

MAORI AND MINING AT TE AROHA

Philip Hart

Te Aroha Mining District Working Papers

No. 28

2016

Historical Research Unit
Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, New Zealand

ISSN: 2463-6266

© 2016 Philip Hart

Contact: prhart1940@gmail.com



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

MAORI AND MINING AT TE AROHA

Abstract: *Before the existence of gold was confirmed at Te Aroha, the Ngati Rahiri reserves were finally delineated. For long there had been rumours of gold, but prospecting was not permitted until 1880. Once Hone Werahiko found what might be a payable goldfield on Maori land, one could not be proclaimed until an agreement was reached with the landowners. To prevent confusion, and to be fair to Ngati Rahiri, it was decided to create a separate mining district.*

Members of Ngati Rahiri were divided over the terms of an agreement, with some (possibly prompted by Pakeha) demanding a bonus of £1,000. Rangatira who had received income from the Thames field ignored this demand and agreed to open their land in the expectation of receiving a steady supply of money from mining plus timber cutting rights and residence and business site licenses. Mokena Hou was especially supportive of prospecting and opening his land, and had a township, known as Morgantown, surveyed (his daughter Ema, wife of George Lipsey, owned the adjacent Lipseytown). The agreement specified all the fees to be paid, and permitted Maori to withdraw their land from the goldfield.

Right up to opening day, demands were made for a bonus, but the opening went smoothly, with Mokena and another rangatira participating in the ceremony and many Maori marking out claims. Maori from many hapu were shareholders in all parts of the goldfield, and some actively worked their claims, usually guided by an experienced Pakeha miner. Encouraged by the Te Aroha rush, some Maori prospected elsewhere.

Revenue from the new field soon declined as it faded, prompting complaints and officials requiring all those working on Maori land to hold a miner's right. Although most Ngati Rahiri did not benefit, the Mokena family most certainly did, and treated the revenue they received as their own personal income.

MAORI RESERVES ON POTENTIALLY AURIFEROUS LAND

Although the Aroha Block had been sold to the government in August 1878, by mid-1880 the boundaries of the Ngati Rahiri reserves had not been surveyed. George Stewart O'Halloran,¹ the pioneer Te Aroha storekeeper

¹ See paper on his life.

and publican who was the local correspondent for the *Thames Advertiser*, wrote that he could

vouch for the fact that the natives are only too anxious to have *all* their reserves properly defined so they can amongst themselves allot certain portions to each hapu.... In many cases they would take up their residences and live on the land which at present they own but cannot fix their boundaries.²

Despite difficulties in dividing these reserves amongst all those entitled to a share, all opposition to surveying the boundaries of the Omahu and Wairakau reserves had been overcome at meetings with the native agent, George Thomas Wilkinson,³ during June.⁴ The subdivisions were surveyed during July, the owners 'giving every facility'.⁵

Once surveyed, the Wairakau Reserve, upriver from the future goldfield, was leased to a farmer, Charles Stanislaus Stafford.⁶ According to a Te Aroha correspondent, who was expressing a widespread Pakeha perception, 'unless the natives are willing to lease it for a long term, it will very probably remain uncultivated ... and remain a sad memorial of the folly of allowing the natives to select the cream of the land, and then permit them to treat it just as they think fit'. Believing that most of the reserves were on 'the best of the land', he was amazed the government let Maori retain ownership of the mountain despite knowing it probably contained gold.⁷ As the *New Zealand Herald* noted, formerly Ngati Rahiri 'would not have the hilly portions, as these were almost useless for cultivation, or for catching eels; now, fancying that these hills are full of golden reefs, they are all eager to have their portions marked off there'.⁸ Other newspapers concurred.⁹ Pakeha wanting development, by Pakeha, of the district and its

² Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 26 May 1880, p. 3.

³ See paper on Merea Wikiriwhi and George Thomas Wilkinson.

⁴ Editorial, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 October 1880, p. 4; letter from G.T. Wilkinson, recorded in Thames High School, Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Governors, Memorandum of 16 June 1880, High School Archives, Thames.

⁵ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 15 July 1880, p. 3.

⁶ See paper on Harry and Charles.

⁷ Own Correspondent, *Auckland Weekly News*, 11 December 1880, p. 15.

⁸ Editorial, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 October 1880, p. 4.

⁹ Special Reporter, *Thames Star*, 25 October 1880, p. 2; *Waikato Times*, 30 October 1880, p.

supposedly auriferous resources complained that ‘there was a time when the Government could have secured the freehold of the hills’ but had failed to act, thereby penalizing prospectors.¹⁰

PROSPECTING

John Wallace, an old miner,¹¹ in 1930 recalled that before 1880 Ngati Rahiri had warned prospectors off the mountain.¹² Pakeha believed that in (unspecified) legends Maori knew it as ‘the mother of gold’,¹³ prompting several attempts to prospect, but in reality there are no Maori legends about gold at Te Aroha or anywhere else, for before European settlement they had not known about gold.¹⁴ These references to ancient legends about great wealth within the mountain were wishful thinking, for the meanings of the peaks of Te Aroha were about love, not gold.¹⁵

Before 1880, those enticed by such rumours were not welcomed. Writing in July that year, O’Halloran recalled

a party of a few adventurous spirits on prospecting bent being deprived of their swags, tents, etc, and marched ignominiously off the ground. From the experience gained of the Thames and Ohinemuri, our dusky brethren have changed their minds, and having received substantial advantages from gold mining in the past, are now only too anxious that the pakehas should find the precious metal in Te Aroha, so that they may replenish their ever diminishing coffers.¹⁶

This interpretation was supported by the report that, when the first prospectors arrived in October after learning of Hone Werahiko’s discovery,¹⁷ Ngati Rahiri were ‘encouraging men to prospect’ and ‘assisting

¹⁰ *Thames Advertiser*, 3 December 1880, p. 3.

¹¹ See Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 225, 282, 285, 304, 305, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A; *Te Aroha News*, 12 October 1932, p. 5, 7 December 1939, p. 5.

¹² *Te Aroha and the Fortunate Valley*, ed. F.W. Wild (Te Aroha, 1930), p. 277.

¹³ *Auckland Weekly News*, 25 September 1880, p. 9.

¹⁴ See paper on Maori and mining.

¹⁵ See A.W. Reed, *Treasury of Maori Folklore* (Wellington, 1963), p. 216, n.

¹⁶ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 30 July 1880, p. 3.

¹⁷ See paper on his life.

in every way the men already out'.¹⁸ Like all prospectors, Werahiko and his helpers saw no reason to assist Pakeha rivals: whilst being happy to discuss their find, they would not reveal its exact location.¹⁹ Indeed one rumour, that 30 Maori from Tauranga had arrived, not for their ostensible reason of catching eels, but to protect 'the interests of the native prospectors',²⁰ illustrated both Pakeha concerns about possible Maori belligerence and Maori caution about being tricked out of their discovery. Werahiko and his party were not the only Maori out prospecting: reportedly another party (names not recorded) discovered gold shortly before the field opened.²¹

OBTAINING AGREEMENT TO OPEN LAND FOR MINING

Ngati Rahiri would not permit any mining before financial arrangements were made with the government. On 11 September 1880, Adam Porter,²² in informing the goldfields under-secretary, Oliver Wakefield, that gold had found, said he was 'afraid it is not on government ground'. Consequently, 'some steps will have to be taken by the Government to secure the right to the Minerals on the Maori Reserves on the Upper Thames, as the more I see of the District, the more I am convinced there are to be found some good payable Reefs'.²³ On the same day he repeated these views to the warden, Harry Kenrick,²⁴ adding that 'it would be a misfortune if the same complications should be allowed to take place that have caused so much trouble on the Thames Gold Field'.²⁵ These 'complications' were access to land and payments of goldfield revenue. To avoid such issues arising again, two years previously Porter had recommended that all the land at Te Aroha be acquired because of the rumours of the mountain being auriferous;²⁶ clearly he did not believe the owners should benefit.

¹⁸ *Thames Star*, 5 October 1880, p. 2.

¹⁹ *Thames Star*, 25 October 1880, p. 2.

²⁰ Special Reporter, *Thames Star*, 1 November 1880, p. 2.

²¹ *New Zealand Herald*, 25 October 1880, p. 5.

²² See paper on his life.

²³ Adam Porter to Oliver Wakefield (Under-Secretary, Gold Fields), 11 September 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

²⁴ See paper on his life.

²⁵ Adam Porter to Harry Kenrick (Warden), 11 September 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

²⁶ *Thames Star*, 9 October 1880, p. 3.

Immediately after writing these letters, he went to Auckland to discuss the issue with Frederick Whitaker, the Attorney General, who ‘at once requested that I should take away the men as it would complicate matters with the natives and cause undue excitement. In compliance with that request I went back and took away the men’.²⁷

Whitaker arranged for a surveyor to check whether the find was within the Hauraki Mining District, the southern boundary of which touched the peak of the mountain, or on land reserved for Maori. As it was on the latter, as feared, ‘it was necessary to arrange with them for permission to mine’.²⁸ Obtaining permission was expected to be complicated by 150 Maori having interests in the reserves.²⁹ O’Halloran commented that it was ‘a great pity that the native reserve boundaries are not defined, as a prospector at present does not know on what ground he may be working. If on native ground, and he makes a find, he is liable to be turned off, as his miner’s right would be no license to mine on other than Government land’.³⁰ Until surveyors determined the boundaries, prospectors were ‘patiently kicking their heels in Auckland, or at the Thames - anywhere, rather than in the direction of their discovery, with no defined title to the land’.³¹ All requests for permission to prospect were declined until negotiations were concluded.³²

Warden Kenrick asked the Native Department to obtain permission to mine on land reserved for but not yet vested in Ngati Rahiri. Once permission was granted, this land would be included within the Hauraki field and its owners would receive the goldfield revenue. Following Whitaker’s wishes, Kenrick ‘purposely delayed visiting the ground, it being most inadvisable that attention should be attracted to the discovery - until the native rights have been secured and the boundaries of the Gold Fields extended’. He recommended prompt action to secure these rights before

²⁷ Evidence of Adam Porter, 26 September 1884, Gold Fields and Mines Committee, 1884, Legislative Department, LE 1, 1884/14, ANZ-W.

²⁸ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 23 September 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W; Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 2 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, H-17, p. 12.

²⁹ *Thames Star*, 23 October 1880, p. 2.

³⁰ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 20 September 1880, p. 3.

³¹ *Thames Advertiser*, 30 September 1880, p. 3.

³² Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 5 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353; decision of 11 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 80/944, ANZ-W.

private speculators started negotiating on their own behalf.³³ It is not known how many private negotiations were made, but those by Porter and Peter Ferguson³⁴ were made public. The latter, with David Martin McIntyre,³⁵ went to Te Aroha on 5 October,³⁶ because, according to Ferguson's letter to Kenrick of 18 October, he had previously prospected to the southeast of the mountain, with encouraging results.

I procured a map of the district and found from it that part of the Land I wished to prospect was Native Reserves. About the middle of last month I found out who were the Native owners, and made an agreement with them that Mr D.M. McIntyre and myself would search for gold and the Native Owners agreed to give what Leases we pegged off.

He also claimed, falsely, to have successfully prospected Te Aroha in conjunction with Werahiko.

Now if the Government wish to extend the Gold Fields there will be great confusion. Men are coming and pegging off and the Native owners would like to carry out their agreement with those to whom they gave permission to prospect. I understand that Mr Wilkinson is negotiating to have the Land opened but I am in possession of information which convinces me that Native interpreters will never succeed in opening these Lands without the Mackaytown Rush [the opening day of the Karangahake field] being repeated - whereas by recognizing the arrangement that the Native owners have made with us and others there need be no difficulty whatever. I could get all these signatures at once.

His postscript added that 'we have marked off the ground the Native owners promised'.³⁷ There is no record of Kenrick responding. Commenting

³³ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 23 September 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

³⁴ See chapter on Peter Ferguson and his New Era.

³⁵ See *Thames Guardian and Mining Record*, 17 October 1871, p. 3, 23 May 1872, p. 2, 31 May 1873, p. 3; *Thames Advertiser*, 7 January 1875, p. 2, 11 January 1876, p. 3; *Thames Star*, 19 January 1881, p. 2.

³⁶ *Thames Star*, 4 October 1880, p. 2.

