such a thing has never taken place as a St. Stephen's boy becoming a schoolmaster?—Yes, I know of one who was an assistant master in a Maori boarding-school in the Waiapu Diocese—something like St. Stephen's. He applied for, and nearly got, an appointment as assistant master at St. Stephen's.

28. *The Chairman.*] The way Mr. Bird put it was this : that, in his opinion, it was not the benefit to the individual that was to be considered by educating him, but the benefit to the whole race ?—I agree with that, and it has been before our minds distinctly in the management of St. Stephen's and Victoria Schools. Some people say we ought to train these girls up as domestic servants. We have steadfastly set our faces against that, because we want to train them to go back to their kaingas and uplift their own people. We train them in nursing, cooking, housekeeping, and cleanliness, and gardening ; but we set our faces against the idea of sending them out as servants to white people. We apply the same principle to the boys, with this reservation, that the Government has pressed upon us very strongly to give facilities for boys to be apprenticed to trades in Auckland, and to learn those trades. But I am not quite clear in my own mind that the policy is a good one, although we have yielded to the pressure of the Government in giving these facilities as an experiment to see how it will turn out.

29. *Mr. Quick.*] It has turned out very well at present ?—Yes, fairly well. At the same time, it is indorsing a principle thoroughly opposed to the principle we always bear in mind in working St. Stephen's. The way I could put it is this : we have tried to turn out the boys, give them an ordinary public-school teaching, a little gardening, a good deal of carpentering, to give them industrious habits, and to send them back to their own people. That was the idea in my mind as regards St. Stephen's, and the Government then came in and pressed us to make this experiment, and reluctantly we consented,

30. Does not that lead to the same thing ?—When they have learned their trade, will they not go back to their own people ?—A boy who has learned a trade is more likely to live in the town and to be absorbed into the white population. But the matter is in an experimental stage.

31. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think a boy would be more likely to return and help to lift his fellows of his own race if he were not kept at school quite so long ? Possibly they may be kept too long, and lose their Maori sympathies before they leave school ?—I do not think there is any danger of that. The only danger is that when a boy learns a trade he can only practice in the town ; he is used to the town.

32. I was struck with the fact that in the Waikato the Native opinion, so far as we can judge by the evidence, was in favour of agricultural training rather than mechanical ; whilst in Otaki the preponderance of opinion was strongly in favour of mechanical trades. They make a great feature of the fact in the Waikato that at St. Stephen's there is no agricultural training ?—The Natives in the Waikato have been spoiled by the old mission stations, where, owing to the large amount of money from the society, it was possible for the mission stations to raise farming institutions. But that could not be done unless there was money available from outside sources again.

33. *Mr. Quick.*] Are the Natives industrious enough to carry it on unless they are brought into towns and brought into contact with industrious people to give them an example ?—I think they need to be in close contact with industrious people.

34. *The Chairman.*] In reference to questions put by us as to whether a school at St. Stephen's did not meet the requirements, Mr. Bird expressed the opinion that it did not ; that there should be a boarding-school like St. Stephen's in the Waikato, so that boys should not lose their Maori associations and ties with their relatives ?—They do not lose them while at St. Stephen's ; but I am certain, if the trustees had the money, they would be very glad to extend the operations of St. Stephen's to the Waikato. But they have raised the money to extend operations to the girls, and there is no chance of getting money from the public to start an institution in the Waikato.

35. If they had the Te Awamutu money, what then ?—It could not be done ; but I maintain that the land was for a different purpose. Even supposing it were the same trust, it could not be done at any rate until Te Awamutu was developed.

36. *Mr. Quick.*] How often do the boys and girls go home for their holidays ?—We give one long holiday in the summer, and they have a few days' holiday in the winter, but do not go home. The summer holiday is about seven weeks.

37. *The Chairman.*] What we gather from evidence in the Waikato is that the value of all these properties together, including your trust, would come to £10,000 or £12,000 ?—Yes, about that.

38. Well, would £12,000 not be enough to start the school ?—If we had £12,000 given to us, with other properties, there would be no difficulty in starting the school and maintaining it. But if you were going to realise the property, and get a net return of 4½ per cent. on £12,000, you would only get a little over £500 a year, which would go a very short way. And in the first place, you would have to spend several thousands on buildings, and you would reduce your capital to about £8,000, which would give you £400 a year with which to run the school. I do not think it could be done without a very substantial grant from the Government or the public. In the old days, the Church Missionary Society supplied the sinews of war, which cannot be looked to in the future.

39. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are the institutions at St. Stephen's and at Gisborne the only institutions maintained by the Church Mission Trust Board or the Diocesan Board for Native children ?—These trusts here have nothing to do with any institution except St. Stephen's and Te Rau Theological College. The Te Awamutu revenue goes to the maintenance of Te Rau, and the other trusts go to the maintenance of St. Stephen's and Victoria School.

40. You recognise the prospect of a great increase in the rent and value of the Te Awamutu property is imminent ?—Yes. I am satisfied that if we get additional powers, this property could be developed and made very greatly more valuable.

41. We were told that land adjacent had been sold at as high a price as £65 an acre, but that the average value would be from £25 to £40, and the road frontage would be worth £40 ?—I should estimate the value of the property at about £70,000, if it were my own property and I had absolute power to deal with it as I liked.

42. *The Chairman.*] In your answer as to the establishment of a school, are you taking into account the probability that you will have, as at St. Stephen's, a number of boys supported by the Government ?—That is not a certainty ; the Government are not at all anxious to increase the number of their exhi-

bitions, and I am very much afraid that if they granted scholarships to boys at such a school, it would be at the cost of St. Stephen's by withdrawing a number from that school, which would be very disastrous.

43. For St. Stephen's?—For the Maori race.

44. *The Chairman.*] What may be suggested is this: if the same spirit is shown in starting a school in the Waikato as was shown in starting the Victoria School, a good school could be established and maintained?—Nobody had more to do with Victoria School than I. I know exactly what it involved, and the difficulty I had in securing from the Government a concession as regards getting Government scholars for that school. I should not like, being a busy man, to undertake a job of starting anything of the same kind again.

45. I am right in supposing that Victoria School was started without anything like £12,000 or £14,000?—Yes. In the first place, a site was granted at St. Stephen's site, so as to give it a claim on St. Stephen's trust for partial maintenance. Then we succeeded in getting about £6,000 raised by subscriptions. In addition to that, we organised a band of ladies, who guaranteed to collect £300 a year for the maintenance of the school. It involved a great deal of labour to do all that. The amount was got chiefly by direct subscription.

46. The fact of it being a girls' school created more sympathy for the movement than if it had been a boys' school?—Possibly.

47. *Mr. Quick.*] Victoria School is only a matter of yesterday, so you have not had a chance of seeing what the practical result is?—No, it is not fair to say anything about the results after only two years.

48. Have you seen the results of Hukarere at all?—It is outside my ken, but I have met in different places old Hukarere girls, and certainly the influence seems to have been for good. It has been in existence at least twenty years, probably more.

49. *The Chairman.*] Supposing we say the trusts should be amalgamated, would the Church missionary body resent it?—I feel certain they would; they would look upon it as a grave reflection cast upon them after all the years of labour and sums of money and the men and women they have given to the work; they would resent it very strongly indeed.

50. *Mr. Quick.*] It would materially interfere with their Maori clergy work?—Very materially indeed.

51. *Mr. Wardell.*] The missionary society as a society has ceased its work in this colony altogether, and transferred its functions and duties to the diocesan authorities: you have no missionaries here now?—Yes, we have; some are appointed for their life. The Church Missionary Society withdrew its grant on the 1st June, 1903. Since then it has ceased to send money from England, and, consequently, from that date the Church, as an organised body, has had to take over the work and responsibility for the maintenance of the Maori clergy; consequently the Mission Trust Board had to consider the whole position as to its attitude and what was its duty as regards these moneys and properties that were under its control—how it should fulfil its trust; and it deliberately came to the conclusion that the best way to fulfil its trust was to devote the revenues to the education of Maori clergy.

52. The school at Gisborne is held by the Mission Trust Board?—Yes, it is their property.

53. It is contemplated that the Board, as representing the missionary society in England, will continue to hold this school and train Maori clergy?—Yes, for the different dioceses.

54. And they will be independent of the missionary society as soon as they obtain orders?—Quite so.

55. Does the diocese recognise this position, and look upon the Trust Board as to be the educators of their clergy?—Individuals in the General Synod have asked the question whether or no the New Zealand Mission Trust Board would consent to having this institution and its revenues brought under the authority of the General Synod and of the Bishops of the province. Up to the present, the Board has not seen its way to concede this. It may do so in the future, and, if so, it will be necessary to get an Act of Parliament.

56. Is the land on which the school stands trust land held under a similar grant to that which we are discussing?—I think it is a simple trust for missionary services, bought in comparatively recent times with the society's own money. The greater part of the property of the Mission Trust Board is property acquired directly.

57. *Mr. Quick.*] The position is this now: From the 1st June, the missionary society has ceased to make grants for Church purposes in New Zealand. They left their endowments in the hands of the Mission Trust Board wherewith to carry on the work they had done minus the grants from Home, and these have to be replaced by personal effort of churchmen throughout New Zealand?—Yes.

58. *Mr. Wardell.*] Does the Board carry on the work the society used to carry on?—No; the Mission Trust Board was responsible for the payment of the salaries of the Maori clergy up to 1903, for which they got a grant from the Home society. Since then they have ceased to have any responsibility for the salaries of those ministers, and churchmen have to put their hands in their pockets for the payment of those salaries.

59. *Mr. Hutana.*] Can you tell us the amount and standard of work done by the school at Te Awamutu in Mr. Morgan's day?—No, I have no personal knowledge of it.

60. Perhaps you have heard that the children cultivated their own food, and the parents supplemented that?—Yes.

61. Are there any schools now supported by the contributions of parents and by the work of the pupils?—Practically, no; there have been individual cases of parents paying for their children, but they are an exception.

62. You would approve of a system whereby the children are taught agriculture and the growing of food in aid of the school where they are living, which could be supplemented by the parents?—If we had the money to run such a school we should be delighted to do so.

63. Perhaps you could have this carried out if you established a school on a large area?—To start a school such as you speak of would cost £4,000 for buildings and equipments.

64. Supposing they were able to grow their food and aid the school in that way, it would lessen the amount required to run it?—Unquestionably.

65. Then it is clear you could not grow food at a place like St. Stephen's?—No, not beyond garden-produce; there are only between 4 and 5 acres there.

66. Could a school similar to the one I have indicated be established at Hopuhopu, say, if St. Stephen's were removed there?—You had better get better land than that is. And where is the money to come from to remove it? Then, again, the trust would not allow it without an Act of Parliament.

67. Could you not get support from the Government?—I should not like to ask for it.

68. But if the Government would grant a sum of money?—If they were to grant an adequate sum, we should be only too glad to do it.

69. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was the school at Te Awamutu existing prior to 1853?—I could not say at the moment. I know Mr. Morgan went to establish a mission station and to make a school as soon as he could. He bought the property in 1839, and I believe a school was established from very early times, but not a boarding-school.

70. Assuming that the school existed in 1852—the grant describes Puniu as being in the neighbourhood of an existing school: would you understand that to refer to the school at Te Awamutu?—I should not think so, because it is referred to as established under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand, who did not have any jurisdiction over that school at any time. I do not see for that reason how it could apply to Te Awamutu.

71. *The Chairman.*] Some of the witnesses profess to say that Puniu was granted to grow food to support the school at Te Awamutu?—That may be so; but the trust is distinctly different.

72. *Mr. Wardell.*] Assuming it does refer to the Te Awamutu school, and that the trust is “to hold for as long as instruction is given in the school there,” do you think that trust has been fulfilled?—I cannot admit the premise, and therefore I cannot argue about it.

73. But I put it as a supposition?—My answer would be this: that when the war came on it introduced a condition of things wholly and entirely different from that contemplated when the trust was drawn up, and it would be the duty of the trustees to do the best they could with the trust; and I believe they did the best thing they could under the circumstances in educating boys at St. Stephen's.

74. If they were justified in closing the school in consequence of Native disturbance in 1863, has there been no period since at which the duty to re-establish would revive?—A great many years elapsed before the Waikato Maoris became at all friendly; it was not till nine years ago they would receive the Maori clergy. And the Church Missionary Society, which was the body the money would have to come from, were so disheartened by the results of the war that they were not ready to lavish money for similar institutions after the war.

75. We were told that seven years after 1863 the condition of things was such that there was no obstacle to the re-opening of the school?—I was not in New Zealand at that time, but I have had information from others, including Archdeacon Maunsell, who was intimately connected with the Maoris, and I know from their statements that it was not practicable for two reasons—the hostility of the Natives, and the missionary society not being willing to find the money to start afresh. The fact of the matter is, all the old missionaries have passed away in the last few years—Mr. Burrows, and Archdeacon Maunsell and Archdeacon Clark, who knew this country. From them I learned all I know about this past history.

76. *The Chairman.*] Archdeacon Williams may know all about it?—Yes, possibly, he has a wonderful knowledge of Maori work.

W. S. COCHRANE (examination continued).

*Witness:* I attended to-day in response to a telegram asking for any correspondence showing the steps taken to secure that boys from the Waikato are admitted to St. Stephen's School. My answer is that St. Stephen's has always had more applications than there were vacancies, and the trustees prepared a form of application, a copy of which I produce. At the end of the form we ask for a reference to verify the statements. The reference is generally to the Maori clergyman who visits the district, or a prominent layman who knows the applicants. If they say they come from a certain part of the Waikato we mark them “Waikato,” and admit them as Waikato boys. We call the whole extent of country from Kawhia and the King-country “Waikato,” and include the Ngatimaniapoto and Waikato Tribes. In the form of application we ask for the circumstances and calling of the father, &c.

77. *Mr. Quick.*] How do you discriminate, supposing there are two or three applications—boys being apparently equal in attainments and equally worthy of appointment?—We decide by the age. If a boy of eight and a boy of nine apply we take the latter, because the other can wait another year. We always take full Maoris in preference to half-castes. The educational standard is also one criterion, but the age affects that too. The Government will not appoint boys who have not passed the Fourth Standard, and we take boys who have passed the Third in preference to those who have passed the Second.

78. *Mr. Wardell.*] How are they brought under notice? How do the applications come?—Sometimes they come in Maori from the parents, and I get them interpreted by Mr. Hawkins or some Maori scholar.

79. Do they come through the Maori clergyman or a Maori teacher?—They are generally referred to the Maori clergy if they do not come through them. Lately we have been encouraging them to come through the Maori clergy. And we get applications from Native-school teachers who have made application to have boys admitted through the Government, for whom the Government have not had room, the number of Government scholars being limited. The teacher certifies that they have passed the standard, and we send a form of application to be filled up, and I refer this to the clergyman.

80. We may take it that all applications are referred to the clergyman?—Yes, unless we know something of them individually.

81. *Mr. Hutana.*] It has been stated in evidence by the Maoris that on application for admission to St. Stephen's their children have been refused, and they were told that they could not be admitted unless they paid £20. The person who gave that evidence was the brother-in-law of Mahuta, and he said that was one of the reasons why the Maoris did not bring their children to St. Stephen's, and became discouraged. I would like you to explain what this request for £20 means?—The Government allows £20 for the maintenance of boys, and in considering applications those are first favoured who show that they are not in a position to pay anything towards the maintenance of their children. If the parents are supposed to be in possession of means they are then asked to contribute.

82. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are there any in the school whose parents are paying for their maintenance?—I do not think there is one; two years ago we had one who was there for two years who was being paid for—a Thames boy.

83. *Mr. Hutana.*] Can you recollect Herangi making application for the admission of his children to St. Stephen's?—I recollect one application coming through a gentleman in Hamilton for admission of a girl to Victoria School.

84. You admit they are requested to pay money?—Yes; but no one has been refused admission because of his parents' poverty.

85. Are the donors of the land aware that they cannot get their children into the schools unless they pay £20?—There is no such rule. The £20 referred to was only asked in connection with the girls' school. That school has no endowment such as St. Stephen's, and it is therefore necessary that those who are supposed to be in a position to pay should be asked to pay, and it is for them to explain their inability to pay. Again, in the case of this school, the trustees decided that full Maoris should have first claim. In regard to St. Stephen's I remember now an application for the boy was made three years ago. The position was this: the boy was at the Wesleyan college and wanted to come to St. Stephen's. The trustees saw no reason to take him away from the Wesleyan college unless the parents could afford to pay. And to support the trustees' position I should like to say that a European from the Waikato said the father of the girl could afford to pay something, and that he would try and endeavour to get him to make a contribution.

86. Is it the rule at St. Stephen's that children of rangatiras can only get admission by payment?—It is not a hard-and-fast rule, but it is with the idea of showing them their responsibility towards their children.

#### HECTOR ALFRED HAWKINS examined.

*Witness:* I am Superintendent of Maori Missions in the Diocese of Auckland. I came to this diocese in the beginning of 1900. I was previously tutor at Te Rau for three years. I was paid by the Church Missionary Society. Now I am paid by the diocese.

87. *Mr. Quick.*] What is the extent of your recollections of Maori doings in this diocese?—Only since 1900. I joined Te Rau in 1896. There is a general yearly average of two Natives ordained from that college.

88. Do they devote their energies exclusively to the North Island?—I think so.

88A. In addition to what Te Rau receives from endowments are there subscriptions from Europeans?—No, I think the funds from the lands are sufficient. The maintenance of the clergy afterwards is a diocesan matter. There is a St. Stephen's boy teaching in charge of a Government Native school at Rangiawhia, in addition to the one referred to by Canon MacMurray.

89. What are your duties in regard to Maori missions?—At the present we have nineteen Maori clergy, and my duty is to go round and supervise. If there is any local trouble I have to assist the clergy, and am generally the medium between them and a good many branches of life. Applications for admission to St. Stephen's come to me generally.

90. Have you heard any complaints from Maoris in regard to the conduct of educational matters in the diocese?—Yes; nothing formal, except one formal complaint that came from Kohanga about a piece of land called Tikirahi, which is claimed by the Natives as not being included in the lease. I went there and went over the land with them and read them the terms of the lease. I could not prove whether the piece of land was in the lease or not. Another point was about the founding of a Government school at Kohanga. Their main contention was that the 5 acres which was reserved was not sufficient for a school. I do not know whether it was quite that or whether they meant that 2 acres was not enough for a cemetery, or whether it was a natural disinclination to have a school so close to a cemetery. I deputed Nikora Tautau to see them again, offering that the Trust Board would buy 3 acres and hand it over to the Government, to show that we wished to meet them; but as the land was leased we could not force Mr. Muir to give them a site. So far we have received no reply.

91. *Mr. Wardell.*] The offer has not been made to the Education Department?—Not that I know of.

92. *Mr. Quick.*] To what land do you refer?—A piece on the left—it is not on the reserve, but borders on it. We would be willing to buy it to remove any idea of soreness as to our not treating them fairly. They seemed to think we could take a piece of the reserve whether Mr. Muir liked it or not.

93. *Mr. Wardell.*] You could not negotiate with the tenant to surrender an acre or two for the purpose?—That did not come before me.

94. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you heard anything about any difficulties in regard to Hopuhopu?—The remark frequently heard about that is that it has never been properly cared for. But it is commonly believed amongst the Maoris there (I do not know what foundation there is for it at all) that it is very probable by some means that land will be returned to them so that Mahuta and his people may live on it, as they have very little land where they are. It is very commonly stated in the paper that the Maoris are not an agricultural people, and therefore they should be only taught trades. Anybody who

knows the Maoris will know they are very mechanical and artistic, but nobody who uses his eyes could say, where they are given a chance at all, they are not agricultural. You see them doing very fair cultivation in the Waikato, and get on just as well as the white people around them.

95. They do it by rule of thumb?—Yes, and they are very quick to learn.

96. Perhaps the necessity for teaching them farming is hardly recognised, because they can farm very well without it?—Yes, but if they could be taught farming it would be a very good thing.

97. Which do you consider the better alternative—farming or handicraft?—My impression is that they ought to be put on the land. I do not think the Maori is built for living in towns, where he would largely have to make his living.

98. Is there any necessity for his living in towns?—It is not the logical alternative, but it is the practical alternative. I have spoken to Maori boys working at trades in Auckland—seventeen or eighteen—who have come from Te Aute, St. Stephen's, or Three Kings, and you will find they do not want to go back home, they want to stay in town; and it is the same with the girls. I say, "You are just throwing your education away, because the greatest good you can do with it is to go and teach your own people."

99. There are two distinctly opposite views on this point?—I expect they are probably both true. There are some young fellows who have gone back and who are doing excellent work among their own people, but not those who have been taught trades in town; they have generally gone in for matriculation, and then gone home.

100. They belong to the Young New Zealand party?—Yes.

101. *Mr. Wardell.*] Who constitute the Young New Zealand party?—I was mixed up intimately with the beginning of things about it. It consists of past and present students of Te Aute—mainly past. One of its objects is to work for the amelioration of the Maori race, physically, morally, socially, and intellectually.

102. *Mr. Quick.*] Have they done much towards the upraising of the Native character?—I think they have done a good deal. It is very hard to say. They are principally Ngatiporous, and have done the most good among their own people. Coming back to the subject of St. Stephen's, it is for the north and south of Auckland. We have not heard any of the northern views at all, but when Waikato begins to call out that the school should be removed there, you would get as strong a call for it to be left where it is because the majority of the boys are from the north. If any school is established, if it is to help the Maoris in any wide sense, it will have to be a boarding-school. The Government has established three technical schools amongst the Maoris—at Rakaumanga, Whirinaki, and Waiapu. They are day-schools. In the case of these three schools they are only taken advantage of by the settlement; not a soul comes from outside, simply because there is no boarding arrangement. They teach carpentering, soldering, turning, &c. The teacher himself is the instructor. You can see, on the basis of such a teacher being rare, you can only have a limited number of such schools.

103. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are there any other Government schools in those localities?—There are some ordinary Native schools without technical education.

104. *Mr. Quick.*] Are they taught blacksmithing, or tailoring, or shoemaking at the schools you mention?—No, only woodwork; nor are they taught farming.

105. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any idea of the number of boys who attend and get any benefit from technical education?—I should say about twenty.

106. Are the girls given technical training?—Only sewing. In regard to a remark that has been made about the boys being kept too long at school, I rather think the opposite is the case. If we had half the number of children and kept them twice as long, we should, I think, get better results. The general cry is that after we educate them they go back and become Maoris again. If that is true, they do not lose touch with Maori life. We send them out at a very critical time, and the difficulty is not in educating the Maori but in keeping him when he is educated.

107. But in keeping him would you not take him away from his hapus and family, and deprive them of his example?—I am now talking about ordinary education; they get through the Sixth Standard, or whatever it may be, and I have noticed the boys who have been in school from childhood and have stayed till they got the spirit of the school in them are the ones who turn out the most satisfactory.

108. What age would you suggest as being the best to leave school and to return to their families?—If they could go back at twenty they would be fairly stable. As it is they leave when they are about seventeen, which is a critical time, and if there is any chance of going wrong they go wrong.

109. With your experience of country life have you not found amongst Europeans, when boys go back to the farm after having been kept at school to the age you indicate, they show very little inclination to go back to farm life, and is it not the same with the Maoris?—There may be that danger, but the difficulty with the Maoris is that there is nothing regular being done in a settlement. My wonder is that any of the boys turn out a success from these schools. There is no ambition in the race.

110. In the training of Maoris for the Church, is not English considered an important element?—It is as far as we can get it, but it has not been in the past.

111. *Mr. Quick.*] Have the Maori clergy an elevating influence amongst the Maori people?—Yes, I think they have an excellent influence, and they are very often taken by the Maoris as advisers. Apart from religion they have a great educating influence. In regard to Hukarere girls marrying Te Aute boys, I have come across very few instances. These two schools have been in that district for twenty years, and I have come across one case.

112. *Mr. Hutana.*] You say you have known about sixteen boys who have acquired trades and are working at those trades: would you state how many you know who have gone back to their kaingas?—I have been trying to find out ever since I have been in the diocese. There is one at Waikato Heads and one has gone to Rewiti; those are the only two I know of.

113. What has become of the majority of the boys?—I do not know.



114. Have you known of any who have become schoolmasters?—Only the two that have been mentioned.

115. *Mr. Quick.*] You seem to be rather pessimistic about the advantages of teaching the Maoris at all?—I would not say that; but the leakage is very great, and one does not like to see leakage. On the other hand, I must say as you go about the country you find the white people saying, “The greatest rascals in this district are the St. Stephen’s or Te Aute boys.” That is an absolute fallacy. It is not true. Some of the best Maoris in the diocese have come out of our secondary schools. I think the bad ones are undoubtedly an exception, and I have often found where young fellows have gone astray it is through the influence of the white men. There is no doubt the effect of education is decidedly for good, though perhaps not so rapid as one could wish. I have noticed, also, that where a Native has been educated at one of these schools he wants his children to go there too.

AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 10TH JULY, 1905.

HENARE KAIHAU, M.H.R. for Western Maori District, examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] The trustees of the Bishop’s grants in the Waikato district say it is true they are not supporting a school in the Waikato, but they are using the funds for placing boys at St. Stephen’s from the Waikato. And the missionary people say it is true they are not maintaining a mission station in the Waikato, but they are educating by aid of the funds Maori clergymen at Te Rau. If you have any information about the matter we are ready to hear it, or if you have any complaint to make we are ready to receive it?—The matter I wish principally to bring before the Commission is in reference to the grounds upon which the Natives ceded these lands to the Church, and then I desire to give my opinion as to the power under which they hold and administer these lands. I would like the Commissioners to specially inquire into this aspect of the case, and the reasons why these lands were given to the Church. In regard to Kohanga, I know the reason why the Natives gave the land, viz., for a site for a school and a church, and they also increased the area so that the school might have sufficient land on which to grow food for the children. It is well known that the site for a school does not need to be a very large piece of land; about 10 acres would be quite sufficient; and the people made the area large so that there should be sufficient land to maintain and provide for the children on the spot. If the Maoris had known the land was going to be absolutely transferred to the Church, and the Church only put into the title, they would not have agreed to hand over the land as they did. Therefore, I should like the Commissioners to search the original documents; perhaps they would show the purposes for which the land was handed over. I should also like to know whether the Maoris authorised the Crown to vest the land absolutely in the Church. The intention was that the land should be handed over as a residence for the children and to cultivate food for them, and provide a residence for their parents. I am aware of what the intentions of the people of the lower Waikato were when they gave the land; I have been told by them. They did not think the land was going to be taken entirely away and handed absolutely to the Church. In reference to the revenue derived from these lands comprised in all the Waikato grants I think the proper way to dispose of it would be to give it back for the use of the children of the hapus who gave the land; it should be expended in establishing schools for them, and a church.

2. *The Chairman.*] Do you know how much revenue is got from Kohanga?—No.

3. *Mr. Wardell.*] We are told that in fifty-three years they have got £37 10s.?—I know the land has only been recently leased; it was lying idle before that.

4. *The Chairman.*] The revenue from Kohanga would not go very far towards erecting a church or school?—Perhaps the Government might subsidise it, and probably would. I think the Maoris would be satisfied if the revenues were expended in this way.

5. *The Chairman.*] Do you mean one church and one school for all, or one school and one church for each?—I would suggest that a small school would suit Kohanga and Pepepe, and I would put a large school at Hopuhopu; and, after the children in the lower school have passed the Fourth Standard, transfer them to Hopuhopu. I would like the Commissioners to inquire into the matter of how it was that all the land was vested in the Church. I should have thought 10 acres at each place would have been sufficient for a school and church, and the balance of the land should be returned to the donors. I do not propose that the land should be handed to the Maoris for them to sell or dispose of as they like, but to maintain them round the centre where the school is—to provide homes for them round about the school-site. Or, perhaps, it might suit if they laid out a township round the school, so that the Maoris should have a place wherein to dwell. Because if that were not done, and they had not a permanent kainga and lived at a distance, the result would be there would be no children at the school. If a portion were laid out as a township, they could be there taught how to build houses and utilise the land. I would ask the Commissioners to so word their report that my view of the case might be considered by Government, and given effect to.

6. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think Hopuhopu suitable land for a village?—Yes; it is a central place and would be suitable for a settlement of that kind.

7. Is the land suitable for people to cultivate and live upon?—Some parts are suitable for growing crops; and the unsuitable portions could be used as sites for houses. By establishing a model settlement of this kind it would become easier to teach the Maori youth the European and civilised way of doing things. I heard somewhere it was suggested that white children should attend the school. I consider that would cause confusion and trouble. I think the best course to follow would be to keep the Native children separate from the European. The condition on which the land was given was that it should be Maori children only—not for European children. I think Hopuhopu and Puniu would be suitable places for Maori townships. Both of these two places are central for the Waikato Maoris.

8. *The Chairman.*] Do you know St. Stephen’s School?—Yes.



9. Do you think it would be better to have a new school established in the district than to send the children to St. Stephen's School?—I think a Waikato school would be preferable, as it would be near the parents. St. Stephen's is very far away, and the cost of reaching it is very great.

10. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you realise the cost of maintaining a school at Hopuhopu? We are told at St. Stephen's it costs £20 a head; to keep twenty-five boys at Hopuhopu would cost £500 a year, exclusive of the cost of buildings: do you realise that the lands placed in trust for educational purposes would not yield that revenue? Where is the money to come from?—I do not know where the money would come from; but that is the wish of the Waikatos—to have a central school at Hopuhopu. Perhaps, if a committee were appointed, they might find the means of raising funds.

11. How many children would be likely to attend a school at Hopuhopu above the Fourth Standard?—I should think over a hundred. If all the applications for schools in various parts of the Waikato were granted, it would not be long before there would be five hundred available.

12. Do you think Hopuhopu is a more suitable site than Puniu?—The Ngatimaniapoto, the Kawhia, and Upper Waikato people are a considerable number, and the best centre for them would be Puniu; but for the lower Waikato, which are also numerous, Hopuhopu would be the most central. The wish of all the people in the Waikato is for a school and a model township. I include the Hauraki Maoris as part of the Waikato Tribe.

13. Do you think that would be followed by a desire for another school at Puniu, or would one at Hopuhopu be satisfactory to the whole district?—They would like the two schools, but they might not get enough funds to build two. But I would suggest Hopuhopu should be built first and see how it succeeds, and afterwards there might be one at Puniu.

14. Do you realise it is impossible for the trustees of the lands under consideration to erect this school out of the revenues of their own trusts?—Yes, I am aware a school of this kind could not be established with the funds now in the possession of the trustees, but I think with subsidies from the Government, from the Native schools vote, it could be done.

15. In your mind, would it be satisfactory to the Natives of the district if there was an increase in the Government Native schools throughout this district, and one central industrial school at Hopuhopu?—Yes.

16. Then, if the trustees are willing to surrender the grants of Kohanga and Hopuhopu, do you think it would be desirable to amalgamate the two and for the Government to establish a school?—Yes, I think that would give satisfaction to the Maoris.

17. You quite realise it cannot be done out of the trust?—Yes, I am quite aware of that; but I think the Maoris are entitled to some of the revenue of the colony for the purpose of building schools. They contribute a large amount to the taxation of the country, and are entitled to consideration. The Natives have made many applications to the Church to establish schools in the lower Waikato, but have never succeeded in getting any school, and have suffered in consequence. If the Maoris of the Waikato are not granted a higher school at Hopuhopu, they will be left as they were before in darkness, and would not have any means of acquiring the knowledge of the European race.

18. Are there no schools for the Natives except the Government schools in the whole of the Waikato?—There are very few schools from Waiuku to Kawhia and the upper Waikato. I do not know of any but Government schools. I should like the Commissioners to make a strong recommendation for the establishment of Native schools in the Waikato, because, though they have been without schools during all this time, they have contributed towards the revenue of the country and have received no benefit from it at all. The Europeans have been reaping the benefits through the education vote, and I should like the Maoris of the Waikato to receive their share of that vote.

19. Have you any knowledge of the number of Natives in the Waikato at present—adults and children?—I think about four thousand; there would be about two thousand of those children.

20. We took some trouble when in the Waikato to ascertain the number of children, but the largest number named to us was about six hundred?—That would not include all the children; those above school age would not be included. In my own settlement, at Waiuku, there are about a hundred.

21. Would they attend the school you refer to?—Yes; Waiuku is part of the Waikato territory.

22. What other settlements are there where there are any number of children?—The Ngatitahinga, on the Te Akau 90,000-acre block; they would perhaps number three hundred. Between Raglan and Kawhia I think there would be quite three hundred. If all the Waikatos were counted there would be quite four thousand—not including the Hauraki, Ngatipaoa, and Ngatiraukawa. I am speaking of Waikato proper.

23. *Mr. Quick.*] Does Waikato proper extend to Kawhia?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Hutana.*] You have stated you would like the bulk of the land set aside for a Maori township?—Yes.

25. Would you not suggest as a better course to cut the land up into small pieces and lease it to Europeans, and support the school with the rental?—Yes, that would be a good course; but I think the better plan would be to do what I suggest and lay out a model township, and teach the people to live in the same way as Europeans do. Then the Maoris could devote a part of the money they earned to the maintenance of the school, which would amount to the same thing.

26. What would you suggest should be taught at such a school?—I am not quite prepared to say; but I should think handicrafts, such as carpentering, engineering, blacksmithing, tailoring, and all those kind of things.

27. *Mr. Wardell.*] You know Kohanga?—Yes.

28. Are you able to say whether during the tenancy of Mr. Muir any considerable part of that land has been cleared?—Yes, he has cleared a large area.

29. Are you satisfied he is doing justice to the land?—Yes, I think so; the land used to be full of briars.

30. Do you find any fault with the trustees for having allowed the land to become covered with briars? could they have prevented it?—Had they allowed the Maoris to occupy it it would have been so covered; they would have used it. Families could have taken up 10 acres each and kept it clear.

31. Since how long have the Natives returned to Waikato and settled down to ordinary occupations?—The Kohanga people never took part in the war. They were loyal, and did not vacate their lands.

32. How did the buildings get destroyed?—The reason was that after the war the missionaries gradually ceased visiting them, and allowed the buildings to go to decay.

33. Do you recognise that there was existing in the Waikato after 1867 good reason for no Native schools being carried on?—I do not know of any reason why there could not have been schools. Since the war till now they have been crying out for schools, schools, schools; and have never got any. I have been asking the Government for schools till I am tired.

34. We have been told that the Native feeling towards the Government and the missionary body after the war was such that they were unwilling to send their children to school till comparatively recently: is that true?—That would not apply to the lower Waikato; it would apply to the King-country. The feeling, however, did not continue long. All the loyal Natives have been asking for schools ever since the war—asking both the Government and the Church. The Church's answer was that there was a school at St. Stephen's. But when they brought their children to St. Stephen's they would not take them in as the school was full. They would also make inquiry, and if they found an applicant was the child of a rangatira it would not be admitted; they were told they were able to pay.

35. Are you aware that the Government pays for about thirty boys at St. Stephen's?—Yes, but they are not all Waikato children.

36. *Mr. Quick.*] How long is it since the Government established schools in the Waikato?—About six years.

NAPIER, FRIDAY, 14TH JULY, 1905.

Archdeacon S. WILLIAMS examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] It has been represented to the Commission, on behalf of the Natives at Otaki, that what they desire is that the Porirua trust and the Otaki trusts should be amalgamated, and both devoted to the maintenance of a school as Otaki, or somewhere in the neighbourhood on the West Coast. We should like to hear what you, as representing the Church Missionary Society, have to say upon the matter?—We have already expressed our willingness on behalf of the Church Missionary Society to meet the wishes that have been expressed by the trustees of the Porirua trust, to hand over the Otaki property to the General Synod. The desire to meet the wishes of the Porirua trustees has been expressed by formal resolution, on the conditions expressed by the trustees of the Porirua trust themselves. We were consenting parties. At one time it was expressed as a "large portion" of the money from the "Porirua trust"; at another time it was expressed as "the whole" of the money. This is the first resolution of the Mission Board on the subject in 1897: "A resolution of the Porirua College trustees having been considered, in which it is proposed that the Otaki School should be transferred to trustees appointed by the General Synod, on condition that a large sum of money from the Porirua trust be made available for promoting its efficiency, it was resolved, That the Board is prepared to accede to the proposed arrangement on condition that the school continues to be conducted in accordance with the terms upon which the trust is held."

2. *Mr. Quick.*] What led up to that resolution?—It was an offer from the Porirua trustees. A few months after the special meeting of the General Synod, 1901, we received another letter from the secretary of the Porirua trustees asking if we would reaffirm our consent to their proposal. We did so. Then we were asked to send a deputation to wait upon the Government to see whether they would accept this as a solution of the difficulty, but unfortunately the Premier was not in Wellington. We, however, saw Mr. Carroll (Mr. MacMurray and myself) and he met us in a very friendly way and seemed quite disposed to fall in with the proposal, but he could say nothing definite in Mr. Seddon's absence. We have not heard anything of the matter since, nor do we know how far it was followed up.

3. That was after the trustees were committed to an appeal to the Privy Council?—Yes. But the General Synod passed a resolution urging that every possibility of settling the matter in a friendly way should be exhausted before going to the Privy Council. I produce the following memorandum on the subject: "The Ven. Archdeacon S. Williams and the Rev. Canon MacMurray waited upon the Hon. J. Carroll, Native Minister, as a deputation from the New Zealand Mission Trust Board. They explained that the New Zealand Mission Trust Board had received a communication from the trustees of the Porirua Estate, stating that they were anxious to come to a settlement with the Government *re* the Porirua Estate; that they had proposed to the Government as a settlement of the difficulty that the Porirua and Otaki trusts should be amalgamated, and that a school should be built and maintained at Otaki by the Porirua trustees. It was pointed out that this would meet with the approval of the Ngatitōa Maoris, who had objected to the proposal to appropriate the Porirua property for the purpose of establishing a school in the Wairarapa. The deputation stated that the New Zealand Mission Trust Board, who held the Otaki property, were willing to surrender this property for the purpose if the Government accepted this solution of the difficulty. The deputation wished to know whether Government were about to make any communication to the Porirua trustees which would accept this settlement.—Wellington, 11th February, 1902." I produce also the following correspondence:—

DEAR SIR,—

Diocesan Office, Wellington, 27th June, 1904.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd April. With reference to the conditions mentioned by you, namely, that the Porirua College trustees should devote part of the funds

belonging to that trust towards the maintenance of the school at Otaki, I am now directed to say that the trustees regret that they are unable to accept such condition, as they are advised that they have no power to extend their trust funds in the manner indicated. My trustees understand that any proposal by them to take over the Otaki trust without blending the same with the Porirua trust must come from them in the shape of a fresh proposal for submission to your Board. Before, however, submitting any further proposal my trustees would like to see a copy of the last balance-sheet of the Otaki Native School Trust, and a statement showing the capital of the trust, and the annual income and expenditure, and the length of the terms of the leases. They would also be glad to know if it is probable that the land can be leased to greater advantage when the present leases expire. The Porirua trustees ask for these particulars in order that they may, before making any new proposal, have before them full information concerning the Otaki trust. I shall, therefore, feel much obliged if you can kindly supply me with these particulars at your earliest convenience.

J. F. CARTER, Diocesan Treasurer.

The Secretary, New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

DEAR SIR,—

Te Aute, 7th November, 1904.

I must apologize most sincerely for the long delay in answering your letters, dated the 18th March and 27th June. With regard to the first letter, I consulted the members of the Executive Committee on the question and proposed calling a meeting to consider it, but it was felt that the Committee cannot deal with it. It is also evident that the circumstances under which I was instructed to take steps have not occurred, and I am quite powerless to move in the direction of getting deeds prepared; and nothing can apparently be done until the next meeting of the New Zealand Mission Trust Board. This will probably be held early in January. It seems to me quite clear that any new proposal must of necessity be submitted by your trustees to the full Board for their consideration. And I may mention here, in reply to yours of 27th June, that the condition upon which the Board agreed to hand over the Otaki School and school property was proposed by the Porirua trustees themselves in a letter dated the 7th February, 1902, as follows: On condition that the trustees are willing and able to conduct a school thereon to which the moneys accruing from the Porirua trust will be applied. My Board made no proposal nor conditions; they merely accepted those of the Porirua trustees, and I am very sorry to hear that the trustees cannot carry them out. I gladly send you the information you ask for about the Otaki School trust. The rents, £200 from J. D'Ath and £35 from Swainson and Bell, are shown in the receipts. These were the highest offers received the last time applications were called for; and the Ven. Archdeacon Williams, who manages the trust for the Board, does not think it probable that a higher rental can be obtained for the whole of the property. Since the Archdeacon took charge of the trust he has fostered the funds as much as possible, and has invested any balances over from the School Account, with the result that at the present time there is a capital account of about £1,500 invested and increasing at compound interest.

A. F. WILLIAMS,

Hon. Sec., New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

The Diocesan Treasurer, Wellington.

DEAR SIR,—

Diocesan Office, Wellington, 7th February, 1902.

I am directed by the Porirua College trustees to write to you on the matter of the Otaki School trust. On the 23rd February, 1897, at a meeting of your Board, a resolution of the Porirua College trustees having been considered, in which it was proposed that the Otaki School should be transferred to trustees appointed by the General Synod on condition that a large sum of money from the Porirua trust be made available for promoting its efficiency, it was resolved, That the Board is prepared to accede to the proposed arrangement on condition that the school continues to be conducted in accordance with the terms upon which the trust is held. But on the 27th January, 1898, a somewhat different course was approved by your Board, who resolved, That if approval be given by the General Synod of resolution 3 of the New Zealand Mission Trust Board, passed on the 23rd February, 1897, the secretary be requested to communicate with the Church Missionary Society, and to prepare immediately a deed providing for the transference of the Otaki School and lands on which it is situated to the General Synod. At the special session of General Synod held in Wellington in September last, it was resolved, That the trustees (of the Porirua College) be instructed to ascertain whether it was possible to devise a scheme for the Porirua trust which would satisfy all parties. The hope expressed by several speakers at the General Synod was that the Otaki and Porirua trusts should be amalgamated so far as it is possible; accordingly, the Porirua College trustees wish to know if the New Zealand Mission Trust Board will now hand over to them the Otaki estate and trust on condition that the trustees are willing and able to conduct a school thereon to which the moneys accruing from the Porirua trusts will be applied.

CHAS. P. POWLES, Secretary.

The Rev. A. Williams, Secretary New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

DEAR SIR,—

Diocesan Office, Wellington, 18th March, 1904.

At a meeting of the Porirua College trustees, held on the 17th ultimo, it was resolved, That the trustees do now avail themselves of the generous offer made by your Board to transfer to them the Otaki School property. The trustees are willing to accept the condition imposed by your Board that such trustees shall conduct on the property a school in accordance with the trusts on which the Board now holds the property. Two of the Porirua trustees, the Rev. T. H. Sprott and Mr. T. F. Martin, who have been deputed by the meeting of the 17th ultimo to draft the application for the transfer, took the opportunity of calling upon the Ven. Archdeacon Williams during his recent visit to this city. The

Archdeacon very kindly explained to them several matters connected with the trust, and they gathered that there would be no objection on the part of your Board to the transfer being made. Under these circumstances, my trustees would be very much obliged if you would at your earliest convenience give instructions for the preparation of whatever legal documents may be necessary to effectuate the transfer.

W. F. KENNEDY,

Secretary, Porirua College Trustees.

The Rev. A. F. Williams, Hon. Sec. New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

DEAR SIR,—

Te Aute, 22nd April, 1904.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th March, and I must apologize for the delay in answering the same, which was owing to the fact that I was just leaving home for several weeks when it reached me, and I had no time to write then. I believe the New Zealand Mission Trust Board are still quite willing to transfer the Otaki School property to the Porirua trustees on the conditions mentioned in the resolution passed on 11th February, 1902. We notice, however, that you have omitted all mention in your letter of the application of the Porirua money to the school at Otaki, which was one of the conditions proposed by your trustees on 7th February, 1902, and emphasized by the Board in the resolution referred to by you. We should like to know whether this was merely an oversight on your part, or whether you intentionally omitted it, in which case your letter will have to come before the Board as an entirely new proposal. Awaiting an early answer,

A. F. WILLIAMS,

Hon. Sec. New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

We did not put any difficulties in the way.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you consider that it will be to the advantage of the Natives of the district that these two trusts should be amalgamated and the money spent at Otaki?—I am not prepared to give an answer positively. It is a large question. I have hitherto avoided giving an opinion on this subject. We have always endeavoured to meet the wishes of those who have the control; and when they proposed to spend the money at Otaki, knowing the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa had been allied for generations, I did not see any difficulty in the matter, that is, if the terms of the Otaki trust are to be carried out. The idea of spending the Porirua money at Otaki came from the Porirua trustees, and we agreed to it. On a question like this, I should like to feel my way with the Maoris.

5. *Mr. Quick.*] You have no reason to imagine that the Mission Trust Board are of a different mind now, assuming that legislative power can be obtained?—No. I have no reason to think so. We foresaw we should most likely have to go to the House for sanction.

6. You told me at the last meeting of the General Synod called to consider this matter, that you had yourself obtained a private Bill to amalgamate two trusts?—It was passed as a public Bill to enable the Te Aute trustees to take over as a free gift the Maori girls' school at Hukarere, which had hitherto been carried on as a private school. That Bill was passed without any difficulty whatever. I believe the House only wants to be assured that it is an honest endeavour to make the best use of the trusts, and they will help us.

7. *The Chairman.*] What I understand you to say is that you are not prepared to express any opinion on the proposal to amalgamate the two trusts. You are not prepared to say the Porirua trustees have not taken a right view about their own trust, their view being apparently that it is better that the funds should be applied for the present in sending students from the West Coast to the school established in the Wairarapa. I understand that you are not prepared to criticize that opinion?—So far as that is concerned, I have disapproved of it. I have said I thought a proposal of that kind looked at from a Maori point of view would not be tolerated, and I told them so.

8. You disapprove of it as a member of the Church or Synod?—In any character; either as a member of the Church, or as a private individual, looking at it from a Maori point of view. I avoid interfering with other trusts as far as possible; but they made up their minds to amalgamate the Otaki and Porirua trusts, and I agreed to it, both as an individual and as a member of the Synod too. But as to whether I should like to take the responsibility of recommending a scheme, I do not feel quite equal to it just now. I should like to feel my way with the people. When it was proposed to use the money from the several trusts in giving scholarships to allow the descendants of the donors of these estates to go to any other school, I certainly was agreeable to that, and so far as I could ascertain the whole of the Natives were agreeable.

9. *Mr. Wardell.*] That they should go where?—To any school that might be approved of in any part of the Island.

10. *Mr. Quick.*] That was the first scheme submitted to the Court?—Yes. There is a good deal in what Bishop Wallis says about the Porirua School. When it was first founded it was promised and understood to be a college. There are a good many things I should feel ought to be taken into consideration before giving a final answer to the question. I should like to interview the Maoris on the subject.

11. *Mr. Wardell.*] In the letter you forwarded to the Commission, you express very strongly the impropriety of sending children from the West Coast to the Wairarapa?—My opinion on the matter is expressed in the letter I sent. The matter was imperfectly thought out. It was never discussed or brought before the General Synod. It was never discussed with any members of the Synod or with the Maoris, the descendants of the donors. The Clareville property was offered for sale, and they accepted it. I think we ought to consult the mind of the Maoris in all these matters. The Maoris are a reasonable people, and if you can show them there is a good reason for the wish you are endeavouring to carry out, you may be tolerably certain they will waive their objections. But there was no discussion on the subject in this case at all. I suppose some of the authorities, being new to the country and the people, did not see the advisability of consulting them.

12. *The Chairman.*] You are prepared to criticize and express your opinion on the present arrangement, but not to criticize the action of the Bishop's trustees in being of opinion that a secondary school was intended, and might be desirable, if it could be managed—I do not mean to say at Otaki. You are not prepared to say that it is not more within the Porirua trust that the funds should go for the establishment of a secondary school rather than a primary school?—I have never been asked to express my opinion before on this subject, and I have never volunteered it. It requires grave consideration, and it should be taken in all its bearings.

13. *Mr. Quick.*] You say the original intention with regard to Porirua was to create a college?—Yes, like St. John's. That was put before them; and Matene to Whiwhi and Tamihana Rauparaha were at St. John's under my control to a great extent.

14. *Mr. Wardell.*] It was quite a different institution from the St. John's of to-day?—No. We had students for orders.

15. I thought St. John's of that day was more like St. Stephen's at the present day?—No. St. Stephen's is a school. St. John's was a college with students, both English and Maori. We had also schools for young people in connection with it; we had an English boys' school and a Maori boys' school.

16. *Mr. Quick.*] It was a school and a college?—Yes. The education was both primary and secondary.

17. Have you received boys for education for professions, or for other than theological study?—We did not go so far as teaching professions.

18. But boys with a lay career before them have been received?—Yes; just as now there are theological students and students for other occupations.

19. Where were you at the time that Matene te Whiwhi was there?—I was in charge of the Native department at St. John's.

20. *Mr. Wardell.*] In what division were Matene te Whiwhi and Tamihana?—They were put in the higher division because they were men.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you know anything personally about the gift of the land?—I know Tamihana Rauparaha and Matene te Whiwhi were the principal speakers, and as chiefs of the Ngatitōa urged the members of their tribe at Porirua to give the land to the Bishop. They always spoke of having urged their people to do so. Their own individual claim, however, was at Te Horo, between Otaki and Waikanae. I was not present when the Bishop spoke to the Natives, although I was in the district at the time; but it was a matter of public notoriety and was never called in question. Bishop Selwyn took a fancy to the site at Porirua, and considered it an ideal place for a college, and he said to the Natives, "You give me this, and I will build a college like St. John's." It was not given so much as an endowment as for a site and for the use of the college. The idea of those days was for a boarding-school, and the money would be provided from other sources. It was the same with the Waikato schools, and Wae-rengahika, near Gisborne. The Government grant continued till a year or two after Sir George Grey left for the Cape, and then it was altered. Instead of a block sum to carry on the establishment and for the people in charge to make the best use possible, as had been the practice, they gave a grant in aid nominally of £10, but practically often £6 or £8, per head per annum. When I was invited by Sir George Grey to come over to Hawke's Bay, he said, "I will do what I can to help you," and I received a block sum of £300 per annum, to do the best I could with for educational purposes, for a few years. These boys cost me about £25 a head, including teacher's salary. I got, at the outside, £10 per scholar towards it. In consequence of this circumstance, and tribal disturbances upon the land question, I thought it desirable to close the school and make a fresh start later on. I was promised everything necessary in Sir George Grey's time, but I never got a sixpence towards my buildings.

22. How long were you at Otaki?—About eight years. I took charge in 1847. I have seen it given in evidence that there was no Government grant, but there was a Government grant for a few years. In the same evidence an excessive value was put on the building that was burned down. It was built mainly by Maori young men; we gave them 1s. 6d. a day whilst learning the use of carpenters' tools. We had a carpentry class, and it only cost us that sum, besides the wages of a good man to teach them.

23. Archdeacon Hadfield came after your time?—He returned to Otaki shortly before I left.

24. It was the fact of his health having broken down that took you there?—Yes. Between Archdeacon Hadfield's health breaking down and my going there we had a young man put there by Bishop Selwyn for a short time, and the Rev. Mr. Govett was there for a short time. There was a Maori school of a primitive kind in Otaki carried on by voluntary effort when I first went there in 1847, prior to the grant of any land by the Natives. The Natives did not give the land as an endowment; they were promised that money would be found. At a later period the Ngatiraukawa offered to surrender a block of 10,000 acres where the boundaries of four sections of their tribe met, so that each of the four should give 2,500 acres. Governor Browne went over the ground, but said he was advised there was no machinery for conveying it; and the Natives were not allowed to convey it.

25. Was this offered for an endowment for the school at Otaki?—For the purpose of general Church work in that part of the country. The grants of land for the Otaki School were not issued till some time after the land was given by the Natives.

26. Why do you say the Governor would not allow the 10,000 acres to be given?—He did not say that; he said he was advised there was no machinery for conveying it, but there was the same machinery as that by which Te Aute was given.

27. *The Chairman.*] We should like to get your opinion as to the advisability or otherwise of a Maori school being amongst Maori people or away from Maori people. We have had different opinions expressed as to whether it would be better for the Maori people that a school like the Otaki School should be established at Otaki or whether it would be better for it to be established with the amalga-

mated funds somewhere else, away from the Maori people. We have discussed the matter to some extent in regard to Otaki and Porirua, and also a good deal in Auckland, with reference to St. Stephen's as against having a school in the Waikato?—I think we have been more successful with boarders on a distance. We have a considerable number of Maoris in the vicinity of Te Aute College, and we have found them less anxious to avail themselves of the advantages of the College than Natives further away. It has been a central school for the whole of New Zealand. We have had scholars there from Stewart Island, from Dunedin and Canterbury, and from up as far north as the Bay of Islands and Mangonui. There is no difficulty in their coming nowadays with such increasing facilities for travel. By having a large school you can secure a better class of teachers. The scholars get more information, and they work better. When I was asked to resume control of the Otaki School Estate, on the retirement of Bishop Hadfield from the diocese, I found circumstances had entirely changed since my residence there. A good deal had been said against the methods of the schoolmistress. I considered Mrs. Jennings was doing her best single-handed with the scholars she had, and the size of the school did not warrant the expense of an assistant. I informed the Maoris I would put the school under the control of the Education Department. I asked Mr. Pope to examine the school and give me a candid opinion as to the teacher's abilities. I told the Natives that if the Inspector advised a change being made I would make it. I found she had three or four classes to attend to. If it had been a larger school there would have been more teachers, and the children would have got better attention than was possible under the existing circumstances. There was a good deal of complaint in regard to one boy not having learnt anything, but on full inquiry I found that he had only been to school three times in the year. Mr. Pope reported he considered Mrs. Jennings had very good teaching-abilities, and did not recommend any immediate change. On asking people who made complaints when they were at the school last, I found that they had never been there; so I told them their complaints were worthless. The Natives seemed satisfied with what I told them in regard to Mr. Pope. Shortly after the application came from the Porirua trustees, and I made up my mind to hold on as best we could to avoid complicating matters for my successors, and the school could be established on a better footing. Our success has been better at Hukarere and Te Aute. We have had girls and boys from all parts of New Zealand, and I think we have done far better work both for the girls in the town and the boys at Te Aute than would have been the case had the effort been divided up amongst the Maori settlements. I took a prominent part in raising the money for the building and upkeep of the Queen Victoria Memorial Native Girls' School in Auckland, and in doing this my object was to assist the Waikato girls as much as those of any other Natives in the Auckland Diocese. In regard to the trusts in the Waikato I have been asked my opinion a good many times, and I have said I thought they could not do better than use the money, for a time, at all events, in Auckland for the education of Waikato scholars. Perhaps the greatest advantage in taking the Native girls' school to Napier was that we were enabled to avail ourselves of the honorary services of the Misses Williams, at Hukarere, as also at the Queen Memorial School in Auckland, where the supervision and encouragement given by Mrs. Neligan (the Bishop's wife), and other Christian ladies, is of inestimable value, not only to the pupils but also to the mistresses, which they could not get in an isolated position.

28. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you seen the scheme purporting to be the scheme of the Ngatiraukawa?—I have. It does not look like Ngatiraukawa to my mind.

29. When did you visit Otaki last?—Some few months ago.

30. This scheme was under consideration at that time: did you hear anything of it?—I never heard anything of it. They have been much dissatisfied with the position of affairs. This question about scholars going to the Wairarapa has much disturbed them.

31. *The Chairman.*] We desire to bring before you this: supposing we admit the right thing is to establish a boarding-school without a day-school, is it in your opinion undesirable that with the amalgamated funds it should be established at Otaki, that being a Maori settlement?—That is a very strong point; you get the Maori boys in as day-scholars. I had boarders there, and about half the scholars were day-scholars. There was no difficulty then; the boarders and day-scholars worked very well together. The day-scholars were regular in their attendance. It was a punishment to a child to be excluded for a day from the school for misconduct.

32. The master of the Government school at Otaki gave evidence to the effect that there was great difficulty in keeping the boys together—that they were irregular in their attendance?—There is this difficulty: if the Maoris go to a tangi the commissariat goes with them, and the boys or girls who stay behind do not know where to get their meals. But I never heard of the children at a boarding-school going away to tangis. In the case of day-scholars, however, they must go with their parents or starve.

33. This scheme that has been suggested would do away with religious education?—I should say that is not Maori. I never heard that idea expressed by a Maori. I have heard them often complain they are not allowed to have religious instruction in a Government school, but I never heard any who thought that it should be excluded. I have lately opened a village Church school where there are Mormons and Roman Catholics, but I have not heard any objection raised by any one of them to religious instruction. I think you can teach religion without treading on each other's toes. When it comes to a question of preparation for confirmation we always tell them if their sympathies are with another denomination we do not want to interfere with them.

34. Would you approve or disapprove of leaving to the Government the establishment of a day-school at Otaki, and applying the Porirua and Otaki funds solely to a boarding-school, and dissevering the children, while they are obtaining instruction, from association with other Maoris?—That is the line upon which we have always tried to work with the Government. The Government have the village schools, and our scholars are as much as possible drafted from the Government schools. Some people have remarked the Government are opposed to religious education of Maoris. I replied that is contrary

to fact; they send us their best scholars from the village schools and send money to support them, knowing that we give them religious instruction. I never had any difficulty with the Government on that point. I should consider our funds better spent by giving some additional attention to the best scholars from the Government village schools than by getting a lot of children and teaching them the alphabet.

35. Do you think it would be better for the Maoris if the Government were left to establish a day-school at Otaki, and the Porirua and Otaki funds were used for the establishment of a boarding-school either at Otaki or elsewhere, and that these funds should be used for a boarding-school for advanced pupils?—I should not like to express that with regard to Otaki without feeling my way, the Natives having been led to expect the expenditure of the Porirua money at Otaki; nor should I care to pledge myself or the Church not to establish village Church schools. You can often do a thing gradually, leading the people to enter into your views without raising opposition. As a general rule, it is my opinion that the money should be spent for boarders—on the better material.

36. Leaving the Government to establish a day-school at Otaki, and perhaps some other places on the same coast?—Yes; as a general rule that is my opinion, and I have acted on it.

37. Then there is the other question. Do you think there is a real objection to establishing a boarding-school in the neighbourhood of Maori settlements, or is it certainly better that a boarding-school should be out of the way of the distracting influence of a Maori settlement?—If it is managed properly it ought not to matter. A question was raised as to the advisability of having a girls' school at Napier, but I said I would chance it.

38. *Mr. Quick.*] But that is the opposite position?—I am mentioning this to show that you cannot go altogether on one idea. It was said we could not do it here. My answer was, if the scholars were kept under proper control, whether in an English town or a Maori village, it could not make any difference. If the masters had no control over their scholars, it would be the last thing I should countenance; they might get a great deal of harm if not under control. Something has been said about the scholars at Otaki being of an objectionable character. I will say this for Mrs. Jennings: we have one of her scholars as a pupil-teacher at Hukarere and one as a master at Te Aute.

39. She sends you about two pupils a year, does she not?—Yes. The headmaster at Te Aute always speaks very highly of their behaviour and the way they have been grounded in their education. But she has many disadvantages; and we have done nothing about it because of the change which it has been proposed to make, and for that reason we have never attempted rebuilding or anything of that sort; not wishing to complicate matters for our successors.

40. *The Chairman.*] Would it be better, supposing it were determined to amalgamate the two trusts and to leave to the Government the establishment of village schools for the Maoris, to establish the new boarding-school for Maori children at Porirua rather than Otaki—that being nearer Wellington, and away from the Maori people?—It has surprised me that the trustees have not seen the advantage of building a school at Porirua instead of in Wairarapa, but I did not wish to interfere with them. It is what I should have done. With regard to the amalgamation of the two trusts for building at Porirua the trustees themselves have complicated matters by promising the Otaki Maoris to expend the Porirua money at Otaki, and I could not recommend the expenditure of the Otaki money at Porirua without consulting the Otaki Natives and gaining their consent. At the time of the Porirua gift the Otaki school was in existence as a Native village school. Some of the Porirua Native children came to my school at Otaki, and we had girls and boys from all parts of the district. The Ngatitoo looked upon it as their school. When the special meeting of the General Synod was called for the consideration of this subject, some of the Porirua Natives called upon me in Wellington and requested me to assure the members of the Synod that they had no wish that this property should be taken out of the hands of the Church authorities, as long as they (the Church authorities) would carry out their promise in expending the funds at Otaki, and that they would be prepared to join the Church in appealing to the Privy Council to secure this object. Mr. Quick also informed the Synod that Mr. Baldwin, the legal adviser of Ngatitoo, had called at his office to say that he had been instructed by Ngatitoo to inform the Church authorities that they were prepared to join the Church in the appeal for the same purpose.

41. *Mr. Wardell.*] Would the Mission Trust Board consent to the amalgamation of the trusts on the understanding that the income from the Otaki lands should be expended at Porirua?—I do not think there would be any difficulty so far as the Board is concerned; but we should feel bound to try and carry the Natives with us, having had a school at Otaki, and having had the promise that they should have the school at Otaki. It would be rather harsh to say "We agree to the school going to Porirua" without their being considered. I think I may say we would not oppose it.

42. Would it not be more in accord with your trusts to have a secondary school at Otaki, or rather a school running up to the Sixth or Seventh Standards, and teaching industrial pursuits, and that the funds accruing from the Porirua trust should be applied to the development of that school?—As far as we are concerned, we should not raise any difficulty.

43. Do you think it would be satisfactory to your Board?—I think it would be, but we must educate the Natives to it.

44. It is considered that there should be one primary school, and another carrying the scholars up to the Sixth and Seventh Standards, and then any brilliant pupils should be transferred to Te Aute or one of the universities?—Those are the lines on which we work.

45. Where do your superior lads go to after you have done with them?—Some go into the Church, some law, others medicine, educational, &c.

46. Where do they go for education?—Some to Christchurch and Otago, some to St. John's (we have one boy at St. John's now), others to the Theological College at Gisborne. Apirana Ngata was



one of our boys ; he went to Christchurch and we had another at Christchurch, but he did not take a degree. Peter Buck also took his medical degree at Otago. Dr. Pomare was also one of our Te Aute boys.

47. Is it a satisfactory scheme, in your mind, that there should be a primary school at Otaki or at Porirua reaching up to the Fourth Standard, that there should be an industrial school with teaching up to the Sixth Standard at Otaki, and that the funds of the two estates should be applied to this purpose ?—I am in favour of one good school in the present state of funds.

48. Have you any Government scholars at Te Aute ?—The number varies from ten to twenty.

49. How many scholars are there altogether ?—Seventy-five. The Government give us a subsidy for eleven, but we sometimes take up to twenty, because we think we are doing more good for the people by distributing the advantages.

50. Taking into consideration the number of the Native population and the growing youth, do you think two superior boarding-schools are sufficient to provide for their wants ?—As time goes on the desire for education increases, and the time is coming when there will be a necessity for more.

51. Having at present a school like St. Stephen's in the North, and having one like Te Aute here, are they in your mind sufficient to provide for the higher education of the Native youth ?—They have been so far, but the desire for education is increasing, so that we shall have to expand. We have nothing under the Fourth Standard at Te Aute, and we are pretty full.

52. Your buildings can grow ?—Yes, there is plenty of ground.

53. And the larger the school the cheaper ?—Yes, undoubtedly.

54. So, if the school were extended and the number of scholars increased, the average cost would be less and the educational advantages greater ?—Yes. The present building would not accommodate more than eighty-five.

55. Can you tell us the average cost of the maintenance of pupils ?—We calculate that £25 a year includes all cost including teaching-staff.

56. In regard to the lower school, do you think it advantageous that the two races should be instructed together ?—We find no difficulty whatever ; we have never seen any class feeling.

57. *The Chairman.*] Where does this amalgamation of Europeans and Natives exist ?—At Te Aute ; we have a dozen English boys.

58. *Mr. Wardell.*] How do they get admission to Te Aute ?—There is no positive rule. We generally try to take a boy so situated that he cannot perhaps get into a school otherwise. In this connection, as bearing upon the whole question of Maori trusts, I may mention that Bishop Selwyn's interpretation, given personally to me, of the clause referring to the admission of both races to the benefits of essentially Maori trusts was that in communication with Sir G. Grey, and foreseeing the possibility of necessitous cases of poor English children living amongst the Maoris in the near neighbourhood, the words are inserted "so that the trustees shall not feel obliged to exclude such from the benefits of the trust." We have always tried as far as possible to regulate the admission of English boys on the lines of this interpretation.

59. Do you exercise any selection as regards those sent up by the Government ?—No. They send their best scholars.

60. Are any of your pupils paying-pupils ?—Some of them pay where they can. We always try to get something where they are able to pay ; but it is irregular.

61. Is there any formal application or recommendation for admission ?—They send us an application, and we give a paper to be filled up by their friends and then it is taken into consideration.

62. Are the applications submitted to any body of trustees ?—They are submitted to the headmaster and myself ; it is our personal selection, but they must all conform to certain regulations. We try to give the first applications the preference if we can.

63. Taking matters as they are at the present time, do you think the Te Aute School supplies all that is required for the accommodation of pupils sent up from the Government or private schools of another character ?—I think we are just on the border ; we just manage.

64. *The Chairman.*] Does the existing state of things in regard to the higher schools afford a reason for not establishing a third school ?—I should not say so. I think there is plenty of room for another.

65. *Mr. Quick.*] We want a decided opinion from you as to the advisability of establishing a secondary school, with industrial training, in a Maori settlement, or in a town or a country district away from the Maoris ?—I have not found any difficulty. I should not lay any stress on having it in either place. At Otaki we had our boarders and day-scholars, and they worked together very well, the boarders, especially boys, for the most part coming from distant villages.

66. The fact of there being a large population of Maoris in the neighbourhood did not affect it ?—Not a bit. It is simply a matter of control. We have never allowed the question to interfere with any of our schools. In having a school isolated from the Maori villages, unless you have a goodly number of scholars, there is a danger of creating a feeling of loneliness which is fatal to the happiness of Maori children.

67. You have no large Maori population near your school at Te Aute ?—No, not at Te Aute itself, but several small settlements in the near neighbourhood.

68. *The Chairman.*] One difficulty you referred to was in consequence of Maori children attending tangis ?—That applies only to day-scholars. It does not affect boarders at all.

69. *Mr. Wardell.*] If you think it desirable that another school for higher education should be established for the benefit of the Native race, do you think it would be well that all the trusts of your society should be amalgamated so that the wealthy trust might support the poor trust ?—It is proposed to do this in the case of Porirua and Otaki.

70. Do you see any reason why the Te Aute trust should not be amalgamated with the other Church of England or similar trusts for educational purposes ?—We have done it so far with Hukarere and



Te Aute. The proposal of the General Synod was that the proceeds of such estates as Porirua should be used in the form of scholarships which might be held at any of the existing boarding-schools, so that the pupils should derive the full advantage of the available money without the extra expense of buildings and teaching-staff.

71. Looking at it from another point of view, not as a trustee, but looking at the interest and welfare of the race, do you think it would be advantageous to unify the trusts of this character and have them administered by one board of control for the various schools?—That is a large question to go into; you have to consider the legal aspect. I must say, speaking about the income, that we, with the assistance given to Hukarere School, have as much to do as we can comfortably get along with. In fact, we have to draw largely on private resources to secure the efficiency of the schools.

