

## CHAPTER 5

# PRE-1865 COMPARATIVE DATA

### 5.1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Any comparative study employing a sampling technique needs to proceed according to an explicit methodology. A comparative study should assist in establishing the frequency with which a sample may appear in a general population. In other words, a comparison should indicate how typical or atypical the sample may be. I selected the Bay of Islands and Kaipara as sample areas within the Auckland district owing to the intensity of transactions there, but this may have made them more atypical than typical.

To establish the typicality or otherwise of the Bay of Islands and Kaipara, I will attempt three kinds of comparisons. The first will be a comparison between these two areas to explore their different historical, demographic, and resource characteristics. The second kind of comparison will be between these two areas and two other areas, Muriwhenua and south Auckland, at opposite ends of the district. The third kind of comparison is based on aggregate old land claim and Crown purchase information for both the Auckland district and other districts.

### 5.2 ISSUE APPROACH

With the three kinds of comparisons described above, a multi-issue approach such as presented for the Bay of Islands and Kaipara becomes difficult, if not impossible. All comparative studies require some form of quantitative analysis to convey at least a degree of precision. Even though the issues of representation, boundaries, and price negotiation are essentially qualitative in nature, they do yield a measurable outcome in the fourth issue. This fourth issue, what was left in Maori hands at the end of 1865, has to be the focus of this comparative chapter.

Consequently, I will make no effort to examine the frequency and nature of disputes in Muriwhenua and south Auckland. I will compare mainly what appears to have been the tangible outcomes of Crown activity in the different areas, and in the district as a whole. A more detailed analysis of all the issues in other areas within the district may require further investigation.

### 5.3 BAY OF ISLANDS/KAIPARA COMPARISON

The different historical, demographic, and resource characteristics of these two areas may be briefly traversed. The longer and more intense history of pre-Treaty Pakeha trade and settlement in the Bay of Islands perhaps explains the intensity of old land claim activity there. When the outcomes of old land claims, Crown grants, surplus land, and scrip awards are compared, this pattern becomes obvious:

Area	Grants	Scrip (£)	Surplus
Bay of Islands	59,328	8700	31,317
Kaipara	26,742	3088	7134

The 1825 military defeat inflicted upon Ngati Whatua and Te Uri o Hau at Te Ika a Ranganui by Nga Puhi apparently contributed to this kind of disparity between the two areas. By all accounts, Nga Puhi of the Bay of Islands enjoyed trade, technology, demographic, and political advantages over their Kaipara neighbours during the 1830s. Conversely, the Crown-sponsored shift of administrative and commercial activity from the Bay of Islands to Waitemata/Auckland during the 1840s may have reversed this balance to the advantage of Ngati Whatua/Te Uri o Hau. With the passage of the Bay of Islands Settlement Act 1858, the Crown apparently attempted to rescue the Bay from the depression it had contributed to during the previous decade. None the less, as explained in the old land claims chapter, this act failed to kick-start the local economy.

A comparison of Crown purchase activity in the Bay of Islands and Kaipara reveals the reverse of the old land claim pattern. According to the Auckland district Crown purchase schedule, the following pattern emerges:

Area	Acreage	Price (£)	Price per acre
Bay of Islands	70,597	8839	2s 6.04d
Kaipara	372,103	22,197	1s 2.32d

### *Pre-1865 Comparative Data*

Both the old land claim and Crown purchase figures presented above should be used only with appropriate caution. In the case of old land claims, I have indicated the amount that Commissioner Bell determined the Crown to have paid claimants in scrip, which could then be exercised in the Waitemata/Auckland area during the establishment of the new colonial capital there. I have assumed that the Crown acquired an acreage equivalent to the scrip exchanged in the Bay of Islands and Kaipara, as (by its own rules) it was legally entitled to do. Maps of both areas indicate that the Crown acquired a greater quantity of scrip land than the cash or land credit quantities it gave to claimants. In fact, I have probably erred on the conservative side in the above tables by estimating what the Crown appears to have acquired on the basis of what it paid claimants. Likewise, Crown purchase acreage figures depend either on survey information, or upon Turton's estimates in compiling his published deeds and plans volumes during the 1870s. In the Bay of Islands, however, we lack any sort of acreage information for eight out of 27 (or almost 30 percent) of Crown purchases. This means that Crown purchase figures for the Bay are much less reliable than the comparable Kaipara figures.

