

the least money was paid at the outset. It is obvious that if the Natives there had been properly treated at the outset we should not have been here to-day. I do not know that I can aid the Committee further. It is not for me to suggest what the Committee ought to do. But what we do suggest is, seeing that these claims, as we put it, have not been satisfied, some grant of land should be made, altogether outside of the Landless Natives Act, in compensation for these wrongs. The extent of the land to be granted would, of course, be measured probably by the fact that already there are the reserves made under that Act, though at the present time they produce nothing. They have not ameliorated the condition of the Native in any way, and when they will do so is problematical. So that what really is essentially requisite at the present time is that in some way the landless Natives' provision of 1906 shall be supplemented, because, if it is not, then the Landless Natives Act will have altogether failed to accomplish its purpose. I have not much evidence to call.

Hon. Mr. Ngata: Before you do so let me ask you whether you have gone into detail as to the question of schools and medical assistance?

Mr. Hosking: I have not gone into detail with regard to that. That has all been dealt with, up to 1891, very fully in Mr. Mackay's reports, and it was also dealt with before the Joint Committee; and if there is one thing more than another that is established it is that in respect of schools, and medical attendance, and general solicitude on the part of the Government, no duties were more grossly neglected, and that for a period of over forty years the promises made by the Government in that respect were most inadequately carried out. I am not able to say what the position is now. I think that now, perhaps, there is not so much foundation for the strictures that were applicable in the earlier times. But what I would put to the Committee is this: Are the Natives, in respect of this deprivation for so many years of what was promised to them on the occasion of the purchase—are they to be treated in exactly the same way as persons who received no promises in this respect have been treated—namely, by the allocation of 50 acres of land per head if they were landless? And then with regard to reserves. Are they to receive no compensation in view of the fact that they only got the miserable pittance of 10 acres per head in 1848 and were restricted to that till 1868, when it was raised to 14 acres; and they have had no addition made to that since, although under the Landless Natives Act large reserves have been made elsewhere, which, as I have said, are as yet of no practical benefit to them? Are they to receive no compensation in respect of their deprivation of these reserves, or what they ought to have had as reserves, over so many years? It seems to me that if the case was one where there happened to be a legal right at the foot of it the Court would at once award to the complainant who had so suffered very heavy compensation in the way of damages. What we are now asking Parliament to do is this: In the absence of any immediate practical benefit from the Landless Natives Act, to give us something in addition, not because we are landless, but because we had these promises made to us in 1848, and because they were so shamefully neglected, and because the Natives have been so shamefully treated over this long period of years with regard to these solemn promises.

The Chairman: Have you got any evidence to call?

Mr. Hosking: Yes, these witnesses that you see. Mr. Parata is a member of the Committee, but he perhaps is better acquainted with the facts that I have stated regarding the character of the reserves, and what Matiaha said, and so on. If the Committee think that relevant, I would ask if he could make a statement.

The Chairman: We could not have a member of the Committee as a witness. He can make his statement to the Committee afterwards.

Mr. Hosking: That is what I thought would be the position. With regard to any further evidence, I cannot, of course, pretend to bring anything in the shape of contemporary evidence; that is dead and gone. But I have some statements from the Natives which are very short, and I should like, if the Committee will bear with me for a short time longer, to have them taken down.

The Chairman: Are these in any way authoritative? Are they affidavits?

Mr. Hosking: No. Perhaps the witnesses could make their statements, and they could be taken down.

The Chairman: That would be the best way—if you would call your witness, read his evidence, and then ask him if that statement is true.

Mr. Hosking: Quite so. I will read it as I took it down. I will call Mr. Green.

THOMAS EUSTACE GREEN examined. (No. 2.)

Mr. Hosking: This is the statement that you made to me: I will read it and ask you if it is correct. "I was present at Judge Fenton's Court in 1868. It was not expected that the Ngaitahu purchase would be gone into. The inquiry was really about Kaitorete—a strip between Lake Ellesmere and the sea—and outside the boundaries of all the purchases. Kemp's deed was thrown out because it wanted a signature. An order was made in Chambers by the Judge privately. The Natives were represented by Mr. Cowlishaw, but he was engaged for the Port Levy case. He was then asked to look into the case of the Kaiapoi reserves, and he told us to withdraw from the claim. He knew nothing of what was in the order as to the extinguishment of rights. I knew nothing of this until the fishing case at Kaiapoi." That was years after?

Witness: Yes.

Mr. Hosking: "When the deed was thrown out, Mr. Rolleston came into Court and asked each place to appoint a spokesman to specify the land that they wanted and to sign the deed again. The Kaiapoi spokesman asked for 50,000 acres, but they only got 1,000 acres for Kaiapoi, including the award for Port Levy and Raupuku, which took 650 acres, so we were only left with 350 acres. The 350 acres were accepted by Wi Naihira. As to the land given for landless Natives,