

CHAPTER 11

THE McCLEVERTY RESERVES AND WELLINGTON MAORI

11.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed the way in which Lieutenant-Colonel William McCleverty dealt with the question of Maori cultivations on sections claimed by settlers. McCleverty assigned land to Wellington Maori in ‘exchange’ for their cultivations, but the Tribunal has found that no genuine exchange took place, because the land assigned to Maori by McCleverty belonged to them already. The McCleverty arrangements were followed by the 1848 Crown grant to the New Zealand Company, which awarded the company the whole of the Port Nicholson block, with the exception of public and Maori reserves. As a result, Maori were left with only their reserves to support them. These reserves were now of two types: the tenths reserves and those awarded by McCleverty. The remaining tenths reserves were held in trust for Maori, and were administered on their behalf by the Government. The reserves awarded by McCleverty were assigned to the Maori of particular pa, and were largely managed by those Maori themselves. The administration and alienation of both types of reserve are discussed in later chapters of this report.

This chapter is concerned with the question of whether or not the land reserved by McCleverty was sufficient for the needs of Wellington Maori. It looks at the land assigned by McCleverty to the Maori of each pa and assesses the adequacy of this land in relation to the long-term requirements of these communities. It also discusses trends in Maori agriculture, economic position, population, and health, as well as the shift of the Maori population to the Hutt Valley and the departure of many Maori from the Wellington district altogether. Finally, the chapter examines the claim that the McCleverty arrangements led to a decline in Maori agriculture and population in Wellington.

11.2 THE LAND RESERVED BY McCLEVERTY

Governor Grey evidently intended that Maori should live on and cultivate the land assigned to them by McCleverty, and that these reserves would be a permanent land base for Maori in Wellington. In his instructions to McCleverty in 1846, discussed in the previous chapter (see s10.5), Grey explained that his aim was to provide Maori with lands ‘of such extent and

quality as to render them good and obedient citizens, by giving them a valuable and permanent interest in the prosperity of the country'. Grey added that every exchange should be advantageous to Maori in order to secure their comfort and 'their attachment to the form of Government under which they live'. Maori were to be placed in possession of 'lands adapted to their wants', and Grey urged McCleverty to ensure that both existing cultivations not on settler-claimed sections and adequate land for future cultivation should be included in the land to be assigned to them.¹ McCleverty believed that he would be carrying out Grey's instructions by attempting to ensure that the land which he assigned to Maori could be used for cultivation or other purposes, and by guaranteeing them their pa sites.

The Wellington Tenth's Trust's statement of claim alleges that 'The Crown granted land to Maori following the McCleverty awards which was generally situated far from pa and far from the commercial centre of the township'.² Claimant counsel's closing submissions strongly suggest that the land reserved for Maori by McCleverty was inadequate in both quantity and quality and that, as a result, Maori agriculture and population at Port Nicholson suffered serious declines after 1847.³ Ngati Tama claimants have also argued that the land assigned by McCleverty to Ngati Tama was inadequate, although they acknowledge that Ngati Tama fared better than some other Wellington Maori.⁴ In response, the Crown contends that Maori would not have agreed to the McCleverty arrangements if they had not seen them as being in their favour, and that McCleverty compensated for the remoteness of much of the land which he assigned to Maori by reserving areas of land which were much larger than the areas already under Maori cultivation.⁵

The question of whether or not the McCleverty arrangements contributed to a decline in Maori agriculture and population is addressed at section 11.4, but this section outlines the land reserved by McCleverty and attempts to assess its adequacy for Maori needs. The urban and rural McCleverty reserves are shown in maps 9 and 10.

11.2.1 The McCleverty deeds

The first deed signed by McCleverty and Wellington Maori was that signed at Te Aro Pa on 22 March 1847. It assigned Te Aro Maori land in town and in the town belt, together with land some distance from the town, on the Ohariu and Porirua Roads. It also guaranteed their pa. In addition, a second deed, signed on 7 October 1847, assigned half of Ohiro section 26 to Te Aro Maori. This supplementary deed followed complaints by Maori at Te Aro that they lacked suitable land for kumara cultivation. In total, Te Aro Maori received 579 acres.⁶

1. Grey's instructions to McCleverty, 14 September 1846, BPP, vol 5, p 611

2. Claim 1.2(d), para 12.15

3. Document 03, pp 238–250, 253–255

4. Document H39, pp 21–24; doc N4, pp 30–31

5. Document P1, p 82

6. Document 18, pp 104–131; Te Aro deeds and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:1–3:5, 3:7, 3:11–3:12

The Waiwhetu deed, signed on 30 August 1847, reserved for Waiwhetu Maori their pa and two areas of land in Lower Hutt, one reasonably close to their pa and the other more distant. They also shared Lower Hutt section 20 with Petone Maori, but it is not clear how this section was allocated between the two groups. Much of the land they received was good quality, and it had good road and river access. Exclusive of Hutt section 20, Waiwhetu Maori received a total of 250 acres.⁷

The Kumutoto deed was signed on 23 September 1847. It guaranteed Kumutoto Maori an urban tenth reserve containing their pa site, plus an area of land which they were cultivating in the town belt, on the present-day site of the Wellington Botanical Gardens, giving them a total of 54 acres.⁸

The Ngauranga deed, signed on 4 October 1847, assigned Ngauranga Maori a section and several adjoining part-sections on the western side of the harbour. This land, totalling 222 acres, included their pa and cultivations.⁹

Petone Maori signed their deed on 13 October 1847 and were assigned a total of 6926 acres. They were assigned harbour sections in the Hutt (including their pa site), together with a large area of land just to the north of the harbour sections, as well as two sections in Lower Hutt some distance away from their pa. McCleverty also reserved for them the large Parangarau block in the southeast of the Port Nicholson district, which was far away from their pa but which, according to McCleverty, contained 'extensive cultivations', eel ponds, and fishing stations.¹⁰

The deed for Ohariu, signed on 18 October 1847, reserved for Ohariu Maori a large area of land around their pa, another area somewhat further away but still within the Ohariu district, and a section of the Kaiwharawhara block closer to the town. It included the site of their pa and land already under cultivation, and covered some 2282 acres.¹¹

Signed on 1 November 1847, the Pipitea deed reserved a number of town sections (including the Pipitea Pa site) and an area of the town belt which Pipitea Maori were already cultivating. Further out of town, McCleverty reserved part of the Kaiwharawhara block and two sections on the Porirua Road for Pipitea Maori. They were also assigned the large Orongorongo block in the south-east, around Turakirae Head, much of which was outside the Port Nicholson deed of purchase boundary. This block was very remote from Pipitea Pa and contained little land suitable for cultivation. The total area reserved for Pipitea Maori was 7436 acres.¹²