While recognising the limitation of these figures, it is still possible to estimate the relative proportions of land transferred out of Maori ownership before 1865. In Kaipara the Crown purchased an estimated 53 percent of the entire land area, and presided over the transfer of a further 5 percent as a result of old land claims. In the Bay of Islands it appears that about 25 percent of the entire area passed out of Maori ownership as a result of old land claims, while the Crown purchased perhaps 20 percent directly. In Kaipara the Crown reserved much less than one percent for Maori, while in the Bay of Islands it reserved about one percent. In Kaipara in 1865, therefore, 42 percent of the entire area remained unreserved Maori land. In the Bay of Islands about 54 percent remained as unreserved Maori land.

This, of course, says nothing about the quality of the remaining land, whichever way that quality is measured. A cursory examination of the remaining Maori land in the Bay of Islands suggests that it was predominantly marginal land, remote from the main commercial and transport centres. Concentrated along the northern coast of the Purerua peninsula, near Rangaunu/Whakataha, Oromahoe, south of Pakaraka, and in the Te Rawhiti/Whangaruru peninsula, this land is all relatively rugged. In the 1860s much of it may have been forested, but it is difficult to estimate the value of either its timber or arable land. All that can be said about the value of the land remaining in Maori ownership is that it appears to have been less valuable in commercial terms than the land transferred before 1865.

If it is difficult to assess the value of Maori land in the Bay of Islands at 1865, it is even harder to do so in Kaipara. While Maori retained a substantial acreage with reasonably good water access between the Paparoa purchase in the north, and Hoteo (or Tauhoa) purchase in the south, the value of these lands would also depend upon the use of its forest resources. Again, it is almost impossible to determine how Maori

## *Auckland*

were placed to benefit from commercial forestry during the 1850s and 60s. The Crown purchases at the Dargaville and Helensville ends of the harbour appear to be more strategically placed with respect to both trees, trading stations, and transport. Beyond this, speculation on relative economic benefits is not useful.

A demographic comparison should also be taken into account in any estimate of per capita resource distribution. Using Fenton's published figures as the most reliable pre-1865 demographic data, the Bay of Islands Maori population of 1641 is almost double the Kaipara figure of 880.<sup>1</sup> From this figure we can estimate a per capita land ownership figure of 375.57 acres for Kaipara, which is higher than the comparable figure for the Bay of Islands.

---

1. 'Table Showing (as far as can be ascertained) the Aboriginal Native Population of New Zealand', in F D Fenton, *Observations on the State of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of New Zealand*, Auckland, 1859. I have included Waimate and Kawakawa and excluded Kaikohe from the Bay of Islands figure.

In all comparisons of different areas, a number of imponderables should be acknowledged. To what extent, for example, did the intensity of pre-Treaty transactions, and subsequent investigations of them, promote conflicts over land and authority in the Bay of Islands?<sup>2</sup> Did the Crown contribute to the outbreak of war in the north during 1844–45 in the way that Governor Grey alleged in his ‘blood and treasure’ despatch? Did the removal of the colonial capital, scrip exchanges, and the subsequent Northern War condemn Bay of Islands Maori to relative marginality? If so, does the Crown share responsibility for this?<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if Kaipara Maori benefitted from their proximity to the relocated colonial capital of Auckland after 1842, was this a reward for their continued expressions of loyalty to the Crown? Could the Crown have consciously rewarded ‘loyal’ Ngati Whatua/Te Uri o Hau at the expense of ‘disloyal’ Nga Puhi (with the notable exception of Tamati Waka Nene) in this way? Finally, of course, there remains considerable doubt over whether Te Uri o Hau really benefitted from all their professions of loyalty. Didn’t they end up losing more land than Nga Puhi, and who did Grey ultimately favour in the Mangakahia/Te Wairoa dispute?

