

1883.
NEW ZEALAND.

WASTE LANDS COMMITTEE.

(REPORT ON THE RUSSELL EXCHANGE OF LAND BILL, TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND APPENDIX.)

(Report brought up on 3rd day of September, 1883, and ordered to be printed.)

REPORT.

THE Waste Lands Committee have had the Bill intituled "The Russell Exchange of Land Act, 1883," under their careful consideration, and have taken all available evidence on it. After full investigation, their opinion is that the Bill ought to be allowed to proceed, as the Government have received the full consideration stipulated in the agreement with Mr. Russell. The Committee, herefore, hold that the Government is bound, in all fairness, to implement the engagement entered into, however irregular this transaction may have been, as, at the date of its inception, such dealings were quite common, and were not viewed with the same condemnation they would now evoke.

3rd September, 1883.

JAMES FULTON, Chairman.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, 31st AUGUST, 1883 (Mr. FULTON, Chairman).

Sir GEORGE GREY, M.H.R., examined.*

1. The CHAIRMAN.] We will hear what you have to say on this matter, Sir George? What I want to say is contained in the Appendices to the Journals for 1875 (C.-3).

2. Do you wish to have the Journals? No; but I think the Committee will find it all there in a more complete form than I could give it now.

3. Mr. MACANDREW.] Could you refer the Committee to the salient points in the Appendix you have alluded to, or do you think it necessary for the Committee to read this correspondence? I think the matter would be better understood after reading it.

4. Perhaps, as Sir George has the whole thing at his fingers' ends, he might give the Committee the facts of the case as they appear to him? I stated them in the House the other night. I believe facilities were given to Mr. Russell in the original purchase which were given really to no other Queen's subjects—such as the Native officers being employed to assist in this purchase.

5. Do you refer to Mr. Mackay? No; the Native officers of the department generally; and I think that the system of buying people off—agreeing with them that they should not compete with the Government—is a very wrong one. Certainly a large number of people in the country would not go into these purchases, believing them to be unjust. Large fortunes might have been made by many men who thought them wrong, and the law declared them to be absolutely null and void; and, if so, it is difficult to see why the public should pay such an enormous sum as they are likely to pay now to a person for abandoning that which the law made null and void. Then, I think that a person saying that for a certain sum or consideration he would discontinue a transaction of this kind is detrimental to the whole public acquiring the land, and I cannot see why any payment should be made to him. I think it is unjust to the Natives; it prevents their getting the full price for their lands; and, in the next place, I think that to pay a man for ceasing to injure his fellow-men, and to compel those who are injured to pay him, is an extreme hardship.

* This evidence was not corrected by the witness.—J. FULTON, Chairman, Waste Lands Committee.

6. The CHAIRMAN.] Any other statement you have to put in evidence we shall find, I suppose, in the report of your speech which was delivered in the House the other night? Yes. The proof, however, has not yet been corrected by me, and it contains several important errors. There has been some rather bad reporting in the *Hansard* gallery of late; some of the reporters have been ill. However, those were the objections I took at the time. The Committee will find, if they look into the Appendices, that there are a great number of cases in which great advantages were given to Mr. Russell at the same time, and also to his friends. For instance, there was the case of the Waikato Swamp, in which they had the preference of over 96,000 acres given to them to purchase under conditions under which no other of the Queen's subjects were allowed to purchase.

7. Mr. DRIVER.] I think the advantages they have got are very doubtful, but it might appear as if they had advantages at the time? But that is not the question. If a man believes he is getting a great advantage by being allowed to break the law it is all the same; it is the breaking of the law that I object to.

8. Quite right? Then, there is a case in which a timber-lease was given in the same way, which was bought for ninety-nine years—a block of land the whole timber on which had been sold for ninety-nine years, and the public does not come into possession for that great length of time. That was done by Mr. Mackay too. Then, again, there was another large sum paid on the Patetere Block on the same condition: that they were to retire and not compete with the public afterwards. I object to those things.

9. Assuming, Sir George, that all you say is correct as to the impropriety of these transactions on moral grounds and otherwise; supposing the Committee were to say, "We find that Mr. Mackay did make a bargain with the knowledge of the Government with Mr. Russell," do you think—even taking into consideration the impropriety of the transaction—that it is one which the colony ought to destroy now? Would not that be an act of a worse character even than the other was? Well, this is the case: a gentleman who had been Mr. Russell's land-purchasing agent—

10. I do not think you should look at Mr. Russell in the matter; it might be Mr. A, B, or C. Well, the same gentleman who is his land-purchase agent is appointed the Government Land Purchase Agent, and the two meet together, which is evidently wrong.

11. Evidently; I agree with you there? And the thing is conducted in this way. I say nobody has a right to make any arrangement of that kind.

12. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Is it not the case, Sir George, that rights to timber have been recognized by the Governor of the colony considerably prior to this transaction? The question is whether they are lawfully recognized.

13. But are you not aware that that was actually the case; that they had been recognized for a course of years—by yourself, in fact? In reply to that, I may say that the very moment I came into office I did my best to set them aside.

14. As Governor? No; as Superintendent.

15. But is it not true that the rights to cut timber were respected over lands that were being acquired by the Crown? I had nothing to do with it as Governor; it rested with Ministers.

16. Are you not aware that Mr. Gillies, as your predecessor, had pressed upon the Government of the colony, that in order to acquire the freehold of lands they should respect these engagements with regard to timber? I really know nothing about Mr. Gillies's actions, nor should I respect them if I thought them wrong. Of course, these things are so easily said about what a man's opinions were. Only lately it was said in the House that I was to blame for having assented to that Act by which the Crown's right to pre-emption was given, whereas it will be found, if the correspondence is looked into, that I protested to my very utmost against the thing taking place, and proposed a series of regulations by which no unfairness could have taken place, and so that one European should have no advantage over another; that all Native lands were to be sold by auction only, and in small farms; and Ministers told me it was impossible to get the Assembly to assent to that, and that I should be responsible for the disturbance if I did not assent to the arrangements being continued, and I gave my assent on that understanding. I am not responsible for anything Mr. Gillies has done. If I considered it unlawful, directly I came into office I should have tried to stop it.

17. Do you hold that it is absolutely in defiance of the law, and that such transactions are void? I think to say the thing is void is to say that it is against the law—that you cannot do it.

18. You think it is the same thing to say that a thing is not authorized by the law, and that therefore it is illegal? It is not only not authorized by the law, but it is absolutely void if a man takes anything. That is what is said. The two things are totally distinct from saying that it may be done or not. You are told that you cannot do it; and then, if a man is told that he cannot do it, in order that every one may have the same rights, it appears to me to be a wrong thing to reward him for having done that which he was told he could not do.

19. In 1862 was responsible Government established in this colony? Yes.

20. I mean in respect of Native affairs? Well, I forget the date, but it was virtually always responsible Government from the time of the Assembly. Before Parliament took over the whole charge it amounted to the fact of it being responsible Government. The Governor was really obliged to come to terms with his Ministers, because if he had not agreed to their advice in regard to Native affairs, and they were put out of office, they would not have been put back again, and there would have been a deadlock.