The land reserved by McCleverty for Kaiwharawhara Maori was recorded on an undated memorandum attached to a plan of the reserves. They were guaranteed their pa at

7. Document 18, pp 132–139; Waiwhetu deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:6–3:8

8. Document 18, pp 98–103; Kumutoto deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:28–3:29

9. Document 18, pp 139–145; Ngauranga deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:8–3:10

10. Document 18, pp 145–164; McCleverty's final report, 20 November 1847, CO208 (doc C1(c), pp 265–266); Petone deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:12–3:16

11. Document 18, pp 165–180; Ohariu deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:16–3:18, 3:21

12. Document 18, pp 189–207; Pipitea deed and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:19–3:22, 3:24

Kaiwharawhara and Pakuao, together with an area of land near the Kaiwharawhara pa and a share in the Kaiwharawhara block. In all, they were assigned 451 acres.¹³

In addition, McCleverty reserved land for the Maori communities on the south-west coast, although Maori at these pa did not have cultivations on settler sections, so the reserves in this area were not considered to be 'exchanges', as the other McCleverty reserves were. The 1848 Crown grant excluded 20,600 acres on the south-west coast pending the reservation of pa and cultivation land for the Maori communities there. McCleverty visited these settlements in June and July 1848, reserving 400 acres at Waiariki, 20 acres at Oterongo, and 350 acres at Ohaua/Te Ika a Maru.¹⁴ There is little information available about the quality of this land.

11.2.2 Adequacy of McCleverty reserves

All the Maori communities which participated in the McCleverty arrangements had their pa sites reserved for them, and most were assigned some land which they were already cultivating. Otherwise, the amount and quality of the land they were assigned varied widely. The two tables on the facing page set out, in both absolute and per capita terms, the amount of land reserved by McCleverty for different pa. There are two reports on the record of this inquiry which attempt to estimate how much of the land reserved by McCleverty was cultivatable. These reports, one a Crown report by Armstrong and Stirling and the other an essay by a J Pyatt which was originally submitted for a university course, base their estimates on surveyors' reports and McCleverty's own comments. The figures for cultivatable acres in these two reports differ, but in most cases not markedly. The main differences are in their assessments of those awards which included large blocks of unsurveyed land, where estimates of the amount of cultivatable land are pure speculation. Even for the other McCleverty reserves, about which there is more information, any attempt to assess the amount of cultivatable land must be very speculative.

The amount, quality, and location of the land received by different pa varied enormously. At one end of the scale, Petone Maori were assigned a comparatively large area of land close to their pa, together with a very large block which, although it was far away from their pa, contained cultivations, eel weirs, and fishing stations. They were assigned more than 50 acres per person, and, even if only cultivatable land is counted, they probably received something in the order of 10 acres per person. At the other end of the scale, Maori at the most populous pa in the Port Nicholson district, Te Aro, were assigned somewhat more than three acres per head, of which the cultivatable land came to less than two acres per head, a pitiful amount. It is little wonder, then, that Kemp found in 1850 that Petone Maori 'in point of comfort and

13. Document 18, pp 181–188; Kaiwharawhara memorandum and plans in doc A10(a), pp 3:23–3:24

14. Document 17, p 44

Land reserved by McCleverty for pa in the Port Nicholson block

Pa	Population*	Granted (acres)	Cultivable (acres)	
			Armstrong and Stirling [†]	Pyatt [‡]
Te Aro	172	579	320	301
Waiwhetu	60	250 [§]	212	183
Kumutoto	23	54	52	52
Ngauranga	68	222	176	166
Petone	134	6926	1000+	3837
Ohariu	160 [¶]	2282	665	965
Pipitea	116	7436	1000+	381
Kaiwharawhara	60	451	227	324
Waiariki	44	400	N/A	N/A
Oterongo	20 ^{**}	20	N/A	N/A
Ohaua/Te Ika a Maru	30 ^{**}	350	N/A	N/A
Total	887	18,970	3652+	6209+

* Except where indicated, population figures are from McCleverty's 'Report on Port Nicholson Cultivations', enclosed with Governor Grey to Earl Grey, 21 April 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], p 39. Other sources of information on population are given at section 11.3.2.

† Armstrong and Stirling (doc c1), p 282

‡ Pyatt (doc A18), p 31

§ Not including Waiwhetu's share of Hutt section 20.

¶ Population figure estimated by averaging Kemp's 1850 figure of 119 and Spain's 1844 figure of 200. Kemp noted that, by the time of his visit to Ohariu, a number of people had left for Taranaki with Wiremu Kingi in 1848 and the pa had suffered high mortality from disease.

|| Kemp's 1850 figure; only 20 residents were recorded in Spain's report in 1844.

** Population figures from Spain's 1844 report.

N/A Not available

Land reserved by McCleverty, per person

Pa	Acres granted per person	Cultivable acres per person	
		Armstrong and Stirling	Pyatt
Te Aro	3.4	1.9	1.7
Waiwhetu	4.2	3.5	3.0
Kumutoto	2.3	2.3	2.3
Ngauranga	3.3	2.6	2.4
Petone	51.7	7.5+	28.6
Ohariu	14.3	4.2	6.0
Pipitea	64.1	8.6+	3.3
Kaiwharawhara	7.5	3.8	5.4
Waiariki	9.1	N/A	N/A
Oterongo	1.0	N/A	N/A
Ohaua/Te Ika a Maru	11.7	N/A	N/A

wealth are better off than any of the Port Nicholson Natives', while Te Aro Maori would struggle over the following decades just to sustain their community.¹⁵ In 1847, Te Aro Maori told McCleverty that none of the land assigned to them was suitable for planting kumara. As a result, McCleverty reserved an additional 50 acres of Ohiro section 26 for them. However, surveyor Fitzgerald described this section as 'unfit for the purposes of agriculture', it being almost devoid of soil. It was thus clear from the outset that Te Aro Maori had insufficient cultivation land. By the late 1870s, commissioner of native reserves Charles Heaphy found that Te Aro Maori had 'not much land fit for cultivation', and he consequently arranged for £96 to be distributed among the heads of families there.¹⁶ Other pa were better able to meet their immediate subsistence needs, and may even have been able to continue engaging in commercial agriculture for a time, but overall the McCleverty awards did not provide well for the future needs of Maori.

