

1884.
NEW ZEALAND.

WEST COAST ROYAL COMMISSION.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER APPOINTED UNDER "THE WEST COAST SETTLEMENT (NORTH ISLAND) ACT, 1880."

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

Hon. Sir W. Fox, West Coast Commissioner, to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

West Coast Commission Office,
Wellington, 2nd June, 1883.

SIR,—

I have the honour to forward a report on the progress and present position of the work of my Commission, and to request that you will lay the same before His Excellency the Governor.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

To His Excellency the Hon. Sir WILLIAM FRANCIS DRUMMOND JERVOIS,
G.C.M.G., C.B., Governor of New Zealand.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

Referring your Excellency to my report of the 7th June, 1883, I have now the honour to report the further progress of the work done under the Commission held by me since that date.

1. I then expressed my hope that, if the weather proved favourable, the work would be finished at an early date. In this I was somewhat disappointed. The prevalence of the wettest winter weather ever remembered in the colony, and the extremely rough character of most of the bush country, in which a large part of the compensation awards and reserves had to be allocated, retarded the completion of the surveys till about a month since. They are, however, now finished, and the whole of the survey parties which had been employed on the work of the Commission have been dispensed with. As the surveys progressed I have been able to allocate all the reserves and compensation awards which remained to be disposed of at the date of my last report; and I have made recommendations to your Excellency from time to time for the issue of grants in respect of them, which have been accompanied by special reports explaining the grounds on which my recommendations were made. I have appended hereto such of those reports as appeared of sufficient interest to be thus placed on record.

2. An important subject which came under my consideration during the year was the irregular leases, which had been entered into in many cases between Natives and colonists, of lands which, though intended to be made Native reserves, had not been then granted, but were technically and in fact Crown lands under the "confiscation," and which leases themselves had no legal validity. "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," and "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act 1881 Amendment Act, 1883," contained provisions by virtue of which the Governor was empowered to confirm these leases on being satisfied by the report of the West Coast Commissioner that certain conditions had been complied with. In pursuance of notice given by me applications for confirmation

were made in the cases of sixty leases. Of these, many were not in conformity with the provisions of the Acts referred to; but the defects of most of them (such as imperfect plans) were rectified, and I was able ultimately to recommend thirty-nine of them, comprising about 14,000 acres of land, for your Excellency's confirmation, which has been given to them, and the leases returned to the owners, of which a list will be found appended. Records of these transactions have been kept, and handed to your Excellency's Government.

There was one class, however, which, I had no power to recommend for confirmation—namely, such as had been entered into subsequently to the passing of "The Confiscated Lands Inquiry and Maori Prisoners Trials Act, 1879," shortly after which date the Commissioners of 1880 commenced their labours. These were, I think very properly, excluded by the terms of "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881." For it was known from the first of those dates, and to nobody better than the West Coast settlers, that Parliament had given special powers to the Governor to investigate and to remove the very serious complications affecting the confiscated lands on that coast. It was evident to every one from that date that any further unauthorized dealings with the lands in question must tend to increase the complications and to render their solution more difficult. It was clearly the duty of every one to abstain from such transactions. And most of the settlers did so; and, though several were very desirous of increasing their holdings or getting their terms extended, they very properly refrained. In one instance a gentleman who had actually got an arrangement in writing entered into with Natives for the extension of a very valuable lease, on receiving a hint from the Government that such transactions might complicate matters, tore up the document. Some persons, however, did, after the period specified by the Act, enter into new leases, or got extended terms of leases previously granted, and asked me to recommend their confirmation. Of course I declined, both because the Act prohibited me, and because I did not consider that on equitable grounds they had any right to ask it. I have been informed by one of them that a petition to Parliament is in course of signature asking that the restriction of the Act of 1881 may be repealed and their leases or agreements rendered confirmable by your Excellency. I think it my duty to express a hope that, if only in justice to those whose loyalty prevented them engaging in such transactions, the law will not be relaxed in favour of those whose self-interest led them to disregard such a motive. They appear to me to have no claim whatever to any equitable consideration, and it seems that it would be a bad precedent to grant it.

Which is with great respect submitted to your Excellency.

WILLIAM FOX.

Wellington, 2nd June, 1884.

APPENDIX I.

No. 1.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 15th January, 1884.

I have the honour to forward a special report on the grants recommended by me for issue to the Ngatirahiri tribe, and to request that you will lay the same before His Excellency the Governor.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

West Coast Commissioner.

REPORT on the Grants recommended to be made to the Ngatirahiri Tribe.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

The circumstances connected with the granting to the Ngatirahiri tribe of lands between Rau-o-te-Huia and Titirangi render it necessary that I should lay before your Excellency a special report explanatory of the case, and that I should make a recommendation that, beyond the issue of the grants, some special compensation should be given to that tribe.

1. From the commencement of the West Coast difficulties the Ngatirahiri tribe, with the exception of about twenty individuals, was always loyal, and even those few who joined the rebels returned to their loyalty before Sir George Grey's condoning Proclamation of 1865, which restored them to all their rights as members of the tribe. A number of the tribe were enrolled under Captain Good, two lieutenants, and an ensign, and employed in the military occupation of the

Urenui District during the war, a duty which they performed faithfully and zealously, frequently coming into conflict with the rebels, repulsing and capturing them on several occasions. To enable them to do the work efficiently the Civil Commissioner, Mr. Parris, was ordered to induce the tribe to move from their usual settlement inland at Tikorangi, and, quitting their pas, cultivations, and peach-gardens, to take up a position on the sea-coast several miles off. When they had been there for a considerable time the Government took the land they had thus temporarily abandoned and planted upon it two regiments of European military settlers, to whom it proceeded, under the powers of the New Zealand Settlement Act, to issue Crown grants. This was not done without the most resolute remonstrance of the Ngatirahiri tribe, who declared they would have their lives taken before they would be thus deprived of their ancestral homes. They, however, abstained from attempting to recover them by force, but have never ceased to ask for the return of their property. When hard pressed by them, Major Parris could only reply that the Europeans had "become as a large rock very deeply imbedded, and that it was not in his power to remove them." In 1866 their claims were brought before the Compensation Court, when, by special agreement under the Act of 1865, the whole of their lands, except the portion taken for the military settlers, was returned to them, on the same principle as the Stony River and Opunake Blocks had been returned to the tribes owning them—namely, that they had not abandoned their allegiance to the Crown, and had maintained their loyalty to the Queen all through the wars. But they still protested against the taking of their homesteads at Tikorangi, and declared that nothing would satisfy them but their restoration. It is not surprising that ultimately they became devoted adherents of Te Whiti, who promised to restore them to their lost possessions; but, except that a few of them joined in the "ploughing," and paid the penalty of imprisonment, they have never gone beyond peaceful remonstrance and assertion of their rights. In 1873 their case was brought before the Native Minister, Sir Donald McLean, at a large meeting at Waitara, who, after hearing the case, said that he considered they had been very "unfairly" used, and he was prepared to have paid them a "very large sum of money" as compensation, a proposition which they refused to accept. On a late occasion, when the Government constructed a road across their lands for public use, and offered several hundreds of pounds as compensation for the land taken for that purpose, they declined to receive it, and the money still stands to their credit in the hands of the Government. On a later occasion, 28th May, 1878, the Government, on the application of Major Brown, Civil Commissioner, agreed to fence the road above mentioned, and gave him an authority to draw for the necessary funds, no limit being imposed; but nothing further appears to have been done, and the fences are not yet erected. There are a great number of official records bearing on this case, and extending over several years. It is not, however, necessary to refer to more than the Commissioners' Reports of 1880, page iv.; Evidence, questions 296, 439, and 755; Appendix E., No. 1, Claim D; and various letters from the Civil Commissioner to the Government on record on the official files of the Native and Defence Offices from 1865 downwards.

