

12. In the face of these facts it is preposterous that the descendants of the man Paremata te Wahapiro, who did all the mischief, and upon whose disposal of his imaginary interest in the Whakapuaka Block the Government were induced to found a claim to the block, should now endeavour through adventitious means to gain a share of the land which their father actually disposed of, so far as he was concerned, whether he had any title or not thereto. In some of the correspondence relative to the disturbances at Happy Valley Paremata te Wahapiro is described by persons who had only an imperfect knowledge of the matter as the "Chief of Whakapuaka." This is a mistake, he could not possibly be the "Chief of Whakapuaka" under the circumstances already narrated. Had a better knowledge of affairs prevailed it would have been known that "Wi Katene" or "Te Manu," as he was then known as, was the Chief according to Maori custom, and that it was only Paremata's assertiveness and bumptious conduct that caused the Europeans at that time to assume that he was a person in authority, whereas his half-brother, Wi Katene, was highly annoyed with his misconduct and, in fact, turned him away from Whakapuaka in consequence. Para. 223.

13. A petition was before the Legislative Council in the session of 1903, when certain assertions were made by some of the petitioners (the Paremata family) under examination by the Native Affairs Committee, that Huria Matenga had promised them if they remained quiescent, when the Whakapuaka Block was before the Native Land Court that she would protect their interests. These statements were referred to Huria Matenga for reply, and, as she was unable to go to Wellington, it was decided to hear her evidence at Whakapuaka. Mr. Wilford, solicitor on behalf of Huria Matenga, and Mr. T. Ellison on behalf of the Paremata family, went over to Nelson to conduct the examination. It is understood that the petition was reported against by the Native Affairs Committee.

14. As to the alleged statement that Huria Matenga promised, if the Paremata family remained quiescent when the Whakapuaka was adjudicated upon, to protect their interest, I feel convinced that the same is utterly untrue, for the reason that none of the family of Paremata te Wahapiro would presume to dictate terms to Huria Matenga their ariki, according to Maori custom, through her descent from Te Puoho the elder brother. The Paremata family on several occasions attempted to claim an interest in the Whakapuaka Block, but on each occasion have failed to support their contention. Para. 225.
Para. 180.

15. Owing to the difficulty of getting reliable evidence concerning the early history of the block, there has been a disposition to listen to the statements of persons who had little or no knowledge of the matter, and it has come to my knowledge that Mr. John Tinline, an early resident at Nelson, is reported to have stated that the Whakapuaka Block was a reserve made by the New Zealand Company for the Natives. This statement is evidently a misapprehension of the true position of the matter, as the fact was the New Zealand Company had no authority to make reserves beyond the Tenths stipulated for in their deeds of purchase from the Natives, but even then that did not authorize them to localize such lands. It will be seen that the statement is a fallacy. The New Zealand Company claimed to have acquired large tracts of country from the Natives, but the extent of the purchases had to be finally determined by the Commissioner (Spain) sent out by the Imperial Government armed with plenary powers to award such tracts of land as were found to be acquired by the New Zealand Company, but no part of the Whakapuaka Block was allotted to the company in the Nelson award, consequently it will be seen, irrespective of other reasons, that the company had no authority to meddle in any way with the said block. Para. 226.

16. A dispute took place in the early part of 1845 between Paremata te Wahapiro and the European settlers in the Happy Valley on land awarded to the company by Mr. Commissioner Spain, which led to Mr. Donald Sinclair, the Police Magistrate, and Mr. John Tinline, his Clerk, proceeding to the scene of the disturbance. Paremata was very bumptious and threatened to assault both Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Tinline, but nothing eventuated, and they returned to Nelson. As the New Zealand Company considered they were entitled to the land under the award made by Mr. Commissioner Spain in 1844, and had located settlers on it, the Resident Agent, Mr. Fox (afterwards Sir William Fox), decided to fix the northern boundary of the award on the ground with a view to putting an end to further disputes about its position. It is safe to assume that Mr. John Tinline was not present when the boundary was cut, for the following reasons—namely, (a) Prior to Mr. Fox proceeding with a party to cut the line, he informed Mr. Sinclair of the intention and asked him to be present, but Mr. Sinclair declined to accompany the party, and as Mr. Tinline was Mr. Sinclair's Clerk it is reasonable to assume that he did not go either, as he had no separate function in the matter; (b) another reason is that the only known person present when the boundary was fixed who could speak Maori was the Reverend Mr. Reay, and when it was resolved to send a messenger to the pa who could speak Maori Mr. Reay declined to go; if, therefore, Mr. Tinline, who understood Maori, had been present he would in all probability have been asked to go instead. After the commotion caused by Paremata in 1845 nothing further happened at Whakapuaka to necessitate the authorities interfering, consequently the Government officials were not called upon to interfere or concern themselves about the Natives there, the result being that very little was known about them either individually or collectively as to their landed rights or other matters of importance. The reason of this in a great measure was that the Native Settlement was outside the boundary of the New Zealand Company's award, consequently no European interest was involved, and so long as the Natives did not interfere with the European settlers on the company's lands the authorities had no occasion to take cognizance of their inter-tribal proceedings. The position was different with the Native residents at Motueka and Massacre Bay: these Native people resided amongst the European settlers, and came more into contact with the authorities in consequence. Para. 226.