In his first report to Grey, McCleverty estimated that, in order to compensate Maori for the 580 acres they were cultivating on settler-claimed sections, they would need to receive 'at the very least' twice as much land in exchange – that is, 1200 acres or, very roughly, two acres per person for the 633 Maori living around the harbour. The reports by Armstrong and Stirling and Pyatt both use this figure of two acres per person as a benchmark for assessing the adequacy of McCleverty's provision for Maori.¹⁷ However, McCleverty made no claims to having assessed either the current or the future needs of Maori; he was simply trying to estimate how much land he would need to find in order to make a one-for-one exchange of cultivatable land for land already under cultivation on settler-claimed sections. His figure of 1200 acres was based on the assumption that, even if all the land in a particular section were good, in many cases Maori would be able to cultivate only half of it owing to their methods of cultivation. Moreover, earlier in the same report he wrote that, assuming that 1800 acres of tenths reserve land were suitable for cultivation (that is, very roughly three acres per person), 'this quantity is insufficient for the wants of those in the immediate neighbourhood of Wellington', as well as those in the more distant settlements.¹⁸ The figure of two acres per person is, therefore, quite meaningless as a benchmark for either the short-term or the long-term needs of Wellington Maori.

The Ngai Tahu Tribunal heard evidence on the adequacy of reserves and discussed the question in its report. It found that the reserves set aside for Ngai Tahu, which amounted to an average of 12.5 acres per person, were 'so grossly insufficient as to be no more than

15. HT Kemp, 'Report on Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), p 595)

16. Document 18, pp 129–130; Fitzgerald to superintendent, Wellington, 24 December 1845, 1A1/1847/1557 (doc C1(b), p 349); 'Report of the Commissioner of Native Reserves', 1 July 1879, AJHR, 1879, G-7 (doc A24, p 128)

17. Document A18, pp 18–19; doc C1, p 273

18. WA McCleverty, 'Report on Port Nicholson Cultivations', enclosed with dispatch from Governor Grey to Earl Grey, 21 April 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], p 40

nominal in character'.¹⁹ At best, these reserves were sufficient for bare subsistence, but the Crown had an obligation to provide more than this bare minimum. The Ngai Tahu Tribunal found that, had the Crown fulfilled its Treaty obligations:

it would have ensured that, in addition to their kainga and cultivations, Ngai Tahu were left with very substantial areas of good quality land on which to develop side by side, and on at least an equal basis, with new settlers in agricultural, pastoral or dairy farming. In addition, appropriate areas of considerable dimension would have been reserved to provide access to traditional resources, some of which might as development occurred be adapted to conventional farming. In short, generous provision in keeping with the spirit of the Treaty was called for.²⁰

We consider it appropriate to adopt this standard for Maori in the Port Nicholson district, and in fact it is strikingly similar to the standard which McCleverty set himself. In his final report, McCleverty remarked that he had endeavoured to reserve sufficient land for the future wants of Maori 'as to Cultivations, fishing stations, facilities for obtaining firewood and their future attention to cattle', noting that it was desirable that Maori should begin to graze cattle on their land.²¹ Despite his efforts to provide sufficient land for these various purposes, however, it is quite clear that McCleverty's provision for most of the Wellington pa was even more inadequate than the provision of reserves for Ngai Tahu.

In the case of Port Nicholson, where access to the economic opportunities provided by the growing town of Wellington was important to Maori, and where urban land would outstrip rural land in value, it was also particularly important that Maori be assigned land in or near the town. In this respect, too, the Maori of some pa fared better than others. All the principal urban pa sites were reserved, while Te Aro and Pipitea Maori were assigned an additional 31 and 11 urban tenths respectively, and Te Aro, Kumutoto, and Pipitea Maori were granted portions of the town belt. Other rural sections (in the lower Hutt Valley and in the harbour district, for example) were quite accessible to the town. Nevertheless, McCleverty's provision of reserves in and around the town was far from generous, especially in light of the Tribunal's finding in chapter 6 that the entire town belt had been taken by the Crown without Maori consent and without any payment being made to Maori.

19. Waitangi Tribunal, *The Ngai Tahu Report 1991*, 3 vols (Wellington: Booker and Friend Ltd, 1991), vol 3, p 828. It is also worth noting that, under the South Island Landless Natives Act 1906, Maori were classified as 'landless' if they had less than 50 acres per adult or 20 acres per child. This Act, which made provision for the allocation of land to such landless South Island Maori in order to increase their holdings to 50 acres (for adults) or 20 acres (for children), was described as a 'cruel hoax' by the Ngai Tahu Tribunal owing to the poor and remote nature of most of the land allocated. Most of the land reserved for Wellington Maori by McCleverty was similarly poor, yet only a few Wellington pa received anywhere near 50 acres per adult. As for the South Island Landless Natives Act, see *The Ngai Tahu Report 1991*, vol 3, ch 20.

20. Waitangi Tribunal, *The Ngai Tahu Report 1991*, vol 2, p 639

21. W A McCleverty, final report, 20 November 1847, CO208 (doc C1(c), pp 268–269)

If viewed as an exchange, the McCleverty arrangements might appear generous, with Maori giving up 467 acres of cultivations in exchange for more than 18,000 acres. However, the Tribunal has found that no such 'exchange' took place, since McCleverty assigned to Maori land which already belonged to them. Moreover, the land assigned to Maori by McCleverty had to meet not only their immediate cultivation needs but also their other requirements in both the short and the long term. To meet their cultivation needs alone, they required several times the amount of land they already had under cultivation, in order to take account of the fact that much land could not be used owing to its poor quality or unsuitability for Maori methods of cultivation and the fact that Maori shifted their cultivations every few years when the fertility of the soil was exhausted. Crown officials were well aware of Maori methods of agriculture and should have taken greater account of such requirements. Maori also needed large areas of land (including forest and foreshore) for such uses as hunting, fishing, and collecting shellfish, and gathering food, firewood, and traditional medicines. In addition, if Maori were to develop on an equal basis with Pakeha settlers, it was essential that they retained very large tracts of land on which they could raise sheep or cattle, so that they were not left behind as pastoralism became the mainstay of the economy.