21. But, as a matter of fact, did not he consistently refuse to take their advice in regard to Native affairs till 1864 or 1865? Not to my knowledge. There were often discussions between the Governor and his Ministers, but I think the matter was always arranged between them.

22. Mr. J. B. WYTHE.] Is it not a fact, whether this transaction is proper or improper, that the colony is benefiting by it? Which arrangement?

23. With Mr. Russell? No; I do not think it is; I think it has lost by it. If it was improper, and he could not have done this, nothing was done, and then the colony could have

bought the land without coming to any arrangement at all with him. Of course, in my belief, it has set a very bad example. I think Mr. Russell agreed to be paid off, and a transaction like that is demoralizing to everything in public life.

24. Of course, what I meant was that the Government would not have got the land at that time, and on such terms as they did? I believe they would have got them on better terms if they had not embarrassed these proceedings.

25. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] But are you aware, Sir George, that from time to time—from the year 1860 downwards—the Government were compelled in various parts of the country to recognize private arrangements that had been made, and that they did so in what they conceived to be the public interest? I am aware that that is the statement that is made. But I believe, if the Government officers were to refrain from going into these transactions themselves, and the law had been enforced, the difficulties would never have arisen.

26. But I am asking whether, as a matter of fact—the object of my question is to ascertain whether, from precedent and from what was done in a number of instances, parties who did make these arrangements with the Government had or had not a right to expect they would be given effect to, judging from what had been done before? I do not think that any number of wrong transactions done with the Government authorities gave people a right to expect that they would be allowed to continue such wrong transactions. For instance, because some people were allowed to gridiron the lands in Canterbury in the public interests I cannot conceive that a permanent precedent was established that every one should be allowed to do the same thing.

27. Is it a fact, or is it not a fact, that, in dealing with the Tokatea and Kapanga Blocks, you in 1862 recognized the right of Europeans over the timber, in order that you might acquire the blocks? 1862 is a long time ago.

28. When your letter was referred to Mr. Mackay he stated that, in 1862, your predecessor in office, Mr. Gillies, had been in the habit of recognizing these arrangements, and that the action of the Government with regard to Mr. Russell was only in accordance with what had been done before; and Mr. Mackay states in this letter—and he supplies the correspondence in support of it—that, when the Tokatea and Kapanga Blocks were ceded to the Crown for gold-mining purposes in July, 1862, you sanctioned reservations of kauri timber? I was entirely under the advice of Ministers.

29. You do not deny the fact, however, that it was done? I simply cannot recollect; but I have no doubt that, if it is stated, it was so. That fact, however, was not presented to my mind. My duty was to the public to use an influence that I had with the Natives to get them to yield the land for gold-mining purposes, which I did; and, as to the details of the arrangements which were made under the advice of Ministers, it is impossible for me to speak. I, as Governor, had no power for acting.

30. Would you have considered it proper of a succeeding Government to decline to fulfil such an engagement as that which had been made with the sanction of the Governor and his Ministers in 1862 after they had obtained it, with certain understandings with regard to the forests, however much you might have disapproved of it? If they had done that which was unlawful I should have felt myself bound to confirm it. But, in the first place, I do not quite see the analogy of the thing, because there is no doubt whatever that Mr. Russell was a very powerful person in the country, and anything he confirmed, or his friends confirmed, was done virtually with the approval of the Government. But I never did anything of that kind, either directly or indirectly.

31. Do you mean that Mr. Ormond was a friend of Mr. Russell's? Upon my word I do not know. Mr. Ormond sanctioned it, I understand, when it was done.

32. I do not understand that. I understood your answer to be that the circumstances of this case were different, because the Minister who did it was personally allied to Mr. Russell in some way? I was simply speaking of Mr. Russell's general influence with the Government at that time.

33. You do not assert, then, that Mr. Ormond had any alliance with Mr. Russell in the matter? No; I was talking about Mr. Mackay; and I understand Mr. Ormond then gave what might be a very perfunctory sanction to the thing. I do not consider I am bound, as a member of Parliament, either by the arrangement or by the sanction, if it was wrong.

34. You are aware that the claim is not for a gift of land, but for the purchase of the land at the price which it cost the Government to acquire it? Perfectly; but I consider that only a veil—a covering; because it is absolutely a gift of so much. The Government buy a large block of land, and they pay an average price for it, good, bad, and indifferent; and I understand that this is taken out at the average price of all those classes of land put together; and I am told by those who know it that a great part of this is worth several pounds an acre, and will sell for that, whereas the price proposed to be paid is only a few shillings an acre. I understand that a great part of it is very valuable; but I may be wrong about that.

35. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] It is worth, as you say, a great deal more than the price proposed; but the land is not above the average of the whole block? I am told that it is worth several pounds an acre, and likely shortly to be worth more.

36. At any rate I do not think it is worth more than the average of the block? What I mean is that it is a present of so much land for a very small payment, and there is no doubt whatever that land is very scarce, and it would be infinitely better to pay anything in money rather than in land.

37. You think Mr. Russell is entitled to a money compensation? No; I do not say he is entitled to anything. It should be taken on what he paid the Natives.

38. There is one aspect of the question which seemed to be missed in the House the other night, and that was, after what might be called "competition with the Government" was settled, the Government said they did not wish to take land on one side of the river. They said to Mr. Russell, "You can have that, and we will have this;" but it was afterwards found that the tribal right was so completely intermixed that it would be a wise thing to buy the two together, and then let Mr. Russell have his own piece on a particular side of the river, and the Government could take

the other piece, otherwise Mr. Russell would have bought his own piece and had it, and the Government would have bought theirs and had it? I considered that. But what appears to me to be the case is that Mr. Russell had no business there at all, knowing that what he was doing was null and void. The whole thing was wrong. He told the Government practically that although he could not purchase any land in the Thames District, and knowing that such a purchase would be null and void, yet he would remain there competing against them for what he could not get unless Government gave him a certain compensation for retiring.

39. Suppose we concede that part. The Government say, "We only want the land on one side of the river;" he would proceed at his own risk to buy land on the other. But it is found advisable in the interests of both parties to throw the land into one block? But what right had he at his own risk, to go and try to prevent his fellow-subjects from acquiring land when he could not get anything. I cannot conceive what claim he had either on one side of the river or the other. I cannot see why the country should be taxed—for that is what it amounts to—to reward a man for pretending to buy that which he could not buy, thus embarrassing the interests of the whole of the inhabitants of New Zealand. Supposing this land is worth £20,000?

40. But that is not the point I wish to bring out? But I would like to put an answer to that. If the land is worth £20,000 and the people of New Zealand are to lose that sum, and are to be deprived of the opportunity of fairly competing for the land, why should we give this to a gentleman who, knowing that he could not acquire the land, still continued to compete to buy that which he clearly could not buy? Why should we be taxed for that?

41. That is not what I contend at all. Here is an individual, at his own risk, negotiating for the land on one side of the river, and it was found that the title was so intermixed that it would be better to come to an arrangement and buy the whole of the block in one piece instead of two. It was then decided that the Government should buy the land, and Mr. Russell should take his own piece? Yes; but he had no business there.

42. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Was it done by Proclamation? Of that I am not certain. I can state, however, that it was not under Proclamation. But that has nothing to do with it.

43. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] The preamble of this Bill states that Mr. Russell made this agreement in the month of March, 1873; was it void at that date? Yes; he had nothing there.

44. But he had entered into an agreement with the Natives on that date. Was it unlawful for him to make such an agreement at that particular time? The agreement was nothing; I regard it as unlawful. The law says, "If you do agree you cannot recover, and we warn you of that."

45. Subsequently the Government entered into arrangements for the block, and they found that Mr. Russell had entered into previous engagements. According to the practice of the country, were those engagements void at the time? Under the law of the country they were void.

46. Even if no Proclamation had been issued? Even if no Proclamation had been issued.

47. In this case no Proclamation had been issued? That is immaterial in my view.

48. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] It is very material, because he was not breaking the law then. If there had been a Proclamation he would have been breaking the law, and the whole thing would have been completely bad, without a doubt? It was all bad in the other case.

49. Mr. DRIVER.] I was going to ask Sir George something to the same point. A certain practice had grown up, and Mr. Russell was paying money on the good faith of the Natives carrying out the agreement with him; and, so far as I am able to judge, it redounds greatly to the credit of the Natives that in most cases they have carried out such agreements, though they could have repudiated them. Mr. Russell thereby constituted himself a strong opposition of the Government purchase, and, while he was not authorized by law to do so, he was not restricted from negotiating with these Natives honourably. That seems to me to be the position. I admit with you that it is a wrong system, but do not you recognize that he, with others, was dealing with the Natives in an honourable way, trusting to the future to get his grant, and thereby raising himself as an opponent to the Government in acquiring the land. Whether it was a proper thing to do on either side is another question? I answer they were all wrong-doers. They were doing what was at variance with the interests of the whole European race. It will be seen, from the correspondence between myself and Mr. Bell, that the Ministers had passed an Act doing away with the Crown's right of pre-emption in 1861. I sent in a plan to Ministers, in which I agreed with them that the Crown's right of pre-emption might be taken off on condition that all the Native lands were then sold as public lands. The Ministers of the day accepted this proposition with terms of the warmest approval, but there was some delay. The Crown's right of pre-emption was however ultimately taken away. I requested that if they took it away they would follow up the plan by giving every European the same chance of acquiring land as former Ministers had proposed to do. They found it would be impossible to get the General Assembly to agree to such a law, but they agreed to put in a clause for the protection of Europeans generally. I know a large number of persons—Mr. Watt, in the House, for instance, might have been one of the wealthiest men in the place, but, believing that it was a wrong thing to do, he never would buy a bit of land. But, because, a few, and Government officers amongst them, did go in and purchase in this way—I look upon them as wrong-doers—and because a Minister gave his approval to what was wrong, it does not make it right. These parties may have been so powerful that they could compel the Government to do it; they might have been all ruined otherwise. But any person who has injured the interests of the mass of his fellows has no claim on the sympathy of the public; and the fact of so many powerful people being mixed up in it, instead of making it right makes it worse.

50. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] I presume you are aware that, under the laws which stood then, only large capitalists could buy the land at all, on account of the risks and delays connected with it? I am aware that was the case. The whole of the rest of the community were thus cut out, and that makes the proceeding so much the more wrong. It was done by the wealth of the country. Then I say that, if you put the whole of the taxation of the country—all the moneys that are raised in the

country—into the hands of a few individuals, they have the power of helping their friends. They become capitalists, and I think it is still more our duty to stand against the actions of these men. You will find that the people who did this to a large extent—Messrs. Whitaker and Russell, for instance—were all connected with the great establishment, into which all our money went.

51. We will not go into that, Sir George? I am only giving my reasons why I think these things should not be sanctioned; and, if it is as I have said, I think it becomes all the more wrong that these should do it; and I think every man who cares about the welfare of his country should resist it to the utmost.

52. You are also aware, I suppose, that if it had not been for these people the settlement of the country would have been impeded to some extent? On the contrary, I think the Natives would have sold in small pieces, and Parliament would have made such a law as I asked. But was it likely that these powerful men would have assisted Parliament in anything of the kind? It was from that class of men that the Ministers were taken.

53. Did not the very act of making such negotiations void have the effect of lowering the price of the lands by increasing the risk? If the transactions had been valid the Native owners would have been able to get full value. But it was the action of these gentlemen that made it impossible.

54. Mr. MACANDREW.] Are you aware of any other person or persons who had similar dealings with the Natives, but whose claims the Government of the day declined to recognize? I should have to think over that for a long time. In the first place, those persons whose claims have not been recognized are those who would not do it, because they thought it wrong. I think there is a large class of persons of that sort; but I am sure I can find many instances—in fact, it is clear such must have been the case, because people could not get to the public offices. I would only take these recent transactions that have gone on during the last year. I would never have dared to have gone to the public offices and proposed to have restrictions on alienation taken off in my favour; and, if you took thousands of people together, you would not find one in a thousand who would have said he would dare to do such a thing. We are told distinctly in these cases, in the very district where Mr. Russell was, that they had the assistance of officers of the Native Department to help them, who would not have given it to any ordinary citizen. An ordinary citizen would have been turned out of the office if he had made such a request. There must be a large number of persons who would not have their claims recognized.

55. My reason for putting the question was that I have got a notion. It strikes me that there are several others who had precisely similar dealings, and I thought you might be able to recollect? I do not recollect at this moment.

56. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Are you not aware, on the other hand, that there are a large number besides Mr. Russell whose claims were recognized by the Government of the day? I am not aware that there were a great many.

57. But a large number were recognized at the time? Yes; I believe so; but the Native Minister of the day was largely mixed up in these transactions.

58. But did the Government of the day recognize and buy off claims that private individuals thought they had upon lands at the time? Certainly; it must have been the case where Ministers themselves were mixed up in the transactions.

59. I think it is unfortunate to bring up this in regard to a Minister who is dead and gone in order to prove a thing? But it would come out in regard to other Ministers. Any wrong acts of this kind would not make a thing right. There was a case stated the other day in which it appears one Minister found it necessary to do this; but that does not make it right.

60. Were you not aware that during the time you were in office this case of Mr. Russell's was brought up, and that he requested a settlement of it? No; I cannot say I remember it. On the contrary, the impression on my mind was that the case had been withdrawn; that the claim had been abandoned altogether.

61. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] Is it not a fact that during your term of office your own Government took over negotiations of that nature? I was told so the other day; but that, to my mind, does not make it right.

62. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] Are you aware that there were some disputes in reference to this block, the Mangapouri or Hungahunga Block; that a Mr. Alley had a certain claim upon it, of Hikutaia? I remember that Mr. Alley had some claims in the neighbourhood of Hikutaia. I have seen Mr. Alley here, and he has spoken to me several times about claims of his, and I recollect it in connection with the word Hikutaia, but the nature of that I cannot recollect at all.

