xxvii A.—4B.

which are as follow . . . (b) We formed the Mau and continued to support all laws of the Government for the past seven months, but in doing so we have belittled ourselves in your opinion; therefore we have decided to remain gathered together in Apia until we receive the decision which we are expecting, and none shall depart until the answer we are waiting for shall be received.

It is clear that very shortly after the Minister's visit to Apia the Administrator quite properly came to the conclusion that the Mau organization had set out to paralyze the activities of the Government, that a constant propaganda originating from the committee at Apia was being distributed amongst the Natives, and that a large number of Natives were determined to remain in Apia until the result was known of Mr. Nelson's visit to New Zealand, which will be presently referred to. The Administrator's officers, both European and Natives, including his Faipules, impressed on him the necessity for taking steps to suppress and discourage the organization. He himself was satisfied that the activities of the Mau could not be permitted to subsist alongside of and concurrently with the administration under the mandate. The steps taken by him will be more conveniently discussed at a later stage when dealing with the so-called banishment orders based on political considerations.

It is clear that it is of the utmost importance for the economic welfare of the Natives that they should be under continuous inspection in relation to the weeding of their coconut plantations as well as to the replanting partially of the plantations from time to time. If the plantations are not weeded they quickly become choked by vegetation, one of which, a creeper, has been given the descriptive name of a "mile-a-minute." Cognate with this is the necessity for keeping down the beetle known as the rhinoceros-beetle, which feeds upon the fronds of the coconut-palm This is shown by the circumstance that in the financial and is most destructive. year 1926-27 beetles, larvæ, and eggs to the amount of over 5,300,000 were accounted for to the Department of Agriculture in the Territory. We are satisfied that the Natives are not to be trusted to keep their plantations clear, or to keep down the beetle, unless they are under constant inspection. All well-informed opinion agreed as to this necessity: see the evidence of Mr. Connor, an Inspector whose district comprises about 4,000 acres of coconut plantations (at pages 328–29), and also the evidence of another Inspector, Mr. Southon (at pages 335–36). There is no doubt that as soon as the official inspection of plantations is relaxed the plantations deteriorate in condition. That has been in the main the consequence of the organized refusal by members of the Mau to render obedience to the law relating to keeping their plantations clean and the destruction of the beetles. is obvious from the figures we have given that unless the destruction of the beetles is constant and continuous the consequence must be serious to the Natives in reducing the efficiency of their plantations.

The persons of mixed or wholly European blood who were concerned in the

The persons of mixed or wholly European blood who were concerned in the activities of the Mau were: Mr. Nelson, who is a half-caste Samoan and a person of considerable wealth acquired in Samoa; Mr. Meredith, also a half-caste Samoan, and married to Lago Lago's sister; and Messrs. Westbrook, Williams, and Gurr, all Europeans who have married Native women. Mr. Smyth is of pure European descent. We mention these circumstances because their association with the Samoans was calculated to increase their influence with them.

While on this subject, it is right to say that we are satisfied that the ordinary trader in no way associated himself with the organization, and that there was no sign or indication of the existence of any German influence supporting the Mau.

Mr. Nelson left Samoa on the 1st June, 1927, to visit New Zealand for the purpose of supporting the parliamentary petition of March, 1927, to which we have referred. That petition was referred to a Joint Committee of members of the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives of the New Zealand Parliament. Mr. Nelson's evidence was taken at great length. A parliamentary paper, entitled, "Joint Samoan Petition Inquiry Committee," and containing a full report of the addresses of counsel and the evidence taken before the Committee was made available to all parties to the Commission, and a copy of it was, on arrival of the Commission at Samoa, handed to Mr. Baxter, the leading counsel for the petitioners.

The greater part of the evidence taken before the Joint Committee, perhaps necessarily, was hearsay, and we determined on this ground to exclude the report