Wellington Maori, a population of around 900, were assigned some 19,000 acres by McCleverty (this figure includes the south-west coast reserves, which were not viewed as 'exchanges'). They were thus left with about 21 acres per person, and much of this land was of little value for their present or future needs. Three-quarters of the land assigned by McCleverty was in four large blocks of unsurveyed land, which McCleverty himself admitted were mostly unsuitable for cultivation and which were in any case assigned to only three pa. While these blocks could be used for other purposes and could potentially have allowed some Maori to take up pastoralism, this does not make up for the insufficiency of land for cultivation. If Maori were to be assured of a future in Wellington, they needed sufficient land for their present and future cultivation needs (taking into account their methods of cultivation), plus land for gathering food and other resources and enough land to allow them to move into pastoralism, dairy farming, or other land-use activities in due course. Instead, most Wellington Maori were awarded only enough land to meet their short-term subsistence needs, and in at least one case probably not even enough land for that purpose. They also needed land in and around the town of Wellington, so that they could benefit from the economic opportunities which the town provided. Some land near their pa, and accessible to the town, was assigned to Wellington Maori. However, by far the largest area of land reserved for them was in two large, rugged, and relatively barren blocks, located very far away from the town and assigned to only two pa. In summary, then, the reserves set aside for the present and reasonable future needs of Wellington Maori by McCleverty were grossly inadequate. The Crown's failure to ensure adequate reserves for Wellington Maori is particularly egregious in light of the Tribunal's finding in chapter 10 that Maori had neither willingly surrendered nor been paid for over 120,000 acres in Port Nicholson which was awarded to the New

Zealand Company in the 1848 Crown grant. Moreover, of the extensive area of Maori land which was granted to the company gratuitously and in breach of the Treaty, only a very few acres were subsequently sold by the company. This land should have remained in Maori ownership.

11.2.3 Tribunal finding

The Tribunal finds that the Crown neglected to protect the rights of Maori living in the Port Nicholson district who were parties to the McCleverty deeds by failing to set aside reserves which left them with an adequate land base for both their short- and their long-term cultivation and resource-gathering needs, and which made adequate provision for Maori to develop on an equal footing with Pakeha (particularly by taking up pastoralism or other farming and land-use activities), and that such Maori were seriously prejudiced thereby.

11.3 MAORI IN WELLINGTON AFTER 1847

In the early years of Pakeha settlement in the Wellington area, Maori proved willing and able to adapt to the changed circumstances and to profit from the new opportunities provided by the settlers' presence. Within less than a decade, however, they had become marginal to the Pakeha economy and to the social life of the growing town of Wellington. Maori population had shifted towards the Hutt Valley, and many Maori had left the Wellington region altogether, returning to their ancestral lands in Taranaki. This section describes these developments, while the next section assesses the impact of the McCleverty arrangements on Maori society in Wellington.

11.3.1 The Maori economy

Wellington Maori took to cash-cropping with enthusiasm, and in the early years of the Port Nicholson settlement they came to dominate the markets for potatoes and wheat. They also competed successfully with Pakeha farmers in the market for pigs, although their investment in other livestock was far lower than that of Pakeha.²² Maori were able to undersell their Pakeha competitors because their production costs were lower: they had no rental or land purchase costs, their labour costs were low because they worked collectively for the hapu, and they did not have to purchase food, clothing, or shelter, which could (at least for a time) be provided from traditional sources.²³ In the long run, however, these advantages were not

22. MK Watson and BR Patterson, 'The Growth and Subordination of the Maori Economy in the Wellington Region of New Zealand, 1840–52', *Pacific Viewpoint*, vol 26, no 3, 1985, pp 525, 533–534

23. Ibid, p 534; W A McCleverty, 'Report on Port Nicholson Cultivations', enclosed with dispatch from Governor Grey to Earl Grey, 21 April 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], p 40

sufficient to prevent a serious downturn in the fortunes of Maori agriculture, the reasons for which are explored below. In 1847, Maori in the Wellington region outproduced the much larger Pakeha population in wheat and potatoes, but thereafter Maori production declined, while Pakeha production increased for most crops.²⁴ McCleverty reported in 1847 that Maori were cultivating 872 acres in the Port Nicholson area (including Ohariu/Makara), but in 1850 the Native Secretary H Tacy Kemp recorded only 169 acres of Maori cultivations in the same area, a drop of 80.6 per cent. If the west coast settlements are excluded (because McCleverty provides no population figures for this area), this represents a decline from roughly one acre of cultivation per head of population in 1847 to less than a quarter of an acre per head only three years later.²⁵

As their ability to compete in the agricultural produce market decreased, Wellington Maori became more reliant upon casual wage labour to supplement their income from trading. Maori labour had been in demand since the early 1840s, partly because Maori workers were paid less than their Pakeha counterparts, but also because of their skills and capacity for hard work. Maori were employed building houses, constructing roads, clearing bush, building fences, and acting as guides, drovers, porters, and ferrymen.²⁶ Maori were extensively employed on the construction of the Porirua and Wairarapa military roads in the late 1840s, and the superintendents of those road works commented very favourably on the work of the Maori labourers.²⁷ Maori worked hard in order to earn money to buy Pakeha goods: in 1847, Maori road workers were reported to be spending their wages on flour, European clothing, agricultural implements, mills, and cooking utensils and, occasionally, on buying breeding cows and mares.²⁸ The introduction of wage labour into the Maori economy did not, however, break down the communal basis of Maori society, since hapu members still worked together in order to save money for the group. In 1849, it was reported that a group of Ngati Raukawa working on the Wairarapa road had deferred their wages in order to save money to buy a flour mill and that their example had been followed by ‘many others, especially the late followers of Rangihaeata’.²⁹

Kemp found in his 1850 survey of Maori settlements in the Port Nicholson district that Wellington Maori had acquired some horses and cattle, mills, weatherboard houses, and

24. Watson and Patterson, p 533

25. W A McCleverty, ‘Report on Port Nicholson Cultivations’, enclosed with dispatch from Governor Grey to Earl Grey, 21 April 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], pp 39–40; H T Kemp, ‘Statistical Table for Port Nicholson District’, 15 June 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), p 605). Researcher Steve Quinn suggests that McCleverty may have underestimated the amount of land in cultivation, in which case the drop in cultivation area may have been even greater: doc 18, pp 50–51. However, Crown counsel has also suggested that Kemp’s figures for the area under cultivation are too low and that he probably recorded only the area cultivated on reserves, not the total area cultivated by Maori: doc P3, pp 41–42.

26. Watson and Patterson, p 527

27. See the reports of A Hamilton Russell and T H Fitzgerald (superintendent, military roads, and surveyor respectively), 1 January 1848, 18 April 1849, 1 May 1849, *New Munster Gazette*, 1848, 1849 (doc N3(b), pp 287–288, 304–305)

28. Russell to Grey, 24 June 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], p 5

29. Report by Fitzgerald, 1 May 1849 (doc N3(b), p 305)

carts, and that they were 'anxious to obtain' more of these items. Kemp reported Maori engaging in a variety of economic activities, including collecting mutton shell (paua) for export, fishing, raising pigs, selling firewood, starting to prepare flax for export, and working for Pakeha for daily wages. He did not mention Maori in the Port Nicholson district selling agricultural produce, however.³⁰ Thus, by 1850 Maori found themselves in an increasingly marginal economic position. With the collapse of the cash-cropping that had initially seemed to offer them the opportunity to benefit from their proximity to a major town, Maori were left to survive on a mixture of subsistence agriculture, wage labouring, small-scale trading, and, increasingly, renting or selling their reserve land.