63. It was in reference to these identical blocks which have been before the House in previous years? I recollect that case.

64. You are not aware of the allegations that he made? I do not remember that I have heard it at all. He has always told me that he has been ill-treated, and he has great cause for complaint.

65. His agreement would be equally void with Mr. Russell's? Yes.

66. It would be a dispute between two people, whom you hold had no rights whatever? Yes; when I said they have no rights whatever, I have always held this: that, if large sums of money had been paid which the public got the advantage of afterwards, that is, supposing Russell had paid £120,000 or £130,000 on this, I should have been inclined, on the whole, to have said this: "Well, as this thing has gone on, I recognize it to this extent: if you have paid that money, and the public get the land, and it is settled, I should have been inclined to have voted it if I was asked in the House."

67. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Are you aware that some portion of this land in Mr. Russell's claim has been sold at a very considerable sum since? I have heard it, but I am not aware to what extent. So far as I am concerned I would give these gentlemen the land if I did not know that I should be injuring thousands, and I have no right to injure thousands to give it to these few. It is with pain and sorrow that I always refuse to do so, but it is my duty to do it.

68. Mr. J. GREEN.] I gather generally that it is your opinion that Mr. Russell had no right to be in the way of the Government? Yes.

69. And, from your knowledge of the whole of the circumstances, the Government ought not to recognize the claim which Mr. Russell set up in this matter? To do that would be to rob the inhabitants of New Zealand, and the Government ought not to be a party to that.

70. And you also think that, if the Native officers had not been similarly engaged, this transaction would not have been sanctioned? I believe the whole public mind had got into a kind of fever.

71. But the acts of Ministers and their officers at the time assisted it? Yes; Ministers thought they were justified in doing it. I was under compulsion literally from the Ministers to confiscate considerable blocks of land in the Waikato, and the very Ministers who persuaded me to do that, in the course of years, became the principal possessors of the blocks that had been confiscated. If I was reading a history, and found that a certain number of gentlemen got possession of large portions of confiscated lands on terms more favourable than the rest of the Queen's subjects were allowed to get them, I should say it was a very sad transaction to contemplate; and I, as the Governor who made the confiscation, would rather have died than done it if I had known that that was to be the end of the thing.

SATURDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1883.

Mr. SHEEHAN, M.H.R., examined.*

72. Mr. MACANDREW.] It was stated here in evidence, Mr. Sheehan, that it was illegal to have any dealings with the Natives referred to in this Bill at the time mentioned. Is that so? Yes.

73. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] What do you understand by "illegal" in this case? Forbidden by law.

74. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Which law forbids it? Several Native Land Acts then in force and now in force. I explained in another place that, in my opinion, the Crown was a bigger sinner in this respect than anybody else.

75. Mr. DRIVER.] What clause of any of these Acts makes it absolutely illegal, in your opinion, for private Europeans to have transactions—for whatever they were worth—with the Native race for the purchase of Native lands? The law says generally that every transaction of that kind is void.

76. And that makes it illegal? I do not say it forbids it in direct language, but the inability to enforce any contract of this kind makes it illegal. Of course there is a distinction between an illegal contract and a void contract.

77. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] What is maintained by many is that there was no actual breach of any known law: you simply ran your own risk in doing this? But there is no doubt that the State told every person that, as a matter of fact, they should not engage in negotiations for the purchase of Native lands. I know of many cases, however, in which persons have sued to recover advances made on certain blocks of land, and judgment has been given in their favour.

78. Mr. MACANDREW.] Would you refer to any statute in which it is forbidden? I think it is in the Act of 1865, clause 75. [Clause read.] That is emphasized by the Act of 1873, section 87. [Clause read.]

79. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] But can you show us any clause in any Act distinctly forbidding negotiations with the Natives? Yes, I can; but it would not apply to this case. The Acts of 1877 and 1878 make that point perfectly clear.

80. You mean under Proclamation? Yes.

Mr. J. B. WHYTE: Ah, yes! we all know that.

81. Mr. DRIVER.] Were not the Acts of 1877 and 1878 passed to prevent what was being done from being done again? They were passed for the express purpose of showing private dealers in land that the Government meant business.

82. Previous to that, private dealers could run in competition with the Government? In one way perhaps they could. At any time it would have been competent for the Government to stop any transaction with the Natives.

83. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] By Proclamation? No; before it. Proclamation was only a cheaper and more public remedy.

84. Mr. MACANDREW.] Was Mr. Russell or were his agents strong competitors with the Government in the acquisition of Native lands? I could not say that.

85. When you were Native Minister, engaged in the acquisition of Native lands, did you find yourself thwarted and embarrassed at all by private individuals? Very much indeed. Not, I may say in fairness, by Mr. Russell, however. So far as I am aware, not having reference to the papers, the agreement made by Mr. Russell with the Government of the day was loyally kept by Mr. Russell. That is, he withdrew from further speculations, and awaited the time when the Government would be able to carry out their intention.

86. What Government was that? The Government of Sir Julius Vogel.

87. Who was Native Minister? Sir Donald McLean; and Mr. Ormond was Minister for Public Works.

88. Then you are aware that there is an obligation on the part of the Government of the day to fulfil this contract? There is an obligation of a certain kind, which I myself would not have thought of carrying out, nor would I even now support, only because the Government since then have withdrawn from the purchase of Native lands, and, that being so, I do not see why Mr. Russell

* The Chairman of the Waste Lands Committee. I decline to correct.—J. SHEEHAN.

should not be allowed to purchase with other people. I refused to recognize the transaction when I was in office. The papers were rather meagre at that time.

89. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] You refused to recognize the transaction? I declined to accede to it only for the reason that, the Government being in the market buying the Native land, it would be a dangerous thing to set up a precedent of that kind.

90. As a matter of fact, during the time you were in office, were not a large number of these transactions recognized by positive money engagements, and is it not the only difference? The difference is really a very small one indeed; it is a matter of paying in money to the European purchaser or allowing him to get land. I think I may safely say that there were transactions before I came into office, promises made by my predecessors, which I felt bound to carry out. The case that has been referred to by Mr. Gill—that of Watt Brothers, was one of them. I found an express promise had been made by my predecessor, Sir Donald McLean, that it should be done.

91. But was not there a promise in this case with Mr. Russell? I do not think the cases were in the same position. Watt had practically opened up the country by building a steamer on the lake, and had given other evidence of his desire to acquire the land for the purposes of settlement.

92. Had not Mr. Russell done the same in the Waikato? He had opened the Waikato by putting on a steamer for war purposes.

93. But, if it is a question of recognizing colonizing efforts, had not the efforts of Russell been as great in the colonizing way as the efforts of Watt? I grant that Russell was a man who was always at work in opening-up and developing the country.

94. I do not understand how it is that you say that you would not recognize his claim, and yet you did recognize a number of claims, by pecuniary payments, which were on the same footing? I only carried out the promises so far as they were made by a previous Minister.

