That suggestion was not acted upon. Then, in 1882 a further petition was presented. And in this connection, if there is one thing more than another that must strike any one, it is the wonderful persistence of the Natives in bringing their claims before Parliament—a persistence which, I understand, has cost them many, many thousands of pounds. It must be obvious to any one acquainted with the expenses that are necessarily incident to petitions to Parliament, that the Natives are justified in saying that they have in that way denuded themselves of their property—their chattels and money—to an enormous extent. And that very circumstance, I might incidentally urge, is one that ought to commend them to the favourable consideration of the Committee. For why should the Native have had to spend all this money in endeavouring to obtain his rights? It was for the Government to have taken the initiative rather than that the Natives should have had thrown upon them this enormous expenditure and persistent labour in endeavouring to obtain what every Committee appointed to inquire into the subject has admitted—namely, that the promises had not been fulfilled. This petition of 1882 was referred to the Committee, and the Committee reported as follows:—

"The substance of the petition may be summed up thus" (and they state what it is). "With regard to the first allegation" (that is, that when the Middle Island purchases were made there was an engagement that, in addition to the cash payments for the land, ample reserves should be made for the Natives to reside upon) "it is in evidence that the reserves made at a sitting of the Native Land Court held at Christchurch on the 7th May, 1868, were given in final settlement of all claims under this head. The Committee would further refer to 'The Ngaitahu Reference Validation Act, 1868,' in confirmation of this position."

Well, now, that was a summary dismissal of the matter in that case by simply referring to what the Native Land Court had done. I have already commented sufficiently on that to show that very little weight can be attached to that finding. The Committee go on,—

"There is no evidence to show that the claim for what are called the 'tenths' was thought of until within the last few years. The purchase deeds contain no mention of them. Mr. Commissioner Mackay, who for many years has been conversant with Maori affairs in the Middle Island, says that he had heard nothing of the claim amongst the Natives themselves until recently."

Then,—

"Schools and medical attendance have been supplied since 1868 fully, and since 1865 partially."

I think this finding of the Committee, which does not seem to have been based upon any evidence that was taken, or very little, is not borne out by the later report made by the Joint Committee in 1891. Then, in 1887 there was a very valuable report presented by Mr. Mackay—I.-8, page 61—and that perhaps is one which, if read, will be found to summarize the whole case for the Natives up to that date. It is a most valuable contribution on the subject. Mr. Mackay set himself to work to ascertain what method of compensation could be adopted. After reviewing the evidence in connection with the purchase, he says,—

"Sufficient evidence has been adduced in the foregoing extracts to show that the Natives, instead of being consulted in respect of the land they desired to retain, were coerced into accepting as little as they could be induced to receive."

Then he goes on to speak of what was actually reserved, and ultimately he says,—

"In the report of 1879, previously alluded to, the Commissioners state that it is a task beyond their power to estimate the damage sustained by the Natives from the non-fulfilment of the promises made them at the cession of their lands."

Then he goes on to address himself to the subject, and he, upon the basis which he adopts, recommends an area of 150 acres per head to be given, and he estimates that—

"An allotment of 150 acres each for this number would make a total of 150,000 acres for all purposes, 50,000 acres of which should have been allocated for their use and occupation, and 100,000 acres for an endowment for the purposes before enumerated. . . . Assuming it cannot be gainsaid that 150,000 acres would have been a fair quantity to have set apart to meet all the requirements of the Natives if the aggregate area already reserved is deducted, the balance will represent within a few acres the quantity—namely, 130,700 acres—now recommended to be appropriated for the purpose with a view to finally settle the question."

One hundred and thirty thousand acres of land was, according to Mr. Mackay, the proper amount to be awarded, so far as could be ascertained then by the method of computation that he adopted. That, as I explained before, was by averaging the prices paid to Natives for lands throughout the colony. He says in conclusion,—

"Assuming that it has been incontrovertibly proved in the foregoing narrative of particulars that the Native owners of Kemp's block were inadequately paid for the territory ceded by them, that the terms of the deed as regards the reservation of their *mahinga kai* (food-producing places) and the setting-apart of additional lands have not been equitably fulfilled, or the promises that were looked on as the main consideration for the cession of the land have never been carried out excepting in a manner that cannot affect the general question, I venture to express a hope that the recommendation made by me may be treated in a generous spirit."

That was in 1887. The matter, then, was referred to the Joint Committee of both Houses, who made their interim report in 1888 and their final report in 1889, and that report was one that was