11.3.2 Population

Population statistics for Maori in the nineteenth century are notoriously unreliable, not least because Maori were highly mobile, but it is clear that in the long run the Maori population in the Port Nicholson district declined dramatically. Edmund Halswell, the commissioner of native reserves, undertook a careful count of Maori in pa around the harbour in 1842 and gave a population figure of 541, but this excluded the south-west coast area.³¹ In 1844, Commissioner Spain estimated the population of the various pa in the Port Nicholson block at 922, with another 200 Maori listed as 'Rauparaha, Rangiaiaata and natives of the Hutt'.³² Kemp visited each pa in the Port Nicholson district and took a census of the population at each location, so his population figure of 745 in 1850 can perhaps be regarded as more accurate than most.³³ By 1857, Fenton recorded a population of 583, and while his exact figure is somewhat suspect, the apparent downward trend is consistent with the evidence of population decline presented below.³⁴ Moreover, census figures for the Maori population of the Wellington district in the latter decades of the nineteenth century make it clear that there had been a very substantial population decline since the 1840s. A Maori population of 161 was recorded in 1874, falling to 118 in 1878, and rising again to 136 in 1881.³⁵ The dramatic fall in the Maori population of Wellington following Pakeha settlement can be explained by a high rate of mortality from disease, a low ratio of children to adults, and a substantial outflow of Maori returning to their ancestral homelands in Taranaki.

30. H T Kemp, 'Report on Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, 'Statistical Table for Port Nicholson District', 15 June 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), pp 593-595, 605)

31. Halswell to Colonel Wakefield, 4 July 1842 (doc A29, p 494)

32. 'Schedule showing the Proportions of the £1,500 Actually Paid, and . . . Offered to be Paid . . . to the Different Tribes or Families in the Port Nicholson District', 11 April 1844, BPP, vol 5, p 31

33. H T Kemp, 'Report on Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, 'Statistical Table for Port Nicholson District', 15 June 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), pp 593, 605)

34. Watson and Patterson, p 540

35. 'Approximate Census of the Maori Population', AJHR, 1874, G-7, p 17; 'Census of the Maori Population, 1878', AJHR, 1878, G-2, p 25; 'Census of the Maori Population, 1881', AJHR, 1881, G-3, p 26

Maori in Wellington were hit hard by disease in the 1840s and 1850s. Epidemics of influenza and whooping cough took a heavy toll in 1848, and when Kemp visited pa in the Port Nicholson area at the end of the following year he found that there had been a high level of mortality at Ohariu and Pipitea. Kemp also reported that Maori at Te Aro, the most populous pa, were far from healthy, and in his general comments on the condition of Maori in the southern North Island he noted that their health was ‘retrograding, and this decline is especially visible in and near the European Towns’.³⁶ Wellington Hospital had many Maori patients in the first few years after it opened in 1847, and efforts were made to vaccinate Wellington Maori against smallpox, but it seems that European medicine could do little to arrest the decline in the Maori population.³⁷ The poor state of Maori health was no doubt related to their poor housing, for, although a few weatherboard houses had been built, Kemp described most Maori dwellings as decaying and dilapidated.³⁸ He also mentioned in his comments on Maori in the southern North Island that there were comparatively few births.³⁹ The low number of children was particularly apparent in the town of Wellington, where children under 15 made up 21.2 per cent of the total Maori population in 1847, falling to 16.2 per cent in 1850, and 9.5 per cent in 1857. These figures contrasted with those for Lower Hutt, where the Pakeha population was much smaller: in this area, 26.3 per cent of the Maori population were under 15 years of age in 1847, and by 1857 the figure had fallen only to 22.2 per cent.⁴⁰ While the exact figures are somewhat unreliable, the downward trend and the difference between the town and its rural hinterland in the Hutt are clear. The combined effects of mortality from disease and an insufficient number of surviving children must have contributed to the drop in the Maori population in the Port Nicholson district. As the Wellington-based Wesleyan missionary James Watkin lamented in 1848, ‘the leaves fall off the tree without being replaced’.⁴¹

The other main reason why the Maori population of the Wellington district decreased is that many Maori returned to Taranaki. Members of the migrant tribes had been going back and forth to Taranaki ever since they first arrived in Te Upoko o te Ika (see ch 2), and Pakeha commentators in the 1840s noted that the Taranaki tribes remained very attached to their ancestral land. Halswell reported as early as 1841 that the inhabitants of Te Aro were contemplating returning to Taranaki, and the following year he claimed that ‘The natives are all now

36. John Roberts, *The Wesleyan Maori Mission at Te Aro, 1839–1877*, ca 1991, p 12 (doc E8, p 426); H T Kemp, ‘Report on the Port Nicholson District’, 1 January 1850, and final report, 15 June 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), pp 594–595, 603)

37. Derek A Dow, *Maori Health and Government Policy, 1840–1940* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1999), pp 27–28, 30, 51

38. H T Kemp, ‘Report on the Port Nicholson District’, 1 January 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), pp 594–595)

39. H T Kemp, final report, 15 June 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), p 603)

40. Watson and Patterson, p 541. See also the comments of the *New Zealand Journal* in 1848 on the small number of children at Pipitea Pa (doc N3(c), p 592).

41. Watkin to Wesleyan Missionary Society, 22 February 1848 (quoted in Roberts, p 12) (doc E8, p 426)

talking of leaving this part of the country for Taranaki'.⁴² In 1847, McCleverty noted anxiously that Maori were threatening to migrate to Taranaki if they did not receive land 'in the immediate vicinity of Port Nicholson', a development which he feared would increase 'the difficulty attached to the Settlement of New Plymouth'.⁴³ That same year, the Te Atiawa chief Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake announced at a meeting with Governor Grey his intention to leave Waikanae and return with his people to their lands at Waitara in order to prevent the sale of that land. Kingi led 587 Te Atiawa back to Taranaki in 1848, and, although this group came mainly from Waikanae, it also included people from the south-west coast settlements within the Port Nicholson block.⁴⁴ The following decade saw increasing conflict between Maori and Pakeha over land in Taranaki, culminating in Kingi's refusal to accept the supposed sale of Waitara in 1859 and the resulting first Taranaki war of 1860–61.⁴⁵