2. It was not surprising that, in my first interviews with this tribe, I did not find much inclination on their part to discuss the position; but, as events have progressed, they have been brought to do so, and, though they will never be reconciled to the undoubtedly rough-handed and arbitrary seizure of their old homesteads, they have practically abandoned all hope of their restoration, and have acquiesced in the survey of the rest of their block and its subdivision among the hapus in the quantities and form which I have had the honour to recommend (14th January, 1884). They have, towards that end, cordially aided Major Parris in ascertaining the names of the individual grantees; and I hope will, before long, see the advantages to be gained from the administration of their lands under the leasing powers of the Act of 1881. They were formerly one of the most industrious tribes in the island, and are still remarkable for their agricultural enterprise. They will no doubt require very considerable reserves to be set apart for their own use.

3. The recommendation which I have the honour to make of compensation is simply in accordance with the expressed intention of Sir Donald McLean above mentioned. The quantity of land taken for military settlement at Tikorangi was 5,900 acres, about one-half of which belonged to the Otaraoa tribe, leaving at least 2,950 acres of it for the Ngatirahiri, though they say their share was larger. At the time it was taken the value of the land without improvements was at least £1 sterling per acre; and at the present day, also without improvements, it cannot be taken at less than £3 an acre. If an intermediate value between these two were taken, it would amount to more than £4,000; and I venture to suggest that that sum be taken as an amount not in excess of what is due to the tribe for the "unfair" treatment they have received, and, as I have reason to believe, not more than the "very large sum of money" which Sir Donald McLean was prepared to have paid them many years ago.

4. In making this recommendation, however, I beg respectfully to add that I think the amount should not be paid to the Natives in cash. The experience which I have had in districts south of New Plymouth of the reckless manner in which the licensing benches of the country have spread a perfect network of drink-shops all over the recently-occupied confiscated lands, up to the very margin of the newly-granted reserves, in direct defiance of the representations of the Commissioners of 1880 on the subject, contained in their Second Report, Section IX., satisfy me that no greater injury could be inflicted on the Natives than to place a large sum of money in their hands, much of which would inevitably be swallowed up in the vortex of the drink-shop, and be the cause of a general amount of dissipation and utter ruin to the helpless victims whom it was intended to benefit. After much consultation with Major Parris, I venture to suggest that the bulk of the sum recommended should be expended by the Government in erecting substantial fences of the most durable class along the principal roads on the reserves. Unless this is done very great trouble will arise in the future when parts of the block, or adjacent blocks, may be occupied by Europeans. A small portion of the amount might probably be well expended on agricultural implements, which would be a further fulfilment of an intention of Sir Donald McLean which I consider amounted to a distinct

pledge on the part of the Government, and to be of the class to secure the fulfilment of which the Commissioners of 1880 and 1881 were appointed.

15th January, 1884.

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

No. 2.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,— West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 22nd April, 1884.

I have the honour to forward herewith a supplementary report on the reserves recommended to be granted to the Ngatirahiri tribe and the Pukerangiora tribe, and to request you to lay the same before His Excellency the Governor for his information.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT on the Reserves recommended to be granted to the Ngatirahiri Tribe and the Pukerangiora Tribe.

A QUESTION has arisen as to whether these reserves will come under the administration of the Public Trustee by the provisions of "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," and the amendment Act of 1883.

The definition of the word "reserves" contained in the interpretation clause of the first of those Acts excludes from its operation "all lands given under awards of the Compensation Courts." The question is whether the grants to the Ngatirahiri and Pukerangiora tribes are given under an award of the Compensation Court. If they are, then they will not come under the administration of the Public Trustee; if they are not, they will.

1. The Ngatirahiri always contended that, as an absolutely loyal tribe who had never been in rebellion, they were entitled to have their lands restored to them *in solido*, to hold in their entirety under Native custom, and without individualization. (G.-2, 1880: Evidence, qq. 296 and 756.) Their claim was, however, brought before the Compensation Court in 1866, when the decision of the Court was arrested by an agreement between their agent and the Crown agent, under the Act of 1865, by which it was agreed by them to accept the remainder of their land (after deducting that taken for the Tikorangi Military Settlement). Three years afterwards (March, 1869) Judge Rogan, in pursuance of, or disregarding the existence of, the agreement, made an award of the Compensation Court at New Plymouth in favour of the Ngatirahiri tribe of "all the land owned by them not taken for military settlement." According to the opinion of Mr. Attorney-General Prendergast (G.-2, 1880, Appendix C, p. 2), both these transactions were *ultra vires*, as the Acts of 1863 and 1865, under which they proceeded, did not apply to the claims of tribes or hapus, but only individuals. The agreement and award were, therefore, nullities, and are of no force whatever, except as affording evidence of a "promise made by the Government," of a class to deal with which falls within the scope of my Commission: at which conclusion the Government seems to have arrived, as it omitted them from the *Gazette* notice (1867, p. 443) in which the "Divisions" of compensation to individuals were gazetted. Reference to my previous report (15th January, 1884) on the Ngatirahiri case will show that it is, in my opinion, one in which the confiscation should have been "abandoned" in the same manner as it ought to have been, but was not, in the Stony River and Opunake Blocks—that is, by a Proclamation of the Governor under the 3rd section of the now repealed "Confiscated Land Act, 1867;" in which case there would have been no pretence for treating the "abandonment" as technically a case of "compensation."