³⁷ Peter Ferguson to Harry Kenrick, 18 October 1880, Thames Warden's Court, Inwards Correspondence 1879-1896, BACL 13388/1a, ANZ-A.

on Porter's negotiations, one reporter stated that Mokena Hou,³⁸ upon whose land the discovery had been made, was

quite willing to see the district thrown open if the pakeha is satisfied there is sufficient inducement, but he insists that the claims of any persons who have been prospecting and found gold should be respected, and that Porter should not possess a sheep-run because Hone, the real discoverer, entrusted him with certain stone, and desired him to get protection for the piece he had chosen. The chief Morgan [Mokena], who is the owner of 400 acres, near the prospectors' claim, is quite willing that mining should be allowed upon it, as I have said, but declines to hand over any portion of his land because a person chooses to bring him a lease to sign, although it may be accompanied by a money bribe. He is opposed to leases, and wants all to have a fair show, if the district is considered sufficiently attractive. He does not think the prospectors, whose right he recognizes, should have more than five acres.³⁹

One reason why the authorities may have wanted the discovery of gold kept secret was to prevent Ngati Rahiri learning how much it had increased the value of their land. As the *Thames Star* wrote, the land was not likely to be leased to the government 'if the fact were known that good gold reefs existed upon it'.⁴⁰ Whitaker at first sought 'to purchase the interests of the natives in the reserve upon which the discovery was made - to effect that secrecy being in his opinion essential'.⁴¹ One newspaper believed the government wanted to buy the land 'to obviate the many annoyances and vexations that have taken place at the Thames, owing to the natives being the owners of the soil, and merely leasing it', but it doubted the government would be able to buy the land cheaply, as intended,⁴² for, although it did not admit this, Ngati Rahiri now had greater bargaining power. Owing to the pressure to open the field as soon as possible, there was no time to acquire the owners' interests.⁴³

³⁸ See paper on his life.

³⁹ Special Reporter, *Thames Advertiser*, 25 October 1880, p. 3.

⁴⁰ *Thames Star*, 21 September 1880, p. 2.

⁴¹ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 22 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁴² Editorial, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 October 1880, p. 4.

⁴³ *New Zealand Herald*, 22 October 1880, p. 5.

Although reluctant to be rushed into opening a goldfield lacking either a defined reef or proof of payable gold, a month after the first reports of the discovery Whitaker decided that, 'to prevent confusion', a new mining district would have to be created.⁴⁴ Kenrick had told him that, when at Paeroa on 18 October, he had received four applications for prospecting claims, and on the following day had heard that 'some twenty miners were on the ground', along with many Maori, who were 'well aware of the existence of gold on their reserves'. Secrecy being no longer possible, he was worried that 'several Europeans were attempting to secure private leases'. Accordingly, Whitaker ordered him, with Wilkinson, to make an agreement on similar terms to earlier Hauraki ones.⁴⁵ When announcing that a goldfield would be proclaimed, it was emphasized that 'no rights or claims of any kind' acquired before the proclamation would be recognized. 'It is utterly futile to attempt to make any bargains with the native owners of reserves or to attempt to create any rights. The natives can neither sell nor lease the land without the sanction of the Government, and that Ministers are determined to refuse in all cases'.⁴⁶

Because of 'complications ... likely to arise from the presence of a number of men on native lands', newspapers reported Whitaker's decision that opening the field was 'the lesser of two evils'; it was universally assumed that prospectors could not be 'kept off'.⁴⁷ (For instance, Werahiko had not sought permission from the local hapu when first prospecting their land.) The 'complications' that concerned officials were that prospectors would work on Maori land whose owners 'would expect a revenue. This the Government would have no means of collecting, while it remained an unproclaimed district, so to save complications which would be sure to arise', a goldfield had to be proclaimed.⁴⁸ Instead of extending the boundaries of the Hauraki Mining District, a new district was to be formed, requiring new miners' rights to be taken out 'so that faith may be kept with

⁴⁴ Frederick Whitaker (Attorney General) to Minister of Mines, 21 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁴⁵ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 22 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁴⁶ *New Zealand Herald*, 22 October 1880, p. 5.

⁴⁷ Editorial, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 October 1880, p. 4; *Thames Advertiser*, 4 November 1880, p. 3.

⁴⁸ *Thames Star*, 3 November 1880, p. 2.

the Natives'.⁴⁹ If the existing boundary had been extended, as originally intended, any Hauraki miner would have been able to use their existing rights and only men from non-mining areas would have had to purchase rights, thereby greatly reducing Ngati Rahiri's income.

Fortunately for the negotiators, the gold was found on land principally owned by either Mokena Hou or Wirope Hoterene Taipari, for both were amenable to opening their land.⁵⁰ On 22 October, Kenrick wrote that Taipari had accepted the terms and would, with himself and Wilkinson, attend a meeting at Te Aroha to obtain the signatures of other owners to an agreement specifying what payments they would receive.⁵¹ Owners who lived at Thames were signing it,⁵² but at this meeting, held on Mokena's land on 26 October, Ngati Rahiri were divided. Their principal rangatira, Karauna Hou,⁵³ was the spokesman for those demanding a bonus of £1,000 in addition to receiving goldfield revenue. Such a bonus had not been given previously, although in 1869 Mackay had offered £500 to tempt the owners of Ohinemuri to open their land,⁵⁴ a precedent not raised during these negotiations. The bonus was, as a newspaper put it, 'declined with thanks',⁵⁵ for officials had no intention of paying one. Wilkinson later describing this demand as 'extortionate' and 'out of the question', especially because the owners 'were to get for themselves all the miners' rights fees, timber licenses, &c, as well as town rents'.⁵⁶ With Kenrick, he circumvented the demand

⁴⁹ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 22 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁵⁰ Frederick Whitaker to John Hall, 14 October 1880, Sir John Hall Papers, Telegrams to and from F. Whitaker 1880-1882, folder 196, p. 39, MS 1784, Alexander Turnbull Library.

⁵¹ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 22 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁵² *New Zealand Herald*, 25 October 1880, p. 5.

⁵³ See paper on his life.

⁵⁴ *Auckland Weekly News*, 27 February 1869, p. 22; confirmed by James Mackay in *Thames Advertiser*, 10 December 1874, p. 3.

⁵⁵ *Thames Advertiser*, 27 October 1880, p. 3.

⁵⁶ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, p. 9.

by enlisting on the Government side several Natives - including W.H. Taipari, Mokena Hou, and others - who, through owning lands within the Thames Gold Field, had already tasted the sweets of being able to receive Native revenue from the same in the shape of miners' rights fees, &c, at regular intervals. These people were negotiated with, and after the matter had been explained to them, they readily signed the agreement to open the field in so far as their blocks were concerned.⁵⁷

When attempting to prospect Te Aroha in 1877, Werahiko had been ordered to leave by some Ngati Rahiri but it was unlikely, judging by his later attitudes, that Mokena was one of those. At an unspecified date in 1880, he gave written permission for Werahiko and Arama Poata (of whom nothing is known; he would not acquire any interests in the goldfield) to 'do work on his lands at Te Aroha'.⁵⁸ His youngest son, Rewi,⁵⁹ for a short time assisted Werahiko's prospecting, and when gold was found they pegged it out under an arrangement with his father.⁶⁰ In October, to encourage prospectors, Mokena granted permits to prospect without requiring payment,⁶¹ O'Halloran writing that all parties worked 'under the authority or by the leave of Morgan' [Mokena].⁶² In gratitude, he was given interests in the Prospectors' Claim and the four adjoining claims.⁶³ When the Prospectors' Claim had its first crushing, the loose surface 'rich stone' was not included, 'the same having been left with Morgan, the native owner, who had some claim to it on the ground that it was obtained prior to the opening day'.⁶⁴

Contemporaries noted that Mokena had a good appreciation of the value of a goldfield on his land, having had shares in at least one Thames

⁵⁷ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁸ Written statement [in Maori] by Mokena Hou, n.d. [1880], Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W; translation provided by Tom Roa, University of Waikato.

⁵⁹ See paper on his life.

⁶⁰ Special Reporter, *Thames Advertiser*, 25 October 1880, p. 3.

⁶¹ Special Reporter, *Thames Star*, 25 October 1880, p. 2, 2 November 1880, p. 2.

⁶² Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 19 October 1880, p. 3.

⁶³ Special Reporter, *Thames Advertiser*, 25 October 1880, p. 3.

⁶⁴ *Thames Advertiser*, 8 December 1880, p. 3.

claim and receiving rent from owning land there.⁶⁵ As well, his son-in-law, George Lipsey,⁶⁶ who had lived at Thames for several years,⁶⁷ must have advised him about the financial prospects. Other leading owners were also aware of the advantages and may have wanted a local goldfield. Keepa Te Wharau,⁶⁸ for instance, another Ngati Rahiri rangatira, a part owner of five blocks of auriferous land at Thames, had received £20 from miners' rights by 1 January 1869,⁶⁹ and would have received much more since then. Karauna Hou had banked £16 in July 1868, presumably from goldfield revenue, and received a smaller amount later that year.⁷⁰ Mokena was described as 'very friendly and intelligent', with 'sufficient foresight to appreciate the advantages that would accrue to his hapu were a profitable goldfield to be discovered'.⁷¹ 'He would only hear of the permit system, by which the miners' right money would flow into his pocket. The old man seems for many years to have made up his mind not to sell, having refused various offers to purchase land around the Springs'.⁷² One reporter quoted him saying that he had 'thrown open 1400 acres, Crown Granted to himself and his tribe for prospecting, and free to all. He does not want to invite anyone up, as if it proved a duffer they would blame him, but he would like to see them all the same'.⁷³ Mokena's speech to the 26 October meeting was, therefore, predictable:

⁶⁵ Thames Warden's Court, Applications for Protection of Claims, Shortland, 1868, no. 94, BACL 13819/1a, ANZ-A; G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, p. 9; for his interest in Korokoro D at Thames, see Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 2, pp. 177-178.

⁶⁶ See paper on his life.

⁶⁷ Thames Warden's Court, Register of Miners' Rights 1867-1868, no. 2111, dated 14 November 1867, BACL 14358/1a, ANZ-A; *Cyclopedia of New Zealand*, vol. 2, p. 833.

⁶⁸ See paper on his life.

⁶⁹ Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books, no. 1, pp. 151, 153, 158; no. 2, p. 5; 'Return of Revenue Received from Miners' Rights at the Thames Gold Fields', *AJHR*, 1869, B-15.

⁷⁰ Bank of New Zealand, Shortland Branch, Individual Accounts Ledger 1868, folios 166, 618; Individual Accounts Ledger 1868-1869, folio 293, Bank of New Zealand Archives, Wellington.

⁷¹ Special Reporter, *Thames Star*, 2 November 1880, p. 2.

⁷² Editorial, *Thames Advertiser*, 27 October 1880, p. 2.

⁷³ Special Reporter, *Thames Star*, 1 November 1880, p. 2.

There was the land; there were the miners; he was glad to see them; if they got gold he was quite satisfied to take the same arrangement as that made at Shortland and Grahamstown [Thames]. In any case, he had every wish that they should prospect the land. The land had been ceded to him as his share of the block, and the other natives had nothing to do with it.⁷⁴

Wilkinson recorded a detailed account of this meeting:

I commenced by telling them the reason for my visit, and stated that some Europeans had discovered gold on a portion of the lands that has been promised should be given to them out of the Government land at Te Aroha - That in all probability, Gold would also be found on other parts of the hills within the Aroha district and extending to the East Coast - That Gold having been found, it was impossible to keep the Europeans from coming to search and dig for it - That as the Maories could not well dig for it themselves to the exclusion of others, it would be advisable to let the Europeans come. That if the Europeans were allowed to come it would be necessary for the safety and protection of all that they should not be allowed to come unless the law came with them (i.e. that they worked under the recognised laws for Gold Mining). That as the Maories had no laws, and were not in a position to make any, affecting Gold Mining, and that as a much larger extent of Government land than Maori land would be included in the proposed Gold Field, I considered it would be advisable for them to include the Reserves that they were to get out of the Aroha Block within the land the Government proposed to open as a New Gold Field, in return for which they would be allowed to receive all the Revenue accruing therefrom in the shape of Miners Rights Fees, Business, Battery and Residence Site fees, also Kauri Timber and firewood licenses, the Government binding itself to collect these monies and pay the same over to them quarterly.

Te Karauna Hou was the first of the Natives to speak in reply and he stated that they had no objection to having their land opened for Gold Mining purposes provided the Government paid them a bonus in money at once in consideration of their so doing, which bonus was not to be deducted from their Gold Fields Revenue after the field was open. - Several other natives followed in the same strain.