72. How many girls are there at Hukarere?—About sixty-five.

73. *The Chairman.*] Your opinion is that there are not substantial disadvantages in having an industrial school in the neighbourhood of the Maoris?—No; it is all a matter of discipline.

74. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you consider it desirable that industrial training should be made an important feature in the training of youth?—To a certain extent, if not carried too far. We should have had it at Te Aute, but the difficulty is this: it is the only school where higher education is attempted, and when it was suggested that we should give technical instruction the Education Department, in offering assistance, stipulated that every boy must spend a certain number of hours at it. We remonstrated, and said that boys are not all alike, and we should be allowed to exercise discrimination, and that certain boys should be selected who were not so quick at book-learning. But they insisted that every boy in the school was to have so many hours' technical education.

75. Are St. Stephen's boys sent on to you?—Yes, occasionally. We have not come to any agreement as yet in regard to technical instruction; we have been doing a little in that direction.

76. Do you send any boys up for matriculation from Te Aute?—Yes; twelve went up this year, and five passed.

77. Natives?—Yes.

78. *The Chairman.*] Have any taken degrees?—Yes. Apirana Ngata took his degree, and so did Peter Buck.

79. *Mr. Hutana.*] Canon MacMurray stated in his evidence that he saw no objection to the Otaki trusts being amalgamated with the Porirua trust; but he said, as a matter of opinion, he would say the school should be established at Otaki: what is your opinion?—I should hesitate to decide where it should be—one place or the other. I should not like to say it must be at Otaki, and not at Porirua, or *vice versa*. It is a question that the people should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon.

80. During the time you were at Otaki did the children grow their own food?—As far as possible we tried to carry out the terms of the trust, and to give them an industrial training, and we succeeded in getting them to assist in the cultivation of food for themselves. We hired the hard labour that was required.

81. Would you advise now in these times to revert to that system and let the children grow food for the school?—We had to do it at one time, but the parents have for some years objected to it, saying, "We send the children to you to teach them what we cannot teach them ourselves; we can ourselves teach them to plough." In some schools it might be done, but not where higher education is attempted. None of our scholars are employed on the land; but they take part in preparing food, and there is a good deal done in the way of cultivating vegetables and so on—no extensive cultivation.

82. Do you approve of technical instruction for Maori children?—Certainly.

83. Would it be advisable to introduce technical instruction into Te Aute?—We have done a good deal in the way of teaching the use of carpenters' tools, &c., and we have offered to extend the system if we can come to an understanding with the Government that all the boys are not to be carpenters. We have no master carpenter to teach carpentering, though the Department have offered to provide one if we can agree to their terms.

84. You mean if the Government subsidise you, you would approve of technical education?—If we can agree to a system that will not clash with the other work.

85. You approve of carpentry, tailoring, blacksmithing, and shoemaking?—Carpentry is the subject that has been brought formally before us by the Government; but as a general rule in the learning of trades we cannot do better than adopt the plan of apprenticing to a master hand; we can only go so far as giving a little idea of the use of tools.

86. Would it be a good thing, if the Porirua and Otaki trusts were severed from the Wairarapa institution, and a school established at Otaki, to establish technical education in connection with it?—Up to a certain extent. I am of opinion that we should train the boys' minds first, and exercise their brains, and then let them learn trades afterwards.

87. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you remember what was the utmost annual subsidy received from the Government during the time you were at Otaki?—No; it was not a regular annual amount; we had special grants.

88. Can you give us the outside amount?—I could hardly say at this distance of time. I heard some wild statements made in regard to it. We got a substantial grant, amounting to a few hundreds; not so much as £1,000; but afterwards it was stopped.

89. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you give us any accounts of receipts and expenditure in connection with the Otaki trusts antecedent to those in a blue-book from 1872 to 1874?—No; I think all the accounts we can supply have been put in.

90. May we take these accounts, signed by Basil Taylor, as being the correct accounts of the trust for the period from 1872 to 1874?—Yes. The accounts I put in are from 1875 to 1877, and from 1880 to 1904.

91. These show the accumulated capital at the present time to be £1,736 4s. 2d. ?—Yes. It was invested at 5 per cent. for a number of years, but when it appeared that the money might soon be required it was reinvested at call at 4 per cent.

92. We have been unable to trace any accounts in connection with Otawhao earlier than 1894, there being a period of forty years during which there are no accounts whatever: you cannot give us any information as to them, or tell us where we are likely to get it ?—No.

93. Canon MacMurray said that Mr. Burrows does not appear to have handed over any papers, and said they might have been sent Home to the Church Missionary Society in London ?—I do not think that is likely. A statement would be rendered yearly, but nothing in the shape of vouchers or anything of that sort.

94. *Mr. Quick.*] The balance-sheet would go ?—No doubt.

95. Have you any trace of copies of such balance-sheets ?—I will look and see.

96. *The Chairman.*] You keep copies of letters sent to the society in London ?—They should be amongst the papers. I have never been responsible for those documents. During Mr. Burrows's time they were in his charge as secretary to the Church Missionary Society. I will endeavour to get hold of anything I can. I have a distinct recollection that at the time of Mr. Burrows retiring from his office of secretary his accounts were carefully examined by the Board and found to be perfectly correct.

97. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us when the present leases in Otaki will expire ?—I think they were for fourteen years. Mr. E. F. Hadfield, solicitor, Wellington, could give you the information.

98. Are you taking any steps in regard to dealing with the land at the expiry of the leases ?—No; I thought it would be wise to avoid complicating matters.

99. The money received from the insurance of the building that was destroyed went to Capital Account ?—Yes. I think it was insured for its full value. In regard to the number of scholars that were at Otaki, there have been some rather random statements made. I think the highest number we ever had was 130, boarders and day-scholars.

100. Was the support of the school a considerable charge upon the Church Missionary Society ?—No; they paid very little. It was supported by what was made out of the property by very careful management; and the work of the boys saved something, by cultivating potatoes, &c.; and the Government grant was the principal item.

101. From your knowledge of affairs in the Waikato country, can you express any opinion as to whether, assuming at the time of the disturbance in 1863 there was sufficient reason for abandoning the schools, a period arrived when they could have been wisely and well re-established, and what that period was ?—I question if it could be done even at the present time, excepting, perhaps, with some of the lower Waikato Natives who were not engaged in the war. It is worthy of notice that the late Archdeacon Maunsell, who took the deepest interest in the Maori, never returned to live in the Waikato after the war, and never once to my knowledge advocated the re-establishment of the Maori schools, one of which he himself had started and superintended. The original mission stations were maintained, and the salaries of the missionaries who occupied them were paid by the Church Missionary Society. The money for the support of the schools was provided by the Government, neither of which sources of income is now available. I was the first English clergyman who went up after the war, and at that time it was impossible to think of anything of the kind. They would not listen to a missionary at all. They took it into their heads that the missionaries came to blind them. It was the missionaries who advised them to sign the Treaty of Waitangi, and submit to Government rule, and they said they had been deceived. That feeling is not extinct yet. In regard to the Maoris attempting to get the Porirua land back again, as I have stated the Maoris asked me to assure the Synod they had no wish to take the trust from the Church, and they were prepared to join the Church in the appeal in order to retain it for the Church, if the trustees would carry out their promise to expend the income at Otaki. At a later period Neera said he had not intended to take the land from the Church, "but that, as they were assured the Church had lost it, they considered they ought to get it back."

102. We were told at Otaki that nothing would induce them to send their children to the Wairapa: is there any truth in that ?—I am certain of it. I told the Wellington Church authorities when the idea was first suggested it would be many a long year before any boys from Ngatitao or Ngatiawa or Ngatiraukawa would be sent to Wairapa. It is written on the Maori mind; it would be *infra dig.* from the Maori point of view.

103. *Mr. Hutana.*] Do the children who go to Te Aute have to pay ?—Occasionally we get fees from people who are able to pay.

104. Do the descendants of the donors pay, or others ?—We never had a sixpence from any Native in Hawke's Bay. It is people who are in good circumstances who are asked to give something.

105. In the case of St. Stephen's, I heard that descendants of the donors of Waikato lands were asked to pay: is that right ?—I should very much doubt it. If we have erred at all it is in being too lenient. If you will furnish me with the particulars of any such case I will inquire into it.

106. *Mr. Quick.*] What was the curriculum at St. John's in Bishop Selwyn's time ?—We had candidates for hold orders and other English students, but I could not remember the curriculum at this distance of time.

107. Was there any technical education ?—They used to dig and prepare gardens, and do a small amount of cultivation to keep the boys out of mischief. No handicrafts were taught except a little carpentering.

108. *Mr. Wardell.*] In regard to St. John's or any other school of a similar character, would you consider ecclesiastical training for the ministry to be the primary object or an incidental ?—At Te Rau it is the primary object; at the others it is not.

109. Would you call St. John's an ecclesiastical seminary ?—Partly so.

110. Is it on the same footing as Gisborne?—The latter is purely Maori; the other is English and Maori. Some of the students study law and medicine.

111. Do you think the Porirua donors contemplated in the giving of this land a school for the training of ministers only?—No, I do not think so; they would not exclude everything else, nor would they attempt to exclude the English had the conditions been fulfilled. They were asked to give this land as their contribution, and the Bishop promised to find the money to build and maintain a college. I do not, however, see how these facts can carry much weight at the present time, inasmuch as Bishop Selwyn was compelled to give up the Porirua gift as a site for a college, to his great disappointment; and the present Bishop of Wellington declared it to be in every way unsuitable and inaccessible, and upon these grounds first proposed to spend the funds elsewhere, and subsequently applied to the Supreme Court for power to expend the income at Wairarapa.

112. Do you consider the land was given by the Natives in consequence of a promise on the part of the Bishop to establish a school or college?—Decidedly so. It was not like Natives giving waste lands. The Porirua Natives could not have had 1,000 acres of clear land in that locality, and they gave 500 acres out of their home on the clear understanding that a college was to be built there. Then when there was some discussion about applying part of the funds to an English school, I asked, "How could any one have the face to ask for a portion of this grant to be applied to English schools when the Church has never fulfilled the terms of the gift, and the only income you have is derived from the Natives' contribution towards the college?" and the Synod took that view of it. Bishop Selwyn was grievously disappointed when he did not get the money he had counted upon for the building of the college. This was almost the only land the Porirua Natives had on which to keep their cattle and horses in that neighbourhood. Theirs was a very hard case.

WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 17TH JULY, 1905.

Bishop WALLIS examined.

*Witness*: Having been asked by the Commissioners to bring proof that the college at Porirua was intended to be a *bona fide* college and not an ordinary school, I went to Government House to see if I could find any documents which would throw any light on the point. I found some documents, which I refer to in the following statement which I now produce, showing that it was meant to be a *bona fide* college for higher, not elementary, education:—

At the last meeting of the Commissioners which I had the honour to attend, the question was asked me "What evidence is there that it was designed that the institution at Porirua should be a college and not a school, a place for secondary and not for primary education?" I respectfully submit the following considerations:—

1. In the deed of gift by the Maori donors of the 24th March 1849, (which is later than their letter to His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief dated the 16th August, 1848), the words *hei kareti* (college) are used, not *hei kura* (school).

2. The letters of Bishop Selwyn printed in the first volume of the Rev. H. W. Tucker's "Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn" (London, 1879), which has, I believe, been laid before the Commissioners, show that the Bishop regarded the institution as a college. These letters are given on pages 279-80, 282-84, 341-44. On page 343 he writes, "All the students will be united in one general system of academical instruction, and public examination." I would draw attention to the use of the words "students" and "academical instruction." (It is worthy of note that in pages 341 (last line) and 342 he states that the land was given by persons belonging to the Ngatiraukawa Tribe in the documents to which I am about to refer, Ngatitua Natives are said to have given the land.)

3. Similar language is employed in various letters and despatches belonging to the year 1849, which are preserved at Government House. His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to grant me permission to examine these documents and to make quotations therefrom. I have to thank, also, Captain Bingham, Aide-de-camp to His Excellency, for his kindness in collecting these documents. They are as follows:—

- (i.) Letter from Bishop Selwyn to Lieutenant-Governor Eyre, dated the 24th March, 1849 (enclosing a copy of the deed of gift by the Natives already referred to, and a sketch-map of the land).
- (ii.) Despatch from Lieutenant-Governor Eyre to His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief, dated the 7th April, 1849, with a reply written on the back of the last page by His Excellency, dated the 15th May, 1849.

I wish to draw attention not merely to the use of the word "college," which is uniformly employed in all these documents, but to the significance in relation to the question proposed by the Commissioners of the expressed desire that the institution should be isolated as far as possible—a desire which is in harmony with that which was expressed by myself on the last page of the statement which I had the honour of presenting to the Commissioners on the 12th instant. Thus (page 3) the Lieutenant-Governor writes, "With regard to the extent of land to be granted to the Bishop, I have been guided by Your Excellency's instructions and by a consideration of the purpose for which the land is required, and which makes it of paramount importance that the position should be as compact and isolated as possible." (Page 5): "I had no difficulty in consenting to the adoption of the boundary-line originally proposed and shown in the accompanying map, and my reasons for so consenting were that I believed it important to the objects contemplated by the Bishop that his position should be as isolated, as compact, and as free from all possibility of interference and annoyance as possible."

- (iii.) Despatch from His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief to Lieutenant-Governor Eyre, dated the 11th May, 1849, approving the arrangements suggested in the latter's despatch of the 7th April, 1847. (ii., above).
- (iv.) Despatch from Lieutenant-Governor Eyre to His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief, dated the 17th May, 1849, transmitting an opinion of the Attorney-General as to the power of Government to issue grants in New Munster.
- (v.) Despatch from Lieutenant-Governor Eyre to His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief relative to the Attorney-General's opinion (see above, iv.), dated the 28th November, 1849, also inquiring whether His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief will authorise His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor to issue grant to the Lord Bishop of New Zealand for college land at Porirua.
- (vi.) Reply from His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief, dated the 28th January, 1850, recommending the Lieutenant-Governor to take the opinion of the Attorney-General of New Munster, and to act in accordance therewith.

23rd June, 1905.

FREDERIC WELLINGTON.

*Mr. Stafford* produced affidavits filed in the Court of Appeal adverse to the scheme which had been approved by the Supreme Court, and also affidavits relating thereto by the Bishop of Wellington and the Rev. Mr. McWilliam. (See Appendix.)

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 21ST JULY, 1905.

E. HADFIELD, Solicitor, examined.

*Witness* : I produce particulars of the Otaki leases. In regard to two of the leases, tenders were called by advertisement in two newspapers ; three or four tenders were refused ; I think the highest tenders were accepted. All leases were by tender, excepting the hospital lease. I should like to say that at the time the Porirua lands were selected the mover in the matter was not Tamihana te Rau-paraha, but the old Te Rau-paraha, and when he requested my father to go down it was to select unoccupied tribal lands, and the essence of it was that being unoccupied lands the sole disposing-power lay with old Te Rau-paraha. When Whitireia was selected it was so selected because my father thought it was a desirable place, and the approval of the other Natives was given, not by way of validating the determination of Te Rau-paraha, but by way of expressing approval of the mode in which he was exercising his disposing-power, who could have done whatever he liked with the land, being unoccupied tribal land. The approval of the others had no effectuating influence whatever. Had the lands been occupied lands it would have been different.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any old account-books or records from which you could supply a hiatus in the Otaki accounts ?—None whatever.

2. Do you know anything in regard to the fire—with respect to the insurance ?—No. I should like to say (in regard to the college at Porirua) there is no doubt Bishop Selwyn anticipated he would be able to put a college there, because he made a remark as to the possible principal of such a college.

3. *Mr. Quick.*] Was there not some idea of your uncle being appointed to that position ?—Yes, there is a letter in which that is mentioned.

ALBERT FOWLER examined.

*Witness* : I produce a list of valuations of the Porirua, Otaki, and Waikato properties, showing the following capital values : Porirua (500 acres), valued in 1902 at a capital value of £4,000 ; Otaki (578 acres), valued in 1904 at a capital value of £8,347 ; Kohanga (750 acres), valued in 1903 at a capital value of £865 ; Hopuhopu (1,358 acres), valued in 1905 at a capital value of £2,194 ; Puniu (860 acres), valued in 1903 at a capital value of £3,125 ; Otawhao (173 acres), valued in 1903 at a capital value of £4,701 ; Pepepe (170 acres), valued in 1903 at a capital value of £170. (For details of valuation see Appendix.)

FREDERICK JOHN CARTER examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Chapman) : I am diocesan treasurer. I have charge of the Kaikokirikiri and Papawai accounts. The accounts of the two trusts are kept together and cannot be separated, so far as payments are concerned ; in regard to receipts they may be separated. The money has accumulated, and has been invested on mortgage, and so far as the interest on mortgage is concerned, I do not see how the receipts can be separated. The block is let now. There are four leases, and one monthly tenancy. Three leases expire on the 20th May, 1909, and one on the 4th October, 1909. The total rent is £209 18s. 11d. I can produce no accounts further back than 1867 ; nothing appears in the old ledger, which in the case of other trusts goes further back than that date. The first entry I find is an item " Rent, £10 0s. 7d." For about two years the revenue has been used for Clareville College, the first payment having been made on the 15th June, 1903. Prior to that the money was accumulating, except in regard to secretary's salary and office expenses. [At this stage the witness was requested to prepare and subsequently produce a detailed statement of receipts and expenditure.]

MONDAY, 24TH JULY, 1905.

Examination of ALBERT FOWLER continued.

*Witness* : I produce the Government valuation of the Kaikokirikiri property made in 1904 and 1905. There is a slight discrepancy between the area shown on the plan (190 acres) and the area actually leased (174 acres 2 roods). The capital valuation of the 174 acres is £8,340, the unimproved value being

£7,515. I produce also the Government valuation of the Whakarewa property. There is also a discrepancy here in the areas shown on the plans and the area leased. The total area shown in the grants is 1,078 acres, whereas the area leased is shown as 931 acres 3 roods 12 perches. The capital value of the property is £20,251, the unimproved value being £11,695 (valuations made in 1904), the value of improvements being £8,556. The value of improvements in one section of 2 acres (unleased) is £2,291. The area of one section in the grant (No. 6) is given as 50 acres, whereas we have it as 18 acres and the balance washed away by river-encroachment.

TE WHATAHORO (JOHN JURY) examined.

*Witness* : I belong to Wairarapa, my kainga being Papawai, but I have been living at Whanganui for two years and a half. My tribe is Ngatikahungunu. I am not quite sure when the Kaikokirikiri land was given; it was in 1852 or 1853. The first person who asked for the land was Mr. Donald McLean. He made representations to the Maoris under instructions from Sir George Grey that they should set aside two pieces of land, one for a school for boys and one for a school for girls. I am speaking of Kaikokirikiri and Papawai. Papawai was set aside for boys and Kaikokirikiri for girls. I remember this; I was there at the time. Te Manihera, Pirika, Te Warahi, and Te Watarauhi were the principal leaders in the matter. After they had signed the document in reference to Papawai they went to Masterton, where Sir G. Grey met them, and Kaikokirikiri was arranged there. Te Korou, Wi Waaka, and Te Ropiha and others arranged the matter. Sir G. Grey told us these places were reserved for the purpose of educating the Maoris and teaching them technical and industrial and other education. He told us it was for the purpose of teaching the children to make mills and farm the land and to make improvements, such as fencing, and so on, and it was settled at the time that the Bishop (Selwyn) was to take charge of and administer these lands. Sir G. Grey also told us that in this way the two people might grow up as one, and be taught civilisation. From that day to this Kaikokirikiri has remained as it was, and no school has been erected there.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was there never a school for Native boys or girls there?—No.

2. *Mr. Quick.*] There was one at Papawai?—Yes, but it did not last very long. Mr. Ronaldson conducted it.

3. There is a Government school on the Papawai reserve?—Yes; a school was applied for in 1877, and it was erected about two years afterwards. I heard that the land had to be leased by the Government from the Bishop before it was put up. Since its erection till now, that school has continued without intermission. The great drawback in connection with a school at Papawai is that the children from other kaingas in the Wairarapa do not attend, because there is no place where they can live, so the school really only serves the Papawai children. I should like to say what I think would improve the school. I would suggest in regard to all the schools from the Wairarapa up to Whakatane, on the other side of the East Cape all the district belonging to one kindred tribe—the Ngatikahungunu—that the money arising from all similar trusts throughout the district should be amalgamated into one fund to establish one good school at, say, Te Aute, where children could be taught general, technical, and industrial education.

4. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know of any other trusts except Papawai and Kaikokirikiri?—There is one at Waerengahika.

5. *Mr. Quick.*] Do Ngatikahungunu extend as far as Whakatane?—Yes. In regard to small schools, there is another reserve at Waiapu within the Ngatiporou boundary—Te Rahui—those are the people who support the Te Aute school.

6. Does not Te Aute get scholars from all parts?—That is so, but only a few. In connection with Papawai, I would suggest that the local children should be taught there till they have passed the Fifth Standard, and should then be transferred to Te Aute; that is how all Government schools should be used in connection with the large institution. If what I suggest is not carried out, or if no schools are placed on the reserves in connection with the trusts, then I say the proper thing would be to give the lands back to the donors. When the present Bishop of Wellington was at Papawai it was reported to him that it would be a good thing to have a boarding-school at Papawai in order to board children from other parts of the Wairarapa. He said it could not be done unless the Maoris were prepared to bear the cost of erecting the buildings.

7. *Mr. Quick.*] How long ago was that?—I cannot recollect. I think it was on the Bishop's first visit to Papawai. The Bishop told them he was going to erect an industrial school in the Wairarapa on another spot—that he would erect the place there out of funds given by a gentleman in England. He bought a piece of land, and a school was erected on it at Clareville, and we were present at the opening. There are not many children there, I hear, owing to lack of accommodation in the building.

8. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think if Clareville were a boarding-school and a technical school it would meet the requirements of both Papawai and Masterton?—Yes, it would meet the requirements of the Wairarapa. I would suggest Te Aute as the most central situation; it would be more accessible for all the children of the East Coast.

9. *Mr. Hutana.*] In the event of the revenue derived from these reserves you mentioned in this large district not being sufficient to establish a school at Te Aute, how would you suggest that the funds should be subsidised?—If they will not raise sufficient money, then divide it into districts. Let Wairarapa be satisfied with Clareville, and another one be established in the Ngatiporou district.

10. If you carry that out there will be no technical school at Te Aute; my question was to give effect to the wish of the people to have an industrial school at Te Aute: how would you raise funds, supposing the income from these reserves were not sufficient?—It is difficult to answer that. If these funds cannot produce enough revenue to enable that to be done, I would suggest that we Maoris might collect money and ask the Government for a subsidy. We could set aside a piece of land, and then

the Government would give us pound for pound for its value. I should say it would be well to ascertain the total amount of revenue received by the Bishop from the endowments, and then the Maoris could be told the amount required to make the sum sufficient to establish a central school, and then the Maoris perhaps would contribute in land to make up the total sum required; the Tuhoe would give a piece, the Ngatiporou would give a piece, the people about Wairoa, and the people of Wairarapa. I make this suggestion so that a good scheme may be thought out for the education of the Maori children, for we know that after fifty years of education none of our children are engaged in any European trades.

11. *Mr. Wardell.*] What are your views about technical instruction to be given in these schools?—I should say teach them shoemaking, carpentering, bricklaying, farming, blacksmithing, engineering, &c.

12. *Mr. Quick.*] How was it that Mr. Ronaldson's school at Papawai fell through?—The clergyman in charge became alarmed at the Hauhau movement, and abandoned the place and crossed over to the Wairau.

13. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think it more essential that the boys at such a school as you mention should be taught trades than that they should be carried to a high standard of education?—I think the Sixth Standard is quite sufficient for them, and after that they should devote their time to learning a trade. But, of course, this remark would not apply to those who intended to follow up the law, and so on.

14. Archdeacon Williams told us he was opposed to technical instruction at Te Aute: what is your view?—I condemn that; I do not approve of it. There was a large piece of land given by the rangatiras of Ngatikahungunu for the education of children in all matters connected with the civilisation of the European. It will never do for Archdeacon Williams to dictate as to what is to be done. Te Aute is the most central position for the East Coast, and the most suitable; it is the largest piece of land given for educational purposes, and technical instruction should be included in the curriculum there.

MASTERTON, WEDNESDAY, 26TH JULY, 1905.

WILLIAM HORT CRUICKSHANK, Land Agent, examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] We are ready to hear any information you can give us in regard to the Kaikokirikiri land?—At the present time there is a shortage of small areas close to the Borough of Masterton—that is to say, from 5- to 10-acre holdings. I sold the other day a section of 10 acres of rather poor land, with a small cottage on it worth perhaps £50, for £650. I have had several applications from clients for small holdings, and have been unable to secure them. If this reserve were cut up into 5- or 10-acre holdings, the people residing in the town would pay very good rent for them. I daresay you could get as high as £2 an acre for the best of it.

2. For what term?—Of course, they would require it for a term of twenty-one years, I should say, with a revaluation at the end of that time. You would have no difficulty in disposing of the whole block in 5- and 10-acre holdings on twenty-one-year leases with a revaluation of ground-rent without improvements. People would take it up and build on it. I would make the leases twenty-one years with a right of renewal for another twenty-one. For the poorer part you would get from £1 10s. to £1 15s. an acre.

3. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you speaking of it as for residential sites?—Yes, for residential sites and workmen's homes.

4. Do you know what it has been realising as pastoral land?—No.

5. Have you known any land in the neighbourhood being let for residential purposes at £2 an acre?—No; it has all been sold freehold. I am basing it on a 5-per-cent. basis.

6. Valuing the land at what?—A great deal of it at £40; if it were put up to auction and sold as freehold you would get, I daresay, £50 an acre for a good deal of it.

7. *The Chairman.*] Do you know why the present trustees did not act in the way you have said would be advisable?—I do not know; I know there has been an agitation in the town to have it cut up.

8. Do you base your estimate on any lease of the kind you have granted?—No; only on inquiries.

9. You do not know of any land of similar kind let on the terms you suggest?—No.

10. You base your estimate entirely on what you consider to be the value of the land?—Yes; on a 5-per-cent. basis.

11. You do not know whether there is a demand for that sort of tenure?—Yes, there is a demand. I know a great many people in town who would lease who are not in a position to buy.

12. Do you mean they have been inquiring for leases?—Yes; through my agency for the past two years.

13. How many inquiries do you think you have had?—I think I could place the whole of this block on the figures I have given.

14. Did you take any part in the petition presented to Parliament in connection with the property?—I believe I did sign it.

15. Before doing so did you inquire what leases were in existence?—No.

16. Your petition and your estimates are based on the existence of no leases?—Yes; presuming there were no leases on the land at present.

HAPETA WHAKAMAIRU examined.

*Witness:* I am a resident of Wairarapa. I am an Assessor. My father is Ihaia Whakamairu, and I am a grandson of Retimana te Koru, one of the donors of the land. I am acquainted with the conditions upon which Kaikokirikiri was given to the Bishop. Peneamine, Te Ropiha, and Te Akau were

also donors, and many others. They were supported in what they did by the whole of the people in giving the land to the Bishop in response to the application made by the Bishop when he said that schools and education were most important for their welfare. The tribe who owned the land consented to give it so that their children should be educated, and the gift was approved by Sir George Grey and Bishop Selwyn. They promised they would erect a school—that is, a college; and that they would also erect a church, and also a mill for the maintenance of the children and their parents. From that day to this—a period of fifty years—not one of those promises has been given effect to. Therefore we desire that the land should be returned to us, because the promises made have not been given effect to.

17. *The Chairman.*] It is in regard to the administration of the trust, and any suggestion as to its administration in future, that we are to inquire. It is not within the Commission at all to inquire into whether it is just that the land should be given back to the Maoris?—Then, as the Bishop has not given effect to his promise, and has neither erected a school nor a church nor a mill, I would suggest that new trustees should be appointed to administer the trust.

18. Do you know why they have done nothing? If nothing has been done has it ever been explained to you why nothing has been done?—No.

19. Have you never had any explanation that the trustees have done something which they consider to be administering the trust?—I heard last year that they had established a school at Clareville.

20. Is that the first explanation that has been made to you?—Yes; and I went to the meeting held in connection with the Clareville institution; and again after that I went to Greytown to a meeting there and objected to the Clareville institution as proposed by the Bishop. I protested against the money from Kaikokirikiri being devoted to the support of that institution. If they have the minutes of that meeting, you will find my protest is there. I said the school should be established on the land here out of revenue. I also heard a speech by the Premier, when he said it would be better if the trust were handed over to the Government and let them establish a school on the land. I heard some of my elders approve of that proposal. Therefore I ask the Royal Commissioners to carefully consider this matter, inasmuch as the trusts have not been carried out, with the hope that they will make some suggestion for an improvement in the matter so that the promises made to our fathers may be given effect to.

21. Have you thought of what kind of school would be the right kind to establish?—I think the most suitable school would be a technical and industrial school to teach our children trades, so that they may be equipped for the future.

22. Do they not teach trades at Clareville?—I do not know; at that school there are only twelve children, or one or two more, and what is the good of that? Our children do not attend that school; they attend the Government school here.

23. *Mr. Wardell.*] There is no Government Native school here?—No; it is a Board school.

24. *Mr. Quick.*] Does the schoolmaster speak Maori?—No.

25. How many Maori children go to that school?—About thirty or forty. The majority of the children at Te Oreore are Maori children.

26. Are there many Maori children about here who do not attend any school?—No; they all go to school.

27. *Mr. Wardell.*] There is a school at Te Whiti now?—Yes.

28. Is there any Government or Church Maori school in this district other than Clareville?—No; I do not know of any. In former times there was one at Papawai; I think it opened in 1862, and broke up in 1864 owing to the Hauhau movement.

29. *The Chairman.*] Would the Maoris approve of this scheme: the lands to be let so as to get the greatest amount of money, and the whole of that money to be spent at Clareville, educating the children from Masterton and its neighbourhood?—I would like the school to be here on the spot that our fathers gave for a school.

30. You think it should be a local school?—Yes.

31. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you give any idea of the number of children who would attend such a school?—I should think about one hundred.

32. *Mr. Quick.*] But they would be taken away from the Government schools?—Yes.

33. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do they get any technical education at the Government schools?—No.

34. And that is what you desire they should have?—Yes; such training as would be for their benefit. I do not say the school should be for Maori children only; I would include pakeha children too; but it should be here; it is the central place. I can recollect, I think, when the Bishop's successors first leased this land. I think it was in 1869 they first leased it to Mr. Bannister, and that lease would expire in 1890. It was leased again for ten years and the rents increased, some portions 10s. and some portions £1 an acre. At the expiration of that time they were leased again; I do not know for what term.

35. *Mr. Quick.*] How old were you when your grandfather and the other chiefs gave the land?—I was about two years old. I did not see the land given, but I have heard of it afterwards.

36. *The Chairman.*] Is the kind of school you are thinking of to be a day-school or a boarding-school?—If it is to be a technical school I think they should be day-scholars. The children who are being taught handicrafts would be fairly grown up and well able to go backwards and forwards to school and home.

37. Do you think they should have finished their education at a Government school and then go to the technical school?—Yes; that is partly what I mean.

38. They should pass the Fourth or Fifth Standard and then go to a day technical school where they teach something else, perhaps, besides handicraft?—Yes.

39. *Mr. Wardell.*] All the young boys and girls of the Natives are living within a radius of about three miles from the spot, are they not?—Yes; from one to four miles.



40. We have heard something about the two grants, Kaikokirikiri and Papawai, being intended for schools for different sexes: have you ever heard anything of that?—No, I heard nothing about that; but it is a fact that the children who attended Papawai were all boys. Papawai was set aside for the people extending from those settlements seawards, and this was for the Maoris extending from here inland and extending to Castlepoint.

41. *Mr. Quick.*] How are all those supposed to attend a day-school at Masterton?—They would not have far to go. When I said it should be a day-school I meant to serve the children round about here.

42. Was the original idea of the donors to have a day-school or a boarding-school?—A boarding-school; and that is why the land was given, so that there should be plenty of land on which to cultivate food for the maintenance of the school. That is why they gave 196 acres of their best land.

43. Is there any reason why there should not be a boarding-school now?—I think it would be a very good thing; but I had in my mind the amount it would cost; there might not be sufficient funds.

44. *Mr. Wardell.*] Does the boarding-school at Clareville satisfy you or the Natives of this district?—No.

45. *Mr. Hutana.*] What are the handicrafts you would like taught at the school?—Carpentering, blacksmithing, engineering, commercial training, and other useful things of that sort.

46. Would it not be better, if it is a technical school, for the children to reside on the premises?—Yes, that would be best; that is to say, if you have enough money.

47. If you have not enough money to erect a school, what would you suggest in aid of that?—I would ask the Government for money.

48. Would it not be better to have a school at Te Aute and let the money from Kaikokirikiri and Papawai go towards supporting it?—No; I would not agree to that.

49. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you regard Te Aute as the chief school for the Ngatikahungunu extending from Palliser Bay up north?—Yes, that is our most important school; but we cannot all get our children there.

50. But for advanced children is that the best school to send them to?—It may be so.

51. What standard do you think sufficient for the ordinary education of Maori boys?—The Seventh.

52. Do you think it essential that they should reach the Seventh Standard?—It is a good thing, but it is not necessary.

53. Do you realise that the funds derived from the 190 acres by leasing can never be expected to reach more than £400, at the very utmost?—Yes.

54. Do you realise that that would be a very small sum for the maintenance of a school?—You must recollect when the promise was made to our parents there was nothing said about there being no money to erect schools; all the Bishop said was that he would put a school up.

55. You do not consider that the land ought to be looked upon as the sole support of the school?—No.

56. Your idea is that the land was given to assist in doing what the Bishop said he was about to do?—Yes; the Bishop was to set up a school, and so the land was given. That was the condition on which all the lands were given, and the promises have not been carried out.

57. In regard to religious education in schools, have you anything to say in regard to that?—I do not attach much importance to that. Handicraft is far more important. Religion as taught by the Church does not teach the Maoris anything that will benefit their bodies.

58. Would any difficulty arise in the school from the fact of religious instruction being given by any religious body?—It would cause trouble, because some of the parents and children would not belong to the Church. For instance, in regard to Clareville, the people of my kainga do not send their children there, because they are Catholics.

59. Are there any Mormons in this district?—Yes.

60. Are there any Wesleyans?—No.

61. *Mr. Chairman.*] You have told us what the land was given to the Bishop for: how do you know about that?—My parents told me.

62. Who were the actual givers of the land?—Te Korou was one. I do not mean to say that my father had any right to the land, but he was there; he was not an owner.

63. Who were the owners of the land?—Karaitiana te Korou, Retimana te Korou, Peneamine, Te Ropiha, Te Akau, Wi Kingi Tamawheti, Tamihana Kauhanga, Ihaka te Ao, Ani Kanara, Niniwaki-te-Rangi, and others.

64. Are any of these persons alive now?—No.

65. And you tell us what your father told you about what intention the owners had about the land?—Yes; I heard it from him and others.

66. And you say the Bishop made some promises?—Yes.

67. And that you know in the same way?—Yes. You must remember that talk with Maoris is a very important matter, and they are not likely to forget.

68. According to your understanding, did the Bishop say where the school was to be?—Yes; I understood from what I was told that it was to be on the land. And there was a post, known as the Bishop's post, which he put in as the site for the school. And we know where the mill was to be. A tree is standing there which marks the spot.

69. When you came into Court it was for the purpose of getting the land back, was it not?—Yes, inasmuch as the Bishop had not given effect to the promises.

70. That was the purpose for which all the Maoris came here?—That was one purpose; but there were other reasons as well.



## KUKU KARAITIANA examined.

*Witness* : I live at Masterton, Te Ahura, Takapau, Te Oreore, and Heretaunga. I am a grandson of Retimana te Korou, one of the donors of the land. I am also a grandchild of Wi Kingi Tamawheti, My father was a son of Retimana te Korou. I was not present when the land was given to the Bishop, but the evidence I am giving I heard from my parents. The hapus who gave the land were : Ngatituhakeke (living at Te Akura), Ngatipakuahi (living at Te Oreore), Ngatehina (living at Te Whiti), Ngatitamahau (living at Te Oreore), Ngatitehikaopapauma (living at Mataikoua and Whakataki), Ngatimapuhia (living at Waikekeno and Kaiwhaata, twenty-two miles away), and others. The Bishop told the donors and those hapus that I have mentioned that it was a good thing to have a school and a church and a flour-mill erected ; the school for the purpose of teaching the children the English language, the church for the purpose of teaching the children and their parents religion, and the mill for the support and maintenance of the children and their parents. The chiefs of these hapus thought what the Bishop said was a very good thing, and they agreed and gave the land. From the day when these chiefs and their hapus handed over the lands to the Bishop in the presence of Sir George Grey and Mr. Tollomache, not one of these promises has been carried out. As the Bishop has not carried out the promises he made when the land was given, my father petitioned to have the land returned to the hapus that gave it. As Parliament did not consent to give back the land, what we propose now is this : we should like new trustees appointed to administer the land, and perhaps they might find a way of erecting a school there to give effect to the promise made by Bishop Selwyn to our parents. Our earnest wish is that the Government should be the trustee, for it is the Government that now educates our children who go to the Government school. My earnest wish is that the school should be erected at Kaikokirikiri. If it was handed over to the Government I know they would subsidise it and place a school there.

71. *Mr. Wardell.*] Where were you at school ?—At Masterton and at Waingawa State schools. Hapeta was at Ronaldson's school at Papawai for four years. I forgot to mention that the children belonging to the hapus I mentioned are all being educated at the Government schools. My younger brother's son is at St. Patrick's in Wellington, and two nieces of mine are at Hukarere.

72. Does the Clareville school satisfy you and others ?—No ; I do not approve of that school. Hapeta has been sent to protest against it, and to ask that it should be established here, so as to be close to the kaingas mentioned.

73. *Mr. Chapman.*] Do you desire to have a day-school or a boarding-school ?—I do not approve of a day-school ; I want a boarding-school, so that children from a distance may come and live there.

74. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us how we can get an idea of the number of Native children living between this and Castlepoint, taking in the coast as well ?—I should think there are over three hundred, taking in Waikekeno.

75. Do they go to school ?—Yes, they are attending Government schools throughout all that district.

76. Are there any Native schools established by the Government in that district ?—No.

77. What is your idea about the education of the two races together ? Is it better that they should be educated together or that the Natives should be taught by themselves ?—It is best to have them mixed, because the English children teach them the English language and ways. I want to make this statement about the people from Wairarapa. I want to say that the Wairarapa people are rangatiras, and the Ngatiraukawa were never able to conquer them. I object to these statements that have been made, that the Ngatikahungunu were beaten by the Ngatiraukawa, and I want that statement withdrawn from the evidence. If it is not withdrawn, I will bring an action in the Supreme Court.

## TOI TAMATI examined.

*Witness* : I live at Landsdown, near Masterton. I will speak of the time when Bishop Selwyn arrived here with Sir George Grey and another. I was there and heard what was said. At that time we were being taught our alphabet at Mr. Colenso's school at Kaikokirikiri. The Bishop asked the Natives to give him a piece of land on which to put a school for the purpose of educating the Maori children thoroughly, so that we would learn civilisation and knowledge of the world. He asked that a piece of land should be given first on which to place a school, then a church, and then for a mill-site. That was on Saturday, and the hapus present gave their consent so that their descendants should be educated. On the Monday the Bishop was taken out to inspect the land at Kaikokirikiri that was to be given for this purpose, and all the hapus there accompanied him on to the site. When they arrived at the Kaikokirikiri they pointed out that this was the place he was to have for his school, and the Bishop approved. The site for the school was pointed out, and for the church. Then the Bishop asked them to look for a suitable place for the mill, and the Bishop led them towards the mouth of the creek near where the railway-station now stands to the stream called Tokorou ; and the Bishop and the others went to the very spot and stood there. Then the boundaries of Kaikokirikiri were laid off. When they came to a totara-stump they put a stick into the hollow of the stump, and it was named " Bishop." Then the boundary went on from there to the Waingawa Stream, which is now dried up ; from there it came downwards towards the Kaikokirikiri Pa ; from there to Te Waiamuhea ; from there it came back to the starting-point, where the mill-site was near the creek. Kuku has not mentioned all the hapus. The ones he did not mention were : Ngatiahuru, Ngatimaruinga, Ngatikaingaatu, Ngatitewaituku, Ngatimatangiuru, Ngatihamua, and Ngatihorahanga.

78. *Mr. Wardell.*] At this time there were a considerable number of Natives living in the neighbourhood ?—Yes.

79. All the people at Kaikokirikiri went and pointed out the boundary ?—Yes.

80. The hapus you mention are those of all the people who assembled on that occasion ?—Yes, including those mentioned by Kuku.

81. *Mr. Quick.*] Were the donors who have been mentioned the chiefs of these hapus?—They were the persons who managed the affairs in connection with the land.

82. Had all these hapus an interest in the land?—Yes, they all had an interest in the land.

83. They lived all over the country, from here to Castlepoint?—No; the ones who gave the land were all local hapus. From the year in which the gift was made to the present year there has been no school there, nor a church nor a mill erected. The only church built was built by the Maoris themselves a good while after they gave the land. They moved on to the land and lived there.

84. Are any Maoris living there now?—No; outside the upper boundary there are some Maoris living.

85. They used to live there before the land was given?—Yes, not a mile away.

86. Did Sir George Grey say anything all this time, or was he quiet?—He said nothing to the Maoris.

87. *Mr. Wardell.*] The church you speak of has long gone?—They took it away.

88. *Mr. Quick.*] Where was it moved to?—To Te Oreore.

89. *Mr. Wardell.*] When and how did Mr. Colenso's school terminate?—The school was there before the giving of the land.

90. Had he ceased to keep a school at that time?—It went on after that.

91. Did Mr. Colenso live there?—No; he used to visit. I approve of what the former witness said that there should be a school erected on the land, and I do not want Papawai amalgamated with this one; I want them kept separate. This land was set apart for this part of the district, and that piece of land for that part of the district. This place has gone ahead, and there is a large European population around it.

92. *Mr. Chapman.*] What sort of a school do you want?—A school for children in which European knowledge is taught, and all things such as carpentry.

93. Children of what age?—The usual age that children are sent to school.

94. A day or a boarding school?—A boarding-school.

95. You had a meeting, did you not, last night?—Yes.

96. Was the boarding-school talked of at that meeting?—Yes, it was mentioned.

97. Did the meeting agree about the boarding-school?—Yes.

98. Where should the money come from?—We would approach the Government and ask them to take charge of the matter.

99. Would the Natives pay anything for their children?—No; they should not pay, because they have given the site.

WILLIAM BOYCE CHENNELLS, Land Agent, examined.

*Witness:* I understand the Commission wish to find out the rentals of the sections in the Kaikōkiri reserve. I have collected the rents for the last fifteen or sixteen years. With the exception of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  acres, the whole of the land is leased for ten years from the 20th May, 1899. It was leased by tender to four tenants. I produce the particulars of the leases. [See Appendix.]

100. *Mr. Wardell.*] How were tenders called?—They were advertised in the newspapers.

101. Does the lease expire at the same time in all the cases?—Yes, with the exception of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  acres. The tenants pay the rates, except the tenant of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  acres.

102. *The Chairman.*] Are there any building or improvement covenants?—I understand there are old buildings on some of the property, and the usual covenants apply to those buildings as in ordinary cases. The tenants have to keep the fences and buildings in repair.

103. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you explain the discrepancy in the acreage: your total is  $174\frac{1}{2}$  acres, whereas the grant says 190?—A portion was taken for part of the railway-station site, and other portions for roads.

104. Have you formed any idea of the value of the property yourself, apart from the Government valuation?—The rentals at the time the land was let were considered fair and reasonable. The rental for Section 6 I considered at the time was very high for what could be made off it—£2 5s. 6d. and rates. The rating is on the unimproved value, and consequently amounts to a large sum per annum. The land is not producing at present as much as it is worth. It is used for market-gardening. The rest of the area is used for farming and grazing.

105. If it were in the market at present what would be its rental value?—You could not get much more per acre, because the term of the leases is so short. Ten years is not long enough, and there is no compensation at the end of the term, and that gives no opportunity of making improvements. If the whole property were cut up into building sections, in areas from  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre to 5 or 10 acres, it would produce, in my opinion, a very much higher rental than it is producing now, provided the term of the lease was long enough, and there was a compensation clause. If the land were cut up and sold some of it would bring over £200 an acre.

106. At the end of the existing terms of these leases you think the trustees may look forward to largely increased revenue?—Not in the existing blocks; they must be reduced in size.

107. *The Chairman.*] What is the distance of this building from the part you say is worth £200 an acre?—About a mile. It is within 150 yards of the railway-station. Land adjoining has been sold as high as £250 an acre, and some, about 10 chains away, at £400 per acre. Part which is producing £2 5s. 6d. an acre, if sold would bring not less than £200 an acre. I believe I am below the mark in regard to some of the best sections.

108. Taking things as they are, could you make a rough estimate as to what the estate would yield cut up in suitable sections, making the best terms you could with a sixty-years lease?—In my opinion the diocesan trustees could get more out of it by selling and investing the money than by leasing it. You would get a better return from the income of the purchase-money of the land invested on mortgage than they would get no matter how it was cut up.

109. In five years' time?—I think so.

110. They would lose the increase in value then?—Certainly. But if they sold for £15,000 and invested that sum on first-class mortgage, they would get a better return from that investment than by holding on to the land.

111. *Mr. Wardell.*] At what do you put its present market value?—I have scarcely considered that point. Approximately, I am satisfied in my own mind considerably more than the Government valuation would be obtained if the property were cut up and sold, notwithstanding the fact that in subdividing you have to make provision for roads. Judiciously cut up, the Government valuation could be doubled.

112. Then it would be worth between £16,000 and £17,000?—I think so, if judiciously handled. Speaking roughly, perhaps I should not say "doubled"; I should say it would bring in half as much again as the present valuation—from £12,000 to £13,000.

113. *Mr. Quick.*] You mean if cut up into smaller lots?—Yes; it would not do to operate on the same-sized sections as those in which it is leased now. If the land cannot be sold, it might be dealt with by long lease with periodical valuations of ground-rent, and compensation for improvements.

114. *Mr. Wardell.*] What would you consider long leases for building purposes in a district like this?—Forty-two or sixty years. I should consider forty-two years a reasonable lease. If you are to have periodical revaluation you have to make your leases longer. It would not do to value the land every ten years.

115. *Mr. Quick.*] The trustees have the right to lease on building-leases for sixty years: it would be reasonable to divide that into periods of twenty years?—Yes.

116. The revaluation would be of the ground-rent; but at the end of the sixty years whatever remained of the improvements would revert to the landlord?—If you do not have compensation you must not have periodical revaluation. Take a block of 10 acres without any buildings, and lease it to a man for sixty years at £2 per acre rental. He puts up a house worth £600 or £700; he at once improves the value of the land, and consequently if you revalue at the end of twenty years you are going to value him on the improvements he has effected.

117. Cannot you value irrespective of the house?—Yes; but if you could see the ground in twenty years' time the fact of the tenant having improved it and made a nice garden, &c., would prejudice him, because the valuer does not remember what the ground was formerly.

118. Could you not arrive at the prairie-value twenty years hence?—There will be no prairie there twenty years hence.

119. *The Chairman.*] Do you know what reason the trustees had for making the terms ten years?—No.

120. Had the Masterton rise commenced in 1899?—I cannot say it had; it really started about three years ago. But at the time these rents were considered fair and reasonable, and you must bear in mind a lot of the land is light for agricultural purposes, and I doubt if in some instances you would get more of a rental for farming purposes to-day than was got then. If the fifteen-and-eightpenny land were put in the market to-day it might bring £1 or a shilling or two more per acre, as there is a demand for suburban land in Masterton. There has been a suggestion that the trustees should give a half-chain to enable Mr. Wagland, who owns a neighbouring freehold, to make a chain road in order that he could open up his land, and at some future time the trustees could open up theirs.

#### WILLIAM IORNS examined.

121. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us any facts in connection with the acquisition of the Kaikokirikiri estate?—Nothing more than what I have been told by the old Natives.

122. You have heard the evidence given by the Natives this morning: how does their statement agree with what you have been told?—I was told that the Bishop was to build a church, a school, and a flour-mill; I understood it was mentioned in the deed of cession. They told me that was an undertaking.

123. Who told you that?—I was told by Peneamine, Te Korou, and Ropiha. They used to come to Kaikokirikiri to church on Saturday, and go away to their kainga on Monday.

124. Do you know anything of the number of Maori children in this neighbourhood up to the age of sixteen or seventeen?—I think there are about forty-five or fifty attending the Te Oreore School, and three or four attending the Masterton School.

125. Are there any Native children who are not receiving any education from any cause?—No; they are all attending State schools. I remember Bishop Abraham allowing two Natives who used to look after the church at the kainga to receive part of the rentals from Mr. Bannister in remuneration for their services.

126. Did Mr. Colenso ever have a school here?—No; but he used to come about forty-five years ago and hold service, and give a few days' instruction, and then return to Hawke's Bay.

127. How long have the Natives expressed dissatisfaction in regard to the trust?—For twenty years.

128. Dissatisfaction with the way it was administered?—Yes; because they got no benefit from it; they would not send their children to another place.

129. Do you think the present expressed dissatisfaction of the Natives arises from a desire to get the land back, or is it a continuation of the old complaint of non-performance of the trust?—I think it is due to the latter; I think they know better than to think they can get the land back.

130. You do not think that is their motive?—No; they were not properly represented when the Bishop came up to Carterton a year or so ago. The Natives petitioned the House when Mr. Beetham was member in regard to the non-fulfilment of the trust.

131. Has it not been notorious and generally understood that this reserve has not been doing what the Natives expected it to do?—Yes; both among Natives and Europeans.

WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 28TH JULY, 1905.

Examination of F. J. CARTER continued.

*Witness* : I produce detailed accounts in connection with the Papawai and Kaikokirikiri reserves.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any charge against the Papawai trust in connection with the Clareville School?—There is a scholarship of £36, which represents one scholar for one year, and the balance, £6 2s. 9d., represents travelling-expenses for three. That is the only charge on the Porirua trust.

2. Do you know how many boys there are at Clareville at present?—I think there are eleven.

3. We were informed yesterday, at Clareville, that the roll at present only contains seven; that the school had commenced with twelve but there are only seven now: is that correct?—So far as I know. One is away sick, and there are two fresh boys to come.

Examination of Archdeacon FANCOURT continued.

4. *The Chairman.*] The Natives at Masterton say there was a very express arrangement when the reserve was made that it was for a church, a school, and a mill: have you any knowledge of that?—No.

5. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any knowledge of the fact that Papawai was given for a boys' and Kaikokirikiri for a girls' school?—I never heard it mentioned; there is nothing in the grant to suggest that. They worked the two trusts together when the school was at Papawai. They have always been considered to be practically one trust.

6. Has any college been established?—Papawai College was established under Mr. Ronaldson. It was there for some time—three or four years. The boys objected to the industrial work.

7. Have you any records of what the school consisted of?—It was a boarding-school; I suppose there were a dozen or eighteen boys there.

8. Have the trustees no account of what they were doing with the trust?—They had reports.

9. Could those be produced?—The Synod's printed reports could be produced.

10. *The Chairman.*] At what date do you consider the school was first established?—I should think about 1860. I think it was given up in 1864—the year before I arrived in New Zealand—at the time of the outbreak of Hauhau-ism, which broke up everything.

11. Can you refer us to anything in print which gives any account of it?—I will look up the printed reports and see. The Government used to give large grants towards the school, but it broke up very much in debt to the Diocesan Fund. The Maoris did practically nothing.

12. Why did it cease? because the Government ceased to contribute or because the Maoris would not send their children?—It was chiefly owing to the outbreak of Hauhau-ism, which destroyed all the missionary work in the Wairarapa.

13. *Mr. Wardell.*] There is an item in the accounts, "Excess contribution over Government grants"?—That is what was paid out of a fund that belonged to the diocese, which must have advanced the money to pay the debt off. I take it whatever was derived from the property and the Government grants was insufficient to pay the cost up to the date of closing.

14. We want to know what the income from the property was, because no income is shown for fourteen years after the grant?—They were supposed to use the property by farming it.

15. Are you able to say that for that period there was no income?—No, I am not. As soon as the school ceased to exist they let it to a man named Varnham, who took it at a small rental and made it into a good farm.

16. The rent paid by Mrs. Varnham appears to have varied from year to year: do you know anything about that?—No, the land would not be rentable, so to speak, at the time Kaikokirikiri was given. There was no Masterton. And Papawai was not a place to rent except at a nominal rent; there was no road to get at it.

17. *Mr. Quick.*] Is there not some evidence of Papawai having been purchased?—Yes, the Government purchased it. When I held a meeting at Clareville in 1903, when we were going to open the Clareville School, I asked for a meeting of the Maoris from the whole of the Wairarapa to talk about the matter. I did not get a meeting of the whole Wairarapa; the Greytown end held aloof, but they came from around Masterton—representatives of the original givers of Kaikokirikiri from Taueru to Gladstone. The question to which I wanted an answer was, "Will you send your children to this school in this central place between the two trusts?"; and Taueru and Gladstone said "Yes, we will," and were quite favourable. The man who represented the Waikokirikiri Natives made a long speech and told us how Bishop Selwyn promised a mill, and said all sorts of promises were made and had never been fulfilled, and ended up by saying that he would not have anything to do with Clareville. Then I said, "Am I to understand it is the place you object to?" and he told me "No." I said, "Am I to understand you would not send your children?" and the answer I got was, "We are waiting to see how the case brought by Wi Neera in the Porirua trust case goes; if it goes in favour of the trustees we will send our children." Which meant to say they were satisfied with the site and building, but if the Porirua people succeeded in getting their land back they would get theirs back. And they would not commit themselves by sending their children before the case was decided. They did not say a word about wanting a school on the land.

18. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us how it is, if the school was closed in 1864, it was necessary to wait forty years before you opened another?—There was not sufficient money. There was nothing like sufficient income to board the children until quite recently. Recently of course rents have increased very much.

19. Do you think that a year and a half ago is the period referred to in the following passage in the grant: "whereas a college is about to be established"?—The Privy Council answered that pretty distinctly. They said that did not in any way commit the Bishop to immediately start a school. It

meant to say that it was his intention to start one. They said all sorts of circumstances arose which might have prevented the school from being started. For instance, he himself went Home, and the Maori war broke out, and Hauhau-ism. And they said the property itself was not sufficient to keep a school. It might have been he looked to get a large amount of money at Home or expected to get it in other ways. No doubt he looked to receive help from the Government. The Provincial Government used to give help, but that ceased. If the Government had given pound for pound it would have been possible to start twenty years ago. The Privy Council, however, said a hundred years would not have set aside the purpose of the trust.

20. Do you recognise that the education of Maori children in the Wairarapa has been absolutely neglected by the trustees of these estates from the time of the closing of the school at Papawai to the opening of the school at Clareville?—I do not acknowledge that it was the duty of the trustees to educate the children. It was a general trust—not a local trust. They are all general trusts. It is the work of the Government to see to the education of the children. What we aim at is to give religious education. So far as that is concerned, we gladly and willingly in each case granted a lease of land for the Government to put up a school on each of the estates. My contention is that it was never intended for the general education of the Maoris of the locality.

21. You say, when the Maoris gave this land it was not with the view to any local benefit at all, or to the education of the children of the neighbourhood?—They looked no doubt to have picked children educated.

22. Have they been educated by the trustees under these trusts?—They could not be. We could not spend the money in sending them to school elsewhere under the trust. I am not a trustee now. The trouble with us has been that we have not done anything that could be brought up against us as being illegal. If we had gone on spending the money in sending picked scholars to some school in Wellington, we would never have heard a word about this. It is because we would not spend the money in an evasive or illegal way that, now the thing has accumulated and become valuable, everybody wants to get hold of it.

23. *The Chairman.*] Were any resolutions passed by the trustees as to any future intention when the fund became greater?—Not that I know of. In the old days I was not a trustee. I only became a trustee twelve or fifteen years ago.

24. Did the matter come up for consideration then or for some time before the Porirua trouble?—No; it never came up except in connection with Porirua. We used to say if we could only amalgamate all the trusts we could do something, and that was what led to our making an appeal to the Supreme Court to grant a scheme under which we could amalgamate.

25. It has an appearance of neglect: cannot this be met by your saying, “No, it was not neglect; it was that we saw the difficulty of doing anything with the existing funds; but we contemplated at some future time doing something when it became greater”?—The impression in my mind, and I believe in the mind of the trustees, is that the funds have been very carefully nursed with the intention of devoting them to education.

26. But if the trustees have to meet a suggestion of neglect, something is wanted of a definite kind; I think there must be something of the sort showing the trustees' intentions?—You mean there ought to be some resolution expressing their intention to do something in the future? I will see if there is anything of the kind; there may be.

27. *Mr. Wardell.*] Where we have taken Native evidence in respect to each grant the evidence of the Natives has gone to show that the lands were given with the idea of the establishment of a local school for the education of the children of the immediate neighbourhood: does that come as a surprise to you in any way?—Yes, it does. Although I am not altogether surprised, because it has been in their minds of recent years.

28. Are you aware that in the evidence reported in 1869 the same complaint is made by Native witnesses, that nothing was being done in accordance with the trust?—No, I am not aware of it.

29. *Mr. Hutana.*] At the time these lands were given to the Church was it made clear to the Maoris that schools could not be erected there until the revenue produced by the land was sufficient to support the school?—I do not know, but I should say not.

30. Then do you think, had that been explained by the Bishop, they would have given the land at all?—I cannot tell; no doubt the Bishop did hope to receive outside moneys, and he looked to the Maoris to help in the development of the estate, that they should help to support the school.

31. We know that at the period the land was given the Maoris were anxious to have the schools then; it was more important to them at that time to have the schools and they wished to see the schools going on?—But they would not expect that a piece of land covered with bush could possibly support a school.

32. From whom did the desire for the Government school at Papawai spring?—From the Natives themselves; the application for the land came from the Education Board.

33. How is it the Bishop himself did not move in the matter and have a school erected?—Because the land was given for a boarding-school, not a day-school; that has been the difficulty.

34. *Mr. Wardell.*] Knowing what you know now of the circumstances of the donation of these several lands, are you of the opinion that at the time of the donation it was in the mind of the donors, or of the Bishop, that the lands were to be the sole support of the schools to be established?—Certainly not.

35. Then from what source do you consider the shortage was to be made up?—From the Bishop's own friends in England.

36. *The Chairman.*] And with general support?—Yes.

37. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you think that amounted to a promise that if the Natives gave these lands to assist to promote the institutions the Bishop's friends or himself would find the money for a building?—No: I do not think he made any promise of that sort.

38. *The Chairman.*] Are you sure that search has been made for the purpose of ascertaining anything in existence showing the origin of the Masterton grant? Do you think anything might be found at Government House?—The only possibility is that there might be some letter; but Sir George Grey was here himself at that time; there was no Lieutenant-Governor for him to write to.

39. *Mr. Quick.*] Knowing Bishop Selwyn's reputation, would you think he would accept a grant of this reserve which expressed trusts contrary to a promise he had made to the Natives?—No; it would be impossible; he could not do a double thing.

40. *Mr. Wardell.*] We were told in Auckland in connection with one grant that it did not express his intention, and that when it came into Bishop Selwyn's possession he was very angry about it?—There is nothing to lead us to suppose he was dissatisfied.

41. *Mr. Hutana.*] How do you know the Government bought the Papawai land?—It is stated in evidence given before a Committee of the Legislative Council in 1875.

42. If it was so bought, how did these words come into the grant, "which said piece of land has been ceded by the Natives owners"?—It may mean "ceded on a certain condition."

NELSON, MONDAY, 31ST JULY, 1905.

*Mr. Harley* informed the Commissioners that he was instructed to appear on behalf of the trustees.

JOHN PRATT KEMPTHORNE, Priest in Holy Orders, examined.

*Witness:* I am a Church of England clergyman, resident in Nelson. I am one of the trustees of the Wakarewa trust under the grant; the other trustees are the Bishop of Nelson and Archdeacon Grace. The trustees were appointed by the Diocesan Synod. I have resided in Nelson for twenty years. I have been superintending this trust since the trustees were appointed—I think in 1892. My care has been principally in connection with the orphanage, the institution established in connection with the trust in 1888. At present there are forty-three children in the institution—five Natives and the rest Europeans; their ages are from four to fifteen years. We use 32 acres of the estate in connection with the orphanage; the buildings are on these 32 acres. They are insured for £2,000. The first part of the buildings was erected, I think, in 1888, and it has since been enlarged, another wing having been added at a cost of £1,000. The institution is under the management of Mr. Haycock and his wife, who reside in the institution; there is also a schoolmistress and two servants. The children receive ordinary State-school instruction up to the Sixth Standard, and the school is under a Government Inspector. There are eleven European girls and twenty-seven boys, and three Native boys and two Native girls.

1. *Mr. Quick.*] What class of children are they? Are they committed from the Magistrate's Court?—No; we have none from the Court; we have no right to admit that class of children. They are sent from Charitable Aid Boards, or on the application of private persons. Some are paid for by the Nelson Charitable Aid Board, and some are paid for by private individuals. Some are sent by the Public Trustee.

2. *Mr. Harley.*] Through whom is application for admission made?—The application is made to the trustees; there is no printed form of application. The class of children admitted are orphans or destitute children; a child deprived of one parent is considered an orphan.

3. Must they necessarily be destitute?—They are generally destitute; if they are not they have to be paid for. We do not admit without payment children who can be paid for.

4. Who decides whether they are suitable for admission?—The trustees decide upon what terms they are to be admitted.

5. How are the Maoris admitted?—In the same way.

6. The Maori relatives apply?—Yes.

7. And their case is considered in the same way as those of Europeans?—Yes.

8. Do you charge Maoris for their children?—We do not charge them much; we make a nominal charge. I think those who are there now do not pay anything.

9. What religious teaching do they receive?—They receive instruction in the Scriptures and in the Church Catechism.

10. The school is treated as a Church of England institution?—Yes.

11. What industrial training do the children receive?—The girls who are able to do so help in the housework out of school hours, and the elder girls who have passed through the standards also assist in the house till they are able to take situations.

12. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any children beyond the Sixth Standard?—Yes; there are some who are not able to pass the standards, and when they are over fifteen, and unable to go further in education, they are taught household work. Some of them are intellectually deficient. The boys help on the farm in the same way. The 32 acres are farmed; there is a vegetable garden, orchard, &c.

13. To what age do you keep the children?—Till they are about fifteen; then we find them situations as domestic servants or farm lads.

14. *Mr. Harley.*] How do you account for there being so few Maoris at the school?—There are very few Maoris in the district.

15. Are Maoris admitted freely when they apply?—Yes, certainly; we are glad to admit them.

16. Who provides their clothing?—It is sometimes provided by the parents. As a general rule we ask them to provide clothing—it costs about £1 a year. If the parents or relatives are unable to provide the clothing, it is provided by the institution; but they generally give some money towards it.

17. Has there been any difficulty during your time in carrying on the orphanage under this system?—Not the slightest.

18. Have there been any complaints from the Maoris to the trustees?—I do not think so.

19. Do the trustees find any difficulty in carrying on the trust under these conditions?—No.

20. Is any part of the trust fund spent for any purpose other than the orphanage?—No.

21. Do you suggest any modification of the trust that would help the trustees in any way?—I do not think so.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the qualification for admission to the institution?—That the children are poor and destitute. That is the only condition.

23. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you exclude any denomination?—We have never had any difficulty. The question has never been raised. It is understood that we give religious instruction according to the Church of England, and the children on Sunday attend the parish church.

24. *Mr. Wardell.*] Is there any qualification in regard to locality?—None whatever, we take children from any district. We have taken one or two whose parents can pay; for instance, a parent may have an unruly child, and he pays the full charge. We have had one or two cases of that kind, in which the institution is fully paid for the maintenance of such child; we charge from 5s. to 7s. a week, according to capacity to pay. We reckon from 7s. to 8s. is required for the support of each child. We take poor children for 5s., thus making a considerable reduction.

25. Do you know anything of the antecedent history of the trust—before 1888?—No, I know nothing except from hearsay.

26. We find it stated in certain records that the school has been absolutely in abeyance for years, and no school carried on: do you know anything of that?—No.

27. Is there any attempt at technical teaching or industrial training in the institution?—No; the children are too young. There is no more than teaching boys farming, ploughing, &c. No trades are taught. I may say we are proposing to take over one of the leases falling due next year, consisting of 500 acres, and farming it ourselves, making use of the older boys, and so get land enough to train them in farming-work.

28. Do you know anything of the connection of the Native population of this district with that of the Taranaki District, because there is a close intimacy between the Natives of the two districts?—I cannot give any evidence of that.

29. Do you know whether the Natives of Taranaki would make use of this school if it were made a central Native school?—I could not say; I should hardly think so, being so far off. They do not like to go far away from their homes as a rule. There would be no difficulty in receiving any Natives from there if we had room.

30. Do you know whether any Native applicants for admission have been on any ground refused?—Not that I am aware of.

31. *The Chairman.*] You have no revenue except from the leases?—No.

32. There is no accumulation of funds?—No.

33. How do you do for repairs to buildings, &c.?—We have sufficient for that out of the trust.

34. Is there any sinking fund set aside for enlarging or rebuilding?—No; the buildings are comparatively new, and will last twenty or thirty years. We were in debt at the end of last year to the extent of £300 on current account in connection with a loan for enlargement of the building. We have a credit balance at the bank this year.

35. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell what became of the income while there was no school?—It was invested at that time.

36. *Mr. Quick.*] The accumulations enabled you to put up the orphanage?—Yes; we have suffered a great deal on account of the river; £999 has been spent on protective works. This was a very great drain on the estate.

37. Is that difficulty mastered now?—I hope so.

38. *The Chairman.*] You have never heard of complaints having been made to the Government or to Parliament?—I am aware that there have been inquiries into the institution before.

39. *Mr. Quick.*] You know of no complaints since the orphanage was started?—No.

40. *Mr. Wardell.*] The river protective works appear to have been an annual charge up to two years ago?—Yes.

41. *Hemi Matenga.*] Do you recollect a complaint being made by the Maoris to the Bishop (Suter) in regard to the taking of this land for an orphanage?—No, I do not think I was here at the time.

42. Do you remember hearing of myself and Paaka going to see Bishop Mules in respect to the complaint about Wakarewa being taken by the Bishop?—No, I do not.

43. What reason do you offer for the Maoris being obliged to pay for their children at the school?—It is only in the case of those Maoris who can afford to pay, because the trust is for destitute children.

44. How do you arrive at the knowledge whether a Maori has the money to pay?—From his own statement.

45. Do you not think Maori children ought to enter free, seeing that the land was given by the Maoris?—We have to administer it according to the trust; it is for destitute children of both races.

46. *Mr. Wardell.*] That is the interpretation you put on all these trust deeds?—Yes.

47. *Hemi Matenga.*] Who put those words into the grant?—I cannot answer that.

48. Can you say who is responsible for it?—No; that is too long ago.

*Mr. Harley* called attention to letters appearing in Mackay's "Compendium of Official Documents relative to Native Affairs" (1872), in connection with the appearance of the words "destitute children."

49. *Hemi Matenga.*] You said Taranaki was too distant for Maori children to come from there to the school: are you not aware there are now three Taranaki children at the school?—No; they were residing at Motueka when they joined the school.



50. Do you recollect Hohaia Rangiauru, who took care of those children, being asked to pay £6 per annum for each child?—Yes, I do; but he has not paid it.