Members of Te Atiawa and other Taranaki tribes in the Wellington region followed events in Taranaki closely, and the need to establish their claims to land in Taranaki was a strong incentive to return, if only temporarily. The strong ties between Maori in Taranaki and those in Wellington meant that travel between the two locations remained a common occurrence, as Kemp noted in 1850:

The Native population within the district of Wellington, fluctuates very much. Many of their friends come in from Taranaki on long visits, and generally return accompanied by some of their relatives. . . . The whole of the 'Ngatiawas' entertain to this day the strongest attachment for their Native soil, and a desire once more to mingle with their relatives and friends.⁴⁶

Increasingly, however, Wellington Maori migrated permanently to Taranaki. In 1853, most of the remaining inhabitants of the south-west coast settlements of Waiariki, Oterongo, Ohaua, and Te Ika a Maru sold the land reserved for them by McCleverty and moved north.⁴⁷ Further migration occurred once the wars in Taranaki were over: in 1868, a group of Ngati Tama who had been occupying reserves at Pakuratahi returned to Taranaki, and a large group of Te Atiawa moved from the Hutt to Waitara in 1873.⁴⁸ It is impossible to

42. Halswell to secretary, New Zealand Company, 11 November 1841; Halswell to Colonel Wakefield, 4 June 1842 (doc A29, pp 484, 494)

43. W A McCleverty, 'Report on Port Nicholson Cultivations', enclosed with dispatch from Governor Grey to Earl Grey, 21 April 1847, BPP, vol 6, [892], pp 38–39

44. Waitangi Tribunal, *The Taranaki Report: Kaupapa Tuatahi* (Wellington: GP Publications, 1996), pp 43, 47; Ann Parsonson, 'Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake', DNZB, vol 1, p 500. Kemp reported that Maori from Ohariu, Ohaua, and Oterongo Pa had accompanied Kingi's group: H T Kemp, 'Report on the Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), p 594).

45. Waitangi Tribunal, *The Taranaki Report: Kaupapa Tuatahi*, chs 2–4

46. H T Kemp, 'Report on the Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), p 596)

47. Deed of sale, 18 July 1853, in *Turton's Deeds*, p 414 (doc A27); Judge Mackay, memorandum concerning sitting of Native Land Court in Wellington, 14 April 1888 (doc A39, pp 111–112)

48. Carol M Evans, 'The Struggle for Land in the Hutt Valley, 1840–1875', MA thesis, Victoria University, 1965, p 76 (doc N3(e), p 930)

quantify the extent of the migration to Taranaki, but there can be little doubt that it contributed significantly to the decline in the Maori population of the Wellington district.

11.3.3 The place of Maori in Wellington

It is likely that one reason for the migration of Wellington Maori to Taranaki was that Maori came to feel that they had no place in the Wellington district, and particularly in the town of Wellington itself. There were already some 1500 Pakeha at Port Nicholson by June 1840, and the chief Te Wharepouri, shocked at the huge number of Pakeha arriving in such a short space of time, announced his intention to take his people back to Taranaki, though he was quickly dissuaded from doing so.⁴⁹ By 1844, there were 4000 Pakeha living around the harbour, outnumbering Maori by more than four to one.⁵⁰ Although Maori were initially able to benefit from the influx of Pakeha by selling agricultural produce, as noted above, the collapse of their cash-cropping pushed them into a marginal economic position. Under the McCleverty arrangements, Maori lost much of their best cultivation land in the vicinity of the town. Moreover, they increasingly found themselves living in a Pakeha-dominated settlement, where they had little political influence or social standing. The strong desire of officials and others to remove pa from the town, discussed in chapter 13, indicates that Maori were seen as out of place in an urban environment.

Little wonder, then, that many Maori preferred to move to the more sparsely settled Hutt Valley, if they did not leave Wellington altogether for Taranaki. The marginalisation of Maori in the town was not the only reason for the shift to the Hutt, however, because they also seem to have found the Hutt more suitable for cultivation. Kemp noted in 1850 that Maori from Kumutoto, Pipitea, Kaiwharawhara, and Ngauranga were cultivating land in the Hutt, and he reported that 'The Natives of Wellington have no cultivations to speak of on the lands in the outskirts of the Town – all have hired land from Settlers upon the Hutt'. He believed that Maori would gladly exchange their land in town for land of equal value in the Hutt, since the Hutt soil was better and the environment more suited to their method of agriculture, and he commented that Maori were clearing land owned by Pakeha settlers at such a rate that the valley would very soon be clear of bush and ready for the settlers to lay down pasture.⁵¹ Three years later, a Wesleyan missionary wrote that Maori had generally left town owing to the scarcity of land, while the Wesleyans' Wellington circuit report for 1853 observed that most Maori were now living at the Hutt 'for the purpose of raising food, which many of them

49. Rosemarie V Tonk, 'The First New Zealand Land Commissions, 1840–1845', MA thesis, University of Canterbury, 1986, p 149

50. See the statistics on the British civil population of Wellington in C G F Simkin, *Statistics of New Zealand for the Crown Colony Period 1840–1852* (Auckland: Department of Economics, Auckland University College, 1954) (doc N3(c), p 431)

51. H T Kemp, 'Report on the Port Nicholson District', 1 January 1850, *New Munster Gazette*, 21 August 1850 (doc N3(c), pp 594–596)

do on land which they rent from Europeans'.⁵² The extent of the shift away from the town and towards the Hutt is quite astonishing, if Fenton's census of 1857 is to be believed: he recorded 396 Maori living in Lower Hutt, 124 in Upper Hutt, and only 63 in Wellington.⁵³ By this time, the settlements on the south-west coast were almost deserted.

Maori did not disappear from the town entirely, and foreign visitors still noticed their presence on the streets of Wellington in the 1870s and 1880s, but the centre of Maori life in the Wellington region had shifted to the Hutt.⁵⁴ The 1881 census recorded 99 Maori in the Hutt (mainly at Waiwhetu) and 37 at Te Aro and Pipitea.⁵⁵ There is some evidence that the situation of the small Maori population in Wellington gradually improved toward the end of the century. The census enumerator for Maori in Hutt County (which included Porirua as well as Wellington) in the 1880s and 1890s described the health of Maori in the district as 'fairly good' and noted that many now lived in wooden houses. In 1886, he speculated that Maori cultivated only small areas of land because they could survive on their rental income, but the area cultivated by Maori in Hutt County increased from 34 acres in 1886 to 228 acres in 1896, and in the latter year the enumerator found that some Maori had 'nice holdings, the produce of which is sufficient for their maintenance, surplus products finding a ready market at the European centres'.⁵⁶ The Maori community in Wellington retained strong ties with their relatives in Taranaki, and between the two world wars Taranaki Maori began migrating to Wellington once again. The new migrants, who came looking for work or seeking to present their grievances to the Government, were assisted by those descendants of the Taranaki tribes who had remained in Wellington. The growing numbers of Te Atiawa in the Hutt Valley, and the increasing security of their position, was marked by the opening in 1933 of Te Tatau o te Po meeting house on the Hutt Road.⁵⁷ During and after the Second World War, even larger numbers of Maori were attracted to Wellington by the employment opportunities which the capital provided, although the migrants were no longer drawn predominantly from Taranaki.