Under these circumstances there is, I think, no doubt that these reserves do come within the provisions of the West Coast Settlement Reserves Acts, 1881 and 1883, and are subject to the administration of the Public Trustee. I beg, however, most respectfully but most earnestly to express my conviction that the case is one in which the greatest care should be taken to give full effect to the spirit of the Act of 1881, which provides, in the 8th section, that the Trustee, in making arrangements for leasing portions of the reserves under his administration, "should obtain the assistance of some Native or Natives who shall be best acquainted with the circumstances, and to act as far as possible in accordance with the wishes of the Natives interested in such reserves." If this provision be honestly adhered to in the spirit in which the Legislature intended it, as a protection against the possible arbitrary exercise of the great powers intrusted to the Trustee, I think it would do much to prevent the difficulties which I understand have arisen elsewhere in the ascertainment of the rights of individual members of the tribe to receive specific proportions of the rents, a circumstance which has already gone far towards defeating the intention of the Legislature and of the Government in the cases referred to. And I venture to suggest—in this particular case, at all events—that it would be desirable, before the Trustee takes any steps, that an attempt should be made to induce the grantees to individualize their shares in the reserves intended to be operated upon: at all events on paper, as was successfully done by Major Parris in the case of the Stony River reserves. From information I have received from an intelligent member of the tribe I am inclined to believe that there is an opening for such a course in this case, if it be undertaken with prudence and a sufficient acquaintance with the personal surroundings of the case. An additional reason for making these suggestions is the fact that the Ngatirahiri tribe is an exceptionally industrious one and has devoted itself very remarkably to agricultural pursuits, and, when once the status of their lands is settled to their satisfaction, will be likely to utilize a larger portion of their own reserves than many other tribes which have exhibited less energy and aptitude for the pursuits of civilized life. It would, I venture to suggest, be a great mistake too hastily to lease so large a portion of their land as might unduly limit their own holdings.

2. Pukerangiora Grant: This is similar to the Ngatirahiri grants in the respect that, being made in favour of a collective tribe, it does not come under the power of the Acts of 1863 and 1865, and consequently is not in the nature of "compensation" but of "abandonment," and, as such, is not excluded by the Act of 1881 from the administration of the Public Trustee.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 22nd April, 1884.

No. 3.

Supplementary List of Compensation Awards merged in Tribal Grants
(vide Appendix II., G.-3, 1883, pp. 12-17).

TABLE showing the COMPENSATION AWARDS in the District between Urenui and Rau-o-te-Huia, merged into the Ngatirahiri Tribal Grants. (Name of Reserve in which Award is merged: Ngatirahiri Tribal Reserve).

Division III.—Urenui to Rau-o-te-Huia.

Number and Name of Awardee, as printed in G.-2, 1880, Appendix B., page 17.	Amount of Award.	Name of Awardee as inserted in the Recommendation for Crown Grant.	Grantees of the Section (of Reserve) in which Award is made.	Hapu or Locality.
	Acres			
49. Hopenaia	50	Hopenaia	Perere Nikorima and others..	Ngatiwairaka.
57. Amiria	50	Amiria Hakaraiā	Rameka te Para Iwikahu and others	Ngatimoeahu.
58. Meri Ri	50	Meri Ri	Ditto	Ditto.
59. Ria	50	Ria (Tutereiao)	Tuiti te Kahutopa and others	Ngatiwhiwhiao.
61. Kihirini Huriwaka	50	Kihirini Huriwhaka	Rameka te Para Iwikahu and others	Ngatimoeahu.
69. Hera Ngamoka	50	Hera Wirihana (Ngamako)	Perere Nikorima and others..	Ngatiwairaka.
70. Erina	50	Erina (Teau)	Ditto	Ditto.
71. Meri Ngamoka	50	Mere Ngamako	Ditto	Ditto.
84. Ihaka Tapuhi	100	Ihaka Tapuhi	Tuiti te Kahutopa and others	Ngatiwhiwhiao.
85. Piriki Rongoaka	50	Pirika Rongowaka	Pitama Pirika and others ..	Ngatiikaporo.
86. Pita Hongihongi	50	Pita Hongihongi	Pita Hongihongi and others ..	Ngatitamarongo.
89. Teieti Kotuku	50	Teieti Kotuku	Perere Nikorima and others ..	Ngatiwairaka.
93. Matiaha Hakapu	50	Matiaha Kapu	Ditto	Ditto.
95. Kereopa te Wahana	50	Kereopa Tamaitua (Te Wahana)	Ditto	Ditto.

APPENDIX II.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 22nd April, 1884.

I have the honour to forward a report on the allocation of compensation awards* made by the agreements under the provisions of the New Zealand Settlements Acts Amending Acts of 1865 and 1866, and to request that you will lay the same before His Excellency the Governor for his information.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

REPORT on the Compensation Awards allocated between Waipingao and Titoki, Titoki and Urenui, and Urenui and Rau-o-te-Huia.

THE history of these awards will be found in the Second Report of the Commission of 1880, page xxxvi., and at the foot of page xxxviii. The remark at the close of the latter passage that whoever should have the allocation of these awards to make would have some trouble on his hands, has been fully realized.

Division I.—Waipingao to Titoki.

As regards Division I., between Waipingao and Titoki, the difficulty was not so great, consisting chiefly in the fact that the land available within the defined limits was almost entirely bush, the open country between it and the sea having been entirely appropriated to Pukearuhe military settlers, and having by them been subsequently sold to Europeans. The Commissioner cannot help thinking that it was not fair towards the Loyal Natives, who were entitled by law to have their lands returned to them, that they should have been thrust back into the bush and away from the sea frontage in favour of military settlers who never settled, but who received their land merely as so much pay for services, and sold it as soon afterwards as they could to some Europeans, all of whom disposed of their interest to a single European, who now occupies it to the entire exclusion of the original loyal Native owners. But the wrong is past repair, and the Commissioner could only meet these claims out of such lands within the district between Waipingao and Titoki as remained at his disposal.

The allocation was made in the same manner as in Divisions II. and III., hereafter described.

Eight of the awardees in this division are also entitled to one town acre each in the Pukearuhe Township.

* Division I.: Waipingao to Titoki. Division II.: Titoki to Urenui. Division III.: Urenui to Rau-o-te-Huia.

Division II.—Titoki to Urenui.

The whole of this block, or at least the whole of the open and seaward portion of it, ought to have been available for the satisfaction of the awardees, who, in the Commissioner's opinion and in that of Judge Fenton, had a right prior to any other class of claimants. But the invasion of the Chatham Islanders, and their location on the open land under the express authority of the Government of the period, made them (to use an expression employed on another occasion) "a great rock too firmly embedded to be removed." The claim also of the half-caste daughters of Betty Nicol to a specific portion of open land, on which they had been actually put by the express personal authority of a Native Minister, could not be entirely set aside. The result was that so great a part of the open and seaward land was preoccupied that a comparatively small portion remained available for the operations of the Commissioner in locating the Court awards.