51. Their father being a European, and being alive, should he not have been asked to pay?—There was no means of getting it out of him.

*Hemi Matenga*: In regard to the Crown grant, we should like to be sure whether there is any documentary evidence to show cession by the Maoris or any gift of this land prior to the issue of the grant. We want to know who gave the land. If the Maoris did not give the land, what have we to do with it?

*The Chairman*: There is no doubt that in days gone by objections have been made that the grant interfered with Maori rights, but we have nothing to do with that; it is not in our Commission to inquire into that at all.

52. *Hohaia Rangiauru*.] Do you recollect my coming to you and informing you that the father of these children had cleared out, and that the mother was dead and that she was a relative of mine, and I asked you what were the terms if I brought the children to you?—Yes.

53. And you replied that it would be £6 for each child, and I said, "I can never pay that"?—Yes, that is so.

54. Then you said you would take them for £4?—Yes.

55. And that I must find clothing for them?—Yes.

56. *The Chairman*.] You have already said the regulation is that if the Natives seem to be able to pay you try to get them to pay?—Yes.

57. And if you cannot get the full amount you get as much as you can?—Yes.

58. There are no regulations in print?—No.

59. *Huta Paaka*.] Who were the trustees in Bishop Suter's time?—He was the sole trustee.

60. Do you recollect the school that was established at that time, of which Mr. Baker was the master?—Yes; it was a girls' school, I think.

61. Did the Maoris pay for their children at that school?—I do not know, I think not.

62. Do you know why the parents did not pay for their children at that school?—I do not know.

63. Do you know that the revenue received from these lands was to pay for the education of the children?—I believe that was the case, but I have no knowledge of it.

*Witness* (to the Chairman): In connection with the existing leases on the property a valuation was made by a valuer representing each side, and the rents arrived at in that way. The leases were not put up to competition by auction or tender.

#### HEMI MATENGA examined.

*Witness*: I live at Whakapuaka. When a school was first established at Motueka it was not where the college now stands; it was on the sea-shore, not on the trust land. At that time Mr. Tudor was in charge of the school. The children who attended it were admitted free. After that another school was established under Mr. Baker, during whose time only girls attended, and they were admitted free, and did not even have to pay for their clothing. After that there was no school for a long time. The first school on the Wakarewa land was, I think, about 1862, under Mr. Harris. I was there. The children were admitted free, and clothing and food were found free of cost. Inasmuch as the children were admitted free to the former schools, we do not see why we are asked to pay now. We want our children admitted free. These lands formed part of the Native reserve, and now only a small portion remains for the occupation of the Maoris for their present wants; yet the trustees ask these people to pay for their children. If I had been able to find out the names of the people who gave the land to the Church I should have had more to say; but if that cannot be supplied I have not much more to say. If these lands were on the same footing as the Otaki and Whitireia lands, and I had seen a deed showing the Natives who gave this land, and the purpose for which it was given, I should then have been able to say more in regard to the matter. I mention this because it has been said that Wakarewa was in precisely the same position as Whitireia, and given for the same object. I heard Bishop Selwyn say, before I went to St. John's College, that the young men he was taking up to St. John's were being taken so as to return and take up the position of teachers or masters at Whitireia for the Maori youth. But from that day no school has been established at Whitireia.

64. *Mr. Wardell*.] Are you aware that grants of money were made at one time by the Government for the support of this school?—No.

65. Do you know anything of Mr. Ronaldson's school?—I know of that school.

66. What have you to say about that school?—The same as I said about the others.

67. In what order were the different teachers at this school?—Mr. Tudor came first, then Mr. Harris, then Mr. Ronaldson, and then Mr. Baker. Mr. Harris was there not quite two years. I was only there one year. After I left the children ran away, and the school ceased.

68. Do you complain that at any time there was a failure to fulfil the trust in the grant?—I think, latterly, they have not carried out the trust. In the first schools the children were free; now they are asked to pay, and that I consider to be a breach of trust.

69. Do you complain of a breach of the trust in the fact of no school being carried on?—Yes; the school was intermittent. Why did not the ministers carry on the work instead of having intervals between the teachers?

70. What intervals do you complain of during which there was no school?—I complain that the school was not continuous. I consider the fact of their being lapses of time during which there was no school as being a breach of trust.

71. How long time elapsed between the closing of the last school and the opening of the present institution?—I could not tell you.

72. Are you aware of any Native children who have desired to be admitted to a school on the land who were unable to gain admittance?—No, I do not know of any.



73. *Mr. Hutana.*] How many children attended the first school?—I cannot tell you, but when I was there there were about fifteen Maori children; they did not belong to Motueka only, some came from D'Urville Island.

74. How many Maori children are there of the right age to go to school who do not attend it?—I cannot tell you exactly—more than ten, perhaps twenty.

75. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are there any Native children who are not receiving education?—No; they are all going to some school.

76. Do they find the Government Maori schools suitable for their children?—Yes, it suits them because they are close to where they live.

77. Do you think they are entitled to receive any special education out of the grants which is not given to them at the State schools?—Yes; if there was a school to teach them farming and technical education, that would meet their requirements.

78. Do you think the work the children get on the land is suitable to the Native youth, or should they have some other kind of technical instruction?—It might suit some of the children; you might get half a dozen suited for that sort of work, but it might not suit others. There are engineering, carpentering, sewing, blacksmithing, and learning mercantile and law business, and so on; we have reached a stage now when we must find occupations for the men who are growing up. If there was some place to teach these things, it would be a great benefit for the children and their parents.

79. Do you, yourself, or on behalf of the Natives, raise any objection to the trust being employed for the benefit of the class of children Mr. Kempthorne has described—indigent orphans and children of unsound mind?—Yes, I object. If I had the original paper ceding the land by the Natives I could then make the statement I wished to make, and would make myself clear. But all we know about it is that it was a Native reserve. If it is Crown land I do not feel that we should make any objection, but if it was a free gift I should consider I was entitled to make objection. Unless I am sure whether it was a free gift or what it was, I do not like to make any objection.

*The Chairman:* Our Commission does not authorise us, or make it part of our business, to go into the invalidity of the grant; we have to see what the trust covered by the grant is, and ascertain whether it has been administered properly.

#### HUTA PAAKA examined.

*Witness:* I live at Motueka. We are aware that this land was reserved for the purpose of a Native school to educate the children in the knowledge of the English language and European civilisation, and to teach them farming, blacksmithing, shoemaking, capentry, watchmaking, and many other trades that would enable them to earn a livelihood amongst Europeans. At that time the Maoris prized learning very much, and gave their land freely for that purpose. At that time there were a large number of Natives living at Wakarewa and near there, and when the land was given for school purposes they abandoned their settlement and went away to other lands to live, so as to leave the land clear for school purposes. They were told at the time they would not have to pay for their children attending the school that was to be built there. And when the school was first established at Motueka the children attended free. After that when the desire of the Maoris for this kind of education had increased very much, they sent their children there during Mr. Baker's time. At that time the majority of children attending the school were girls; they were well educated, and were taught how to read and write and speak English, &c. But afterwards the Bishop stopped the school. We asked the Bishop why he stopped it, and he told us the funds were not sufficient to carry it on. After his engagement here ceased, Mr. Baker went to Gisborne, and after his departure Bishop Suter came to me and asked me to find him two Maori youths, and he would make one a blacksmith and teach the other to be a wheelwright, and he would pay for their instruction. I asked the other Maoris to find two suitable young boys, as I had no children myself. Their reply to me was that as the Bishop had stopped the school the land should be returned to them. They forwarded a petition to Parliament asking for a return of the land to them, the reason being that the school was discontinued. The Maoris would not comply with my request to let me have children for the Bishop to instruct. Some time after that when I had children (Bishop Suter being then dead), I thought I would make a similar request to the present Bishop, and I asked him to let my two children be taught suitable occupations, and that the expense of their instruction should be defrayed out of the revenue from the Wakarewa land, and the Bishop's reply was that he could not do that. I sent two applications to him by letter. After that he sent for me and Matenga to go to his house. The Rev. Mr. Bennett acted as interpreter. He told me he could not gratify my request, that he could not use the funds of the land for the purpose, as it was set aside for the use of Maori children and children from the Islands. He further explained that the land was given to the Church by Sir George Grey, not by the Maoris. That there was nothing mentioned in the deed as to what Maoris gave it. Notwithstanding this, we still think the school was intended for the purpose of educating the Maoris in European ways. You have heard the evidence that the children attending the school were admitted free at the time that Mr. Baker used to teach. Afterwards the reserve, which was for the benefit of the Maoris, was diverted for the purpose of an orphanage. At the present time, supposing I had a great deal of land, and if I was asked to give it for the purpose of educating my children, and if I gave it and if I were afterwards asked to pay for their education, do you think I would give the land had I known I should be asked to pay? Mr. Mackay told us there were 900 acres included in this grant, and if the Maoris had to pay for their children they were being asked to pay double, because they gave the land; that the Crown land in the grant was only about 300 acres. I know some Maori children want to go to school, but cannot attend for want of funds. I went to Taranaki last year to visit the kaingas, and I asked them why they did not send their children to school. They said the Government schools were so far away, and if they thought of sending them here they were afraid they might be asked to pay for them. The school at Wakarewa is a fine school, well equipped, and the children

are well looked after, and the managers are in every way very fit for the position. Every Sunday the children are taken to church, and things are very well managed. I am very anxious to see our children going there, so that they may be able to avail themselves of the advantages; but what keeps them away is the knowledge that we have to pay. Hohoia has complained to me that he had to pay too much for the three children you have heard of, so I spoke to Archdeacon Grace about the matter, he being one of the trustees, and he said he ought not to have been asked to pay so much, that the amount should be reduced, or they should be admitted free, and so far as I remember, he reduced the amount by £4.

80. *Mr. Wardell.*] Did you hear Mr. Kempthorne tell us that there are only three scholars now who are free?—Yes, but I do not know whether they are Maoris or pakehas.

81. Do you realise that the income necessarily limits the power of accommodation?—Yes.

82. *Mr. Harley.*] How many children are there in Motueka between the ages of five and fifteen?—About ten.

83. Where are they educated?—Five are attending the orphanage, and five the Government school.

84. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are those five being paid for?—Yes, I think so.

85. Are their parents living at Motueka?—The parents of two have gone away, and the other three are those who have been mentioned as being in the care of Hohoia.

86. *Mr. Harley.*] In days gone by there was an attempt made to teach the Maori children farming, was there not?—This was, perhaps, before I went to live there.

87. Do you know that the Maoris had an objection to their children working?—I do not know anything about that. I was one who had to work on the farm.

88. Have you heard of any Maori children being refused admission to the school at any time?—No; the only thing that would bar them would be want of room.

89. Have you been to the orphanage recently?—Yes; when any stranger comes, I take them over the school to show them what a good place it is, and how well it is kept inside and outside.

90. What relationship is there between the Motueka Natives and the Croixelles Natives?—They are of the same tribe. When the conquest of this part of the South Island took place, the Ngatikoato, the Ngatiawa, and the Ngatitua were the first to come here. Some came from the north of Taranaki and some from Taranaki.

91. Are they related to the Taranaki Natives?—Yes, that is where they come from.

92. Are they related to the Whangarae Natives?—No, that is a different tribe.

93. Are the D'Urville Island Natives related to the Motueka Natives?—They are Ngatikoata.

94. What are the hapus at Whangarae?—Ngatikoata.

95. At D'Urville Island?—Ngatikoata.

96. At Motueka?—Ngatiawa and Ngatirarua.

97. At Taranaki?—Ngatiawa.

98. *Mr. Wardell.*] The Taranaki Natives are intimately connected with the Motueka Natives?—Yes.

99. And were connected with the Natives in the occupation of this land before it was granted to the school?—Yes.

100. *Mr. Harley.*] Have not the Natives an objection to sending their children away to a distance?

Yes, that is so in regard to the Natives who are living in a state of ignorance.

101. Do you think the Natives at Taranaki or Whangarae would send their children to board at Whakarewa?—Those who are intelligent would do so, but those who are still in ignorance would not.

102. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any knowledge of agricultural work yourself?—That is how I make my living.

103. Do you think the land is being well used?—Yes, very well.

104. Do you know the rents they are paying?—No, but I think that in some cases the amount is not sufficient. The greater part of the land in Wratt's occupation is shingly. If it was all good land it would be worth £1 an acre.

105. What is the 400-acre patch worth?—I think he is paying a fair rent, considering the character of the land. About 20 acres of the land is worth £1 an acre rent.

106. The 30 acres occupied by Goodman?—That is shingly; I think £12 is a fair rent.

#### HOHAI RANGIAURU examined.

*Witness:* I live at Motueka; I was born there. During Sir George Grey's time I was a boy there. He asked the Maoris to give a piece of land to be reserved for a school for their children, and the Maoris agreed to that. The tribes present when Sir George Grey made the request were Ngatirarua and Ngatiawa. After we had given the land we were asked to go on it and clear it of stumps and fern. At that time, Bishop Selwyn gave us four bullocks, one cart, and a plough and harrows, and we worked the bullocks to clear the land, and we worked on the land cutting stumps out and clearing fern. After that the Bishop leased the land to Europeans, and they occupied it, and we moved down the coast to a spot adjoining Greenwood's land; and we there also cleared and drained some other land belonging to the Bishop, and we lived there and cultivated it; it was outside the grant. The school was put on this piece of land outside the grant, and we occupied our time in improving that piece of land. You must remember that education at that school was not the same as we get nowadays. They used to sing hymns in the evenings, and in the morning they went out to work on the land. After they had got the land improved and cleared, they stopped the school. There was nothing more for them to do, so the school ceased. Then we went on to another piece of land of the Bishop's, close to this piece I have spoken about; it was standing bush. We cleared the trees, roots and all, and we were told we would get a school. We did all the work; there were no pakehas to help us. We stayed there two

years clearing this land, and then we were sent off. During that time we had a school there; the teacher was a man called Totorewa [Sutcliffe?]. Then the school ceased in that part. After that we had a school at Motueka, in the church, where we were taught writing and arithmetic in the evenings only. The scholars were engaged in farm-work during the day, lifting potatoes and harvesting oats, and so on. After that there was no school. Now I come to Mr. Harris's time, when the school was at Whakarewa, when all the children ran away. The reason they ran away was that, after going into an orchard to get apples they were afraid of being thrashed, and so they all ran away. After Mr. Harris's time, Mr. Ronaldson took charge for two or three years. He lived by himself at the college, and used to go to teach the children (six of them) at Motueka. After him came Mr. Baker; he taught ten girls. When this school came to an end there were no more schools on the land.

107. *Mr. Wardell.*] Were you present when the conversation took place between Sir George Grey and the Natives?—Yes.

108. Do you profess to remember the conversation?—Yes, I can remember what the Maoris said. He said he wanted them to give a piece of land, so that he could reserve it for their children to erect a school for their education.

109. *Mr. Hutana.*] After Mr. Baker's school ceased, how many years was it before the orphanage was erected?—I cannot tell you.

110. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was there any school between Mr. Ronaldson's leaving and Mr. Baker's coming?—No; it was about a year, I should think.

ALFRED RUTLAND EDWARDS examined.

*Witness (to Mr. Harley):* I am a farmer at the Moutere; I am bailiff of the Wakarewa estate. I produce a schedule showing particulars of the leases as on the 1st August, 1905. The area under lease is 999 acres and 18 perches, the total rents amounting to £436 3s. 7d. There are, in addition, about 30 acres held for the orphanage, and protective works occupy about 2 acres. About 52 or 53 acres have been washed away by the river.

111. Has any of the area been washed away since the leases were granted?—Some of it has. There was a 50-acre section some fifty years ago which has been reduced, so that there is only 16 acres left. The form of lease used is very similar to the Native trust leases, and all leases granted in November, 1901, are in that form. I have been bailiff for about fourteen years. I receive £45 a year, and my duties are to collect the rents, visit all the properties twice a year to see that the tenants are carrying out their leases, &c., and to supervise the various river-works and everything in reference to the estate. I pay the rents as I receive them into the Bishop's Trust Account in the Union Bank. The rents fixed in the leases granted in 1901 were arrived at by arbitration. I acted on behalf of the trustees, and Messrs. H. Everitt, John Alexander, and Michael Simpson, on behalf of the tenants.

112. What happened when you could not agree with the other assessors?—We did agree after some trouble, but there was to be an umpire in the event of disagreement. All the leases entered into in 1901 were got at in that way except eight. There are thirty-eight tenants occupying forty leases.

113. The rents are fair and reasonable in your opinion?—They are looked upon as very fair by the Motueka people; there was very little trouble about them.

114. Are the tenants as a whole satisfied?—I think they are; there have never been any complaints that I have heard.

115. Is there much trouble with the river?—It has caused a good deal of trouble at times, and has cost a great deal of money, both to the trustees and the Government. The work has been done at various times; whenever there was damage done it was seen to at once. The river does not always break through in one place, but in various places.

116. Who supervised the erection of the protective works and designed them?—I have done so hitherto. I have had other experience in this kind of work, having done some very heavy works of the kind under the supervision of the Government. I spent upwards of £3,000 of Government money at Takaka on river protection.

117. Have these works you erected on the Wakarewa estate been approved by the Government?—Yes; and lower down I have carried out others approved of by Commissioner Murray.

118. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are the rents paid punctually?—Fairly well; if the tenants are hard-pressed the trustees are very lenient, and often wait twelve months for their rent instead of six, which is sometimes a great convenience to farmers; they have no hard-and-fast rule.

119. Since the new leases in 1901, has any rent been lost?—No, none has been lost. We have never lost 1s. of rent that I am aware of since I had the collecting of it. The tenants all pay at some time or another; there are very little arrears now.

120. *Mr. Harley.*] You say the tenants generally are satisfied?—The last issue of leases has given perfect satisfaction.

121. Previous to the last issue the tenants lost their improvements at the end of the term?—No, they did not. I do not think the trustees ever anticipated that they should. They have been very kindly disposed towards the tenants. The Bishop thought it would be a great encouragement to them to know that they were not going to lose their improvements.

122. The new leases were given with the object of giving the improvements as far as they could?—Yes.

123. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know what the rentals were in 1869?—No, it was before my time.

124. Mr. Tudor's evidence in that year said it amounted to about £350, 660 acres not being under lease, but being farmed for the benefit of the trust. Do you know anything about that?—It was before my time, and I have not heard about it.

125. Does it not strike you that, if in 1869 the rental was £350, its present rental of £436 does not show a great advance in thirty-six years?—It does not.

126. You do not know what this means about the 660 acres not being under lease?—No.
127. But even if that 660 acres was under lease, you are surprised that the rent now is only £436?—It is not an extravagant rent; it is very low, I think.
128. I suppose you had good motives for putting the rentals low on behalf of the trustees: why did you do so?—I did the best I could for the trustees under the circumstances, but in arbitration more than one person has a say.
129. If they had been put up to public competition would they have realised larger sums?—I believe they would.
130. There are now thirty people holding tenancies of 10 acres and less: how are those sections occupied? are they worked as farms or gardens?—Some are farms, and some hop-gardens, and some fruit-gardens. Some are town sections.
131. Is this half-acre let for three terms of twenty-one years a town section?—Yes.
132. Is there a house on it?—No.
133. The small sections are good land?—Yes. Part of the 400-acre block is poor.
134. What is this block of 100 acres let to Atkins?—It is reduced to 87 acres. That is very good land; it is the best farming section in the district of Motueka.
135. Do you expect it will realise a higher rent when it falls in next year?—I do.
136. How would you recommend this to be dealt with? auction?—If the land were put up to auction it would fetch a good deal more, I dare say. As it stands now it is worth £1 an acre; put up to auction it would fetch more.
137. Does that apply to all the lands recently leased?—Yes, I am certain if they had been put up to auction they would have brought a much higher rent all round.
138. *Mr. Harley.*] Why were they not put up to auction?—I believe the trustees thought it was a nice principle to go upon to allow the improvements to go to the tenants.
139. The improvements had been put up by the tenants?—Yes, but they had no right to them.
140. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are there many cases in the district of leases for twenty-one years with a right of two renewals for the same term?—Not unless it is Native-trust leases.
141. *Mr. Quick.*] When you valued the leases for the present term, you valued the improvements?—I do not think we did.
142. But you did not make them a present of the improvements they were not entitled to?—No, we did not.
143. Then you must have valued the improvements?—I believe they were not valued, but I have not a record.
144. Were the new leases granted altogether to old tenants?—Yes.
145. They were granted for new terms?—Yes.
146. Can you not recollect whether you valued the properties as a whole?—I am not quite sure about that; it is several years ago, and I have forgotten. The rents were fought hard enough over.
147. Can you not remember on what principle you had to value?—It was the ordinary principle.
148. Did you not value for each of the tenants as if they were strangers?—Of course we did.
149. The leases were granted comparatively recently?—I do not think we valued the whole of the improvements.
150. Did you value for each tenant as if he were a stranger, or did you treat him as a favoured individual?—Not at all.
151. If you made him a present of his improvements, you must have treated him as a favoured individual?—The trustees made a present of the goodwill. I did not. I know the people made a fuss at the time, and the Bishop went over at the time about the matter.

## HERBERT HAYCOCK examined.

*Witness (to Mr. Harley):* I am manager of the orphanage, having held that position for ten years. My salary is £120. The matron is my wife; she receives no payment. We live there and are found in everything except clothes.

152. What assistance have you besides?—My two daughters; one receives 10s. and the other 5s. with board. One is thirty and the other nearly twenty-one. There is a schoolmistress who receives £72 and her board; there is one boy for outside work, who gets 5s. a week. My daughters' duties are general housework and supervising the children; they have nothing to do with the teaching. About 50 acres are worked in connection with the orphanage. The area in connection with the orphanage-site is 32 acres, and another piece of about 12 acres was acquired from Wratt's lease, which is used in connection with the farm. We grow oats, potatoes, swedes, and almost everything grown on a farm. The boys do the principal farm-work. I produce a list showing the number of children at the orphanage since I have been there.

153. What becomes of your produce from the farm?—I sell it.

154. Where do you send the money you get for it?—I bank it in a general account. I have a banking account at Motueka in my own name as a trust account. I pay the accounts every quarter. I buy on my own account.

155. Where do you get the money from?—I ask for a sum every quarter that I think will pay the quarterly accounts. I apply to the trustees for a lump sum. In applying for an amount I take into consideration the amount at credit in my account at the bank. Mr. Kingsley audits my accounts. The money I receive is only from farm-produce and what I get from the trustees.

156. What religious education is given at the school?—A portion of Scripture is read in the mornings at 7, for which the children are assembled, and a form of prayer is used—arranged by Bishop Suter. The day-school is opened with half an hour's religious instruction. I read the portion of Scripture and the prayer.

157. It is your duty to see that religious instruction is carried out?—Yes.
158. In regard to English education, what is the nature of it?—The same syllabus as at the Government schools.
159. Do the children go to church on Sunday?—Yes, to the English church in Motueka; if they are unable to go in the evenings there is service at the school. I read service if I am there, and, if not, Mrs. Haycock or the teacher.
160. Does any local clergyman attend the school?—Yes, Mr. Johnstone, of Motueka, comes occasionally.
161. There is a schoolmistress?—Yes, she is selected by the trustees; she holds a D certificate.
162. In regard to industrial training, what are the girls taught?—Housework and cooking, and dairy-work and laundry-work.
163. Are they made to work as far as they are able?—They are expected to work, but there is time for recreation as well.
164. At what age do you put them to work?—No particular age; at ten or eleven they are set to do what they can.
165. What do the boys do?—They are taught to plough and milk, to kill and dress a sheep, and ordinary farm-work; and they are taught to do odd jobs in the carpentry line. I generally supervise them. They do all the farm-work with the exception of the heaviest work, for which I employ labour.
166. *Mr. Wardell.*] How do you farm your 50 acres?—Last year we had 4 acres in oats, 2 acres in swedes, 1 acre potatoes, and about a quarter-acre in mangolds. Four cows are kept, some horses, and we buy small lots of sheep (from twenty-five to thirty) for killing. The bulk of the land is poor; there are about 20 acres of fair land.
167. Does the bringing-up of the children give satisfaction to those who put them there?—Yes; I have a number of testimonials to that effect.
168. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you look upon it as your duty to follow their history after they leave the school?—We try to.
169. Is the conduct of the children generally satisfactory after leaving?—Yes, they generally turn out well.
170. *Mr. Wardell.*] You do not have “waifs and strays” at the school, do you?—They are quite neglected children in many cases.
171. *Mr. Quick.*] Is it your duty to find them places when they are old enough?—Yes.
172. You draft them into situations—that is part of the scheme?—Yes.
173. And generally they turn out satisfactorily?—Yes, both boys and girls.
174. Do you get many applications for them from outsiders?—A great many.
175. They are looked upon with approbation by persons requiring labour?—Yes. I get applications nearly every week.
176. *Mr. Wardell.*] How many did you send to situations last year?—I think two.
177. To what standard are the children taught?—Up to past the Sixth Standard, one girl has passed the Sixth.
178. What is the age of the girl who has passed the Sixth?—Thirteen years old.
179. What is the age of the oldest child in the institution?—There is one looked upon as a help about twenty-two years of age.
180. Is she being paid for?—No; she has been found in clothes; she is mentally deficient.
181. Is she the only one who is mentally deficient?—No, we have one other.
182. Do they associate with the other children?—Yes; but they are not bad cases by any means; they are only a little wanting.
183. Do you think their association with the other children is beneficial to the others?—It has no bad effect.
184. Is there no disposition amongst the other children to trifle with their mental weakness?—No, I do not think so.
185. Are all the children at the institution orphans?—No, I know some are not.

NELSON, TUESDAY, 1ST AUGUST, 1905.

ROBERT INGPEN KINGSLEY examined.

*Witness (to Mr. Harley):* I reside in Nelson. I have been acting as accountant and secretary of the Wakarewa trust for six or seven years. My position is almost an honorary one. I collect all the fees contributed by the parents or guardians of the children at the orphanage. The orphanage accounts are kept at that building by Mr. Edwards, the bailiff. At the half-yearly or yearly statement the Bishop hands me over the bailiff's accounts of rents accruing and payments made, and with the pass-books I prepare the accounts to lay before the Synod. I have the bailiff's accounts from 1868, and the balance-sheets from 1893.

1. *Mr. Wardell.*] We want an annual account of receipts and expenditure of the trust from 1853 to the present date: can you supply that?—I do not think I can supply accounts for the whole of that period. The statement I produce I can certify as being correct from 1868 to the 31st March, 1905. This shows the total receipts and expenditure for each year.

2. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do these accounts show what moneys you have raised and expended in building?—£305 was borrowed at 5 per cent. in 1902. We built a new wing. Some years ago Bishop Suter at great expense built the wing next to the road, but it was found there was not sufficient accommodation, and in 1902 another wing was built at the opposite end which provided a dormitory for sixteen girls, a hospital for girls, and a teacher's room. The total cost was £1,000.

3. *The Chairman.*] Out of what fund was Bishop Suter's expenditure made?—Out of the accumulations in the trust fund. He found the trust could not be carried out in terms of the grant without some large buildings, so allowed the fund to accumulate on fixed deposit until it was sufficient to warrant the building.

4. Mr. Kempthorne was asked yesterday about any documentary evidence there might be in writing or print showing what resolutions of the trustees there had been as to the character of the school they would carry on: are you able to tell us anything about that?—I have not come across any minutes.

5. *The Chairman.*] One would have thought prudent men in dealing with trust-money would have had something in writing for their own protection. The suggestion on the part of the Natives is natural, that the trust created for the purpose of the civilisation of the Natives has been turned into a European orphanage. That is the suggestion. I do not say that is the conclusion I arrive at?—I may say I have come across a letter written by Dr. Greenwood in which he made a statement which coincided with what one of the Maori witnesses said—that when Bishop Selwyn came over and stayed at his house he called the natives together, explaining to them what he wanted to do—to have a school, and have boarders—and they afterwards saw Sir George Grey and acquiesced in the transfer of this land.

6. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any particulars in regard to the accounts antecedent to 1868?—I have looked through a great many papers and have found that during the first three years of Bishop Selwyn's occupancy as trustee the rents collected were: 1854, £55 8s. 9d.; 1855, £116 18s. 1d.; 1856, £88 1s. He sold produce from the farm during that period to the amount of £321 5s. 6d., making the total receipts £581 12s. 6d. The payments for that period were £1,769 7s. 4d. He met these out of various grants—the Southern Board, the Wellington Education Board, and other sources which do not come under the heading of the trust.

7. How is it you have not included in this statement of accounts for the period antecedent to 1868 a debit against the trust of the Government grants?—I cannot make this an account, because it is not an account, it is merely compiled from certain memoranda.

8. Do you recognise it is right and proper to show the amount of the Government contributions as against the school salaries and boarding-expenses, &c.?—That is no doubt how the Bishop met them, but even then there is a balance against him.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] Were the balance-sheets submitted to the Diocesan Synod?—Not in 1868; not until the new body of trustees was appointed.

10. Was not an annual account presented to the Diocesan Synod by the Bishop?—Bishop Hobhouse did so for three years, but it was discontinued afterwards.

11. What was the reason for that?—I think it was because the trustees were not appointed by the Diocesan Synod. I believe it was reported to the General Synod.

12. *Mr. Wardell.*] Has there been any ledger account kept for the trust?—The Bishop keeps it in his private ledger; I am not aware of any other.

13. Have you been instructed to keep one for the future?—Two or three months ago the Bishop asked me to undertake a ledger and cash-book.

14. So far as you know, they have not been kept up to the present?—Not that I know of, except in the Bishop's private account.

15. And you have to abstract the items from his pass-book to make up your accounts?—Yes.

16. *Mr. Quick.*] There has been no debit of Government grants in the balance-sheets?—I think not; not since the very early days of Bishop Selwyn.

17. *The Chairman.*] Are any payments shown for pupils?—Now they appear under the Orphanage Account.

18. *Mr. Wardell.*] Does the Government pay anything for the support of any children?—No.

19. When did you first charge fees for children?—The trustees have never charged fees, the charge has been for boarding.

20. Does the trust manage and control the orphanage or is it undertaken by some one outside the trust?—I should not like to say that; the trustees give general instructions to the orphanage.

21. *The Chairman.*] Is the orphanage a separate trust, and do the trustees pay a certain amount towards the orphanage trust?—It is all one trust.

22. It has acquired the name of an orphanage?—Yes.

23. If it is one trust the amount of contributions of all kinds ought to appear in one account?—The simpler way is to keep the Orphanage Account separate and show the amount it draws from the trust.

24. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you find it impossible to make an approximate statement of account from 1859 to 1862, or any statement more satisfactory than the one you hand in?—This is the best I can produce; I cannot supply any account between 1862 and 1868. In regard to the items marked "School," and those marked "Orphanage," the latter term is used when there was no school open. In the year 1855, in which £65 appears under the head of "School," there is also an item—£47 5s. 8d.—under the head of "Orphanage." The explanation of that is that in that year children were boarded out at a private orphanage, and payments made to Mrs. Wallace, who kept it. I cannot say whether those orphans were Maori or European.

25. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is the explanation of this item £215 5s. 2d. under the head of "Orphanage" in 1886?—There are included in that, payments in respect of the new building, such as furniture. But there may be some maintenance of orphans included in the sum. The same in respect to the item £630 in the next year.

26. *The Chairman.*] No one is suggesting that any member of the trust has put the money into his own pocket; but what we want to see is something to show what has become of the money?—It would take a great many folios to show all the details.

27. *Mr. Harley.*] Are there any accumulated moneys belonging to the trust?—No.

28. And there is a debt of £305 owing by the trust?—Yes, for money borrowed.
29. How much is there in the bank to credit account?—£168 5s. 1d.
30. You have a schedule showing the expenditure on protective works?—Yes, I produce it.
31. How many children are placed in the orphanage by Charitable Aid Boards?—Thirteen.
32. What rate are they paying?—5s., 5s. 6d., and 6s.
33. The Public Trustee places some in the institution?—Yes, there are three from Wellington; they are paying 7s.
34. How are the others placed there?—By relatives or guardians; there are nineteen; they are paying 4s., 5s., 6s., and 7s., and there are three free.
35. There appears to be no uniform rate?—No.
36. How many Natives are there?—Five; they are nearly free. There was a small charge for clothing, but it has not been paid regularly; I think there has been only one payment by a Maori.
37. Why is the charge not uniform?—The trustees ascertain what are the capabilities of persons who wish to place children in the orphanage, and charge accordingly.
38. You get as much as you can up to a fair charge?—Yes.
39. And what is considered a fair charge? What does it cost?—Taking the expenses of salaries of manager and mistress it would average about 8s.
40. So you get as much as you can towards that 8s.?—Yes.
41. It was understood that the five Natives should contribute £2 per head per year for clothing?—Yes.
42. They have not done so: will the payment be enforced?—I do not think the trustees will enforce it; it is for them to answer that.
43. And these children are boarded and fed and clothed?—Yes, and returned to their homes; or if they stay, employment is found for them.
44. *Mr. Wardell.*] And one payment has been made on account of these Natives?—Yes, one payment of £2.

NELSON, WEDNESDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1905

Bishop MULES examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] We have heard from some of the witnesses something in regard to the administration of the trust, but we desire to hear from you what you may have to tell us about the present administration and the future intentions, and also what you know as to past administration?—With regard to the past, all I could give the Commission is what they can gather for themselves from published papers. I can give very little information except in regard to certain specific details—very slight details—which may have been brought before my notice now and then through questions put to me, and matters talked of between me and Bishop Suter, with whom I came out to the colony forty years ago and with whom I was on terms of considerable intimacy during the whole time of his being trustee and being in the colony. In regard to the administration of the trust since my own dealing with it, the trustees, having to start with the particular form in which the trust was proposed to be administered by Bishop Suter, and believing that was in accordance with the terms of the trust, endeavoured to carry out the intentions of Bishop Suter as effectually as they possibly could. I do not know that I can express it in more general terms than that. If there are any specific details on which the Commissioners desire to question me, I will gladly give what information I can.

2. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you indicate any documents to which you would refer us as giving a proper view of the administration of the trust from your point of view?—In regard to that, I hardly think I can put that in any form more clearly and precisely than in the actual terms of the trust. The conception which Bishop Suter had as to the working of the trust appears in a variety of forms in his addresses to the Diocesan Synod, which are all published and of which there are several copies in existence. I have never seen any concise history of the trust. Had longer time been given us we should have been able to make an effort in this direction which would have been more satisfactory to the Commission, but the very short notice given us has not enabled us to satisfy the Commission in regard to details. There are also reports issued by the trustees and presented to the Diocesan Synod. I can put my hand on all reports since I have had anything to do with the trust.

3. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you find reports going as far back as you can recollect?—I am not able to answer that question just now. I only arrived in Nelson this morning at 8 o'clock, and my time has been very short.

4. Would you not have in your custody a bound copy of reports going back forty years?—Yes; but the question is would the diocesan reports contain the reports required.

5. *Mr. Wardell.*] Our inquiry is not so much what Bishop Suter had in his mind, or what he contemplated doing, as a dry business inquiry as to what has been done with the trust from the beginning?—You ask me if I know of any document which embodies that. I know of none—no single document.

6. Can you give any evidence on that subject or suggest any one who can?—I can suggest no individual person, but there are in all probability documents in the possession of trustees which would enable an answer to be given to that question, if time were given.

7. *The Chairman.*] You quite understand there are two points: one is the proper dealing with the land itself—properly letting it, and so on, and the collecting of rents and investing accumulations; the other is what has been done with the money—whether it has been rightly applied, not only to a right purpose, but in a prudent way; we are not expressing any opinion at all?—We can at once point, since I have had anything to do with the trust, to balance-sheets in print which have been submitted to the inspection of men of business in the General Synod, and they embody the whole triennial proceedings of the trust. They commence with 1898, and are carried on to 1904.



8. Yesterday, in the course of some questions, we thought there must be something which would show in writing whether either the trustees themselves or the Bishop or the Synod had come to any conclusion as to the method in which the trust itself should be carried on for the future, but we could not ascertain that: do I understand you to say there is any documentary matter?—Bishop Suter was the sole trustee from the period of his appointment in 1868 until we were appointed—that is twenty-four years, and the whole management of the trust was in his hands.

9. *Mr. Wardell.*] How did he become sole trustee?—He was appointed under the Bishop of New Zealand Trust Act.

*Mr. Harley:* I can produce the deed under which he was appointed.

10. *Mr. Kingsley* gave us some accounts which start from 1868, and is endeavouring at present to compile some accounts of income and expenditure from material he has at hand for the antecedent period: have you in your possession any documents or accounts which would help him?—All the documents I have in connection with the trust were put into his hands.

11. Are you able to give us any information in respect to the details of the income and expenditure of the trust?—Yes; but only since I became a trustee.

12. Had the baliff of the property your authority in arbitrating in regard to the new leases granted in 1901?—Yes, he had the trustees' authority.

13. Had he any instructions from you as to the terms in which he was to arbitrate in respect to these leases—as to the rent which was to be paid?—Not as to the amounts.

14. I mean as to the general principles?—Yes; at this moment I cannot recollect whether they were in writing or not; but we had several interviews in the presence, if I remember right, of our solicitors, and interviews apart, and we gave him general instructions after discussing the matter with him as to the precise way the rents were to be assessed.

15. *Mr. Quick.*] Will you tell us what those general principles were?—As nearly as possible that we considered the rents should be increased, giving to the trust the unearned increment.

16. *Mr. Wardell.*] How would that affect improvements?—It did not affect improvements.

17. They were not taken into account?—We did not specify that; they were left out of consideration; we did not precisely say they were not to be taken into account.

18. Are you aware of the terms of the then existing leases?—Yes, generally.

19. Are you aware there was a special covenant in these leases that all improvements, buildings or otherwise, attached to the soil or otherwise, were, it was distinctly understood, to become the property of the trust, or as it says "the Bishop"?—I am willing to believe they did; my memory does not extend to the precise terms.

20. If those leases did contain that specific covenant, why and under what principle was that put aside?—First of all, partly because we were given to understand—I think my recollection of private conversations with Bishop Suter led me to suppose—that in cases where the properties had been transferred he had intimated to the person who desired to transfer his lease that he would renew it, and at the same time he might dispose of the buildings, or the goodwill of the property, to the incoming tenant; secondly, that on considering the matter and observing that the buildings were mostly wood, we considered it would be on the whole not disadvantageous to the trust, and it would lessen the amount of labour devolving on the trustees and so benefit the trust, if the trustees declined to take charge of the buildings, inasmuch as many were wood; and the same applied to fencing; and they were allowed to devolve upon the tenants. We observed the Native reserves were let on similar principles. There was considerable clamour at the time, as the time of renewal came near, on the part of many tenants who considered they had a claim on the improvements, and we considered it would probably lead to an easier letting of the property, cause less trouble, and give satisfaction to our tenants, if we gave them the buildings and simply concerned ourselves with the unearned increment of the property.

21. *Mr. Quick.*] *Mr. Edwards* said yesterday if the land had been put up to auction or public tender, the farms would have fetched a higher rental?—I was a little surprised to hear that; because our instructions to him were certainly not in any way to allow to the tenants anything but what would be a fair and reasonable rental. Competition might have been keen at the time. There might have been local reasons to account for it. It is quite possible that the fruit industry, or the canning industry at Motueka, which at that time was very successful, might have led to an advance on what one might term legitimate rents. I think that is very probable; but I do not know but that we should have thought that rather close bargaining, and not quite fair and honourable to take advantage of a rise of that kind. It is quite possible the desire for land there might fall at any time in consequence of the fruit industry being blocked, and that entered into the minds of the trustees. So far as I know, the rents were quite fair and reasonable. I have not heard anybody say the rents were other than reasonable.

22. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you realise that there are duties incumbent on trustees which control their powers and prevent them from acting as a man would act with his own estate? Do you realise that the trustees of an estate are bound in a way that a private individual is not bound, and cannot deal with the estate as a private individual is at liberty to deal with it?—Yes, I am aware of that as a general principle; but I was not at all aware of the precise way it bore on the transaction of which we are now speaking.

23. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think you did your best for the trust from a business point of view, irrespective of sentiment?—Yes, I think we did; because we considered it important to maintain the good will of our tenants.

24. *The Chairman.*] What do you mean exactly by that?—There was a good deal of clamour at the time. We thought there was reasonable ground for it, and we had an interview with our tenants, and having, as I mentioned, the practice of the Native reserves before our eyes, we proceeded upon the same lines and copied the leases of Native reserves in this respect. We assumed that the lessors



of the Native reserves were acting in a strictly legal way, inasmuch as we had before us Government procedure in that respect; and we thought, on the ground of the dissatisfaction existing, we should be able to say to persons who might be dissatisfied, "We treated you fairly, because we treated you as the trustees of the Native reserves are treating their tenants."

25. *Mr. Quick.*] Have you had any trouble with these holdings since the new leases were granted?—None at all.

26. You have good tenants who keep the property in first-class order?—Yes. If there is any trouble at all it lies in our being called upon to pay a little more for protective works than we ought to do. We happen to border on the river, and are called upon to protect our own property by protective works, and there being no River Board, and it being against the interest of some of the tenants to get one, they permit to devolve upon us to a somewhat unreasonable extent the expenditure of our moneys on protective works.

27. *Mr. Wardell.*] Seeing that you have spent a considerable amount of money on these works, do you think, as business men, that those works have been undertaken in a proper and economical manner?—Yes.

28. By employing your own bailiff to do them?—Yes; he has been so successful that he has been employed at Takaka to do works of the same kind.

29. Was the work carried on by contract or day-labour?—I think by day-labour, under his inspection.

30. Is there any supervision of expenditure in this respect, because the amount is very considerable?—The Public Trustee sent over an officer to inspect the work, and he was so pleased with it that on a subsequent occasion he helped us to construct further protective works when they were required.

31. Have you received any contributions towards the protective works?—Yes, but I cannot say the amount or when they they were received; it is on record. The contributions shown do not necessarily come from the Public Trustee; they might be from the Motueka Borough Council. The position of the property is such that unless it is protected at Wakarewa, the whole place would be inundated, and the consequence is we are saddled with rather heavy expenditure. We have advised the Council that in future, unless they make it a small charge on their properties, we shall hardly be able to keep up our works as we should desire to do. The Borough Council have therefore given certain contributions, and so has the Public Trustee, whose property is just below ours. If the river were to break through it would do us and the Borough Council and the Public Trustee injury. We should be glad to know of some way to compel the other bodies to help us.

32. So the estate is really charged with the cost of protecting not only its own land, but that of others?—You might say so; but it has to protect its own property, and it does so.

33. Are the works merely for the protection of the trust estate?—Yes.

34. You have not done work on account of other parties?—Oh, no.

35. *The Chairman.*] Are you satisfied that it is a fair administration of the trust that the school as worked really is for European children, and not for Natives?—Well, Yes, and No. One must answer somewhat ambiguously from that point of view. We are obliged to make some rules, whether written or merely in accord with the view the trustees have kept in their own minds, as to the children who are to be admitted to the trust. And we have felt that inasmuch as, so far as the history of the trust is known to us, the Maoris have claimed and feel that they have a right to consideration in the matter, which the exact terms of the trust do not specify in any way, we have felt very glad to give them a prior claim provided in other respects the position between any two claimants was equal. But, as a matter of fact, under the conditions under which the trust has been administered by us, which seem to us exactly in accordance with the terms of the trust, no Maoris have applied for admission who have not been admitted, except in one instance the details of which I cannot recollect, but in which the parents or guardians—I think the latter—were well able to pay fees, and when we applied for them, they at once declined to send the children, urging that free admission ought to be given.

36. Am I right in supposing that the view the trustees have taken is this: that it is really a trust for the education of poor persons?—Yes; it is a philanthropic trust, we have always considered, for the education, industrial training, and religious instruction of poor persons. We have not supposed it to be purely educational; the industrial training seemed to give it a different form.

37. For poor persons?—Yes; for children of the poor and destitute persons; there is one clause in the grant which mentions "other" poor and destitute persons; therefore, we felt compelled to assume the persons for whom it was intended were all poor and destitute.

38. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you aware the grant for Wanganui College is in precisely the same terms?—I was told the word "other" was left out of that.

39. *The Chairman.*] What I really wanted to see was this: whether, according to the views the trustees now hold, any force is to be attached to the special mention of both races, and also whether any force is to be attached to the sources from which this endowment came?—Of course we have attached of necessity force to the fact that it is for the education of the children of all races. But we have not in our own mind, excepting when other things are equal, attached force to the source from which it is said the trust came; inasmuch as we have considered, so far as the donors to us are concerned we understand the Crown to be the donor. Our action is to be guided by the terms of the trust, regarding the Crown as the donors. We assume the Crown has specified the object of the trust precisely in the terms in which it has been given to us.

40. You do not entertain the view that there was a definite object—viz., the civilisation of the Native people, except of course by education? You do not entertain the view entertained by some persons that the main object was not the interest of individual Maoris living in the locality or in the same Island, but the main object was the civilisation of the Maoris by educating them with Europeans?—What we have thought is that whatever may have been the interpretation put upon it, for instance,

by Bishop Selwyn, to whom it was given, as time went on and circumstances altered, we had to interpret it as the literal meaning of the language would lead us to do; and if poor and destitute persons who were Europeans applied for admission, other things being equal, we are justified in admitting them, and the children of any other race, whether Maoris or inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean. The question was raised many years ago in the Diocesan Synod by Mr. Jennings. He claimed that this trust was for the benefit, for instance, of his own children, assuming he was in the position of a poor and destitute person.

41. *Mr. Quick.*] Do I understand you to say, other things being equal, the trustees would give preference to Maoris?—They would do so.

42. The meaning of it is this: given a Maori child and a white one, you would prefer the Maori?—I think so, looking back on the history of the trust.

43. *Mr. Wardell.*] At the present time you would do so?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Quick.*] How do you account for there being so few applications on the part of the Maoris?—If I were to judge, not by putting the questions to Maoris, but by what has happened in the past, their idea of teaching differs so essentially from ours that that has lessened the number of applications, and their instability of character operates in the same direction. The children themselves would not be induced to stay, and the parents would not let them stay away from home; and a school carried on under such conditions as this, where children are perpetually taking holiday, is such a hopeless enterprise that unless the children are prepared to submit to European discipline we feel justified in giving the advantages of the trust to children of other races.

45. Do you explain the few applications on the part of Maoris to the fact that they do not like restraint?—That is what I understand partly, and partly that the parents do not like them to go away from home.

46. Are there many children in the Motueka district?—I gather there are not many. I saw a statement to the effect that there are ten or twelve. I do not know of my own personal knowledge. It has been assumed by the present trustees that these efforts as to a school were at first tentative to a great extent. I should regard the word “established” as having a different force from the word “opened.” It implies that many tentative efforts must be made before the work is actually started and carried out. This has always appeared to me part of the reply to the complaints made that the school has not always been maintained. So far as I can see, there is no requirement that it should be always maintained. All the terms of the trust asks is that if there are any children to be instructed they should be given a certain class of instruction, but it does not require that the school should be always maintained. The school was not in existence when the grant was made, and it was obvious that there must be many tentative efforts before success.

47. *The Chairman.*] Did not Mr. Tudor have some sort of a school before the grant?—Not that I know of. But a school was about to be established, and therefore it could not refer to that school.

48. I suppose his school was a private school maintained by the Church people?—I do not remember.

49. I am not saying that I have an opinion that the real meaning of the grants is what is very generally understood—that the schools were for the Natives, and that the prevailing idea was “We are going to establish a school for the civilisation of the Natives, that being best attained by educating them with Europeans”?—I have never had the opportunity of conversing with any one really familiar, except my predecessor, with what was originally intended. The other view, as I understand it, is that Sir George Grey and the Government were initiating a general system of education for the people of New Zealand, and that these grants were for the establishment of a system of education. But, in order to make it clear that it was not for white people only, it says “for all races.” Then what has been talked about in days gone by—and possibly now—that he also had in view persons who were not subjects of Great Britain, but inhabitants of islands in the neighbourhood, and that he introduced these words which were the subject of a good deal of talk in days gone by. Some people supposed it made the grants invalid, because public land was devoted to the education of persons who were not British subjects. Whether the true interpretation is that “poor persons of the neighbouring islands” meant that they were not to educate the children of persons who were really belonging to the islands unless they were poor and destitute—whether that is to govern the preceding words—is a difficult question. In the present day I do not think there is much importance in it. The main difficulty in regard to Nelson, so far as it strikes me, at present is, rightly or wrongly, the Nelson trustees seem to arrive at a conclusion which has not been prevailing, I think, elsewhere. At any rate, no one has suggested it either in the Waikato, or Porirua, or Otaki, or Masterton. Everybody has apparently accepted the view that they were really intended for Maoris mainly. I do not say that is correct.

50. *Mr. Harley.*] The total income from rents is £436: is there any other income from any other source than rents?—Not belonging to the trust.

51. So that is your total income from the trust lands and properties?—Yes.

52. Has this income at any period of the trust been greater than at present?—Never.

53. Is this sum of money sufficient to establish and carry on a school with any appreciable number of pupils?—Obviously not to give them industrial training—quite insufficient.

54. What, in your opinion, does it cost to maintain and educate a child there?—I made an estimate a few years ago; I think about £15 or £16 a year. I have not made an estimate since.

55. Have the orphanage buildings been built out of rents and savings?—Exclusively.

56. Have all the moneys from the trust at all times been spent upon the orphanage and upon educating and supporting children?—So far as I know, on the persons in charge of the school and the children.

57. Have any of the trust funds been diverted to any other persons?—Not so far as I am aware

58. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us why the character of the institution was altered from a school to an orphanage?—Because of the tentative character of the establishment of the school. Something that would really work was aimed at by the trustees and, when it was found that the Maoris, who had almost had exclusively the benefit of the proceeds of the trust for a long time, did not avail themselves of it to the extent to which it was hoped they would have done, the character of the institution was changed, because a school was desired to be established and not merely opened.

59. What is the alteration in character between the school and the orphanage?—The pupils who are admitted are of a somewhat different character as a rule, inasmuch as it is open to all children; and as the accommodation was limited we had to make some limitation. We do not admit all children who are poor and destitute, but rather those who are orphans.

60. You regard it as an orphanage for poor and destitute orphans?—Yes.

61. You are receiving revenue on account of all the inmates except three and some Maoris?—Yes

62. You say the cost of maintenance is £15 or £16. I will take it at £20. Your income is £400; that, at £20 each, would maintain twenty pupils?—But no teacher.

63. How is it the number is necessarily so small?—We have forty-three there now. There are twenty-three in addition to the possible number. You want £800 to support forty.

64. My question leads to this: why are not the Maori children provided for first, and then have those who can pay? Why take all you can get on a paying basis and leave the rest?—I explained we built three years ago at considerable cost. We had no savings except a sum of a few hundred pounds (about £400). There was no hope of getting out of debt (we are not entitled to borrow on our trust) unless by alteration of our system; and in order to enable us to put up large buildings and provide for a greater number of children, for the time being we were obliged to sacrifice to that extent our admission of free children; not that I am aware of any persons having been excluded to enable us to meet our engagements.

65. But there has been no charge on your capital for the maintenance of the children?—To the best of my recollection at the last account there was a credit balance in the bank of £400, but at the same time there was a debt of £300 owing from the trust in consequence of the putting-up of the new building, and one or two additional things—some drainage, a septic tank, and a proper water-supply—so that we have not been able to maintain the trust in its present position out of the funds which have come into our hands.

66. *Mr. Quick.*] Do we understand you hope within a short time to bring matters back to a more liberal arrangement?—Yes, directly we are in a position to do so. At present £400 is not too much to keep in the bank.

67. How long do you think it will be before you come back to a more generous arrangement?—We are nearly on the point of it; say a year or two years.

68. But you are not aware of any Maori children being refused admittance?—No, excepting two, and we did not decline them; when we asked for payment there was an end of it. The parents were in good circumstances.

69. *Mr. Hutana.*] There is an impression, according to some of the evidence, that Wakarewa was Crown land: can you inform the Commission whether Wakarewa was part of the Maori “tenths” or not?—When it was given the documents I have mentioned lead us to draw the conclusion that it was Crown land, because it was given back by the Maoris to the Crown.

70. Can you lay before the Commission the correspondence or words spoken by Sir George Grey at the time the cession was made?—It is to be found in Mackay’s compendium, which has been put before the Commission. [See Appendix].

71. What have you to say in regard to the wish by the Maoris that their children should be admitted free to your institution?—I should like to have the opportunity of conferring with the other trustees before I make any statement about that, because it refers to the future. It is clear that it would limit the number of persons we are able to receive, and the question is, is it just to other poor and destitute persons to make such limitations?

72. We will take into consideration the observations that have been made. The Maori children are all attending Government schools in various parts, but the Maori idea is that after they have passed certain standards they should be taught at an institution where they could be given technical education to fit them for trades. They expect Wakarewa to supply that?—It must be remembered such a request would involve a complete change in the objects of the institution, and it is clear that £460 would give industrial training to a very limited number.

73. This school is now an orphanage, and there are some mentally deficient children there: does the Church of England give anything in aid of the institution?—Yes, it does, indirectly. There is an institution under the Charitable Aid Board—St. Andrew’s Orphanage—supported by voluntary contributions from members of the Church (not exclusively), and it pays for children who are sent to Wakarewa.

74. *The Chairman.*] Do you know the exact course taken in regard to getting Maoris into the school? Supposing two or three boys were leaving the institution, what would be done?—We make no effort to secure anybody. We have waited till applications are made on behalf of scholars. We are never without sufficient applications to fill the institution.

75. *Mr. Quick.*] Is St. Andrew’s institution a denominational one?—It is Protestant, it does not belong to any particular Church.

76. *The Chairman.*] Is there any intention to alter the mode of carrying out the trust in regard to making it more industrial than it is?—Yes, there is an intention. We have given notice to a tenant, who holds about 400 acres, of our intention to resume possession at the expiry of his lease next year, and we intend to make use of that for the support of the institution, and trust to give the boys at least

a better industrial training as farm hands, and to admit more children if, as we hope, the income will be increased.

77. *Mr. Wardell.*] That, we are told, is the poorest land on the estate: would they not get better training on a smaller area of better land?—We are guided by our bailiff, and other practical men. This 400 acres has supported an enterprising man for years, and he has done very well out of it, so it cannot be so poor.

78. *Mr. Quick.*] It is in the neighbourhood of the institution?—Yes, that is the chief reason for choosing it; and the other leases contain right of renewal.

79. *Mr. Wardell.*] In regard to making it more industrial in character, are you prepared in the future to give it a more educational and industrial character than that of a home for orphans?—If it is simply a question of name, Yes. We would have no objection to a change of name. There is a further step we have not gone so far as to determine upon in the direction of asking the Education Board what help they would give in putting the school into their hands, and asking them to take it under their care sufficiently to enable us to have a certificated teacher. That would give it a more scholastic character, and the additional number of acres would give it a more industrial character.

80. It has been put before us by Native witnesses that the school should, although of a mixed character as to race, be an educational establishment, and for industrial training of youth according to the terms of the trust: are you prepared to give it that character?—I hardly know quite what is implied under such a term. It would be quite hopeless for an institution like Burnham, for instance, to be established. If it is a question of further teaching, we could do that if we could look to anybody who could supply us with funds; if we could get a grant of so-many thousands we should be very willing to accept it.

81. *The Chairman.*] Turning it into an industrial school would involve sending away all children under eight years of age, would it not?—Yes. We applied many years ago to have it constituted an industrial school under the Act; but at that time there were a very large number of applications for similar Roman Catholic institutions, and that put a stop to our being gazetted an industrial-school grant.

82. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you consider the establishment of an industrial school on this land would be a fulfilment of the trust under the grant?—I think our present mode of using the trust is certainly very much nearer to the terms of the trust; but I am not prepared to say it would be inconsistent.

83. *The Chairman.*] You used the expression "clamour" earlier in your evidence; you said you took a certain course in regard to the reletting of the properties in consequence of "clamour": clamour about what?—Clamour on the part of the tenants and other persons interested in the custom of the trust in the former case, because it was hoped that easier terms might be secured than those offered to the lessees; in the latter, because they hoped to gain some special benefit having in view the terms offered by the Native trustees.

84. *Mr. Harley.*] Do you remember attending a public meeting at Motueka in reference to the granting of the leases?—Yes.

85. What transpired?—An appeal was made to me, to the best of my recollection, to meet the tenants on these terms; and the tenants desired that our leases should not be formed on the model of the lease of Native reserves in certain respects. We called upon them to insure their buildings, and they considered that a hardship. We found, on inquiry, that the clause which appeared in relation to insurance in the ordinary form of Native-reserve lease was deleted in each individual case, and therefore we withdrew that clause. They further gave us to understand that they objected to our bailiff as an arbitrator, and to that objection we did not yield. In other respects they professed themselves on the whole fairly satisfied with our proposals.

86. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you understand that at present and for the future under those leases which have a currency of sixty-three years you have no claim on improvements?—No; but we have a claim on the unearned increment.

87. *The Chairman.*] Supposing the tenant does not pay the rent fixed by the valuer, and supposing no one else comes forward and pays valuation for improvements, they are left on the ground?—Yes.

88. *Mr. Quick.*] At the end of the sixty-three years the improvements fall back to the trustees?—That is so.

#### Examination of R. I. KINGSLEY continued.

*Witness:* I produce account showing the Rent Account from 1894 to December, 1904, at which time the arrears amounted to £54 11s. 9½d. That has to be added to the balance in hand, which is £168 5s. 1d., making a total of £222 16s. 10½d.

89. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are there any other debts to the trust?—Not that I am aware of.

90. Have you combined the Orphanage Account with the Trust Account as you submitted it yesterday?—No; it would take several days to do that.

91. Who are the trustees of the St. Andrew's Orphanage?—The Bishop, Mr. Mackenzie, and Mr. Kempthorne. They ask the trustees of Wakarewa whether they can receive children, and they pay for them on business lines. No advantage is shown to St Andrew's Orphanage children over those of strangers.

92. Is being Protestant children a qualification?—No.

93. What is the qualification for admission to St. Andrew's Orphanage?—There is no religious qualification. No inquiries are made as regards religion. I suppose if any request were made by guardians as regards religious training it would be entertained. It is a charitable institution, and reports to the Government in the ordinary way.

94. Are the Public Trustee and St. Andrew's Orphanage the only two bodies from whom you receive money?—Yes.

95. Are all the children admitted through St. Andrew's Orphanage?—No; there are two who have come direct to the institution from Wellington—from the Public Trustee on application to the Whakarewa trustees. The amount paid for salaries in 1903 was £181, exclusive of domestic servants, whose salaries are charged to the house accounts. The house accounts for the same year amounted to £450, which were disbursed on voucher by the manager. The other items of expenditure (making a total of £694) were £7 for the maintenance of a boy at the Hospital for Mental Diseases, petty cash £8 0s. 4d., £10 for church-seat rents, payment to Motueka Borough Council £1 14s. 1d., payment to the School Inspector £1 1s., £10 annual auditor's fee, and donation to the Church Building Fund £25. This £25 is charged as against the orphanage, and should have been charged against Land Revenue Account. The cost of the orphanage for the year ending the 30th June, 1904, amounted to £669 0s. 5d., less £464 9s. receipts, leaving £204 11s. 5d. as the net cost of the institution, which is its cost to the trust. During that time there were thirty-nine children at the commencement and forty-one at the end.

96. Is it your intention henceforth to keep your accounts in such a way as to amalgamate the expenses of the orphanage with the Trust Account?—We do it now to a certain extent.

97. But will you endeavour in future to keep the Orphanage Account and the Trust Account as one account?—I have been instructed to do so.

HARRY VINCENT GULLY examined.

*Witness* (to Mr. Harley): I am Secretary to the Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board. There are twelve from the Board at the Wakarewa Orphanage at present. They were sent through the trustees of St. Andrew's Orphanage.

98. Supposing you have some children you want to send to the orphanage, what takes place?—We hand them over to the St. Andrew's Orphanage trustees, and they send them where they like, unless the Board makes a special request to have them sent to any particular institution. We simply pay for them.

99. Did these twelve go there by the Board's direction?—Not in all cases; most were simply handed over to the St. Andrew's trustees.

100. Is the Board satisfied with their being sent there?—Yes, thoroughly.

101. Are you informed in any way of their being sent to the institution?—We are not informed; the arrangement is generally made with St. Andrew's Orphanage trustees, and the children are sent. The Board generally knows where the children are being placed.

102. How long has this arrangement been carried on?—For a number of years—for ten or twelve years at least.

103. Have you always had as many as twelve children there?—We commenced with a smaller number, and the number has increased; twelve is the greatest number we have had.

104. How long have you been Secretary?—For twenty years.

105. Has the treatment so far as you know been satisfactory at the Whakarewa Orphanage?—Yes.

106. Have you been to the institution yourself?—Yes, on one or two occasions I have been there unofficially.

107. Can you speak as to the fitness of the Manager and Matron for the positions they hold?—Yes; I went through the institution and saw the whole of the children and the arrangements, and everything appeared to be carried on in a very satisfactory manner. Both the Manager and Matron hold a very high reputation.

108. The Board has always been satisfied with the treatment the children get there?—Yes.

109. And they continue to send them?—Yes. On several occasions the Board has specially requested the St. Andrew's trustees to put their children at Whakarewa.

110. *The Chairman.*] What are the arrangements about payment?—Six shillings per week.

111. Irrespective of age?—Yes. That includes everything.

112. Is that the rate you pay everywhere?—Yes.

113. Do you send to other institutions besides?—No; there is no similar institution.

114. If you have Roman Catholic children what do you do with them?—We have had a few Catholic children boarded out in private families.

115. Are there any Maori children sent through St. Andrew's?—No.

116. Do you allow more if the children are put with private families?—We allow the same rate wherever the children are placed.

117. *Mr. Wardell.*] According to a list that has been put in there are only ten at Whakarewa from the Charitable Aid Board at present—you said twelve: which is correct?—That list is probably correct.

118. Eight are paid for at the rate of 5s. per week and two at 5s. 6d.?—We should pay the St. Andrew's trustees the same rate as they pay.

119. Then you do not pay 6s.?—Not for all.

120. On what principle do you pay different rates?—We pay on the arrangement that is made at the time with the St. Andrew's trustees.

121. Do you in any way look upon Whakarewa institution as connected with the St. Andrew's Orphanage?—Yes.

122. The Manager of St. Andrew's Orphanage and of Wakarewa are the same person?—Yes, Mr. Kempthorne.

123. And you look upon the two as connected?—As connected in a certain sense, because we have to apply to St. Andrew's Orphanage to get them admitted to Whakarewa.

124. Can you not get them admitted without their going through St. Andrew's?—We have never tried. We understood that was the regular course, and that has always been adopted.

125. The Grey Charitable Aid Board pays 6s. a week for their children : do you know of any principle upon which your children should go to Whakarewa at a cheaper rate than those from Grey ?—No ; but I understood that in some cases we were given more favourable terms because we were sending a larger number of children.

BLenheim, SATURDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1905.

*The Chairman :* Our business is to inquire into the past administration of the Bishop's school reserve at Whakarewa, and to hear, if it is considered deficient, any suggestions are regards the future. If there is any person who wishes to give information we are ready to hear it.

*Hapeta Rore Puke Kohatu :* I would ask the Commission to give us some information as to the evidence at Nelson, so that we may understand the position. We are the descendants of the people to whom the reserve belonged.

*The Chairman :* My recollection of the principal statement of the Natives at Nelson was that the Maoris ought to be received into the school free, and they complained that a small fee of £2 a year was the regulation price for those who were poor. The Maoris objected on principle to paying anything.

*Hapeta Rore Puke Kohatu :* Those who gave evidence at Nelson never had any rights in the reserve.

*Mr. Wardell :* You should distinctly understand that the Commission has nothing to do with saying who has a right to be there. Some Maoris thought the land had been taken from them and they could get it back. That is not our business ; our business is to see whether the trust has been carried out.

TAPATA HAREPETA examined.

*Witness :* I live at Spring Creek. When Bishop Selwyn came to Motueka he came to visit the Ngatiawa. I do not recollect the year, but it was before the establishment of Mr. Tudor's school. The Bishop asked Ngatiawa to send their children to school and to give a piece of land on which to place a school. Ngatiawa replied that they had no land to give : "Go to Ngatirarua, the people who have land, because these lands upon which we live belong to them." So Bishop Selwyn came to Ngatirarua, and asked them to give land for a school and to send their children, and to give land on which to grow food for the school. But the old people did not consent to this. But, owing to the persistency of the Bishop saying, "Give us the land for a school and send your children to school, and when this is no longer necessary I will return the land," the Maoris consented. When they handed it over they abandoned their houses and cultivations, and went elsewhere to live.

1. *The Chairman.]* Do you mean the Natives were living on some land, but the Government gave them some other land in place of it ?—No. They went to land of their own. They were lands reserved by the company for us.

2. *Mr. Wardell.]* Did they ever receive land in substitution for that given to the Bishop ?—No.

3. *The Chairman.]* The land you were occupying you consented to be given up for a school ?—Yes, on the word of the Bishop that when it was no longer required for a school it would be returned.

4. Who ever said that before now ?—When I was a lad our elders told me so. And I petitioned for the return of the land during the time Tairaroa was a member.

5. You say it was distinctly stated that if it ever happened it was not wanted for a school it was to be given back ?—Yes.

6. So far as I can see, it is quite irrelevant to our inquiry ; what we have to inquire into is whether, taking it for granted the trust continues, it is being properly administered, and, if not, in what respect, and to hear suggestions for the future administration of the trust ?—I thought the Commission had come here to inquire into the statements in the petitions which I sent to Parliament.

7. Are you desirous of showing that a school has not been carried on, or, that if it ever was carried on it has ceased to be carried on ?—When Mr. Baker's school ceased, Ramari Herewini, one of the owners of the land, informed the Bishop that the school had ceased, and she wanted the land returned ; that was when Bishop Suter bade farewell to Mr. Baker on his leaving the district.

8. Was that the woman who had to go to the Asylum because she was ill ?—Yes.

9. Have you not heard she was satisfied out of other lands ?—She received that land through other sources and other rights.

10. That is a matter we have no jurisdiction to go into ?—I thought you came to do that. I cannot say whether the Bishop has administered the trusts rightly or wrongly. All I can say is about the wrong that has been done in the land being taken away.

11. *Mr. Wardell.]* Do you mean the not carrying-on of a school is wrong ?—No ; the wrong was the non-fulfilment of the promise to return the land when the school ceased.

12. *The Chairman.]* Then the wrong is practically the school ceasing and not giving the land back ?—Yes.

13. *Mr. Wardell.]* How long a period elapsed during which no school was carried on there ?—The first school was established by Mr. Sutcliffe. Several years after that school ended another for adults was established which I attended, kept by Mr. Ronaldson. After I had been there three months the school was shifted to the church, and we were taught there. Mr. Baker carried it on for about ten years, and then the school ceased, I think in 1882, or before. At that time the Bishop discontinued the school. After that Mr. Baker gave a farewell meeting to the people, and the Bishop and Archdeacon Grace came to the meeting. The Bishop spoke and Ramari said, "Now the school has ceased give us back the land." The Bishop made no reply.

14. *The Chairman.]* Why do you say the school was closed when Mr. Baker went away ?—Mr. Baker told us the school had come to an end.