I was not able to take notes of all that was said at the meeting as I had to be continually on my legs talking or answering questions - But it was evident that the majority of them had made up their minds to object to their lands being opened as a Gold Field unless

⁷⁴ *Thames Advertiser*, 27 October 1880, p. 3.

they could get an immediate Cash benefit out of it which was not to be deducted from their Revenue hereafter. - W.H. Taipari who accompanied me, and was one of the Natives who rendered so much assistance to Mr Mackay in opening the Thames Gold Fields, addressed the natives and strongly advised them to open the land, though he did not condemn so strongly as I would have liked their demand for a bonus - He however used his influence to further the wishes of the Government in the matter.

After a great deal of talking Te Mokena Hou, the principal owner of the block containing seven hundred and fifty acres on which the gold was found, stood up and stated that as the gold had been found on his land, and [as] he and his sons had assisted the diggers to prospect for it he did not now intend to put obstacles in the way, and that he would therefore agree to my request to give the land up for Gold Mining on the terms mentioned by me and he would not ask for any bonus for fear the field should turn out to be "a duffer" and he might have to refund it.

This area of seven hundred and fifty acres given up by Mokena added to the seven hundred and forty acres already ceded by the Taipari family and which adjoins it, makes nearly one thousand five hundred acres and extends from the northern boundary of the Thames High School Endowment Reserve Block to the southern boundary of the Ruakaka Block and the place where the gold has been found is situate about the centre of this land that has been given up.

As it was getting towards evening I thought it best to let the meeting break up as no good could come from further discussing the matter especially as I saw that the more desirous I appeared to be that the Natives should give their land up the more persistent they were in requiring to be paid for so doing. After the meeting several of them came to me privately and stated that it would be all right but that I must not expect them to agree to all I wanted without their opposing me and trying to make something out of it - There are a few obstructive ones, on whose land gold has not yet been found and who do not see themselves in receipt of a speedy source of income from Miners Rights fees, and will hold out as long as they can in the hopes of getting something out of the Government. But I believe the majority of the Natives will withdraw their objections and cease to oppose the opening of the field as far as their lands are concerned.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ G.T. Wilkinson to Frederick Whitaker, 30 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

The immediate consequence of the demand for a bonus was a delay while Wilkinson held further negotiations.⁷⁶ Before leaving he got Mokena, his wife Rina, his daughter Ema Lipsey, and two of his sons, Ranapia⁷⁷ and Rewi, to sign the agreement, and suggested how they might receive further revenue:

As the block ceded by the Mokena family is nearest the present Gold find and as there is a portion of it suitable for a digging township, Mr Kenrick and myself suggested to the old gentleman that he should set aside a portion of the land that we otherwise intended to exempt from the Gold Field, he requiring it for a cultivation Reserve, and let this portion be surveyed into a Township, this he agreed to do, and a spot of about twelve acres was marked off to form the nucleus of a future township should the necessities of the Gold field require one.

This block was shown to Mr G[eorge Henry] A[rthur] Purchas⁷⁸ the Government Surveyor who is at present at Te Aroha engaged surveying the Maori Reserves, and that gentleman made a sketch plan of it on paper which showed that it would contain, after the necessary roads were laid off, cross ways and down to the landing at the River, about (60) sixty allotments averaging about one eighth of an acre each.⁷⁹

The agreement was as follows:

The Government being about to constitute a New Gold Mining district under the "Gold Mining Act 1873" the said district will include certain lands which have been promised to the Natives as Reserves.

The usual fee of one pound will be made payable for Miners' Rights and every man who is engaged in Mining operations in the District will be required to take out a Miner's Right.

In consideration of the government exercising over the promised Reserves the full rights and powers vested with the "Governor by the Gold Mining Districts Act 1873" and by all Acts amending the same, they will pay over to the several Natives entitled to the Reserves the Revenue derived from the same as hereinafter defined.

⁷⁶ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 13 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

⁷⁷ See paper on his life.

⁷⁸ See paper on the Aroha Block to 1879.

⁷⁹ G.T. Wilkinson to Frederick Whitaker, 30 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

All fees derived from Miners Rights, Timber Licenses, Kauri Trees Licenses, Residence and Business Site Licenses and All Revenue derived from Townships laid off upon the said Reserves will be paid to the Native Owners.

At the request of Ema Mokena [daughter of Mokena Hou and wife of Lipsey], We undertake to cut out and reserve from occupation under the Gold Mining Districts Act all the land from the river to the foot of the hills within the Reserve Block at Te Aroha required for the use of herself and children.⁸⁰

Revenue would not be received from licensed holdings, as this had not been intended when the Thames field opened and was only paid after the Act of 1873; the reasoning was that, being duplications of other fees, licensed holding fees should go to the local bodies to meet goldfield expenses.⁸¹ The Waitangi Tribunal would argue that this decision meant a lower income for the landowners.⁸² Whitaker informed the Minister of Mines that, having secured this agreement with those owning the portion where gold was found, he had ‘no doubt’ owners of adjoining land would ‘accept the same terms eventually’.⁸³ When Wilkinson next visited, in mid-November, a reporter outlined developments:

As far as Mokena’s reserve - on which the prospectors’ claim is situated - is concerned, all difficulty is at an end, as the old man will throw open the land for mining at once, there being only one dissentient out of the nine owners of the ground and he is supposed to be under the influence of some “antiquated legal fossil” at the Thames, who, however, can do no harm, as this nineth shareholder will be simply ignored and work gone on without his consent. Furthermore, Mokena has given the government some land for a township, which will be laid out and leased on his behalf by the authorities. When this block is opened, the owners of the other lands are bound to follow suit, because the Maori never yet lived who could see his friends enjoying the

⁸⁰ Minutes re Te Aroha Reserves and Land, signed by Harry Kenrick and George Wilkinson at Te Aroha on 26 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W.

⁸¹ Harry Kenrick to Oliver Wakefield, 22 October 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353; memorandum by G.T. Wilkinson, 10 November 1888, Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W.

⁸² Waitangi Tribunal, *The Hauraki Report* (Wellington, 2006), vol. 2, p. 483.

⁸³ Frederick Whitaker to Minister of Mines, 7 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

good things provided for them and not have to “dig in” on his own account. You may rest assured that the money difficulty is at an end.⁸⁴

The solitary dissentient was Akuhata Mokena,⁸⁵ Mokena’s eldest son, then living at Puriri. ‘Those of the Mokena family who have signified their willingness to dispose of their interests in the block, say that Akuhata’s refusal to sign will not deter them from having the field thrown open’.⁸⁶ The ‘antiquated legal fossil’ was Henry Elmes Campbell, a Thames solicitor, who earlier that year had assisted Maori owners of the Thames field to obtain their full income from miner’s rights,⁸⁷ and had now ‘stirred up’ some of the owners to demand the bonus.⁸⁸ The *Thames Star* described the unnamed man behind the demand as a Pakeha Maori who was ‘noted for shoving his nose into his neighbour’s kail pot’,⁸⁹ but as Campbell was not a Pakeha Maori and it later referred to the opening being ‘much retarded by those gentry who make their living by playing on the cupidity of the natives’,⁹⁰ clearly more than one Pakeha was involved, an assessment confirmed by Wilkinson.⁹¹ The *Thames Star* argued that the owners had been ‘quiescent’ until this easy way of making a large amount of money was suggested to them.⁹² When the opening was postponed until those demanding the bonus had signed the agreement, the *Thames Advertiser* grumbling that it was ‘a matter for regret that any persons should have been instrumental in inducing several of the natives to refuse to dispose of their interests at large figures’, and blamed the delay on these ‘unscrupulous persons’.⁹³

Clearly it was assumed that such meddlers expected to share in any bonus; if so, they were to be disappointed, because ‘the threat of the modest

⁸⁴ Special Correspondent, ‘Te Aroha’, *Waikato Times*, 18 November 1880, p. 2.

⁸⁵ See paper on his life.

⁸⁶ *Thames Advertiser*, 17 November 1880, p. 3.

⁸⁷ See paper on Maori and goldfields revenue.

⁸⁸ *Thames Advertiser*, 13 November 1880, p. 3.

⁸⁹ *Thames Star*, 13 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹⁰ *Thames Star*, 18 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹¹ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, p. 9.

⁹² *Thames Star*, 13 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹³ *Thames Star*, 17 November 1880, p. 2; *Thames Advertiser* 18 November 1880, p. 3.

gentlemen demanding the bonus, that they would not allow the field to be opened was treated as it deserved'.⁹⁴ When it was decided that the land of any dissatisfied owners would be excluded, the *Thames Star* found it 'gratifying to find the Government showing such a determined and firm demeanour. It will prove to the natives that no matter how they have been petted and pleased in the past, other hands are at the plough now'.⁹⁵ On 19 November, the proclamation declaring Te Aroha open was signed. The *New Zealand Herald* commented that the 'obstacles raised by the natives have not been entirely got rid of, but the Government will not be delayed because of them, but will do what is fair and just amongst the parties without being humbugged by the different claimants to particular patches'. It praised Wilkinson's conduct of negotiations.⁹⁶ Wilkinson, pleased with this comment, in his official report included a variant of it when noting that his refusal to pay the £1,000 bonus had resulted in

a decided split in the opposition camp, who now reduced their demand for a bonus to £500. This also was denied them, and as it was now apparent that the bold but necessary stroke of opening the field, whether some of the Natives were willing or not, could be carried out without any real danger, it was decided to do so ... much to the surprise and chagrin of some of the dissenting Natives; who, seeing that this was the first time, for a number of years, that any policy (however necessary for the public good) at which they chose to express disapproval, should be forced upon them, seemed quite taken aback, and unable at first to realize the position.⁹⁷

Those Ngati Rahiri still wanting the bonus attempted, unsuccessfully, to get Mokena to repudiate his agreement.⁹⁸ In subsequent negotiations, Wilkinson and Kenrick assured the owners that, as all claims would have to be 'fully and continually manned', they would not lose revenue through any being only partly worked.⁹⁹ The agreement signed with the other owners

⁹⁴ *Thames Star*, 12 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹⁵ *Thames Star*, 13 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹⁶ *New Zealand Herald*, 20 November 1880, p. 5.

⁹⁷ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, p. 10.

⁹⁸ *Thames Star*, 12 November 1880, p. 2.

⁹⁹ G.T. Wilkinson to Harry Kenrick, 13 December 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W.

was identical to that made with the Mokena family, except that the final paragraph concerning land for Ema Lipsey and her children was replaced by other clauses:

The said revenue will be paid over to the Natives as soon as practicable after the close of each quarter.

The owner of a miners right shall be entitled to all the privileges set out in the various agreements made between the Natives at Hauraki and the Government permitting mining on their land, all will also be permitted to occupy any portion of his claim by virtue of his said right.

The necessary cost of enforcing the payment of the revenue will as at present at Hauraki be defrayed from the Revenue collected. Native cultivations and Tapus together with the ground occupied by them for residence will be laid off and exempted from occupation under the Act.

Any additional land that may be wanted by the Natives for cultivation will be reserved as required by them.¹⁰⁰

The latter clause was interpreted by Wilkinson to mean that Ngati Rahiri could withdraw from the field ‘any part of their reserve’ required ‘for settlement purposes’. He also interpreted the agreement as permitting them to cut firewood without paying a fee.¹⁰¹ The annual fees were fixed at the same rates as on earlier Hauraki goldfields: £1 for a miner’s right, £1 for a residence site, £5 for a business site, and £10 for a machine site. For each kauri tree felled, £1 5s was to be paid, and an annual timber license for cutting trees for other than mining purposes would cost £5.¹⁰² These terms

¹⁰⁰ Copy of agreement in Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Transfers and Assignments 1882, BBAV 11581/1a, ANZ-A; a copy of the final two paragraphs is in H.W. Northcroft to Under-Secretary of Lands, 24 July 1891, Thames Warden’s Court, Warden’s Letterbook 1886-1893, folio 482, BACL 14458/2b, ANZ-A; the copy once held by the Mines Department was removed by Frederick Whitaker and not returned (see note in Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W); the copies held by the Maori Affairs Department and the Lands Department were destroyed in one of the many calamities that struck their records.

¹⁰¹ Memorandum by G.T. Wilkinson, 17 October 1887, Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Certified Instruments 1887, BBAV 11581/8a, ANZ-A.