The total area of the awards between Titoki and Urenui was 6,450 acres. There were about 1,600 acres of open land undisposed of, sufficient to give each awardee one-fourth of his amount, while the remaining three-fourths had to be distributed in the bush country immediately adjacent. An exception is recommended in favour of the representatives of Pamariki, a very important and loyal chief, deceased, who it is recommended should receive 200 out of his 500 acres, and his niece, Makareta Retimana, the whole of her 100 acres, in the open—an arrangement which was acquiesced in by the other claimants.

The daughters of Betty Nicol I considered it only fair to the other claimants should not receive more than one-half (250 acres) of their special grant in the open, although they had the promise of a former Native Minister (Mr. Sheehan) that the whole of their piece should be in the open. But such a promise had no legal validity, and must be taken to have been made subject to the possibility of its being fulfilled without inflicting an injury on other claimants who had prior rights.

Division III.—Urenui to Rau-o-te-Huia.

In this division the Urenui Military Settlement was made upon the greater part of the open land, and the only block available for the allocation of the awards was between the Onaero River and the Ngatirahiri tribal reserves.

As the awardees in Division II. received only one-fourth of their awards in the open land, the Commissioner decided to make a similar arrangement in the case of those in Division III., and allocated one-fourth of their awards in the open land, and the remainder in the bush. The bush portions are very rough, and were surveyed with great difficulty.

Fourteen of the awards in this division the Commissioner has merged in the Ngatirahiri tribal grants. (See Appendix I., No. 3.)

In endeavouring to disentangle these complications it was found to be impossible to maintain the priority of rights between the several classes of claimants. If those to whom the priority properly attached have suffered, it must be borne in mind that it was in part owing to their own opposition to the survey of their lands by the Government that the awards were not allotted long ago, when the difficulties might have been less insuperable.

In allocating the awards the following method was adopted: Tickets were numbered consecutively with the numbers attached to the awardees on page 17 of Appendix B., G.—2, 1880. These were then put in a bag, and drawn out by an impartial person. As the numbers were taken from the bag, the order of drawing was placed opposite each awardee's name, and the Chief Surveyor allocated the sections as nearly as possible in the order of drawing from a given starting point. Separate drawings were made in Divisions II. and III. for the bush proportions, so that if an awardee got an inferior section in the open, he was given the chance of getting a front bush section, and *vice versa*.

The Natives to whom these grants are recommended are for the most part without any other land than that now recommended to be granted to them. Judge Fenton, in letters to the Secretary for Crown Lands, dated the 6th June and the 21st June, 1878, and to the Native Minister dated the 10th September, 1879, 6th December, 1879, and the 26th February, 1880 (see official files), recommended very earnestly that these grants should be made *absolutely* inalienable. I think it sufficient to impose the restrictions usually inserted in Crown grants to Natives, permitting alienation with the Governor's consent *previously* given; except in a very few cases, where equitable transactions have already taken place, and one or two in which the grantees, owing to personal infirmities, require protection. It is, however, important, in all other cases but those, that the Governor's consent should be given before the alienation, whether entire or partial, is effected.

In conclusion, the Commissioner begs to call attention to the fact that these awards, being made to individuals under awards of the Compensation Court, are to all intents and purposes within the exemption contained in the interpretation clause of "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," and are not subject to the administration of the Public Trustee.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 22nd April, 1884.

 APPENDIX III.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

I have the honour to enclose a report on the grant of 576 acres, Block VI., Mimi, Section 4, recommended to be made to the Ngatitama tribe, and to request you to lay the same before His Excellency the Governor for his information.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

REPORT on the Grant recommended in favour of the Ngatitama Tribe.

THE ancestral northern boundary of the Ngatitama tribe was the Mokau River, which was many years ago shifted to Mohakatino by the peace arrangements, after long hostilities. Subsequently the Northern tribes drove the Ngatitamas from the district, and they migrated to the South, where they remained until the arrival of European settlers, when they began to return, and settled in many places so far as Tongaporutu. During some of the meetings held in Waikato under the auspices of the Maori King movement the Ngatitamas were invited to attend, which they did, and were formally promised the restoration of their ancient rights to the land, and recommended to live on it, which they were doing (so far as Tongaporutu), when the Native Land Court sat and by its decision completely upset the understanding which had been arrived at. So far as I have been able to ascertain the facts, the Ngatitama failed to establish their case in consequence of a mistake in the manner in which it was brought before the Court, and if they had been allowed a rehearing, for which they applied, they would most probably have succeeded in establishing their right to the land between Tongaporutu and the Confiscated Block; but the Chief Judge of the Land Court positively refused a rehearing. The Ngatitama, being thus stripped of all the land they had, were thrown on the world, and appealed to the Government. The Hon. the Native Minister, Mr. Bryce, suggested to the Commissioner to locate them inside the confiscated boundary; and, there being a small block of about 576 acres near Pukearuhe available for this purpose, which they were willing to accept, it was surveyed for them, and they have been put in possession of it.

Some of them had previously been occupying a portion of the town-belt on the south side of the Town of Pukearuhe, which is never likely to be more than a town on paper, and which had, by a former arrangement with the Crown Agent, been made available for settling Native claims. It has been thought desirable to add 71 acres of this belt to their award.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

APPENDIX IV.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

I have the honour to enclose a report on the awards made by the Government to absentee members of the Ngatitama, Ngatimutunga, Ngatiawa, and Taranaki tribes, and to request you to lay the same before His Excellency the Governor for his information.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

REPORT upon the Awards in favour of the Absentee Members of the Ngatitama, Ngatimutunga, Ngatiawa, and Taranaki Tribes (referred to in Second Report, 1880, pp. xxxvii. and xxxviii.; Evidence, q. 363, 806-808; and Appendix C, No. 1).

IN the case of the absentees whose claims were disallowed by the Compensation Court in 1866, which decision gave rise to great dissatisfaction, the Government, after considering the merits of the question, at the recommendation of Sir G. Grey, then Governor, by Order in Council, made an award in the proportion of sixteen acres to every absentee, a list of whom was made out, at a large meeting of about three hundred Natives assembled in Wellington for the purpose in 1867, from information supplied by members of each tribe.