15. What did the Bishop say ?—I do not know.

16. Was it not said that something would be done in regard to education afterwards?—No.
17. Were you there?—No; my elders gave me the information.
18. It was not likely the Bishop would be there and not say something as to the future?—I was not told what he said.
19. *Mr. Wardell.*] If you can show us that the school ceased it is for you to do so?—All I can say is that Ramari told me Mr. Baker said his school had ceased.
20. Do you know whether any school has been carried on since then?—Yes, there is one. It was opened after I sent my petition. I mean the orphanage.
21. *The Chairman.*] Supposing a good school for Maoris were carried on there now, would that be an answer to your complaint?—No; that would not satisfy me; I want the land returned.
22. Supposing the school ceased to be carried on for a day, would that give the Maoris the right to have the land?—No; I would not have petitioned had it only ceased for a day.
23. Supposing the revenue from the land was not enough to carry on the school; supposing the rents and produce of the land would not pay the expenses, would that be an answer to your complaint?—I will answer in this way. After Baker's school ceased the Government put Maori schools in various districts where the Maoris lived. In fact, some of them were placed there before Mr. Baker's school ceased, and at the time the Nelson "tenth" were gone into at Nelson it was arranged we should give subsidies in aid of the support of these schools. Therefore, the school at Whakarewa became unnecessary, inasmuch as our children were attending the schools towards which we had been asked to contribute.
24. *Mr. Wardell.*] In what year did you petition the House?—The same year as Mr. Baker's farewell.
25. *The Chairman.*] It would be relevant for you to give facts that would establish that the trust was not being carried out; for instance, if you could establish that no attempt had been made to carry on the school when Mr. Baker went away?—I do not know anything against the trustees after Mr. Baker's time.
26. Did the Bishop not do anything with the money coming from the estate after Mr. Baker felt?—I do not know what he did.
27. You do not know of anything being done between 1881 and 1888?—No.
28. If it is established that some kind of work was being done after Mr. Baker went away, and then the orphanage was established, have you any complaint to make against the orphanage?—My complaint is that the revenues from Wakarewa go to the support of that institution.
29. But the orphanage is a school?—But it is a European school, not a Maori school.
30. They say it is for both?—My parents and ancestors did not give the land for the purpose of a school for Europeans or other races.
31. But the Queen did?—I do not know that.
32. It is in the grant?—That is the Bishop's grant, and I say it is a wrong grant.
33. You know the Queen made the grant to the Bishop for both races?—If the Bishop had made that clear to us we would not have given the land. We look at it in this way: land reserved for us and our descendants is being kept away for the benefit of Europeans.
34. But do you not know the grant was made for a school for both races?—It is the first time I have heard that. The grant does not accord with what was stated to the Bishop. Had they known it was for educating the children of all races the Natives would not have given the land.
35. As a matter of fact there are five Natives there?—Yes, but they are paying for their maintenance there.
36. There is nothing in the grant which implies free education?—We have nothing to do with the orphanage, nor do we wish to sanction it.
37. Do you contend that if it should continue it should be only for Maoris, and should be free?—We do not want it at all; we are satisfied by the Government schools. I object to the orphanage.
38. *Mr. Wardell.*] On what ground do you object to it?—Because of the words in the grant, "other races."
39. Do you object to it on the ground that it is exclusively for the use of orphans?—Yes, I object to the land being used for that purpose.
40. Do you wish to make any suggestions as to the manner in which the school is to be carried on in the future?—If the Commissioners could discuss my petition I would have something to say.
41. *Mr. Hutana.*] During Mr. Baker's time was there any trouble in connection with the school?—No.
42. The only trouble was the ceasing to carry it on?—Yes.
43. *Mr. Wardell.*] You disapprove of the admission of Europeans; if you had it entirely a Maori school would that suit you?—We already are served by two schools to which we contribute, and what is the use of our money going to support another school.
44. Would it not be a good thing if the revenue from the land were devoted to a school for higher education than these?—There should be such a school at Whitireia, parts of the rights to which belong to us.
45. Would not this be more convenient and closer to you?—It is further from us than Whitireia would be.
46. At the time you were at Baker's school, was it purely a Maori school?—Yes.
47. *Archdeacon Grace.*] In regard to the stopping of the school, you say it was stopped during Mr. Baker's time: were the Maoris always eager for the school to go on?—Yes, during Mr. Baker's time.
48. Did they never keep their children away when myself or Mr. Baker wrote and asked that they should be allowed to attend the school?—No, we never withheld our children during his time.
49. But were you not away in the Waikato, and therefore not in a position to know how the children were attending?—I went away while Mr. Baker was there, and when I came back he was still there. I did not know what was done while I was away.



50. You cannot say whether the Maoris made it difficult for us to get children or not?—No.
51. Were not the Maoris always speaking at that time about intending to leave Motueka for Tara-naki and down here?—No; I did not hear them.
52. Were they not continually leaving, and was not Motueka left pretty well without Maoris at that time, when Te Whiti was at his height?—It was before that they went.
53. Were they not leaving in the seventies while Mr. Baker was teaching?—Yes, that is so.
54. And from there being eighty Maoris or so in Motueka they were reduced to less than half that number?—I could not say how many there were.
55. Did they not take their children away when they left?—Yes, some of them.
56. When Mr. Baker's school broke up there were not more left than five or six?—I could not say.
57. Did you not hear the Bishop wanted to keep the school open, but could not because the Maoris withheld their children?—I do not know.

KEREI PUKE KOHATU examined.

*Witness*: I live at Motueka; I was there when Bishop Selwyn arrived. He first went to Ngatiawa and asked them for land on which to put a school and to grow food, and they replied they had no land, that the lands on which they lived belonged to Ngatirarua. So the Bishop went to Ngatirarua and asked them for land for a school and a residence for the teacher and to grow food, and he said if the school ceased he would return the land to the Maoris. The elders agreed, and gave the land on the word of the Bishop that it would be returned if not required for a school. They further added that the school was to be for Ngatirarua only—that they did not wish the children of other tribes or other people to come to the school.

58. *Mr. Quick.*] To whom do you want the land returned?—The Ngatirarua; I am one of the principal people of Ngatirarua.
59. *The Chairman.*] Do you recollect Mr. Tudor's school being commenced?—Yes.
60. Was that before this talk with the Bishop or after?—The talk with the Bishop was before the establishment of Mr. Tudor's school. Mr. Tudor's school was not on this land.
61. You mean he did not carry on a school off this land?—He was there—first a clergyman, and it was some time afterwards he put a school up.
62. *Mr. Quick.*] Why did he not put up a school on this land if the land had been given at the time?—There was no schoolhouse there; he used to hold school in the Maori churches.
63. Before the land was given?—This was before the land was given.
64. *The Chairman.*] Are you prepared to make any suggestions about carrying on the orphanage in a different way?—I can make no suggestions in regard to the orphanage; we have nothing to do with the Crown grant.
65. You will not take any interest in the school under the Crown grant?—The land was given by Ngatirarua for their own children only, not for other children.
66. Do you not know that Sir G. Grey gave the land for the children of both races?—This is the first time I have heard it. It was not the donors who made the Crown grant.
67. You say you do not take any interest in the school which is said to be under the grant?—That is why I asked for the return of the land.
68. You are not prepared to make suggestions as to future management?—I do not know what suggestion to make.
69. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any complaints to make of the way in which the trust has been carried out?—I object; and I want the land returned to us.
70. What do you object to?—I object because the school for children has ceased, and because the Bishop said when the school ceased the land would be returned to us.
71. *Mr. Quick.*] How long ago was that promise made?—I do not know; it was when the land was given.
72. How old are you?—Eighty.
73. *Mr. Wardell.*] Were you a man when the conversation took place with the Bishop?—Yes, I was grown up; I was not married.
74. *The Chairman.*] So far as I know there is nothing in writing showing this alleged transaction with the Bishop?—It was the Bishop's word, and we would not have anything on record.
75. *Mr. Wardell.*] Was the Governor present at the time or did he come afterwards?—He came when payment was made for Pakewa. I could not say whether that was before or after the conversation with the Bishop.
76. *The Chairman.*] Was this land not part of the land reserved as "tenths"?—Yes, that is so.
77. This was not Maori land but only a trust for the benefit of the Maoris?—This was their *papa-tupu*, and when the land was sold to the company this was reserved for them.
78. *Mr. Wardell.*] Are you satisfied or not with what the Bishop has done with the land, seeing the terms upon which it was given to him?—I do not know whether it is good, because our children have not been at school.
79. Why not?—The Bishop discontinued the school. It ceased in Mr. Baker's time.
80. How long did it cease to be carried on?—I do not know; a long time.
81. Do you know of any sufficient reason for its ceasing?—I do not know whether it was the Bishop who stopped it or Mr. Baker.
82. Did the Natives stop it by refusing to send their children there?—No, those young women over there were at the school.
83. Do you know whether when Mr. Baker stopped the school it had dwindled down to one child?—I do not know anything about it.
84. *Archdeacon Grace.*] Were you at Motueka when Mr. Baker's school ceased?—Yes.
85. If so, how is it you do not know the attendance had dwindled down to one, and therefore the trustees were not justified in paying a teacher for the one child?—I did not go and see what children attended the school.



## HAPETA RORE PUKE KOHATU examined.

*Witness*: I contend that the trust is being broken by the school ceasing. Whether Sir G. Grey bought the land from the Natives I am not aware, but it was reserved for them by the company, and is inalienable. The Crown grant was made contrary to the wishes of the Natives who gave the land. I have here a map showing the reserves made inalienable for the Maoris.

86. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you find any fault with the administration of the reserve at present?—I have never gone into that question as to whether the money was rightly or wrongly used.

87. *Mr. Quick.*] If you were a trustee, what would you do to make the best of the thing? Could the present scheme be improved upon?—I do not know of any scheme, because we, the heirs, have got a school now at Wairau and a similar reserve. And not only that, but we are interested in Whiti-reia and we would go there; whereas if we suggested a better way to educate our children it would take £300 or £400 to educate them. There is a big portion now kept back by the Public Trustee out of the “tenths”; they are only paying us a third, the other two-thirds go for schools and hospitals, &c., and we are entirely destitute of land, and this is the only land we have to depend upon. It takes a great many of us all our time to make both ends meet.

88. Do you make any complaint as to violation of the trust on the part of the trustees in respect to the management of the school?—Not that I am aware of. Only that the school is closed and the Bishop said the land was to be returned. The school was closed when Mr. Baker left.

89. What about the present institution?—We do not recognise that as properly being in the trust at all, because it was ceded by our forefathers for Natives only.

90. You recognise that a portion of the land not included in the “tenths” was included in the grant to the Bishop?—Yes.

91. You say that does not show there was any intention to include Europeans?—No.

92. Apart from the question of the admission or predominance of the Europeans, do you object to the character of the institution being for poor orphans?—Yes, I do object.

93. Supposing it is carried on as it is now, to whom ought it to be open remembering that a portion of the land was not Native land?—The orphanage was only formed after the petition for the land to be given back, to try and make the trust good again, and I contend it has not made it good. It was only started to frustrate the petition.

94. I do not see how the Maoris are to complain if they do not send their children; you cannot carry on a school with only one child?—That was no reason for closing the school. There was enough land to keep one child. If they kept on they kept the trust good; there were funds from the reserve to maintain the school.

95. *Mr. Wardell.*] We were told the Natives withdrew the children?—Probably there were no children there.

96. In 1879 Mr. Baker said before a Royal Commission that he felt that the Natives were withdrawing their children, being dissatisfied with the land having been given to the school and believing that if the school ceased they would be entitled to get the land back: have you ever heard that?—I never heard that before. Many of the Ngatiawas went away to Parihaka with their children.

97. Do you know of any children who would go to Motueka if there was a school there—a boarding-school?—I do not know of any at present.

98. *Mr. Quick.*] How many Native children are there about there?—Twenty or so; they go to the Government schools.

99. Do you understand that the moneys charged against the “tenths” for Maori schools are paid to the Government Native School Fund?—Yes.

100. *Archdeacon Grace.*] Do you think it would have been wiser to spend the necessary £200 or £300 a year in salaries to teach one child for several years than to allow such payments to accumulate till a better state of things could be set on foot? Would you have made a complaint if we had done that?—I would not say it was wise; but it would have kept up the trust. The Bishop might have made provision for the single child elsewhere. In order not to break the trust, some provision should have been made for that child.

## THOMAS SAMUEL GRACE, Archbishop of Marlborough, examined.

101. *The Chairman.*] When did you first become cognisant of the trust, and what has been done under it?—I first became acquainted with it in 1869, and I should like to make a statement of my connection with it and its working. I became connected with it as a student at the Bishopdale College from July, 1869. Having a knowledge of Maori I was asked to look after the Maoris a good deal. I visited them at Motueka and at Whakapuaka where there were very considerable settlements; at the latter place there were about one hundred Maoris, and at Motueka between eighty and one hundred. Mr. Tudor had, just prior to my visiting Whakarewa, left the district to take up work at Picton, and Mr. Ronaldson had filled the vacancy, being the resident Maori missionary. There may have been an interim, but he was always spoken of as the successor to Mr. Tudor so far as missionary work was concerned. In 1872 Mr. Baker was appointed. Mr. and Mrs. Baker had great difficulty in keeping up the numbers of the children, because the Natives were very indifferent about sending them to school, and in many instances they positively refused to send them. They would have quarrels—the Ngatiawas and Ngatiraruas—and would say, “I will not send my children because those other people have no right to the school,” and it often fell to my lot to try and settle the difficulty. If they were told once they were told dozens of times that the school was for the mixed population, and that if they did not avail themselves of their privileges in regard to it it would revert to the white people; because we told them the white people would not be slow to take advantage of the school if the Natives made no use of it. Notwithstanding this they were perverse, and again and again I made efforts to get them to send children

from Whakapuaka, but they would not send them, so we founded an independent school at Whakapuaka between 1873 and 1875, and built a church beside it. This went on for a long time. Then Mr. Mackay assisted us with funds, but afterwards the school lapsed through all the Maoris clearing out. The school at Whakapuaka ceased in 1880 or 1881. We discovered the reason to be that the Maoris were very unsettled through the influence of Te Whiti. The Motueka Natives were very much affected by the spread of Te Whiti-ism, and were going away to Taranaki. He was telling them that the land was all going back to the Maoris—that they had only to wait and be good, and all their land would come back to them. When we spoke to them about the school the expression they used was, “For whom is that school?” The trustees therefore could only do the next best thing; the Maoris positively refused to come, and the children we had had grown out of school age. Wi Parata, Hemi Matenga’s brother, was the chief mover in this matter; he used to come over from the other Island and harangue the Maoris, and tell them they were to have nothing to do with the school and that they should cut themselves off from the pakeha. At the time Mr. Baker resigned, the school had dwindled down to nothing; and, as the Maoris refused to send their children, it was deemed advisable by Bishop Suter, the sole trustee, to allow the funds to accumulate and build the institution at Wakarewa. There was a building there, but it was in bad repair and was not large enough, as we knew as soon as it was thrown open to the white people there would be no difficulty in filling it. But he thought we should still help the Maoris, and he offered to apprentice some to carpenters and blacksmiths. But the Maoris would not avail themselves of this either, and would neither send their children to school nor to be taught trades. There was nothing to be done with them. They said Bishop Suter had closed the school. We maintained that we had done no such thing; the Maoris had closed the school by their obstinate and perverse action. Now they come and say, “You closed the school.” We maintain that it was impossible to carry on the school, because there were no children going to it. The consequence was we entered on a new departure and availed ourselves of the other clause in the deed, which threw it open to European children and the children of poor people. Now the Maoris say, “We are not going to have anything to do with a poor people’s school; we are above that; we do not recognise it; the land is ours; we are the proprietors and should have free admittance.” We say they have admittance; there is nothing to prevent a small charge being made, especially as the funds of the trust are not sufficient to carry the school on on a large and extensive scale. In regard to the charges made for Maoris who have been recently seeking admission, it is true I saw the two trustees in Nelson in regard to that, and I think I remember saying something to one Maori that if possible they should go in for nothing; but there is nothing to compel us to admit them free. I said, “You have thrown away your opportunities and privileges, and did not avail yourselves of them; the trustees kept the school open for years and years solely for you, and you stood in the way of the prosperity of the whole affair.” I think the Commission should understand the trustees had the Maoris very much at heart, and up to the time of the orphanage it was held for them, and perhaps the trustees were not really carrying out the terms of the trust in taking such a lenient view in wishing the Maoris to have the first benefit from the moneys accruing from the land. I wish the Commission to understand that the Maoris are to blame for the present position so far as they are concerned.

102. *Mr. Quick.*] During the interregnum between the school being closed and opened, what measures did Bishop Suter take to establish apprenticeships?—He endeavoured to apprentice Maori youths and pay tradesmen for instructing them in a trade.

103. *Mr. Wardell.*] That is the effort referred to by Matenga in his evidence?—Yes.

104. *Mr. Quick.*] You attribute the action of the Maoris partly to Te Whiti-ism?—Yes; to the unsettled state of their minds in regard to where they should live and to Te Whiti’s influence over them. And that is the case not only in regard to this, but other trusts.

105. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you ever give the Maoris to understand that the school is open if they like to send their children there?—Yes; not very long ago we were endeavouring at the Spring Creek kainga to establish a system by which the Natives should contribute towards the work of the ministry, and they raked up this question of the Whakarewa trust and would not contribute.

106. We have heard something about a meeting at the time of the breaking-up of Mr. Baker’s school: were you present at that?—Yes.

107. Will you give us your version of what occurred?—The occasion was Mr. Baker’s leaving the school, and it was a farewell to the Maoris and children he had been teaching; and, naturally, the question of what was to be done next came up, as Mr. Baker was announcing the closing of the school. When it was asked what was to be done next, the Bishop, in the course of the proceedings, made a speech and said how sorry he was that the school had to be closed, and he clearly pointed out it was because the Maoris did not allow their children to come to school. Another speech was the one made by Ramari to the effect that the school being closed the land should go back to the Maoris.

108. When do you say teaching was resumed after this closing?—I left Nelson in 1881, and was not in actual contact with the work after that, and I am unable to say how many years elapsed. I think it was somewhere about 1887 or 1888.

109. *Mr. Quick.*] And in the meantime the trustees erected new buildings?—Yes.

110. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you know anything of the five years’ interval between Mr. Tudor’s school ceasing and Mr. Harris’s beginning?—No.

111. Or of the five years’ interval between Harris’s ceasing and Mr. Ronaldson’s arrival?—No.

112. But there were those two intervals of five years?—Yes; I suppose so.

113. *The Chairman.*] So far as you know the money was unexpended during those two periods?—Yes; it was accumulating.

114. *Mr. Wardell.*] As one of the trustees, seeing your income is approximately £400 a year, and seeing we are informed by your cotrustees that the cost of the maintenance of each child, including teaching and maintenance, is approximately 8s. a week or £20 a year, and seeing the great majority

of the children are being paid for in sums varying from 5s. to 7s. a week, do you not consider there is a field for free scholars, a large margin on which you might maintain from ten to fifteen?—If the 8s. a week includes salaries and all-round maintenance, and other expenses of the estate, there ought to be a margin to enable scholarships to be founded.

115. If that is so, do you not think the "free seats" should be first filled?—I think they should be.

116. And in regard to the Maoris, being specially interested, do you consider a certain number of "reserved seats" should be for them?—I certainly think that was the effort of the trustees up to breaking-point, which was the absolute disregard the Maoris interested had for the institution. I am further of opinion that had they shown any desire to make use of the school that would have been the position of affairs with them still. They would have been admitted free, as they were while the whole money was being expended on them. It might be well, perhaps, to give them another trial.

117. *Mr. Quick.*] The trustees would welcome a return of interest on the part of the Maoris?—I am sure they would.

118. And be glad to give them another chance?—Yes.

119. Would your influence be sufficient to induce them to try and take advantage of it?—I think if the Maoris were to understand that the land is not going back to them possibly we might bring them to reason.

120. *Mr. Wardell.*] Speaking approximately, out of 1,178 acres Mr. Mackay said there were 900 acres of Native reserves and the balance was Crown land: do you see any difficulty, other than a financial one, in the teaching of certain trades, say, carpentering, in connection with field-work, in the institution?—I see no difficulty in an elementary sort of way, but to make real tradesmen would mean the engagement of qualified teachers. But in a school of this kind, situated near a village, it would be feasible.

121. Would it not be possible to have a qualified man to come, say, two days a week to give instruction?—I do not think that would be the right way to do it. That would imply expenditure in plant. I would suggest that the youth should go into the village and learn from a qualified man, and return in the evening, paying a small premium.

122. You see no reason why that should not be done?—No reason whatever.

123. Bishop Mules in the course of his evidence, when a question was put to him in regard to the free admission of Natives, said he felt it would be necessary to consult with his cotrustees on the subject?—I think it would be the wish of the trustees. But the Maoris should understand that white people have a right to the use of the school, and perhaps that would make them appreciate their privileges better than they have done in the past.

124. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think it would have the effect of making it more attractive to the Maoris if a Maori were put on the trust?—I think it would be a very good thing; and when the trustees were being appointed that was a question, and the Bishop asked me about Matenga going on. I think the Bishop communicated with him on the subject, and he did not care to go on. It would, I think, be well to have a real descendant of the Ngatirarua Tribe—Te Rore Pukekohatu, for instance—who would be able to communicate to the Maoris generally the state of things. I should be desirous to admit such a trustee.

125. *Mr. Wardell.*] Speaking without any intention of offence to the cloth, do you think as a rule clergymen are good business men to have the management of an estate?—Well, we are told we are not.

126. Do you think such a trust would be better in the hands of a business layman?—I think those who have not been brought up to account-keeping cannot be the best trustees, and I should say a good business layman would be a desirable acquisition to the trust provided he was a Church of England member.

127. *Mr. Quick.*] The Synod admits of there being five trustees: do you think it would be advantageous to increase the number of trustees?—The Bishop suggested the present trustees, and Mr. Kempthorne and myself fell in with his wish. Before that the Bishop (Suter) was sole trustee.

128. *Rore Puke Kohatu.*] It is stated that during Mr. Baker's time the children ceased to attend, and so the school was wound up: can you give us the names of those children?—Not at this remote period.

129. Can you remember the children who were of school age at that time?—No; I was not living at Motueka at that time. My visits were only occasional.

130. Was it not that the Ngatirarua had no children; not that they did not allow them to attend?—The children were there, running about the kaingas; and as we had no Act or truant officer to assist us they simply would have their own way. When I visited Parihaka about that time, where Te Whiti was, I saw numbers of Motueka children there. The parents had migrated with their children, and their inclinations being with Te Whiti, they did not want to send their children to school.

131. Do you not know that the people who went about in this nomadic way were Ngatiawa?—Yes.

132. Do you not know that during this time five Ngatirarua were attending the school?—Yes; those were the children Mr. Baker had.

133. Are you not aware that it was because they grew up beyond school age that they left?—Yes; but I say that if the attitude of the Ngatirarua towards the Ngatiawa had been a little more friendly the latter would not have been so ready to go away to another part of New Zealand.

134. *The Chairman.*] Do you know of your own knowledge, from the parent's communication, that the Maoris refused to send their children?—Yes.

135. And that was the main cause of the closing of the school?—Yes.

136. Do you know that the reason they would not send their children was that they thought it would put them in the position of getting the land back for themselves?—No; but they spoke in a

disparaging way—"We have nothing to do with that school. For whom is that school?" Whether they had behind that a desire to break up the thing and get the land back I am not prepared to say; but it looked rather like it, especially when they were being urged on by these communications from Te Whiti that their land was going back to them and the Europeans were going to be driven into the sea.

137. *Mr. Wardell.*] Mr. Baker said they had taken a personal dislike to himself: is that so?—I think it was very modest of Mr. Baker to say so; I know Mrs. Baker was most beloved by them.

138. *Rore Puke Kohatu.*] Do you know that the last child there was at the school was a Ngatirarua child—the last Ngatirarua child of school age?—I cannot tell you. The condition of affairs was owing to the fact that the Ngatirarau had migrated down here.

139. *Tuiti Makitanara.*] It has been disclosed that there were 900 acres given by the Maoris, and if it could be shown that a greater benefit would accrue to the donors by putting the land to other purposes than a school, what do you say about that?—I can express no opinion; it is a school trust. If there was a balance after providing for a school, I should say good use could be made of it; but I do not see any possibility of that, because if the Maoris are going to make use of their opportunity and use the trust it will not be confined to the Ngatiraruas; it is for Maoris from any part of New Zealand, and Maoris would take the opportunity of sending their children to a place like this, and every shilling of the trust would be utilised.

140. *Rore Puke Kohatu.*] If it is found that the land belongs to Ngatirarua, and a certain amount of money is accruing from the 900 acres; if there is a balance after providing for the school, would it not be better for the Natives who are entitled to these reserves to receive the balance?—We have no power to do anything of the kind; the trust would have to be altered.

WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1905.

HENARE PARATA examined.

*Witness:* I live at Papawai. I have held the position of Chairman of the Papawai Government Native School for fourteen years. I am also Chairman of the Native Committee in connection with the Clareville College and have held that position for three years. The institution is on land bought from funds given to the Bishop by Mr. Harrington with instructions to purchase a site for a school. The present position is that there are eight children of Wairarapa district attending the school, and some are half Ngatitua; they are all male children and all boarders, and the revenue derivable from Papawai and Kaikokirikiri is being devoted to the maintenance of those children. The Bishop also proposes to apply the money from Whitireia in support of the children from the West Coast at that school. The present Bishop last visited Papawai in 1898; he assembled the Natives there and said he wished to ascertain their wishes in regard to the reserve. He informed us the accumulated funds derived from the Kaikokirikiri trusts had amounted to £4,700.

1. *The Chairman.*] Were the Natives from Masterton there?—Some of them were. He also told us the interest from the money was between £400 and £500 a year.

2. Did that include rents?—No it did not. The Bishop did not explain to us whether it did or not. The first trustees of Papawai and Kaikokirikiri did not administer the trust properly. The first trustees leased Papawai (400 acres) to a person called Varnham for twenty-one years at a rental of £70. After the expiration of the first term they renewed it for twenty-one years at a rent of £100. Varnham sublet to other tenants at £1 per acre.

3. *Mr. Quick.*] How can you prove that?—They are still living; some of them paid £1 an acre rent. This shows that instead of the trustees getting the full benefit of the rents the middleman got them.

4. When were the leases granted?—About ten or twelve years ago.

5. After Varnham had put improvements on the place?—He did not spend a penny on the place; the improvements were made by the people he sublet to.

6. Were the houses put up by the subtenants?—No. The fences were put up by the subtenants.

7. How long did Varnham have the property?—He was not the person who made the improvements. The person who did most of the improvements was Fuller. I make this statement to show that the benefit of the land, instead of coming to the trustees came to Varnham. Varnham's lease expired last year, and tenders were called for the lease at my request in consequence of what I had seen that the profits went to a middleman, but I cannot tell you what price they got.

8. *The Chairman.*] Is what you are telling us a reason for putting an end to the trust or carrying it on?—I do not want the trust put an end to. I want to show that the large amount of revenue being obtained should be applied to make Clareville a larger institution. The revenue obtainable from Kaikokirikiri and Papawai is sufficient to support more children at Clareville.

9. *Mr. Quick.*] The only thing is to get them to go to Clareville?—I will tell you why they will not send their children there. I may say roughly there is over £350 coming from Papawai rents, and if Kaikokirikiri was leased in some way by public tender I think it would bring £2 or £2 10s. an acre. Then there is 100 acres at Clareville which Compton told me was let at £1 2s. an acre. These sums added together would make over £600.

10. *The Chairman.*] And instead of there being eight children at Clareville there might be twenty?—Yes. If the Bishop was right in saying that the interest on the accumulated funds of Papawai and Kaikokirikiri was £400 or £500, it would make over £1,000 revenue.

11. Do you not know that the rate of interest is only 5 per cent.?—Prior to the Government bringing it down they used to get 8 per cent. and 10 per cent. And if they were receiving £1,000 a year that would support twenty-five or thirty children.

12. You wish to say the whole revenue ought to be expended in supporting as many children at Clareville as can be supported?—Yes. I will tell you why the parents will not send their children there. It is because they are asked to do outside work, such as digging and other work about the farm, which they think it is not proper for them to do. The things the Maori parents want to have their children taught are English and technical training, such as shoemaking, carpentry, engineering, and other trades. They are taught two trades, and classes are held on Thursday for carpentry and shoemaking. A carpenter is paid £30 a year, and he comes the whole of Thursday, and an instructor in shoemaking gives half a day every Thursday, and he gets £12 a year.

13. Is any payment made for any of the boys at the school?—No, they are quite free; their parents clothe them, and the college finds bedding.

14. Are the parents of the children some of them well off?—No; if they had money they would send their children to Wellington. They are not very well off.

15. *Mr. Wardell.*] You want them taught trades instead of being taught farm-work?—Yes. They can learn milking and so on at home.

16. *The Chairman.*] If a boy were kept at that school seven years attending the carpentry class, could he earn his 12s. a day at the trade?—Yes, I think so. Perhaps he might not be an expert carpenter without further training.

17. *Mr. Quick.*] You say there is some idea of letting the farm land?—They are going to lease 100 acres.

18. Do the Maoris object to their children milking the cows and drinking the milk? Do they want others to milk for them?—Yes.

19. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you mean to say they would object to them milking cows if they were taught trades also?—Speaking for myself, I would not object; my boy goes there.

20. Would others object?—Yes; one spoke to me about it the other day.

21. But there is a difference between farm-work occupying all their attention when not in school and being merely an incidental matter in connection with a certain amount of necessary work while they are being taught trades?—I have no objection myself, but the majority of the people do object.

22. If the boys are being taught for nothing, and their parents are not called upon for their support, do they want servants too?—I think there ought to be a certain amount of attendance on them; they contribute the money inasmuch as their ancestors gave the land.

23. *The Chairman.*] If you reduce the expense of the maintenance of eight children you may be able to take four more, and you would do that if the boys contribute some labour?—That is so, of course.

24. Would there be anything degrading or wrong in that?—There might not be so much objection to milking the cows, but they object to digging and making fences.

25. *Mr. Wardell.*] Do you see any objection to the school being for both races, and the money of the trust going for the education of both races?—I would not agree to that. I understood the reserves were given for Maoris only. If the rents come to £1,000 and the Europeans were to add another £1,000 I would not object then.

26. Do you know that the grants under which the trustees hold the land say it is for the children of both races?—I did not know that.

27. *Mr. Quick.*] Can you tell us why children do not come from Kaikokirikiri to Clareville?—I have heard it said they want the land given back. If they sent their children it would be an admission that they wanted a school.

28. *Mr. Hutana.*] But they have said they want a school put there?—The reserve by itself would not support a school.

29. *Mr. Wardell.*] What is your view about the education of Native girls in the Wairarapa?—I think they ought to be educated.

30. Are they being educated anywhere except at the Government schools?—Only at the Government schools.

31. *Mr. Quick.*] Do any go to Hukarere?—Some do.

32. *Mr. Wardell.*] Can you tell us whether the Kuratawhiti reserve is the same as Papawai?—No, it is not. I wish to say that what the Wairarapa Natives wish is that farm-work should be stopped and the school increased so as to accommodate from twenty-five to thirty children.

33. *Mr. Quick.*] Do you think there is a chance of them getting over the prejudice against farm-work?—I think not; they object to it very much. I think their objection is unreasonable; I do not object as far as my boy is concerned.

34. *Mr. Hutana.*] The children you would like to see at the school are those from Government schools?—Yes; those who have passed the Fourth Standard. I consider Clareville a most suitable and healthy site for a school.

35. *Mr. Wardell.*] Have you any scheme for the education of girls as well as boys?—I should like to see an institution established to teach girls nursing and cooking and suitable occupations of that kind. Wairarapa specially requires something of that kind. The Maoris have given land to the Government for nothing, and the Government might do something in this way.

36. Would you rather see the whole amount of the revenue spent for boys, or half on boys and half on girls?—I would like both to have a share if a building could be erected for the girls.

37. *Mr. Chapman.*] You say there is an income of about £1,000. Supposing it is, say, £800; you would divide it into two parts—one for boys and the other for girls?—Yes, and apply to the Government for a subsidy.

38. Four hundred pounds would not keep up a school?—No.

39. *The Chairman.*] Have you anything to say about the West Coast Natives coming to your school?—If they like to, I should be very pleased to see them come; some are there now; there is one from Porirua and one from Taranaki.

40. *Mr. Wardell.*] We were told at Otaki that there are no Ngatitooa at Clareville, but some children of Ngatitooa mothers and Ngatikahungunu fathers?—That is so.

WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1905.

*Mr. Stafford*: I submit the following argument in support of the scheme submitted to the Commissioners by Natives for the future administration of the Porirua and Otaki School trust properties and funds:—

1. Porirua is not a suitable place for a school or college, nor would the funds of the trust be sufficient to establish and maintain a suitable school or college there.

In the eighth paragraph of the statement of claim in the action in the Supreme Court, No. 6417, *Wallis and others v. the Solicitor General*, it is stated: "It has been the earnest desire of the said Bishop of New Zealand and of the trustees for the time being of the said land to literally carry out the trusts of the said Crown grant. He expended money on the land for the purpose of improving it and rendering it fit for occupation and reproductive. The land has been let and the rents have been invested, but though the accumulated sum now in the hands of the trustees or represented by investments which they hold amounts to £6,480 and upwards, or thereabouts, they, the trustees, have not been able to carry out the trusts: First, because the funds have never been sufficient to permit of their erecting the necessary school buildings at Porirua and at the same time allow them to keep a sufficient sum in hand to produce by investment such an income as would with the rents be adequate for the purpose of paying a staff of teachers, supplying the cost of maintaining a school, and of giving education to children as originally contemplated. Secondly, and more particularly, because the juvenile Maori population of Porirua has almost ceased to exist, and the trustees have deemed that the trusts of the Crown grant could not be properly performed unless the children of the Maori race were awarded at least an equal consideration with the children of Europeans."

In the fifth paragraph of Archdeacon Fancourt's affidavit, he says, "The said land has become an unsuitable place for a school. There are too few persons inhabiting the district to make it advisable to build a day-school there, and it is not a desirable site for a boarding-school, as it is not conveniently near to a settlement where supplies could be obtained. Moreover, the Native population in the neighbourhood have almost ceased to exist. I am informed and believe that the Ngatitōa Tribe, who were once most numerous on the west coast of this Island in and near the Porirua district, have about twenty years ago been reduced to about forty Natives, and these were scattered throughout the North Island of New Zealand." See the report of this case in 19 N.Z.L.R. 214. See also same case before Court of Appeal, 19 N.Z.L.R. 665. The Court of Appeal's judgment was reversed by Privy Council A.C. (1903) 173.

His Honour the late Chief Justice declined to give effect to either the scheme put forward by the Bishop or that put forward by the Solicitor-General.

An amended scheme was in 1900 submitted by the Bishop to the Supreme Court (Stout, C. J., and Edwards, J.). Stout, C. J., in delivering judgment, said, at page 226: "The evidence is conclusive that it would be a waste of the trust-moneys to erect a school on the reserve, and if such a school were started then it would fail to fulfil the purposes of the trust. The scheme proposed seems to us to go beyond what is necessary in utilising the trust. It practically proposes to absorb the trust-moneys to support a similar institution in the Wairarapa. The trust may be carried out without allowing this absorption. If the scheme were so amended as to provide (a) for the maintenance of such a number of scholars in the Wairarapa as the rentals and income would permit, a fair sum being charged for maintenance and education; (b) that preference should be given to children, belonging to the Ngatitōa Tribe, failing them, preference to children of the West Coast tribes; (c) that the proposed system of education as appears in the original trust; (d) that no youth be refused a scholarship on the ground of religious belief, no religious test whatever being applied to the applicants—the Court would be prepared to approve of it. It was urged by counsel for the Solicitor-General that the Government intended to introduce into Parliament a measure dealing with this and similar trusts. The Court is aware that there are several trusts similar to this one, and held by various Church organizations. The approval of such a scheme as is here suggested cannot in any way hamper either the Government or the Parliament in dealing with this trust or the trusts referred to."

A decree was afterwards drawn up and sealed in accordance with this judgment.

It will be noted that the Solicitor-General did not put forward any counter-scheme to the amended scheme put forward by the Bishop, nor were the Natives, who were the donors of the land, or their descendants, whose claim would at least be superior to that of the Crown, represented directly or indirectly in these proceedings. See judgment of Privy Council, A.C. (1903) 187. When the case went to our Court of Appeal, the appeal was not against the scheme but on the following grounds (see A.C. (1903) 183):—(1.) That the funds and lands have reverted to the Crown either absolutely or as trustees upon a failure of the objects and purposes of the Crown grant, and are not subject to administration by or under the direction of the Court *cy-près*. (2.) That no general charitable purpose existed or is proved either in the Native donors or the Crown, but only a purpose of creating a specific school at a specified site, and the funds and lands are therefore not subject to administration by or under the direction of the Court *cy-près*.

A motion was filed in the Court of Appeal on behalf of the appellant, the Solicitor-General, for leave to file and read certain affidavits. Affidavits were filed in support of the motion to the effect that it had been very difficult to obtain information when the case was before the Supreme Court, so as to place the position fully before the Supreme Court; that the solicitor acting for the Solicitor-General had only become aware of certain matters connected with the action after the decree had been made in the Supreme Court; that he had been made aware of these matters by Mr. W. H. Field, M.H.R. for the Otaki District, to whom the Natives in that district complained as soon as they became aware of the effect of the decree which had been made, and that until the decree had been actually made these Natives had not understood that it was proposed to devote the trust funds to the maintenance of

scholars at a school in the Wairarapa district. The substance of the new evidence proposed to be adduced was that the land near Porirua in question in the action had not been ceded to the Crown by members of the Ngatitōa Tribe only, but by members of three kindred tribes—viz., the Ngatitōa, the Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa; that these tribes had intermarried, and that, although it could not be said that there were many Natives who could be singled out as being purely the descendants of any one of such three tribes, there were in the neighbourhood of Porirua, Waikanae, Otaki, Ohau, and in the Hutt district many hundreds of Natives who were descendants from an assimilation of the said three tribes, and that there were no members of the said three tribes in the Wairarapa district; and that the Natives in that district belonged to the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, which had been at enmity with the said three tribes; and that the Natives on the West Coast were much more numerous than those in the Wairarapa, but in much poorer circumstances; that the Natives on the West Coast strongly objected to a diversion of the funds to the Wairarapa district, which they alleged would practically deprive them of the benefit of the trust, notwithstanding the preference proposed to be given them by the decree, and that the land, the subject of the trust, was much more valuable than had been made to appear in the Supreme Court and more capable of supporting a separate school on the West Coast.

The Bishop's counsel opposed the adducing of the above evidence, notwithstanding that the Natives had never before had their side of the question represented to the Court. The sole object of the action brought by the Bishop was to have the trusts carried out *cy-près* (i.e., as nearly as possible in the manner originally intended), and one would have thought that the trustees before they approached the Court would have endeavoured to find out what the Natives desired, and placed before the Court for its information the result of such inquiries.

The Court without hesitation granted the motion, and the affidavits were filed. But the Court of Appeal did not consider it necessary to go into the merits of the scheme as shown by such affidavits, the Court deciding that the land and funds had reverted to the Crown. This judgment was reversed by the Privy Council, but that tribunal did not deal with the merits of the scheme.

It is plain, therefore, that the Natives' views on the scheme have never been discussed and dealt with by any Court, and if the facts set out in the affidavits filed in the Court of Appeal had been before the Supreme Court, the scheme sanctioned by that Court would most probably not have been so sanctioned.

Any attempt to appropriate any part of the Otaki property or funds to maintain a college or school on the Porirua property would be bitterly opposed by nearly the whole of the West Coast Natives.

It might meet with the approval of the few Ngatitōas who reside at Porirua, but all the Ngatiraukawas in and about Otaki (and they are the great majority of the West Coast Natives) would disapprove.

Why should the great majority of the Natives be obliged to send their children to board at the Porirua school? The Natives of the West Coast are generally in poor circumstances, their children are of great assistance to them out of school hours in milking, feeding pigs, digging up the land to plant potatoes, &c., and other similar purposes, and, if the children were boarded at Porirua, their parents would be deprived of this assistance, and, as a result, the bulk of the Otaki children would not go to the Porirua school. Why should the property and funds of the Otaki trust, which was the gift of the Ngatiraukawas, be used out of their district? All these funds are wanted to maintain the school at Otaki, and without these funds the Otaki school cannot continue, or if it does, will confer no good on the Natives. The Natives not only want the boys to be educated but the girls also. The Porirua school would therefore have to provide for the boarding of girls, this would involve a great increase in the cost of maintenance, which would be largely diminished if the school was at Otaki.

If it had of necessity to be a choice between the Clareville School and maintaining a school at Porirua, then, of the two evils, the Natives would choose Porirua. Nevertheless, the Natives do not think circumstances require any such choice to be made; the bulk of the Native population is in or about Otaki, and that is where the school ought to be.

*Archdeacon S. Williams's views.*—He approves of the amalgamation of the two trusts. He utterly condemns the Wairarapa scheme. He sees no difficulty or objection to a day and boarding school at Otaki. As to using income, &c., from Otaki property in maintaining school at Porirua, he thinks it harsh to do this unless Natives concur. Thinks they should be educated to it. It is a question that the people should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon. Is certain that nothing will induce the West Coast Natives to send their children to Wairarapa school.

2. *Otaki* is a suitable place. It is the centre of a large Native population; the climate is excellent; there is situated the granted land, which is ample; a school has existed there for the last fifty years; there is easy railway means of getting there; sea-bathing can be got; the trusts of the Porirua grant and the Otaki grants are identical; the Church mission school is a failure, and neither the public schools, the Government Native schools, nor the schools of denominations are sufficiently used by the Native children, while if a school was established such as is suggested by the scheme, it would secure the attendance either as day-scholars or boarders of nearly all of the Native children resident between Porirua and the Rangitikei River. Moreover, the Natives themselves desire that the school shall be at Otaki.

The Native donors of the Porirua land were partly Ngatiraukawas and partly Ngatitōa. Te Rauparaha, his son Tamihana to Rauparaha, and Hoani to Okoro, were Ngatiraukawas. Matene te Whiwhi was partly Ngatiraukawa and partly Ngatitōa. Heni te Whiwhi, one of the principal witnesses before the Commission, is Matene te Whiwhi's daughter. There is no contention that all the Native donors of the Otaki land were not Ngatiraukawas. The principal settlement of the Ngatiraukawas was at Otaki.

3. The Natives entirely object to the funds being devoted to the Clareville school, Wairarapa. They were not consulted when the scheme was placed before the Supreme Court. They say they will not send their children there, and at most only a few might go there. They say it is absurd to ask them to send their children to such a school, when their urgent want is a school established in their



midst which would give their children the necessary education. They say they do not want higher education for a few, but education for the many boys and girls alike, similar to that given in the public schools, and they want their children to receive technical instruction as defined by section 16 of "The Education Act, 1904." They want their children to be capable of earning their living by means of a trade. They say that when the Otaki school was at its best, it boarded 150 boys and 50 girls, and they say that by applying the Porirua trust funds in aid of the Otaki school, the same or a better result will be obtained, and a better education given them than can be obtained in either the public or Native Government schools, and that the children can be taught trades. But they say, to do this, no Church ought to have the management, because Natives will not send their children to the school if it is under the control of any denomination different from their own, discord will arise, and the school will be a failure; further, the Church for many years in its past administration of the school at Otaki has not been a success, and Church management in the future will not be so.

4. There can be no sound objection to the appropriation of the Porirua funds to the establishment of a school at Otaki for the Natives. The trusts of the grants are identical, both are "for the use and towards the maintenance and support of a school." The objection that the Bishop administers the trust of the Porirua land, while the trusts of the Otaki land are under the superintendence of the Church Missionary Society, is purely nominal; in reality, the administration in both cases lies with the Church of England. The same object is sought by both trusts—viz., education by means of schools. As a fact, the Church Missionary Society offer no objection to the two trusts being amalgamated. See Archdeacon S. Williams's evidence.

The trustees have utterly failed to carry out the trust so far as the Porirua trust is concerned, and the accounts show that over £900 from that trust has been applied to educate Ngatitōa children at the Otaki mission school.

The trustees, by so applying this money, recognised that Otaki is the place where the school should be established. The West Coast Natives are poor, while the Wairarapa Natives are comparatively well off.

The mission school at Otaki, although at one time a success, is now a failure. By uniting the two trust funds a good school can be set up at Otaki. If the school at Otaki is not assisted financially, it will die out.

5. As to the original intention as regards the Porirua land, the cession was made at Otaki, 16th August, 1848. The language used would be that of the Bishop. "It is a perfect consenting on our part that Whitireia shall be given up to the Bishop for a college." The Natives ceding the land could not then appreciate the difference between a school and a college. What they did understand was that the object should be such teaching as Europeans got. The grant was issued on the 28th December, 1850. That grant recites that a school (not a college) "is about to be established." The trust is "for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school." It ought to be assumed that before the grant issued, the terms of it were submitted to the Bishop, and that he approved its terms, and that the word "school" was deliberately specified in the grant. If a college for higher education was intended, why was it not so stated in the grant? The Crown must be assumed to have satisfied itself that what was intended by the cession was the establishment of a school. After fifty years it is too late for the grantees to say that the school was really to be a college for the higher education of Natives, the Natives would know little or nothing of higher education. But whether the object was for higher education or not, the Natives say what they want is such education as the scheme suggested will give all their children, and not to a selected few.

6. It cannot be denied that the objects of both grants was to include instruction of a religious character, and that would be according to the doctrines of the Church of England. But the Church, as to the Porirua land, has never given such teaching, and as to the Otaki land, the school as carried on by the Church Missionary Society is now a failure. The Natives say that the consensus of public opinion in this colony as to the wisdom of teaching religion in schools for education has changed during the last fifty years, and that the Legislature by "The Education Act, 1877," has laid down a cardinal principle that religion ought not to be taught in educational institutions. The same principle applies to Government Native schools, and they say, if this be the State's policy, why should it not apply to such a school as is suggested? The grant is not intended for the benefit of any denomination; the recital is "whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua . . . for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons, being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean"; therefore it is a school of a *quasi*-public character. They say if you teach religion in the school, or if the management is to be intrusted to a religious denomination, then the school will not succeed, because they say there are many Natives who are Roman Catholics, others Mormons, others who have no religious belief ("and this condition of things will continue to exist and grow"), and they say if you teach the religion of the Church of England, or of any other Church in this school, or if the Church, or any Church manages this school, those persons intended to be benefited will not send their children to it. They say teach our children such things as fit them for earning their livelihood, and let the clergy of each denomination teach its religion at the churches and Sunday-schools, but not in school. They say if this system be good for the public and Government Native schools, why is it not equally good for the Natives as regards the school suggested.

They say this land was given by their ancestors for the purpose of securing to them and their descendants education, that purpose the Church failed to carry out, and as it is clear that the original purpose cannot now be carried out in its integrity they have a moral right to be consulted as to what modifications ought to be made. They say if you insist on the teaching of religion you bring in an element that may mar the main object. They say they do not find fault with religion, but they say all experience goes to show that religious teaching will breed dissension, and consequently tend to destroy the benefit of a school. On this point they claim to have the same freedom of opinion as the



European. Supposing, they say, we were all Roman Catholics, would it be right to insist that the control of the school should be in the hands of the Church of England, or *vice-versa*? or supposing that a number of us held the opinion that religion was not correct, ought we to be placed in the position of either sending our children to a school in which religion is taught, or of losing the advantage of education which such a school confers?

It will be said that if you do not allow the school to be managed by the Church, and its doctrines taught, you are making a radical departure from the trusts of the grant, and there is no denying that to be the case; but the Natives say the existing circumstances demand such a departure in order to secure the main and principal object—viz., education.

7. Now, what is the scheme which the Bishop wishes to be carried out?

Curiously enough, while the question of administering the trusts *cy-près* was before the Supreme Court, the Synod determined to establish a school at Clareville, in the Wairarapa, and they have persuaded the Supreme Court to authorise the devotion of the funds from the Porirua trust to maintain scholars in that school. The Supreme Court did not have before it the whole of the facts. The Court did not have before it the fact of the grant of the Otaki land, and that its trusts were identical with the trusts of the Porirua land; that a school had been carried on there for nearly fifty years; that the Natives, descendants of the donors, and the general bulk of the Native population live in and about Otaki; and that the Natives would not send their children to the Wairarapa School.

It may be fairly assumed that if all the facts as are now known to the Commission had been before the Court, it would not have made the decree it did. It is not right to say that the Court was deceived, but they do say that the Court was not informed of many material facts necessary for the Court to know before making its decree, and which information it was the duty of the trustees to place before the Court.

Now, what is the scheme which the Court has sanctioned? It is—(1.) The net rental and income in the hands of the plaintiffs, as far as the same will permit, shall be devoted to the maintenance of scholars in the Wairarapa institution, a fair sum being charged for maintenance and education. (2.) That preference shall be given to children belonging to Ngatitooa Tribe, failing them, preference to the children of the West Coast tribes. (3.) That the proposed system of education shall be such as appears in this judgment; this refers to paragraph 2, which is as follows: "That such school should be a training-school for children of the poorer class who have progressed to some substantial extent at the common schools, or their equivalent, and are then prepared to take full advantage of some industrial training, either, for instance, in farming operations or farming and some other art or arts, it not being necessary to make instruction in English a principal feature."

The meaning of this is by no means clear, "progressed to some substantial extent at the common schools, or their equivalent," ought to have been more particularly specified, and "industrial training" should be the technical instruction as defined by section 169 of "The Education Act, 1904."

The words of the decree are "devoted to the maintenance of scholars in the Wairarapa institution, a fair sum being charged for maintenance and education." Therefore it is quite clear that the Bishop has succeeded in getting a scheme approved of by the Supreme Court by means of which all rental and income arising from the Porirua property is made applicable for the maintenance and education of all children attending the Wairarapa school, although not a single one of these children comes from the West Coast, or belong to any of the West Coast tribes, and, in fact, the scheme is an ingenious means of appropriating trust funds arising from property on the West Coast, given by donors who were resident there, to maintain a school established by the Church of England in a foreign district altogether, attended by Natives of another tribe, and who can claim no right to participate through the original donors.

The West Coast Natives say that they will not send their children to the Wairarapa school, and if this is adhered to the Bishop will have succeeded in getting the funds arising from the Porirua reserve appropriated to the support of the Wairarapa school, regardless of the question whether the children of the West Coast Natives get any benefit therefrom or not. This is an entire diversion from the original intention with which the land was given, and is not a proper administration under the doctrine of *cy-près*. But the Bishop says that time has not been given to test the efficiency of this scheme.

The West Coast Natives say that time is not necessary, because they will not send their children to the school. They say the Bishop had no right to put forward the scheme as a means of bringing pressure upon them to send their children to the school, they say he ought to have considered their wants before he put such a scheme before the Court. He knew, or ought to have known, that in the best interests of the Natives a proper school was necessary at Otaki, and that as the trusts of the two grants were identical it was a proper scheme to suggest to the Court that the Porirua funds should be appropriated to Otaki. He has devised a scheme not to their advantage, and they will have nothing to do with it.

Then the Bishop desires to make out that three of the West Coast Native children have already taken advantage of his scheme, and that is some evidence that others in time will do so. He says that there are now three scholars from the West Coast, two of them of the Ngatitooa Tribe, who are supported by the Porirua trust, though none of those come from the neighbourhood of Otaki. This is ingenious, but is misleading; the three scholars he refers to are children of women who have married into the Wairarapa Tribe (Ngatikahungunu), the children were born in the Wairarapa and have always lived there, as well as their parents, and according to Native custom such Native children are not recognised as members of the West Coast tribes, but as members of the Wairarapa Tribe (Ngatikahungunu) into which their mothers married, consequently this is no evidence that members of the West Coast tribes have fallen into the scheme.

Then the Bishop says for the reasons he mentions that it would be extremely difficult to maintain two separate colleges, one on the East Coast and one on the West Coast. But the difficulty is of his own creating, for he chose to establish the Wairarapa school while the question was pending in the Court

as to how the Porirua trust could be best administered. He was not considering the wants or wishes of the West Coast natives, but now he could best get an income to carry on a Church school in the Wairarapa, and to do this he has sacrificed the interests of those who should have had his first consideration.

The Bishop, before he put his scheme before the Supreme Court, ought to have consulted the West Coast Natives; he ought in justice to them and for the information of the Court to have placed before the Court the facts, that there was a large area of land at Otaki held under identical trusts as those of the Porirua trust, that for over fifty years a school had been carried on there, that the great majority of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa were residing between Porirua and the Rangitikei River. If he had done this, then the Court would have been able to see that the Wairarapa scheme was not the best one to be adopted, but that a school at Otaki was what ought to have been established. The Natives complain that they have not been dealt with fairly, and they resent it, and they will neither send their children to the Wairarapa or to the mission school at Otaki, because of the way in which the Church has acted in this matter.

The Bishop, before he brought his scheme before the Supreme Court, ought to have sought to find out what were the wishes of the West Coast Natives as to establishing an effective school at Otaki. Even if the Ngatitooa desired that the property and funds of the Porirua trust should be given back, that ought not to have prevented him from placing before the Supreme Court every circumstance which would enable the Court to determine what was best to be done. He knew there was a school at Otaki, that there was a large area of land which had been granted for that school, and he must have known that there was a large population of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa who permanently lived between the Rangitikei River and Porirua, and none of these tribes lived in the Wairarapa. Why did he not inform the Court of these circumstances? and if he had is it likely that the Court would have sanctioned a scheme to take the funds of the West Coast Natives and devote them to the education practically of Wairarapa Natives? If a question of legality had arisen, could he not have said to the Court it is proper that the Porirua property should be applied to the establishment of a satisfactory school at Otaki, and ask leave to promote a private Bill to erect the purpose by uniting the Porirua and Otaki trusts? The Natives complain that they have not been justly treated, and that the Bishop, instead of considering what was best for them, has only considered how best support to the Wairarapa school could be got.

The residue of the Bishop's reasons, set out in "Thirdly," on page 2 of his statement, the Natives fail to appreciate. They say that if the Otaki and Porirua properties are combined there will be means enough not only to give the children a fair education, but also to teach them a variety of trades, and that there is no necessity to resort to the Wairarapa school.

But the Bishop says there is difficulty in doing this because the administration of the Otaki trust is in the hands of the Church Missionary Society, while the Porirua trust is administered by the Synod. But the difference is nominal and has no substantial reality; the trusts of the grants are identical, the object in both cases is education. That such is the case is supported by the fact that the trustees of the Porirua trust have paid to the Church Missionary Society over £900 of trust-moneys for the maintenance and education of children of Natives from Porirua at the Otaki school in the early years.

Then the Bishop says that the General Synod disapproves of the transference of Otaki trust to the General Synod. Why it disapproves is not stated, but that is no reason why the Porirua funds should be sent to the Wairarapa. It is a fair inference to draw that the real reason for the Synod's disapproval is that the funds from the Porirua trust are essential to support the Wairarapa school, and hence the real interests of the West Coast Natives have been lost sight of. It is clear from the evidence taken by the Commission that the Otaki school is nearly on its last legs, and, as the Church Missionary Society or the Synod do not appear able to do anything to revive it, it must either come to an end or the Legislature must step in and provide some scheme to give new life to it. What better scheme to create a new life can be suggested than that of uniting the two trusts in the manner suggested? If the Porirua funds are to go to the Wairarapa, how is the Otaki school to be kept alive? The Missionary Society are not able to do it, nor is the Synod, and it cannot be expected that the Government will do so, and therefore the real remedy is by the application of the Porirua funds as suggested. The Rev. Archdeacon Samuel Williams is and has been for a number of years an advocate for such a combination, and probably no man living is capable of giving a better honest opinion on the subject.

Then the Bishop says, "It is inadvisable on moral grounds for the boys of the Otaki trust and the lads of the Porirua trust to be educated under the same roof." This is a serious thing to allege, and His Lordship gives no reasons in support of it, and the Commissioners must entirely disregard such a statement as having no foundation. In the past the trustees did not think this to be the case for they applied nearly £900 of the Porirua trust funds for the education and maintenance of Porirua lads at the mission school at Otaki. The Porirua lads must then have been educated under the same roof as the boys of the Otaki trust.

Then the Bishop says it would be dangerous to the morality of the lads educated under the Porirua trust that they should be educated in a town the size of Otaki. Here again His Lordship fails to give a reason, and there is no real reason for this objection. The Porirua children, if sent to the Otaki school, would probably be boarders, and subject to the control of the headmaster or other governing authority, and if they were day-scholars would be under the charge of relatives or friends. Further, in any statute to give effect to the scheme power could be given for the Governor in Council to make regulations which would control in a degree the conduct of children attending the school.

Then the Bishop says it would be subversive to the discipline of the college if the parents or friends were near enough to interfere with the training of the lads, or to attempt to draw them away to tangis or other gatherings. No difficulty on this ground appears to have existed in the past, when there were two hundred boarders and Archdeacon Williams was in charge. The Rev. Mr. McWilliam in his evidence was clearly of opinion that there was no difficulty on this ground, and as already stated regulations could be made to meet this objection if it existed.

All the Bishop's arguments are advanced to support the expenditure on the Wairarapa school; he fails anywhere to show that the wants of the West Coast Natives will not be better satisfied by the application of the Porirua funds to the Otaki school.

Lastly, the Commissioners ought not to consider the interests of the Church of England as against the interests and welfare of the West Coast Natives. It was their ancestors who gave the land, and it must have been contemplated by the donors that their descendants would be primarily considered in carrying out a system of education. What did the donors anticipate when they gave this land? Surely that it would not be appropriated to educate children in a district so far removed as Wairarapa is from the places where they had permanently settled, and to educate children of other tribes. The Commissioners ought not to place any great weight on the use of the word "college" in the cession instrument; it was the language they understood as meaning a place for giving education.

If it was all-important that the higher education should be given, how was it that nothing of the kind is to be found in the grant? The recital does not support the idea that higher education was the object, the words "for the education of children of our subjects of all races and of children of other poor and destitute persons." These words go far to show that higher education such as a college would give was not intended. Why, then, if the wants of the West Coast Natives are not those of higher education but of such an education as fits them to best make their way in life, should they see these funds sent out of their district to keep up an institution set up by the Bishop in a district so far from their own homes, and in which they are not interested? The Natives cannot understand why so great an injustice should be done them.

The Porirua trust fund is fully sufficient if dealt with as they suggest to rehabilitate the school at Otaki, and thereby constitute a first-class means of getting the education the Natives need, and they say neither the Bishop or the supposed meaning of the original instrument of cession ought to be allowed to stand in the way of their getting what they need and what they morally are entitled to.

Of course nothing is intended in these remarks to convey the idea that the Bishop, the Synod, or the trustees have, in the course they have taken, been influenced by improper motives.

As to the ways and means available if the scheme suggested be carried out, the following is a rough estimate:—

1. The funds in the hands of the Porirua trustees are now a little over £9,000, and by the time the scheme was started, say twelve months hence, this by accumulated interest would probably be £10,000.

2. The Porirua land is valued by the Government at £4,000, but it is quite certain that this is far too low an estimate. There are 500 acres, and Mr. W. H. Field, M.H.R., in the fifth paragraph of his affidavit filed in the Court of Appeal (copy of which the Natives have supplied to the Commissioners), says that there are 100 acres which, if cut up into a township, would fetch £100 per acre—£10,000; and the remaining 400 acres would realise £15 an acre—£6,000; thus making a total of £16,000, but this estimate may be too sanguine, and it is better to assume that the Porirua land would net £12,000. The total funds would therefore be £22,000. It would take £4,000 to erect the necessary school and boarding accommodation and furnish the school, &c. This would leave £18,000 to be invested at 5 per cent., producing £900 per annum. The Otaki land is 561 acres 1 rood 23 perches, and it is suggested that the portion not required for the school, &c., might be let or sold and the proceeds be invested. The result would be to produce an additional income at least of £600, thus making the total income £1,500. It is suggested that 100 acres be kept for the school, &c., that 100 acres be subdivided into town allotments, which would realise £80 per acre, say £8,000, which would produce at 5 per cent. £400 per annum, and the remaining land, 361 acres 1 rood 25 perches, let, say, for £200 per annum, and, if this was done, the income would be from this source £600.

The annual expenditure is approximately put down at £1,095 (which is probably too low), made up as follows:—

	£
Headmaster, with Board .. .. .	200
Mistress and housekeeper, with board .. .. .	150
Three assistant teachers, with board .. .. .	225
Three servants, with board .. .. .	120
Books, stationery, &c. .. .. .	100
Food, &c., for maintenance of staff .. .. .	300
Vegetables, fruit, &c., might be grown upon the land by the scholars	
	£1095
This would only leave £405 to maintain boarders .. .. .	405
	£1,500

Now, the lowest cost for each boarder would be £30 (Archdeacon Williams, on page 6 of his evidence, says that the boys at the Otaki school cost about £25 a head), so that not more than fourteen boarders could be taken, and these should, in fairness, be children of the Ngatitoas at Porirua. But, if the scheme suggested was adopted, it is reasonable to hope that as the school would be practically under the control of the Government, they would be willing to contribute the cost of the salaries of the teaching-staff—viz., £575 per annum—and, if so, at £30 per annum this sum would maintain about twenty more boarders, and half of the total boarders might be Ngatitoas.

It is quite certain that the Government dare not (in face of public opinion that public money should not be given to support denominational schools) contribute anything to the maintenance of the school if it is to be under the management of any religious denomination, while that objection would not arise if the scheme suggested was carried out.

It is quite evident from the scantiness of the income that it would only provide for a limited number of boarders, and the school would be mainly a day-school, but, as it would be in the Native centre of population, this would not be of so much importance as it would if the school was at Porirua, where boarding of both boys and girls would be all-important in order to secure a fair number of scholars.

If out of the £405 (the balance of income) £200 was applied in paying for technical instruction in trades such as carpentry, blacksmithing, tailoring and saddlery, and dressmaking there would be only £205 out of which boarders could be maintained unless the Government contributed the £575 for teachers' salaries. Out of the £200 £40 a year each might be given to a carpenter, a tailor, a blacksmith, and farmer, saddler, and dressmaker to give instruction two afternoons of each week in their respective trades, &c.

If the school was a day-school only, then the income would be fully sufficient to provide for ordinary teaching and for giving technical instruction in trades. The estimate would then be—

Headmaster, without board .. .. .	£	250
Headmistress, without board .. .. .		175
Three assistant teachers, without board .. .. .		300
Technical instruction .. .. .		300
		<hr/>
Total .. .. .	£1,025	
Thus leaving a balance out of income for contingencies .. .. .		475
		<hr/>
Total .. .. .	£1,500	

The annexed statement, "A," shows the number of Ngatiraukawa children of school age residing between the Rangitikei River and Porirua. The number of Ngatitōa and Ngatiawa children it has been found impossible to ascertain, as these tribes will not give the information, but they are estimated at a hundred.

Ngatiraukawa and Muaupoko .. .. .	631
Ngatitōa and Ngatiawas .. .. .	100
	<hr/>
Total .. .. .	731

The annexed returns, "B," "C," from the Education Department show the number of children who attend schools in the area referred to as 150 and 110 263

But this return would include not only children of the Ngatiraukawa but also of the Ngatitōa, Ngatiawa, Rangitane, and Muaupoko

—  
465

So that at least 465 children do not go to any school. It is anticipated that three hundred children would go to the school if established under the scheme at Otaki.

The Natives earnestly press upon the Commissioners that it is only just and equitable that their costs of and incidental to this inquiry should be paid either out of the trust fund or out of the public fund, and they ask the Commissioners in their report to make a recommendation to that effect. They are aware that these costs could not be ordered to be paid out of the trust fund, and that without legislative sanction they cannot be so paid, but as legislation will be necessary to give effect to any scheme which the Commissioners reports in favour of (if such scheme involves a departure from the terms of the original trusts), the statute giving effect to such report could contain provision for payment of such costs. These Natives are in poor circumstances, and it would be inequitable that they should have to bear the costs they have of necessity incurred in placing before the Commission their views as to the future administration of the trusts. They are not to blame for the non-administration of the trusts, they were never afforded an opportunity of placing their views before any tribunal until this Commission sat, and it was only after the Bishop had succeeded in getting the decree of the Supreme Court that they became aware that the trust funds were to be devoted to the support of a school in a foreign district, and then they immediately appealed by petition to Parliament to prevent what they thought a great injustice, and Parliament considered that they had made out such a *prima facie* case as rendered it advisable to cause further inquiry to be made into the matter, and the result was the setting-up of this Commission. It cannot be denied that the Natives have materially assisted the Commissioners in their investigation, and it is but just that the cost of so doing should be paid either by the Government or out of the trust funds. If the Natives had been afforded an opportunity of putting forward before the Supreme Court their views in opposition to the Bishop's scheme, that Court would have allowed them their costs of so doing out of the trust funds, and the Commission, while not having power to do this, should recommend that provision should be made for their payment; the Natives, therefore, ask the Commissioners in their report to recommend that provision should be made for the payment of their costs, and they will be prepared to rely upon the Government and the Legislature to give effect to the recommendation.

*Mr. Heke:* I desire to draw the attention of the Commissioners to the Natives' reasons why the Bishop of Wellington and his cotrustees should not be allowed to divert the Whitireia funds to Wairarapa.

We desire to draw the attention of the Commission first of all to the relationship between the Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitōa Tribes, because it appears to us that the Bishop of Wellington and his cotrustees have not at any time made the necessary inquiries in this direction. We notice that in one or two of the affidavits submitted to the Supreme Court reference only is made to the children of Ngatitōa and the Ngatitōa people when they speak of the Whitireia reserve, and the benefits to be conferred are only for the Ngatitōa children, and failing that, then the children of the West Coast. We say that Ngatitōa has not decreased in numbers, neither has the Ngatiraukawa, and that Ngatiraukawa has an equal right to be considered together with Ngatitōa.

For the better understanding, therefore, of the Commission, we say,—

1. The donors of the land called Whitireia, in Porirua, were: (1) Te Rauparaha, (2) Tamihana te Rauparaha, (3) Matene te Whiwhi, (4) Hoani te Okoro, of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa; and (5) Wiremu te Kanae, (6) Rawiri Puaha, (7) Watarauhi Nohorua, (8) Rawiri Hikihiki, of Ngatitōa.

The home of the former (four) at the time of the cession of this land to Bishop Selwyn was in Otaki, and the home of the latter was in Porirua and Cloudy Bay. The country occupied by the Ngatiraukawa Tribe at the time of the cession of Whitireia ran from a portion of the country south of the Otaki River and as far north as the Rangitikei River. Ngatitōa occupied all the country from a point south of the Otaki River as far as Porirua. Ngatimutunga, the first allies of Ngatitōa, occupied Waikanae and the Hutt. Ngatitōa and Ngatiawa also lived in settlements in the Nelson and Marlborough districts. Otaki was the central settlement of the Ngatiraukawa Tribe prior and up to 1848. Porirua and Taupo—i.e., Plimmerton—were the central settlements of the Ngatitōa Tribe. Waikanae was the central settlement of the Ngatiawa Tribe.

The Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitōa Tribes are to a great extent one and the same people. Both tribes trace from Hoturoa, the chief of the Tainui canoe which landed finally in Kawhia, on the west coast of this (the North Island) from Hawaiki. The Ngatiraukawa people lived at Maungaritari, and the country about that district in the Waikato. The Ngatitōa people lived in Kawhia, both districts adjoining one another. The two tribes associated as one people down to and since the Ngatitōa migrated south in 1819–20. The Ngatiawa Tribe had entirely intermarried with some of the Ngatitōa people long before this migration, so also had Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa intermarried with the two former tribes. When Te Rauparaha decided to migrate south, Te Peehi and other half Ngatitōa–Ngatiawa chiefs decided to come with him. Prior to Te Rauparaha's leaving Kawhia, he went to Maungatautari from Kawhia, and endeavoured to persuade Ngatiraukawa to come with him, but the latter refused his request on every occasion. Before the Ngatitōa and Ngatiawa, under Te Rauparaha and Te Peehi, had taken the country from the Manawatu River, and as far south as Wellington, Te Rauparaha went back to Maungatautari to again ask Ngatiraukawa to come south. Some of the Ngatiraukawa left Maungatautari and came south—other Ngatiraukawa migrations followed at different times afterwards. Te Rauparaha gave the land from Otaki to the Rangitikei River to Ngatiraukawa. Ngatiawa and Ngatitōa occupied the land at Waikanae and the Hutt. Ngatitōa occupied the land at Kukutauaki, south of Waikanae, to Porirua, also the country in the Nelson and Marlborough districts. Ngatimutunga, a hapu of Ngatiawa, who migrated south with Te Rauparaha and Te Peehi, afterwards went to the Chatham Islands. We do not refer to the troubles of the times with the original owners of the country so occupied, as it is the strong wish of the Maoris, since peace reigned over us, that the past troubles should be forgotten.

The Commissioners will see that, from traditional Hawaiki and the sailing of the Tainui canoe until it reached New Zealand at a spot in Kawhia, and from the landing of its occupants down to the time of the “giving” of Whitireia to Bishop Selwyn by the Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitōa chiefs, these people have been practically one, not only by old associations, but also by intermarriages. We want to impress this point on the Commission, because the cession of the land in Porirua and Otaki will appear more clear if this old relationship between the two tribes is kept in view. It will also show that the Ngatitōa alone are not the only tribe immediately interested in the Whitireia reserve, and any benefits to be conferred. It will also show the reasonableness of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa objections to the Whitireia money being spent in Wairarapa.

2. We feel it our duty to point out to the Commission rules in Maori custom bearing on the question of these gifts.

According to Maori custom, then, any person of standing can come to a chief or set of chiefs, and ask for a piece of land, as was done in the case of Bishop Selwyn. A chief, or set of chiefs, cannot, however, give that land away unless they are paramount among all others, and possess the unbounded confidence of their fellow-chiefs and people. The agreeing to give the land so asked for is contingent on the fellow-chiefs being informed of it, as well as the people, but not so much the people as the chiefs. This would be done by a high chief to uphold the honour and mana of his people, as well as his status as the chief of that people, and in acts of this kind much depends on the cause for which the land is asked for. There are many causes for which land is given—causes created by customs. The main point, however, we desire to show the Commission is this: (a) That Maori land was not the property of the chief or chiefs, but was the property of the people; (b) the chief or chiefs, however, could give the land away if the cause is a good one, and the person or persons who ask for it are men of high standing.

3. The Commission will understand then, that the land in Porirua belonged to those of these two tribes who could show a right to it under Maori custom, and for the purpose in question, the land was given for the benefit of their people.

4. Bishop Selwyn asked for the land both in Otaki and Porirua, and it was given him.

5. The Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa chiefs knew that Bishop Selwyn was the head of the Haahi Mihingare (Church Missionary), or, as southern Maoris called it in those early days, the Haahi o Paihia (the Church of Pahia).

6. The Church of England and its work was first told to Natiraukawa, Ngatitōa, and Ngatiawa by one Matahau, of Ngatiraukawa by birth, who was taught religion at Paihia, Bay of Islands. Wi Parata was wrong when he said that this man belonged to Ngapuhi. This is the man who paved the way for Mr. Hadfield and Mr. H. Williams, in 1839.

7. You were told by Heni te Whiwhi and Wi Parata that Matene te Whiwhi and Tamihana te Rauparaha expressed a wish to have a minister in their midst to teach their people *te rongō pai* the glad tidings (the Gospel) of the Christian faith, and they went to Paihia to ask for one.

8. The Commission will see, therefore, that Matene te Whiwhi and Tamihana te Rauparaha were the two chiefs who created a cause for the “giving” of land to Bishop Selwyn, and when the Bishop

asked for land of them, they readily gave it, although in the Porirua case Matene te Whiwhi hesitated for some time according to Heni te Whiwhi's statement, but in the end gave his consent, notwithstanding the absence of Te Rangihaeata and Te Rauparaha at the time. The Commissioners will also see that Tamihana te Rauparaha went to Porirua and consulted with his fellow-chiefs of Ngatitōa.

9. Whitireia was afterwards given to the Bishop.

10. Now let us ask what was the Whitireia land given for, and for whose benefit? According to Heni te Whiwhi, Raiha Puaha, and Wi Parata "it was given to the Bishop because he asked for it." "It was given to the Bishop because he told the chiefs he wanted them to give him a piece of land for a school to teach their children all the education taught to European children." Well, according to the statements of Heni te Whiwhi, and Raiha Puaha, two daughters of two of the donors of Whitireia to the Bishop, the cause for which this land was given is clear—"it was for a school."

11. (1.) What was the belief entertained by the chiefs when they gave the land to the Bishop? (2.) Did they know, or did they feel or believe that some day the proceeds of Whitireia would be taken and expended in a district other than their own? (3.) Did they know that they gave the land for a college and not a school? (4.) Did they know that, when a school was built, only lads were to be taught, and not the younger boys? (5.) Did they know that the girls were not to be taught in the school for which Whitireia was given? (6.) Did they know that the proceeds of Whitireia were to be used for the purpose of supporting and maintaining only those children of their people whose parents were poor? (7.) Did they know that the school, if built, was to be open to children of all races? The answer to all these questions is, No. To those who understand the Maori character of that time, and even now, there is no other answer.

Now, let us examine the material we have before us. Let us take the letter of cession of the 16th August, 1848. How is it worded? It opens by saying:—"Friend Governor Grey, greeting: Our consenting is true to Whitireia as a college for the Bishop. It is not a cession by us as a home for the Bishop, but for him, for the Bishops in after-time, who will fill his standing place." Although the word "college" appears in it, it is not a term which the Maoris would use. The use of this word indicates that the letter was written by a European, the composition also goes to show this. The Maori name for "school," "college," "or university," in the northern districts of this Island would be "whare-wananga," the house of lectures. South of Auckland, in Waikato, and the districts of the Tainui Tribes it was "whare-wananga" and "whare-maire." In other parts it was "whare-wananga," "whare-maire," and "whare-kura." We take it, however, that the use of the term "college" is not material in this case, and the stress the Bishop of Wellington puts on it to impress the Commissioners that it was meant for higher education falls to the ground when we come to analyse the following words of this same letter. After "standing place" it goes on to say, "to cause to grow the directions of the belief to the Christ . . . to leave it as an upright as a shelter against uncertain winds of the world, that is evil." The Bishop of Wellington says that there is a distinction between the Porirua trust and the Otaki trust. The Porirua trust was intended for a college for lads, as distinguished from boys or children, and, as his statement reads, to the exclusion of girls as well as boys.

12. Now, what was this college to teach, according to this letter which the Bishop relies on in his endeavour to create a difference between this trust and that of Otaki? It was to teach, to quote the words of the letter "to cause to grow the directions of the belief to the Christ." That is to say, it was for the purpose of teaching Christ's doctrines, so that it may stand as a shelter against the evils of the world. The Commission will see then, that according to this reply by the chiefs to Governor Grey, they say in general words that it is for teaching the doctrine of Christianity.

13. Would this mean then that the teaching in this direction was only for the "lads," as the Bishop of Wellington says in his statement? No; it means that these doctrines were to be taught to the little boys and girls, lads, and young women of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa peoples.

It appears to us that there is no other reasonable construction to be placed on these words. It is certain it was not meant for any unselfish object as that stated by the Bishop, "that it was for the purpose of teaching 'lads.'" We cannot help pointing this out to the Commission, because the Bishop says in paragraph 1 of his statement, "Again, the Porirua trust is for a college, that is for lads," &c., and then in paragraph 3 of his statement the Bishop says, "I am strongly of opinion, and I am speaking from knowledge, that it is indavisable on moral grounds for the boys of the Otaki trust and the lads of the Porirua trust to be educated under the same roof." The latter statement points out clearly and absolutely the line of demarcation the Bishop has drawn between "lads" as distinguished from boys and children not of the age of lads; and that girls are not to be included.

This is also clear: that according to these statements of the Bishop he would not allow the Maori children, boys and girls who would be deprived of the Whitireia benefits, to go to the Clareville college, or to the Whitireia college, if he had to build a college on Whitireia.

The question then arises that if this is the true and correct interpretation of the cession of Whitireia as set out in the letter to Governor Grey, it violates straight away the intention effected by the words as embodied in that letter. The use of the term "college" is misapplied in the letter if we read the meaning of the letter aright, together with the construction put on the college by the Bishop, and his opinion in regard to the children and lads of the Porirua and Otaki trusts not being fit to be educated under one roof.

We shall not go into the charge contained in the Bishop's opinion, but we are at a loss to find what he means, as he does not state it.

14. But surely the words of the letter of cession including the term "college" has been swept away by the grant. If this be so, then it is clear that Whitireia was for a school on the same lines as that in Otaki, the words of the two grants being identical.

15. Let us ask, Was Whitireia given by the chiefs for a college, and did they understand so? Did the chiefs believe that it was given for a school to teach their lads, as the Bishop says, or the youth,

as the grant says? We think the chiefs believed it was for the purpose of a school to teach the youth of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa—this would include girls.

16. The next most important point is for us to tell the Commission that Otaki was a large settlement and was the central settlement of the Ngatiraukawa people. Bishop Selwyn, on seeing this to be so, asked the chiefs for a piece of land to endow a school with, so that their children could be educated in the English language, industrial training, and religious teachings. We say, then, that the school was meant to be built in Otaki and nowhere else. The children were there and the people were there.

17. As to Whitireia and the Ngatitōa settlements at Porirua.

Bishop Selwyn knew, because he saw that there were a large number of Ngatitōa people living there, and the settlements not far from Porirua, belonging to the same people. He asked for land for the same purpose as that in Otaki. Bishop Selwyn intended to build a school on Whitireia, because there were a number of children living there with their parents, and he did not intend to build it anywhere else. The wording of the grant shows this: "Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua," &c.

18. Now, let us come to another important aspect of the question. Supposing Bishop Selwyn lived long enough in New Zealand, and he found, after trial, that either one or the other of these two trusts (Whitireia and Otaki) was not capable of maintaining a separate school fit to equip educationally the boys and girls of Ngatitōa in Porirua, and Ngatiraukawa in Otaki, would it not be the most natural thing for him to suggest to Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa to agree to combine the two trusts?—(a) The Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa were then, and are now one and the same people; (b) the two lands were according to Maori custom tribal lands; (c) the benefits of the scheme were for their children; (d) the scheme would be strengthened and the main object of educating the children in the courses cited in the grant stood a better chance of being properly and more efficiently carried out.

The Ngatitōa of Porirua or elsewhere could not object to the locality for such a school, because: (a) It was the larger centre, there were more people there, and more children; (b) the leading chiefs living in Otaki were not only leading chiefs of Ngatiraukawa, but also of Ngatitōa, Te Rauparaha being their leader ever since the people left Kawhia and through all their troubles and hardships, many of the Ngatiraukawa living in Otaki and other settlements further south being also of Ngatitōa descent.

19. Now let us come to another question. Did Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa know that the Porirua trust was under the authority of one body, that known as the General Synod, and that the Otaki trust was under another body, that known as the Church Missionary Society, and that both bodies were controlled by a different set of laws? No. In the early days the Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitōa chiefs knew only Bishop Selwyn. They knew he was the head of the Church of England in New Zealand, and that is all. Their descendants also thought this, until they were told by the Bishop of Wellington in Otaki, in 1904, that such was not the case. But let us accept the Bishop's statement, that it is the case: What difficulties does this aspect of the question present? None whatever. The two tribes were not, and are not strangers to one another.

Did the General Synod know of the relationship between the two tribes when they discussed the question to combine the two trusts, as stated by the Bishop in paragraph 2 of his statement? There is nothing to show that the General Synod had information of this kind before them. If they had, we feel sure the General Synod would have adopted the scheme to combine the two trusts.

20. Now let us come to the difficulties as stated by the Bishop, of maintaining two colleges. We do not consider the question of two colleges at all. When the trustees of the Porirua reserve were moving the Supreme Court for power to divert the Whitireia funds to a school in Wairarapa "they had not obtained the land at that time, nor had they any buildings then in Wairarapa." But a body of the Church of England people did have a building capable of boarding 150 to 170 boys, and a school building on the Otaki reserve then. Why was not this utilised? They will answer, because the General Synod did not agree to the Otaki-Porirua combination. We cannot but think that the representatives of the Church of England, who were the trustees of the land in Porirua, the land which the chiefs gave to the first head of the Church in New Zealand, had very little consideration for the young of the donors' people, when we come to reason their action and the action of the General Synod out calmly.

21. Let us come to the harsh and inconsiderate opinions expressed by the Bishop of Wellington against the Maori children of Otaki, and the people, apparently both Europeans and Maoris, when he says in paragraph 3 of his statement, "I am strongly of opinion, and I am speaking from knowledge, that it is inadvisable, on moral grounds, for the boys of the Otaki trust and the lads of the Porirua trust to be educated under the same roof." And in paragraph 4 of his statement he says, "I hold that it would be dangerous to the morality of the lads educated under the Porirua trust that they should be educated in a town of the size of Otaki." We take it that these are the only reasons advanced before the Commission by the Whitireia trustees for its consideration to support their action in diverting the Whitireia moneys to Wairarapa, and we take it that the General Synod must have been persuaded to disagree with the scheme to combine these two trusts on these unsupported charges. This speaks very little for the Church of England and the representatives of that Church. It speaks very little for the General Synod. It speaks very little for the energy of any one in the Church, if the moral state of the Maoris in Otaki, both old and young, is so bad as is painted by these sweeping charges of the Bishop.

22. But this is not so. There is no more immorality in the young or old, either the Maoris or Europeans, in Otaki, than there is in any other part of New Zealand. We would ask the Commission to cast these unsupported charges aside when it considers the proper locality for a school such as that indicated in the scheme submitted to it for approval. We submit that Otaki is the proper centre for this school. Its nearness to the homes of parents is not a weak spot in the suggestion. It will, on the contrary, be its strong point.



23. We assume that the children for this school will not all belong to Otaki. They will be from all settlements from Marlborough and Nelson to the Rangitikei River. The numbers will be chosen according to the capacity of the funds in hand. We take it that the Otaki children, or most of them, will be day-school children, and not boarders. We believe that the objection to the Church of England people—*i.e.*, the ministers—shown by the parents of Ngatiraukawa children and Ngatitooa children over their refusal to put up and equip an efficient school in Otaki will be removed altogether if the school is built in Otaki. We are given to believe that the parents and prominent chiefs in Otaki have expressed their wish to form a strong committee to help the Board in preventing interference by parents, and in keeping the attendance up, if the school is built in Otaki.

24. That Otaki is the proper place for a school of this kind there is no doubt. It has the most children, and the place is healthy, and it is the central settlement both of Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa.

25. Let us now come to another most important point. This is in regard to the education of the girls. It is entirely essential that the girls should be educated properly. The moulding of the proper conduct of children depends solely on the women. The proper care of children depends on the proper education given to the girls. It is useless to go into details on this aspect of the question, as the Commissioners in their own experience have a full knowledge of what is required in a people like the Maoris, who have only emerged from a long period of primitive life.

26. On the question of religious teaching, the Commission will recognise that these two properties were tribal properties; that the two religions which Ngatiraukawa embraced in the early days were (1) the Church of England, (2) the Roman Catholic Church; that since the Church of England fell off in taking any interest in the spiritual welfare of its people, the Ngatitooas at Porirua left the Church of England and joined the Mormon Church. This does not mean the right to have more wives than one. That is not a part of the teaching of the Mormon Church in New Zealand at any rate.

It is entirely Maori custom to invite and allow all members of the people to participate in the advantages of any tribal property. To enable this to be done, the teaching of religion should not be given during school hours or at the boarding-place. We feel that the Commissioners will not create a bar to children belonging to another religion. It may be said that scriptural teachings are given the boys at Te Aute and St. Stephen's; this does not answer the question. There is trouble now in the Turakina school, a school put up and supported by the Presbyterian Church. All Roman Catholics, as far as we know, send their daughters to St. Joseph's Convent in Napier, and not to Hukarere.

27. To give the children religious teaching, we say that each Sunday the boys and girls should be allowed to attend their services in their own churches and Sunday-schools, in their own Sunday-school buildings conducted by persons of their own religion. The Roman Catholic church and Church of England are not far from the Otaki school reserve. This was done in the early days, and we see no reason why it should not be done again.

28. That, if the Church of England trustees of the Whitireia reserve desire to have an efficient school for the East Coast boys, those at Wairarapa, &c., the proceeds of the Papawai and Ngaumutawa reserves, near Greytown North and Masterton (controlled by the Church of England trustees), should be spent in enlarging the school and its educational pursuits at Te Aute. That is really a Ngatikahungunu school. There would then be no waste of money or reserves as in the majority of cases now, not only in Wairarapa, but in Porirua and Otaki, through the want of sufficient means and a properly and efficiently equipped schools. We say that the education taught in our schools in the past has not been beneficial to the majority of Maori children, although it is true that some boys have received benefits. That only speaks of the few, but not of the majority of boys, and especially girls. We say that a knowledge of trades for boys and a better and higher training for girls in the useful and domestic work of life is entirely essential for their betterment as a people. We say that our scheme submitted to you for your approval is the one to effect this object. We say that there are no well-to-do Maoris amongst the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa. There are only one or two, but we are speaking for the people as a whole. We say that the Whitireia moneys should not be spent in Wairarapa under any pretext whatever; we say that the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa people are entitled to the first consideration, and we have not had that consideration given us.

29. We are entitled to ask for this to be done for the reasons: (1.) That the property Whitireia belonged to the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa chiefs, and that the said property was tribal property. (2.) That these two tribes are practically one and the same people. (3.) That Ngatiawa, many of them being half Ngatitooas and being an ally of Ngatitooa in former days, should receive educational benefits from this land. (4.) That we have other tribes in our midst that should receive educational benefits. (5.) That the land is in the district where Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitooa live. (6.) (a) That the number of children of school age amongst Ngatiraukawa number 600; (b) that the children of Muaupoko number 50; (c) that the total adults of Ngatiraukawa number 572; (d) that the total of other tribes number 162; (e) that those of Ngatiraukawa, Ngatitooa, Rangitane, Muaupoko, and Ngatiapa in the district who have passed school age should have an opportunity, should they desire, to attend lectures or demonstrations in trades to be given in this school. This would also apply to boys of these tribes who may not be able to be accommodated at this school, but who may be living in and about the settlements near Otaki. All of these Maoris live between the Rangitikei River and Porirua, and Porirua and Marlborough and Nelson.

30. We desire now to point out to the Commission what we have observed amongst the Maoris as the faults which militate against the proper education of the Maori children under the present and past conditions and methods of education. The faults in our country districts, where we have our Government Native schools and mission schools, are: (1.) The majority of Maori parents are not well off. This position of the parents causes them to keep back their children from school. The parents, in the majority of cases, require the boys and girls to help them in their planting seasons, and the seasons for



raising the crops. (2.) The retention by the parents of their children to attend to other work which now and again crops up. (3.) The repugnance many parents have to laws passed by the Parliament, especially those in regard to different forms of taxation or other liabilities created by such laws. (4.) The poor condition of the parents, not being in a position to provide for the proper clothing of their children, and in regard to the larger schools such as Te Aute and St. Stephen's for boys, and Hukarere, St. Joseph's Convent, and the Victoria Maori Girls' School, the parents cannot afford to maintain their children in clothing and the expenses of paying for travelling to such schools and home again. (5.) In the country day-schools tangis and other gatherings are responsible. (6.) The roving character of the Maori parents. This applies mostly to parents who are compelled to seek for work. (7.) The lack of confidence of many Maori parents in the good to be effected by education. This feeling grows on them through actual experience. In the past, the majority of boys and girls who have finished school at Te Aute, St. Stephen's, Hukarere, and St. Joseph's Convent, apart from country schools, have not been able to demonstrate the usefulness of their education. The falling-back of the majority on to their parents and people for support. The existence of cases in their midst of Maoris or half-castes who have had no education at all, who have by their own work and efforts made a success in the world, and have become fairly well-to-do. (8.) The faults in the system of education. (9.) The communistic customs of the people. (10.) The inefficiency of the education to qualify the boys for employment in either trades or situations where efficiency or education is required. The grounding in the English language being poor—poor in every respect, excepting in a slight degree they are able to read or converse in English, but very poor in the construction of the English language, and especially in the meaning of words, and very bad in grammar. (11.) The lack of personal application in many. (12.) The want of means and a better system of education. (13.) We would now state to the Committee that we realise that education for Maori children to be of any use to them personally, and as a people, should teach them first to live for themselves and their children; a knowledge of trades is essential for the majority of them. By having this taught we do not bar the bright boys and girls from pursuing the higher grades of education. Trades would encourage thrift and continuity of purpose, and would cause the Maoris to shake off their communism and other customs now keeping them back; would elevate them; would give them a sense of responsibility.

31. Education in agriculture and farming is required, but the difficulties keeping many Maoris back are, the Maori parents in many cases are not able to give their boys a sufficient area of land to work on after they leave school, and many of the parents are not in a position to acquire for their children lands from the Crown. If the parents possessed a sufficient area of fairly good land, there are many Maori boys who would take to working on the land, and who could work it to advantage, notwithstanding their deficiencies in education. This would apply also to boys who have had no education at all. Maoris are known to be good imitators and good workers, notwithstanding the many disadvantages they are surrounded with.

32. The condition of the titles of their parents to lands, in the majority of cases, is a drawback. Amongst other disadvantages in this district are: (1.) The enormous number of owners in many of the lands, which renders the cutting-up into individual areas an impossibility to make such divisions of any use. (2.) The scattered interests: in most cases, small areas in each block renders these useless. (3.) In cases where the owner or owners own large areas of land in one block, and where an owner or owners own large areas in a number of blocks, the right to convert a part or a block into money is necessary if they are to carry on improvements. The Government, in endeavouring to protect such Maoris, in some cases refuses them the right to convert. This attitude of the Government, we know, is taken not selfishly, but on account of the action of some Maoris who have been given that right, and who have squandered the proceeds in useless directions. (4.) A very large number of the Maoris being landless.

33. With those Maori parents who have reasonable-sized areas of land and fairly good land, the want of monetary assistance acts as a drawback. This applies to individual Maori owners, as well as to two or more owners. It is this lack of monetary assistance which cripples many Maoris who have sufficient lands. Many of them who are capable workers cannot work their land properly, and for this reason many are forced to lease their lands.

34. We say that separate schools, to be supported by each of these trusts separately, cannot be carried on to any advantage to our children, but a combination of the two trusts will support one school. We say we do not wish to bar any Maori children of other tribes, or Europeans, from this school, but we claim first consideration for our children. We tender this information to the Commission because we think it of sufficient importance in regard to the question of education raised by this inquiry. We also do so because we have realised the faults either by design of the parents or by circumstances. We do so because we desire an efficient school for our children. We do so because we feel it our duty to assist the Commissioners to improve on the scheme we have submitted before them for their consideration. We do so because we feel that the Commissioners feel with us the desirability to find and adopt a better means for the education of our children, to better equip them for the battle of life, so that they could be made better citizens and settlers of our country.

A word in conclusion in regard to the control of this school, and the administration of these reserves. We think that the Church of England trustees in both trusts should cease to have control. The past administration of the Otaki school by them did do some good work for a time, but the interest taken in our people and our children has practically ceased for a considerable number of years up to now. Nothing has been done for them in regard to the Whitiorea land for the advantage of our children. Any effort made by them to combine the two trusts and to build and equip an efficient school in our midst has been frustrated by the General Synod of the said Church. To throw the deficiencies in regard to the proper equipment of the Otaki school on to the Government, as stated in the Bishop of Wellington's statement, is to cast aside the main intention of Bishop Selywn, and the duty of the said Church. We feel that by placing the administration of the said trusts and this school under three responsible

Government Civil servants and two Maoris from the Ngatiraukawa and the Ngatitōa Tribes, to act as a Board, the object in view could be better and more efficiently carried out.

*Mr. Stafford* : There is one point on which I was not so emphatic as I should have been. It seems to me if such a scheme as I suggested is carried out the result would almost certainly be to get a contribution from the Government of a very considerable sum for the purpose of at least paying the teachers. It is evident the funds available, careful as you may be of them, are barely sufficient to carry on any scheme in a fully effective manner ; but if the scheme is carried out tantamount to a Native Government school there will be a fair claim—a claim almost irresistible—to ask the Government to contribute at least the cost of paying the salaries of those who are conducting it. It will diminish the expenditure of the Government in other directions on the Natives because Government schools would have to be established. If it be true there are over 475 children who go to no school, something must be done by the Government, and if this school is effective surely there would be an unanswerable claim on the Government to contribute ; whereas if the scheme were carried out by the Church no assistance could be got from the Government. To my mind, it means that £600 or £700 a year which would be obtained by the one scheme would be lost by the other. I put this to the Commissioners as a very strong element for them to consider : whether this is not sufficiently strong to get rid of the element of the original object of the grant being for religious instruction.

*Mr. Chapman* : I would first ask the Commission to take notice of this, with regard to the difference between the question whether the grant or the deed of cession is to be looked upon as the authentic declaration of trust. My submission is that the Crown grant, not the deed of cession, is really the authentic declaration of trust, and should be looked to for the trust by the Commission. This appears to be largely agreed to by the persons who attack the Bishop. But a great deal has been said about the deed of cession. The Commission will observe that while the deed of cession is relied on for the purpose of showing that the trusts have not been observed, they say the deed of cession is not to be looked to because it mentions the word "college." As to this, I think it should be observed that two of the persons who were donors under the deed of cession were pupils of St. John's College. The chiefs were Te Rauparaha, Tamihana te Rauparaha, and a cousin, Matene te Whiwhi. Both the latter had been at St. John's, and probably these persons were the prime movers in making the cession. They would understand the difference between a school and a college. I throw this suggestion out to the Commission in considering whether the foundation which will be recommended by them (I assume some recommendation as to the nature of the foundation will be made) will include such higher education as is given at a college—not necessarily exclusively—or not. The donors themselves evidently must have contemplated something of that nature and wanted to have an institution at which persons should be sufficiently taught to enable them to impart their education to their own countrymen. However, I must assume for the present, for the purpose of my argument, that the Crown grant is the authentic declaration expressing the trust, because some document had to be looked to by the trustees, and I apprehend the proper document for them to look to would be the Crown grant. Several accusations have been made that the trust has not been properly administered in the past. This is a charge of delinquency on the part of the trustees. It can only be supported by proof (1) that the trustees were able to carry out the specific trust, (2) that they deliberately or negligently refrained from doing so. Mr. Stafford says he makes no imputation of improper motives, but his whole reasoning is to prove delinquency. He wishes to treat the trustees as delinquent trustees are treated by taking away from them the administration of the trust confided to them. As to this, all evidence of the terms of the deed of cession will be irrelevant. The trustees could only look to one instrument to ascertain their trust and that was the Crown grant. If they knew the terms and objects of the cession, and those terms and objects were different from what is expressed in the grant, then the trustees could not give effect to them, but they must confine themselves to the powers under the grant. Their doings, therefore, must be judged by the Crown grant alone. The trust is easily ascertained if this was so, and if there was any delinquency the proper court to investigate such delinquency is the Supreme Court. The Commissioners have not the proper powers for investigating a case of delinquency. But there is no evidence, I submit, of delinquency. There is abundant evidence that the funds available were never sufficient to support an institution of the nature indicated in the grant, and this fact is the foundation of the scheme settled by the Supreme Court. It is admitted by Mr. Stafford, and also by Mr. Heke in his remarks to you, that the fund was never sufficient to create such an institution as is contemplated by the grant, nor, I may add, such an institution as may have been contemplated by the deed of cession. The change of idea from a school to a college appears to me to have had its origin in the deed of cession. It is only from the deed of cession the idea has ever been obtained of a college instead of a school. I do not know whether it is material, because the trustees never did erect a college. Any institution they ever had was only a school, and of course the scheme settled by the Supreme Court cannot be imputed as a delinquency to the trustees. If there had been actual delinquency it would have been alleged and proved in one of the suits in the Supreme Court. I think I am justified in assuming that the Commission cannot find any delinquency on the part of Bishop Selwyn or his successors. If the Natives suffered from want of education it was not because of any impropriety in dealing with the funds of the trust, but because those funds were utterly inadequate. There was no breach of trust, but its objects were not attained, because they could not be attained with the moneys available. Now, the Natives, or a section of them, come on the scene and say something should be done. What ? Give back the land to the Natives is the first cry, and that is really what is wanted by this section. I do not imagine that it is a large section ; I imagine that it is a very small one, and I assume theirs is a hopeless demand. Then they say, "If the land is not to be given back we put forward various schemes." And I submit one of these schemes ought to be rejected without the least hesitation, and that is the abandonment of religious education. It is an unheard-of thing that a trust founded by Christian persons for the purpose of religious Christian education should be destroyed, to erect something totally

different in its place. Some of those who ask that the money should be devoted to secular education claim to be descendants of the donors. When I say "claim" I do not mean to suggest they are not descendants of the donors. This is no reason for giving any weight to their views which they would not intrinsically have. If we are to look beyond the grant, we find the donors indicated a special purpose which is subsequently named in the grant. That special purpose is religious education. It is common sense, common morality, and common justice, that the trust should be administered and not destroyed. It is the reverse of all these things that, because the descendants of the donors have adopted different religious views from those of their ancestors, their views and not the views of the founders of the charity should be adopted, and that not in the administration, but in the destruction of the charity. The descendants of the donors have the right only in common with those for whose benefit the trust was designed to come in and say the trust shall be administered, not to choose the manner of administration, and still less to say the trust shall be destroyed. I call it destruction of the trust to abandon religious education. If these persons say, "Our opinions are now such that we will not send our children to be taught religion," the trust ought still to be kept open for the benefit of those who are anxious that their children shall be taught religion. We do not know which are the majority, but I submit that is quite immaterial. It is not probable that those who have anti-religious scruples are in the majority or are even very numerous. It is said those who still desire it are numerous and they are probably the larger body, because the Maoris are now to be looked upon as a Christian people and, more than that, a religious people. The fact that there are Mormons and Hauhaus among them seems to me, bearing in mind that this is a Christian country where the Christian religion is part of the common law of the land, a grotesque reason for diverting the funds of a Christian religious institution to a purpose of a totally different nature, and a purpose which could not possibly be administered by the persons originally chosen as trustees by the founders of the charity. The aspirations of the Natives who think themselves peculiarly the objects of the trust are very varied. Some merely want the land for themselves; some want a school, others a college. Some want religious education, some want none. Some want technical education; some apparently want to exclude from technical education that which would be most useful—namely, the cultivation of the soil. It is impossible to satisfy all. I submit, so far as the nature of the education is concerned, the wisest scheme and that best for the Natives would be to adhere to the original objects of the grant, and provide religious and industrial training. It is possible the present scheme for the Porirua trust is so far defective that it offends against ancient tribal prejudice. I leave that question whether it is so to the Commissioners, who have heard all the evidence. I would not urge anything myself, because I recognise if such objections really do exist to go against them would probably be to very much diminish the value of any institution. As to the amalgamation of the Porirua and Otaki trusts, I ask the Commissioners to give considerable attention to the objections to Otaki as the locality for a combined school. Such a combined school would be far more successful if the children were somewhat removed from the immediate influence—I will not say of their parents—but of a large Native community. There is, I submit, a strong consensus of opinion that a boarding-school would be far more beneficial to the children attending it than a day-school. Moreover, a purely day-school would be practically inaccessible to all those who do not live in the immediate vicinity. What is the use of a day-school at Otaki to children resident at Porirua or Waikanae? I wish to insist that the funds of the Whitireia property should be applied to a boarding-school and not a day-school at Otaki. If applied to a day-school at Otaki they would be applied for the benefit of the Otaki Natives alone, because it could not be attended by the Natives of Porirua or Waikanae, nor those from further up the coast, of whom Mr. Heke spoke. I submit it is manifest the object of this trust can best be carried out by the funds being applied to a boarding-school and not a day-school, which would be only of value to those in the immediate vicinity. If the trusts are to be combined, it ought to be a boarding-school if a vestige of the trust is to be carried out. Whatever is recommended regard must evidently be had to the amount of the funds available to carry it out. The demands of some of the Native witnesses are simply extravagant as applied to the trust. They demand an institution should be created which would languish from the beginning from want of funds. That is practically admitted; but it was claimed at one place that Bishop Selwyn or the Governor should have provided the funds. Now there is only a hope expressed that the Government might find the funds wanted. There is no evidence of such a promise ever having been made. Indeed, the greater part of the evidence is vague hearsay handed down from one generation to another, and it is quite impossible that the Commission can find such a promise. Whatever is recommended must fall within the means of the trust. What this means will appear from the accounts before the Commission. They are decidedly modest. As to Mr. Heke's scheme, that, I think, on careful analysis, will be found, whatever its merits may be, to want very much more than the funds available. They are really very small, I think £1,500 a year. Mr. Stafford's estimate will be acknowledged to have been sanguine. I think it is very sanguine. Mr. Heke's proposals are vague, and they could not be otherwise, of course. I think, if analysed, it would take many times £1,500 to carry them out. I shall now make a few remarks about Kaikokirikiri. There is a great diversity of opinion among the Maoris there as to what they want. The suggestion that Papawai and Kaikokirikiri were respectively for boys and girls is a manifest (unconscious) invention. There is no trace of that in the grant or the deed of cession of the one block of which we have the deed of cession. And I submit to the Commission it would be utterly impracticable to erect two schools, one for boys and one for girls, the one at Kaikokirikiri and the other at Papawai. It would mean an amalgamation of the funds of the two grants, and yet a separation of their objects, and I think it would be found far from satisfying the Natives themselves, as they are not at one in the matter. They themselves say they desire a school for their own children at their own place. This was said by the Kaikokirikiri Natives and presumably the Papawai Natives would say the same. The Natives at Masterton insisted that the land was given by their ancestors; they say that of both Kaikokirikiri and Papawai. As to Papa-

wai, what evidence there is contradicts that; the land was bought and a price paid for it. (This evidence is to be found in the blue-books; such as it is it is evidence of purchase.) I submit to the Commission the merely hearsay evidence of Natives is not enough to establish as a fact that the land was a free gift. The deed of cession of Kaikokirikiri is also contrary to that. There is a purchase deed of the whole block for a price. On the face of this the price was for the whole. Is this displaced by evidence, purely hearsay, of the descendants of the ceding Natives? The recital in the grant is not contrary to this view. The land was purchased for a school, and therefore the grant recited it was ceded for a school. If the trustees, say, of a hospital, were to purchase land for a hospital it would be proper to recite that purpose even though the vendor received the full price. What little evidence there is in the case of Papawai was that the land was purchased for the purpose mentioned in the grant and the word "ceded" does not connote a gift. A purchased land is ceded. As to the European petition, I understand the trustees do not object to that, with limitations. At present the land is under lease. Before any leasing scheme can be carried out the present leases must expire. The petitioners speak ignorantly when they say the time has now arrived for cutting up the land for close settlement. That time cannot arrive till the present leases expire. A few words more about the proposal to abolish religious teaching. The great object of educating the Maoris is to civilise them; to teach them to abandon their insanitary mode of life, their immorality, their superstition. The right time to put them in the right path to do that is when they are children, and that Mr. Heke admitted. One of the first steps towards the rejection or abandonment of superstition or immorality is religious education, and that can only be done in childhood. Those who propose to abandon it propose to abandon the children to immorality and superstition. If they do not get religious instruction at school, where and when will they get it? Not when they grow up, for they will not seek it; not at home, for who will there be to teach it at home? Europeans learn religion at their mother's knee. Can any Maori mother be trusted for that? They will not get religious teaching at all, and will be abandoned to immorality, superstition, and their tohungas. I say for a race like the Maoris the absence of all religious instruction in their childhood would be a serious misfortune never to be compensated for in after-life. I ask the Commission carefully to consider whether they are prepared to undertake the responsibility of recommending that funds and lands devoted by the founders of the charity to the teaching of religion—a teaching they had experienced the benefits of—shall be diverted from the purpose for which it was given and Maori children shall be deprived of religious teaching and all it implies. It is a very grave responsibility not to be measured by the standard of European child-education. The European child begins religious education from the moment he can lisp his first words. He is thus in a totally different situation from the Maori child who has absolutely none of the religious influences which surround a European child. If the religious observances of the Europeans were destroyed, the children would still have the best part of their religious education left—namely, that given at home. I use the word "religion" in its natural and best sense. Take away from the Maori religious observances and there is nothing left of their religious education. I hope the Commission will duly contrast the two cases. The suggestion that because religion is not taught in the public schools it should not be taught in this school means that no religion is to be given at all. The scheme of public education of the Education Act is to leave religious education to private schools. But now it is proposed that it is not to be left to private schools, but it is to be taken away from the private schools—to be taken away altogether. That would be totally different from the practice in regard to the education of Europeans. There is no precedent for abolishing religious education in the European private schools. It is because the State has recognised that it is the duty of the people to supply at private establishments religious education that religious education is not taught at public schools. But here the petitioners come on a private foundation—a foundation that was essentially for the purpose of teaching religion, and now ask that it should be turned into a purely secular school. The Kaikokirikiri school may not have been properly carried out by the trustees, but what is the proper thing to do? Not to destroy the trust, but to take means that it shall be carried out properly, and this is as much the case with a foundation of this kind as a European foundation. Suppose they have done all sorts of things they ought not to have done, and have not done all sorts of things they ought to have done, the Commission should not say, "We will destroy the trust," they might say, if they found delinquency, that the trustees should be removed and proper trustees appointed, just as a Court would say. A Court of equity proceeds on natural justice in regard to these charities; it does not destroy a charity because it has been badly administered in the past. It says, "We will see that it is properly conducted in the future; if the trustees are delinquent we will put in proper ones; if the trustees are not delinquent but only ignorant, we will show them how to carry on the trust." Even if we call the whole of the Ngatitōa and Ngatiawa and Ngatikahungunu the founders, it was designed by them for religious education, and now it would not be right, simply because not the founders but the persons who are to be benefited by the trusts have changed their religious views, that they should be allowed to say, "Now we will not have the trust, we will destroy it and erect something else in its place." I feel great difficulty in making any suggestions as to what is to be done; if the Commission think the scheme settled by the Supreme Court was ill-considered and the prejudices of the Maoris cannot be destroyed (which no doubt would be desirable), then I admit to some extent they should be respected—that is to say, a charity like this should be administered so as to be useful and not useless. It may be the Commission will find it was not a well-considered scheme to send the money to the Wairarapa. In that case, I submit a boarding-school should be established—whether at Porirua or at some other place. I submit the money of this trust should be used for a boarding-school, and it should not be in the vicinity of a large settlement. I quite sympathize with the objections of Mr. Heke and others to any expressions which appear to cast a slur on their people, and I do not wish to use any such expressions; but I would ask the Commission to consider the evidence. There are other things besides immorality. I do not wish to insist on immorality.

Children when they are close to their homes may be led away by all sorts of things. The parents may like to have them when they go to tangis or horse-races; they do not recognise that they are doing their children any harm—and European parents are not very much different. We, ourselves, find it sufficiently difficult to procure proper attendance at school; we have to have truant inspectors and persons to see that parents do send their children to school; parents will keep them away for amusements, and for their own benefit, and they have to be looked after. I do not claim any superiority for European parents in this respect. But I submit everything of this sort—every influence of this sort must be greater where there is a large collection of Maoris; the tangis are greater and more numerous, excitements are more frequent, and I submit the school should not be near a large settlement.

*The Chairman:* Do you understand the scheme approved of by the Supreme Court for Porirua required religious education?

*Mr. Chapman:* Oh, yes, I think so. I do not know whether the scheme expressly states so, but certainly the Bishop understood so. I submit if it does not mean religious education it was very wrong, bearing in mind the objects of the founders.

*The Chairman:* You understand the scheme is not to prevent the admission of children of other denominations, but it is founded on a supposition that there will be religious education of the kind found in the Church of England?

*Mr. Chapman:* Yes, I understand that is so. We have no tests anywhere so far as I know in New Zealand. I have very little more to say. Either in conjunction with Otaki or alone, the place should be determined by considerations of convenience, and not by the fancies of the Maoris. The extent of the school would have to be proportionate to the funds available—that is to say, a pretentious establishment should not be founded merely in the hopes of a subsidy from the Government. As to Kaikokirikiri, the funds should be used for Clareville until the leases fall in, after which they can be applied (the increased rentals) to the establishment of such a school as is in accordance with the trust at Kaikokirikiri. In both cases the trusts of the grant should be adhered to as nearly as the funds will admit.

*Mr. Quick:* Do you suggest that Clareville can be carried on with the Papawai funds?

*Mr. Chapman:* I suggest it should be carried on with the funds of both those reserves until there are funds enough for the establishment of a school at Kaikokirikiri, and then one should be established. I should not like the Commission to make a recommendation which could not be carried out for want of funds. At present I apprehend the funds are not sufficient to carry on two establishments, one at Papawai and one at Clareville. So long as these conditions hold, I submit there should be only one establishment, but when the funds increase, as there appears to be a good prospect of, then they should be divided so as to get two establishments, one at each place; because, I submit, it is of importance that the Natives should send their children the shortest possible distance to the school.

*The Chairman:* There is nothing in the Commission which authorises us to suggest amalgamation in Masterton; but there is nothing to prevent our suggesting that something of the sort should be done as is done now at Porirua, namely, founding scholarships to Clareville?

*Mr. Chapman:* It would be outside the Commission to recommend that Papawai should be turned into a State school, for instance. But the Commission is not confined to Kaikokirikiri as the place where the money shall be used, and it is therefore in the scope of the Commission to say they should be used to maintain the school at Papawai. I submit there is no reason why the Commission should make any recommendations as to costs. The first object of the petitioners is apparently to do that which involves the destruction of the trust and the creation of a new trust: to abolish religious education—one of the objects of the trust—and divert the funds to education of a different kind; that is destruction of the trust. The petitioners come here and ask, as one of their cardinal points, that the trust shall be destroyed, that it shall be taken away from the trustees and altered in character so as to have no resemblance to that indicated by the founders. I do not propose to make any anticipations, but I imagine the Commissioners will not contemplate that, in which case the object of the petitioners will have entirely failed. It may be that good will result from the petition; I hope that it will; but I submit that is not a reason why the Commissioners should recommend what is probably a very large expenditure being cast upon the trust funds.

*Mr. Stafford:* I do not suggest it should be cast on the trust fund—it is quite open for the Commissioners to so recommend; but it may be they will recommend that under the circumstances the Government should provide for it. It has been stated that the persons who were the donors of the Motueka reserve were Ngatitōa. I am told that reserve is not sufficient to carry out the intended purpose, and if that is so what is there to prevent Motueka being included with Porirua and Otaki?

*Mr. Heke:* The idea is to bring together a sufficient number of reserves to produce sufficient proceeds to set up a strong technical school, and Mr. Stafford's suggestion is a good one, because the tribes are one and the desire is one.

## APPENDICES.

## APPENDIX A.

## GRANT FOR COLLEGE AT PORIRUA.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at Porirua . . . . . under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by a deed from the Natives been ceded for the support of the school:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, Bishop of New Zealand, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at the entrance of Porirua Harbour . . . . . and bounded on the southern side by a line running from Rocky Bay, near Titahi Bay, at an angle of 99 deg. with the magnetic meridian till it intersects the base of the hills on the south side of the One Poto Creek, the foot of the hills forming the boundary from thence to the head of the creek; on the east by Porirua Harbour; and on the north and west by the sea; the content being five hundred acres or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated in the plan drawn in the margin of these presents— together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

28th December, 1850.

G. GREY.

## APPENDIX B.

E HOA E KAWANA KERI,—

Tena koe. E pono ana ta matou whakaaetanga ki "Witireia" hei Kareti ma te Pihopa. E hara i te mea he tuku atu na matou hei kainga ma te Pihopa, otira mona mo nga Pihopa a muri ake nei e whakakapia ai tona turanga, hei whakatupu i nga ritenga o te whakaponono ki a te Karaiti kia waiho ai hei patutu kia ruru ai i nga hau huanoa o te ao, ara i te he. Heoti ano, kua tuman rawa taua kainga hei Kareti ma nga Pihopa o te Haki o Ingarangi.

Na

Otaki, 16th Akuhata, 1848.

TE RAUPARAHĀ.

TAMIHĀNA TE RAUPARAHĀ.

MATENE.

HOANI TE OKORO.

WIEMU KANAE.

RAWIRI PUHA.

WATARAHĪ NOHORUA.

RAWIRI HIKIHĪKI.

[ORIGINAL (FREE) TRANSLATION.]

FRIEND GOVERNOR GREY,—

Otaki, 16th August, 1848.

Greeting. It is a perfect consenting on our part that Witireia shall be given up to the Bishop for a college. We give it up not merely as a place for the Bishop for the time being, but in continuation for those bishops who shall follow and fill up his place to the end that religion in faith in Christ may grow, and that it may be as it were a shelter against uncertain storms—that is, against the evils of this world. This is the full and final giving-up of that place as a college for the Bishops of the Church of England.

TE RAUPARAHĀ. (Died 27th November, 1849.)

TAMIHĀNA TE RAUPARAHĀ. (Died 22nd October, 1876.)

MATENE TE WHIWHI. (Died 29th September, 1881.)

HOANI TE OKORO.

WIEMU KANAE.

RAWIRI PUHA.

WATARAHĪ NOHORUA.

RAWIRI HIKIHĪKI.

## [LITERAL TRANSLATION.]

O FRIEND GOVERNOR GREY,—

Otaki, 16th August, 1848.

Greeting. Our consent as to "Witireia" for a college for the Bishop is true (*bona fide*). It is not that it is a gift by us for a kainga (residence) for the Bishop, but for him and the Bishops who will hereafter fill his position, to promote the growth of the principles of faith in Christ, and that it may remain a break-wind affording shelter from the various winds of the world—that is to say, from evil. Sufficient. That kainga stands absolutely permanent (fixed or firm) as a college for the Bishops of the Church of England.

Signed by us, TE RAUPARAHA, &amp;c.

His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor, Wellington.

E HOA E TE KAWANA,—

Kei Otaki, 24th March, 1849.

Na matou tenei whenua. I tukua atu ki a te Kuini hei kainga pumanu mo te Pihopa o te Hahi o Ingarangi, mo nga Pihopa hoki o mua atu, hei kareti mo nga tamariki Maori Pakeha, kia honohonoa hei iwi kotahi i roto i te tikanga hou o te whakapono ki te Karaiti, o te whakarongo hoki ki nga tikanga o te Kuini.

TE RAUPARAHA.  
TE WATARAUHI NOHORUA.  
WIREMU NEERA KANAE.  
RAWIRI PUAHA.  
HOHEPA HENGIA.  
KO ROPATA.  
HOANI TE OKORO.

RAWIRI PIHANA TE KOTAHI.  
PAEA.  
HOROPAPERA PAKEKOU.  
APERAHAMA TE KAWE.  
TAMIHANA TE RAUPARAHA.  
HENARE MATENE TE WHIWHI.

## [TRANSLATION.]

O FRIEND THE GOVERNOR,—

At Otaki, 24th March, 1849.

This is our land. It has been given to the Queen as a permanent place for the Bishop of the Church of England, and also for former (*sic.* ? future) Bishops, as a college for Maori and Pakeha children, to join them together as one race in the new principles of the faith in Christ, and in obedience to the authority of the Queen.

## APPENDIX C.

## COPY OF LETTER FROM LORD BISHOP TO LIEUT.-GOVERNOR EYRE.

MY DEAR SIR,—

Otaki, 24th March, 1849.

I enclose the rough plan of Whitireia as agreed upon with the Native owners of the Ngatitooa Tribe this day, and I hope that Your Excellency will approve of the alteration. If possible, I would suggest that a surveyor might accompany Mr. Williams on his return from Wellington to remove all further doubt with regard to the boundary, and to resurvey the new boundary, the expenses of which I shall be, of course, willing to defray. After this I have the honour to request that the Crown grant may be issued, upon which I will take the earliest opportunity of commencing the works. I also beg an extension of the time proposed by His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief in consideration of the present high price of labour, and the low state of the English funds in which part of the money is invested which would be spent upon the college estate, but which would now have to be sold out at a heavy loss. To the condition itself I have no objection, but very much approve of the principle.

I have, &amp;c.,

G. A. NEW ZEALAND.

## COPY OF DESPATCH FROM LIEUT.-GOVERNOR EYRE TO GOVERNOR GREY.

SIR,—

Government House, Wellington, 7th April, 1849.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's despatch No. 7 of the 5th February last, on the subject of an application which the Lord Bishop has made to be allowed to have a portion of land transferred to him by the Ngatitooa Tribe for the purpose of building a college at Porirua, and in which Your Excellency sanctions the Bishop's application being complied with subject to certain restrictions. Upon communicating to the Bishop the general terms upon which it was proposed to carry out this arrangement, His Lordship at once acquiesced, but requested that the period within which he should be required to complete the expenditure of £5 per acre should be extended from three years to five, on the grounds that if compelled to spend the whole amount in so short a time as three years the buildings which might be erected would not in reality represent an equivalent in value to the expenditure, owing to the very high prices at which, owing to particular circumstances, building-materials are now saleable, and to the great scarcity of mechanics, and the consequent exorbitant rates of wages demanded by them.

Fully assured of the justice of His Lordship's objection, and knowing from the great difficulty experienced in getting the Whanganui Hospital built, that at the present moment it is almost impossible to get work of any kind executed unless at a rate far beyond its fair value, I at once consented to extend the time from three years to five, on condition of the Lord Bishop being bound down to expend a sum which shall amount to not less than £1 per acre within the first year, £2 per acre within the second year, £3 per acre within the third year, £4 per acre within the fourth year, and £5 per acre within the fifth year.



With regard to the extent of land to be granted to the Bishop, I have been guided by Your Excellency's instructions, and by a consideration of the purpose for which the land is required, and which makes it of paramount importance that the position should be as compact and as isolated as possible. To attain this, advantage has been taken of the natural features of the ground, and a boundary-line been determined on which will connect the two converging bays of a peninsula and cut off by a single line of fence the required quantity. The acreage has not yet been ascertained, but it will probably be about 600 acres—somewhat more than the Bishop would under ordinary circumstances have wished to have had, inasmuch as a very large portion consists entirely of steep and inaccessible hills, but which it was necessary to include in order to obtain that compactness and isolation which were desired, as well as to obviate the necessity of a large expenditure being incurred in running fences to enclose the property across steep and unavailable mountains. I enclose a copy of a sketch showing roughly the general aspect of the ground and the boundary-line proposed. This is the original arrangement proposed by the Bishop when he first communicated with me on the subject, and in which the Natives at the time fully assented. Upon my sending out a surveyor, however, towards the close of last year he reported that the Natives were unwilling to give up the whole block wished for by the Bishop, and excepted a piece upon which a cottage was built by Mr. Servantes. The result was that an immense line of fence would have been required, running for the most part over very rugged and precipitous hills (as shown by the dotted lines in the accompanying plan), and a point would have existed almost close to the site of the intended college, which might have been appropriated or made use of in a way that might materially have interfered with the utility of the institution. When, therefore, the Bishop upon his recent visit to Wellington undertook to pay Mr. Servantes a fair value for his house, and the Natives upon this understanding at once withdrew their former objections to parting with the whole block wished for by the Bishop, I had no difficulty in consenting to the adoption of the boundary-line originally proposed and shown in the accompanying map, and my reasons for so consenting were that I believed it important to the object contemplated by the Bishop that his position should be as isolated, as compact, and as free from all possibility of interference or annoyance as possible, and more especially because whilst the boundary-line determined upon would not interfere with the interests of the Natives or deprive them of any land which (except the narrow belt contiguous to Mr. Servantes' house) they could use or render available by letting, it would by enclosing a larger tract of land (barren and worthless though a large portion of it is) compel a larger expenditure by the Lord Bishop for the purpose of the college than he would have had to incur had he been limited to the quantity of land actually available. I would remark, also, that I have been personally over the ground, and can fully confirm the representations made to me by the Lord Bishop, that unless the boundary had been altered from the one laid down when the surveyor was sent out last year, and shown by the dotted lines in the plan, the site would have presented so many difficulties and disadvantages as to have rendered it doubtful whether His Lordship would have felt himself justified in incurring the responsibility of adopting it as the college-site, and in incurring upon it the heavy expenditure which the establishment of such an institution necessarily entails. In its present form the ground presents unusual advantages and facilities, and is admirably adapted for the purposes for which it is required.

I have, &c.,  
J. EYRE.

COPY OF DESPATCH FROM GOVERNOR GREY TO LIEUT.-GOVERNOR EYRE.

SIR,—

Government House, Auckland, 16th May, 1849.

In reply to your despatch No. 35 of the 7th April last, upon the subject of the arrangements you had sanctioned for securing a site for a college for the Church of England at Porirua, I have to state that the alterations you have made in the conditions I had named as those upon which your sanction might be given to the proposed arrangement appear to me to be judicious, and that I see no objection to the grant to the Bishop of New Zealand.

I have, &c.,  
G. GREY.

COPY OF DESPATCH FROM LIEUT.-GOVERNOR EYRE TO GOVERNOR GREY.

(No. 147.)

SIR,—

Government House, Wellington, 28th November, 1849.

In my despatch No. 48. of the 17th May, 1849, I had the honour of transmitting to Your Excellency the opinion of the Attorney-General of New Munster relating to the interpretation which he considered ought to be put upon the Imperial Act 10 and 11 Vict., cap. 112; and I at the same time pointed out many of the very serious evils which would result to this province by delaying the adjustment of various land questions of importance if that opinion were to be adopted, and informing Your Excellency that in consequence of such opinion I deemed it my duty to bring the whole subject again under Your Excellency's review before I took any steps to complete arrangements respecting which so grave a doubt had been raised. Among the more important questions of which the adjustment was thus unfortunately deferred was that mentioned as the fourth in my despatch No. 48—viz., the granting to the Lord Bishop of New Zealand the lands given up by the Ngatitooa Natives as the site for a college at Porirua, an arrangement which Your Excellency had directed me to carry out in your despatch No. 32 of the 16th May, 1849, prior to being aware of the difficulty raised by the opinion of the Attorney-General of New Munster. Not having received from Your Excellency any further instructions in relation to this question, I am anxious to bring the subject again under Your Excellency's consideration, as the Lord Bishop gave me to understand when last he visited Wellington that it was His Lordship's intention to come down to the southern province about December of the present year for the purpose of commencing the buildings necessary for the establishment of a college, if by that time he could be put in possession of a full

and complete title, which I myself at the time believed there would be no difficulty in doing, and which I accordingly led His Lordship to suppose might be done prior to the period named for his coming to the south. Under this impression His Lordship gave directions (prior to his quitting this province) for sawn timber to be prepared ready for commencing the contemplated operations, and a considerable outlay has already been incurred on this account. But His Lordship distinctly informed me that unless the question of title were finally adjusted in sufficient time it would be impossible for him to do anything during the present summer. I am therefore most anxious that, if possible, the earliest intimation should be conveyed to the Bishop of whether under the circumstances in which the question is now involved Your Excellency will feel justified in authorising me to carry out the instructions given in despatch No. 32, and complete the arrangement by issuing to His Lordship a grant for the land given up by the Natives for the college or not, so that His Lordship may be enabled to make his arrangements for the summer accordingly; and I should feel extremely obliged if Your Excellency would have the goodness to direct that His Lordship be informed from the office of the Civil Secretary whether Your Excellency can still authorise me to issue the grant or not, as by that means the great delay of my having to communicate Your Excellency's decision from Wellington will be obviated; and if the reply be in the affirmative, no delay whatever need take place in His Lordship's carrying into effect his contemplated arrangements, as the mere preparation and execution of the grant would not occupy more than a day or two, and could be completed immediately I received Your Excellency's authority to do so. The importance to the province of the institution which the Bishop contemplated commencing this summer, and the great drawback it will be to the community, both Native and European, should such intention be defeated or considerably postponed owing to the non-completion of the grant, are so obvious that I need only mention them to insure Your Excellency's most anxious desire to avert if possible any delay in the issue of the grant in question.

I have, &c.,

J. EYRE.

COPY OF DESPATCH FROM GOVERNOR GREY TO LIEUT.-GOVERNOR EYRE.

SIR,—

Taranaki, 28th January, 1850.

In reply to your despatch 147 of the 28th November, 1849, requesting me to state whether, under the circumstances in which the question is now involved, I should feel justified in authorising you to issue a grant to the Lord Bishop of New Zealand for certain lands at Porirua, I have the honour to state that it appears to me that the advisable course for you to pursue will be to take the opinion of the Attorney-General of New Munster on the subject you allude to, and to act in conformity with his opinion, that being the course usually pursued in strictly legal questions.

G. GREY.

APPENDIX D.

AFFIDAVITS FILED IN THE COURT OF APPEAL.

I, ALEXANDER McDONALD, of Shannon, in the Provincial District of Wellington and Colony of New Zealand, sheep-farmer and licensed interpreter, make oath and say,—

1. That I arrived in Wellington in the year 1840, and have since then continuously resided in the Provincial District of Wellington, having resided from the year 1849 in the Otaki district.

2. From the time of my arrival in 1840 I have had a great deal to do with the Natives in the Wellington District, and have continuously kept up an acquaintance with them and their history and character.

3. I was personally acquainted with all the Natives who, as I am informed and believe, were the original owners and successors of the piece of land known as Whitireia—viz., Te Raupurahu, Tamihana te Rauparaoa, Matene te Whiwhi, Hoani te Okoro, Wiremu Kanae, Rawiri Puaha, Watarauhi Nohorua, and Rawiri Hikihiki—some of whom resided at Otaki, and others at Porirua.

4. All the said Natives belonged to one or more of the three tribes known as the Ngatitooa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes, which at the time when the land was ceded—namely, 1848—were allied both by blood and intermarriage.

5. I have had many conversations with the persons named in the last preceding paragraph of this my affidavit, and with other Natives belonging to those three tribes, and have always understood from such conversations that the intention of the Natives at the time that the land was ceded was that it should form a trust for the use and support of a school for the benefit primarily of the said tribes and their descendants.

6. I have also had many conversations with the Natives generally, both at the time when various other lands were ceded for educational purposes and since, and to my knowledge obtained from such conversations the intention in each case of the Natives who gave the land was that the trust should be for the benefit of the local Natives and for the tribes of which each of the donors were members and their descendants.

7. There are, to my knowledge, a very large number of Natives belonging to the said three tribes between Palmerston North and Wellington. I should say that there are at least one thousand who belong to one or more of the said three tribes.

8. At the time when I arrived in Wellington and thereafter it was common knowledge that the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, which now resides in the Wairarapa, had previously been the owners and in occupation of the land in the neighbourhood of Porirua, including the piece of land known as Whitireia, and that the said Ngatikahungunu were expelled therefrom by the said three tribes between the years 1820 and 1826.

9. The Ngatikahungunu Tribe in the Wairarapa district have become a very wealthy tribe, while the said three tribes residing between Palmerston North and Wellington are comparatively poor.

10. In my opinion, the said three tribes would decline to allow their children to go to a school or college in the Wairarapa district which was attended also by any number of the Ngatikahungunu Tribe. The feeling is still strong between the said three tribes and the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, and, in my opinion, quite apart from the fact that the said three tribes may be too poor to incur the expense of sending their children to a school at a distance from home, they would nevertheless, for the reason aforesaid and for superstitious reasons, not send their children to the Wairarapa, and, in my opinion, the descendants of the said three tribes would derive no benefit from the scheme settled on the 7th day of September, 1900, by the Supreme Court, a copy of which scheme I have read.

11. In my opinion, the said land known as Whitireia is one of the finest pieces of land in the district for pastoral or residential purposes. It is now of very great value as mere sheep-country. I consider it worth £20 per acre; but a large portion of the land is admirably suited for seaside residences, and would readily sell as such at high prices.

12. The children of the tribes between Palmerston North and Wellington suffer very much from want of education. They are not nearly so well educated as their parents, and some school in the neighbourhood of Otaki or Porirua which the Native children of the district could attend is, in my opinion, badly wanted.

Sworn at Wellington, the 19th March, 1901.

I, WILLIAM HUGHES FIELD, of the City of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, solicitor, make oath and say,—

1. That I am member of the House of Representatives for the Otaki District, which district extends from the Township of Levin on the north to Pencarrow Lighthouse on the south, including the greater portion of the Hutt Valley and the Native settlements at Porirua, Pukerua, Wainui, Paraparaumu, Waikanae, Otaki, Manakau, and Ohau.

2. That there are resident in my electoral district Natives of the number of one thousand or thereabouts, and all the said Natives, with a few trifling exceptions, are, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the descendants of one or more of three certain tribes, to wit, the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa.

3. That I am well acquainted with the land known as Whitireia, which is the land comprised in the grant dated the 28th day of December, 1850, and the subject-matter of these proceedings, the said land being situate in my electoral district.

4. I am also well acquainted with the value of land in the said electoral district, and have recently carefully examined the piece of land known as Whitireia for the purpose of ascertaining the value thereof.

5. In my opinion, the said piece of land is one of the best pieces of land within the district. Its situation renders it of special value. It is bounded on one side by the Porirua Harbour, on the other by the ocean, and, judging from the values recently obtained for land at Titahi Bay, adjoining the Whitireia Block, there are at least 100 acres of that block which are worth for the purpose of a township and seaside residences at least £100 per acre. The remaining portion of the land is particularly good pastoral country, and is, in my opinion, worth at the very least £15 per acre, and I am satisfied a large portion of it would in the near future be readily saleable at high prices for residential purposes.

6. Almost immediately after the decree was made in these proceedings by the Supreme Court on the 7th day of September, 1900, a large number of the said Natives in my electoral district came to me and pointed out and complained that under the scheme in the said decree they would derive no benefit whatever, as they were unable to send and would not send their children to school in the Wairarapa. They also complained that they were the persons who ought to receive the benefit of the trust property, as the land was given for their benefit and by the members of the tribes from which they are descended. The said Natives also inform me that they do not consider that they would be receiving any benefit from the trust property unless the trust property were devoted to some school close to their doors and in the neighbourhood of either Porirua or Otaki.

7. From my own knowledge of Native customs, and bearing in mind the former hostile relations existing between the Ngatikahungunu Tribe and the Ngatitōa and kindred tribes, it is my opinion that the latter tribes would consider it derogatory to themselves to send their children to a school in a district occupied by the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, and, as a matter of fact, would not so send them.

8. I am well acquainted with Wi Neera Te Kanae, Hanikamu Te Hiko, Raiha Puaha, Ngahuka Tungia, and Erenora Tungia, all of Porirua, and Heni te Rei, of Otaki, and know them all to be leading members of the Ngatitōa and kindred tribes.

Sworn at Wellington, the 20th March, 1901.

I, WILLIAM THOMAS LOCKE TRAVERS, of the City of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, solicitor, make oath and say,—

1. That I have resided in the Provincial District of Wellington for thirty-four years, and have always taken a great interest in the Maoris, their character, and history.

2. I acted as counsel for the Ngatitōa, Ngatiawa, and Ngatiraukawa Tribes in the inquiry before a special Native Land Court in 1869 as to the title of those tribes to the land extending from Wangaeu to Wellington, which they claimed to hold by right of conquest against the Ngatiapa, Muaupoko, and Rangitane Tribes, who had previously owned the same, and I then became well acquainted with the number and condition of the said several tribes.

3. I was personally acquainted with Tamihana te Rauparaha, Matene te Whiwhi, and many other leading chiefs of the Ngatitōa, Ngatiawa, and Ngatiraukawa Tribes, and I know that the people of the Ngatitōa Tribe were for many years previously, and at the time of the arrival of the first colonists of the New Zealand Company, in possession of the land known as Whitireia.

4. I know that many of the leading chiefs of the said tribes considered themselves as belonging to the said tribes by reason of relationship by blood and marriage.

5. From my own knowledge, I know that there are now resident between the south bank of the Manawatu River and Wellington a considerable number of Natives belonging to the said three tribes.

6. The Ngatikahungunu Tribe reside in the Wairarapa district, and are in no way related, as far as I have been able to ascertain, to the said three tribes. The said three tribes were at war with the Ngatikahungunu Tribe at a period between the years 1820 and 1826.

Sworn at Wellington, the 20th March, 1901.

I, HENI MATENE TE WHIWHI, of Otaki, in the Provincial District of Wellington, aboriginal native of New Zealand, make oath and say,—

1. That I am the daughter of Matene te Whiwhi, one of the original owners of the land known as Whitireia.

2. That I am descended from and belong to three several tribes—namely, the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes.

3. My father, the said Matene te Whiwhi, and also Te Rauparaha and Tamihana te Rauparaha, with whom I was acquainted, all resided at Otaki.

4. I remember the time when the said land was ceded by the owners thereof for the purposes of a school, and at the time when the said land was ceded Bishop Selwyn was at Otaki.

5. At the time when the said land was ceded it was intended that the school to be established was to be a school which should benefit primarily the said three tribes—namely, the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa—and their children and descendants, the land having been given by members of those said three tribes, but that the children of other tribes should also attend the school if they wished.

6. I have heard from my ancestors and relatives that before the war between the said three tribes and the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, the said Ngatikahungunu Tribe owned and resided upon the said land known as Whitireia and the adjoining lands, but that during the war the said tribe was driven from the said land and the adjoining lands by the said three tribes above named.

7. The said Ngatikahungunu Tribe is in no way related to the above-named three tribes by either blood or marriage, and were by the said tribes, and are still considered by the descendants of the said three tribes, as entire strangers.

8. There are resident at Otaki a great many Natives who are descended from the said three tribes.

9. There is at Otaki a school attended by Native children. There was also a college established there for Native children between the years 1840 and 1850, but, although the college buildings remain and are used for the purposes of habitation by the children who attend the Native school at Otaki, the college itself has become disused as such.

I, ERENORA TUNGIA, of Porirua, in the Provincial District of Wellington and Colony of New Zealand, aboriginal native, make oath and say,—

1. That I am descended from the three tribes known as the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes, and I am over seventy years old.

2. I am a niece of Te Rauparaha, and was acquainted with him and the other Natives who formerly owned the piece of land known as Whitireia.

3. I remember the time when it was decided to give the said piece of land to the Bishop of New Zealand for the purpose of a school. It was first intended by the Natives to give a piece of land at Otaki, but after much discussion they agreed to give a piece of land at Porirua instead, and Whitireia was given accordingly.

4. The intention of the Natives at the time when the said land was given was that the school should be for the benefit of the said three tribes and their descendants, and it has always since been assumed by the descendants of the said three tribes that such was the intention of the donors.

5. The Natives resident at Porirua and in the neighbourhood would not, for tribal and other reasons, send their children away from home to a school in the Wairarapa district, and therefore, if the trust property be devoted to the purposes of a school in the Wairarapa, the descendants of the said three tribes would derive no benefit therefrom.