¹⁰² Province of Auckland, *Rules and Regulations for the Hauraki Gold Mining District* (Auckland, 1873), p. 35.

were exactly the same as those accepted by the Thames High School for its endowment land at Waiorongomai.¹⁰³

Despite this agreement, not all difficulties were ended. Under the heading 'Native Bounce', a newspaper reported that, on the day before the field was to be proclaimed, some owners told Kenrick they would not agree to its opening. 'To this Mr Kenrick replied that every arrangement had been made, and nothing should stop the field being opened'.¹⁰⁴ Kenrick later gave his version of his meeting with them:

The day prior to the opening, the natives objecting to their portions of the reserve being included in the goldfield, waited upon me at my office, raising objections and asking for various concessions and privileges. Finding that these would not be granted, one of the most obstructive expressed his intention of taking the gold from any miners found on the reserve, but a quiet intimation that if the threats were not withdrawn, he would at once be arrested and detained until he found sureties for his good behaviour made him retract.¹⁰⁵

According to one of his critics, as this man 'did not retract' but remained 'as obstructive as ever', Kenrick 'was foolish to threaten him with imprisonment when he ought to know that he had no power to do so'.¹⁰⁶ But the *New Zealand Herald* confirmed Kenrick's version: 'On one native asserting that he would prevent anyone from taking gold off his land, Mr Kenrick at once replied that if he attempted violence of any kind he would have him arrested. The native gave in at once'.¹⁰⁷ If this unnamed man did continue to be obstructive, he was ineffective. And when some Ngati Rahiri demanded 15 men's ground adjoining the Prospectors' Claim, Kenrick refused, 'saying in a few words that he thought they had enough already'.¹⁰⁸

OPENING DAY

¹⁰³ *Thames Star*, 3 November 1880, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ *New Zealand Herald*, 26 November 1880, p. 5.

¹⁰⁵ Harry Kenrick to Minister of Justice, 6 December 1880, printed in *Thames Star*, 15 December 1880, p. 2.

¹⁰⁶ Letter from 'Spectator', *Thames Advertiser*, 21 December 1880, p. 3.

¹⁰⁷ *New Zealand Herald*, 26 November 1880, p. 5.

¹⁰⁸ *Auckland Weekly News*, 11 December 1880, p. 15.

Wilkinson attended the opening ‘in order to make everything clear to the natives and if possible overcome any objection that still exists with some of them to having their land thrown open for mining without the Government pay them a bonus’.¹⁰⁹ After the ceremony, he reported its success:

The Chief Mokena who will own the Land where the Prospectors Claim is accompanied me to the hill of the prospectors claim and fired off the gun as a signal for the opening of the field after the proclamation was read. No opposition was offered by the natives and everything passed off satisfactorily without any hitch or quarrelling. The natives are now anxious to have their different holdings within the reserve Block properly defined and I would ask you to get the Hon Native Minister to authorize me to confine my attention to this matter for a few days as I think now there is a possibility of getting this matter settled.¹¹⁰

Kenrick reported that ‘the day after the opening the whole of the Natives came in and signed the agreement’, and other accounts confirmed that those who formerly objected to their land being included were ‘now only too eager to have it thrown open’.¹¹¹ According to one reporter, Kenrick had been ‘very successful’ with the owners, who were ‘now prepared to grant all his requests’. Those who had

threatened all sorts of obstructions to the Warden, and who had to be threatened with arrest, came this morning in a body and said they were willing to throw open their sections of land on the same terms as Morgan and others. So much for firmness and the reversal of the former mode of dealing with these sons of the soil.¹¹²

Wilkinson later reported that, ‘in a great many cases’, the former objectors ‘pegged out claims with as much zeal as their European

¹⁰⁹ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 22 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹¹⁰ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 25 November 1880 (telegram), Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W [punctuation added].

¹¹¹ *Thames Star*, 15 December 1880, p. 2; *Auckland Weekly News*, 4 December 1880, p. 9.

¹¹² *Thames Star*, 1 December 1880, p. 2.

brethren'.¹¹³ On opening day, 'all hands' praised his 'tact and knowledge of how to treat the Maories', which had avoided 'the almost inevitable native difficulty'.¹¹⁴ Immediately after the guns were fired, 'old Pineha raised a Union Jack flag'.¹¹⁵ He was Piniha (sometimes Pineha) Marutuahu of Ngati Maru,¹¹⁶ who had been involved in opening Thames to mining.¹¹⁷ He probably was the 'Peneha' who had deposited a small sum in a bank in 1868, presumably derived from goldfield revenue.¹¹⁸

Without receiving any publicity, further requests for a bonus of some sort continued. Taipari was granted £3 3s for spending three days at Te Aroha helping to open the field after claiming to have been 'very much occupied with my private business when instructed to perform this service'.¹¹⁹ In February 1881, Lipsey claimed it was 'through Mr Wilkinson's and my own persuasion' that Mokena was the first to agree to mining and that at Wilkinson's request he had done his 'utmost to bring the matter to a successful issue'. Through his 'long residence in this district' and influence over Mokena and others he had been able to 'largely assist the Government in their negotiations'.¹²⁰ Wilkinson confirmed that he had given 'every assistance' and must have influenced Mokena 'considerably',¹²¹ but as the value of his land was 'considerably enhanced' by the goldfield, on Wilkinson's recommendation he received only £10.¹²² In May 1881, Karauna Hou, Piniha Marutuahu, Reha Aperahama, Keepa Te Wharau, Aihe Pepene, Tutuki Peehi and 'in fact the whole of Ngatirahiri tribe at Te

¹¹³ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, G-8, p. 10.

¹¹⁴ *Thames Star*, 26 November 1880, p. 2.

¹¹⁵ *New Zealand Herald*, 26 November 1880, p. 5.

¹¹⁶ See *Te Aroha News*, n.d., reprinted in *Waikato Times*, 18 November 1890, p. 2.

¹¹⁷ See paper on Maori and mining.

¹¹⁸ Bank of New Zealand, Shortland Branch, Individual Accounts Ledger 1868-1869, folio 477; Individual Accounts Ledger 1869, folio 499, Bank of New Zealand Archives, Wellington.

¹¹⁹ W.H. Taipari to Native Minister, 8 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²⁰ George Lipsey to Frederick Whitaker, 14 February 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²¹ G.T. Wilkinson to Jackson, 5 April 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²² G.T. Wilkinson to Native Minister, 12 April 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

Aroha', so they claimed, asked Wilkinson for their bonus: 'Friend be strenuous in this matter'.¹²³ None of the Mokena family, not even Akuhata, signed this request. Kenrick, after discussed their request with the claimants, told Wilkinson that he thought it would be 'good policy to make them some grant under the circumstances.... The matter was referred to by them before the opening of the Gold Field - I then said that if the application was made I would support it - they clearly understanding that no promise was made'.¹²⁴ In the view of government officials, the regulations did not permit granting a bonus, and to do so would mean no end to such requests.¹²⁵ After the application was filed (and hence ignored), attempts to obtain a bonus ceased. The refusal was not aimed at Maori specifically, for Pakeha landowners had no right to any payment either and private landlords on other goldfields did not receive one. The only substantial payment to be approved was a reward for discovering the goldfield: Werahiko's estate received £350.¹²⁶

SHAREHOLDINGS

According to one account of opening day, 'a very large number of natives were deeply interested spectators, although to many of them the mysterious action of the apparently demented pakeha during the pegging out must have been somewhat bewildering'. Not all were merely onlookers, for 'a good many' took out miners' rights and either pegged out claims for themselves or as part of Pakeha parties. One of the 14 claims pegged out near the Prospectors' Claim was a four-man 'Maori party'.¹²⁷ A party 'besieged by Maoris' came 'to some arrangement'.¹²⁸ On the first day, 20 Maori took out miners' rights, and during the next month at least a further

¹²³ Karauna Hou and others to G.T. Wilkinson, 31 May 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²⁴ Harry Kenrick to G.T. Wilkinson, 14 June 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²⁵ Oliver Wakefield to T.W. Lewis (Under-Secretary of Native Affairs), 28 June 1881, Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²⁶ For correspondence concerning the reward from Adam Porter and others, 1881 to 1885, see Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W.

¹²⁷ *Thames Star*, 26 November 1880, p. 2.

¹²⁸ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Auckland Star*, 27 November 1880, p. 2.

77 were issued to them.¹²⁹ The total number is unknown, as the names of about 200 men who received them on opening day¹³⁰ are now unavailable, no registers of miners' rights having survived and the butt books being incomplete; only 18 Maori and one 'half-caste' were recorded in the now-incomplete warden's court records.¹³¹ Like Pakeha, many acquired interests to sell for a quick profit. Just over a week after the proclamation, the *Te Aroha Miner* reported shares in the Bonanza being sold 'at from £25 or £30', the sellers being 'principally' Maori.¹³² Another newspaper wrote that, 'with the exception of young Morgan', meaning Rewi Mokena, the Maori shareholders had 'parted with all their interest' for £35 per share.¹³³

Maori were shareholders, often majority shareholders, in claims at Te Aroha, Tui, and Waiorongomai. In the rush of 1880-1881, 131 Maori held shares (all those known to be half-castes are included in this total); at least 44 more took out miners' rights and helped to peg out and prospect claims that were not later registered.¹³⁴ Between December 1880 and December 1881, parties that included Maori pegged out 19 claims.¹³⁵ At Te Aroha, they were six of the eight owners of the Waihou, six of the 14 of Morgan's Claim, and all 15 of the owners of Whakapipi.¹³⁶ The subsequent rush to the Tui Creek area in December 1880 and January 1881 involved about 150 miners, of whom 'by far the greater majority' were Maori.¹³⁷ Of the initial 17 shareholders in the Goldfield, 14 were Maori, one was a half-caste, and two Maori later purchased interests. Maori were all but one of the 14 owners of Omahu No. 1, seven of the ten owners of Native, all 15 owners of

¹²⁹ Frederick Whitaker to Minister of Mines, 26 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

¹³⁰ *Thames Star*, 25 November 1880, p. 2.

¹³¹ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Miners' Rights Butt Books November-December 1880, BBAV 11533/1a-1f, ANZ-A.

¹³² *Te Aroha Miner*, n.d., cited in *Thames Star*, 6 December 1880, p. 2.

¹³³ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 6 December 1880, p. 3.

¹³⁴ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Butt-Books of Miners' Rights 1880-1881, BBAV 11533/1a-1i, ANZ-A.

¹³⁵ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Notices of Marking Out Claims 1880-1881, nos. 74, 76, 99, plus Treaty of Waitangi claim, BBAV 11557/1a; nos. 131, 132, 162-164, 188, 189, 204, 208, 221, 226, 227, 354, 378-380, BBAV 11557/1b, ANZ-A.

¹³⁶ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 190, 212, BBAV 11567/1a; Plaintiff Book 1880-1898, 2/1880, BBAV 11547/1a, ANZ-A.

¹³⁷ Own Correspondent, *Auckland Weekly News*, 22 January 1881, p. 21.

New Zealand, and all 16 owners of Hapapiu, in which another five Maori would buy shares. Eleven of the 16 owners of the Treaty of Waitangi were Maori.¹³⁸ Some of those who had tried to obstruct the opening of the field became shareholders: for example, Akuhata Mokena was one in Morgan's Claim along with Aihe Pepene, the other owners being Pakeha.¹³⁹

In January 1881, a small rush near the mouth of the Waiorongomai Valley involved 'quite a number' of Maori.¹⁴⁰ All 14 owners of Taute and all 15 of Buck Reef were Maori.¹⁴¹ In the prospecting that led to his most important discovery, further up the valley, Werahiko was assisted by Karaka Kamura, Parata, and Hori Aperahama.¹⁴² Fewer Maori had shares in Waiorongomai mines, although they comprised all 15 owners of Three Brothers (the former Buck Reef), all four owners of Union Jack No. 2, nine of the 14 owners of Queen of Beauty No. 2, and four of the six owners of Smile of Fortune.¹⁴³ By April 1882, a solicitor held 'fifteen thirtieth shares in the Three Brothers Claim' for the owners in trust 'without power of sale of transfer by them or any of them without my written consent first being had and obtained'. They were to receive 'all profits and benefits', but control of the remaining half of the interest was left to his discretion. If extra ground was taken up, the owners were 'entitled to an equal interest pro rata'.¹⁴⁴

Maori shareholding after the early 1880s was almost non-existent, for reasons that were probably in part financial and in part reflected the fact that few Maori worked deep underground.¹⁴⁵ Three who had been shareholders in the 1880-1881 rush renewed their miners' rights in 1882, and six who were not part owners of claims took out rights in 1882, as did

¹³⁸ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 203-206, 211, 216, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.