When Bay of Islands and Kaipara Maori considered the benefits of colonisation, they often regarded towns as the most tangible manifestation of such benefits. During 1851 Nga Puhi petitioned the Governor to establish a bicultural town in the Bay of Islands.<sup>4</sup> Later Maori support for the Bay of Islands Settlement Reserve confirms this desire for a town with its associated services. Ngati Whatua, of course, welcomed Hobson’s decision to move the colonial capital to Auckland for the same reason.<sup>5</sup> Kaipara Maori undoubtedly benefitted from their proximity to the commercial and administrative services there.

James Belich recently touched on the relationship between Maori and colonial towns throughout the North Island. In his account, during the mid-19th century, towns ‘represented the median of Maori–Pakeha relations. Tribe and town were twin communities co-operating in an often tense but more or less equal “symbiosis”’.<sup>6</sup> This symbiosis of tribe and town led Belich to describe the period from 1840 to 1860 as ‘the heyday of New Zealand race relations’.<sup>7</sup>

Although Ngati Whatua and Te Uri o Hau benefitted from the establishment of the colonial capital at their doorstep, no historian has demonstrated the extent of these

- 
2. This is one of the arguments Philippa Wyatt presented in the concluding chapter of ‘The Old Land Claims and the Concept of “Sale”: A Case Study’, MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1991, pp 229–257.
  3. In one area, the Crown did initiate policies that were intended to achieve a southward shift of commercial activity, and succeeded in doing so. This was its scrip exchange policy first announced as part of the 1842 Land Claims Ordinance: see Rigby, ‘Empire on the Cheap’, claim Wai 45 record of documents, doc F8, pp 59–60.
  4. They recommended Mangonui Te Tii as the site for this town: petition, 5 February 1851, Grey papers, GNZ MA 378.
  5. Alemann, Ngati Whatua transactions, pp 103–113
  6. James Belich, ‘The Governors and the Maori’, in Keith Sinclair (ed), *The Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand*, Auckland, 1990, pp 84–85
  7. *Ibid*, p 86

benefits, and how they compared with services to the settler population. There remains, also, the question of whether the Crown promised the benefits of town-based services to Maori in persuading them to sell their land.

#### **5.4 MURIWHENUA COMPARISON**

Muriwhenua is useful for comparative purposes. The ongoing Tribunal historical investigation there makes it perhaps the most studied of all areas within the Auckland district. While its pre-Treaty history of remoteness from the centre of most intense contact in the Bay of Islands resembled Kaipara's, it also shared the bay's post-1842 lapse into marginality when the Crown moved administrative and commercial activity southward. While Muriwhenua Maori, like Te Uri o Hau, remained loyal during the Northern and New Zealand Wars of the 1840s and 60s, they also had very little to show for it by 1865. Demographically, Muriwhenua resembles the profile Fenton produced for the Bay of Islands rather than Kaipara. Fenton reported the Muriwhenua population as 1988 (compared to 1641 in the bay, and 880 in Kaipara) in 1859.<sup>8</sup> Muriwhenua, thus, resembles the bay in some ways and Kaipara in others.

Muriwhenua's history of old land claims and pre-1865 Crown purchases shares features from both the Bay of Islands and Kaipara. According to the relevant schedules, the Crown presided over an old land claims process by which 11 percent of the entire area (as opposed to 25 percent in the bay and 5 percent in Kaipara) passed out of Maori ownership. In Muriwhenua the Crown purchased 36 percent of the total area, compared with 20 percent in the bay and 53 percent in Kaipara. Native reserves in Muriwhenua appear to account for a further one percent of the entire area, about the same proportion as in the bay. Thus, by 1865, Muriwhenua Maori retained about 53 percent of the entire area (defined by the boundaries of Mangonui County prior to 1990), compared with about 55 percent in the bay and 42 percent in Kaipara.