I, RAIHA PUAHA, of Porirua, in the Provincial District of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, aboriginal native, make oath and say,—

1. That I am the wife of Joshua Henry Prosser, of Porirua, farmer.

2. That I am of the age of forty-eight years, and have always lived at Porirua, and am descended from the Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes.

3. I am well acquainted with the land known as "Whitireia," which land is the subject of the Crown grant in question in these proceedings.

4. It was and always has been assumed by the Natives at and in the neighbourhood of Porirua that the said land and the income thereof were granted for the purposes of a school at Porirua for European and Native children alike, but that, so far as the Natives were concerned, the Natives who were to attend and derive benefit from the said school were to be the children and descendants of the three kindred tribes, the said Ngatitōa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes.

5. There are at present resident at Porirua about a hundred Natives, men, women, and

children, all of whom are either pure Ngatitoas, or are descended from one or more of the said three tribes.

6. In addition to the said Natives at Porirua, there are also at Waikanae, Otaki, and Ohau, and in the Hutt district a large number of Natives who are descended also from one or more of the said three tribes.

7. That, according to Maori history, as I have heard from my parents and other relatives now deceased, the said land known as "Whitireia" was in former times occupied and owned by the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, which said tribe was driven out from the said land by the said Ngatitoo and kindred tribes, who thus acquired the said land by conquest.

8. The said Ngatikahungunu Tribe were driven by the said Ngatitoo and kindred tribes into the Wairarapa district, where they now reside, and, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, there are no Natives whatsoever in the Wairarapa district belonging to the said three tribes or any of them.

9. The said three tribes have never been on intimate terms with the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, and regard them as total strangers.

10. To the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the effect of the scheme settled by this honourable Court was first explained to the Porirua and neighbouring Natives by one of the Native members of the House of Representatives—I think, Mr. Hone Heke—and the Natives at Porirua at once complained that the said scheme would be of no benefit to them or their children, and they further say that unless the school to which the trust property is devoted be at Porirua or Otaki, or in the neighbourhood thereof, the same will not be of any benefit to them or their children.

I, HANIKAMU TE HIKO, of Porirua, in the Provincial District of Wellington and Colony of New Zealand, aboriginal native, make oath and say,—

1. That I am a descendant of the Ngatitoo, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes, and that I am forty-seven years of age, and have lived the whole of my life at Porirua.

2. That, according to Maori history, as I have heard from my parents and other relatives, the land known as "Whitireia" was in former times occupied and owned by the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, which said tribe was driven out from the said land by the said Ngatitoo and kindred tribes, who thus acquired the said land by conquest.

3. As soon as the Natives at Porirua and the neighbourhood became aware that it was intended to devote the trust fund arising from the said land known as "Whitireia" for the purposes of a school in the Wairarapa district, they complained that such scheme would be of no benefit to them or their children. The said Natives would not send their children to such school in the Wairarapa.

4. The Natives at Porirua and the neighbourhood thereof all are of the opinion that unless the school to which the trust property is devoted be at Porirua or Otaki, or in the neighbourhood thereof, the same will not be of any benefit to them or their children.

This affidavit was read over and explained in the Maori language to the deponent Hani Kamu te Hiko by Charles James Freeth, of the City of Wellington, a licensed Maori interpreter, who was duly sworn before me that he would truly and faithfully interpret, and had so truly and faithfully interpreted, the oath to be administered to the said deponents therein; and such deponent was afterwards by the interpretation of the said Charles James Freeth sworn to the truth of this affidavit at the City of Wellington, this 20th day of March, 1901, the said Charles James Freeth having also been duly sworn before me that he had so truly and faithfully interpreted such oath to the said deponent before me.—MARTIN LUCKIE, a Solicitor of the Supreme Court of New Zealand.

I, WI NEERA TE KANAE, of Porirua, in the Provincial District of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, aboriginal native, make oath and say,—

1. That I am of the age of fifty-five years, and am a member of the Ngatitoo Tribe, and have lived the whole of my life at Porirua.

2. That I am and have been for the three years last past an assessor of the Native Land Court, and am able thoroughly to understand the English language.

3. I am well acquainted with the land known as "Whitireia," which land is the subject of the Crown grant in question in these proceedings.

4. I was personally acquainted with all the original Native owners of the said land who ceded the land to the Crown, with the exception of Te Rauparaha and Watarauhi Nohuroa. Of the said Native owners Te Rauparaha, Tamihana te Rauparaha, and Matene te Whiwhi were descended from both the Ngatitoo and Ngatiraukawa. Wiremu te Kanae and Rawiri Puaha were pure Ngatitoas, Watarauhi Nohuroa and Rawiri Hikihiki belonged to the Ngatitoo, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes. The three first-named of the said Natives resided at Otaki, the others at Porirua.

5. It was and always has been assumed by the Natives at and in the neighbourhood of Porirua that the said land and the income thereof were granted for the purposes of a school at Porirua for European and Native children alike, but that, so far as the Natives were concerned, the Natives who were to attend and derive benefit from the said school were to be the children and descendants of the three kindred tribes, the said Ngatitoo, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes.

6. There are at present resident at Porirua about a hundred Natives—men, women, and children—all of whom are either pure Ngatitoas, or are descended from one or more of the said three tribes.

7. In addition to the said Natives at Porirua, there are also at Waikanae, Otaki, and Ohau, and in the Hutt district a large number of Natives who are descended also from one or more of the said three tribes.

8. I have considerable knowledge of the Natives living between Palmerston North and Wellington and in the Hutt district, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief there are resident in those districts considerably over a thousand Natives who are descended from one or more of the said three tribes. In addition there are resident in the Rangitikei district about two or three hundred Ngatiraukawas.

9. That according to Maori history, as I have heard from my parents and other relatives now deceased, the said land known as "Whitireia" was in former times occupied and owned by the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, which said tribe was driven out from the said land by the said Ngatitooa and kindred tribes, who thus acquired the said land by conquest.

10. The said Ngatikahungunu Tribe were driven by the said Ngatitooa and kindred tribes into the Wairarapa district, where they now reside, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief there are no Natives whatsoever in the Wairarapa district belonging to the said three tribes or any of them.

11. The said Ngatikahungunu Tribe belongs to the same tribe as the Natives in the Hawke's Bay District, and the said tribe have already a college, to wit, the Te Aute College, to which they are able to send their children for instruction, the said Te Aute College being attended, so far as Natives are concerned, solely by children belonging to the Ngatikahungunu and East Coast Tribes.

12. The said three tribes have never been on intimate terms with the Ngatikahungunu Tribe, and regard them as total strangers.

13. The Natives at Porirua and other places on the coast are very poor and own very little land, nor are their children so well educated as the children of most other tribes. The Natives in the Wairarapa district are in much better circumstances, and their children enjoy better educational advantages, and are better educated than the children of the said three tribes. The people at Porirua are averse to sending their children far from home to school, and within my knowledge and recollection only one child has been sent from Porirua to any school at a distance, and in that instance such child was sent to the Te Aute College. There are reasons, founded on Native custom, and based upon the former relations existing between the Ngatitooa and kindred tribes on the one hand, and the Ngatikahungunu Tribe on the other, which would render it humiliating and impossible for the said Ngatitooa and kindred tribes to send their children to a school established on the tribal lands, or in the district occupied by the Ngatikahungunu Tribe.

14. To the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the effect of the scheme settled by this honourable Court was first explained to the Porirua and neighbouring Natives by one of the Native members of the House of Representatives—I think, Mr. Hone Heke—and the Natives at Porirua at once complained that the said scheme would be of no benefit to them or their children; and they further say that unless the school to which the trust property is devoted be at Porirua or Otaki, or in the neighbourhood thereof, the same will not be of any benefit to them or their children.

15. The said land known as "Whitireia" adjoins land at Titahi Bay, which has recently been sold at prices ranging from £40 to £80 per quarter-acre section. There are many sites on Whitireia which are superior to the said land at Titahi Bay. About three-fourths of the area of Whitireia is ploughable, and is as good pastoral land as any in the district.

I, JAMES MCWILLIAM, of Otaki, in the Provincial District of Wellington, clerk in holy orders, do make oath and say as follows:—

1. That in 1867 I was appointed by Bishop Abraham, who was then Bishop of the Diocese of Wellington, and Archdeacon Hadfield, who then lived at Otaki, to be teacher of the Native school conducted under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society at Otaki, and I continued to act as such until the year 1870, when I was appointed by the Church Missionary Society to take the spiritual charge of the Maori district, of which Otaki was the headquarters, and I have resided at Otaki in that capacity up to the present time.

2. That the said district extended formerly from Wellington to the Rangitikei River, but more recently to Palmerston North, and I thus became well acquainted with the Maori population in that district, and had an intimate knowledge of their history and traditions.

3. The only tribes represented between the Manawatu River and Wellington are the Rangitane, the Muaupoko, the Ngatiraukawa, the Ngatiawa, and the Ngatitooa. The Rangitane and Muaupoko were the original tribes, and the Ngatiraukawa, the Ngatiawa, and the Ngatitooa the conquering tribes.

4. The Rangitane Tribe resides mostly between Foxton and Palmerston North, the Muaupokos on the banks of the Horowhenua Lake; the Ngatiraukawa, the Ngatiawa, and the Ngatitooa are to be found here and there along the coast from the Manawatu River to Porirua.

5. I intimately knew Tamihana te Rauparaha, Matene te Whiwhi, and Hoani te Okoro, three of the original donors of Whitireia. They were Christian converts who had come under the influence of Bishop Selwyn and Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Hadfield, as I believe the other donors had also.

6. I have a distinct recollection of conversations with Tamihana te Rauparaha and Matene te Whiwhi on the subject of their gift of Whitireia, and they fully understood, and led me to understand, that their gift was not for the exclusive benefit of their own tribes, but for children, the Queen's subjects, of all races.

7. Both Tamihana te Rauparaha and Matene te Whiwhi were by far the leading chiefs (except Te Rauparaha, who died before my time) among the donors, and they had been educated at St. John's College, Auckland. The other donors were, I believe, dead before 1867, when I came into the district, or I should have met with them in the course of my duties.

8. The old prejudice or superstition against sending boys to school into the country occupied by a tribe formerly at enmity has almost completely died out. There have been several boys sent from Otaki who are now at Te Aute College in the land of the Ngatikahungunu—namely, Kingi te

Tahiwi, Rawarakei Tata, and Terei Roera brothers, as well as one from Porirua, a son of Wi Neera te Kanae. Besides these, the following boys from the Otaki district have been educated at Te Aute—namely, Manawaroa te Aweawe, Titi Ruihi Wehipeihana, Edward Coutts, and Tumeke Tarahape, besides others whose names I do not recall. The above, except Coutts, are pure-bred Maoris, whose names I remember and are all of the above-mentioned West Coast tribes, two of them belonging to the Rangitane. This process has been going on for several years past, and there are now more applications from the West Coast than can be accepted at Te Aute, also several girls from this coast have been educated at Hukarere, in Napier, also in the Ngatikahungunu country.

9. Our chief difficulty at Otaki with the Church Missionary school there is that it is a day-school in the midst of a Maori population, and consequently the children's attendance is most irregular. The Government Inspector reports well of the school, but he has always had to be lenient owing to irregular attendance, which he knew to be inevitable, as the pupils lived at home.

10. Whenever Maoris of the above tribes, whether conquerors or conquered, are at Otaki they all worship together.

11. Pineaha, formerly the Maori clergyman in the Wairarapa, who died three or four years ago, was a Ngatiraukawa, who did good work among the Ngatikahungunus, and married one of them.

Sworn at the City of Wellington, the 22nd day of March, 1901.

I, FREDERIC WALLIS, of the City of Wellington, Bishop of the Diocese of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, do make oath and say,—

1. That I have read the affidavits sworn and filed herein by leave of this honourable Court.

2. That I have been informed by persons intimately conversant with the life and character of the Maori people, and believe that the usefulness of day-schools for children of that race is greatly impeded by irregularity of attendance arising from the proximity of the parents and relatives of such children, and that such children receive the greatest benefit at boarding-schools, where they are removed from the surroundings and influences of their homes.

3. That the Native school at Otaki is under the control of a trustee appointed by the Church Missionary Society in London, and is in no way controlled by the residents or by the Bishop of the Diocese of Wellington.

4. That it is intended by the trustees of the Porirua College estate that the amounts to be applied out of the funds of the trust shall be sufficient to cover not only the maintenance of the scholars at the school to be established in the Wairarapa, but also the cost of their journeys to and from that school.

5. That the site determined for the said school is seven miles distant from the nearest Maori pas, which are at Papawai and at Te Oreore, and that children of the Ngatitooa, Ngatiraukawa, and Ngatiawa Tribes who may attend the school will therefore not be brought into contact with parents of children resident in the Wairarapa or elsewhere.

6. That I am informed by Mr. John Thornton, master of the Native school at Te Aute, Hawke's Bay, and believe that scholars from all parts of the North Island are educated at that school, and that no disputes have occurred among children belonging to various tribes. The following is a copy of a telegram received by me yesterday from Mr. Thornton, in answer to my inquiry on the subject: "We have representatives of nearly all the principal tribes, including West-Coasters. Never had the shadow of a disturbance amongst boys arising from ancient tribal feuds. The idea is absurd.—JOHN THORNTON, Te Aute."

7. That the scheme adopted by the Supreme Court provides, and that it is the *bonâ fide* intention of the respondents to carry out the provision, that all such benefits from the Porirua Estate trust shall accrue to children of the Ngatitooa Tribe (and failing them to children of the West Coast tribes) as can possibly have been contemplated by the original donors of the land other than may be involved in the fact that it was contemplated that the site of the proposed college should be at Porirua.

8. That the purchase-money for the site of the proposed school in Wairarapa, together with the buildings on the said site and the farm appurtenant thereto, will be paid from other than the Porirua College funds, and that no benefit therefore will accrue for the Wairarapa Natives from the Porirua endowment as has been alleged.

9. That £200 a year, the present rental of the Porirua Reserve, is the amount assessed on the 17th May, 1894, as the basis of a fourteen-years lease by Mr. A. J. Rutherford, a competent valuer appointed for that purpose by the trustees of the reserve, and that the said reserve is valued under "The Government Valuation of Land Act, 1894," at £2,500.

Sworn at the City of Wellington, the 22nd May, 1901.

AFFIDAVIT OF OCTAVIUS HADFIELD (SWORN 29TH MARCH, 1899)

I, OCTAVIUS HADFIELD, of Marton, in the Provincial District of Wellington, in the Colony of New Zealand, Bishop, do make oath and say,—

1. That I have resided on the west coast of the North Island of New Zealand so far back as the year 1839 until the year 1870, when I was consecrated Bishop of the Diocese of Wellington, since which time until my resignation of the pastoral care of the diocese I resided in the City of Wellington.

2. That during the portion of my career in New Zealand and until my consecration my principal duties lay with the Maori population living between Wellington and the Manawatu River, and I was well acquainted with the tribes inhabiting the coast within those limits, and also with the different leading and influential members of such tribes.

3. I was well acquainted with Te Rauparaha, Matene te Whiwhi, and Tamihana te Rauparaha. The two latter, belonging to the west coast of this Island, and to the Ngatiraukawa Tribe, were placed by Bishop Selwyn (then Bishop of New Zealand) at St. John's College, at



Auckland, which was an institution established by him for the purpose of giving religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language for Her Majesty's subjects of all races, and of children of poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the South Pacific, and at which institution English and Maoris were educated together. It was their experience at St. John's that induced the donors to request the Bishop to make provision that, when circumstances should admit of it, a college similar to St. John's College should be established in the southern part of this Island.

4. These Natives being desirous that a similar institution should be established near their own homes, which would serve as a centre of education for the southern part of the Island, they and other chiefs made a proposal to Bishop Selwyn. They offered, and he accepted, a piece of land as a site or as an endowment for "a college for the English and Native youth to be brought up together in the new principles of obedience to the Queen and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."

5. The quotation is a statement of Bishop Selwyn's made in a letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Ely in September, 1850; but I was sufficiently acquainted with the Bishop and with the donors and the circumstances generally to know that the statement was correct.

6. The following is a copy of the letter written by the donors, having reference to the giving of the said piece of land:—

" Otaki, 16th August, 1848.

" FRIEND GOVERNOR GREY,--Greeting. It is a perfect consenting on our part that Whitireia shall be given up to the Bishop for a college. We give it up not merely as a place for the Bishop for the time being, but in continuation for those Bishops who shall follow and fill up his place, to the end that religion and faith in Christ may grow, and that it may be as it were a shelter against uncertain storms—that is, against the evils of this world. This is the full and final giving-up of that place as a college for the Bishops of the Church of England."

[Signed by Te Rauparaha, Tamihana te Rauparaha, Matene te Whiwhi, and five others.]

In reply to this, the following minute was written:—

" Acknowledge this, and say that I shall have much pleasure in sanctioning this giving-up a portion of their reserve at Porirua for the benevolent and useful purpose of founding a college, and that I will communicate their offer to the Lord Bishop. Such laudable and generous conduct will be made known in England, and cannot fail of insuring the commendation of all good men, and the Queen will rejoice in seeing her Maori subjects setting so good an example to the Europeans.

" When they wish I will send out a surveyor that they may indicate the quantity and boundaries of the land they wish to transfer to the Bishop, that a plan may be made and the arrangement completed.

" 7th October."

" E. EYRE, Lieutenant-Governor.

7. Two years later a grant of the said land from the Crown was issued to the Lord Bishop of New Zealand. It recited, "Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua, under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of the children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by a deed from the Natives been ceded for the support of the same school," and expressed the trust as follows: "To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, to and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

It is plain that the land thus made over to Bishop Selwyn was intended to be a site and to serve as an endowment for a school or college to be used primarily by the English and Maoris, but also by Her Majesty's subjects of all races, and by poor inhabitants of islands in the Pacific which did not belong to the Crown, and it was to be under the control of the Bishops of the Church of England in this colony, and that emphasis was laid on religious teaching.

8. Bishop Selwyn expended on the land much more money than its value. Money was paid to a Mr. Servantes, who occupied a house on it, as a compensation for the house, and there were improvements effected to the said land in clearing and fencing, from Porirua Harbour to the sea-coast.

9. From my first acquaintance with Porirua, in 1839, onwards, there were never more than about 125 of the Ngatitōa Tribe living there, and the proposed college was never intended for them as a tribe having any peculiar interest in it.

10. A schoolmaster was sent on to the land to make a beginning, but the children attended so irregularly that he resigned. I was not at that time a trustee of the land, but Bishop Selwyn consulted me as to the appointment of the schoolmaster and the commencement of the school; and I was interested in the proposed college from the beginning, as I acted on behalf of both the Bishop of New Zealand and the donors in obtaining the land referred to.

11. St. John's College, Auckland, even at the time of the gift of the said land, was, though in an early stage, a thriving institution. Two of the students—Rev. Riwaē te Ahu and Rev. Rota Waitoa—had previously been my pupils at Waikanae and Otaki. They completed their education at St. John's, and were subsequently admitted to holy orders.

12. At the time of the gift, land on the west side of Porirua Harbour was of small value, and the 500 acres was not worth more than the money expended on it by Bishop Selwyn for the purpose of a building, clearing the land, and carrying a good fence across the harbour to the sea-coast, and without making this expenditure the trustees could not have accumulated the funds now in their hands.

## ORDER AND SCHEME OF SUPREME COURT.

*Sealed 15th October, 1900.*

On this 7th day of September, 1900.

THIS case having been argued on the 18th and 19th April, 1900, by Mr. Quick and Mr. Tolhurst, of counsel for the plaintiffs, and Sir Robert Stout and Mr. Gully, of counsel for the Solicitor-General, this Court did on the 19th day of May, 1899 (amongst other things more particularly hereinafter set out), declare that neither of the schemes filed on behalf of the plaintiffs and defendant should be adopted, but that the matter should stand over for further consideration: Whereupon the plaintiffs, having filed an amended scheme which was submitted to the consideration and for the adoption of this Court on the 16th August, 1900, by Mr. Quick, of counsel for the plaintiffs, and opposed by Mr. Gully, of counsel for the Solicitor-General, this Court has made certain modifications or additions to the said amended scheme, which, having been assented to by the plaintiffs, are embodied in the scheme set forth in the schedule hereto. Now this Court, having taken into consideration the facts which have been proved to its satisfaction at the first hearing of this case, doth hereby declare,—

1. That the land situate at the entrance to Porirua Harbour, described in the Crown grant set out in the statement of claim as having been granted to the late Bishop Selwyn, was held by him, and is now held by the plaintiffs, his successors, as an endowment for a school for the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly known as the Church of England.

2. That such school should be a training-school for children of the poorer class who have progressed to some substantial extent at the common schools or their equivalent, and are then prepared to take full advantage of some industrial training, either, for instance, in farming operations, or farming and some other art or arts, it not being necessary to make instruction in English a principal feature.

3. That the religious teaching taught at such school shall be such as is approved of by the said Church.

And it appearing that it would be a waste of the trust-moneys to erect a school on the land so granted, and that if such a school were started there it would fail to fulfil the purpose of the trusts; and it appearing that certain trustees hold land in the Wairarapa district and funds accruing therefrom, which lands were granted to the late Bishop Selwyn on the same trusts as those set out in the Crown grant of the land at Porirua Harbour, excepting that they were granted for the use, maintenance, and support of a college in the Wairarapa Valley; and it appearing that the said trustees are about to start an institution in the Wairarapa Valley to comply with their trusts, and that they have agreed to accept scholars whose maintenance and education shall be provided for by the plaintiffs or their successors; and this Court being of opinion that the scheme set forth in the schedule hereto is a proper scheme for the future management of the net rent and profits arising from the said land at Porirua Harbour, and the net income of the fund representing accumulated rentals and interest: let the said scheme be adopted and carried into effect; and let the plaintiffs' costs of and incidental to these proceedings, as taxed by the Registrar as between solicitor and client, be paid out of the income of the trust.

## SCHEDULE.

SCHEME for the Application of Rents accruing from a Piece of Land comprised in a Crown Grant dated the 28th day of December, 1850, to George Augustus, Bishop of New Zealand, of a Piece of Land granted for the Endowment of a School at Porirua, and also for the Application of the Interest accruing from the Investment of such Rents.

That the trustees of the said land be empowered to expend the net rents and profits arising from the said land, and the net income from the fund representing accumulated rentals and interest, in the following manner:—

1. A school or college being about to be established in the Wairarapa Valley out of endowments vested in trustees for the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called "the Church of England," upon trusts the same as those expressed in the Crown grant of the land at Porirua, the net rent and income in the hands of the plaintiffs, as far as the same will permit, shall be devoted to the maintenance of scholars in the Wairarapa institution, a fair sum being charged for maintenance and education.

2. That preference shall be given to children belonging to the Ngatitōa Tribe; failing them, preference to children of the West Coast Tribe.

3. That the proposed system of education shall be such as appears in this judgment.

4. That no youth shall be refused a scholarship on the ground of religious belief, no religious test whatever being applied to the applicants.

5. That the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called "the Church of England," or by its consent, the Diocese and Synod of the Diocese of Wellington or its standing committee, shall have power to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the foregoing portion of this scheme under the subject to which the same shall be carried out.

By the Court.

[The seal of the Supreme Court of New Zealand.]

W. A. HAWKINS,  
Deputy Registrar.

APPENDIX E.  
PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS.

<i>Receipts.</i>		£ s. d.	<i>Expenditure.</i>		£ s. d.
1853			1855.		
to	Cash, Bishop of New Zealand ..	197 0 0	April 26	Loan, Church of England Edu- cation Society ..	200 0 0
1859.	Rents to 1st October, 1856 ..	80 0 0		Balance carried forward ..	77 0 0
		277 0 0			277 0 0
1859.			1859.		
Sept.	Balance brought forward ..	77 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	227 14 1
Oct. 11	Rents — Arrears, 3 years to 1st				
and 17.	April, 1859 .. .. .	150 0 0			
Dec. 31.	Interest on Account .. .. .	14 1			
		227 14 1			227 14 1
1860.			1861.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	227 14 1	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	227 14 1
1862.			1862.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	227 14 1	May 14.	Loan, Bishop of Wellington ..	200 0 0
Mar. 10.	Part loan, Church of England Edu- cation Society, repaid ..	100 0 0	July 3.	" ..	200 0 0
May 6.	Rent paid by Richards, two years to 1st April, 1861 .. .. .	100 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	53 14 1
	Interests—				
July 3.	On fixed deposits .. .. .	8 0 0			
Aug. 13.	Loan to Education Society ..	10 0 0			
Nov. 13.	" Bishop of Wellington ..	8 0 0			
		453 14 1			453 14 1
1863.			1863.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	53 14 1	Dec. 31.	Fixed deposit* .. .. .	150 0 0
July 22.	Remainder of loan, Church of Eng- land Educational Society, repaid	100 0 0		Balance carried forward ..	130 4 1
Aug. 18.	Rents, Richards, two years to 1st April, 1863 .. .. .	100 0 0			
	Interest—				
July 12.	On fixed deposit .. .. .	0 10 0			
Nov. 13.	Education Society, one year ..	10 0 0			
	Bishop of Wellington, one year, to 14th May and 1st July ..	16 0 0			
		280 4 1			280 4 1
1864.			1864.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	130 4 1	Jan. 18.	Loan, Bishop of Wellington, 18 h January .. .. .	100 0 0
April 8.	Rent, Richards, one year to 1st April, 1864 .. .. .	50 0 0	Oct. 11.	Fixed deposit .. .. .	150 0 0
Nov. 12.	Interest, Bishop of Wellington, £500 at 4 per cent. ..	20 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	54 4 1
Oct. 11.	Paid Union Bank by Mr. Thatcher (probably part loan repaid and £4 interest: see year 1863) ..	104 0 0			
		304 4 1			304 4 1
1865.			1865.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	54 4 1	May 29.	Loan, Crofton Grammar School ..	300 0 0
April 5.	Rent, Richards, one year to 1st April, 1865 .. .. .	50 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	41 2 11
May 22.	Deposit repaid, per Bishop of Wellington .. .. .	150 0 0			
May 22.	Bishop of Wellington (probably part loan repaid) .. .. .	50 0 0			
	Interest—				
May 22.	On deposit, £150, at 7 per cent., from 11th October, 1864, to 22nd May, 1865 .. .. .	7 18 10			
Nov. 13.	On loan, Bishop of Wellington ..	29 0 0			
		341 2 11			341 2 11
1866.			1866.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	41 2 11	Jan. 4.	Mr. Knell, for Otaki School ..	25 0 0
Feb. 13.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st April, 1866 .. .. .	75 0 0	April 9.	F. D. R. .. .. .	100 0 0
Nov. 13.	Interest, Bishop of Wellington, one year .. .. .	38 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	29 2 11
		154 2 11			154 2 11
1867.			1867.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	29 2 11	Dec. 31.	Otaki School .. .. .	137 10 0
Feb. 13—	Rent, Richards, one year and a			Balance carried forward ..	42 2 11
Oct 2.	half, to 1st October, 1867 ..	112 10 0			
Nov. 13.	Interest, Bishop of Wellington, one year .. .. .	38 0 0			
		179 12 11			179 12 11

\* This appears to have been withdrawn and lent to the Bishop, being repaid £100 on 11th October, 1864 (with interest), through Mr. Thatcher, and £50 on 22nd May 1865, by the Bishop.

## PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—continued.

<i>Receipts.</i>		£ s. d.	<i>Expenditure.</i>		£ s. d.
1868.			1868.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	42 2 11	July 2.	Otaki School .. ..	112 15 0
July 7.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st October, 1868 .. ..	75 0 0	Dec. 31.	Metropolitan Reg. .. ..	5 0 0
April 14.	F. D. R., interest, 9th April, 1866, to 14th April, 1868, at 6 per cent. .. ..	12 8 4		Balance carried forward ..	135 11 3
April 14.	F. D. R. .. ..	100 0 0			
July 1.	Interest, Bishop of Wellington ..	23 15 0			
		253 6 3			253 6 3
1869.			1869.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	135 11 3	Dec. 31.	McWilliam, Otaki School ..	75 0 0
Dec. 1.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st October, 1869 .. ..	75 0 0		Balance carried forward ..	183 11 3
July 23.	Interest, Bishop of Wellington, one year, to 1st July, 1869 ..	48 0 0			
		258 11 3			258 11 3
1870.			1870.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	183 11 3	Dec. 31.	McWilliam, Otaki School ..	45 10 0
Mar. 28.	Rent, Richards, half-year, to 1st April, 1870 .. ..	37 10 0		Balance carried forward ..	223 11 3
	Interest, Bishop of Wellington, one year, to 1st July, 1870 ..	48 0 0			
		269 1 3			269 1 3
1871.			1871.		
Jan. 1.	Balance .. ..	223 11 3	Dec. 31.	McWilliam, Otaki School ..	37 10 0
Oct. 27.	Rent, Richards, one year and a half, to 1st October, 1871 ..	112 10 0		Balance carried forward ..	346 11 3
	Interest, St. Hill (formerly paid by Bishop of Wellington), one year, to 1st July, 1871 ..	48 0 0			
		384 1 3			384 1 3
1872.			1872.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	346 11 3	July 8.	McWilliam, Otaki .. ..	37 10 0
Nov. 5.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st October, 1872 .. ..	75 0 0	Sept. 28.	Miss McWilliam, Otaki ..	37 10 0
Aug. 7.	Interest, St. Hill, one year, to 1st July, 1872 .. ..	48 0 0	Sept. 7.	Share cost of safe .. ..	5 0 0
		469 11 3	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	389 11 3
					469 11 3
1873.			1873.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	389 11 3	June 24.	McWilliam, Otaki .. ..	12 10 0
Nov. 3.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st October, 1873 .. ..	75 0 0	Nov. 12.	Menzies, Otaki .. ..	58 10 0
July 24.	Interest, St. Hill, one year, to 1st July, 1873 .. ..	48 0 0	Dec. 31.	Balance carried forward ..	441 11 3
		512 11 3			512 11 3
1874.			1874.		
Jan. 1.	Balance brought forward ..	441 11 3	Jan. 5.	McWilliam, Otaki .. ..	12 10 0
April 25.	Rent, Richards, half-year, to 1st April, 1874 .. ..	37 10 0	April 2.	Menzies, Otaki .. ..	50 0 0
Feb. 13.	Interest, St. Hill, half-year, to 1st January, 1874 .. ..	24 0 0	May 27.	Balance carried forward ..	440 11 3
		503 1 3			503 1 3
1874.			1875.		
May 27.	Balance income account brought forward .. ..	440 11 3	July 7.	Salary, Menzies, Otaki Native school .. ..	125 0 0
1875.			June 4.	Loan to Mr. Lodd .. ..	630 0 0
Jan. 15.	Mortgage, St. Hill, repaid 15th January, 1875 .. ..	800 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	610 11 3
Feb. 4.	Rent to 1st April, 1875 (Richards) ..	75 0 0			
Jan. 23.	Interest, St. Hill, £300 at 6 per cent., one year and fifteen days ..	50 0 0			
		1,365 11 3			1,365 11 3
Accumulated funds—			1876.		
	Balance at bank .. ..	610 11 3	Mar. 27.	Salary, Menzies, Otaki Native school .. ..	100 0 0
	Mortgage .. ..	630 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	642 5 3
		1,240 11 3			742 5 3
1875.			1876.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	610 11 3			
1876.					
April 8.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st April, 1876 .. ..	75 0 0			
June 6.	Interest, Lodd, one year, at 9 per cent., to 4th June, 1876 ..	56 14 0			
		742 5 3			742 5 3
Accumulated funds—					
	Balance at bank .. ..	642 5 3			
	Mortgage .. ..	630 0 0			
		1,272 5 3			

## PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—continued.

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
		£ s. d.			£ s. d.
1876.			1876.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	642 5 3	Aug. 9.	Loan, Crowther, ..	600 0 0
1877.			1877.		
June 27.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st April, 1877 ..	75 0 0	June 21.	Commission, &c. ..	32 6 0
" 27.	Interest, Lodd, one year, at 9 per cent., to 4th June, 1877 ..	56 14 0	" 30.	Balance carried forward ..	171 13 3
" 1.	Interest, Crowther, two quarters, at 10 per cent., to 9th February, 1877 ..	30 0 0			
		803 19 3			803 19 3
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank ..	171 13 3			
	Mortgage ..	1,230 0 0			
		1,401 13 3			
1877.			1877.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	171 13 3		Commission to 31st December	6 12 6
1878.			1878.		
June 4.	Rent, Richards, one year to 1st April, 1878 ..	75 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	342 11 3
" 4.	Interest, Lodd, three quarters, to 4th March, 1878 ..	42 10 6			
" 4.	Interest, Crowther, one year, to 9th February, 1878 ..	60 0 0			
		349 8 9			349 8 9
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank ..	342 11 3			
	Mortgages ..	1,230 0 0			
		1,572 11 3			
1878.			1878.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	342 11 3	May 3.	Mortgage, St. Paul's ..	500 0 0
1879.			June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	5 1 9
April 1.	Rent, Richards, one year, to April, 1879 ..	75 0 0			
" 5.	Interest, Lodd, three quarters, to December, 1878 ..	42 10 6			
May 14.	Interest, Crowther, three quarters, to 9th November, 1878 ..	45 0 0			
		505 1 9			505 1 9
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank ..	5 1 9			
	Mortgages ..	1,730 0 0			
		1,735 1 9			
1879.			1880.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	5 1 9		Commisison for 1879 ..	8 16 2
1880.				" to 30th June, 1880 ..	7 8 4
April 9.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st April, 1880 ..	75 0 0		Postages ..	0 19 8
Feb. 21.	Interest, Lodd, two quarters, to June, 1879 ..	28 7 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	196 4 7
March 2.	Interest, Crowther, three quarters, to 9th August, 1879 ..	54 0 0			
		153 8 9			153 8 9
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank ..	196 4 7			
	Mortgages ..	1,730 0 0			
		1,866 4 7			
1880.			1880.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	196 4 7		Rent, Crowther, to Natives ..	97 10 0
	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st April, 1881 ..	75 0 0		Rates, to 5th October, 1880 ..	2 10 0
	Interest, Lodd, to 12th March, 1881, one year and thirty-five days ..	96 17 11		Commission to 9th May, 1881 ..	4 10 9
	Interest, St. Paul's, two years twenty-nine days, to 1st June, 1881 ..	86 9 3		Cash paid Ollivier and Co. ..	12 6 7
	Sale of land, Crowther ..	102 10 5	1881.		
	Rent, Crowther ..	113 15 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	493 19 10
		610 17 2			
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank ..	493 19 10			
	Mortgages ..	1,730 0 0			
	Less Crowther's, foreclosed ..	600 0 0			
	Land at Sandon from mortgage foreclosed ..	30 0 0			
		1,653 19 10			610 17 2

PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—*continua.*

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
		£ s. d.			£ s. d.
1881.			1881.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	493 19 10	July 1.	Commission .. ..	18 1 10
	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st		July 1.	Rent to Natives <i>in re</i> Crowther ..	58 10 0
	April, 1882 .. ..	75 0 0	Aug. 1.	Repairing house .. ..	12 19 2
	Interest, Lodd, one year and one		Aug.	Survey to rectify boundary .. ..	15 0 0
	quarter, to 12th June, 1882 ..	78 15 0	1882.		
	Rents, Crowther .. ..	50 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward .. ..	593 3 10
					697 14 10
		697 14 10			697 14 10
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank .. ..	593 3 10			
	Mortgages .. ..	1,130 0 0			
	Land at Sandon .. ..	30 0 0			
		1,753 3 10			
1882.			1882.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	593 3 10	Oct. 26.	Legal expenses <i>in re</i> Crowther ..	21 3 6
1883.				Commission to 30th June, 1882 ..	10 3 9
April 3.	Rent, Richards, one year, to 1st		1883.		
	April, 1883 .. ..	100 0 0	June 30.	30th June, 1883 .. ..	9 12 5
June 30.	Interest, St. Paul's .. ..	60 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward .. ..	765 15 2
Mar. 12.	Interest, Lodd, one year, to 12th				
	June, 1883 .. ..	53 11 0			
		806 14 10			806 14 10
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank .. ..	765 15 2			
	Mortgages .. ..	1,130 0 0			
	Land at Sandon .. ..	30 0 0			
		1,925 15 2			
1883.			1883.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	765 15 2	July 1.	Commission, A. Baker .. ..	8 19 4
1884.			Sept. 3.	Loan, St. Paul's .. ..	700 0 0
April 1.	Rent, Jillett, one year, to April,		1884.		
	1884 .. ..	100 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward .. ..	236 3 10
Mar. 11.	Interest, St. Paul's, to 31st De-				
	cember, 1883 .. ..	29 0 0			
June 12.	Interest, Lodd, for one year, to				
	12th June, 1884 .. ..	50 8 0			
		945 3 2			945 3 2
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank .. ..	236 3 10			
	Mortgages .. ..	1,830 0 0			
	Land at Sandon .. ..	30 0 0			
		2,096 3 10			
1884.			1885.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	263 3 10	May 5.	Secretary's salary .. ..	10 10 0
1885.			Feb. 24.	Stationery .. ..	1 0 0
May 2.	Rent, Jillett, one year, to 1st		April 24.	Loan, Sorwall .. ..	750 0 0
	April, 1885 .. ..	100 0 0	June 30.	Balance carried forward .. ..	692 17 10
May 13.	Interest, St. Paul's, to 30th Sep-				
	tember, 1884 .. ..	63 0 0			
Jan. 8.	Interest, Lodd, half-year, to De-				
	cember, 1884 .. ..	25 4 0			
Jan. 8.	Loan repaid, Lodd .. ..	630 0 0			
May 13.	Part loan repaid, St. Paul's ..	400 0 0			
		1,454 7 4			1,454 7 10
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank .. ..	692 17 10			
	Mortgages .. ..	1,550 0 0			
	Land at Sandon .. ..	30 0 0			
		2,272 17 10			
1885.			1886.		
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	692 17 10	May 14.	Secretary's salary .. ..	10 10 0
1886.			May 15.	Printing .. ..	1 7 6
April 21.	Rent, Jillett, one year, to 1st		1885.		
	April, 1886 .. ..	100 0 0	Sept. 21.	Loan, Hollard .. ..	450 0 0
June 30.	Interest, St. Paul's, to 30th June,		Oct. 6.	Loan, Gaby .. ..	150 0 0
	1886 .. ..	84 0 0	1886.		
May 5.	Interest, Sorwall, one year to 24th		June 30.	Balance carried forward .. ..	506 12 10
	April .. ..	56 5 0			
April 20.	Interest, Gaby, to 20th April ..	8 0 0			
Mar. 29.	Interest, Hollard, half-year, to				
	19th March .. ..	15 15 0			
May 29.	Interest, Wellington Trust, Loan,				
	and Investment Company .. ..	11 12 6			
April 20.	Loan, Gaby, repaid .. ..	150 0 0			
		1,118 10 4			1,118 10 4
	Accumulated funds—				
	Balance at bank and on deposit	506 12 10			
	Mortgages .. ..	2,000 0 0			
	Land at Sandon .. ..	30 0 0			
		2,536 12 10			

PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—*continued.*

<i>Receipts.</i>		£	s.	d.	<i>Expenditure.</i>		£	s.	d.
1886.					1887.				
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	506	12	10	June 11.	Secretary's salary ..	10	10	0
1887.					1886.				
May 3.	Rent, Jillett, one year, to 1st April, 1887 ..	100	0	0	Nov. 25.	Loan, Pownall ..	400	0	0
May 7.	Interest, Sorwall, one year, to 24th April, 1887 ..	56	5	0	1887.				
April 30.	Interest, Hollard, one year, to 19th March ..	31	10	0	May 13.	Loan, Longhurst ..	150	0	0
June 27.	Interest, St. Paul's, one year, to 30th June ..	56	0	0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	204	17	10
	Interest, Equitable Building and Investment Company ..	15	0	0					
		765	7	10			765	7	10
	Accumulated funds—								
	Balance at bank and on deposit ..	204	17	10					
	Mortgages ..	2,550	0	0					
	Land at Sandon ..	30	0	0					
		2,784	17	10					
1887.					1888.				
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	204	17	10	June 30.	Secretary's salary ..	10	10	0
1888.					1887.				
Jan. 6.	Rent, Jillett, three quarters, to 1st January, 1888 ..	100	0	0	July 25.	Advertising ..	2	9	6
April 25.	Interest, Sorwall, one year, to 24th April ..	56	5	1	1888.				
May 31.	Interest, Longhurst, one year, to 14th May ..	12	0	0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	446	18	5
April 19.	Interest, Hollard, one year, to 19th March ..	30	15	0					
June 30.	Interest, St. Paul's, one year, to 20th June ..	56	0	0					
		459	17	11			459	17	11
	Accumulated funds—								
	Balance at bank and on deposit ..	446	18	5					
	Mortgages ..	2,550	0	0					
	Land at Sandon ..	30	0	0					
		3,026	18	5					
1888.					1889.				
July 1.	Balance brought forward ..	466	18	5	June 21.	Secretary's salary ..	10	10	0
1889.					" 21.	Printing ..	1	7	6
Feb. 6.	Rent, Jillett, one year, to 1st January, 1889 ..	150	0	0	1888.				
April 30.	Interest, Sorwall, one year, to 24th April ..	55	6	3	Nov. 24.	Loan, Skelly ..	200	0	0
April 11.	Interest, Longhurst, one year, to 14th May ..	12	0	0	Dec. 3.	Loan, Johnson ..	200	0	0
May 2.	Interest, Holland, one year, to 19th March ..	31	10	0	1889.				
Jan. 4.	Interest, St. Paul's, half-year, to 31st December ..	24	0	0	June 30.	Balance carried forward ..	314	17	2
May 31.	Interest, Johnson, half-year, to 1st June ..	7	0	0					
		726	14	8			726	14	8
	Accumulated funds—								
	Balance at bank ..	314	17	2					
	Mortgages ..	2,950	0	0					
	Land at Sandon * ..	30	0	0					
		3,294	17	2					
1890—					1890—				
	Balance brought forward (in hand) ..	314	17	2	Secretary ..	10	10	0	
	" invested in mortgages ..	2,950	0	0	Stationery ..	0	10	0	
	Interest ..	207	15	10	Reinvested in mortgage ..	450	0	0	
	Rent, Jillett, one year, January, 1890 ..	150	0	0	Balance ..	3,611	13	0	
	Loan repaid ..	450	0	0					
		4,072	13	0			4,072	13	0
	Balance down—								
	Invested in mortgages ..	3,150	0	0					
	In hand ..	461	13	0					
		3,611	13	0					

\* Not shown in published accounts till 1903, when the land was sold.



PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—*continued.*

<i>Receipts.</i>			<i>Expenditure.</i>		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Year ended 30th June, 1891—			Year ended 30th June, 1891—		
Balance brought forward—			Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
Invested in mortgages .. ..	3,150	0 0	Printing and stationery .. ..	1	12 0
In hand .. ..	461	13 0	Legal expenses .. ..	1	17 9
Interest .. ..	254	15 6	Balance .. ..	4,002	8 9
Rent, Jillett, one year, 1st January, 1891 .. ..	150	0 0			
	4,016	8 6		4,016	8 6
Balance down—					
Invested in mortgages .. ..	3,200	0 0			
" mortgage .. ..	750	0 0			
In bank .. ..	52	8 9			
	4,002	8 9			
Year ended 30th June, 1892—			Year ended 30th June, 1892—		
Balance brought forward .. ..	4,002	8 9	Grant towards road, Porirua .. ..	20	0 0
Interest .. ..	269	2 0	Commission .. ..	16	5 0
Rent, Jillett, one year, January, 1892 .. ..	150	0 0	Printing and stationery .. ..	1	19 3
Loan paid off .. ..	750	0 0	Fee for examining securities .. ..	0	6 8
	5,171	10 9	Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
Balance down—			Deposited at interest .. ..	750	0 0
Invested in mortgages .. ..	3,200	0 0	Balance .. ..	4,372	9 10
Deposited at interest .. ..	806	9 6			
In bank .. ..	366	0 4			
	4,372	9 10		5,171	10 9
Year ended 30th June, 1893—			Year ended 30th June, 1893—		
Balance brought forward .. ..	4,372	9 10	Examining securities .. ..	0	6 8
Interest .. ..	296	12 6	Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
Rent, Jillett, one year, 1st January, 1893 .. ..	150	0 0	Stationery .. ..	0	5 0
Interest transferred from Harington trust .. ..	28	0 0	Balance .. ..	4,776	0 8
	4,787	2 4			
Balance—					
Invested in mortgages .. ..	4,220	0 0			
Deposited at interest .. ..	106	9 6			
In bank .. ..	449	11 2			
	4,776	0 8		4,787	2 4
Year ended 30th June, 1894—			Year ended 30th June, 1894—		
Balance brought forward .. ..	4,776	0 8	Legal expenses .. ..	1	3 10
Interest .. ..	280	8 10	Fee for inspecting reserve .. ..	5	5 0
Rent, Jillett, one year, 1st January, 1894 .. ..	150	0 0	Stationery .. ..	1	0 0
	5,206	9 6	Exchange .. ..	0	0 6
Balance—			Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
Invested in mortgages .. ..	4,120	0 0	Balance .. ..	5,188	10 2
Deposited at interest .. ..	205	10 0			
In bank .. ..	863	0 2			
	5,188	10 2		5,206	9 6
Year ended 30th June, 1895—			Year ended 30th June, 1895—		
Balance brought forward .. ..	5,188	10 2	Legal expenses .. ..	0	13 4
Interest .. ..	398	5 5	Printing for General Synod .. ..	0	15 0
Rent, Jillett, half-year, to 1st July, 1894 .. ..	75	0 0	Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
	5,661	15 7	Stationery .. ..	0	10 0
Balance down—			Balance .. ..	5,649	7 3
Invested in mortgages .. ..	4,970	0 0			
Deposited at interest .. ..	485	10 0			
In bank .. ..	193	17 3			
	5,649	7 3		5,661	15 7
Year ended 30th June, 1896—			Year ended 30th June, 1896—		
Balance brought forward .. ..	5,649	7 3	Legal expenses .. ..	16	10 6
Interest .. ..	344	12 6	Secretary .. ..	10	10 0
(One year's rent, £200, remitted for improvements in accordance with terms of lease.) .. ..			Stationery, stamps, &c. .. ..	0	19 9
	5,993	19 9	Balance .. ..	5,965	19 6
Balance down—					
Invested in mortgages .. ..	4,820	0 0			
Deposited at interest .. ..	485	10 0			
In bank .. ..	660	9 6			
	5,965	19 6		5,993	19 9
Interest due at 30th June unpaid .. ..	46	4 0			





PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST ACCOUNTS—*continued.**Capital Account, 31st March, 1905.*

Balance, 31st March, 1904 .. .. .	£	s.	d.	Property, College reserve, Porirua, taken at	£	s.	d.
	4,000	0	0	property-tax valuation .. .. .	4,000	0	0

*Accumulated Funds.*

Balance, 1st April, 1904.. .. .	£	s.	d.	By balance, 31st March, 1905, collected as	£	s.	d.
Transfer from Income Account £343 11 2	8,850	0	0	follows:—			
Less law costs, <i>Wi Neera v. Trustees</i> .. .. .	143	11	2	Mortgages .. .. .	2,550	0	0
	200	0	0	Deposits .. .. .	5,500	0	0
	£9,050	0	0	At bank for loan granted .. .. .	1,000	0	0
					£9,050	0	0

*Income Account.—Statement of Receipts and Payments for the Year ended 31st March, 1905.*

<i>Receipts.</i>			<i>Payments.</i>			£	s.	d.
Balance, 1st April, 1904 .. .. .	£	s.	d.	Contribution, salary Diocesan Treasurer ..	25	0	0	
Rent, Jillets, one year to July, 1904 ..	200	0	0	" audit fee .. .. .	3	10	0	
Interest .. .. .	311	1	1	Scholarships at Clareville Maori College—one				
				scholar for one year, £36; travelling-ex-				
				expenses for scholar, £6 4s. 9d. .. .. .	42	4	9	
				Report on college reserve .. .. .	4	11	6	
				Advertising .. .. .	3	11	2	
				Printing, £1 4s. 3d.; stationery, 8s. 9d.;				
				stamps, £1 5s.; sundries, 8s. 6d. .. .. .	3	6	6	
				Bank charge .. .. .	0	10	0	
				Transfer to Accumulated Fund Account ..	343	11	2	
				Balance at bank .. .. .	137	17	10	
					£564	2	11	

## SUMMARY OF LEGAL EXPENSES, TRUSTEES, PORIRUA TRUST.

1900. Legal expenses, Supreme Court .. .. .	£	s.	d.
1901. Legal " .. .. .	120	10	8
1902. Legal expenses .. .. .	58	13	8
1904. " .. .. .	1,234	12	11
1905. " <i>Wi Neera v. Trustees</i> .. .. .	598	15	2
	143	11	2
	2,156	3	7
Less refunds, 1904 .. .. .	1,002	2	8
Balance .. .. .	£1,154	0	11

## APPENDIX F.

## PORIRUA RESERVE.

*Government Valuation, 1902.*—Capital value, £4,000; unimproved value, £3,130.

*Valuation by Mr. F. Bennett.*—A large portion of this block would cut up into very valuable residential sites, especially the numerous bays on the western side of the Porirua Harbour. I consider there would be a large revenue derived from this estate if not cut up into too small sections. The valuation I have put upon the block is what I consider it is worth as a farm. The reserve, consisting of 500 acres, principally well grassed low hills, suitable for sheep or cattle farming, is well watered, subdivided into paddocks; no buildings. I value the 500 acres at £10 per acre—£5,000.

## APPENDIX G.

## GRANT FOR A SCHOOL AT OTAKI.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at Otaki . . . . . under the superintendence of the Church Missionary Society, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the Ven. William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu, the Ven. Octavius Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapiti, the Rev. Richard Taylor, of Wanganui, in trust for the said Church Missionary Society, or in the event of the death or absence of any of the above-named trustees, then to such other trustees as may be by the Church Missionary Society appointed for that purpose, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at Otaki . . . . . the boundary of which commences at a

point distant 686 links from the junction of the west side of Te Rauparaha Street with Kiharoa Street, Town of Hadfield, Otaki, measured westward along the north side of the latter street, and runs at right angles to Kiharoa Street southward for 290 links; turning at right angles to this latter line it runs towards the west 185 links, then turning southward it forms an angle with the magnetic meridian south-west 10 degrees and extends 440 links; from thence a line bearing south-west  $70\frac{1}{2}$  degrees (magnetic) forms the boundary for 3405 links; turning at the latter point south (magnetic) it extends 105 links to the Maringiawai, along which stream it extends as the water flows (westward) 3797 links to its junction with the Mangapouri; crossing this latter stream it proceeds along the foot of the hills, the verge of the flat ground on the west side of the Mangapouri for 3590 links, when it turns on a magnetic bearing north-east  $11\frac{1}{2}$  degrees 7705 links to the Waitohu Stream, by which it extends towards its source (eastward) 4863 links; from thence it proceeds by a line bearing south-east  $31\frac{1}{2}$  degrees magnetic for 3153 links to the Mangapouri; turning westward it runs as the water flows 2337 links to the fencing, by which it extends towards the north-east 960 links, and from thence by a line bearing south-east 65 degrees magnetic for 910 links; turning on a magnetic bearing south-east  $11\frac{1}{2}$  degrees it extends 1470 links to meet the continuation towards the west of the north side of Kiharoa Street along the side of which street it extends 997 links to the starting-point on a bearing (magnetic) south-east 82 degrees: the content being 396 acres 2 roods 30 perches, or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated in the plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said William Williams, Octavius Hadfield, and Richard Taylor, or their successors as appointed by the said Church Missionary Society, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

5th February, 1852.

G. GREY.

#### GRANT FOR A SCHOOL AT OTAKI.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at Otaki . . . . under the superintendence of the Church Missionary Society, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the Ven. William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu, the Ven. Octavius Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapiti, and the Rev. Richard Taylor, of Wanganui, in trust for the said Church Missionary Society, or, in the event of the death or absence of any of the above-named trustees, then to such other trustees as may be by the said Church Missionary Society appointed for that purpose, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at Otaki . . . . the boundary of which commences from a stake at a bridge over the Makuratawhiti, which stake is distant from the junction of the south side of Te Whiwhi with the east side of Te Rauparaha Street, Town of Hadfield, Otaki, 1688 links on a magnetic bearing north-west 70 degrees, and extends along the Makauratawhiti Stream towards its source a distance of 6530 links, when it turns northward and runs along the fencing and edge of the swamp 1120 links; turning at this point it runs by the foot of the hills in a westerly direction 2094 links, and from thence by a line bearing south-west (magnetic) 33 degrees 440 links; turning again on a bearing north-west 79 degrees (magnetic) it extends 910 links. The foot of the hills on the south side forms the boundary from this point westward for 2630 links when it turns on a bearing south-west  $24\frac{1}{2}$  degrees (magnetic) for 680 links to the starting-point, the content being 68 acres 2 roods 35 perches, or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated in the plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said William Williams, Octavius Hadfield, and Richard Taylor, or their successors appointed by the said Church Missionary Society, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

5th February, 1852.

G. GREY.

#### GRANT FOR A SCHOOL AT OTAKI.

WHEREAS a school has been established at Otaki . . . . under the superintendence of the Church Missionary Society, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean, and the Native owners have given a portion of land for the support thereof: And whereas it would promote the benevolent objects of the said Church Missionary Society to set apart the said piece or parcel of land for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the Ven. William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu, the Ven. Octavius Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapiti, and the Rev. Richard Taylor, of Wanganui, in trust for the said Church Missionary Society, or, in the event of the death or absence of any of the above-named trustees, then to such other trustees as may be by the said Church Missionary Society appointed for that purpose, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at Otaki . . . . containing 62 acres, or thereabouts, and bounded towards the south-west by land granted to the Church Missionary Society 3155 links; towards the east by Native land, a line bearing 345 degrees 58 minutes, 2066 links; towards the south by the southern bank of the Mangapauri Stream 1740 links; and towards the

north by the Waitohu Stream: the said boundaries being more particularly delineated on the plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said William Williams, Octavius Hadfield, and Richard Taylor, or their successors as appointed by the said Church Missionary Society, in trust nevertheless; and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

16th July, 1853.

G. GREY.

#### GRANT FOR A SCHOOL AT OTAKI.

WHEREAS a school has been established at Otaki . . . . under the superintendence of the Church Missionary Society, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean, and the Native owners have given a portion of land for the support thereof: And whereas it would promote the benevolent objects of the said Church Missionary Society to set apart the said piece or parcel of land for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the Ven. William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu, the Ven. Octavius Hadfield, Archdeacon of Kapiti, and the Rev. Richard Taylor, of Wanganui, in trust for the said Church Missionary Society, or, in the event of the death or absence of any of the above-named trustees, then to such other trustees as may be by the said Church Missionary Society appointed for that purpose, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at Otaki . . . . bounded towards the north by the Mangapouri River; towards the east by a line bearing 345 degrees 58 minutes, 1710 links; towards the south by a line bearing 91 degrees 14 minutes, 447 links, being part of the northern boundary of a piece of land granted to the Church Missionary Society; towards the south-west by a line bearing 112 degrees 23 minutes, 1182 links, being the north-eastern boundary of the said piece of land granted to the said Church Missionary Society, and being also the north-eastern boundary of a piece of land granted to the Church Missionary school; towards the south-east by a line bearing 45 degrees, 960 links, being the north-western boundary of the said piece of land granted to the said Church Missionary Society; and towards the west by the Mangapouri River: the contents being 33 acres 3 roods, or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated on the plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said William Williams, Octavius Hadfield, and Richard Taylor, or their successors as appointed by the said Church Missionary Society, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

18th June, 1853.

G. GREY.

#### APPENDIX H.

##### SCHEME SUBMITTED BY MR. STAFFORD ON BEHALF OF NGATIRAUKAWA.

THE Natives desire that the administrative control and management of the Porirua and Otaki reserves, mentioned in the schedule to the Commission, and of the accumulated rents, income, and profits thereof should be as follows:—

##### *As to Porirua Reserve.*

That this reserve and all accumulated income, rents, and profits now held by the trustees be transferred to the Public Trustee upon trust, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to sell the land or any part thereof (with power to postpone the sale) by public auction or private contract, and either together or in parcels, and to buy in and rescind any contract for sale, and to resell without being accountable for any loss occasioned thereby.

The Public Trustee to have power, with the consent of the Board hereafter constituted, to let the same land or any part thereof for any term not exceeding thirty years, absolute or determinable at the option of either party (or of one party only), to take effect in possession or within six calendar months from the making of the demise, at such rent as can be reasonably gotten without taking anything in the nature of a fine, premium, or forfeit, and under and subject to such powers, provisions, and covenants as the Public Trustee in his discretion may think fit.

To invest the moneys to arise from any sale and the accumulated rents, income, and profits now in the hands of the trustees upon such securities as may from time to time be authorised by the Governor in Council.

To pay the annual rents and income from time to time arising from the said land, or the investments aforesaid, to the Board, to be applied for the maintenance and support of the school hereinafter mentioned.

Power for the Public Trustee, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to apply any portion of the capital money in the erection of buildings for schools or buildings to accommodate the boarding and lodging of children attending the schools, or persons employed in teaching in such schools, on the Otaki reserve hereinafter mentioned, or in the repair thereof.

A commission of not exceeding 2½ per cent. to be retained by the Public Trustee upon the annual rents and income arising from the said land on the investments aforesaid.

[NOTE.—The Natives do not object if it is thought advisable that, instead of the trust property being transferred to the Public Trustee, it should be transferred to the Board, to be dealt with and disposed of in the same manner as is provided in case of transfer to the Public Trustee.]

*As to the Otaki Reserves mentioned in the Commission.*

That such reserves and all accumulated rents and incomes arising therefrom be transferred to a body corporate of five persons, to be called "The Otaki School Trust Board," consisting of three of the persons for the time being filling any of the following offices—that is to say, the Under-Secretary Native Department, the Public Trustee, the Secretary to the Department of Education, the Surveyor-General, the Under-Secretary for Lands, and the Auditor-General, and two Natives, descendants of and members of the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatitōa Tribes, to be appointed and removed by the Governor in Council, upon trust for that purpose of the school hereinafter mentioned.

Power for the Board, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to sell the land or any part thereof, and to lease the same as is provided in the case of the Porirua reserve, the capital moneys to be invested in like manner, and the income to be applied in like manner, with power for the Board, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to apply capital as is provided with respect to the Porirua reserve.

The Board may from time to time erect on some portion of the Otaki reserves such school buildings and other buildings and improvements as they may consider necessary, and may acquire by purchase or otherwise all furniture, fittings, goods, chattels, and things as may from time to time be necessary for the purpose of carrying on such school or incidental thereto, or to the purposes herein mentioned:—

(a.) For the purpose of providing for the teaching therein of Maori children over the age of five years and under the age of nineteen years, including in the term "Maori children" half-castes and their descendants.

(b.) For the boarding of such children.

(c.) For the use as a dwellinghouse of any teacher employed in teaching in such school.

Provided that if it shall be found that there is accommodation for teaching and boarding more than the Maori children for the time being attending or boarding, the Board may permit children (other than Maori children) over the age of five years and under fourteen years of age to attend such school or become boarders.

And may from time to time add to, pull down, and repair such buildings, and insure the same against fire or accident.

The Board shall make no charge for teaching any child, nor shall any religious instruction be given to any child while in school or while a boarder.

The subjects of instruction in such school shall be reading, writing, arithmetic, Maori language, English grammar and composition, geography, history (including Maori history), elementary science and drawing, object-lessons, vocal music, and, in the case of girls, sewing and needlework and the principles of domestic economy, and such other subjects as may from time to time be directed by the Governor in Council.

The class-books used in the school shall be approved by the Governor in Council.

The school shall be open at all times to the visits of any person appointed by the Governor.

Provision shall be made by the Board for the instruction in military drill of all boys, and the Board shall cause physical drill to be taught to all boys and girls over the age of eight years attending the school.

Provision to be made rendering it compulsory to send Maori children to the school as in the case of public schools—only to apply to children residing within a distance of \_\_\_\_\_ miles of the school, and the like exemptions to exist as in the case of public schools.

The Governor in Council may direct the Board to provide the means of instruction in such school in the principles of any specified science or art as applied in industries, accompanied by individual laboratory or workshop practice, or instruction in modern languages, or in such other subjects connected with industrial, commercial, agricultural, or domestic pursuits as may be prescribed by regulations. If the Governor in Council so provides, then the Board may permit any person, being a Maori (including in that term half-castes and their descendants), although over the age of nineteen years, to attend any classes established for any of such purposes.

The Board may agree to provide board and lodging for any child attending such school free of charge, provided that the Governor in Council may, by regulations, provide how children shall be selected as entitled to be so boarded and lodged, and may limit the number thereof, and in all cases the children of the Ngatitōa and Ngatiraukawa Tribes shall have preference over all other children.

The Board may employ teachers, servants, and other assistants as they think fit, and may employ a clerk to keep the accounts of the Board, and may remove or suspend any persons so employed, and may pay such salaries or wages, and make such allowances to the persons so employed as they think fit.

The Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations—

(a.) For holding meetings of the Board, the number to form a quorum, who shall preside at such meetings, as to keeping minutes, and generally how the business of the Board shall be managed and conducted.

(b.) For regulating the mode in which the school shall be carried on, the hours of attendance, and generally for the administration of such school, and may provide that the Board may exclude or suspend any child from being taught in such school for want of cleanliness, or who may be likely to communicate any contagious disease, or who, from gross misconduct or incorrigible disobedience, may be considered an injurious or dangerous example to other scholars.

(c.) For auditing the accounts of the Board, and for the manner and form in which such accounts shall be kept, and how payments and receipt shall be vouched.

(d.) For limiting the number of children to be taught in such school.

HENI TE WHIWHI and others.





person at Otaki. His advanced age (eighty-three) and state of health prevent his travelling any long distances during the winter months.

I have, &c.,

ARTHUR F. WILLIAMS,  
Hon. Sec., New Zealand Mission Trust Board.

APPENDIX.—IA.

RETURN SHOWING PARTICULARS IN REGARD TO MAORI CHILDREN BETWEEN RANGITIKEI AND PORIRUA.

Maori Settlements.	Adults.	Children of School Age.	M.	F.	No Sex given.
Ngatiraukawa—					
1. { Katibiku .. .. .	198	152	70	82	..
{ Huatere .. .. .					
{ Otaki .. .. .					
2. Manakau .. .. .					
3. Ohau .. .. .	61	38	23	15	..
4. Muhunoa .. .. .	94	92	41	51	..
5. Raumatangi .. .. .	22	29	14	15	..
6. Poroutawhao .. .. .	12	11	7	4	..
7. Kereru .. .. .	38	23	12	11	..
8. Kereru .. .. .	13	17	..	..	..
9. Himitangi .. .. .	7	7	6	1	..
10. Motuiti .. .. .	52	24	12	12	..
11. Moutoa .. .. .	5	20	12	8	..
12. Puketotara .. .. .	3	3	3	..	..
13. Oroua Bridge .. .. .	14	13	4	9	..
14. Aorangi .. .. .	8	16	7	9	..
15. Kai-Iwi .. .. .	29	21	11	10	..
{ Awahuri .. .. .	..	..	..	..	..
16. Ohinepuhiawe .. .. .	17	24	8	16	..
17. Matahiwi .. .. .	5	9	2	7	..
18. Maramikoea .. .. .	3	1	..	1	..
19. Parewanui .. .. .	1	2	2	..	..
20. Mangamahoe .. .. .	6	2	2	..	..
21. Te Peureu .. .. .	..	5	3	2	..
22. Te Kotuku Whare .. .. .	10	3	2	1	..
23. Te Pohue .. .. .	5	2	2	..	..
24. Pikitara .. .. .	1	10	5	5	..
25. Te Tikanga .. .. .	6	10	7	1	2
26. Kakariki .. .. .	19	21	9	12	..
27. Te Houhou .. .. .	7	1	..	1	..
28. Rata .. .. .	9	3	2	1	..
29. Utiku .. .. .	2	1	..	1	..
30. Arama .. .. .	..	1	..	1	..
31. Onepuehu .. .. .	3	2	..	..	..
32. Whareporara .. .. .	4	2	..	..	..
33. Waituna .. .. .	2	1	..	..	..
34. Tauranga-aruru .. .. .	7	4	..	..	..
35. Panekawa .. .. .	6	3	..	..	..
36. Te Waerenga .. .. .	2	8	..	..	..
37. Awapuni .. .. .	8	..	..	..	..
38. Karangahiku .. .. .	11	..	..	..	..
{ Whirokino .. .. .	15	..	..	..	..
	703	581	266	276	2
Muaupoko—					
39. Horowhenua .. .. .	84	50	..	..	..
Rangitane—					
40. { Oroua Bridge.. .. .	78	..	..	..	..
{ Puketotara .. .. .					
{ Raurangi .. .. .					
{ Ngawhakararau .. .. .					
{ Awapuni .. .. .	..	..	..	..	..
{ Ngaawapurua .. .. .	..	..	..	..	..
	865	631	266	276	2

RETURN OF MAORI CHILDREN ATTENDING SCHOOLS ON MANAWATU LINE.