95. Mr. MACANDREW.] Of course you are aware of the action of the Superintendent of Auckland with regard to this particular question? Yes; I am aware. You are referring, I presume, to what took place in Committee when Mr. Mackay was examined at great length.

96. Yes? I am aware of that.

97. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] Did not Watt's operations in Taupo cease when the Government explained their pleasure? I think the two events were contemporaneous.

98. Your action in Mr. Russell's case was dictated from political experience rather than anything else? Yes; I felt that having to enter the lists against the whole of the private purchasers I could not make a greater mistake than making a concession to Russell.

99. Mr. MACANDREW.] Was the engagement entered into by McLean or Ormond, or both of them, subsequent to or prior to the protest of the Provincial Government? It was prior to it. It is only fair to add that at the time Russell began the negotiations the Government were not desiring to acquire this particular block of country, and he was there on the ground as a purchaser through his agents when we determined to buy.

100. Are you aware of any similar transactions between Europeans and Natives which have not been recognized by the Government? Yes; I am aware of a number.

101. Can you name some of them? There is one case—that of the Paeroa.

102. Who were the parties? The purchaser was Mr. William Cudby, formerly a member of the House; Te Rangi is another.

103. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Was not that under Proclamation? No; not at that time. It was proclaimed afterwards. The Grey Government proposed to take it on a recommendation which had been made by an officer of the Government to pay a certain amount of money to Mr. Vercoe, who was acting in the matter, which he declined to receive.

104. An offer was made? Yes. That is quite true.

105. Mr. PEARSON.] Did not the Government come to a similar arrangement with Jones of Mokau? No; in the case of Jones the Government went further; they told Jones they would not proclaim the block.

106. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] However, you are of opinion that in the whole matter Russell has behaved legally and fairly, and abstained from embarrassing the Government? Yes, I am bound to say that.

107. Mr. MACANDREW.] I understood you to say you knew of a number of these cases in which the Government have declined to recognize the claims? If you give me a list of the Native land purchases for the last eight or ten years I could point to nearly every third case in which this happened.

108. If it is right in the case of Russell for the Government to propose a Bill of this kind would it not be right in the case of others? That is a question of policy. If you ask me what I think about the matter, I say at once that I can see no reason for dealing differently with Russell than others who have been dealing with Native lands except by Proclamation. I would not sanction any attempt made to acquire land that is not under Proclamation. Previous to that everybody knew that although it was void they were allowed to enter into such transactions unmolested.

109. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] Even public officers were engaged in those transactions? Yes.

110. Mr. MACANDREW.] If this Bill is passed will it not afford a good precedent for applications of a similar nature? I think that any person who comes within the four corners of that Bill ought to be entitled to receive the same consideration.

111. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] In Russell's case there was a distinct contract entered into by the Government.

112. Mr. DRIVER.] Mr. Gill stated positively to the Committee that there has never been a case in the whole of the department except Watt's that has not been dealt with by the Government? I have not said to the contrary.

113. Mr. Macandrew asked you if you knew of any other instances of an exactly similar character which the Government have refused to deal with? Mr. Macandrew asked me if there

were other blocks or pieces of land in respect of which the Government had dealt with before Government Proclamation. I know there are a number of cases. The Rangipo case is exactly on all fours with this.

114. And they carried it out? Yes.

115. That is all that Mr. Gill said: that he knew of no case exactly similar that has not been given effect to by the Government, with the exception of Watt's? You mean, of course, cases of this kind where the Government come into contact with the European, and have said to him, "If you do so-and-so, we will do so-and-so?"

116. Yes. I do not know of any such case; but I do not place any of these cases on a better footing than those of ordinary private speculators.

117. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] These remarks apply, I understand, to the want of provision in this Bill, such as is indicated by Mr. Stevens's clause? To some extent they do. That clause would be a fair one to add.

* Hon. Mr. BRYCE, examined.

Hon. Mr. BRYCE: I may say to the Committee that anything regarding my own administration I can tell you all about; but anything regarding former administrations could be better got from the head of the Land Purchase Department, Mr. Gill, who, I understand, has already been examined.

119. Mr. MACANDREW.] Sir George Grey and Mr. Sheehan have given diametrically opposite evidence to that tendered by Mr. Gill. It has been said that it was illegal for Europeans to have any dealings with Natives for the purchase of their lands at the date mentioned in connection with Mr. Russell's transaction. Can you say whether that was the case? I had occasion to consult lawyers upon that subject, and they draw a distinction that I am not quite able to understand. They draw this distinction: that it was without law, but not against law. As for the word "illegal," I have a very high authority for saying that that means something which is not legal, so that it would be quite proper to call it illegal. But, with regard to the transactions generally, I am advised that they are without law, although they cannot be said to be against the law. The law takes no notice of these things. It is not improper, I am advised, to use the word illegal, because it is something which is not legal.

120. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] But no actual breach of the law has been committed? Exactly.

121. Mr. MACANDREW.] Do you know of any similar cases to this to which this may be a precedent? Of course, I have not the same knowledge of the departmental records that the old officers have, but I do know of some cases.

122. That are on all fours with this? Pretty nearly. I know at least of one that was brought before my notice not long ago, which appears to be strictly on all fours; and I know of numerous cases where money has been given in consideration of claims.

123. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] But I understand Mr. Macandrew wishes to know if this Bill could be used as a precedent for future cases? I am aware of one case of that kind.

124. The CHAIRMAN.] Is that the one of Watt Brothers? Yes; it appears to me to be strictly on all fours with this. It is a case in which Mr. Ormond made a very distinct promise; and I think it is likely there will be others, though it is rather difficult to find them. It is easy to find from the records where money has been paid, and where the matter has been confused in a manner similar to the present instance; but the thing depends on the correspondence.

125. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] Do you know of any similar claims which the Government have declined to recognize? No.

126. Would this case of Watt's involve a large concession if Russell's agreement is carried out? As to acreage it will involve a considerable concession, but the land is of an extremely poor character.

127. Have Watt Brothers shown any particular anxiety to have that promise carried out? Certainly. I had to express an opinion on the matter not long ago, and the opinion I expressed was that Mr. Ormond appeared to have no legal right to make the promise; but whether it was desirable to bring in a Bill for the purpose of giving effect to the arrangement was another thing, and I did not express an opinion on that.

128. But the arrangement to begin with was contrary to law? No.

129. Mr. MACANDREW.] Did you express an opinion that Mr. Ormond had no legal right to make the promise to Watt Brothers? If so, had he a legal right to make the promise to Mr. Mackay? Of course, there is nothing legal about it, or else there would be no necessity for the present Bill.

130. Then, in fact, we would be validating an agreement which was illegally made? Just so. No man can say anything in condemnation of the system that I am not prepared to indorse.

131. But the department having made this arrangement ought to carry it out? Yes.

132. Do you think it would be a bad thing to prevent an illegal promise? I do. I think when a party is engaged in a transaction of that kind, and it is indorsed by the Government, that, unless there is upon the face of it a high improbability of its being carried out, really the Government are morally bound to carry it out.

133. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Was not the Rangipo and Murimotu on circumstances exactly similar? To some extent it was, and it was not. It was well understood at the time that it was made that it would have to be validated by the House. I do not know that Mr. Russell expected that there would have to be a formal Act of settlement, because they had a much easier way of arranging matters at that time than we have now.

134. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] Do you not understand, from your knowledge of this case, that, after the

so-called competition had ceased, Mr. Russell was to buy on one side of the river and the Government on the other, and afterwards they found it advisable to negotiate for the whole block? I should not like to speak definitely without the papers before me. It is rather an intricate case, and I should not like to speak positively. I may say this: that I was satisfied, from a perusal of the papers, that the withdrawal of Mr. Russell from this competition, whether legal or illegal, was a real advantage to the Government in the way of facilitating purchases by the Government. As a matter of fact, he could have shown very great opposition.

135. And you are distinctly of opinion that the colony benefited by that arrangement with Mr. Russell? Yes; although I am not going so far as to say that Mr. Russell's conduct in throwing these impediments in the way of the Government would have been proper.

136. But he did not throw any impediments in the way. He was simply there, and they found him there? Yes; and, if the Committee like to ask me what I would have done under the circumstances, I may say that I should have ignored Mr. Russell and proclaimed the land. I have no hesitation in saying that, if I had been in office at the time, and had been exposed to what the Government of that day were exposed to at the hands of private purchasers, I should have been prepared to bring in a Bill to coerce private purchasers from doing what they were doing without law.

137. But, failing that, do you not think an arrangement of this kind was the next best thing? Yes, possibly; although I cannot say I would have done it. I would have fought the matter out myself; but perhaps I might have sacrificed some of the interests of the colony generally in doing so.

138. So that it resolves itself into a matter of opinion as to the course which ought to be pursued? It is a matter of opinion as to which would have produced the best results to the colony as a matter of expediency.

139. Mr. PEARSON.] You consider that the Government is bound morally to carry out the agreement entered into? I think the Government is bound to carry out an agreement of that kind.

140. Mr. J. GREEN.] Even if wrongly made at the time? Even if wrongly made.

141. Mr. STEVENS.] If you consider the Government were morally bound to carry out an agreement wrongly made, do you not consider also the Government are morally bound to carry out agreements between themselves and the Maoris, although illegally made? I am speaking of the whole question generally. The Government are no parties to it. The latter arrangement, as I understand it, is an arrangement between private persons and the Maoris, and not between the Government? In reply to that I say that, the Government having made engagements, I consider they are bound to recognize them.

142. In the interests of equity and justice do you not consider that, if the Government, as the representatives of the people, are bound to carry out an illegal transaction because it is fair to do so, they were also bound to allow the people themselves to carry out such transactions? The two cases do not appear to be parallel. In one case the Government has made a positive engagement which would expose them to a charge of breach of faith if not fulfilled; in the other case the Government have made no engagement, and I do not think the Government are bound to countenance these transactions to which you allude, and which were made illegally in the sense I have explained.

143. Then, your answer is this in substance: That the Government are morally bound to carry out transactions made between Natives and Europeans in those cases where they are known to the Government, but in the other case they are not to be carried out? I did not say anything of the kind. I say that my distinct reason for saying that the case before the Committee should be carried out is that the Government made the engagement itself.

144. The CHAIRMAN.] In other words, the Government is bound to carry out its own engagements, but is not bound to recognize other people's engagements? Exactly.

145. Mr. J. GREEN.] Do you wish the Committee to understand that you not only think it right that the Government should carry out the engagements they enter into, but they should also do so in the case of engagements entered into by a previous Government? The Government is a continuous body. I do not distinguish between one Government and another in that respect.

146. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] Has it not been the practice of the Government to recognize transactions that were made in the earliest times? What I refer to are those claims which existed at the foundation of the colony by Europeans, who were professing to be settled here. Some were recognized and some were not.

147. But the whole of those claims were illegal? Certainly, in the sense of being without law. Even in this case the Government are by no means bound to recognize Mr. Russell's claims or transactions with the Maoris. They thought it was an expedient thing to do.

148. And that principle of expediency is what actuated the Government in all its relations with transactions in Native lands? Yes.

149. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Are you aware of any recognition of those claims in the Land Purchase Department of late years—since the present Government have been in office? No. I have been taxing my memory about it, and I cannot think of a case, big or little.

150. Mr. J. B. WHITE.] Of course, your policy has been all through to retire from Government purchases of Native lands? Yes; and from competition with private individuals. But I have insisted on some blocks. I am insisting on the purchase of one or two blocks now. Others, again, where the land has not been very desirable for public purposes, I have been very anxious to retire from altogether.

* Mr. GILL, examined.

151. The CHAIRMAN.] What position do you occupy, Mr. Gill? I am Under-Secretary to the Native Land Purchase Department, and I have charge of the whole of the land purchase negotiations of the Government.

* Evidence not corrected by witness.

151A. The Russell Exchange of Land Bill is the Bill before the Committee, and we want some evidence upon it from you.

152. Mr. MACANDREW.] I understand what we want to know is the legal position of Mr. Russell at the time the negotiation in question was commenced, and the state of the law regulating the position of Maori lands? The title of Native lands in those days had not been returned by the Court, and the Native lands were held under Native tenure.

153. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] It was not under Proclamation? Not under Proclamation then.

154. Mr. MACANDREW.] Mr. Russell's dealings with the land were quite within the four corners of the law? A great many purchases had been going on in the North Island similar to this. It was a common practice in Auckland to purchase land at the same time as Mr. Russell's transactions, but the purchasers ran a risk that their purchases would be void when the land passed through the Court.

155. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] They ran a risk of losing their money? Yes.

156. The CHAIRMAN.] Have you received a memorandum of the question upon which we should require your information? I have.

157. Will you kindly speak on the points mentioned in that memorandum? The legal question is one which I am not competent to speak upon. I may explain that the Proclamation of 1872 embraced all the land from Cape Colville, and the whole of the land on the Thames Peninsula; but it took in no land on the western side of the Waihou River. This is the Proclamation [produced]; it is dated 31st July, 1872. In 1874 Mr. Mackay extended his operations and commenced to purchase land on the western side of the river.

158. On behalf of the Government? On behalf of the Government. This is a Proclamation [produced] taking in the land embraced in the Proclamation of 1872.

159. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] What was the date? 22nd October, 1874.

160. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] And it was between these two dates that the arrangement was made with Mr. Russell? Yes.

161. So that the latter Proclamation does not really bear on it? I may say that this Proclamation only had force for three years. In 1878 it became necessary to re-proclaim the lands, and they were again proclaimed under their separate blocks in that year.

162. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] When those Proclamations were initiated, did the Government put them on blocks of land, irrespective of whether there were private interests in them or not? They did.

163. Did they, in those cases, give any instructions generally to recognize or not to recognize such interests? In all cases of private dealings with land they were recognized by the Government.

164. In all cases? In all cases that I am aware of.

165. And how were they dealt with? By money payments.

166. Can you state what number of cases there were in which money payments were made? A return laid on the table of the House in 1875 gives them.