Crown purchase activity in Muriwhenua resembled that in Kaipara (to a much greater extent than the bay's) as far as survey activity is concerned. In both Muriwhenua and Kaipara, it possible to estimate the area of all except one or two purchases (as opposed to seven in the bay) on the basis of contemporaneous survey data. None the less, the disputed 1863 Mangonui purchase presents a major difficulty in Muriwhenua. Since the Crown failed to survey this purchase before Turton published his deeds and plans, he reproduced the sketch map from the original deed but refrained from estimating acreage. I have estimated that the Crown

---

8. '... Native Population ...', in Fenton, *Observations*. This figure is the aggregate of Fenton's totals for Ahipara, Muriwhenua (ie, Te Hapua/Te Kao), Mangonui, and Kaitaia.

### *Pre-1865 Comparative Data*

acquired 10,000 acres by purchase, and a further 7000 acres by scrip exchanges (of questionable legality) in the immediate hinterland of the port of Mangonui.<sup>9</sup>

Despite the limitations of Crown purchase data, it is still possible to make a meaningful price per acre calculation for Muriwhenua and Kaipara, though not for the Bay of Islands. In Muriwhenua the average ninepence per acre figure is substantially lower than the halfpenny per acre paid in Kaipara. At the same time, it is worth remembering that the Kaipara figure increased dramatically after Te Uri o Hau relayed a strong protest to Crown officials about low purchase prices at the 1860 Kohimarama conference. Before Kohimarama the Crown paid an average price of one shilling per acre (much closer to the Muriwhenua figure), but afterwards it paid an average of 1s 10d per acre in Kaipara. This may well have reflected a response to insistent Te Uri o Hau and Ngati Whatua requests for more liberal Crown payments. The disadvantage distance inflicted on Muriwhenua Maori gave them fewer political opportunities to improve their bargaining position. The distance between Auckland and the far north apparently dictated that no Muriwhenua representatives were able to attend the Kohimarama conference.

---

9. Claimant researcher Maurice Alemann estimates the area to be 22,000 acres, but he treats it entirely as scrip land: Alemann, 'Muriwhenua Land Tenure', claim Wai 45 record of documents, doc M4, p 1. The legally questionable nature of these scrip exchanges derives from Commissioner Godfrey's failure to investigate the claims upon which the Crown later based its title to Mangonui scrip land.

Oliver's analysis of the tangible outcomes of Crown actions in Muriwhenua may well be applicable to other areas within the Auckland district. In Muriwhenua, Oliver found that the pre-1865 pattern of major Crown land transfers out of Maori ownership and control continued throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By 1908, when the Stout–Ngata commission reported on the extent of remaining Maori land, all except 18 percent of the land in the area was owned by non-Maori, and Maori controlled only about 9 percent of the entire area. In Oliver's account, twentieth century landlessness was a logical consequence of the pattern of alienation established before 1865.<sup>10</sup>

At a time when Muriwhenua Maori controlled about 9 percent of the available land, they constituted, according to the 1906 census, 42 percent of the population of Mangonui county.<sup>11</sup> Using both Stout–Ngata and 1906 census data, Oliver's analysis can be extended to both the Bay of Islands and Kaipara. In the Bay of Islands county (including Kaikohe and Motatau), 2571 Maori retained ownership of 228,737 acres.<sup>12</sup> Thus, the Bay of Islands' Maori land ownership of 88.9 acres per capita exceeded the comparable Muriwhenua figure of 53.4 acres. In the counties of Rodney, Otamatea, and Hobson around the Kaipara Harbour (considerably larger than the area in which I examined Crown purchases) 1421 Maori retained ownership of 118,470 acres in 1906–08, or 83.3 acres per capita.<sup>13</sup>