¹³⁹ *Thames Star*, 29 November 1880, p. 2.

¹⁴⁰ Own Correspondent, *Auckland Weekly News*, 29 January 1881, p. 9.

¹⁴¹ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 226, 226, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁴² Te Aroha Warden's Court, Memorials for Registration 1880, BBAV 11559/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁴³ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 231, 241, 245, BBAV 11567/1a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folios 13, 48, BBAV 11500/9a, ANZ-A.

¹⁴⁴ Joshua Cuff to Mining Registrar, 19 April 1882, Te Aroha Warden's Court, General Correspondence 1882, BBAV 11584/1c, ANZ-A.

¹⁴⁵ See paper on Maori and mining.

another two in 1883; no others were recorded before the end of 1886.¹⁴⁶ Five of the eight owners of the Morgan, at Tui in 1888, were Maori.¹⁴⁷

Some Maori invested in companies. For example, Karauna Hou, whose active involvement was limited to assisting 12 other Maori peg out a claim,¹⁴⁸ held 261 (out of 15,000) shares in the Bonanza Company.¹⁴⁹ When a company was formed to erect a battery at Te Aroha, Maori took 'a great interest', and three, Taipari, Mokena, and Rewi Mokena, bought shares.¹⁵⁰ A 'half-caste', William Grey Nicholls,¹⁵¹ was briefly a director of the Te Aroha No. 1 South Company, retiring when he ceased to hold the requisite number of shares.¹⁵²

Most rangatira, like most Pakeha businessmen and investors, were sleeping partners, viewing mining as a way of making money, either from speculating in shares or from receiving revenue from their land. Mokena owned shares in three Te Aroha claims,¹⁵³ but the only record of him mining was when, aged 84, he was seen 'putting in a shift right manfully' in the Whakapipi.¹⁵⁴ Taipari, who had shares in several areas from the 1860s to the 1880s,¹⁵⁵ never worked any of his interests. In two examples from November 1880, his interest in the Smile of Fortune was 'represented by'

¹⁴⁶ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Butt Books of Miners' Rights 1882-1886, BBAV 11533/1i-1o, ANZ-A.

¹⁴⁷ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 325, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁴⁸ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Notices of Marking Out Claims, December 1880, no. 99, BBAV 11557/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁴⁹ *New Zealand Gazette*, 20 January 1881, p. 111.

¹⁵⁰ *Te Aroha Miner*, n.d., reprinted in *Thames Star*, 28 January 1881, p. 2; *New Zealand Gazette*, 28 April 1881, p. 476.

¹⁵¹ See paper on his life.

¹⁵² *Thames Advertiser*, 6 December 1880, p. 2; *Waikato Times*, 24 February 1881, p. 2.

¹⁵³ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 190, 212, BBAV 11567/1a; Licensed Holdings Grant Book 1880-1882, folio 62, BBAV 11549/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁵⁴ *Thames Star*, 25 January 1881, p. 2.

¹⁵⁵ For examples of his shareholdings at Thames, see Thames Warden's Court, Thames Claims Register 1868-1869, nos. 479, 714, BACL 14397/2a; Thames Claims Register 1869, nos. 1465, 1821, 1828, 1837, BACL 14397/4a; Thames Claims Register 1884-1886, nos. 1377, 1424, BACL 14397/14a, ANZ-A; for examples of his shareholdings at Coromandel, see Coromandel Warden's Court, Instruments, 1821/36, 1828/40, AAAE 15180/4a, ANZ-A.

Henare Tutamure and Hori More's interests was 'represented by' Tati Netana;¹⁵⁶ in other words, these 'representatives' worked these interests (neither were shareholders in their own right). Some Maori who recorded their occupation as 'miner' when registering as shareholders were nothing of the sort. For instance, Aihe Pepene,¹⁵⁷ Akuhata Mokena, and William Grey Nicholls, three of the four Maori who were shareholders of the Bonanza Company; Rewi Mokena, who had done a little prospecting, correctly gave his occupation as 'farmer'.¹⁵⁸ William Grey Nicholls was briefly a prospector at Tui during the rush,¹⁵⁹ but did not work in any of the many claims he partly owned at Te Aroha and Ohinemuri in the 1880s and 1890s,¹⁶⁰ being far too busy supervising his large landholdings and being a leading member (including chairman for five years) of the Ohinemuri County Council.¹⁶¹ Similarly, some Pakeha shareholders who claimed to be miners included Nicholas Cleary,¹⁶² who was a policeman, and James

¹⁵⁶ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Notices of Marking Out Claims 1880, no. 49, BBAV 11557/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁵⁷ See paper on his life.

¹⁵⁸ *New Zealand Gazette*, 20 January 1881, pp. 110-111.

¹⁵⁹ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 8 December 1880, p. 3.

¹⁶⁰ Te Aroha Warden's Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 177, BBAV 11567/1a; Licensed Holdings Grant Book 1880-1882, folio 55, BBAV 11549/1a; Thames Warden's Court, Register of Licensed Holdings 1885-1886, folio 74, BACL 14397/16a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1887-1891, folio 180, BACL 14355/1a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1888-1892, folios 97, 182, BACL 14355/2a; Register of Applications for Licensed Holdings and Special Claims 1887-1896, folios 2, 96, 172, BACL 14376/1a; Register of Applications for Licensed Holdings and Special Claims 1896-1897, no. 542, BACL 14376/2a; Register of Licensed Holdings and Special Claims 1896-1897, folios 19, 60, BACL 14355/4a; Paeroa Warden's Court, Register of Special Claims 1895-1896, folios 39, 195, ZAAP 13294/1b; Register of Special Claims 1896-1897, folio 40, ZAAP 13294/2a; Thames Warden's Court, Applications for Licensed Holdings and Special Claims 1896-1897, 107/1896, 128/1896, AAAE 14350/1a; Paeroa Warden's Court, Register of Licensed Holdings and Special Claims 1896-1898, folios 49, 63, 68, 69, ZAAP 13293/2a, ANZ-A.

¹⁶¹ See paper on his life.

¹⁶² See *Thames Star*, 23 November 1880, p. 2.

Craig,¹⁶³ who was an auctioneer and commission agent.¹⁶⁴ And Eliza Cartwright certainly did not do any mining.¹⁶⁵

In 1910 John McCombie recalled ‘a good deal of ill-feeling’ on opening day ‘owing to some Europeans buying miners’ rights for, and paying Maoris to represent them at the pegging. One man had seven Maoris on his staff of peggers, and this meant that he was entitled to eight shares when the allotment took place. A lot of bickering resulted over the allocation of shares, but eventually matters were squared up’.¹⁶⁶ Complaints were more common over sleeping partners not paying for working the claim, sometimes by providing a ‘representative’. For instant, one Maori, who had shares in the Native, sued another shareholder, a Pakeha, for not working his interest, and won.¹⁶⁷

Three Maori shareholders did not work their interests because of their gender. Like the small number of Pakeha women who owned shares, the latter were probably bought on the advice of their husbands. Lavinia Johnson,¹⁶⁸ originally Rawinia Manukau, of the Uriwha hapu of Ngati Tamatera, had interests with other Maori in two claims in December 1880.¹⁶⁹ As her English husband had mined in Coromandel in 1863, prospected at Ohinemuri in 1866 and at Karangahake between 1868 and 1875, and then held shares in Ohinemuri mines,¹⁷⁰ he was competent to advise her on suitable claims in which to invest. Ema Lipsey¹⁷¹ had shares

¹⁶³ See *Thames Advertiser*, 8 December 1880, p. 3.

¹⁶⁴ *New Zealand Gazette*, 23 March 1882, p. 490.

¹⁶⁵ *New Zealand Gazette*, 1 June 1882, p. 799.

¹⁶⁶ John McCombie, ‘Early Days of Te Aroha’, *New Zealand Herald*, 2 December 1910, p. 7.

¹⁶⁷ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 205, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A; Te Aroha Warden’s Court, *Thames Star*, 21 January 1881, p. 2.

¹⁶⁸ See paper on Lavinia and Henry Dunbar Johnson.

¹⁶⁹ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Notices of Marking Out Claims 1880, no. 76, BBAV 11557/1a; Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 204, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A; Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book, no. 14, p. 186.

¹⁷⁰ Obituary of Henry Dunbar Johnson, *Observer*, 23 February 1924, p. 5; Henry Dunbar Johnson to Under-Secretary for Mines, 29 July 1920, Mines Department, MD 20/1135, 21/1, ANZ-W; *Thames Advertiser*, 24 September 1878, p. 3; Thames Warden’s Court, Report Book of Mining Inspector, no. 2, 1876-1878, folio 12, BACL 14451/1a; Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Ohinemuri Claims 1875, folios 26, 30, 58, BBAV 11568/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁷¹ See paper on George Lipsey and his family.

in two claims;¹⁷² her husband had been at Thames since November 1867, where he had held interests in at least two mines, and speculated in several Te Aroha and Waiorongomai mines.¹⁷³ The third woman, Merea Wikiriwhi,¹⁷⁴ one of the owners of a Tui claim in December 1880,¹⁷⁵ would have been advised by her common law husband, George Thomas Wilkinson, the native agent,¹⁷⁶ who, although primarily concerned with his official tasks, was sufficiently interested in mining to have purchased a share in an Ohinemuri claim during the 1875 rush.¹⁷⁷

Because of the loss of some records and the inconsistent or unreadable spelling of some names, it is impossible give a precise total of the number of Maori who had earlier owned shares elsewhere. At least eight held shares in early Thames claims, at least five in Coromandel ones (at the end of the 1860s), and at least 18 in Ohinemuri.¹⁷⁸ Some who worked their Te Aroha claims had prior experience in mining, usually at Ohinemuri: in the Goldfield, at Tui, with the exception of one Pakeha all the shareholders were ‘Ohinemuri natives, who go about their work in a manner which would be no discredit to a European party of miners’.¹⁷⁹ Two months later, ‘a number’ of Ngati Hako were mining ‘at the south end of the Aroha

¹⁷² Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 192, BBAV 11567/1a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folio 62, BBAV 11500/9a, ANZ-A.

¹⁷³ Thames Warden’s Court, Miners’ Rights Register 1867-1868, no. 2111, BACL 14358/1a; Claims Register 1868, folios 15, 83, BACL 14397/1a; Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folios 192, 254, BBAV 11567/1a; Complaint Book 1880-1898, 2/1880, BBAV 11547/1a; Licensed Holdings Grant Book 1880-1882, folios 21, 62, BBAV 11549/1a, ANZ-A; *New Zealand Gazette*, 30 December 1880, p. 1797, 20 January 1881, p. 111, 28 April 1881, p. 476, 23 March 1882, p. 490, 27 April 1882, p. 647, 20 September 1883, p. 1345.

¹⁷⁴ See paper on Merea Wikiriwhi and George Thomas Wilkinson.

¹⁷⁵ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 178, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁷⁶ See paper on Merea Wikiriwhi and George Thomas Wilkinson.

¹⁷⁷ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Ohinemuri Claims 1875, folio 6, BBAV 11568/1a, ANZ-A.

¹⁷⁸ References are far too detailed to list; the information was obtained from Thames, Coromandel, and Ohinemuri Warden’s Court registers and instruments, BACL 14472/1a, 14376/2a, 14397/2a, 14397/5a, 14397/9a, 14396/1a; BACL 13819/1a; ZAA 1159/1a, 1160/1a; BBAV 11568/1a; AAAE 15180/1a-4a, ANZ-A.