It has been found to be now impossible to ascertain the names of the Natives in whose favour Mr Richmond's promises were made, or even to discover where they are. The estimates of the number of absentees of each tribe appear to have been made by him at the time of the promise from some information then given, whether accurate or not it is not now possible to decide. There are some imperfect lists in the possession of the Native Office at New Plymouth, but the Commissioner is assured that they are entirely unreliable. It is certain also that many who were absentees when the promises were made have returned to the district, and have been included in tribal reserves made by the Commissioner or at other times. Among these are undoubtedly the Chatham Islanders (Ngatiawa), the bulk of whom have been allocated on special blocks between the Urenui and Mimi Rivers. The Commissioner has made every effort to clear up the difficulty, but without success. Among others he has consulted Major Parris, Mr. Rennell, and Mr. Alex. Mackay, the latter of whom, from his connection with Native affairs in the Middle Island, would be able to throw light upon it if any one could, and he has made special search among his records without success. Very little interest in the subject appears to exist either among any absentees that there may be, or among the resident members of the same tribes. This is probably owing to the fact that the individual interest of the class is so small, only sixteen acres each, as to be scarcely worth claiming.

The course which the Commissioner has thought it best to pursue is to have reserves surveyed and allocated to each of the tribes entitled under Mr Richmond's promise (except the Puketapu, who sold out to the Government, receiving their interest in money), but not to recommend any further action till the Government may be able (if it ever is) to ascertain who are the proper persons to become grantees. The reserves have accordingly been surveyed, and plans are herewith forwarded. Considering the fact above alluded to, of the small dimensions of the interest of each absentee, it would probably be a good course for the Government to arrange with any claimants who might turn up for the purchase of their allotments, as was done in the case of the Puketapus. In

the meantime the execution of the surveys will have made it possible, if the necessity ever occurs, to deal with the land in the manner contemplated at the time the promises were made.

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

APPENDIX V.

The Hon. Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,— West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 17th January, 1884.

I have the honour to forward a report on two grants of sections of which I have recommended the issue by His Excellency the Governor, and have to request that you will lay it before His Excellency.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

REPORT on the Exclusion of Tapa te Waero and Mihaka Rererangi from Recommendations for the Issue of Crown Grants.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

I have forwarded through the Native Minister recommendations for the issue of grants for part of Sections 389 and 390, Block VIII., Wairoa, and Section 388 and part of Section 394, Block VIII., Wairoa, from which it will be observed that I have purposely erased the names of two Natives, who, but for the reasons given below, would have been entitled to have their names included.

1. The first of these is the grant of Section 388 and part of Section 394, Block VIII., Wairoa, from which I have excluded the name of Tapa te Waero. The reasons for my having done so will be found in my report of the 10th May, 1882, laid before your Excellency's predecessor, giving a full account of Tapa's claims. Since the date of that report I have made two separate attempts, by personal interviews with Tapa and large gatherings of the tribe to which he belongs, to induce him to remove himself and his people from the sections illegally occupied by them, and to accept of a grant of other lands, which I consider fully equivalent in value to those they would have to abandon, and a full and liberal satisfaction of all pledges and promises given at any time to "Tapa and his people" by the Government. He has persistently, and, on the last occasion with more determined obstinacy, refused to accept the terms offered to him; and I have distinctly told him that he would be excluded from the grant now recommended for issue.

2. The other case is that of Mihaka Rererangi, whose name I have in like manner excluded from the grant of part of Sections 389 and 390, Block VIII., Wairoa, it having, after a very exhaustive inquiry, been made perfectly clear that this Native has wrongfully appropriated, and several times positively refused to account for, a sum of £1,500 paid into his hands by an officer of the Government for subdivision among a portion of the Ngarauru tribe. I have intimated to him that, until he refunds the money, I would make no recommendation of any grant to him. His exclusion will make some small reparation to the grantees for his dishonesty. The whole of the particulars have been forwarded in letters from myself to the Hon. Mr. Rolleston, dated 10th June, 1881, and 19th April, 1882.

WILLIAM FOX,

New Plymouth, 17th January, 1884.

West Coast Commissioner.

APPENDIX VI.

MEMORANDUM in *re* Application of Messrs. Ross and Arundell for Confirmation of a Lease of Part of the Otautu Reserve, dated the 3rd December, 1880 (on the ground that it was entered into in pursuance of a written agreement dated June, 1879, which agreement is alleged to have been lost).

In order to get over the difficulty of the non-production of the above agreement, statutory declarations were made by Messrs. Ross, Taurua, Cowern (who acted as an agent in the matter), and Wallace (who is said to have conducted the negotiation for an extended lease, and to have interpreted and witnessed the agreement said to have been entered into in June, 1879).

These statutory declarations exhibit the most remarkable lapses of memory and confusion of dates on the part of four several persons with which I have ever met, and which seem to me entirely to invalidate their testimony.

1. They all concur in asserting that the missing agreement was entered into in the presence of the whole of them, in Mr. Cowern's office, in Patea, in or about June, 1879, and they make no allusion to any other agreement between that date and the 3rd December, 1880, when the lease which had been agreed to be entered into was executed. Yet there is in my possession a complete and original agreement, dated 3rd September, 1880, containing the exact terms said to have been in the agreement of 1879, duly stamped and executed by Taurua and Mr. Ross. It naturally occurs to ask why, if a formal written agreement between the same parties, containing identical terms, had been entered into in June, 1879, this other agreement was entered into the year afterwards (on the 3rd September, 1880) instead of the lease said to have been agreed upon in the former, and which lease was actually executed three months after the date of the latter—namely, in December, 1880? And why, in all the statutory declarations, which are minutely specific in many matters, is no allusion whatever made to the fact of there being two agreements previous to the lease? Not only is there none, but Mr. Wallace emphatically declares that he had never been employed by Ross and

Arundell in connection with the Otautu Reserve since the transaction of 1879, when he took part in the preparation of the agreement then executed in Mr. Cowern's office. Yet his name actually appears as witness and interpreter to the second agreement of 1880. How could all the parties concerned, who profess to remember the minutest facts connected with the alleged agreement of 1879, even to the colour of the paper on which it was written, so entirely ignore and forget the agreement of 1880, in the execution of which there is the evidence of their own handwriting to show that they took part?

2. The agreement of September, 1880, exactly corresponds in all particulars but one (the alleged signature of Pawhare) with the description given by Messrs. Cowern and Wallace of the agreement of 1879. It is on "blue paper," and in Mr. Cowern's handwriting, and signed by Messrs. Ross and Taurua as parties, and Wallace as witness and interpreter.

3. The only conclusion at which I can arrive is that, though negotiations for an extended lease may have been entered into in June, 1879, they were not concluded, at least no formal agreement was entered into, till 3rd September, 1880, when the agreement of that date was executed in Mr. Cowern's office, and then witnessed and interpreted by Mr. Wallace, who declares that only on one occasion was he employed by Messrs. Ross and Arundell. It is not impossible that, in a protracted negotiation, which this appears to have been, the whole of the parties, though tolerably correct in their recollection of facts, may have forgotten the dates when they occurred. But it is remarkable that none of the declarants—all of whom, except Taurua, are men of business, and two of whom (Messrs. Cowern and Wallace) most probably received fees or commission for their action in the matter—make any reference to entries in their business books, which might afford better evidence than their mere recollection of certain things being done at supposed dates. Such facts as the payment of commissions or fees, the precise date of Pawhare's death, the time when the bonus of £100 was paid to Taurua, ought to be on record and easily ascertainable from office diaries or other similar sources.