11.4 THE EFFECTS OF THE MCCLEVERTY ARRANGEMENTS ON WELLINGTON MAORI

The effects of the McCleverty arrangements on Wellington Maori have been the subject of opposing arguments in the closing submissions of the Wellington Tenths Trust and the

52. Aldred to Wesleyan Missionary Society, 8 January 1853, and 'Report of Southern District Meeting', 12 October 1853 (quoted in Roberts, p 13) (doc E8, p 427)

53. Watson and Patterson, p 540

54. David Hamer, 'Wellington on the Urban Frontier', in *The Making of Wellington, 1800-1914*, David Hamer and Roberta Nicholls (eds) (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1990) pp 231, 306 (fn 21)

55. 'Census of the Maori Population, 1881', AJHR, 1881, G-3, p 26

56. 'Census of the Maori Population', AJHR, 1886, G-12, pp 11, 17; 'Census of the Maori Population', AJHR, 1891, G-2, pp 4-5; 'Census of the Maori Population, 1896, H-13B, pp 9, 13. The cultivation figures exclude 'sober grasses'.

57. Angela Ballara, 'Ripeka Wharawhara Love', DNZB, vol 3, p 282

Crown. Counsel for the tenths trust argued that, following the McCleverty arrangements (and, by implication, as a result of the inadequacy of the reserves assigned by McCleverty), both the area cultivated by Maori and the Maori population in the Wellington district suffered sharp declines.⁵⁸ Crown counsel maintained that ‘The McCleverty arrangements put Maori agriculture on a sounder footing than the 1844 agreement by providing a much greater area for the development of new gardens’.⁵⁹ Furthermore, Crown counsel submitted, the movement of the Maori population to the Hutt, and out of the Wellington region altogether, cannot be taken as evidence of the inadequacy of McCleverty’s provision for Wellington Maori. This population movement began before the adequacy of the McCleverty reserves had been put to the test, and it can be explained ‘in terms of Maori preferences and the exercise of a rational choice’.⁶⁰ Two key questions emerge from these submissions:

- ▶ Why did Maori agriculture in Wellington decline so rapidly after its initial success?
- ▶ Why did so many Maori abandon their McCleverty reserves, either moving to the Hutt Valley or leaving the Wellington region altogether?

11.4.1 The decline of Maori agriculture

Because the decline of Maori agriculture coincided with the McCleverty arrangements, it is tempting to conclude that there is a direct causal link between the two events, but a more complex explanation is required. A number of factors, including developments quite unrelated to the McCleverty arrangements, appear to have contributed to the fall in Maori agricultural production.

While the McCleverty arrangements alone cannot take the blame for the decline of Maori agriculture, they must have contributed to it, in part because Maori lost much of their best cultivation land close to the town. McCleverty himself admitted that ‘The Lands now relinquished by the Natives are the very best selected on account of soil, aspect, and vicinity to their homes, and are therefore scattered over a large extent of country’. The land which they had received in exchange did not have these advantages, McCleverty pointed out, so he had tried to compensate for this by reserving several very large blocks on unsurveyed land. However, it is hard to see how the sheer size of these blocks could compensate for the loss of prime cultivation sites close to town, since, as McCleverty noted, there was little land available for cultivation on the blocks.⁶¹ The quality of the land assigned by McCleverty varied enormously – from excellent to appalling – but the poor quality of much of the land was only part of the problem. A larger problem was that, following the McCleverty arrangements and the issuing of a Crown grant for Port Nicholson to the New Zealand Company, Maori

58. Document 03, pp 253–255

59. Document P1, p 82

60. Document P3, p 45, and more generally pp 29–45

61. W A McCleverty, final report, 20 November 1847, CO208 (doc C1(c), pp 265, 269)

were locked out of most of Port Nicholson. Where once they had been able to select for themselves the most suitable cultivation land anywhere within their territory, now Maori found themselves restricted to the land assigned to them by McCleverty. Given that Maori had not adopted crop rotation but instead relied on moving their cultivations every few years when the fertility of the soil had been exhausted, this was a serious limitation. Thus, the McCleverty arrangements resulted in Maori losing much of their best cultivation land in favour of the settlers; being assigned in return land which was further from town and was in many cases of poor quality; and losing the freedom to choose for themselves where to cultivate when they needed to shift their cultivations. These consequences of the McCleverty arrangements must have had a detrimental effect on Maori agriculture in Wellington.

A second explanation for the decline of Maori agriculture is that Maori were unable to sustain their initial success in the commercial agricultural market. As the Pakeha community grew in numbers and became more established, the settlers increasingly supplied their own needs and became less reliant on Maori agriculture. Taringa Kuri had foreseen this outcome in 1844, when he explained his refusal to give up land in the Hutt by saying that 'it is very good for the white people to live at Port Nicholson and buy the pigs and potatoes of the natives; but that, if they give up the land to the Europeans to cultivate, the latter will no longer purchase of them'.⁶² However, the Pakeha agricultural economy was itself changing, and the bigger picture of agriculture in Wellington provides another reason why Maori agriculture did not fulfil its initial promise. At the foundation of the Port Nicholson settlement, it was anticipated that the economy would be based on growing grain, and indeed in 1845 grain crops made up 57 per cent of the acreage under Pakeha cultivation in the settlement.⁶³ By 1855, however, grain accounted for only 13 per cent of the cultivated acreage. Wheat had fallen from 45 per cent of cultivated acreage to just 5.4 per cent over the same period, and it had fallen not just in relative but also in absolute terms. While the total area cultivated by Pakeha grew in this period, this was due to a huge increase in the acreage of sown grass, a sure sign that livestock farming, 'initially viewed as an essential adjunct to cropping, . . . had in short order become an end in itself'. As historian Brad Patterson has demonstrated, by the mid-1850s 'a settlement conceived as agriculturally based was already well on the way to becoming one with a rural economy dominated by large sheepruns'. The granting of so much of their land to the New Zealand Company meant that Maori were largely excluded from developing into pastoral farming on any scale. The Wellington region proved unable to compete successfully in the local market with grain imported from Australia and other countries, and it became apparent that grain exports from Wellington were also unviable. Wool

