

No. 10.

The Hon. the SECRETARY for CROWN LANDS to Mr. A. MACKAY.

Office of the Court of Land Claims, Wellington,
25th November, 1874.

SIR,—

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, forwarding Returns A, B, C, and D relative to the half-caste claims at Stewart Island, and to draw your attention to certain points in connection therewith.

1. I observe in Return A, which I presume you forwarded as a return of all half-castes to be provided with land under "The Stewart Island Grants Act, 1873," the names of about fifteen persons whose names are not in either your list made in 1868, or in Mr Pearson's made in 1871; these, I suppose, should be considered new or additional claims.

2. In Return D, the names of eight persons are given, to whom you recommend the apportionment of certain so called vacant lots, whose names are not in Return A.

3. There seems to be some confusion with regard to the correct names of certain of the claimants. In the list of 1868, Margaret Newton is said to be the wife of J. Cross, while in Return A, Mary Newton is returned as Mrs. Cross. Jane Anglem is stated to be the wife of J. Parker; but, from the records of the Anglem's land claim, I find that the wife of Parker is Elizabeth Anglem. In Return D, a Mary Anglem is mentioned—who is she? I understand that Anglem had but two daughters, Ellen and Elizabeth.

In Mr. Pearson's list, Jane (somebody) is supposed to be Mrs. Flint; in the list of 1868, Betsy Grooms is said to be Mrs. Flint.

The correct names of all claimants under the Stewart Island Grants Act must be positively ascertained before the grants are issued.

4. If Christopher Anglem died before the purchase of Stewart Island, his brother cannot be entitled to 10 acres as his representative, as he had no claim under the deed of purchase.

5. The Chaselands and Lowrys cannot be granted any land in consideration of their fathers' long residence on the island, as clause 4 of the Stewart Island Grants Act refers only to the three persons specified in the Schedule to that Act.

6. The list of claimants forwarded by Mr. Pearson was based on that furnished by yourself in 1868, and all the claimants specifically objected to by you now are included in your first list, as well as others whose names are not in your new list (A), though not objected to by you.

Considering all these circumstances, and that Mr. Pearson's report and list were made after his having held duly advertised meetings at the Neck, Campbelltown, and Riverton, and were approved by the late Land Claims Commissioner, I do not deem it advisable to allow any alteration of the allocation made by him, or to entertain in connection with that report any question of quarter or three-quarter caste, but shall consider any new claims that may be advanced.

I therefore return the Schedules forwarded by you on the 19th instant, and request that you will be good enough to furnish me with a complete alphabetical list of all claims under "The Stewart Island Grants Act, 1873," giving the reasons, other than those already stated, why any have been struck out from the list of 1868, and distinguishing the additional claims allowed by you or Mr. Pearson since 1868.

I have, &c.,

A. Mackay, Esq.,
Commissioner Native Reserves, Nelson.H. A. ATKINSON,
Land Claims Commissioner.

No. 11.

The Hon. the SECRETARY for CROWN LANDS to Mr. A. MACKAY.

Office of the Court of Land Claims, Wellington,
23rd December, 1874.

SIR,—

Referring to the letters and schedules relative to the fulfilment of promises made to half-castes on the cession of the Ngaitahu and Murihiku Blocks, and Stewart Island, forwarded by you to the Native Under Secretary, I have the honor to inform you that, upon reviewing the whole question of these claims, it appears to me that the claims arising out of the promises made by Mr. Mantell, when purchasing the Ngaitahu and Murihiku Blocks, should be kept quite distinct from those under the deed of purchase of Stewart Island, as grants in fulfilment of promises made on the purchase of the first-mentioned blocks can be issued under "The Crown Grants Act (No. 2), 1862," while those under the last-named purchase will be issued under "The Stewart Island Grants Act, 1873." Moreover, the Government has made an arrangement with the Provincial Government of Otago, by which the General Government pays for the survey of the Stewart Island claims, and on that account also it is necessary that they should be kept separate.

The list of outstanding applications furnished by Mr. Mantell, in 1854, shows a total of seventy half-caste children among twenty-one families (none of whom appear to have resided in Canterbury); while I observe your list gives ninety in Otago and fifty-four in Canterbury. It is evident, from your list, that some of the families included in it either were not resident in the purchased blocks at the time of purchase by Mr. Mantell, or, if resident, had not made application to him. As of course no families but those who were residing on the Ngaitahu and Murihiku Blocks at the time of purchase can be entitled to grants of land in consideration of the promises made by Mr. Mantell, I have to request that you will be good enough to endeavour to ascertain what families of half-castes were living on those blocks at the date of purchase, and to make out a separate list of them (List No. 1).

With regard to the families that have sprung up since the purchase of the blocks before mentioned, if you will make out a list of all those persons of the half-caste race for whom you consider it is desirable that provision should be made—as in the case of the Stewart Island purchase—I shall endeavour to have an Act passed to authorize the issue of grants to them.