

This Quick-Action FOOD TONIC

Builds up WEAK RUNDOWN Men & Women



This natural food tonic re-nourishes your system with a daily action of vital Mineral Salts.

The concentrated Mineral food value in Vikep is tremendous. For instance, one day's supply gives you as much Calcium as in 7 Eggs—as much Iron as in 23lbs. of Oranges—as much Phosphorus as in 4lbs. of Butter. And Vikep contains 9 of the 12 essential Mineral Salts plus Food Iodine—all bringing you much-needed nutriment.

And as all these precious Minerals and Vitamins get into your system they gradually re-nourish it. You begin to build up. Nerves steady. Tiredness turns into energy—weakness into strength. You have found the way back to new health and vitality.

Fassett & Johnson Ltd.,
Manners St., Wellington. 5436

VIKEP



"Old Father William"—with apologies to Lewis Carroll and Sir John Tenniel

Said the Youth, "a performance of yours I admire
Is sculling a boat on the River
For several hours 'gainst the Wind and the Tide—
But isn't that bad for your Liver?"

"I said once before," Father William replied,
"And I hope I shan't have to repeat it,
I'm fit and I'm gay and my tribute I pay
To Andrews — there's nothing to beat it!"

You, too, can be cheerful and vigorous at all times if you keep fit the Andrews way. Health comes from a system that is functioning smoothly. Andrews Liver Salt promotes good health because its sparkling effervescence helps to refresh the mouth and tongue; next, Andrews soothes the stomach and relieves acidity; acts directly on the liver and checks biliousness; and finally gently clears the bowels, correcting constipation.



ANDREWS LIVER SALT

Scott & Turner Ltd., Andrews House, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England.

Through New Zealand (XVII)

By "SUNDOWNER"

THE DEPOPULATED EAST

I WAS in Tolaga Bay when the weather broke, and it was when I was waiting there for the sun to come back that I first heard of the depopulation of the East Coast. I had of course heard of the East Coast Commission and been aware for many years of the desire of the Maoris to resume possession of their East Coast lands. But I had heard of those things without taking them in; either not thinking about them at all or feeling that they were "old, unhappy, far-off things" with which I was no longer concerned. Now I became suddenly aware of them as immediate and pressing problems.

I hesitate even yet to say that I at last understand them. But I spent three days talking about them to Pakehas who had been dispossessed and felt sore, and to Maoris who wanted resumption to be speeded up and made no secret of their delight that the Pakeha was at last being squeezed out.

The Pakeha argument was roughly that he had made the land what it now was: cleared it, drained it, fenced it, built on it, given the Maori his rent and the Dominion its present productiveness. In some cases he had occupied it for 42 years, and in all cases for 21, and he had now to walk off and watch production fall, see the scrub come back and the fences rot, and the home in which he had reared his children revert to owners with no home



consciousness. No Pakeha with whom I spoke said that he had suffered legal injustice. Some argued that it was moral injustice to allow them to think that they were in possession indefinitely if they were good tenants, and now tell them that however they had farmed their time was up. Two agreed that the land belonged to the Maoris, that it was good to see Maoris interested in farming, and that if they could farm their own lands they should be allowed to do so. Even these two, however, thought that the prospect of successful farming by individual Maoris was remote.

"You think that production will fall?" I said to one of them.

"I'm sure of it. I like the Maoris, and don't agree at all that they are lazy and improvident. But they are gregarious. When they work in gangs they're excellent: shearing, for example, or road-making, or bush-felling. Without them this East Coast country could never have been developed. But they're temperamentally unfitted for farming on their own account, which involves something that Maoris have never done—planning years ahead and waiting."

"What about collective farming?"

"It all depends on what you mean by that. If you mean combined operations under Maori control, the situation is still the same. There are not six Maoris on the Coast ready to take control, and if there were the other Maoris would not accept their leadership."

"You think resumption a retrograde step?"

"Economically, yes. It may have a social justification, but that is another question."

I FOUND the case of the Maoris a little more difficult to follow, but it seemed to come to this:

- (1) They want their land back for general reasons—as you and I would want something back that we lent to someone else before we appreciated its value.
- (2) They now regard land as necessary to their prestige and future development.
- (3) They no longer feel satisfied with the rents they get, or with what remains by the time payment reaches them.
- (4) Many returned soldiers are asking for farms.
- (5) They have successfully farmed one or two blocks already (especially Whangara), and feel that they could succeed with others. In any case, they demand the same right as the Pakeha enjoys to succeed or fail with their own property.

The situation is much more complicated than this, much more involved historically, and incapable of reduction to a land



question and a land question only. Some of the arguments used are tribal, some legal, some economic, and some raise questions that most of the Maoris themselves don't understand clearly—the consolidation of blocks, the pooling of interests, the unification of control, and so on. But I left Tolaga Bay wondering how I had lived so long in New Zealand without realising how tenaciously the Maori now clings to his land, how determined he is to regain control of it, how impossible it is to say to him in 1947 that he is still not ready to take control, how difficult it is to help him without injuring him, and how certain it is that helping him will injure the fine band of Pakeha farmers who have been his neighbours for two generations.

WHEN I said something like that to a dispossessed Pakeha he said something like this in reply:

"Them who rules New Zealand—a million and a half Pakehas or a hundred thousand Maoris?"

"Both, I think."

"Is it majority rule?"

"Yes, but with protection for that minority."

(continued on next page)