167. That was a return we saw yesterday. There is another in 1879. Do those returns exhaust the cases in which they were dealt with by money? Yes.

168. Do you know of any other cases besides Mr. Russell's in which there were engagements for land? I only know of one case.

168A. What is it? The case of a block of land at Taupo—an arrangement made by Mr. Ormond.

169. And you think this and Mr. Russell's are the only two cases in which there was an engagement to provide for land? These are the only two I can speak of positively.

170. They were both made by Mr. Ormond? I think Mr. Ormond was the Minister for Public Works then, but I am not sure. The other case is evidently similar to the present. [Returns put in—C.-3B, 1875; and C.-9, 1879.]

171. What power had the Natives to give a deed of lease or a deed of sale if the negotiations were null and void? They held them for the time being.

172. Were leases lawful? They were a good holding title.

173. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] What I understand you to mean is that practically they were in a good holding title, which the Government could not upset—not legally? The Government had great difficulty in inducing the Natives to break their former engagements.

174. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] I see in this return the names of McDonnell and Brassey: they were land purchase commission agents? They were.

175. Did the Government take them over as Agents in consequence of this? Yes.

176. And they took them over with these engagements on their hands? Yes.

177. And paid them for what they had done? Yes; paid them for what they had returned to the Natives.

178. Did this lead to Agents going in for purchases of land with a view to the Government taking them up from them? No, not generally, I think; but it did lead to some abuses in that respect.

179. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] It fostered opposition to the Government? There were two notorious cases, Brissenden, and McDonnell and Brassey, Wanganui. The Government of the day were anxious to obtain the whole of the Wanganui country. Speaking within bounds, nearly a million of acres had been negotiated for in the upper Wanganui country. McDonnell and Brassey were commission agents and land purchase agents on their own account. They offered to the Government the interest they had in certain blocks on certain conditions.

180. There is great difficulty in getting other agents than them? Great difficulty. They were opposing Mr. Booth in his land purchases at Wanganui for a time.

181. And so they were practically bought off? Yes.

182. When was the last of the recognition of this by the Government? The latest date is the 4th October, 1879. There has been one payment since.

Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] Of these blocks of land, how many have been actually acquired since. For instance, we will take, "James Mackay received £266 for Puketotara." Is that acquired? Not paid.

184. To this day? No.

185. What is done with it? It has not been through the Native Land Court.

186. Is it still under negotiation? Yes.

187. Then, there is Kaitangiwhenua? We have purchased that block.

188. And the £1,000 went as part of the purchase-money? The Natives recognized £500 as part of the purchase-money.

189. That is Williams's case? Exactly; £500 the Natives acknowledged, and the other was paid to Williams and Covern, they having previously negotiated for the purchase of the land, and having the Natives in their hands. It was a very large block of land.

190. Mr. MACANDREW.] It has been stated that it was illegal to have any dealings with the Natives referred to in this Bill at the date at which Mr. Russell's claim commenced. Is that so? I should not like to give an opinion on that.

191. But as a matter of fact. It is not a question of opinion; it is a question of fact. Is it so in your knowledge? I should not like to say as a matter of fact whether it was lawful or not. I am not a solicitor, and I might not read the law properly. In my opinion, as a layman, it was not wrong—it was not unlawful—for Mr. Russell to negotiate for the land as he did. I know of scores of similar cases which were done at the same time.

192. Are you aware of any similar transactions between Europeans and Natives which were not recognized by the Government? No.

193. Do you recollect negotiations on the part of some people in Dunedin some years ago; Hudson I think was one, and Beale? Yes; I remember the case.

194. Can you state the position of that? That block was under Proclamation at the time, and the Government had paid large sums of money upon it. It was under Proclamation when they commenced to deal with it.

195. Are you sure of that? I am certain of it; there is no question of it whatever. [Marked list produced.] In this list the transactions are closed. I do not mean that in the whole of the cases the Government have acquired the whole of the lands, but in many cases the Government have come to the Native Land Court to ascertain what has been advanced; but the transactions are closed.

196. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] That is, closed by the absolute acquisition of the land? Just so.

197. The CHAIRMAN.] In all except six cases, then, in the return of 1875 (C.-3B) the transactions have been closed? Yes.

198. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] And in the other six cases? They are still open.

199. Mr. J. BUCHANAN.] But you clearly do not mean that in all cases the Government had acquired the whole of the land referred to? Not the whole of the land.

200. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] Still they have acquired considerable blocks? Yes.

201. In every case those negotiations were recognized by the Government Land Purchase Agents? They were recognized in all cases. The proof is the return which is before you.

202. Hon. Mr. ROLLESTON.] In this particular case of Mr. Russell's, was not the Government pressed by the Superintendent of the day, Mr. Gillies, to do what was done in the matter to initiate the purchase? Mr. Gillies was very anxious, as Superintendent, to acquire the whole of the Thames Peninsula, the land being auriferous. In 1873 no purchases of Native lands could take place without the sanction of the Superintendent.

203. Are you aware, with regard to any previous transactions, whether the Government recognized the unauthorized occupation of Maori lands—in the Wairarapa, for instance? In the very early days I could not say.

204. Do you know anything of the Kapanga and Tokatea Blocks in the Coromandel Peninsula? Yes.

205. Did not the Government recognize the purchase of timber there for Europeans? Certainly. On many of the lands the Government purchased there, there were previous timber leases existing over them, and which are in force now. Some of those leases are ninety-nine years' leases. The object of purchasing the land was for gold-mining purposes.

206. Mr. MACANDREW.] Who are the parties to the Taupo case you have mentioned? Watt Brothers.

207. And it is an exactly similar case to that of Mr. Russell's? Exactly.

208. And, if this case is decided, it will have an important bearing on the other? I think it would.

209. Mr. J. B. WHYTE.] Is there quite a distinct promise in Watt's case? Yes; it is clear.

210. In what year was it made? In 1874, and followed up subsequently in 1878 and 1879.

211. Mr. MACANDREW.] Do you know of any other claims that are likely to follow suit? No.

APPENDIX.

1.

RETURN giving the Names of all Europeans from whom Lands or Claims to Lands have been purchased, or to whom compensation has been paid, in respect of Claims to Land out of the £700,000 set apart for the purchase of Native Lands; also showing the Amounts paid to each of such Persons respectively, and the Position and Area of Blocks in respect of which such Payments have been made. (C.—3B, 1875.)