¹⁷⁹ Own Reporter, ‘Te Aroha Goldfield’, *Thames Advertiser*, 26 January 1881, p. 3.

mountain', presumably at the entrance to the Waiorongomai valley.¹⁸⁰ The presence of Maori from Ohinemuri may have annoyed some Ngati Rahiri, who in 1877 had provoked conflict with them.¹⁸¹ In the Kuku, at Tui, 'great rivalry' occurred: soon after work started, 'the shareholders disagreed as to the mode of working the ground', resulting in two tunnels 'being driven parallel to each other - one by the members of one tribe, and the other by those of another'.¹⁸² Which hapu were involved was not recorded. These rival tunnels would not have been driven for very long because of the abrupt ending of mining there after the murder of Himiona Haira.¹⁸³

'A large number of natives from all parts' were present when the goldfield opened, presumably meaning from Thames, Ohinemuri and Piako rather than further afield.¹⁸⁴ It is not possible to trace the normal place of residence of many Maori, partly because their names were sometimes incompletely recorded (for example, Hori and Paora), were sometimes wrongly spelt, or did not appear in any other record apart from one register; and some, confusingly, had alternative names. As only the important members of iwi and hapu normally gave evidence in the land court, many names did not appear in that invaluable source, which did record the place or places of residence. Note 'places': many led a peripatetic life, and may not have been at their main abode when the goldfield opened. Nevertheless, it is possible to determine the main residence of 96 of the 131 Maori who were shareholders in Te Aroha claims in 1880 and 1881 (absolute certainty in identifying a few of these 96 is uncertain, for the reasons given above). In 1880 one lived at each of Piako, Morrinsville, Puriri, and Tamahere, eight lived at Thames, 13 at Matamata, 17 at Te Aroha, and 54 at Ohinemuri.¹⁸⁵ One of those living at Te Aroha in 1880 was Hone Werahiko, who previously had lived at Rotorua and on the East Coast.¹⁸⁶

Hapu affiliation can be traced in fewer cases, and even then, because of intermarriage, it is not always certain which was the main affiliation. The

¹⁸⁰ Ohinemuri Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 22 March 1881, p. 3.

¹⁸¹ See paper on Ngati Rahiri versus Ngati Tamatera.

¹⁸² *Thames Advertiser*, 26 January 1881, p. 3.

¹⁸³ See paper on the Te Aroha murder.

¹⁸⁴ Frederick Whitaker to Minister of Mines, 26 November 1880, Mines Department, MD 1, 12/353, ANZ-W.

¹⁸⁵ This information was obtained from the Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books, *Thames Advertiser*, *Thames Star*, *Waikato Times*, and *Thames Electoral Roll*, 1879.

¹⁸⁶ See paper on his life.

land court minute books, the principal source of this information, recorded multiple memberships because claimants provided the appropriate affiliation and ancestry to justify claims to share ownership of particular blocks of land. For example, Matiu Poono, a rangatira living at Thames, was of Ngati Maru, but he also claimed membership of the following hapu: Ngati Hako, Ngati Wharo, Ngati Potu, Uriwha, Ngati Rahiri, Ngati Rangipakihi, and Ngati Ua of Ngati Naunau.¹⁸⁷ With this in mind, and listing only principal iwi and hapu, there were two Ngati Whanaunga, seven Ngati Maru, eight Ngati Hako, 12 Ngati Haua, 15 Ngati Koi, 16 Ngati Tamatera, and 19 Ngati Rahiri, as well as one each of Waikato, Ngati Rangi, Ngapuhi, Ngati Hine, and Arawa.¹⁸⁸

WORKING THEIR CLAIMS

Kenrick's first report noted that on opening day about 20 Maori took out miners' rights and began 'to work as miners'.¹⁸⁹ Maori and Pakeha hunted for the mother lode that had produced the loose gold-bearing stone found by Werahiko, and immediately after the opening several prospectors, including a Maori who was 'one of the mates' of an experienced Pakeha miner, found 'good stone' in a creek near the Prospectors' Claim.¹⁹⁰ Pakeha and Maori shared ownership of several claims; in the United, a half-caste, James Nicholls,¹⁹¹ and his Pakeha brother-in-law, Charles John Dearle,¹⁹² were partners.¹⁹³ Taipari's son-in-law, Hamiora Mangakahia,¹⁹⁴ led a party that pegged out ground on the first spur to the south of Prospectors' Spur.¹⁹⁵ In January 1881, 'a number' of Maori 'created a little excitement'

¹⁸⁷ Maori Land Court, Auckland Minute Book no. 2, p. 294; Coromandel Minute Book no. 4, p. 330; Hauraki Minute Books, no. 6, pp. 81, 510; no. 8, p. 453; no. 10, p. 163; no. 11, p. 290; no. 13, p. 7; no. 14, pp. 1, 12, 52.

¹⁸⁸ This information obtained from Maori Land Court, Auckland, Coromandel, and Hauraki Minute Books.

¹⁸⁹ Harry Kenrick to Minister of Justice, 6 December 1880, reprinted in *Thames Star*, 15 December 1880, p. 2.

¹⁹⁰ *Thames Star*, 27 November 1880, p. 2.

¹⁹¹ See paper on William Nicholls.

¹⁹² See paper on Alice Grey Dearle.

¹⁹³ Special Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 1 December 1880, p. 3.

¹⁹⁴ See paper on Maori land in Hauraki.

¹⁹⁵ *Te Aroha Miner*, 2 December 1880, reprinted in *Thames Star*, 3 December 1880, p. 2.

by announcing that they had “struck it heavy,” and hawking about a very fair specimen which they claimed they had taken from their claim.... In fossicking about on the hill behind Mr Geo. Lipsey’s house, they picked up a quartz boulder, which, on being broken, was found to contain nice gold. They immediately pegged out a claim of fifteen men’s ground, and today they have been very busy tunnelling for the purpose of cutting the leader from which they believe the boulder was broken.¹⁹⁶

Shortly afterwards, Maori took up a second claim nearby.¹⁹⁷ Because, like many Pakeha, their skills were elementary, several claims with a majority of Maori shareholders also had a small number of experienced Pakeha miners, one of whom normally acted as the manager. For example, at Tui, in the Omaha No. 1, Charles Collins, the only Pakeha, who had some experience as a miner,¹⁹⁸ can be assumed to have fulfilled this role.¹⁹⁹ John Redman, an early Thames miner,²⁰⁰ managed the Native.²⁰¹ In the Goldfield, the experienced Clement Augustus Cornes,²⁰² the solitary Pakeha, was the manager, and would have supervised driving the ‘well-timbered’ adit.²⁰³ There were also some claims with no Pakeha miners as manager: the New Zealand, also at Tui, was worked ‘under the management of one of the local chiefs of some pretensions known as Grace’,²⁰⁴ whose correct name is not known.

In December 1880, there was a small rush to the Tui area after some Maori, who had pegged out the Te Aroha Atai discovered ‘a large reef

¹⁹⁶ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 6 January 1881, p. 3.

¹⁹⁷ *Thames Advertiser*, 12 January 1881, p. 3.

¹⁹⁸ Thames Warden’s Court, Register of Miners’ Rights 1867-1868, no. 28, BACL 14358/1a, ANZ-A; *Thames Star*, 7 January 1881, p. 2, 4 March 1881, p. 2.

¹⁹⁹ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 204, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.

²⁰⁰ See Thames Warden’s Court, Register of Miners’ Rights 1868, no. 13211, BACL 14358/2a, ANZ-A.

²⁰¹ *Thames Advertiser*, 10 May 1881, p. 2.

²⁰² See paper on his life.

²⁰³ *Thames Advertiser*, 26 January 1881, p. 3, 10 May 1881, p. 2; *Waikato Times*, 7 May 1881, p. 2.

²⁰⁴ *Waikato Times*, 7 May 1881, p. 2.

showing gold'.²⁰⁵ Most of the 15 prospectors who located the first reefs there were Maori.²⁰⁶ Kenrick later described the Tui area as 'a favourite with the Natives, who were largely interested in most of the claims, doing a considerable amount of work'.²⁰⁷ By January they had established 'quite a village' on the spur where the gold had been found and were 'most sanguine of getting rich stone'.²⁰⁸ So many were mining at Tui, and to a lesser extent elsewhere, that after the first rush subsided and many Pakeha had left it was estimated that 'fully one quarter' of the remaining miners were Maori.²⁰⁹ That many intended to mine rather than speculate was indicated by a report that 'the native owners of the Goldfield Claim report another splendid prospect from the solid reef. They are not desirous of selling, being quite satisfied that their lode is a payable one'.²¹⁰ Of course some already knew, or quickly learnt, the speculative ways of the Pakeha: for instance, O'Halloran wrote that one party had 'taken up a claim of ten men's ground above the Bonanza, and named it the Waihou. It appears to me they are doing mere shepherding, the only work done during the past month has been stripping of the large reef in half a dozen places'.²¹¹ (Shepherding meant doing the minimum amount of work to avoid forfeiture.)

In the Tui district in particular, Maori progressed beyond mere surface prospecting. For example, by mid-January 1881 the 14 working the Goldfield under the guidance of Cornes were using dynamite to excavate 'hard blue stone' from the face of the drive.²¹² During the following week they drove a 30-foot tunnel, 'timbered-up to the face in a substantial manner'. Cornes was about 'to start a low level tunnel, in order to employ the whole of the natives, who at present cannot be all profitably employed in the one tunnel'.²¹³ By early February, they had driven on the lode for 35 feet.²¹⁴ After the murder of Himiona Haira, who was mining at Tui, that locality was abandoned by Maori, but by May Kenrick was 'glad to say' that

²⁰⁵ *Te Aroha Miner*, cited in *Thames Star*, 9 December 1880, p. 3.

²⁰⁶ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 8 December 1880, p. 3.

²⁰⁷ Harry Kenrick to Under-Secretary, Gold Fields, 2 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, H-17, p. 13.

²⁰⁸ *Thames Star*, 13 January 1881, p. 2.

²⁰⁹ *Te Aroha Miner*, 20 January 1881, reprinted in *Thames Star*, 21 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹⁰ *Te Aroha Miner*, 3 February 1881, reprinted in *Thames Star*, 3 February 1881, p. 2.

²¹¹ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 28 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹² Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 19 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹³ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 26 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹⁴ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 4 February 1881, p. 3.

they appeared 'to have got over their scare' and were 'gradually returning to their claims'.²¹⁵ Shortly afterwards, the Goldfield was noted as being 'another claim' there that was 'in a good measure worked by natives'; they had driven upon two reefs, one of the drives being 42 feet in length and 'well-timbered', and there was about 20 tons of quartz ready for crushing.²¹⁶

Where unaided by men with more experience, problems sometimes occurred because Maori lacked more specialized skills. For instance, in January 1881, when the mining inspector visited the Tui mines, after inspecting three of the Maori mines he 'ordered work to be suspended, and not resumed until an experienced miner had been appointed to the charge of each'. He

was compelled to take these steps in the interests of safety, the claims not being properly timbered up for such dangerous country. He explained to the natives (through an interpreter) the reason he had ordered operations to be suspended, they at once saw the necessity of the steps taken, and promised to employ a competent man in each claim.²¹⁷

As with amateur Pakeha miners, their lack of detailed knowledge of mineralogy could cause unnecessary excitement; for example, O'Halloran was told 'that the Goldfield had struck something good, but on making enquiries I found that only some mineralized stone had been obtained, and the native shareholders believing that the mineral was gold, reported that they had struck the precious metal'.²¹⁸

PROSPECTING FURTHER AFIELD

The opening of the Te Aroha goldfield encouraged Maori to prospect nearby areas. In December 1880, some explored up-river at Waiharakeke.²¹⁹ The following month, 'several parties' were prospecting above Matamata.²²⁰ This was an area devoid of gold, which is not a reflection on their lack of knowledge, for much more experienced Pakeha prospectors exploring this

²¹⁵ Harry Kenrick to Under-Secretary, Gold Fields, 2 May 1881, *AJHR*, 1881, H-17, p. 13.

²¹⁶ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Waikato Times*, 7 May 1881, p. 2.

²¹⁷ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 15 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹⁸ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 19 January 1881, p. 3.

²¹⁹ *Thames Star*, 10 December 1880, p. 2.

²²⁰ *Thames Advertiser*, 12 January 1881, p. 3.

locality were also unaware of its true potential.²²¹ These Pakeha reported that Maori living there had ‘all caught the gold fever, and wanted to gain as much information as possible from the Pakehas regarding the precious metal’.²²²

In January 1881, Maori started exploring Waiorongomai, and were the majority of those working there by April.²²³ After Werahiko, assisted by three other Maori, discovered gold later in the year, Maori brought out the first specimens for testing and took shares in many of the first claims.²²⁴ ‘Morgan and the natives’, presumably a reference to a party organized by Rewi Mokena, made the first track from Te Aroha to Werahiko’s find.²²⁵ But involvement in mining there was minimal once claims were pegged out. Those with shareholdings made some profit from selling these. For instance, Charles Stanislaus Stafford²²⁶ on the same day purchased one share from a Maori and another from a Pakeha in the same claim, paying the former £1 and the latter £5.²²⁷ In the previous year, Stafford had bought six shares in another claim from one Maori for £42 20s and sold one of these for £5 to another, benefiting both Maori.²²⁸

Some Maori joined the rush at the Tiki, near Coromandel township, in March 1881. The *Coromandel Mail* reported that ‘about a dozen’ who had arrived from Te Aroha after hearing ‘of the rich character of the Tiki goldfield’ had begun prospecting immediately.²²⁹ The names of these prospectors cannot now be traced, but some who explored other areas are known.²³⁰ At least 12 Maori shareholders in claims in the Te Aroha area

²²¹ For example, Peter Ferguson: *Thames Advertiser*, 28 December 1880, p. 3.