4. As the matter stands I cannot arrive at any other conclusion (consistent with the belief which I entertain in the good faith of all the parties concerned) than that the agreement of the 3rd September, 1880, is the only one which ever existed, and that the confusion of the date of its execution with that of the preliminary oral negotiations conducted in 1879 has led the gentlemen who have made these declarations into the singular error which evidently exists.

5. But, even if the existence of the agreement of 1879 could be proved, I could not, in conformity with the provisions of "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," recommend it for confirmation unless it were actually produced. In order to enable the Governor to confirm a lease, or an agreement in the nature of a lease, he must have it before him: he cannot write his confirmation on a file of affidavits or declarations by which it is attempted to account for its non-appearance.

It is with much regret, therefore, that I feel bound to decline to recommend the confirmation of the alleged agreement.

15th January, 1884.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

APPENDIX VII.

REPORT on the Case of Rehara Hami's (otherwise Rehara Puanu's) Grant in respect of two Awards of the Compensation Court in favour of herself and her father, Hemi Puanu, deceased.

THE Commissioner has already reported (29th June, 1882, G.—5c, Schedule, No. 14) upon a claim preferred by Nevil S. Walker as purchaser from Rehara of these awards for the price of £400, to be increased to £500 on a contingency which has since occurred (the allocation of the land awarded at a defined place). Mr Walker having at the date of his alleged purchase paid only £20, I declined to recognize any interest in him beyond a right to have that amount refunded before the grants should be handed to Rehara.

Notwithstanding my decision Mr. Walker shortly afterwards sold his interest in these awards to Mr. Thomas Bayly for £1,000, subject to the payment by Mr. Walker to Rehara and her husband, Eruini te Rangirihau, of the purchase-money agreed upon between them and Mr. Walker. A deed to give effect to this transaction was prepared by Mr. Bayly's solicitors, and was executed by Rehara and her husband; but not by either Mr. Walker or Mr. Bayly, although it contains covenants on behalf of the former, and acknowledgments of the payment and receipt of the various sums of money. The amounts of consideration to be paid to the Native vendors are left blank, as are also the names of the districts in which the allotment is said to be and the boundaries of the allotment itself, and the latter are said to be delineated on a plan drawn thereon, which is not there. Then follows a power of attorney to T. Bayly authorizing him to sign all deeds, transfers, &c., necessary to vest the said lands in himself.

I understand from Mr. Bayly's solicitor that the latter has paid £800 to Mr. Walker, who is supposed to have paid £200 of it to Rehara and her husband, of which, however, no proof has been offered to me, and that Mr. Bayly retains £200 towards the payment of the balance of the purchase-money due to Rehara when Crown grants shall have been issued and handed to him.

On the 26th June, 1883, Rehara Hami made a will, duly executed according to English law, whereby, after reciting her sale to Walker and his sale to Bayly, and that she was desirous of completing the title of the latter, she devises to him in fee all her interest in the said grants of land, and appoints him her executor. This will was prepared by Mr. Bayly's lawyers and taken to Rehara, in the absence of her husband, by Mr. Bayly, and Mr. Elliott, one of the attesting witnesses, accompanied by George Stockman as interpreter. When signed Mr. Bayly took possession of it and kept it, which, it may be presumed, is the reason it was not destroyed when it was subsequently revoked. On the 6th of August, 1883, however, by another will, she cancelled the first, and devised the land to her daughter Patuone Rehara and to her husband Eruini te Rangirihau, without appointing any executors. On the 28th August, 1883, by an "addition" to this last will she

“wishes” Jane Brown to be guardian with Eruini for her child Patuone. Then follows an explanation of her reasons concerning the sale of her said land to Bayly, viz., that she wished for the purchase-money to cherish her body during her illness, but that he had refused to make advances beyond one £5, “therefore I do not wish my husband or child to confirm the sale when I am gone.” Shortly after the last date, about the 1st September, 1883, Rehara died, leaving her sole child Patuone and her husband her surviving, but without having applied for or obtained a succession order as the representative of her father Hami Puanu.

It appears quite clear that Rehara's sale of the unallocated award of 200 acres made to her father was void, on the ground, among others, that she had not during her lifetime been declared his successor. It seems also clear that the amount agreed to be paid to her for her own award and that of her father by Walker was very inadequate, from the fact that Bayly, even after my unfavourable decision on Mr. Walker's claim, actually agreed to give him £1,000 cash for what, not long before, Walker had agreed to pay only £400 or £500 at an indefinite future date. It is not, however, my duty to decide whether and to what extent Mr. Bayly may, by this payment, to Walker, have acquired an equitable right as against Rehara and her husband or either of them. The question for my consideration is, to whom the grants of the land allocated to these awardees should be made in satisfaction of the pledges of the Government, and to whom they ought to be handed. The only persons who appear to me to stand in a position to demand these grants from the Crown are Patuone, the sole child of Rehara and heiress-at-law, whom I consider entitled to the entirety of the sections awarded to Hemi Puanu as his granddaughter and heiress, and the said Patuone and Eruini te Rangiihau, to the sections awarded to Rehara Hami, in undivided moieties, as tenants in common, by virtue of the will of the said Rehara Hami.

I beg therefore respectfully to recommend that a grant of Sections 10, Block IV., Waitara, and 20, Block V., Upper Waitara, be made in favour of Rehara Hami, to vest in her from the 6th August, 1883, and a grant of Sections 20, Block IV., Waitara, and 35, Block V., Upper Waitara, in favour of Hemi Puanu, to vest from the same date; and that both grants be handed to the Public Trustee—that in favour of Rehara to be in trust for Patuone and her father Eruini te Rangiihau as tenants in common, and that in favour of Hemi Puanu in trust for Patuone and her heirs. Succession orders have been made accordingly.

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

West Coast Commission Office, New Plymouth, 26th April, 1884.

APPENDIX VIII.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE HON. THE MINISTER OF LANDS AND THE WEST COAST COMMISSIONER IN REFERENCE TO RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF MR. HUMPHRIES IN CHARGE OF THE COMMISSION SURVEYS.

No. 1.

Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the MINISTER of LANDS.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, Wellington, 13th May, 1884.