Names.	Amounts.	Particulars of Claim; Position and Area of Blocks in respect of which Payments have been made.
	£ s. d.	
John Charles MacCormick ..	718 8 0	Purchase of Pungaere Block, Bay of Islands District, Auckland, 7,184 acres.
John McLeod ..	100 0 0	On account of judgment debt against Hori te More, to be deducted from the purchase money of the Pakiri Block, Kaipara District, Auckland, 32,000 acres.
Stannus Jones ..	150 0 0	In consideration of his final surrender of his rights over the timber on Pakiri Block, Kaipara District, Auckland, 32,000 acres.
Allan K. Taylor ..	189 16 2	Purchase money and legal expenses in connection with transfer to the Crown of part of Waipapa Block, Kaipara District, Auckland, 1,306 acres.
Whitaker and Russell ..	126 0 0	Purchase money, Pukeatua Block, Coromandel District, Auckland, 239 acres 1 rood 20 perches.
	130 0 0	For all their interest in Cabbage Bay Block, Coromandel District, Auckland.
	52 10 0	For all their interest in Papa-Aroha Block, Coromandel District, Auckland.
James Foley ..	10 0 0	Claims in Ohinemuri Block, Coromandel District, Auckland. (This amount has since been refunded to Government by the Native owners).
Edward Wood ..	15 0 0	For losses sustained by stoppage of survey of the Paeroa Block, at Ohinemuri, Auckland.
Daniel Joseph O'Keefe ..	1,500 0 0	Transfer to Government of liens (amounting to £2,105) over Wharekawa West, 15,000 acres; Wharekawa East, 10,754 acres; Omaha, 7,056 acres; Otama East, 1,217 acres; Otama West, 1,298 acres; Whitihipirua, 1,245 acres; Coromandel District, Auckland.
Edwin Torrens Brissenden ..		
Thomas Logan ..		
Michael Hannaford ..		
Daniel Joseph O'Keefe ..	20 0 0	Unsatisfied claims in Wharekawa East Block, 10,754 acres, Coromandel District, Auckland.
Walter Hallett ..	98 0 0	Balance of survey lien registered against Runanga No. 2 Block, 45,000 acres, Taupo District, Auckland.
M. R. Miller ..	300 0 0	Relinquishing claims to leases—Horohoro, 50,000 acres; Te Tatura, 25,000 acres; Paeroa, 100,000 acres; Kaimanawa, acres; Ratoreka, 35,000—Taupo District, Auckland.
William Thorn Buckland ..	2,070 0 0	Purchase of 10,000 acres of Oruanui Block, Taupo District, Auckland, and refund of expenses connected therewith.
	55 0 0	Transfer to Government of lease of 20,142 acres of Oruanui Block, Taupo District, Auckland.
	500 0 0	For all interest in Taharua Block, 13,900 acres, Taupo District, Auckland.
Gavin McIntyre Park ..	400 0 0	For all interest in Tauhara Middle Block, 11,594 acres, Taupo District, Auckland.
James Macmurray ..	50 0 0	Ditto, ditto. (£10 of this amount has been refunded to Government by Native owners.)
George Edward Read ..	697 2 0	For all interest in Tolaga Township Blocks Nos. 1 and 2, 253 and 164 acres respectively, Poverty Bay District, Auckland.
	400 0 0	On account of the purchase of Mangawaru Block, acres, at Waiapu, Poverty Bay District, Auckland.
Charles William Ferris ..	200 0 0	Part payment for his interest in Te Marunga Block, 7,660 acres, at Tolaga Bay, Auckland.
Richard David Maney ..	3,000 0 0	For all his interest in about 267,120 acres of land at Wairoa and Turanga, Auckland.
Percival Barker ..	1,500 0 0	For all their interest in Tukurangi and Waiapu Blocks, 75,000 acres, Upper Wairoa District, Auckland.
— Cable ..		
— McDonald ..		
— Drummond ..		
Henry Charles Young ..	124 3 6	For all his interest in Lot 12, Parish of Matata, 4,200 acres, Bay of Plenty District, Auckland.
Whitaker and Russell ..	858 16 8	Refund of payments to Natives, and survey expenses, &c. Matakana Island, Tauranga District, Auckland.
Preece and Graham ..	150 0 0	For all their interest in Te Tapatai, Tauranga District, Auckland.
Edwin Torrens Brissenden ..	3,600 0 0	For all their interest in Ngatiraukawa lands, Patetere, estimated 249,000 acres, Waikato District, Auckland.
Charles Tothill ..		
Thomas Morrin ..		
James E. Dalton ..		
Alexander Kennedy ..	175 10 0	Survey lien on part of ditto, ditto, ditto.
..	536 12 0	For all his interest in Rotokakaranga Block, estimated 50,000 acres, Hawke's Bay.
Thomas Fox ..	343 0 0	For all his interest in Hikurangi Block, about 9,555 acres, Poverty Bay District, Auckland.
	£18,269 18 4	

2.

RETURN (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper C.—3B., 1875) giving the Names of all Europeans from whom Lands or Claims to Lands have been purchased, or to whom Compensation has been paid in respect of Claims to Land out of the Appropriations for the Purchase of Native Lands in the North Island, stating, in each instance, the Locality, Date, and Amount. (C.—9, 1879.)

Names.	LOCALITY.		Date.	Amount.
	Name of Block.	District.		
				£ s. d.
Andrew Peters	Runanga No 2 ..	Taupo	16th June, 1875 ..	100 0 0
Charles W. Ferris	Te Marunga	Poverty Bay ..	14th August, 1875 ..	280 0 0
Richard D. Maney	Upper Wairoa	Wairoa	11th January, 1876 ..	1,376 4 3
"	Hangaroa	"	11th January, 1876 ..	623 5 9
"	"	"	9th December, 1876 ..	500 0 0
"	Upper Wairoa	"	19th June, 1877 ..	50 0 0
Barker, Cable, and Co. ..	"	"	4th August, 1877 ..	1,500 0 0
Thomas Craig and E. V. Dixon	Ohinemuri	Thames	27th November, 1876 ..	700 0 0
A. J. Thorp	"	"	20th January, 1877 ..	230 0 0
Edmund Foley	Kaituna, &c.	Bay of Plenty ..	8th February, 1878 ..	250 0 0
John Stevens	Mangoira-Ruahine ..	Wanganui	6th February, 1878 ..	222 17 6
C. F. Mitchell	Ohinemuri	Thames	10th June, 1878 ..	392 15 0
C. B. De Thierry	Arawa Lands	Patetere and Rotorua	20th August, 1878 ..	250 0 0
Henry Alley	Waiharakeke	Thames	3rd August, 1878 ..	100 0 0
"	"	"	— September, 1879 ..	300 0 0
William Cowern	Kaitangiwhenua ..	Patea	5th December, 1878 ..	1,000 0 0
James Mackay	Puketotara	Wanganui	27th December, 1878 ..	266 0 0
"	Te Keikei	"	11th December, 1878 ..	55 0 0
"	Mangoihe	"	4th October, 1879 ..	250 0 0
McDonnell and Brassey ..	Maungakaretu	"	17th June, 1878 ..	200 0 0
"	Karewarewa, &c. ..	"	21st November, 1878 ..	150 0 0
"	Otupari, &c.	"	24th January, 1879 ..	300 0 0
"	"	"	4th February, 1879 ..	557 15 5
"	Maungakaretu	"	6th February, 1879 ..	151 4 0
John Hurley	Kaiatauha	"	22nd March, 1879 ..	350 0 0
Thomas Morrin	(Mangaetoroa	"	25th September, 1879 ..	247 16 2
	Hukaroa	"		
	(Potokatoka	"	23rd June, 1879 ..	200 0 0

... of the ... (1937) ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...
... of the ...