

The Crown was also able to refer to a *Gazette* notice, 1879, page 1481, showing that an area of 764 acres, being Lot 37, Mangere, 1 acre, and Lot 73, Waipa Parish, 347 acres, and Lot 75, Waipa Parish, 416 acres, a total of 764 acres, had been returned to the Ngati-Apakura. This was disputed at the hearing, and it was alleged that the only area so returned to a member of the Ngati-Apakura was Lot 37, Mangere, containing 1 acre. The *Gazette* of 1879, however, if not a more reliable guide than the statement made to-day that the grantees were not members of the Ngati-Apakura, does show that it was intended the area of 764 acres should be for them and was thought to have been granted to them.

The Crown also produced copies of extracts from reports by Mr. G. T. Wilkinson, Government Native Agent, of 1883. These are contained in the Appendices to the Journals, House of Representatives, 1883, G-1, page 3, and 1886, G-1, pages 8 and 9. It does appear from Mr. Wilkinson's reports that the feeling amongst the displaced Maoris at that time, together with the effect of the King Movement, was the explanation for their apathy in accepting land offered by the Government for Maori settlement. Mr. Wilkinson does, however, refer to certain members of the Ngati-Apakura Tribe having expressed a desire to settle on unoccupied Government land in the vicinity of Alexandria and the Puniu River. Mr. Wilkinson's reports may to some extent explain why the Ngati-Apakura did not obtain any substantial grants of land from the Government.

In connection with the settlement of the Rohepotae Block, which is referred to in the Otorohanga Minute-book of the Native Land Court, Volume 4, page 71, the Ngati-Puhiawe obtained an award on evidence given by Hone te One.

From the evidence presented to the Court it does appear that the Sub-tribes Ngati-Apakura and Ngati-Puhiawe did lose substantially by the confiscation and that there were not any substantial Crown grants to them at a later stage. There is no doubt that prior to confiscation they were well settled at Rangiaohia, where they were working their land and growing wheat and pigs for the Auckland market. This land was not restored to them; but the failure of the N'Apakura to take advantage of the opportunities that were offered by the Government to both friendly and rebel Natives to have land restored to them for occupation resulted apparently from their own apathy and the feeling of bitterness and distrust they held towards the Government. It is well known that the Maniapotos made a gift to the N'Apakura of 1,000 acres in the Maniapoto district because they had been displaced and were to a large extent landless. Some of this land they hold to-day, but some of it they have sold.

Reverting again to the petition, it will be apparent from what I have said that the Crown has been able to show that the allegations set out in the petition are groundless and all that can be said to be the result of the hearing is that it is proved that the two sub-tribes did suffer as the result of confiscation to a greater extent perhaps than other sections of the Waikatos. No comparison was able to be made, however, as between these sub-tribes and the other sections of the Waikatos as regards their loss.

I regard it as hardly possible that the claims by these sub-tribes were overlooked by the various Courts and Commissions that have dealt with confiscation from time to time. Particularly would this be the case during the sitting of the Commission under the Chairmanship of Sir William Sim (referred to as the Sim Commission) which sat in 1926. After a full hearing by the able members of this Commission, they came to the conclusion that some compensation should be made for the confiscation of Waikato lands, and they recommended the payment of the sum of £3,000 per annum to be distributed amongst those who had