	Maoris.		Half-castes.		Half-castes living in European Fashion.		Total.		
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	Total.
Plimmerton .. .. .	3	1	..	..	..	..	3	1	4
Paikakariki .. .. .	2	1	..	..	1	..	3	1	4
Paraparaumu .. .. .	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	1	2
Te Horo .. .. .	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
Kereru .. .. .	..	2	..	..	2	3	2	5	7
Manakau .. .. .	9	5	..	..	3	..	12	5	17
Porirua .. .. .	1	1	3	7	..	..	4	8	12
Waikanae .. .. .	8	4	..	..	..	..	8	4	12
Ohau .. .. .	17	10	2	1	..	1	19	12	31
Otaki .. .. .	10	12	..	..	7	6	17	18	35
Johnsonville .. .. .	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	1	2
Levin .. .. .	3	3	12	4	2	2	17	9	26
Total .. .. .	53	40	17	12	17	14	87	66	153



OTAKI SCHOOL ACCOUNT—*continued.*

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
1875.			1875.		
Balance brought forward	81	3 2	Oct. 17. Board of two Maori girls	20	0 0
April 1. Mr. Death's rent	50	0 0	Dec. Sundries as per Rev. J. Williams's account	8	18 0
Oct. 1. School fees	6	0 0	" Sundries as per Mrs. Hadfield's account	4	18 0
Interest	6	0 0	Balance carried down	159	7 2
	<u>£193</u>	<u>3 2</u>		<u>£193</u>	<u>3 2</u>
1876.			1876.		
Balance brought forward	159	7 2	Sept. 30. Board of two Maori girls, six months	16	16 0
April 1. Mr. Death's rent	50	0 0	Dec 31. Board of one Maori girl, three months	4	4 0
Oct. 1. " (at £200 per ann.)	100	0 0	June 30. Sundries as per Rev. J. McWilliam's account	15	16 0
School fees	13	0 0	Dec. 31. Ditto	11	14 6
Balance of interest	9	7 6	June 30. Mr. Menzies, schoolmaster	15	0 0
	<u>£331</u>	<u>0 0</u>	Oct. 31. Rev. J. McWilliam, acting-schoolmaster ( <i>pro tem</i> )	25	0 0
			Balance	243	4 2
				<u>£331</u>	<u>14 8</u>
1877.			1877.		
Balance brought forward	243	4 2	Board for two Maori girls	18	4 0
April 1. Mr. Death's rent	100	0 0	" one Maori girl	4	4 0
Oct. 1. School fees (1876)	100	0 0	June 30. Sundries, as per Rev. J. McWilliam's account	4	12 0
" " " "	5	0 0	Mar. 31. Mr. Nicholls, schoolmaster	32	10 0
Balance of interest	4	10 9	Aug. Mr. Hughes, printing school-books	18	8 6
			Fittings for schoolmaster's house (W. and R.)	4	18 9
			American stove for ditto (Gardiner)	5	13 0
			Sept. 30. Mr. Christie, schoolmaster	32	10 0
			" travelling-expenses	6	0 0
			Dec. 31. " salary (at £150 per annum)	37	10 0
			Prizes for school boys (Ambrose)	2	3 4
			" girls (by Mrs. Hadfield)	2	17 9
			Sept. 20. Native teacher's house (Rev. R. Te Wanui)	30	0 0
			Dec. 31. Sundries, as per Rev. J. McWilliam's account	2	19 0
			Balance	262	14 7
	<u>£465</u>	<u>4 11</u>		<u>£465</u>	<u>4 11</u>
1880.			1880.		
Balance brought forward	363	4 7	Mar. 31. Salary, Christie	37	10 0
April. Rent, Mr. Death	100	0 0	June 30. Sundries as per Mr. McWilliam's memo.	6	0 0
Oct. School fees	6	18 0	Balance	513	14 11
Interest, Messrs. Johnston and Co.	24	12 4		<u>£594</u>	<u>14 11</u>
	<u>£594</u>	<u>14 11</u>			
1881 to			1881.		
Mar. 31, 1882.			Feb. 9. Land Court, Buller and Gully	30	0 0
Balance brought forward	513	14 11	Aug. 8. Repairs of house, Mr. McWilliam	35	12 5
April. Rent, Mr. Death	100	0 0	" 31. Interest, Union Bank of Australia	0	2 6
Oct. " " (at £270 per annum)	135	0 0	Nov. 23. Legal expenses, Buller and Gully	21	0 0
Interest, Messrs. Johnston and Co.	30	3 0	1882.		
			Jan. 11. Sundries, Clark	3	13 9
			" 16. " Warburton	1	6 2
			Feb. 28. Interest, Union Bank of Australia	0	12 4
			Mar. 31. Salary, Mr. Jennings	37	10 0
			" 31. Sundries as per Mr. McWilliam's memo.	9	15 5
			Balance	639	5 4
	<u>£778</u>	<u>17 11</u>		<u>£778</u>	<u>17 11</u>









OTAKI SCHOOL ACCOUNT—continued.

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
1898.			1898.		
Brought forward	263	15 6	Brought forward	147	7 10
			Sept. 30. Interest, Bank of New Zealand	0	2 2
			Oct. 26. Mrs. Jennings—salary, third quarter, £37 10s.; boarders, third quarter, £12 9s.; maintenance, 11s.; sanitation, 8s.; sundries, 8s. 4d.	51	6 4
			" 26. W. Warn, building	5	10 0
			" 26. J. C. Tanner, repairs to building	8	7 8
			" 28. Cheque-book	0	2 6
			Dec. 31. Mrs. Jennings—salary, fourth quarter, £37 10s.; boarders, fourth quarter, £12 8s.; sanitation, 8s.; sundries, 13s.	50	19 0
				<u>263</u>	<u>15 6</u>
1899.			1899.		
Jan. 5. Cheque, W. Busby	53	0 0	Jan. 1. Balance	27	8 10
April 5. " A. Death, rent to 1st April	100	2 6	" 12. Interest, Bank of New Zealand	0	2 9
Oct. 7. " " " 1st October	100	2 6	" 13. Exchange added cheque Bank of New Zealand	0	0 6
			Mar. 30. W. Warn, repairs	6	7 9
			April 22. Mrs. Jennings—salary, first quarter, £37 10s.; boarders, first quarter, 17s.; sundries, 14s. 1d.; repairs, 17s. 6d.; prizes and treat, £2; sanitation, 8s.	42	6 7
			July 29. Mrs. Jennings—salary, second quarter, £37 10s.; boarders, second quarter, £17 7s.; fuel, £1 6s.; sanitation, 8s.; repairs, 10s.; sundries, 9s. 10d.; maintenance, 6s. 9d.	57	17 7
			Sept. 30. Bank fee	0	5 0
			Oct. 24. Mrs. Jennings—salary, third quarter, £37 10s.; repairs, £1 19s.; sanitation, 8s.; school requisites, 12s.	40	9 0
			Dec. 31. Mrs. Jennings—salary, fourth quarter, £37 10s.; sundries, 4s.; sanitation, 8s.	38	2 0
			Balance	40	5 0
				<u>253</u>	<u>5 0</u>
1900.			1900.		
Jan. 1. Balance	40	5 0	Mar. 31. Bank charge	0	5 0
April 3. Cheque, Death, rent to 1st April	100	0 0	May 5. Mrs. Jennings—salary, first quarter	37	10 0
Oct. 9. " " " 1st October	120	0 0	June 8. Mrs. Jennings—sanitation, 8s.; school requisites, 10s. 1d.; treat and prizes, £2	2	18 1
			July 28. Mrs. Jennings—salary, second quarter, £30; boarders, second quarter, £8 8s.; fuel, second quarter, £1 6s.; sanitation, 17s. 6d.; school requisites, 17s. 10d.; repairs, 5s.	41	14 4
			Sept. 30. Bank fee	0	5 0
			Oct. 26. Mrs. Jennings—salary, third quarter, £30; boarders, third quarter, £16 17s.; sundries, £1 10s. 9d.; sanitation, 8s.	48	15 9
			Nov. 24. J. Campbell, painting and papering	58	10 0
			Dec. 12. Mrs. Jennings—salary, fourth quarter, £30; boarders, fourth quarter, £15; school requisites, 13s. 2d.; sanitation, 8s.	11	6 4
			" 31. Balance	46	1 2
				12	19 4
				<u>260</u>	<u>5 0</u>
1901.			1901.		
Jan. 1. Balance	12	19 4	Jan. 12. D. Nees, repairs	5	7 6
April 4. Cheque, Death, rent to 1st April	120	0 0	" 14. B. Brown, supplies	3	5 5
May 3. " Moorhouse and Hadfield (balance C. Bell, rent to 1st April)	8	5 4	" 25. H. M. Brown, supplies	4	11 11
Oct. 1. Cheque, C. Bell, rent to 1st October	17	10 0	Mar. 30. Bank fee	0	5 0
" 2. " Death	110	0 0	May 3. Mrs. Jennings—salary, first quarter, £30; boarders, first quarter, £10 7s.; prizes and treat, £2 13s.; repairs, £1 5s.; school requisites, £1 1s.; sanitation, 8s.	45	14 0
			" 6. Exchange on cheque	0	0 6
			July 5. Mrs. Jennings—salary, second quarter, £30; boarders, second quarter, £11 3s.; sundries, 14s. 3d.; sanitation, 8s.; metalling, £3	45	5 3
				<u>104</u>	<u>9 7</u>
			Carried forward		
Carried forward	268	14 8			



## OTAKI SCHOOL ACCOUNT—continued.

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
1901.		£ s. d.	1901.		£ s. d.
	Brought forward	268 14 8		Brought forward	104 9 7
			Sept. 30.	Bank fee	0 5 0
			Oct. 14.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, third quarter, £30; fuel, £2; sanitation, 12s.; school requisites, 6s. 11d.	32 18 11
			Dec. 31.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, fourth quarter, £30; sundries, 9s. 5d.; sanitation, 12s.	31 1 5
				Balance	99 19 9
		<u>£268 14 8</u>			<u>£268 14 8</u>
1902.		£ s. d.	1902.		£ s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance	99 19 9	Mar. 27.	Bank fee	0 5 0
April 7.	Cheque, C. Bell, rent to 1st April	17 10 0	April 19.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, first quarter, £30; prizes and treat, £3; sanitation, 12s.; repairs, 5s.; school requisites, 4s. 10d.	34 1 10
" 7.	" J. Death	110 0 0	April 21.	Rev. J. McWilliam, for labour, &c.	1 8 0
Oct. 11.	" C. Bell, rent to 1st October	17 10 0	May 27.	Rev. J. McWilliam, insurance, college and school, £5 19s.; rates, £2 11s.	8 10 0
" 16.	" J. Death	110 0 0	Aug. 2.	Cheque-book	0 2 6
			" 2.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, second quarter, £30; sundries, 9s. 5d.; sanitation, 12s.; labour, 7s.; fuel, £1 12s.; repairs, 8s.; treat, 4s.	33 7 5
			Sept. 30.	Bank fee	0 5 0
			Oct. 16.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, third quarter, £30; boarders, third quarter, £1 16s.; school requisites, £1 13s. 2d.; sanitation, 12s.	34 1 2
			Nov. 27.	C. H. Williams, repairs	12 7 9
			Dec. 31.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, fourth quarter, £30; maintenance, £9 16s. 7d.; sanitation, 12s.	40 8 7
				Balance	190 2 6
		<u>£354 19 9</u>			<u>£354 19 9</u>
1903.		£ s. d.	1903.		£ s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance	190 2 6	Mar. 18.	Insurance	3 14 0
Mar. 19.	Cheque, insurance, £400, less exchange	399 10 0	" 18.	E. Lanchester, papering	7 0 0
April 8.	Cheque, J. Death, rent to 1st April	110 0 0	" 19.	J. Wilson, ceiling room	0 12 0
" 20.	" C. Bell	17 10 0	" 19.	B. Brown, paper, &c.	1 2 11
Oct. 3.	" C. Bell, rent to 1st October	17 10 0	" 23.	R. Martin, papers	6 15 3
" 8.	" J. Death	110 0 0	" 31.	Bank-fee	0 5 0
			April 6.	Transfer to Capital Account	500 0 0
			" 17.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, first quarter, £30; treat and prizes, £3; sanitation, 8s.; boarders, £7 5s.; sundries, £1 6s. 10d.	41 19 10
			July 16.	Cost of chimney (Riwai's)	8 7 0
			" 25.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, £30; school requisites, £1 5s. 11d.; repairs, 12s. 3d.; sanitation, 8s.; maintenance, 8s. 6d.	32 14 8
			" 27.	J. Bly, pulling down and rebuilding double chimney	12 10 0
			Aug. 15.	R. Brown, bricks	3 15 0
			" 18.	W. Warn, building shed, £9 15s.; Edwards, desks, £5 5s. 4d.	15 0 4
			" 18.	Whitcombe and Tombs, maps	2 1 3
			Sept. 19.	Williams, iron roofing (shed)	2 17 0
			" 21.	Whitehorn, material and building fence	4 6 3
			" 30.	Bank fee	0 5 0
			Oct. 3.	Sawmill, timber	8 5 1
			" 28.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, £30; school requisites, 18s. 4d.; sanitation, 8s.; fuel, 18s.; gravel, 8s.; boarder, 7s.	32 19 4
			Dec. 31.	Mrs. Jennings—salary, £30; sundries, 12s. 6d.; sanitation, £1 4s.	31 16 6
			" 31.	Timber	0 5 0
			" 31.	Insurance (1904)	3 4 0
				Balance	124 17 1
		<u>£844 12 6</u>			<u>£844 12 6</u>



OTAKI SCHOOL ACCOUNT—*continued.*  
*Accumulated Rents and Interest.*

1893.	Dr.	Interest.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	1893.	Cr.	Interest	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
April 18.	To Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 347 days ..	4 15 0		100 0 0	Mar. 31.	By Balance account, Johnston and Co., 365 days ..	31 6 0		625 14 4
Aug. 2.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 241 days ..	3 6 0		100 0 0	April 27.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st April, 1893, 338 days ..	6 10 0		140 0 0
Nov. 11.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 140 days ..	0 19 0		50 0 0	Oct. 10.	Cheque, Union Bank of Australia (Limited), 172 days ..	0 17 0		36 10 4
Dec. 21.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 100 days ..	0 14 0		50 0 0	" 17.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st October, 1893, 165 days..	3 3 0		140 0 0
1894.					1894.				
Mar. 31.	Interest to balance	32 2 0			Mar. 31.	Balance of interest	..		32 2 0
	Balance of account	..		674 6 8					
		<u>£41 16 0</u>		<u>£974 6 8</u>			<u>£41 16 0</u>		<u>£974 6 8</u>
1894.				£ s. d.	1894.				£ s. d.
April 10.	To Cheque paid Otaki School Account ..			50 0 0	Mar. 31.	By Balance of account ..			674 6 8
July 7.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account ..			50 0 0	April 3.	J. D'ath's rent to 1st April, 1894 ..			140 0 0
Oct. 11.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account ..			60 0 0	Oct. 4.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st October, 1894 ..			140 0 0
1895.					1895.				
Jan. 18.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account ..			60 0 0	Mar. 30.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st April, 1895 ..			140 0 0
Mar. 31.	Balance of account ..			912 1 8	" 31.	Balance of interest to date ..			37 15 0
				<u>£1,132 1 8</u>					<u>£1,132 1 8</u>
1895.		Interest.		£ s. d.	1895.		Interest.		£ s. d.
April 8.	To Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 358 days ..	2 14 0		55 0 0	Mar. 31.	By Balance of account, 365 days ..	45 12 0		912 1 8
July 12.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 263 days ..	2 18 0		80 0 0	Oct. 7.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st October, 1895, 176 days..	2 8 0		
Aug. 8.	Commission, Johnston and Co., 5 per cent. on £200, 236 days	0 6 0		10 0 0	1896.				
Oct. 11.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 172 days ..	1 6 0		55 0 0	Mar. 31.	Balance of interest	..		39 19 0
Dec. 30.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 92 days ..	0 15 0		60 0 0					
1896.									
Feb. 28.	Cheque paid Otaki School Account, 32 days ..	0 2 0		20 0 0					
Mar. 31.	Interest to balance	39 19 0							
	Balance of account	..		772 0 8					
		<u>£48 0 0</u>		<u>£1,052 0 8</u>			<u>£48 0 0</u>		<u>£1,052 0 8</u>
1896.				£ s. d.	1896.				£ s. d.
April 20.	To Cheque, Otaki School Account			60 0 0	Mar. 31.	By Balance of account ..			772 0 8
May 27.	" " " "			62 0 8	April 2.	J. D'Ath's rent to 1st April, 1896 ..			100 0 0
" 27.	Balance of account transferred to W. Busby ..			750 0 0					
				<u>£872 0 8</u>					<u>£872 0 8</u>
1896.				£ s. d.	1896.				£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	To Cheque paid to Otaki School Account (interest) ..			22 7 11	May 27.	By Amount of draft, Johnston and Co.'s account ..			750 0 0
	Balance of account ..			750 0 0	Dec. 31.	218 days' interest at 5 per cent. on £750 ..			22 7 11
				<u>£772 7 11</u>					<u>£772 7 11</u>
1897.				£ s. d.	1897.				£ s. d.
June 30.	To Interest paid to Otaki School Account ..			18 15 0	Jan. 1.	By Balance of account ..			750 0 0
Aug. 13.	Part principal paid to Otaki School Account ..			70 0 0	June 30.	Half-year's interest at 5 per cent. on £750 ..			18 15 0
	Balance of account ..			697 11 3	Aug. 13.	44 days' interest at 5 per cent. on £750 ..			4 10 5
				<u>£786 6 3</u>	Dec. 31.	140 days' interest at 5 per cent. on £680 ..			13 0 10
				<u>£786 6 3</u>					<u>£786 6 3</u>

OTAKI SCHOOL ACCOUNT—*continued.*  
*Accumulated Rents and Interest—continued.*

1898.	<i>Cr.</i>	£ s. d.	1898.	<i>Dr.</i>	£ s. d.
Jan. 15.	To Interest paid to Otaki School Account to 31st December, 1897 .. ..	16 4 2	Jan. 1.	By Balance of account .. ..	697 11 3
" 15.	Part principal paid to Otaki School Account to 31st December, 1897 .. ..	20 0 0	Dec. 31.	Interest on £661 .. ..	33 1 0
Dec. 31.	Balance of account .. ..	694 8 1			
		£730 12 3			£730 12 3
1899.		£ s. d.	1899.		£ s. d.
Jan. 5.	To Cheque paid to Otaki School Account (interest) to 31st December, 1898 .. ..	33 0 0	Jan. 1.	By Balance of account .. ..	694 8 1
	Cheque paid to Otaki School Account (part principal) to 31st December, 1898 .. ..	20 0 0	Dec. 31.	Interest on £641 .. ..	32 1 0
Dec. 31.	Balance of account .. ..	673 9 1			
		£726 9 1			£726 9 1
1900.		£ s. d.	1900.		£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	To Amount of principal and interest .. ..	707 2 1	Jan. 1.	By Balance of account .. ..	673 9 1
		£707 2 1	Dec. 31.	One year's interest at 5 per cent. on £673 .. ..	33 13 0
1901.		£ s. d.	1901.		£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	Amount of principal .. ..	742 9 1	Jan. 1.	By Amount brought down .. ..	707 2 1
		£742 9 1	Dec. 31.	One year's interest on £707 .. ..	35 7 0
1902.		£ s. d.	1902.		£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	Amount of principal .. ..	779 11 1	Jan. 1.	By Amount brought down .. ..	742 9 1
		£779 11 1	Dec. 31.	One year's interest on £742 .. ..	37 2 0
1903.		£ s. d.	1903.		£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	Amount of principal transferred to J. N. Williams, Esq. .. ..	818 11 1	Jan. 1.	By Amount brought down .. ..	779 11 1
		£818 11 1	Dec. 31.	One year's interest on £780 .. ..	39 0 0
1903.		£ s. d.	1903.		£ s. d.
April 2.	To Exchange on cheque .. ..	0 12 6	April 2.	By Amount transferred from School Account .. ..	500 0 0
Dec. 31.	Balance of account .. ..	1,332 17 9	Dec. 31.	273 days' interest at 4 per cent. on £500 .. ..	14 19 2
		£1,333 10 3	" 31.	Amount transferred from W. Busby, Esq. .. ..	818 11 1
1904.		£ s. d.	1904.		£ s. d.
Dec. 31.	Amount of capital .. ..	1,386 4 2	Jan. 1.	By Balance of account .. ..	1,332 17 9
		£1,386 4 2	Dec. 31.	One year's interest at 4 per cent. on £1,333 .. ..	53 6 5
					£1,386 4 2

N.B.—A sum of £350 has been transferred from the balance of the School Current Account during 1905, being accumulated balance of rents.

### APPENDIX K.

#### OTAKI RESERVES.

*Government Valuation, 1904.*—Capital value, £8,347; unimproved value, £3,935.

#### PARTICULARS OF OTAKI LEASES.

Date, 23rd July, 1901; term, fourteen years; rent, £35 per annum; lessee, Swainson and Bell; area, 56 acres 1 rood 33 perches.

Date, 23rd July, 1901; term, fourteen years; rent, £220 per annum; lessee, J. D'Ath; area, 482 acres 1 rood 30 perches.

Date, 20th August, 1900; term, nineteen years (with right of renewal); rent, £12 17s. 6d. per annum; lessee, Wellington District Hospital Board; area, 12 acres 3 roods 20 perches.

## APPENDIX KA.

## RESOLUTION OF THE PORIRUA TRUSTEES, 31ST JULY, 1896.

RESOLVED, That the trustees are prepared to apply to the General Synod at its next session for leave to take the necessary steps, through the Supreme Court or otherwise, to obtain leave to apply half the funds of the Porirua estate to the Otaki school for Maoris, provided that the school and its endowments be handed over to the General Synod, and half the funds to the Wanganui Collegiate School.

## EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF MEETING OF PORIRUA COLLEGE TRUST, 28TH JANUARY, 1897.

Application of funds in hand: The Bishop said that the Maori Mission Board would meet in February, and he would be present, and that the question of handing over to the General Synod the Otaki school, on condition of steps being taken to have half the fund of the Porirua trust handed over to the school, would come before the board. He thought that, as the Maoris had given the land, the whole of the funds should perhaps go to their school. A discussion ensued, in which it was pointed out that the Wanganui school was open to Maoris, and that the money of Europeans had brought that school to its present state of efficiency, and that neither one nor other school was entitled to more than a share of the funds.

WM. R. E. BROWN, Chairman.

## RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEW ZEALAND MISSION TRUST BOARD.

1897.

A resolution of the Porirua college trustees having been considered, in which it is proposed that the Otaki school should be transferred to trustees appointed by the General Synod, on condition that a large sum of money from the Porirua trust be made available for promoting its efficiency, it was resolved, That the Board is prepared to accede to the proposed arrangement on condition that the school continues to be conducted in accordance with the terms upon which the trust is held.

1898.

Resolved, That if approval be given by the General Synod of resolution 3 of the New Zealand Mission Trust Board, passed on the 23rd February, 1897, the secretary be requested to communicate with the Church Missionary Society, and to prepare immediately a deed providing for the transference of the Otaki school, and the lands on which it is situated, to the General Synod.

1902.

The letter from the secretary of the Porirua college trustees, dated the 7th February, 1902, having been read, it was resolved, That the New Zealand Mission Trust Board is prepared to transfer the Otaki school property to the trustees appointed by the General Synod for the Porirua estate, on condition that the said trustees conduct a school thereon in accordance with the terms on which the (Otaki) property is now held by the Board, to which the moneys accruing from the Porirua trust shall be applied.

## APPENDIX L.

## GRANT TO THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR A SCHOOL AT OTAWHAO.

WHEREAS a school hath been established at Otawhao . . . . in connection with the Church Missionary Society, and whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart for the use and maintenance of the same certain pieces or parcels of land in the immediate neighbourhood thereof:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, hereby grant unto the Ven. Archdeacon William Williams and the Ven. Archdeacon Brown, and the Revs. R. Maunsell, R. Taylor, R. Burrows, G. A. Kissling, O. Hadfield, R. Davis, James Hamlin, Thomas Chapman, J. Matthews, and W. Colenso, trustees of the said society, and to their successors, all that allotment or parcel of land situated at Otawhao, containing by admeasurement 173 acres and 38 perches more or less, and bounded on the north by the Mangapiko and Mangaoi Rivers; on the east by Native land, 940 links; on the south by Native land, 780 links; again on the east by a road, 639 links; again on the south by a road, 730 links; on the south-east by Native land, 3840 links; on the south-west by Native land, 1796 links; on the north-west by Native land, 2570 links; and on the west by Native land, 1300 links, and intersected by a road 100 links wide, as shown on the plan on the other side of this deed; with all the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging. To hold unto the said trustees for ever upon trust, to permit the same to be used and occupied by the said Church Missionary Society in and as a mission-station, or as a site for a place of public worship, or for schools, or in other like manner for purposes connected with the religious and moral instruction of our subjects inhabiting these Islands, or of other persons being children of poor and destitute people inhabiting any islands in the Pacific Ocean.

15th October, 1850.

G. GREY.

## APPENDIX M.

## OTAWHAO (TE AWAMUTU) ACCOUNT.

(J. Walton, in Account with Rev. R. Burrows—Rents.)

Receipts.		£ s. d.	Expenditure.		£ s. d.
1894.			1895.		
Sept. 27.	Bockett, balance to 1st September, 1894 .. .. .	4 15 0	Jan. 22.	County rate to 31st March, 1895 ..	1 8 9
Nov. 23.	Bockett, on account, quarter to 1st December .. .. .	4 0 0	" 31.	Commission .. .. .	2 17 6
Dec. 3.	J. B. Teasdale, on account .. .. .	10 0 0		Cheque for balance .. .. .	53 1 9
" 20.	Gresham, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	5 0 0			
1895.					
Jan. 7.	Duffus, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	12 10 0			
" 7.	Vause, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	3 0 0			
" 19.	Andrew, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	5 10 0			
" 21.	Lynch, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	2 12 0			
" 30.	Clark and Gane .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 30.	Grazing .. .. .	5 1 0			
		<u>£57 8 0</u>			<u>£57 8 0</u>
1895.		£ s. d.	1895.		£ s. d.
Feb. 4.	Lyons, half-year to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	5 0 0	July 31.	Commission .. .. .	2 16 6
" 18.	Teasdale, on account .. .. .	10 0 0		Cheque for balance .. .. .	53 10 6
" 20.	Rogers, to 1st January, 1895 .. .. .	2 10 0			
Mar. 20.	Bockett, on account .. .. .	4 0 0			
June 29.	Gresham, to 1st July (end of tenancy) .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 29.	Vause, to 1st July .. .. .	3 0 0			
July 1.	Duffus, to 1st July .. .. .	12 10 0			
" 20.	Andrew, to 1st July .. .. .	5 10 0			
" 20.	Tennis club, now given up .. .. .	3 0 0			
" 26.	Lynch, to 1st July .. .. .	2 12 0			
" 31.	Grazing .. .. .	3 5 0			
		<u>£56 7 0</u>			<u>£56 7 0</u>
1895.		£ s. d.	1895.		£ s. d.
Aug. 5.	J. H. Lyons, to 1st July .. .. .	5 0 0	Aug. 23.	Mission-house insurance .. .. .	1 4 9
" 13.	Clark and Gane, to 1st July .. .. .	5 0 0	Sept. 28.	Expenses to Te Awamutu re mission farm .. .. .	2 10 0
			Oct. 14.	Commission .. .. .	0 10 0
				Cash for balance .. .. .	5 15 3
		<u>£10 0 0</u>			<u>£10 0 0</u>
1895.		£ s. d.	1896.		£ s. d.
Nov. 15.	Bockett, on account .. .. .	5 0 0	Mar. 5.	Commission .. .. .	2 15 0
1896.			" 5.	Cash for balance .. .. .	52 4 6
Jan. 2.	Bockett, balance to 1st September, 1895, as agreed .. .. .	3 0 0			
" 28.	Lynch, balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	2 12 0			
" 28.	Duffus, balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	12 10 0			
" 31.	Clark and Gane, balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	5 0 0			
Feb. 4.	Lyons, J. H., balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 15.	Vause, W., balance to 1st January, 1896, as agreed .. .. .	1 10 0			
" 15.	Andrew, J. F., balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	5 10 0			
" 15.	Andrew, J. F., balance to 1st January, 1896, land .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 15.	Rogers, F. J., balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 15.	Grazing, balance to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	4 17 6			
		<u>£54 19 6</u>			<u>£54 19 6</u>
1896.		£ s. d.	J. WALTON.		£ s. d.
Mar. 6.	Balance received from Rev. Burrows .. .. .	118 18 4	Mar. 19.	Paid Walton for commission .. .. .	2 0 9
" 19.	Ditto, Teasdale, rent to 1st July, 1895 .. .. .	20 10 0	Aug. 11.	" Waipa County rates .. .. .	1 8 9
" 19.	Ditto, Teasdale, rent to 1st January, 1896 .. .. .	20 5 0	" 11.	" insurance premium, New Zealand Insurance Company ..	1 12 6
Aug. 11.	From Captain Bockett to 1st March .. .. .	10 0 0	" 11.	" Williams for support Native clergy .. .. .	20 13 4
" 11.	" Vause, one year, to 1st July .. .. .	2 10 0	" 11.	" Walton, commission .. .. .	2 13 0
" 11.	" J. F. Andrews, to 1st July .. .. .	5 10 0			
" 11.	" Andrews .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 11.	" Duffus, to 1st July .. .. .	12 10 0			
" 11.	" Lyons, to 1st July .. .. .	5 0 0			
" 11.	" Lynch, to 1st July .. .. .	2 12 0			
" 11.	" Clark and Gane, to 1st July .. .. .	3 15 0			
" 11.	" Rogers, to 1st July .. .. .	2 10 0			
" 11.	" grazing .. .. .	3 8 0			
		<u>£212 8 4</u>			<u>£212 8 4</u>

## OTAWHAO (TE AWAMUTU) ACCOUNT—continued.

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
1897.		£ s. d.	1897.		£ s. d.
Feb. 9.	From Bockett, to 1st June ..	5 0 0	Mar. 8.	Paid county rates .. ..	1 8 9
" 9.	" " to 1st September ..	5 0 0	Aug. 13.	Insurance premium .. ..	1 0 6
" 9.	" " to 1st December ..	5 0 0	" 13.	Paid fencing .. ..	1 9 0
" 9.	" Lyons, to 1st January, 1897 ..	5 0 0	" 13.	" surveying .. ..	1 1 0
" 9.	" Andrews, to 1st January, 1897 ..	5 10 0	Dec. 3.	" commission .. ..	5 0 0
" 9.	" " .. ..	5 0 0	" 31.	" Rev. Williams, Native clergy stipend .. ..	116 19 9
" 9.	" Duffus, to 1st January, 1897 ..	12 10 0			
" 9.	" Rogers, to 1st January, 1897 ..	2 10 0			
" 9.	" grazing .. ..	5 5 0			
Aug. 13.	" Clark and Gane, 1st January ..	3 15 0			
" 13.	" Vause (final) .. ..	2 10 0			
" 13.	" Bockett, to 1st March .. ..	5 0 0			
" 13.	" " to 1st June .. ..	5 0 0			
" 13.	" Lyons, to 1st July .. ..	5 0 0			
" 13.	" Andrews, to 1st July .. ..	5 10 0			
" 13.	" " .. ..	2 3 0			
" 13.	" Clark and Gane, to 1st July ..	3 15 0			
" 13.	" Duffus, to 1st July .. ..	12 10 0			
" 13.	" Rogers, to 1st July .. ..	2 10 0			
" 13.	" Lynch, to 1st July .. ..	5 4 0			
" 13.	" Teasdale, to 1st July, 1896 ..	20 0 0			
" 13.	" grazing .. ..	3 7 0			
		£126 19 0			£126 19 0
1898.		£ s. d.	1898.		£ s. d.
Jan. 4.	From Bockett, to 1st September ..	4 5 0	Jan. 31.	Paid Waipa County rates .. ..	1 8 9
" 31.	" Teasdale, to 1st September ..	20 0 0	" 31.	" Te Awamutu Town rates .. ..	1 8 9
" 31.	" Bockett .. ..	3 0 0	Aug. 13.	" premium, insurance of dwelling .. ..	1 0 6
" 31.	" Duffus, to 1st January .. ..	12 10 0	Dec. 31.	" Rev. Williams, Native clergy .. ..	138 10 0
" 31.	" Lyons, to 1st January .. ..	5 0 0			
" 31.	" Clark and Gane, to 1st January .. ..	3 15 0			
" 31.	" Andrews .. ..	5 10 0			
" 31.	" " .. ..	9 13 0			
" 31.	" grazing .. ..	3 18 0			
Aug. 13.	" Rogers, to 1st January .. ..	2 10 0			
" 13.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	20 0 0			
" 13.	" Clark and Gane, to 1st July ..	3 15 0			
" 13.	" Andrews, to 1st July .. ..	5 10 0			
" 13.	" " .. ..	9 13 0			
" 13.	" " .. ..	1 6 0			
" 13.	" " .. ..	1 6 0			
" 13.	" Lyons, to 1st July .. ..	5 0 0			
" 13.	" Rogers, to 1st July .. ..	2 10 0			
" 13.	" Duffus, to 1st July .. ..	12 10 0			
" 13.	" grazing .. ..	0 17 0			
Dec. 30.	" Bockett .. ..	10 0 0			
		£142 8 0			£142 8 0
1899.		£ s. d.	1899.		£ s. d.
Feb. 15.	From Rogers, 1st January, 1899 ..	2 10 0	Feb. 15.	Paid Henderson, posts .. ..	2 17 6
" 15.	" Duffus, 1st January, 1899 ..	12 10 0	" 15.	" Aubin, wire .. ..	2 5 0
" 15.	" Lyons, 1st January, 1899 ..	5 0 0	" 15.	" Kirkham, fencing .. ..	4 1 0
" 15.	" Andrews, 1st January, 1899 ..	17 15 0	" 15.	" Mandeno, repairs .. ..	19 15 3
" 15.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	20 0 0	" 15.	" Te Awamutu rates .. ..	0 13 9
" 15.	" grazing .. ..	1 19 0	" 15.	" Waipa rates .. ..	0 13 9
June 23.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	5 0 0	Aug. 5.	" insurance premium .. ..	1 0 6
" 23.	" Clark and Gane .. ..	3 15 0	" 5.	" drainage rates .. ..	0 12 2
Aug. 5.	" Rountree, rent of land, one qr. ..	1 12 6	Dec. 31.	" Rev. Williams, Native clergy ..	120 10 1
" 5.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	5 0 0			
" 5.	" Rountree, one qr., 1st July ..	1 12 6			
" 5.	" cricket club .. ..	1 10 0			
" 5.	" Duffus, to 1st July .. ..	12 10 0			
" 5.	" Rogers, to 1st July .. ..	2 10 0			
" 5.	" Lyons, to 1st July .. ..	5 0 0			
" 5.	" Clark and Gane .. ..	3 15 0			
" 5.	" Andrews .. ..	17 15 0			
Oct. 24.	" Bockett .. ..	22 15 0			
" 24.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	10 0 0			
		£152 9 0			£152 9 0
1900.		£ s. d.	1900.		£ s. d.
Feb. 21.	From Rountree, to 1st October ..	1 12 6	Feb. 21.	Paid Te Awamutu rates .. ..	0 13 9
" 21.	" Lyons, to 1st January .. ..	5 0 0	" 21.	" Waipa rates .. ..	0 13 9
" 21.	" Andrews, to 1st January ..	17 15 0	June 30.	" Andrews, drainage rate .. ..	0 10 5
" 21.	" Duffus, to 1st January .. ..	12 10 0	" 30.	" premium, insurance .. ..	0 11 7
" 21.	" Rountree, to 1st January ..	1 12 6	" 30.	" " .. ..	0 7 8
" 21.	" Clark and Gane, to 1st January ..	3 15 0	Dec. 31.	" Rev. Williams, Native clergy ..	131 12 4
" 21.	" Rogers, to 1st January .. ..	2 10 0			
" 21.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	10 0 0			
June 30.	" Bockett, on account .. ..	6 1 6			
" 30.	" Teasdale .. ..	5 0 0			
" 30.	" Cooper, to 1st April .. ..	1 12 6			
" 30.	" Teasdale, on account .. ..	10 0 0			
	Carried forward .. ..	77 9 0		Carried forward .. ..	184 9 6

## OTAWHAO (TE AWAMUTU) ACCOUNT—continued.

1900.		Receipts.		£ s. d.		1900.		Expenditure.		£ s. d.			
			Brought forward ..	77	9	0			Brought forward ..	134	9	6	
Jun.	30.	From	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0							
"	30.	"	Bockett, on account ..	3	18	0							
"	30.	"	Lyons, to 1st July ..	5	0	0							
"	30.	"	Cooper, to 1st July ..	1	12	6							
"	30.	"	Duffus, to 1st July ..	12	10	0							
"	30.	"	Rogers, to 1st July ..	2	10	0							
"	30.	"	Andrews ..	17	15	0							
"	30.	"	Clark and Gane ..	3	15	0							
"	30.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0							
				£134	9	6					£134	9	6
1901.				£ s. d.		1901.				£ s. d.			
Jan.	12.	From	Bockett, on account ..	3	18	0	Feb.	12.	Paid	drainage rates ..	0	15	8
"	12.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0	"	12.	"	" ..	0	18	3
"	12.	"	" ..	10	0	0	"	12.	"	Waipa County rates ..	0	13	9
"	12.	"	Cooper, to 1st October ..	1	12	6	"	12.	"	Te Awamutu ..	0	13	9
"	12.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0	"	12.	"	exchange ..	0	1	0
Feb.	11.	"	Rogers, to 1st January ..	2	10	0	July	23.	"	insurance ..	0	11	7
"	11.	"	Bockett, on account ..	3	18	0	"	23.	"	" ..	0	7	8
"	11.	"	Lyons, to 1st January ..	5	0	0	"	23.	"	papering, Bockett ..	0	15	3
"	11.	"	Cooper, to 1st January ..	1	12	6	"	23.	"	exchange ..	0	1	6
"	11.	"	Andrews ..	17	15	0	Dec.	31.	"	Williams ..	179	4	1
"	11.	"	Duffus, to 1st January ..	12	10	0							
April	12.	"	Buddle, B., and Co. ..	3	15	0							
"	12.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0							
"	12.	"	" ..	10	0	0							
July	23.	"	Bockett, on account ..	2	5	6							
"	23.	"	Cooper, to 1st April ..	1	12	6							
"	23.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0							
"	23.	"	Bockett ..	4	11	0							
"	23.	"	Teasdale ..	5	0	0							
"	23.	"	Buddle, B., and Co. ..	3	15	0							
"	23.	"	Rogers, to 1st July ..	2	10	0							
"	23.	"	Cooper, to 1st July ..	1	12	6							
"	23.	"	Duffus, to 1st July ..	12	10	0							
"	23.	"	Lyons ..	5	0	0							
"	23.	"	Andrews, to 1st July ..	17	15	0							
Dec.	2.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0							
"	2.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
"	2.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
"	2.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
"	2.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
				£184	2	6					£184	2	6
1902.				£ s. d.		1902.				£ s. d.			
Feb.	26.	From	Bockett, on account ..	19	3	6	Feb.	26.	Paid	clearing ..	2	11	0
"	26.	"	Cooper, to 1st January ..	3	5	0	"	26.	"	Waipa County rates ..	0	13	9
"	26.	"	Rogers, to 1st January ..	2	10	0	"	26.	"	Te Awamutu rates ..	0	13	9
"	26.	"	Duffus, to 1st January ..	12	10	0	"	26.	"	Mangahoe County rates ..	0	6	1
"	26.	"	Lyons, to 1st January ..	5	0	0	Aug.	19.	"	premium, insurance ..	1	1	11
"	26.	"	B. Buddle and Co. ..	3	15	0	"	19.	"	Kirkham, repairs ..	0	15	0
"	26.	"	Andrews, to 1st January ..	17	15	0	"	19.	"	Rev. Williams, Native clergy	121	2	6
Aug.	19.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0							
"	19.	"	Bockett ..	5	10	6							
"	19.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0							
"	19.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
"	19.	"	Duffus, to 1st July ..	12	10	0							
"	19.	"	Lyons, to 1st July ..	5	0	0							
"	19.	"	Andrews, to 1st July ..	17	15	0							
"	19.	"	Rogers ..	2	10	0							
				£127	4	0					£127	4	0
1903.				£ s. d.		1903.				£ s. d.			
Feb.	11.	From	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0	Feb.	11.	Paid	Cooper, half cost bonedust	5	7	0
"	11.	"	Buddle, B., and Co., 1st July ..	3	15	0	"	11.	"	and seed ..	1	13	7
"	11.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	10	0	0	Aug.	15.	"	premium, insurance ..	1	1	11
"	11.	"	Cooper, 1st October ..	4	17	6	"	15.	"	rates ..	0	5	3
"	11.	"	Bockett, on account ..	10	5	0	"	15.	"	Rev. Williams ..	153	16	3
"	11.	"	Lyons, 1st January ..	5	0	0							
"	11.	"	Cooper, 1st January ..	1	12	6							
"	11.	"	Rogers, 1st January ..	2	10	0							
"	11.	"	Duffus, 1st January ..	12	10	0							
"	11.	"	Andrews, 1st January ..	17	15	0							
"	11.	"	Bockett, 1st January ..	3	15	0							
"	11.	"	Teasdale ..	5	0	0							
Aug.	15.	"	Teasdale, on account ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	" ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	Bockett ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	Teasdale ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	Bockett ..	10	9	0							
"	15.	"	Teasdale ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	Lyons, 1st July ..	5	0	0							
"	15.	"	Bockett ..	3	15	0							
"	15.	"	Andrews ..	17	15	0							
"	15.	"	Rogers ..	2	10	0							
"	15.	"	Duffus ..	12	10	0							
"	15.	"	Cooper ..	3	5	0							
				£162	4	0					£162	4	0



OTAWHAO (TE AWAMUTU) ACCOUNT—*continued.*

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
1904.			1904.		
		£ s. d.			£ s. d.
Feb. 12.	From Teasdale, on account	10 0 0	Feb. 12.	Paid drainage rates	0 5 3
" 12.	" " " "	5 0 0	" 12.	" commission	3 19 6
" 12.	" Bockett .. ..	5 0 0	" 12.	" exchange	0 2 0
" 12.	" Teasdale .. ..	12 0 0	June 22.	" premium, insurance	0 18 6
" 12.	" Lyons, 1st January	5 0 0	" 22.	" rates	0 14 1
" 12.	" Cooper, 1st January	3 5 0	" 22.	" " "	0 14 1
" 12.	" Bockett, 1st January	3 15 0	" 22.	" " "	0 12 2
" 12.	" Andrews, 1st January	17 15 0	" 22.	" commission and exchange	4 17 6
" 12.	" Duffus, 1st January	12 10 0	" 22.	" Rev. Williams, Te Aute College	163 10 11
" 12.	" Teasdale, on account	2 15 0			
" 12.	" Rogers, 1st January	2 10 0			
April 19.	" Bockett, on account	10 0 0			
June 16.	" Teasdale, arrears to 1st July	36 10 0			
" 22.	" Bockett, on account	5 0 0			
" 22.	" Rogers, 1st July ..	2 10 0			
" 22.	" Lyons, 1st July ..	5 0 0			
" 22.	" D. Bockett .. ..	3 15 0			
" 22.	" Andrews .. ..	17 15 0			
" 22.	" Cooper .. ..	3 5 0			
" 22.	" Duffus .. ..	12 10 0			
		<u>£175 15 0</u>			<u>£175 15 0</u>
1905.			1905.		
Feb. 9.	From Bockett, June, 1904	5 0 0	Feb. 9.	Paid rates	3 13 4
" 9.	" Teasdale, 1st January	10 0 0	" 9.	" commission and exchange	4 4 0
" 9.	" Bockett, 1st February	5 0 0	" 9.	" repairs, Bockett's house	14 17 10
" 9.	" " 1st December	5 0 0	April 12.	" " "	18 10 6
" 9.	" Teasdale, 1st January, (1904 balance)	12 15 0	" 12.	" insurance .. ..	0 11 7
" 9.	" Andrews, ditto ..	17 15 0	" 12.	" commission .. ..	2 13 0
" 9.	" Cooper, ditto .. ..	3 5 0	June	" Rev. Williams, Te Aute College	92 17 7
" 9.	" Duffus, ditto .. ..	12 10 0			
" 9.	" Rogers .. ..	2 10 0			
" 9.	" Lyons .. ..	5 0 0			
" 9.	" Bockett .. ..	3 15 0			
March 9.	" Walton .. ..	1 17 10			
April 12.	" Teasdale, on account	20 0 0			
" 12.	" " "	2 15 0			
" 12.	" " balance .. ..	22 15 0			
" 12.	" Bockett, on account	5 0 0			
" 12.	" " balance .. ..	2 10 0			
		<u>£137 7 10</u>			<u>£137 7 10</u>

GEORGE MACMURRAY.

## APPENDIX N.

## OTAWHAO RESERVE.

Government Valuation, 1903.—Capital value, £4,701; unimproved value, £1,913.

## PARTICULARS OF OTAWHAO LEASES.

Area, 1 rood; tenant, J. F. Andrew; term, weekly tenant; annual rent, £2 12s.

Area, 2 roods 20 perches; tenant, J. F. Andrew; term, thirty-three years, from 1st January, 1894; annual rent, £11.

Area, 16 perches; tenant, D. Bockett; term, thirteen years, from 20th May, 1903; annual rent, £7 10s.

Area, 1 rood 6 perches; tenant, J. H. Lyons; term, twenty-four years, from 1st January, 1894; annual rent, £10.

Area, 1 rood 36 perches; tenant, R. D. L. Duffus; term, thirty years, from 1st January, 1880; annual rent (with promise of renewal for twenty-one years at rent of £65), £25.

Area, 32 perches; tenant, T. J. Rogers; term, thirty years, from 1st January, 1894; annual rent, £5.

Area, 3 acres and 22 perches; tenant, J. B. Cooper; term, weekly tenant; annual rent, £6 10s.

Area, 1 acre and 19 perches; tenant, J. F. Andrew; term, weekly tenant; annual rent, £2 12s.

Area, 6 acres 1 rood 36 perches; tenant, Captain Bockett; term, annual tenant; annual rent, £30.

Area, 9 acres 1 rood 15 perches; tenant, J. F. Andrew; term, ten years, from 1st January, 1897; annual rent, £19 6s.

Area, 135 acres 1 rood 8 perches; tenant, J. B. Teasdale; term, fourteen years, expires 1st September, 1905; annual rent, £45.

Total annual rentals, £164 10s.

*Engagements not completed.*

Area, 5 acres 1 rood 30 perches; sold to Diocesan Board for £100 (incomplete).

Area, 2 roods; tenant, J. B. Teasdale; term, twenty-one years, from 1st September, 1905, at £19 10s.

Area, 1 rood; tenant, Laurie; term, fifty years, from July, 1905, at £5.

Area, 2 acres 2 roods 22 perches; tenant, Laurie; term, to be resumed at will, at £5.

## APPENDIX O.

## GRANTS TO THE BISHOP OF NEW ZEALAND AT KOHANGA, NEAR HIKUTAROA, ON THE RIVER WAIKATO.

WHEREAS schools have been established under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand for the education of the children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the same:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, Bishops of New Zealand, all that allotment or parcel of land in our Colony of New Zealand, containing by admeasurement 470 acres more or less, situated at Kohanga, on the left bank of the Waikato River, in the Province of Auckland, and known as Hikutaroa: bounded on the north-east by a line 3830 links, 2430 links, and 970 links, and by the present course of a path on the east by a line, 1150 links and 1100 links, and by a stream; on the south by a line, 4050 links, by the centre of a swamp, and by land already granted to the aforesaid Bishop for the purposes aforesaid; on the south-west by the same land already so granted and by land in the possession of the Natives; and on the north-west by the Waikato River at high-water mark. To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the said schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to youth educated therein and maintained thereat.

29th December, 1853.

G. GREY.

WHEREAS schools have been established under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand for the education of children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institutions to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the same:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, Bishops of New Zealand, all that allotment or parcel of land, containing 280 acres more or less, situated at Kohanga, near Hikutaroa, on the left bank of the River Waikato, in the Province of Auckland, New Zealand, bounded on the north by the Hikutaroa Swamp; on the east by a line, 440 links, 891 links; and again on the north by a line, 2757 links; on the north-east by a line, 610 links, and by a stream; on the south by the Pairau Stream; on the west by the Waikato River; and on the north-west by a small stream and by Native land, 2160 links; together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use or towards the support and maintenance of the said schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to youth educated therein and maintained thereat.

29th October, 1853.

G. GREY.

## GRANT IN TRUST TO THE BISHOP OF NEW ZEALAND, SITUATED AT HOPUHOPU.

WHEREAS schools have been established under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand for the education of children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institutions to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the same:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, Bishops of New Zealand, all that allotment or parcel of land in our Colony of New Zealand, containing by admeasurement 1,385 acres more or less, situated at Hopuhopu, on the right bank of the Waikato River, in the Province of Auckland, and known as Pepepe South, bounded on the north-west by the Waikato River; on the north-east by the Waikeri Stream; on the south-east by Native land, 8500 links; and on the south by a line, 15900 links. To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the said schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to youth educated therein and maintained thereat.

15th December, 1853.

G. GREY.

## GRANT TO THE BISHOP OF NEW ZEALAND ON THE RIVER PUNIU.

WHEREAS schools have been established under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand for the education of children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institutions to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the same:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, Bishops of New Zealand, all that allotment or parcel of land situated on the northern bank of the River Puniu, in the Province of Auckland, New Zealand, and bounded on the north by a line of 11050 links; on the east by the Ruapahau Stream; on the south by the Puniu River; and on the west by a line, 7996 links; as more particularly set forth and delineated in the map drawn in the margin of this deed, and containing 870 acres more or less: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in English language shall be given to youth educated therein and maintained thereat.

29th October, 1853.

G. GREY.

GRANT TO BISHOP OF NEW ZEALAND AT PEPEPE, ON THE RIVER WAIKATO.

WHEREAS schools have been established by the Government under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand for the education of children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institutions to set apart certain pieces or parcels of land in the immediate neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the same:

Now know ye that We, of our especial grace, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, Bishops of New Zealand, all that allotment or parcel of land situated at Pepepe, on the left bank of the River Waikato, in the Province of Auckland, New Zealand, bounded on the north by a line, 4230 links; on the east by lines, 154 links, 1240 links, 808 links, and 2500 links respectively; on the south by the Waikato River; and on the west by lines, 1810 links and 1355 links; as more particularly set forth and delineated on the map drawn on the back of the deed, and containing 133 acres 3 roods more or less: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use or towards the support and maintenance of the same schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

29th October, 1853.

G. GREY.

APPENDIX P.

SCHEME IN REGARD TO WAIKATO NATIVE SCHOOL RESERVES.

1. It is proposed by the Maoris that, owing to the failure of the Church Missionary Society to carry out the purposes for which the reserves known as Kohanga, Hopuhopu, Pepepe, Puniu, and Otawhao were given, Parliament be asked to vest the lands in trustees for the purpose of enabling the original intention of the donors to be carried out.

2. That combined technical and agricultural schools be established at Kohanga, Hopuhopu, and Puniu, or Te Awamutu.

3. That in order to provide the necessary funds for the support and establishment of the three schools, public subscriptions both from Maoris and Europeans be collected, and Parliament be asked to grant a £1 for £1 subsidy. Two very wealthy gentlemen, who do not wish their names made public at present, are willing to subscribe largely both to the establishment and endowment of these schools, and may contribute between them half the amount of subscription required. The members of the International Brotherhood League, a very powerful organization in America and Europe, will also assist, provided that the broad principles of universal brotherhood irrespective of creed, caste, race, or colour is taught, and the schools are conducted for the purpose of the upliftment and betterment of the Maori race and its social, moral, and intellectual advancement.

4. It is expected that after the first few years the schools, under proper management, will become almost self-supporting, as it is proposed to sell the surplus stock and produce raised by the agricultural department of the schools, also the articles manufactured by the technical department, giving the scholars a portion of the profits as an incentive to become industrious. It will be admitted that the Maoris contribute largely to the revenue of the colony through the Customs, and are therefore entitled to the consideration of the colony in the matter of grants in aid of schools. Further, in the interests of the colony and the Maori race, it will be far better to educate the Maori youth of both sexes, and fit them to become respectable settlers and citizens, than allow them to drift into vice and crime, which are the natural fruits of idleness. They are our downcast and weak brothers in distress, calling to us their pakeha brothers for help, which we ought not to refuse, for, as an Eastern sage has said, "Inaction in a deed of mercy becomes an action in a deadly sin."

To allow these reserves to remain as they are at present is to deprive the Maori of the benefit of this proposed scheme, and the land while only producing a small rent will not benefit the numerous Maori children at present receiving no education, and will cause widespread ruin to adjacent lands through the extensive growth of blackberry, gorse, briar, and other noxious weeds.

On the other hand, if the land is properly cultivated by the Maori lads under competent supervision, the noxious weeds will be eradicated, the schools will contribute to their support, and the experience gained by the Maori youths will enable them as they grow up to settle down on their own lands as successful farmers, beneficial alike to themselves, to a noble race, and to the colony.

JOHN ST. CLAIR,

Solicitor for Hon. Mahuta and Ngatitipa.

## APPENDIX Q.

## KOHANGA.

1. This trust estate now consists of 470 acres held under Crown grant dated the 29th December, 1853, and 280 acres held under Crown grant dated the 29th October, 1853: 750 acres in all.

2. There is no money in the trust.

3. In 1889 30 acres were leased at £5 a year. The lease lasted seven years.

4. In 1897 a lease was granted for twenty-eight years to Alexander Muir, the first seven years at 1s. a year, the other twenty-one years at an annual rent of £37 10s. (1s. per acre). The land to be cleared of gorse and grassed during first seven years.

5. The total receipts to the 30th June, 1904 (as per list attached) have been £37 7s., and the disbursements were £4 13s. 1d.—leaving £32 13s. 11d.

No records available from 1853 to 1869, and no transactions from 1869 to 1890.

1890.		<i>Receipts.</i>		£ s. d.		1890.		<i>Disbursements.</i>		£ s. d.			
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	7	2	0	June 30.	Rates ..	..	..	1	2	3
								Balance	..	..	5	19	9
				£7	2	0					£7	2	0
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1891.	Balance	..	..	5	19	9	1891.	Rates ..	..	..	0	14	8
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	5	0	0	June 30.	Balance	..	..	10	5	1
				£10	19	9					£10	19	9
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1892.	Balance	..	..	10	5	1	1892.	Rates ..	..	..	0	9	10
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	5	0	0	June 30.	Balance	..	..	14	15	3
				£15	5	1					£15	5	1
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1893.	Balance	..	..	14	15	3	1893.	Balance	..	..	17	5	3
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	2	10	0	June 30.	Balance	..	..	17	5	3
				£17	5	3					£17	5	3
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1894.	Balance	..	..	17	5	3	1894.	Balance	..	..	22	5	3
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	5	0	0	June 30.	Balance	..	..	22	5	3
				£22	5	3					£22	5	3
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1895.	Balance	..	..	22	5	3	1895.	Balance	..	..	22	5	3
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1896.	Balance	..	..	22	5	3	1896.	Balance	..	..	34	15	3
June 30.	Rent, J. L. Crawford	..	..	12	10	0	June 30.	Balance	..	..	34	15	3
				£34	15	3					£34	15	3
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1897.	Balance	..	..	34	15	3	1897.	Balance	..	..	34	15	3
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1898.	Balance	..	..	34	15	3	1898.	Rates ..	..	..	0	6	4
				£34	15	3	June 30.	Balance	..	..	34	8	11
				£	s.	d.					£34	15	3
1899	Balance	..	..	34	8	11	1903.	Balance	..	..	34	13	11
to				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1903.	Balance	..	..	34	8	11	June 30.	Balance	..	..	34	13	11
June 30.	Rent, A. Muir	..	..	0	5	0					£34	13	11
				£34	13	11					£34	13	11
				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
1904.	Balance	..	..	*£34	13	11					£	s.	d.

\* This sum has been devoted to the maintenance of Maori boys from the Waikato at St. Stephen's School.

*Leases current in 1905.*

Lessee, Alexander Muir; term, twenty-eight years; date of expiry, 1st August, 1925; annual rent, seven years 1s., twenty-one years £37 10s.—£500 to be spent on permanent improvements during first seven years.

HOPUHOPU.

1. The trust estate now consists of 1,385 acres, known as Pepepe South, and held under Crown grant dated the 15th December, 1853.
2. There is no money in the trust.
3. In 1885 the property was leased for twenty-one years at £30 a year. The lessee only remained two years.
4. In 1890 354 acres were leased for twenty-one years (in two lots) at an annual rental of £18 10s.
5. In 1902 another lot of 180 acres was leased for twenty-one years at £9 a year rent.
6. In 1904 463 acres were leased in three lots for twenty-one years, with right of renewal, five years free of rent, the remainder of the term at an annual rent of 1s. per acre.
7. The total receipts to the 30th June, 1904 (as per attached list), have been £392 18s. 9d.; the disbursements were £287 7s. 10d.: leaving £105 10s. 11d.

No records available from 1853 to 1869.

No transactions from 1869 to 1885.

<i>Receipts.</i>			<i>Disbursements.</i>		
1885.		£ s. d.	1885.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	3 7 8	June 30.	Travelling-expenses .. .. .	3 7 8
		<u>£3 7 8</u>			<u>£3 7 8</u>
1886.		£ s. d.	1886.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Rent, T. McDonald, two years .. .	60 0 0	June 30.	Balance .. .. .	3 7 8
		<u>£60 0 0</u>		Legal expenses .. .. .	2 12 6
				Balance .. .. .	53 19 10
		<u>£60 0 0</u>			<u>£60 0 0</u>
1887.		£ s. d.	1888.		£ s. d.
1888.	Balance .. .. .	53 19 10	June 30.	Legal expenses .. .. .	3 10 6
		<u>£53 19 10</u>		Rates .. .. .	4 6 8
				Clearing gorse .. .. .	8 15 0
		<u>£53 19 10</u>		Balance .. .. .	37 7 8
					<u>£53 19 10</u>
1889.		£ s. d.	1890.		£ s. d.
1890.	Balance .. .. .	37 7 8	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	2 6 11
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart, six months .. .	3 0 0		Clearing rabbits .. .. .	8 0 0
	" B. Stubbing, six months .. .	6 5 0		Survey, &c. .. .. .	13 1 4
		<u>£46 12 8</u>		Balance .. .. .	23 4 5
					<u>£46 12 8</u>
		<u>£46 12 8</u>			
1891.		£ s. d.	1891.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	23 4 5	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	2 17 9
	Rent, D. Stewart .. .. .	3 0 0		Expenses re gorse .. .. .	1 4 0
	" B. Stubbing .. .. .	6 5 0		Balance .. .. .	30 7 8
	" .. .. .	2 0 0			<u>£34 9 5</u>
		<u>£34 9 5</u>			<u>£34 9 5</u>
1892.		£ s. d.	1892.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	30 7 8	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	2 1 8
	Rent, D. Stewart .. .. .	6 0 0		Clearing gorse .. .. .	8 7 6
	" B. Stubbing .. .. .	11 15 0		Balance .. .. .	37 13 6
		<u>£48 2 8</u>			<u>£48 2 8</u>
1893.		£ s. d.	1893.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	37 13 6	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	3 1 6
	Rent, D. Stewart .. .. .	6 0 0		Clearing gorse and rabbits .. .	16 12 6
	" B. Stubbing .. .. .	13 5 0		Balance .. .. .	37 4 6
		<u>£56 18 6</u>			<u>£56 18 6</u>
1894.		£ s. d.	1894.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	37 4 6	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	3 1 6
	Rent, D. Stewart .. .. .	6 0 0		Clearing gorse .. .. .	8 11 0
	" B. Stubbing .. .. .	18 15 0		Balance .. .. .	50 7 0
		<u>£61 19 6</u>			<u>£61 19 6</u>
1895.		£ s. d.	1895.		£ s. d.
June 30.	Balance .. .. .	50 7 0	June 30.	Rates .. .. .	3 9 3
	Rent, D. Stewart .. .. .	6 0 0		Balance .. .. .	65 7 9
	" B. Stubbing .. .. .	12 10 0			<u>£68 17 0</u>
		<u>£68 17 0</u>			<u>£68 17 0</u>

## Hopuhopu—continued.

Receipts.			Expenditure.		
		£ s. d.			£ s. d.
1896.	Balance .. ..	65 7 9	1896.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 0 0	June 30.	Clearing gorse .. ..	12 3 6
				Balance .. ..	54 16 9
		<u>£71 7 9</u>			<u>£71 7 9</u>
1897.	Balance .. ..	54 16 9	1897.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 0 0	June 30.	Rabbits, destruction of .. ..	3 17 0
	" B. Stubbing .. ..	12 12 0		Balance .. ..	65 4 3
		<u>£73 8 9</u>			<u>£73 8 9</u>
1898.	Balance .. ..	65 4 3	1898.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 2 9	June 30.	Clearing gorse .. ..	10 8 6
	" B. Stubbing .. ..	12 10 0		Travelling-expenses .. ..	1 19 0
		<u>£83 17 0</u>		Balance .. ..	67 2 0
					<u>£83 17 0</u>
1899.	Balance .. ..	67 2 0	1899.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	2 17 0	June 30.	Clearing gorse .. ..	6 5 6
	" B. Stubbing .. ..	12 10 0		Advertising .. ..	1 2 6
	" F. G. Jackson .. ..	10 0 0		Legal expenses .. ..	1 2 0
	Gum rights, J. A. Wilson .. ..	20 0 0		Balance .. ..	99 11 6
		<u>£112 9 0</u>			<u>£112 9 0</u>
1900.	Balance .. ..	99 11 6	1900.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 0 0	June 30.	Clearing gorse .. ..	8 2 6
	Gum rights, W. C. Wilson .. ..	25 0 0		Travelling-expenses .. ..	1 10 0
		<u>£130 11 6</u>		Balance .. ..	116 11 6
					<u>£130 11 6</u>
1901.	Balance .. ..	116 11 6	1901.	Rates .. ..	2 18 4
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	9 0 3	June 30.	Destroying rabbits .. ..	9 2 0
		<u>£125 11 9</u>		Draining and fencing .. ..	28 0 0
				Advertising and travelling-expenses .. ..	2 2 3
				Balance .. ..	83 9 2
					<u>£125 11 9</u>
1902.	Balance .. ..	83 9 2	1902.	Rates .. ..	4 7 6
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	3 0 0	June 30.	Timber .. ..	1 16 3
	" B. Stubbing .. ..	33 0 0		Grant towards house .. ..	15 17 1
		<u>£119 9 2</u>		Balance .. ..	97 8 4
					<u>£119 9 2</u>
1903.	Balance .. ..	97 8 4	1903.	Rates .. ..	5 16 8
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 0 0	June 30.	Travelling-expenses .. ..	1 10 10
		<u>£103 8 4</u>		Survey .. ..	34 0 0
				Clearing gorse .. ..	7 0 0
				Balance .. ..	55 0 10
					<u>£103 8 4</u>
1904.	Balance .. ..	55 0 10	1904.	Rates .. ..	5 16 8
June 30.	Rent, D. Stewart .. ..	6 0 0	June 30.	Survey .. ..	1 5 0
	" B. Stubbing .. ..	41 18 0		Balance .. ..	119 15 11
	" H. and S. Worsp .. ..	21 10 0			
	Gum royalties .. ..	2 8 9			
		<u>£126 17 7</u>			<u>£126 17 7</u>
	Balance .. ..	*£119 15 11			

\*This sum was devoted to the maintenance of Maori boys from Waikato at St. Stephen's School, Parnell.

Lessee, D. Stewart (104 acres); term, twenty-one years; date of expiry, 1st June, 1911; annual rent, £6; to fence and improve.

Lessee, B. Stubbing (250 acres); term, twenty-one years; date of expiry, 1st June, 1911; annual rent, £12 10s.; to fence and improve.

Lessee, H. Worsp and others (180 acres); term, twenty-one years; date of expiry, 1st July, 1923; annual rent, £12; to fence and improve.

Lessee, H. M. Porter (213 acres); term, twenty-one years; date of expiry, 1st July, 1925; annual rent, five years 1s., sixteen years £10 13s.; right of renewal for twenty-one years more at same rent,



## Punua—continued.

Receipts.			Disbursements.		
		£ s. d.			£ s. d.
1886.	Balance .. .. .	183 6 10	1886.	For Waikato scholars at St.	76 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., nine months	75 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	182 6 10
		<u>£258 6 10</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£258 6 10</u>
1887.	Balance .. .. .	182 6 10	1887.	For Waikato scholars at St.	110 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., fifteen months	125 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	197 6 10
		<u>£307 6 10</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£307 6 10</u>
1888.	Balance .. .. .	197 6 10	1888.	For Waikato scholars at St.	130 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., twelve months	100 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	167 6 10
		<u>£297 6 10</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£297 6 10</u>
1889.	Balance .. .. .	167 6 10	1889.	Sundry expenses .. .. .	7 11 6
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., twelve months	100 0 0		Balance .. .. .	259 15 4
		<u>£267 6 10</u>			<u>£267 6 10</u>
1890.	Balance .. .. .	259 15 4	1890.	For Waikato scholars at St.	300 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., eighteen months	150 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	8 0 0
		<u>£409 15 4</u>		Travelling-expenses .. .. .	101 15 4
				Balance .. .. .	<u>£409 15 4</u>
1891.	Balance .. .. .	101 15 4	1891.	For Waikato scholars at St.	150 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., twelve months	75 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	26 15 4
		<u>£176 15 4</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£176 15 4</u>
1892.	Balance .. .. .	26 15 4	1892.	For Waikato scholars at St.	100 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., nine months	56 5 0		Stephen's .. .. .	
		83 0 4		Balance .. .. .	<u>£100 0 0</u>
	Balance .. .. .	16 19 8			
		<u>£100 0 0</u>			
1893.	Balance .. .. .	56 5 0	1893.	Balance .. .. .	16 19 8
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., nine months	40 14 8		For Waikato scholars at St.	80 0 0
	Balance .. .. .	40 14 8		Stephen's .. .. .	
		<u>£96 19 8</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£96 19 8</u>
1894.	Balance .. .. .	112 10 0	1894.	Balance .. .. .	40 14 8
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., fifteen months	8 4 8		For Waikato scholars at St.	80 0 0
	Balance .. .. .	8 4 8		Stephen's .. .. .	
		<u>£120 14 8</u>		Balance .. .. .	<u>£120 14 8</u>
1895.	Balance .. .. .	125 0 0	1895.	Balance .. .. .	8 4 8
June 30.	Rent, Westney Bros., twenty-one months	125 0 0		For Waikato scholars at St.	100 0 0
		<u>£125 0 0</u>		Stephen's .. .. .	16 15 4
				Balance .. .. .	<u>£125 0 0</u>
1896.	Balance .. .. .	16 15 4	1896.	For Waikato scholars at St.	50 0 0
June 30.	Rent, Bispham, twelve months	50 0 0		Stephen's .. .. .	1 18 5
	Balance .. .. .	2 6 7		Insurance .. .. .	11 9 2
		<u>£69 1 11</u>		Rates .. .. .	5 14 4
				Advertising and expenses .. .. .	<u>£69 1 11</u>
1898.	Balance .. .. .	25 0 0	1897-1898.	Balance .. .. .	2 6 7
June 30.	Rent, C. A. Bowden, twelve months	25 0 0		Legal expenses .. .. .	4 5 0
		<u>£25 0 0</u>		Balance .. .. .	18 8 5
					<u>£25 0 0</u>





## Pepepe--continued.

Receipts.			Disbursements.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
1886 to 1893. 1894. June 30.	No money received.		1886 to 1893. } Balance	8	17 9
	Rent, J. Jackson, twelve months ..	5 0 0			
	Balance .. .. .	3 17 9			
		<u>£8 17 9</u>			<u>£8 17 9</u>
1895. June 30.	Rent, J. Jackson, two years ..	10 0 0	1894. June 30. Balance	3	17 9
			1895. June 30. Balance	6	2 3
		<u>£10 0 0</u>			<u>£10 0 0</u>
1896. Balance		6 2 3	1897. Balance	11	2 3
1897. June 30.	Rent, J. Jackson, twelve months ..	5 0 0			
		<u>£11 2 3</u>			<u>£11 2 3</u>
1898. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	11 2 3	1898. Balance	16	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	5 0 0			
		<u>£16 2 3</u>			<u>£16 2 3</u>
1899. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	16 2 3	1899. Balance	21	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	5 0 0			
		<u>£21 2 3</u>			<u>£21 2 3</u>
1900. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	21 2 3	1900. Balance	26	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	5 0 0			
		<u>£26 2 3</u>			<u>£26 2 3</u>
1901. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	26 2 3	1901. Balance	31	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	5 0 0			
		<u>£31 2 3</u>			<u>£31 2 3</u>
1902. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	31 2 3	1902. Balance	46	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	15 0 0			
		<u>£46 2 3</u>			<u>£46 2 3</u>
1903. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	46 2 3	1903. Balance	61	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	15 0 0			
		<u>£61 2 3</u>			<u>£61 2 3</u>
1904. June 30.	Balance .. .. .	61 2 3	1904. Balance	76	2 3
	Rent, J. Jackson .. .. .	15 0 0			
		<u>£76 2 3</u>			<u>£76 2 3</u>
	Balance .. .. .	*£76 2 3			

\* This sum was devoted to the maintenance of Maori boys from the Waikato at St. Stephen's School, Parnell.