Oliver also contended that in 1865 Maori retained the least productive land in Muriwhenua. He noted that, after 1865, Crown purchase agents continued to urge Maori to sell them their best land; 'a quarter of the bullock', not 'the head and the hoofs'. This marginal Maori land, the Crown contended, would increase in value in proportion to its proximity to Pakeha settlement. Oliver rejected the logic of this. He argued that 'The idea that Maori would share in a flourishing agrarian economy could have no reality unless they retained the essential land base.'<sup>14</sup> Clearly, sufficient productive land accessible to transport and commercial centres was needed as an essential land base.

---

10. Oliver, 'The Crown and Muriwhenua Lands', claim Wai 45 record of documents, doc L7, pp 2–3. The Crown vested almost half the Maori land in Mangonui County in the Tokerau Land Board, which usually leased it without the consent of owners.

11. Table II (Maori population); table XVI (non-Maori population), *Census of New Zealand*, 1906

12. Stout–Ngata commission report, AJHR, 1908, G-1J, p 7

13. AJHR, 1908, G-1G, p 1

14. *Ibid*, pp 25–27

Oliver believed that the Crown could have ensured that Maori retained this essential base by implementing its well-known reserve policy. In Muriwhenua, however, the Crown reserved only about one percent of the entire area (or about 4 percent of the Crown-purchased area) for Maori before 1865. Oliver found that the pattern of inadequate reserves prior to 1865 continued after that date when the Crown charged the Native Land Court with responsibility for protecting Maori land.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, he concluded that the Crown could have protected Maori land, but chose not to. Oliver argued that the Crown could have halted purchases ‘well before a state of near landlessness’ afflicted Maori. It could have provided adequate reserves, and it could have reserved surplus land.<sup>16</sup>

Charles Heaphy, as Commissioner of Native Reserves, alerted the Crown to each of these options as early as 1871. He reported that both Te Rarawa and Ngati Whatua were ‘in danger of becoming paupers’. He calculated that Te Rarawa (in which he probably included all Muriwhenua iwi) had only 19 acres reserved per person. He therefore recommended a moratorium on Crown purchases from both Te Rarawa and Ngati Whatua. He further recommended that the Crown reserve surplus land in the Hokianga/Bay of Islands area for Maori purposes.<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, the Crown adopted none of these recommendations.

## **5.5 SOUTH AUCKLAND COMPARISON**

At the opposite end of the Auckland district from Muriwhenua, south Auckland stands as another area worthy of comparison. The 1993 Husbands–Riddell report commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal defined this area as extending from Otahuhu south to a line between the Waikato River mouth and Miranda (on the Firth of Thames).<sup>18</sup> South Auckland differs from other areas within the district in that it experienced both pre-emption waiver claims and confiscations, in addition to the more typical old land claims and Crown purchases. Generally, the pattern of Crown land transfers in south Auckland is a more complex one than that of other areas, with the possible exception of Waitemata–Auckland.

---

15. *Ibid*, pp 31–33

16. *Ibid*, p 34

17. ‘Report from the Commissioner of Native Reserves’, 19 July 1871, AJHR, 1871, F-4, p 5

18. Paul Husbands and Kate Riddell, *The Alienation of South Auckland Lands*, Waitangi Tribunal Research Series, 1993, no 9, p 1. The Auckland district boundary falls 5–10 miles north of this line, roughly at the Bombay Hills.