²²² *Thames Star*, 19 January 1881, p. 2.

²²³ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 219, BBAV 11567/1a ANZ-A; Own Correspondent, ‘Te Aroha Goldfield’, *Thames Advertiser*, 14 April 1881, p. 3.

²²⁴ *Thames Star*, 14 October 1881, p. 2.

²²⁵ *Thames Star*, 22 October 1881, p. 3.

²²⁶ See paper on Harry and Charles.

²²⁷ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folio 13, BBAV 11500/9a; Transfers and Assignments 1883, nos. 490, 491, BBAV 11581/4a, ANZ-A.

²²⁸ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folios 16, 19, 20, BBAV 11500/9a; Transfers and Assignments 1882, nos. 170, 200, BBAV 11581/1a, ANZ-A.

²²⁹ *Coromandel Mail*, 12 March 1881, p. 5.

²³⁰ See paper on Maori and mining.

later had shares in Ohinemuri ones, eight had shares in claims from Puriri to Waiomu, and one had shares in Coromandel.²³¹

One of those who prospected Te Aroha with Hone Werahiko was his future father-in-law, Hoera Te Mimiha,²³² who in early 1890 ‘unburdened himself of a secret, namely, the existence of a rich gold reef in the neighbourhood of the New Find ground’. According to a Waiorongomai correspondent, he had

lately been showing rich specimens, said to have been taken from the reef quite recently, and all he requires is a modest £2,000, to place his friends in possession of this future Eldorado. It would be risky to state that he is to get this sum, but certain preliminaries have been gone through, and a well-equipped party, headed by Mimiha, intend to start ... on the track of this payable gold reef.²³³

That the *Te Aroha News* ignored his claim suggests that he was seen as attempting to extract money from the gullible. Nothing further was heard of this reputed rich reef.

The mining boom of the 1890s revived interest in prospecting, a Maori syndicate taking up the Manukawa claim in the Mangakino Creek area. Although the reef gave good values, they did ‘nothing systematic or of any value’, and the ground was soon ‘protected and not being worked’.²³⁴ This claim was unsuccessful, the fate of all in this locality.

INCOME FROM OWNING GOLDFIELD LAND

Maori were well aware of the financial advantages of owning land. In February 1880, for example, Reha Aperahama²³⁵ advertised in the Thames press demanding the payment of a license fee of £1 from all those digging

²³¹ References are far too detailed to list; the information was obtained from Thames, Coromandel, and Paeroa Warden’s Court registers, BACL 14452/1a, 14376/1a, 14376/2a, 14376/3a, 14397/16a, 14397/14a, 14397/15a, 14397/17a, 14397/18a, 14350/1a, 14350/48, 14355/1a, 14355/2a, 14355/4a; ZAAN 1161/1a; ZAAP 13294/1b, 13294/2a, 13293/1a, 13293/2a, ANZ-A.

²³² See paper on his life.

²³³ Waiorongomai Correspondent, *Waikato Times*, 11 February 1890, p. 2.

²³⁴ *Thames Advertiser*, 9 December 1896, p. 3.

²³⁵ See paper on his life.

for kauri gum in the Waitawheta Valley, his justification being that a portion of that area belonged to Ngati Rahiri.²³⁶ In early November a reporter met one 'Morgan', meaning Rewi Mokena, a partner in the Prospectors' Claim: 'On my asking him if he was going to work, he answered with a "child-like and bland smile" that the pakeha might work but he would make plenty of money and live at his house. Truly these children of the soil are becoming highly civilized'.²³⁷ No doubt he had been advised by his brother-in-law George Lipsey of the benefits of having a goldfield on his land. His father, equally well advised, had quickly arranged for the surveying of what became the Morgantown portion of Te Aroha.²³⁸ After the opening, it was reported that as 'old Morgan' was 'feeling a little jealous of Lipsey getting sections laid off on his land' he was offering 'to drain and form a road in order that more sections may be laid off'.²³⁹ Kenrick's first report on the field, written on 6 December, gave a different slant:

The owners have behaved in the most liberal manner in respect to reserves - consenting to a block being set aside for Government Buildings, schools, churches, hospital, and cemetery, the land being inalienable. I pointed out to the natives the necessity for draining and forming some of the streets, and that as it was for their benefit, they should bear the expense. They have agreed to this, and are at present engaged in draining and forming one street, and clearing another.²⁴⁰

The other half of the township, granted to Mokena's daughter Ema and her elder children and known as Lipseytown, was surveyed to provide housing on 'the gentle slope around Mr Lipsey's dwelling-house'. Adjacent was 'a Maori reserve the property of the native policeman', Te Meke Ngakuru,²⁴¹ with 'some splendid sites for houses'.²⁴² Immediately after the opening, the owners were 'throwing open more of their reserves on the line

²³⁶ Advertisement, *Thames Star*, 28 February 1880, p. 2.

²³⁷ Own Correspondent, *Bay of Plenty Times*, 11 November 1880, p. 2.

²³⁸ *Thames Star*, 10 November 1880, p. 2.

²³⁹ *Thames Star*, 1 December 1880, p. 2.

²⁴⁰ Harry Kenrick to Minister of Justice, 6 December 1880, reprinted in *Auckland Weekly News*, 18 December 1880, p. 9.

²⁴¹ See paper on the Aroha Block after 1880.

²⁴² *Thames Advertiser*, 1 November 1880, p. 3.

nearer the Ruakaka block'.²⁴³ The Thames solicitor acting for the Maori landowners arrived at the end of November and sought to have the restrictions on their inalienable reserves removed so that land outside the township could be leased for agricultural and garden purposes, but as the permanency of the goldfield was uncertain and officials regarded Ngati Rahiri as improvident, this was refused.²⁴⁴ Persistent attempts by Reha Aperahama to sell the inalienable Te Kawana block to meet his debts were likewise declined because 'the Government desire that the natives should not denude themselves of their land'.²⁴⁵ A policy that would change with time; the goldfield and the development of agriculture hastened by it would lead to the loss of almost all of Ngati Rahiri's land.²⁴⁶

For a while, goldfield revenue became an important source of income for the landowners. Early in February 1881, it was reported that they were 'anxiously awaiting the arrival of the Warden' so that they would 'receive from him the money collected as fees'.²⁴⁷ Delays were caused because of slow Treasury processes and disagreements amongst recipients about entitlements.²⁴⁸ As shopkeepers also wanted to know when the money would be paid, clearly they had provided goods on credit. 'The natives urge that the races come off this week, and they require money for the occasion, but until these payments are made they will have none'.²⁴⁹ One reporter commented that, when the division of money took place, 'we shall no doubt have some lively times',²⁵⁰ implying heavy drinking. Wilkinson reported that when the field was opened Maori were promised 'that as the amount would likely be larger than any succeeding quarter on account of the first

²⁴³ *Thames Advertiser*, 27 November 1880, p. 3.

²⁴⁴ *Thames Advertiser*, 27 November 1880, p. 3; H.E. Campbell to Harry Kenrick, 1 December 1880; G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 10 December 1880; Under-Secretary, Native Department, to Native Minister, 16 December 1880; note by Minister, 16 December 1880, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 13/86, ANZ-W

²⁴⁵ Under-Secretary, Native Office, to Native Minister, 13 November 1880, and note by Native Minister, 13 November 1880, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 13/86, ANZ-W.

²⁴⁶ See paper on the Aroha Block after 1880.

²⁴⁷ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 4 February 1881, p. 3; see also 'Te Aroha', *Thames Star*, 22 January 1881, p. 3.

²⁴⁸ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 4 February 1881, p. 3, 8 February 1881, p. 3; Te Aroha Correspondent, *Waikato Times*, 5 February 1881, p. 2.

²⁴⁹ Own Reporter, 'Te Aroha Goldfield', *Thames Advertiser*, 8 February 1881, p. 3.

²⁵⁰ Te Aroha Correspondent, *Waikato Times*, 5 February 1881, p. 2.

rush that the first quarter would be considered due directly after 31st Decr'. As they were complaining about the delay he obtained the money from the public account and requested a refund.²⁵¹ This money was not paid until the beginning of March, when it was expected that many Maori would come into the township.²⁵² The landowners received £1,167, but some of the revenue, £276 16s, went to the council.²⁵³ As anticipated by Wilkinson, the second payment, made in May, was only about £300.²⁵⁴

With the decline of the Te Aroha mines and the discovery of gold on Crown land in the Waiorongomai Valley, the amount of revenue paid to landowners declined. Changes to mining law also led to a decrease. Unlike other Hauraki fields, landowners did not receive income from mining leases as well as from miners' rights, and the Mining Act of 1886 meant that fewer miners were required to obtain rights, meaning, Wilkinson noted, that Ngati Rahiri were 'in a much worse position', especially as licensed holdings were permitted to work with fewer men than previously, again reducing their income.²⁵⁵

The amount of revenue varied from year to year, depending on the fortunes of the goldfield and the wider district. For example, 'Te Aroha Native Revenue' was recorded as being £377 11s 6d for 1880-1881, £861 for 1881-1882, £1,162 15s 4d for 1882-1883, and £789 19s 5d for 1883-1884.²⁵⁶ From these totals salaries and other costs connected with allocating the revenue were deducted, and increasingly more and more money went to local bodies and to Pakeha who bought the land, although often this change was hidden under 'Goldfields Revenue' or 'Native Revenue' or just 'Revenue'. Vouchers that would have indicated what each person received

²⁵¹ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 15 February 1881 (telegram), Mines Department, MD 1, 85/1006, ANZ-W; for Maori complaints, see *Thames Star*, 21 February 1881, p. 3.

²⁵² Te Aroha Correspondent, *Waikato Times*, 1 March 1881, p. 2; *Thames Star*, 3 March 1881, p. 2; *Thames Advertiser*, 4 March 1881, p. 2.

²⁵³ 'Native and Piako County Council Revenue', 25 November 1880 to 12 February 1881, Te Aroha Warden's Court, General Correspondence 1881, BBAV 11584/1b, ANZ-A.

²⁵⁴ *Thames Advertiser*, 19 May 1881, p. 3.

²⁵⁵ G.T. Wilkinson, 'Report on the question of Miners' Rights and other revenue payable to the Native owners of the Thames, Coromandel, Ohinemuri and Te Aroha Goldfields', 30 May 1889, Justice Department, J 1, 96/1548, ANZ-W.

²⁵⁶ Native Revenue, Hauraki: Te Aroha; Native Reserves Te Aroha, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 13/35b, ANZ-W.

have been destroyed,²⁵⁷ making precision impossible. Deducting amounts paid to officials or local bodies, the total payments to Maori (and increasingly to Pakeha owners of former Maori land) was £836 for 1881-1882, £1,123 7s 10d for 1882-1883, £764 9s 5d for 1883-1884, £752 10s 1d for 1884-1885, £512 7s 9d for 1885-1886, £620 14s 1d for 1886-1887, £629 19s 5d for 1887-1888, £878 13s 4d for 1888-1889, £720 12s 6d for 1889-1890, £408 12s 4d for 1890-1891, £461 17s 11d for 1891-1892, £536 15s 4d for 1892-1893, £304 9s for 1893-1894, £340 4s 4d for 1894-1895, £448 17s 11d for 1895-1896, £698 2s 6d for 1896-1897, £561 8s 5d in 1897-1898, £636 7s 10d for 1898-1899, and £291 16s for 1899-1900. In the latter years, these amounts were an increasingly small percentage of the total paid out. For instance, in 1897-1898, the £561 8s 5d paid to Maori and Pakeha landowners was out of a total of £1,366 13s 9d, the following year's £636 7s 10d was out of £1,775 10s 5d, and for 1899-1900 they received £291 16s for £623 4s 6d.²⁵⁸

Maori were very insistent on receiving their entitlements on time. In July 1888, the warden instructed that the £66 received for residence and business sites should be paid, less expenses incurred advertising notices of forfeiture.²⁵⁹ Delay in the payment (which had been approved) led those entitled to contact a parliamentarian, who reported that they were 'getting very impatient'.²⁶⁰ In mid-1888, Lipsey and six Maori owners petitioned parliament for £300 rent received from licensed holdings and sales of forfeited business and residence sites which had been paid to the county council.²⁶¹ Not till the following March were Wilkinson and the warden asked to consider their petition: when they decided in their favour, they received £345.²⁶²

Subsequently, the Minister of Mines was asked by Alfred Jerome Cadman, a future minister, 'under what Act, under what authority', had

²⁵⁷ 'Hauraki Goldfields Native Revenue, Treasury Statement Relative to Petitions', n.d. [October 1937], p. 35, Treasury, T 1, 40/71, ANZ-W.