62. Wakefield to secretary, New Zealand Company, 14 March 1844, in *Seventeenth Report of the Directors of the New Zealand Company* (London: New Zealand Company, 1845) (doc N3(a), p 116)

63. The figures quoted here include areas outside the immediate vicinity of Wellington: Wanganui, Rangitikei–Turakina, Wairarapa–East Coast, and Ahuriri. However, even in 1855 these areas made up less than a quarter of the total acreage.

exports, on the other hand, proved very profitable, although most of the sheep were raised outside the Port Nicholson block.⁶⁴

It seems, then, that commercial agriculture of the kind that Maori practised so successfully in the early years of the Port Nicholson settlement was unviable in the long term for Maori and Pakeha alike. As this became apparent, the area cultivated by Maori probably fell, in part because Maori abandoned cash-cropping and returned to subsistence agriculture supplemented by wage labour and rental income. Significantly, Maori failed for the most part to take up pastoralism, which required considerable capital, instead renting their reserve land to Pakeha pastoralists who could use it more effectively by incorporating it into their already large runs. An exception were the Petone Maori who were recorded as running sheep on the Parangarau block in 1867, but a few years later a Pakeha was leasing the block as a sheep run in their place.⁶⁵ When Maori agriculture in Wellington is considered within a wider context, it is clear that the fall in the area cultivated by Maori, and the failure of Maori commercial agriculture in the longer term, were only partly due to the McCleverty arrangements. Maori were disadvantaged by being restricted to cultivating land chosen for them by McCleverty (or else renting land from Pakeha), but it is likely that Maori agriculture would have declined anyway owing to the economics of agricultural production in the Wellington district.

11.4.2 Maori departure from Wellington

It was originally intended that Maori would live on and cultivate their McCleverty reserves, which would give them an interest in the district and prevent them from returning to Taranaki. Yet, as early as 1850, Kemp reported that many Maori were cultivating not their reserve land around the town but land rented from settlers in the Hutt. By 1867, Maori were living on only a few McCleverty reserves, mainly in the Hutt, and by 1871 even fewer reserves were still occupied by Maori.⁶⁶ By this time, a large number of Maori had left the Wellington region permanently.

It is clear from Kemp's 1850 report that Wellington Maori had a strong desire to cultivate land in the Hutt and were keen to swap their land around the town for Hutt land. This was in part because much of the land on the outskirts of the town was no longer of use to Maori, having 'undergone the usual course of Native cultivation', but also because the Hutt had

64. Brad Patterson, 'The Grain Mirage: Ideal and Reality in Early Wellington Agriculture', *Stout Centre Review*, vol 2, no 2, 1992, pp 14–26 (quotes at pp 14, 18); see also Brad Patterson, 'Laagers in the Wilderness: The Origins of Pastoralism in the Southern North Island Districts, 1840–55', *Stout Centre Review*, vol 1, no 3, 1991, pp 3–14

65. Document 18, p 162. Henare Te Puni was recorded as running 1400 sheep at Parangarau in 1869 and 1870: see sheep inspector's reports for the Wellington district in *Wellington Provincial Gazette*, 30 December 1869, p 213, and *Wellington Provincial Gazette*, 18 November 1870, p 133 (doc N3(c), pp 614, 618).

66. 'Return of All Lands Vested in the Governor . . .', 1867, AJHR, 1867, A-17, pp 3–6 (doc A24, pp 37–40); 'Report from the Commissioner of Native Reserves', 1871, AJHR, 1871, F-4, pp 49–52 (doc A24, pp 49–52)

appreciably better soil and was more suited to Maori agriculture.⁶⁷ If McCleverty had selected land in accordance with Maori wishes, then it seems that he should have assigned much more land in the Hutt to Maori. McCleverty's hands were tied, however, because Hutt land was also highly prized by Pakeha, so there was little land available there to award to Maori. Apart from a very few cases, no effort was made by the Crown to acquire settler-owned land for Maori, either in the Hutt or anywhere else in Port Nicholson; on the contrary, the McCleverty arrangements were intended to get Maori off land claimed by settlers. The Crown can therefore be held responsible for the fact that Maori did not own sufficient land at the Hutt and had to rent land there from Pakeha, but the decision to move to the Hutt was, in large part, one made voluntarily by Maori because of the advantages which this location offered. In addition to the attraction of the Hutt, there were other reasons why Maori did not end up living on or cultivating most of their McCleverty reserves in the long run, the most notable being the poor quality of much of the land. With commercial agriculture becoming less economically rewarding by the 1850s, Maori may also have found that they could better ameliorate their situation by renting out their land than by living on it and cultivating it themselves.

As for the exodus of Maori from Wellington to Taranaki, this is best explained in terms of a combination of push and pull factors. It is quite clear that Maori were travelling back and forth between Te Upoko o te Ika and Taranaki before the establishment of the New Zealand Company settlement at Port Nicholson, and that some Wellington Maori were already talking about returning to Taranaki in the early 1840s. As Kemp observed, Wellington Maori remained strongly attached to their Taranaki homeland, and, as the conflict over land there intensified, many were drawn back to defend their own interests and those of their kin. At the same time, despite the turmoil there, Taranaki remained a district almost entirely under Maori control until the mid-1860s, and a large area remained independent of Government authority until the suppression of Parihaka in 1881. As Wellington became swamped by Pakeha, many Wellington Maori may have felt more at home in Taranaki than in Pakeha-dominated Wellington. Wellington Maori were increasingly unable to benefit from their proximity to a relatively large Pakeha community, in part because of the McCleverty arrangements but also because of more general problems in Wellington agriculture, and they found themselves increasingly economically and socially marginalised. For many, therefore, the drawbacks of living in Wellington must have started to outweigh the benefits, with the result that returning to Taranaki became an ever-more attractive prospect.

11.4.3 Conclusion

The Tribunal considers that the inadequacy of the reserves made by McCleverty was a major contributory factor to, but not the sole cause of, both the decline of Maori agriculture and

67. See s 11.3.3 above, and Kemp to Colonial Secretary, 28 July 1851, NM8/1851/1002 (doc A40, p 359)

the departure of many Maori from the town of Wellington and the wider Port Nicholson area. Furthermore, as a result of the Crown's action in granting more than 120,000 acres in the Port Nicholson block to the New Zealand Company without gaining the consent of Maori or making any payment to them, Maori were left with nothing but these inadequate reserves to sustain them and provide them with an economic base. As we shall see, their only other source of support, the remaining tenths reserves, provided them with little or no income for many decades.