## Lease current in 1905.

Lessee, J. Jackson; term, twenty-one years; date of expiry, 20th September, 1905; annual rent, seven years 1s., seven years £5, seven years £10; fence and improve.

## APPENDIX R.

## GOVERNMENT VALUATIONS.

Kohanga Reserves (1903): Capital value, £865; unimproved value, £750.  
 Hopuhopu Reserve (1905): Capital value, £2,194; unimproved value, £2,074.  
 Puniu Reserve (1903): Capital value, £3,125; unimproved value, £1,750.  
 Pepepe Reserve (1903): Capital value, £170; unimproved value, £170.

LIST OF MAORI BOYS (not including Government scholars) from the Waikato maintained at St. Stephen's School, Parnell, from 1892 to 1905.

[The first date given is when the boy was admitted, the second is when his name was removed.]

Tukotahi Randell (Waikato)—19th April, 1892; 6th July, 1897. John MacGruther—12th February, 1894; 12th December, 1897. Rangipataka—9th February, 1894; 2nd February, 1901. Wewe te Warama—9th February, 1894; 3rd February, 1902. Hoete Tutakawa—31st May, 1894; 31st January, 1900. Tuku Perc—January, 1895; 4th February, 1901. William Brown—5th

March, 1895; 21st January, 1898. Whataiwi Brown—5th March, 1895; 6th February, 1901. Kapene Brown—5th March, 1895; 31st January, 1900. Edward Randell (Waikato)—10th February, 1896; 6th July, 1897. George Awa (Waikato)—10th February, 1896; 8th March, 1898. Tame Tana (Otorohanga)—8th February, 1897; 16th December, 1898. Tukiterangi—8th February, 1897; 14th February, 1899. T. Fred Cartman—3rd March, 1897; 3rd February, 1899. Karaipu Simon (Piako)—6th March, 1897; 31st January, 1900. Te Ngara Tehari—6th March, 1897; 31st January, 1900. Wiremu Wharara (Raglan)—6th March, 1897; 31st January, 1900. William Taekata—5th May, 1897; 4th February, 1901. Hotutahaunga Taupaki—4th March, 1898; 27th February, 1901. Karaka Keena—25th March, 1898; 2nd June, 1898. Pene Keena—25th March, 1898; 16th November, 1903. Rawiri Hautaku—14th February, 1899; 16th December, 1904. Tuhoro Paki (Otorohanga)—14th February, 1899; 16th December, 1904. Tumakere Brown—2nd March, 1899; 2nd February, 1901. Papaka Ngatete (Waikato)—26th April, 1899; 31st March, 1902. Putu Ngatete (Waikato)—26th April, 1899; 31st March, 1902. Edwin Aubrey (Waikato)—13th June, 1899; 31st December, 1903. Henry Marshall (Waikato)—27th February, 1900; 16th December, 1904. Thomas Curtis—27th March, 1900; 18th February, 1901. Arapo Edwards—3rd March, 1900; 13th April, 1900. Papa Cowell—3rd March, 1900; 13th December, 1901. Percy Moke (Kawhia)—3rd March, 1900; 15th December, 1902. Whiu Nepe (Waikato)—2nd February, 1901; 15th December, 1902. Tuteao te Uira—25th March, 1901; 28th March, 1902. Ruru te Aho—2nd April, 1901; 31st December, 1903. Heta Taranaki—2nd April, 1901; third week of the third quarter, 1901. Edward Glen—6th April, 1901. Pene Coffin (Kopua)—30th January, 1902. Te Utunga Tau Watere (Kawhia)—22nd February, 1902; 14th December, 1904. William Amuketi Rokena—19th March, 1902. Tena Poiwohare (Kawhia)—2nd February, 1903. Te Huka Kaahu (King-country)—9th February, 1903. Taimui Kaia Kaahu (King-country)—9th February, 1903. Tuterangi (King-country)—3rd February, 1904. Wiri Tau (Kawhia)—19th February, 1904. Mai Toataua (Kawhia)—19th February, 1904. Porima Morgan (Kawhia)—19th February, 1904. Haku Maihi—22nd February, 1904; 12th October, 1904. William Amukite (Kawhia)—25th April, 1904. Pikiahu te Anga (King-country)—16th February, 1905. Reihana Archer—16th February, 1905. Te Hiringa Mateono—19th February, 1905. Huiarangi Te Rauwhero—19th February, 1905. Hare Tai—21st February, 1905. Matini Hopa—22nd February, 1905. Te Aho te Hae—11th February, 1905. Fifty-six boys in all, of whom eighteen are still at St. Stephen's.

The school records prior to 1892 were burnt in a fire that destroyed the school buildings in April, 1904.

PARTICULARS RESPECTING CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS IN THE WAIKATO DISTRICT  
(furnished by Education Department).

Locality.	Section.	Area.	Present Capital Value.	Term of Lease.	Date of Lease.	Present Annual Rental.
Taupiri No. 1	463	a. r. p. 1,730 0 0 (456 acres leased 15th Sept., 1903, for £7 12s. 2d. for 21 years)	£ 432	Years. ..	..	£ s. d. ..
" 2	463	1,992 0 0 (106 acres leased for right of road)	498	21 21	1/5/03 1/4/03	20 16 0 5 0 0
" 3	463	1,505 0 0	376	Not leased	..	No offer.
" 4	463	953 0 0	238	"	..	"
" 5	463	1,336 0 0	334	"	..	"
" 1A	463	95 0 0	24	21	21/7/03	2 7 6
" 2A	463	104 0 0	26	Perpetuity	1897	2 0 0
" 3A	463	99 0 0	25	"	1896	2 0 0
" 4A	463	100 0 0	25	Occupation with right of pur- chase	"	2 10 0
" 5A	463	94 0 0	27	Ditto	"	2 7 0
" 6A	463	117 0 0	29	"	"	2 18 6
" 7A	463	113 0 0	28	"	"	2 16 6
" 8A	463	100 0 0	25	Year to year	17/11/03	2 0 0
" 9A	463	100 0 0	25	Not leased	..	..
" 10A	463	100 0 0	25	..	..	2 0 0
" 11A	463	200 0 0	50	..	..	4 0 0
" 12A	463	100 0 0	25	..	..	2 0 6
" 13A	463	100 0 0	25	..	..	2 10 0
" 14A	463	100 0 0	25	..	..	2 0 0
" 15A	463	100 0 0	25	Perpetuity	1896	2 0 0
" 16A	463	198 0 0	49	"	"	4 4 0
" 17A	463	106 0 0	26	"	1899	2 3 8
" 19A	463	88 0 0	22	..	..	2 4 0
" 20A	463	66 0 0	16	..	..	1 13 0
" 21A	463	62 0 0	..	..	..	1 11 1
" 21B	463	..	..	..	..	..
" 21C	463	..	..	..	..	..
" 22A	463	93 0 0	23	..	..	1 9 6
" 23A	463	102 0 0	25	..	..	2 11 0
" 24A	463	38 0 0	9	..	..	0 19 0
Raglan No. 1	174	1,214 0 0	304	21	9/12/01	15 3 6
" 2	174	1,829 0 0	457	21	1901	22 18 0
" 3	174	612 0 0	153	21	1904	7 13 0
" 4	174	1,296 0 0	324	21	6/1/02	16 4 0
" 5	174	611 0 0	153	21	..	15 5 6
" 6	174	986 0 0	246	21	..	12 6 6

## ST. STEPHEN'S SCHOOL, PARNELL.

The number of boys maintained from 1892 to 1904 have averaged fifty-eight a year. The Government have paid for an average of twenty-one a year; the trusts have maintained an average of thirty-seven a year.

At present (1905) there are seventy boys at the school. The Government pays for thirty scholars; the trusts maintain forty scholars.

## APPENDIX S.

## GRANT TO BISHOP OF LAND AT WAIRARAPA FOR A COLLEGE.

WHEREAS a college is about to be established in the Wairarapa Valley, under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which said piece or parcel of land has been ceded by the Native owners for the support of the said college:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, all that piece or parcel of land situate and being adjacent to the Town of Kaikokirikiri, in the Wairarapa Valley, in the Province of Wellington, in the Islands of New Zealand, the boundary of which said piece of land commences at a point marked "A" upon the plan drawn in the margin of these presents, being the junction of the Awatokoru Stream with the Makakaweka River, and also by an irregular line, 40 links and 2428 links; from thence the boundary-line runs north-easterly, 3909 links; thence south-easterly, 5007 links; thence south-westerly by an irregular line, 1744 links and 130 links, to the Awatokoru Stream by which it is bounded, to the starting-point, the contents being 190 acres or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated in the said plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said college so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

14th June, 1853.

G. GREY.

## APPENDIX T.

## PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS.

Years 1853 to 1866.

IT APPEARS from the minutes that the lands were leased only at peppercorn rentals in consideration of improvements.

Note *re* years 1867-75: The rents to the amount of £312 10s. 7d. were paid to the Diocesan Fund to pay off the following: Excess contributions to Papawai school over government grants, £275 15s.; balance of accounts, Papawai School, £31 1s. 9d.; retained as interest, £5 13s. 10d.: total, £312 10s. 7d.

Receipts.				Payment.			
		£	s. d.			£	s. d.
1867—				1867—			
	Kaikokirikiri rent	10	0 7		Diocesan Fund	10	0 7
1868—				1868—			
	Papawai rent	10	0 0		Diocesan Fund	10	0 0
1869—				1869—			
	Papawai rent	30	0 0		Diocesan Fund	30	0 0
1870—				1870—			
	Papawai rent	38	0 0		Diocesan Fund	38	0 0
1871—				1871—			
	Kaikokirikiri rent	30	0 0		Diocesan Fund	52	0 0
	Papawai rent	22	0 0				
		52	0 0			52	0 0

PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS—continued.

Receipts.			Payment.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
1872—			1872—		
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	15	0 0	Diocesan Fund .. .. .	40	0 0
Papawai rent .. .. .	25	0 0			
	40	0 0		40	0 0
1873—			1873—		
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	15	0 0	Diocesan Fund .. .. .	50	0 0
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
	50	0 0		50	0 0
1874—			1874—		
Papawai rent .. .. .	17	10 0	Diocesan Fund .. .. .	17	10 0
1875—			1875—		
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	30	0 0	Diocesan Fund .. .. .	65	0 0
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
	65	0 0		65	0 0
1876—			1876—		
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	30	0 0	Balance .. .. .	65	0 0
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
	65	0 0		65	0 0
1877—			1877—		
Balance .. .. .	65	0 0	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	167	8 4
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	45	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	52	10 0			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	4	18 4			
	167	8 4		167	8 4
1878—			1878—		
Balance .. .. .	167	8 4	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	202	14 10
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	15	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	17	10 0			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	2	16 6			
	202	14 10		202	14 10
1879—			1879—		
Balance .. .. .	202	14 10	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	401	17 7
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	45	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	52	10 0			
Public works, for Kaikokirikiri land taken for railway purposes .. .. .	86	8 1			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	15	4 8			
	401	17 7		401	17 7
1880—			1880—		
Balance .. .. .	401	17 7	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	490	12 2
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	30	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	23	14 7			
	490	12 2		490	12 2
1881—			1881—		
Balance .. .. .	490	12 2	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	582	4 2
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	30	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	26	12 0			
	582	4 2		582	4 2
1882—			1882—		
Balance .. .. .	582	4 2	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	659	11 2
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
Papawai rent .. .. .	35	0 0			
Interest on deposit .. .. .	7	7 0			
	659	11 2		659	11 2

PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS—*continued.*

<i>Receipts.</i>				<i>Expenditure.</i>			
Year to 30th June, 1883—				1883, to 30th June—			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Balance .. .. .	659	11	2	Valuation, Papawai .. .. .	2	2	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	20	0	0	Balance at bank and on deposit .. .. .	694	19	2
Papawai rent .. .. .	17	10	0				
	697	1	2		697	1	2
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1884—				Year to 30th June, 1884—			
Balance .. .. .	694	19	2	Balance—			
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	20	0	0	Mortgages .. .. .	700	0	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	37	10	0	Deposit .. .. .	107	5	0
Interest .. .. .	54	15	10				
	807	5	0		807	5	0
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1885—				Year to 30th June, 1885			
Balance .. .. .	807	5	0	Commission .. .. .	2	9	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	40	0	0	Balance—			
Papawai rent .. .. .	80	18	0	Mortgages .. .. .	800	0	0
Interest .. .. .	89	4	6	Deposits .. .. .	214	18	6
	1,017	7	6		1,017	7	6
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1886—				Year to 30th June, 1886			
Balance .. .. .	1,014	18	6	Secretary's salary .. .. .	10	10	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	40	0	0	Printing .. .. .	2	0	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Balance—			
Interest .. .. .	77	11	6	Mortgages .. .. .	800	0	0
	1,207	10	0	Deposit .. .. .	345	0	0
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1887—				Year to 30th June, 1887—			
Balance .. .. .	1,195	0	0	Secretary's salary, two years .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	40	0	0	Balance—			
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Mortgages .. .. .	900	0	0
Interest .. .. .	80	19	7	Deposits .. .. .	469	19	7
	1,390	19	7		1,390	19	7
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1888—				Year to 30th June, 1888—			
Balance .. .. .	1,369	19	7	Secretary's salary .. .. .	10	10	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	40	0	0	Balance—			
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Mortgages .. .. .	900	0	0
Interest .. .. .	88	10	2	Deposits .. .. .	662	19	9
	1,573	9	9		1,573	9	9
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1889—				Year to 30th June, 1889—			
Balance .. .. .	1,562	19	9	Secretary's salary .. .. .	10	10	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	123	2	0	Report, Kaikokirikiri Reserve .. .. .	5	5	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Survey, Kaikokirikiri Reserve .. .. .	13	0	0
Interest .. .. .	94	10	10	Commission .. .. .	4	3	2
	1,855	12	7	Printing and stamps .. .. .	2	0	0
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1890—				Year to 30th June, 1890—			
Balance .. .. .	1,820	14	5	Balance—			
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	103	15	10	Mortgages .. .. .	800	0	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Deposits .. .. .	1,000	17	7
Interest .. .. .	99	5	2	Bank .. .. .	19	16	10
	2,098	15	5		1,855	12	7
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1890—				Year to 30th June, 1890—			
Balance .. .. .	1,820	14	5	Secretary's salary (two years) .. .. .	31	10	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	103	15	10	Advertising, Kaikokirikiri Reserve .. .. .	2	11	9
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Survey .. .. .	4	4	0
Interest .. .. .	99	5	2	Cheque-book .. .. .	0	4	2
	2,098	15	5	Balance—			
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Year to 30th June, 1890—				Year to 30th June, 1890—			
Balance .. .. .	1,820	14	5	Mortgages .. .. .	1,650	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	103	15	10	Deposits .. .. .	286	4	4
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Bank .. .. .	124	1	2
Interest .. .. .	99	5	2				
	2,098	15	5		2,098	15	5
<hr/>				<hr/>			

## PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS—continued.

<i>Receipts.</i>				<i>Expenditure.</i>			
Year to 30th June, 1891—				Year to 30th June, 1891—			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Balance .. .. .	2,060	5	6	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	150	5	4	Rates, Kaikokirikiri .. .. .	1	19	6
Papawai rent .. .. .	87	10	0	Legal expenses .. .. .	2	8	4
Interest .. .. .	129	15	9	Printing and stationery .. .. .	1	0	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	1,950	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	196	16	0
				Bank .. .. .	254	12	9
	2,427	16	7		2,427	16	7
Year to 30th June, 1892—				Year to 30th June, 1892—			
Balance .. .. .	2,401	8	9	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	157	15	8	Stationery and exchange .. .. .	1	14	6
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Inspecting securities .. .. .	0	13	4
Interest .. .. .	120	14	0	Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,150	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	200	1	6
				Bank .. .. .	406	9	1
	2,779	18	5		2,779	18	5
Year to 30th June, 1893—				Year to 30th June, 1893—			
Balance .. .. .	2,756	10	7	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	152	15	8	Stationery and exchange .. .. .	1	5	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Inspecting securities .. .. .	0	13	4
Interest .. .. .	131	2	8	Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,650	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	467	10	7
	3,140	8	11		3,140	8	11
Year to 30th June, 1894—				Year to 30th June, 1894—			
Balance .. .. .	3,117	10	7	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	152	3	8	Stationery and exchange .. .. .	1	3	6
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Report, Papawai Reserve .. .. .	5	5	0
Interest .. .. .	189	7	2	Legal expenses .. .. .	1	1	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,950	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	580	11	11
	3,559	1	5		3,559	1	5
Year to 30th June, 1895—				Year to 30th June, 1895—			
Balance .. .. .	3,530	11	11	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	129	5	2	Printing and stationery .. .. .	1	15	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	49	18	6	Examining securities .. .. .	0	13	4
Interest .. .. .	192	0	6	Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,125	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	300	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	453	7	9
	3,901	16	1		3,901	16	1
Year to 30th June, 1896—				Year to 30th June, 1896—			
Balance .. .. .	3,878	7	9	Secretary's salary .. .. .	21	0	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	119	6	2	Legal expenses .. .. .	14	13	6
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Stationery, stamps .. .. .	1	3	0
Interest .. .. .	205	3	9	Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,425	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	300	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	541	1	2
	4,302	17	8		4,302	17	8
Year to 30th June, 1897—				Year to 30th June, 1897—			
Balance .. .. .	4,266	1	2	Secretary's salary .. .. .	32	0	6
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	119	7	8	Safe .. .. .	8	10	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Inspecting securities .. .. .	0	13	4
Interest .. .. .	263	14	0	Stationery, stamps, and exchange .. .. .	1	6	6
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,041	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	1,300	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	365	12	6
	4,749	2	10		4,749	2	10
Year to 30th June, 1898—				Year to 30th June, 1898—			
Balance .. .. .	4,706	12	6	Secretary's salary .. .. .	27	6	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	108	16	0	Printing and stationery .. .. .	2	10	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	100	0	0	Legal expenses .. .. .	3	8	4
Interest .. .. .	250	1	11	Exchange .. .. .	0	2	9
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,883	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	2,100	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	149	3	4
	5,155	10	5		5,155	10	5

## PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS—continued.

Receipts.				Payment.			
Year to 31st March, 1899—				Year to 31st March, 1899—			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Balance .. .. .	5,132	3	4	Secretary's salary .. .. .	20	9	6
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	119	9	8	Stationery and exchange .. .. .	0	12	9
Papawai rent .. .. .	75	0	0	Inspecting deeds .. .. .	0	13	4
Interest .. .. .	144	16	4	Report, Kaikokirikiri Reserve .. .. .	3	3	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,033	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	2,100	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	313	10	9
	5,471	9	4		5,471	9	4
Year to 31st March, 1900—				Year to 31st March, 1900—			
Balance .. .. .	5,446	10	9	Secretary's salary .. .. .	27	6	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	172	10	6	Printing, advertising, and stationery .. .. .	4	15	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	62	10	0	Commission .. .. .	7	6	0
Interest .. .. .	235	5	9	Inspecting deeds .. .. .	0	13	4
				Bank charges and exchange .. .. .	0	14	9
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,700	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	1,850	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	326	1	11
	5,916	17	0		5,916	17	0
Year to 31st March, 1901—				Year to 31st March, 1901—			
Balance .. .. .	5,876	1	11	Secretary's salary .. .. .	27	6	0
Kaikokirikiri rents .. .. .	122	5	4	Printing and stationery .. .. .	4	6	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	125	0	0	Commission and exchange .. .. .	4	18	9
Interest .. .. .	248	19	11	Travelling expenses and valuation fees .. .. .	3	12	3
				Inspecting deeds .. .. .	0	13	4
				Bank charge .. .. .	0	10	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,400	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	1,850	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	1,081	0	10
	6,372	7	2		6,372	7	2
Year to 31st March, 1902—				Year to 31st March, 1902—			
Balance .. .. .	6,331	0	10	Secretary's salary .. .. .	27	6	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	244	1	10	Printing and stationery .. .. .	2	12	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	250	0	0	Advertising .. .. .	5	19	0
Interest .. .. .	364	6	0	Legal expenses .. .. .	7	15	0
				Commission and exchange .. .. .	12	10	1
				Bank charge .. .. .	0	10	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	3,250	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	1,850	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	2,032	16	7
	7,189	8	8		7,189	8	8
Year to 31st March, 1903—				Year to 31st March, 1903—			
Balance .. .. .	7,132	16	7	Secretary's salary .. .. .	27	6	0
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	236	18	0	Advertising and stationery .. .. .	3	2	0
Papawai rent .. .. .	125	0	0	Commission and reports .. .. .	14	4	3
Interest .. .. .	236	5	0	Legal expenses .. .. .	9	15	2
Refund from Diocesan Trustees for advertising .. .. .	5	19	0	Bank charge .. .. .	0	10	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,650	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	4,350	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	682	1	2
	7,736	18	7		7,736	18	7
Year to 31st March, 1904—				Year to 31st March, 1904—			
Balance .. .. .	7,682	1	2	Clareville Maori College Account .. .. .	1,127	6	2
Kaikokirikiri rent .. .. .	231	5	10	Secretary's salary .. .. .	6	16	6
Papawai rent .. .. .	125	0	0	Contribution, Diocesan Treasurer's salary .. .. .	32	12	7
Interest .. .. .	343	0	0	Contribution, cost of opening Diocesan office .. .. .	25	0	0
				Audit fee .. .. .	5	5	0
				Commission .. .. .	16	11	0
				Printing .. .. .	4	10	0
				Rates, Kaikokirikiri .. .. .	3	15	8
				Stationery, stamps, &c. .. .. .	7	2	0
				Balance—			
				Mortgages .. .. .	2,200	0	0
				Deposits .. .. .	4,600	0	0
				Balance due on land sold, mortgage being foreclosed .. .. .	150	0	0
				Bank .. .. .	195	8	10
				Cash .. .. .	6	19	3
	8,381	7	0		8,381	7	0







BISHOP'S RESERVE, KAIKOKIRIKIRI—continued.

Summary of Receipts and Payments from Kaikokirikiri and Papawai Trusts, 1867 to 31st March, 1905—continued.

		Payments.		£	s.	d.
Expenses, Papawai College, closed in 1865				312	10	7
Expenses, Clareville Maori College, from 1st April, 1903, to 31st March, 1905				1,775	7	5
Special expenses of Kaikokirikiri Reserve (commission, surveys, reports, rates, &c.)				148	0	3
Papawai Reserve (commission, surveys, reports, &c.)				97	3	4
General expenses of management of Papawai and Kaikokirikiri trusts from 1865 to 1905				636	7	2
				<u>£2,969 8 9</u>		
Total receipts				10,086	14	10
Less total payments				2,969	8	9
				<u>£7,117 6 1</u>		
				£ s. d.		
Total existing investments—mortgages, fixed deposits				6,925	0	0
Balance at bank and on hand				192	6	1
				<u>£7,117 6 1</u>		

		Receipts.		£	s.	d.
1867.	Rent			10	0	7
1871.	Rent, Bannister, two years to Oct. 1, 1870	1, 1870		30	0	0
1872.	" " one year " " 1, 1871	1, 1871		15	0	0
1873.	" " " " 1, 1872	1, 1872		15	0	0
1875.	" " two years " " 1, 1874	1, 1874		30	0	0
Sept. 1, 1876.	" " " " 1, 1876	1, 1876		30	0	0
Sept. 1, 1877.	" " one year " " 1, 1877	1, 1877		30	0	0
1877.	" " half-year " April 1, 1878	April 1, 1878		15	0	0
June 30, 1878.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1878	Oct. 1, 1878		15	0	0
1879.	" " " " April 1, 1879	April 1, 1879		15	0	0
June 30, 1879.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1879	Oct. 1, 1879		15	0	0
Dec. 31, 1879.	" " " " April 1, 1880	April 1, 1880		15	0	0
June 30, 1880.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1880	Oct. 1, 1880		15	0	0
Dec. 31, 1880.	" " " " April 1, 1881	April 1, 1881		15	0	0
June 30, 1881.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1881	Oct. 1, 1881		15	0	0
Dec. 31, 1882.	" " " " April 1, 1882	April 1, 1882		15	0	0
June 30, 1882.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1882	Oct. 1, 1882		15	0	0
Dec. 31, 1881.	" " " " April 1, 1883	April 1, 1883		20	0	0
June 30, 1883.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1883	Oct. 1, 1883		20	0	0
Feb. 6, 1884.	" " " " April 1, 1884	April 1, 1884		20	0	0
Aug. 5, 1884.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1884	Oct. 1, 1884		20	0	0
Mar. 6, 1885.	" " " " April 1, 1885	April 1, 1885		20	0	0
Aug. 18, 1885.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1885	Oct. 1, 1885		20	0	0
Mar. 1, 1886.	" " " " April 1, 1886	April 1, 1886		20	0	0
Aug. 4, 1886.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1886	Oct. 1, 1886		20	0	0
April 4, 1887.	" " " " April 1, 1887	April 1, 1887		20	0	0
Oct. 3, 1887.	" " " " Oct. 1, 1887	Oct. 1, 1887		20	0	0
Oct. 3, 1888.	" " " " April 1, 1888	April 1, 1888		20	0	0
Jan. 29, 1889.	" " one year " April 1, 1889	April 1, 1889		40	0	0
				<u>£570 0 7</u>		

Rents for Ten Years from 20th May, 1889.

E. Taylor, Section 6, £42 16s. per annum.

1889.	£	s.	d.	1892.	£	s.	d.	1895.	£	s.	d.
May 21	21	8	0	Dec. 8	21	8	0	Nov. 5	21	7	6
Nov. 29	21	8	0	1893.							
1890.				June 10	21	8	0	1897.			
June 2	21	8	0	Dec. 13	11	7	6	May 20	21	8	0
Nov. 28	21	8	0	1894.							
1891.				Jan. 18	10	0	0	1898.			
June 2	21	8	0	June 12	11	7	6	May 6	21	8	0
1892.				July 9	10	0	6	Total	£320	19	0
Jan. 15	21	8	0	Dec. 19	21	8	0				
June 8	21	8	0								

J. Hoffeins, Sections 1, 2, 5, £65 19s. 8d. per annum.

1889.	£	s.	d.	1893.	£	s.	d.	1896.	£	s.	d.
June 5	34	9	10	Mar. 30	34	9	10	Nov. 17	34	9	10
Dec. 10	34	9	10	Sept. 4	34	8	10	1897.			
1890.				1894.				May 20	34	9	10
Aug. 19	34	9	6	Feb. 23	34	9	10	Nov. 22	34	8	0
1891.				Sept. 17	34	8	10	1899.			
Jan. 7	34	9	10	1895.				Jan. 14	68	19	8
Aug. 20	34	9	10	May 16	34	8	10	Total	£654	19	10
1892.				Nov. 15	34	8	10				
April 27	34	9	10	1896.							
Aug. 27	34	9	10	April 23	34	9	10				

J. Fitzgerald, Section 7, £6 10s. (reduced to £5, part being taken for railway).

1889.	£	s.	d.	1894.	£	s.	d.	1897.	£	s.	d.
June 5	3	5	0	May 22	2	10	0	Dec. 7	2	10	0
Dec. 10	2	10	0	Nov. 21	2	10	0	1898.			
1890.				1895.				May 21	2	10	0
Aug. 19	2	10	0	May 18	2	10	0	Nov. 23	2	10	0
1891.				Nov. 20	2	10	0	1899.			
Aug. 27	5	0	0	1896.				May 23	2	10	0
1892.				May 21	2	10	0	Total	£50	15	0
May 25	5	0	0	Nov. 24	2	10	0				
1893.				1897.							
May 22	5	0	0	May 21	2	10	0				

## BISHOP'S RESERVE, KAIKOKIRIKIRI—continued.

## Rents for Ten Years from 20th May, 1889—continued.

M. Kerins, Sections 3, 4, £48 per annum.

1898.	£ s. d.	1894.	£ s. d.	1899.	£ s. d.
June 29	24 0 0	May 4	24 0 0	May 12	24 0 0
1890.		Dec. 12	23 19 0	June 14	24 0 0
Mar. 13	24 0 0	1896.		Oct. 13	24 0 0
1891.		Mar. 25	24 0 0		
Jan. 21	36 0 0	Sept. 11	24 0 0	1900.	
1892.		1897.		Feb. 27	24 0 0
Feb. 25	36 0 0	July 3	48 0 0		
1893.		1898.		Total	£467 19 0
Feb. 11	36 0 0	Sept. 22	48 0 0		
Nov. 8	24 0 0				

## Rents from Leases, 20th May, 1899, to 20th May, 1909.

## Wagland.

1899.	£ s. d.	1902.	£ s. d.	1904.	£ s. d.
Oct. 13	24 14 10	July 6	24 14 10	June 22	24 14 10
1901.		1903.		1905.	
April 14	24 14 10	Mar. 31	24 14 10	Feb. 18	24 14 10
July 10	24 14 10	July 9	24 14 10		
1902.		Oct. 1	24 14 10	Total	£272 3 2
Mar. 6	24 14 10	Dec. 23	24 14 10		

## M. Kerins.

1900.	£ s. d.	1902.	£ s. d.	1904.	£ s. d.
June 29	17 2 0	June 28	17 2 0	June 22	17 2 0
1901.		1903.		1905.	
April 19	17 2 0	Jan. 7	17 2 0	Jan. 13	17 2 0
June 13	17 2 0	Mar. 31	17 2 0		
1902.		July 9	17 2 0	Total	£188 2 0
Mar. 6	17 2 0	Dec. 23	17 2 0		

## J. Hoffeins.

1899.	£ s. d.	1902.	£ s. d.	1904.	£ s. d.
Sept. 11	20 10 8	Mar. 6	20 10 8	June 22	20 10 8
May 17	20 10 8	June 28	20 10 8	1905.	
1901.		1903.		Jan. 13	20 10 8
Jan. 10	20 10 8	Jan. 7	20 10 8		
July 2	20 10 8	July 9	20 10 8	Total	£225 17 4
		Dec. 23	20 10 8		

## C. and A. Cook, ten years from 4th October, 1899.

1899.	£ s. d.	1902.	£ s. d.	1904.	£ s. d.
Dec. 27	18 15 0*	Mar. 29	30 0 0	June 22	37 10 0
1900.		June 28	7 10 0	1905.	
June 1	26 12 0*	Sept. 10	37 10 0	Jan. 13	37 10 0
Nov. 22	37 10 0	1903.			
1901.		Jan. 7	37 10 0	Total	£382 17 0
July 2	37 10 0	July 9	37 10 0		
		Dec. 23	37 10 0		

\* Rent to 20th May, 1900, from 4th October, 1899.

## G. Day, from 20th May, 1899, at £10 per annum (no lease).

	£ s. d.
1900. Feb. 27	10 0 0
1901. June 13	10 0 0
1903. Jan. 7	10 0 0

## Mrs. Hanley, from 16th January, 1903, at 17s. per month (no lease).

1903.	£ s. d.	1905.	£ s. d.
Mar. 31	2 11 0	Jan. 13	6 16 0
July 9	1 14 0	Mar. 23	2 11 0
Oct. 1	3 8 0		
Dec. 23	1 14 0	Total, 26 months to 16th March, 1905	£22 2 0
1904.			
June 22	3 0		

## PAPAWAI AND KAIKOKIRIKIRI TRUSTS.—ACCUMULATED FUNDS.—Year ending 31st March, 1905.

	£	s.	d.
Mortgages .. .. .	3,300	0	0
Deposits .. .. .	3,500	0	0
Balance due on land sold, mortgage being foreclosed .. .. .	125	0	0
Balance at bank .. .. .	75	0	0
	<hr/>		
Papawai and Kaikokirikiri School Trust Imprest Account .. .. .	7,000	0	0
Balance at bank on current account .. .. .	70	4	0
Cash on hand .. .. .	46	11	10
		0	10
	<hr/>		
	£7,117	6	1
Approximate estimation of proportion of accumulated funds belonging to the Kaikokirikiri trust—			
Total accumulation .. .. .	7,117	6	1
Less cash for part Kaikokirikiri Reserve taken for railway purposes .. .. .	86	8	1
	<hr/>		
	£7,030	18	0
Total rents, Kaikokirikiri Reserve .. .. .			
Less special expenses .. .. .	3,185	14	11
	<hr/>		
	£3,037	14	8
Total rents, Papawai Reserve .. .. .			
Less special expenses .. .. .	2,795	11	6
	<hr/>		
	£2,698	8	2
£7,030 18s., divided in the proportion of £3,037 14s. 8d. to £2,698 8s. 2d., gives £3,723 4s. as the proportion belonging to the Kaikokirikiri trust and £3,307 14s. to the Papawai trust.			
		£	s.
Kaikokirikiri, net rents .. .. .	3,723	4	0
Add for land taken for railway purposes .. .. .	86	8	1
	<hr/>		
Total amount belonging to Kaikokirikiri trust out of accumulated funds .. .. .	£3,809	12	1

## GOVERNMENT VALUATION OF KAIKOKIRIKIRI RESERVE.

Area, 174 acres 2 roods. Capital value, £8,340; unimproved value, £7,515; improvements, £825.

## APPENDIX U.

## GRANT FOR INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL AT MOTUEKA.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of the diocese in which the Town of Nelson is situated, and to his successors in that diocese, all that piece or parcel of land situated at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, in the Islands of New Zealand, containing 660 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north and east by public roads; on the south partly by Section No. 224, and partly by a Native reserve, No. 236; and on the west partly by Rural Section No. 31, partly by Sections Nos. 253, 252, 251, and 250, and partly by a public road, the boundaries of which said piece of land are more particularly delineated on the plan drawn in the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of the diocese in which the Town of Nelson is situated, and to his successors, Bishops of that diocese, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

25th July, 1853.

G. GREY.

## GRANT FOR INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL AT MOTUEKA.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart the undermentioned pieces or parcels of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same:

Now know ye that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of the diocese in which Nelson is situated, and to his successors, Bishops of that diocese, all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson, in the Islands of New Zealand, marked "J" on the plan drawn in the margin of these presents, and containing 4 acres 2 roods 29 perches or thereabouts, bounded on the north by a public road,

and on the east, south, and west by Section No. 157: also that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "F" on the said plan, and containing 102 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north partly by a public road and partly by Section No. 158; on the east by public roads; on the south partly by Block G and partly by public roads; on the west partly by Section No. 185 and partly by a public road: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "L" on the said plan, and containing 34 acres and 24 perches or thereabouts, bounded on the north partly by Sections Nos. 181 and 164; on the east by Block H; on the south by Section No. 165; and on the west by a public road: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "K" on the said plan, and containing 4 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north, south, and west by Section No. 157, and on the east by a road: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "H" on the said plan, and containing 41 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north by Block G; on the east by a public road; on the south by section No. 165; and on the west partly by Sections Nos. 162, 163, and 164, and partly by Block L: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "I" on the said plan, containing 100 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north by Section No. 156; on the east by a public road; on the south by Section No. 139; and on the west by a public road: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, marked "M" on the said plan, and containing 29 acres and 32 perches or thereabouts, bounded on the north, south, and west by public roads, and on the east by mud-flats: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, numbered 22 on the said plan, and containing 50 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north and east by Section No. 21, and on the south and west by public roads: also all that piece or parcel of land situate at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, numbered 6 in the said plan, and containing 50 acres or thereabouts, bounded on the north by a public road; on the east by Section No. 7; and on the south and west by a public road: all the boundaries of the said pieces or parcels of land being more particularly delineated on the plans drawn on the margin of these presents: together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of the diocese in which the Town of Nelson is situated, and to his successors, Bishops of that diocese, subject to all existing leases of the said lands or any part of them, a schedule whereof is indorsed on these presents, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

4th August, 1853.

G. GREY.

## APPENDIX V.

### DESPATCHES.

#### Governor GREY to Earl GREY.

MY LORD,—

Government House, Auckland, 22nd March, 1849.

1. In reference to my despatch to Your Lordship, No. 130, of the 9th December, 1847, detailing the system of public education which I thought most applicable to the circumstances of this colony, and enclosing an Ordinance the object of which was to secure the introduction into this country, and the permanent operation of the proposed system of education. Adverting at the same time to Your Lordship's despatch No. 47, of the 27th June last, in which you notified to me that Her Majesty had been pleased to confirm and allow the above-mentioned Ordinances, I have now the honour to state to Your Lordship that, as the means of education have been afforded to the Natives of this country, so has their desire to secure a good education for their children increased; and Your Lordship will find from the enclosed letter from the General Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions that in one institution alone, which has been established under the authority of the Ordinance sanctioned by Her Majesty, 130 children are being boarded and educated, and a great number of others are desirous of obtaining admission to the same institution.

2. Under these circumstances I find that the means of procuring proper food for the various educational institutions which are already in progress will become a very difficult matter; whilst, as by law the whole of these institutions must necessarily be conducted on the industrial system, the pupils of the establishment could, if there was a sufficiency of land at their disposal, not only produce sufficient supplies for their own support, but they would at the same time be instructed in the approved modes of agriculture, which, as the people of this country are distinctly an agricultural race, would confer the greatest benefits on themselves, the European population, and generally upon the whole country.

3. In this young country, where such waste tracts of land remain unappropriated, there is no difficulty in obtaining a sufficiency of land for each educational institution in its immediate vicinity; but I do not, without receiving express instructions upon the subject, feel authorised in conveying lands to these institutions unless they pay for them in cash.

4. The only mode in which they could pay for the lands they require would, however, be by deducting the necessary sum from the funds placed by the Government at their disposal for the purposes of education, and the result of this would be that at a moment when education appears so necessary for this race, just emerging from barbarism, considerable sums intended for educational purposes would in point of fact be diverted from their legitimate object.

5. Under these circumstances I have felt justified in directing that, until I receive further instructions from Your Lordship, sufficient reserves for the wants of the Native children to be boarded and educated in these institutions should be kept apart for the use of each institution;

and as a considerable value will be given to these reserved lands by the improvements that may be made upon them, I think that it would be an equitable rule to allow each religious denomination, at any time within ten years, to purchase these lands at the upset price of £1 per acre, as the value which the lands will have then attained will have been wholly conferred upon them by the improvements made upon them by the institution, it being at the same time made a condition of these grants that the lands could not be disposed of, but were solely conveyed for the purpose of being used for the support of an educational establishment which was to be conducted under the superintendence required by law, and in all other respects in conformity with the Education Ordinance.

6. I think the result of this system would be that each of these institutions would in a few years after its establishment entirely support itself, and that all Native and half-caste children as well as all destitute European children, would receive an excellent and useful education.

7. I should perhaps add as rather an interesting fact that I find that wherever these institutions are established the European out-settlers are very anxious to send their children to the day-schools that are conducted at them.

[NOTE.—Not dated.]

G. GREY.

Earl GREY to Governor GREY.

SIR,—

Downing Street, 16th October, 1849.

1. I have received your despatch No. 33, of the 22nd of March last, submitting for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government a proposal that reserves of land should be made for the support of Native schools established under "The Education Ordinance No. 10, of 1847."

2. It appears that, with a view of rendering those establishments, the principal of which is industrial, capable of supporting themselves eventually, you have reserved portions of land in the vicinity of each, which you propose should be allotted to them for the purpose of enabling the scholars to raise their own food and to acquire improved modes of agriculture. You propose to allow each religious denomination, at any time within ten years, to purchase these lands at the upset price of £1 an acre, as the value which the lands so improved by cultivation will have obtained, it being at the same time made a condition of those grants that the land shall not be alienated from the institution by which they are occupied, but that they should be conveyed for the sole purpose of being used for the support of the peculiar institution.

3. Attaching as I do great importance to the successful development of such a plan, I do not hesitate to sanction the arrangement which you propose, and I should further be prepared to approve of your granting still more favourable terms, if you think proper, to such schools, either by allowing the purchase to be made at a lower price than £1, or even by allotting the lands to the schools gratuitously, provided due security could be taken for their proper use. It may, however, be a reason against choosing this last course that one of the best securities for the improvement of the land occupied by those institutions may be derived from their being aware that they will eventually have a moderate price to pay for it.

GREY.

Governor GREY to Earl GREY.

MY LORD,—

Wellington, New Zealand, 29th January, 1851.

1. In reference to my despatch No. 33, of the 22nd March, 1849, upon the subject of the manner in which lands are to be secured for the production of the agricultural supply required for the support of the children to be educated at the industrial schools established in New Zealand for the civilisation of the Native race; and in reference to your Lordship's reply to that despatch of the number and dates specified in the margin, by which, on account of the great importance of the successful development of the proposed plan, authority was given to me, if I found it requisite to do so, even to allot gratuitously lands for the support of such institutions, I have now the honour to report—

2. That several large institutions, conducted respectively by the Church of England, the Wesleyan body, and the Roman Catholic Church, are now in full and successful operation in New Zealand, and that grants for the portions of land requisite for the growth and production of the necessaries of life required by the children and for their training in agricultural pursuits have been issued gratuitously to these institutions, conveying the land in trust for the use and towards the maintenance of such schools, so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language are given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat, such grants being made in the names of the persons who are authorised by the Education Ordinance to exercise entire control and supervision over the schools.

3. These institutions are founded in the first instance jointly by the Government and the religious bodies who conduct them, and each school is then supported by the religious body to which it belongs, by the produce of the land allotted to it, and for the first few years, until it becomes self-supporting, by the Government.

4. The funds supplied by the religious body are chiefly derived from the large missionary societies in England; lands granted to the schools are also the property of the Crown, and the value which these lands are rapidly acquiring from cultivation and improvements is imparted to them by the children educated at such institutions and by their teachers, who are, I think, in nearly all instances paid and supported at the entire expense of the English societies, and must be so for a considerable number of years. These institutions, which must shortly exercise so extensive an influence, should therefore be regarded as to some extent being not colonial, but British property, which should be administered for the welfare of the entire Empire.

5. I have on several occasions called Your Lordship's attention to the conditions of the many islands in the Pacific Ocean in the immediate neighbourhood of New Zealand, and have pointed

out the absolute necessity which existed for the protection of the interests of Christianity and civilisation, as also for the protection of the interests of our commerce and shipping, that the inhabitants of these islands should be converted and civilised, and that they should be encouraged to adopt our language, laws, and customs, and to use such articles as we could advantageously supply them with, in exchange for the many commodities which their islands produce.

6. Your Lordship is also aware that the Wesleyans and Roman Catholics have already extensive missions in several of these islands, and that the Colonial Church of England is about to establish missions in other of the islands. Many of them are, however, so unhealthy that English missionaries cannot advantageously reside there during the entire year; and the missionaries with whom I have consulted are anxious to remove the most promising children from those islands and to educate them in New Zealand, where they will be surrounded entirely by Christian associations, and where also they will be brought up in British customs and habits, with British tastes, and with a knowledge of the English language.

7. In order, therefore, to give every facility to the development of a plan which I regard as essential to the interests of the Empire in this part of the world, I framed the grants of lands for the support of the industrial schools, now under consideration, in the enclosed form, in which it will be observed that I have inserted words which make these institutions available for the education of the poor and destitute persons, being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean, the effect of which words will, in fact, be to make such institutions a component part of that great system of missions which the piety and benevolence of Great Britain has established throughout the Pacific, instead of confining them to New Zealand alone; and, although such a proceeding undoubtedly vests considerable discretion in the hands of missionary bodies, I am sure, from long experience of their proceedings, that this may be safely done. As, however, the objects I have contemplated by the issue of these grants is a very extensive one, embracing rather Imperial interests than those which fall within my immediate jurisdiction as a colonial Governor, I have thought it right to report what I have done for your Lordship's information in order that, should it not meet with the approval of Her Majesty's Government, no such grants may be issued for the future.

8. In as far as the interests of the Colony of New Zealand are concerned, no valid objection to the issue of such grants presents itself to me; for New Zealand would still enjoy the greater part of the benefit of these educational institutions, whilst their establishment in this country would probably lead the missionary societies to continue their operations in New Zealand, and to lend this country their aid for a much longer period than they would otherwise do; and New Zealand itself, being made the centre of education and civilisation for a large number of islands, and for the missionary establishments, would, from the great resort to its shores which would spring from these causes, become in a great measure the metropolis for a considerable number of islands, and would certainly enjoy an extensive and lucrative commerce.

G. GREY.

ENCLOSURE.

COPY of CROWN GRANT to be issued for Land to be appropriated as an Endowment for Native Schools.

Victoria, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, and so forth.

To all to whom these presents shall come: Greeting.

WHEREAS a school is about to be established at \_\_\_\_\_, in the Province of New Munster, in New Zealand, under the superintendence of the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Munster, New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons, being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood hereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by deed from the Natives been ceded for the support of the said school:

Now know ye, that We, for Us, our heirs and successors, do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus, Bishop of New Zealand, all that piece or parcel of land situate, &c., and the boundaries being more particularly delineated in the plan drawn in the margin of these presents, together with the rents, issues, and proceeds thereof, to hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors, in trust, nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school, so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.

In testimony whereof we have caused this our grant to be sealed with the seal of the said province.

Witness our trusty and well beloved, &c.

Earl GREY to Governor GREY.

SIR,—

Downing Street, 3rd August, 1851.

I received your despatch No. 16, of the 29th January last, on the subject of the establishment of industrial schools for the civilisation of the Native race in New Zealand, and representing the benefits likely to arise from these institutions, not only to the inhabitants of New Zealand, but also to the Natives of the other island in the Pacific, from the measures now in progress.

The principle of the scheme appears to me to be salutary and politic, and I have to express my high approval of it, as well of the general sufficiency of the instrument by which you propose to convey the land set apart for the maintenance of the schools.



I have, however, had my attention called by the Church Missionary Society to one point in connection with this arrangement on which it appears to me that some modification would be desirable. I enclose for your information copy of a letter which I have received from that society upon the subject. They object, and not unnaturally, to that provision of the Education Ordinance of the 7th October, 1847, by which all the schools which are already or which may be hereafter established under the superintendence and management of the society's missionaries, and which may receive Government grants, would be placed under the Bishop of New Zealand, who would have the power of appointing and moving teachers at his pleasure.

I should wish you to bring the subject under the consideration of the Legislative Council, expressing my opinion that the society's objections to the Ordinance as it at present stands are not unreasonable, and my hope that it may be amended in such a manner as to remove any obstacle to the continuance of the valuable assistance given by the society in promoting the education of the Natives in New Zealand.

GREY.

SECRETARY, Church Missionary Society, to Right Hon. Earl GREY.

MY LORD,—

Church Missionary House, 16th July, 1851.

The despatch from Governor Grey, dated Wellington, New Zealand, 29th January, 1851, which you have done us the honour of transmitting for the information of the Church Missionary Society, respecting educational grants in New Zealand, has first directed the attention of the Committee to an Education Ordinance passed in the Legislative Council, 7th October, 1847.

It appears from the Governor's despatch that he regards all the schools of the Church Missionary Society which have received Government grants to be placed by virtue of this Ordinance under the superintendence and management of the Bishop of New Zealand, who shall have the power of appointing and removing the teachers of such schools at his pleasure.

The Committee direct me respectfully to state to Your Lordship that the schools in question are already under the superintendence and management of ordained missionaries of the society, and therefore the committee cannot consent to their being brought under the provisions of the Ordinance.

The committee have no objection to any system of inspection which the Governor may establish, or to submit any points of difference which may arise to the decision of the Bishop, or to place their mission schools under such superintendence as is exercised by Bishops at Home; but the provisions of the Education Ordinance go far beyond these limits, and are inconsistent with the principles upon which the operations of the society are conducted.

The committee observe that the schedule to the Education Ordinance places the Wesleyan schools under the "superintendent of the Wesleyan mission," and other schools under "the head or minister of any religious body."

The committee trust, therefore, that the schools of the Church Missionary Society which receive Government grants may still continue under the superintendence and management of the missionaries of the society.

H. STRAITH,

Secretary, Church Missionary Society.

MEMORIAL from the PROVINCIAL COUNCIL of the PROVINCE OF NELSON to the Hon. the Members of the House of Representatives for the Colony of New Zealand, in Council assembled.

SHEWETH,—

That by the terms of agreement entered into between the purchasers of lands in the Settlement of Nelson, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, and the New Zealand Colonisation Company, in the year 1842, it was especially provided that certain portions of land within the said province should be set apart and conveyed to trustees for the sole use, benefit, and advantage of the Natives resident in the said province.

That by a certain deed of grant from the Crown, bearing date the 25th day of July, 1853, certain lands, purporting to be two blocks of Crown lands, containing in the whole 660 acres, and by a certain other deed of grant from the Crown, bearing date the 4th day of August, 1853, certain blocks of Native reserves, containing in the whole 418 acres and 5 perches, were conveyed by His Excellency the Governor of this colony by a Crown grant to the Right Rev. the Bishop of New Zealand in trust for an industrial school at Motueka, in the Province of Nelson aforesaid, for the education of the children of both races.

That this Council protest against the said grants, for the following reasons:—

1. Because the grant of the reserves set aside for the benefit of the Natives for purposes other than those contemplated by the terms of purchase of the Nelson Settlement, whereby the funds arising from the same are liable to be expended for the benefit of Europeans and of Natives throughout the Pacific Islands, is a violation of the contract in virtue of which the settlement was founded.

2. Because in endowing with public lands an institution for education and industrial training the utmost care should be taken that public property is not made subservient to sectarian religious teaching, and a blow thereby given to religious equality; but that an institution so founded should be established on a basis which will admit children of all sects and creeds to partake of its advantages; whereas the grant given to the Bishop of New Zealand and his successors of 1,100 acres of the most valuable land in the district of Motueka is made over (without this necessary restriction) to the head of a particular Church, who may use it as an instrument of proselytism and religious aggrandisement.

That in calling attention of your honourable House to these grants this Council does not question in the smallest degree the philanthropic feeling which induced His Excellency Sir George Grey to endow the institution in question; neither is this Council aware that the Bishop of New Zealand is cognisant of the grant, or that he has accepted the grant or the trust therein imposed upon him by the same; but for the reasons hereinbefore set forth this Council is of opinion that His Excellency the Governor, in his anxiety to benefit the aborigines, has lost sight of the broad rule of justice, which can never be violated, even for a benevolent end, without endangering the object it is intended to serve. And if there be one leading principle which this Council is desirous to see maintained, and which it believes to be essential to the future welfare and happiness of this province, it is that all religious bodies shall stand on a perfect equality in the State, and that no preference or privilege shall be obtained by any one sect or creed to which all others shall not be equally entitled. The preference therefore given to the Bishop of New Zealand by these grants, and the endowment of the Protestant Episcopal Church with public land and private reserves of great value and large extent, this Council cannot regard otherwise than a most serious infringement of the religious equality which it is desirous to see maintained.

Your memorialists therefore pray that the necessary steps may be taken to set these grants aside.

Signed in the name and by order of the Council.

DONALD SINCLAIR, Speaker.

#### APPENDIX W.

WHAKAREWA TRUST.—STATEMENT of the CHILDREN in the Institution as on the 30th June in each Year since the building of the Present Orphanage.

Year ending 30th June.	European.				Native.				Total.		
	Boys.	Girls.	Free.	Partly paid for.	Boys.	Girls.	Boarded free.	Partly paid for.	Boys.	Girls.	Totals.
1888 .. ..	8	4	8	4	..	..	..	..	8	4	12
1889 .. ..	8	3	8	3	2	..	1	1	10	3	13
1890 .. ..	8	3	8	3	2	..	1	1	10	3	13
1891 .. ..	10	3	7	6	2	..	1	1	12	3	15
1892 .. ..	9	4	7	6	1	..	1	..	10	4	14
1893 .. ..	9	3	5	7	1	..	1	..	10	3	13
1894 .. ..	9	8	5	12	1	..	1	..	10	8	18
1895 .. ..	8	8	6	10	1	..	1	..	9	8	17
1896 .. ..	9	4	4	9	1	..	1	..	10	4	14
1897 .. ..	11	6	5	12	..	..	..	..	11	6	17
1898 .. ..	15	7	5	17	3	1	4	..	18	8	26
1899 .. ..	20	6	5	21	3	1	4	..	23	7	30
1900 .. ..	23	4	4	23	3	1	4	..	26	5	31
1901 .. ..	27	5	4	28	2	2	4	..	29	7	36
1902 .. ..	27	7	6	28	..	1	1	..	27	8	35
1903 .. ..	23	14	6	31	1	1	2	..	24	15	39
1904 .. ..	26	13	4	35	1	..	1	..	27	13	40
1905 .. ..	27	11	3	38	3	2	5	..	30	13	43

NOTE.—The ages of these children vary from four to sixteen years, only one being over sixteen.

Compiled from the Register.  
24th July, 1905.

ROBT. J. KINGSLEY,  
Accountant.

WHAKAREWA ORPHANAGE SCHOOL.—LIST OF CHILDREN PARTIALLY OR WHOLLY SUPPORTED BY CONTRIBUTIONS.

By whom Fees are paid.	Number of Children.	Rate per Week.	Remarks.
Public Trustee, Wellington .. ..	3	s. d. 7 0	
Nelson Charitable Aid Board .. ..	8	5 0	
Through St. Andrew's Orphanage (incorporated) .. ..	2	5 6	
Grey Charitable Aid Board, through St. Andrew's Orphanage ..	3	6 0	
North Wairarapa Benevolent Society, through St. Andrew's Orphanage	3	5 0	
Guardians, St. Andrew's Orphanage .. ..	4	5 0	
" .. ..	11	6 0	
" .. ..	1	7 0	
" .. ..	3	Free ..	Helping in kitchen or on farm.
Natives .. ..	5	..	Really free, although friends arranged to pay £2 per year towards clothing.
Total .. ..	43	..	

Made up to 30th June, 1905.

R. J. KINGSLEY.











## MOTUEKA TRUST ACCOUNT—continued.

1893.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1893.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance .. ..	490	13	11	July 1.	To Disbursements—			
	Rents collected .. ..	432	19	11		Estate Account .. ..	79	4	2
	Interest .. ..	45	2	6		Protective works .. ..	184	5	7
	Protective work refund .. ..	8	0	0		Orphanage, net .. ..	265	5	8
					1894.				
					June 30.	Balance—	£	s.	d.
						Fixed deposit .. ..	500	0	0
						Agent .. ..	35	17	5
							535	17	5
						Less overdraft .. ..	87	16	6
									448 0 11
									<u>976 16 4</u>
									<u>976 16 4</u>
1894.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1894.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance .. ..	448	0	11	July 1.	To Disbursements—			
	Rents collected .. ..	377	11	1		Estate .. ..	137	1	8
	Interest .. ..	30	0	0		Protective works .. ..	78	18	10
						Orphanage, net .. ..	196	9	4
					1895.				
					June 30.	Balance .. ..	443	2	2
									<u>855 12 0</u>
									<u>855 12 0</u>
1895.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1895.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance .. ..	443	2	2	July 1.	To Disbursements—			
	Rents collected .. ..	431	19	6		Estate Account .. ..	85	9	1
	Interest .. ..	30	0	0		Protective works .. ..	80	2	6
	Protective works refund .. ..	12	10	0		Orphanage .. ..	201	0	3
					1896.				
					June 30.	Balance—			
						Investment .. ..	500	0	0
						Current Account .. ..	50	19	10
									<u>917 11 8</u>
									<u>917 11 8</u>
1896.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1895.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance .. ..	550	19	10	July 1.	To Disbursements—			
	Rents collected .. ..	437	12	11		Estate Account .. ..	74	6	11
	Interest .. ..	15	0	0		Protective works .. ..	121	15	5
	Protective works .. ..	12	10	0		Orphanage .. ..	173	19	7
					1897.				
					June 30.	Balance—			
						Investment .. ..	500	0	0
						Current Account .. ..	146	0	10
									<u>£1,016 2 9</u>
									<u>£1,016 2 9</u>
1897.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1897.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance—				July 1.	To Disbursements—			
	Cash invested .. ..	500	0	0		Estate expenses .. ..	14	8	
	Current Account .. ..	140	8	9		Bailiffs and Collectors Com-			
	Orphanage .. ..	5	12	1		mission .. ..	43	2	6
	Receipts—					Protective works .. ..	13	18	4
	Rents .. ..	431	6	4		Orphanage farm—			
	Interest .. ..	45	0	0		Live-stock .. ..	34	16	6
	Protective works grant .. ..	25	0	0		Seeds, &c. .. ..	15	2	3
	Orphanage—					Labour .. ..	27	2	5
	Farm-produce .. ..	23	3	9		Repairs and fencing .. ..	10	16	2
	House sundries .. ..	3	3	9		House—			
	Hop-picking (earnings of					Provisions .. ..	59	11	3
	inmates) .. ..	13	8	7		Clothing .. ..	39	13	0
	Maintenance fees .. ..	132	14	6		Medicine .. ..	2	2	9
						Educational, including			
						teacher's salary .. ..	73	10	4
						Sundry expenses .. ..	41	11	9
						Wages .. ..	10	4	0
						Furniture £27 3s. 1d., dra-			
						perty £4 3s. 9d. .. ..	31	6	10
						Salary, master .. ..	100	0	0
						Balance—			
						Cash invested .. ..	500	0	0
						Current Account .. ..	297	18	2
						Orphanage .. ..	4	13	5
									<u>£1,319 17 9</u>
									<u>£1,319 17 9</u>
1898.	<i>Cr.</i>	£	s.	d.	1898.	<i>Dr.</i>	£	s.	d.
July 1.	By Balance—				July 1.	To Expenditure—			
	Cash invested .. ..	500	0	0		Insurance .. ..	8	18	3
	Current Account .. ..	297	18	2		Rates .. ..	9	8	1
	Orphanage .. ..	4	13	5		Bailiff's and collector's com-			
	Receipts—					mission .. ..	42	5	2
	Rents .. ..	422	12	7		Legal expenses .. ..	5	11	0
	Interest .. ..	30	0	0		Petty cash .. ..	4	9	3
									<u>70 11 9</u>
	Carried forward .. ..	1,255	4	2		Carried forward .. ..	70	11	9



MOTUEKA TRUST ACCOUNT—continued.

1898.	Cr.	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Brought forward	1,255	4	2
	Orphanage farm—			
	Live-stock	10	10	2
	Produce	8	2	8
	Fruit	9	9	8
	Sundries	3	13	5
	House Account—			
	Sundries	0	19	1
	Clothing	1	2	9
	Wages	0	10	0
	Discount	3	19	8
	Hop-picking	41	0	6
	Maintenance per Haycock trustees	3	1	9
		163	12	0

£1,501 5 10

1899.	By Balance—	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Cash invested	500	0	0
	Current Account	297	1	4
	Orphanage	6	0	10
	Receipts—			
	Rents	408	13	6
	Interest	30	0	0
	Farm Account—			
	Live-stock	11	17	5
	Produce	8	9	7
	Fruit	14	4	5
	Sundries	1	14	1
	House Account—			
	Clothing	4	0	9
	Discounts	5	10	5
	Hop-picking	24	13	4
	Maintenance	236	14	4

£1,549 0 0

1900.	By Balance brought forward—	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Cash invested	500	0	0
	Current Account	427	7	3
	Orphanage	12	8	0
	Receipts—			
	Rents	431	13	4
	Interest	14	19	0
	Farm—			
	Live-stock	8	7	3
	Produce	8	0	3
	Fruit	7	18	8
	House—			
	Clothing returned	2	9	6
	Sundries	0	15	0
	Discount	6	5	9
	Hop-picking	35	7	8
	Maintenance	307	10	1

Carried forward .. 1,763 1 9

1898.	Dr.	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Brought forward	70	11	9
	Protective works supervision	20	0	0
	Purchase of goodwill of 8 acres	15	0	0
	Fencing and clearing ditto	27	0	8
	Maintenance (boy Miller at Asylum) to 30th June	10	8	0
	Payments, live-stock	48	17	6
	Seed	2	9	11
	Sundries	10	4	2
	Labour	17	5	8
	Repairs	2	15	0
	Tools	9	5	0
	House Account—			
	Provisions	105	15	6
	Clothing	65	19	7
	Medical	1	16	8
	Educational	75	7	11
	Sundries	55	12	4
	Wages	23	10	0
	Drapery	16	7	0
	Furniture	19	17	0
	Salary, master	100	0	0
	Balance—			
	Cash invested	500	0	0
	Current Account	297	1	4
	Orphanage	6	0	10

£1,501 5 10

1899.	To Expenditure—	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Insurance	8	18	3
	Bailiff, commission and supervision	20	8	7
	Collector of rents, commission	20	8	7
	Survey and legal expenses	5	7	10
	Petty cash	6	3	10
	Rates	9	1	6
	Protective works	1	3	6
	Farm Account—			
	Live-stock	38	3	6
	Seeds, &c.	9	6	8
	Sundries	37	6	1
	Labour	20	10	6
	House Account—			
	Provisions	100	15	8
	Clothing	68	19	0
	Medical	2	3	4
	Educational	69	17	4
	Sundries	49	6	8
	Wages	13	9	0
	Drapery	10	16	0
	Furniture	16	18	11
	Salary, master	100	0	0
	Balance—			
	Cash invested	500	0	0
	Current Account	427	7	3
	Orphanage	12	8	0

£1,549 0 0

1900.	To Disbursements—	£	s.	d.
July 1.	Insurance	8	18	3
	Bailiff's commission and salary	41	17	2
	Petty cash, rates, &c.	9	14	1
	Grubbing gorse	5	14	6
	Architect, plans and alteration house	22	10	0
	Legal expenses	5	16	8
	Protective works	35	4	9
	Farm Account—			
	Live-stock	58	3	0
	Seed	3	2	9
	Sundries	20	4	7
	Labour	28	17	0
	Implements	3	5	0
	Fencing	3	3	6
	House Account—			
	Provisions	137	17	8
	Clothing	75	18	11
	Medical	1	14	2
	Educational	72	10	2
	Sundries	58	1	11
	Wages	13	0	0
	Drapery	6	15	5
	Furniture	15	2	3

Carried forward .. 637 11 9





## APPENDIX X.

## WHAKAREWA TRUST ESTATE.—SCHEDULE of AMOUNTS expended on RIVER PROTECTIVE WORKS from 1886 to 31st March, 1905, from the Trust Funds.

Year ending 30th June—	£	s.	d.	Year ending 30th June—	£	s.	d.
1886 .. .. .	35	4	0	1900 .. .. .	1	3	6
1888 .. .. .	22	17	0	1901 .. .. .	35	4	9
1889 .. .. .	1	11	1	1902 .. .. .	102	6	0
1891 .. .. .	1	15	0	1903 (less refund from contributors, 1904, £64 6s. 4d.) .. .. .	30	3	11
1892 (net) .. .. .	324	13	4	1904 .. .. .	4	6	0
1893 .. .. .	176	5	7	1905 (ending 31st March) .. .. .	0	10	0
1895 .. .. .	78	18	10				
1896 (net) .. .. .	67	12	6				
1897 .. .. .	108	5	5				
1898 .. .. .	£13	18	4				
1899 .. .. .	20	0	0				
	33	18	4				
Less refund from contributors—	25	0	0				
	8	18	4				
					£999	15	3

NOTE.—This only includes the money from the Trust Funds. Money from contributors not included.  
31st July, 1905. ROBERT J. KINGSLEY.

## APPENDIX Y.

## GOVERNMENT VALUATION OF WHAKAREWA RESERVE.

AREA, 931 acres 3 roods 12 perches. Capital value, £20,251; unimproved value, £11,695; improvements, £8,556

## SCHEDULE OF LEASES OF WHAKAREWA TRUST LANDS AS EXISTING ON THE 1ST AUGUST, 1905.

Name of Lessee.	Area.		Rental.		Term of Lease.	Right of Renewal.
	A.	R. P.	£	s. d.		
J. S. Wratt .. .. .	408	0 26	69	3 6	Fourteen years from 17th July, 1892	No right.
William Taylor .. .. .	10	1 21	9	1 6	Fourteen years from 25th March, 1892	"
William Eggington .. .. .	10	1 17	9	1 0	Ditto .. .. .	"
James Satherly .. .. .	10	0 18	8	17 0	" .. .. .	"
William Atkins .. .. .	100	0 0	55	0 0	" .. .. .	"
William Eggington .. .. .	33	2 16	29	8 0	" .. .. .	"
Stephen Eggington .. .. .	10	1 17	9	1 0	" .. .. .	"
R. J. Trewavas .. .. .	8	2 10	4	12 7	Twenty-one years from 25th March, 1898	Right of renewal, twenty-one years.
B. M. Jennings .. .. .	8	0 0	8	8 0	Twenty-one years from 25th September, 1901	Two terms of twenty-one years.
Emma Jane Hodgson .. .. .	12	0 0	6	0 0	Ditto .. .. .	Ditto.
H. Mitchell Burnard .. .. .	8	0 0	5	4 0	" .. .. .	"
H. J. S. Rumbold .. .. .	4	0 0	3	16 0	" .. .. .	"
John Delaney .. .. .	3	0 0	6	0 0	" .. .. .	"
Emily Parker .. .. .	5	0 0	4	5 0	" .. .. .	"
Eliza Bisley .. .. .	23	3 0	13	5 0	" .. .. .	"
Philip Quayle .. .. .	2	0 0	4	0 0	" .. .. .	"
Thomas Holyoake .. .. .	16	3 25	5	18 6	" .. .. .	"
Lucy Rowling .. .. .	53	2 31	25	0 0	" .. .. .	"
William Atkins .. .. .	9	2 0	8	1 6	" .. .. .	"
John Hunt .. .. .	5	0 12	5	5 0	" .. .. .	"
Alice H. Ryder .. .. .	3	0 0	3	15 0	" .. .. .	"
James H. Rankin .. .. .	5	0 0	6	17 6	" .. .. .	"
H. R. Duncan .. .. .	1	3 0	7	5 0	" .. .. .	"
T. G. Brougham .. .. .	3	0 0	4	10 0	" .. .. .	"
Francis Spicer .. .. .	7	0 0	3	3 0	" .. .. .	"
Edmund Parker .. .. .	7	2 0	6	7 6	" .. .. .	"
Albert Goodman .. .. .	30	1 24	12	18 6	" .. .. .	"
F. W. Huffam .. .. .	4	0 0	5	10 0	" .. .. .	"
Henry C. Raikes .. .. .	22	0 10	10	0 0	" .. .. .	"
Christopher Remnant .. .. .	3	2 5	5	6 0	" .. .. .	"
James S. Bryant .. .. .	14	2 0	6	10 0	" .. .. .	"
R. J. Trewavas .. .. .	0	2 0	1	5 0	" .. .. .	"
Joseph A. Boyes .. .. .	7	2 0	7	2 6	" .. .. .	"
E. L. Fearon .. .. .	100	0 0	25	0 0	" .. .. .	"
Charles Green .. .. .	9	0 0	7	13 0	" .. .. .	"
William Chamberlain .. .. .	16	1 36	14	8 0	Fourteen years from 25th March, 1892	No right of renewal.
John Limmer .. .. .	10	2 0	8	0 0	Twenty-one years from 25th September, 1901	Two terms of twenty-one years.
Joseph Thorne .. .. .	3	0 0	5	0 0	Ditto .. .. .	Ditto.
James Satherly .. .. .	6	2 0	3	0 0	Yearly.	"
Alfred Inwood .. .. .	6	2 0	4	5 0	"	"
	999	0 18	436	3 7		

NOTE.—The total income from leases prior to issue of new leases in 1901 was £417 19s. 11d.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1905.