²⁵⁸ 'Hauraki Goldfields Native Revenue, Treasury Statement Relative to Petitions', n.d. [October 1937], Treasury, T 1, 40/71, ANZ-W.

²⁵⁹ Warden to Under-Secretary, Mines Department, 23 July 1888, Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W.

²⁶⁰ J.B. Whyte to Colonial Secretary, 2 November 1888, Mines Department, MD 1, 6/14, Part 1, ANZ-W.

²⁶¹ *Te Aroha News*, 30 June 1888, p. 2; *AJHR*, 1888, I-3, p. 14.

²⁶² *Thames Star*, 11 July 1889, p. 2.

mining revenue been reduced. ‘The question was consequent upon the presentation of the petition from interested natives last year’. Cadman considered that, ‘if the law authorised the reduction, the natives were entitled to some compensation. He urged the Government to consider the matter promptly, because the longer it was delayed the greater would the compensation claim become’. He was told that the 1886 Act specified that licensed holdings and special claims were to be ‘granted at an acreage rate, and holders were not required to take out miners’ rights, but an acreage rate was paid’ to Maori landowners. As they ‘still claimed that every miner should hold a miner’s right’, he had instructed that in future ‘no special claim or licensed holdings should be granted on native land, but that every claim-owner should hold a miner’s right’.²⁶³ The warden enforced this rule for all new licenses,²⁶⁴ but as almost no mining or treatment was taking place on Maori land this concession did not assist many owners. In 1898, a solicitor was ‘called on’ by owners of land leased for a machine site at Tui, ‘bothering him about the rent (£10) now due’, and two years later the owners again agitated for payment.²⁶⁵

Allocating revenue was always difficult. For instance, in early 1889 £101 was undistributed,²⁶⁶ probably in part because of problems identifying and tracing owners.²⁶⁷ In September 1896, to assist his successors, Charles John Dearle, who had administered the allocation, provided a detailed list of all owners of reserve land at Omahu and their entitlements.²⁶⁸

Although after the first rush most Ngati Rahiri gained little from the goldfield, the Mokena family did benefit, particularly because a township was built on their land. When payments to particular Maori were specified, by far the largest amount went to the extended Mokena family. In 1884-1885, for example, £858 3s 7d was paid out: of this, Mokena Hou ‘and others’ received £79 2s plus another payment of £366 4s 11d, his son

²⁶³ *Te Aroha News*, 28 August 1889, p. 2.

²⁶⁴ *Thames Star*, 3 October 1889, p. 2.

²⁶⁵ Jackson and Russell to John Chambers, 20 January 1898, Letterbook no. 68, p. 599; Letterbook no. 75, p. 721, Jackson and Russell Papers, MS 360, Library of the Auckland Institute and War Memorial Museum.

²⁶⁶ Memorandum of Accountant to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 2 March 1889, Justice Department, J 1, 96/1548, ANZ-W.

²⁶⁷ See paper on Maori and goldfields revenue.

²⁶⁸ Memorandum by C.J. Dearle, 25 September 1896, Te Aroha Warden’s Court, General Correspondence 1896, BBAV 11584/5a, ANZ-W.

Ranapia received £1, his daughter Eta's husband Hare Renata 'and others' received £100 18s, and his daughter Ema Lipsey received £93 7s 8d.²⁶⁹ Akuhata and Rewi Mokena were subsumed under the 'others', but in future years received money under their own names. Between the quarter ending 30 December 1880 and that ending 31 March 1889, Mokena, his wife, his three sons, his daughter Eta and her husband, Ranapia's wife Raina Te Hemoate, and one other owner received £2,404 13s 4d from Morgan's Block. From the same quarter of 1880 to the quarter ending 31 December 1894, the revenue from Ema Lipsey's Block was £5,481 14s 8d.²⁷⁰ This block was owned by Ema and her first two children Ani and Akuhata, but her husband ensured that he had a legal right to share in the income by marrying her under Pakeha law on 6 November 1880, less than three weeks before the goldfield was proclaimed.²⁷¹ After receiving the first installment of revenue in February 1881 he gave a 'champagne splash' for his Pakeha friends.²⁷²

Dearle recorded that Mokena was responsible for distributing revenue amongst his family.²⁷³ Some should have been distributed to the 'others' who were minor owners of the land, but to what extent this was done is unknown; the absence of complaints may or may not be an indication that his distribution was regarded as fair. That Mokena shared Taipari's view of his own status as compared with that of the humbler members of his tribe was illustrated by an exchange in the land court in June 1880, when he was being questioned about the land his tribe claimed within the Ohinemuri goldfield. After indicating the boundary of the Ngati Rahiri block, he indicated that he was to get adjacent land for himself alone. When asked: 'Why did you take the large share and leave your tribe the small share?' he replied, in words which the clerk did not understand and therefore wrote down incorrectly, 'Nataku Whakakeke Koananoke te tangote'. He probably said: 'Mataku whakakeke - koa ana noki te tangata', a proverb whose English equivalent is along the lines of 'like it or lump it'. The next question

²⁶⁹ Native Revenue, Hauraki: Te Aroha; Native Reserves Te Aroha, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 13/35b, ANZ-W.

²⁷⁰ Waihi Warden's Court, Te Aroha Gold Field Native Land Blocks 1880-1893, BAFV 13781/1a, ANZ-A.

²⁷¹ Marriage Certificate of George Lipsey, 6 November 1880, 1880/2738, BDM.

²⁷² *Observer*, 19 February 1881, p. 236.

²⁷³ C.J. Dearle to Receiver of Gold Revenue, Te Aroha, 13 August 1883, Thames Warden's Court, Thames Native Agent's Letterbook 1883-1893, folio 40, BACL 14458/2a, ANZ-A.

was: ‘Your tribe then is nothing?’ He replied: ‘Epaiana’, really ‘E pai ana’, meaning ‘it’s all right’ or ‘fine’.²⁷⁴ From this exchange it was clear that Mokena felt that his mana entitled him to take the best land for himself, and, that being the case, it may be assumed that most of the money earned from his land and goldfield revenue remained with his family.

THE FINANCIAL STRUGGLES OF ONE INVESTOR

A Maori whose name was recorded as Paora Te Unga was the only Maori mining agent at Te Aroha; indeed he was the only Maori in Hauraki to be described as one. His name was correctly Paora Tiunga, a rangatira of Ngati Hako and other hapu.²⁷⁵ The confusion over the spelling of his name was caused by his signing as ‘Paora ti unga’ when pegging out three claims at Waiorongomai in late 1881.²⁷⁶ Holding shares in five claims, in two months he sold interests to five Pakeha and one Maori for a total of £132.²⁷⁷ He should have transferred more interests to five other Maori, who successfully sued him in April 1882 for ‘transfer of certain shares or their value’, totalling £154.²⁷⁸ In June, one whom he had not paid as required sued him again, and he was ‘ordered to pay the sum of £65/18/- on or before July 6th – or in default three months imprisonment with hard labour in

²⁷⁴ Evidence by Mokena Hou re Ohinemuri Goldfield, 9 June 1880: Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 12, pp. 354-355; translations by Tom Roa, University of Waikato.

²⁷⁵ See Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books, no. 10, pp. 84-85; no. 16, pp. 341, 346; no. 28, pp. 207-210, 216, 226; no. 29, pp. 18, 27; no. 32, pp. 173, 175-184; no. 33, pp. 141, 145, 173, 183-184; no. 35, pp. 172, 181-182; no. 36, pp. 148-149, 223; no. 46, pp. 115, 117, 132-136, 139; no. 47, pp. 64, 67, 76-77; no. 48, pp. 265-266, 268, 289; *Auckland Weekly News*, Supreme Court, 17 June 1909, p. 26 and 24 June 1909, p. 27, Paeroa Correspondent, 21 May 1913, p. 26; *Te Aroha News*, 30 October 1929, p. 1.

²⁷⁶ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Notices of Marking Out Claims 1881, nos. 328, 329, 356, BBAV 11556/1b, ANZ-A. For a magistrate recording his name as Te Uinga, see Thames Magistrate’s Court, Magistrate’s Notebook 1905-1911, p. 264, BAOL 13830/1b, ANZ-A.

²⁷⁷ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folios 16, 19, 21, 48, 55, BBAV 11500/9a; Transfers and Assignments 1882, nos. 170, 207, 209, 235, 268, 298, 299, BBAV 11581/1a, ANZ-A.

²⁷⁸ Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Complaint Book 1880-1898, 39, 41-44/1882, BBAV 11547/1a, ANZ-A.

Mount Eden Gaol'.²⁷⁹ The local newspaper explained why he had been taken to court:

A MAORI MINING AGENT – Paora Te Unga, who was brought up under a judgment summons at the Warden's Court on Tuesday, and ordered to satisfy the claim within one month, or to go to gaol for three months, appears to have acted as a sort of mining agent for a number of Maoris. At the close of the proceedings referred to, a number of complaints were laid against him for the recovery of Werahiko mining shares alleged to have been wrongly sold by him. It is maintained that these shares were held in trust, and sold without the consent of the owners, whilst on the other hand the defendant is understood to maintain that he had such an authority, but the shares having since gone up in value the authority is now sought to be denied.²⁸⁰

In court, Paora 'deposed that he had no money. He had received £75 since the judgment was obtained against him', but he had paid Edward O'Brien Moore, a storekeeper,²⁸¹ with part of this amount 'and Government had the balance'. By selling land to another Pakeha he had received the £75, 'but had promised the money or the land to Moore for a debt of £60. He had also given Moore a quarter share in the Queen of Beauty, according to a promise made before judgment was obtained against him. He had also given three quarters of a share' to a Maori

for a small loan, but of that interest a half share was held for Pineha's son, on account of a loan from the mother obtained soon after the field was opened, when he was working the Three Brothers. He sold his land at the Thames for £150, paid £50 to Moore, £60 to the Government, part of which was for an advance by [James] Mackay, and part for native duty. He received £75, and paid £50 out of it to Edward Moore. – The examination was continued at some length to show that defendant had sold mining interests and land since judgment had been obtained against him, but he had made no effort to satisfy the same.

²⁷⁹ Te Aroha Warden's Court, *Plaint Book 1880-1898*, 39/1882, entries for 1, 6 June 1882, BBAV 11547/1a, ANZ-A.

²⁸⁰ *Te Aroha Mail*, 10 June 1882, p. 2.

²⁸¹ See *Thames Advertiser*, 25 November 1880, p. 3, 30 November 1880, p. 3, 10 June 1882, p. 3, 23 October 1883, p. 2, 18 December 1883, p. 2; Supreme Court, *New Zealand Herald*, 23 October 1883, p. 6.

His failure to do so was why he was threatened with imprisonment if the debts were not paid.²⁸² Somehow he managed to settle his debts out of court,²⁸³ and was not imprisoned.

CONCLUSION

The experience of Paora Tiunga provided another illustration both of how many Maori seized the opportunities offered and also of how most (as with Pakeha) did not profit from these opportunities. For which the lack of success of the goldfield was largely responsible. In the short term, some Ngati Rahiri, notably the Mokena family, did well out of it, but as with all goldfields as the field faded so did the revenue received. Many Maori from all over Hauraki participated for a while, but their involvement ended as mining changed from surface to underground working.

²⁸² Warden's Court, *Te Aroha Mail*, 10 June 1882, p. 2.

²⁸³ Te Aroha Warden's Court, *Plaint Book 1880-1882*, 39, 41-44/1882, entries for 19 May 1882, 1 August 1882, 15 August 1882, BBAV 11547/1a, ANZ-A.