The surveys connected with the West Coast Commission having been completed, and the several parties of surveyors engaged upon the work having been dispensed with, I am desirous of expressing my entire satisfaction with the manner in which, since the death of Captain Skeet, in July, 1882, Mr. Humphries, the District Surveyor of Taranaki, has performed the duty of Chief Surveyor to the Commission, which at that time, under arrangements made with yourself, devolved upon him. Owing to the complicated character of the work, the very rough country in which much of it had to be done, and the unprecedentedly wet weather which prevailed during a great part of the time, the task was a very severe one, and required the employment of ten or eleven survey parties for the greater part of the time, nearly doubling the amount of work which would have occupied the time of the District Surveyor in the ordinary course of events in connection with the district surveys. Under these circumstances I have the honour to suggest that some substantial recognition of Mr. Humphries' services should be made by the Government. He has received no salary from the Commission, while his undertaking the work has saved the salary, for about eleven months, which would have been paid to the Chief Surveyor of the Commission if the special appointment had existed as it did before July, 1882. In other particulars also there has been a considerable saving upon the estimate made by Captain Skeet immediately before his death (see Appendix to my report to His Excellency, 3rd June, 1882). In support of this I have appended a brief statement, to which I have the honour to refer you.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,
West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Minister of Lands.

<i>Statement above referred to.</i>				£
Actual cost under Captain Skeet, twelve months of 1881	2,904
Six months of 1882, say	1,500
Year-and-half of Captain Skeet's salary, forage, &c., say	900
				£5,304
Captain Skeet's estimate for two years following, to complete the work				9,500
				14,804
Actual cost under Mr. Humphries, nearly two years	£6,850
Saving as between Mr. Humphries' and Captain Skeet's actual work and estimate	£2,650

—about £1,500 of which represents the salary of Chief Surveyor, saved by Mr. Humphries performing the duty without pay.

WILLIAM FOX.

No. 2.

The Hon. the MINISTER of LANDS to Sir W. Fox.

SIR,—

General Survey Office, Wellington, 23rd May, 1884.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, expressing entire satisfaction with the manner in which Mr. Humphries, the Chief Surveyor of the Taranaki District, has performed his duties in connection with the West Coast Commission since the death of Captain Skeet, and suggesting that some substantial recognition of his services should be made by the Government. It is a matter of gratification to me that this department has been able to meet your requirements, and the Surveyor-General will convey to Mr. Humphries an expression of the sense which you entertain of his services. I have no doubt such a recognition will be grateful to Mr. Humphries. I do not, however, think that he would expect any further recognition for the performance of work which really falls within the scope of his duties; and I feel that it would be invidious to single out one officer of the department for special reward, without extending the same boon to a number of other officers who have recently been performing an unusual amount of work.

I have, &c.,

W. ROLLESTON.

Sir William Fox, Westoe, Rangitikei.

No. 3.

Sir W. Fox to the Hon. the MINISTER of LANDS.

SIR,—

West Coast Commission Office, Wellington, 29th May, 1884.

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 23rd instant, in reply to mine of the 13th, in which I had requested that some substantial recognition should be made to Mr. Humphries of the valuable services which he had rendered, for a period of nearly two years, during which he had charge of the West Coast Commission surveys, and by which he practically saved to the colony the cost of a special chief surveyor for the Commission, amounting for the period, with contingencies, to not less than £1,500.

I am extremely sorry that you should feel yourself unable to give a more liberal response to my request than that the Surveyor-General will be directed to convey to Mr. Humphries an expression of the sense which I entertain of his services. As I have already very cordially given expression to the same effect personally to Mr. Humphries, I can only hope that its repetition by the head of his department, on my behalf, will intensify the gratification which you say you have no doubt Mr. Humphries will feel.

Considering, however, the strict economy which I have exercised in reference to the work of the Commission during the whole period of its progress, endeavouring to keep down the expenses to the lowest figure compatible with efficiency, I cannot help regretting that, at the termination of my labours, the modest request which I have made on behalf of an officer whose services, as well as his manner of performing them, seemed to me to entitle him to something more than a mere expression of satisfaction, should have been refused. The more so, as I feel that the position in which Mr. Humphries was placed by the devolution upon him of the work of the Commission was one very different from that to which you allude as having fallen to the lot of other officers of the Survey Department elsewhere, who have recently "been performing an unusual amount of work." He was not a mere departmental officer, but holding a position in connection with the Commission, receiving his instructions from myself, altogether apart from his departmental responsibilities, and involving a distinct relationship to myself his recognition of which, no doubt, contributed very materially to the satisfactory and smooth working of the Commission surveys.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM FOX,

West Coast Commissioner.

The Hon. the Minister of Lands.

APPENDIX IX.
No. 1.

SCHEDULE of LEASES recommended by the West Coast Commissioner for Confirmation.