Our south Auckland schedules indicate that the Crown granted 10,786 acres to pre-Treaty old land claimants, and acquired 23,963 acres of surplus land in the process.<sup>19</sup> According to Husbands–Riddell, the Crown granted an additional 2140 acres to pre-emption waiver claimants. It probably acquired an additional 5000 acres of surplus land in the process.<sup>20</sup> Husbands–Riddell point out the difficulty of quantifying south Auckland Crown purchases because only about 13 percent of the published deeds are accompanied by plans. None the less, using a digital scan of old land claim/Crown purchase maps, they calculated that by the end of 1865 the Crown had presided over the alienation of approximately 58 percent of south Auckland.<sup>21</sup> Coincidentally, this is the same percentage alienated in Kaipara during the same period.

Of this 58 percent of land that was alienated, the Crown confiscated almost half during early 1865. Although the Crown confiscated 135,907 acres, this included 40,031 already purchased by the Crown. Therefore, I have taken 95,878 acres as the effective confiscated acreage.<sup>22</sup> While the Crown reserved about 4 percent of the total area prior to 1865, it then confiscated about 7000 acres of the Pukekohe and Pukaki native reserves. This left less than 3 percent of the total area as reserved land.<sup>23</sup> According to Husbands–Riddell, the remaining 40 percent of the area which was unreserved Maori land ‘lay in the infertile and inaccessible Hunua and Wairoa ranges’. They concluded that the extent of alienation meant that the Crown failed in its obligations ‘to ensure that South Auckland Maori were left with “a sufficient endowment for their foreseen needs”’.<sup>24</sup>

## 5.6 AUCKLAND DISTRICT AGGREGATE DATA

The limitations of survey information in south Auckland highlights the difficulty of estimating accurately the extent of grants, scrip/surplus land, and Crown purchases for the district as a whole. The best available old land claim data for the Auckland district can be tabulated as follows:

--	--	--	--

19. Ibid, pp 9–10. Husbands’ and Riddell’s surplus land estimate of 71,512 acres of appears too high. It apparently included parts of the extensive Fairburn/Tamaki claim that were later Crown purchased. I have relied upon the conservative Surplus Land Commission estimate of 21,500 acres of ‘nominal surplus’ in the Fairburn claim area: summary, MA 91/23 (590), p 1.
20. Ibid, pp 34–35. Again, Husbands and Riddell appear to have overestimated the amount of surplus land arising from these claims. They calculated that the Crown acquired between 15,000 and 17,000 acres of surplus land from pre-emption waiver claims.
21. Ibid, pp 16–17
22. Ibid, pp 17, 44
23. Ibid, pp 14, 47
24. Ibid, pp 38–39

*Pre-1865 Comparative Data*

	Grants	Scrip (£)	Surplus
Pre-Treaty	363,584	101,206	133,372
Pre-emption waiver	28,381	7917	31,468
Total	391,965	109,123	164,840

These figures depend largely upon Bell and the Surplus Land Commission corrections of his data. They can be relied upon with regard to grant acreage, which is invariably supported by relatively accurate survey and title information. Unfortunately, their data is less reliable when it comes to scrip/surplus acreage. None the less, by comparing the above aggregate data with area data, we can see how the proportions differ.

Area	Grants	Scrip (£)	Surplus
Muriwhenua	27,955	12,887	27,456
Bay of Islands	59,328	8700	31,317
Kaipara	26,742	3088	7134
South Auckland*	10,786	549	23,963
Total	124,811	25,224	89,870
Percentage of district total	34.3	24.9	58.0

\* South Auckland surplus figures do not include pre-emption claims

This data suggests that the four areas investigated in this chapter are not too atypical of the district as a whole. The most atypical feature of the above figures is the percentage of surplus land. This is mainly due to the 21,500 acres of 'nominal surplus' contained within the Fairburn Tamaki (south Auckland) claim.

