

"judgment, under which he could have claimed nothing. Nevertheless, the action of the Government had the semblance of what was arbitrary. It appeared to Parakaia like taking an unfair advantage of him. *He had a right to claim a fresh reference and a fresh adjudication*, for he was not a party to the other suit. Practically, it is only a question of some 5,000 acres of indifferent land, *and I think it would have been a more dignified course to let Parakaia retain what a previous Court had (in error, as it now turns out) awarded him*. This, I believe, is the general feeling of the Natives. *They regard our taking of Parakaia's piece, under the circumstances, as a 'muru,' or confiscation. On broad grounds of policy and fairness, I would say, give it back to him*; not admitting his right, but as an act of grace. But I should hardly like to see this done in Dr. Featherston's absence, for I know he is averse to giving Parakaia a single acre. On the other hand, while the question is in abeyance, I am unwilling to let the trig. survey proceed on Himatangi. It is, no doubt, important to keep the triangulation right, but far more so to keep right with the body of the Natives in the district. Negotiations with Parakaia in the present attitude of the question would only place me in a false position, without much chance of my succeeding. I must solicit further instructions. If I remember aright, the Attorney-General agreed in my view as to Himatangi." [The italics are mine.]

The Attorney-General had some time before, as I have said above, indicated his opinion about Parakaia. He had suggested, that although the judgment by which Parakaia had been awarded part of Himatangi had failed to become effective by reason of his neglect, which neglect the Court had afterwards considered as rendering the judgment unavailing,—and although the reasons given by the Court would exclude him from all share, not only at Himatangi, but in the whole block,—it was a question whether it would not be politic to give him the land that had been awarded to him, notwithstanding his refusal to accept it.

I cannot find that, notwithstanding so serious a representation by Mr. Buller, any orders were given to stop the survey finally. At any rate it went on; but it was not long before fresh violence occurred. Early in May, a trig. station situated on the right bank of the Oroua Stream was destroyed. The circumstances were reported by the district surveyor on the 10th May, but the particular Natives engaged in them were not known; and two white men, squatters on the block, refused to give any information about the offenders. A few days afterwards, another violent act occurred. On the 17th May, Mr. Buller telegraphed to the Colonial Secretary, that Mr. Downes the surveyor, and Mr. Ward, had gone to Te Reureu that morning: "On arrival, they found that Hopa had pulled up seven pegs along two miles of line; he then pulled up in their presence three more pegs, and afterwards went on and destroyed the pegs for about two miles and a half more. Ngawaka sanctioned this. Ngawaka asked Downes to remove his camp. Downes said, 'No.' The tents were then taken down and removed across the Rangitikei by Ngawaka's order, and under his personal supervision. There was evidently a combination of action extending beyond this *hapu*." Mr. Buller adds: "The Natives concerned in this outrage were declared by the Native Land Court to have no title or interest in the block; and the promise of a reserve made to them by Mr. Fox was conditional on their good behaviour. Ngawaka is brother to Noa Rauhihi, the Assessor. There is less excuse for him, as he actually signed the deed of cession."

The next day (18th May) the Government received a letter from Parakaia, addressed to Mr. McLean, acknowledging that the survey pegs had been pulled up by his orders. "This is a word," he said; "give heed to it. Not one little bit of the Himatangi claim will be given up to the Government. But perhaps you had better go into the matter again. I and all the people wish you to go into the question respecting this land, and then an amicable settlement will be arrived at. Let us do it together. I have said to you at Wellington that if you and I do it, it will be settled properly." On the same day, Te Whiti and Ngawaka wrote to the Government that the survey pegs were all pulled up, and Ngawaka said, "I told Mr. Fox, when we had our argument at Te Huru, not to let the chain be taken across to the south side of the Rangitikei. I will not allow the chain to be laid down."

Upon this letter Mr. Fox minuted that Ngawaka was one of those whose title was expressly negatived by the decision of Judges Fenton and Maning; that besides this, he had sold what he pretended to have, to Dr. Featherston, and had signed the deed of cession; and that he had been in open rebellion during the Waikato war. Mr. Fox then directed the papers to be referred "to accompany my memorandum for Ministers of this day's date [31st May] on 'the Manawatu surveys.'"

This memorandum I have not seen, and indeed I should not, being a Cabinet paper, insert it here if I had. I gather, however, from the papers suddenly coming to an end at this point, that it was then that the Government finally decided to postpone the whole question, and put a stop to the survey, until Mr. McLean should go to the district.

A considerable time elapsed, however, before Mr. McLean could get there. In the meantime the province was feeling the loss of the land revenue which had been expected from opening the block for sale. The papers laid before Parliament in 1872, under the title of "Claims of the Province of Wellington against the Colony, 'Manawatu Purchase,'" commence with the representation made by the Deputy-Superintendent to the Government for Treasury assistance, some months after the events I have described. Mr. Waring Taylor wrote on the 26th September, 1870, describing the financial straits to which the Province was reduced by "the