Number and Date of Lease.	Lessors.	Lessees.	Sections.	Block and Locality.	Area.	Name of Reserve.
1. June 16, 1875	Meiha, Keepa Rangihiwini and others...	Henry Axup	16	Okotuku	A. 37 R. 3 P. 0	Herenua.
2. Oct. 3, 1876	Te Ratoia and others ..	McRae and Nicholson	387 0 0	Ngamutu, part Whareroa.
3. Nov. 4, 1878	Patohe and others ..	Frederick Riddiford	525 0 29	Koromatarua, part Whareroa.
4. Aug. 9, 1877	Tutaki and others ..	James R. Lysaght	740 0 0	Titahihoa, parts Whareroa and Mokoia.
5. Aug. 17, 1877	Tumaroroa and others ..	Carrol and Campbell	286 3 0	Heiawhe, part Mokoia.
6. Feb. 25, 1878	Tuata and others ..	John Steer, jun.	11 1 34	Tuturiniui, part Whareroa.
7. Jan. 3, 1876	Ngairo and others ..	George Johnston	39 and 40	Okotuku	61 3 0	Oturi.
8. March 31, 1879	Te Kaewa and others*	R. B. Pearce	168 0 0	Whakapaipo, part Oioia.
9. Sept. 19, 1877	Rangiwahia and others ..	Foreman and McRae	437 0 0	Kotoe, part Taumaha.
10. Dec. 10, 1878	Te Kahua and others ..	J. S. Caverhill	20	Block I., Hawera	289 0 0	Okahu.
11. June 7, 1878	Kake and others ..	J. S. Caverhill	18 and 19	Block I., Hawera	492 0 0	Kanini.
12. May 9, 1878	Rawiri and others ..	W. and G. Newland	Pt. 218	Block VI., Wairoa	122 0 0	Part Oika Reserve.
13. Nov. 4, 1878	Hauora and others ..	A. S. Hobbs	199 0 0	Upoko-o-Kanga, part Mokoia.
14. Feb. 2, 1876	Hauora and others ..	David McMasters	2,000 0 0	Part Mokoia Reserve.
15. Oct. 2, 1876	Matao and others ..	James R. Lysaght	190 0 4	Part Mokoia Reserve.
16. Oct. 14, 1874	Ngakawe Ngairo and others ..	Walter Symes	467 2 0	Patahi.
17. May 22, 1879	Taurua and others ..	Francis Symes	470, 141	Okotuku	256 2 0	Part Oika Reserve.
18. June 8, 1875	Hakopa Kiwa and others ..	Henry Axup	361 and pt. 218	Block VI., Wairoa	406 3 0	..
19. June 8, 1875	Hare Tipene and others ..	Henry Axup	417	Okotuku	405 1 27	..
20. Oct. 29, 1879	Te Uranga Kaiwhare and others ..	Henry Axup	418	Okotuku	505 3 29	..
21. Oct. 14, 1874	Raunatae Tekahu and others ..	William McBroon	419	Okotuku	52 3 29	..
22. May 13, 1877	Tamatautahi and others ..	D. Carroll and W. S. Campbell	177	..	501 0 0	Te Hapua:
23. July 13, 1877	Uru-te-Angina and others ..	D. Carroll and W. S. Campbell	194 2 0	Ngatua, part Whareroa.
24. March 26, 1877	Te Ratoia and others ..	W. Aikman and D. Johnstone	515 0 0	Hauraro, part Whareroa.
25. July 7, 1877	Komako and others ..	James Davidson	34 0 15	Part Whareroa.
26. July 27, 1879	Tito Hanatana and others ..	James Davidson	486 0 0	Tarerewahina, part Whareroa.
27. July 15, 1879	Tuata and others*	Frederick Riddiford	198 0 0	Taiporohenui, part Whareroa.
28. May 1, 1879	Ropata Ngamongamate and others ..	Charles White	Pt. 4	Oakura	273 3 4	Otapawa, part Whareroa.
29. Sept. 14, 1876	Pokan and others ..	W. Bayly	28 0 0	Part Whareroa.
30. April 8, 1878	Ngahina and others ..	W. Bayly	205 2 0	Part Pahitere.
31. May 16, 1879	Komako and others ..	Thomas Palmer	800 0 0	Makohai, part Whareroa.
32. May 1, 1876	Ueroa and others ..	Corrigan and Stewart	356 0 0	Ohangae, part Whareroa.
33. Sept. 11, 1876	Tamihana and others ..	George Hall	Pt. Manutahi Town-belt, Huirangi District	..	232 0 0	Potairauponga, part Whareroa.
34. Aug. 25, 1874	Tumahuake and others*	S. B. Corrigan	15 0 22	Karakais, part Taumaha.
35. Aug. 4, 1878	Rangihaeata and others ..	David McMasters	586, 587	Patea District	500 0 0	Part Taumaha.
36. June 20, 1876	Taurua and others ..	Alfred Wood	84	Patea District	319 0 0	Okotari.
37. Aug. 2, 1876	Te Whiu and others ..	John Verry	Pt. 389, 390, 391	Blocks VIII. and XII., Wairoa	14 0 0	Waioituru.
38. Jan. 12, 1876	Mihaka Rererangi and others ..	John Verry	Pt. 389, 388, pt. 390, and pt. 384	Blocks VIII. and XII., Wairoa	500 0 0	..
39. Jan. 12, 1876	672 3 16	..
	Total	13,886 3 9	..

* Agreement only.

No. 2.

SCHEDULE of LEASES submitted to the West Coast Commissioner, but not recommended for Confirmation.

Number and Date of Lease.	Lessors.	Lessees.	Section.	Block and Locality.	Area.	Name of Reserve.
1. Dec. 29, 1873	Meiha Keepa Rangihivini and others ..	C. A. and J. W. Durie ..	301, 302, 308, 344, 352, 356, 357	Okotuku ..	A. R. P. 1,365 3 13	Ihupuku and Okoia.
2. June 4, 1881	Aperahama Tamaipea and others ..	C. A. and J. W. Durie ..	301, 302, 308, 344, 352	Okotuku ..	997 3 0	"
3. Sept. 10, 1881	Tito Hanakaua and others ..	Frederick Riddiford	700 0 0	Opoke, part Whareroa.
4. Sept. 21, 1880	Hare Rangiteaio and others ..	Donald Buchanan	949 2 0	Turangare, part Whareroa.
5. Dec. 4, 1880	Kuraitetu and others ..	Jerry Hayr Siggs	430 0 0	Parts Tiroitimoana and Whare-
6. Sept. 28, 1880	Te Kahuatonga and others ..	John Douglas	112 0 0	Kawau, part Whareroa. [roa.
7. June 24, 1879	Te Aio and others ..	C. E. and H. G. Gibson	424 0 0	Makara, on Mountain Road.
8. July 24, 1879	Moe Rewarewa and another ..	James McMasters	23 2 4	Parapara, part Whareroa.
9. July 19, 1880	Tumahuiki and others ..	John Scott Caverhill	500 0 0	Part Taumaha.
10. Oct. 6, 1880	Maruera and others ..	William Covern	168 0 0	Whakapaipo, part Otoia.
11. Dec. 3, 1880	Ngawaka Taurua and others ..	Wm. John Arundell and John Ross	1,000 0 0	Part Otautu.
12. Jan. 17, 1876	Te Moanaroa and others ..	Matilda Rhatigan	700 0 0	Part Otoia.
13. Aug. 20, 1881	Wiremu Ngapaki and others ..	William Wilson ..	370	..	532 0 0	Te Oho.
14. Aug. 31, 1877	Te Kawau Komene and others ..	Alfred Gower	Okotuku ..	594 0 0	Matukuroa.
15. Aug. 31, 1877	Herepu and others ..	Alfred Gower	376 0 0	Patari.
16. Feb. 23, 1877	Pawhare and others ..	W. and S. Gower	75 0 0	Part Otautu.
17. Oct. 1, 1877	Hokopaura and others ..	W. and S. Gower	165 0 0	Waipuna, part Otautu.
18. Nov. 3, 1880	Tuata and others ..	Joseph Copeland	30 0 2	Tiwhaiti, part Whareroa.
19. Nov. 11, 1880	Ratoia and others ..	Joseph Copeland	59 3 10	Waihokio; part Whareroa.
20. Nov. 27, 1875	Heke Pakeke and others ..	Hamiora Waka and Tamati Tikona	300 0 0	Part Tiroitimoana.
21. Oct. 13, 1880	Komako and others ..	William Bayly	47 0 10	Hapua, part Whareroa.
	Total	9,549 1 39	