## Auckland

The district-wide picture of Crown purchases appears quite similar to old land claims. Just as with old land claim data, acreage and price information is incomplete. The best Crown purchase estimates I have arrived at are as follows:

Area	Acreage	Price (£)	Price per acre
Muriwhenua	215,187	8097	9.03d
Whangaroa	25,800	1908	1s 5.75d
Hokianga	14,584	2250	3s 1.02d
Bay of Islands	70,597	8839	2s 6.04d
Whangarei	266,527	17,649	1s 3.89d
Kaipara	372,103	22,197	1s 2.32d
Mahurangi/Kumeu	188,195	11,950	1s 3.23d
Waitemata/Auckland	28,299	481	4.08d
South Auckland	416,386	16,051	9.23d
Hauraki Gulf	45,556	1,360	7.16d
Total	1,643,234	90,746	1s 1.25d

The most atypical features of the above data are the variations in price per acre, particularly in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga. In case of the Bay of Islands, little weight can be placed upon this figure because acreage information isn't available for almost 30 percent of pre-1865 Crown purchases there.<sup>25</sup>

When the incomplete Crown purchase acreage figure is added to old land claim figures for the district, it appears that the Crown presided over the transfer of 2.3 million acres out of an estimated total land area of 4.3 million acres.<sup>26</sup> If these figures can be relied upon as relatively accurate estimates, the Crown transferred about 53 percent of the total land area out of Maori hands before the end of 1865.

---

25. In the case of Hokianga, the very low acreage figure makes the price per acre deviation from the Auckland district average less significant.

26. This estimate of the total area of the Auckland district is based on a digital scan, which calculated that the district contains 17,554 square kilometres or 4,335,838 acres.

### *Pre-1865 Comparative Data*

When we consider that the total land transfer proportions varied between 45 percent in the Bay of Islands and 58 percent in Kaipara and south Auckland, these areas appear to be more typical than atypical.

Finally, the incomplete Auckland district aggregate data can be compared with even more incomplete data from other districts, to give some indication of how typical the areas under investigation are in the broader national context. In comparing Auckland district old land claims with other districts it soon becomes evident that they are quite atypical in their extent. Auckland district old land claims based on pre-Treaty transactions apparently account for 82 percent of the national grant, and 95 percent of the national surplus, acreage. In grants/surplus resulting from pre-emption claims, Auckland's atypicality is even greater. All the grants and 97 percent of the surplus resulting from Crown actions upon such claims occurred within the Auckland district. This atypicality also characterises the pre-emption waiver grants/surplus within the Auckland district. They all occurred in either the Waitemata/Auckland or south Auckland areas. Hauraki was the only other district affected by surplus land arising from this class of claims.

This Auckland atypicality, however, is partly the result of Bell and the Surplus Land Commission's decisions to limit the scope of their respective investigations. Both Bell and the Surplus Land Commission considered the extensive New Zealand Company claims based on pre-Treaty transactions in Taranaki, Wanganui, Wellington, and the northern South Island. Since we have depended upon Bell and the Surplus Land Commission for most of our old land claim data, our schedules show very insignificant grant and no surplus acreage in these areas. At the same time we know that the New Zealand Company changed the land history of all these districts, particularly in laying the foundations of subsequent Crown purchases. The fact that they do not feature prominently in the quantitative data, and that they thereby increase the statistical atypicality of Auckland, is therefore somewhat misleading.

This picture of Auckland atypicality appears to be less pronounced when Crown-purchased acreage is added to transfers resulting from old land claims. When the percentage of all land transferred is compared for each district, we are again confronted with serious problems regarding the incomplete nature of the data. For example, in Wairarapa, which experienced the largest number of pre-1865 Crown purchase transactions in any single area, only about 10 percent of 150 deeds or receipts are accompanied by survey plans. In this case, we have had to estimate from an 1870 Crown purchase map that 85 percent of the area passed out of Maori ownership by the end of 1865. Of course, 99 percent of the southern South Island (the area investigated by the Ngai Tahu Tribunal) had passed out of Maori hands by 1865. At the other end of the scale, it appears that less than one percent of the volcanic plateau district changed hands before 1865. According to this very sketchy

*Auckland*

total transfer comparison, Auckland looks less atypical than it does when compared with other districts solely on the basis of old land claims.

